DATE: April 23, 2020, Regular Meeting
TIME: 9:30 AM
PLACE: **By Virtual Teleconference Only**

Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20, issued on March 17, 2020, this meeting will be held by teleconference only. No physical location will be available for this meeting; however, members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting as noted below, and online streaming will continue as normal via the County Agenda Portal, YouTube Channel, and Live Audio Stream.

To address the Board in public comment, please review the Public Comment Instructions below, then access the teleconference at: https://zoom.us/j/93413896539

Further instructions for accessing the teleconference will be posted online at: www.sccgov.org/bosmeeting

AGENDA
-- The recommended actions appearing on the agenda are those recommended by staff. The Committee may take other actions relating to the issues as may be determined following consideration of the matter and discussion of the recommended actions.

-- Items that will require action by the Board of Supervisors may be forwarded to a future Board of Supervisors meeting for consideration.

-- Language interpretation services are available. Please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001 no less than three business days prior to the meeting to request an interpreter.

-- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Brown Act, those requiring accommodations in this meeting should notify the Clerk of the Board's Office 24 hours prior to the meeting at (408) 299-5001, or TDD (408) 993-8272.

-- To obtain a copy of any supporting document that is available, contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001.

-- Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to all or a majority of the Board of Supervisors (or any other commission, or board or committee) less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board, 70 West Hedding Street, 10th Floor, during normal business hours.

Members of the Public may provide public comments at this meeting as follows:

- Written public comments may be submitted by email to BoardOperations@cob.sccgov.org. Written comments will be distributed to the Committee as quickly as possible, however, please note that documents may take up to 24 hours to be posted to the agenda outline.

- Spoken public comments will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, click on the link above for the appropriate meeting to access the Zoom-based meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully.

  1. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in-browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
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2. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. The Clerk requests that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.

3. When the Chairperson calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand.” The Clerk will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.

4. When called to speak, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted.

Notice to the Public

Please be advised that Supervisors Dave Cortese and Cindy Chavez preside over both the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee (CSFC) and the Finance and Government Operations Committee (FGOC), and constitute a quorum of both Committees.

This meeting is therefore noticed as both a CSFC and FGOC meeting. However, this meeting focuses on items under the purview of the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee.

Opening

1. Call to Order.

2. Public Comment.

   This item is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on any matter not on this agenda. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on any item not listed on the agenda should request to speak at this time. The Chairperson will call individuals to the podium in turn.

   Speakers are limited to the following: three minutes if the Chairperson or designee determines that five or fewer persons wish to address the Committee; two minutes if the Chairperson or designee determines that between six and fourteen persons wish to address the Committee; and one minute if the Chairperson or designee determines that fifteen or more persons wish to address the Committee.

   The law does not permit Committee action or extended discussion of any item not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Committee action is requested, the Committee may place the matter on a future agenda. Statements that require a response may be referred to staff for reply in writing.

3. Approve Consent Calendar and changes to the Committee’s Agenda.

   Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be considered at the end of the regular agenda for discussion. The Committee may also add items on the regular agenda to the Consent Calendar.

   Notice to the public: there is no separate discussion of Consent Calendar items, and the recommended actions are voted on in one motion. If an item is approved on the consent vote, the specific action recommended by staff is adopted. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on Consent Calendar items should comment under this item. Each speaker is limited to two minutes total.
4. Receive updates relating to COVID-19. (ID# 101142)
   a. Discuss expansion of child care access to additional essential workers throughout the County.
   b. Discuss support for CalFresh and the General Assistance Program.
   c. Discuss flexibility of requirements for Requests for Proposals, including possible use of vacant buildings for Meals on Wheels and other needs.
   d. Discuss impact of COVID-19 response on the County Budget.
   e. Additional discussion items related to Children, Seniors, and Families and COVID-19.

5. Consider recommendations relating to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board's placement of a three-county measure to impose a one-eighth of one percent retail transactions and use tax to be used for operating and capital purposes of the Caltrain rail service on the November 3, 2020 election ballot. (Office of the County Executive) (ID# 101162)
   Possible action:
   a. Receive report from the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.
   b. Forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration a recommendation to support the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board's placement of a three-county measure to impose a one-eighth of one percent retail transactions and use tax on the November 3, 2020 election ballot.

6. Receive quarterly report from the Office of the County Executive and the Facilities and Fleet Department relating to the Vietnamese American Service Center. (ID# 101091)

7. Consider recommendations relating to the annual report from the Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds. (ID# 101078)
   Possible action:
   b. Receive response from the Social Services Agency, Department of Family and Children's Services.

8. Receive report from Social Services Agency relating to alignment of Cross-Systems Prevention Efforts. (ID# 100980)
9. Receive report from the Social Services Agency, Office of Supportive Housing, and Facilities and Fleet Department relating to the housing project status and short-term operations of the Hub. (ID# 101054)

10. Receive report from the Social Services Agency relating to Contract and Procurement Operations. (ID# 101040)

11. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to the expansion of recruitment and retention efforts for transgender, gender-nonconforming, nonbinary, and gender diverse employees, applicants, and contractors, with special focus on transgender women. (Held from March 26, 2020, Item No. 10)

   **Request from Administration to hold item to September 24, 2020**

12. Receive report from the Social Services Agency relating to updates to the Department of Family and Children's Services website. (Referral from February 27, 2020, Item No. 9)

   **Request from Administration to hold item to date uncertain**

13. Receive verbal report from Social Services Agency Director.

14. Receive verbal report from Department of Child Support Services Director.

**Consent Calendar**

15. Approve minutes of the March 26, 2020 Regular Meeting.

16. Receive report from the Board of Supervisors Management Audit Division relating to the annual management audit risk assessment. (ID# 101086)

17. Receive report from the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention relating to the development of a comprehensive Request for Proposals to address gender-based violence, including the design, work plan and timeline for these efforts. (Referral from November 14, 2019, Item No. 11) (Chavez) (ID# 100760)

**Adjourn**

18. Adjourn. The next regular meeting of the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee that focuses on items under the purview of the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee is on Thursday, May 28, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose.
DATE: April 23, 2020

TO: Children, Seniors, and Families Committee

FROM: Cindy Chavez, Supervisor
      Dave Cortese, Supervisor

SUBJECT: Discussion on COVID-19 Related Issues

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Receive updates relating to COVID-19.

a. Discuss expansion of child care access to additional essential workers throughout the County.

b. Discuss support for CalFresh and the General Assistance Program.

c. Discuss flexibility of requirements for Requests for Proposals, including possible use of vacant buildings for Meals on Wheels and other needs.

d. Discuss impact of COVID-19 response on the County Budget.

e. Additional discussion items related to Children, Seniors, and Families and COVID-19.
DATE: April 23, 2020
TO: Children, Seniors, and Families Committee
FROM: Steve Preminger, Director, Strategic & Intergovernmental Affairs
Danielle Christian, Legislative Manager

SUBJECT: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Placement of a Measure on the November 2020 Election Ballot

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Consider recommendations relating to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board's placement of a three-county measure to impose a one-eighth of one percent retail transactions and use tax to be used for operating and capital purposes of the Caltrain rail service on the November 3, 2020 election ballot. (Office of the County Executive)

Possible action:
   a. Receive report from the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.
   b. Forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration a recommendation to support the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board's placement of a three-county measure to impose a one-eighth of one percent retail transactions and use tax on the November 3, 2020 election ballot.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no impact to the County General Fund as a result of approving the recommended action. The County’s costs of placing the sales tax measure on the November 2020 ballot will be reimbursed by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
Senate Bill 797 (SB 797), authored by Senator Jerry Hill, was signed into law in 2017. The bill authorized the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) to implement a new retail transactions and use tax of up to 0.125 percent in the Counties of Santa Clara, San Francisco, and San Mateo, provided that all of the following occur:
   a) The Board of Directors of the JPB adopts by a two-thirds vote, a resolution submitting the measure to the voters;
b) The measure is approved by the Boards of Supervisors in the Counties of Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco, consistent with each county’s applicable procedures;

c) The measure is approved by a majority vote of the governing boards of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the San Mateo County Transit District, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency; and

d) The tax is adopted by a two-thirds vote of the three counties’ voters.

Approval of the resolution by the County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors requires a vote of three Board members.

SB 797 allows a regional measure by the JPB to impose the retail transactions and use tax, even if, combined with all taxes imposed by cities or counties, it exceeds the two percent combined cap.

Net revenues generated from the retail transactions and use tax will provide a dedicated funding source to support the operational and capital costs of Caltrain service. Specifically, the tax revenues from the measure will be prioritized to support the operation of Caltrain service levels throughout its corridor to expand service and increase capacity; support the infrastructure, rolling stock, and capital projects necessary to advance the expansion of Caltrain peak hour service from six trains per hour per direction to eight trains per hour per direction, as well as expansion of Gilroy services to a minimum of five morning and five afternoon trains; and to develop and implement programs to expand access to the Caltrain service and facilitate the use of the system by passengers of all income levels. Revenues from the measure would also help leverage other local, regional, state, and federal investments to advance the capital projects necessary to implement the Caltrain Business Plan’s 2040 Service Vision.

Administration has participated in conversations with Caltrain staff over the past four months about its interest in placing the three-county measure on the November 2020 election ballot. At the request of the Caltrain Executive Director, Administration is bringing a Resolution to the Board of Supervisors in May to approve the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board’s (JPB) placement of the measure on the November 2020 election ballot. The five other agencies that must approve placement of the measure on the ballot will consider the item over the next few months. The JPB must adopt a resolution to submit the measure to voters before the end of August 2020.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is the governing body for the Caltrain

Board of Supervisors: Mike Wasserman, Cindy Chavez, Dave Cortese, Susan Ellenberg, S. Joseph Simitian
County Executive: Jeffrey V. Smith
Agenda Date: April 23, 2020
Peninsula commuter rail transit service between San Francisco and Gilroy. The JPB is a joint powers authority formed pursuant to a 1996 joint powers agreement between the City and County of San Francisco, the San Mateo County Transit District, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (together, the Member Agencies). The JPB is comprised of nine representatives, three each from San Francisco, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties.

Since its inception, the JPB has not had a dedicated source of funding other than passenger fares. It relies on contributions from its Member Agencies for its operating and capital budgets under two different funding formulas. Funding levels are determined each year through a process that results in an uncertain financial and planning environment for the JPB. It is further exacerbated by rising operating, maintenance, and repair costs that prevent the JPB from operating at service levels that meet the rising passenger demands for Caltrain service.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

Failure to approve the recommended action will prevent the Committee from receiving the report and forwarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration.

ATTACHMENTS:

- SB797 Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PDF)
Caltrain Business Plan
APRIL 2020

SB797 Update
Key Topics

- SB797 Overview; Caltrain Corridor Today and Tomorrow
- Costs and Funding Needs
- The SB797 Opportunity: Electrified Expanded Benefits
SB797 Overview + Caltrain Today & Tomorrow
3-County 1/8-Cent Sales Tax

- 2/3 of total combined vote from the 3 counties
- Can exceed 2% local sales tax limit
- ~$108 million/year for operating & capital needs

Annual Projection: $108 million

- San Francisco County $26.5
- San Mateo County $25.0
- Santa Clara County $56.5

(amounts in millions of dollars)
7-Agency Approval Process

Regional
Caltrain Board of Directors (⅔ majority)

San Francisco County
- SFMTA Board of Directors
- Board of Supervisors (⅔ majority)

San Mateo County
- SamTrans Board of Directors
- Board of Supervisors (⅔ majority)

Santa Clara County
- VTA Board of Directors
- Board of Supervisors (⅔ majority)
Caltrain Corridor Today

- Bi-directional commute, multiple destination centers
- Seventh largest commuter rail in county
- ~65,000 daily riders; 22 miles ave. travel length; 32 stations
- $0.5 Subsidy for each mile traveled (compared to $5-7 per mile other Bay Area systems)
- Most efficient railroad in the country
- Overcrowding trains
- Diesel system past it’s retirement date
- Electrification Project in Construction
Future Caltrain Corridor

- By 2040, Caltrain ridership demand of over 200,000 daily riders
- Corridor expected to add 1.2 million people and jobs within 2 miles of Caltrain (+40%)
- Significant freeway congestion
- Major transit infrastructure projects further increase Caltrain demand
  - BART to Santa Clara County
  - San Francisco Downtown Extension/Pennsylvania Avenue Tunnel
  - Dumbarton Rail
- Electrification Project foundation for future growth
Near Term Electrified Expansion Path
Possible, with additional resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Electrified Baseline</th>
<th>Electrified Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5 trains/peak hour 92 trains/day</td>
<td>6 trains/peak hour 168 trains/day</td>
<td>8 trains/peak hour 204 trains/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>8 trains/peak hour 204 trains/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>268 Caltrains/day 134 CAHSR trains/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caltrain Service Vision
## Electrified Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>现状</th>
<th>新增</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Trains per peak hour at major stations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 hours of peak service per day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Off-peak trains per hour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gilroy roundtrips daily</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More standardized schedules and enhanced connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electrified Expansion Details

8 Trains per peak hour at major stations (5 today)
7.5 hours of peak service per day (5 today)
4 Off-peak trains per hour (2 today)
5 Gilroy roundtrips daily (3 today)
More standardized schedules and enhanced connections
Costs and Funding Needs
Operating Costs & Revenue

Caltrain Today

- No dedicated funding sources
- Member Agencies help fund on annual basis:
  - Operations (ridership based formula)
  - Annual Capital SOGR (split evenly)
- Major Capital Projects have unique separate funding plans with a mix federal, state, local, member agency funds

All costs shown in YOE $
Annual Member Contributions

Caltrain Today

- No dedicated funding sources
- Member Agencies help fund on annual basis:
  - Operations (ridership based formula)
  - Annual Capital SOGR (split evenly)
- Major Capital Projects have unique separate funding plans with a mix federal, state, local, member agency funds

### Combined Share of Annual Capital SOGR & Ops vs. Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>% of FY20</th>
<th>% of riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$15.6M</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>$16.6M</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>$20.2M</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$52.4M</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in YOE $
Ridership Projected Growth by County

While the overall ridership increases dramatically, ridership percentage by county varies only slightly over time.

### Combined Share of Annual Capital SOGR & Ops vs. Future Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Combined Share of FY20 Funding</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>28,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>46,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in YOE $
## Baseline Electrified Growth

Total Member Agency Obligation without SB797

To cover existing electrified baseline plans, Member agencies would have higher funding obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Member Agency Obligation</th>
<th>Increased Member Agency Obligation from Today FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Expense – Electrified Baseline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Op</td>
<td>$37 million annually (average)</td>
<td>$7 million annually (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Annual Capital (SOGR) Needs</td>
<td>$40 million annually (average)</td>
<td>$20 million annually (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Capital Investment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All costs shown in YOE $*
Baseline Electrified Growth
By County, Member Agency Obligation without SB797

To cover existing electrified baseline plans, Member agencies would have higher funding obligations.
## Electrified Expanded Growth Costs

Total Member Agency Obligation without SB797

Electrified Expanded Growth would increase member agency contributions even higher

### Electrified Expanded (8 trains per hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Expense – Enhanced Growth</th>
<th>Total Member Agency Obligation</th>
<th>Increased Member Agency Obligation from FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Op</td>
<td>$58 million annually (average)</td>
<td>$28 million annually (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Annual Capital (SOGR) Needs</td>
<td>$40 million annually (average)</td>
<td>$20 million annually (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Capital Investment</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in YOE $
### Electrified Expanded Growth

Total Member Agency Obligation with SB797

After Operating and Capital SOGR, SB797 would provide $300 million over 30 years ($10 million annually). Member agency contributions or other external sources of funding would be needed to cover the remaining $~700 million. If Member contributions were maintained at FY20 level, $1.8B available for new capital investments.

### Electrified Expanded (8 trains per hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Expense – Enhanced Growth</th>
<th>Total Member Agency Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Op</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Annual Capital (SOGR) Needs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Capital Investment</td>
<td>~$700 million total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~$233 million each member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in YOE $
With SB797: Expenditure Plan

Revenues prioritized:

- Operations and annual capital (state of good repair) needs
- Capital – infrastructure such as level boarding and rolling stock to advance the expansion of the Caltrain peak hour service to 8 trains per hour, per direction as well as the expansion of service on the Gilroy extension to a minimum of five roundtrip per day
- Equity benefits

Additional revenue:

Revenues will also be eligible to help advance capital projects necessary to implement the Caltrain Business Plan’s 2040 Service Vision.
SB797 Opportunity: Electrified Expanded Service Benefits
Electrified Expansion Benefits
Ridership, equivalent capacity of 3 additional Chase Centers

Daily Ridership

Existing: 63,000
Electrified Expansion: 110,000

3 Additional Chase Centers
Electrified Expansion Benefits
Adds the equivalent capacity of 2 new freeway lanes

Trains vs. Lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electrified expansion</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain currently carries 4 freeway lanes’ worth of traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equivalent 2 additional freeways lanes
Increasing service from six to eight trains per hour, per direction enables more frequent service to more stations. With an expanded electrified service, 20 of 24 mainline stations would receive at least four trains per hour, per direction, and nearly half of stations would receive eight trains per hour, per direction.
Electrified Expansion Benefits
Over 240 million fewer vehicle miles traveled per year by riders

Vehicle Miles Not Traveled by Riders

Existing: 396
2030: 639
Next Steps
7-Agency Approval Process

Regional
Caltrain Board of Directors (⅔ majority) – ACTION JULY

San Francisco County
- SFMTA Board of Directors --- ACTION MAY
- Board of Supervisors (⅔ majority) -- ACTION JULY

San Mateo County
- SamTrans Board of Directors --- ACTION APRIL
- Board of Supervisors (⅔ majority) --- ACTION MAY

Santa Clara County
- VTA Board of Directors – ACTION JUNE
- Board of Supervisors (⅔ majority) --- ACTION MAY

August 7, 2020 deadline to place a measure on the ballot
FOR MORE INFORMATION
WWW.CALTRAIN2040.ORG
BUSINESSPLAN@CALTRAIN.COM
650-508-6499
DATE: April 23, 2020
TO: Children, Seniors, and Families Committee
FROM: Steve Preminger, Director, Strategic & Intergovernmental Affairs
SUBJECT: Vietnamese American Service Center (VASC) Status Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive quarterly report from the Office of the County Executive and the Facilities and Fleet Department relating to the Vietnamese American Service Center.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal implications associated with the receipt of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the Vietnamese American Service Center (VASC) – Executive Meeting on September 7, 2017 and October 31, 2017, it was recommended that a status update on the VASC project be presented to the Children, Seniors and Families Committee (CSFC) in order to receive feedback on the recommended Service Model and Operational Plan. The last quarterly report was presented to CSFC on February 27, 2020 (Item No. 7).

The overall project timeline has remained the same since the February report. At the County’s Lunar New Year community event on February 7, 2020, an update was provided to the community regarding construction progress and the building’s lighting design. The anticipated “topping off” of steel will take place in early Summer 2020.

Members of the community who are interested in staying up to date on this project may visit the project’s website (https://www.sccgov.org/sites/faf/capital-projects/vasc/Pages/home.aspx). The website includes a video rendition of the completed center, project timeline, and an email sign-up to receive updates.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

Board of Supervisors: Mike Wasserman, Cindy Chavez, Dave Cortese, Susan Ellenberg, S. Joseph Simitian
County Executive: Jeffrey V. Smith
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

**BACKGROUND**

On February 23, 2016 (Item No. 12), the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the designation of the County-owned parcel located at Senter Road near Tully Road in San José as the site for the future VASC. It was the intent of the Board that the approximately 30,000 to 50,000 square foot building, along with a parking structure, house the VASC as well as other County services.

On completion, the VASC will serve as a one-stop hub for the County’s health and human services, supporting the delivery in a culturally competent and language-accessible manner. In 2012, the Santa Clara County Public Health Department completed the Vietnamese American Health Assessment, as proposed by the Board. A subsequent VASC Stakeholder Assessment further affirmed the need for access to County’s health and human services. Accordingly, during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-2017 Budget process, the Board approved a funding allocation of $7,000,000 for the programming and design of the VASC.

The VASC planning and programming phase has included extensive engagement with County departments and stakeholders and will continue to engage with the stakeholders through the design phase. The Initial Building Programming was completed in December 2017 and the Design Contract was awarded to AEDIS Architects on January 9, 2018. The project remains a top priority for the County, and Facilities and Fleet Department (FAF) continues to work towards completion of the design with the services of AEDIS.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The Children, Seniors, and Families Committee will not receive this quarterly report.

**LINKS:**
- Linked To: 100478 : 100478

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- VASC CSFC Report 04232020 (PDF)
County of Santa Clara
Vietnamese American Service Center (VASC)

FAF Status Report for Children, Seniors and Families Committee
April 23rd, 2020
PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

• FOUNDATION WORK COMPLETE
• STEEL FABRICATION – IN PROGRESS

KEY WORK IN PROGRESS- HIGHLIGHTS FOR THE NEXT FEW MONTHS

• Layout of underground utilities
• Erection of steel and metal decking
  • Interior metal framing

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Lunar New Year community event took place on February 7th. Updates given on construction progress and building lighting design.

Anticipated topping off of steel to take place in early Summer, 2020.
### County of Santa Clara VASC Project Schedule

#### Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Feb 2020 Report</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Start</td>
<td>2/20/2018</td>
<td>2/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design End</td>
<td>4/22/2019</td>
<td>4/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction End</td>
<td>6/15/2021</td>
<td>6/15/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move-in / Project Closeout</td>
<td>9/15/2021</td>
<td>9/15/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Engagement Plan

- Community Meet and Greet with the Design Team. Presentation of schematics to receive community and stakeholder input.  
  - July 2018
- Establish dialogue between community and design team. Receive community and stakeholder feedback during Schematic Design phase.  
  - October 2018
- Community Report on the Progress of the VASC. Presentation of potential design to receive community input on interiors, colors and textures.  
  - January 2019
- Groundbreaking Ceremony and Community Celebration.  
  - November 23, 2019
- Lunar Year Celebration and Project Updates.  
  - February 7, 2020
- "Topping Off" Construction Progress Celebration.  
  - Summer 2020
- Lunar Year Celebration and Hard Hat Tours.  
  - Winter 2020
- Ribbon Cutting Ceremony.  
  - Spring 2021
- Grand Opening and Open House  
  - Fall 2021
DATE: April 23, 2020
TO: Children, Seniors, and Families Committee
FROM: John P. Mills, Director, Employee Services Agency
SUBJECT: Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds Annual Report covering January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Consider recommendations relating to the annual report from the Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds.
Possible action:
   b. Receive response from the Social Services Agency, Department of Family and Children's Services.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal implications associated with the receipt of this informational report.

CONTRACT HISTORY
The County of Santa Clara has maintained a juvenile welfare ombuds function in conjunction with the Social Services Agency’s (SSA) Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS) since 1992, with the Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds (JWOO) providing these services through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) since 2004.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
The Children, Seniors, and Families Committee (CSFC) requests annual reports from JWOO.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action positively impacts the indicator Children Living in Safe and Stable Family Environments by providing DFCS with additional opportunities to assess and improve the quality of its services.
SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
DFCS has closely reviewed JWOO’s attached Annual Report and is working with JWOO on an ongoing basis, where appropriate, to further investigate and address concerns raised. DFCS remains committed to addressing concerns identified on a systems level, as well as individual concerns unique to particular cases. DFCS will continue its practice of regular meetings with JWOO to review current complaints and track relevant information for analysis in order to inform the development of concrete action plans.

DFCS recognizes the value of JWOO’s work in providing a safe and neutral environment for DFCS clients to voice their concerns, as well as in providing constructive feedback for DFCS to address. This partnership ensures that the needs of families and children are met in the most appropriate manner possible.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION
The Children, Seniors, and Families Committee would not receive the JWOO Annual Report.

STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL
The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors should follow the usual procedures for a report of this type.

ATTACHMENTS:
- CY 2019 JWOO Report to CSFC (PDF)
- CY 2019 JWOO - DFCS Matrix Trend #1 (PDF)
- CY 2019 JWOO - DFCS Matrix Trend #2 (PDF)
Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds Report
(Covering January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019)
Children, Seniors, & Families Committee
Katja De Groot, Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services

Building Bridges
Within the Santa Clara County Juvenile Welfare System
“All the work you’ve put in has made a difference ... thank you for setting up the opportunity to have a healthy dialogue with my social worker.”

~ Visitor to the JWOO
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Message from the Ombuds

The Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds (JWOO) continues to engage productively and collaboratively with the Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS) to address concerns raised by individuals and families who are experiencing the child welfare system. Visitors to the office bring forth issues that are complex, multi-dimensional and require open lines of communication to address. We offer visitors a unique opportunity to partake in an informal, confidential, neutral and independent process to help improve communication and relationships, and to explore alternative options to formal processes. Our partnership with the DFCS enables us to provide the broadest set of options to our visitors.

In the following Annual Report, we aim to provide insight as to communication and engagement disconnects and gaps through the lens of our visitors’ experiences and narratives. We also offer our thoughts and ideas for the Department’s consideration as to what changes may help to improve how families and children experience the child welfare system.

We look forward to our ongoing joint efforts and collaboration with the DFCS management and social work teams in the year ahead.

Katja De Groot, JD
Program Manager, Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services (OMOS)

David Galan, MA
Senior Mediator and Juvenile Welfare Ombuds, OMOS

Kate Flynn, JD
Senior Mediator and Juvenile Welfare Ombuds, OMOS
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2310 N. First Street, Ste. 100, San José, CA 95131 • Phone (408) 993-4114 • Fax (408) 297-2463 • OMBUDS@ceo.sccgov.org
www.sccgov.org/amos
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Executive Summary

The Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds (JWOO) assists visitors in addressing concerns with the Santa Clara County Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS). The JWOO fulfills one of the responsibilities of our organization by submitting this Annual Report to share information and provide feedback to the Santa Clara County Children, Seniors, and Families Committee (CSFC), the Social Services Department, the DFCS and the public. In this report we describe the role and activities of the JWOO, the various services we provide, and the collaborations in which we participate. We report statistical data on the types of issues and current and emerging trends that surfaced, as well as comparative data from previous reporting periods. Additionally, we discuss addressing associated risks and the potential costs of conflict.

As an accompaniment to the Annual Report, the JWOO presents system improvement suggested actions and the DFCS provides corresponding responses in the form of the jointly developed January 2019 – December 2019 Matrix of JWOO Identified Trends Raised to DFCS Administration (Matrix), which is attached to this report. The Matrix provides the JWOO the opportunity to present forward-focused recommendations and the DFCS to respond with actionable follow up items, projected timelines, and identification of resources necessary to help effectuate any operational and/or systemic improvements. The JWOO recommendations are proffered for the Department’s consideration and emerged from two trends emanating from JWOO visitor-raised concerns: 1) Relatives and Non-Relative Extended Family Member (NREFM) Visitors Seek Clarity as to Options and Decision-Making Factors for Maintaining Ongoing Connections to a Child/Children; and 2) Families Express Confusion over the Communication and Application of Domestic Violence Policies and Protocols.

The JWOO continues to work with visitors to the office by discussing options to address and help resolve their concerns. The JWOO identifies and processes the concerns raised by each of those visitors through issue categories and subcategories. Highlights of information and statistical analysis of the JWOO’s cases for this reporting period’s twelve-month span of January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019 are as follows.

Cases

- The JWOO provided services to its visitors in a total of 195 cases.
- 292 children were attached to the visitor cases.
- Case counts trended upward, with the number of cases in 2019 increasing by 13% over the prior calendar year.
- Parents remain the most prevalent visitors to the JWOO at 54%.
Visitor Concerns and Case Trends

- The JWOO identified 396 issues, organized into 12 issue categories, the majority of which at 92% were substantive concerns.
- The most prominent issue categories of visitor concerns remain 1) Social Worker Behavior; and 2) Communication.

Ombuds Activities:

- The JWOO facilitated meetings with visitors and the social work team in 17% of cases.
- The JWOO increased its collaboration with the DFCS by providing extended neutral services, including facilitating meetings and acting as a communication resource/support.
- The JWOO conducted extensive outreach, including presenting at Parent Orientation classes.
- The JWOO bridged the DFCS to the Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services (OMOS) Child, Senior & Family Conflict Resolution Program.
**Background & Role of the Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds**

The Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds (JWOO) is a designated neutral office established in 1992 within the County of Santa Clara on the recommendation of the Harvey M. Rose Accountancy Corporation. The JWOO is part of the Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services (OMOS) and is located within the County Executive’s Office structure in order to preserve its independent function as distinctly separate from the Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS), and is governed by a set of protocols first established by the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. The JWOO focuses its resources - 2.5 full-time equivalents - on 1) addressing case-specific concerns regarding JWOO visitors’ experiences with the Santa Clara County Child Welfare System, generally, and the DFCS, specifically; 2) identifying and evaluating trends, and providing corresponding operational and system improvement recommendations to the DFCS for their consideration; and, 3) providing communication and conflict coaching; dispute resolution trainings, facilitations, conciliations, mediations and additional neutral services support.

Each year, the JWOO highlights and reports on issues of concern, and provides recommendations for system change in the JWOO Annual Report to the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee.

**Organizational Ombuds**: A designated neutral who is appointed or employed by an organization to facilitate the informal, independent, and confidential resolution of concerns by identifying options for visitors and raising systemic issues to the attention of the organization.

~ International Ombudsman Association

**Visitor**: Any individual contacting the Ombuds for information, referral, or about a concern regarding the Juvenile Welfare System generally, or the Department of Family and Children’s Services specifically.

**Case**: Any contact to the JWOO by a visitor with one or more issues involving the juvenile welfare system generally, or the DFCS specifically.

**Issue**: A question or concern connected to a child welfare case that the visitor has not been able to satisfactorily resolve on their own.

**Trend**: Concerns cited by multiple visitors or implicating a serious nature, raised to executive leadership for system improvement.
Ombuds Office Overview

An organizational ombuds is a designated neutral who is appointed or employed by an organization to facilitate the informal, independent, and confidential resolution of concerns pertaining to the organization, by identifying options for visitors and raising systemic issues to the attention of the organization.

Standards of Practice
The JWOO adheres to the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) Standards of Practice\(^1\) for Organizational Ombudsman to maintain:

1) **Independence**, by functioning within the County Executive’s Office and reporting directly to the CSFC. The JWOO is independent from DFCS within the county structure and does not take direction from nor is overseen by any agent of the Department.

2) **Neutrality**, by not serving in an advocacy role for the visitor nor for the governmental agency. The Ombuds seeks to be *multi-partial*.

3) **Confidentiality**: by protecting the information shared by a visitor up to the point they permit the Ombuds to reveal and share information with agreed upon others; by anonymizing data and safeguarding the identity of individuals when raising trends; and by not testifying in any formal or judicial processes, including trials. The JWOO adheres to a routine schedule of destroying any notes an ombuds may have made while working with a visitor.

4) **Informality**: by providing an uncomplicated process for its visitors; by working in a mediative and facilitative manner; by not conducting investigations, by not serving as an office of notice; by not making written or verbal conclusions or binding decisions; by not formally adjudicating issues; and by not mandating policies. The Ombuds does not participate in formal investigations.

How We Work with Visitors and the Department
System involvement can represent some of the most trying times for families and others involved with the child welfare system. Navigating the process can feel overwhelming, cause significant stress and hamper a person’s ability to communicate effectively and retain information. As tension and frustration levels rise, trust in the process diminishes and feelings of lack of belonging, understanding, respect, safety and trust increases. By focusing on strengthening communication, the JWOO helps visitors and social workers engage with one another in ways that allow for a more productive relationship to develop and for positive movement forward.

When we as ombuds work with a visitor, we listen deeply for possible misunderstandings, unspoken expectations and underlying unmet needs our visitors may have. As issues are jointly identified we can provide a neutral perspective and function as a confidential sounding board, help prioritize needs, share relevant policies and discuss options. If the visitor chooses to remain anonymous, we can help by empowering them to self-advocate by brainstorming approaches toward building positive communication and a productive relationship with their social worker. This could include help with developing questions, phrasing requests, or coaching on techniques for better navigating conflict.

If the visitor wants to move forward and have the Ombuds help to bridge communication, then we ask the visitor to verbally waive confidentiality so the Ombuds can discuss their concerns with their social worker. When we speak with social workers, we emphasize that one of the roles of the Ombuds is that of a communication professional who helps to facilitate conversations between them and their clients in such a way that they may have a more constructive working relationship. Oftentimes, the social worker is also frustrated with the communication dynamic and welcomes the JWOO’s involvement. We can act as a resource for the social worker in sharing and reinforcing important information they need to relay to their client. For some visitors, the relaying of important pieces of information may be all that’s needed to provide clarity, otherwise we will set up a meeting with the social work team, the visitor and ourselves as facilitator. During ombuds facilitated conversations we utilize our communication tools to help those present navigate difficult subjects, reframe and restate important information so it may be heard and understood, and deal with conflict effectively. We listen for disconnects, communication styles and we ask clarifying questions to shed light on the issues presented by the visitor.

How We Worked with our Visitors in CY19

![Graph showing how visitors were worked with](image-url)
From January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019, the JWOO provided ombuds services in 195 cases. 99% of visitors connected with an ombuds for an initial conversation regarding his or her concerns. In these initial conversations the Ombuds explained our services and how we practice, listened deeply to help unpack the visitor’s stories and concerns, validated feelings, helped to set expectations, and discussed options for addressing the concerns. Oftentimes, in addition to providing system information and identifying and bridging to resources, the Ombuds provided communication and conflict coaching during these initial calls.

For the majority of visitors, the JWOO provided ongoing assistance without bridging to the DFCS. Some common reasons for the Ombuds not bridging to the Department include:

- Issue resolved with Ombuds initial call
- Visitor requested communication coaching in lieu of bridging
- Visitor felt empowered to communicate directly with the social worker or social worker supervisor
- Visitor expressed concern about the impact on the case and/or SW retaliation
- Visitor case is in trial mode

For 30% of visitors the Ombuds worked more extensively and maintained ongoing conversations with the visitors until they were able to move forward. This extended work typically involved shuttle diplomacy with the social worker and communication and conflict coaching for the visitor.

---

2 These resources included the Dependency Advocacy Center (DAC), the California State Foster Care Ombudsman’s Office, Legal Advocates for Children and Youth (LACY), the Kinship, Adoptive & Foster Parent Association (KAFPA), Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County’s Kinship Resource Center, Seneca RASS, Child Advocates of Silicon Valley, the SCC Board of Supervisors, the SCC District Attorney, SCC Family Court Services, SCC Equal Opportunity Department, the SCC Department of Employment and Benefits Services Ombudsman. (DEBS);the SCC Child Support Ombudsman, the SCC Long Term Care Ombudsman, the SCC Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services (OMOS) Juvenile Victim Offender Mediation Program, and the OMOS Senior Family and Special Needs Mediation Program.

3 In many cases, visitors have questions or concerns that are resolved with information about how the DFCS system generally works. Visitors express finding it helpful to hear information from a neutral third party and this process oftentimes builds trust between the visitor and the department without express bridging.

4 The JWOO suspends facilitative engagement with a visitor where there is a calendared trial date.

5 It is important to note the Ombuds works with the visitor to help them address specific issues and concerns and does not function as an advocate partner to the visitor throughout their involvement with the Department in the manner of a parent or resource parent advocate.
and, oftentimes, the DFCS staff. Additionally, the Ombuds researched DFCS policies and procedures to help inform visitors and identify areas of possible disconnect and misunderstandings, or to raise possible procedural irregularities to DFCS management.

For approximately 20% of visitors, the Ombuds facilitated meetings between the visitor and the social worker/social work team. This involved meeting preparation for both the visitor and social worker(s) to provide the best opportunity for informed and constructive dialogue. Post-facilitated meeting, the Ombuds regularly conducted follow up calls or meeting debriefs with both visitors and social work teams. These visitors typically presented multiple and more complex issues and required extended involvement with the Ombuds and the Department.6

Finally, for a small sub-set of cases the JWOO reached out to DFCS Management with the permission of the visitors for situations that presented high-conflict or intractable issues, or presented possible risk to the organization for management to consider.

**JWOO Office Highlights**

Over the past year, the JWOO has continued to strategically seek out opportunities to reach out to all sectors of the child welfare community to share, learn and collaborate through meet and greets, trainings, attendance at DFCS and System Partner meetings, and by conducting group facilitations. Those endeavors help to increase JWOO’s understanding of the child welfare system for casework and development of recommendations. The bird’s eye view gained provides the JWOO opportunities to contribute synergistically by bridging people and programs, and by illuminating and working to fill in gaps for needed services. Below are some of the past year’s highlights.

**JWOO – DFCS Collaborations**

The JWOO continues to keep informed of significant initiatives, developments, changes, issues and gaps in the child welfare system. In doing so, opportunities arise for bridging and collaboration. The JWOO wants to act as a supportive resource wherever possible to DFCS such that already existing programs and groups may share information about the JWOO to potential visitors, and also to offer our communication expertise to enhance existing DFCS initiatives wherever possible to help magnify impact. A few highlights of this period include:

- The JWOO provided facilitation services to the Child Abuse Prevention Summit cabinet to categorize the many community collected concerns into more digestible, broader themes;

---

6 The amount of time an ombuds worked on a case varied from under 2 hours for initial conversations to 4-10 hours for those involving shuttle diplomacy and facilitated meetings. For those cases involving a combination of high conflict, complex issues and management involvement the Ombuds typically provided 10+ hours of assistance.
and provided dialogue agenda design, as well as offered additional Senior Mediator facilitators from OMOS for the event initially planned for 2/28/2020.

- The JWOO facilitated conversations with resource parents and placement workers to provide opportunities for improved communication and greater understanding of each respective group’s issues so they may move forward collaboratively.

- The JWOO offered facilitation services to the Cultural Brokers to aid the brokers and management in discussing data collection and program updates.

- The JWOO continues to be present at the meetings of the Cultural Brokers, Children of Color, Multi-Cultural Community Team (MCCT), and Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI), as a communication resource and to remain open to opportunities for supportive action.

- The JWOO is providing feedback to the DFCS as to its visitor’s experiences with the DFCS complaint process to help inform the Department as it reviews its processes and procedures. We view this complaint process dialogue as a collaborative and responsive partnership focused on improvements and inclusive of the JWOO’s expertise in communication and conflict.

**Historical Highlight from CY 2018**

To showcase the strength of the JWOO’s collaboration with the DFCS, we would like to acknowledge the work the Department has done in response to the prior year’s Matrix Item focused on Child and Family Team (CFT) Meeting Policies and Procedures. At the time JWOO visitors expressed a lack of understanding of CFT meetings, including CFT plans, items on the agenda, participation, and rules around confidentiality. Visitors sought greater clarity on CFT meetings to adequately shape their expectations. DFCS, in response to the JWOO’s observation of the need for clarity in communication, responded with a robust set of actions designed to address visitors’ questions and concerns around CFT meetings. As one of its initiatives, the DFCS developed a CFT brochure to be included in Parent Orientation handbooks, and for Parent Orientation instructors to place greater emphasis on CFT meetings and incorporate an overview of the process during class.

The JWOO is heartened to see that through our combined efforts - the JWOO’s finger on the pulse of trending issues, and a responsive, open, and collaborative relationship with DFCS - that the CFT trend was so substantively addressed by the Department. *To date the JWOO has heard far fewer CFT related concerns from its visitors.*

---

*See JWOO Report to the CSFC, 4/17/19 Regular Meeting, Agenda Item #6, 2019 JWOO-DFCS Matrix (July ’18 to Dec. 18) Final.*
2019 Visitor and Community Engagement Activities

The JWOO regularly connects with and conducts informational presentations, informal meetings, and meet and greets, and attends community events and meetings in the various visitor communities, including the parent, resource parent, youth, service providers and the DFCS community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Community</th>
<th>Resource Parent Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Parent Orientation</td>
<td>• KAFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parent Advocates ARCC</td>
<td>• Seneca RASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentor Parents DAC</td>
<td>• Catholic Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DAC Attorneys and Social Workers</td>
<td>• West Valley FKCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Community</th>
<th>Other System Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The HUB</td>
<td>• Child Advocates of Silicon Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bill Wilson Center</td>
<td>• Santa Clara County Office of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal Advocates for Children and Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFCS Community</th>
<th>DFCS Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New Social Worker Academy</td>
<td>• DFCS Community Engagement Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DFCS Staff and Partners Meetings</td>
<td>• Well-Being Project Community Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Worker Resource Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child, Seniors & Family Conflict Resolution Program

Over the past year, based on the JWOO’s observations of incoming cases, the office has recognized a strong need for services that would allow family members a space to communicate in new ways, allowing them to engage in meaningful dialogue, collaborate on plans for the future, and to share and acknowledge multiple perspectives.

The JWOO recognizes that effective communication is important not only toward resolving conflict, but toward preventing conflict or escalation of conflict through planning and collaboration. As families in the child welfare system work to complete case plans and address concerns in caring for their children, it is easy to overlook the broader extended family’s communication patterns and conflict dynamics. Indeed, the degree to which any social worker may work to improve relationships between families is likely very limited due to a burdensome caseload and the vital focus on children’s needs and family’s reunification services. To that end the Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services (OMOS), of which the JWOO is a part, is uniquely positioned to provide informal mediation support tailored to families, relatives, caregivers, foster
youth and others who are child welfare system involved, through its Children, Seniors & Family (CSF) Conflict Resolution Program.  

CSF mediation provides opportunities for family members to collaborate and discuss important topics such as co-parenting plans, parent youth behavior plans, grandparent visitation plans, Non-Minor Dependent (NMD) roommate conflicts, etc., all utilizing a voluntary, confidential and cost-free process that can result in lasting, durable, self-determined agreements. This process is facilitated by OMOS mediators who work independently of the JWOO.

**Visitors to the JWOO**

As discussed above, the assistance provided by the JWOO is an informal process that captures information as self-determined and relayed by the visitor to an ombuds. The visitor does not complete any paperwork and is under no obligation to share personal or demographic identifying information in exchange for the assistance provided. The following shows the breakdown of the types of visitors coming to the JWOO.

**JWOO Visitors by Type**

![Visitor Types](image)

The JWOO serves any and all parties that are connected to a child who is either receiving services from the DFCS and/or is a dependent of the Santa Clara County Juvenile Court, or had a prior Santa Clara County juvenile welfare case. Visitors who typically contact the office include: bio-parents, relatives, resource parents, legal guardians, foster youth, NREFM’s, social workers, system partners, community members and other governmental agencies. Occasionally, callers will contact the JWOO from outside the jurisdiction of Santa Clara County, or can be in search of a different type of ombuds. The JWOO assists all callers to help them connect with the resource that can best address their specific need.

---

8 For more information and to initiate the process, interested parties may contact the Children, Seniors, Families (CSF) Conflict Resolution Program at 408-993-4124 or csinfo@ceo.sccgov.org.
In the above chart, comprising a combined 54.36%, the most prominent visitors to the office are bio-parents. This is followed by a grouping labeled “Other,” comprised of multiple smaller categories including those for Social Worker, NREFMs, community-general/neighbor, governmental agencies, children’s attorneys, non-juvenile welfare visitors, therapist-psychological professionals, other interested parties and “unknown.” Combined, these sub-categories totaled 18.45% of JWOO visitors. Relatives, foster parents, and foster youth, including non-minor dependents comprise the remaining categories.

JWOO Visitors by Ethnicity

When visitors to the office raise issues or concerns they feel are the result of differential treatment due to their race, ethnicity, culture, language, or when they assert inadequate recognition of a protected status, the JWOO captures those concerns in the concern category: Language/Identity/Culture/Protected Class/Legal Status. As few visitors self-identify such characteristics as pertinent to their concern(s), the JWOO continues not to assess visitor ethnic demographics proactively. The JWOO continues to be cognizant and sensitive to the reality that foster youth have an added well-publicized avenue of redress through the California State Ombudsman for Foster Care, who practices according to a classical governmental ombuds model, which is a more formal, investigative approach than the organizational ombudsmanship practiced by the JWOO. In certain instances, the State Ombudsman will engage the assistance of the JWOO to address a visitor’s concerns.

The JWOO recognizes that disproportionality is an area of ongoing focus in Santa Clara County. While the JWOO does not track disproportionality as a separate concern category, it does capture visitor perceived experiences through the lens of the Child and Family Practice Model (CFPM) 23 behavioral practices. (Beginning in CY14, The JWOO began to identify visitor concerns through the CFPM 23 behavioral practices framework. See discussion, infra p. 27) The Practice Model is a “comprehensive and culturally responsive approach to both practice and system level change. It is designed to improve safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for all children and reduce disparities in outcomes for communities and Tribes whose children are disproportionately represented in...
many visitors fear being tracked by their ethnic identity, viewing themselves as part of a vulnerable population due to increased attention on immigrant communities by governmental authorities.

**Overview of Case & Issue Trends**

The following sections present a broad overview of the historical JWOO case count trends from CY2010 – CY 2019 and a summary overview of visitor inquiries and visitor articulated issues for the current reporting period. The JWOO’s 4-quarter timeframe for this reporting period runs from January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019. Note the JWOO’s prior report provided data comprising a 2-quarter timeframe (July 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018). The JWOO intends to provide annual reports on a calendar year cycle going forward.

