AGENDA

1. Call to Order
   • Introductions & Announcements
   • Agenda Review/Modifications

2. Open Forum for Youth and Parents of Young Children

3. Adoption of Prior Meeting Minutes from January 15th and February 8th, 2014

4. Adoption of the Revised Lesbian, Gay, Bi-Sexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning Youth Services Strategy approved by City Council


6. Administrative Matters
   • General Announcements
   • Upcoming Meetings/ Scheduling

7. Adjournment

Public Comment: The POC welcomes you to its meetings and your interest is appreciated.

- If you wish to speak before the POC, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the staff of the POC.
- If you wish to speak on a matter not on the agenda, please sign up for Open Forum and wait for your name to be called.
- If you wish to speak on a matter on the agenda, please approach the Committee when called, give your name, and your comments.

Please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Only matters within the POC’s jurisdiction may be addressed. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair.

In compliance with Oakland’s policy for people with chemical allergies, please refrain from wearing strongly scented products to meetings. In compliance with the American Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in the meetings for the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth Planning & Oversight Committee, please contact the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth at 510-238-6379. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City of Oakland to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. If you have questions regarding this agenda or related materials, please contact our office at the number above.
I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m.

II. Open Forum for Youth or Families with Small Children
There were no speakers.

III. Adoption of Prior Meeting Minutes from November 20th and December 11th 2013
Marcus Montague made a motion, which was seconded by Derrick Muhammad, to adopt previous meeting minutes from 11/20/13. The motion was approved.

Steven Wirt made a motion, which was seconded by Derrick Muhammad, to adopt previous meeting minutes from 12/11/13. The motion was approved.

IV. OFCY Grant Renewal Process for FY2014-2015
Staff presented the grant renewal process and timeline for the FY2014-2015 including the evaluation process, interim and final evaluation reports, contract execution and new term of service.

There was one speaker for public comment.

V. Adoption of Strategy Amendment to FY2013-2016 Strategic Investment Plan for LGBTQI Youth Services
Staff presented on the Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQI Youth strategy which would amend the 2013-2016 Strategic Investment Plan. Staff also presented the major elements of a draft RFP and timeline. POC had subsequent discussion and approved the adoption of the Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQI Youth strategy to amend the FY2013-2016 Strategic Investment Plan.

There was one speaker for public comment.

VI. Review Process & Timeline for LGBTQI Youth Services Strategy
Staff presented a brief review process for proposals submitted to the RFP for the Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQI Youth strategy. The review process will include scoring of proposal elements by staff, presentation of proposal rankings to POC, and interviews
with highly ranked proposers with the POC Review Subcommittee prior to final selection by the full POC.

There was no speaker for public comment.

VII. **Administrative Matters**
The next meeting of the POC will be the POC retreat on February 8, 2014.

The FY2012-2013 evaluation report was moved to February 25th Life Enrichment Committee meeting.

The Evaluation Subcommittee will meet on January 30th 2014 to discuss the RFP for evaluation of OFCY programs for FY2014-2016.

VIII. **Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 7:24p.m.
I. **Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m.

The next POC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 2014.

II. **Open Forum for Youth or Families with Small Children**
There were no speakers.

III. **POC Retreat**
Consultant Renato Almanzor facilitated exercises with the POC around communication and team building.

IV. **Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.
To: Planning and Oversight Committee, OFCY
From: Sandra Taylor, Human Services Manager, DHS
Date:    February 13, 2014
Re: Adoption of Revised LGBTQ Youth Services Strategy

Executive Summary
At the January 28, 2014 Life Enrichment Committee meeting, LEC requested that the focus on funding collaborative applicants be removed from Strategy #12: Safe Spaces for LGBTQ Youth. A revised Strategy #12 without the focus on collaborative applicants was presented to the full City Council on February 4, 2014 and they approved the revised strategy on the condition that the Planning and Oversight Committee adopt and ratify the attached revised Strategy #12: Safe Spaces for LGBTQ Youth. With the POC’s approval and ratification, OFCY expects to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) in late February 2014 for LGBTQ Youth Services Strategy.
# OFCY Strategy Area

Youth Leadership and Community Safety

# Funding Strategy

#12: Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth

**Strategy Description Summary:**

OFCY will expand community-based programming and safe spaces specifically for LGBTQ youth in Oakland. Safe spaces specifically for LGBTQ youth in Oakland will support the formation of positive identities, foster peer connections, help youth to develop self-sufficiency skills and to work towards achievement of personal goals, and provide opportunities for youth to give voice and leadership in making a more inclusive community and city. Successful services for LGBTQ youth will work to address the need for family support and reconciliation services and enhance their capacity to support youth and their families.

