helping people who are disadvantaged or in crisis to obtain the resources they need
Human Services Agency
Mission

The San Francisco Human Services Agency serves San Franciscans who are disadvantaged, in crisis or unable to participate fully in the social and economic life of the community.

We assist individuals and families with income assistance, direct benefits, and other supportive services; with employment preparation and placement services to facilitate economic self-sufficiency; with protective services to shield against abuse; with family and community building services to help individuals and families to reach their fullest potential within the context of family, community and society.
Human Services Agency
Program Goals

• Provide safety-net services to low-income persons unable to support themselves;

• Promote self-sufficiency among public assistance recipients, the working poor, seniors and the disabled; and

• Preserve and protect the well-being of families and children
Budget Forum Objectives

- Provide overview of Family & Children’s Services and Child Care programs
- Discuss local and state budget forecasts
- Work with HSA stakeholders and partners to develop budget priorities
Family & Children’s Services
Circle of Outcomes

Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance

- Rate of Referrals/Substantiated Referrals
- Reentry to Care
- Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
- Shorter Lengths Of Stay
- Stability Of Care
- Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
- Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care
- Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors
- Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
- Shorter Lengths Of Stay
- Stability Of Care
- Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
- Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care
- Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

FCS Caseload by Component, September, 2000 - September, 2006

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

Ethnic Proportions of San Francisco Children in Child Welfare System
January - December, 2005

- Population:
  - Asian/Pacific Islander: 22%
  - White: 37%
  - Latino: 26%
  - African American: 11%
  - Other: 6%

- Referrals:
  - Asian/Pacific Islander: 38%
  - White: 44%
  - Latino: 27%
  - African American: 27%
  - Other: 15%

- Substantiated:
  - Asian/Pacific Islander: 26%
  - White: 48%
  - Latino: 26%
  - African American: 16%
  - Other: 11%

- Entries:
  - Asian/Pacific Islander: 15%
  - White: 70%
  - Latino: 22%
  - African American: 15%
  - Other: 6%

- In Care:
  - Asian/Pacific Islander: 8%
  - White: 10%
  - Latino: 14%
  - African American: 10%
  - Other: 0%

Sources: Population - 2000 census; child welfare data - UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research (http://cssr.berkeley.edu/cwscmsreports/)
Referrals by Ethnicity, 2000 - 2005

Source: UC Berkeley Center for Social Service Research: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/Referrals/rates.asp
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

Substantiated Referrals by Ethnicity, 2000 - 2005

Source: UC Berkeley Center for Social Service Research: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/Referrals/rates.asp
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

San Francisco First Entries into Care, 1998-2005

- African American
- Latino
- White
- Asian/Pacific Islander

Caseloads over time for different racial and ethnic groups.
Types of Foster Care Placements
July 1, 2006

- **Kin**: 1,027 (53%)
- **County-Licensed Foster Home**: 176 (9%)
- **Guardianship**: 81 (4%)
- **Other**: 112 (6%)
- **Foster Family Agencies**: 325 (17%)
- **Group Homes**: 210 (11%)

Total: 1,931

---

**Family & Children’s Services Caseloads**
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

Placement Types by Ethnicity/Race July 1, 2006

- Native American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- African American
- Latino
- White

- Other
- Guardianship
- County Licensed Foster Home
- Kin
- Group Home
- Foster Family Agency
Length of Time Case Open in Years
(All Active Cases in October, 2006)

- African American: 7.15 years
- Latino: 2.72 years
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 2.39 years
- White: 3.57 years
- Native American: 4.77 years

*Family & Children’s Services Caseloads*
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

Age When Case Opened
(All Cases Active October, 2006)

- **African American**: 4.36
- **Latino**: 7.88
- **Asian/Pacific Islander**: 7.62
- **White**: 5.83
- **Native American**: 4.67
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

Permancy Outcomes by Ethnicity, 2005

Total = 248

Source: UC Berkeley Center for Social Service Research: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/dynamics/exitsperyr/
Family & Children’s Services Caseloads

San Francisco Re-entries into Care, 1998-2004

- African American
- Latino
- White
- API

Caseloads for different race/ethnicity groups from 1998 to 2005.
Nine Key Recommendations:
Reducing Disproportionality of African American Children in San Francisco Child Welfare System

- Implement circles of support within the community that support and mentor the individuals/families struggling to move out of crisis.

- Launch a targeted, focused, “Positive Message” campaign that saturates the city to influence community thinking and actions regarding disproportionality in foster care.

- Develop effective family support strategies and programs for priority areas and populations.

