SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

Department of Benefits
and Family Support

Department of Disability
and Aging Services

Office of Early Care
and Education

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

London Breed
Mayor

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO:	HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION
THROUGH:	TRENT RHORER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM:	SUSIE SMITH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND PLANNING ESPERANZA ZAPIEN, DIRECTOR OF CONTRACTS
DATE:	APRIL 21, 2023
SUBJECT:	NEW GRANT: **CHAPIN HALL at the UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO** (NON-PROFIT) FOR LOCAL EVALUTION OF GUARANTEED INCOME FOR EXTENDED FOSTER YOUTH PILOT
GRANT TERM:	MAY 1, 2023 – APRIL 30, 2028

GRANT AMOUNT:

NEW	CONTINGENCY	TOTAL
$565,984	$56,598	$622,582

ANNUAL AMOUNT:

FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25	FY25-26	FY26-27
$19,232	$97,820	$94,835	$135,255	$116,479

FY27-28
$102,363

FUNDING SOURCE PERCENTAGE:

Local	State	Private	CONTINGENCY	TOTAL
$104,000 18%		$461,984 82%	$56,598	$565,984 100%

The Department of Benefits and Family Support (BFS) requests authorization to approve a sole source waiver and to enter into a grant with Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago (Chapin Hall) for the period of May 1, 2023 to April 30, 2028, in an amount of $565,984, with a 10% contingency, for a total amount not

to exceed $622,582. The purpose of the grant is to provide a local evaluation for the Guaranteed Income (GI) for Extended Foster Youth Pilot Program.

Background

In September of 2022, the Human Services Agency (HSA) applied to the State of California's request to launch a Guaranteed Income for Extended Foster Youth Pilot Program (GI Pilot Program). HSA received notice of award in the fall of 2022. The GI Pilot Program will offer a $1,200 monthly benefit over a period of 18 months to a total of 150 foster youth who age out of extended foster care at age 21. Additionally, the Pilot Program will provide optional supportive services to participants, including case management, financial coaching, and benefits counseling.

While a statewide evaluation will be conducted for pilot sites funded through the California GI Pilot Program, HSA will complement this research with a local evaluation. The goals of the local evaluation are to:

1. Supplement the statewide evaluation to comprehensively evaluate our local GI Pilot in ways that are relevant for our local context; and
2. Summarize all San Francisco implementation and outcome findings in locally focused reports and research documents.

Given Chapin Hall's extensive expertise and past experience conducting rigorous evaluations of child welfare and foster youth programming, Chapin Hall was listed in HSA's application for California's GI Pilot Program as the intended partner for our local evaluation.

Services to be Provided

Evaluation activities associated with the comprehensive local evaluation will include, but are not limited to, the following.

Chapin Hall will:

1. Provide project management services, including facilitating regular check-in meetings with HSA Planning and Family and Children's Services, the statewide evaluation team, Participant Ambassadors, and relevant partner staff. Grantor shall manage project activities and deadlines to ensure completion in accordance with the mandated project timeline.
2. Collaborate with statewide evaluation partners to update a monthly dashboard that provides quantitative measures related to implementation (e.g., enrollment figures, amount of aid disbursed, participation in optional support services).
3. Administer a brief post-enrollment survey to gather feedback from participants about their experiences with the enrollment process and with the disbursement of monthly stipends.

4. Administer surveys to participants at Program Enrollment, Program Exit, 1 Year Post-Program Exit, and 2 Years Post-Program Exit.
5. Conduct approximately 15 in-depth interviews with participants at three points during the project period: 9-10 months post-enrollment, just after the pilot ends, and 2 years post-exit. The interviews will focus on participants' experiences with the pilot and the impact of the pilot on their financial stability, well-being and future goals.
6. Conduct interviews with representatives from Family and Children's Services as well as the CBO partners, Bay Area Legal Aid (BALA) and First Place for Youth (FPFY), which are providing optional supportive services during the Pilot Program.
7. Present survey results and other interim outcomes at monthly Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) meetings with HSA Planning and FCS staff, Participant Ambassadors, and representatives from various collaborating agencies.
8. Analyze administrative data from various sources to examine the outcomes of participants and to compare their outcomes to the outcomes of young people who did not participate in the pilot.
9. Draft 4 local research briefs and a 5th/final cumulative report covering: (1) enrollment and baseline survey findings; (2) interim implementation findings; (3) final implementation and exit outcome findings; (4) one-year follow up outcome findings; and (5) two-year follow-up outcome findings.
10. Prepare 1-hour presentations that summarize local findings for HSA staff, Community-Based Organizations (CBO) partners, and philanthropic funders following the release of each local research brief/report.

