San Francisco Department of

Early Childhood

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #24-05 FOR:

Data and Evaluation Services

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS ISSUED:	06/10/2024
BIDDERS' CONFERENCE:	07/02/2024 1:00PM
DEADLINE TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS:	08/09/2024 12:00PM

Contents

I. Introduction and Solicitation Schedule

A. Introduction

1. GENERAL

This Request for Proposals (hereinafter "RFP" or "Solicitation") is being issued by Department of Early Childhood (hereinafter, "DEC" or "City"). DEC is seeking to partner with qualified suppliers ("Proposers") to provide proposals ("Proposal") for four distinct service areas: 1) Data Mapping and Data Governance for better utilization, tracking, and reporting of information coming into DEC; 2) High Quality Evaluation Implementation for six critical early childhood initiative program areas within DEC; 3) Landscape Analysis to understand the broader context DEC operates within; and 4) Data Systems Development and Systems Project Management for identifying database and data system needs and advising on software development.

2. BACKGROUND

The Department of Early Childhood (DEC) is dedicated to the early care and education, health, and well-being of San Francisco's youngest residents, children under the age of five, and their families. Our department's purpose is to elevate the importance of early childhood and ensure that every child reaches their full potential, and has a strong foundation of nurturing, health, and learning. We partner with other public agencies and community organizations to focus on equity-centered solutions that make our city the best place in the nation to raise young children and collectively work towards advancing racial equity and disrupting racialized child outcomes.

Kindergarten readiness is a major predictor of later academic and life success, and as such acts as a key indicator for child well-being in San Francisco. Research suggests that third- and eighth-grade test scores in low-income districts in California are behind national counterparts because children start out less ready for school (First 5 Center for Children's Policy, 2020). Moreover, because of extensive kindergarten readiness research within San Francisco and across the state stemming back to 2007, it is known that there are several factors strongly associated with high levels of readiness for kindergarten. Kindergarten readiness is influenced by several factors including identity, language, and cultural affirmation which have an impact on the healthy development of a young child's early learning experience. Being kindergarten ready provides an outlook for future education, job, and economic mobility since children who are academically, socially, and emotionally ready for kindergarten tend to be more successful learners.

Despite gains in school readiness over time, San Francisco Unified School District's 2021 Kindergarten Readiness study showed that 42% of entering kindergartners in San Francisco were still not adequately prepared for school. Children in the study sample not yet meeting readiness standards were disproportionately from: Latino, African American, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander households; households with non-native speakers of the English Language; and were more likely to have an identified disability. Making strides toward improved kindergarten readiness for San Francisco's children necessitates city-wide, universal strategies to ensure that all families and children are supported within their communities as well as targeted strategies so that the families most in need and farthest from opportunity have easy access.

In 2022, two existing city organizations with a long history of supporting young children and their families through innovations in early care and education, family support services, and programs for health child development, First 5 San Francisco and the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE), merged to create the Department of Early Childhood (DEC). Decades of research show that access to high quality early care and education, child health, development and early intervention services, and family and parenting support are critical contributors to children's kindergarten readiness. The joining of these two organizations has allowed for the City of San Francisco to expand capacity and funding to better integrate the City's early childhood services and make sustained investments to address challenges to school readiness. DEC's three main core strategies guide our most critical initiatives (see Appendix 1 for initiative overviews) to cultivate a strong foundation for children:

- Early Learning – We support teacher preparation and compensation, enhance program quality, and improve affordability and access.
- Child Health – We ensure universal developmental screening and promote access to health and mental health services for children and their families.
- Family Strength – We ensure that families have opportunities for social and professional connections, linkage to resources, and information on parenting and child development.

3. DIVERSITY, INCLUSION, AND RACIAL EQUITY

DEC is committed to a culture of inclusion; everyone should have what they need to thrive no matter their race, age, ability, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or country of origin. The Department believes that a diverse and inclusive workforce will produce more creative and innovative outcomes for the organization, and ultimately, its clients.

DEC is committed to combating systemic racism and disparate impact of governmental services by advancing racial equity in all aspects of our work, ensuring access to services and providing support to communities to ensure their ability to succeed and thrive.

DEC seeks to partner with Proposers that share these values in their organizational culture and program operations. This should include a description of the organization's plans, strategies, and activities to address racial equity and inclusion among staff and program participants, as well as internal controls to regularly review current practices through the lens of racial equity and inclusion to identify areas of improvement.

The department sees our contracted partners and their work as a way to enhance and further advance efforts to address racial equity and inclusion across San Francisco. As such, the Proposers chosen for this Solicitation will be able to implement the work through a racial equity lens and have the ability to engage in the work using linguistic and culturally responsive methods. The ideal respondents for this proposal will have familiarity with the diverse communities in San Francisco where young children and families live and will be able to ensure that they are authentically represented in the work areas described in this RFP.

Additional examples of information to be provided are as follows: the organizational mission or inclusion statements, non-discrimination documents, and/or other supporting documents, community outreach plans, staff training activities on racial equity, and a description of or data on the demographics of staff and program participants.

4. SELECTION OVERVIEW

Proposers may apply for one or more service areas, using Section II (Scope of Work) as the basis for their proposal. DEC shall award a contract to multiple Proposers that meet the Minimum Qualifications of this Solicitation and obtain the highest average scores within the proposed respective service area(s). The final number of funded entities will be determined based on review of applications received and availability of funding and is subject to change. Responsive Proposals will be evaluated by a panel ("Evaluation Panel") consisting of one or more parties with expertise related to services being procured through this Solicitation. Proposals will be evaluated based on the criteria outlined herein.

If applicable, a Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) Contract Compliance Officer will assess Proposal compliance with Local Business Enterprise (LBE) requirements and assign a rating bonus to Proposal scores. The CMD-adjusted scores (if applicable) will then be tabulated, and Proposers will be ranked starting with the Proposer receiving the highest average score, then continuing with the Proposer receiving the second highest average score, and so on.

B. Anticipated Contract Term

A contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation shall have a tentative term of up to five (5) years from January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2029 subject to annual availability of funds, annual satisfactory contractor performance, and need. Additionally, DEC reserves the right to enter into contracts of a shorter duration, or to extend all or some contracts for two additional one-year extensions.

Anticipated terms for each individual service area are as follows:

- Service Area I: Data Mapping and Data Governance – January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2026.
- Service Area II: Evaluation Implementation – January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2029.
- Service Area III: Landscape Analysis – January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2029.
- Service Area IV: Data Systems Development and Systems Project Management – January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2028.

C. Anticipated Contract Not to Exceed Amount

The total estimated annual funding for the entirety of this Solicitation is approximately $2 million dollars per year, which may increase or decrease depending on funding availability. The source of funding for these services is local funds. Payment for all services provided in accordance with provisions under this contract shall be contingent upon the availability of funds. DEC shall not guarantee any minimum amount of funding for these services.

Funding awards may be reduced or eliminated in response to reduced allocations or decreased funding availability to any of the City awardees. Also, funding made through this RFP may be augmented, if additional funds become available, without additional application processes provided they are in alignment with the scope and services outlined in this RFP.

Table A, below, indicates the level of funding available for each service area. The actual funding levels will be determined based on review of applications received and availability of funding.

Table A

	Service Area	Maximum Annual Funding Allocation
I	Data Mapping and Data Governance	$150,000
II.1	Evaluation Implementation: Access and Enrollment	$225,000
II.2	Evaluation Implementation: Program Quality Improvement	$275,000
II.3	Evaluation Implementation: Compensation and Workforce	$275,000
II.4	Evaluation Implementation: Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation	$175,000
II.5	Evaluation Implementation: Family Resource Centers	$275,000

II.6	Evaluation Implementation: Universal Screening and Early Intervention	$225,000
III	Landscape Analysis	$200,000
IV	Data systems Development and Systems Project Management	$200,000

D. Cooperative Agreement

Any other City department, public entity or non-profit made up of multiple public entities, may use the results of this Solicitation to obtain some or all of the commodities or services to be provided by Proposer under the same terms and conditions of any contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation.

E. Solicitation Schedule

The anticipated schedule for this Solicitation is set forth below in Table B. These dates are tentative and subject to change. It is the responsibility of the Proposer to check for any Addenda to this Solicitation or other published pertinent information.

Table B

Proposal Phase	Tentative Date
Request for Proposals Issued	June 10, 2024
Deadline for Written Questions	June 28, 2024 at 12:00 PM PST
Bidders' Conference	July 2, 2024 at 1:00 PM PST Remote via link: **https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87641512245**
Mandatory Letter of Intent Deadline	July 9, 2024 at 5:00 PM PST
Deadline to Submit Proposals	August 9, 2024 at 12:00 PM PST
Tentative Evaluation of Proposals	August 9, 2024 – September 27, 2024
Notice of Intent to Award	September 30, 2024
Period for Protesting Notice of Intent to Award	Within three (3) business days of the City's issuance of a Notice of Intent to Award.
Bidders' Conference Details	
Proposers are encouraged to attend a Bidders' Conference on July 2, 2024, at 1:00 PM PST to be held virtually at **https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87641512245**. All questions will be addressed at this conference and any available new information will be provided at that time. If you have further questions regarding the RFP, please send to DEC-Contracts@sfgov.org. Failure to attend the Bidders' Conference shall not excuse the awarded Proposer from any obligations of a contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation. Any change or addition to the requirements contained in this Solicitation as a result of the Bidders' Conference will be	

> executed by a written Addendum to this Solicitation. It is the responsibility of the Proposer to check for any Addendum to this Solicitation or other published pertinent information.

F. Written Questions and Request for Clarification

Proposers are encouraged to submit written questions before the due date stated in Table B to DEC-Contracts@sfgov.org. All questions will be addressed at the bidders' conference or by email, and any available new information will be provided in writing via email to Proposers. All written questions must be submitted on or prior to June 28, 2024 at 12:00 PM PST. Please include the term "RFP DEC24-05 question" in your subject line.

G. Contract Terms and Negotiations

The successful Proposer will be required to enter into a contract in the form attached hereto as Attachment A, City's Contract Terms. Failure to timely execute City's Contract Terms, or to furnish any and all insurance certificates and policy endorsements, surety bonds or other materials required in City's Contract Terms, shall be deemed an abandonment of the Proposal and City, in its sole discretion, may select another Proposer and proceed against the original selectee for damages.

H. Target Populations

In accordance with the DEC Diversity, Inclusion and Racial Equity policy previously stated in this RFP, DEC's research and evaluation operations are designed to serve all populations and ethnicities in San Francisco and rely on expertise in utilizing culturally and linguistically responsive and sensitive methods to support and engage neighborhoods and city-wide populations who face inequitable access and barriers to services and thus experience disparate educational, social, health, emotional, financial, and/or other well-being outcomes. DEC will be inclusive of firms that have expertise engaging with and elevating individuals from under-represented communities who may experience more barriers to service access, including but not limited to: parents under the age of 24; African-American/Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and/or Indigenous families; recent immigrant families; unhoused families and those living in public housing sites; low-income families; pregnant people; parents who are LGBTQ or who have LGBTQ youth; families of children with special health care needs and families of children exposed to violence. Agencies will be expected to engage these and all stakeholders (e.g., children, families, educators) in non-extractive, culturally responsive, and equitable practices when needed within the RFP's requested services.

