



## Our Children, Our Families Council



### **Service Inventory Working Group**

#### **DRAFT Meeting Notes**

**February 10, 2016 at 4PM**

**DCYF, 1390 Market Street, Suite 900, Mint Conference Room, San Francisco, CA**

#### **Attendees:**

Adam Nguyen	Office of the City Administrator
AnneMarie Donnelly	Recreation and Parks
Aumijo Gomes	Dept. of Children, Youth, and their Families
Bob Palacio	Recreation and Parks
Graham Dobson	Office of Early Care and Education
Kimberly Coates	SFUSD
Krista Canellakis	Mayor's Office
Lyslynn Lacoste	BMAGIC/PEEF CAC
Laura Busch	Mayor's Budget Office
Margaret Farruggio	SFUSD
Max Rocha	Dept. of Public Health
Michelle Jeffers	San Francisco Public Library
Paula Jones	Dept. of Public Health

#### **Council Staff:**

Dr. Laurie Scolari; Jennifer Tran

#### **Members of the Public:**

Rod Hsiao	InPlay
Sally Jenkins-Stevens	Dept. of Children, Youth, and their Families
Ruth Sappelt	OEWD/Workforce
Sonali Joshi	OCOF Consultant

### **I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

- Call to Order. Co-chair Aumijo Gomes called the meeting to order and reviewed the following meeting objectives:
  - To provide an update on the progress that's been made since our last meeting in November both for OCOF overall and for the Service Inventory pilot
  - To hear a presentation from our consultant and vendor on the plan for the pilot
  - To clarify how we will define summer programs
  - To discuss the next critical steps needed to move the pilot forward
  - To discuss how this pilot will lead towards the long term goal of a citywide inventory of all services
- Roll call and review of meeting norms by co-chair Lyslynn Lacoste

- Be disrupters of the status quo - voices challenging the current way of doing things is encouraged
- Be respectful, actively listen to other perspectives, and assume best intentions, but be comfortable with discomfort
- Be solutions-oriented
- Be considerate of use of acronyms
- Encourage use of personal stories to ground us in why we are doing this work
- Be conscious of how much space you're taking up in the conversation
- Be sure to put equity at the center of our decision-making

## **II. Update of the progress made since the November Service Inventory Working Group meeting**

- OCOF Outcomes Framework was passed at January 28 meeting
- At the next Council meeting on May 26 we will provide an update on the work of the Service Inventory WG
- Dr. Laurie Scolari reviewed OCOF deliverables with group (Outcomes Framework, 5-Year Plan, data sharing, and citywide service inventory)
- Reviewed the short and long-term vision for the service inventory
  - At the last meeting, the group agreed to focus on developing a summer programming pilot
  - A smaller group has been convening to build the pilot
  - Goal is to have soft launch of pilot in late February/March, which is when families start looking for summer opportunities
  - The pilot will focus on targeting disconnected families
- Sonali Joshi, OFOC consultant for the service inventory pilot project provided an update on progress to date:
  - Overview of the difference between the short-term pilot (digital summer activity resource guide targeting 5 neighborhoods) and the long-term project (comprehensive city-wide resource guide for children, youth, and families)
  - Pilot vision and objectives:
    - Database of activities that would make it easy for families to find activities directly or through helpers/connectors to services
    - Want to report findings and evaluations to inform the development of the long-term service inventory. Identifying when and what type of services people are looking for.
    - Goal is to excite key stakeholders and show what's possible
    - Want to assist critical populations in finding summer resources (low-income, under-resourced)
    - Help streamline marketing and applications for service providers
  - Show forward momentum toward Prop C voter mandate
- **Pilot Overview** by Sonali Joshi
  - Data collection underway
    - In the longer-term we will need to develop and adopt data standards
  - InPlay will serve as the database for the pilot; they have an easy-to-use platform
  - Data management will be an ongoing process through the summer
  - We'll be doing outreach and evaluation for the pilot

- **Timeline overview** by Sonali Joshi
  - In the midst of data gathering
  - Soft launch late February/March
  - InPlay is responsible for making data is up-to-date, mechanisms in place for data updates
  - There may be smaller CBOs or departments that will require more follow-up to gather all of the data. Goal is to have enough data for a strong soft launch.
    - The first enrollment fair is March 12
    - Public launch in April
  - Q: Is there an evaluation team?  
A: It's the smaller working team and anyone interested in participating can participate
  - Q: What type of outreach will we be doing?  
A: Working with connectors/helpers for grassroots marketing effort. It'll be more direct user marketing.
  