For more specific detail regarding services to be provided, please refer to Appendix A (attached).

Location of Services
Services will be offered under the auspices of Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago: 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Il, 60637.

Selection
The evaluation work for the GI Pilot Program is a sole source, as Chapin Hall is named in the application to the State.

Funding
Funding is provided through local General Funds, plus additional philanthropic support is from Tipping Point.

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A: Services to be Provided
Appendix B: Program Budget
Sole Source Approval Memo and Approval

Appendix A: Services to be Provided
Chapin Hall of the University of Chicago
Local Evaluation of Guaranteed Income for Extended Foster Youth Pilot
May 1, 2023 – April 30, 2028

I.   Purpose

The San Francisco Human Services Agency (SFHSA) administers child welfare services which promote child safety, family crisis assistance, and support for foster youth. San Francisco's Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) provides case management support to young people who have been arrested in San Francisco. Both SFHSA and JPD supervise foster youth in extended foster care with the aim to guide them into their transition to a successful adulthood. The purpose of this contract is to provide a local evaluation of the Guaranteed Income (GI) for Extended Foster Youth Pilot Program (GI Pilot).

The goals of the local evaluation are to:
1. Evaluate our local GI Pilot in ways that are relevant for our local context and reflect our program-specific design; and
2. Summarize all San Francisco implementation and outcome findings in locally focused reports and research documents.

II.   Definitions

BALA:	Bay Area Legal Aid
CARBON:	Contracts Administration Reporting & Billing Online database
CBO:	Community-Based Organization
CITY:	City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation
FCS:	Family and Children's Services, San Francisco's child welfare agency
FPFY:	First Place for Youth
GI:	Guaranteed Income
GRANTEE:	Chapin Hall of the University of Chicago
JPD:	San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
SFHSA:	San Francisco Human Service's Agency
Unity Care:	A local non-profit organization that provides housing support for certain eligible former foster youth

III.   Target Population

Young adults who have or will turn 21 in San Francisco supervised foster care (supervised by either child welfare or juvenile probation) between 1/1/2022 and the end of our enrollment period. Young adults must meet income thresholds outlined by Insight Center's Family Needs Calculator, which establishes individualized income thresholds that take into account the county of residence and household size of each young adult. As an example, the Family Needs Calculator income threshold for a single adult residing in San Francisco is $60,232

annually, and the threshold for a single adult with one infant child residing in San Francisco is $124,392.

IV. Description of Services

SFHSA determined that a quasi-experimental study design best suits the needs of the GI Pilot and its target population. The following description of services reflects tasks necessary to conduct this quasi-experimental study.

SFHSA retains the right to revisit this scope and budget pending accessibility of administrative data, feasibility of certain evaluation tasks, and budgetary considerations as the pilot continues.

Grantee shall complete the local evaluation over a five-year period. The scope of work will include four components: (A) data collection; (B) data analysis; (C) reporting; and (D) project management.

A. Data Collection (May 1, 2023 to July 1, 2027)

As the GI Pilot is administered by Family and Children's Services (FCS), Grantee will use mixed-methods to collect and analyze primary and secondary data. Grantee will work closely with statewide evaluators to ensure that data collection is not duplicated and is focused on locally pertinent findings and programs. Grantee will also be responsible for supplementing the statewide evaluator's data collection tools or creating new tools that capture local needs.

Data Sharing Infrastructure: Grantee will lead the development of any data sharing agreements and consent forms necessary to fulfill services and deliverables. Data sharing partnerships may be needed with external partners between Chapin Hall and partners, such as Transitional Age Youth Research & Evaluation Hub at UC Berkeley, Urban Institute, AidKit, Social Finance, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), among others.

Primary Data Collection

Grantee will collect primary data from young people in the treatment group through surveys and in-depth interviews. Grantee will also attempt to collect interview data from partnering staff. Financial compensation will be provided for youth participation in all research activities. These data collection activities will be designed to understand the lived experience of participants with the Pilot and the perceived effects of the Pilot on their lives. They will also inform improvements to the Pilot implementation.

Surveys:
Participants will be asked to complete five optional surveys over the course of the five-year project period at the following intervals: program enrollment; 1-month post-enrollment; program exit, 1-year post-pilot; and 2-years post-pilot. Grantee may disseminate these

surveys via AidKit, an app that will disperse funds to participants and has built-in evaluation capabilities, or by reaching out to participants directly.