**JWOO Historical Case Count Trend CY2010 – CY2019**

During the 12-month reporting period for this report, the JWOO provided service in a total of 195 cases. Case counts trended upward, with the number of cases in 2019 increasing by 13% over the prior 2018 calendar year, during which there were 173 cases. The JWOO anticipates a continuing increase in case numbers for CY20, as the Q1’20 case numbers exceeded those of Q4’19 by 54%.

---

11 See JWOO Report to the CSFC, 4/17/19 Regular Meeting, Agenda Item #6,
12 For the period of Oct. 1, 2019 – Dec. 31, 2019 there was a total of 34 cases, compared with the period of Jan. 1, 2020 – March 31, 2020 during which time there were 50 cases, representing a 47% increase.
Categorization of Visitor-Articulated Issues

Beginning in 2004 the JWOO, operating jointly with the DFCS administration, developed a system to categorize visitor’s substantive concerns. The system was conceived as a method to succinctly articulate the nature of the stories told by visitors in a way that would be useful to the DFCS. As a result, 12 issue categories capturing the visitor-expressed concerns were identified (see Appendix A – Issue Categories). Those categories are further compartmentalized into issue sub-categories by the JWOO to assist in trend identification, thereby shining a more focused light on the specific nature of the concerns.

The Visitor Issue Categories chart above identifies the breakdown percentages of the broad issue categories for concerns received over the 12-month period from January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019. For this reporting period the JWOO identified 396 issues. Of those 92% involved substantive concerns and 8% involved general visitor inquiries. Comprising 24.2% of the issues, the most prominent category, Social Worker Behavior, reflects how various visitors perceived the quality of the interactions with their social workers. As illustrated, the second most prominent category of visitor-articulated issues over the 12-month period is centered on Communication, with 23.2% of issues comprising this category, compared with 16.5% in the prior reporting period. The two categories, taken together, describe how visitors perceive the quality of the engagement by their social workers.
Additionally, The JWOO speculates that these two continuing predominant visitor categories: Communication and Social Worker Behavior, representing a combined 47% of issues, could likely be positively correlated to the significant organizational changes the DFCS experienced in 2019. Additionally, the state implementation of the Continuum of Care Reform\(^\text{13}\) (CCR) reduced the availability of group homes as a placement option for children in foster care, overwhelming the Receiving Assessment and Intake Center (RAIC) and increasing the need for well-trained relative and foster home placements. These strains on the DFCS may have contributed to sustaining the Social Worker Behavior/Conduct and Communication concern categories.

**Snapshots of Visitor Inquiries & Issues**

Visitors to the JWOO present a variety and combination of concerns and interests. Each visitor case may, therefore, include general inquiries and/or one or more substantive concerns pertaining to a child welfare matter. Inquiries encompass general questions about the child welfare process, requests for information and requests for referrals to resources. Issues involve substantive concerns the visitor feels they have not been able to satisfactorily resolve on their own and for which they seek JWOO involvement for further discussion, exploration and development of options.

*It is critical to understand* the Ombuds takes visitor perceptions at face value. Rather than investigating whether what the visitor expresses is true/accurate or not, the Ombuds recognizes there is likely a communication breakdown and encourages the visitor to consider the option for the Ombuds to act as a bridge and permit the Ombuds to reach out to the social worker to share the visitors perceptions with them. Sometimes, the Ombuds receives clarifying information that can be relayed back to the visitor and the visitor is able to move forward. Other times, such as when there are several issues raised or the perceptions and assumptions are deeply held, the Ombuds will arrange a meeting with the visitor and the social work team to provide space for sharing of feelings and experiences, and to provide the opportunity for explanation, clarification and “healthy dialogue.”

The following sections provide a snapshot of statistical information for the JWOO’s cases covering this reporting period’s twelve-month span of January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019.

---

Nature of Most Prominent Visitor – Perceived Substantive Concerns

**SOCIAL WORKER BEHAVIOR (↓)**

![Social Worker Behavior Graph](image)

Historically the *Social Worker Behavior* concern category was less than 16% from 2006-2008 with a significant spike in 2009 to 28% and a swift significant decline in 2010 to 12%, with a subsequent high of 30% in 2011. Since 2011 this category has consistently remained at over 20% of issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN19 DEC19</th>
<th>JUL18 DEC18</th>
<th>MOST PROMINENT SUBCATEGORIES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>1. Not supporting bio parent &amp;/or family reunification (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Disrespectful/rude/hostile/negative (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lack of appropriate/adequate service delivery / follow-through (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Making inappropriate comments (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For CY2019 24.2% of visitor concerns fell under the *Social Worker Behavior* category, representing a slight decrease over what comprised 26% of visitor concerns for the second half of the 2018 reporting period. This likely means the level of concerns in this area remained relatively consistent for visitors compared to the prior year. In addition, this category of concern has continued at over 20% since 2011.

Feelings that the *social worker was not supporting the bio-parent and/or their family reunification* was the sub-category of majority concern at 22%, which is a slight increase from 2018 (18%), followed by *disrespectful/rude/hostile/negative behaviors* (16%); visitor’s assertion...
of a social worker’s lack of service delivery / follow-through (13%); and social worker making inappropriate comments (12%).

Parent visitors who expressed not feeling supported in their reunification efforts, included those who perceived their social worker had not provided them important information in a timely manner or was slow to refer them to services. Sometimes, visitors characterized such actions as “sabotage.” Some parent visitors shared feeling their social worker “aligned” or “sided” with the caregiver, including both foster and relative placements. Notably, visitors frequently indicated a desire for positive feedback. One parent compared their current social worker with their prior one who they felt offered more strength-based feedback and a “sense of forward progress.” A common refrain was, “my social worker focuses only on what I am not doing, rather than on what I am doing,” Similarly, the Ombuds heard from visitors that “my social worker assumes the worst about me.” Some visitors expressed feeling “betrayed” by their social worker when they felt they “had been honest” with them and there followed a perceived “unexpected negative impact” in their dependency case, or they felt information they had shared was “twisted” into a negative connotation. One visitor expressed feeling “hopeless” when they believed the social worker had told their children they were not going back with them before it was decided in court. And, various parent visitors expressed feeling their social worker was “not polite,” “mocking,” “condescending,” “interrogating,” “threatening,” or “unprofessional.” Most all visitors, whether they were parents, relatives or caregivers, came to the JWOO because they felt they had been “disrespected” in some manner.

COMMUNICATION (↑)

---

14 See JWOO Report to the CSFC, 2/14/18 Regular Meeting, Agenda Item #13, Attachment: JWOO Discussion-DFCS Response Matrix, Discussion #5, pp. 14-17 Level of Social Worker Supportive Engagement.
Visitor sub-category concerns of feeling the social worker was *not listening or one-sided* (20%), *not being notified of important events* (19%), and *unavailable/phone calls not returned* (17.5%) comprise the majority of the Communication category issues, followed by social worker *Non-emphatic/does not convey understanding* (15.6%) and social worker making *assumptions* (15%).

Feeling the social worker is *not listening or is one-sided* was the visitor Communication sub-category of most concern. Contextually, some of the most common subject matters of the concerns in this category were related to case plan issues, placement and visitation. Increasing opportunities for deeper conversation and the sharing of information, rationales and perspectives could help to reduce the prevalence of these frequently heard concerns. Two of the more common visitor concerns in the Communication category historically have been *social worker unavailable/phone calls not returned*. When visitors present these concerns, the Ombuds will first discuss the typical response time they could reasonably expect to receive a call depending on the nature of the issue or circumstances within the Department. Helping to set reasonable expectations will commonly resolve the issue for the visitor. And, if the concern persists the Ombuds can set up a meeting for the visitor and social worker to discuss and develop a realistic and mutually agreeable communication plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN19 DEC19</th>
<th>JUL18 DEC18</th>
<th>MOST PROMINENT SUBCATEGORIES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>1. Not listening / one-sided (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Not notified of important information or events (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Unavailable/phone calls not returned (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Non-emphatic/does not convey understanding (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Assumptions (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placement as a category accounts for 11.4% of all visitor issues raised to the JWOO. 19% of visitor concerns in the sub-category involved visitors feeling *denial of placement with birth parent/relative/NREFM/foster parent was unfair or unjustified*, 15% of concerns pertained to fears that a *child was being neglected/mistreated in out of home placement* and 12% felt they were *not provided sufficient RFA or placement explanation to allow for informed decision-making*.

While placement related issues decreased by 20% from the prior reporting period, visitors who felt they were unfairly denied placement or felt they were not provided enough support to make an informed decision presented some of the highest intensity feelings and potential for escalated conflict. Underlying these complaints was an expressed fear of losing connection to a child. The JWOO identified this issue as a trend that extended from prior years\(^\text{15}\) and included it in this reporting period’s *Matrix* as Trend #1: *Relatives and Non-Relative Extended Family Member (NREFM) Visitors Seeking Clarity as to Options and Decision-Making Factors for Maintaining Ongoing Connections to a Child/Children*.\(^\text{16}\) Visitors who perceived family/relatives were not prioritized experienced this in all points of entry in the placement process from the Emergency Response and Dependency Investigation stages through case dismissal. Some examples of visitor concerns in this area included: family members perceiving they had not received a thorough or timely enough explanation of the RFA process, possibly leading to stretches of time in which children can bond with their other caregivers reducing the likelihood of a change in placement; social workers not following up on visitor requests for placement with family; and Non-Relative NREFM visitor not being considered as placement initially. Additionally, some visitors have expressed feeling confused and frustrated as to why Emergency Response (ER) workers seemingly did not make emergency placements with available family members, but rather placed children in a non-relative Resource Parent home.

Additional examples of Placement concerns raised by parents included them feeling the Department did not take seriously or “dismissed” concerns they raised about the level of care or


\(^\text{16}\) See Attachment to this JWOO Annual Report to the CSFC, April 23, 2020.
potential abuse of their children in the caregiver’s home,\textsuperscript{17} and concerns about their children traveling with the caregivers. A final example of a visitor-raised concern was the perception that out of county placements created barriers to their court ordered visits with their children.

\textbf{VISITATION (↓)}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|l|}
\hline
\textbf{JAN19} & \textbf{JUL18} & \textbf{MOST PROMINENT SUBCATEGORIES:} \\
\textbf{DEC19} & \textbf{DEC18} & \\
\hline
9.1\% & 14.3\% & 1. Not enough/untimely visits; Visits not stepping down (26\%)
2. Visitation orders not being followed (11\%)
3. Concerned about location of visits (7\%)
4. Relative/NREFM/Foster Family seeks visitation (6\%)
\hline
\end{tabular}

9.1\% of Visitation concerns in this reporting period represents a 36\% decrease from 14.3\% of concerns from the prior reporting period. The JWOO speculates the reduction is due in part to the DFCS developing and distributing to families the Visitation and Family Reunification brochure that helps to explain the levels of visitation and the visitation “Step-Down Model.”

26\% of concerns comprising the Visitation category related to the perception from visitors there were \textit{not enough or untimely visits; or visits not increasing or becoming less restrictive}, coupled with 11\% of visitors believing that \textit{visitation orders were not being followed by either the social worker or the foster family}.

\textsuperscript{17} Note, if the JWOO discerns there is imminent risk of serious harm the Office will bring the concern to the attention of the DFCS Child Abuse and Neglect Center (CANC).
The *Not enough or untimely visits* sub-category may be linked to JWOO hearing from visitors they are told by their social worker there are insufficient numbers of social workers to supervise visits. A lack of social workers to supervise visits can lead to frustration on the part of visitors if their visits are cancelled and need to be rescheduled. Visitors expressed feeling “forced” into visitation time slots that are not ideal for them because they may conflict with their jobs or services. Historically, visitors have reported inadequate staffing of Social Worker I’s to support court ordered visits or sibling visitation and this issue is still prevalent in 2019.18 And, similar to placement concerns, visitation concerns create heightened sense of frustration and a sense of urgency on the part of the parents because they perceive missed or delayed visits with their child/ren will negatively impact reunification.

Additionally, some visitors have expressed lacking understanding of the requirements to step down visits. This can leave visitors confused and frustrated as they feel they are unable to make a connection between what they must do to progress to more frequent and/or less restrictive visits with their children. This is particularly so if the change in the level of the visits is perceived as “abrupt” or “unexpected.” The JWOO oftentimes can help by bridging the visitor to the social work team to create additional opportunities to increase understanding as to the reasons for any increased restrictions. Finally, although not a reported on sub-category for this report, restrictiveness for some visitors may go beyond the frequency and duration of visits, and extend into the perceived quality of the visits themselves. Parents have expressed the need for more guidance into what constitutes a “successful” visit, as it is perceived by them that supervising social workers may be operating under rules that are unclear to the visitor, thus increasing the risk that the social worker may intervene in a visit, leaving the visitor with the sense that he or she will be reprimanded for doing something wrong. An associated expressed concern is that the social worker will document the parent’s deficient behavior during the visit in a court report.

Finally, miscellaneous Visitation category issues include concerns that sibling visitation orders are not being followed and an expressed desire from a small subset of visitors for the Department to provide more *post-case* dismissal support for maintaining visitation and assisting with changes to visitation order/agreement between parents.

---

18 Note the JWOO raised the issue of visitation in a prior report. See JWOO Report to the CSFC 2/14/18 Regular Meeting, Agenda Item #13, Attachment: JWOO Discussion – DFCS Response Draft Matrix: Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombuds, Discussion Item # 8.
GENERAL QUESTIONS / INFORMATION / REFERRAL INQUIRIES (↓):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN19 DEC19</th>
<th>JUL18 DEC18</th>
<th>MOST PROMINENT SUBCATEGORIES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>14.19%</td>
<td>1. Resource identification (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Explanation of/referral to records request process (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. How the DFCS/JV Welfare System work in general (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When working with any visitor the Ombuds helps to build understanding about the Juvenile Welfare process, identifies resources, and provides information. For this reporting period the JWOO captured General Questions/Information/Referral Inquiries solely for those visitors whose singular need was to understand processes and/or resource options. The 45% decrease in such requests is primarily due to the JWOO ombuds team capturing this data category differently than in prior years. While visitors who worked further with an ombuds received the same assistance in identifying resources and explanation of processes, the JWOO ceased capturing those needs in the General Questions/Information/Referral Inquiries category.

One of the roles of an ombuds is to brainstorm options, which may often require the Ombuds to help the visitor by identifying resources, explaining how the JV DFCS welfare system works in general, and describing the referral/records request process. This may mean that we aid visitors in connecting with their attorneys and other County organizations that provide information and/or services that may be of help for resolving the visitor’s question or concern. To help clarify common misconceptions and surface misunderstandings, the Ombuds may also assist the visitor by explaining how the Child Welfare System works. If a visitor wishes to procure records, the Ombuds helps to direct them to the appropriate pathway. The JWOO responds to every call or email, including from those who reside outside of the County for whom the Ombuds will redirect the visitor to an appropriate ombuds office or governmental agency.

TRENDING OF REMAINING CONCERNS
There were no statistically relevant data or trends for the following concerns categories: Service Plan; Removal; System Resources; Legal Process/Court Records; DFCS Policies and Procedures; Language/Identity/Culture/Protected Class/Legal Status; and Adoption.

---

19 These resources include the Dependency Advocacy Center (DAC), the California State Foster Care Ombudsman’s Office, Legal Advocates for Children and Youth (LACY), the Kinship, Adoptive & Foster Parent Association (KAFPA), Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County’s Kinship Resource Center, Seneca RASS, Child Advocates of Silicon Valley, the SCC Board of Supervisors, the SCC District Attorney, SCC Family Court Services, SCC Equal Opportunity Department, the SCC Department of Employment and Benefits Services Ombudsman.
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Child and Family Practice Model Application

The Child and Family Practice Model\textsuperscript{20} (CFPM) provides behavioral guidance and recommendations to enable social worker productive communication with families and other parties connected to a juvenile welfare case, as they jointly work to build and maintain safety, permanency and well-being. The graph below highlights areas of suggested focus by the Department under the CFPM visioning. In CY14, The JWOO began to identify visitor concerns through the CFPM 23 behavioral practices framework (see Appendix B – Child and Family Practice Model (Condensed). Santa Clara County was among four counties in California selected to help develop the CFPM. The DFCS continues to train and support social workers in utilizing the model in their daily work with families and other parties.

For this reporting period the JWOO observes most social work staff are naturally working in alignment with the CFPM behavioral practices, as the JWOO is not receiving articulated concerns about the majority of social work staff. The JWOO sees that implementation of CFPM practice


2310 N. First Street, Ste. 100, San José, CA 95131 • Phone (408) 993-4114 • Fax (408) 297-2463 • OMBUDS@ceo.sccgov.org
www.sccgov.org/omos

Page 27 of 34
behaviors leads to reduced conflict and improved experiences with service delivery, by helping families to gain a better understanding of relevant issues with their cases and helping to build the mutual trust necessary for families to work effectively with their social work teams.

Of the 23 Practice behaviors the areas where continued focus by the Department could make the most difference from the JWOO’s perspective, discerned through the visitor narratives and concerns are: 1- Listens With Openness; 4- Nurtures Honest Dialogue; 5- Ensures Connection and Support; 17- Continuous Dialogue and Support; and 7- Interactions Are Affirming.

**Addressing Conflict and Costs of Conflict**

Unresolved conflict creates both risks and costs to an organization. The JWOO works to mitigate those risks and costs by promoting a proactive organizational culture that can thoughtfully address visitor concerns and manage trending issues *early* to reduce both the number of complaints and the likelihood of escalated/future conflict. Our Office works to promote transparency and clear and timely communication and encourages having difficult conversations. The JWOO welcomes opportunities to support the DFCS staff in this endeavor.

The JWOO’s experience is that DFCS staff who were open to an informal conflict resolution process and addressed visitor issues early were better able to neutralize conflict and restore positive working relationships with their clients. Through provision of communication coaching for both the visitor and the DFCS staff, informed by the CFPM and trauma-informed practices, and facilitating meetings between visitors and DFCS staff in which misunderstandings/concerns are discussed and/or resolved, the JWOO can help to reduce the need for people to seek out formal processes to resolve their concerns.21 Additionally, the JWOO can help to reduce tension and stress for both staff and visitors, alike, by providing a confidential safe space for them to unpack their story and generate options for moving forward.

**CY 2019 Matrix Trends**

A significant component of our work is the identification of important trends and organizational concerns. As the JWOO works with visitors to the office, we make efforts to categorize and capture the issues the visitors present. Over time, we notice patterns and trends emerge. The cases that have come to contribute to the trends share similarities with regards to the issues the visitors present, and policy or case related practice.

21 These processes may include internal and external grievance/complaint processes, contested Dependency Court hearings, and litigation against the County. The JWOO contemplates providing further discussion on the topic of the cost of conflict and the value of informal conflict resolution options for the CY20 reporting period.
The JWOO shares the trends with the DFCS as early as possible to provide the opportunity to discuss them with the DFCS Administrative Support Bureau throughout the year. This collaborative process helps to mutually inform both the JWOO and the DFCS in drafting thoughtful recommendations and responses. The JWOO raises the trends in the form of a 3-column matrix. The first column describes the trend and includes examples of corresponding visitor concerns. The second column provides JWOO suggested actions for the DFCS to consider, along with discussion supporting the recommendations. The JWOO provides the recommendations to shine a light on areas where it discerns communication and/or conflict create opportunities for conversation, exploration and possible change. The third column provides the space for DFCS to respond to the recommendations. Oftentimes, the recommendations correspond to and highlight areas the Department is already considering for its own initiatives and improvements. This is a natural outcome of the collaborative process described above.

Over the past year, our office identified two trends in the issues visitors brought to our attention: 1) **Relatives and Non-Relative Extended Family Member (NREFM) Visitors Seeking Clarity as to Options and Decision-Making Factors for Maintaining Ongoing Connections to a Child/Children**; and 2) **Families Expressing Confusion over the Communication and Application of Domestic Violence Policies and Protocols**.

The first trend reflects relative and NREFM visitors who came to the JWOO when they experienced or anticipated a permanent loss of connection to a child or children. Thematically, the concerns center on Family Finding and Engagement Practices, Resource Family Approval Support for Relatives, and Permanency with Connections: Using Neutral Services to Support the Circle of Support and Post-Adoption Contact Permanency Planning Mediation. The visitors who raised these concerns sought clarity as to options for maintaining connections with a child or children. The JWOO suggested actions include 1) utilization of dedicated Family Finding social workers to locate and develop a Circle of Support for the child, 2) employing tailored communication and information sharing practices to help relatives and NREFM’s explore placement, connection and RFA approval, 3) exploring the use of Community Partners and neutral services providers to help facilitate conversations and negotiate appropriate plans for maintaining community and family connections, and 4) clarifying options for post-permanency/post-adoption contact and developing best practices that help guide and inform the Department, families and the community.

The second trend involves visitors whose questions and concerns centered on the DFCS Domestic Violence Policies and Protocols and generally revealed the confusion and fear these visitors expressed around their DFCS Case Plan components pertaining to behavioral expectations, and the perceived negative impact on their families of “rules” for contact.
cohabitation, and parenting. Thematically, these concerns center on Safety Organized Practices and Differential Domestic Violence Responses for Fathers, Partners and Families. The JWOO suggested actions include 1) enhanced training and reinforcement of existing Safety Organized Practice tools (Safety Mapping and Child and Family Team Meetings) to concretely communicate and illustrate the safety concerns and desired changed behaviors, and 2) further development of tools and capacities for differentiated domestic violence responses pertaining to perpetrator assessments, batterer intervention programs and father inclusive practices.

**Future Trends**

Toward the end of the 2019 calendar year and already into the first quarter 2020, the JWOO is experiencing a steady increase in Resource Parent visitor concerns. With the advent of the State of California’s Continuum of Care Reform,23 spurring the state-wide transition from congregate care (group homes) to family home care, and the local directive24 from the SCC Board of Supervisors for the DFCS to find alternatives to the Receiving Assessment and Intake Center, there is a pressing and increased need for Resource Family Homes. As more Resource Families welcome high need children and youth into their homes, there are increased needs and pressures on caregivers and the social work teams who support them. To date the JWOO is hearing visitor concerns pertaining to Special Care Increments, transportation supports, children’s behavioral health services, respite support and placement and permanency connections.

Additionally, the JWOO continues to receive concerns from visitors who have contemporaneous or prior Family Court involvement and some level of DFCS involvement. Typically, these parent visitors were litigating custody and visitation matters in Family Court and the high-conflict dynamics raised concerns over child safety that were brought to the DFCS’s attention. To date such visitor concerns thematically pertain to Family Court and DFCS safeguards and services. Visitors are seeking clarity as to what information can be shared with them and what information is shared between the Family Court, Dependency Court and the DFCS. Additionally, visitors perceive misuse by the other parent of the various systems and express a need for safeguards and support services such as parenting plans, parental coordinators or mediation services.

The JWOO anticipates developing the Resource Parent and Family Court Cross-over trends to raise to the DFCS for the CY20 reporting cycle. The JWOO looks forward to discussing those and any additional emerging trends with the DFCS in the coming months.

---


24 See March 20, 2020 Social Services Agency Off-agenda report with updated status of actions relating to the closure of the Receiving, Assessment, and Intake Center (RAIC).
Conclusion

The JWOO is uniquely positioned to listen, gain insight and share experiences with the DFCS to assist its visitors with their case specific concerns and to raise awareness of issues and trends to the DFCS, the Board and the broader community. Through the lens of our visitors’ experiences and narratives, and the jointly developed process for sharing, discussing and responding to trends in the Matrix, the JWOO shines a light on communication and engagement disconnects and gaps. Over the past year, the JWOO partnered with the DFCS to provide its visitors increased avenues and options for addressing their concerns. The JWOO will continue to seek opportunities with the Department to address issues and conflict early by offering communication and dispute resolution expertise to the internal benefit of the DFCS, as well as to its visitors. We are pleased to see our partnership with the DFCS has come to bear fruit with its responsiveness to our feedback and we look forward to continuing to help inform the Department as it works to improve the system experience for children, their families, caregivers and all those who support them. The JWOO is honored to participate in that endeavor and it is with this intention we tender this report.

Respectfully Submitted.
### Appendix A - Issue Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Visitor has need for increased communication efficiency with other individuals associated with the case, including client, social worker, attorney, family members, etc. Improved communication will result in improvement in case disposition amongst involved parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Visitor is concerned about the placement of the child vis-à-vis issues such as safety, proximity, relative involvement, choice of relatives vs. non-relatives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>When the status of an adoption, including the timeframes, logistics, feasibility, home study, etc. are at issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Questions / Information &amp; Referrals</td>
<td>When individuals have questions concerning process, contact, next steps, legal concepts, case flow, chain of command, County policy, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language / Identity</td>
<td>When a visitor feels that difficulties inherent to the case are the result of inadequate recognition of protected status, culture, or language, or other imperative elements of relationship and understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker Behavior / Conduct</td>
<td>The Visitor has concerns vis-à-vis the conduct or behavior of a social worker or supervisor in the sense that intentional malfeasance has occurred which is generally assumed to be the result of malice or prejudice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>The Visitor is concerned about the visitation schedule such as issues related to times, drop off/pick up, non-occurrence at mandated intervals, observations, accuracy of records, location, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Process / Court Records</td>
<td>The concern related to this category is to ensure the accuracy of the court records in relation to the perceived facts. Similarly, with respect to the legal process, visitors have questions about entitlements and rights, next steps, legal methods for achieving desired outcomes, standing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Resources</td>
<td>Persons falling within this category are generally looking for assistance in relation to funding, mental health, education, housing, and other means of assistance to prepare for the return of or assist in family maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal</td>
<td>Visitors within this category are concerned that the removal of the child was unwarranted and generally seek to invalidate the juvenile welfare process, often seeking immediate return of the child as the measure of relief. This category, used infrequently, often concerns those visitors who attempt to utilize several avenues of relief and contact to make their concerns widely known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Plan</td>
<td>Concerns regarding a service plan generally include issues related to more narrow tailoring of services such as travel times and distances for testing or visitation, issues related to mandated classes and the perceived absence of fit with the specific circumstances of the case, perceptions in attendance at mandatory classes, graduation vs. non-graduation, paperwork and logistics of schedules, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFCS Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>Issues raised pursuant to this category concern the prospect that Agency decision-making arguably violated best practices in social work, or that the Agency de facto violated either law, policy, or protocol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B – Child & Family Practice Model (Condensed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values &amp; Principles</th>
<th>Core Practice Elements</th>
<th>Practice Behaviors Condensed</th>
<th>Mnemonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Exploration &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>Inquiry - Mutual exploration with family and others</td>
<td>1. Listens with openness</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Seeks inputs from family, listens, translates, and identifies emerging patterns, confident in role</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement - Invites in and makes central the families perspective</td>
<td>3. Actively finds connections, builds trust and empowers families to become active partners</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Collaborative model of social work (CSOMS®) principles, working with families in meaningful roles, building trust</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Family support and referral</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Power of Family</td>
<td>Self-Advocacy - Supports family to speak for themselves</td>
<td>6. Lends family</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Encourages open, honest, and empowering conversations, builds confidence and skills</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy - Speaks out for the family and their perspective to strengthen/support</td>
<td>8. Interactions are affirming</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Advocates for family, promoting family voice in decisions</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circle of Support</td>
<td>10. Uses Cultural Lens</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Reaches out</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Empowers families</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Creates environments for group-level social learning</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Encourages families to build networks</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Normalizing Needs</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Explores family rules</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Continues dialogue about family roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Explores family decision making and goal setting processes</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19. Teaches families</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20. Helps families understand their roles</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. Explores power and control</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22. Encourages families to build relationships</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. Coaches families in family skills</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Trend: RELATIVES AND NON-RELATIVE EXTENDED FAMILY MEMBER (NREFM) VISITORS SEEK CLARITY AS TO OPTIONS AND DECISION-MAKING FACTORS FOR MAINTAINING ONGOING CONNECTIONS TO A CHILD/CHILDREN.</th>
<th>JWOO Suggested Actions:</th>
<th>DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines &amp; Needed Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Issue Categories:</strong> Communication, Placement, Visitation&lt;br&gt;<strong>Description of Trend:</strong> For the period of January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019, 14% of visitors to the JWOO were relatives and NREFM’s who sought clarity and understanding as to DFCS recommendations and decisions pertaining to child placement, visitation and permanency plans they perceived created actual or potential loss of connection to a child or children. The JWOO previously raised similar concerns and encouraged the Department to increase understanding of processes and options pertaining to familial placement. See discussion of Placement, p. 21, JWOO Report to the CSFC, June 17, 2017, and Attachment D - Information for Relatives and Family Friends of Children in Dependency flyer. All examples of visitor concerns are visitor-perceived experiences as expressed to the JWOO and are organized thematically to correspond with the themes for the suggested actions and discussions in Column 2.</td>
<td>The following recommendations are intended to encourage conversation and exploration as to what is possible for the Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS) to maintain and strengthen connections between children and those who can safely encircle and support them. The JWOO believes the following recommendations will help reduce concerns from relatives and NREFMs by increasing clarity and broadening options. The JWOO respectfully submits the following recommendations in the spirit of shining a light on identified areas for the Department’s consideration. <strong>Family Finding and Engagement</strong> Consider utilizing dedicated Family Finding Social Workers to locate and develop a Circle of Support, including maternal and paternal relatives and NREFMs, for the opportunity to make lifelong connections and networks for children and youth to maintain ties to family, culture and community. <strong>Resource Family Approval (RFA) Support for Relatives</strong> Consider developing and employing tailored communication and information sharing practices to help relatives and NREFMs explore placement, connection and RFA approval. <strong>Permanency with Connections/Neutral Services to Support the Circle</strong> Consider expanding the exploration and use of Community Partners and neutral service(s) (providers) who can help nurture a Circle of Support by facilitating conversations and</td>
<td>1) <strong>Family Finding and Engagement</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS) realizes that family finding and engagement is vital in order to locate and develop a circle of support, including maternal and paternal relatives and Non-Relative Extended Family Members (NREFMs), for the opportunity to make lifelong connections and networks for children and youth to maintain ties to family, culture and community. To this point, the DFCS has made and is making significant progress towards continuously improving and addressing this concern. The DFCS holds that family finding is a core principle of social work, which envelopes each stage of the DFCS case planning process. The Family Finding model is designed to promote strategies and social work practices to locate and engage family members or relatives, NREFMs, or a resource family for a child being separated from their parent(s) or caregiver(s). After identification, relatives and other supportive adults are encouraged to participate in all aspects of the child’s life, and to be a part of the child’s circle of support. The goal of family engagement is to maximize involvement and improve placement options, which can aid children in building permanent, trusting, and supportive lifelong connections. Family Finding is a department-wide responsibility and is incorporated in all aspects of a dependency case. During the investigation phase of a referral, at the Emergency Response (ER) level, if it is determined that a child’s removal may occur, then the ER social worker will ask birth parents and the child if appropriate, of any family members or NREFMs who could...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Issue – JWOO Issue Category</td>
<td>JWOO Recommendations</td>
<td>DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines &amp; Needed Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Issue – JWOO Issue Category</td>
<td>• Trend</td>
<td>• Description of Trend</td>
<td>• Examples of Visitor Concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family Finding and Engagement**

**Description of Issues:**

Grandparents present questions and concerns regarding the court case and regarding DFCS assessments and recommendations for child placement, visitation and post permanency family connections.

What can a grandparent visitor expect when looking for guidance, information and pathways to determine their future role in a grandchild’s life?

**Examples of Visitor Concerns:**

- A group of NREFM visitors experienced a reduction in the level of contact with a foster youth to whom they felt they had provided consistent support and resources. As a result, the visitors expressed feeling worried and deterred by the Department’s disruption of their “vital” connections to the youth. The visitors perceived themselves to have been left out of the communications loop and any discussions that explored options. They associated their disconnection and diminished ability to support the youth with their perception of a decline in the youth’s safety and an escalation of the level of crisis experienced by the

negotiating appropriate plans for maintaining community and family connections.

**Post-Adoption Contact/Permanency Planning Mediation**

Consider clarifying the options for post-permanency/post-adoption contact and developing best practices that help guide and inform the Department, families and the community.

**JWOO Discussion and Rationale**

Relative and NREFM visitors come to the JWOO seeking understanding as to their place in, and indicating a need to belong to, a child’s “Circle of Support,” as defined in the Child and Family Practice Model, or CFPM. Such visitors express an underlying fear of losing connection to children they felt bonded with and were looking for a path that would lead to continued or future connection. When individuals perceive they are losing connection to someone they deeply care for, they naturally express frustration, anger and, sometimes, hopelessness.

The JWOO identified, through visitor stories and interactions with the Departments, four areas, discussed below, where relatives and NREFM’s participation and membership in a child’s Circle of Support could be enhanced through improved

During the investigation phase of a referral, at the Emergency Response (ER) level, if it is determined that a child’s removal may occur then the ER social worker will ask birth parents and the child, if appropriate, of any family members or NREFMs who could be considered as a placement option. This process continues through the life of the case. DFCS is currently seeking ways to streamline and expedite the family finding process. One step toward this goal is through recognizing and acting on early identifiers that lead to potential placements, such as at the time a call is received of child abuse and neglect by the Child Abuse and Neglect Center (CANC).

Once relatives are identified, the social worker reaches out to determine who is available and agrees to welcome the child into their home. The social worker initiates and completes an emergency family resource approval of the relative. This approval requires a criminal background check, home inspection, and an assessment of the relative to determine whether, or not, they can meet the child’s needs. These requirements are essential to establishing an appropriate fit; however, they can also act as a barrier in placing a child with a family in cases where a family member has a criminal history, there is inadequate space for the child in the home, or the relative is unable to meet the child’s needs.

As outlined above, children and/or families involved with DFCS benefit from family finding efforts, and connectivity, using a variety of additional methods and resources. For children whose relatives have yet to be identified alternative

---

1 Circle of Support Reference: CFPIC CFPM Condensed Practice Model: [https://cfpic.org/sites/default/files/CFPM%20CONDENSED%20PRACTICE%20BEHAVIORS.pdf](https://cfpic.org/sites/default/files/CFPM%20CONDENSED%20PRACTICE%20BEHAVIORS.pdf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Visitor Issue – JWOO Issue Category</th>
<th>JWOO Recommendations</th>
<th>DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines &amp; Needed Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Description of Trend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examples of Visitor Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JWOO Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FAMILY FINDING AND ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting in 2019, the DFCS has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instituted and staffed a Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding Unit, committed to “family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finding efforts starting before a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child is removed” and to “integrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family finding into day to day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practices.” The JWOO provides our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedback and recommendations to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help fortify and deepen the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant efforts the DFCS is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>currently making to front-end early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family finding and increase family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Circle of Support connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to create lifelong natural support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>networks for children and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In sum, the JWOO recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are in the spirit of supporting the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFCS to continue its mission to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>establish a family engagement and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permanency culture that enhances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the lifelong well-being of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and communities. Per the California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Social Services (CDSS),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the purpose of undertaking Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding and Engagement is to ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that children and youth in care are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>able to maintain and develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permanent connections with relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and other important individuals in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their lives.” Therefore, family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finding resources are required in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>order to provide them with the best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunity for placement with a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family. The following additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources are available to support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family finding and placement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wendy’s Wonderful Kids (WWK), which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is a program with one identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFCS social worker who works in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration with other WWK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programs nationwide to develop and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>achieve strategic adoption goals for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified children. There are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>currently 12 children in this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program. A dedicated Family Finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team within DFCS was created, as of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 2019. Prior to this new team,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there had been one dedicated staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>member within the existing placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unit focused on engagement and family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finding for youth in congregate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>care. Discussions are being held to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determine if moving this position to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Family Finding unit would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate. It is noted that this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social worker is included in Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding trainings and has been in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>many unit activities to ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistency in practices. Additionally,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to strengthen the department’s family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finding efforts DFCS has partnered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Seneca Family of Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Seneca). The goal of the contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Seneca is to support front-end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family finding while DFCS staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct ongoing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 12.10.19 Addendum on RAIC Significantly Strengthen and Improve Initial Intake and Assessment Processes (November 2019 through January 2020 and ongoing) “DFCS, in collaboration with BHSD and Probation, is redeveloping and improving its intake, removal, and placement processes, as well as its policies and procedures. The goal is to ensure that family finding and general placement search efforts begin before a child is removed from his or her home or before the disruption of a current placement. A workgroup was created that will involve the input of social workers and supervisors at all levels.”

3 8.21.19 CSFC Menicocci report on Family Finding: “better understand the value of fully incorporating family finding into day-to-day practices and the benefit it provides to children and families.” “DFCS is developing a stand-alone Family Finding unit.”

4 All County Information Notice No. I-35-11, June 13, 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Visitor Issue – JWOO Issue Category</th>
<th>JWOO Recommendations</th>
<th>DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines &amp; Needed Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Description of Trend</td>
<td>Examples of Visitor Concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RFA Support for Relatives and NREFM'S**

**Description of Issues:**

Visitors present questions and concerns arising throughout the process, relating from the initial call to consider being a placement through the RFA approval process.

**What can a relative expect for support to consider placement and navigate the phases of the approval process including corrections and denial and appeal processes?**

**Examples of Visitor Concerns:**

- Multiple immediate family visitors (both maternal and paternal side) and bio parent visitor perceived the removal of a young child into foster care to be unexpectedly urgent without first being provided the

---

5 "...there is broad policy support for child and family practices that recognize the "importance of protecting and promoting attachment bonds, family connections, and their cultural group(s) as we work with family members," and for "...children and youth in foster care and adoption... to help them keep ties to family and community, develop new attachments, and an enhanced prosocial support network." The California Integrated Core Practice Model for Children, Youth, and Families “ICPM”

6 "...when the CPS worker removes a child, the multiple tasks which face her are daunting. (Among her other duties she has to provide services that will prevent the need for removal, ensure that the child is safe, explain to the parents what is happening and why, identify and engage relatives, and prepare reports for any court proceedings which will occur in a day or two.) One person can be challenged to effectively accomplish all of these tasks. This over-load of responsibilities has been ameliorated in some larger jurisdictions by designating a social worker or a team of social workers whose job it is to identify and engage relatives” Pg. 20 Summer 2016 The Bench Judge Edwards article “How To Improve Outcomes for Abused and Neglected Children: Engaging Relatives Early”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Issue – JWOO Issue Category</th>
<th>JWOO Recommendations</th>
<th>DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines &amp; Needed Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of Trend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examples of Visitor Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (see CDSS RFA Written Directives Section 4-08 (effective 4-11-19) - Emergency Placement Prior to Approval for RFA O.P.P. 2-9 protocols and W &amp; I Code 361.3 and Family Code 7950)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More relatives in the process and to support children and their birth families.

DFCS is also participating in joint trainings with family finding experts, such as Seneca, and other leaders so that common approaches and shared resources are considered in the work being done with children and families. DFCS would like to increase the number of children placed with relatives from 31% in 2019 to over 40% by the end of 2020.

The newly developed family finding team in DFCS is located within the Assessment and Stabilization Bureau and is part of the placement unit. The DFCS Family Finding unit, initially established in August 2019, was staffed with one (1) social worker. Since inception, the department has been working diligently on developing this unit and anticipates having a total of six (6) social workers supporting family finding efforts as soon as feasible possible. As of March 2020, DFCS has hire three social workers to support family finding efforts. The team of three recently hired social workers, called Family Connectors, will focus on the exploration, identification, and initial contact with family members in instances where families are unable to, or refuse to, provide contact information for family members. The goal of the unit is to integrate the work of placement finding with family finding and to develop a model that offers methods and strategies to locate and engage relatives more expediently. The team is working on establishing clear policies and procedures as well as establishing baseline data.

## RELATIVES/NREFM’S AND RESOURCE FAMILY APPROVAL

As codified in W&I Code 361.3, “preferential consideration shall be given to a request by a relative...for placement of the child.” The relative visitors with RFA questions the JWOO heard from were predominantly grandparents who had concerns regarding their current place and future role in their grandchildren's lives.

Family Finding and RFA workers can team to engage with the Circle of Support on an ongoing basis and could provide the necessary clarifications at multiple touchpoints that naturally arise in a complex system. Family Finding and RFA workers can help relatives and NRFM’s increase their understanding of the critical procedures, protocols and policies involving placement, visitation and Resource Family Approval.7

Most relatives are not expecting to receive a call regarding taking placement of a child. This is an essential distinction between foster parents and relative caregivers even as both parent “types” are currently categorized as resource parents. The JWOO often hears from relative visitors after they have learned of a removal, a placement decision, or the permanency timeline (e.g., children under age 3) and bonding as a key factor in permanency decisions.

The JWOO recommends developing tailored communication and information sharing practices to help relative and NRFM’s
### Permanent with Connections

#### Description of Issues:

NREFM and Relatives and Resource Parents visitors are seeking continued involvement to support and maintain connections to children and youth in foster care and permanent placements:

*What can a circle of support member expect with regards to information, pathways and ongoing support in the interest of maintaining desired permanency connections with children and youth in RFA placements and post-adoption?*

- A grandparent visitor did not perceive herself to have a voice nor to have her concerns adequately clarified by the DFCS. She perceived her connection and communication with DFCS to be inconsistent and the explanations of the RFA process and the procedural status of the case to be lacking. Additionally, many of the frustrations stemmed from a perception that being monolingual resulted in her experiencing inconsistent translation for phone calls and documents and lack of interpreter support for CFT meetings.

#### JWOO Recommendations

- Explore placement, connection and RFA approval. The DFCS commitment to start family finding efforts at removal is a best practice. As Dr. Denise Goodman details in her California Department of Social Services (CDSS) training, Child Welfare Departments can help better prepare relatives for placement decision-making by 1) building supportive relationships and 2) providing proactive support to aid informed decision-making and RFA applications. Relatives seek the support of social workers to make decisions and guidance to understand and undertake the approval process which some visitors perceive as daunting and intrusive with home assessments and criminal background checks. Goodman’s training collateral includes examples of easy to read brochures and checklists on criminal background checks / minor criminal waiver criteria and home approval.8

#### DFCS Response:

This team of Family Connectors will support ER, DI, and Continuing Social Workers throughout the case planning process, which includes a warm hand over to the Resource Family Assessment (RFA) worker for certification or to a DFCS contracted provider who will assist the family members complete the necessary certification requirements. The goal of this additional family finding team and additional training to lead to changes in policies and practices that result in increases in the numbers.

2.) Resource Family Approval (RFA) Support for Relatives

Social Workers are able to go to the home and complete an emergency packet to be able to approve the relative/NREFMs for emergency placement. Once the SW completes that packet the SW submits a copy to RFA so the RFA unit can begin working with the family for RFA approval. The other way the relative(s) are referred to RFA approval is through a referral to RFA if the child is not going to be placed within 30 days of the referral. Once RFA is assigned, the process can take up to three months depending on the availability of the family, timely submission of all required documentation and completion of training, including criminal background checks for all over the age of 18 in the home or who...
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#### Examples of Visitor Concerns:

- When visits with a child who was eventually placed with their parent ceased, a relative visitor expressed feeling a lack of Departmental support for what they had “hoped” would be a continuing relationship with the child. This visitor shared they feared a “permanent loss,” and indicated it would have made a difference if the Department had explored with them options for supporting an ongoing relationship with the child.

- A grandparent visitor, who pursued placement, expressed that there was no effort to connect them to the adoptive family to explore any possibility of future connections.

#### Neutral Services to Support the Circle

**Description of Issues:**

Relative and NREFM visitors seek additional options for reducing familial conflict to help build capacity and increase opportunities to explore and create family-determined plans for permanency connections.

- When one set of grandparents moved forward with adopting their grandchild, the other set of grandparents (visitors to the JWOO) perceived they included parents, grandparents, kin and NRFM) express they felt they were not offered a pathway nor were directly part of any discussion, whether engaging with a social worker or participating in a permanency planning mediation, to consider the possibility of future connections. The JWOO suggests that the DFCS consider developing two options: 1) the use of neutral services including using third parties to mediate conflicts and negotiate allowable agreements (we recognize that visitation and placement are court ordered agreements) among the Circle of Support and 2) using Permanency Planning Mediation for biological and adoptive families to explore contact agreements before the finalization of adoption.

**NEUTRAL SERVICES TO SUPPORT THE CIRCLE**

The JWOO recommends utilizing neutral resources such as community partner services to engage and convene a circle of support and, where needed, work toward reducing familial conflict and creating family determined plans for permanency connections. County Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services9 and community service mediation partners could address family conflicts and resistance and facilitate the conversations to help negotiate contact, visitation and supports such as transportation and respite. Finally, the JWOO recommends using Child, Family Team meetings to convene and engage family and NRFM supports and to strive to identify and include both the maternal and paternal sides have significant contact. Once these requirements have been met the family will be RFA Approved.

Through the Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI), DFCS can review how information and expectations are shared with relatives regarding the RFA process and approval requirements. Trainings can be deployed to all DFCS social workers to clarify the RFA process so when concurrent planning discussions take place, expectations are set regarding timelines and creating that safety net at the onset.