OFCY will expand offerings and outlets for LGBTQ youth in community based settings by:

1. Supporting a **collaboration** to provide consistent programming specifically for LGBTQ youth at a transit-friendly location or locations.

2. Supporting community-based agencies to expand their offerings and/or develop new programming and services specifically for LGBTQ youth, including peer support groups, leadership programming, or recreational/cultural activities.

Programs supported through the strategy would be expected to participate and support efforts to better coordinate and promote the network of LGBTQ youth service providers in Oakland.

---

1. OFCY defines a collaborative application in its’ RFP as consisting of three or more agencies, each contributing substantial participation toward a mutual goal, and at least two of which are proposed to receive OFCY funds. Substantial participation includes providing direct services, planning and coordinating services, and having equal partnership in decision making around program design and implementation. No one agency should receive more than eighty percent (80%) of the funding.

The lead agency of a collaborative will be the agency that contracts with the City of Oakland. Collaboratives must choose a lead agency that has the fiscal and management capacity to support the other partners or subcontractors by issuing payments in a timely and professional manner. All partners of a collaborative must have the capacity to provide services according to proposal submitted by the fiscal sponsor for the collaborative.
### Target Population

Oakland LGBTQ youth ages 14-20.

### Activities

OFCY will support agencies that provide:

- Safe space for LGBTQ youth by providing a welcoming and inclusive climate.
- Connections to caring adults.
- Positive youth development activities through consistent and diverse programming, provided by a qualified and culturally competent staff.
- Access and support to a network of services, support and referrals for LGBTQ youth and their families.
- The capacity to address the need for family support for LGBTQ youth.
- Programming to build strong and secure peer relations and attachments.

### Goals and Outcomes

Programming will achieve the following goals:

- Expansion of programs and available services specifically for LGBTQ youth.
- Increased LGBTQ youth participation and engagement in high quality youth development programs specifically for LGBTQ youth.
- Enhancement of the broader network of support available for LGBTQ youth and improved LGBTQ youth referrals to appropriate services.
- Increased capacity in service providers to address family needs and provide family support.
- Youth have access to enriching activities in safe and supportive places through quality programs

OFCY Outcomes

- Increased levels of community engagement
- Increased confidence/self-esteem
- Increased connection to caring adults

### Alignment with Other Systems of Support

A successful collaboration partnership to provide consistent and quality LGBTQ youth services must support and improve the network of support and referrals available for LGBTQ youth in Oakland.

All programs supported through the strategy would be expected to participate and support efforts to better coordinate and promote the network of LGBTQ youth service providers in Oakland.
**Funding Allocation:**

Between $200,000 and $300,000 in annual funding is projected to be available in FY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016 to support and enhance the infrastructure and network of support services for LGBTQ youth in Oakland available through safe spaces in the community. OFCY seeks to support a collaboration to expansion of LGBTQ specific safe spaces for youth in Oakland, and to support community-based organizations to expand their services or to develop LGBTQ specific programming and services.

**Data / Research Supporting Strategic Need/Investment:**

National studies of adolescent youth indicate that 3% to 6% of youth identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB), reported same-sex attraction, or engaged in same-sex sexual activity\(^1\). A 2011 analysis by the Williams Institute of multiple national population-based surveys of adults estimates that approximately 3.5% of adults in the United States identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual, and an estimated .3% are transgender\(^2\).

There are 22,456 Oakland youth 15-19 years of age\(^3\). Three to six percent is equal to between 674 to 1,347 Oakland LGB youth. Based on the estimate that .3% of the population is transgender, the estimated number of Oakland transgender youth ages 15-19 is 67 individuals.

Recent studies found that the average age gay and lesbian teenagers first self-identify is between 13 and 16, compared to the 1980’s when it was between 19 and 23. However, many individuals report knowing that they were lesbian, gay, or bisexual in the sixth or seventh grade or even earlier\(^4,5\). Self-identification at an earlier age can lead to the stigmatizing of youth, harassment, and discrimination, exposing youth to rejection at home and at school.

Family rejection, discrimination and harassment at school, and homelessness are threats to the health and wellbeing of LGBT youth. These can lead to negative physical and mental health outcomes, negative academic outcomes, increased rates of contact with the juvenile justice system, and increased risky behavior.

