Our Children, Our Families Council

**Summary of Stakeholder Meetings
to Provide Input on Outcomes Framework**
November, 2015

In November 2015, Our Children, Our Families Council staff hosted three meetings for stakeholders and service providers to provide input on the November 6th version of the draft outcomes framework (see appendix for the Nov 6 version). During the meetings, an overview of the Our Children, Our Families Council and its charge to create an outcomes framework was provided, and then participants broke into small groups to provide feedback on the draft goals and measures in the framework. Below is a summary of the feedback received at those meetings, as well as notes from each meeting.

Attendees: approximately 90 people attended one of the three meetings

Participants were given a draft list of goals and measures and asked to rate them on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being highest level of support and 5 the lowest).

 Composite goals rating = 2.3
 Composite rating for measures related to ages 0-5 = 3.4
 Composite rating for measures related to ages 6-17 = 2.9
 Composite rating for measures related to ages 18-24 = 3.0
 Composite rating for measures related to families/community = 2.9

Summary of comments related to Goals:
- Language is very broad, ambitious and idealistic
- Need to ensure that "all" includes those beyond youth in public school and served by publicly-funded services; also need to ensure affirming equity lens
- Would like to see some goals related to desired systems changes
- Need to consider data beyond what is currently collected
- Housing seems to be missing and a huge factor in family stability
- Suggest adding a goal around accessibility to information and ability to make informed decisions
- Goal related to school success needs more definition and perhaps focus on opportunity
- Goal related to post-secondary and career paths: recognize that some students may choose paths directly into careers
- Goal related to health: include self confidence/resiliency, and reaching each individual's full capacity
- Goal related to economic security: needs some definition; should also include young adults not in families; should also include access to support services for families
- Goal related to family friendly: needs more detail/definition

Summary of comments related to all measures:
- Would like to see language affirming equity lens
- Would like to see some goals related to desired systems changes
- Need to consider data beyond what is currently collected

Summary of comments related to Measures for ages 0 to 5:
- Need more focus on infants ages 0 to 1
- Families need services beyond the educational setting
- Dental measure does not capture all health needs
- How many families are connected to services after receiving a developmental screening?

Summary of comments related to Measures for ages 6 to 17:
- Need more focus on exposure to trauma, community violence, Adverse Childhood Experiences
- Suggest more measures related to behavior, school climate, engagement in school, and quality of education
- Suggest adding more measures related to socio-emotional health
- Many measures related to school – could broaden scope beyond school to out of school time and other domains
- Suggest more measures for lower elementary grade students
- Measure related to body composition: Consider malnutrition and/or physical activity
- Measure related to proficiency in math and language arts: consider including other subjects such as STEM, arts, etc
- Measure related to being close to someone at school: consider a measure related to being close to someone in the community; caring adult relationship

Summary of comments related to Measures for ages 18 to 24:
- Suggest adding a measure related to health and mental health
- Suggest adding a measure related to exposure to trauma and violence
- Suggest adding a measure related to self-sufficiency/economic security
- Suggest adding a measure related to connectedness, caring relationships, etc.
- Measure related to degree completion: include students beyond SFUSD, perhaps City College (and remediation rates)

Summary of comments related to Measures for families/community:
- Suggest adding a measure related to exposure to trauma and violence
- Suggest adding more measures related to housing (housing stock, prices, shelter waitlists, etc.)
- Suggest adding measures related to access to open space, cultural institutions, afterschool, arts, fitness
- Suggest adding a measure related to food security
- Measure related to families feeling supported/valued: consider asking about accessibility and usability of services
- Contributing measure related to plans to move: also track numbers who have actually moved; incorporate mobility and migration of families

Notes from November 12th Meeting

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION OF GOALS
Group A's ratings (from a scale of 1-highest to 5-lowest): 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1
- Very ambitious
- Changing demographics can impact all goals
- Families need stability
- Need to focus on individuals having access and individualized approaches

- "all" needs to include those beyond public schools and city-funded programs
- Appropriate housing needs to be part of the picture
- Goal C: ensure it includes confidence in self; resiliency
- Need more detail and definitions for each goal

Group B's ratings: 3, 2, 2.5
- Missing connection to community
- Consider network access issue
- Leadership within the community
- Consider revision of F goal
- Revise E goal to say families blossom in a safe/nurturing environment
- Goal A: how do we define school success
- Goal C: mental health services (way to remove stigma and access)