1. *Enrollment/Baseline Survey:* The enrollment survey will capture baseline data across various domains, including but not limited to, overall well-being, financial health, food security, housing, transportation, employment, enrollment in and completion of education and training programs, physical and mental health, healthcare access, criminal justice involvement, commercial sexual exploitation, parenthood, residence (in San Francisco vs. Outside San Francisco), and other program participation (e.g., THP+, FYI and EHV vouchers, EHAP stipend).

2. *1-Month Post Enrollment Survey:* Grantee will develop a brief survey that can be administered approximately one month post-enrollment and after the first monthly stipend has been dispersed. The aim of this survey is to learn about participants' experience enrolling in the program and accessing their first monthly stipend. Participants will also have an opportunity to provide feedback about how the experience could be improved.

3. *Program Exit Survey:* Grantee will supplement the statewide evaluators' program exit survey with an exit survey that measures the same outcomes as the baseline survey to assess change over time. Additional questions related to program exit may also be included.

4. & 5. *Post Enrollment Surveys:* Grantee will develop two follow-up surveys to be administered at 1- and 2-years post-exit which will measure the same outcomes as the baseline survey to facilitate an examination of change over time. Additional questions related to longer-term outcomes may also be included.

The statewide evaluators intend to survey participants at Program Enrollment (#1 above) and Program Exit (#3 above). Where feasible, the Grantee will collaborate with statewide evaluators to add locally relevant survey questions at these two overlapping time periods. Grantee will also work alongside statewide evaluators to ensure that any baseline and program exit survey data collection is not duplicative or burdensome for the participants.

Grantee will ensure that all surveys are available in all the preferred languages of participants and meet the City's design standards for inclusion and accessibility.

Interviews:

In-depth Youth Interviews: Grantee will conduct approximately 15 in-depth youth interviews at three different time periods (post-enrollment, after pilot exit, and approximately 2-years post-exit). The aim of these youth interviews is to understand how young people feel they have or have not benefitted from the pilot. Specifically, the in-depth interviews will address the following questions:

1. How do participants feel that Guaranteed Income payments affected their financial and housing stability, professional and educational pursuits, and their well-being?
2. How do participants feel that optional supportive services affected their financial and housing stability, professional and educational pursuits, and their well-being?
3. Do participants feel the pilot has had any unintended negative consequences?

Staff Interviews: Grantee will interview representatives from CBO partners, Bay Area Legal Aid (BALA) and First Place for Youth (FPFY), who will be providing optional supportive services (case management, financial coaching, and benefits counseling) to participants. Grantee will also interview the FCS GI Program Coordinator.

Acquisition of Secondary Data

Pilot Program Data: Grantee will access individual-level program data (e.g., enrollment dates, amount of aid disbursed) from a locally tailored data collection system. Most likely, this will be some adaptation of the AidKit platform.

Administrative Data: Grantee will access administrative data through the California Department of Social Services and/or other external data sources to examine select outcomes of pilot participants and compare their outcomes to the outcomes of young people who did not participate in the pilot. These outcomes may include but are not limited to: CalWORKs and CalFresh participation (CDSS), Supplemental Security Income receipt (CDSS/SSA), employment and earnings (Employment Development Department); postsecondary educational enrollment and attainment (National Student Clearinghouse); homelessness and receipt of housing services (Homeless Data Integration System); and criminal justice system involvement (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation). Grantee will also access child welfare and juvenile probation data from SFHSA.

B. Data Analysis (January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2027)

Grantee will analyze primary and secondary data to evaluate the pilot's implementation and outcomes. Specifically, the implementation analysis should focus on enrollment, attrition, participant characteristics, engagement in optional supportive services, and implementation challenges.

The analysis of outcomes should focus on whether providing young adults who aged out of extended foster care monthly cash payments for 18 months increases their financial and housing stability, human capital development, and overall wellness. Grantee will specify the conditions by which the Pilot is effective, for whom, as well as any conditions by which the Pilot does any harm (if at all). Grantee will analyze outcomes for participants at three time points: program exit, 1-year post-Pilot exit, and 2-years post-Pilot exit. Grantee will determine the appropriate time points for comparing the intervention and comparison group.

The Grantee will need to identify how to best estimate the impact of the intervention. Grantee may consider the use of propensity score matching to create a comparison group of (1) young adults who have aged out of extended foster care in a county similar to San Francisco that is not implementing a GI program or (2) young people aging out of San Francisco foster care after the Pilot ends. Grantee must ensure that this methodology best suits the San Francisco context.