Compared to LGBT adults, LGBT youth are extremely vulnerable to the effects of discrimination and stigma because they have not yet had the opportunity to develop networks of support elsewhere if their schools and homes are hostile to them. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the stigma of being LGBT, along with related harassment and discrimination, can cause LGBT youth to develop more troubling health behaviors than their heterosexual counterparts, including depression, homelessness, violence (e.g., bullying, teasing, harassment, physical assault, and suicide-related behaviors), early exposure to sexual activity and drug use. In a study conducted by the CDC, which surveyed 156,000 high school students from 2001-2009, LGBT youth were 63.8% more likely to exhibit risky behaviors; such as, physical violence, unprotected sexual activity, drug use and abuse, and self-inflicted violence, compared to youth not identifying\(^6\). These high rates of substance abuse, called the minority stress effect, are linked to high rates of discrimination and family rejection. Researchers have found, for example, that 51 percent of surveyed LGBT youth reported that they were either currently smoking or were former smokers\(^7\).
The risk of family rejection plays a larger role today than in past years. Lesbian, gay, and bisexual young adults who reported higher levels of family rejection during adolescence were 8.4 times more likely to report having attempted suicide, 5.9 times more likely to report high levels of depression, 3.4 times more likely to use illegal drugs, and 3.4 times more likely to report having engaged in unprotected sexual intercourse compared with peers from families that reported no or low levels of family rejection.

LGBT youth who are accepted by their families are much more likely to believe they will have a good life and will become a happy, productive adult. In families that are not at all accepting of their adolescent’s gay or transgender identity, only about 1 in 3 young people believes they will have a good life as a gay adult. But in families that are extremely accepting, nearly all LGBT young people believe they can have a happy, productive life as an LGBT adult.

Studies show that between 78 percent and 86 percent of LGBT students experience verbal harassment in their schools because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Nearly a quarter of LGBT students report being physically attacked in school. These acts of bullying were not only student-to-student incidents: in a national survey, nearly a third of transgender respondents reported being verbally harassed by teachers or staff in a K-12 school.

In a new study by the Urban Institute, which surveyed 3,745 youth in 7th to 12th grades, 43% of LGBT youth reported being victims of physical dating violence, compared to just 29% of heterosexual youth. Numbers were even higher for victims of emotional abuse (59% of LGBT youth versus 46% of heterosexual youth). Transgender youth had some of the highest rates of victimization, despite making up a tiny percentage of the total respondents.

Community input supporting strategic investment:

Community and youth input identified the need to provide more community-based programming specifically for LGBTQ youth, and cited the lack of current infrastructure in Oakland. Community input was strong in supporting collaborative efforts to expand programming. Youth and community input emphasized that for programs to be successful they must employ culturally competent staff. OFCY broadly received feedback that there is a need to support community-based groups that currently do not have explicit LGBTQ programming to enhance their services to be more intentional and directed specifically for LGBTQ youth. There was a significant amount of feedback regarding the need for current providers to better coordinate services and referrals, and to improve the quality of existing services. Another consistent theme was the need to address family support, reconciliation and acceptance, and the lack of existing resources currently available to support youth in context with their family. Input from service providers highlighted the need for ongoing training and technical assistance to support staffing and agencies to become more inclusive and provide more accepting and supportive spaces for queer or questioning youth.

Evidence-based research/practices framing strategic investment:

Recognized best practices in serving LGBT individuals and families include services that provide a welcoming and inclusive climate, and the provision of linkages, referrals and resources appropriate for their LGBT clients. Another cited best practice are services
that provide the tools for clients to recover from past emotional and psychological trauma related to living in stigmatizing and/or abusive family, school and community environments, and programming that helps to reduce and eliminate stigma and culturally-defined barriers.

While family rejection can lead to homelessness, family acceptance has been shown to have protective effect, and accepting families help to protect LGBT youth against risky health behaviors\(^ {14}\). For youth experiencing or at risk of homelessness, reconnecting to family in a positive way can facilitate reunification and reduce long-term negative consequences\(^ {15}\). Researchers have found that accepting families come from all ethnic and class backgrounds, including families with no formal education or income\(^ {16}\).

Best practices established in serving LGBT youth in out-of-home care, which are also applicable to wider range of youth programming, include supporting family acceptance and reconciliation; creating permanent connections for LGBT youth; promoting positive adolescent development; and providing appropriate health, mental health, and education services to LGBT youth\(^ {17}\).

Community-based programming that is experienced in providing strength-based or asset-based services to LGBT youth are also cited as strong practices\(^ {18}\). Asset-based programming that promotes positive youth development is effective in helping youth achieve positive outcomes and reduce risky behaviors. Studies of resilience for youth who are a sexual/gender minority have demonstrated that positive social relationships moderate distress, while positive family support and acceptance leads to adolescent comfort and resilience in later life. Secure attachment during the coming out process functions to enhance coping with antigay prejudice, self-acceptance, and self-esteem\(^ {19}\).