- **OCOF Summer Pilot Team**
  - Suggestion: add evaluation to the table to specify who will be doing that work
  
- **Prioritized Populations**
  - Low income, low-access population in 5 neighborhoods (Bayview, Tenderloin, Chinatown, Excelsior, Mission)
    - Q: Are we restricting ourselves to services in these neighborhoods?  
A: Not restricted to these 5 neighborhoods, but prioritizing these five ones. Trying to find data and information for smaller providers will be challenging. For Year 2, there will be a bigger push for all service providers so it's more comprehensive. This is a more doable approach for our timeframe
  
- **WG Feedback from November meeting**
  - This criteria was used to evaluate vendors
  - Workgroup wanted to focus on the user and our key demographic of low-income, underserved communities
  - Intuitive
  - Accessible/inclusive
  - Easy-to-use search filters
  - Mobile friendly
  
- **Prioritized features, Alignment with long term vision, and Tradeoffs**
  - Components of RFP
  - Starred items on page 16 of presentation are ones we're getting with InPlay
    - Non-starred items are pushed to year 2 due to time and budget constraints
  
- **Selected Platform for pilot: InPlay**
  - Rod Hsiao introduced InPlay and provided background on why they operate as a mission-driven non-profit
    - Mission to engage low-income students in opportunities to discover own unique interests and talents - when children are doing things out of their own interest and discovery, they build their own confidence and self-efficacy, which result in positive spillover effects

- Built a platform and piloted in Fremont Unified last Spring
  - District promoted to all the families (35,000 students)
  - Principals promoted the free service
  - Connecting families with activity providers
    - Activity providers (not vendors) do not go into it to make money – see them as partners, not vendors
    - InPlay interviewed providers and learned they needed help filling classes – unfilled seats make/break the business
    - Goal was to build structures to lead families to providers, and providers would take families the rest of the way. Do not try to get in between families and providers.
- **Project goal: help families discover activities**
  - Discovery problem based on interviews with parents
  - Parent process: discover, explore options to identify best fit, group planning with friends, then register and pay. Last stage is coordination to get kid to/from activity.
  - Facilitate a connection between parents and agencies
  - InPlay has plans to develop evaluation and coordination tools for group planning for Y2 and beyond
  - Not all functionality is available with the pilot because we've prioritized focusing on disadvantaged communities.
  - Q: What are the key lessons learned from the Fremont Unified experience about targeting disadvantaged populations?
    - Site only currently in English, but working on translating to Chinese and Spanish
    - Low-income families got sticker shock – trying to figure out how with as few clicks as possible to guide users to the most affordable/accessible activities
    - Site hasn't been optimized for mobile site
    - Timing is key for getting activities into database
  - Found that higher-priced camps have slots for lower-income families, but question of how to promote? And how to promote a technical solution?
    - Beyond the technical solution, challenge of making people feel welcomed and inclusive
      - Larger broader policy, cultural shifts – how we bring those options to broader a community and to keep the slots available to the point when we know lower income families tend to register
    - Did limited pilots to connect income-eligible kids to scholarship opportunities
      - More of a policy issue and mind shift that has to take place. But there are programs with unfilled spots because they can't find qualified kids
      - Trying to get around federal law that prevents sharing of names
      - Interested in exploring solutions with group

### **III. Demo of [InPlay.org](http://InPlay.org)**

- Currently loading summer activities into system
- Each activity has organizational information, program description, and sessions (specific classes, days/times, prices)
- Haven't put up a big registration wall
- Ability to email direct link to website and session info
- Q: Would this be a live inventory? How to pull off closed camps when registration fills up so users don't get frustrated clicking on activities that are full?

- A: Would need access to back-end
  - For some providers, they'll set aside 30% of seats for non-online registrations/disadvantaged families. Question of when to release so users can register for these?
  - Sonali commented that there may be a short-term solution for Parks SF Parks and Rec to decide which ones to take off InPlay. In the future we can figure out how to make this more seamless
- Q: Is there a feature to get an alert when waitlist spots open up?
- A: InPlay does have a waitlist feature and there's an alert that can go out via email
  - If we prioritize linkages that connect back and front end. Technology or process solution – culture change between providers
- Other features: filtered search function, interactive map, tags, dates, tag for kids feature, save/bookmark feature
- The pilot will be a San Francisco OCOF branded site – possibly SFInPlay.Org or a re-direct from a .gov subdomain to redirect
- Location tag will have the five neighborhoods prioritized
- Q: Browser accessibility – what browser are most of our users using?
- A: Will look at devices and browsers
- Q: Will this take the place of SF kids?
- A: That's the long-term vision

#### **IV. Discussion of what are the critical next steps to enable Our Children Our Families to actualize the summer pilot in accordance with the planned timeline**