I. Definitions for Acronyms Used

Table C

DEC	Department of Early Childhood
CBOs	Community-Based Organizations
CFC	Children and Families Commission
CMD	Contract Monitoring Division
CPAC	Child care Planning and Advisory Council
DPH	Department of Public Health
EC COAC	Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee
ECE	Early Care and Education
ECMHCI	Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Initiative
EESSG	Early Educator Salary Support Grants
ELSF	Early Learning San Francisco
FCS	Family and Children's Services division of HSA
FFPSA	Family First Prevention Services Act
FRC	Family Resource Center
HAS	Human Services Agency
ISAs	Integrated Service Agencies
MHC	Mental Health Consultants
MRA	Max Reimbursable Amount
PFA	Preschool for All
QRIS	Quality, Rating, and Improvement Systems
R&Rs	Resource and Referral agencies
SFUSD	San Francisco Unified School District

II. Scope Of Work

The Scope of Work is to be used as a general guide and is not intended to be a complete list of all the work necessary to complete the project. Proposers should use this description when designing their proposals. However, Proposers may suggest modifications and/or additions that will, in their estimation, make the work more feasible or effective. The description below outlines the key elements and services the selected vendor(s) will provide.

DEC has developed unifying strategic priorities to advance racial equity in all aspects of our work, ensuring access to services, and providing support to communities to ensure their ability to succeed and thrive, as outlined below. DEC will review and examine our core funded activities through the lens of these strategic priorities, ensuring these priorities continue to be supported across all service areas outlined in this scope.

- **Strategic Priority 1:** Amplify parent voice and influence in shaping policy and programs.
- **Strategic Priority 2:** Increase cultural responsiveness of all early childhood development services.
- **Strategic Priority 3:** Increase transparency in communications and open access to information and services.

During this time, DEC reserves the right to further develop scopes of work permitted under this RFP and consistent with the terms of this RFP. For clarity, no scope development may exceed the terms of this RFP.

A.   Services Requested

Across all four service areas, the selected Proposers will work closely with the DEC Data and Evaluation team and stakeholders to plan, conduct, and carry out services outlined below.

Stakeholders include parents/caregivers and families, early child care educators, community members, child care administrators in the Early Learning San Francisco network, the First 5 San Francisco Commission, the Early Childhood Community Oversite Advisory Committee (EC COAC), Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC), and others. Additionally, the contracted partners for each service area will be expected to convene as needed and work in conjunction with one another when elements of work connect.

The descriptions below outline key program elements. It is not expected that Proposers will hold the necessary experience for all service areas listed below. Each proposal should clearly indicate which service area is being addressed, and separate proposals should be submitted in the event that a firm wishes to propose for more than one service area.

Service Area I: Data Mapping and Data Governance (One Entity)

Across each of the DEC's initiatives, there are multiple data systems. Following the merge of First 5 of San Francisco and the Office of Early Childhood Education (OECE), the DEC seeks to partner with a Qualified Proposer who can connect and standardize multiple data sources into a cohesive framework. This will aid evaluation and continuous quality improvement, while also supporting the further development and refining of data at DEC. Services will include, but are not limited to:

- Assessing the state of all of DEC's current data systems, including DEC-funded data systems implemented by grantees, in relationship to industry best practices, data security practices, and current technology standards;
- Identifying key data quality issues and obstacles to better the integration of data across all programs and initiatives, including those outside of DEC, such as other City departments;
- Supporting the development of data dictionaries and uniform standards for commonly collected data;
- Comparing the current assessment/tracking systems with other national tools;
- Making department-wide recommendations to improve the efficiency of data collection, cleaning, analysis, and reporting across the department to support the ability to answer key research questions;
- Developing comprehensive standardized language for: data use and sharing agreements; data acknowledgement and consent forms that conform to industry best practices;
- Documenting recommendations for policies, protocols, and practices to adequately secure data, protect privacy, keep families informed about data collection practices;
- Working with DEC staff and external grantees to support and guide any shifts/modifications in data governance;
- Developing a detailed framework that connects and maps data from all six DEC initiatives, drawing upon each initiative's logic model, research questions, and data inventory in a way that can aid continuous quality improvement and evaluation.

Service Area II: Evaluation Implementation for One or More Initiative Areas (Up to 6 Entities)

Selected Proposer(s) will provide evaluation services for one or more of six early childhood initiative areas based on organizational experience and expertise. Proposers should specify which of the initiative areas they are proposing services for in their proposal and, in the event Proposers are applying to more than one initiative area, should submit a separate proposal for each initiative area. These early childhood initiative areas are:

1. Access and Enrollment (Early Care and Education)
2. Program Quality Improvement (Early Care and Education)
3. Compensation and Workforce (Early Care and Education)
4. Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation
5. Family Resource Centers
6. Universal Screening and Early Intervention

Descriptions of the six initiatives and their current logic models can be found in Appendix 1 and Appendix 3. For each initiative, proposed services should include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying and documenting methodologies for formative, process, and outcome stages of evaluation that employ equitable strategies, are community-centered, and address the initiative's research questions and goals (see Appendix 2);
- Drawing upon best practices and lived experience from community, literature, and subject-matter experts to inform evaluation activities and evaluation development;
- Securing institutional review board approval, if appropriate, for research and evaluation
- Engaging in primary data collection and field research using linguistic and culturally diverse methods to extend DEC's information sources beyond administrative data, to address research questions and evaluation needs as identified;
- As needed, securing long-term data sharing agreements with other City departments, San Francisco Unified School District, and other key agencies holding data that pertain to tracking key performance indicators and outcomes;
- Developing a report with evaluation findings and recommendations for the program initiative as well as future evaluation efforts.

Service Area III: Landscape Analysis (One Entity)

To help DEC track population-level indicators of child and family well-being in the city of San Francisco, Selected Proposer(s) will provide research and evaluation services including, but not limited to:

- Conducting annual or biennial city-wide needs assessment of families of young children, which may include surveys, focus groups, interviews, and strategies that seek participation and input from traditionally under-represented populations;

- Conducting a biennial survey of parents with children entering kindergarten in SFUSD to track demographics, family needs and stressors, prior participation in programs and services, parenting practices, and indicators of cognitive, social, emotional, and physical development;
- Analyzing kindergarten parent survey results in relationship to SFUSD Kindergarten Readiness Inventory outcomes and demographic group differences;
- Developing a report to contextualize DEC's work in relation to landscape analyses;
- Documenting and supporting the presentation of findings on an annual or as needed basis.

Service Area IV: Data Systems Development and Systems Project Management (One Entity)

DEC seeks to identify a qualified Proposer(s) to support the development and management of data systems technology. Proposed services should include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying needs of data system users across the DEC staff, grantees, and other key stakeholders and developing a cohesive summary for inclusion in a request for proposals for software development;
- Advising procurement process of a software developer capable of supporting the development of a data system (or systems) that meets the needs of users and can be used across internal and external DEC data areas;
- Engaging in research and interviews to further support procurement process of a software developer;
- Project managing the development of the software with the software developer and serving as the primary point of contact with the developer;
- Serving as a liaison between software engineer/developer and DEC staff, stakeholders, and technology users through development and launch;
- Managing the rollout and adoption of the software, ensuring any training needs are met.

B. Objectives

Proposers funded through this RFP are expected to be able to achieve their proposed service scopes in a manner that addresses the above-listed services as well as the following objectives. Proposers will be expected to demonstrate how their proposed scope aligns with intended impact areas and addresses objectives, linking back to the identified target populations. Proposers may also propose additional outcome objectives provided they are in alignment with the vision and goals of the project.

1. SERVICE AREA I OBJECTIVES: DATA MAPPING AND DATA GOVERNANCE

As part of the efforts to connect and standardize multiple data sources into a cohesive framework, anticipated deliverables include:

- Data dictionary with streamlined terminology for all of the department's collected data
- Department-wide data map identifying all sources of data and responsible parties
- Recommendations for new data sources (and onboarding training as applicable)
- Guidance and documented instructions for ongoing data governance across the department
- Comprehensive data and evaluation framework that connects data map to outcome objectives across the department

2. SERVICE AREA II OBJECTIVES: EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION

For each of the early childhood initiatives, research questions have been identified to help inform programmatic and continuous improvement. Funded Proposers for Service Area II are expected to support evaluation strategies to meet the needs of the research questions outlined in Appendix 2. Further details on each initiative can be found in Appendix 1.

As part of the evaluation efforts for each initiative, anticipated deliverables include:

- Annual evaluation reports with most recent learnings from evaluation activities
- Documented programmatic recommendations based on data findings
- Evaluation framework and/or tools to guide future and ongoing evaluation efforts (as applicable)
- Cumulative evaluation report connecting process and outcome evaluation components
- Presentation slide decks for each respective report to use in communicating findings to the community and stakeholders

3. SERVICE AREA III OBJECTIVES: LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

Through the continual examination of the larger community of San Francisco's parents, caregivers, families, and children, the anticipated deliverables for the analysis include:

- Annual report of needs assessment of San Francisco families
- Annual report of kindergarten entry patterns and kindergarten readiness in San Francisco
- Integrated comparison of DEC programming and the needs of the larger community
- Presentation slide decks for each respective report to use in communicating findings to the community and stakeholders

4. SERVICE AREA IV OBJECTIVES: DATA SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND SYSTEMS PROJECT MANAGEMENT

As part of the contracted partner's efforts to support the development and management of data systems technology, anticipated deliverables include:

- Summary of department-wide software development needs
- Scope of work for software development proposal
- Procurement and software development project plan and timeline
- Software systems training documentation
- Project management communication
- Training documentation and transition plan
- Software risk assessment

III. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) Program Requirements

A. CMD Compliance Officer

The CMD Compliance Officer (CCO) for this Solicitation and any Contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation is:

Melinda Kanios
Contract Compliance Officer I
Contract Monitoring Division
City and County of San Francisco
Tel: 415.274.0511
Email: Melinda.Kanios@sfgov.org
Website: www.sfgov.org/cmd.

B. Application of LBE Rating Bonuses

LBE Rating Bonuses shall be applicable to at each phase of the Solicitation evaluation and selection process, in accordance with the values shown below.

1. RESERVED (COMMODITIES)

2. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Estimated Contract Value	Small/Micro LBEs Rating Bonus	SBA LBEs Rating Bonus
Greater than $10,000 but less than or equal to $400,000.	10%	0%
Greater than $400,000 but less than or equal to $10,000,000.	10%	5% *So long as it does not adversely affect a Small or Micro-LBE Proposer's participation or, for Professional Services, an JV Proposer's participation.*
Greater than $10,000,000 but less than or equal to $20,000,000.	2%	2%

3. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BY JOINT VENTURES

Estimated Contract Value	Small/Micro LBE Subcontracting Level	Rating Bonus
Greater than $10,000 but less than or equal to $10,000,000.	Equals or exceeds 35%, but less than 40%	5%
	Equals or exceeds 40%, but less than 100%	7.5%
	100%	10%

If applying for an LBE rating discount as a Joint Venture (JV), the Micro and /or Small-LBE must be an active partner in the JV and perform work, manage the job and take financial risks in proportion to the required level of participation stated in the Proposal, and must be responsible for a clearly defined portion of the work to be performed and share in the ownership, control, management responsibilities, risks, and profits of the JV. The portion of the Micro and/or Small-LBE JV's work shall be set forth in detail separately from the work to be performed by the non-LBE JV. The Micro and/or Small-LBE JV's portion of the contract must be assigned a commercially useful function.

C. LBE Subcontracting Participation Requirements

The Subcontracting Requirements are waived for this Solicitation and any resulting Contract.

D. Reserved (CMD LBE Forms)

There are no CMD forms required to submit for this Solicitation.

E. LBE Payment and Utilization Tracking

LBE payment and utilization tracking does not apply to this Solicitation and any resulting Contract.