Chapin Hall
Appendix A

A primary goal of the local evaluation is to understand which components of the GI Pilot should be offered to participants in any future GI programs in San Francisco. Grantee will supplement gaps in the statewide evaluation by examining the differential impact of the GI payments, participation in the optional support services (e.g., case management, financial coaching, and benefits counseling), and receipt of other local benefits on youth outcomes. Grantee will also seek to identify any lasting positive effects of GI Pilot participation one and two years after the pilot ends, as well as any negative effects on participants when the money is discontinued, by analyzing post-pilot participant data.

C. <u>Reporting (August 1, 2023 to April 30, 2028)</u>

Evaluation Plan: Grantee will develop an evaluation plan that includes an introduction and description of the purpose of the evaluation, research questions, study design, methodology, analysis plan, and deliverables. Grantee may use SFHSA Evaluation Plan drafts as a reference.

Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Meetings: Grantee will facilitate monthly CQI meetings and present aggregate survey and interview data as well as a monthly dashboard (described below). Grantee will flag any implementation issues raised by the data for discussion. Meetings will include representatives from SFHSA Planning, FCS, and JPD; the statewide evaluation team (including those from Urban Institute and Social Finance); Participant Ambassadors; and representatives from various collaborating agencies (BALA, FPFY, Unity Care).

Monthly Dashboard: The statewide evaluation partner, Social Finance, will develop a standardized monthly dashboard for each site using program data. This dashboard will include information about enrollment and aid disbursement. Grantee may collaborate with Social Finance to ensure that the uptake of optional support services is included in the monthly dashboard. This dashboard will be presented at monthly CQI meetings.

Local Research Briefs and Report: While the statewide evaluators intend to release a single report at the end of the Pilot, the Grantee will be responsible for authoring four local research briefs and a cumulative final report which will summarize locally pertinent findings from the statewide evaluation and include findings from all relevant local evaluation activities (e.g., surveys, interviews, administrative data analyses). The five written products include:

1. *Implementation and Baseline Research Brief*: At the conclusion of the 6-month enrollment period, Grantee will summarize early implementation findings and baseline outcome findings, including any recommendations to improve implementation for subsequent projects. Tentative due date: 7/1/2024, six months after enrollment ends.
2. *Interim Research Brief:* Halfway through the Pilot, Grantee will provide initial outcome findings, with a particular focus on implementation outcomes and qualitative feedback. Tentative due date: 4/1/2025, halfway through Pilot

3. *Program Exit Research Brief:* At the conclusion of the Pilot, Grantee will summarize additional implementation findings and outcome findings at program exit. Tentative due date: 3/1/2026, eight months after the last participant exits the Pilot.
4. *1 Year Follow-up Research Brief:* One year after the last participants exits the Pilot, Grantee will summarize outcome findings one year post-Pilot exit. Tentative due date: 3/1/2027, eight months after the one-year anniversary of the last participant exiting the Pilot.
5. *2 Year Follow-up/Cumulative Report:* Two years after the last participant exits the Pilot, Grantee will summarize outcome findings two years post-Pilot exit and produce a cumulative final report reflective of the entire 5-year evaluation. Tentative due date: 3/1/2028, eight months after the two-year anniversary of the last participant exiting the Pilot.

While the content of these local briefs will vary based on stage of the Pilot, they will include a brief overview of the pilot, a short description of the methods, a presentation of the findings, and a discussion of their implications. The comprehensive report will include a detailed background on the Pilot, the Pilot's specific intervention and Theory of Change, description of the target population and baseline characteristics of participants, evaluation methodology, and results of analyses of qualitative and quantitative data related to implementation and outcomes.

SFHSA will have the opportunity to review and provide comments on each of the Grantee's reports prior to the delivery of the final products.

Presentations of Findings and Recommendations: After the release of each local brief and the comprehensive report, Grantee will prepare two one-hour presentations that summarizes local findings. The presentations will be given to SFHSA staff and CBO partners involved in implementing the Pilot and to philanthropic funders, upon request.

D. <u>Project Management (On-Going)</u>
Grantee will provide project management services, including the facilitation of monthly CQI meetings (as discussed above in deliverables). Grantee shall manage project activities and deadlines to ensure completion in accordance with the mandated project timeline.

Youth Advisory Board: Grantee will be tasked with facilitating a discussion with a Youth Advisory Board to further incorporate participant input on survey questions and interview guides to ensure that questions young people feel are important are addressed and that questions are asked in a clear and culturally relevant manner. Grantee may be able to coordinate with other youth boards to receive this input, such as the statewide evaluation council and a Youth Empowerment Board at Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA).