Further, DFCS will explore feasibility of providing an online video parent orientation to relatives and other collaterals to educate them on the child welfare system and what families go through. This will ensure relatives who are potential placements are educated and informed, and can follow-up with the primary social worker regarding steps become licensed RFA homes should the need arise.

3.) Permanency with Connections/Neutral Services to Support the Circle

Once a child is adopted, the adopted family can legally make all decisions for that child, including maintaining relationships with extended family members of origin. However, there are opportunities for the Department to educate families on the importance of attachment and the impacts of loss and trauma on children. This process begins in the preservice trainings for resource parents and continues through the life of a case with the social

---

9 County Santa Clara, Office of Mediation and Ombuds Services (OMOS), [www.sccgov.org/omos](http://www.sccgov.org/omos)
### Post-Adoption Contact/Permanency Planning Mediation

**Description of Issues:**

- A maternal grandparent visitor expressed a desire to have an opportunity to explore and discuss future connections with their grandchildren, before they were placed with paternal family. The Ombuds ultimately convened a meeting with the SW team where post-adoption contact and mediation were discussed.

- The concept of “some degree of openness” recognizes that these are choices for contact made between birth and adoptive families, and in real life circumstances, these choices for contact happen over time and as relationships develop gradually. The potential for connection to community and family ties can lessen the adverse effects of trauma loss for children, families and communities.

- Permanency Planning Mediation is a confidential process “to focus the family of origin and the prospective permanent family on children’s need for permanence as well as to invite their participation in making a permanent plan.”

- As professional neutrals, the JWOO recognizes that confidential, informal processes provide individuals the best opportunity to make their own decisions and agreements reached through voluntary mediation are more enduring and durable. Permanency Planning Mediation affords complete worker and often with one of the two resource parent support agency resources from Seneca, Resource and Advocacy Support Services (RASS) and Kinship Support (KS). Additionally, Child and Family Team Meetings (CFTs) are a venue for families to express their worries and hope regarding permanency and family contact. The Department can also work toward ensuring all of the child’s Circle of Support are welcome to the CFT and that their voices are considered when making plans. The Department can leverage existing relationships with service providers to provide relationship building and conflict management to support potential contact after adoption. There are a number of efforts underway to bridge this gap, including the development of a transition plan for youth at all stages of their case. The Department will continue to engage the Parent Advisory and Resource Parent Advisory groups to elevate this issue and DFCS recognizes this as a painful issue for relatives and children.

- DFCS will also explore maintaining connections through neutral services to support this area.

**4.) Post-Adoption Contact/Permanency Planning Mediation**

In August of 2019, the Department of Santa Clara County Family and Children’s services started discussion with the...
Visitors would like to be provided the opportunity to explore and negotiate post-adoption contact agreements, including the mediation of inter-family conflicts.

What can a relative, Resource Parent or NREFM expect with regards to exploring and negotiating the possibility of post-adoption contact agreements?

Examples of Visitor Concerns:
- Maternal grandparent visitors did not feel they were afforded equal consideration of permanent placement of grandchildren as was the paternal side of the family that received the social worker’s recommendation. The approach of a .26 hearing to terminate caused the visitors to grieve, as the meaning of the recommendation dawned on them. The Ombuds ultimately convened a meeting with grandparents, social worker and the social work supervisor to have a difficult conversation about the termination of parental rights, post adoption contact, and further offered mediation between members of the paternal and maternal sides of the family.

Conclusion

The suggestions made by the JWOO are a reflection of a trend in visitor-perceived complaints and concerns of Relatives and NRFM’s. These JWOO Relative and NRFM visitors were seeking greater understanding of and a need to belong to a child’s Circle of Support. In this report, The JWOO made 4 suggested recommendations that could establish or strengthen a permanency connection for a child or children to a Circle of Support Relative or NRFM and potentially reduce the high intensity emotions the JWOO hears from its Visitors when they feel they were not provided an opportunity to belong to the Circle:

1. Utilizing dedicated Family Finding Workers to locate and engage connections and networks for children can control over the extent of contact and is a confidential mediation. Permanency Planning Mediation or PPM is voluntary, confidential, informal and free of charge. The process of PPM is non-adversarial and independent from the Dependency Court and the DFCS. PPM in California provides a caucus style mediation (mediator shuttles between the parties and only conveys what is authorized by the parties). affords space to discuss issues, and encompasses a complete range of contact possibilities from annual emailed updates only (minimal contact) to face to face visits (maximum contact). PPM is also available to reconvene mediation participants to help resolve post-agreement issues.

Juvenile Welfare Office of the Ombudsmen (JWOO) in an effort to collaborate and to set forth a plan to increase post-adoption contacts in the Department of Family and Children Services. The idea of postadoption contacts is not new to the Department of Family and Children’s Services. However, having adoptive parents agree to postadoption contacts requires multiple levels of intervention. Parents involved with the Department of Family and Children’s Services that result in an adoption are often the result of complicated unsafe behaviors as a result of drug use, mental health issues, poverty, discrimination, domestic violence, etc. resulting in some form of child abuse falling under the Welfare and Institutions Code Section 300. Parents are offered court intervention via a case plan such as drug treatment programs parenting, domestic violence classes, mental health services, etc. in an effort to ameliorate the concerning behavior/s that result in risk to children. When parents are unable to reunify with their children it is often a result of lack of case plan compliance. This usually means they did not participate in programs or they did not make any behavioral changes to reduce risk to their children. This is important to highlight because many of these behaviors remain in place when adoptions are finalized resulting in lack of agreement on behalf of adoptive parents to make formal or informal postadoption contact agreements who are unprepared to deal with concerning behaviors. The issue of concerning behavior by parents impacts agreement by social workers to make efforts to reach agreements toward postadoption
help them to maintain ties to family, culture and community.
2. Tailored supports to help Relatives and NRFM’s fully consider taking placement of a child or children and to navigate the RFA approval process.
3. Permanency with Connections could be enhanced by addressing relationship conflicts and negotiating appropriate plans with the assistance of third party neutrals.
4. Post-Adoption Contact Agreements could be a voluntary option explored through Permanency Planning Mediations for birth and adoptive families to agree to future contact.

Contact agreements because they themselves highlight the behavioral concerns and are driven by safety for children.

DFCS is committed to increasing understanding for social workers about adoption. Adoption specific trainings about grief and loss and a child’s search for connections to family are being offered to caregivers and social workers in 2020. Efforts by social workers to have foster parents meet each other and support increased communication is occurring through the joint partnership meetings with KAPFA, DFCS an caregivers. These efforts are aimed at increasing relationships amongst the adults in a child’s life and can increase the ability to reach agreements about contact postadoption. The Department is building in additional training for caregivers to better understand adoption and permanency and navigating these challenges including continued contact with family.

In addition, the Department is working to support additional knowledge about post adoption services including therapeutic supports that could be available if children continue to have some form of contact with biological parents. Postadoption social workers play a crucial role to determine therapeutic needs and could assist in the relationship between adoptive parents and former parents or biological parents if relationships and agreements are reached prior to adoption.

The Department of Family and Children’s Services has increased focus on family finding efforts toward identificatio
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**January 2019 – December 2019 Matrix of JWOO Identified Trends Raised to DFCS Administration**

A trend has been identified where family and non-extended family members and may result in more postadoption contact agreements. To address this, two family finding specialists have been hired to search through cases and locate family and non-extended family members who are often more willing to accept both formal and informal postadoption contact agreements. Efforts to find family and non-related family members are being put in place in all stages of a case.

The Department of Family and Children’s Services has had family team meetings in the past and has changed the practice to Child and Family Team Meeting which include all members in life of a child/ren. Family finding staff should also be included in Child and Family Team Meetings in order to increase postadoption contacts.

The Department of Family and Children’s services has emergency placement packets available in all stages in the life of a case. Should family finding staff identify a potential placement staff may request assistance from our RFA staff to approve a placement or they may complete the RFA paperwork themselves and approve a home. This provides social workers the ability to immediately place child/ren with family and non-extended family which will also increase our postadoption contact agreement efforts.

As the new generation of social workers enters the workforce they are provided training specific to departmental efforts to increase postadoption contacts and are going to CFT’s in an effort to increase post-adoption contacts. Seasoned worker:...
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have also been trained on consulting on post-adoption contacts during the emergency response phase. The Department of Family and Children’s Services would benefit from postadoption efforts to increase in efforts to establish and maintain relationships between family and non-extend family relationships. The training regarding postadoption contacts should be utilized to start moving the departmental culture toward acceptance of long-term relationships with parents, extended family and non-extended family by highlighting the long-term impacts for our child/ren.

Adoptions are not always permanent and often the Department of Family and Children’s Services finds itself in a position to seek placement resources when adoptive parents are no longer willing to maintain child/ren in their care. Postadoption efforts will help maintain connections with parents and non-extended family who may be available if willing to provide a placement if needed. There are disproportionate numbers of children of color in foster care in Santa Clara County. There are racial, cultural and socioeconomic differences between families involved in the child welfare system and foster care parents. Efforts identified such as postadoption contacts training, departmental expectations, and a departmental cultural shift toward postadoption efforts would help increase placement options, increase postadoption connections between child/ren and parents, family and non-extended family. Training for foster parents, parents, family and non-extended family members, and child/ren to help decrease the racial, cultural, and socioeconomic cultural differences gap between
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### Trend: FAMILIES EXPRESS CONFUSION AND FRUSTRATION OVER THE COMMUNICATION AND APPLICATION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POLICIES AND PROTOCOLS

**Issue Categories:**
- Communication
- DFCS Policies and Procedures
- System Resources

**Description of Trend:**
For the period of January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019, 12% of visitors to the JWOO sought clarity and understanding as to DFCS recommendations and decisions pertaining to the domestic violence (DV) component of their juvenile dependency case.

All examples of visitor concerns are visitor-perceived experiences as expressed to the JWOO and are organized thematically to correspond with the themes for the suggested actions and discussions in Column 2.

### Safety Organized Practices

**Description of Issues:**
Parent and Relative Visitors present questions and concerns that show a lack of understanding of the Domestic Violence criteria for parents to measure and track their potential for reunification, demonstrate the concrete behavioral expectations to keep safe boundaries and show insight and accountability.

### JWOO Suggested Actions:

**1.) Safety Organized Practices**

The following recommendations are intended to encourage conversation and exploration as to what is possible for the Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS) to enhance and differentiate communication and engagement with DV involved families.

The JWOO respectfully submits the following recommendations in the spirit of shining a light on identified areas for the Department’s consideration.

**Safety Organized Practices**

Consider the systemic training and reinforcement of using Safety Organized Practice tools (Safety Mapping, Structured Decision Making (SDM) Assessments, Child and Family Team Meetings) in DV cases so that all members of a team and family are using the same language and measures to concretely communicate and illustrate the safety concerns and desired changed behaviors, and to measure and monitor progress.

**Differential DV Responses for Fathers, Partners and Families**

Consider further developing the tools and capacities at the DFCS for differentiated domestic violence communications in and around perpetrator assessments, batterer intervention programs and father inclusive practices.

**JWOO Discussion and Rationale**

The JWOO hears from visitors whose questions and concerns about child welfare and the courts center on the DFCS Domestic Violence policies and protocols and the perceived...
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**What supports can a DV Visitor expect when they are confused, stuck and struggling to understand their potential for reunification, how to demonstrate safe behaviors and maintain relationship boundaries?**

**Examples of Visitor Concerns:**

- Bio parent Visitor expressed frustration and disagreement with SW in attempting to reunify with children. Visitor expressed not having a clear understanding of the Department’s safety concerns around the reported DV relationship with spouse. Visitor expressed not fully understanding the connection between their actions and having step-down visits or moving towards reunification. As a result, V perceived SW as “deceitful,” further impacting communication and straining a potentially productive relationship.

- Bio parent shared her confusion and expressed desperation to comply with what she understood she needed to do in order to reunify. The visitor indicated being unaware of the gravity of the DV concerns and,

impact on their families and how to manage: visits with children, reunification pathways, relative placements, mandated services, retaining housing, and parent/parenting relationships. The JWOO DV visitor questions generally reveal the visitor’s confusion and fear about their DFCS service plans behavioral expectations and the rules for contact, cohabitation, parenting and the impact on their families. As Ombuds, we provide our visitor trend feedback and make recommendations in the following two areas not to make explicit policy recommendations, but rather to inform how DFCS could enhance communication to help parents better understand their DV case requirements.

**Safety Organized Practices**

The majority of visitors the JWOO hears from with domestic violence questions are parents who express confusion over the expectations and restrictions in their case plans. The routinely communicated expectations for perpetrators to demonstrate accountability and insight may not always or effectively translate into an actionable plan for changed behaviors. The admonition for victims and family members to keep boundaries is also often confusing and hard to manage if there are not sufficient opportunities for clear and direct conversations and demonstrable action exposed to episodes of Domestic Violence and Coercive Abuse:

**COMMON CORE 3.0**

Common Core 3.0 is a California State Mandated Training curriculum for all new Child Welfare Social Workers throughout the state of California. The curriculum is required for all new social workers. Core 3.0 training is divided into practice areas to provide social workers with integrated practice skills in 5 key practice areas. The training curriculum starts by providing a foundation concepts and key information that are interwoven through practice and then centers training on five key practice areas:

1. Engagement
2. Assessment
3. Service Planning
4. Monitoring and Adapting
5. Transition

These identified practice areas are the core activities that Social workers do with families and they incorporate concepts from the most significant practice innovations affecting child welfare in California:

1. The Child Welfare Core Practice Model
2. Katie A.

---

1. Pg. 38-40 Appendix A on Batterer Intervention Programs: Santa Clara County Intimate Partner Violence Blue Ribbon Task Force Appendix 2017

2. Pg. 22 Recommendation 4: Effective Intervention in DV (Greenbook) "Because domestic violence encompasses a wide range of behaviors-from the extremely dangerous to the less serious-families require a range of intervention, some of them voluntary and some mandated. To create safety and stability for families requires careful assessment of risk and the capacity to make differential responses."
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor was a bio parent, identified by the Department as the batterer whose child was placed into foster care. The visitor expressed having little information or understanding about the case plan requirements and the necessity for the parents to separate in order to return the child to the family home. Visitor also expressed concerns about a perceived lack of connection with the SW and a lack of a clear roadmap to reunify. The Ombuds convened a meeting and utilized shuttle diplomacy with the SW team, and the visitor later expressed being able to proceed with more accurate information, services and support.</td>
<td>plans from their SW team. And the reality that a couples’ decision to remain together can significantly impact reunification recommendations can be an “elephant in the room,” where legal constraints prevent the social worker from directly acknowledging same, which effectively keeps the parents’ decision making not fully informed. JWOO visitors with DV issues and services include parents whose families hope to reunify, live and stay together. The JWOO hears from many of its DV visitors that they feel unable to meaningfully discuss with their social workers, let alone explore, the complex variables within their family using the language and limits of the current system response to DV. Alternatively, existing Safety Organized Practices provide an effective framework for helping forge better understandings and partnerships between families and social workers. Structured Decision Making assessments can help DV families think through difficult situations. Signs of Safety with Safety Mapping supports the creation of detailed action-oriented plans for safety organized strategies. And, Child Family Team “CFT” meetings and action plans used to monitoring case plan progress can help families to concretely understand the child welfare process and to become full participants and partners with child welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor was a bio parent, identified by the Department as a DV victim, whose children were placed out of county with a resource family. Visitor continually expressed confusion and disagreement with the no-contact or couple’s services assessment with their</td>
<td>A common dynamic the JWOO observes is that many of our DV visitors are not understanding the child welfare concerns and are also not partnering with their teams in an effective manner that helps them to move forward. The consistent use of Safety Organized Practices has the potential to describe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines & Needed Resources

- 3. The California Partners for Permanency project
- 4. Safety Organized Practice
- 5. Structured Decision Making 3.0

**Common Core 3.0 Curriculum:**

1. Organizes training around practice areas (see the above) so that all the concepts included in the content are grounded in practice skills. This series makes strategic use of online modules to maximize classroom time for skill building and practice.

2. This provides new social workers with opportunities to enhance classroom learning through application of concepts in the field. The curriculum incorporates wider range of training modalities, including e-learnin classroom learning, coaching, and mentoring. It includes materials and supplemental resources to support transfer of learning and to carry the learning experience into the field. The curriculum provides picture of child welfare practice for new social workers; uses field experiences to ground training in actual social work practice; streamlines learning to focus on key knowledge, skills, and values; and uses a variety of training modalities to promote expediency in providing content. There are three pillars of the Core curriculum.
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<td>and differentiate assessments and services and desired outcomes in clear and more concrete terms. These practices can help to inform development of DV plans using language and measures that could more clearly be recognized and understood by families.³</td>
<td>100 level classroom training, Field Activities (with Field Instructor/Supervisor), and 200 level advance classroom training. In addition, Santa Clara Coun provides additional Santa Clara County specific trainings as vetted by the Induction Advisory Team for newly hired social workers, which combined, create the 14-week SW Academy. These training opportunities are reinforced and reiterated in various DFCS department wide joint leadership, bureau and unit meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ “An Introduction to Safety Organized Practice for Parents and Caregivers” Northern California Training Academy, UC Davis Extension, Center for Human Services.


² Differential DV Responses for Fathers, Partners and Families

#### Description of Issues:

Parent visitors to the JWOO who have DV-related cases often have multiple, complex factors that are challenging for them to understand, including: a DV victim with a case opened due to their failure to protect, or a parent identified as both a batterer and a victim who has questions regarding their service plan. Further, the JWOO often hears complaints that the service plans and programs required of batterers, while effective for safety and maintaining separation, are not individualized enough for families, who when deemed eligible, might effectively engage in some alternative services, including shared interventions and co-parenting.

Differential DV Responses for Fathers, Partners and Families

**Description of Issues:**

Parent visitors to the JWOO who have DV-related cases often have multiple, complex factors that are challenging for them to understand, including: a DV victim with a case opened due to their failure to protect, or a parent identified as both a batterer and a victim who has questions regarding their service plan. Further, the JWOO often hears complaints that the service plans and programs required of batterers, while effective for safety and maintaining separation, are not individualized enough for families, who when deemed eligible, might effectively engage in some alternative services, including shared interventions and co-parenting.

**Differential DV Responses for Fathers, Partners and Families**

“In sum, Colorado’s approach to domestic violence treatment recognizes that assessment and evaluation of domestic violence offenders is an ongoing process requiring differentiation to successfully treat a heterogeneous population of offenders.”⁴

Complex situations require tailored communications and innovative responses. Santa Clara County’s 2017 Report from the Intimate Partner Violence Blue Ribbon Task Force is an additional and detailed resource which outlines the potential consideration of new or additional strategies to try and better meet the diverse needs of families experiencing domestic violence. The JWOO makes the recommendation to consider differential DV communications in the light of our DV visitor’s experiences working with the DFCS, so as to better assess and engage with them.

⁴ Pg. 3 Colorado Model Santa Clara County Intimate Partner Violence Blue Ribbon Task Force Appendix 2017
Can a DV visitor expect any differentiated response when they perceive a “one-size fits all approach” that “fails to meet” their perceived, “individualized” family “spectrum of needs and contexts?”

**Examples of Visitor Concerns:**

- Visitor was identified by the Department as both the offending parent and a victim of intimate partner violence. Children were placed with the non-offending parent with Family Maintenance and who was also under a criminal restraining order as to the visitor. Visitor services were to enhance visitation, the reality of which was never fully understood by visitor up through and including when the case was dismissed with full custody to the other parent. The duality and complexity of this visitor, as both DV victim and offender, and the demands of the service plan requirements exceeded the time and resource capacity of the SW and SW team. The Ombuds noted the large amounts of time and high levels of frustration for both the visitor and the SW team. The SW team was committed but appeared to need more specialized resources to communicate and work with this visitor.

Providing an understanding of violence in terms of power and control through a group process with the desired outcome of perpetrator accountability and insight is the model. Based on our visitor’s expressed needs and the complexity of their life situations, solely using broad based psycho-educational language and descriptors when talking and working with batterers is potentially insufficient at least some of the time. “Domestic violence informed practice rests squarely on the idea that we need to be able to articulate how the perpetrators behaviors and choices impact child and family functioning. This is a specific variation on a foundational father-inclusive perspective: that men’s choices, good or bad, matter to child and family functioning.”

Differential responses can include fathers or adult partners who are perpetrators of violence and consider and note any and all variables for potential future contact and configuration including: continued father involvement desired by father and/or mother and/or children or the wish for no further contact between the adults and/or with the children. These types of conversations could unearth both the strengths a father brings to the family as well as contribute to an understanding of the real impact of their violent behavior. SW’s may need supportive supervision to engage the visitor.

DFCS can explore this with current IPV contractors to determine if this can be met with current resources. If this is not within our current providers capabilities, DFCS will explore further next steps to ensure all families impacted by IPV receive individualized plans and care.

---


### January 2019 – December 2019 Matrix of JWOO Identified Trends Raised to DFCS Administration – Trend #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Visitor Issue – JWOO Issue Category</th>
<th>JWOO Recommendations</th>
<th>DFCS Response: Follow-up Actions, Projected Timelines &amp; Needed Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low income and unstable housing visitor parents expressed needing to share housing and combine income to support the family. Bio parent was struggling to figure out how to maintain the family’s recently attained supportive housing, where the parent Visitor was the perpetrator, primary income earner and did not have alternative housing near his work site. The Visitors felt the &quot;stay apart&quot; admonition was forcing them into more instability without sufficient systems-supportive economic and housing resources. Visitor was extremely adamant that the investigation and service plan were not reflective of a complicated blended family dynamic and that the forced separation and looming threat of losing housing was more traumatizing to the family. Ombuds facilitated meeting with SW which afforded the Visitor an opportunity to directly discuss their perspective on the family dynamics and their hopes.</td>
<td>with men as parents who are also domestic violence perpetrators to determine whether and how their work with him could benefit other family members. Differential Response in the DV context is already being considered in Santa Clara County. The Santa Clara County Probation Department is designing an alternative Batterer Intervention Program under the authority of California Assembly Bill 372. While this program will be for probation clients, it is considering evidence-based approaches for risk assessment and differentiation. The pilot also provides for victim advocates to work with and gather data on victim quality of life improvements. And finally, the pilot will be assessed by an outside evaluator which ensures a thorough and scientific measurement of success.</td>
<td>Conclusion The JWOO recognizes the DFCS is charged with incredibly vital and difficult work to protect victims of family violence and to work with these families toward safety and reunification, which is often extremely challenging. The JWOO writes in this report in the spirit of making communication practice suggestions to the DFCS to support successful outcomes measured by lessened conflicts and improved partnerships between the DV involved families and their Social Worker teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 AB 372: [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB372](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB372)
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SSA, the Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS), the Juvenile Probation Division (JPD), OCC in the Division of Equity and Social Justice, BHSD, Public Health Department (PHD), and Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) continue to engage in cross-system collaboration to align strategies for greater collective impact on the County’s most vulnerable families. A foundational purpose of this work, as reported over the past years by each respective department and as part of the cross-system report and the Cross-Agency Service Team (CAST) reports previously submitted, has been to effect and document systemic changes that remove or minimize institutional barriers to keep children safe, increase families’ access to community-based services, provide services in the least restrictive manner, and to lift family voice and their circles of support to meet their needs in a manner that respects and is responsive to their cultures.

CAST currently has a dedicated group of people coming together, the CAST Prevention workgroup, to develop a robust framework for promoting upstream prevention efforts across the county. The county-wide framework will outline systems-level strategies, intermediate outcomes and initial indicators to achieve the following long-term impact: “Community-driven and relationship-based upstream efforts that will keep children, youth, and families on a path to achieving sustainable, positive life outcomes based on their hopes and aspirations for the future.”
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A fundamental purpose of our cross-agency prevention work is to keep children safe, increase families’s access to community-based services, provide services in the least restrictive manner, and to lift family voice and their circles of support to meet their needs in a manner that respects and is responsive to their cultures. This cross-system partnership is the foundation of the Cross-Agency Services Team (CAST) led by Social Services and including Probation Department, Behavioral Health, Office of Cultural Competency (OCC), Public Health Department (PHD), Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE), County Executive, First 5, Judges, Attorneys and technical support from MIG Consultants.

CAST partners have worked in developing a county-wide prevention strategies that include upstream prevention and targeted interventions. CAST partners seek to understand how the strategies drive common outcome goals and/or eliminate non-effective elements to improve outcomes for children, youths, and their families. Individual departments have prevention strategies with the focus of further system penetration that will be outlines on this report. The goal of CAST is to align all these separate strategies into a comprehensive aligned County strategy.

It should be noted that through regular reporting to CSFC of many of the strategies presented in the report, many programs reported are finding implementation success and that outcome goals are being reached for each program and/or initiative. More importantly, successful strategies are becoming institutionalized by partnering and aligning the work to support children and families. This aligns with the vision of the report to present on the prevention strategies from Behavioral Health, Probation, Social Services, Office of Cultural Competence and Office of Supporting Housing, including other partnerships to support prevention efforts in Santa Clara County.
INTRODUCTION

A request was made at the February 17, 2020 Children, Seniors, and Families Committee (CSFC) to report back on prevention efforts within SSA, OSH, BHS, and Probation to better understand (1) what services the County is currently providing, (2) how the work being done by respective departments intersects, and (3) where the current and potential opportunities for collaboration in the area of prevention are.

This cross-system report outlines the work of each department, highlighting the strategies and interventions used. The opportunities for further collaboration and potential opportunities in the area of prevention are being evaluated and discussed among the various cross-systems partners. The Cross-Agency Service Team (CAST) is developing a county-wide framework to promote the steady shift of the County’s service system to a “no wrong door” model that is addressing the needs collectively of the children, family and community. CAST has been working diligently to develop cross-system trauma informed practices for a number of years. Most recently and in partnership with key partners, CAST has launched a coordinated and integrated effort to start working on prevention strategies and implementing of the trauma-informed & healing framework. Some of the efforts include the creation of shared agreements, a common agenda, common language, developing performance metrics and promoting information-sharing protocols across sectors to break down silos and be able to better assess gaps, needs and barriers to serving the most vulnerable population in Santa Clara County. The focus of CAST is on integrating those individual efforts and merging them into one county-wide collective impact framework. As with any prevention frameworks, in order to build collaboration, trust and partnership, it takes time, it take a shift in mind set to address the root causes, breakdown silos and institutionalized believes. This framework will reflect a racial and social equity lens with the aim of addressing the trauma to children, families and communities and strive towards a healthy thriving community where children and families are healthy, happy and stable.

There are many risk factors that affect the health and well-being of children in the community. According to the National Research Council (US) and Institute of Medicine (US) Committee, early emotional and behavioral problems predict school failure, unplanned pregnancy, and crime.1 Supporting a child, a family and a community has many complexities, each one has to be approached in various ways in order to address the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) that are barriers for the families we serve. Furthermore, according to the national academies of sciences, the nation’s social and economic well-being depends in part on the well-being of its communities, and many are facing great and evolving challenges. Some of those challenges are insufficient access to jobs, adequate transit, safe and affordable housing, parks and open space, healthy food options, or quality education—the necessary conditions and opportunities to fully thrive. This lack of opportunity is particularly evident in the disparities that exist in health status and health outcomes for children. Community-wide problems such as poverty, unemployment, low educational attainment, inadequate housing, lack of public transportation, exposure
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to violence and neighborhood deterioration (social or physical) shape health and contribute to health inequities. Health inequities are not just negatively impacting children and families, but they are also costly to our community.

Conditions in the neighborhoods, community and environment where people live, learn, work and play affect a range of health risks and outcomes. Communities with unstable housing, low income, unsafe neighborhoods and substandard education resources makes a difference in being on track for positive life outcomes. We know poverty can limit access to healthy food choices and safe neighborhoods and that not having equitable access to education may place someone off course to achieving positive life outcomes. We know that differences in health care are striking in communities with poor Social Determinant of Health (SDOH). By applying what we know can not only improve individual and community health but also advance health equity and create social and physical environments to promote good health for all. Each system, due to funding and focus of programs, have a variety of prevention strategies and interventions. Separating funding, with corresponding different requirements, creates a service maze for families. The following report outlines the prevention programs and initiatives that help reduce risk factors and/or stressors by building and strengthening protective factors and skills and increasing support. Each programs incorporates the essential elements of prevention in a variety of ways. The work each system is doing, the collaboration cross-system and partnership towards common goals and collective impact on the common agenda ensuring the children of course from a positive, stable and thriving life.

**PREVENTION STRATEGIES**

Prevention requires understanding the complex factors that influence child development, family dynamics, and systemic and institutional opportunities and barriers. Our communities, social and economic well-being, depends part on the well-being of its neighborhoods and families. Many communities consistently face great and evolving challenges that can impact the life expectancy due to many social determinants such as insufficient access to jobs, healthcare, education, safe and affordable housing, adequate transportation, healthy food options, etc. Poverty shows its impacts on communities with high rates of obesity, heart disease, cancer, diabetes and other traumatic experiences that impact physical and emotional health. The approach to prevention rely on enhancing the role of the community in strengthening protective factors in a child’s life and providing an environment that promotes early
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2 Communities in Action: Pathways to Health Equity (2017); http://nap.edu/24624
3 CDC – https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/index.htm
prevention services. Such services should target the needs of the entire family and address risk factors that can cause emotional and behavioral problems early on in the life of a child. Prevention is broadly defined as multi-tiered interventions and strategies to reduce underlying causes and risk factors, and to strengthen protective factors, thereby positively impacting the health and well-being of individuals, especially children, and families.

This county-wide system prevention effort will strive toward strengthening families, building capacity to have community-centered (family-to-family) initiatives and partnerships. The goal is to address within the community those factors that negatively impact the health and well-being of the children, youth and families. Using the “Upstream Prevention” model, CAST will leverage existing collaborative work being done by the Corridor Program, the Children’s Health Initiative, School Linked Services, Universal Access Pilot program, the Neighborhood Safety Unit, and any other efforts in Santa Clara County. Many of the work done by all the departments is focused on building protective factors and resiliency for children, youth and families to be on a path to achieving sustainable positive life outcomes based on their hopes and aspirations for the future.

**ECOLOGICAL MODEL**

The ecological systems theory holds that we encounter different environments throughout our lifespan that may influence our behavior in varying degrees. These systems include the micro system, the mesosystem, the exosystem, the macro system, and the chronosystem. Child development is affected by their social relationships and the world around them, prevention starts in the home and within the community. Children and families are at the core of all the work and services being provided by county systems. The ecological model directs attention to the ways in which each layer impacts the well-being of the child through conditions of the family, school, neighborhood, policies and practices of government agencies and other organizations, more macro social norms and policies at the societal level, and changing events (such as the Covid19 pandemic). Ecological systems theory, then, may direct attention to a multi-tiered lens approach to prevention.

The complexity of support for children, youth, families and community needs requires a prevention framework that is broadly defined as multi-tiered interventions and strategies to reduce underlying causes and risk factors, and to strengthen protective factors, thereby positively impacting the health and well-being of individuals, especially children, and families. Social determinants need to be addressed at the community level in order to see a positive impact in the lifecycle of a child. The prevention framework is striving to have a system-wide prevention effort focused on strengthening families and building community capacity to address some of the social determinants that impact the health and well-
being of a child. We recognize that positive outcomes will not be easy or quick, but the hope is to start moving towards the right direction. This county-wide system of change will thrive to strengthening families, building community capability to have community-centered (family-to-family) initiatives and partnerships that will address the root cause of the problems within Santa Clara County and within the community to address that negatively impact the health and well-being of the children, youth and families. The collaborations, partnerships and alignment of work and measurable outcomes will allow for a collective impact to support the complex needs that children, youth, families and community require to address risk factors and prevent trauma at the micro-level, at the core of the family.

**Life Course Framework & Continuum of Support**

One of the foundational theories used by CAST to illustrate the importance of a systemic approach to trauma is [Glen Elder’s Life Course Framework](#). The Life Course Framework provides a structured way to understand what leads to a child’s success along each stage of their life. It emphasizes that there is not one “make or break” point of investment in children’s lives. Instead, the key factor is for the community to invest early in children’s lives, and to continue that support to keep children on track. The model illustrated in the graphic on the following page is based on Arnold Chandler’s “[A Life Course Framework for Improving the Lives of Boys and Men of Color.](#)” CAST’s recommendations emphasize the importance of keeping children, youth and adults on a positive life path. We believe every child should have the opportunity to succeed in school and in life, regardless of race, zip code, or circumstance. This is the most pressing issue and we share the belief that real change is rooted in community transformation. By bringing together people from across a community and keeping equitable results at the center of our work we can transform systems and achieve more equitable outcomes for children and families commensurate with the scale of the problem. Given our aligned beliefs, CAST is partnering to develop a county-wide prevention framework. Through this partnership, community organizations and county system will ramp up our abilities to meet an increasing need, align to common outcomes, and to influence what is becoming a robust policy opportunity to increase community-based efforts across the County. Together we will work with community leaders to design and implement collectively initiatives to ensure the success of every child.

The recommendations also underscore the need to address the inadvertent acts of our system of care that can trigger or re-traumatize the people we are committed to helping. Using a trauma-informed and healing-centered approach, CAST is trying to shift the tide of the system’s impact on trauma and acknowledge the system’s role in re-traumatizing individuals and build bridges of healing back to community supports. Each system/department or agency has an array of prevention program with specific goals and outcomes. Each one with a specific focus and for a specific population. However, all have goals that intercept, align, build and strengthen the child, family and community as outlined below for each system and how they align to the CAST prevention theory of change and framework.

**Behavior Health Services Department (BHSD)** has an array of prevention programs in the Family and Children Division’s Coordinated Continuum of Care. Programs include School Linked Service Initiative (SLS-I), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) Behavioral Health, Nurse Family Partnership (NFP), Reach Out and Read (ROR), and Raising Early Awareness and Creating Hope (REACH). BHSD contracts with Community Based Organizations to provide these services. BHSD prevention
programs help reduce risk factors and/or stressors by building and strengthening protective factors and skills and increasing support. Programs are less intensive, community-based, and each program incorporates the essential elements of prevention in a variety of ways.

**Probation Department** has an array of prevention programs in the Juvenile Services Division including the Neighborhood Safety Unit (NSU), Dually Involved Youth Unit (DIY), Prevention Early Intervention (PEI) Unit, Community Based Probation Unit (CBPU), Youth Advisory Council (YAC), a partnership with public health to support healthy relationships, and School Based Probation Officers. Many of these programs are offered in partnership other county agencies and community-based organizations. The programs span primary prevention activities that focus on the averting families and youth from entering the justice system, to programs that reduce further penetration into both the justice and child welfare systems.

- **The Neighborhood Safety Unit (NSU)** has at the core components that include community engagement, violence prevention through pro-social programming, and collaboration with school districts to enhance school climate initiatives. By strategically partnering with County, City, and community-based organizations, the NSU provides leadership training to residents to assist them in identifying meaningful community action goals that improve perceptions of safety. The NSU also employs a multi-generational approach in funding pro-social services, where activities for both youth and adults may include, but are not limited to, health and wellness workshops, physical fitness classes, and access to sports and extra-curricular activities during the school year and spring/summer breaks. Finally, the NSU partners with schools to ensure youth who are presenting truant and/or at-risk behaviors are linked to pro-social and other violence prevention programs or activities. NSU’s role is to strengthen existing community assets and resiliency through improved connections between residents (Social Cohesion and Social Capital) and to develop and sustain capacity within each neighborhood to address racial and economic inequity through leadership development and root-cause analysis (Informal Collective Action and Collective Efficacy).

- The goal of the **Community Based Probation Unit (CBPU)** is to connect community members to resources which can empower youth to stay out to the Juvenile Justice System. CBPU supports non-justice involved youth with strength-based prevention methods to encourage healthy habits, choices, and decision making. The evidence-based strategies focus on collaboration with the youth, caregiver, school and justice system partners.

- **School Based Probation Officers** work with a variety of schools in the County. The Probation Officer acts as a liaison for County services, has a relationship with the school and connects youth/families to services. The Probation Officer’s primary focus is on preventative/restorative work with at risk youth. The School Based Probation Officers are trained in Restorative Justice principles such as restorative justice circles and National Compadres Curriculums to provide prevention work at school sites. The Probation Officer assists by addressing issues such as attendance, and behavior, with the desired goal of preventing violations of probation or new law violations.

- **Prevention Early Intervention (PEI)** is the primary diversion program for low level and early offenders referred to the Probation Department and employs a light touch approach. The PEI
program has two tiers of service, including Letter of Acknowledgement/Encouraging Conversations and a program/case plan for 30 to 90 days with referrals to address all four key life domains (personal, family, school, and community), including behavioral health services, mentoring, and community service-learning opportunities. The goal is to prevent youth with low level offenses further penetration into the Juvenile Justice System, or re-offending.

- **Youth Advisory Council (YAC)** members serve as Justice Consultants and work collaboratively with system partners to inform and enhance current Juvenile Justice related processes, policies and practices. Consultants also have opportunities to participate in monthly community meetings and commissions, and to conduct presentations. Their input brings invaluable life experience and voice to the Probation Department.

- The partnership with **Public Health Department**, the Public Health Education Associate focuses on teen dating violence and teaching youth how to build healthy relationships through events, educational workshops for a variety of audiences, including train-the-trainer sessions for partner agencies. Public Health provides technical assistance for curriculum and policy development, engages youth and provides peer leadership programs.

- **Dually Involved Youth (DIY)** - Provides a coordinated approach between the Department of Children’s Services (DFCS) and Probation. This model enables social workers, probation officers, and Youth Advocates to be co-located to provide strength-based united case management approach for intensive services for youth and their families. The seamless collaboration provides more than one voice in the advocacy and resource linkage based on each organizations’ lens and the best interest of the youth and family.

**Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS),** Title IV-E California Well-Being Project provided an opportunity for Santa Clara County to use federal funds more flexibly in order to test innovative approaches to child welfare service delivery and financing. Using this option, counties have been able to design and demonstrate a wide range of approaches to reforming child welfare and improving outcomes in the areas of safety, permanency, and well-being. DFCS’ collaborative efforts in this arena have aided in the development of initiatives such as the Parents Café, among others. The Well-Being Project allowed child welfare and probation departments to offer federal foster care supports to children and families not normally eligible for Title IV-E support and provides funding for certain services not normally covered under Title IV-E.

Building from efforts through the Well-Being Project and other reform efforts, Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) longstanding goal of ensuring that all children live as members of committed, nurturing, and permanent families; and, where reliance on congregate care is limited to short-term, therapeutic interventions that is one part of a continuum of care services. DFCS in particular, has been moving to align services with statutory changes. More importantly, however, CCR aligns with the vision of the department through its targeted prevention strategies and implementation of the Child and Family Practice Model (CFPM). The present report serves the purpose of outlining key strategies across DFCS and Probation to reduce the over-representation of children of color by developing and strengthening early community prevention and system diversion strategies. Other strategies include partnerships with First 5 for the FRC to promote community-based Parent Child Visitation and Child and Family Team Meetings, in addition to partner to have Second Harvest to provide access to food in the community in these locations.
Office of Supportive Housing (OSH) administers two significant homelessness prevention programs, both of which are operated by the seven CBOs that form the Emergency Assistance Network. The Community Plan to End Homelessness identifies homelessness prevention programs as one of three primary interventions to reduce homelessness in Santa Clara County.

- **EAN Homeless Prevention Program (EAN HP Program).** The EAN was originally established by the United Way of Silicon Valley (now United Way Bay Area) in partnership with seven community-based organizations in Santa Clara County. The EAN was established as a means for the United Way to organize and distribute funding for emergency needs throughout Santa Clara County. Currently, the EAN agencies operate as a collaboration. The County has agreements with eight (8) EAN agencies to provide homelessness prevention services to residents throughout the county. The EAN HP Program began in Fiscal Year 2016 and allocates funding to the eight EAN “regions” evenly. Collectively the EAN HP Program agencies on an annual basis serve approximately 424 households and provide an average of $1,317 in financial assistance per household.

- **Homelessness Prevention System Pilot (HPS Pilot).** The County, in partnership with Destination: Home, the City of San José, and private funders, began operating the HPS Pilot in July 2017. The HPS Pilot targets families who have the highest needs and provides more robust and longer-term financial assistance and support services such as legal services, employment services, child care, and transportation assistance. The HPS Pilot program was launched with the goal of implementing a more systematic, comprehensive, and data-driven countywide homelessness prevention system. The HPS Pilot’s initial goal was to serve 660 families over a 24-month period (July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2019). The HPS Pilot program is undergoing an independent evaluation conducted by the University of Notre Dame’s Wilson Sheehan Lab for Economic Opportunities. Between July 2017 and September 2018, the program served 371 households, providing an average of $3,723 in financial assistance per household. Seventy-four percent (74%) of families received financial aid within 72 hours of application, and 97.3% of families remained stably housed while receiving prevention assistance.

The Homelessness Prevention System Pilot is able to provide support tailored to each household's needs to stabilize its housing. These services include help paying future and past due rent or mortgage payments, security deposits, utility bills, and other expenses that place the household at risk of homelessness, such as transportation costs, medical bills, and childcare. Partner agencies also offer case management and follow up to provide additional support if participants find themselves at risk of homelessness again in the future. The program leverages the following strategies to provide comprehensive support to at-risk households: 1) Coordinating to provide "no wrong door" access to prevention services and 2) Partnering to provide streamlined access to legal assistance in landlord-tenant proceedings.

**Essential Elements & Intended Outcomes of Prevention**
Each department has various strategies, interventions and programs that support prevention. The information contained hereafter is outlined by essential element of prevention with identified outcomes for each based on the CAST Theory of Change developed for the County-wide prevention framework.

Community, Peer, Family & System Network Collaboration
Outcome(s): Linking and engaging with services and resources

The DFCS Prevention Bureau team, collaborates, educates, and advocates through community focused programs and policies to prevent maltreatment, entry and re-entry into foster care. The Prevention Bureau’s goal is to create safe, supportive and self-sufficient communities where families and children have access to culturally appropriate services and resources necessary to mitigate the need for child welfare intervention. Prevention is defined holistically, from preventing families from entering into the child welfare system (Primary), preventing families from DFCS monitored involvement (Secondary) and preventing families with the DFCS monitored involvement from returning into the system (Tertiary). Broadly, this framework of service delivery is structured to build communities and increase families’ abilities to promote safe, stable, and nurturing environments for their children.

The Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) is leading the School Climate Leadership Team System Alignment which will create better utilization and connection between systems (schools, districts, law enforcement agencies, county and community based organization services) so students and families get what they need, when they need it, leading to better academic and social outcomes. A number of county agencies are working together to align efforts to develop a coordinated method of working with local education agencies through the development of a common MOU process and a catalog of tiered services. The School Climate Leadership Team is working in partnership with CAST to align the prevention initiatives for a single system of care that will support the children, youth and families in Santa Clara County. The framework to support youth is Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), which is an integrated, comprehensive framework that aligns academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning in a fully integrated system of support for the benefit of all students. MTSS offers the potential to create needed systematic change through intentional design and redesign of services and supports to quickly identify and match to the needs of all students. Current areas of work include: creating a common MOU to utilize between organizations and creating processes from point of referral to receipt of services; utilizing evidenced-based model, create a standardized program model for a human “school connector”; create a searchable catalog of tiered services; collective planning process map.

The Dually Involved Youth (DIY) Unit comprised of teams of specialized staff, including a social worker, probation officer, and a youth advocate, who work together to understand the family unit as a whole and respond effectively to the complex needs of the youth and family. Further, the team have explicit encouragement by management to develop nontraditional solutions, which will include, among other things, linkages to non-traditional, smaller, culturally appropriate service providers.

The Juvenile Services Division has the following prevention programs that touch engagement with services and resources:

- **South County Youth Task Force** is a partnership with the City of Gilroy, the City of Morgan Hill, Gilroy and Morgan Hill Unified School Districts, local community-based agencies and the
County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors to address the effects of violence and gangs on the youth in the South County communities. The SCYTF brings together a collaborative of local government, law enforcement, schools, and community-based agencies and resident voice through a thorough community engagement process to provide positive opportunities for youth and their families.

- The goals **Victim Awareness** of the program are to increase empathy through educating and sensitizing youth to the impacts of crime and promoting a system of justice that recognizes harm caused to victims and supporting positive steps to repairing those harms. The workshop curriculum is victim centered and enhanced by community members who have been victims of youth crime and give a firsthand account of the impacts of crime.

- **National Compadres Network** provides capacity building for community-based organizations to support youth and families through culturally centered and healing curriculum including Joven Noble, Xinachtli, Cara y Corazon, and is built on the Cultura Cura framework, meaning that the culture as cure. The curriculums are based on indigenous principles of the individual’s interconnectedness to the family, the community, and nation. This curriculum provides a dialectic process of Reflection, Consciousness raising, Creation, and Action, while supporting and building on the strengths of the individual. The curriculum incorporates an educational and organizing method in the development of leadership capacity and personal community responsibility; allowing participants to serve as teachers and guides in their community.

- **City of San Jose Parks and Recreation** expansion of teen centers. The expansion provides access to teen centers throughout various hot spots including gym membership, organized sports, and a variety of supervised activities.