- Strengthen interdepartmental collaboration among DHS, DPH and other key City Depts. to support parents and adult caregivers who are substance abusers (and related problems, such as mental illnesses).
Nine Key Recommendations:
Reducing Disproportionality of African American Children in San Francisco Child Welfare System

- Focus on youth permanence, i.e. permanent placement of foster youth through Legal Guardianship, adoption or reunification

- Implement policies and practices that ensure continuity, consistency, equity and effectiveness within SFDHS, especially in family placements.

- Focus on prevention, culturally competent and family responsive services

- Improve and expand City Departments’ data systems

- Initiate and maintain interdepartmental and community collaboration.
FCS Revenues by Source, FY 06-07

- Federal: 39.2%
- County: 41.5%
- State: 19.0%
- Private: 0.2%
FCS Original Expenditure Budget FY 06-07
$115.1 Million

- Foster Care Aid: $44,346,379 (38.5%)
- Adoptions Aid: $17,327,832 (15.1%)
- Kin-GAP Aid: $1,748,757 (1.5%)
- CBOs: $11,541,222 (10.0%)
- Work Orders & Recoveries: $3,458,459 (3.0%)
- Materials & Support: $67,046 (0.1%)
- Professional Services: $517,861 (0.4%)

Foster Care & Kin-GAP Child Care Aid of $4.2M is shown in the Child Care budget
FCS Original CBO Contract Budget
FY 06-07, $11.5 Million

- Family Resource Centers: 32%
- Other Family Support & Preservation: 13%
- Respite & Mental Health Services: 6%
- Targeted Case Mgmt: 6%
- Child Abuse Prevention: 7%
- Adoption Services: 5%
- Kinship Services: 5%
- Independent Living: 9%
- Wraparound Services: 4%
- Other: 3%
- Training: 3%
- Other Family Support & Preservation: 5%
FCS Supplemental Budget Additions
FY 06-07, $3.9 Million

In Addition

- $550,000 to FCS Child Care (Child Care)
- $503,667 for THP+ (Housing & Homelessness)
- 1 Accounting Staff and 1 Foster Care Eligibility Analyst Staff
Child Care: Issues, Initiatives and Opportunities

- CalWORKS Child Care enrollments declining
- Pressing facilities needs for child care centers
- State changes in child care provider rates
- ACCESS: City initiative for Child Care for Homeless families
- Continued effort to create a system of high quality early care and education
Child Care: Historical Changes in CalWORKs Child Care Subsidies

CalWORKs Stages 1, 2, & 3: July 1998 - October 2006

- Stage 1
- Stage 2
- Stage 3
Child Care Achievements: The City’s Return on Investment - Affordability

- Pressured the state to implement RMR on a county-wide basis. New rates went into effect in Oct. ’06.
- New State Median Income went into effect (increased from $35,200 to $43,675)
- Increased income ceiling for exits from care through the SF pilot. (ceiling increased from $35,200 to $54,000)
- ACCESS program for homeless families is designed and underway.
Child Care Achievements: The City’s Return on Investment – Capacity/Accessibility

• Since 1998 the number of licensed center slots has increased from 16,083 to 18,153

• Infant toddler ctr. slots nearly doubled during the period - increasing from 573 to 1076. (290 ctr. slots from ’01 to ’06)

• Retention and expansion strategic based on need.
Child Care Achievements: The City’s Return on Investment – Quality

- Project that by the close of FY 06-07 62% of Centers and 29% of FCC will have been Assessed by Gateway to Quality.

- Increased number of programs are basing funding on quality scoring and quality improvement plans. (PFA, ACCESS, Infant/Toddler Sustaining)
Foster Care Child Care Aid of $4.2M is shown in this slide as part of the overall Child Care budget. An additional $550,000 was gained through a supplemental budget.
HSA Child Care Original FY 06-07 Subsidies
$31.5 Million

- Foster Care Child Care Aid of $4.2M is shown in this slide as part of the overall Child Care budget.
- An additional $550,000 was gained through a supplemental budget.