V. Key Deliverable and Reporting Requirements
A. The following table outlines the key deliverables to be provided.

Key Deliverable	Timeframe
Evaluation Plan	6/1/23
Monthly Dashboard Updates	Monthly (7/1/23-7/1/25)
Local Research Brief #1	7/1/24
Presentation #1	8/1/24
Local Research Brief #2	4/1/25
Presentation #2	5/1/25
Local Research Brief #3	3/1/26
Presentation #3	4/1/26
Local Research Brief #4	3/1/27
Presentation #4	4/1/27
Final Local Report	3/1/28
Presentation #5	4/1/28
CQI Meeting Facilitation	Monthly (7/1/23-7/1/25)

A full description of each key deliverable is provided in Section IV.C. – Description of Services, Reporting above.

B. Grantee will provide a final report summarizing the contract activities, referencing the tasks above once all deliverables are met. This report may also include accomplishments and challenges encountered.

C. For assistance with reporting requirements or submission of reports, contact:

Taryn.C.Ness@sfgov.org
Program Support Analyst, SFHSA

Christine.Lou@sfgov.org
Director of Research and Evaluation, SFHSA

Johanna.Gendelman@sfgov.org
Senior Contracts Manager, SFHSA

Appendix B: Calculation of Charges
Chapin Hall of the University of Chicago
Local Evaluation of Guaranteed Income for Extended Foster Youth Pilot
May 1, 2023 – April 30, 2028

	Tasks and subtasks	Period 1 Start 5/1/2023 — Period 1 End 6/30/2023		Period 2 Start 7/1/2023 — Period 2 End 6/30/2024		Period 3 Start 7/1/2024 — Period 3 End 6/30/2025		Period 4 Start 7/1/2025 — Period 4 End 6/30/2026		Period 5 Start 7/1/2026 — Period 5 End 6/30/2027		Period 6 Start 7/1/2027 — Period 6 End 4/30/2028	
		Hours by task	Cost by Task	Hours by task	Cost by Task	Hours by task	Cost by Task	Hours by task	Cost by Task	Hours by task	Cost by Task	Hours by task	Cost by Task
1	Component 1: Tool Development/Data Collection	34	$ 5,917	152	$ 16,201	123	$ 17,648	122	$ 17,623	68	$ 13,790	63	$ 7,552
1.1	Tool Development - Survey	24	$ 3,960	0	$ -	20	$ 3,658	20	$ 3,886	20	$ 4,131	0	$ -
1.1.1	Baseline survey	20	$ 3,244	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.1.2	Postenrollment survey	4	$ 716	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.1.3	Exit survey	0	$ -	0	$ -	20	$ 3,658	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.1.4	1st follow up survey	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	20	$ 3,886	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.1.5	2nd follow up survey	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	20	$ 4,131	0	$ -
1.2	Tool Development - Interviews	0	$ -	19	$ 3,263	19	$ 3,466	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.2.1	Youth interviews	0	$ -	14	$ 2,429	14	$ 2,579	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.2.2	Staff interviews	0	$ -	5	$ 834	5	$ 886	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.3	Data Collection - Survey	0	$ -	78	$ 6,491	39	$ 6,641	45	$ 8,142	45	$ 8,655	6	$ 1,227
1.3.1	Baseline survey	0	$ -	39	$ 3,245	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.3.2	Postenrollment survey	0	$ -	39	$ 3,245	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.3.3	Exit survey	0	$ -	0	$ -	39	$ 6,641	6	$ 1,086	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.3.4	1st follow up survey	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	39	$ 7,056	6	$ 1,154	0	$ -
1.3.5	2nd follow up survey	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	39	$ 7,501	6	$ 1,227
1.4	Data Collection - Interviews	0	$ -	44	$ 3,377	44	$ 3,587	54	$ 4,650	0	$ -	54	$ 5,257
1.4.1	Youth interviews	0	$ -	27	$ 2,060	27	$ 2,188	54	$ 4,650	0	$ -	54	$ 5,257
1.4.2	Staff interviews	0	$ -	17	$ 1,317	17	$ 1,399	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
1.5	Secondary Data Collection	10	$ 1,957	11	$ 3,069	1	$ 296	3	$ 945	3	$ 1,004	3	$ 1,068
1.5.1	Program Data (DSAs)	10	$ 1,957	1	$ 279	1	$ 296	1	$ 315	1	$ 335	1	$ 356
1.5.2	Administrative Data (DSAs)	0	$ -	10	$ 2,790	0	$ -	2	$ 630	2	$ 669	2	$ 712

