San Francisco Youth Commission
Civic Engagement Committee
Minutes - Draft
Monday, May 10, 2021
4:30-6:30 PM

Public Comment Call-in:
+1-415-655-0001
United States, San Francisco (toll)
Access code: 187 100 4056
There will be public comment on each item.

Members: Valentina Alioto-Pier, Arianna Arana, Sarah Cheung, Sarah Ginsburg, Stephen "Rocky" Versace, Adrianna Zhang

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 4:33pm.

Commissioner Versace is absent (by arriving later past bylaw regulations).

Valentina Alioto-Pier - aye
Arianna Arana - aye
Sarah Cheung- aye
Sarah Ginsburg - aye
Stephen "Rocky" Versace - absent
Adrianna Zhang - aye

2. **Approval of Agenda (Action Item)**

Commissioner Ginsburg, seconded by Commissioner Zhang, motioned to approve the agenda. A roll call vote was taken. Motion passes. No public comment.

Valentina Alioto-Pier - aye
Arianna Arana - aye
Sarah Cheung- aye
Sarah Ginsburg - aye
Stephen "Rocky" Versace - absent
Adrianna Zhang - aye

3. **Approval of Minutes (Action Item)**

A. **April 26, 2021**
   ([Document A](#))

Commissioner Alioto-Pier, seconded by Commissioner Zhang, motioned to approve the minutes. A roll call vote was taken. Motion passes. No public comment.

Valentina Alioto-Pier - aye
Arianna Arana - aye
Sarah Cheung- aye
Sarah Ginsburg - aye
Stephen "Rocky" Versace - absent
Adrianna Zhang - aye

4. **Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (Discussion Only)**

There was no public comment.

5. **Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**

   A. Team Building Activity

Commissioners engaged in a team building activity.

   B. Review group agreements

Commissioners reviewed group agreements.

   C. Vote16SF/Prop G Round 3 Poll Discussion + Planning
       Presenter: Brandon Klugman, Associate Director - Campaigns, Generation Citizen;
       Michele Gerus, community member

Sarah C. - did you read all the materials that Michele had sent? All Commissioners read the research brief.

Brandon - excited to be a part of the discussion, awesome that you find a poll valuable. A lot of interest in open ended questions from the initial brainstorming. We want to find out perception and some of the polling may not be able to get open ended questions with some polling groups.

Brandon and Generation Citizen will still be able to help CEC/YC carry the campaign forward to help with institutional memory as the Commissioners transition out.

Sarah C. - last time Survey Monkey was proposed what are your thoughts on that?
Brandon - wants to hear how it would be distributed/contacted.

Michele - sample pieces that she put together and best practice to lay out the objectives. What is the intent of the study and what do we want to do with the data? Lays out recommendations for methodology. Have research brief lays out what we want to do, why, and what we plan to do with the info once we have it.

Online survey is recommended to get open ended answers for a poll. There are ways to capture both open and closed data.

Hard numbers complimented by the "whys". What projects have you worked on that you felt compelled to do phone, online, focus groups.

Brandon - happy to defer to your expertise on this. Direct experience and was involved in polling this past year and more deeply in 2016. Observer on other projects in other states.

Michele-you brought up the sample piece. Where do we get these people? The issue is how we obtain our sample/contact information is a challenge for anyone doing research and ensuring we get the right profile. You are trying to get a read on SF voters. She doesn't have access to list of voters in 2020 election. Support needed on sources for contact information to get proper read of people who should be surveyed.

Brandon - experience has been through firms who do election polling. Has done it with both expensive and least expensive and only has experience of those who specialize in election realm and hasn't done it where we have to come up with contacts ourselves.

michele- cost aside, phone surveys vs. online surveys, did the phone survey companies talk about what they felt was about their advantages.

Brandon- phone companies can do live calls in other languages not just English. Doesn't remember other advantages.

Michele- pollsters have been a little off in general and methodologies have been challenged. What's the best mousetrap to catch the mice we need to catch. Language issue is fair assessment.

Jennifer - in last meeting we had discussed LWV running the poll but realized that the League can't do this because it would be an in kind contribution and can't actually run it and Michele is helping us as a volunteer not affiliated with the LWV.

Michele- Brandon/GC could take lead on the poll for credibility. Platform selection/partnership selection could help us.

Research brief content: was it close to what you had discussed.

Sarah G. - questions aligned with discussion.

Commissioner Versace arrived at 5:10pm.

Commissioner Cheung: likes that it's short and succinct, likes questions 4 & 5. Another question to add on next round if a presidential election had an impact on the voter turnout (do you vote out every year or just vote this year because of the presidential election)?

Michele- how would the answer to this impact how we read the data? If it goes back on the ballot for 2022 or 2024 do we do something different based on either year? From this perspective could qualify voters up front so when selecting sample you could talk to people who vote consistently in presidential and off year elections.

Staff Hosmon: adding in a question on if voters would have voted in favor of it if it only focused on school board elections and not all voting rights in SF.