- **Public Health violence prevention** workshops and technical assistance for youth, schools, and provides subject matter expertise on dating and relationship violence from a public health perspective.

- **Young Women’s Freedom Center** provides leadership development program for women, girls, transgender and gender-nonconforming youth. The Youth Women’s Freedom Center’s goal is to provide a strategic system of care for this population that shows significant results in reduction of risk of recidivism and victimization along with improved quality of life improvements.

The NSU actively engages with a variety of county agencies and community-based organizations to provide resources and service linkage to families who live within our partner communities. The following are examples of recent service linkages in NSU partner communities in Zip Codes 95122 and 95020:

**NSU Valley Palms:**

- In the Fall of 2019 residents of the Valley Palms community (ZIP Code 95122) participated in a Mental Health First Aid workshop offered by the Behavioral Health Department. Residents learned about how to detect early warning signs of stress and other mental health symptoms, as well as suicide prevention and who to call in the event of a mental health emergency.

- In the summer of 2019, Valley Palms residents also partnered with the Behavioral Department to participate in the Suicide Prevention QPR Trainings.
In September 2019, the Public Health, Department of Family and Children’s Services, and the District Attorney’s Office conducted a walking tour of the San Ysidro neighborhood. County staff met with the resident leadership group Nueva Vida to learn about the violence prevention work being done in East Gilroy through DFCS, NSU, SCYTF and the City of Gilroy, as well as opportunity areas for collaboration.

The Probation Department, in partnership with the Department of Family and Children’s Services and First 5 of Santa Clara County, identified the need for a comprehensive system of care that preserves and strengthens family connections throughout all stages of a parent’s involvement with the criminal justice and child welfare systems. The Corridor Program, offered by the Dependency Advocacy Center, provides services for parents on formal probation include a limited scope of legal services to parenting adult probationers, such as legal advice and safety planning for the care of their children to minimize or prevent their involvement with the child welfare system in case of future arrests or relapse. In addition, social workers and parent mentors will link clients to community supports, such as mentoring, economic supports/public benefits, substance use treatment, housing assistance, employment & job training, transportation (for parents and/or children), counseling/therapy, home visitation, parent education and support, high quality early child care and education, early intervention for children with developmental concerns, school supports and other services as needed. The overarching goals for this program are to ensure children of arrested or incarcerated parents are healthy, thriving, and living in safe and nurturing families; ensure arrested or incarcerated parents have access to resources that strengthen their capacity to raise healthy, thriving children; and increase family reunification, minimize involvement in multiple systems (criminal justice, child welfare), and prevent recidivism.

Universal Access Pilot Program (UAP) is a cross-system partnership focused on collaboratively supporting the families in the community. The Universal Access to Early Childhood Education, Care and Health Pilot (UAP) is committed to cross-system coordination and integration in service to family navigation that is culturally responsive and applies a whole child, whole family approach where all doors lead to support. The target population includes all children, zero through third grade, and their families in the Alum Rock Union School District (ARUSD) and Franklin McKinley School District (FMSD). The UAP cross-system partnership includes SCC, FIRST 5, Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE), ARUSD, FMSD, City of San Jose Public Library, SSA, BHSD School Linked Services, and PHD. UAP partners work collaboratively to support families’ connection to quality early education programs, childcare, and access to services and supports that strengthen social determinants of health and well-being. Using the Pathways to Success Logic Model developed and adopted by the two school districts (with adaptations to meet the specific needs and priorities of each), cross-system coordination of services and supports are expected to improve child outcomes in the areas of reading and math proficiency by third, reaching developmental milestones, families that are informed and engaged in their children’s wellbeing and education, and partners that are skilled, aligned and interdependent. As the diagram below indicates, for young learners to succeed by third grade, supports need to be nested within each layer of children’s ecosystem and in a manner that builds on each layer across their lifespan.
UAP partners are committed to developing cross-system partnerships that bridge alignment toward a shared vision that is holistic, unified and integrated across the educational system, FIRST 5 Family Resource Centers (FRC), SLS coordinators, community-based supports, and county safety net programs. In this manner a service delivery system has been built in each school district through partner coordination to align services in the best interest of families and children.

The UAP cross-system service delivery model espouses a high-quality customer service approach that together with cross-system leaders seeks to eliminate and/or reduce the number of bureaucratic barriers families need to overcome before gaining full access and utilization of critical resources.

UAP is focused on achieving the following key alignment and integration system strategies:

- Maximize families’ access to resources and avoid duplication of efforts across systems by identifying and implementing cross-system adaptations to effectively sustain service coordination and integration, as well as addressing systemic barriers to ensure that all families successfully and efficiently connect with County and/or community services through a variety of portals.

- Integrate County services into the UAP Service Delivery Model to support the cross-system partnership with FIRST 5 FRCs and the school districts by modifying or recreating systems to be coordinated, aligned, and integrated to support families’ linkage to quality early education and universal access to services.

- Alignment with initiatives and strategic plans of ARUSD, FMSD, SCCOE, FIRST 5, PHD’s Children’s Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), BHSD SLS, Cross-Agency Services Team-Prevention Subcommittee (CAST), Homeless and Housing Prevention Systems approach, and elements of the Joint Foster Youth Task Force.

- To create a seamless network of support for families and their young learners where there is no wrong door for accessing supportive services and resources.

**BHSD School Linked Services (SLS)** Initiative includes district level and school level SLS Coordinators to support with family engagement and service coordination. Referrals made by school administration, faculty, and self/family are centralized with the SLS Coordinators. SLS Coordinators assess the student’s needs and link students and their families to resources throughout the county such as BHSD, Supportive Housing, family support, food banks, etc. This program serves as an initial access point to engage families early, to prevent risk exposure, and to provide resources to help them navigate resources throughout their child’s education. Through family engagement, families are welcomed on school campuses and provided a sense of safety.
**BHSD** provides funds for the *Dependency Advocacy Center Peer Mentor Program*. This program employs peers to support parents involved in Dependency Wellness Court providing peer mentorship, linkage and resources to the community.

Established in 2010, the *BHSD’s Suicide Prevention Program* has the mission of reducing and preventing suicides in Santa Clara County, by bringing community awareness to the issue and engaging in community prevention efforts. Our work includes the following:

- Running crisis intervention services, such as the Suicide and Crisis Hotline;
- Running public education and outreach campaigns to encourage people to seek help when they need it;
- Promoting safe and effective messaging and reporting in the media;
- Training community members to identify and support others who are in crisis;
- Working with County schools to strengthen suicide crisis response and prevention;
- Implementing policies that are supportive of suicide prevention; and
- Collecting data and evaluating activities to monitor and strengthen program efforts.

**BHSD’s Substance Use Prevention Services (SUPS)** contributes to the health and well-being of our community. In 2011, as part of the *Affordable Care Act*, the National Prevention Strategy was developed and focuses on improving the quality of life for individuals, families, and communities. The goal of the national strategy is to slow down the age of onset of substance use for youth by focusing on wellness and changing community conditions. Substance use is shaped by social settings. Communities can take steps to create conditions that support positive choices about substance use. Our County SUPS prevention services work to reduce or prevent substance use or abuse among individuals. SUPS also works to address community conditions that contribute to substance use issues. Not only does SUPS focus on youth, but works with all ages to prevent prescription drug misuse, opioid misuse, and other substance use issues.

- SUPS addresses problems associated with alcohol and other drugs (AOD) use and abuse.
- SUPS promotes safe and healthy behaviors and lifestyles.
- SUPS seeks to educate individuals, help individuals develop skills to live healthier and happier lives, and affect community factors that normalize use.

**BHSD’s Office of Family Affairs** assists families in navigating the behavioral health system of care. They offer direct, support, information, and education with the goal of providing recovery and hope. The mission is to empower family members and their loved ones receiving services in the Santa Clara County behavioral health system with accessible education, support, and resource opportunities. The Office of Family Affairs can help you during this time of need by providing the following services:

- Assist families in navigating the behavioral health system of care
- Direct one-on-one support
- Information and education with the goal of providing recovery and hope
Offer a host of referrals to community resources to link families to wellness and recovery everywhere
- Support at the Mental Health Urgent Care (MHUC) clinic

**DFCS Early System Diversion – Cultural Brokers Program.** which began in December 2016, facilitates communication and bridges cultural gaps between the DFCS staff and families using ethnic and cultural experts from the community. DFCS, in collaboration with three community agencies, ICAN, Unity Care, and ConXion/CARAS started the *pilot* program with the intention of decreasing disproportionality and disparity and increasing well-being for children and families. Six communities in Santa Clara County were the target of this work, this includes the ZIP codes: 95111, 95112, 95116, 95122, 95127 from East San Jose and 95020 from Gilroy. These are the areas where data show marked disproportionate rates of child abuse and neglect referrals for children and youth of African Ancestry and Latino backgrounds.

Cultural Brokers are trained, trusted members of the community who partner with DFCS during initial investigations by assisting social workers with engagement efforts to:

1. Support the understanding of cultural differences,
2. Help families become better connected with culturally relevant community resources,
3. Assist families in better navigating the child welfare system; and
4. Honor families’ unique strengths, potential, and ability to self-advocate through cultural humility and respect.

Cultural Broker partners work directly with Emergency Response social workers at both the Julian Campus and South County office assisting on Immediate Response (IR) and 10-day Referrals.

Since the launch of the program in December 2016 and through June 30, 2018, the Cultural Broker Program has received 555 referrals. Over 69 percent of families referred enrolled in services offered by a cultural broker; the remaining declined a service referral.

**A Cultural Broker Success Story**

Seneca has been working with the Ramirez family since they first entered the child welfare system in December of 2018. The Cultural Broker (CB) was invited to support the family during their Child and Family Team (CFT) meeting. During the CFT, the CB was able to support the family by assisting the family with understanding the expectations of the department. The CB also helped the department gain a clearer picture of the family’s dynamics. Throughout the first CFT and those that followed, the CB was able to ensure the family was aware of the services they had to complete to get their family out of the system. During the earlier CFTs the CB was able to get the family linked with the Differential Response (DR) program and other community-based services and financial support. Around the holiday period the family was struggling to provide gifts for their children, so the CB was able to get the family connected with free gifts. As time went on, the mother relapsed and began to struggle with drugs again, so the CC worked with the father to ensure he could keep the kids safe. The family received another CPS referral because of Mom’s struggle with drugs. The department removed the children. The CB worked with the family and their natural supports to strategize a way to reunite the family. The CB worked with the Differential Response Team and DFCS’s Joint Decision-Making Unit to organize a CFT to put together a
The mother got sober, yet soon after she relapsed again. The mother gave birth to her third child while she had drugs in her system. Instead of giving up on the family, the CB and all the supportive team came together to have another CFT. At that CFT, the team agreed to place the children with their grandmother and their uncle. The team also identified a program to help the mother work on her sobriety and keep regular supervised visits with her children. The mother tested negative for drugs 6-months in a row and was able to reunite with her children. The father and the mother stated that they could not have reunited with their children without the unwavering support of their team. This has been a clear representation of the importance of partnership between family, community partners, and DFCS. This family was faced with difficult realities and was able to stay committed to one another and their children. To see the family light up after reunifying was the greatest pay day for the Cultural Broker! On behalf of the family they wanted everyone to know they appreciated their family, the CB, the DR team, DFCS, and everyone who assisted in getting their family back together.

**Health and Well-being**

Outcome(s): Strong, stable and resilient family, Safe and healthy environment, Healthy Pregnancy and Birth, Sense of hope for the future

Several Probation Department programs are designed to help with family engagement with the intent of family reunification, strong and resilient family environments. These programs are strength based and provide an assortment of activities with passionate, caring adults who are culturally competent and truly care about our youth and their families.

Programs include:

- National Compadres Network, Xinachtli Germinating Seed Curriculum is a comprehensive bilingual/bicultural youth development process designed to provide adolescent female youth the guidance for healthy development into adulthood. It is based on indigenous principles of the individual’s interconnectedness to the family, the community, and nation.
- New Hope for Youth Si Se Puede provides family assessments and case management to help middle school aged youth and their families be successful.
- Community Based Probation Unit (CBPU) connects community members to resources which can empower youth to stay out to the Juvenile Justice System. The evidence-based strategies focus on collaboration with the youth, caregiver, school and justice system partners.
- In July 2019, Valley Palms residents participated in vision and dental screenings by the Healthier Kids Foundation.
- Teen Success provides an education program for teen mothers and/or pregnant teens. Our partnership with Public Health Specialist provides workshops on healthy relationships.

**The Universal Access Pilot Program (UAP)**, for collective impact the UAP service delivery model is anchored on six pillars of health and well-being: housing security, food security, quality preschool and childcare, developmental assessments, children’s and parent’s health, and school connectedness and attendance. While first attending to families’ primary presenting need, family navigators and partners ensure that families and their children are whole in the six UAP pillars. This is done by connecting with families in a manner that is guided by quality family engagement and customer service strategies that
allows successful linkage to quality early child education programs, childcare, County, and community services.

By responding to families’ presenting priority need and focusing on the six UAP pillars in a manner that is culturally responsive, trust is developed with families. This has led to the disclosure of other hidden concerns. For many immigrant and/or families of color, disclosing personal concerns in the areas of mental health or domestic violence, for example, are taboo or difficult to discuss. However, these are important family factors that need resolving for the well-being and normal development of children. One mother referred to a family navigator for housing assistance as the presenting priority need, once trust was formed later shared that her husband was controlling and abusive. This abuse not only affected her well-being, but the mother also disclosed that their child was sad and anxious about their home life. The family navigator connected the mother with mental health counselling services, helped with obtaining a restraining order at the self-help center, and secured legal representation through the Step Forward foundation. The family was also able to connect with a cultural broker through the ICAN Family Resource Center, where the children had volunteer opportunities to improve their emotional well-being. When children’s families are secure and whole in the 6 UAP pillars and their priority presenting needs addressed, this creates a sense of security in children’s most important ecological system, the family. Strength and security derived from healthy family systems strengthen children’s resiliency and learning.

Probation has several of their programs designed to help with family engagement with the intent of family reunification, strong and resilient family environments. Our programs are strength based and provide an assortment of activities with passionate, caring adults who are culturally competent and truly care about our youth and their families. Programs include:

- National Compadres Network-The Xinachtli Germinating Seed Curriculum is a comprehensive bilingual/bicultural youth development process designed to provide adolescent female youth the guidance for healthy development into adulthood. It is based on indigenous principles of the individual’s interconnectedness to the family, the community, and nation.
- New Hope for Youth Si Se Puede. Provides family assessments and case management to help middle school aged youth and their families be successful.
- Community Based Probation Unit (CBPU)- CBPU’s goal is to connect community members to resources which can empower youth to stay out to the Juvenile Justice System. The evidence-based strategies focus on collaboration with the youth, caregiver, school and justice system partners.

BHSD contracts with Community Based Organizations to provide prevention services through our Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) program at 63 schools in 11 school districts. PEI is a school based universal prevention and early treatment services program designed to prevent mental illness and emotional disturbance from becoming severe and disabling and to improve emotional well-being. PEI teams consist of Family Partners to support with case management and linkage, Family Specialist to provide behavioral support in home and in the classroom and to provide parenting workshops, and Clinicians to provide short-term individual and family therapy using Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) such as Triple P Level 5, Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavior Therapy, and Brief Family Therapy. Additional EBPs are provided through Enhanced Support and Prevention tiers such as Triple P Level 4,
Strengthening Families, and Triple P. In addition, BHSD funds the Public Health Department’s Nurse Family Partnership program which is an EBP community health program demonstrating significant improvements in the health and lives of pregnant and first-time mothers and their children living in poverty. Services are provided during the first two years of the child’s life. BHSD’s Substance Use Prevention program has developed campaigns that address safe and healthy living environments as well as healthy pregnancy and birth.

**Economic Stability, Housing, & Basic Needs**

Outcome(s): Employment opportunities and economic stability, Housing, Food Security, Other basic needs (e.g. accessible transportation)

One of the strengths of the Probation Department is our collaboration and information sharing systems. In collaboration with the County of Santa Clara departments, many of the economic stability, housing and basic needs are supported. Unfortunately, the number of resources available for residents are limited. Every Probation Officer and Community Based Organization (CBO) has a list of resources to assist in linking in youth and families to needed services. Our prevention programs listed above help youth, siblings, and their families including working with churches and private organizations to obtain food, put families on housing waiting lists and address transportation needs. A recent partnership for a path to employment is the Santa Clara and San Benito County Building Trades Council. They partnered with the Probation Department and extended their apprenticeship program to youth or anyone interested. Our CBOs can refer directly to the Trades program. In addition, we work with the following agencies for employment services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Conservation Corps</td>
<td>Combination High School and Paid Job Training through: Zero Waste/Recycling, Environmental Projects/Services Program, and Americorps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work2Future</td>
<td>Work Readiness Training, Subsidized employment opportunities, transportation Assistance, food pantry, Career coaching, Job Developer consultations, Vocational assessments, Career Technical Training, Job Search guidance and training, Remediation software, Supportive services, Incentives, Job leads, Job fairs, and Computer labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVA</td>
<td>Career Guidance Services NOVA receives funds to assist economically disadvantaged, out-of-school youth (ages 16-24) in their career goals. Participants receive individualized support and meaningful work experiences. Our Career Guidance program targets: Foster youth High school dropouts/ Youth at risk of dropping out Ex-offenders Pregnant/Parenting teens Youth with disabilities Individual Support Staff assist youth in exploring and developing educational and career goals. Goals focus on improving basic skills, attaining high school diploma/GED,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pursuing higher education, training, or the military, and ultimately, securing employment.

**Work Experience Program**
Youth starting out in their careers are matched with employers offering work experience. Youth gain valuable skills, responsibility, and income; employers gain a motivated intern whose wages are subsidized by NOVA.

| **San Jose Job Corps** | Job Corps is a no-cost education and career technical training program administered by the U.S. Department of Labor that helps young people ages 16 to 24 improve the quality of their lives through career technical and academic training.  
**Training Areas**: Facilities Management, Clinical Medical Assistant, Medical Office Support, Security and Protective Services, Culinary Arts, Material Handling and Distribution Operations, and Retail Sales |
| **Genesys Works** | 8-week skills training, yearlong internship placement, college and career coaching, and alumni support |
| **TeenForce** | Staffing Agency/job placement for disadvantaged youth |
| **Year Up** | Year Up Bay Area is a one-year, intensive training program that provides low-income young adults, ages 18-24, with a combination of hands-on skill development, coursework eligible for college credits, corporate internships, and wraparound support.  
**Silicon Valley Campus Specialty Tracks**: Helpdesk/Desktop Support, Project Management Support, Data Analytics, and Network Support |
| **Center for Employment Training (CET)** | Job Training Program  
**Training programs available in San Jose**:  
**Automotive Specialist**  
**Culinary Arts**  
**Early Childhood Teacher Assistant**  
**Electrician**  
**Green Building Construction Skills**  
**HVAC Technician & Green Technology**  
**Medical Assistant**  
**Medical Office Administration**  
Also, offers Immigration and Citizenship Services: Citizenship Classes and Workshops and DACA Clinics |
| **Silicon Valley Career and Technical Education (SVCTE)** | A Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics (STEAM) high school program offering 24 courses (17 of which are UC “a-g” approved) that prepare students for college and future careers.  
**Career Paths**:  
**Animation**  
**Auto Body Refinishing**  
**Auto Body Repair**  
**Automotive Services**  
**Construction Technology**  
**Culinary Arts**  
**Cybersecurity** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUMA Ventures</th>
<th>Part-time employment at one of our concession businesses in a major sporting venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job skills training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Development Account for college savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds to match your college savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College and career tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College application and financial aid help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one mentorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring and SAT preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support through college completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NSU:**
- In March 2020, residents of the Valley Palms community participated in a San Jose city council hearing where the owners of the Valley Palms Apartment Complex were asked to include a variety of structural and property management improvements to the complex as part of a revised regulatory agreement funded through the state. Residents successfully advocated for the property owner to build a synthetic turf field, providing translation of lease agreements and other documents into Spanish and other languages, and implementing security improvements including lighting and gating. Ideally, these improvements lead to decreased hosing displacements as a result of miscommunication or improperly managed tenant/landlord relations.

**The Universal Access Pilot Program (UAP)** family navigators work with families to address any concerns with housing and basic needs, such as food security, as well as address economic stability challenges. Through the triage process in each school district (ARUSD, FMSD), school staff and/or SLS coordinators identify the most appropriate UAP partner for each family. Based on this initial screening, family support may be received through FRC community providers, school social workers, SLS
coordinators, UAP family navigators, or housing navigators. Families requiring more assistance in navigating services or with more complex needs are referred to UAP County family navigators who, for example, may assist with filling out the forms, ensuring all required documents are at the ready, and by accompanying families to the application interview appointments. Families with more complex challenges, often experience housing and food security as key challenges. Family navigators are strong advocates of families in securing housing resources. In one example, FMSD partners shared that

“the UAP staff member called multiple agencies and was able to eventually connect [the family] with West Valley Community Services, who were able to provide the needed amount which amounted to well over $2,000. The UAP staff member advocated for the family with the landlord to allow the agency time to be able to produce the check. The family was also connected with the Social Services Agency for food and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. As a result of the efforts of the UAP team, the student’s attendance at school this year has significantly improved.”

Housing security, nonetheless, is a predominant challenge for many families in the ARUSD and FMSD school districts. Therefore, a goal is to increase the knowledge of UAP partners in homeless and housing programs and services and to develop stronger alignment with the Office of Supportive Housing, Destination Home and the Prevention Network in efforts to reduce homelessness and housing insecurity. UAP is hosting ongoing meetings to develop system improvements and changes to allow more families to access housing programs throughout the county system. Recent data showed that 35 percent of families across the two districts were moderately or very concerned about their housing situation, 17 percent were a little concerned, and 48 percent were not concerned at all. Responses for accompanying family challenge, food security, showed that 25 percent were moderately to very concerned, 18 percent were a little concern, and 56 percent were not concerned at all. These data represented perceptions prior to the shelter in place order.

The UAP partner network fully activated after the health officer’s shelter in place order to address emerging community needs. Not different from news reports, housing-, food security and financial stability are in greater peril as a result of the expected far reaching aftermath of Covid19. The UAP partner network have held weekly conference calls to continue alignment, recalibration, and sharing resource information of available services and supports. For example, the school districts activated to provide daily breakfast and lunch boxes; FIRST 5 and SCCOE partnered to distribute calming and learning kits; FIRST 5 and the City of San Jose have secured funds to provide diapers, wipes and formula milk; BHSD has provided access to hotline numbers and telehealth services; SSA DEBS has shared critical information on extensions and relaxed eligibility requirements for food and cash aid benefits; and partnership with Second Harvest Food Bank, housing navigators and the Rental Assistance program have been critical supports to families.

Through School Linked Serviced (SLS-I), SLS Coordinators provide service coordination and linkage to resources within the county to support students and their families. Referrals are made to the Department of Supportive Housing, food banks, healthcare, immigration support, transportation, behavioral health services, etc. to help families have their needs met. In addition to SLS-I, the PEI programs include a Family Partner in their team to support caregivers with linkage to community resources. Also, flex funding is included in PEI contracts to support families with unforeseen financial
expenses. BHSD’s **Supportive Housing Services** works closely with Office of Supportive Housing to help those individuals and families impacted by homelessness.

**SCCOE McKinney-Vento** – The homeless student program provides services to youth designed to address their vital educational needs. The program provides technical assistance to school districts and connections to collaborating community partners for services. In addition, the program provides professional learning of the numerous educational laws that protect the rights of McKinney-Vento youth.

**Education and Career Development**

Outcome(s): Ready for school, Proficient in reading and math skills at key points, High School Graduation, Ready for College and Career

The **Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE)** leads a number of initiatives with cross agency collaboration designed to support students to be Ready for school, Proficient in reading and math skills at key points, reach High School Graduation, and be Ready for College and Career. The following presents some of these initiatives with key cross agency collaborations which SCCOE currently leads that are specific to Education and Career Development.

- **Strong Start** – This is a coalition of community leaders, early education providers, nonprofit organizations, elected officials, members of the business community and other key stakeholders who are committed to expanding access to high quality early learning opportunities for all children age 0 to 8 in Santa Clara County.

- **Inclusion Collaborative** - The Inclusion Collaborative leads the promotion and support for the inclusion of all students. The research shows that increased participation in inclusive environments supports not only students with special education, but their typical peer. This initiative also manages the Warm Line.

- **SCC College and Career Readiness Consortium** – SCCOE convenes this consortium of Santa Clara County School Districts, regional labor workforce boards, and post-secondary institutions, to ensure equitable access to industry partnerships for all students in order to build and provide a sustainable, diverse, and talented labor force that represents Bay Area diversity and needs.

- **Positive Behavior Intervention Supports** - PBIS is a decision-making structure that guides selection, integration and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving important behavior outcomes for all youth.

- **Multi-Tiered System of Supports** – MTSS is comprehensive framework that aligns academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning in a fully integrated system of supports for the benefit of all students.

- **Opportunity Youth Academy** – OYA offers students a blended program of teacher-directed instruction and online credit accrual and recovery options. The individualized support of teachers, counselors, navigators, liaisons and access to the services of SCCOE partners from community-based organizations is the hallmark of this unique program. The focus is ensuring that students leave the program with a high school diploma, and a path to post-graduation college or career.
• **Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program** - The FYSCP provides educational support to foster youth who suffer the traumatic effects of displacement from family and schools. By offering technical assistance and professional development to school districts and supports interagency collaboration, we build capacity at both the system and student level. The program’s focus is on maintaining school of origin stability and improving educational outcomes for youth in foster care.

**NSU:**

• NSU partners with the Evergreen Valley Elementary School District to support the Katherine Smith Elementary School’s school-wide Learning Café. The Learning Café is an innovative approach to integrating Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to the school-wide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support framework used to ensure students achieve both academically and social-emotionally. Students can choose from a variety of activities within the learning café including danza, drumming, recreational sports and art.

• NSU has partnered with two schools within the GUSD system that serve East Gilroy residents by supporting the implementation of MTSS and PBIS through funding school-wide initiatives that improve students and parents’ connection to the school community. This effort is outlined in each school’s Violence Prevention Plan and includes activities such as recreational opportunities and dance. Some funding is also used to support supply purchases for school-wide PBIS initiatives including prizes for good behavior (school-wide).

The following programs address elements of culture, trauma, and education and career development.

- **Project Evolve**, coordinated by SCCOE, engages youth in culturally competent, trauma-informed programs as well as mentorship, leadership, academic skill building, life skills, employment/career workshops and pro-social activities. Services are provided at middle schools and high schools in South County.

- **New Hope for Youth Si Se Puede Program** focuses on middle school youth with wraparound services including educational needs and focusing on educational success.

- **School Based Probation Officers** work with a variety of schools based on regions. The Probation Officer acts as a liaison for County services, has a relationship with the school and connects youth/families to services. The Probation Officer’s primary focus is on preventative/restorative work with at risk youth. The Probation Officer assists by addressing issues such as attendance, and behavior.

**Universal Access Pilot (UAP)** principal outcome goal is to ensure that children are proficient in reading and math by third grade. This is done by ensuring that all families have information on the importance of quality early learning and are linked to quality early childhood education programs for all children.

**FIRST 5** offers a menu of early education programs that are interconnected to collectively impact families, educators, administrators and ultimately, the healthy development of children. These supports enhance the professional development of early learning educators and the quality of center- and family-based care providers. This is a particular need for family childcare homes.
When operating in isolation without access to information and resources, family childcare home providers face the challenge of adequately supporting their families and children. To address this need, FIRST 5 expanded professional development opportunities intentionally designed to support building the capacity of family care providers through their SEEDS of Early Literacy (SEEDS) program. SEEDS is a relationship-based professional development program designed for parents and family childcare providers. SEEDS provide family childcare providers with an avenue to introduce parents to the importance of early literacy for their toddlers and ways they can facilitate this process at home. Providers and parents notice the difference conversation makes in their child’s communication and development.

SCCOE tracks usage of all subsidized early childhood education slots and shares this information with UAP partners to ensure all slots are fully utilized and to identify gaps. In the most recent data analysed, 97 percent of subsidized early education child slots were filled, with a waitlist of 57 children. This data was last updated on March 4, 2020, a little before the Shelter in Place Order to control the spread of Covid19. Access to quality early education is particularly important for children with developmental delays. Thus, UAP partners’ focus on ensuring that all children receive developmental assessments and screenings for dental, vision, and hearing are critical. FIRST 5 partners with the Healthier Kids Foundation to ensure health screenings are available to all children in the two school districts. Services that are provided through the educational system and family resource centers create friendly and useful settings.

BHSD’s KidConnections Network (KCN), a Birth – 5 System of Care, provides developmental and behavioral health services to the youngest population in Santa Clara County and their family. With a focus on the caregiver/child relationship as the driver of intervention, a team approach is utilized to support families with children Birth – 5 who have developmental and behavioral health concerns and support school readiness. The KCN is a partnership between BHSD and FIRST 5. BHSD’s Student Intern and Career Pathways program offers a summer program to high school students who are interested in a career in behavioural health. With those who want to pursue this career, BHSD offers a scholarship program for undergraduate studies in the field. BHSD REACH program, who serves youth and Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) ages 10-25, provide an array of services to support consumers who are at clinical risk for psychosis (CHR-P). Through this prevention program, consumers are provided educational and employment support by an Education and Employment Specialist (EES) to assist the consumer with their CCOC classes, linkage to Department of Rehabilitation, build employment skills, one-on-one support with rehearsing skills such as communication, expressing oneself and sharing desired goals surrounding employment opportunities. The EES works with the consumer to obtain jobs, learn their strengths and areas for growth, and support the consumer with utilizing public transportation to independently go to work and/or school. In addition, EES supports the consumers with navigating public resources. BHSD actively participates on the Santa Clara County School Climate Leadership team led by Santa Clara County Office of Education. This team focuses on County leadership collaboration to strengthen the cradle to college pipeline.
**Safety & Prevention of Trauma**

Outcome(s): Parent’s awareness and knowledge of child development, Proficient in social-emotional skills

Since 2007, **BHSD** has funded the Valley Medical Center Foundation to provide the *Reach Out and Read (ROR)* program. ROR is an EBP that promotes early detection and early prevention of developmental issues with children. It also empowers the parent and supports the development of strong and healthy parent child relationships.

In 2011, **BHSD** in partnership with FIRST 5 Santa Clara County launched the *first Triple P Positive Parenting Program* in Santa Clara County. Triple P aims to prevent problems in the family, school and community before they arise and to create family environments that encourage children to realize their potential. It offers population-level early intervention to prevent child abuse, mental illness and anti-social behavior. BHSD and FIRST 5 continue to offer this program.

In 2015, **BHSD** implemented the first trauma informed initiative, *T² Trauma Transformed*, to initiate and provide trauma informed care and infuse trauma informed practices at all levels within the organization. This initiative was expanded through a cross-system integration and developed a cross systems training team. Practices in this initiative include creating a safe, supportive, welcoming, and respectful environment; educating and training all staff including administrators, direct care staff, case managers, and support staff about the impact of trauma; implementing screening, and assessment tools and procedures to identify clients who have experienced trauma and determine the impact of that trauma, and training clinical staff in trauma-specific treatments. With the implementation of this initiative and its growth across the county, BHSD has hired a Program Manager to support ongoing efforts in this initiative.

**BHSD’s PEI** school-based programs provides individual and family evidenced-based interventions to address safety and prevention of trauma:

- Strengthening Families Program-Parent, child and family skill development program
- Triple P Levels 4 and 5-Individual and Group Parenting Series and Enhanced Parenting Series to provide intensive support for parents coping with emerging behavioural challenges
- Brief Family Therapy-Intensive, direct intervention for parents and their children to address emerging behavioural and emotional concerns
- Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy-Intervention for parents and children to address or prevent behavioural and emotional concerns resulting from exposure of trauma
- Skill-streaming-Classroom-wide prosocial skills training using modelling, role-playing, performance feedback, and generalization

**DFCS Primary Prevention – Cross-System Partnership to reduce general neglect referrals**

To assist in the prioritization of where to launch the prevention strategies, DFCS conducted a review of the data relating to referrals for general neglect. Thus, the strategies focused on six ZIP codes with the highest number of referrals for general neglect in Santa Clara County – they are in East San Jose (95111, 95112, 95116, 95122, 95127) and Gilroy (95020).
South County Prevention Efforts

South County—including Gilroy, San Martin and Morgan Hill—has been historically overrepresented relative to the rest of Santa Clara county with the highest general neglect referrals, substantiated allegations for general neglect, and entry into foster care due to general neglect. Gilroy, a community of 55,069 residents, is predominately Latino/a (60%). It is the fastest growing city in Santa Clara County and possesses a mounting youth population, with 7.7 percent of the population under five years old, compared to a national average of 6.2 percent. Gilroy is a rural city that lacks access to local social services and is surrounded by three freeways and near the border of four counties. Though only approximately 4 percent of youth within Santa Clara County live in Gilroy’s zip code, this area accounted for 7 percent of all Santa Clara County youth arrests and citations in 2017, third in arrests in Santa Clara County behind 95122 and 95116, both in east San Jose. South County families also face high economic insecurity in part due to rising housing prices stemming from South County’s proximity to Silicon Valley, 58 percent of South County households that rent expend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Gilroy has a very high proportion of renters (46%) and Santa Clara County's annual point-in-time homeless census found that Gilroy's homeless population increased by 64 percent from 2015 to 2017. South County’s poverty and unemployment rates are higher than the rest of the County, with Gilroy’s unemployment rate at 3.2 percent, the highest of any city within the County. Almost half (48%) of Gilroy public school students are eligible for free/reduced price lunch and 19 percent of Gilroy children (under the age of 18) are living in households below the Federal Poverty Line.

As a result of these challenges, prevention efforts have been concentrated in this geographic area including the following, but not limited to:

(1) Collaboration and Teaming

Community Peace Building: Support the development of a Restorative Justice (RJ) Center (The Gilroy Way), a facility available for public meetings, RJ practitioner trainings, meditation, mindfulness and restorative practices that emphasizes building relationships within community and repairing the harm caused by negative/disruptive behaviors and can lead to the transformation of people, relationships and communities.

South County Youth Task Force Tech Team (SCYTF): Co-Chair Tech Team and Chair of the Community Resource and Professional Development Subcommittee. Aid in the service delivery model of the SCYTF in effort to coordinate community resources to meet the needs of South County youth and

---

7 Gilroy’s homeless population increased from 439 in 2015 to 722 in 2017.
their families; essentially, surrounding them with a safety net of services. Participated in two community events--Adopt a Complex and Honoring the Badge--through the Faith Based Coalition. Participated in Party in the Park and National Night Out community events through the Community, Outreach, Engagement and Parks Subcommittee.

**South County Collaborative:** DFCS is an active member of the Collaborative and recruits other agencies to become members. The South County Collaborative is composed of 54 local non-profit community-based organizations, schools, private hospitals and clinics, and public agencies that serve South Santa Clara County’s most vulnerable populations. The Collaborative works to increase the quality and quantity of human services as well as making them more accessible, efficient, and effective in an area of the county where government services are scarce, and government funding, foundation and individual giving are even more so.

**Safe, Secure and Loved: Resilient Families Parent Education (RFP) Programs:** In partnership with Sacred Heart, St. Mary’s Parish, Gilroy Library and San Ysidro Community Center. RFP promotes intergenerational healing, family wellbeing and resilience. Focused on classes for mothers with children ages 0-3, the class led by Promotoras, teaches parents to engage in healthy attachment to their children, i.e. emotional presence, stress management, self-care, compassionate listening, brain development, etc. Mothers are then paired with Godmothers (Madrinas) whose mission is to provide support and encouragement to the non-biologically related mothers after they complete their six classes. The godmothers remain present in the mother’s life for one year. Monthly Family Social Gatherings take place in which mothers and godmothers are encouraged to participate and bring their spouses and children. DFCS supports the recruitment of Mothers and Godmothers at community events, GUSD parent groups, etc.

**The Differential Response Program** will now offer services to families who have been identified to be at risk of child abuse/neglect but have NO involvement with Santa Clara County child welfare system by connecting them to supportive services prior to the family being called to the attention of DFCS. The three strategies for this Pathway:

1. **School based,** starting with Gilroy and Morgan Hill Districts. After a six-month pilot with these high needs’ districts, expansion to other high need districts will be explored.
2. **Engaging with five First 5 Family Resource Centers in which relationships are already under development.** Education to be provided to them on how to refer by mid-January for immediate launch and acceptance of referrals thereafter. After a six-month pilot with these FRCs, expansion to the remaining will be explored.
3. **SSA Referrals** from potentially Department of Employment and Benefit Services (DEBS) and In-Home Support Services (IHSS).

These three strategies will be piloted. At the end of the first year, June 2020, we will evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies to implement improvements and to consider expansion.

**Resource Family Recruitment:** Through community relationship building with faith-based institutions and in partnership with Help One Child, aid in the recruitment of Resource Family homes in Gilroy. Also, participating in community events throughout the South County area.
Community-Based Events: In partnership with local city municipalities, police departments, Juvenile Probation (Neighborhood Safety Unit), Probation Department, Community District Attorney’s, Public Health, Behavioral Health, South County Youth Task Force, non-profit agencies and profit agencies/companies, launched summer community events and “Party in the Park” series. Events promote a more connected, engaged and safer neighborhoods and to foster positive relationships with county agencies, local law enforcement and key agencies. Participated in “Summer Fun in the Park” event series in Morgan Hill which promoted outside activities for the community.

(2) Education and Training

Parent Project Training: Collaborated with DA’s office to offer Parent Project Training at DFCS for both community and DFCS families. Community Worker in progress to complete the training of trainers to conduct two classes, six sessions each in three years.

Resilient Families Program: See above.

Be Strong Parent Cafes, just launched in November of 2019, are physically and emotionally safe spaces where parents and caregivers talk about the challenges and victories of raising a family. Through individual deep self-reflection and peer-to-peer learning, participants explore their strengths, learn about the Protective Factors, and create strategies from their own wisdom and experiences to help strengthen their families. Cafés are structured discussions that use the principles of adult learning and family support. They are highly sustainable with training reinforcement, institutional support, and a commitment to an approach that engages and affirms parents as leaders. Parent Cafés will occur each month in partnership with Catholic Charities, SOMOS Mayfair, International Children’s Assistance Network (ICAN) and Rebekah’s in San Jose and Gilroy. Parent Cafes are hosted in Vietnamese, Spanish and English. Cafes are open to any parent in the community.

Community Forum with DFCS Director: Dialogue and develop a partnership between DFCS and the community at-large.

Resource Directory: Developed resource guide outlining South County resources.

Father Support: Supported Gilroy Unified School District (GUSD) to offer Gilroy El Canto Colibri Film which focuses on Latino fathers supporting their LGBTQ sons.

New Hope for Youth: Will provide evidenced-based/informed Case Management Intervention gang prevention services for referred youth that range from: “At risk” youth residing in a high-risk community (hotspot areas, low socioeconomic areas) all the way to “Gang-intentional” which includes youth explicitly identified and/or arrested for gang-related incidents or acts of gang violence through the justice department.

East San Jose Prevention Efforts
East San Jose is very diverse ethnically and linguistically; however, it is largely Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander. The vast majority (ranging from 60% to 81%) speak languages other than English. Common across our target ZIP codes is that there is significant poverty, the majority of households have incomes of less than $60,000 compared to the county’s median of over $97,000. Mayfair shows the greatest concentrated poverty.
Recognizing the challenges faced by these communities, the following interventions have focused intentionally on these five ZIP codes.

(1) Collaboration and Teaming

**Community Forums:** Offered an opportunity for conversation between the DFCS Director and the African Ancestry community at First AME Zion Church, for Filipino Americans in Milpitas, in East San Jose for Vietnamese residents and at the Mayors Gang Prevention Task Force.

**Party in the Park:** In partnership with local city municipalities, police departments, Juvenile Probation (Neighborhood Safety Unit), San Jose Mayor’s Gang Prevention Task Force, Community District Attorney’s, Public Health’s East Side Peace Partnerships and the South County Youth Task Force, launched their summer community events and “Party in the Park” in Gilroy.

**Intimate Partner Violence Curriculum:** Supporting the work of the East Side Peace Partnership to embed this curriculum in East San Jose community.

**The Differential Response Program:** See description in Gilroy Section. The School intervention will not launch in East San Jose for at least six months.

(2) Education and Training

**Mandated Reporter Training:** In collaboration with NSU, Promotoras are offering community education regarding child abuse and neglect in SOMOS Mayfair Neighborhood/Valley Palms.

**Resilient Family Programs:**

**Be Strong Parent Cafes:** See description in Gilroy Section.

**Other Noteworthy Collaboration and Teaming – Countywide**

The prevention team actively collaborates throughout the county to leverage partnership and resources. Additional examples that benefit the county include:

**DFCS Food Pantry:** In partnership with the YMCA of Silicon Valley and Second Harvest Food Bank, shelf-stable snacks now available for our children, youth and families during visits and other appointments.

**Support of Child Abuse Council Prevention efforts:** To help raise awareness about the important connection between healthy relationships, healthy families and healthy communities – the Child Abuse Prevention Council has partnered with DFCS, First 5, and the County Office of Education to promote a VTA ad campaign with the message that, “Healthy Relationships are…Safe, Respectful, and Kind” and thousands of posters to that effect are being distributed to schools, government offices, community agencies, and selected Courts county-wide.
**Fatherhood Conference:** DFCS actively participates in promoting this event among fathers throughout the county, solicits participant raffle prizes and provided scholarships for 100 participants.

**Parent Project:** Collaborated with District Attorney’s (DA) Office to offer Parent Project Training to both community and DFCS families

**Mandated Reporter Training:** revamped curriculum to include expanded lessons on cultural humility, reporter bias and how poverty does not necessarily correlate to general neglect.

**Resource Fair:** In partnership with the Behavioral Health Department, hosts a Social Worker resource fair in which over 100 DFCS staff engage with local non-profits in effort to learn more about local resources that can benefit families they work with.

**Public Outreach & Community Engagement:** In partnership with ICAN, DFCS Agency Director aired on 3 local Vietnamese Radio and TV programs in effort to conduct outreach about the importance of child abuse prevention and promoting the five protective factors.

**Gang Awareness Training:** Partnered with DAs office to offer a series of trainings for DFCS staff and partners, raising safety awareness for their work in the field.

**Inform existing directories (211):** Identify new community resources and share with 211 to add to online directory.

**Supervised Visits:** Partner with First 5 and their Family Resource Centers to explore hosting supervised visits for children under the age of five.

**Cross-System Partnerships:** Active participation with the Santa Clara County Office of Education’s School Climate Leadership Workgroup, Safety Net Meeting at SHFB, School Linked Services (SLS), Black Leadership Kitchen Cabinet (BLKC), among others.

**NSU:**
- Beginning in Spring 2018, Valley Palms Unidos (VPU), in East San Jose, partnered with FIRST5 funded Catholic Charities to offer early childhood educational series “Mommy and Me” classes. The classes were so popular a waiting list was generated. The Valley Palms resident leaders used part of their pro-social funding to support these classes, and Catholic Charities/FIRST5 paid for the remaining of out of their operational budget.
- Nueva Vida members in Gilroy participated in the 2nd Bilingual Community Police Academy starting September 4, 2019 held at the Gilroy Police Department. The purpose of the community police academy is to provide residents a better understanding of the role and responsibilities of the police department, what resources are available to residents, and learn from each other on ways to improve community/police relations.
- In August 2019, over seventy residents participated in a Community Healing Circle in the Aftermath of Gilroy Shooting. This circle was collectively organized by the District Attorney’s Office, the NSU, the Behavioral Health Department and Gilroy Unified School District.
- Gilroy Garlic Festival Shooting Response: On July 29th, following the shooting at the Garlic Festival, the San Ysidro Center was opened all day for anyone who wanted to come to the center and be in community as a circle. Seventy-two people came throughout the day, as early as 10
AM and as late as 5 PM. The night ended when many of residents and staff, including San Ysidro families, attending an impromptu vigil that took place outside of City Hall. For several weeks following the shooting, NSU, SCYTF, and District Attorney staff held space for a circle dialog for anyone wanting to come to San Ysidro to discuss their feelings. A youth circle began on Tuesday evenings and an adult circle was held every other Thursday.

- In July 2019 as a partnership with the Gilroy Unified School District, teachers were trained in Restorative Justice Practices to support the culture of RJ in schools and in community.

**Culture of Racial Equity**

**Culture of Racial Equity**

The County of Santa Clara through various initiatives began normalizing the conversation of race and the role of government in racial equity. In 2002, Annie E. Casey Foundation helped fund and design the implementation of Juvenile Detention Reform (JDR). This initiative identified various decision-making points by demographics to understand disproportionate contact in the justice system. JDR instilled the framework for several system changes that improved policies, created innovative programs and emphasized a collaborative approach. In 2008, JDR is expanded to the Juvenile Justice System Collaborate (JJSC), through its workgroups Race Equity in Justice System (REJS) and Race Equity and Prevention (REP) is involved in several collaborative efforts to address system priorities—such as decreasing racial and ethnic disparities, reducing the use of congregate care, ensuring a seamless transition in services for youth, improving youth and family engagement and other strategies to attain successful outcomes along with preventing and reducing recidivism for youth involved in the Juvenile Justice System. The workgroups have embedded a culture of analyzing data through a racial equity lens. having conversations about the impact, and a multi-system approach to addressing racial equity in the community and in the justice system with the end goal of eliminating racial and ethnic disparities.

