



# Our Children, Our Families Council



5-Year Plan Working Group  
DRAFT NOTES  
December 15, 2015  
4:00 p.m.  
1390 Market Street, Suite 1125

Attendees: Co-Chairs Ken Epstein and Myong Leigh; Kevin Truitt, Theo Miller, Michael Wald, Jill Hoogendyk, Katie Albright, Candace Wong, Christy Estrovitz, Lea LaCroix (substitute for Allen Lu), Lisa Fisher, Kristy Wang, Stephanie, Julia Sabory, Barbara Carlson, Susie Smith, Kentaro Iwasaki, Theo Miller, Sarah Wan, Ophelia Williams, Phil Halperin, Jen Low, Stefanie Eldred

Not Present: Laurel Kloomok, Lily Langlois, Mia "Tu Mutch" Satya, Greg Asay, Carla Bryant

Council Staff in Attendance: Laurie Scolari, Jennifer Tran, and Karin Little

## 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

Attendees introduced themselves and Co-Chair Myong Leigh introduced the objectives for the meeting:

- Continue to build understanding about the purpose of the plan and this group
- Review Our Children Our Families 5-Year Plan approach and outline to share with the OCOF Council in January

## 2. Review Purpose and Objectives of the Our Children Our Families 5-Year Plan (discussion only)

Myong reviewed the purpose of this working group:

- Advising on an outline for the Plan
- Providing feedback on the Plan's contents
- Co-presenting the Plan to the Council

He then reviewed the purpose of the Our Children Our Families 5-Year Plan:

- Outline recommendations on how to achieve the Outcomes Framework
- Create an aligned and connected system of services and programs

Myong reviewed the draft timeline for this working group's remaining meetings and how that relates to the Council's overall timeline. The goal is for the Council to take action on

a draft 5-year plan at its May 26, 2016 meeting. This group will meet three more times to support the Council in approving a Plan in May. After January, we hope to have an approved Outcomes Framework that we can use to guide our work.

The group expressed concerns about the multiple planning processes taking place right now and the challenge of integrating and aligning efforts. There is a desire to make this process different than with previous coordinating councils. There were also questions about the process for writing the plan as a group. The OCOF staff will be synthesizing the working group discussions and continue to build in greater specificity to the plan.

The group also discussed the responsibility of its members to do the hard work of alignment in its respective organizations/communities as other plans are created. This planning process is at a macro level because the Mayor and Superintendent are leading the work. Over time we hope to experience less fragmentation in terms of meetings and planning processes.

### **3. Discussion of Possible Plan Approach and Focus Areas for the Our Children Our Families 5-Year Plan (discussion only)**

Co-Chair Ken Epstein reviewed the draft proposed approach for the plan. These guidelines came from the first working group meeting.

- Framed as a “plan to plan” – robust community and stakeholder engagement and buy-in will be critical in initial and ongoing development
- Dynamic framework for action with room for flexibility and changing circumstances over time
- Focus on 1-2 priority areas each year of the five years that cut across multiple strategies
- Accessible language at all levels and user friendly to ensure buy-in
- Inspiring and empowering assets-based tone/content
- Focus on new initiatives instead of highlighting work that is already being implemented

The only new addition was the idea of choosing 1-2 priority focus areas for each year of the plan to “dive-deeper” across multiple organizations that would require a systems change focus.

There were questions about the “plan-to-plan” approach. And all groups addressed this in their small group discussions. There were questions about stakeholder engagement around the plan and how it would compare with the Outcomes Framework engagement. Ken and Myong shared that we’re planning some form of engagement in the spring but welcome input on what form it takes. They also shared that each person on this working group should be bringing their experience into the room to be the voice of the communities and organizations they represent.

There was discussion about the language we’re using and the need for common definitions – not just for the public, but for the working group members also.

The group broke into four groups to provide feedback on the approach. See the comments shared with the whole group and the full chart notes are included in the Appendix.