IV. Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Phase	Maximum Points
Minimum Qualifications Documentation	Pass/Fail
Calculation of Charges	10 Points
Written Proposal	90 Points
TOTAL	**100 Points**

A. Minimum Qualifications (Pass/Fail)

Proposers must provide documentation that clearly demonstrates each Minimum Qualification (MQ) listed below has been met. Minimum Qualification documentation should be clearly marked as "MQ1", MQ2", etc.... to indicate which MQ it supports. Each Proposal will be reviewed for initial determination on whether Proposer meets the MQs referenced in this section. **This screening is a pass or fail determination and a Proposal that fails to meet the Minimum Qualifications will not be eligible for further consideration in the evaluation process.** The City reserves the right to request clarifications from Proposers prior to rejecting a Proposal for failure to meet the Minimum Qualifications.

Table D

MQ #	Description
MQ1	Current certified vendor or the ability to become a certified vendor with the City and County of San Francisco within ten (10) days of notice of award.
MQ2	Proposers have at least three (3) years of experience providing community centered program evaluation and/or data and technological support to early childhood organizations or similar agencies working with target populations as described in the RFP.
MQ3	Must be willing and able to comply with the City contracting requirements set forth in this RFP.
MQ4	Proposers must submit a format compliant proposal that includes all required forms and attachments.

Proposals should clearly demonstrate that the qualifications are met. Insufficient or incomplete information may result in a proposal being considered non-responsive and may not be eligible for award of the contract.

B. Evaluation Panel Scoring

The primary purpose of Evaluation Panel scoring is to assess and score the application's quality and responsiveness to the RFP. Application scoring will be completed by subject matter experts recruited from community, government, and other sources to assist with this process. Applications that meet minimum qualification requirements will move on to the Evaluation Panel and will receive an Application Score. Before reading applications, all subject matter experts will be trained on the goals, service requirements, and target populations for this RFP. Each reader will use a rubric provided by DEC to assign a score between 0 and 100 points to each proposal. The point values for each section in the scoring rubric are listed below.

For consistency in scoring, the following are mandatory section headings for each application.

Table E

	Application Section	Maximum Score
MQ	Minimum Qualifications	Pass/Fail
	Work Approach	40
	Organizational Capacity	30
	Racial Equity	20
	Calculation of Charges	10

V. Written Proposal (90 points)

In addition to submitting documents supporting each Minimum Qualification as required by this Solicitation, Proposers shall also submit a complete Proposal consisting of each item set forth in *Attachment C, Written Proposal.*

VI. Calculation of Charges (10 points)

A. Calculation of Charges Format and Allocation of Points

In addition to submitting documents supporting each Minimum Qualification as required by this Solicitation, Proposers shall also submit a complete *Calculation of Charges* consisting of each item set forth in *Attachment D, Calculation of Charges.*

B. Calculation of Charges Evaluation Period

The City will attempt to evaluate proposed Calculation of Charges within one-hundred eighty (180) days after receipt of Proposals. If City requires additional evaluation time, all Proposers will be notified in writing of the new expected award date.

VII. Submission Requirements

A. Mandatory Letter of Intent Submission Instructions

Proposers intending to submit an application are required to submit a letter of intent to DEC by July 9, 2024 at 5:00 PM PST. The letter of intent should be on agency letterhead and indicate the proposer's intent to apply for this solicitation (DEC24-05). The letter should indicate the specific service area that will be the focus of the application. If applying for one or more service area, please submit separate letters of intent. To the extent possible, the letter should name the proposers to receive funds through the proposed contract, including the lead Proposer and any subcontractor agencies. The letters of intent are not binding and are used by staff to anticipate the number of proposal evaluation panel members needed. The letters of intent are to be emailed to DEC-Contracts@sfgov.org. Please include the term "**RFP DEC24-05 Letter of Intent**" in your subject line.

B. Time and Place for Submission Applications

Proposers shall submit via email three (3) electronic pdf files and one excel document to DEC-Contracts@sfgov.org by August 9, 2024 at 12:00 PM PST.

Email submissions should be clearly marked. If you have multiple submissions, please send a separate email for each application. If there were corrections made to the original submission, please resend the full corrected application. Partial or complete omission of any required content may disqualify Proposals from further consideration. Late Proposal submissions will not be considered and failure to adhere to the above requirements may result in the complete rejection of your Proposal.

Proposers are encouraged to email their Proposals to DEC-Contracts@sfgov.org as early as possible to address any technical issues that may arise during the submission process.

Department staff will confirm receipt of all Respondent submissions within three (3) working days after the deadline for receipt noted above.

Please refer to Appendix 4 – RFP Forms Overview for detailed instructions on RFP proposal submission.

VIII. Supporting Documentation Required Prior to Contract Execution

Proposers must provide each Required Supporting Documentation ("RSD") identified below prior to Award. Failure to do so may result in the Proposal being deemed Non-Responsive.

RSD #1	Evidence that Proposer is 12B compliant or likely to become compliant within 30 calendar days of the Proposal Due Date.
RSD #2	**Completed Proposal Attachments:** ☐ Attachment E: HCAO and MCO Declaration Forms ☐ Attachment F: First Source Hiring Form
RSD #3	Insurance in accordance with Article 5 of Attachment A, City's Contract Terms.
RSD #4	**Non-Profit Entities:** If Proposer is a non-profit organization and receives a cumulative total per year of at least $250,000 in City funds or City-administered funds: (1) a statement describing Proposer's efforts to comply with the Chapter 12L provisions regarding public access to Proposer's meetings and records, and

(2) a summary and disposition of all complaints concerning the Proposer's compliance with Chapter 12L that were filed with the City in the last two years and deemed by the City to be substantiated. If no such complaints were filed, the Proposer shall include a statement to that effect.

Failure to comply with the reporting requirements of Chapter 12L or material misrepresentation in Proposer's Chapter 12L submissions shall be grounds for rejection of the Proposal and/or termination of any subsequent agreement reached on the basis of the Proposal.

IX. City's Social and Economic Policy Requirements

The San Francisco Municipal Code establishes a number of requirements for people seeking to do business with the City ("Social and Economic Policy Requirements"). The Social and Economic Policy Requirements set forth below are not intended to be a complete list of all Social Policy Requirements applicable to this Solicitation and any contracts awarded from it.

A. Proposers Unable to do Business with the City

1. GENERALLY

Proposers that do not comply with laws set forth in San Francisco's Municipal Codes may be unable to enter into a contract with the City.

2. ADMINSTRATIVE CODE CHAPTER 12B

A Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation may not, during the term of the Contract, in any of its operations in San Francisco, on real property owned by San Francisco, or where work is being performed for the City elsewhere in the United States, discriminate in the provision of bereavement leave, family medical leave, health benefits, membership or membership discounts, moving expenses, pension and retirement benefits or travel benefits, as well as any benefits other than the benefits specified above, between employees with domestic partners and employees with spouses, and/or between the domestic partners and spouses of such employees, where the domestic partnership has been registered with a governmental entity

pursuant to state or local law authorizing such registration, subject to the conditions set forth in §12B.2(b) of the San Francisco Administrative Code

B. Insurance Requirements

Unless otherwise stated, within thirty business days of the receipt of a notice of award of a Contract, the Proposer to whom the contract is awarded shall deliver the specified insurance certificates and policy endorsements to City. If the Proposer fails or refuses to furnish the required insurance within thirty days after receiving notice to award a Contract, the City may, at its option, determine that the Proposer has abandoned its Proposal. Thereupon the tentative award of said contract to this Proposer shall be canceled. The most commonly required insurance certificates are outlined in Attachment A, City's Contract Terms. The department will work with each awarded Qualified Proposer and the City's Risk Manager to determine the appropriate levels of insurance.

C. Health Care Accountability Ordinance

A Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 12Q. For each covered employee who is not subject to Prevailing Wage, an awarded Proposer shall provide the appropriate health benefit set forth in Section 12Q.3 of the Health Care Accountability Ordinance (HCAO). If a Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation chooses to offer the health plan option, such health plan shall meet the minimum standards set forth by the San Francisco Health Commission. Information about and the text of the Chapter 12Q and the Health Commission's minimum standards are available at http://sfgov.org/olse/hcao. Any Subcontract entered into by Proposer shall also be required to comply with the requirements of the HCAO and shall contain contractual obligations substantially the same as those set forth in this section.

D. Minimum Compensation Ordinance

Where applicable, a Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation shall comply with Administrative Code Chapter 12P. A Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation shall pay covered employees who are not subject to Prevailing Wage no less than the minimum compensation required by San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12P, including a minimum hourly gross compensation, compensated time off, and uncompensated time off. A Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation is subject to the enforcement and penalty provisions in Chapter 12P. Information about and the text of the Chapter 12P is available on the web at http://sfgov.org/olse/mco.

E. First Source Hiring Program

A Proposer selected pursuant to this Solicitation shall comply with all of the applicable provisions of the First Source Hiring Program, Chapter 83 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

F.   Non-Profit Entities

To receive a contract under this Solicitation, any nonprofit Proposer must be in good standing with the California Attorney General's Registry of Charitable Trusts by the time of contract execution and must remain in good standing during the term of the agreement. Upon request, Proposer must provide documentation to the City demonstrating its good standing with applicable legal requirements. If Proposer will use any nonprofit subcontractors to perform the agreement, Proposer will be responsible for ensuring they are also in compliance with all requirements of the Attorney General's Registry of Charitable Trusts at the time of Contract execution and for the duration of the agreement.

G.   Other Social Policy Provisions

The City's Contract Terms, identifies the City's applicable social policy provisions related to a contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation. Proposers are encouraged to carefully review these terms and ensure they are able to comply with them.

X. Terms and Conditions for Receipt of Proposals

A. How to Register as a City Supplier

The following requirements pertain only to Proposers not currently registered with the City as a Supplier.

Step 1: Register as a BIDDER at City's Supplier Portal:

https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/pages/index.aspx

Step 2: Follow instructions for converting your BIDDER ID to a SUPPLIER ID. This will require you to register with the City Tax Collector's Office and submit Chapter 12B and 12C forms through the Supplier portal. Once these forms have been completed, submitted, and processed, you will be notified via email with your organization's new Supplier ID. That email will also provide instructions for completing your Supplier registration.

- **City Business Tax Registration Inquiries:** For questions regarding business tax registration procedures and requirements, contact the Tax Collector's Office at (415) 554-4400 or, if calling from within the City and County of San Francisco, 311.
- **Chapter 12(B) and 12(C) Inquiries:** For questions concerning the City's Chapter 12(B) and 12(C) Equal Benefits and Non-Discrimination in Contracting requirements, go to: www.sfgov.org/cmd.

B. RFP Addenda

The City may modify this Solicitation, prior to the Proposal Due Date, by issuing an Addendum to the Solicitation, which will be posted on the DEC website. **The Proposer shall be responsible for ensuring that its Proposal reflects any and all Addenda issued by the City prior to the Proposal Due Date regardless of when the Proposal is submitted.** Therefore, the City recommends that the Proposer consult the website frequently, including shortly before the Proposal Due Date, to determine if the Proposer has downloaded all Solicitation Addenda. It is the responsibility of the Proposer to check for any Addenda, Questions and Answers documents, and updates, which may be posted to the subject Solicitation.

THE SUBMITTAL OF A RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION SHALL EXPLICITLY STIPULATE ACCEPTANCE BY PROPOSERS OF THE TERMS FOUND IN THIS SOLICITATION, ANY AND ALL ADDENDA ISSUED TO THIS SOLICITATION, AND THE PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS.