Group C's ratings: 3, 3, 3, 3, 2
- Broad/vague
- More details on family friendly and community support
- Evidence-based?
- Doesn't feel rooted in reality (smallest # of children compared to other cities, statement of current state)
- Worried about inaction/lip service
- Curious about longevity/sustainability
- Language feels soft
- No mention of honoring culture
- Worried that there are no systems level goals; the system needs to support change

Group D's ratings: 2, 3, 3,1
- Would like a mission and Theory of Change vision to be better defined and articulated (and positive)
- Asset based vision
- Break down health related goal (too broad). Separate physical from mental/emotional
- Incorporate citywide and community wide health
- Define goals related to institutions
  Individual comments:

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION OF MEASURES OF SUCCESS
Ages 6-13 GROUP: 3,3,3,3,3,3,3, 2, 2, 2.5, 5
- Doesn't address goals B and C
- Doesn't spell out barriers/trauma
- Why dental caries and not medical homes?
- Missing stress, poverty, housing, ACES
- More around behavior, classroom climate, quality of education
- Not holistic enough and not focused on growth
- What is the unique contribution this council wants to make?
- What is the willingness to look at data collected by service providers, nonprofits, etc?

- Can't separate systems integration from outcomes framework
- Get more specific; link to goals

Ages 18-24 GROUP: 3, 3
- All measures need to consider TAY, especially considering violence/trauma
- Trauma team caseload students (school site mentors)
- Measure the system
- Need to include the readiness and training/workforce development; level of engagement at school
- Measuring connectedness
- Navigation skills
- Measuring "first steps"
- Individuals:
    - Need measures to address all of the three main (school, housing and jobs) and intersection (connectedness, navigation, productivity)
    - 9: graduation for all
    - 10: enrollment in school/job training/competent
    - 13: less homelessness
    - Add one re: access to opportunity/social emotional support

Family GROUP: 3, 4, 1.5, 3
- Include witnessing child maltreatment and violence in the community
- A lot of measure related to feeling safe (liquor stores, pedestrian safety, etc)
- How do you define stably housed and economically secure?
- Track homelessness
- Look at macro-level housing issues – housing stick, prices, shelter waitlists
- Incorporate food security and availability of healthy food
- Incorporate availability of affordable child care
- Like #17 – include difficulties and bureaucracy related to enrollment (huge barrier)
- What does a family friendly city look like? Accessibility to space, cultural institutions
- Focus on middle income family migration
- Shift "likely to move out" to have moved out
- Incorporate effects of high level in- and out migration /mobility
- Incorporate participation in school sports/afterschool activities
- Incorporate arts/ fitness (eg teachers/counselors devoted to these subjects)
- Disparities related to school fundraising

Notes from November 16th Meeting

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION OF GOALS
Group A: 2,3,3,2,2
- How will the goals be achieved? Too idealistic and not specific enough
- Pie in the sky; too broad

- Add a goal around accessibility to information and ability to make informed choices (ie housing, child care, jobs, etc.)
- Examine the word "all;" daunting to accomplish; how long do we need? What systems would be in place? What is the timeframe? What after 5 years?
- Include preschoolers specifically
- Infants and toddlers lack vocal advocates
- Define "transitional age"
- Feels ambitious. Terms are subjective
- Include families definition and perspective
- A & F: seem achievable
- C: add socially healthy

Group B: 2,2,2,2,2,2,2, 1, 3, 3
- B: Does not capture systemic change; not all youth go into post-secondary, can reach economic success without a degree or certificate
- Goals D & F: how do we consider young adults who are not in a family – needs to be reflected in the language
- Capturing data that is not currently being collected – needs to be considered- push ourselves to gather
- Ensure we capture rec space
- How are the systems being responsible/accountable instead of putting it all on the families

Group C: 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3
- Overall: Goals feel unrealistic due to the word "all"
- Goal C: all children should reach goal of full capacity/potential re: disabilities, illnesses
- Goal A: the opportunity for school success
- Goal B: post-secondary and/or career paths
- Goal D: all families have access to supports; quality of programs; overall too lofty of a goal
- Goal E: define the environmental context
- Goal F: clarity of statement; how does it relate to vision statement

Group D: 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3
- Goal B: what does success look like? Resources in comm.. schools; "success" and "succeed" – need more specific language
- Goal D: how to guarantee; what does economic security mean? (Housing, education, etc)
- Goal A: How do we define school success? How is it a reality?
- Where does housing fit in?
- Goals for decision makers and leadership; do goals mirror what is happening in government?
- Goal E: attainability of goals?