**Probation Departmental Culture**

- Increased usage of objective tools to aid in decision making including the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS)and Juvenile Hall Admissions Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI). Clinical tools used by our service providers such as the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS), Massachusetts youth Screening Instrument (MAYSi), Youth Level of Service Inventory (YLSI), etc.
- Innovative court processing practices have resulted in shorter lengths of stay in Juvenile Hall.
- Year-to-year reductions in number of youth sent to the Department of Juvenile Justice (formerly California Youth Authority). Youth are being committed locally to the Enhanced Ranch Program.
- Decreased utilization of institutional settings for youth, such as the ranches and Juvenile Hall.
- Increased usage of wraparound services in lieu of out-of-home placement.
- State grant funding continues to support evidence-based treatment modalities to improve outcomes for youth.
Probation collects racial and ethnic data for all juveniles entering the system through the Juvenile Contact Record completed by law enforcement agencies. This data is aggregated for reporting purposes as White, Black, Hispanic, Asian and Other (including Native and Pacific Islander clients). More refined ethnicity data is available in the system for Asian clients only. Data collection became standardized in 2009 and continues to be an area of emphasis throughout the department, we are constantly improving our data collection methods and system.

Increased usage of data driven decision making, evidence by the creation of the juvenile services and institutions dashboard. This dashboard provides us with demographic information about our institutions and services divisions. Appropriate staff also receive daily reports regarding the demographics and average length of stay of youth in our institutions.

Cultural norm within the department to acknowledge and work towards solutions related to racial and ethnic disparities (RED).

The culture in our agency is that RED is front and center in all the work that we do. Intolerance is not accepted within the department.

Every new program is developed with our core constituency of youth of color in mind.

All contracts are written to encourage and ensure cultural competency of our service providers.

Increased emphasis on a holistic approach that offers family and caregivers services and provides additional service to siblings if need arises.

Emphasis on providing service in the home and community.

**NSU:**

- Valley Palms Unidos Promotoras participated in a variety of workshops offered through Somos Mayfair’s *Universidad Popular*, which is supported by FIRST5. These workshops are conducted entirely in Spanish and are grounded in the popular education model widely used throughout Latin America. Themes such as self-care, leadership, financial well-being, advocacy and time management are covered, among many other topics.

- In partnership with the South County Youth Task force (SCYTF) and NSU, Gilroy Nueva Vida leaders attended a national conference entitled “United We Rise for a Healthy Community,” which focused on promotora development and health equity. Attendance at this conference led to a partnership between Visión y Compromiso (Vision and Compromise) and Gilroy’s Nueva Vida to begin developing their own promotora model for leadership and advocacy development in East Gilroy.

**BHSD** and prevention programs provide culturally and linguistically responsive services to meet the diverse population of our county. **BHSD’s Cultural Competency** Unit is committed to providing culturally and linguistically proficient services to people affected by mental illness. Most services are provided in the major languages spoken by county residents, by skilled staff using the individual's culture as a foundation for service delivery. The Unit develops and monitors the Cultural Competency Plan for the Behavioral Health Services Department, and works with the Continuous Learning Unit in providing trainings for the Public Behavioral Health System staff.
BHSD’s Ethnic and Cultural Communities Advisory Committee (ECCAC) within BHSD, provides outreach to diverse populations in the community in efforts to link them to services and trainings and provide education, advocacy and support. ECCAC envisions communities where consumers and family members from all cultures have quality of life, are free from stigmas associated with mental health status, and are empowered to move within mental health systems, through linguistically competent services, resources and support, justice and fair treatment. This program also outreaches to schools to offer Youth Mental Health First Aid trainings to teachers and educators.

In addition, BHSD contracts with community-based organizations to provide ethnic specific specialty mental health services. BHSD has opened the first Vietnamese Community Service Center and plans to open Wellness Centers.

Universal Access Pilot Program (UAP) has been deliberate in the hiring of family navigators by ensuring they are representative of the communities served and are able to authentically connect with parents as it relates to preferred language and cultural experience. Both ARUSD and FMSD have high proportions of their general student population that are English Learners, 40 and 44 percent, respectively. Among English Learners, the two most common languages are Spanish and Vietnamese. Additionally, when reviewing proficiency school data for language arts and mathematics, both districts show that Latinx, African Ancestry and Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander children are less likely to be meeting proficiency standards (with large proportions either not meeting or nearly meeting the standard).

Success Story
FMSD FY20 Q2

A 5th grade male student at McKinley Elementary, in Franklin McKinley School District, was referred to SLS due concerns his teacher had about his behavior in the classroom. The student was at that time receiving services from PEI Catholic Charities, but it was evident, based on his behaviors that the student needed a higher level of care. During my provider’s meeting, the team evaluated the student’s behaviors and the student was referred to SLS Uplift. While the agency started to work with the parent to get consent forms and other documentation signed, the student continued to exhibit behavior that was putting him and others in danger. While this process took place, the school social worker and SLS Coordinator worked on developing a trusting relationship with the student’s mom. They learned the student’s family had experienced a traumatic event, witness to gang activity around his neighborhood, and his family had economic hardship and challenges. SLS obtained the parent’s permission and make the referral to the Santa Clara County’s Universal Access Program (UAP) for case management. Based on the information that SLS learned from the family and the student continuing to show behavior that putting him at risk, another referral was made to Uplift Family Service’s Katie A program. In addition, UAP provided the parent with information about a housing clinic in Sunnyvale which the parent successfully attended. The collaboration between FMSD, SLS, UAP, and Uplift Family Services provided the parent with access to community resources to help improve the family’s knowledge of mental health services available to the student. In addition, the family became aware of different housing resources and food resources available in the community because of the referral made to UAP. The effort and
collaboration with the different partners involved gained the parent’s trust in the school and the process of support and linkage to community resources.

**GOALS/GAPS**

Overall findings suggest that across all systems there is an active effort to partner with each other, align the work to collectively address the complexities of the children, family and communities being served. There are great strides to alignment, partnership and evaluation of data collection on everyday work. Although there is always opportunity to improve, existing effort shows there is the willingness from all the partners to continue to develop, in partnership, goals that will collectively support the children and families in the community.

**NEXT STEPS**

The following outlines next steps for prevention work in Santa Clara County:

- Work in partnership to develop a single system of support to ensure a “no wrong door” concept.
- Create a framework that meets the **Five Conditions of Collective Impact**
  1. Common Agenda
  2. Shared Measurement
  3. Mutually Reinforcing Activities (alignment of work)
  4. Continuous Communication
  5. Backbone Support Organization
- Align the work of SCCOE, SSA, Probation, Behavioral Health, UAP, OSH and many of the partners that support the community.

Normalizing collaboration and partnership on everyday work is not a quick and easy task, but CAST is committed to continue to work on developing a framework that will be sustainable and will address the social determinants of health and ensure every child is on track to a thriving, successful and positive life outcome.
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Ecological Model:
Circles of Influence

Adapted From: Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Ecological Systems Model
How Are We Working Together?

- Law Enforcement
- Social Services
- Education
- Court Systems
- Health/BHS
- Community Organizations
- Office of the CEO
- Probation
- Child/Family

With Purpose

Common Objectives

Collective Efforts

Collaboration
How are we doing this?

COLLECTIVE IMPACT
Common agreement to align the work and have common measurable outcomes

Five Conditions of Collective Impact
- Common Agenda
- Shared Measurement
- Mutually Reinforcing Activities (alignment of work)
- Continuous Communication
- Backbone Support Organization

Cross-System Collaboration, Training & Policies
Focus of Prevention

Desirable Essential Elements to enhance the quality of life in our community:

- Community, Peer, Family & System Network Collaboration
- Health and Well-being
- Economic Stability, Housing, & Basic Needs
- Education and Career Development
- Safety & Prevention of Trauma
- Culture of Racial Equity

Goal: Moving upstream and preventing issues before they happen.
Life Course Outcomes

Ecological/Contextual Factors

0-5
- School Ready
  - Cog. & Soc. Skills (Kinder)
  - Allends Pre-K
  - Secure Attach

6-11
- School Ready
  - Cog. & Soc. Skills (Kinder)
  - Proficient 4th Gr. Math, Reading, & Socioemo. Skills

12-18
- Proficient, Good Grades
  - 8th Gr. Math, English, Middle-School Grades

19-25
- H.S. Graduation
  - (College & Career Ready)
  - College Enrollment

26-35
- Stable Housing
  - Stable Full-Time Employment @ 300% FPL
  - College Completion (4-year college)

On Track

Off Track

Pre-term Birth/low Birthweight
- Insecure Attach
  - Not School Ready

Criminal Offending (esp Violent)
- Arrest, Detention, Recidivism

Juvenile Delinquency (esp Violent)
- Arrest, Detention, Recidivism

Not Proficient, Fails Math or English 8th Gr. Math & Reading
- School Mobility

Violence Victimization or Untreated Substance Abuse or Behavioral Health Problems
- Grade Retention

Behavior Problems & Discipline
- Behavior problems (antisocial behavior, violence), Suspensions, Expulsions

Housing Instability or Homelessness
- Disconnected from School and Work

Long-term Unemployment or Underemployment (>6 Months)
- Earning Below 300% FPL

Stable Full-Time Employment
- Postsecondary Credential
- Stable Full-Time Employment

© Forward Change Consulting
What does it mean for families?

- Understand and respond to the needs of all customers Individualized & customized service approach in the community
- Streamlined access to public programs in the community
- Shorten and amplify all feedback loops
- Create and embed knowledge where needed (Outreach, Engagement & Awareness)

**Goal: Respectful Family-Centered Customer Service with Warm Hand-offs**
**Success Story:** A 5th grade male student at McKinley Elementary was referred to SLS due concerns from teacher. Student was receiving services from PEI Catholic Charities but needed a higher level of care.

- Child was referred to SLS Uplift for behaviors,
- SLS coordinator learned family experienced traumatic event (witness gang violence in the neighborhood) and family had economic hardship and challenges.
- Referral to Universal Access Program (UAP) for case management was done. The collaboration between FMSD, SLS, UAP, and Uplift Family Services provided the parent with access to community resources to help improve the family’s knowledge of mental health services available to support the student.
- Family became aware of housing resources and food resources available in the community. The effort and collaboration with the different partners involved gained the parent’s trust in the school and the process of support and linkage to community resources.
What does it take?

Paradigm Shift

Silos with Gaps and Lots of Hand-Offs  —>  Seamless and Integrated

Transactional  —>  Relationship-Based

Passive  —>  Activated, Engaged and Empowered

Facility Centric  —>  Client Centric (In Community)

Reactive  —>  Preventative and Proactive

Provider  —>  Team approach
What is Different Now?

Systems
- SSA: DFCS/DEBS
- Probation
- Behavioral Health
- Court
- Law Enforcement
- School/Education

Youth Engagement, Voice & Leadership

Caregivers
- Family/Caregiver Engagement, Voice & Leadership

Community
- FIRST 5 SCC
- Somos Mayfair
- Alum Rock
- Rebekah's
- Other CBOs
- Neighborhoods
What Have We Learned?

Family needs are complex due to generational trauma & inequities.

- There is no “one-size fits-all” intervention or program to support the complexity of the needs a family might have.
- Systems inevitably interact with and influence all aspects of the children's lives and can be retraumatizing when families have to tell their story over and over.

It takes a village!

- Have Partnership & Collaboration
- Need common agenda & goals
- Need common measurable outcomes to align the work.
- Need to leveraging each other’s resources
Next Steps:

- CAST to continue to work in partnership to develop a county-wide prevention framework
- Develop a single system of support to create a “no wrong door” concept in Santa Clara County
- Embed the collective impact framework, to develop:
  1. Common Agenda,
  2. Shared Measurement,
  3. Mutually Reinforcing Activities (alignment of work)
  4. Continuous Communication
  5. Backbone Support Organization
- Align the work across the County of Santa Clara (SCCOE, SSA, Probation, Behavioral Health, UAP, OSH and many other partners that support the community).
- Normalize collaboration and partnership on everyday work.
DATE: April 23, 2020
TO: Children, Seniors, and Families Committee
FROM: Jeffrey D Draper, Director, Facilities and Fleet
Robert Menicocci, Social Services Agency Director
Ky Le, Director, Office of Supportive Housing

SUBJECT: Report on Hub and Housing Status at Parkmoor

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Social Services Agency, Office of Supportive Housing, and Facilities and Fleet Department relating to the housing project status and short-term operations of the Hub.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no impact to the General Fund as a result of receiving this report. If the project is approved there would be a future fiscal impact to the General Fund of approximately $13 million for tenant improvements and furniture, fixtures, and equipment for the Social Services Agency’s (SSA) Department of Family and Children’s Services’ (DFCS) Hub Youth Center (Hub) space.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
On December 17, 2019, the Board of Supervisors (Board) received a report from the Office of Supportive Housing (OSH), SSA, and the Facilities and Fleet Department (FAF) relating to the Parkmoor Housing Feasibility Study and subsequently directed the Administration to proceed with exploring housing and the Hub at the 1510-1540 Parkmoor Avenue, San Jose location (Parkmoor). This report is a status update regarding the housing project process with the City of San Jose and the short-term plan for Hub operations.

Housing Project Process and Timeline
On March 17, 2020, FAF submitted a Preliminary Review Request to the City of San Jose (City) for analysis and feedback on the general parameters of the project; the City responded on April 3, 2020. The project could be eligible for a ministerial approval of developments
that include supportive housing units under Assembly Bill (AB) 2162, the Supportive Housing Streamlining Act, based on their initial review, as it meets most of the criteria found in Government Code sections 65650. The County would confirm its full compliance with the City as the project progresses into design and during the full development application review.

Under AB 2162 the City would first determine if the Ministerial Permit application is complete within 30 days of receipt, and then complete their review within 120 days. If the project meets all objective standards it would be reviewed and approved administratively. However, if the project does not meet the criteria under AB 2162 then a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to approve the proposed mixed-used residential/commercial development. The average project timeline for a CUP approval is seven months from the time of application, with the appropriate environmental document, to the time of hearing.

The Administration will continue to work with the City to confirm the project’s eligibility for a ministerial approval under AB 2162. If eligible, this would reduce and streamline the City’s project approval process.

**Short Term Services for Current and Former Foster Youth at the Hub**

The Hub is a youth led and organized community center dedicated to supporting current and former foster youth between the ages of 15 to 24. It strives to meet this goal by providing a safe, welcoming center where youth feel a sense of belonging, empowerment, and are offered a variety of services by their peers and other caring community members. The current Hub is located at 591 North King Road (King Road) in San Jose.

The current and former foster youth that utilize the Hub have participated in the planning and development of the new Hub to be located at Parkmoor, and they fully support the County’s intent to include affordable housing at the site. On December 2, 2019, staff from DFCS, FAF, OSH, and County of Santa Clara’s Supervisorial District Two hosted a learning session with the foster youth to discuss affordable housing options at Parkmoor. The youth embraced the option and expressed a preference that the maximum number of housing units should be built. Additional learning sessions will be scheduled to engage with youth and to receive their input on the development of the Parkmoor Hub.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-2019 approximately 260 units of services were provided monthly at the King Road Hub, and these services will continue to be offered at the Parkmoor facility. Employment assistance was the most frequently used service, with access to shower facilities and laundry being second and third most used respectively. The below chart displays the services most commonly utilized by Hub youth:
The County’s lease agreement for the King Road facility is due to expire on November 30, 2021, but the County would consider all available alternatives to continue Hub operations while the Parkmoor site is under construction. Though DFCS does not plan to expand the Hub’s programming and services at this time, there is sufficient floor space at King Road for programmatic expansion should the need arise. As construction of the new facility progresses, and in conjunction with FAF, DFCS will ensure a safe transition of Hub programs and services to Parkmoor, with no interruption in services and no negative impact to youth.

Next Steps

- By June 30, 2020:
  - OSH will bring back to the Board a proposed developer for the site.
  - In partnership with key stakeholders, including consumers of Hub services, current foster youth and former foster youth, finalize programmatic considerations for the Hub and the residential component.
- By December 31, 2021 – unless altered by City of San José entitlement processes – the selected developer would design and engineer the development, complete entitlement processes and secure necessary financing.
- By June 30, 2022, the developer would begin construction.
- By July 1, 2024, the developer would complete construction.
- DFCS will work with FAF to develop a schedule for the Parkmoor Hub and a work plan to define timelines leading up to move in FY 2024.

**CHILD IMPACT**

There is no/neutral impact to children as a result of receiving this report.

**SENIOR IMPACT**
There are no/neutral impacts to seniors as a result of receiving this report.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no/neutral impacts to sustainability implications as a result of receiving this report.

**BACKGROUND**

On August 15, 2017, Item No. 8, the Board approved the Adoption of Resolution to purchase the real property located at 1510, 1520, 1530, and 1540 Parkmoor Avenue, San Jose as the site met the criteria established to house the Hub, the SSA program that serves current and former foster youth that is currently housed in a leased facility at 591 King Road.

On June 19, 2019, Item No. 7, the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee received a report from the Administration regarding the Hub facility at Parkmoor.

On August 13, 2019, Item No. 11, the Board directed the Administration to assess and report on the feasibility of developing affordable housing on five specific County-owned properties, one of which was the future Hub site on Parkmoor.

On November 19, 2019, Item No. 24, the Board received a report from the Administration regarding its progress in determining the feasibility of using five specific County-owned sites for affordable housing.

On December 17, 2019, the Board received a report from OSH, SSA, and FAF relating to the Parkmoor Housing Feasibility Study and directed Administration to proceed with exploring housing option.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The Board would not receive this report.

**STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL**

Follow the regular process for this type of file.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Parkmoor_City of San Jose_PRE20-037_Housing Dept Letter (PDF)
- Parkmoor_City of San Jose_PRE20-037_Planning Div Letter (PDF)
Memorandum

TO:        David Ying
PBCE        FROM:       Tina Vo
              Housing Department

SUBJECT:   Housing Department’s Initial Response
to Planning Application PRE20-037        DATE:       March 26, 2020

PLANNING NO.: PRE20-037

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Enhanced Prelim to inquire about demolishing four
existing office buildings and constructing one multi-story
building with sitework and surface parking. The ground
floor of the multi-story building would consist of the main
lobby and office space for a supportive housing program
managed under the County Office of Supportive Housing
and office space for the Hub. Within the building, a level
of parking would be provided either in the basement or
directly above the ground floor. Above the parking level
and ground floor would be additional floors of
supporting housing units and support space for the
housing residents. The total number of supportive
housing units and floors have not yet been determined.

LOCATION(S): 1510 Parkmoor Ave

The Housing Department received the subject project recently, and submits the following
comments and requirements:

Actions Required Prior to Planning Approvals

1. Permit Issuance and/or Tentative Map or Parcel Map Approval

   If the above referenced proposed development(s) contains 20 or allows the creation of more
dwelling units, it is thus subject to the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. This includes
alteration of structures and conversion of use or tenure. If the above referenced proposed
development(s) contains 3-19 dwelling units, it may be subject to the Affordable Housing
Impact Fee (AHIF). The Applicant shall, as part of the application for First Approval, submit
to the Housing Department for approval an Affordable Housing Compliance Plan
Application (Compliance Plan), and all relevant attachments. The Compliance Plan is
available at: www.sjhousing.org/IHO.
The Developer must also submit with the Compliance Plan the required application processing fee to the Housing Department.

The Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and AHIF Resolution provide a process that allows developers to make a claim that a project may be exempt from affordable housing obligations. However, the Applicant who believes their project is exempt must submit a Compliance Plan, and provide information regarding eligibility for a claimed exemption.

Please contact the Housing Department as soon as possible to initiate Affordable Housing Compliance Plan completion. The Compliance Plan must be submitted and approved by the Housing Department prior to Planning scheduling the project for hearing.

A. The above listed permit(s) may seek demolition or remodeling of existing structures with residential dwelling units. If the existing structure is multi-family (triplexes or larger), the owner/developer is required to comply with the Tenant Protection Ordinance, and cannot evict tenants without good cause (as described in the Tenant Protection Ordinance).

B. If the project involves demolition or repurposing of existing multi-family residential units built before September 7, 1979, or otherwise subject to the Apartment Rent Ordinance (ARO), it is subject to the City’s Ellis Act Ordinance.

Requirements imposed upon the owner/developer include, but are not limited to, delivery of 120-days minimum to 1 year notice to tenants of owner’s intent to withdraw building from the rental market, provide tenant relocation assistance, record an Ellis Act covenant.

New or remodeled units rented within five years of withdrawal under the Ellis Act are subject to the ARO and impacted tenants are notified of their right to return to the property upon owner’s intention to bring back the property onto the rental market. For information, please visit: www.sjhousing.org/rent and/or call (408) 975-4480.

2. Actions Required for Housing Department’s Clearance for Building Permit(s) or Map Approval

Prior to the approval of any final or parcel map, or issuance of any building permit for a rental residential development, if the proposed development(s) contains 20 or more dwelling units, the developer must record an Inclusionary Housing Agreement on all parcels needed to implement the project’s residential uses and affordable housing obligation including contiguous property under common ownership and control.

If the proposed development(s) contains 3-19 dwelling units, the developer of a Rental residential development shall either pay the outstanding AHIF fee(s) or, if the developer is claiming an exemption, the owner and developer shall execute an Affordable Housing Agreement to memorialize the project’s affordable housing obligation, the outstanding requirements, and if needed, obtain a fee deferral. The Affordable Housing Agreement must then be recorded against the entire development.
3. **Actions required for Housing Department’s Clearance of Final Inspection and Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.**

No Final Inspection Approval, Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, Certificate of Occupancy, or Notice of Completion for any units will be issued until all requirements of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and Guidelines, or, if applicable, the AHIF Resolution and implementing regulations are met.

**Status of Review**

Please be advised that this response does not signify the Housing Department’s final review of this project or the Compliance Plan. Staff will continue to work with you and Planning throughout the entitlement process and, if necessary, may provide additional comments at a later time.

Please contact me at tina.vo@sanjoseca.gov or 408-975-4416 if you have any questions about the information contained in this letter.

Tina Vo  
Development Officer  
Housing Department
April 3, 2020

Emily Chen
County of Santa Clara
2310 N 1st St, Suite 200
San Jose, CA 95131

RE: Enhanced Preliminary Review (File No. PRE20-037) for a mixed-use development with supportive housing and 17,000 square feet of County Supportive Services Agency space on a 1.62-acre site at 1510-1540 Parkmoor Avenue.

Dear Emily,

Thank you for submitting an Enhanced Preliminary Review for the proposal above. Our goal with the Preliminary Review process is to work with you to arrive at a successful outcome that furthers the development of San José as envisioned in the General Plan.

Below are our comments and analysis of your prospective project regarding consistency with the City of San José Envision 2040 General Plan and other applicable City regulations and policies:

Proposal Issues and Concerns

Based on review of your application, the items listed below are the substantial issues that would affect the proposed project. These issues are explained in more detail in this letter.

1. The project may be eligible for AB 2162 ministerial approval, but more information is needed to confirm that. Please review the contents of this letter and provide the needed information to determine eligibility in your formal submittal.

2. The required amount of residential and social services parking exceeds the amount provided. However, the project may be eligible for various parking reductions. Please review the contents of this letter for additional information.

Preliminary Review

1. Project Description

   Based on the conceptual plans and information you provided, we understand the project to include the demolition of the four existing vacant office buildings and the construction of a 4 to 11-story mixed-use building containing 67 (assuming large unit scheme and 4 stories) to 366 (assuming small unit scheme and 10 stories), 17,000 square feet of social service space, and 124 parking spaces; outdoor amenity space; and a 41-space surface parking lot.
Please confirm the description above includes all aspects of the proposed project. If the project description is not accurate, please let us know.

2. General Plan Consistency

The subject site is designated **NCC Neighborhood/Community Commercial** on the Land Use/Transportation Diagram of the Envision San José 2040 General Plan. The subject site is located within the boundary of the **Race Street Light Rail Urban Village**, whose plan has not been developed or adopted.

Density: FAR up to 3.5 (1 to 3.5 stories)

This designation supports a very broad range of commercial activity, including commercial uses that serve the communities in neighboring areas, such as neighborhood serving retail and services and commercial/professional office development. Neighborhood / Community Commercial uses typically have a strong connection to and provide services and amenities for the nearby community and should be designed to promote that connection with an appropriate urban form that supports walking, transit use and public interaction. General office uses, hospitals and private community gathering facilities are also allowed in this designation.

While residential uses are not typically allowed under this designation, the project is able to take advantage of Implementation Policy IP-5.12, which is analyzed below.

**IP-5.12** Residential projects that are 100% affordable deed restricted by a public entity for a period not less than 55 years to low income residents (earning 80% or less of the Area Median Income), can proceed within an Urban Village ahead of a Growth Horizon, or in a Village in a current Horizon that does not have a Council approved Plan, if the project meets the following criteria. *(Analysis: Since this is a County permanent supportive housing project, and the Race Street Light Rail Urban Village Plan has not been adopted, the project presumably meets the affordability requirement.)*

1. The project does not result in more than 25% of the total residential capacity of a given Urban Village being developed with affordable housing ahead of that Village’s Growth Horizon. For Villages with less than a total housing capacity of 500 units, up to 125 affordable units could be developed, however the total number of affordable units cannot exceed the total planned housing capacity of the given Village. *(Analysis: The Race Street Light Rail Urban Village has a total residential capacity of 2,612 units. At its largest proposed unit count of 366 units, only 14% of the Urban Village’s total residential capacity would be developed, so the project meets this criterion.)*

2. The development is consistent with the Urban Village Plan for a given Village, if one has been approved by the City Council. *(Analysis: Because the Urban Village Plan has not been adopted, this criterion does not apply.)*

3. Development that demolishes and does not adaptively reuse existing commercial buildings should substantially replace the existing commercial square footage. *(Analysis: “Substantially reuse” is defined as at least 50% of the original square footage. Since the existing commercial square footage on site was not provided in this submittal, please...*
include that information in your formal application.)

4. The project is not located on identified key employment opportunity sites, which are sites generally 2 acres or larger, located at major intersections and for which there is anticipated market demand for commercial uses within the next 10 to 15 years. (Analysis: At ~1.62 acres in size, the site is less than 2 acres, so it is not located on a key employment opportunity site. Therefore, it meets this criterion.)

5. Affordable housing projects built in Villages under this policy would not pull from the residential Pool capacity. (Analysis: The project would not pull from the residential Pool capacity, so it meets this criterion.)

The proposed project is also consistent with the following goals and policies of the General Plan:

H-1.1 Through the development of new housing and the preservation and rehabilitation of existing housing, facilitate the creation of economically, culturally, and demographically diverse and integrated communities.

H-2.1 Facilitate the production of extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing by maximizing use of appropriate policies and financial resources at the federal, state, and local levels; and various other programs.

Race Street Urban Village

As noted above, the site is located within the boundary of the Race Street Urban Village plan area. The Urban Village concept, one of the twelve major strategies of the General Plan, promotes the development of active, walkable, bicycle-friendly, transit-oriented, mixed-use urban settings for new housing and job growth attractive to an innovative workforce and consistent with the Plan’s environmental goals.

The General Plan establishes the Urban Villages concept to create a policy framework to direct most new job and housing growth to occur within walkable and bike friendly Urban Villages that have good access to transit and other existing infrastructure and facilities. While the plan set provided did not include elevations, we strongly encourage you to consider the following policies from the Community Design Chapter of the General Plan (as well design guidelines in Section 7 below) as you move forward and refine the design of the project:

CD-1.17 Minimize the footprint and visibility of parking areas. Where parking areas are necessary, provide aesthetically pleasing and visually interesting parking garages with clearly identified pedestrian entrances and walkways. Encourage designs that encapsulate parking facilities behind active building space or screen parked vehicles from view from the public realm. Ensure that garage lighting does not impact adjacent uses, and to the extent feasible, avoid impacts of headlights on adjacent land uses.

CD-1.8 Create an attractive street presence with pedestrian-scaled building and landscaping elements that provide an engaging, safe, and diverse walking environment. Encourage compact, urban design, including use of smaller building footprints, to promote pedestrian activity throughout the City.
CD-1.11 To create a more pleasing pedestrian-oriented environment, for new building frontages, include design elements with a human scale, varied and articulated facades using a variety of materials, and entries oriented to public sidewalks or pedestrian pathways. Provide windows or entries along sidewalks and pathways; avoid blank walls that do not enhance the pedestrian experience. Encourage inviting, transparent façades for ground-floor commercial spaces that attract customers by revealing active uses and merchandise displays.

3. We encourage you look for ways to create engaging, pedestrian friendly frontages along Meridian Avenue and Parkmoor Avenue. Consider moving the parking lot away from the sidewalk, so that it is not completely visible from the street. **Applicable City Council Development Policies**

Please note the following City Council policies may be applicable to your project:

- Green Building Policy
- Lighting: Outdoor Lighting on Private Developments
- Post Construction Urban Runoff Management
- Public Noticing (On-Site Posting)
- Public Outreach Policy for Pending Land Use and Development Proposals
- Transportation Analysis Policy

4. **Zoning Consistency**

The subject site is located in a **CN Commercial Neighborhood Zoning District**. This district provides for neighborhood serving commercial uses without an emphasis on pedestrian orientation except within the context of a single development. The following is a discussion of the project’s conformance to those standards:

a. **Use**: A mixed use residential/commercial development (Supportive housing & Social Service Agency) can be allowed with the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in CN Zoning Districts. Please review the findings required for the issuance of a CUP in Section 20.100.720.

The project may also be eligible for ministerial approval under AB 2162 (see Section 6). In that case, a Ministerial Permit, would be required.

b. **Height**: Under Subsection 20.85.020(E) of the Zoning Ordinance, the maximum height for a Neighborhood/Community Commercial-designated site in an urban village is 120 feet. All potential building heights for this project are at or below this limit.

c. **Setbacks**: The Zoning Ordinance measures setbacks from the public or private right-of-way, whether that right-of-way is owned in fee title or through an easement. The following table describes the required and proposed setbacks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front (Parkmoor Avenue)</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>Minimum 15 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Parking:

a. **Vehicle:** Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 20.90.060, the following table describes the required and proposed parking. Should you choose to proceed with a development application, please include the intended commercial use to determine the required amount of parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Vehicle Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwelling</td>
<td>1.25 open vehicle spaces per studio or 1 bedroom unit, 1.7 spaces per 2 bedroom unit, 2 spaces per 3 bedroom unit, and 0.15 per each additional bedroom thereafter</td>
<td>104 to 463 (rounded up from 462.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service agency</td>
<td>1 per 250 square feet of floor area</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required with 20% UV reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>138 (rounded up from 137.6) to 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>165 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Reduced Vehicle Parking:** The project may be eligible for one of the following parking reductions:

i. **State Density Bonus:** The following table lists the maximum parking ratios the City can require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1 bedroom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 bedrooms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. City’s Parking Incentive (Density Bonus): The following table describes the City’s Parking Incentive, pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 20.90.060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability of Unit</th>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0 to 1 bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 3 bedrooms</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0 to 1 bedroom</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 3 bedrooms</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>0 to 1 bedroom</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 3 bedrooms</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Because the project is located within 2,000 feet of a light rail station and is located within an urban village, the project is eligible for up to a 50% reduction in parking under Zoning Ordinance Section 20.90.200 if it implements at least 3 TDM measures. Measures include (but are not limited to) a transit incentive program, a vehicle sharing program, and unbundled parking.

iv. AB 2162 parking reduction: Projects eligible for AB 2162 (this is discussed more in Section 6) are not required to provide parking for the units occupied by supportive housing residents if they are within ½ mile of a public transit stop. Since this project is roughly 1,000 feet from the Race VTA light rail station, it would be eligible for this parking reduction if it complies with the other eligibility requirements of AB 2162.

c. Bicycle Parking: Please review Part 2.5 – Bicycle Parking Requirements of Zoning Ordinance Chapter 20.90 for information on long-term parking requirements and other design requirements. For example, long term bicycle parking facilities for tenant and occupant use must be conveniently accessible by pedestrians from the street and located within 100 feet of building entrances. The table below describes the required bicycle parking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Bicycle Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Multiple dwelling | 1 per 4 living units | 17 (rounded up from 16.75) to 92 (rounded up from 91.5)
Social service agency | 1 per 4,000 square feet of floor area | 5 (rounded up from 4.25)

The location and quantity of bicycle parking is not specified in the application packet. Please include this information in your formal submittal.

d. **Motorcycle Parking:** Please review Part 4 – Motorcycle Parking Standards of Zoning Ordinance Chapter 20.90 for information on motorcycle parking and design requirements. For example, motorcycle parking must be generally located within 50 feet of an entrance and if in an auto parking area, be separated by a physical barrier. The table below describes the required motorcycle parking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Motorcycle Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-dwelling</td>
<td>1 motorcycle space per 4 units</td>
<td>17 (rounded up from 16.75) to 92 (rounded up from 91.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location and quantity of motorcycle parking is not specified in the application packet. Please include this information in your formal submittal.

e. **Other Development Standards**
   a. Section 20.40.525 – Residential uses: Prohibition on provision of services to nonresidents. No residential use which includes the provision of service to residents may offer services to nonresidents.
   b. Section 20.40.530 – Lighting: All lighting or illumination shall conform with any lighting policy adopted by the City Council. Light fixture heights should not exceed eight feet when adjacent to residential uses unless the setback of the fixture from property line is twice the height of the fixture. No ground mounted light fixture shall exceed twenty-five feet in height.

5. **Density Bonus**
   The State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915 et. seq.) allows certain housing developments to request concessions or incentives to reduce development standards. Development standards include – but are not limited to – height limits, setback, FARs, open space requirements, and parking ratios. Housing developments are eligible for concessions or incentives as follows:

   - 1 concession or incentive for projects with 10% of units for lower income households (up to 80% of Area Median Income) and at least 5% for very low income households (30 to 50% AMI).
   - 2 concessions or incentives for projects with 20% of units for lower income households and
at least 10% for very low income households.

- 3 concessions or incentives for projects that include at least 30% of units for lower income households and at least 15% for very low income households.
- 4 concessions or incentives for projects that are 100% affordable excluding manager’s unit(s), where 20% may be for moderate income households (80% to 120% AMI), and a height limit increase of up to 3 stories (33 feet) if the project is within half a mile of a major transit stop (Analysis: The project is within a half mile of the Race VTA light rail station, so it qualifies for the increase).

As proposed, the project – which has 100% affordable units – is likely to qualify for at least one concession or incentive, if it provides units at the specified income levels. Please note that you will need to submit documentation (e.g., pro formas) that demonstrate identifiable and actual cost reductions to provide deed-restricted affordable units to take advantage of a density bonus incentive or concession that is not included within Subsection B of Section 20.190.060 of the Density Bonus Chapter.

In addition to concessions or incentives, the project, under the Density Bonus Law, may also be eligible for waivers or reductions to development standards that physically preclude construction at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by the Law. Unlike concessions or incentives, waivers or reductions are unlimited. Please note that you will need to submit an explanation of why the densities or concessions or incentives are precluded by the standards you wish to waive or reduce.

Should you request concession(s) or incentive(s), or waiver(s) or reduction(s), you must enter a Regulatory Agreement with the City (Zoning Ordinance Section 20.190.100). The agreement would be approved concurrently with the discretionary permit and must be recorded against the property.

6. **AB 2162 Ministerial Approval**

**AB 2162** is a 2018 State law that makes certain supportive housing projects uses by right in multifamily and mixed use zones, including nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses. Local governments must notify applicants if the application is complete within 30 days of receiving the application and complete review in 60 or 120 days, depending on project size. (Because the project has more than 50 units, review must be completed in 120 days.) Projects are also eligible to have parking requirements for supportive housing units waived as described in Section 4d(b)(iv). To qualify, projects must meet the criteria below. Based on staff analysis, this project may be eligible.

- Be 100% subsidized and affordable to lower income households (Analysis: Since this is a County project, and the housing component of this proposal is entirely supportive housing, the project presumably meets this requirement.)
- 25% -- or 12 units, whichever is greater – of units must be supportive housing, with projects that have less than 12 units required to be entirely supportive housing (Analysis: The housing component of this proposal is entirely supportive housing, so the project meets this requirement.)
• Provide onsite supportive services and set aside 3% of nonresidential floor area (or 90 square feet for projects with 20 or fewer units) for that purpose (Analysis: The square footage of the offices, computer room, service provider, and community are not provided, so consistency with this requirement cannot be determined.)
• Units must include at least one bathroom and kitchen (Analysis: While floor plans for the different schemes are not provided, the fact that residential space is listed as full units suggests that the project meets this requirement.)
• Comply with objective development standards that apply to other multifamily development within the same zone (Analysis: Consistency can be determined with a full development application submittal.)

7. Design Guidelines Consistency/Architecture and Site Design
The City of San José’s Residential Design Guidelines are developed to assist in the design, construction, review, and approval of residential, mixed use development in San José. These guidelines cover minimum project standards for achieving a high level of design quality. Please reference Chapter 9 Landscaped Areas, Chapter 10 Common and Private Open Space, Chapter 25 Mixed Use Development, Chapter 25a Transit-Oriented Development, and Chapter 26 Mid-Rise/High-Rise Residential Development for information and suggestions on how to design the project.

Please keep the following in mind:

• Private Open Space should be provided at a minimum of 60 square feet per unit with a minimum dimension of 6 feet. Common open space should be provided at a minimum of 100 square feet per unit. It is not clear how much open space would be on the site as proposed in the preliminary proposal. Please specify the amount in your formal submittal.
• Landscaping should be provided in all setback areas between project walls and fences and the rights-of-way of public streets and sidewalks.
• Only active building elevations, never blank walls or loading areas, should face public streets.
• The exterior building design, including roof style, color, materials, architectural form, and detailing, should be consistent among all buildings in a complex and on all elevations of each building to achieve design harmony and continuity within itself and with its surroundings.
• Overhangs, trellises, projections, reveals, and awnings contribute to the character of the building and create shadow patterns while aiding in climate control, and are encouraged.
• Trash enclosures near residential areas and/or streets should include screens/solid covers to prevent odor and windblown litter. You can find more guidelines in the Solid Waste Enclosure Area Guidelines.
• Mechanical equipment should be located and operated in a manner that does not subject adjacent occupants and activities to noise that is disturbing by virtue of its volume or nature.
• Signs should be coordinated with the scale, materials, and locations of architectural and
8. **Environmental Review - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

Based on the project description and the provided scope of work, an Environmental Evaluation Application should be submitted with the application, in which staff would work on a project scope with your identified consultant firm. An Initial Study by an Environmental Consultant would be required to be submitted. Based on the analysis and review completed in the Initial Study and/or associated technical studies, City staff will determine if a Negative Declaration or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is necessary. Should the project qualify for review under AB 2162, it will be exempt from CEQA.

9. **Comments from Other Departments/Divisions and Agencies**

Attached are memorandum(s) from other departments/divisions and outside agencies as indicated below. Please carefully review the memos, as they contain critical information needed to successfully and efficiently moving the project through the entitlement process.

a. Housing

10. **Community Outreach**

Based on the scale and scope of the project, a community meeting will be required prior to any public hearings for this project. The City would provide public notice of this meeting to property owners and tenants within 1,000 feet of the proposed site, and would coordinate with you and the City Council District Office on an appropriate date, time and location for the meeting.

Since AB 2162 projects are considered ministerial, community meetings and public hearings are not required.

11. **Application Questions**

- **Site requirements and setbacks:** See Sections 2 and 4a through 4c.
- **Building requirements:** Staff is unclear if you are referring to physical development standards for the main building or the requirements of the Building Division. If this is about the former, see Sections 4 and 6. If this is about the latter, you can contact the San José Building Division at InfolInspector@sanjoseca.gov or call their voicemail at 408-535-7641.
- **Parking requirements:** See Section 4d.
- **Project review process and timeline:** You are free to contact us as described in Section 12 if you have any further questions. Once you submit your formal application, it will be reviewed by not only Planning staff, but also staff from other relevant departments such as Housing, Public Works, Building, Fire, and Parks, Recreation & Neighborhood Services. A building permit and associated Building review will also be needed, although this will occur after Planning approval.
- **Permitting process and timeline:** Under AB 2162, staff will have 30 days to determine if the application is complete, and staff will have 120 days to complete review. If the project meets all objective development standards, it will be deemed approved. You can
then proceed to obtaining Building approvals needed for construction to begin. Discretionary Conditional Use Permits can take approximately 7 months from the time of application to hearing.

- Zoning and general plan compliance: See Sections 2 and 4.
- Private open space and recreational access requirements: See Section 7.
- Usage of the State Density Bonus Law: See Sections 4d and 5.

12. Next Steps

As mentioned in Section 4, a Conditional Use Permit will be needed to allow development as proposed by this project. While the average project timeline for Conditional Use Permits is 7 months, this process can be greatly expedited with an application under AB 2162. Since no standard ministerial approval application form currently exists, you would submit a “Development/Use Permit” application and indicate that you wish to use AB 2162 to obtain ministerial approval. If your application is deemed complete, and the project meets all objective standards, it will automatically be approved without a public hearing.

Note that the City ministerial approval ordinance mentioned in Section 4a will clarify the process for applicants and authorize the creation of a uniform ministerial application form. If approved in a timely manner by both the Planning Commission and City Council, the form should be ready by the time you are ready to submit your application.

Please be advised that this summary does not constitute a final review. Additional comments will be provided upon submittal of a complete Planning entitlement application. Should you have any questions, you may contact me at David.Ying@sanjoseca.gov or 408-535-7819. You can also contact the Senior Planner overseeing this project, Ruth Cueto, at Ruth.Cueto@sanjoseca.gov.

We look forward to continuing to work with you and your team on your project in San José.

Sincerely,

David Ying
Project Manager
Planner

Attachments:

- Housing memo
DATE: April 23, 2020
TO: Children, Seniors, and Families Committee
FROM: Robert Menicocci, Social Services Agency Director
SUBJECT: SSA Contracting and Procurement Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Social Services Agency relating to Contract and Procurement Operations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
Per Supervisor Chavez's recommendation, the Social Services Agency (SSA) Contract Summary Report is presented to the Children, Seniors and Families Committee (CSFC) biannually. The report is to inform the CSFC of the SSA contract related activities and various strategic initiatives. The following topics are updated in this report:

- Updates on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-2020 contracts;
- Updates on the creation of a framework for reporting consumer outcomes highlighting achievements or challenges to the Agency, Board of Supervisors (Board) or Board Committees; and
- Infrastructure improvements through technology options, such as ARIBA and eRFPs.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
The mission of the SSA is to provide resources and opportunities in a culturally responsive manner to enhance the quality of life in Santa Clara County by protecting, educating, and empowering children and families. This report includes a summary of the resources invested by the County to improve the wellbeing of residents. The report informs the CSFC of many achievements, various contract performance indicators, and service related outcomes for improvement opportunities.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.
SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND

The SSA Office of Contracts Management (OCM) Department currently has 430 active contracts between 247 vendors that total $140,207,726. In comparison to the data reported on August 21, 2019, there is an increase of 34 new contacts and $11,367,529 in dollar value from the baseline reported on August 21, 2019. The increases are due to recent executed board referrals, continuum contracts, new Office of Gender Based Violence Prevention (OGBVP) and Office of Immigration Relations (OIR) contracts that were executed between the August 21, 2020 to February 23, 2020. The following table summarizes the SSA’s current contracts by vendor types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Types</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>$67,088,393</td>
<td>47.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$43,884,311</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Consultants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$1,118,179</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Higher Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$4,247,716</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$23,869,127</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Categories

The SSA has a broad service portfolio with clients ranging from infants to older adults, with mild to acute concerns. To serve this diverse population, the SSA contracts with a variety of vendors. The table below represents the types service contracts the SSA currently oversees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Categories</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Count %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging Disabled &amp; Dependent Adult Services (ADDAS)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$1,221,785</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit &amp; Eligibility Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalFRESH/Food Services</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$1,459,337</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Council</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,154,661</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$14,015,554</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$909,886</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,923,438</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic/Partner Violence/Rape/Sex Abuse Svc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$6,517,014</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Training/Support</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$4,615,020</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$108,150</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Services/Support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,597,500</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Treatment Foster Care Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,468,098</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Government Agreement</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$11,412,739</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4,531,663</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach/Support Services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,386,402</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Evaluation Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$658,376</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Linked Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,339,439</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Nutrition Services</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$12,938,928</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Agreements</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSA Partners

The SSA OCM partners with various County Divisions to execute different contract types. As of this report, the SSA OCM works closely with the OCCM and the Procurement Department to support eight County subdivisions. The table below includes data for each Division the SSA OCM currently supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SSA Administrative Office</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$8,858,976</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department of Aging and Adult Services</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$18,424,056</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SSA Data Analysis Program Integrity and Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$52,895,850</td>
<td>37.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Department of Employment and Benefit Services</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$9,722,179</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Department of Family and Children's Services</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$40,200,091</td>
<td>28.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SSA Information Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Office of Gender Based Violence Prevention</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$5,989,650</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Office of Immigrant Relations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,916,924</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>$140,207,726</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procurement Activity

Of the 20 recommended solicitations in FY2019-20, 13 were activated, three retracted, and four are pending. The cumulative dollar amount between the FY2019-20 recommended solicitations is approximately $17,154,975.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Child and Sexual Abuse Prevention</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Consultation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clinical and Trauma Consultation for Congregate Care Services</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Retracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resource Advocacy Support Services</td>
<td>$520,432</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management of DFCS Temporary Care Facility Shelter</td>
<td>$1,506,645</td>
<td>Retracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Office of Immigration Services RFP</td>
<td>$4,939,100</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Office of Immigration Unmet Civil Needs</td>
<td>$688,845</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children</td>
<td>$453,650</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP)</td>
<td>$1,792,668</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Continuum of Care Reform Services</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Retracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Educational Rights Project</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Assistance Hearing Officer</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CAPP Train the Trainer</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Grant Writing Services</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Senior Care Commission</td>
<td>$772,500</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Celebrating Families Education Program</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Intensive Up-Front/Parent-Skill Building Services (IPSBS)</td>
<td>$388,636</td>
<td>Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Office of Women’s Policy Domestic Violence Prevention Services</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. CalFRESH Third Party Reimbursement Request for Applications | TBD | Activated
20. Child Welfare and Training | $100,000 | Activated

Grand Total | $17,154,975

SSA’s Procurement Operating Structure

The SSA has a purchasing department in its Central Services Division that is responsible for the procurement of goods and services related to facilities management. Central Services utilizes the County’s master contracts for goods and services and manages requests for projects through the County’s minor public works or capital projects structure.