C. Public Disclosure

All documents under this solicitation process are subject to public disclosure per the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Section §6250 et. Seq) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67). Contracts, Proposals, responses, and all other records of communications between the City and Proposers shall be open to inspection immediately after a contract has been awarded. Nothing in this Administrative Code provision requires the disclosure of a private person's or organization's net worth or other proprietary financial data submitted for qualification for a contract or other benefit until and unless that person or organization is awarded the contract or benefit.

If the City receives a Public Records Request ("Request") pertaining to this solicitation, City will use its best efforts to notify the affected Proposer(s) of the Request and to provide the Proposer with a description of the material that the City deems responsive and the due date for disclosure ("Response Date"). If the Proposer asserts that some or all of the material requested contains or reveals valuable trade secret or other information belonging to the Proposer that is exempt from disclosure and directs the City in writing to withhold such material from production ("Withholding Directive"), then the City will comply with the Withholding Directive on the condition that the Proposer seeks judicial relief on or before the Response Date. Should Proposer fail to seek judicial relief on or before the Response Date, the City shall proceed with the disclosure of responsive documents.

D. Limitation on Communications During Solicitation

From the date this Solicitation is issued until the date the competitive process of this Solicitation is completed (either by cancelation or final Award), Proposers and their subcontractors, vendors, representatives and/or other parties under Proposer's control, shall communicate

solely with the Contract Administrator whose name appears in this Solicitation. Any attempt to communicate with any party other than the Contract Administrator whose name appears in this Solicitation – including any City official, representative or employee – is strictly prohibited. Failure to comply with this communications protocol may, at the sole discretion of City, result in the disqualification of the Proposer or potential Proposer from the competitive process. This protocol does not apply to communications with the City regarding business not related to this Solicitation.

E. Proposal Selection Shall not Imply Acceptance

The acceptance and/or selection of any Proposal(s) shall not imply acceptance by the City of all terms of the Proposal(s), which may be subject to further approvals before the City may be legally bound thereby. If a satisfactory contract cannot be negotiated in a reasonable amount of time DEC, in its sole discretion, may terminate negotiations with the highest ranked Proposer and begin contract negotiations with the next highest ranked Proposer.

F. Cybersecurity Risk Assessment

As part of City's evaluation process, City may engage in Cybersecurity Risk Assessment (CRA). CRA may be performed for each entity manufacturing the product, performing technical functions related to the product's performance, and/or accessing City's networks and systems. Where a prime contractor or reseller plays an active role in each of these activities, CRA may also be required for the prime contractor or reseller.

To conduct a CRA, City may collect as part of this Solicitation process one of the following two reports:

- **SOC-2 Type 2 Report:** Report on Controls at a Service Organization Relevant to Security, Availability, Processing Integrity, Confidentiality or Privacy; or
- **City's Cyber Risk Assessment Questionnaire:** Proposer's responses to a City's Cyber Risk Assessment Questionnaire.

The above reports may be requested at such time City has selected or is considering a potential Proposer. The reports will be evaluated by the soliciting Department and the City's Department of Technology to identify existing or potential cyber risks to City. Should such risks be identified, City may afford a potential Proposer an opportunity to cure such risk within a period of time deemed reasonable to City. Such remediation and continuing compliance shall be subject to City's on-going review and audit through industry-standard methodologies, including but not limited to: on-site visits, review of the entities' cybersecurity program, penetration testing, and/or code reviews.

G. Solicitation Errors and Omissions

Proposers are responsible for reviewing all portions of this Solicitation. Proposers are to promptly notify the City, in writing and to the Solicitation contact person if the Proposer discovers any ambiguity, discrepancy, omission, or other error in the Solicitation. Any such notification should be directed to the City promptly after discovery, but in no event later than the deadline for questions. Modifications and clarifications will be made by Addenda as provided below.

H. Objections to Solicitation Terms

Should a Proposer object on any ground to any provision or legal requirement set forth in this Solicitation, the Proposer must, no later than the deadline for questions, provide written notice to the City setting forth with specificity the grounds for the objection. The failure of a Proposer to object in the manner set forth in this paragraph shall constitute a complete and irrevocable waiver of any such objection.

I. Protest Procedures

1. PROTEST OF NON-RESPONSIVENESS DETERMINATION

Within three (3) business days of the City's issuance of a Notice of Non-Responsiveness, a Proposer may submit a written Notice of Protest of Non-Responsiveness. The Notice of Protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The Notice of Protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the Proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or Solicitation provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the Notice of Protest must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

2. PROTEST OF NON-RESPONSIBLE DETERMINATION

Within three (3) business days of the City's issuance of a Notice of Non-Responsibility, a Proposer may submit a written Notice of Protest of Non-Responsibility. The Notice of Protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The Notice of Protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the Proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or Solicitation provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the Notice of Protest must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

3. PROTEST OF CONTRACT AWARD

Within three (3) business days of the City's issuance of a Notice of Intent to Award, a Proposer may submit a written Notice of Protest of Contract Award. The Notice of Protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the

protest. The Notice of Protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the Proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or Solicitation provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the Notice of Protest must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

4. DELIVERY OF PROTESTS

A Notice of Protest must be written. Protests made orally (e.g., by telephone) will not be considered. A Notice of Protest must be delivered by mail or email to the Contract Administrator whose name and contact information appears on the cover page to this Solicitation and received by the due dates stated above. A Notice of Protest shall be transmitted by a means that will objectively establish the date the City received the Notice of Protest. If a Notice of Protest is mailed, the protestor bears the risk of non-delivery within the deadlines specified herein.

J.   Proposal Term

Submission of a Proposal signifies that the proposed products, services, and prices are valid for 180 calendar days from the Proposal Due Date and that the quoted prices are genuine and not the result of collusion or any other anti-competitive activity. At Proposer's election, the Proposal may remain valid beyond the 180-day period in the circumstance of extended negotiations.

K.   Revision to Proposal

A Proposer may revise a Proposal on the Proposer's own initiative at any time before the deadline for submission of Proposals. The Proposer must submit the revised Proposal in the same manner as the original. A revised Proposal must be received on or before, but no later than the Proposal Due Date and time. In no case will a statement of intent to submit a revised Proposal, or commencement of a revision process, extend the Proposal Due Date for any Proposer. At any time during the Proposal evaluation process, the City may require a Proposer to provide oral or written clarification of its Proposal. The City reserves the right to make an award without further clarifications of Proposals received.

L.   Proposal Errors and Omissions

Failure by the City to object to an error, omission, or deviation in the Proposal will in no way modify the Solicitation or excuse the Proposer from full compliance with the specifications of this Solicitation or any contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation.

M. Financial Responsibility

The City accepts no financial responsibility for any costs incurred by a Proposer in responding to this Solicitation. Proposers acknowledge and agree that their submissions in response to this

Solicitation will become the property of the City and may be used by the City in any way deemed appropriate.

N. Proposer's Obligations under the Campaign Reform Ordinance

If a contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation has (A) a value of $100,000 or more in a fiscal year and (B) requires the approval of an elected City official, Proposers are hereby advised:

1. Submission of a Proposal in response to this Solicitation may subject the Proposers to restrictions under Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 1.126, which prohibits City Proposers, Proposers, and their affiliates from making political contributions to certain City elective officers and candidates; and

2. Before submitting a Proposal in response to this Solicitation, Proposers are required to notify their affiliates and subcontractors listed in the awarded contract or Proposal of the political contribution restrictions set forth in Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code section 1.126.

This restriction applies to the party seeking the contract, the party's board of directors, chairperson, chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, any person with an ownership interest greater than ten percent, and any political committees controlled or sponsored by the party, as well as any subcontractors listed in the awarded contract or Proposal. The law both prohibits the donor from giving contributions and prohibits the elected official from soliciting or accepting them.

The people and entities listed in the preceding paragraph may not make a campaign contribution to the elected official at any time from the submission of a Proposal for a contract until either: (1) negotiations are terminated and no contract is awarded; or (2) twelve months have elapsed since the award of the contract.

A violation of Section 1.126 may result in criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. For further information, Proposers should contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at (415) 252-3100 or go to https://sfethics.org/compliance/city-officers/city-contracts/city-departments/notifying-bidders-and-potential-bidders.

O. Reservations of Rights by the City

The issuance of this Solicitation does not constitute a guarantee by the City that a contract will be awarded or executed by the City. The City expressly reserves the right at any time to:

1. Waive or correct any defect or informality in any response, Proposal, or Proposal procedure;

2. Reject any or all Proposals;

3. Reissue the Solicitation;

4. Prior to submission deadline for Proposals, modify all or any portion of the selection procedures, including deadlines for accepting responses, the specifications or requirements for any materials, equipment or services to be provided under this Solicitation, or the requirements for contents or format of the Proposals;

5. Procure any materials, equipment or services specified in this Solicitation by any other means; or

6. Determine that the subject goods or services are no longer necessary.

P. No Waiver

No waiver by the City of any provision of this Solicitation shall be implied from the City's failure to recognize or take action on account of a Proposer's failure to comply with this Solicitation.

Q. Other

1. The City may make such investigation, as it deems necessary, prior to the award of this contract to determine the conditions under which the goods are to be delivered or the work is to be performed. Factors considered by the City shall include, but not be limited to:
   a. Any condition set forth in this Solicitation;
   b. Adequacy of Proposer's plant facilities and/or equipment, location and personnel location to properly perform all services called for under the Purchase Order; and
   c. Delivery time(s).

2. City reserves the right to inspect an awarded Proposer's place of business prior to award of and/or at any time during the contract term (or any extension thereof) to aid City in determining an awarded Proposer's capabilities and qualifications.

3. Failure to timely execute a contract, or to furnish any and all insurance certificates and policy endorsements, surety bonds or other materials required in the contract, shall be deemed an abandonment of a contract offer. The City, in its sole discretion, may select another Proposer and may proceed against the original selectee for damages.

4. City reserves the right to reject any Proposal on which the information submitted by Proposer fails to satisfy City and/or if Proposer is unable to supply the information and documentation required by this Solicitation within the period of time requested.

5. Any false statements made by a Proposer or any related communication/clarification may result in the disqualification of its Proposal from receiving further evaluation and a contract award.

Appendix 1 Initiative Narratives

The following descriptions provide an overview of each early childhood initiative area's current operations, strategies, and priorities within DEC. As these programs are currently in operation and continually learning from the community, strategies and details are subject to change.

A. Initiative 1: Access and Enrollment (Early Care and Education)

Quality early childhood experience is a cornerstone of a child's development, setting the stage for a child's lifelong success. However, there are still barriers in accessing these essential services. In response to this challenge, the Department of Early Childhood (DEC) has launched the Access & Enrollment initiative, a groundbreaking effort to ensure that every eligible child can access high-quality child care services. Through strategic partnerships with various entities, including Integrated Service Agencies (ISAs), Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), Resource and Referral agencies (R&Rs), and Facility Grants, DEC is working to remove obstacles for families when searching for child care services, and provide financial support for child care, thereby promoting equitable access to early child care education. The design of the initiative is to address the disparity in child care access by providing reliable ECE related resources and funding to eligible families for high-quality child care services. With this initiative, DEC is fostering an inclusive environment where parents and caregivers can easily access reliable child care services that lay a strong foundation for their children's development and future success.

1. THE INITIATIVE'S KEY STRATEGIES:

1. Support families in accessing ECE and ECE related resources
2. Support families in applying for subsidized ECE services
3. Subsidize eligible families' ECE services
4. Provide facility improvement grants to eligible ECEs and increase ECE facilities

B. Initiative 2: Program Quality Improvement (Early Care and Education)

The City and County of San Francisco has a history of taking the lead in Quality, Rating, and Improvement Systems (QRIS). In 2011, when California got a four-year, $75 million grant called the Federal Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge, San Francisco was one of the first counties to start implementing QRIS. Since the beginning, the goal has been setting high standards and engaging in continuous quality improvement. Through the IMPACT grant from 2017 to 2020, more than 400 programs and over 5,000 children each year were impacted.