- **List of Services**
  - Who to include in pilot? Ex: summer lunches, summer jobs
  - Will need to think about how we'll link resources that may not be activities
  - Need a really strong pilot that is accessible and dynamic and manageable
  - Q: What about everything else?
  - A: More comprehensive database with thousands of activities
  - Central data warehouse may not necessarily belong in InPlay
    - Not one front-end solution
  - Other resources families need – city owned and operated
  - Third party platforms to use this database – could we open it up for different use cases
  - Would be a larger, broader ecosystem
  - Q: Families may want services in other neighborhoods rather than services only in those areas we've prioritized
  - A: Have 150 lists, but not comprehensive Chinatown list or other service providers. Mostly for other CBOs.
  - We will need to prioritize. We're starting with 5 but also building something that's citywide at the same time.
- **Criteria for prioritizing activities and list:**
  - City/District vs. CBO vs. for-profit organizations activities
  - Key relationship or partner for OCOF
  - Location (5 key neighborhoods that DCYF is already doing outreach in)
  - Size and scale of programming (two sides)
    - YMCA vs. an 10-child origami class
  - Diversity of offerings (cultural, activity type, cost, age)

- Suggestion: Piloting at summer fairs – programs will be all over the city. Will need to communicate to parents that this is just the start and they’ll be able to see more programs all over the city
- Rod: If you enter your address, search will optimize around radius around that address. Not bounding everything by neighborhood
- Q: Other services beyond activities?  
A: The next phase and long-term vision will be getting to year-round programs
- Willing to take any data right now but just prioritizing those 5 neighborhoods.
- We have to prioritize – if it’s a primary source of information, large set of big data. DCYF reaching out to large service providers
  - Have lists of secondary sources (DCYF grantees, resources, Mo’MAGIC, BMAGIC) – all of them will receive an email, regardless of neighborhood. When it comes to follow-up calls, need input from the group on where we begin to prioritize our follow-up efforts
- Q: Have we talked to service providers to get feedback on how they’d like to be promoted on our website?  
A: For BMAGIC it’s all public information. Already collected a certain way so information provided by agency is up to them, and that’s what will show. We’re generally using public information  
In terms of feedback on how the site looks/feels/usability? Big part of the pilot is to gather that feedback  
Interesting question as we move forward, about the option of opting out or limiting information
  - For DCYF grantees, will probably include language in contracts to be included on website
- Suggestion: to help build in fields to standardized data and capture amount of activities by category type – to be able to say “City has funded x types of slots for x activity for children”
  - Potential: long term solution – marking city/state/federal funded programs classification
- **Suggested prioritization criteria**
  - Flagged as having a key relationship with our group
  - Location
  - Size/scale of program – ten of the largest providers (YMCA, Boys and Girls Club, robust offerings)
  - Balance of some smaller/medium-sized providers
  - Diversity of options – culturally relevant, activity type, cost, age groups
  - Summer-long activities vs once a week
  - For-profit – ones with a lot of scholarship spots, sliding scale
  - Free and low-cost activities
  - Sliding scale option on price tag display on website - \$0 to \$x – what’s the lowest anyone can pay for the program?
    - Free to \$100
    - Some charge by the day, some by punch card
    - Algorithm to show dollar sign ranking (\$, \$\$, \$\$\$, \$\$\$\$)
  - Most providers don’t provide scholarships info on their website, maybe having a simple icon or banner or some other flag to show scholarship available? It would need to be pronounced

- Are we listing and thinking through the free and low cost?
    - Suggestion: pop-up that explains scholarship so that users don't have to leave the site
  - Using the pilot to see what data structure should look like – what do you want future data set to look like? Allow users to search consistently and access
    - Key learning goal is around developing data standards. Want an easy data template, continually evolving the template to improve.
  - Rod: would love to be able to work with families to ask questions as they poke around the site
- Suggestion: **Family Resource Centers** as a go-to place – how people get information to help their families if they don't have access to devices
  - How do we use connectors and other CBOs? Test group, need to provide outreach materials, a lot of reasons to use CBOs or key stakeholders. Want to identify some of these people. Six weeks from now we'll be on outreach.
    - If **WG** members know or can think of a champion in neighborhoods even a community leader or minister that could help identify service providers, send info to the team
  - Suggestion: **CHALK** – DCYF funded (Youth Line) services for children and youth
    - Database probably has a lot of that information

#### **V. Announcements**

- Next meeting is April 27
- OCOF data working group will begin convening in March
- We will send a follow-up email to solicit ideals for priority CBOs and service providers

#### **VI. Public Comment**

- No public comments

#### **VII. Adjournment by co-chair Aumijo Gomes**