#### Approach

- Did not like the plan to plan, liked the what and how
- Aligning around the outcomes structure and within the structure picking 1-2 outcomes within each one that we all shared, mapping all our services into the outcomes (if DPH is doing 50 things, they should somehow fit within each of the 5 goals)
- Received a lot of feedback about the Outcomes Framework
- Liked the concept about the plan to plan; being intentional and thoughtful so we can be successful;
- Liked the assets based
- Clarifying the language
- Clarifying what we mean by doing a plan to plan – developing building blocks over the five years; building on what we focus on in year 1

The groups then discussed specific elements that could be included in the systems sections of the plan. Participants then self-selected into one of five groups based on their interest (the Data Sharing and Integrated Service Delivery groups were collapsed into one). Here is what was shared in the full group report (full chart comments are included in the Appendix):

#### Resources

- Blending resources and integrating planning or delivery
- Putting our most underserved youth and families at the center of our resources from a planning perspective; including them more authentically in resource allocation decisions; including them in a more direct way in terms of benefiting from the resources; paying our clients to help contribute to social change; including youth more directly

#### Data Sharing and Integrated Service Delivery

- Protocols /legal framework
- Timely analysis and dissemination of data on a consistent ongoing basis
- Structure of the services inventory should look
- How we hold systems accountable in systems delivery

#### Organizational Change and Capacity Building

- We need workforce and delivery system that is capable
- Culture of collaboration – needs to be incentivized
- Joint outcomes – funding across philanthropy and city dollars
- Technical assistance – having a model of organizational change that we all share

#### Systems Accountability

- Define systems and accountability – nomenclature might be different – let’s be clear about our meaning
- Creating outcomes for the goals, aligning budget cycles and service delivery as clear outcomes
- We need the public to see how we’re working differently

Next Steps:

Ken shared two homework assignments for the group:

- 1) Send us examples of any strategic plans – explaining what you like and don’t like.
- 2) Provide feedback via e-mail in January, in preparation for the next Council meeting.

#### **4. Announcements (discussion only)**

Laurie Scolari shared the following announcements.

- The fiscal mapping exercise is still in progress and should be completed in the New Year.
- The staff draft of the Outcomes Framework will be available on the website ([www.ourchildrenourfamilies.org](http://www.ourchildrenourfamilies.org)) in the next couple of days. You will receive an e-mail with a link to an online survey to provide feedback.
- Please share your ideas, questions & feedback with OCOF staff
- Our next meeting: Feb 17 at 4pm, City Hall in Room 201
- Please complete Meeting Feedback Form

#### **5. Public Comment.**

No public comment.

#### **6. Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 6 pm.

## Appendix: Small Group Discussion Chart Notes

### Group #1:

#### Feedback on the Plan Approach

- Like plan to plan / starting thoughtfully and intentionally
- New vs. ongoing work, why recreate the wheel? Lots of good work is happening
- Picking 1-2 areas of focus – don't be too attached; build in flexibility and re-evaluate
- Add consideration criteria to priority areas

#### Feedback on the Outcomes Framework

- More layers (e.g. culturally appropriate approaches) beneath layers (i.e. healing centered)
- More aspirational
- Wonder about some of the measures (especially under goal c and d)
- Don't work in isolation / measures are interrelated
- Need to address inter-generational patterns
- Emphasize growth mind set (deeper than assets)
- Asset-focus assumes people already have something
- Focus on healing
- "ensure buy-in" different than authentic engagement

#### Elements to include in Resource Allocation section

- Blended funding across departmental entities around specific initiatives (2)
- Reallocate preschool for all funding to headstart (1)
- Align resources toward leverage state/federal resources
- Use city resources flexibly to enhance core services
- Engage private sector to leverage resources to expand services
- Align funding streams to reduce administrative costs and maximize resources / back office functions supported by city
- Specific RFP language/expectations to ensure collaboration across systems/entities (2)
- Performance based / outcome contracting for entire amounts
- How do we incentivize heterogeneous schools, preschools, etc? (1)
- Strategically located and easily accessible to Family Resource Centers that have Wellness Centers that are partners with neighborhood schools
- Jointly (SFUSD/DCYF/HSA/First5) fund FRC positions to work at school sites (1)
- Transparency to principals, families, stakeholders about school funding (\$ per student based on what formula)
- Equity in PTA funding across schools
- Transparency in budgeting (post all sources and uses online) and have budget analysts lead community workshop on budgeting
- Clients paid to access services (just like all the other stakeholders doing social change work); literally paid for participation and engagement (i.e. paid community improvement intern,) (1)