OCM Operations

The OCM is a Department within the SSA. It is comprised of 18 dedicated employees to support and respond to internal and external customer needs. The OCM operations consist of three operating domains that include contract development and monitoring, budget analysis and invoice processing, and quality/performance monitoring. The following statistics provide details of the SSA OCM operations:

- Staff to contract ratio is one staff to 40 contracts;
- The SSA averages seven requests for new contracts or amendments per month;
- The SSA OCM creates and submits an average of 65 contract related legislative files each year;
- Approximately 2,400 invoices are processed annually; and
- Approximately 1,200 performance reports are collected annually.

The SSA experiences two peak seasons, one at the end of the calendar year and the other at the end of the fiscal year. The SSA's comprehensive, organized, and systemic approach to managing contracts increases the Agency’s ability to handle an extensive workflow cycle that includes renewing contracts, managing various solicitations, conducting onsite monitoring, and closing year-end on a timely basis. The OCM operating sequence complements seasonal workflow priorities. Of the 430 active contracts, the SSA is processing solicitations that will impact 11% contracts, 4% contracts will expire this FY, and the SSA plans to extend 84% contracts into FY2020-21, of which 38% likely to be approved through the Master Contract List (MCL).

OCM Strategic Direction

The OCM Strategic Transformation Initiative started in FY2015-16 and has infused a consistent use of best practice standards, for measurable service and client outcomes. More recently, the SSA has partnered with OCCM to adopt the revised procurement policies and practice standards. The SSA continues to progress toward more efficient methods, increasing integrated processes, staff competencies, and accountable procurement processes. As a framework for healthy transformation, the SSA continues to use Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) methods within the contracting processes to promote ongoing change management and ensure that the needs of the SSA employees and clients are met in a timely and efficient manner. The CQI methods used by the SSA adopt a strengths-based philosophy.
to help improve relationships with vendors, and within our internal infrastructure, build trust, and promote transparency. The following concepts are foundational for the transformation:

- Promote a culture of improvement;
- Incorporate infrastructure needs;
- Standardize performance and outcome measures;
- Define methodologies for analyzing/reporting information; and
- Train staff and vendors on best practices and standards of data collection and usage.

The strategic map below outlines the goals for the OCM over the last three years and the preliminary targets for FY2019-20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2017-18 GOALS</th>
<th>FY2018-19 GOALS</th>
<th>FY2019-20 GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Measure performance of service contracts and administrative performance; 2. Centralize invoices within OCM; 3. Increase community engagement through onsite monitoring and performance reports; 4. Support the County’s transformation in best practice standards; and 5. Shape policy into best practice standards.</td>
<td>1. Increase contract dashboards from 14% to 32% to capacity; 2. Increase use of CQI methods for data driven decisions, communication, improvement initiatives, and performance reports; 3. Partner with OCCM and Procurement to apply best practice standards in a human services organization; and 4. Help shape policy into best practice standards.</td>
<td>1. Solicit programs from the SSA Acquisition Plan in the 1st and 2nd quarter of the fiscal year using the eRFP function; 2. Increase contract dashboards from 32% to 65%; 3. Increase community participation in CQI activities related to contract performance measures; 4. Continue to increase staff knowledge through training of Procurement Standards; 5. Continue to partner with OCCM and Procurement to develop best practice standards; and 6. Help shape policy into best practice standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Framework for Outputs and Outcomes:**

Analysis of contract performance (outputs and outcomes) based on standardized, reliable data collection is central to OCM’s strategic transformation. The SSA’s process is transparent, inclusive, and applies structured data collection methods to better inform the Agency, the Board, the community and other constituents on service effectiveness, population served, and cost for service, among other performance indicators. To that end, OCM has used a logic model framework to connect the overarching goals of a service to the measurement of short-term and long-term outcomes.

The SSA’s framework for measuring various performance measures, including outcome measures, stems from a Logic Model framework. A Logic Model is a top-level road map of the flow of materials and processes to produce the desired results of an organization or program. The model is very useful to organize planning and analysis when designing the organization and its programs or when designing outcome-based evaluations of programs.

Sample Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes/Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what resources go into a...</td>
<td>what activities the...</td>
<td>what is produced</td>
<td>the changes or benefits that result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td>program undertakes</td>
<td>through those activities</td>
<td>from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. money, staff, equipment</td>
<td>e.g. development of materials, training programs</td>
<td>e.g. number of booklets produced, workshops held, people trained</td>
<td>e.g. increased skills/ knowledge/ confidence, leading in longer-term to promotion, new job, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To date, the OCM has initiated standard collection of performance/outcome measures in 65% of the service contracts. In FY2019-20, this work was extended by 33% and the plan is to increase standard performance metrics an additional 35% in FY2020-21. The goal for the SSA is to reach maximum capacity in FY2020-21 and have reliable data to better measure the effectiveness of service.

**Continuous Quality Improvement**

The SSA continues to apply CQI methods to organize positive change management processes, promote transparency and elevate feedback for various stakeholder groups. The following committees are part of the SSA CQI framework (each has specific tasks that play a critical part in achieving strategic milestones):

- **SSA Contract Advisory Committee**: This Committee serves as the oversight committee and is inclusive of stakeholders representing all areas of the SSA operations and representatives from the Office of Budget Administration (OBA). This committee is a standing advisory body that meets monthly to design and implement policies and procedures, and incorporate the elements of the County's transformation initiative into the SSA.

- **Outcomes Measure Workgroup**: This group has primary responsibility for incorporating logic models into each RFP, creating data exchange tools, and evaluating data to develop performance measure dashboards. The dashboards are shared among various stakeholders and vendors to promote feedback for improvement opportunities.

- **Contract and Budget Workgroup**: This committee is tasked with centralizing invoices, budget analysis, and fee structures for the SSA. Incorporated in the scope of this committee is the task of integrating systems, such as CalWIN, SAP, ARIBA, and other applicable systems that will help the County improve spending visibility.

- **Administrative Risk Management**: This workgroup is charged with improving contract monitoring practices to minimize risk, measure quality, and assess community safety with contracted vendors. This process is mainly supported through onsite physical monitoring of provider facilities used for County business.

- **CBO Processes and Engagement**: At the onset of the RFP process, the SSA meets with applicable CBOs to collaborate on incorporating data and outcome tools as part of the negotiation process. Consistent with CQI best practices, proactive collaborative discussion of performance measurements promotes trust and transparency and alleviates concerns associated with sharing performance data between the SSA and vendors.
Through this collaborative approach, the SSA continues to build strong trusting relationships that aim at improving service delivery. In addition to the developments over the past three years, new updates on the SSA strategic direction are listed in the next table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Domain</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures/Outcomes</td>
<td>The SSA activated 43% more standard contract performance measures in FY2019-20. The SSA plans to increase standard performance measures by 35% in FY2020-21 with a goal to reach maximum capacity in FY2020-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRFP</td>
<td>As of January 1, 2020, the SSA, with support from OCCM and the Procurement Department activated the eRFP process. As of January 1, 2020, all RFPs and RFSQ will be managed through the eRFP process. The eRFP process is meant to improve innovation, efficiency, tracking and compliance in the solicitation process to further alleviate risk to the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Implementation</td>
<td>The SSA is working with OCCM and the Procurement Department to design the ARIBA system for improved functionality in a Human Services procurement environment. In FY2018-19, the SSA Contract Management System was approved to help the SSA continue its strategic growth in becoming more efficient, effective and innovative in managing contract risk, measuring service outputs and outcomes, service budgets and rates, and overall quality and contract compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Monitoring</td>
<td>Onsite monitoring procedures and practices were activated in FY2018-19. Onsite monitoring is a method used to engage the community within the primary location where services are delivered. It is a CQI and risk management approach, that ensures services delivered to County residents are compliant and delivered with high quality in a safe and welcoming environment. Through this approach, the SSA evaluates the administrative functions of an organization, the quality of service and organizational internal controls, among other areas. The outcome of these reviews is used to provide technical support to an organization to improve service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Policy</td>
<td>In partnership with the OCCM and other County divisions, the SSA continues to help transform the County's procurement practices into best practice standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contracting Standards (New updates)**

The SSA contracting standards are consistent with the Santa Clara County Board Policy Manual, Chapter 5, Policies on Contracting and Bidding, and when appropriate, Division 23 of the California Department of Social Services Manual, SSA operational procedures, and Federal regulations.

In adherence to the Board Manual, Chapter 5.3.5.1, all Board Contracts are submitted to the Board for approval. When necessary, the Board may choose to delegate authority to the County Executive or their designee as referenced in section 5.3.5.3 of the policy or require signature by the Board President. The SSA also utilizes the authority delegated to the County Director of Procurement under Board Policy 5.3.5.2.

The OCM uses the MCL Delegation of Authority (DOA) from the Board to execute annual contract extensions. The Master Acquisition List (MAL) is used to notify the public and the Board in advance of all RFP release dates. During the FY2019-20 contract renewal season, the SSA utilized the methods shown in the table below to execute contracts.
### Approval Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors (Legislative File)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$51,868,142</td>
<td>36.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive's Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of Authority</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,204,021</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Contract List</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$26,143,935</td>
<td>18.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action (active agreement through the renewal process)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$36,627,013</td>
<td>26.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$4,364,615</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per the Board’s Chapter 5 Policy, the SSA is required to open formal competitive opportunities, unless a service is exempt, or an exception is approved through the OCCM. In FY2019-20, 56% of the entire SSA contract budgets were processed through an open competitive solicitation, 33% are Intergovernmental automatically exempt and 3% are Board Referrals/Inventory Items. The table below gives a breakdown of the procurement approach for the SSA’s active contracts. As of this report, 7% of the total contract budget is single or sole sourced.

### Procurement Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemption</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$38,501,508</td>
<td>27.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$142,855</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Solicitation</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$79,844,318</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory Item/Board Referral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$4,117,113</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Source</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$9,864,714</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$176,851</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Issued License</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$7,560,367</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.70%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a standard operating procedure, the OCM conducts "open forums" for new or modified services. The open forums invite the community to give input into the design of the services and programs before the RFP is finalized. In these instances, the OCM conducts a discussion session for interested community organizations and other stakeholders. This process helps inform the agency's decision making, and allows community providers to learn of new directions in service contracting for internal strategic planning purposes.

To promote feedback and input, the OCM works closely with various community stakeholders and communicates multiple contracting activities with non-profit leadership and non-profit advocacy organizations. This collaboration allows the SSA to incorporate suggestions for improvement to procurement and contract processes, and to adjust methods to support provider organizations participating in these business opportunities.

The SSA collaborates with the Procurement Department and OCCM to address new policy updates and adopt Board action into practice. For systemic changes, the SSA usually uses the contract renewal window to incorporate policy changes (usually seen as contract provisions, etc). In unique situations, such as Board Referrals/Inventory Items, it typically takes an average of 3-months from the date the SSA receives direction to execute it.
**Funding**

The OCM contracts are funded through a wide variety of State, Federal, and local programs. Funding may also be sought through grants (local, philanthropic, and Federal). Most of the State and Federal funds received by the SSA are targeted for specific types of services and resources for vulnerable adults, children, and families.

Three large SSA technology contracts are also included in this report. These are the contracts for the computer application that supports the DEBS automated eligibility system called the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS). DEBS is a member of an 18-county consortium that competitively procures and manages the SAWS CalWIN automated system for benefits determination and maintenance. The SSA manages a contract related to CalWIN quality assurance and project support that is also procured at the consortium level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Funding</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$69,002,557</td>
<td>49.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGF</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>$41,249,417</td>
<td>29.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funded</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$17,341,433</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap Reinvestment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$5,759,139</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Agreement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,889,099</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,881,418</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPC Funded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,084,663</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Cost</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County General Fund Contracts**

The priorities for County General Fund (CGF) services are set by the Board. Over the past five years, the SSA has worked closely with the Board to ensure that the contracts within this group are aligned with the Board priorities. There are two significant categories of funding in the CGF group. These include contracts to serve children and families and contracts to help aging and dependent adults.

The children and family-focused funding has been directed to support the success of high-risk youth in schools for the past four years. Services provided through these contracts are specifically designed to address the needs of youth and their families in high risk, high need areas of the County. These contracts were procured when the SLS initiative was enacted five years ago. The services were procured again in FY2016-17 through a competitive RFP that awarded new contracts in FY2017-18.

The funding for seniors is aligned with the Seniors Agenda. The Seniors Agenda community engagement process developed a set of critical priorities that the SSA then crafted into a RFP to procure services in support.

For both the DFCS contracts and the DAAS contracts, the service focus was developed through collaborative community investment and input process. As these initiatives continue, SSA may bring forward new or modified recommendations for future rebidding of these contracts.
The OIR and the SSA jointly procure and manage contracts for OIR services. OIR monitors the program activities of providers. The SSA is responsible for fiscal monitoring and administrative oversight of the contracts.

Select Domestic Violence (DV) and Office of Gender Based Violence Prevention (OGBVP) services are procured by and managed jointly by the SSA, OWP and OGBVP. For these contracts, the OWP monitors the program activities of providers, while the SSA is responsible for fiscal monitoring and administrative oversight.

**Inventory Items/Board Referrals**

On an annual basis, the Board reviews community proposals and grant funding for CBOs to serve community needs. In FY2019-20, the SSA was assigned two Inventory Items for a total of $100,893 to offer senior transportation and senior nutrition services and a board referral for summer camps of $1,009,350. In FY2018-19, the SSA was assigned six Inventory Items and nine Board Referrals for a total of $1,564,500. In FY2017-18, the SSA managed seven Inventory Items, totaling $655,216. Services funded through these methods include early childhood education and enrichment activities, children and youth interventions, and nutrition or food resources for County residents. The SSA currently has 31 active Inventory Items or Board Referrals shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ada's Café</td>
<td>Job Training and Employment</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amigos de Guadalupe</td>
<td>Support Services for Low Income Latino Families in East San Jose</td>
<td>$561,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asian Americans for Community Involvement</td>
<td>Stopgap Program (FY16 Inventory Item)</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Avenida's</td>
<td>Coordinated Care Outreach Program</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bill Wilson Center</td>
<td>Infrastructure Start-Up Costs</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Caminar-Family and Children Services</td>
<td>Victim Services</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community Services Agency of Mountain View, Los Altos &amp; Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>EAN Community Resource Navigator Pilot Program</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Solutions</td>
<td>Stopgap Program (FY16 Inventory Item)</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Environmental Volunteers</td>
<td>Environmental Education Program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Friends of Deer Hollow Farm</td>
<td>Environmental Education Program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Friends of Palo Alto Junior Museum</td>
<td>Environmental Education Program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Kinship Adoptive and Foster Parent Association</td>
<td>Summer Camp and Activities for County Youth</td>
<td>$1,009,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maitri</td>
<td>Stopgap Program (FY16 Inventory Item)</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Stopgap Program (FY16 Inventory Item)</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Peninsula Family Services</td>
<td>Older Adults Job Counseling Program (FY17 Inventory Item)</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sacred Heart Community Service</td>
<td>EAN Community Resource Navigator Pilot Program</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Saratoga Area Senior Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Saratoga Adult Care Center</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Saratoga Area Senior Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Pilot Program (vehicle repair)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Saratoga Area Senior Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Pilot Program</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Second Harvest Food Bank</td>
<td>Strengthening Summer Meals Program</td>
<td>$392,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SPUR-San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association</td>
<td>Double-Up Food Bucks</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Sunnyvale Community Services | EAN Community Resource Navigator Pilot Program | $82,500
24. Teatro Vision | Theater Youth Program | $100,000
25. Via Rehabilitation Services Inc. | Via West Matching Grant | $60,000
26. Viet Tu Te Charity | Senior Nutrition Program - Congregate Meals | $195,793
27. West Valley Community Services of Santa Clara County Inc. | Senior Transportation Pilot Program (STPP) Grant | $5,000
28. West Valley Community Services of Santa Clara County Inc. | Mobile Food Pantry | $165,000
29. West Valley Community Services of Santa Clara County Inc. | Senior Transportation Pilot Program | $125,000
30. Year-up Bay Area | Career Labs (Formally Career Readiness Program Pilot) | $40,035
31. YWCA of Silicon Valley | Stopgap Program (FY16 Inventory Item) | $70,070

Total | $4,117,113

**Child Abuse Prevention**

The Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC) is an independent body within the County government assigned by the Board to coordinate child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention activities. Per the State Office of Child Abuse Prevention, the Board is responsible for the Children’s Trust Fund (CTF) and determines which programs and projects are funded. The CAPC establishes funding criteria and makes recommendations to the Board for approval. In FY2017-18, the SSA initiated an RFP for child abuse prevention and intervention services that awarded $1,016,413 annually to eight CBOs for a three-year term through FY2020-21. The SSA serves as fiscal agent and administrator for CAPC contracts.

**Transportation Assistance Program (TAP)**

The TAP is the result of a Board sponsored initiative created four years ago to provide bus passes to low income residents. In FY2017-18, the SSA renewed a grant with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to provide Clipper bus passes through FY2019-20, with an option to extend two additional years. The SSA currently contracts with six Emergency Assistance Network (EAN) providers to help screen eligible clients and distribute the VTA clipper cards to low-income residents.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The consequence of negative action is that the CSFC would not accept the information provided on the SSA Agency-Wide contracting activities describing the breadth and volume of contracting activities performed in support of services to the community.

**STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL**

The Clerk of the Board will notify Jorge Montes from the SSA upon acceptance of this report.

**LINKS:**

- Linked To: 89662 : 89662
- Linked To: 92529 : 92529
- Linked To: 84568 : 84568
• Linked To: 95466 : 95466
• Linked To: 97831 : 97831

ATTACHMENTS:

• PowerPoint SSA Contract Strategic Updates (PPTX)
• SSA OCM Contract Executive Summary (PDF)
• FY2019-20 Q2 Contract Dashboards (Combined) (PDF)
CHILDREN, SENIORS, AND FAMILIES COMMITTEE
APRIL 23, 2020

Social Services Agency
Office of Contracts Management
FY2019-20 Summary Report
Jorge L Montes
Background Information

• The Social Services Agency (SSA) Office of Contracts Summary Report is presented at the request of Supervisor Chavez.

• The intent behind the report is to inform the CSFC of the SSA contract related activities, and relevant updates related to the SSA OCM strategic initiatives.

• As of this report, the SSA has 430 active contracts that total $140,207,726 in dollar value. Not all contracts are funded thru the County’s General Fund.
# Notable Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Domain</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2019-20 Contracts</td>
<td>As of April 5, 2020, 430 active contracts totaling $140,207,726. All Board Referrals and Inventory Items, including FY2019-20 budget adjustments are included in this data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>eRFPs were activated in January 1, 2020 and the ARIBA system is going to designed to support Human Services procurement operations and functionality. The SSA, OCCM, and Procurement are working jointly with a plan to initiate the design in September 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Controls</td>
<td>The SSA continues to centralize procurement operations within the SSA Office of Contracts Management Department. As of this report, all SSA contracts are monitored and approved by the SSA OCM, invoice processing for contracts continues to show progress in expediting payment to vendors by up to 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Outcome Measures</td>
<td>The SSA data pilot started in FY2016-17 with the wraparound service network. In this fiscal year, we activated additional structured performance measure for OIR, OGBVP, and select DFCS contracts. The goal is to activate performance measures for 100% of human service contracts by FY2020-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Onsite monitoring standards and procedures were activated in FY2019-20 as part of a CQI intervention. In addition, the SSA offers technical support in a variety of areas, such as performance data tracking, internal controls, budget formulation, etc. The SSA utilizes CQI principles as the method to promote transparency, communications, and ultimately transform the network into positive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Policy</td>
<td>In partnership with the OCCM and other County divisions, the SSA continues to help transform the County's procurement practices to best practice standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Continue to empower staff and vendors to learn, adopt, and practice procurement best practice standards;
• Activate the ARIBA system and design it to support Human Services to improve transparency, spend visibility, performance measurement, and accountable contract processes;
• Initiate CQI on performance measures for course correction and improvement opportunities for new performance dashboards shown below:
  1. Differential Response
  2. Domestic Violence OWP contracts
  3. Immigration Legal Representation and Education Services
  4. Legal Services for Undocumented Minors
  5. Unmet Legal Civil Needs
  6. Program Immigration and Integration
  7. Transitional Housing Program Plus
  8. Senior Nutrition Program
  9. Various DFCS and Older Adult Related Services
• Serve, Empower, and Transform!
Social Services Agency
Office of Contracts Management
FY2019-20 Contract Executive Summary Report

Introduction: The Social Services Agency (SSA) started FY2019-20 currently has 430 active contracts, 9% more contracts from when we started the fiscal year. All Board Referrals and Inventory Items assigned to the SSA are executed. The tables below provide details on the 430 contracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SSA Administrative Office</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$8,858,976</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department of Aging and Adult Services</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$18,424,056</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SSA Data Analysis Program Integrity and Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$52,895,850</td>
<td>37.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Department of Employment and Benefit Services</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$9,722,179</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Department of Family and Children's Services</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$40,200,091</td>
<td>28.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SSA Information Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Office of Gender Based Violence Prevention</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$5,989,650</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Office of Immigrant Relations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,916,924</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Funding</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$69,002,557</td>
<td>49.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGF</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>$41,249,417</td>
<td>29.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funded</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$17,341,433</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap Reinvestment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$5,759,139</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Agreement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,889,099</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,881,418</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPC Funded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,084,663</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Cost</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Types</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>$67,088,393</td>
<td>47.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$43,884,311</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Consultants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$1,118,179</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Higher Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$4,247,716</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$23,869,127</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Methods</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors (Legislative File)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$51,686,142</td>
<td>36.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive's Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of Authority</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,204,021</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Contract List</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$26,143,935</td>
<td>18.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action (active agreement through the renewal process)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$36,627,013</td>
<td>26.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$4,364,615</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td><strong>$140,207,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SSA executes procurement contracts utilizing the County’s Chapter 5 Policy as the applicable approach to solicited and execute contracts. In the tables below, you will see the methods the SSA applied to procure contracts and the category of services the contracts represent.

### Procurement Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemption</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$38,501,508</td>
<td>27.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$142,855</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Solicitation</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$79,844,318</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory Item/Board Referral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$4,117,113</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Source</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$9,864,714</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$176,851</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Issued License</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$7,560,367</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>$140,207,726</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Count %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging Disabled &amp; Dependent Adult Services (ADDAS)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$1,221,785</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit &amp; Eligibility Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalFRESH/Food Services</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$1,459,337</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Council</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,154,661</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$14,015,554</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$909,886</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,923,438</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic/Partner Violence/Rape/Sex Abuse Svc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$6,517,014</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Training/Support</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$4,615,020</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$108,150</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Services/Support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,597,500</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Treatment Foster Care Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,468,098</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Government Agreement</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$11,412,739</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4,531,663</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach/Support Services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,386,402</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Evaluation Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$658,376</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Linked Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,339,439</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Nutrition Services</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$12,938,928</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Agreements</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Camps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,009,350</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$51,420,702</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$9,786,760</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services/Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,806,000</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Legal Civil Needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$319,424</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,090,000</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>$140,207,726</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction: The Social Services Agency implemented standard performance metrics for service-related contracts in FY2016-17. As of this report, much progress has been accomplished in creating a framework that allows structured data collection to track population served, services provided, budget utilization, and outcome measures. This report represents the second quarter of fiscal year 2019-20.

The SSA’s framework for measuring various performance measures, including outcome measures, stems from a Logic Model framework. A Logic Model is a top-level road map of the flow of materials and processes to produce the desired results of an organization or program. The model is very useful to organize planning and analysis when designing the organization and its programs or when designing outcomes-based evaluations of programs.

Sample Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes/impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what resources go into a program</td>
<td>what activities the program undertakes</td>
<td>what is produced through those activities</td>
<td>the changes or benefits that result from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. money, staff, equipment</td>
<td>e.g. development of materials, training programs</td>
<td>e.g. number of booklets produced, workshops held, people trained</td>
<td>e.g. increased skills/ knowledge/ confidence, leading in longer-term to promotion, new job, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION:

On November 3rd, 2017, the Social Services Agency (SSA) released the Aging, Disabled, and Dependent Adult Services (ADDAS) Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Through this RFP, 20 programs, which represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts within the County of Santa Clara, were activated. These programs focus on services providing services and resources to at-risk seniors and disabled and dependent adults that will improve quality of life and assist with continued independent living in the county.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 3,417 people were served between 20 programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following five pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
## Aging, Disabled, and Dependent Adult Services

### Program Dashboard

**Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Disorder Association**
- Information and referral services through 24/7 Helpline, walk-in services, and direct calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Disorder Association</td>
<td>Provide Information on Alzheimer's disease and referrals to care resources to disease victims and their caregivers</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Female 70%</td>
<td>White 38%</td>
<td>Under 5 1%</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 14%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>5 to 9 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 27%</td>
<td>Asian 40%</td>
<td>10 to 14 18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 8%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 15%</td>
<td>20 to 29 15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 2%</td>
<td>Other 11%</td>
<td>40 to 49 11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 13%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 13%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asian Americans for Community Involvement**
- Case Management
- Informational Workshops on Health Insurance and Elder Abuse
- ESL classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans for Community Involvement</td>
<td>Provide case management, classes, and workshops to improve the physical, mental, social, and financial wellbeing of seniors</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Female 73%</td>
<td>White 19%</td>
<td>Under 5 1%</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 17%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>5 to 9 1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 3%</td>
<td>10 to 14 1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 1%</td>
<td>20 to 29 1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 1%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>60 to 69 2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>70 to 79 0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avenidas (Care Partners Program)**
- Case Management counseling sessions and consultations
- Personalized Care Plans
- Caregiver Support Group sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenidas (Care Partners Program)</td>
<td>Case management with educational and support opportunities to allow low-income, at-risk seniors to age in place</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Female 28%</td>
<td>White 74%</td>
<td>Under 5 1%</td>
<td>$46,350</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 22%</td>
<td>Black 19%</td>
<td>5 to 9 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td>10 to 14 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 1%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 2%</td>
<td>20 to 29 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 1%</td>
<td>Other 4%</td>
<td>40 to 49 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avenidas (Community Based Home Health)**
- Adult Day Health Care activities
- Meals
- Transportation services
- Therapy services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenidas (Community Based Home Health)</td>
<td>Provide different levels of adult day care, with activities, meals, and transportation, to improve seniors quality of life</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Female 48%</td>
<td>White 51%</td>
<td>Under 5 1%</td>
<td>$651,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 52%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>5 to 9 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 11%</td>
<td>10 to 14 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 13%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 5%</td>
<td>20 to 29 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 2%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 17%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Disorder Association as not yet served or assessed any clients for outcomes.
### Aging, Disabled, and Dependent Adult Services

#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bay Area Legal Aid**
Uphold the legal rights of adults with disabilities by providing free legal advice, counsel, and extended representation | • Free multilingual legal advice and counsel
• Outreach and community education to low-income, disabled adult community members | 131 | | | | | |
| | Female 60% | Male 40% | Unknown / Other 0% | English 62% | Spanish 9% | Vietnamese 1% | Unknown / Other 10% |
| | White 13% | Black 33% | Asian 27% | Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 18% | Hispanic Latino 11% | Other 1% | Unknown 3% |
| | Under 5 1% | 5 to 9 3% | 10 to 14 24% | 15 to 19 34% | 20 to 29 5% | 30 to 39 7% | 40 to 49 7% | 50 to 59 6% | 60 to 69 7% | 70 to 79 11% | 80 and over 18% | Unknown / Other 9% |
| **Catholic Charities (Adult Day Care)**
Provide affordable, direct care to dependent adults, allowing caregivers to obtain respite and support | • Adult Day Care Services
• Caregiver Respite & Optional Support Group | 120 | | | | | |
| | Female 69% | Male 31% | Unknown / Other 0% | English 60% | Spanish 12% | Vietnamese 1% | Unknown / Other 65% |
| | White 64% | Black 9% | Asian 19% | Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 1% | Hispanic Latino 5% | Other 2% | Unknown 3% |
| | Under 5 1% | 5 to 9 3% | 10 to 14 31% | 15 to 19 22% | 20 to 29 10% | 30 to 39 20% | 40 to 49 11% | 50 to 59 3% | 60 to 69 7% | 70 to 79 19% | 80 and over 18% | Unknown / Other 9% |
| **Catholic Charities (Senior Wellness)**
Information referral, ESL classes, and integration activities to aid at-risk seniors to age in place | • Information Referral & Senior Wellness Check-ins
• ESL classes
• Senior Socialization & Integration Activities | 445 | | | | | |
| | Female 69% | Male 31% | Unknown / Other 0% | English 18% | Spanish 11% | Vietnamese 13% | Unknown / Other 28% |
| | White 85% | Black 13% | Asian 1% | Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 3% | Hispanic Latino 25% | Other 43% | Unknown / Other 9% |
| | Under 5 1% | 5 to 9 3% | 10 to 14 32% | 15 to 19 43% | 20 to 29 5% | 30 to 39 7% | 40 to 49 5% | 50 to 59 6% | 60 to 69 7% | 70 to 79 11% | 80 and over 18% | Unknown / Other 9% |
| **Community Services Agency of Mountain View, Los Altos & Los Altos Hills**
Prevent premature institutionalization of seniors by connecting to benefits/services/activities through case management services | • Case management
• Socialization Seminars
• Door-to-door rides | 179 | | | | | |
| | Female 58% | Male 42% | Unknown / Other 35% | English 69% | Spanish 2% | Vietnamese 1% | Unknown / Other 28% |
| | White 45% | Black 25% | Asian 19% | Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 4% | Hispanic Latino 17% | Other 34% | Unknown / Other 31% |
| | Under 5 1% | 5 to 9 3% | 10 to 14 34% | 15 to 19 31% | 20 to 29 18% | 30 to 39 7% | 40 to 49 7% | 50 to 59 5% | 60 to 69 7% | 70 to 79 11% | 80 and over 18% | Unknown / Other 9% |

---

**Goal** | **Actual**
---|---
Clients increased awareness of their legal rights and where to get help | 100% | 100%
Clients saw 1+ legal issue resolved in their favor | 100% | 90%
Clients began resolving 1+ barrier to safety and self-sufficiency | 100% | 92%
Caregivers benefited from support groups through decreased financial & emotional stress | 100% | 100%
Clients showed higher participation in social activities | 100% | 100%
Event participants became less isolated | 100% | 90%
ESL participants increase knowledge of basic English | 100% | 90%
Clients found referral appropriate | 100% | 80%
Clients have access to required services | 100% | 95%
Clients feel less isolated and form new friendships | 100% | 95%
Clients continue to live independently | 100% | 85%
### Aging, Disabled, and Dependent Adult Services

#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Trust</th>
<th>Collaborate with senior affordable housing sites to provide evidence-based health programs to seniors with chronic condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interventions | - Fitness classes  
                 - Health & Wellness Education                                                                        |
| Count        | 93                                                            |
| Demographic Profile |  
| Gender | Male  
         Female  
         Unknown / Other  
| Ethnicity | English  
         Spanish  
         Vietnamese  
         Unknown / Other  
| Age Group | Under 5  
            5 to 9  
            10 to 14  
            15 to 19  
            20 to 29  
            30 to 39  
            40 to 49  
            50 to 59  
            60 to 69  
            70 to 79  
            80 and over  
| Ethnicity | White  
            Black  
            Asian  
            Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  
            Hispanic Latino  
            Other  
            Unknown  
| Goal | 56%  
| Actual | 56%  
| Budget Utilization | $10,000  
| Utilization | 0%  

| Institute on Aging | Operating a phone center to support aging in place and reduce social isolation for seniors and adults with disabilities |
| Interventions | - Emotional support calls  
                - Social isolation services  
                - Home visit program  
                - Caregiver support group  
| Count | 52                                                            |
| Demographic Profile |  
| Gender | Female  
         Male  
         Unknown / Other  
| Ethnicity | English  
         Spanish  
         Vietnamese  
         Unknown / Other  
| Age Group | Under 5  
            5 to 9  
            10 to 14  
            15 to 19  
            20 to 29  
            30 to 39  
            40 to 49  
            50 to 59  
            60 to 69  
            70 to 79  
            80 and over  
| Ethnicity | White  
            Black  
            Asian  
            Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  
            Hispanic Latino  
            Other  
            Unknown  
| Goal | 2%  
| Actual | 2%  
| Budget Utilization | $10,000  
| Utilization | 0%  

| Korean American Community Services | Information and referral, social and translation services, brown bag application and distribution  
                                    Senior Care Activity including transportation  
                                    Home visit program  
                                    Caregiver support group |
| Count | 522                                                          |
| Demographic Profile |  
| Gender | Female  
         Male  
         Unknown / Other  
| Ethnicity | English  
         Spanish  
         Vietnamese  
         Unknown / Other  
| Age Group | Under 5  
            5 to 9  
            10 to 14  
            15 to 19  
            20 to 29  
            30 to 39  
            40 to 49  
            50 to 59  
            60 to 69  
            70 to 79  
            80 and over  
| Ethnicity | White  
            Black  
            Asian  
            Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  
            Hispanic Latino  
            Other  
            Unknown  
| Goal | 35%  
| Actual | 35%  
| Budget Utilization | $10,000  
| Utilization | 0%  

| Peninsula Family Services | Seniors to receive job development and coaching in order to obtain a job and have greater financial stability |
| Interventions | - Skills Assessment/Individual Employment Plans  
                - Career Advising and Coaching  
                - Job Search Workshops  
                - Job referrals and placements  
                - Coordinate the job internships |
| Count | 107                                                          |
| Demographic Profile |  
| Gender | Female  
         Male  
         Unknown / Other  
| Ethnicity | English  
         Spanish  
         Vietnamese  
         Unknown / Other  
| Age Group | Under 5  
            5 to 9  
            10 to 14  
            15 to 19  
            20 to 29  
            30 to 39  
            40 to 49  
            50 to 59  
            60 to 69  
            70 to 79  
            80 and over  
| Ethnicity | White  
            Black  
            Asian  
            Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  
            Hispanic Latino  
            Other  
            Unknown  
| Goal | 20%  
| Actual | 20%  
| Budget Utilization | $10,000  
| Utilization | 0%  

### Outcomes

- Clients increased self-efficacy and self-confidence
- Clients improved physical abilities
- Clients were satisfied with the emotional support calls they received
- Caregivers decreased stress and increased knowledge of available community resources
- Clients decreased isolation and depression
- Clients avoided placement in nursing homes
- Clients increased knowledge of available community resources

NOTE: The Institute of Aging has not yet served or assessed any clients for outcomes.
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**Aging, Disabled, and Dependent Adult Services**

**Program Dashboard**

**Portuguese Organization for Social Services and Opportunities**

- Coordinated Information and Assistance
- Transportation

Information and assistance, with transportation, to link seniors to public and private community resources

**Hearts & Minds Activity Center**

Provision of specialized therapeutic programming for seniors with Alzheimer’s disease and respite for their caregivers

- Dementia specific inclusive adult day care
- Intergenerational services

**Santa Clara Unified School District**

Provide low-cost classes for stroke survivors and other disabled adults to recover skills and remain in community living

- Classes on Mobility, Independent Living, Communication Skills
- Functional Independent Measurement (FIM) and Functional Assessment Measurement (FAM) evaluations

**Self-Help for the Elderly**

Provide information and assistance, and follow-up services, to seniors and disabled adults to help them remain independent

- Case Management
- Education Workshops
- Employment Training

**Demographic Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 to 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 to 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 to 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity**

- Vietnamese 1%
- Spanish 6%
- English 97%
- Other

**Gender**

- Female 62%
- Male 38%

**Age Group**

- Under 5 22%
- 5 to 9 8%
- 10 to 14 31%
- 15 to 19 22%
- 20 to 29 8%
- 30 to 39 9%
- 40 to 49 7%
- 50 to 59 14%
- 60 to 69 6%
- 70 to 79 13%
- 80 and over 6%

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Budget Utilization**

- $55,000
- $60,000
- $65,000
- $70,000
- $75,000

**Outcomes**

- Transportation services help clients live independently
- Clients are better informed regarding available resources

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Clients maintain or stabilize cognitive functioning...**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Clients age in place and avoid/delay institutionalization**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Clients maintained or improved mobility, independent living, and/or communication skills**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Clients receiving job training and resume assistance found job successfully**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Clients found independent living workshops useful**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Clients are referred to appropriate services**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

**Goal**

- 0%
- 50%
- 100%
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Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Senior Adults Legal Assistance  
Provide free legal services to seniors for intervention and prevention of elder abuse |  
- Legal advice  
- Brief Services  
- Attorney representation  
- Preventative legal planning/documents | 69 | Female 48%  
Male 32%  
Unknown / Other 0% | English 67%  
Spanish 13%  
Vietnamese 10%  
Unknown / Other 0% | White 29%  
Black 10%  
Asian 12%  
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 42%  
Hispanic Latino 43%  
Other 0%  
Unknown 0% | Under 5 5%  
5 to 9 42%  
10 to 14 12%  
15 to 19 29%  
20 to 29 3%  
30 to 39 0%  
40 to 49 0%  
50 to 59 0%  
60 to 69 0%  
70 to 79 0%  
80 and over 0%  
Unknown 0% | $0 | Increased access to legal info/services related to elder abuse prevention |
| Silicon Valley Independent Living Center  
To transition disabled adults from institutionalization back to independent community living |  
- Outreach and Education  
- Care Support Coordination  
- Facilitation and management of care transitions | 66 | Female 47%  
Male 53%  
Unknown / Other 0% | English 68%  
Spanish 0%  
Vietnamese 0%  
Unknown / Other 0% | White 47%  
Black 21%  
Asian 12%  
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%  
Hispanic Latino 0%  
Other 0%  
Unknown 0% | Under 5 6%  
5 to 9 18%  
10 to 14 2%  
15 to 19 3%  
20 to 29 42%  
30 to 39 19%  
40 to 49 10%  
50 to 59 17%  
60 to 69 5%  
70 to 79 51%  
80 and over 0%  
Unknown 0% | $0 | Clients completed objectives and successfully transitioned into the community |
| West Valley Community Services of Santa Clara County  
Case management, resource workshops, and food pantry services for seniors, disabled, and dependent adults |  
- Food pantry services  
- Connection to community resources  
- Case management to help connect clients to public benefits, emergency financial assistance, and transportation access  
- Resource clinics and workshops (i.e. financial literacy, awareness of public benefits, ESL classes, computer literacy, online banking, etc.) | 37 | Female 41%  
Male 59%  
Unknown / Other 0% | English 65%  
Spanish 0%  
Vietnamese 0%  
Unknown / Other 0% | White 49%  
Black 21%  
Asian 0%  
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 19%  
Hispanic Latino 19%  
Other 0%  
Unknown 0% | Under 5 0%  
5 to 9 0%  
10 to 14 0%  
15 to 19 0%  
20 to 29 0%  
30 to 39 0%  
40 to 49 0%  
50 to 59 0%  
60 to 69 0%  
70 to 79 0%  
80 and over 0%  
Unknown 0% | $0 | Clients maximized safety, health, and independence |
| Yu-Ai Kai Japanese American Community Senior Services of San Jose  
Provide transportation, coordinated information and assistance with system navigation, and SDS for at-risk seniors |  
- Affordable and Accessible Transportation  
- Senior Day Services (Social Engagement and Inclusion Services) | 116 | Female 47%  
Male 53%  
Unknown / Other 0% | English 73%  
Spanish 0%  
Vietnamese 0%  
Unknown / Other 0% | White 98%  
Black 0%  
Asian 0%  
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 3%  
Hispanic Latino 2%  
Other 0%  
Unknown 0% | Under 5 0%  
5 to 9 0%  
10 to 14 0%  
15 to 19 0%  
20 to 29 0%  
30 to 39 0%  
40 to 49 0%  
50 to 59 0%  
60 to 69 0%  
70 to 79 0%  
80 and over 0%  
Unknown 0% | $0 | Seniors remained in their home because of attending Senior Day Program |

NOTE: As of 4/3/2020, West Valley Community Services of Santa Clara County has not yet submitted their Q2 report. SSA is following up to confirm whether or not the report was submitted when OCM analysts were transitioning for this contract.
INTRODUCTION: On February 21, 2018, the Social Services Agency (SSA) released the Child Abuse Prevention Services (CAPS) Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Through this RFP, eight programs were activated. These programs recommended for award represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts and focus on providing services related to child abuse and neglect prevention, intervention, and treatment services to children and their families in order to eliminate child abuse and neglect across Santa Clara County.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 1,742 people were served between eight programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following two pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
# Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC) Program Dashboard

## Contract Scope

### Bill Wilson Center - PCIT
- Contractor will provide PCIT to clients for the purpose of preventing child abuse and neglect
- **Interventions**
  - PCIT Phase I and Phase II sessions covering positive parenting skills and techniques
- **Demographic Profile**
  - **Gender**
    - Female: 59%
    - Male: 41%
  - **Race/Ethnicity**
    - White: 4%
    - Black: 4%
    - Asian: 15%
    - Other: 58%
  - **Age Group**
    - Under 5: 1%
    - 5 to 9: 5%
    - 10 to 14: 14%
    - 15 to 19: 30%
    - 20 to 29: 25%
    - 30 to 39: 42%
    - 40 to 49: 49%
    - 50 to 59: 57%
    - 60 to 69: 78%
    - 70 to 79: 85%
    - 80 and over: 91%
  - **Outcomes**
    - Clients showed knowledge of positive parenting techniques after Phase II: 50%
    - Clients showed positive parenting skills during Phase II: 70%
    - Clients improved positive parenting skills after Phase I: 70%

### Caminar
- Contractor will provide Nurturing Parents group sessions and family case management
- **Interventions**
  - Family Education group sessions
  - Nurturing Parents group sessions
  - Case management sessions
- **Demographic Profile**
  - **Gender**
    - Female: 60%
    - Male: 40%
  - **Race/Ethnicity**
    - White: 81%
    - Black: 16%
    - Asian: 26%
    - Other: 3%
  - **Age Group**
    - Under 5: 26%
    - 5 to 9: 14%
    - 10 to 14: 12%
    - 15 to 19: 12%
    - 20 to 29: 36%
    - 30 to 39: 4%
    - 40 to 49: 17%
    - 50 to 59: 5%
    - 60 to 69: 3%
    - 70 to 79: 1%
    - 80 and over: 4%
  - **Outcomes**
    - Case mgmt clients report 2+ positive parenting behavioral changes: 8%
    - Case mgmt clients increased knowledge of positive parenting skills: 8%
    - 100+ of 140 points on Protective Factors survey: 8%
    - Improved Protective Factors score: 8%

### Catholic Charities - Baby Steps
- Contractor will provide home visitations, case management, and “Just Us” parent-child attachment groups
- **Interventions**
  - Home visits
  - Case management
  - Parent-Child attachment group sessions
- **Demographic Profile**
  - **Gender**
    - Female: 60%
    - Male: 40%
  - **Race/Ethnicity**
    - White: 67%
    - Black: 13%
    - Asian: 13%
    - Other: 5%
  - **Age Group**
    - Under 5: 4%
    - 5 to 9: 5%
    - 10 to 14: 12%
    - 15 to 19: 8%
    - 20 to 29: 36%
    - 30 to 39: 34%
    - 40 to 49: 17%
    - 50 to 59: 8%
    - 60 to 69: 1%
    - 70 to 79: 1%
    - 80 and over: 4%
  - **Outcomes**
    - 100+ of 140 points on Protective Factors survey: 8%
    - Improved Protective Factors score: 8%
    - Clients achieved 1+ case management goal: 8%
    - Clients completed 1+ program goal: 8%
    - Clients improved in 1+ category of KIPS: 8%

### Child Advocates
- Contractor will provide foster children with volunteer Court-Appointed Special Advocates
- **Interventions**
  - CASA Assignments
  - CASA court reports
- **Demographic Profile**
  - **Gender**
    - Female: 85%
    - Male: 15%
  - **Race/Ethnicity**
    - White: 51%
    - Black: 27%
    - Asian: 20%
    - Other: 3%
  - **Age Group**
    - Under 5: 6%
    - 5 to 9: 2%
    - 10 to 14: 6%
    - 15 to 19: 25%
    - 20 to 29: 25%
    - 30 to 39: 25%
    - 40 to 49: 14%
    - 50 to 59: 6%
    - 60 to 69: 1%
    - 70 to 79: 1%
    - 80 and over: 1%
  - **Outcomes**
    - Child did not experience re-entry or re-abuse: 82%
    - Statutory hearings had recommendations on critical issues: 82%
### Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC)

#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Scope</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interventions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Demographic Profile</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ethnicity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Age Group</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget Utilization</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcomes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICAN</strong></td>
<td>- Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 5: 17%</td>
<td>$0 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Client Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 9: 11%</td>
<td>$0 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vietnamese-language radio talk shows</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 2%</td>
<td>English: 5%</td>
<td>10 to 14: 21%</td>
<td>$0 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish: 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 19: 23%</td>
<td>$0 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Screenings for ASQ and Family Protective Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese: 7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29: 7%</td>
<td>$0 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family Protective Factors Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39: 18%</td>
<td>$0 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parents Helping Parents**

- Family support services
- Sharing the Journey sessions
- Understanding Maladaptive Behavior in Children with Disabilities sessions
- Social Boundaries Program

**Rebekah Children’s Services**

- Resilient Families Program Parent Workshops
- Day Care/Child Care Sessions
- Peer Support Groups

**San Jose Grail Family Services**

- Parenting Workshops (NuParent, Hablemos Juntos/Let’s Talk Together)
- Support Group Meetings
- Workshops on Building Blocks of Parenting
- On-on-one counseling with case manager
- Safety Education

---

**Office of Contracts Management CAPC Dashboard (FY20 2nd Quarter)**
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INTRODUCTION: On October 3rd, 2017, a request of Delegation of Authority was approved. The Social Services Agency (SSA) initiated administration of the CalFresh Employment and Training (CFET) program, which consisted of six programs. These programs represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts and focus on providing services which support low income families in Santa Clara County by providing employment services and training on how to navigate the resources available to them which improve their quality of life.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from alternate FY2019-2020 (October 2019 to September 2020) reports received show that 373 people were served between six programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following two pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
CalFresh Employment and Training (CFET) Program Dashboard

### Contract Scope Interventions Count Demographic Profile Ethnicity Age Group Budget Utilization Outcomes

**Center for Employment Opportunities**
- Employment services to CalFresh participants to improve skills and employability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Female 21%</td>
<td>White 17%</td>
<td>Under 5 4%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Goal 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 79%</td>
<td>Black 16%</td>
<td>5 to 9 8%</td>
<td>Actual 20%</td>
<td>Actual 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 12%</td>
<td>10 to 14 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 51%</td>
<td>Asian 2%</td>
<td>20 to 29 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td>40 to 49 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Latino 12%</td>
<td>60 to 69 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 2%</td>
<td>70 and over 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Downtown Streets, Inc.**
- Employment services to CalFresh participants to improve skills and employability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female 47%</td>
<td>White 26%</td>
<td>Under 5 4%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Goal 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 53%</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>5 to 9 8%</td>
<td>Actual 20%</td>
<td>Actual 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 26%</td>
<td>10 to 14 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 100%</td>
<td>Asian 11%</td>
<td>20 to 29 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td>40 to 49 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td>60 to 69 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td>70 and over 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goodwill of Silicon Valley**
- Employment services to CalFresh participants to improve skills and employability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Female 28%</td>
<td>White 15%</td>
<td>Under 5 4%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Goal 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 62%</td>
<td>Black 22%</td>
<td>5 to 9 8%</td>
<td>Actual 20%</td>
<td>Actual 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 32%</td>
<td>10 to 14 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 96%</td>
<td>Asian 10%</td>
<td>20 to 29 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 2%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 2%</td>
<td>40 to 49 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td>60 to 69 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Other 2%</td>
<td>70 and over 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sacred Heart**
- Employment services to CalFresh participants to improve skills and employability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female 60%</td>
<td>White 30%</td>
<td>Under 5 4%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Goal 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 40%</td>
<td>Black 5%</td>
<td>5 to 9 8%</td>
<td>Actual 20%</td>
<td>Actual 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 10%</td>
<td>10 to 14 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 85%</td>
<td>Asian 45%</td>
<td>20 to 29 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td>40 to 49 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td>60 to 69 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 3%</td>
<td>70 and over 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** As of 3/25/2020, outcomes have not yet been reported on by any vendors.