Commissioner Zhang: idea of online survey is good and likes qualitative and quantitative. Slight concern-is there a way to get data from people who don't have access to online?

Michele-any methodology can skew the results.

Brandon - try to keep focus narrow to finding information that could make a real difference in how future effort is approached. Based on previous polling there is some decent perception that people have negative reaction re: maturity, previous polling some of the messages on voting a habit, and civic education don't do a whole lot. Encourages us to not repeat these type of things to focus on what makes a difference (where did they get info, hear endorsement, read a slate card)? This could lead us to invest in things that will help the campaign. Whose face do you put on the mail piece.

Michele- you definitely want to look back at the info and how it was collected and learn/build from that. However we execute round 3 you definitely want to review everything that Brandon was describing from Rounds 1 & 2. There must be a profile of those who voted yes vs. those who voted no and GC has this. So this narrows our target to those who voted no - who are they demographically and attitude wise. Primary targets are those who voted no and secondary target are those who voted yes. Go through Round 1 and 2 and learn from this and apply learning from round 3.

Sarah G. - difference of making decisions from old

Generally take away questions that we already have some knowledge information from (framing/messaging) and identify questions that help steer us into future thinking on strategy and what we could do differently in a third round.

Timeline on discussion/future action steps:
- polling done and round three decided by late summer (July/August)
- get into specifics of questions and analyzing each one on how it impacts our strategy
- launch it by beginning of June? (michele thinks this is ambitious)
- how long does it take to get a vendor? companies can do it pretty quickly
- deployment doesn't take long it's the thinking part

1. General idea of what we want to learn (research brief) and objectives
   a. End of June (3 more CEC meetings to figure out this bucket)
   b. invite Vote16 Steering Cmte members to be a part of the conversation for all next 3 meetings (Coleman, Power CA, Generation Citizen, SF Rising)
2. Run past Vote16 Steering Committee
   a. Early July (1x time meeting)
   b. If needed if we didn't get feedback in CEC meetings
3. Get to vendor and see scope of services/cost (Brandon has names of two vendors Change Research and Civiqs)
4. Decision based on cost and services
5. Create strategy for Round 3

$14237 in BLING/YFYI grants remaining. Still some outstanding receipts that have to be turned in so more like $13500, roughly.

Research Brief:

Youth Commission
Vote16 Survey
Research Brief – v1 042321

OVERVIEW/PROJECT BACKGROUND

San Francisco Proposition G, a local election voting age charter amendment measure, was on the ballot as a referral in San Francisco on November 3, 2020.

The ballot question was written as follows:

"Shall the City amend the Charter to allow San Francisco residents to vote for local candidates and local ballot measures if they are U.S. citizens, at least 16 years old and registered to vote?"

A "yes" vote supported amending the city charter to lower the voting age to 16 for local candidates and ballot measures.

A "no" vote opposed amending the city charter to lower the voting age to 16 for local candidates and ballot measures.

A simple majority was required for the approval of Proposition G. Proposition G was defeated, 50.8% to 49.2%

Note: In November 2016, San Francisco voters rejected Proposition F, which would have amended the city charter to lower the minimum voting age requirement from 18 to 16 for city elections. The measure was defeated in a vote of 52.1% to 47.9%.

KEY RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

Inform the campaign and communications strategies supporting Vote16 "Round Three," which is tentatively planned.

SPECIFIC RESEARCH GOALS

· Profile voters who voted against and for Prop G
· Gain a deeper understanding of what voters did /didn't know about the issue
· Gain a deeper understanding of why voters voted against Prop G/for Prop G
· Explore how Prop G advocates can improve the messaging around the issue, and
· Identify ways they might modify the Vote16 initiative next time they put it in front of the voters, to give it a better chance of success

METHODOLOGY

To fulfill the objectives outlined above, an online survey is recommended.

Data Collection

TBD

Target/Sample Criteria (e.g., SF registered voters, age, income, race/ethnicity)

TBD

Response Targets

TBD

Estimated Timeline - TBD

TBD

Deliverables

· Topline results, executive summary (PPT deck)
· Excel data file with results tables
· Excel file with responses to open-ended questions, key demographics, and profile variables
· Live presentation to Youth Commission

    D. League of Women Voters Presentation
        Presenter: Jennifer Helton, Voter Services Committee member

-have been telling volunteers about the SF Youth Commission and have had one youth say she wants to apply
-ready to support efforts on holding SFUSD accountable (next fall could be better time to do this)

    E. CEC related news

None

6. Staff Report

-public comment for Wednesday, May 12, 11:30am budget hearings: talking points. The Budget and Finance committee will be discussing "law enforcement" budgets again, after failing to significantly make cuts last year. It's a really important opportunity for us to ask them to redirect policing and jailing funds into building robust community resources.
       Adrianna, Sarah C. could possibly do public comment based on time
-Interview support needed by non returning commissioners (Sarah C., Sarah G., Rocky, Ariana)

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:14pm.