- Goal F: care the most about families in need (not necessarily all families); more activist approach to supporting families with children; How do you maintain ethnic diversity and how to define; affirmative action plan to maintain diversity?
- Goal C: Language breaking out TAY for youth; broaden to focus on health (medical, dental, drug and alcohol)
- Short-term goals in addition to long term

Group E: 1,1,2,2,3,1.5,
- Would like more affirming language around equity for goals
- Good alignment with YMCA's strategic planning process
- What does economically secure mean?
- Safe and nurturing environment – what does that mean? Perhaps it is too broad; needs more definition; maybe include safe and healthy
- Need to think about how everyone feels safe, especially groups of different socio-economic status living in the same place
- What does success mean in A & B? maybe change to academic success? Emphasize access to opportunity
- Language is broad
- Family friendly is a term of art – needs more definition

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION OF MEASURES OF SUCCESS
Ages 0-5: 3.5, 3.5, 3.5, 3, 4,4
- Nothing for infants – current focus is on school children; 0 to 1 is a critical age
- Include prenatal participation; there is data on care in every trimester
- Parents/families need services outside of the educational setting
- Dental measure does not capture all healthcare issues
- Body composition should include preschool age children
- Access to child care; what is a high quality early care setting?
- What is developmental screening? How does the screening contribute to high quality?
- After screening, what % of families are connected to services?
- Reading to children should include talking, playing, etc.
- Lack of correlation among measures, proposed measures and age ranges
- Why such a focus on SFUSD measures? What about private school and beyond?
- How can we include private and nonprofit services?
- #17 is vague, needs to be discrete.
- Include quality of parent/caregiver/child relationships
- Include breastfeeding (contributes to emotional bonding)
- School attendance should start before K-12
- Include immunization rates
- What is "actively participating" in SFUSD enrollment rates?
- Include number of families n childcare waitlists

Ages 6-17 #1: 2, 3,3,3,3,3,3,3, 3.5, 3.5
- #3 capturing engagement in school

- #5: healthy body composition- how is it defined? From what cultural lens? Consider malnutrition; body image- confidence; need to capture all grades
- #4 and #4- not capturing health- look beyond district
- #6: measure STEM
- #7: feel close at school – how do we measure close in our community? Need to add to do you feel close
- #8- capture measures as they transition from middle to HS; measure grade to grade
- Need to add trauma assessment; drug/alcohol issues not captured
- How can we become trauma responsive?
- African American students have high truancy
- Lack of housing, malnutrition, homelessness, language barriers – how is this captured?
- We are measuring but how are we changing our behavior?
- Access – how is this captured in all measures?
- How can we capture equity across all of these?

Ages 6-17 #2: 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3,
- Goals too broad and not well-rounded; seemed binary; should be more qualitative
- Mental health – body health composition not ideal measure; more qualitative or physical activity instead
- Liked #7
- #7-consider differences in school and in neighborhoods – analyzing the two
- Need more on socio-emotional health - #6 and #8
- #3 – include after school/outside school
- #7- include any support- counselor/advisor and mentors
- Specific measures for specific groups; ie early education, grade school, high school
- #8 additional measure at different levels
- Need measurements for lower grades
- #5 measuring physical activity in schools is difficult
- Overall: expand the measures beyond the school; doesn't give an accurate full picture of youth (ie parks, afterschool, anything outside of school)
- #6: academic testing
- There is a lack of family engagement measures
- Lacks measurement on equity and access to help raise performance for disadvantaged youth

Ages 18-24: 2.5, 3, 3, 3,5
- #9- expand to include all students beyond SFUSD (misses students who don't go to school here)
- City college enrollment that have to take remedial
- No measures to track family friendly
- Youth living independent of families – economic self sufficiency for youth and families
- Wages and self-sufficiency
- #7-epxand to include TAY; how are you engaged/connected in SF community

- Clarity around focus on those who live, work, or both
- #13- clearly defining TAY housing issues for families
- Indicators of system changes
- #13- benchmark on housing burden at both 30% ad 50%
- Health and mental health
- Incarceration, victims of violence, homelessness; out-migration
- Suggestion: narrow list further (ie. Focus on 4 first, then next group)