- Participating budgeting with young people for some portion of funds
- Increased internships and externships for high school students, connected to careers and college pathways
- Trauma-sensitive training for all connected CBOs and non-profits working directly with children & families
- Attendance incentive programs

## Group #2

### Feedback on the Approach:

- Like assets-based framing / approach
- Define what we mean by focus & priority areas; need clear language
- Make sure we capture all age groups in priorities we pick (themes that touch many age groups)
- Language change: “aligning” existing work (bullet 6)
  - o Equity, quality, transparent
  - o Specifying what process of alignment looks like – how?
  - o Linkage to accountability / performance measures
- Clarify once-a-year revision of plan (how often we’ll revisit plan)
- Systems change accountability – policy change and practice
- OCOF would sound the alarm on problems
- Need to clarify terminology / building blocks approach
- Start with 2 focus areas (one hard, one easy); and then like building blocks that continue over time (add 3, 4 in year 2; 5, 6 in year 3), etc.
- Rolling 5-year plan
- 

### Elements to include in Data Sharing section

- Have protocols in place for research orgs (Gardner)
- Break through reluctance on HIPA and FERPA
- Open access to aggregate data
- Agreements by CBOS to share back data
- The plan needs to lay out the action steps to get through the various legal depts. to have a data share agreement
  - o look at best practices for this
- Data share plan should consider data sharing w/ SFSU and CCSF too
- Annual summary / state of the city
- Timely analysis of data / service info so that gaps or overlaps can be identified and resolved quickly
- Protocols for timeliness of data
- Better understanding of the gap of services and trend/ need of youth / families through data sharing

### Elements to include in Integrated Service Delivery section

- designated liaisons in agencies who “own” the responsibility for communicating across agencies

- one stop shopping for parents / caregivers on the topics of summer, 0-5 care, free activities, libraries, parks, jobs for youth, afterschool
- user-friendly interface and ability to extract / search for reports
- through the coordinated service delivery and data sharing, kids/youth/ families should work with 1 lead case worker / advisor to access different services based on the needs. Avoid duplication of services, confusion and increase retention and provide wrap-around care

#### Group #3:

##### Feedback on the Approach:

- What and how vs. plan to plan
- Align around the outcomes; departments work together within outcomes (1-2 in each outcome)
- Outliers may iteratively define new outcomes
- What is the feedback loop?

##### Elements to include in Organizational Change and Capacity Building section

- Workforce and delivery system (2)
- Culture of collaboration (incentives and accountability) (2)
- Co-locations and departments together
- Citywide org for TA for CBOs – common model
- Joint outcomes for funding contracting across philanthropy/ city (3)
- Single master contract
- Supervision model across system (1)
- Ask the question of how you are helping kids and families

#### Group #4:

##### Feedback on the Approach:

- “plan to plan” language – don’t like this; preliminary or high level
- Immediate actions
  - o One action could be more detailed than others
- Focus could be a systems focus area (i.e. budgeting) to start
- For each goal, do short-term successes and long term actions
  - o Or look for cross-cutting strategies for maximizing benefits
- “How”/ theory of change as operating principles (and setting measures for these)
- Housing strong theme but can we make meaningful progress quickly?
- Theory of change is not lined up with the five goals; If these things happen, we know there will be systems change

##### Elements to include in the Systems Accountability section

- Create systems outcomes for the goals
- Align budget cycles (\*)
- Highlight initiatives where alignment / coordination is already happening
- Highlight how practice is changing based on fiscal mapping and deeper analysis of services inventory (\*)
  - o make recommendations on how to change practice

- example of changing enrollment process with DCYF RFP process
- Accessibility goal
- Defining “systems” and “accountability” (diagram of systems and the overlap) (\*)
- Creating measures for the theory of action

Questions:

- Budget cycle may not allow action for at least 3 years?
- What is the intention of the fiscal mapping exercise?
- What other Strategic plans are in development and what is their focus?