



Our Children, Our Families Council



5-Year Plan Working Group
DRAFT NOTES
April 15, 2015
3:00 p.m.

In attendance:

Ken Epstein, Kevin Truitt, Laurel Kloomok, Kristy Wang, Phil Halperin, Sheila Nickolopolous, Christy Estrovitz, Stefanie Eldred, Susie Smith, Michael Wald, Myong Leigh, Theo Miller, Sherilyn Adams, Sarah Wan, Ophelia Williams, Quora Epps

Meeting objectives

- Gather input on the 5-year plan draft
- Enlist your help with stakeholder engagement

5 Year Plan Timeline

- Working Group
 - Two conference calls – May 6 and May 19 at noon
 - WG members continue to review drafts as the document gets refined, and provide input
 - Survey option to provide feedback and will be emailed to the group
- Partner Advisory Sessions
 - April 25 and May 5 two stakeholder sessions
- Council
 - Council member info sessions on May 11 and May 18
 - Council to take action on a plan on May 26
- Similar engagement process to Outcomes Framework

Purpose of the Plan

- Framework for how city would work better together
- Plan doesn't make change, but change doesn't happen without a Plan
- Will ask group about ideas about how to move Plan to making changes
- We agreed to form working groups around the five goals of the Outcomes Framework to improve our service delivery system
- Work to be done about membership of groups, how supported, resources, etc.
 - Have to keep equity at the center of what we're doing
- What it is NOT:
 - It will not include baseline data, targets, content strategies, a detailed implementation plan, or resource allocation recommendations.

- What it IS:
 - Specifies a process and work structure to align and coordinate services for children, youth and families
 - Combined with the Outcomes Framework, it provides a structure for other initiatives, departments, and plans to align
 - Prioritizes delivery of services to children, youth and families with the most need
 - Prioritizes an equity and anti-racist lens and the ways communities of color have not benefited in our City

Discussion about Draft Plan

See appendix for detailed small group notes

- Background
 - Need to simplify terms, eliminate jargon
 - How to create alignment across goals when working groups are separate; the goals and measures are interconnected, the work should be too
 - Add to guiding principles about promoting cross fertilization and broad representation
 - Be more explicit about what the plan is and isn't
 - How will we know if change is happening – how can we be more explicit about application of the collective impact strategies? Rubric?
 - Improve the timeline – longer, adding pressure points (DCYF allocation, etc.),
- Recommendations for Action
 - More lived experience members as part of the Council and working groups; equity and diversity is not reflected
 - Pull back from being so prescriptive and be more inclusive
 - Some of the strategies aren't one-size-fits-all – acknowledging in the Plan that plans don't work across neighborhoods, and communities within the Bayview
 - Equity lens needs to be more explicit; no statement about poverty and out migration
 - Need to connect across groups – tri-chairs for each goal to meet on a regular basis
 - Hold a retreat at the beginning of the year for all working group members – as an orientation and common ground/language across groups Having a different style of delivery – make it fun! The same old, same old is boring.
 - Is it possible to create a fiscal map of caring adults? Caution about using fiscal mapping.
 - Doesn't include 18-24yr olds and kids that are disconnected. Need to include students not engaged at the school district; seems to be heavily weighted towards young children connected to families

- Should this really be titled “Action”; can we withhold our work to wait for OCOF? With certain departments or groups, should we wait until we need a more tangible plan? Guidance is missing for Directors on how they should interact with this document.
- Service delivery is where the work needs to focus
- How will we measure success in terms of our collaboration?
- DCYF (and OECE) funding is an amazing opportunity to make change; can that be influenced? OR delayed?
- Is there a more effective way to facilitated coordinating across five goals? OCOF Council will be challenged to do this
- Whole Group Discussion – what needs to change in order to feel like this plan will move the needle?
 - Mechanics – 2 hours/month with five groups is not realistic
 - Front load the work with a retreat/orientation for all working group members
 - Expedite work for November / March deadlines around DCYF allocation plan
 - A lot of baseline information needs to be absorbed
 - Staffing
 - Do we have the resources to support the work?
 - Equity
 - Be more explicit about leading for equity
 - More inclusive, and equity- based - Equity, race, outmigration, disconnected youth – adequately represented in Plan – not one size fits all
 - Alignment
 - Starts with Mayor and Department heads – do they need a retreat to understand their strategic plans and service delivery
 - Tension of including community; vs. waiting for Mayor/Supt to establish priorities; should be driven by community needs
 - How to have both
 - Understanding what is already in place; department strategic plans
 - Outcomes are interconnected
 - Scorecard – mutually accountable to supporting OCOF
 - unintended consequences of asking departments to say what they’re doing for OCOF; the most interesting thing is how the departments work together
 - Existing collaboratives – building on their work, but augment and strengthen about what we have
 - How does HOPESF and Project 500 fit with in this?
 - Membership