However, it's important to acknowledge that challenges persist despite many efforts and the commitment of staff: there is a gap in kindergarten readiness and how well students from different backgrounds perform in school. This gap disproportionately affects Black and Brown children, and children whose home language is not English. Despite previous attempts, this gap hasn't shown signs of closing over the years.

The Quality Initiative sits at an unprecedented time with a big responsibility. The state recently narrowed down the rules for QRIS, only rating Title 5 spaces and only requiring rating every five years instead of every two. The Quality team at DEC is faced with an extraordinary opportunity where local standards can flourish alongside the evolving QRIS metrics.

It is the emblem of DEC's determination to champion excellence in education and offer families and children not only access to an early education but to one which upholds the highest indicators of quality. DEC is guided by a vision of kindergarten readiness for each and every child, equity, and the resounding belief that all children deserve environments where they can thrive.

1. **THE INITIATIVE'S KEY STRATEGIES:**
    1. Training and Professional Development
    2. Quality Improvement Plans
    3. Coaching and Technical Assistance
    4. Monitoring and Quality Assurance
    5. Collaboration with Partner Agencies

C. Initiative 3: Compensation and Workforce (Early Care and Education)

The Early Care and Education (ECE) Workforce Compensation Initiative, which recently launched July 1, 2022, is the first early childhood educator wage initiative of its kind in the nation. Through grants and educator stipends, the Workforce Compensation Initiative advances pay raises, increases benefits, improves working conditions, and supports educational attainment for San Francisco's workforce of over 2,500 early educators working at City-funded early care and education programs.

By providing additional compensation to support a well-educated, well-compensated and stable workforce, it will provide an environment that produces improved outcomes for San Francisco's children and families. Alongside an increase in wages, funding for improving workplace conditions is also included which results in improved teacher job satisfaction and well-being ultimately benefiting the child and their family. This investment will enable educators to be more fairly paid for their crucial work, and help attract new, quality educators to the field.

1. **THE INITIATIVE'S KEY STRATEGIES:**

1. Compensation & Conditions Area:
    a. Early Educator Salary Support Grants (EESSG) Program - Compensation
    b. CARES Stipend Program - Compensation
    c. Improving Workplace Conditions
2. Education & Professional Development Area
    a. Recruiting and Retention Pathways Program
    b. Child Development Permit Advising Program

D. Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation

The Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Initiative (ECMHCI) through the Department of Early Childhood (DEC) aims to provide high-quality mental health consultation in early childhood learning environments and Family Resource Centers (FRCs) to deliver a strength-based adult intervention to improve the development and well-being of children in San Francisco. Mental Health Consultants (MHCs) are paired with early learning programs and FRCs to build knowledge, capacity, and resilience among important adult stakeholders in a child's life. Through this work, the child is provided with increased opportunities to thrive and grow their social, emotional, and cognitive skills. To deliver this initiative, DEC collaborates and leverages partnerships across citywide departments, early learning programs, and FRCs to ensure qualified MHCs are placed in environments where services can be accessed by Early Childhood Education (ECE) providers, FRC staff, and parents/caregivers.

While the ECMHCI has been a long run program in San Francisco, the initiative is currently in a phase to adapt and redesign services to better meet the needs of the key service populations.

1. THE INITIATIVE'S KEY STRATEGIES:

1. Mental health consultation (Strength-based adult intervention) that is inclusive of and accounts for development screening results
2. Capacity building for early learning providers, FRC staff, and caregivers in child development
3. Ad-hoc crisis mental health counseling services
4. City-wide department collaborations and early learning & FRC partnerships

E. Family Resource Centers

The Family Resource Center (FRC) Initiative through the Department of Early Childhood (DEC) provides services and support to parents/caregivers and families in San Francisco through a network of 26 neighborhood and population-based family resource centers. The approximately 26 FRCs within this initiative serve high priority neighborhoods and service populations with the

aim to ensure parents and caregivers have the resources needed to support their children's growth, development, and future of their child's academic, social, and emotional success. Each FRC provides culturally and linguistically responsive support through varying levels of service that include family engagement, direct services, parent/caregiver education, resource & referral, and formal support for families at-risk for system involvement. A family may access one or more of the services from an FRC, although may not have a touch point with every service and/or activity. With a wide range of service activities and reach to families, DEC is seeking evaluation support to better understand the FRC participant population, fidelity of FRC service program implementation and the short and long-term impacts of the FRC programming on participants.

DEC also has related and newly developing family support initiatives in the areas of FRC quality improvement, collaborative projects that span multiple sectors, settings, and partners of early childhood (e.g., pediatric clinics, preschools, FRCs), and smaller parent/child centers that may perform a subset of the typical FRC services.

1. THE INITIATIVE'S KEY STRATEGIES:

1. Family Engagement and Cross Sector Partnerships
2. Parent Leadership and Community Connections
3. Parent Caregiver Capacity and School Readiness and Success Activities
4. Formal Supports for Individual Families and Those At-Risk for System Involvement

F. Universal Screening and Early Intervention

The Universal Screening and Early Intervention Initiative through the Department of Early Childhood (DEC) aims to address persistent inequities affecting the health, social, and cognitive skills that support school success for Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children in San Francisco. A key strategy to addressing these issues lie in ensuring that every child in San Francisco has access to, and the resources for, age-appropriate health and developmental screenings. Universal and accessible screenings play an important role in early intervention as they help parents and caregivers understand if their child is meeting age-specific milestones while providing an opportunity for a child and their family to be connected to the appropriate resources and support if/when a delay is identified.

The Universal Screening and Early Intervention Initiative is currently in both a formative and expansion phase with the goal to grow the initiative citywide and well-resourced to serve all children of San Francisco. As such, DEC is seeking evaluation support to better understand how to grow the screening, resource linkage, and follow-up services needed for target populations. Additional DEC wants to obtain insight to the short and long-term impacts of the current screening initiative on children.

1. THE INITIATIVE'S KEY STRATEGIES:

1. Universal Developmental Screening
2. Families of Children & Youth with Special Health Care Needs and Early Intervention Population FRC (CYSHN & EI FRC)
3. Centralized Access Point (CAP)
4. Developmental playgroups
5. Care Coordination and Individualized Support Services

Appendix 2 Initiative Research Questions

Following the merge of First 5 of San Francisco and the Office of Early Childhood Education, DEC's capacity has greatly increased, enabling the work to reach more families and educators throughout the community. With this increased reach comes growth in the areas we seek to investigate to support our program development and ensure we are meeting our strategic goals. While each initiative contains distinct elements, all of the department's efforts roll up into a unified goal of supporting child and family outcomes. Given that, while a sample of existing research questions are listed below, it will also be important to understand and investigate the interconnected components of the department's work. Current research questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Initiative 1: Access and Enrollment Research Questions

To better improve services and families' experiences in supporting families in accessing ECE and ECE related resources, in applying for and accessing financial support for services, and in providing facility improvement grants to eligible facilities and toward the increase in facilities, the access and enrollment initiative hopes to address the following research questions:

- What is the process families go through in order to secure child care? How much of identifying and enrolling is parent-driven compared to organization/agency-driven?
- How do families first engage with our access and enrollment services? Which outreach and contact mechanisms are most effective in engaging families? Which mechanisms are least effective or utilized less frequently? How does this vary according to demographic differences among families?
- What are the existing and major barriers to timely and successful enrollment?

- How does a family's pathway to enrollment differ based on the mechanisms by which they sought and accessed care? (e.g., resource and referral agencies versus direct enrollment with a center or family child care home versus online portal)
- How do child care facility needs vary according to demographic differences among families?
- Do the existing policies and systems in place for access and enrollment meet families' needs? What gaps exist and what shifts could be made to better accommodate families?
- How does the access and enrollment system support families when their child care needs change?
- How do access and enrollment systems operate in other locations in the county? Are there different methods and approaches not employed in SF that are valued in other communities?
- What do families do when they are unable to find care that meets their needs through DEC's existing network?
- How do access and enrollment efforts connect to department-wide efforts and child outcomes?

B. Initiative 2: Program Quality Improvement Research Questions

Aimed at defining, measuring, and supporting the development of center based and family child care program quality, the research priorities of the program quality improvement initiative are:

- What constitutes high-quality indicators and program characteristics from parents' perspectives, and how do they differ from current standards? How do these definitions vary across demographic differences?
- What quality characteristics drive a family to opt for one program over another?
- What motivates programs to join the ELS network? Are there barriers to joining related to quality standards?
- How can diverse definitions of quality (parents, providers, government) be reconciled in designing quality metrics?
- What are the best strategies for measuring, monitoring, and enhancing program quality equitably?
- How does program quality and quality interactions differ based on the demographics of the learning spaces?
- For centers and learning spaces that are expanding into infant/toddler care, what's the most effective way to build up their capacity to deliver quality care?
- How do child and quality outcomes from educator coaching and professional development training differ based on dosage and types of coaching/training?

- What motivates a provider to pursue and participate in coaching? And in what ways does this provider/educator coaching have an impact on the classroom quality?
- How do different elements of quality of early education relate to school readiness, social emotional growth, and a child's academic outcomes?

C. Initiative 3: Compensation and Workforce Research Questions

Through supporting early educator compensation, access to higher education, and improvements in workplace conditions, this initiative focuses on recruiting and retaining skilled, well-qualified educators to support the development of young children in their earliest years. Outcome goals to be addressed include:

- Who comprises the network of participating educators and do they mirror the diversity of the city? The child/family populations they serve?
- Are educators obtaining skills/certifications/education and/or having professional advancement?
- Is educator satisfaction and/or participation/interest in professional development changing? And in what ways?
- How do educator views of their compensation and value in the community vary according to other factors (e.g., age taught, years in field)?
- What perspective do families have on the role of the early educator, the educators experience and/or training, in supporting their child's early development?
- In what ways, if any, are family satisfaction and engagement connected to any changes in the educator workforce?
- How does workforce retention, compensation, participation change over multiple years?
- How does teacher preparation impact quality of the early learning experience for families and young children over time? How does this differ across teacher training and education background (e.g., bachelor's degree)?
- How does the educator supply look and change over multiple years relative to education pathway programs (e.g., is there an increase of educators who work directly with children who hold higher education degrees? An increase in diversity)?

D. Initiative 4: Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Research Questions

In order to understand the role early childhood mental health consultations play in early childhood education, the following research questions have been identified:

- What is the demographic information of the population (providers, staff, parents/caregivers, children) using the mental health consultation support? Where are concentrations of need?
- What is the level and types of unmet need? What are the current needs facing key service populations? What is needed to close the gap on unmet need?
- Is the initiative being implemented as it was designed/intended? What barriers exist to implementation?
- What other DEC programs/initiatives touchpoints does each engagement have?
- Is there any relationship between children who have key adult stakeholders who have worked with MHC and their socio-emotional, cognitive, and school readiness outcomes? Their retention in early learning programs?
- Does capacity and knowledge on child development and learning increase for those who have engagement with MHC?