#	Item	Hrs	$	Cost	Hrs	$	Cost	Hrs	$	Cost	Hrs	$	Cost	Hrs	$	Cost	Hrs	$	Cost
2	Component 2: Data Analysis	0	$	-	68	$	9,715	116	$	11,312	332	$	52,707	212	$	40,204	280	$	50,386
2.1	Surveys	0	$	-	38	$	5,618	0	$	-	32	$	5,254	32	$	5,585	32	$	5,939
2.1.1	Baseline survey	0	$	-	32	$	4,656	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.1.2	Postenrollment survey	0	$	-	6	$	962	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.1.3	Exit survey	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	32	$	5,254	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.1.4	1st follow up survey	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	32	$	5,585	0	$	-
2.1.5	2nd follow up survey	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	32	$	5,939
2.2	Interviews	0	$	-	0	$	-	92	$	8,738	92	$	9,284	0	$	-	68	$	7,630
2.2.1	Youth interviews	0	$	-	0	$	-	68	$	6,352	68	$	6,749	0	$	-	68	$	7,630
2.2.2	Staff interviews	0	$	-	0	$	-	24	$	2,386	24	$	2,536	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.3	Program Data	0	$	-	30	$	4,098	24	$	2,574	4	$	456	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.3.1	Monthly data dashboard	0	$	-	30	$	4,098	24	$	2,574	4	$	456	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.4	Administrative Data	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	204	$	37,713	180	$	34,619	180	$	36,817
2.4.1	Identification of comparison group	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	24	$	5,146	0	$	-	0	$	-
2.4.2	Examine outcomes of participants	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	180	$	32,567	60	$	11,540	60	$	12,272
2.4.3	Compare participants to nonparticipants	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	120	$	23,079	120	$	24,545
3	Component 3: Reporting	10	$	2,628	81	$	15,390	75	$	13,263	65	$	12,953	57	$	12,992	74	$	17,938
3.1	Evaluation Plan	10	$	2,628	10	$	2,790	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.2	Monthly Dashboard Updates	0	$	-	14	$	1,770	12	$	1,287	2	$	228	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.4	Local Reports (1 - 5)	0	$	-	45	$	8,550	51	$	9,555	51	$	10,152	45	$	10,257	62	$	15,029
3.4.1	Local Report #1 (Baseline)	0	$	-	45	$	8,550	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.4.2	Local Report #2 (Interim)	0	$	-	0	$	-	51	$	9,555	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.4.3	Local Report #3 (Program Exit)	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	51	$	10,152	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.4.4	Local Report #4 (1 Year Post-Exit)	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	45	$	10,257	0	$	-
3.4.5	Local Report #5 (2 Years Post-Exit)	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	62	$	15,029
3.5	Presentations	0	$	-	12	$	2,280	12	$	2,422	12	$	2,573	12	$	2,735	12	$	2,909
3.5.1	Presentations #1 (Baseline)	0	$	-	12	$	2,280	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.5.2	Presentations #2 (Interim)	0	$	-	0	$	-	12	$	2,422	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.5.3	Presentations #3 (Program Exit)	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	12	$	2,573	0	$	-	0	$	-
3.5.4	Presentations #4 (1 Year Post-Exit)	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	12	$	2,735	0	$	-
3.5.5	Presentations #5 (2 Year Post-Exit)	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	12	$	2,909
4	Component 4: On-Going Project Management	56	$	9,897	280.5	$	43,364	237.5	$	42,415	190.5	$	35,643	170	$	33,285	105	$	26,487
4.1	Project Management	5	$	1,314	26	$	7,255	26	$	7,705	26	$	8,187	26	$	8,703	26	$	9,255
4.2	IRB approval	8	$	1,432	10	$	1,900	6	$	1,211	6	$	1,287	6	$	1,368	2	$	485
4.3	Internal team meetings	25	$	3,930	65	$	10,847	65	$	11,520	65	$	12,240	65	$	13,012	65	$	13,838
4.4	CQI meetings	0	$	-	54	$	9,566	54	$	10,160	8	$	1,715	0	$	-	0	$	-
4.5	Youth Empowerment Board meetings	6	$	1,074	4	$	760	6	$	1,211	4	$	858	4	$	912	0	$	-
4.6	External Meetings	12	$	2,148	25.5	$	4,672	25.5	$	4,962	25.5	$	5,272	12	$	2,735	12	$	2,909
4.6.1	Meetings with statewide evaluator	6	$	1,074	12	$	2,280	12	$	2,422	12	$	2,573	0	$	-	0	$	-
4.6.2	Meetings with HSA	6	$	1,074	13.5	$	2,392	13.5	$	2,540	13.5	$	2,699	12	$	2,735	12	$	2,909
4.6.3	Incentive Payments	0	$	-	96	$	8,365	55	$	5,647	56	$	6,084	57	$	6,556	0	$	-
5	Project Expenses	0	$	790	0	$	13,150	0	$	10,197	0	$	16,329	0	$	16,208	0	$	-
5.1	Project Expenses	0	$	790	0	$	13,150	0	$	10,197	0	$	16,329	0	$	16,208	0	$	-
5.1.1	Survey Incentives	0	$	-	0	$	9,465	0	$	5,721	0	$	10,661	0	$	10,661	0	$	-
5.1.2	Youth Interview Incentives	0	$	-	0	$	615	0	$	615	0	$	1,230	0	$	1,230	0	$	-
5.1.3	Transcription	0	$	-	0	$	2,280	0	$	2,280	0	$	3,648	0	$	2,736	0	$	-
5.1.4	Translation	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-	0	$	-
5.1.5	Youth Advisory Board Incentives	0	$	790	0	$	790	0	$	1,581	0	$	790	0	$	1,581	0	$	-