---

3. US Census 2010 ACS - 1-Year Data: DP03: Selected Economic Characteristics
10. Human Rights Campaign: *Growing up LGBT in America: HRC Youth Survey Report Key Findings*
   http://www.urban.org/publications/904600.html
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19 Peter E. Gamache, P. and Lazear, K. (2009): Asset-Based Approaches for LGBTQI2-S Youth and Families in Systems of Care: Research and Training Center for Children’s Mental Health: University of South Florida, Scholar Commons
To: Planning and Oversight Committee, OFCY  
From: Sandra Taylor, Human Services Manager, DHS  
Date: February 13, 2014  
Re: Selection of the OFCY Independent Evaluator for FY2014-2016

Executive Summary  
On February 5, 2014 the POC Evaluation Subcommittee discussed the funding available and the scope of services for the OFCY evaluation in FY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016. Based on available administration and carryforward funds, OFCY will be able to provide $180,000 in FY2014-2015 and $136,000 in FY2015-2016 towards independent evaluation. Due to the close partnership with OUSD in support of the jointly-funded School-Based Afterschool Strategy and the jointly funded evaluation of the strategy, staff recommends sole sourcing the contract for this strategy with the existing evaluator, Public Profit, for FY2014-2016. OFCY would hold an open and competitive procurement process and release a Request for Proposals (RFP) in late February 2014 for the independent evaluation of the remaining OFCY strategies.

Projected Funding for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2014-2015</th>
<th>FY2015-2016*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CitySpan (1)</td>
<td>$41,250</td>
<td>$41,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (2)</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$136,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Available from admin budget for CitySpan contract.
(2) FY14-15 is funded by $80,000 in carryforward admin funds and $100,000 in true-up FY13-14 budget due to (10%) admin.
*FY15-16 is funded by $100,000 in carryforward from 13-14 admin budget and $36,000 (from $361,982 increase for FY14-15). 
FY2016-2017 budget for evaluation is unknown. Carryforward has been exhausted and projected revenues are unknown.

Scope of Services
The OFCY Independent Evaluator will develop a comprehensive evaluation plan and reports on grantee and strategy performance, program quality, and achievement of program and strategy goals and objectives.

The Evaluator will work with the online CitySpan grantee reporting system and staff to report out on descriptive elements of service at the grantee and strategy level that include:

- youth participation
- hours and types of service delivered
- cost of service
- matching funds raised
- percentage of contracted goals achieved

The Evaluator will also document and report on program quality by collecting data through point of service observations, client surveys, focus groups, or other means. Lastly, the
Evaluator will document and report on grantee achievement of strategy goals and objectives through analysis of data collected via surveys, CitySpan, and other means.

**Evaluation Goals**
The Evaluator’s work will assist the POC and City Council to:

- Prioritize among different funding strategies based on strategy-level understanding of past performance, and to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of funds at the program and strategic level
- Make funding decisions about individual programs based on assessment of grantee performance
- Promote best practices among grantees
- Promote the results and impact of OFCY funding to political and policy decision makers, grantees, and the general public

**Key Activities**
- Identify common outcomes, indicators, methods, and measures for each OFCY funding strategy to assess strategy level performance
- Produce middle and end of the grant cycle year evaluation reports
- Identify and promote promising practices

**Scope of Work**
- **Project Management** – Coordinate with staff on all aspects of the design and implementation of the evaluation. Manage all evaluation activities.
- **Evaluation Design and Implementation** - A comprehensive outcome based evaluation that includes identification of desired outcomes and performance measures for each program and across strategies and strategy areas.
- **Data Collection/Organizing** – Develop and refine data tools, including surveys from various stakeholders.
- **Reporting** - Provide a comprehensive mid-year and final report in formats that are useful and accessible by the public.
- **Engagement of Partners** - As requested, participate in meetings and work with other systems partners in potential areas of integration.
- **Technical Assistance to Grantees and Staff** - Provide technical assistance to grantees to ensure evaluation compliance, and provide grantees with opportunities for evaluation planning for program and organizational development.
**Annual Timeline**

The following is a sample of the probable timeline and deliverables for the evaluation project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Presentation of an Evaluation Design to the staff and Evaluation Subcommittee of the Planning and Oversight Committee for all strategy areas. Initiate data collection and site visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February/March 2015</td>
<td>Mid-year evaluation report delivered to staff and the Evaluation Subcommittee, followed by the POC and City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Submission and presentation of a draft 14-15 final evaluation report to staff and the POC Evaluation Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Submission and presentation of the final Comprehensive OFCY Evaluation Report to the full Planning and Oversight Committee, followed by presentation to the Oakland City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>