E.   Initiative 5: Family Resource Centers

The Family Resource Centers offer important services to families across the city through family engagement, parent leadership, community connections, and support for school readiness. To understand the depth of their reach and services, research questions include:

- Are the services provided meeting the needs of the families in their individual communities? Are there gaps in service needs or populations whose needs are not being addressed?
- How does family access and engagement in services and programs vary across family characteristics and demographics? What barriers to accessing and engaging with FRCs exist?
- How are the wide range of services and programming being implemented across the 26 FRCs? Is the programming being implemented as it was designed/intended? Are the services provided at the same or similar frequency and/or quality?
- What are the short- and long-term impacts of participation in activities at the FRCs for parent/caregivers, children, and families? How do those impacts differ according to engagement, utilization, and needs?
- Do differences in service delivery (i.e., hybrid/remote/in-person) shift the impact of services?
- Are Kindergarten Readiness Outcomes related to FRC participation? If so, in what ways does FRC participation relate and how does that inform future programming and community engagement?

F. Initiative 6: Universal Screening and Early Intervention

As the Universal Screening and Early Intervention Initiative grows city wide and increases investments into services, it is imperative for DEC to better understand the landscape of needs for target populations and obtain insight for where to focus efforts of expansion. The areas identified below are examples of the types of evaluation questions and priorities to support this work.

- What is the best approach to measuring the delivery of developmental screening services and intervention services (including retention of those services)?
- What are the best strategies to deliver services in a targeted way to meet the diverse needs of children? How does this differ according to demographics, and family/community context?
- Who are the children and families that may not require formal services, but still need support? How can resources be tailored to better serve them?
- How do current policies and services support or hinder effective early identification and intervention? (e.g., providing inclusion coaches, ECE screening 45 days after enrollment, providing ECMHC)
- How well do different professionals (pediatricians, educators, therapists, coaches or consultants) collaborate in screening, early identification, and intervention? What does effective integration look like between the universal screening and early intervention components and the greater early intervention provider entities in the city?
- What support systems are in place (in ECEs) for families with children who have special healthcare or educational needs? What is the best way to effectively involve families in the early identification process? What are effective ways to sustain parent engagement through the phases of early identification and early intervention service connection?
- How does the impact on a child shift based on: age of diagnosis/service; type/duration of services; support needs (seeking formal support versus not seeking formal support)? Over time, are children identified for services at earlier ages? How do these factors relate to school readiness?
- How well do the current strategies/components work together to achieve the initiative's overarching goals? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies/components and the initiative as a whole?

Appendix 3 Initiative Logic Models

The following are current logic models for each respective initiative and may be preliminary in nature depending on the initiative's stage of development. Please note that these models are dynamic and are expected to be refined as program development continues.

A.   Initiative 1: Access and Enrollment Logic Model

INPUTS	KEY STRATEGIES & ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	SHORT-TERM/MID-TERM OUTCOMES	LONG TERM OUTCOMES	
DEC provides funding to eligible families for access to high quality ECE services and placements. The Access & Enrollment initiative is aimed at ensuring every eligible child's right to quality early child education. It strives to remove barriers and increase accessibility to essential ECE services for families.	**Support families** in receiving ECE information and facilitating child enrollment in quality programs that meet their children's developmental needs. ***Through partnerships with* CBOs, the Access and Enrollment initiative** builds and maintains relationships with families through the following activities: • Family Outreach and connecting parents to ECE services that are available in their communities. • Provide "best fit" ECE referrals based on family needs/preferences. • Direct and indirect enrollment in ECE quality programs. • Provide services and resource linkages to other ECE and family well-being related resources and coordinate dissemination of information and resources to all families in San Francisco. • Support families in learning about all ECE options and enrolling or changing programs to meet their child's developmental needs.	# of families engaged # of referrals provided to families # of children applied for financial support for ECE # of children enrolled and in which ECE program # of children enrolled by program type # of ECE programs applied for the improvement grant # of new ECE facilities of being added	Children in San Francisco have access to ECE experience. Families in San Francisco have reliable access to resources that support the child and the families' well-being. Families are knowledgeable about their ECE options and how to navigate the ECE system. Families know where to get support and get the support they need when searching for ECE and learning about a family's well-being. Families have positive activities and places to meet that foster a sense of community and social connection and provide opportunities for family leadership. Families know where to apply for subsidized ECE services and receive quality services. Eligible families in San Francisco can receive financial support for ECE services.	Children enter Kindergarten with the cognitive, social/emotional, and physical skills that support school success. Children are in excellent physical and mental health or have reliable access to quality health providers to address concerns. Parents have the information, resources, and connections to peers and professionals to successfully raise their children in San Francisco. Race is not a predictor for achieving these outcomes.	All San Francisco children enjoy a solid foundation to support future success.

	• Promote cultural and linguistic responsive ECE programming in enabling families to find a quality ECE program. • DEC makes funding available to ensure families access ECE quality programs and coordinates multiple funding sources in the city to ensure families experience a seamless transition to K-12 programs. • DEC provides improvement grants to eligible ECE programs to support program quality and increase capacity.		Shorten the gap between ECE services demand and ECE supply. Eligible ECE programs maintain a quality standard by providing children with excellent learning opportunities.

Additional Context:

- In San Francisco, there is a high cost of living, lack of affordable housing, and difficulty meeting basic needs for target populations.
- Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children face persistent inequities in health, social, and cognitive skills that support school success.

Assumptions

- The strategy of the Access & Enrollment initiative is the combination of services for the individual parent/caregiver and child to create long-term positive impact for the whole family.
- A family may have multiple access points to ECE services.

B. Initiative 2: Program Quality Improvement Logic Model

INPUTS	KEY STRATEGIES & ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	SHORT-TERM/MID-TERM OUTCOMES	LONG TERM OUTCOMES	
DEC follows the California Quality Rating and Improvement System Matrix for state-funded preschool requiring ratings every 5 years.

DEC implements monitoring and local rating procedures in addition to state-mandated ones.

(*) Educators: align with the demographics and backgrounds of the children and families they serve, ensuring a culturally sensitive and inclusive learning environment.

(*) Quality Assurances and Standards: Well-defined quality benchmarks, indicators and standards that guide programs to maintain the highest levels of quality and safety in early childhood education.

Professional Development: Resources to enhance the skills, knowledge, and expertise of teachers.

Partnerships with other Organizations: Collaborative efforts with other organizations to collectively improve the overall quality of early childhood education. | **(*) Surveys:** Conduct surveys to gain insights into the specific needs and challenges faced by teachers, enabling the tailoring of resources and support to address their unique requirements.

Training and Professional Development: Offer targeted training sessions and professional development opportunities for teachers and teacher aides (*) to enhance their skills and knowledge, aligning with the latest best practices in early childhood education.

Coaching and Technical Assistance: Facilitate coaching hours for programs, where they can seek personalized guidance and support from experienced coaches.

(*) Alignment and Coordination of Coaching (educator and administrator) and Technical Assistance, Training and Professional Development, and Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation: The alignment of these quality improvement services will support educators, foster quality improvement in learning spaces, and improve interactions with children, families, and each other.

Quality and Improvement Plans (QIPs): Programs are required to develop an annual Quality and Improvement Plan (QIP) that outlines clear goals and steps to enhance program quality. The QIP process involves self-assessment and goal setting, fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

(*) Monitoring and Quality Assurance: Implement rigorous monitoring procedures to assess program adherence to quality | **Identification and Addressing of Quality Gaps:** This initiative leads to the identification and subsequent addressing of quality gaps within early childhood programs. These efforts contribute to improved school readiness outcomes for children, ensuring they are better prepared for their educational journey.

Increase in Quality-Conforming Programs: Over time, the number of programs that meet the established quality standards increases. This outcome reflects the positive impact of the initiative's strategies and activities on enhancing program quality and effectiveness.

# of programs that meet quality standards

Type and frequency of strategies and activities engaged in

DRDP student outcomes – are the students at age-level readiness

Enhanced Understanding of Quality Assurance: Families and programs gain a deeper understanding of the quality | **Equitable Access to High-Quality Education:** Every child gains access to high-quality early education programs, regardless of background or socio-economic status.

Program Quality Assurance: All programs within the ELS network successfully meet the defined quality assurance standards.

Empowered Families in Quality Delivery: Families actively engage and contribute to the design and delivery of high-quality early education settings. Their input informs program development, fostering a collaborative partnership for optimal child development.

Inclusive Environment: Families' diverse cultural backgrounds are respected | **Sustained Progress in Program Quality:** The number of programs meeting the established quality standards demonstrates a consistent and sustained increase over time. | All San Francisco children enjoy a solid foundation to support future success. |

Technical Assistance: Provide expert guidance, mentorship, and support to programs seeking to improve their quality and alignment with established standards. **(*) Leverage Collaborative Partnerships:** Build strategic alliances with complementary initiatives within the DEC, capitalizing on their expertise and resources to enhance the delivery of high-quality early childhood settings. Maximize our collective impact and contribute to a cohesive, well-rounded approach to fostering excellence in education.	standards. Regular check-ins and assessments ensure that programs are on track and provide an opportunity for feedback and improvement. **Child Assessments:** DRDP assessments are gathered yearly. **CLASS Observations:** Administer the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) observations during program intake. This evaluation tool measures the quality of teacher-child interactions and helps identify areas of strength and improvement in early learning environments. **Collaboration with Parent Agencies:** Collaborate with parent agencies to provide targeted technical assistance and coaching, helping programs implement effective strategies that align with both local needs and overarching quality standards.	assurance checklist, comprehending the metrics and benchmarks required for compliance. This heightened awareness enables better alignment with quality standards. **Improved Educator and Administrator Professional Development:** Educator and Administrators' professional development experiences improve through targeted training and support. This results in enhanced skills, knowledge, and teaching practices, contributing to higher-quality learning environments.	and celebrated within early education settings.

Additional Context:

- The high cost of living, lack of affordable housing, and basic needs challenges faced by target populations in San Francisco are essential contextual factors that contribute to the initiative's significance and urgency.
- Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children face persistent inequities in health, social, and cognitive skills that support school success.
- It's important to note that this initiative is currently undergoing a process of reconstruction and reimagining. As we move forward, some of the activities mentioned above are aspirational (*) and represent our collective vision for the future. The aim is to refine and develop these strategies to ensure they align with the evolving landscape of early childhood education and the unique needs of our community. This dynamic approach allows us to embrace innovation, respond to emerging challenges, and create a more robust foundation for the delivery of high-quality settings.
- It's important to acknowledge that the nature of this initiative's reconstruction and reimagining process impacts the clarity of direct outputs at this stage. As activities continue to be refined and developed, direct outputs stemming from these activities are expected to become more evident and defined. This is currently one of the evolving aspects of the logic model that requires further attention and work to identify specific, measurable outputs that directly result from the initiative's strategies. The continuous refinement of these outputs will enhance the logic model's overall robustness and effectiveness in reflecting the initiative's outcomes.

Assumptions

- While the initiative strives for equitable access to high-quality education, it acknowledges that addressing systemic inequities might require collaborative efforts with broader community initiatives.
- The Quality initiative might perform activities not shown in this logic model.
- Given the initiative's reconstruction some activities are still in the process of development and refinement, and their specifics are subject to change.
- The impact of some activities, such as coaching and assessments, might be gradual and require sustained efforts for meaningful change.
- Educators who align with the demographics and backgrounds of the children and families they serve will create a more culturally sensitive and inclusive learning environment. This assumes that demographic alignment directly translates to culture.