- Council or on committees – with people with lived experiences, more diverse, composition of the Council, formerly incarcerated
- What is the role of various advisory bodies in conjunction with working groups?
- The larger the group, the more management
- Focus and sequencing
 - Are we doing too much?
 - Can we voice concern about scope to Council?
 - May be a way to focus the work differently? Intentional conversation about focus?
 - Focus on one collective impact strategy at a time?
 - Ex, if we know these 1000 kids are the most vulnerable – how do we focus on this group?
 - We can't do it all, but how do we think about who the services will be for and how

Announcements

- The working group is needed to:
 - Promote Partner Advisory Sessions to their network
 - Invite OCOF staff to come to community/staff meetings to gather input
- Partner Advisory Sessions taking place on 4/25 from 4 – 5 PM at 555 Franklin, Board Room and 5/5 from 11 – noon in Room 201, City Hall.
- Additional updates and opportunities to provide feedback for the working group members:
 - Conference calls taking place on May 6 and May 19 at noon. Calendar invitation to follow.
 - Survey distributed on May 9

Thank you for your participation and engagement.

Public Comment

No public comment

Meeting Adjourned at 5 PM

Appendix: Small Group Detailed Notes

Small Group – Myong – Background (pages 8-13)

- Audience?
 - There's a lot of jargon – clarifying terms, simplifying language. If community members or service providers are intended to read it, the language needs edited
 - Kristy will email examples of terms that need clarification
 - Phil: primary audience are the city and district bureaucrats and CBOs – they're the ones that need to be excited
- Missing: Creating workgroups aligned to each goal – need one more set of principles/points about how all five goals will be interconnected
 - Ex: How will Goal A will connect to other groups, etc.
 - How will all the workgroups be woven together?
 - Currently no description of the interaction between the five different working groups
 - Recommendation – have people working on more than one different working group – maybe having each WG member serve on two different groups
- Add to Guiding Principles: organizational design that pairs unlikely partners to foster **cross fertilization** and broad representation
- “Purpose of the Plan” -- initial statement should universally be accessible and bold
- Real photos of actual community members (not stock photos)? Consideration of images, who is represented, and simple lead-ins with text – maybe check with Emily Davis/DCYF
- Making the what the Plan is/isn't more explicit
- Making a statement up front about the \$1.5 billion being spent between SFUSD and City on on children, youth, and families
- Leading with ethos of this effort –we're something big, audacious, broader themes that should be drawn out in a clear way
- Longer timeline? A 5-Year Plan would take us out to 2021
- Place to talk about specific applications of these collective impact strategies
 - What do we hope it will look like going forward?

- Rubric has some content we can use to say when will we know if change is happening
 - How things will be different – can we paint a picture of how things will be different if change is happening?
 - Including pressure points in timeline – i.e., DCYF allocation, Kate Howard, District budget process -- what’s going on simultaneously and where can influence decision-making?
- Some of the components on the timeline could be further elaborated on Describing work of other working groups

Small Group – Ken – Recommendations for Action (p 14 – 22)

Notes

- Need clarification on how many times we will meet. On page 16 it says monthly but in another area it says we will meet 6 times. This is inconsistent.
- Concern: the Council members are too high level. Doesn’t see people who are in the system. Recommend to have people with lived experience at the Council member level and in the work group level. Equity and diversity is not reflected.
- Page 16: Under Participants of the Working Groups need to have had a lived experience.
- Concern: The people being invited to OCOF activates are not the people we are trying to serve.
- Meeting frequency: there may be things happening in each of the workgroups. Need to establish a strong communication between each of the group.
- On the framework: need “lived experience.” Need to change: disparities in physical and emotional help –NOT physically and emotionally challenged.
- Page 16: Under objectives:
 - Map existing resources and gaps. Augment; strengthen what resources we already have. Need to focus on what’s working well already.
 - We need to differentiate the needs of the varying districts. What works well in the Bayview won’t work well in Noe Valley. Strategies will be very different for one neighborhood than another. Need to capture this. This really calls out the equity issue. Plan needs to be shaped according to community needs and adjusted
- The plan needs to address the attack on poverty. The city is changing rapidly every day.
- Equity lens: no statement about poverty and out migration. Needs to be added. Then Groups A and B need to address this.