Office of Contracts Management CFET Dashboard (Alternate FY19-20 1st Quarter)
CalFresh Employment and Training (CFET)
Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Conservation Corps</td>
<td>Job search training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female 60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$647,345</td>
<td>Clients gained knowledge to obtain/retain employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$357</td>
<td>Increased potential for higher paid work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clients better prepared to obtain employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job retention services</td>
<td></td>
<td>English 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Partnerships USA</td>
<td>Job search training</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female 30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$67,290</td>
<td>Clients gained knowledge to obtain/retain employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>Increased potential for higher paid work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clients better prepared to obtain employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job retention services</td>
<td></td>
<td>English 96%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: As of 3/25/2020, outcomes have not yet been reported on by any vendors. As of this same date, both San Jose Conservation Corps and Working Partnerships USA have not yet submitted their November 2019 or December 2019 invoices.
Social Services Agency Office of Contracts Management

Differential Response Dashboard

**INTRODUCTION:** On February 5, 2019, the Social Services Agency (SSA) and the Behavioral Health Services Department (BHSD) jointly released the Differential Response (DR) Program Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Through this RFP, four programs were activated. These programs recommended for award represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts and play a vital role in helping families across Santa Clara County with different levels of services to preventing court intervention and re-entry into foster care due to child abuse and neglect.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

**Summary:** The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 562 people were served between four programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following page provides more details by each program.

---

**Gender (FY20)**

- Female: 53%
- Male: 47%

**Primary Language (FY20)**

- English: 72%
- Spanish: 25%
- Vietnamese: 1%

**Race/Ethnicity (FY20)**

- White: 56%
- Asian: 11%
- Black: 5%

**Budget Utilization (FY20)**

- Gardner Family Care: 36%
- Rebekah Children's Services: 3%
- Seneca: 15%
- Uplift Family Services: 37%

**Combined Contract Amount Against Budget Utilization (FY20)**

- Target: $2,923,438
- Utilization: $758,512

---

**NOTE:** The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
## Differential Response Program Dashboard

### Gardner Family Care
- **Contract Scope**: Provision of differential response services prevent and reduce occurrence of child abuse and/or neglect
- **Interventions**:
  - CFT meetings
  - Engagement services
  - Assessments
  - Treatment planning
  - Case management
  - Non-clinical services
  - Specialty mental health services
  - Medication support
  - Crisis intervention services
- **Count**: 142
- **Demographic Profile**:
  - Female: 54%
  - Male: 46%
  - Unknown / Other: 0%
- **Ethnicity**:
  - White: 54%
  - Black: 6%
  - Asian: 4%
  - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 4%
  - Hispanic Latino: 13%
  - Other: 8%
- **Age Group**:
  - Under 5: 16%
  - 5 to 9: 18%
  - 10 to 14: 38%
  - 15 to 19: 11%
  - 20 to 29: 12%
  - 30 to 39: 7%
  - 40 to 49: 5%
  - 50 to 59: 3%
  - 60 to 69: 2%
  - 70 to 79: 1%
  - 80 and over: 0%
- **Budget Utilization**:
  - Goal: $877,049
  - Actual: $584,670

### Rebekah Children’s Services
- **Contract Scope**: Provision of differential response services prevent and reduce occurrence of child abuse and/or neglect
- **Interventions**:
  - CFT meetings
  - Engagement services
  - Assessments
  - Treatment planning
  - Case management
  - Non-clinical services
  - Specialty mental health services
  - Medication support
  - Crisis intervention services
- **Count**: 105
- **Demographic Profile**:
  - Female: 59%
  - Male: 41%
  - Unknown / Other: 0%
- **Ethnicity**:
  - White: 49%
  - Black: 49%
  - Asian: 2%
  - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1%
  - Hispanic Latino: 5%
  - Other: 5%
- **Age Group**:
  - Under 5: 12%
  - 5 to 9: 31%
  - 10 to 14: 43%
  - 15 to 19: 22%
  - 20 to 29: 11%
  - 30 to 39: 7%
  - 40 to 49: 4%
  - 50 to 59: 3%
  - 60 to 69: 12%
  - 70 to 79: 4%
  - 80 and over: 1%
- **Budget Utilization**:
  - Goal: $64,570
  - Actual: $31,899

### Seneca Family of Agencies
- **Contract Scope**: Provision of differential response services prevent and reduce occurrence of child abuse and/or neglect
- **Interventions**:
  - CFT meetings
  - Engagement services
  - Assessments
  - Treatment planning
  - Case management
  - Non-clinical services
  - Specialty mental health services
  - Medication support
  - Crisis intervention services
- **Count**: 72
- **Demographic Profile**:
  - Female: 69%
  - Male: 31%
  - Unknown / Other: 0%
- **Ethnicity**:
  - White: 31%
  - Black: 43%
  - Asian: 8%
  - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 8%
  - Hispanic Latino: 15%
  - Other: 4%
- **Age Group**:
  - Under 5: 22%
  - 5 to 9: 11%
  - 10 to 14: 43%
  - 15 to 19: 22%
  - 20 to 29: 11%
  - 30 to 39: 7%
  - 40 to 49: 4%
  - 50 to 59: 3%
  - 60 to 69: 12%
  - 70 to 79: 4%
  - 80 and over: 1%
- **Budget Utilization**:
  - Goal: $64,570
  - Actual: $31,899

### Uplift Family Services
- **Contract Scope**: Provision of differential response services prevent and reduce occurrence of child abuse and/or neglect
- **Interventions**:
  - CFT meetings
  - Engagement services
  - Assessments
  - Treatment planning
  - Case management
  - Non-clinical services
  - Specialty mental health services
  - Medication support
  - Crisis intervention services
- **Count**: 243
- **Demographic Profile**:
  - Female: 44%
  - Male: 56%
  - Unknown / Other: 0%
- **Ethnicity**:
  - White: 69%
  - Black: 9%
  - Asian: 16%
  - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1%
  - Hispanic Latino: 13%
  - Other: 1%
- **Age Group**:
  - Under 5: 3%
  - 5 to 9: 14%
  - 10 to 14: 6%
  - 15 to 19: 14%
  - 20 to 29: 11%
  - 30 to 39: 7%
  - 40 to 49: 5%
  - 50 to 59: 3%
  - 60 to 69: 4%
  - 70 to 79: 2%
  - 80 and over: 1%
- **Budget Utilization**:
  - Goal: $1,245,000
  - Actual: $740,526

---

**NOTE**: As of 3/24/2020, SSA is awaiting an amended Q2 report from Gardner Family Care as the original submitted did not include any client-level data. As of this same date, SSA is still awaiting a Q2 report submissions from Seneca Family of Agencies.

Office of Contracts Management Differential Response Dashboard (FY20 2nd Quarter)
INTRODUCTION: On June 13th, 2018, the Board of Supervisors allocated one-time funding to the Social Services Agency (SSA) relating to the Community Resource Navigator’s Pilot Program (EAN) for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Through this allocation, three programs, which represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts within the County of Santa Clara, were activated. These programs focus on providing a valuable resource to help residents access community service available to them to better their lives.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 2,292 people were served between three programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following page provides more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
# EAN Community Resource Navigator Program Dashboard

### Contract Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Service Agency of Mt. View, Los Altos, and Los Altos Hills</th>
<th>Establish a network of volunteer navigators to serve community members in accessing EAN programs and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach and one-on-ones</td>
<td>• Systems Navigation leadership training sessions and seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interventions

- 1634

### Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Latino</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $10,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 to $20,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 to $30,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 to $40,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 to $50,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 to $60,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 to $70,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 to $80,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 to $90,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members had increased knowledge of resources</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers learned about EAN Systems Navigator opportunity</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sacred Heart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish a network of volunteer navigators to serve community members in accessing EAN programs and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In-person outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EAN Navigation assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sunnyvale Community Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish a network of volunteer navigators to serve community members in accessing EAN programs and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In-person outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EAN Navigation assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTE: As of 3/13/2020, Sacred Heart has not submitted a December 2019 invoice.
INTRODUCTION: On June 13, 2018, the Board of Supervisors approved funding for the Environmental Education program for Fiscal Year 2018-2019, which resulted in the activation of three programs. These programs recommended for award represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts and provide hands-on, standards-based science programming that may be unavailable to many Santa Clara County students and residents.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 2,051 people were served between three programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following page provides more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
## Environmental Education Program
### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Volunteers</strong></td>
<td>Provide assistance for schools to benefit from environmental education programming that otherwise is unavailable due to cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core nature science education courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends of Deer Hollow Farm</strong></td>
<td>Provide assistance for schools to visit Deer Hollow Farm and receive tours and educational activities from trained docents</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided educational tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends of Palo Alto Junior Museum</strong></td>
<td>Provide assistance for schools to travel to and tour the Museum and Zoo to receive environmental education from trained staff</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographic Profile

- **Transportation**
- **Guided educational tours**

- **Core nature science education courses**
- **Field trips**

- **Friends of Deer Hollow Farm**
  - Provide assistance for schools to visit Deer Hollow Farm and receive tours and educational activities from trained docents
  - Transportation
  - Guided educational tours

- **Friends of Palo Alto Junior Museum**
  - Provide assistance for schools to travel to and tour the Museum and Zoo to receive environmental education from trained staff
  - Classroom visits
  - Field trips
  - Transportation

### Target Utilization

- Students increased knowledge of class subject matter

- Students attend a field trip otherwise not available to them

- Students increased knowledge of class subject matter

### NOTE: As of 3/13/2020, Environmental has not yet submitted a Q2 report.
INTRODUCTION: On October 18th, 2016, the Social Services Agency (SSA), in collaboration with the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD), released the Independent Living Program (ILP) Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2017-2018. Through this RFP, one program was activated. This program empowers youth for successful, self-sufficient, and responsible adulthood. It also provides resources and opportunities in a culturally responsive manner to enhance the quality of life of the community by focusing on permanence and connections for independence, education, employment, youth development, housing, and wellness.

This performance report includes a description of the services the program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for the program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 548 people were served in the Independent Living Program. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following page provides more program-specific details.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
### Independent Living Program

#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Wilson Center</strong></td>
<td>Provision of Independent Living Program services and management of The Hub daily operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tutoring and Education Consults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College/School Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment Workshops and Job Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supportive Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Credit Checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medi-Cal referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health Insurance assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental Health wellness programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demographic Profile

- **Female**: 57%
- **Male**: 43%
- **Unknown / Other**: 0%
- **English**: 79%
- **Spanish**: 17%
- **Vietnamese**: 1%
- **Unknown / Other**: 3%

#### Ethnicity Age Group Budget Utilization Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>$824,002</td>
<td>Graduated with diploma: 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>$350,202</td>
<td>Have at least one connection to a caring/committed adult: 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aware how to access reproductive and sexual health services/resources: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aware how to access mental health services/resources: 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lived in stable housing (6+ months): 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have paid work: 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing</td>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated with diploma: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interventions

- Tutoring and Education Consults
- Classes
- College/School Tours
- Employment Workshops and Job Placement
- Supportive Services
- Mobile Health Services
- Credit Checks
- Medi-Cal referrals
- Health Insurance assistance
- Mental Health wellness programs
- Mentoring
INTRODUCTION: Beginning on July 1, 2019, the Social Services Agency (SSA) assumed oversight of 29 contracts from the Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR). Services to Santa Clara County residents include a variety of immigration-related legal representation, services, and workshops.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 11,206 people were served between 29 programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following eight pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period. SSA is in the final stages of developing a new report template, which will allow vendors to track a true unduplicated client count. This new template will be rolled out by or before the new fiscal year (FY21).
## Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bay Area Legal Aid (Legal Representation, Pro Bono Coordination)</strong> Provide legal services to immigrants and coordinate pro bono services for qualifying residents</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>82% White</td>
<td>76% Under 5</td>
<td>$87,550</td>
<td>Clients benefit from outreach/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12% 5 to 9</td>
<td>Target 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% Black</td>
<td>3% 10 to 14</td>
<td>Actual 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Asian</td>
<td>4% 20 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1% 30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% Hispanic Latino</td>
<td>9% 40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% Other</td>
<td>1% 50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Unknown</td>
<td>1% 60 to 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% 70 to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% 80 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Bay Area Legal Aid (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)** Provide legal services for low-income residents of Santa Clara County | 148   | 60% White | 7% Under 5       | $87,550 | Clients increase awareness of rights    |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 24% Black | 5% 5 to 9       | Target 100%       |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 15% Asian | 1% 10 to 14     | Actual 100%       |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 14% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 2% 20 to 29 |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 18% Hispanic Latino | 11% 30 to 39 |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 16% Other | 8% 40 to 49     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 3% Unknown | 3% 50 to 59     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 1% 60 to 69     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 1% 70 to 79     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 1% 80 and over   |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 5% Unknown       |                  |                                        |

| **Catholic Charities (KYR, Legal Representation)** Provide KYR workshops for residents, and provide legal representation for immigrant populations of Santa Clara County | 855   | 48% White | 5% Under 5       | $73,982 | Clients resolve 1+ legal issue          |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 24% Black | 5% 5 to 9       | Target 100%       |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 15% Asian | 2% 10 to 14     | Actual 100%       |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 13% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 1% 20 to 29 |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 18% Hispanic Latino | 1% 30 to 39 |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 16% Other | 8% 40 to 49     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       | 3% Unknown | 3% 50 to 59     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 1% 60 to 69     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 1% 70 to 79     |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 1% 80 and over   |                  |                                        |
|                                                                                                                               |       |            | 5% Unknown       |                  |                                        |

**Goal** and **Actual** columns show the expected and actual outcomes respectively.
### Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR) Program Dashboard

#### Contract Scope
- **Catholic Charities (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)**
  - Provide immigration legal services to low income residents of South County
  - One-on-one consultations
  - Application assistance and submissions
  - Application filing for supporting documents and background checks
  - Outreach workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>White 92%</td>
<td>Under 5 12% under 14 17%</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
<td>Black 8%</td>
<td>5 to 9 8% 15 to 19 8%</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 4%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td>10 to 19 15% 20 to 29 15%</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 1% 30 to 39 15% 40 to 49 15% 50 to 59 15%</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 15% 70 to 79 15%</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>80 and over 15%</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CET (KYR, Legal Representation, Pro Bono Coordination)**
  - Provide legal services to immigrants and Know Your Rights Community Workshops
  - Screening and consultation
  - Affirmative immigration related legal services
  - Assistance filing applications
  - Informational sessions
  - Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 59%</td>
<td>White 51%</td>
<td>Under 5 1% 5 to 9 4% 10 to 14 4%</td>
<td>$154,500</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 40%</td>
<td>Black 35%</td>
<td>5 to 9 17% 10 to 14 16%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 5%</td>
<td>Asian 9%</td>
<td>15 to 19 13% 20 to 29 13%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 1% 30 to 39 13% 40 to 49 13%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 13% 60 to 69 13%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 13%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto (Legal Services for Minors)**
  - Provide legal representation services for unaccompanied minors and/or family with children
  - Immigration representation
  - Immigration appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 59%</td>
<td>White 97%</td>
<td>Under 5 3% 5 to 9 3% 10 to 14 3%</td>
<td>$176,300</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 41%</td>
<td>Black 3%</td>
<td>5 to 9 29% 10 to 14 29%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 4%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td>15 to 19 1% 20 to 29 1%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 0% 30 to 39 0% 40 to 49 0%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td>50 to 59 0% 60 to 69 0%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>70 to 79 0%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto (Legal Services for Minors)**
  - Provide legal representation services for unaccompanied minors and/or family with children
  - Immigration representation
  - Immigration appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 59%</td>
<td>White 100%</td>
<td>Under 5 2% 5 to 9 2% 10 to 14 2%</td>
<td>$153,941</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 41%</td>
<td>Black 2%</td>
<td>5 to 9 29% 10 to 14 29%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 4%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td>15 to 19 1% 20 to 29 1%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 0% 30 to 39 0% 40 to 49 0%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td>50 to 59 0% 60 to 69 0%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>70 to 79 0%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTE: Catholic Charities and Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto did not include any client outcome data in their report. SSA will follow up and request that this information be provided in an amended report.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Agenda (Legal Representation)</strong></td>
<td>• Consultations • Master Calendar Hearings • Post-Conviction Relief</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Female 51%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$50,672</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other 3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 99%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other 1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Legal Resource Center (Legal Representation)</strong></td>
<td>• Webinars • Manuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Female #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>$14,946</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other #DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice &amp; Diversity Center of the Bar Association of SF (Legal Services for Minors)</strong></td>
<td>• Meetings • Referrals • Recruitment/Training/Mentoring Sessions • Screenings</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Female 39%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other 1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 63%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other 9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice &amp; Diversity Center of the Bar Association of SF (Pro Bono Coordination)</strong></td>
<td>• Legal assistance • Training • Meeting attendance</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Female 29%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other 1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 63%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/Other 9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Human Agenda and Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of SF achieved 0% towards the goal for some of their outcomes. SSA will follow up to understand the reason behind this poor performance. Two contracts also did not identify any outcomes at all and were more focused on outputs. SSA will ensure that, for the new contract cycle, outcomes will be clearly defined in order to measure program impact.
Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR)

Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Foundation of Silicon Valley (Legal Representation)</strong></td>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Female 52%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Clients receive work permit</td>
<td>Goal 75% Actual 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paperwork/Application/Client assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>English 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and Technical Assistance to Pro Bono attorneys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Law Foundation of Silicon Valley (Legal Services for Minors - 43000132907)</strong></td>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Female 59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Clients achieve placement stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paperwork/Application/Client assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>English 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and Technical Assistance to Pro Bono attorneys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Law Foundation of Silicon Valley (Legal Services for Minors - 4300011871)</strong></td>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Female 45%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Clients submit affirmative immigration relief application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 55%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paperwork/Application/Client assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>English 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and Technical Assistance to Pro Bono attorneys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Law Foundation of Silicon Valley (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)</strong></td>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Female 40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Clients maintain housing &amp; avoid displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paperwork/Application/Client assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>English 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and Technical Assistance to Pro Bono attorneys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Law Foundation of Silicon Valley did not include any client outcome data in their report for their “Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs” program. SSA will follow up and request that this information be provided in an amended report.
### Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR)

**Program Dashboard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pars Equality Center (KVR, Legal Representation)</em></td>
<td>Provide legal services to immigrants and Know Your Rights Community Workshops</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>Female 17%</td>
<td>White 31%</td>
<td>Under 5 10%</td>
<td>$12,600,000</td>
<td>Clients file affirmative immigration petitions 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 31%</td>
<td>Black 21%</td>
<td>5 to 9 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 23%</td>
<td>Asian 17%</td>
<td>10 to 14 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 4%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>15 to 19 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 15%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 4%</td>
<td>30 to 39 11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 12%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>People Acting in Community Together (Rapid Response Network)</em></td>
<td>Respond to calls on Rapid Response Network hotline system</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>Female 4%</td>
<td>White 97%</td>
<td>Under 5 100%</td>
<td>$138,000,000</td>
<td>Clients understand immigrant rights 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-lead the development, implementation, and coordination of the Rapid Response Network (RRN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 1%</td>
<td>Black 1%</td>
<td>5 to 9 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 22%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td>10 to 14 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 1%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>15 to 19 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 3%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 4%</td>
<td>30 to 39 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 18%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Bono Project (Legal Services)</em></td>
<td>Provide legal services to victims and/or survivors of domestic violence</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Female 28%</td>
<td>White 61%</td>
<td>Under 5 100%</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>Accompaniment Trainers better prepared to support community 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 22%</td>
<td>Black 27%</td>
<td>5 to 9 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 10%</td>
<td>Asian 2%</td>
<td>10 to 14 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 62%</td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>15 to 19 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 5%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 4%</td>
<td>30 to 39 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Other 2%</td>
<td>40 to 49 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 10%</td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>50 to 59 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sacred Heart Community Service (Rapid Response Network)</em></td>
<td>Provide Know Your Rights (KVR) workshops and colead the coordination of the Rapid Response Network (RRN)</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Female 0%</td>
<td>White 100%</td>
<td>Under 5 100%</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>Clients receive emergency legal services within 24 hours 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 0%</td>
<td>Black 0%</td>
<td>5 to 9 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 100%</td>
<td>Asian 0%</td>
<td>10 to 14 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>15 to 19 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 0%</td>
<td>30 to 39 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td>40 to 49 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 100%</td>
<td>Unknown 0%</td>
<td>50 to 59 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** People Acting in Community Together and Pro Bono Project did not include any client outcome data in their report. SSA will follow up and request that this information be provided in an amended report.
### Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR) Program Dashboard

#### Contract Scope

**Santa Clara University (Legal Services for Unaccompanied Minors)**
- Direct representation
- Serve as point of contact for T or U visa cases involving human trafficking of unaccompanied minors or families with children
- Provide immigration legal services to unaccompanied minors and families with children who reside in Santa Clara County

**SCC Asian Law Alliance (KYR, Legal Representation)**
- Provide immigration legal services and Know Your Rights Community Workshops
- Information and referral services
- Legal consultation/representation
- Workshops

**SCC Asian Law Alliance (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)**
- Provide Santa Clara County residents with access to the legal system through Community Education and Outreach
- Information and referral services
- Legal consultation/representation
- Community education workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara University</td>
<td>Direct representation; Serve as point of contact for T or U visa cases involving human trafficking of unaccompanied minors or families with children</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance (KYR, Legal Representation)</td>
<td>Legal consultation sessions; Legal representation; Workshops</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)</td>
<td>Information and referral services; Legal consultation/representation; Community education workshops</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographic Profile

#### Santa Clara University

- **Female**: 54%
- **Male**: 46%
- **Unknown/Other**: 0%
- **English**: 0%
- **Spanish**: 97%
- **Vietnamese**: 0%
- **Unknown/Other**: 3%

#### SCC Asian Law Alliance (KYR, Legal Representation)

- **Female**: 61%
- **Male**: 39%
- **Unknown/Other**: 0%
- **English**: 69%
- **Spanish**: 34%
- **Vietnamese**: 0%
- **Unknown/Other**: 1%

#### SCC Asian Law Alliance (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)

- **Female**: 60%
- **Male**: 40%
- **Unknown/Other**: 0%
- **English**: 61%
- **Spanish**: 7%
- **Vietnamese**: 14%
- **Unknown/Other**: 16%

### Budget Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Utilization</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$35,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes

- Clients receive stability, economic independence, and protection
- Information & referral clients improve legal understanding
- Legal consultation & representation clients improve legal understanding
- Removal clients improve legal understanding
- Legal consultation clients improve legal understanding
- Community education clients improve legal understanding
- DACA clients improve legal understanding
- Legal representation clients improve legal understanding
- Information & referral clients improve legal understanding

---

**SCC Asian Law Alliance**
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**Attachment: FY2019-20 Q2 Contract Dashboards (Combined) (101040 : SSA Contracting and Procurement**
### Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR)

#### Program Dashboard

**Contract Scope**
- **Senior Adults Legal Assistance** (Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)
  - Provide legal services to older adults of Santa Clara County
- **Services, Immigrant Rights & Education Network (SIREN)** (Legal Services)
  - Provide legal services related to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) through the SCC DACA Collaborative
- **Services, Immigrant Rights & Education Network (SIREN)** (KYR, Legal Representation)
  - Provide Know Your Rights outreach and education services directed towards under-served immigrant populations
- **Step Forward Foundation** (Legal Representation)
  - Provide immigration representation relating to immigration benefits and defensive legal services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Adults Legal Assistance</td>
<td>• Free legal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Legal Services, Unmet Civ Legal Needs)</td>
<td>Provide legal services to older adults of Santa Clara County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Immigrant Rights &amp; Education Network (SIREN) (DACA Legal Services)</td>
<td>• Application assistance • Consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DACA Legal Services)</td>
<td>Provide legal services related to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) through the SCC DACA Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Immigrant Rights &amp; Education Network (SIREN) (KYR, Legal Representation)</td>
<td>• Provide KYR information • Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KYR, Legal Representation)</td>
<td>Provide Know Your Rights outreach and education services directed towards under-served immigrant populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Forward Foundation (Legal Representation)</td>
<td>• One-on-one consultations • Assistance filing applications with USCIS • Representation at hearings • Brief services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>$18,282</td>
<td>$15,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$18,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Client Outcomes

- **Clients increased access to legal information, knowledge, tools, or services**
- **Eligible clients have DACA application submitted**
- **Clients increase knowledge about rights with ICE and public benefit eligibility**
- **Clients obtain information about eligibility to apply for legal status**
- **Attorney represented clients apply for path to citizenship**
- **Clients apply for path to citizenship**
- **Clients receive or placed on waitlist for full representation**

#### Demographic Profile

- **Gender Distribution**
  - Female: 20%, Male: 80%

- **Ethnicity Distribution**
  - White: 32%, Black: 21%, Asian: 5%, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 4%, Hispanic Latino: 2%

- **Age Group Distribution**
  - Under 5: 5%, 5 to 9: 15%, 10 to 14: 20%, 15 to 19: 25%, 20 to 29: 20%, 30 to 39: 10%, 40 to 49: 5%, 50 to 59: 5%, 60 to 69: 0%, 70 to 79: 0%, 80 and over: 0%

- **Budget Utilization**
  - Target: $500,000, Actual: $451,243

- **Goal vs. Actual**
  - Target: $500,000, Actual: $451,243
### Office of Immigrant Relations (OIR)
#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step Forward Foundation (Legal Services for Minors)</td>
<td>Representation in removal proceedings, Representation to obtain legal immigration status</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Female 72%</td>
<td>White 99%</td>
<td>Under 5 27%, 5 to 9 27%, 10 to 14 15%, 15 to 19 5%, 20 to 29 5%, 30 to 39 5%, 40 to 49 5%, 50 to 59 5%, 60 to 69 5%, 70 to 79 5%</td>
<td>$55,270</td>
<td>Goal: 100% Actual: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 28%</td>
<td>Black 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 2%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 98%</td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahirih Justice Center (Legal Representation)</td>
<td>Telephone interview, information, and referral sessions, Legal advice and counsel, Legal representation, Case management</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Female 73%</td>
<td>White 80%</td>
<td>Under 5 6%, 5 to 9 6%, 10 to 14 14%, 15 to 19 23%, 20 to 29 23%, 30 to 39 37%, 40 to 49 12%, 50 to 59 4%, 60 to 69 4%, 70 to 79 4%, 80 and over 4%</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 24%</td>
<td>Black 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 4%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 96%</td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 1%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation (KYR, Legal Representation)</td>
<td>Individual and group sessions, Distribution of informational materials</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>Female 3%</td>
<td>White 100%</td>
<td>Under 5 1%, 5 to 9 1%, 10 to 14 1%, 15 to 19 1%, 20 to 29 1%, 30 to 39 1%, 40 to 49 1%, 50 to 59 1%, 60 to 69 1%, 70 to 79 1%, 80 and over 1%</td>
<td>$38,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 3%</td>
<td>Black 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 94%</td>
<td>Asian 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0%</td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Tahirih Justice Center and Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation did not include any client outcome data in their report. SSA will follow up and request that this information be provided in an amended report.
INTRODUCTION: On March 19, 2018, the Social Services Agency (SSA) released the Programs for Immigration Integration Services (PII) Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Through this RFP, four programs were activated. These programs recommended for award represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts and focus on providing PII services to increase outreach, citizenship applications, and knowledge and understanding of legal options, resources, rights, and responsibilities for all immigrant and refugee residents of Santa Clara County.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 1,380 people were served between four programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following page provides more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
### Programs for Immigration Integration (PII)
#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catholic Charities</strong></td>
<td>• Citizenship application assistance</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Female: 58%</td>
<td>English: 60%</td>
<td>Under 5: 49%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Citizenship Days were effectively planned &amp; implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>• Community education and outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 42%</td>
<td>Spanish: 17%</td>
<td>5 to 9: 51%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Clients gained immigration benefit leading to citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>• Citizenship service navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 0%</td>
<td>Vietnamese: 6%</td>
<td>10 to 14: 11%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Clients improved MyWellBeing score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>• Immigration Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14: 12%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Clients learned about citizenship process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>• Citizenship Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29: 11%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Clients submit citizenship application to USCIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Employment Training</strong></td>
<td>• Red flag screenings and one-on-one consultations to assess eligibility</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Female: 67%</td>
<td>English: 90%</td>
<td>Under 5: 3%</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>Clients are prepared to take USCIS interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Employment Training</td>
<td>• Citizenship Application Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 33%</td>
<td>Spanish: 16%</td>
<td>5 to 9: 7%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Submitted applications move towards obtaining citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Employment Training</td>
<td>• Citizenship Related Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 0%</td>
<td>Vietnamese: 1%</td>
<td>10 to 14: 3%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Clients understand their eligibility for citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Employment Training</td>
<td>• Citizenship Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29: 21%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Clients submit applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pars Equality Center</strong></td>
<td>• Naturalization assistance</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>Female: 43%</td>
<td>English: 63%</td>
<td>Under 5: 1%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Clients obtain citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pars Equality Center</td>
<td>• Education and outreach activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 36%</td>
<td>Spanish: 14%</td>
<td>5 to 9: 17%</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Clients begin citizenship process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pars Equality Center</td>
<td>• Legal services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 23%</td>
<td>Vietnamese: 4%</td>
<td>10 to 14: 17%</td>
<td>$118,450</td>
<td>Clients submit docs to USCIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pars Equality Center</td>
<td>• Citizenship Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29: 11%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Clients understand citizenship process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCC Asian Law Alliance</strong></td>
<td>• Community education presentations</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Female: 61%</td>
<td>English: 72%</td>
<td>Under 5: 3%</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>Clients know how to access imm. legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance</td>
<td>• Immigrant info website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 39%</td>
<td>Spanish: 21%</td>
<td>5 to 9: 17%</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Mock interview clients are prepared for USCIS interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance</td>
<td>• Citizenship application assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 0%</td>
<td>Vietnamese: 14%</td>
<td>10 to 14: 17%</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Clients need information on how to access imm. legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance</td>
<td>• Citizenship Day participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29: 11%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>App. &amp; Adv. clients know how to access imm. legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance</td>
<td>• Mock interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49: 13%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Comm. Ed. clients know how to access imm. legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Asian Law Alliance</td>
<td>• Advice and representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 to 69: 11%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Goal Actual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION: On December 7, 2016, the Social Services Agency (SSA) released the School-Linked Services (SLS) Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2017-2018. Through this RFP, 12 programs were activated. These programs recommended for award represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts as well as the high-risk areas within the County of Santa Clara with risk indicators including poverty, substance abuse, juvenile arrests, mental health clients, teen mothers, low birth weight count, school dropouts, and low test scores.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 4,138 people were served between 12 programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following three pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
## School-Linked Services

### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicty</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Wilson Center (Central)</strong></td>
<td>To support and connect families to appropriate community and public resources so children can remain in school, giving them the best chance of academic success.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homeless prevention school based family advocacy services to youth, family, and school staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informational workshops for parents and training workshops for school staff on identifying the needs of families experiencing homelessness or on the verge of homelessness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 66%</td>
<td>Male 34%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 17%</td>
<td>White 74%</td>
<td>Under 5 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 67%</td>
<td>Spanish 13%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 9 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Wilson Center (East)</strong></td>
<td>To support and connect families to appropriate community and public resources so children can remain in school, giving them the best chance of academic success.</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homeless prevention school based family advocacy services to youth, family, and school staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informational workshops for parents and training workshops for school staff on identifying the needs of families experiencing homelessness or on the verge of homelessness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 66%</td>
<td>Male 34%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 27%</td>
<td>White 93%</td>
<td>Under 5 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 65%</td>
<td>Spanish 15%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 9 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catholic Charities</strong></td>
<td>To increase parents' ability to promote and support their child's academic achievement, pro-social behavior, and school attendance rates, as well as help families to interact productively with their school communities.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 12-month academic and social development intervention program for students and families involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Home visits with information and resource services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student after school pro-social activities and instructional support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Series of interconnected parent workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 82%</td>
<td>Male 18%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 29%</td>
<td>White 71%</td>
<td>Under 5 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 82%</td>
<td>Spanish 12%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hope Services</strong></td>
<td>To promote family engagement and provide assistance accessing services for families and children. To increase parent/caretaker involvement, confidence, and competence in caring for their child. To decrease stress that parents/care takers feel in dealing with their child's needs. To improve nutrition, developmental growth, and school performance of their child.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developmental screenings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Therapy and Developmental goal monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social work therapy sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nutritionalist sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent education trainings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 69%</td>
<td>Male 32%</td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 3%</td>
<td>White 40%</td>
<td>Under 5 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 79%</td>
<td>Spanish 11%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** As of 4/3/2020, Catholic Charities has not submitted a Q2 report and their Q1 report needs to be amended due to inaccurate outcome data. As of this same date, Hope Services has not yet submitted their Q2 report nor have they begun assessing clients for outcomes.

---
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### School-Linked Services

#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rebekah Children's Services** | • Pre-social activities.  
• Academic support.  
• Parenting workshops.  
• Child care workshops.                                                                 | 33    | 39% 3% | 5% 55% | 100% | $519,844 | Increased knowledge on accessing community resources  
Improved attendance, academic performance, and/or professional development  
Students learned a new skill  
Increased positive behaviors  
Increase school connectedness |
| **Seneca**                      | To address student's expressed needs and improve their academic, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes. To improve and increase school-family communication. | 124   | 22% 3% | 3% 57% | 75% | $13,170 | Parents increased knowledge to support student needs  
Teachers increased knowledge to support student needs  
Positive growth on 80% of targeted measures (based on SCA) |
| **Somos Mayfair**               | • Leadership trainings.  
• Community meetings.  
• Parent workshops.  
• Summer programming.  
• Reading circles.                                                                 | 1652  | 63% 11% | 1% 78% | 14% 17% | $101,170 | Increase in child's academic performance  
Increased school-family engagement  
Increase child's access to early learning opportunities |
| **YMCA**                        | • Parenting sessions in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese.                       | 60    | 10% 2% | 9% 57% | 28% | $79,567 | Increase in individual, supporting other students  
Increased effort to connect with teachers  
Positive relationship/school facilitation  
Increased support system  
Improved positive parenting skills |

NOTE: As of 4/3/2020, Seneca has not yet begun assessing clients for outcomes. Similarly, Somos Mayfair has not begun assessing clients for two of their three outcomes.
**School-Linked Services**

**Program Dashboard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caminar</td>
<td>To address healing and reduce teen trauma at school.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>Under 5 26%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Increased knowledge of the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resiliency-building, trauma education workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male 31%</td>
<td>White 77%</td>
<td>5 to 9 18%</td>
<td>$38,542</td>
<td>Parents familiar with San Jose Public Library system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education and outreach activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 4%</td>
<td>English 6%</td>
<td>10 to 14 11%</td>
<td>$69,522</td>
<td>Parents increased 2+ home literacy or numeracy practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training sessions on trauma.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 13%</td>
<td>Black 2%</td>
<td>10 to 19 12%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ mathematics areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wellness coaching sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Asian 7%</td>
<td>20 to 29 10%</td>
<td>$129,432</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ literacy areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wellness kits and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 2%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 2%</td>
<td>30 to 39 4%</td>
<td>$79,567</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ school attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family consultations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 39%</td>
<td>40 to 49 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 10%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Unknown 3%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ social connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 1%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fresh Lifelines for Youth**

To increase students knowledge as it relates to the law and making healthier choices. To improve school engagement. To reduce the number of students entering the juvenile justice system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Female 41%</td>
<td>Black 2%</td>
<td>Under 5 74%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Increased oral health knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 39%</td>
<td>White 3%</td>
<td>5 to 9 2%</td>
<td>$38,542</td>
<td>Have tools to increase oral health self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 6%</td>
<td>Asian 3%</td>
<td>10 to 14 2%</td>
<td>$69,522</td>
<td>Can locate low-income dental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 1%</td>
<td>20 to 29 3%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 3%</td>
<td>30 to 39 3%</td>
<td>$129,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 3%</td>
<td>$79,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Health Trust**

In home supportive health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>Female 45%</td>
<td>Black 2%</td>
<td>Under 5 71%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Increased oral health knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 38%</td>
<td>White 12%</td>
<td>5 to 9 2%</td>
<td>$38,542</td>
<td>Have tools to increase oral health self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 6%</td>
<td>Asian 1%</td>
<td>10 to 14 2%</td>
<td>$69,522</td>
<td>Can locate low-income dental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 1%</td>
<td>20 to 29 3%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 3%</td>
<td>30 to 39 3%</td>
<td>$129,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 3%</td>
<td>$79,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Jose Grain Family Services**

Mentoring sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Female 65%</td>
<td>Black 1%</td>
<td>Under 5 80%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Parents familiar with San Jose Public Library system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 35%</td>
<td>White 4%</td>
<td>5 to 9 19%</td>
<td>$38,542</td>
<td>Parents increased 2+ home literacy or numeracy practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Asian 4%</td>
<td>10 to 14 1%</td>
<td>$69,522</td>
<td>Students improved in 1+ mathematics areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 1%</td>
<td>20 to 29 3%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino 1%</td>
<td>30 to 39 3%</td>
<td>$129,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>40 to 49 3%</td>
<td>$79,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>50 to 59 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>60 to 69 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 1%</td>
<td>70 to 79 1%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** As of 4/3/2020, The Health Trust has not yet submitted their Q2 report. Both The Health Trust and San Jose Grain Family Services have not yet begun assessing clients for outcomes.

Office of Contracts Management SLS Dashboard (FY20 2nd Quarter)
INTRODUCTION: On November 30th, 2016, the Social Services Agency (SSA) released the Safety Net Services (SNS) Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2017-2018. Through this RFP, four programs, which represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts within the County of Santa Clara, were activated. These programs focus on services providing the essentials of life such as emergency shelter, food, supportive services, and supplies to children and their families who are in severe and immediate need, particularly those who are residing in under-resourced neighborhoods.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 30,314 people were served between five programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following two pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
### Safety Net Services

#### Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bay Area Legal Aid</th>
<th>Provide legal advice and representation and outreach and education to low-income clients in Santa Clara County.</th>
<th>• Legal Advice/Consulting Sessions</th>
<th>• Trainings</th>
<th>• Outreach</th>
<th>• Community Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count: 375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 26%</td>
<td>Male 4%</td>
<td>Unknown/Other 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 21%</td>
<td>Spanish 8%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Unknown/Other 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bill Wilson Center | To provide all-inclusive emergency shelter to Santa Clara County youth (ages 11-17) who are dropped off by law enforcement, have run away from home, or have been brought in by their parents due to a conflict at home. | • Shelter (bed-nights); | • Food; | • Case Management; | • Counseling/Therapy; | • Educational Services; | • Medical and Mental Health Care; | • Domestic Violence Prevention Education; | • Independent Living Skills Training; | • Brokering of Family Reunification; | • Internal/External Linkages; | • Leadership Training; | • Recreation. |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                    |                                                                                                 | Count: 13                     |           |               |                  |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|                    |                                                                                                 | Female 23%                    | Male 69% | Unknown/Other 9% |                 |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|                    |                                                                                                 | English 85%                   | Spanish 0% | Vietnamese 0% | Unknown/Other 15% |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Oak Adult Day Services</th>
<th>To provide adult day care and respite services to seniors and their family caregivers who are residents of Santa Clara County to prevent unnecessary institutionalizations, increase the general health and mobility of the senior, and provide respite for the caregiver.</th>
<th>• Adult Day Services;</th>
<th>• Recreational Activities/Mobility-Related Fitness Classes;</th>
<th>• Case Management;</th>
<th>• Workshops for Caregivers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count: 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 47%</td>
<td>Male 41%</td>
<td>Unknown/Other 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 99%</td>
<td>Spanish 1%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Unknown/Other 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence</th>
<th>To provide emergency shelter and case management services to victims of domestic violence and their children who are residents of Santa Clara County.</th>
<th>• Emergency Shelter;</th>
<th>• Case Management Services;</th>
<th>• Transition Plan Development Assistance;</th>
<th>• Child-Centered Recreational Activities;</th>
<th>• Bonding Activities for Families;</th>
<th>• Assistance with Housing Searches;</th>
<th>• Walk-In Crisis Counseling;</th>
<th>• Legal Advocacy (i.e. restraining orders);</th>
<th>• Support Groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count: 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female 33%</td>
<td>Male 9%</td>
<td>Unknown/Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 59%</td>
<td>Spanish 28%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 0%</td>
<td>Unknown/Other 14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographic Profile

#### Ethnicity

- White: 69%
- Black: 5%
- Asian: 3%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1%
- Hispanic/Latino: 1%
- Other: 1%
- Unknown/Missing: 2%

#### Age Group

- Under 5: 5%
- 5 to 9: 19%
- 10 to 14: 21%
- 15 to 19: 31%
- 20 to 29: 17%
- 30 to 39: 7%
- 40 to 49: 11%
- 50 to 59: 6%
- 60 to 69: 2%
- 70 to 79: 1%
- 80 and over: 1%
- Unknown/Missing: 5%

### Budget Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clients gained increased awareness of their legal rights</th>
<th>Contractor achieved positive results</th>
<th>Family members will resolve 1+ barrier(s) to safety and self-sufficiency</th>
<th>Caregivers report increase in dependent adult's mobility status</th>
<th>Caregivers are connected to additional community resources</th>
<th>Caregivers provided emotional support and resources/training</th>
<th>Caregivers report increase in general health status</th>
<th>Families exiting shelter to safe/stable housing don't return to shelter within 90 days</th>
<th>Families exiting shelter to safe/stable housing</th>
<th>DV victims staying at shelter receive one or more needs on client needs a session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes

- Youth remain in stable housing 30 days after discharge: 88%
- Youth are reunified with their family upon program completion: 92%
- Caregivers report increase in dependent adult's mobility status: 50%
- Caregivers are connected to additional community resources: 50%
- Caregivers provided emotional support and resources/training: 85%
- Caregivers report increase in general health status: 0%
- Families exiting shelter to safe/stable housing don't return to shelter within 90 days: 75%
- Families exiting the shelter to safe/stable housing: 50%
- DV victims staying at shelter receive one or more needs on client needs a session: 10%
### Sacred Heart Community Service
- Food and Nutrition Services;
- Case Management.