C.   Initiative 3: Compensation and Workforce Logic Model

INPUTS	KEY STRATEGIES & ACTIONS	OUTPUTS	SHORT-TERM/MID-TERM OUTCOMES	LONG TERM OUTCOMES	
1. DEC provides grant-based funding to participating in-network child development programs to increase wages and benefits, and improve workplace conditions for early educators 2. DEC provides stipend-based funding to individual early educators who work in participating in-network programs to augment wages 3. Local Public Institutions of Higher Education – DEC invests in key strategies to enhance child development student experiences (e.g. investments in student supports, streamlining referrals, articulation agreements amongst institutions, etc.) in degree/certificate-based programming 4. DEC invests in community-based partnerships that offer multiple pathways to access degree-based programming, on-ramps (e.g. specialized ECE training) that support adults and youth interested in classroom experiences in ECE, apprenticeship programming for young-adults and adults to access job-based learning coupled with coursework support and access 5. DEC invests in data and evaluation across all workforce programming, yielding access to key	1. Create system-level policies affecting higher-ed (pathways), SF-wide job pay & conditions, racialized outcomes, & increase in accountability /transparency. 2. Develop education pathway in with higher education institutions to encourage adult learners to become ECE educators of the future. 3. Coordinate community engagement opportunities with early educators and community stakeholders to continue to refine programming, larger initiative goals and implementation efforts. 4. Incent attainment of higher education degrees, certification 5. Financially incentivize the best educators to serve the most vulnerable students. 6. Fund enhanced benefits and workplace improvement actions. 7. Communicate in a targeted and deep manner to in-network orgs, and more broadly to reach out-of-network orgs. 8. Providing webinars, trainings, correspondences, One-on-one	a) Wage Increases - (stipends, grants) b) Developed understanding of implementation practice and policies to inform and advance learnings across region/state launching similar compensation efforts c) Contact List of Educators d) Verified Registry Updates (on workplace and educator data) e) Data and trends of participating child development programs in grant-based compensation program f) Supports for early educators pursuing degree pathways, specialized professional development, g) Improved & more recent educator data quality, related to degrees, wages, permits, demographic h) New and clarified policies i) Data re: Adult students entering and graduating from higher ed pathways program j) Child enrollment and tier state data	Families and educators have high satisfaction in SF ECE system. Families have meaningful relationships and are engaged with educators. Educators (and ECE programs) show increased interest and participation in programs (i.e. more applications). Complex network of ECE stakeholders have strong partnerships, and are comprised of diverse and inclusive participants. Educators are more skilled/educated/certified, and are have advancement opportunities within the classroom/office. ECE educators are sustainably compensated, feel valued to a level where their career path is seen as viable and desirable. Improve workforce conditions and working environment	Track workforce retention, compensation, condition, and participation changes and progress over multiple years. Educator volatility and supply issues erased as retention rates increase, workplace conditions improve, & robust pipeline is implemented. Children enter Kindergarten with the cognitive, social/emotional, and physical skills that support school success.	All San Francisco children enjoy a solid foundation to support future success.

workforce data points such as wages, course attainment, certifications, etc.	technical assistance, info postings (i.e. FAQs), announcements. 9. Especially for pathways, identify teachers/potential teachers from target backgrounds and offer enhanced support	k) Grow the share of educators who culturally/linguistically match student makeup l) Increase compensation for educators	Improved retention rates of early educators Improved opportunities for early educators of color to access higher levels of compensation and advancement opportunities		

Additional Context:	Assumptions:
• The high cost of living, lack of affordable housing, and basic needs challenges faced by target populations in San Francisco are essential contextual factors that contribute to the initiative's significance and urgency. For early educators, these contextual factors are further exacerbated by the traditionally low-wage work as a provider and educator of young children. • As a result of the early education sector experienced and seen as a low-wage job/career, it has not attracted critical talent needed in the field, nor is it a field that young adults pursue, resulting in high turnover, high competition for skilled/experienced educators and an aging landscape of early educators. • San Francisco City & County while avant-garde in its effort to pursue wage-parity with SFUSD's Transitional Kindergarten educators, only addresses the wages and conditions for a portion of the entire early education workforce. • While there has been a long-standing push to incentivize child care workers and early educators towards degrees, degrees have not guaranteed better wages for early educators. Current workforce wage initiatives have been designed to incent higher teacher qualifications (higher education levels result in higher wages), and its reach is limited and does not include all early educators. This challenge has often made it difficult for educators to sustain their commitment to the field of early education. San Francisco has had a long history of investments in supporting degree attainment of early educators, with data showing little evidence that the educators remain in the classroom (while many stay in the field of early education, majority are not in the classroom). • A Grantee Survey identified that among both First 5 and OECE, one of the greatest needs for over half of respondents is higher compensation. In California and the greater United States, early care educators are some of the lowest paid positions in the workforce. There is a significant need for greater financial security so that early care educators can meet the high cost of living in San Francisco. While greater financial support is essential for all early educators, educators experience the burden of low compensation differently based on gender and ethnicity. The distribution of compensation for non-white women nationally in early care is significantly less than their white counterparts. Women of color represent over 73% of the workforce in early education in San Francisco.	• While the initiative strives for equitable access to better wages, better working conditions and professional development, including degree attainment, it acknowledges that addressing systemic inequities might require collaborative efforts with broader community initiatives. • When teachers have access to quality professional development programming, such as degree programs, specializations, the quality of care and education of young children effectively improves a young child's ability to develop. • The Workforce initiative might perform activities not shown in this logic model. • When wages and working conditions are commensurate with the importance of early education, teachers are able to more effectively foster learning and development of young children, thereby improving a child's attainment to future success.

D. Initiative 4: Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Logic Model

INPUTS	KEY STRATEGIES & ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	SHORT-TERM/MID-TERM OUTCOMES	LONG TERM OUTCOMES	
DEC provides $4 million for funding for the Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Initiative. There are 4 community-based agencies that hire, train, and contract MHCs: UCSF-Infant-Parent Program Homeless Children's Network RAMS – Fu Yau Project Instituto Familiar de la Raza There are MHCs who are license eligible and have master's level degree. There are partnerships across citywide departments, early learning programs, and FRCs to implement initiative. There is ongoing professional development and training for MHCs.	MHCs are assigned to sites through a prioritization process. • One consultant is assigned to multiple sites. • MHC are matched based on where sites are located at, language need, and participant population. Consultant agencies may assign MHC to work with specific populations (i.e., Chinese-Cantonese speakers, Spanish speakers, Substance abuse background, unhoused populations, SFUSD, FCC, FRC or ECE). MHCs works with staff, teachers, and directors at ECE and FRC sites to build capacity in areas of child development. • Trainings & Workshops • Ad-hoc support for ASQs • Site Observation • Resource linkage and referrals MHCs build capacity in areas of child development for parents through: • Classes & Workshops • Support Groups • Resource linkage and referrals MHCs provides ad-hoc support to sites for high-needs, crisis situations. • 1 on 1 counseling	# of sites assigned to MHC # of site action plans # of staff, teachers, and directors at ECE sites receiving capacity building in areas of child development # of workshops and trainings provided to staff # of workshops and trainings provided to parent/caregivers # of staff provided counseling services # of resource linkage & referral services provided to staff	Providers increase their capacity and knowledge in child development and socio-emotional support and can work with children and their families when issues in a child's behavior arise. Through training and consultation, providers improve their capacity to manage their classroom effectively and confidently. Providers have a better understanding of individual child's needs. Providers are trained and educated on culturally competent/responsive approaches to addressing child learning and development. Decrease implicit bias for addressing behavior of children of color. Providers feel supported and have an outlet for self-care. This leads to higher retention of providers at early learning and FRC sites.	Providers have built and retained knowledge and skills in child development and the classroom environment is improved for all children. Relationships between providers and child are strengthened. Parents are knowledgeable on child development topics, are better equipped to provide socio-emotional support and develop self-advocacy for their children. Relationships between providers, parents/caregivers, and community resources are	All San Francisco children enjoy a solid foundation to support future success.

	• Family/Group counseling • Staff counseling • Resource linkage and referrals	# of families provided counseling services #of resource linkage & referral services provided to families	Parents/caregivers are knowledgeable and have the resources to better support their child's development and socio-emotional needs. There is a decrease in expulsion for children. Higher rate of retention in early learning programs.	strengthened, which benefits children. Race is not a predictor for achieving school readiness outcomes as providers are trained and educated on how to offer support to child and family wholly.

Additional Context:	Assumptions
• Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children face persistent inequities in health, social, and cognitive skills that support school success. • The initiative is currently undergoing a phase of redesign and may change program administration in the next 1-2 years. • Within the ECMHCI, retention has been an issue with MHCs with experience transitioning out of the program and new hires having greener level of experience. • Due to # of MHC, new ELS programs are introduced to MHC services, but resources are scarce.	Providers of early care and education can face difficulty in providing socio-emotional support for children and families. Mental health consultation provides support to educators and parents/caregivers by building capacity and providing direct services to address and mitigate these issues. Through consultation and coordination between providers, parents/caregivers, and community resources, outcomes for all children can be improved.

E. Initiative 5: Family Resource Centers Logic Model

INPUTS	KEY STRATEGIES & ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	SHORT-TERM/MID-TERM OUTCOMES	LONG TERM OUTCOMES	

DEC, HSA, & DCYF provide funding to FRCs.
 	
FRCI contains place-based centers with expertise and specialized services in a specific neighborhood or with an identified population of families.
 	
FRCs have staff to implement and conduct activities.
 	
FRCs provide professional development for staff.
 	
FRCI commits to the following guiding principles:
 	
• Racial Equity
• Universal Access
• Collaboration with Community
• Continuous Learning & Improvement
• Transparency
	Family Engagement and Cross Sector Partnerships
	• FRCs build and maintain relationships with families through the following activities:
	• Intake & Retention
	• Direct and Indirect Outreach and Engagement
	• Basic Information and Referral
	
	FRCs partner with city departments and/or community-based agencies to provide services and resource linkages to FRC participants.
	
	Parent Leadership and Community Connections
	• For parents enrolled in FRC, there are opportunities for participation in:
	• Parent Leadership activities
	  ○ Parent Advisory Council – Formal venue for parent input for FRC funded activities.
	  ○ DEC Parent Engagement Focus Groups - time limited group(s) centered on providing feedback and input on DEC funded activities.
	• Family Events
	• Field Trips
	
	FRCs host Community Events and Workshops/ Classes for community on:
	• Child/Youth Development
	• Perinatal and Early Infancy
	• Family Economic Success
	
	Parent Caregiver Capacity and School Readiness and Success Activities
	FRCs provide parent caregiver capacity and school readiness and success activities through the following activities:
		# of participants engaged and enrolled in FRCs
		
		# of participants provided information and referral
		
		# of parents/caregivers involved in Parent Leadership activities
		
		# of participants attending Family events
		
		# of community events held
		
		# of workshops/classes held on the topics:
		
		• Child/Youth Development
		• Perinatal and Early Infancy
		• Family Economic Success
		# of participants in attendance of workshops/classes
		
		# of parents/caregivers attend support groups
		
		# of parents/caregivers receiving curriculum-based parent education
			Families develop/build/gain knowledge and skills to build communities/ support systems.
			
			Families are knowledgeable about basic needs and how to navigate services.
			
			Families and agencies work together for community and cultural events and improvements.
			
			Parents/ caregivers confidently use effective parenting practices and problem-solving techniques as a child grows and develops.
			
			Parents/ caregivers and children/youth have secure relationships.
			
			Families have positive activities and places to meet that foster a sense of community and social connection and provide opportunities for family leadership.
			
			Parents/caregivers have the capacity and strengths to influence their child's life.
				Stress Mitigation
				
				Parents/caregiver have the information, resources, and connections to peers and professionals to successfully raise their children in San Francisco.
				
				Self-Efficacy
				
				Parents understand developmental milestones, believe they can influence their child's development, and use practices that promote milestone achievement.
				
				Responsive Relationships
					All San Francisco children enjoy a solid foundation to support future success.