- Cultural identity is not mentioned in the plan.
- It's important for all 5 groups to meet together. Maybe the Tri-chairs can meet monthly.
- The 5 working groups can meet 6 times.
- Tri-chairs: one should be a lived experience person, one a city person, one either SFUSD or CBO.
- More meetings the better –its how we build community.
- Can we change the language to allow for flexibility
- Suggestion: need an orientation for working group members
- Hold a retreat to jumpstart, it can have a orientation session at beginning and then break into working groups
- Having a different style of delivery – make it fun! The same old, same old is boring.
- Fiscal Mapping: how do we do a fiscal map of caring adults? How do we put a dollar value on this? Can we look at ratio of adult to student? Some things cannot be resource bound. Use of resource bound instead of fiscal mapping. Cultural disconnect. Caution on this: don't use fiscal mapping.
- Composition of council and this working group and the lack of diversity. Make sure we have low-income, formerly incarcerated individuals at the retreat. Pull back from being so prescriptive and be more inclusive.

Small Group – Karin – Recommendations for Action

What we liked:

- Belief that programs are in place but the issue is how to align and coordinate; foundation is there but the linkages may not be there; change of practice; change management
- Heard this group's voice in the plan; there are some coordinated systems
- Collective impact as a frame is helpful
- Belief that if align, that it would be better, but is that the secret formula; some strategies don't have outcomes that are leading toward what we desire; ponder our assumptions?
- On the same page about outcomes; the delivery systems and the gaps are the issues of how to get there;
- Access issue as well

Edits/Changes/ Questions:

- We should be focused on the families with the most need; identify them, ensure we're all delivering to those families
- Heavily weighted on young children connected in families (TAY or youth, foster care get mentioned but not really in a way that reflects their experiences)
- Service delivery needs to be focused on how we get the people who aren't getting there, can get there
- Does not reflect the complexity

- No TAY measures in the framework; maybe we need a TAY sub-group to look at how that group is different? Maybe just better clarity
- How we think about a service delivery system that is different when TAY are not connected to schools
- When we start thinking of service delivery, there is a lot of work to be done around that;
- This is so global,
- Access to information; some families still won't be able to access the service inventory (school lottery)
- Problems with CI applied to SF; other cities were starting at ground 0; didn't have plans; we are at a different level
 - o Can the plans be brought together in a coherent way?
 - o Service delivery system is where it breaks down
- Should we have these committees? Doesn't think we can produce a set of things that will move us;
 - o DCYF allocation plan by November and goes out in March;
 - o Need to align faster than this process would propose
 - o Mayor have a retreat with all department heads to go over strategic plans; having department heads at the same table
- A lot of baseline information absorbed by the committees – communities; committee starts off with a one day retreat; people need to work together on a hard set of issues on a period of time; can't be spread out over a couple of months;
- Front end this system with a lot of staff time and a push to be as far along in conception by November/March – and first Five allocation plan
- We all had to submit our strategic plans to the mayor's office; not sure what will come out of that; we'd like to see everyone else's plans; how will they fit in
- Many people did take this information into their plans; framework
- Figure out how plans align in time for the budget cycle
- Looking at data and what works; evaluation; what data do we have to know what works and what doesn't work; missing in the plan now – would like to see that
- This is focused on process; but the goals we're trying to get to from a service perspective, is not clear
- DCYF funding is an amazing opportunity to make change; is there an opportunity to delay that funding?
- First Five and OECE is aligning with DCYF; mechanics of the funding
- There may be other departments that are not dependent on DCYF funds, might be interesting to think about –
- Overlapping of the five goals; some coordinating mechanism – OCOF council can not be a coordinating function – non operating body
- Same person may be the key person for all the outcomes; who will be the department leads for each meeting;
- Rethinking how to develop the working groups; aligning the other work that is happening;

- 2 hours / once/ month is not going to work; very hard to have a complex in depth conversation about these issues in a two hour time frame; they're done and we're just supposed to sign off on them;
- Interstitial work that is hard
- How do we leverage all these resources is more interesting than trying to achieve goal D
- JV probation department are not succeeding; connection between JPD and SFUSD has to happen; set of IEP plan are getting DPH services – very non-preventative.
- Examples – something is working in these initiatives; how are we pulling out the background /levers for why those examples are working
- Devils are in the details; any one of these takes a huge human capital investment;
- Would prefer that we pick 1-2 things and put the resources behind that thing.
- We get distracted by so much (Hope SF, Project 500)
- Pick one of the five strategies; any of these are super hard to do in of itself
- Great and ambitious and nothing is going to happen
- Action vs. process plan
- Discipline in getting behind it;
- Understanding where we should collaborate and what is our role and where don't we play
- Choose one goal per year
- Choose one strategy per year (collective impact strategies)

Questions

- is that true – do we have gaps in service? I think so
- when we talk about alignment? Are we talking about the department level?
Or at the FRC level?
 - o Aligned for the family