- CalWORKs Stage One
  - $10,969,612
  - 35%

- CalWORKs Stage Two
  - $13,500,000
  - 44%

- Homeless Child Care
  - $350,000
  - 1%

- City Child Care
  - $2,303,041
  - 7%

- Foster Care Child Care
  - $4,200,000
  - 13%

- CDE CAPP Vouchers
  - $149,262
  - 0%
HSA Child Care Original FY 06-07 Services
$8.7 Million

- Wages Plus: $3,731,264 (44%)
- Health/Mental Health: $1,972,920 (23%)
- Quality Assessment: $164,364 (2%)
- Facility Fund: $1,506,375 (17%)
- Child Care Capacity Building: $355,000 (4%)
- Inclusion Services: $338,580 (4%)
- Mildly Ill - ER Backup: $290,700 (3%)
- Centralized Eligibility List: $40,000 (0%)
- Administration: $270,187 (3%)
## City-wide Child Care, Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Strategy</th>
<th>DCYF</th>
<th>First 5</th>
<th>HSA-DHS Budget FY 06-07</th>
<th>Multi-Dept Total</th>
<th>Projected Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSIDIES (AFFORDABILITY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs Stage 1</td>
<td>$11,364,612</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,969,612</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs Stage 2</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Children’s Services Child Care</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Child Care (Primarily Infant Toddler)</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,303,041</td>
<td>$3,963,041</td>
<td>$3,963,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS Homeless Child Care</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE CAPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>$148,262</td>
<td>$181,431</td>
<td>$181,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal SUBSIDIES</strong></td>
<td>$31,865,915</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,764,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Quality Assessments/Quality Grants</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$164,364</td>
<td>$1,264,364</td>
<td>$1,264,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal QUALITY</strong></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$164,364</td>
<td>$1,264,364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKFORCE (Accessibility &amp; Quality)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages+</td>
<td>$672,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,731,264</td>
<td>$4,523,904</td>
<td>$4,523,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Building - Provider organizations/associations/networks</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal WORKFORCE</strong></td>
<td>$3,761,264</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,753,904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City-wide Child Care, *Part 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Strategy</th>
<th>DCYF</th>
<th>First 5</th>
<th>HSA-DHS Budget FY 06-07</th>
<th>Multi-Dept Total</th>
<th>Projected Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Consultation (ECMHCI)</td>
<td>$1,328,000</td>
<td>$440,052</td>
<td>$1,513,318</td>
<td>$3,281,370</td>
<td>$3,281,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Consultation - Child Care Health Project (CCHP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$459,602</td>
<td>$459,602</td>
<td>$459,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$338,580</td>
<td>$463,580</td>
<td>$463,580</td>
<td>$463,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Ill and Emergency Back-up care</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$299,421</td>
<td>$369,421</td>
<td>$369,421</td>
<td>$369,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Eligibility List</td>
<td>$48,614</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$88,614</td>
<td>$88,614</td>
<td>$88,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Facilities Fund (LIIF expansion, improvements, and retention)</td>
<td>$186,464</td>
<td></td>
<td>$866,891 (GF)</td>
<td>$2,279,657</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$639,484 (CW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$46,818</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,506,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$773,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,517,296</td>
<td>$7,267,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,308,839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steady progress has been made to reduce a structural imbalance in the General Fund. A projected shortfall of $64 million remains for FY 07-08.
The shortfall is due to higher General Fund expenditures than General Fund revenues.

### FY 2007-2008 GENERAL FUND SOURCES AND USES ($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Loss of One-Time Sources</strong></td>
<td>($2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of prior year starting balance</td>
<td>($99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryforward of FY 05-06 year end balance</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryforward of current year GF reserve</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryforward of other available reserve balances</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected FY 06-07 ending balance</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Growth</strong></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known and Projected MOU Costs</strong></td>
<td>($39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Dental, Pension and Other Benefits</td>
<td>($26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Spending Requirements</td>
<td>($37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Costs</td>
<td>($60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>($162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortfall Projection</strong></td>
<td>($64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This projection assumes:

• No Rainy Day deposits are required in the current year or the budget year.
• No more than a 1.3% inflation adjustment on open labor contracts.
• No changes in state and federal funding.
• No additional General Fund supplementals in the current year.
FY 07-08
Budget Instructions

• Human Services Agency is to submit a 3% or $2.3 million budget reduction based on its General Fund subsidy.

• Agency is advised that additional reductions may be required.
FY 07-08
Budget Instructions

• General Fund departments or clusters of departments may request one-time efficiency grants.

• Departments must justify all new position requests.

• Consider cost pressures affecting nonprofit contractors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>Governor submits Proposed State Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>DHS Commission approves Budget and Submits Budget to Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Governor submits May “Revise” Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Mayor submits City Budget to the Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Budget Committee Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Approves City Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Comment

Today’s Presentation can be found at

http://www.sfgov.org/site/dhs

Please provide additional comments, input, and feedback to Derek Chu at derek.chu@sfgov.org