- Parent Support Groups - Curriculum Based Parent Education - Perinatal Supports - *May include childbirth preparation classes; linkage and referral to prenatal or pediatric care; lactation and infant feeding support; and/or new parent home visiting activities.* - Parent - Child Interaction Groups - Health and Developmental Screenings - Drop-in Child Watch - *provided for children in support of parents participating in other activities at the FRCs* - Parent Classes in School Readiness and Success **Formal Supports for Individual Families and Those At-Risk for System Involvement** FRCs provide formal supports for individual families and those at risk for system involvement (i.e. child welfare, etc.) through: - Family Advocacy - Intensive Case Management - Barrier Removal and Basic Needs - Differential Response - Enhanced Visitation - Family Services Preservation Services Act (FFPSA) services	# of parents/caregivers receiving perinatal supports services # of parent-child interaction groups # of participants in parent-child interaction groups # of participants attend School readiness & Success classes # of participants served through: - Family Advocacy - Intensive Case Management - Barrier Removal and Basic Needs	Children aged 0-17 participate alongside their parents and caregivers in groups, developmental and health screenings, or other early intervention services that promote children's social, emotional, and literacy development. Parents/ caregivers are actively involved in their child's early learning and academic success. Parents/ caregivers partner with schools and teachers. Families in/at risk obtain help when needed and develop long-term strategies. Families experience decreased maltreatment and entry into foster care.	Family members learn from one another and have nurturing, supportive relationships inside and outside family resource centers. **School Readiness & Success** Children enter kindergarten with the cognitive, social/emotional, and physical skills that support school success.

Additional Context:

- In San Francisco, there is a high cost of living, lack of affordable housing, and difficulty meeting basic needs for target populations.
- Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children face persistent inequities in health, social, and cognitive skills that support school success.
- The COVID pandemic changed a subset of services provided by FRCs.
  - Basic needs services have become more essential for families served by FRCs
  - There has been an expansion of services provided remotely in addition to in person such as workshops, support groups, parent leadership, and parent education classes.

Assumptions

- The strategy of the FRC initiative is the combination of services for the individual parent/caregiver and child to create long-term positive impact for the family.
- A family may access one or more of the services from the FRCs, although may not have a touch point with every service/activity.
- FRCs need to have a core set of services/activities to be funded by DEC, which are all indicated on this Logic Model. FRCs may conduct activities out of what is indicated above.

F.   Initiative 6: Universal Screening and Early Intervention Logic Model

INPUTS	KEY STRATEGIES & ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	SHORT-TERM/MID-TERM OUTCOMES	LONG TERM OUTCOMES	
DEC provides funding for the Universal Screening and Early Intervention initiative. There are partnerships across DEC, child care centers, FCCS, FRCs, schools, and clinics. Child care centers, FCCs, and FRCs have staff to conduct health and developmental screenings activities and follow-up. There are universal screening tools that are accessible. • Ages & Stages Questionnaires (ASQ3) • Ages & States Questionnaires –Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE2) There are DEC-funded Care Coordinators for support around navigation and connection to services for families and providers.	**Universal Developmental Screening** ● *Screen*: Accessible Universal Development Screening System in place (Sparkler) ● *Engage*: Screening results inform support strategies at programs (ECE, FRCs, or Clinics) and in-home (parents are fully engaged and knowledgeable) ● *Respond*: All children with an identified concern receive initial on-site support at programs and if needed referral to outside intervention services ● *Connect*: All cases with referral receive a timely connection to early intervention services or community resources **Families of Children and Youth with Special Health Care Needs (CYSHC) and Early Intervention (EI) Population FRC** Provides essential family support services for families of children and youth with special health care needs and families of children seeking early intervention services. ● Responsive Relationships: Family Engagement and Cross-Sector Partnerships Activities ● Parent Self-Efficacy: Parent Leadership and Community Connections ● School Readiness and Success: Parent Caregiver Capacity and School Readiness and Success Activities ● Stress Mitigation: Formal Supports for Individual Families and Those At Risk for System Involvement **Centralized Access Point (CAP)** A hub for information and referrals pertaining to child development, developmental delays, and disability; information and access to developmental screening and immediate follow-up; connection to care coordination and additional service referrals.	# of health and developmental screenings conducted # of health and developmental screenings on Sparkler app # of children who receive early intervention in at-home and child care settings for identified developmental delay need(s) # of children who receive early intervention and are retained in their programs # of referrals to resources and clinical follow-up # of referrals of care coordinators for family resource linkage and support	Children are universally screened for health and developmental delays. Health and developmental needs for children are being addressed and children can stay in their programs. All-important stakeholders in a child's life, parents, early care providers, and clinicians, are knowledgeable and trained on the importance of screenings, referrals, and follow-up. Parents/caregivers can provide at-home early intervention for their children. Parents/caregivers are linked to resources for their child when appropriate. Providers have the skill and knowledge to provide early intervention on-site.	Children's needs are being identified early to seek help sooner and have the best start possible to their lives. Racialized outcomes for children are decreased due to widespread education and access to early intervention for developmental delays. Children enter kindergarten with the cognitive, social/emotional, and physical skills that support school success. Children are in excellent physical and mental health or have reliable	All San Francisco children enjoy a solid foundation to support future success.

There are inclusion coaches and early intervention services (i.e. OT, PT, Speech & Language therapist, etc.).	• Maintain central information and referral hub. • City-wide Access to Developmental screening • Intake • Referral and Triaging • Follow up and monitoring **Developmental Playgroups** Easy to access, culturally responsive playgroups for children birth to age 5 primarily, exhibiting mild to moderate delays, but not eligible for formalized early intervention. • Facilitate Developmental Playgroups • Developmental Monitoring and pre/post-screening • Coordination of easily accessible play opportunities **Care Coordination and Individualized Support Services** Care coordination and individualized support for families with children age birth to 5 who have multiple care provider needs, have a diagnosed disability, and/or are at higher risk for developmental delays. • Identification and Preliminary Assessments • Create a Plan of Care • Care Transitions and Continued Support activities	# of trainings on health and developmental screenings and follow-up pathways for parents/caregivers # of trainings on health and developmental screenings and follow-up pathways for providers # of providers trained on culturally responsive/competent approaches to health and developmental screenings and follow-up # of early intervention service providers	Providers are trained and feel confident to have conversations around screenings and developmental needs with parents that are culturally responsive. There is a network of resources and early intervention providers available for referral and follow-up after screenings when there is an identified health or developmental need. Universal screenings and early intervention data are centralized and integrated in a system which helps to gather information on where investments in the community need to be made.	access to quality health providers to address concerns. Parents have the information, resources, and connections to peers and professionals to successfully raise their children in San Francisco. Providers use tools and resources to tailor and adapt the early learning environment for a child's developmental needs.	

Additional Context:

- Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children face persistent inequities in health, social, and cognitive skills that support school success.
- There is a discrepancy in the rate of follow-up after health and developmental screenings for target populations.
- When Black, Latino, Pacific Islander, and Indigenous children have developmental needs that are not identified until K-12, it is often too late to prevent large racial equity gaps.
- San Francisco had ASQs as a requirement for child care centers as part of Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).
- Since 2020, there has been no QRIS for non-state pre-k programs, however there is still local policy on requiring ASQs in early learning programs.
- ASQs are a screening tool and not a tool for diagnosis. It highlights when to seek resources and/or more formal clinical review.

Assumptions

- For many families, after a health and developmental screening is conducted and there is an identified health and/or developmental need, this is often the first time that they are introduced to navigating these systems for resources and support.
- This initiative is currently in a scaling up and expansion phase with the goal to grow the initiative citywide and well-resourced to serve all children of SF.

Appendix 4 RFP Forms Overview

There are six required attachments for this RFP. All attachments can be downloaded from the DEC website (https://sfdec.org/funding-opportunities/).

In total, each Proposer must submit **three (3) pdfs** and **one (1) excel document** for a total of **four (4)** attachments within a single email to DEC-Contracts@sfgov.org :

- The email subject line should read as follows: "**DEC24-05 Data & Evaluation Services Application-Proposer name (Indicated Service Area number)**"
- **First Combined PDF**: Labeled "**Proposer name_Proposal**"
  - Attachments B and C in a single combined pdf format.
- **Second Combined PDF**: Labeled "**Proposer name_ Attachments**"
  - Contracts (Both Public and Private);
  - Job descriptions and resumes of key staff, your letter of references.
- **Third Combined PDF**: Labeled "**Proposer name_Forms**"
  - Health Care Accountability Ordinance & Minimum Compensation Ordinance (Attachment E), and the First Source Hiring Agreement (Attachment F) in the third combined pdf
- **One Excel Attachment**: Labeled "**Proposer name_Budget**"
  - Attachment D in Excel Format

If Proposers wish to propose for more than one service area, separate proposals must be submitted. For instance, if you are proposing to both service area I & IV, please submit two separate emails that includes four (4) attachments in each email, as follows:

- DEC24-05 Data & Evaluation Services Application-Proposer name (SA I)
  - Proposer name_Proposal
  - Proposer name_Attachments
  - Proposer name_Forms
  - Proposer name_Budget

- DEC24-05 Data & Evaluation Services Application-Proposer name (SA IV)
  - Proposer name_Proposal
  - Proposer name_Attachments
  - Proposer name_Forms
  - Proposer name_Budget

Format

Applications must be created using a word processing software (e.g., Microsoft Word, Corel WordPerfect, LibreOffice, FocusWriter), text should be unjustified (i.e., with a ragged-right margin) using a 12 point serif font (e.g., Times New Roman, and not Arial), page margins should be at least 1" on all sides (excluding headers and footers), use 1.5 line spacing, and sections be within articulated page limits. Document footers should include sequential page numbers, proposer name and category of the application (e.g., service area). **Please convert all forms into "PDF" format other than the Calculation of Charges for proposal submission.**

Department staff will confirm receipt of all proposal submissions within three (3) business days after receipt of the application packet.

Required Attachments

1. MANDATORY LETTER OF INTENT

Proposers intending to submit an application are **required** to submit a letter of intent by DEC July 9, 2024 at 5:00 PM PST. Please refer to RFP Section VII.A for more information.

Do not attach this with your application.

2. ATTACHMENT A: CITY'S CONTRACT TERMS

Do not attach this with your application.

3. ATTACHMENT B: APPLICATION AND MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Submit Attachment B to demonstrate if the submitting Proposer meets each of the Minimum Qualifications. Any proposals failing to meet these qualifications will be considered nonresponsive and will not be eligible for proposal review or award of contract.

Complete and include with Attachment C Written Proposal.

4. CONTRACTS (BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE)

Agencies should submit a statement listing relevant contracts with a description of the services which have been completed during the last three (3) years. The statement must also list any failure or refusal to complete a contract, including details and dates. Proposers receiving funding must not have any city contracts withdrawn or terminated due to fiscal or program compliance issues within the last 24 months. Any Proposers with outstanding issues may not be eligible for proposal review or contract award.

If no outstanding issues, provide a statement that your firm is in full compliance with program and fiscal monitoring. Provide disclosure of any litigation including Respondent, subcontracts, or any principal officers thereof in connection with any contract or grant.

5. ATTACHMENT C: WRITTEN PROPOSAL

Maximum of 18 pages

Complete and include with Attachments B Application and Minimum Qualifications.

6. ATTACHMENT D: Calculation of Charges

Complete and include in Excel format.

7. ATTACHMENT E: HEALTH CARE ACCOUNTABILITY AND MINIMUM COMPENSATION ORDINANCE

Complete and include with Attachment E Health Care Accountability and Minimum Compensation Ordinance.

8. ATTACHMENT F: FIRST SOURCE HIRING AGREEMENT

Complete and include with other Attachment F First Source Hiring Agreement.