Total Hours for Project	2971.5	
Total FTE for Project	1.83	
Total Cost for Project	$ 565,985	

I. HSA will reimburse for services provided based on the above schedule of rates on completion of each phase.

II. Grantee shall submit invoices on a monthly basis in CARBON (Contract Administration, Reporting, and Billing Online) for actual services provided. Invoices shall clearly state the Phase completion.

III. The total amount of this budget is **$565,984**. Contingent amounts up to **$56,598** may be available, at the City's sole discretion.

IV. The total amount shall not to exceed **$622,582.**

Grant Solicitation Waiver Instructions

XXXX

WHEN TO USE: For approval of grant solicitation waivers under Administrative Code Section 21G.8, where:

- A competitive process is infeasible or impracticable
- A Public Purpose may reasonably be accomplished by one particular Grantee

Per the City Purchaser's Administrative Code Chapter 21G Rules and Regulations, this Waiver Form is **_not required_** for grants awarded in accordance with Administrative Code Sections:

- **21G.3(a)(1):** Grants to a governmental entity for programs, activities, or services that can be practically performed only by that particular entity
- **21G.3(a)(2):** Grants to a specific entity as required to comply with applicable law or contract, or as a result of the requirements of the funding source
- **21G.3(a)(3):** Grants made for improvement to property by a property owner
- **21G.8(c):** Grants to any of the four City-owned community cultural center

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete this Grant Solicitation Waiver Form to request approval to waive the competitive solicitation requirements under Administrative Code Section 21G.8. Provide specific and comprehensive information to justify why the requested grant should awarded absent a solicitation. Attach appropriate/required supporting documentation.

The Grant Solicitation Waiver Form must be signed by the Granting Officer or their designee. The Solicitation Waiver must be fully approved before the department makes a commitment to the grantee, and before City funds are encumbered. If the Solicitation Waiver request is denied, the department must conduct a competitive process to select the grantee(s).

For extensions of Solicitation Waivers for a previously awarded sole source grant, attach a copy of all prior approved Solicitation Waivers or other sole source determinations by the relevant authority.

Submit Grant Solicitation Waiver Form for final approval as follows:

- **Granting Agencies under jurisdiction of a commission or board:** to the commission or board, recommending waiver of solicitation requirements for this grant award.
- **Granting Agencies with no board or commission:** to the Purchaser (oca@sfgov.org), who shall convene the Grant Consensus Committee[1] to review the request.

Once fully approved, upload this signed form, all supporting documentation, and commission, board, or Grant Consensus Committee final approval, as applicable, to PeopleSoft. Select the appropriate Purchasing Authority for the grant award in PeopleSoft.

---

[1] Representatives from the Controller's Office, Human Resources Department, Office of Contract Administration, and City Attorney's Office

Grant Solicitation Waiver Form

Department:	Human Services Agency	**Phone:** 415-557-5507	
Dept. Contact:	Johanna Gendelman	**Email:** Johanna.gendelman@gmail.com	

Request: ☒New ☐Modification **Grantee:** Chapin Hall **Supplier ID:** 0000023059

Short Description of Grant: Research&Evaluation of Guaranteed Income Pilot

Grant Amount: $622,582 **Grant Duration:** 5/23-4/28
(Attach itemized budget if available) **Anticipated Dates:** From 5/23 To 4/28

Describe the Public Purpose to be fulfilled by this Grant: Services to former foster youth

---

Justification for Waiver of Competitive Solicitation Requirements
Check the appropriate solicitation waiver reason and address the questions listed. Attach additional supporting documentation as indicated and/or as necessary.

☐ **Competitive solicitation infeasible or impracticable**

- Is this grant required to respond to a public emergency or other exigent circumstances? ☐ Yes ☐ No

- If **YES**, provide a description of the public exigency or emergency, need for the sole source Grant and period of performance, and impact on the Public Purpose if the sole source Grant is not approved.