Families: 3.5, 3.5, 3, 3, 4, 2, 2, 3, 3
- Need to affirm equity in each measure
- Add measure re: alignment of city, SFUSD systems
- Add family success such as literacy, participation in schools, consistent job, etc
- #17: Need more definition; like contributing measures
- Need to go beyond safe
- Look at accessing vs available and usable services
- Some measures not asset-based, but recognize some populations are very vulnerable
- Access to resources, literacy
- Add food security, new American Academy of Pediatrics screening could be used; access to food programs

Notes from November 19th Meeting

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION OF GOALS
Group A: 2,2,2,2,2,2,2 3
- overall: not fully defined; school success, mentally healthy? missing metrics for families
- economically secure for families
- parental mental, physically and emotionally healthy
- C: emotionally and mental is the same
- F: include "welcoming"
- E: safe and supported, include spiritually supported
- overall too much focus on academic, traditional school
- what is definition of success?
- include vocational, being productive, contributing members of society and more broadly define career path and post-secondary
- focus on drop out rate
- F: what is family friendly? workforce, housing?
- parental support - family leave
- relationship healthy, not just mentally healthy
- D is included in E

Group B: 1,1,1, 2,2,3,3,3
- D & F: need more measures
- D: housing and access to healthcare
- concerns about moving the dial - policy reform
- how does this translate to actual implementation?

- how are we holding folks accountable?

Group C: 2,2,1, 2, 3, 3
- A and C: to vague
- succes is defined differently by group and individual
- children need economic security and safe, nurturing, environment beyond school
- how will we address funding and capacity?
- should include disposition (vision 2025), life beyond career/civic engagement
- families' economic security seems lofty - based on individuals' decisions
- address disconnectivity of youth
- naming housing stability and security specifically
- address community erosion
- define safe and supporting environment: school, housing, community?

Group D: 2,2,2,2,2,3,3,3, 4
- A: Can youth succeed in our systems? how do we define?
- A & B: defining "success"; how are we measuring? example is job mobility, career path
- B: adding ability to be financially independent
- E: recognition of capacity to stay in the city
- D: Housing affordability connection
- E: safe and just environment
- F: connecting to institutions; city financially committed to these goals? affordable city
- F: how to affirm families role in participation (in schools, voter engagement)
- F: passive - embracing, celebrating, building on strength, fostering diversity; equal value of groups
- Anti-displacement- which families are we tracking over time? How many youth choose to live and stay in the city?

Group E: 2, 3, 2, 1, 2
- too utopia, need more practical goals, such as access to options for health resources
- goals should be what we want but we want concrete measures/steps to achieve them
- more like visions than goals
- lofty, for E: what qualifies as safe and nurturing environment given our housing crisis?
- focus more on skills for youth and families
- F: define family friendly
- missing cultural competency, more explicit, especially in F
- acknowledge regional, state, national, and global impacts

Ages 0 to 5: 3,3,3
- look more broadly than enrollment; instead look at welcoming of settings, such as family involvement of developmental screenings and welcoming culture
- follow up/evaluation of developmental screenings, not just counting
- support systems, wrap-around resources needed for the whole family/child
- those who are enrolled, not enrolled in early care
- #2: missing socio-emotional readiness, measurement of words
- #2: include early literacy activities with families; getting families engaged at home

- #3: attendance measurement not a good measurement; doesn't include how to make a student-centered environment
- #4: include dental metrics for age 1 year and younger
- Overall too many SFUSD-focused metrics

Ages 6-17 #1: 2,2,2,3,3,3,3,3,4,
- capturing out of school time
- mental and emotional health (depression/anxiety disorder)
- need more measures in order to measure visionary goals
- no measure on family violence
- something about safety in classroom, bullying, access to arts, teen pregnancy, access to sports, leadership opportunities
- TAY homeless
- #5- expulsion data and high school readiness
- health- BMI too narrow
- how do we measure social studies and critical thinking?
- #17- students should feel valued
- gender responsive approach
- ELA-can we measure improvement beyond SBAC?
- Goal F can be captured through CA Healthy Kids Survey