#### Contract Scope
To provide cohesive, coordinated services across all of Santa Clara County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$421,172</td>
<td>Families report increased self-sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$212,629</td>
<td>Clients remain stably housed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Clients report increased food stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / Other</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target Utilization**
- 80%

**Actual Utilization**
- 80%

**Clients report increased food stability**
- 80%

**Clients remain stably housed**
- 80%

**Families report increased self-sufficiency**
- 80%

**Goal**
- 80%

**Actual**
- 80%

---

**NOTE:** As of 03/27/2020, SSA is in the process of following up with Sacred Heart for an amended Q2 report as there were errors in the Outcome data that were reported.
INTRODUCTION: On June 16, 2015, the Board of Supervisors approved an Inventory Item to commence the Domestic Violence Stopgap Program. Through this Inventory Item, five programs were activated. The programs recommended for award support residents of Santa Clara County who are victims of human trafficking, domestic violence, and sexual assault by providing case management, emergency shelter, and housing assistance.

This performance report includes a description of the services the programs will provide, the interventions they will apply, and data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from CY2019 reports received thus far show that 345 people were served among five programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following two pages provide more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
Stopgap Program
Program Dashboard

**Asian Americans for Community Involvement**
The gap in available specialized case management and housing for DV victim/survivors.

- Emergency hotel stays for individuals and families in domestic violence and human trafficking situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Female 76%</td>
<td>White 53%</td>
<td>Under 5 35%</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
<td>Clients that receive emergency hotel stay receive help with safety planning. 75% Goal 88% Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 24%</td>
<td>Black 12%</td>
<td>5 to 9 12%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic 6%</td>
<td>10 to 14 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 6%</td>
<td>20 to 29 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>30 to 39 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>40 to 49 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>50 to 59 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>60 to 69 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>70 to 79 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>80 and over 35%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Solutions**
The gap in available specialized case management and housing for DV victim/survivors.

- Comprehensive assistance to survivors and their children for the purposes of establishing transitional or permanent housing.
- Provide case management and support to non-sheltered clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female 100%</td>
<td>White 45%</td>
<td>Under 5 67%</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
<td>Clients complete safety plan 80% Goal 100% Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 0%</td>
<td>Black 17%</td>
<td>5 to 9 16%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic 17%</td>
<td>10 to 14 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 6%</td>
<td>20 to 29 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>30 to 39 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>40 to 49 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>50 to 59 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>60 to 69 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>70 to 79 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 6%</td>
<td>80 and over 67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maitri**
The gap in available specialized case management and housing for DV victim/survivors.

- Provide case management and legal advocacy sessions to 20 survivors of DV to prevent homelessness and aiding self-sufficiency.
- Provide direct assistance to 12 unduplicated survivors of DV to prevent homelessness by supporting self-sufficiency and basic needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Female 100%</td>
<td>White 96%</td>
<td>Under 5 4%</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
<td>Clients receiving direct assistance are in a safe housing situation 70% Goal 100% Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 0%</td>
<td>Black 2%</td>
<td>5 to 9 2%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic 2%</td>
<td>10 to 14 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Other 2%</td>
<td>20 to 29 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 2%</td>
<td>30 to 39 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 2%</td>
<td>40 to 49 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 2%</td>
<td>50 to 59 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 2%</td>
<td>60 to 69 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 2%</td>
<td>70 to 79 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 0%</td>
<td>Unknown 2%</td>
<td>80 and over 4%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Door Solutions**
The gap in available specialized case management and housing for DV victim/survivors.

- Provide case management sessions to 50 survivors of DV to prevent homelessness and aiding self-sufficiency.
- Provide direct assistance to clients for empowerment, rental assistance, and housing establishment.
- Provide emergency hotel assistance to clients when shelter is full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Female 73%</td>
<td>White 51%</td>
<td>Under 5 8%</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
<td>Clients receiving emergency hotel assistance transfer to safe housing 40% Goal 54% Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 24%</td>
<td>Black 15%</td>
<td>5 to 9 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Hispanic 8%</td>
<td>10 to 14 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Other 8%</td>
<td>20 to 29 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Unknown 8%</td>
<td>30 to 39 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Unknown 8%</td>
<td>40 to 49 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Unknown 8%</td>
<td>50 to 59 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Unknown 8%</td>
<td>60 to 69 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Unknown 8%</td>
<td>70 to 79 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other 3%</td>
<td>Unknown 8%</td>
<td>80 and over 8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** As of 3/23/2020, AACI has not submitted a November or December 2019 invoice. As of this same date, Community Solutions has not submitted their Q4 report.
YWCA of Silicon Valley
To provide services to bridge the gap in available specialized case management and housing for DV victim/survivors.

- Provide case management services to survivors of domestic violence.
- Provide legal advocacy services, including court prep and restraining order prep.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Scope</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YWCA of Silicon Valley</td>
<td>Provide case management services to survivors of domestic violence.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Female: 87%</td>
<td>Ethnicity: 7%</td>
<td>Age Group: 24%</td>
<td>Goal: $70,070</td>
<td>Client reported an increase in safety: 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide legal advocacy services, including court prep and restraining order prep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 5%</td>
<td>Unknown: 13%</td>
<td>5 to 9: 3%</td>
<td>Actual: $70,069</td>
<td>Client moved into safe living environment post shelter day: 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown / Other: 8%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino: 8%</td>
<td>10 to 14: 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English: 84%</td>
<td>Other: 13%</td>
<td>20 to 29: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish: 12%</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 8%</td>
<td>30 to 39: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese: 0%</td>
<td>Hispanic Latino: 4%</td>
<td>40 to 49: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 8%</td>
<td>Other: 3%</td>
<td>50 to 59: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 3%</td>
<td>Unknown: 3%</td>
<td>60 to 69: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown: 3%</td>
<td>Under 5: 3%</td>
<td>70 to 79: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown: 1%</td>
<td>80 and over: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attachment: FY2019-20 Q2 Contract Dashboards (Combined) (101040 : SSA Contracting and Procurement)
INTRODUCTION: On June 19, 2018, the Social Services Agency (SSA) released the Services for Survivors of Domestic Violence and Services for Survivors of Human Trafficking and Workplace Crimes Request for Proposal (RFP) for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Through this RFP, three programs, which represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts, were activated. These programs focus on providing services to survivors of domestic violence, human trafficking, and workplace crimes which are survivor-defined, trauma-informed, and culturally, linguistically, age, gender, and sexual orientation appropriate.

This performance report includes a description of the service each program will provide, the interventions they will apply, data on demographic population served, budget utilization, and outcomes (as applicable) for each program. The report is intended to be used to assess programs for quality and effective delivery of service, and to apply Continuous Quality Improvement where areas of opportunity are realized.

Summary: The data from FY2019-2020 reports received thus far show that 753 people were served between four programs across Santa Clara County. The first page of this report provides an overview of the combined population served; the following page provides more details by each program.

NOTE: The n value in the demographic charts above reflect the cumulative duplicated count of clients served for every quarterly snapshot in the current reporting period.
## Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Budget Utilization</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Clients made...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Clients met...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown / Other</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Clients move into...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Clients can identify...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>IPV clients complete VNST...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vietnamese</strong></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>IPV clients are assessed to have...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown / Other</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Shelter clients achieve...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interventions

- Transitional housing and supportive services
- Bed nights
- Case management sessions
- Economic empowerment and financial literacy sessions
- Support group sessions
- Walk-in peer crisis counseling
- Disability Insurance and Elder Abuse
- Legal advocacy
- Emergency shelter
- Case management
- Therapy clients improved...
- Clients made progress with...
- Clients met Financial Literacy goals
- Clients met Economic Empowerment goals
- Clients move into safe/permanent...
- Clients can identify strategy to increase safety of self and child
- IPV clients are assessed to have...
Notice to the Public

Please be advised that Supervisors Dave Cortese and Cindy Chavez preside over both the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee (CSFC) and the Finance and Government Operations Committee (FGOC), and constitute a quorum of both Committees.

This meeting was therefore noticed as both a CSFC and FGOC meeting.

Opening

1. Call to Order.

Chairperson Chavez called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. A quorum was present via teleconference, pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order N-22-20 issued on March 17, 2020 by the Governor of the State of California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cortese</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Public Comment.

One individual addressed the Committee.

3. Approve Consent Calendar and changes to the Committee's Agenda.

One individual addressed the Committee.

Item No. 7 was added to the Consent Calendar.

Vice Chairperson Cortese requested that Administration continue to consider the implications of gender diverse employee, applicant, and contractor hiring as the budget process moves forward.
3 RESULT:  APPROVED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:  Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER:  Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES:  Chavez, Cortese

Regular Agenda - Items for Discussion

4. Receive report from the Social Services Agency, Department of Family and Children’s Services (DFCS), relating to the former Receiving, Assessment and Intake Center and transportation concerns and proper health assessments for children in DFCS care. (ID# 100859)

Dan Little, Acting Director, Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS), provided information relating to transportation concerns and proper health assessments for children in DFCS care, including options for transportation, locations to which children are transported, vendors who provide transportation in addition to DFCS staff, and health assessments including a program relating to dental appointments for foster youth, and medical and dental exams.

4 RESULT:  RECEIVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:  Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
SECONDER:  Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
AYES:  Chavez, Cortese

5. Receive report from the Behavioral Health Services Department relating to the School Linked Services Implementation Plan. (ID# 100484)

Maretta Juarez, Family and Children's Services Division Director, Behavioral Health Services Department, and Catherine Aspiras, Program Manager III, Behavioral Health Services Department, provided information relating to the number of students served by the program, workshops, and events hosted by the program. Ms. Aspiras also provided information relating to the pilot expansion program at the Alum Rock School District and the Social Emotional Academic Services Program and strategies relating to school closures.

5 RESULT:  RECEIVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:  Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER:  Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES:  Chavez, Cortese

6. Receive report from the Office of Supportive Housing relating to Safe Parking Programs, including the Amigos de Guadalupe Posada Project – Silicon Valley site. (Referral from February 25, 2020, Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 15) (Cortese) (ID# 100681)
Hilary Barroga, Program Manager III, Office of the County Executive, provided information relating to a list of all safe parking programs known to the Office of Supportive Housing and information about each program.

The Committee received the report and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration on April 7, 2020.

6 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS] Next: 4/7/2020 9:30 AM
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

7. Receive report from the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention relating to next steps and needs assessment for sexual assault mapping. (ID# 100373)

   Held to May 28, 2020 at the request of Chairperson Chavez.

MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
SECONDER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

8. Receive verbal report from Director, Social Services Agency.

   Robert Menicocci, Director, Social Services Agency, provided information relating to operations of various departments within the Social Services Agency regarding response to COVID-19, including a reduction of face-to-face contact, the general assistance population, telework for call center workers, and precautions taken for employees who are required to report to their respective offices. He further provided information relating to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and how County residents can access it during the COVID-19 response.

8 RESULT: RECEIVED

9. Receive verbal report from Director, Department of Child Support Services.

   Ignacio Guerrero, Director, Department of Child Support Services, provided information relating to the impact of COVID-19 on essential services and the Department’s efforts to continue providing those services to County residents. He further provided information relating to court closures and their impact on filing cases, as well as call center operations.

9 RESULT: RECEIVED

10. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to the expansion of recruitment and retention efforts for transgender, gender-nonconforming, nonbinary, and gender diverse employees, applicants, and contractors, with special focus on transgender women. (Referral from February 27, 2020, Item No. 8)
Held to April 23, 2020 at the request of Administration.

MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson  
SECONDER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson  
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

11. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive and County Counsel relating to options to implement a basic income pilot program for current and/or former foster youth. (Referral from December 3, 2019, Item No. 8)  
Forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration on April 7, 2020 at the request of Vice Chairperson Cortese.

11 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]  Next: 4/7/2020 9:30 AM  
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson  
SECONDER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson  
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

Consent Calendar

12. Forward the following items submitted to the Committees to the Board of Supervisors as part of the respective Committee reports to the Board.

a. Receive report from the Office of Cultural Competency, the Department of Family and Children's Services, and the Probation Department relating to the Cross Systems Coordinated Report to Support Child Safety and Well-Being. (ID# 100117)

12.a RESULT: FORWARD [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson  
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson  
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

b. Receive report from the Social Services Agency, Department of Aging and Adult Services, relating to the Adult Protective Services Annual Report. (ID# 100777)

12.b RESULT: FORWARD [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson  
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson  
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

c. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to the review and referrals of legislative items. (Referral from December 17, 2019, Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 16) (Cortese) (ID# 100761)
12.c RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

d. Receive report from the Office of the Sheriff relating to Management Audit of the Office of the Sheriff (non-custody) Operations (Recommendation 10.1 internal vehicle policy). (Referral from December 12, 2019, Item No. 5). (ID# 100694)

12.d RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

e. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to the County’s Government Fellowship Program. (ID# 100623)

12.e RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

f. Receive report from the Facilities and Fleet Department relating to the utilization of a monthly construction progress dashboard for projects over a certain threshold. (Referral from January 28, 2020, Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 22) (ID# 100617)

12.f RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

13. Receive report from the Employee Services Agency relating to extra help usage for the first two quarters of Fiscal Year 2019-2020 for agencies/departments reporting to the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee. (ID# 100507)

13 RESULT: RECEIVED

14. Receive biannual report from the Office of the County Counsel relating to the status of the 24/7 Whistleblower Program. (ID# 100671)

14 RESULT: RECEIVED

15. Receive report from the Finance Agency relating to annual Fixed Assets Inventory items that were not located. (ID# 100552)

15 RESULT: RECEIVED
16. Receive semi-annual report from the Finance Agency, Controller-Treasurer's Internal Audit Division, relating to the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Workplan. (ID# 100464)

16 RESULT: RECEIVED

17. Receive semi-annual report from the Employee Services Agency relating to Fiscal Year 2019-2020 extra-help usage for agencies/departments reporting to the Finance and Government Operations Committee and Countywide. (ID# 100236)

17 RESULT: RECEIVED

18. Receive report from the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors relating to recommendation from the Citizens' Advisory Commission on Elections for the County to explore collaboration with the City and County of San Francisco regarding the development of an open source voting system, and forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. (ID# 100219)

18 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

19. Approve minutes of the February 27, 2020 Regular Meeting.

19 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese

20. Approve minutes of the February 13, 2020 Special Meeting.

20 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Dave Cortese, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
AYES: Chavez, Cortese
21. Adjourn. The next regular meeting of the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee that focuses on items under the purview of the Children, Seniors, and Families Committee is on Thursday, April 23, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose.

Chairperson Chavez adjourned the meeting at 10:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Leon
Deputy Clerk
DATE:    April 23, 2020
TO:      Children, Seniors, and Families Committee
FROM:    Cheryl Solov, Management Audit Manager
SUBJECT: FY 2020-21 Management Audit Risk Assessment

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Board of Supervisors Management Audit Division relating to the annual management audit risk assessment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal implications associated with receipt of this report.

CONTRACT HISTORY

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
See attached.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION
STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL

ATTACHMENTS:

- FY 2020-21 Management Audit Risk Assessment (PDF)
April 12, 2020

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Cheryl Solov  
Management Audit Manager

Subject: FY 2020-21 Management Audit Risk Assessment

This memorandum provides an updated management audit risk assessment analysis to assist the Board of Supervisors in selecting FY 2020-21 audits. The risk assessment analysis evaluates 67 County functions and programs to determine the degree of “risk” to the County, including both financial and operational risk, inherent in each of these areas.

Of the 67 functions and programs initially identified in the management audit risk assessment model, 30 functions and programs were excluded from consideration due to having been audited in recent years in accordance with audit frequency guidelines adopted by the Board; due to current or pending audits of these programs; or, due to their critical role in the County’s response to the 2020 Coronavirus Pandemic. These are shown in Schedule 1 under their respective exemption categories.

The FY 2020-21 risk analysis therefore identified 37 potential audits for consideration by the Board, including 12 high risk, 13 medium risk, and 12 low risk audits. These are shown in Schedule 2 under their respective risk categories. Schedule 2 also includes a separate placeholder for any Coronavirus related audit assignments.

One-Time Exceptions

This year the following four auditable areas were excluded on a one-time only basis due to the fact that their respective managers and staff are supporting front line response efforts to the 2020 Coronavirus Pandemic:

- Valley Medical Center (BU 921) – Administrative & Support Services
- Valley Medical Center (BU 921) – Community & Specialty Clinics
- Valley Medical Center (BU 921) – New Hospitals & Health Clinic (O’Connor Hospital, St. Louise Regional Hospital, and De Paul Health Center)
- Custody Health Services (BU 414)
These exempted entities appear under the “one-time” exemption category in Schedule 1.

The Probation Department’s (BU 246) General Operations functions (cost centers except those defining Administration and Support Services) was also excluded on a one-time basis only as we are currently working on a staffing study of Probation, in which personnel costs account for 93 percent of BU 246’s General Fund expenditures.

**Risk Classification Strata**

The initial risk assessment of all functions and programs identifies those audit areas that had been audited within the Board policy audit cycle of every six years for high risk functions, nine years for medium risk functions and 12 years for low risk functions. Schedule 1 lists the 30 areas that met this criterion; the 30 functions include 13 that are currently being audited or are assigned for auditing; 12 that have been audited during the scheduled management audit cycle and are not eligible for audit in FY 2020-21; and, as described above, Schedule 1 also includes five one-time exemptions of audit areas in HHS departments that are impacted by the comprehensive response to COVID-19 and for the Probation Department’s General Operations functions, the riskiest of which are covered in the ongoing staffing study.

Although the risk assessment model encompasses 67 functions and programs, other subject areas may be identified by the Board, including County functions that are components of areas listed, or issues that involve more than one listed audit area. These generally take the form of special studies pertaining to County-wide functional responsibilities or specific programs that are included within a larger departmental budget. The aforementioned staffing study of non-administrative functions of the Probation Department is one example. Another example is the Jail Improvement Recommendation Audit (issued on October 11, 2019), which sought to validate the implementation of the first subset of recommendations to improve custody operations made by the Blue-Ribbon Commission.

The remaining 37 potential audits included in Schedule 2 were classified into high, medium or low risk strata based on the following criteria:

**High Risk:**

- Any function or program with a net General Fund cost in excess of $50 million, or any internal service or enterprise fund with more than $50 million in General Fund equity or annual subsidy.
- Any function or program responsible for the production, collection, expenditure or investment of General Fund revenues in excess of $50 million.
Medium Risk:
- Any function or program with a net General Fund cost in excess of $25 million, or any internal service or enterprise fund with more than $25 million in General Fund equity or annual subsidy.
- Any function or program responsible for the production, collection, expenditure or investment of General Fund revenues in excess of $25 million.

Low Risk:
- Any function or program with a net General Fund cost less than $25 million, or any internal service or enterprise fund with less than $25 million in General Fund equity or annual subsidy.
- Any function or program responsible for the production, collection, expenditure or investment of General Fund revenues of less than $25 million.

Some potential audits have been included in the high or medium risk categories based on special risks identified, including: (1) the importance of the function to the public safety and protection of the County; (2) the total value of County assets and/or resources for which a County department has managerial responsibility; and, (3) legal restrictions on the expenditures of revenues derived from locally generated taxes that would otherwise be General Fund discretionary monies.

Two functions were classified as High Risk using these classification exceptions: (1) County Executive-Office of Emergency Services (BU 107, Cost Center 2530) and (2) Employee Services Agency (BU 130), excluding Human Resources.

An additional six programs/functions were classified as Medium Risk using these classification exceptions: (1) Central Fire Protection District (904); (2) County Library (BU 610); (3) Parks and Recreation (BU 710); (4) Department of Child Support Services (BU 200); (5) County Clerk/Recorder (BU 114); and, (6) FIRST 5 Santa Clara County.

Ranking of Functions and Programs Within Risk Classifications

Schedule 2 lists the 37 functions eligible for audit during FY 2020-21 stratified in High, Medium and Low Risk categories. Within each category, each function is listed in descending order of relative risk, based on a scoring system of 0 to 100 points. The total points awarded to each function are based on a weighting system that assesses nine criteria, which are outlined on the following page and detailed in Schedule 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Relative Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Generation Level</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Level</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Growth Rate (three-year growth)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net General Fund Cost</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Change from Prior Year</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Fixed Assets</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Elapsed Since Last Audited</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Info/Complexity &amp; Criticality of Operations</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0-100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Audit Assignments for FY 2020-21**

In addition to any audits the members of the Board may be considering, Schedule 2 identifies the year in which each of the 37 audit eligible County departments, programs and functions were last audited.

Seven departments and programs have not been audited for 20 years or more, and 18 departments and programs have never been audited. These potential audits are separately shown in Schedule 4.

Once we receive direction from the Board identifying the audit areas the Board has selected, we will provide the Board with preliminary audit task plans for each audit describing in detail the scope of the audit, the programs, functions and services that would be included, and the tasks that would be performed. Based on responses from the Board, the preliminary audit task plans would be amended as necessary to ensure the Board that each audit fully addressed any issues of concern and resulted in an audit scope that meets the Board’s expectations. The audits would then be conducted in the priority order designated by the Finance and Government Operations Committee or the Board.

**Attachments**

Schedule 1: Major County Functions and Programs Exempt from Audit for FY 2020-21
Schedule 2: Major County Functions and Programs Eligible for Audit in FY 2020-21 (including a separate sheet of footnotes)
Schedule 3: Scoring System for Assessing the Relative Risk of Auditable Areas
Schedule 4: Major County Functions and Programs Not Previously Audited, or Not Audited for at Least 20 Years
## Schedule 1

### FY 2020-21 Management Audit Risk Assessment

#### Major County Functions and Programs Previously Audited

**Currently Exempt From Audit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exemption Category</th>
<th>Budget Unit No.</th>
<th>Budget Unit Name</th>
<th>Year Last Audit Report Published or Assigned</th>
<th>Next Eligible Date</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>In - Home Supportive Svcs Program (IHSS)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Public Health Department</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Office of the Public Defender</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Department of Tax and Collections (DTAC)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Procurement Department</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>415*</td>
<td>Behavioral Health Services (BHS) - Mental Health</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>263*</td>
<td>Facilities Department - Capital Programs Division</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>921*</td>
<td>Valley Medical Center (VMC) at Bascom - Inpatient and Support Svs</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Sheriff's Office - Custody Bureau (Jails)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Department of Correction (DOC)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Sheriff's Office - Enforcement Bureau</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>263*</td>
<td>Facilities Department - Bldg Ops &amp; Admin.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Information Services Department (ISD)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Assessor's Office</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>One-Time</td>
<td>921*</td>
<td>VMC - Administrative Services</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>One-Time</td>
<td>921*</td>
<td>VMC - Community and Specialty Clinics</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>One-Time</td>
<td>921*</td>
<td>VMC - New Hospitals and Health Clinic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>One-Time</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>CHS - Custody Health Services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>One-Time</td>
<td>246*</td>
<td>Probation - General Operations</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Santa Clara Health Authority</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>Los Altos Hills County Fire District</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>South Santa Clara County Fire District</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>130*</td>
<td>Employee Services Agency (ESA) - Human Resources function</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>County Communications</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>415*</td>
<td>Behavioral Health Services (BHS) - Alcohol and Drug Svcs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Assigned/In-Progress</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Valley Health Plan (VHP)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Medical Examiner-Coroner (MEC)</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Registrar of Voters</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>County Sanitation District 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Previously Audited</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Office of Pre-Trial Services</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes audit areas covering specific functions or programs rather than the consolidated budget unit.
16.a

FY 2020-21 Management Audit Risk Assessment
Major County Functions and Programs Eligible for Audit
Count

Budget Unit
No.

Risk
Areas

*
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

*
168
263
603
107
810
501
120
108
202
501
130
107

Coronavirus Pandemic-Related Analysis
CEO - Office of Supportive Housing (OSH)
FAF - Property Management
Roads Department *1
CEO - Office of the County Executive (CEO)
Finance Agency - Debt Service
SSA - Agency Office (AO)
County Counsel
CEO - Office of Risk Management
District Attorney
SSA - Employment and Benefit Services Dept. (DEBS)
Employee Services Agency, excl HR *2
CEO - Office of Emergency Services (OES) *3

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

501
904
135
610
501
106
710
110
217
107
200
114
N/A

SSA - Family & Children Services Dept (DFCS)
Central Fire Protection District *4
Fleet Services
County Library *5
SSA - Aging and Adult Services Dept (DAAS) (Inc Sr. Nut)
COB - Clerk of the Board (COB)
Department of Parks and Recreation *6
Controller - Treasurer
Criminal Justice Support
CEO - Office of Budget and Analysis (OBA)
Department of Child Support Svcs (DCSS) *7
County Clerk-Recorder *8
FIRST 5 Santa Clara County *9

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

262
263
261
260
411
608
418
107
246
107
113
612

Agriculture & Environ Mgt
FAF - Facility Administration & Utilities
Environmental Health
Planning and Development
Vector Control District
Airports Department
Community Health Services
CEO - Office of Human Relations (OHR)
Probation - Administration & Support Services
CEO - Equal Opportunity Department (EOD)
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
Children's Health Initiative

Adopted Budget
Revenues
2019-2020

Adopted Budget
Expenditures 1
2019-2020

Adopted Budget
Expenditures
2016-2017

*
29,248,570
3,599,837
99,011,613
16,247,879
6,774,941
23,757,308
1,080,710
100,215,739
17,327,329
277,450,093
3,366,662
0

*
68,010,009
66,662,227
99,162,589
63,155,583
65,764,053
193,245,355
61,939,506
94,921,651
153,645,754
236,417,023
22,977,050
3,471,660

*
30,355,153
44,058,867
61,260,777
25,054,636
21,354,782
149,520,853
42,299,669
82,432,143
132,628,782
207,560,929
37,589,378
3,479,585

106,619,986
125,227,760
33,991,824
57,509,847
50,528,195
60,373
81,871,396
1,531,804,204
236,659,132
0
37,952,814
43,872,787
24,516,153

125,820,510
132,092,464
26,751,245
88,812,068
44,900,689
14,866,696
78,502,943
34,221,765
47,067,368
5,292,461
37,420,405
12,871,825
28,379,738

105,491,302
120,915,065
25,792,923
68,265,494
39,766,230
7,510,331
62,667,651
35,544,503
52,797,943
3,413,870
37,048,886
12,256,355
24,866,564

14,313,431
2,979,890
22,190,780
12,296,523
7,161,139
2,549,550
5,327,814
115,000
21,442,745
0
573,578
0

28,343,129
29,494,651
27,657,656
21,680,949
9,000,741
3,112,798
23,131,807
2,397,570
27,732,973
4,075,072
1,153,334
3,400,000

23,598,006
34,424,894
23,707,728
19,346,019
8,470,275
5,403,554
20,428,182
1,817,957
26,292,497
0
914,173
3,000,000

Expenditure 3Year % Change
2019-2020

Net General
Fund Cost
2019-2020

Manager
Appointment 2
Date

Staffing
2019-2020

Staffing 1-Year
% Change
2019-2020

Contract
Services
2019-2020

Fixed Asset Cost
at 4/1/2020

Total
Last Year Points
Audited
0-100

*

*

17%
8%
0%
18%
0%
7%
9%
2%
3%
0%
37%
20%

*
49,208,338
63,722,924
13,195,394
20,469,233
619,000
36,816,318
12,529,236
69,876,661
5,726,471
23,599,440
2,911,029
526,610

*
10,087,522
22,373,840
455,038,670
526,485
0
1,044,601
325,646
0
4,037,957
292,625
46,445
343,453

*
9/26/2016
7/13/2009
6/5/2017
8/1/2016
12/7/2018
1/5/2015
8/1/2016
7/3/2017
1/3/2011
4/1/2019
4/25/2016
12/9/2013

*
N/A
1994
2000
N/A
N/A
2012
1988
N/A
2008
2009
1996
N/A

*
70
67
67
64
58
58
58
57
52
50
41
30

High Risk Audits - 12
*

*
38,761,439
63,062,390
150,976
46,907,704
58,989,112
169,488,047
60,858,796
0
136,318,425
0
19,610,388
3,471,660

48
14
254
224
0
298
209
52
629
1,556
107
12

19%
9%
4%
30%
13%
98%
25%
-4%
-11%
55%
1%
5%
14%

19,200,524
6,864,704
0
31,302,221
0
14,806,323
0
0
0
5,292,461
0
0
3,863,585

732
320
53
253
293
41
243
111
0
24
217
67
47

2%
-3%
53%
4%
1%
-5%
1%
-15%
0%
18%
-4%
-8%
1%

11,862,128
24,707,500
8,454,890
20,426,160
11,394,405
8,124,090
10,520,874
4,106,066
45,377,920
253,424
983,499
2,199,324
2,514,446

0
0
51,270,148
22,689,305
0
333,046
220,850,557
1,553,863,058
0
35,079
1,206,880
3,711,942
3,705,969

1/3/2020
8/13/2018
7/13/2009
3/2/2020
1/1/2020
5/11/2015
7/16/2018
12/7/2018
N/A
11/3/2014
1/20/2015
11/6/2006
1/1/2005

2013
2005
2009
N/A
2001
N/A
2007
2015
2007
N/A
2003
N/A
N/A

48
44
43
42
42
42
41
39
38
38
33
29
28

20%
-14%
17%
12%
6%
-42%
13%
32%
5%
0%
26%
13%

14,029,698
26,514,761
5,466,876
9,384,426
1,839,602
563,248
17,803,993
2,282,570
6,290,228
4,075,072
579,756
3,400,000

128
38
119
99
40
9
110
14
107
23
4
0

3%
-5%
5%
3%
5%
0%
3%
0%
2%
5%
0%
0%

8,408,225
11,473,487
1,043,041
1,334,079
1,486,799
456,880
4,284,371
177,712
3,051,666
177,683
326,273
3,400,000

783,113
14,153,769
2,695,976
704,337
9,052,156
28,523,591
334,976
33,046
726,215
0
0
0

8/28/2017
7/13/2009
1/16/2017
12/10/2018
1/16/2017
6/5/2017
3/3/2014
7/1/2016
6/9/2014
7/3/2017
7/2/2001
N/A

1987
N/A
N/A
1993
N/A
1999
N/A
N/A
2006
N/A
N/A
N/A

37
36
36
35
35
35
34
33
31
28
23
21

124%
51%
62%
152%
208%
29%
46%
15%
16%
14%
-39%
0%

Medium Risk Audits - 13

Low Risk Audits - 12

1
2

Represents gross expenditures.
For departments that did not complete our April 2014 Management and Operations Risk Survey, operational and organizational complexity was scored based on manager longevity.
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### Schedule 3

#### Scoring Scales

**Revenue Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,001</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000,001</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000,001</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000,001</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000,001</td>
<td>$55,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000,001</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000,001</td>
<td>$70,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000,001</td>
<td>and higher</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,001</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000,001</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000,001</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000,001</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000,001</td>
<td>$55,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000,001</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000,001</td>
<td>$70,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000,001</td>
<td>and higher</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure % Growth Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.1% and higher</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staffing % Growth Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.1% and higher</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Services Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,001</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,001</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,001</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000,001</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,001</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000,001</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,001</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000,001</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000,001</td>
<td>and higher</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fixed Assets Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,001</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,001</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,001</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000,001</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,001</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000,001</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,001</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000,001</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000,001</td>
<td>and higher</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net General Fund Cost Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,001</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,001</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000,001</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,001</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000,001</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,001</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000,001</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000,001</td>
<td>and higher</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Elapsed Since Last Audit Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management Info. & Complexity Grading Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 0-30 scale of survey results
## Schedule 4

**FY 2020-21 Management Audit Risk Assessment**

**Major County Functions and Programs That Have Never Been Audited or That Have Not Been Audited for at Least 20 Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Budget Unit No.</th>
<th>Budget Unit Name</th>
<th>Never Audited</th>
<th>20+ Years</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>CEO - Office of Supportive Housing (OSH)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CEO - Office of the County Executive (CEO)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Finance Agency - Debt Service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>CEO - Risk Management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CEO - Office of Emergency Services (OES)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>FAF - Property Management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Roads Department</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Employee Services Agency, excl HR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>County Library</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>COB - Clerk of the Board (COB)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CEO - Office of Budget and Analysis (OBA)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>County Clerk/Recorder</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FIRST 5 Santa Clara County</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>FAF - Facility Administration &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Vector Control District</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>Community Health Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CEO - Office of Human Relations (OHR)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CEO - Equal Opportunity Department (EOD)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>CEO - Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>Children’s Health Initiative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environ Mgt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Planning and Development</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>Airports Department</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 18 7**
1. The Roads Department (BU 603) scored high in the risk assessment model. Historically, Roads has not required General Fund support as it has a dedicated funding source (i.e. the Roads Fund). However, the County’s FY 2018-19 audited financial statements indicate that the Board of Supervisors approved a ten-year, $21.3 million General Fund loan to the Department in August 2017. Therefore, it is appropriately classified as High Risk.

2. The Employee Services Agency (BU 130), excluding HR, scored a Medium Risk. However, because of the Agency’s County-wide responsibility to develop and negotiate all labor agreements with employee organizations, it is classified as High Risk.

3. Office of Emergency Services (cost center 5700) is one of the four separately presented functions within the County Executive’s Budget Unit (BU 107). While it scored low in our risk assessment model, due to the critical nature of the function performed by the Office of Emergency Services, it is classified as High Risk.

4. Central Fire Protection District (BU 904) budgeted expenditures exceed revenues and it scored a High Risk. However, since the District uses its own fund balance to supplement revenues and balance its budget, no County General Fund support is required. Therefore, the District is classified as Medium Risk.

5. The Library’s (BU 610) budgeted expenditures continue to exceed revenues, which primarily come from property taxes, earning it a high-risk score. However, since the Library uses its own fund balance to supplement revenues and balance its budget, it is classified as Medium Risk.

6. The Parks and Recreation Budget Unit (BU 710) is supported entirely by a Special Revenue Fund from charges for services and special assessments. Further, County voters approved the extension of the Park Charter Fund, which supplements the Parks Operations and Maintenance Fund, until FY 2031-32. Thus, this budget unit is classified as Medium Risk.

7. The Department of Child Support Services (BU 200) scored low in the risk assessment model. However, due to the importance of the services provided by the Department, it is classified as Medium Risk.

8. Clerk-Recorder (BU 114) revenues include County-wide taxes and other revenues which substantially exceed gross expenditures. Consequently, there is no budgeted General Fund support, which resulted in a low-risk risk score. However, due to the magnitude and nature of these revenues, the Clerk-Recorder is classified as Medium Risk.
9. FIRST 5 Santa Clara County is a discreet component unit of the County created by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the California Children and Families Act of 1998. Although FIRST 5 is a legally separate entity, its finances are not entirely separate from the County. As such, FIRST 5 is classified as Medium Risk.
DATE: April 23, 2020
TO: Finance and Government Operations Committee
FROM: David Campos, Deputy County Executive
SUBJECT: Report Back on Gender-Based Violence Contracts

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention relating to the development of a comprehensive Request for Proposals to address gender-based violence, including the design, work plan and timeline for these efforts. (Referral from November 14, 2019, Item No. 11) (Chavez)

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no fiscal impact with the acceptance of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the November 14, 2019 Finance and Government Operations Committee (FGOC) (Item No. 11), the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention (OGBVP), presented on flexible contracting for providers who serve clients that face poly-victimization, relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking. Service providers initially highlighted contracting challenges at the Children Senior and Families Committee (CSFC) Special Hearing on Sexual Assault and Gender-Based Violence on April 15, 2019 (Item No. 2).

A request was made to provide a report back on the feasibility of completing a large gender-based-violence Request for Proposals (RFP) in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 as well as a work plan and timeline for FGOC to provide input on associated contract activities, expansion of legal services and housing services, service model enhancements to centralize the intake process for victims, and programmatic changes with community-based organizations (CBOs), including school-linked services and screenings.

This report is a response to the requests mentioned above.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

**BACKGROUND**
The County Executive has directed the Division of Equity and Social Justice (DESJ) to address domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, and the work to create a countywide strategic plan to address these issues and is led by the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention. Part of this strategic plan is to fund direct services as well as prevention, education, housing initiatives, policy, and research related to gender-based violence.

The significant investments by the County in the last few years to strategically address gender-based violence has presented the opportunity to restructure contract and program design from one that focuses on the type of violence—domestic violence, human trafficking or sexual assault—to one that focuses on function, such as direct services, legal services, prevention, and housing. The major shift will address the spectrum of gender-based violence many survivors experience and satisfy the concerns from the service providers to address poly-victimization. While some of these services will still need to be provided only by state-certified entities, the expectation is that service provision will improve as we move into more than just direct service. This, along with the expansion of vendors to support the community, will happen as we also become more data-driven and improve data collection.

The Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention, in partnership with the County Executive’s Contracting Team and the Office of Contracts Management at the Social Services Agency, currently administers more than 30 contracts related to direct services and prevention efforts. Additionally, the Office of Supportive Housing administers $1.6M in general fund monies for housing assistance for survivors of violence.

**Timeline for the Comprehensive GBV Request for Proposals**
Staff recommends that the comprehensive RFP be released in FY2022 to begin services in FY2023 for several reasons:

- The vast majority of contracts currently in place will complete their terms at the end of FY2022.
- Additional contracts to address immediate needs, such as rape crisis center services, expanded human trafficking services, and services for transitional age youth, have been established to align with this deadline.
- The process for the development and implementation of an RFP takes about six months, taking into account new, Countywide best practices, such as the 10-day pre-bid vendor feedback stage.
- To maximize efficiency, an effort is underway to move contracts associated with gender-based violence from two county departments to one. The recommended timeframe will allow time to transition all gender-based violence contracts from the...
SSA to the contracts team within the Office of the County Executive and build the internal capacity necessary within the Office of the County Executive to manage the contracts.

- The additional time would allow staff to develop and implement a countywide strategic plan, including a data agenda, based on the input from other county departments, various stakeholders, and learnings from current contracts.
- Quarterly meetings with current vendors, as well as other countywide efforts led by Procurement, will continue to address short-term issues and concerns.

The Design of a Comprehensive Request for Proposals

The comprehensive RFP will align with the Community Grants Program established by the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention to provide community-based prevention efforts and comprehensive intervention services for survivors of gender-based violence, including domestic violence, human trafficking, workplace crimes, and sexual assault. Qualifying agencies must meet all applicable federal and state requirements for service provision for the target population.

All services provided to survivors of gender-based violence through the Community Grants Program shall be guided by principles and practices that are trauma-informed, survivor-centered, and culturally and gender-responsive.

The County will award multiple contracts for a period of five years, which will commence in FY2023 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) to address the program areas outlined below. Applicants will be able to submit separate proposals for each program area for which they wish to apply.

Possible Expansion of Services

The Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention is committed to including all stakeholders to inform the community needs that will be addressed by the RFP. This is a process that demands time and due diligence. Immediate concerns around the possible expansion of legal services or housing services, for example, have been met with amendments to current contracts to sustain better human trafficking legal service needs and the addition of housing stipends for male survivors. These efforts will further inform the more extensive RFP process as well.

It is expected that when the large RFP for gender-based violence services is rolled out, it will include an expansion of services.

Centralized Intake and Other Innovative Approaches

The priority will always be to meet the direct service needs of survivors of violence. Once this is done, there is the potential to invite innovation and creativity as efforts around prevention, education, policy, and outreach are determined. Other areas to explore include service enhancements to centralize the intake process for victims. The OGBVP is launching
an in-depth analysis of various screening tools used locally and nationally to determine which best meets the needs of the community. These discussions require input from key stakeholders at the Domestic Violence Council and Board Policy Committees before decisions are made. Ideally, this will coincide with the RFP process as well.

**Programmatic Changes with Community-Based Organizations**

OGBVP fosters collaboration with its vendors, and since its inception in late September 2019 has initiated quarterly training with vendors. While optional, they have been well-attended and allowed for open dialogue to consider any programmatic changes with CBOs. These training include topics such as flexible funding and invoicing, translation services, and identification of best practices. The initial success of training keeps them on the OGBVP priority list, and the information from these sessions will inform future RFPs.

**Priority Service Areas**

The final RFP for gender-based violence services will include multiple rounds of stakeholder sessions to inform the process, scopes, and needs assessments used to establish the various funding categories. Based on current data, the categories will likely include the following services:

**A. Comprehensive Shelter-Based Direct Services**

Qualifying agencies will provide comprehensive shelter-based services that are responsive to the needs of survivors of gender-based violence and their dependents. The services shall include, but are not limited to, the following basic services:

(a) Shelter on a 24-hours a day, seven days a week basis.

(b) A 24 hours a day, seven days a week telephone hotline for crisis calls.

(c) Temporary housing and food facilities.

(d) Psychological support and peer counseling provided in accordance with Section 1037.1 of the Evidence Code.

(e) Referrals to existing services in the community.

(f) A drop-in center that operates during normal business hours to assist survivors of gender-based violence who have a need for support services.

(g) Arrangements for school-age children to continue their education during their stay at the domestic violence shelter-based program.

(h) Emergency transportation as feasible.

**B. Transitional Housing**

Qualifying agencies will provide residential, transitional housing programs offered in conjunction with gender-responsive services that empower survivors of gender-based violence to further develop life skills in order to heal from trauma, access vital services, and find long-term and/or permanent housing.

**C. Direct Intervention and Advocacy Services**
Qualifying agencies will provide accessible and culturally competent emergency support services, case management, and advocacy services, including education, court accompaniment, legal assistance, and individual or group counseling.

D. Legal Services

Qualifying agencies will provide comprehensive legal services in the areas of civil, criminal and family law to survivors of gender-based violence and their dependents, including workplace crimes. These services may include, but are not limited to, immigration status, employment violations, custody, and visitation, accessing public benefits, restraining orders, and other legal matters.

E. Prevention and Education

Organizations will provide accessible, age-appropriate ad culturally competent community-based prevention services that may include evidence-based curriculum, community outreach, and education programs that promote safety, emotional well-being, and economic independence. Priority populations include underserved and at-risk populations such as youth and the LGBTQ community. Community collaborations with institutions, including health, schools, social services, and criminal justice, are encouraged.

F. Research & Policy

Innovative grants will award organizations to conduct research, pilot projects and/or develop new strategies and approaches to prevent and respond to gender-based violence.

Next Steps

Current contracts for intimate partner violence, human trafficking, and sexual assault are in place to meet the needs of survivors of violence in Santa Clara County. Over the next year and a half, data from these contracts will be analyzed, and findings reported to FGOC. Stakeholder meetings will also be convened by the Office of Gender-Based Violence Prevention to provide status reports on the development of the large RFP. The RFP release will likely be in the fall of 2021 so that services can be negotiated and in place by July 1, 2022.
Staff recommends this plan as it will allow for critical analysis and thoughtful implementation so that families impacted by gender-based violence in Santa Clara County are best served, and the potential to heal and to thrive are realities for all residents.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION
The Finance and Government Operations Committee will not receive the requested report.

LINKS:
- Created: 98860 : 98860