- If **NO**, grant is *not* required to respond to public emergency or other exigent circumstance:
   - Why is a competitive process infeasible or impracticable?
   - Why is this the only entity that can fulfill this Public Purpose? What does the entity offer that is essential to fulfilling the Public Purpose?
   - What steps were taken to verify that this is the only entity that can fulfill this Public Purpose? Has the department contacted other entities to evaluate their ability to fulfill the Public Purpose, and if so, describe the entities and explain why they cannot meet the department's needs.

☒ **Public Purpose may reasonably be accomplished by one particular Grantee**

- Why this is the only entity that can fulfill this Public Purpose? What the entity offers that is essential to fulfilling the Public Purpose? See memo

- What steps were taken to verify that this is the only entity that can fulfill this Public Purpose? Has the department contacted other entities to evaluate their ability to fulfill the Public Purpose, and if so, describe the entities and explain why they cannot meet the department's needs.

- Is this a recurring Grant to the same recipient? ☐ Yes ☒ No

- If **YES**: How long has this entity fulfilled this Public Purpose for the department?
   - Has department conducted a formal or informal competitive process within the last five years demonstrating lack of other potential Grantees, pursuant to Admin Code §21G.8(b). ☐ Yes ☐ No
   - Solicitation document(s), result(s), and other supporting documentation attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

---

Grant Solicitation Waiver request is recommended by:

Grants Officer (Dept Head) or Designee Name:

Grants Officer (Dept Head) or Designee Signature: *DocuSigned by: Dan Kaplan ED8A450D2D23472...* Date: 4/20/2023

For departments without board or commission, this Waiver request is approved by:

OCA Director (on behalf of Grant Consensus Committee): Date:

P-21G.8 (01-22) Office of Contract Administration

**SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY**

Department of Benefits
and Family Support

Department of Disability
and Aging Services

Office of Early Care
and Education

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

London Breed
Mayor

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director

Date: April 19, 2023
To: Dan Kaplan, Deputy Director, HSA
From: Esperanza Zapien, Director of Contracts, HSA
RE: Sole Source Waiver request – Chapin Hall at the University of
Chicago to provide research and evaluation of pilot program for
Guaranteed Income for City and County of San Francisco foster youth
exiting extended care.

Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago (Chapin Hall) is a non-profit
research institution with expertise in child welfare policies and practice.
SFHSA was recently awarded $3.3 million in funds from the state for a
Guaranteed Income for Former Foster Youth Pilot Program (GI Pilot).
This memo is a request to grant a sole source waiver for Chapin Hall to
provide research and evaluation for this effort.

In the state application for the GI Pilot, Chapin Hall was listed as
SFHSA's evaluation partner. Therefore, 21G.3(a)(2) is applicable "Grants
to a specific entity as required to comply with applicable law or contract"

SFHSA is proposing the following:

Request: SFHSA will set up a grant for Chapin Hall to conduct a local evaluation of the Guaranteed Income for Former Foster Youth Pilot Program (GI Pilot) for the time period May 01, 2023 to April 30, 2028 for an amount not to exceed $622,582.
Brief description of services: Chapin Hall will supplement a statewide evaluation of the GI Pilot Program with a local evaluation which is specific to and relevant for the local program context.
Duration: A grant term of five years.
Justification for Sole Source: In the state application for the GI Pilot, Chapin Hall was listed as our evaluation partner in the state application. 21G.3(a)(2)-See Attachment A
Key Deliverables and Reporting Requirements: A. The following table outlines the key deliverables to be provided.

Key Deliverable	Timeframe
Evaluation Plan	6/1/23

SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Monthly Dashboard Updates	Monthly (7/1/23-7/1/25)
Local Research Brief #1	7/1/24
Presentation #1	8/1/24
Local Research Brief #2	4/1/25
Presentation #2	5/1/25
Local Research Brief #3	3/1/26
Presentation #3	4/1/26
Local Research Brief #4	3/1/27
Presentation #4	4/1/27
Final Local Report	3/1/28
Presentation #5	4/1/28
CQI Meeting Facilitation	Monthly (7/1/23-7/1/25)

B. A full description of each key deliverable is provided in Appendix A. Section IV.C. – Description of Services, Reporting above.
C. For a detailed list of deliverables, see Appendix B.

Compliance: The grantee will meet the normal city requirements for contracting.

Future procurement: This local evaluation is a one-time request.

X___ Approved   ___ Disapproved

Dan Kaplan

Dan Kaplan, Deputy Director of Administration and Finance