Ages 6-17 #2: 3.5, 3, 4, 2.5, 3.5, 3, 3.5, 3, 4, 3.5
- too academically focused, need to focus on broader community
- #3: include truancy rates
- #4 and 5: include access to healthy food options
- #5 and 7: include K-4
- #5,6,7: look at out of school time
- # 7: school site should include after school. neighborhood should include CBOs
- #8: look at co-enrollment in City College
- include SFUSD's work to address/reduce trauma, including chronic trauma
- "feel safe" is difficult to quantify
- all language needs to be culturally competent/relevant. focus on nuance in translation
- address homeless youth
- include developmental assets. Body composition and dental caries is not inclusive.
- address disconnected youth. Some are disconnected from SFUSD
- include teen pregnancy rates
- include interactions with juvenile justice system
- dating violence, healthy relationships, access to information
- include students who are in alternative education environments or careers
- afterschool programs under-represented in all SFUSD goals
- tie goals to measures
- include holistic focus of SFUSD - access to diverse experiences within the curricular day
- student attendance should be measured more than annually
- address housing, displacement, economic security, high rates of feeling disconnected from or unwanted by the City
- social-emotional health measure falls short
- data exists around SFUSD partnerships

Ages 18-24: 2,2,2,2,3,3,4,4,
- omission of financial knowledge and stability
- #9: level of debt, assets, savings, banked, poverty/income
- too narrow and focused on academic success; need options, mobility, sense of community; participation/engagement in civic life
- health - insurance
- limitations of SFUSD data: narrow funnel, limited, inflexible, outside impact
- 22-24 year olds are mostly non-natives of SF
- self-sufficiency standard: low bar? alternative measure?
- school/work success measurement/definition
- involvement in criminal justice system - who isn't connected to SFUSD and City College?
- 18-24 year old parents and linkages to 0-5
- feeling like contributors and connected to community
- ability to stay and work (quality of work)
- #10: support and attain own job/work; goals toward school/work
- tracking who can stay in SF - understand who/why people are leaving
- who has dropped out of the system
- addressing who is served (youth that moved out of city but use programs/services; youth transferred back to home counties
- 18-24 year olds giving back to city (involvement, donation, volunteerism)

Families/Communities: 2.5, 2, 3.5
- maybe use intermediate outcomes since goals are so visionary before diving into measures
- more around systems change/policy changes
- concern with some family self-reported measures vs. actual outcomes
- compare those doing the best to worst on measures
- not enough focus on local neighborhoods, micro-neighborhoods, such as housing stability, crime, access to health services
- more objective safety measures — self-report and actual crime
- ACES - lots of aspects of safety - pedestrian, parks, lights
- safe in schools, especially for LGBTQ
- nature, frequency and outcome of police encounters
- #7: socially connected for youth and families
- protective factors for families; i.e. knowledge of child's development, etc
- indicators of social isolation
- how leadership/administration reflects community
- teen/young adult pregnancy

APPENDIX

Nov 6. Version of Draft Outcomes Framework

GOALS
    A. School success is a reality for all children, youth, and transitional age youth
    B. All youth and transitional age youth succeed in post-secondary and careers paths

C. All children, youth, and transitional age youth are physically, emotionally, and mentally healthy
D. All families are economically secure
E. All families have a safe and nurturing environment for their children
F. San Francisco is a family friendly city to a diverse array of families

MEASURES OF SUCCESS
1) % of children (ages 0-5) enrolled in high-quality early care and education settings
2) % of SFUSD Kindergarteners ready for Kindergarten
3) % K-12 SFUSD students attending school regularly
4) % SFUSD Kindergarteners with dental caries
5) % of preschoolers and SFUSD students (gr. 5, 7 and 9) who have a healthy body composition
6) % of SFUSD students (gr 3-8 and 11) proficient or above in English Language Arts and Math in elementary and middle schools
7) % of SFUSD students (gr 5-12) who feel close to people at school
8) % of SFUSD 12th graders graduating high school
9) % of all SFUSD college attendees who complete a degree or certificate within six years
10) % of youth ages 18-24 enrolled in school or work
11) % of mothers receiving prenatal care in the first trimester
12) % of families with children who meet the Self-Sufficiency Standard
13) % of stably housed families and young adults
14) Rates of children experiencing child maltreatment
15) # of youth impacted by the juvenile justice system and/or have incarcerated parents
16) % of families who report feeling safe in their neighborhoods
17) % of families reporting they feel valued and supported