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San Francisco is:

- A city with a single county and a single school district
- In the top 3 major cities with the fewest children, but 1 in 3 birth to five year-olds lives in a very low income household
- Comprised of 36 neighborhoods that are diverse in composition and character
- Distinguished by a non-profit sector integral to the life and functioning of the city
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Three Departments with a Vision for San Francisco Families

- **San Francisco Human Services Agency, Family and Children’s Services (HSA)**
  - Administers federal, state, and local dollars with a focus on achieving safety, permanency, and well-being

- **First 5 San Francisco Children and Families Commission (First 5)**
  - Administers state tobacco tax revenue and local dollars with a focus on improved health, child development, family strengthening and systems of care for children birth - 5 and their families

- **Department of Children Youth and Their Families (DCYF)**
  - Administers city general fund dollars focused on improving the well-being of children and youth birth - 24 and their families
Inter-departmental Alignment: How it Worked

• Dedicated time and resources

• Focus on areas of commonality, rather than areas of difference

• Use of existing data to explore and build upon what works
Result 1: Five Goals

• Families build their own capacity to improve family functioning (Early/Intensive Intervention)

• Parents have the knowledge, skills, strategies, and support to parent effectively (Prevention/Intervention)

• Children and youth are nurtured, safe, and supported for school success (Prevention/Intervention)

• Families receive adequate services to meet their basic needs (Prevention)

• Communities are family-focused and responsive (Prevention)
Result 2: Braided Funding Model

**Neighborhood FRC: Basic Service Level**
- Community Building
- Access to Resources
- Parenting Education and Support

- 50% DCYF
- 50% First 5

**Neighborhood FRC: Comprehensive Service Level**
- Basic Service
- Supports for School Readiness and Success
- Case Management
- Linkage with CWS for Coordinated Support

- 25% DCYF
- 25% First 5
- 50% HSA

**Neighborhood FRC: Intensive Service Level**
- Basic Service
- Comprehensive Service
- Intensive Linkage with CWS for Coordinated Support

- 25% DCYF
- 25% First 5
- 50% HSA

**Citywide Special Population FRCs**
Serve families with identifiable need (pregnant/parenting teens, homeless families)

- 16% First 5
- 27% HSA
- 57% DCYF

Service Intensity Increases with Neighborhood Need

$100k - $700k

Funding Increases with Service Intensity
Result 3: Centralized Oversight

- One funding application released
- One agency oversees all contract set-up, billing, reporting, and monitoring site visits
- One central, web-based data system
- Continued support from leadership team and inter-departmental workgroups
Implementation: How it Worked
Three Key Elements

• Focus on Quality

• Essential Service Framework

• Standardized Evaluation Plan
Evaluation Measures

• **Process Measures**
  - Contract Management System Database
  - Participant Program Assessment Survey (Satisfaction/Quality Section)

• **Outcome Measures**
  - Participant Program Assessment Survey (Sources of Coping and Social Support)
  - Parenting Scale
  - Keys to Interactive Parenting Scale (KIPS)
  - Family Development Matrix (FDM)
  - Child Welfare Services Case Management System
What We Learned Year 1

• **Who was served?**
  • Approximately 8,000 parents and 3,500 children
  • A majority where Hispanic or Asian and one in three were not fluent in English
  • 1,600 participants had a history of child welfare involvement
  • 650 had been referred by child welfare or had an active child welfare case

• **What was their engagement?**
  • Average parent had 9 visits during the year
  • Large majority were involved in 1 – 2 types of Essential Services
  • High satisfaction among participants
What We Learned Year 1

• What changed?
  • Participants less likely to be “In Crisis” or “At Risk” at last assessment of the Family Development Matrix
  • Ineffective parenting practices decreased between first and last assessment for parents participating in parent education
  • Grantees are becoming more engaged in data collection and evaluation
  • Funders are better able to describe achievements for families and make programmatic shifts
  • Funding to FRCs has been sustained even during times of budget cuts
  • Other city/county departments are drawn to the FRC model
Next Steps
Refinement and Expansion
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