Youth Commission Policy and Budget Priorities 13-14, 14-15

Contents

[Introductory Letter from Chairwoman Mia Shackelford 2](#_Toc355094455)

[Continuing SF Summer Jobs+ 3](#_Toc355094456)

[Fully Fund the Plan for Affordable Housing for Transitional Age Youth 7](#_Toc355094457)

[Expand Implementation of 12N Sensitivity Training and Efforts to Track LGBT Youth in City Services 9](#_Toc355094458)

[Evaluating Credit Recovery Programs at SFUSD 11](#_Toc355094459)

[Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to Urge SF JPD not to Equip SOP Unit Probation Officers with Firearms 13](#_Toc355094460)

[Fully Implement the Crisis- Intervention-Team Model in SFPD and Ensure a Taser-free Police Force and City 15](#_Toc355094461)

[Three Changes at Police Department 17](#_Toc355094462)

[Following up with JPD on Full Access to Outdoor Recreation Area at Juvenile Hall 23](#_Toc355094463)

[Free Youth Transportation 25](#_Toc355094464)

[Urging SFUSD and City & County to Assist Undocumented Students File for Deferred Action 28](#_Toc355094465)

[Support City College of San Francisco 31](#_Toc355094466)

# Introductory Letter from Chairwoman Mia Shackelford

San Francisco is an amazing and challenging city for youth to live in. We have a growing economy, vibrant cultures, and our local government often serves as a model for the nation on issues of equality and civic participation. On the other hand, not all communities are receiving equitable access to what makes San Francisco so successful. Although San Francisco is often seen and discussed as a community of transplants or childless adults, there is a large youth population that adds to the city’s vitality, and that faces unique needs and challenges.

The San Francisco Youth Commission’s inclusion in the city charter is one way our government recognizes the importance of San Francisco’s young people. Our chartered duty of presenting our Budget and Policy Priorities to the Board of Supervisors reflects that youth voice is valued here in San Francisco. It far from the first the city government has heard from us this year, and it will not be the last. We have passed resolutions, advocated at public meetings, and organized within the community. This document is intended as a distillation of our policy and budget recommendations, both in order to inform the budget process, and more broadly to showcase the values of San Francisco’s youth, and the work we’ve done alongside the community so far.

 We’ve accomplished a lot in our quest to represent youth in city government over the last year, both beginning to investigate new issues and following through on ongoing projects. Despite the transitions that come with a body of young people, we are committed to institutional memory. Our work in previous years on transportation has come to fruition—we are so proud of the collaboration with the community that has led to over 20,000 youth receiving free MUNI passes. Commissioners remain committed to fulfilling the cultural awareness trainings mandated by 12N across more city service providers. The Youth Justice Committee has continued to advocate for recreation for youth involved in the juvenile justice system, but they have also taken part in new conversations about the equipment youth probation officers and SFPD should have. Because of the dedication of commissioners and staff, the assistance of those in the city family, and the ceaseless support and collaboration with community organizations, our policy priorities span a huge breadth, without sacrificing depth of understanding.

To paraphrase a song common in union organizing circles, let the work that we have done speak for us.

Best,

Mia Shackelford

Chairwoman, San Francisco Youth Commission

# Continuing SF Summer Jobs+

Priority #1: Robust oversight and monitoring of SF Summer Jobs+ Campaign, including surveying youth employed for feedback, prioritizing disconnected Transitional Age Youth, and encouraging a financial literacy workshop component for employed youth.

**Background**Locally, San Francisco’s youth job rate is at its lowest in more than 60 years, with 33% of the city’s job seeking youth officially unemployed according to the American Community Survey.[[1]](#footnote-1) In summer of 2012, 1900 San Francisco youth applied for only 596 youth employment slots available in one of the City’s largest paid internship programs, the Mayor’s Youth Employment and Education Program (MYEEP).[[2]](#footnote-2)

As also seen each year by the staggering numbers from the Youth Vote survey, employment is always the highest priority among San Francisco youth. According to the Fall 2012 Youth Vote Student Survey of over 7,000 San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) high school students, youth employment is consistently prioritized over any potential activity, program, club or lesson (Figure # # ) .[[3]](#footnote-3)

In 2011, the national summer youth unemployment rate was at its highest since 1948, with only 49% of youth 16-24 years old employed in July—the busiest youth job month of the year. According to a 2012 report from Civic Enterprises and America’s Promise Alliance, in association with the White House Council for Community Solutions, young people have identified the following as the top three obstacles to connecting to work: they don’t have enough work experience required for the job they want; they don’t have enough education required for job they want; they are not good at interviews and/or don’t know how to write an effective resume (Figure 2.2).[[4]](#footnote-4)

Nationwide, there are 6.7 million transitional-aged youth, young people between the ages of 16 and 24. Many youth in this population are disconnected from education and work,[[5]](#footnote-5) with many not represented in employment statistics because the competitive current job market had dissuaded them from even searching for work.

In response to this crisis, President Obama launched the Summer Jobs+ campaign, an initiative that challenges business leaders and communities to help provide hundreds of thousands of summer jobs for America’s youth. The President proposed $1.5 billion for youth employment.

In April 2012, Mayor Edwin Lee announced the launch of San Francisco Summer Jobs+, which brought together City departments, the private sector, United Way of the Bay Area, and other non-profit organizations to create approximately 5,000 jobs for 16 to 24 year olds in summer of 2012.

In 2012, the Youth Commission passed resolutions no. 1112-05 “Urging the Mayor and the Board to commend President Obama’s Summer Jobs+ Plan”, [[6]](#footnote-6) and no. 1112-10 “Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to launch a local San Francisco Summer Jobs+ Campaign”.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of youth 16 - 24 years old, employed in summer of 2012, rose 2.1 million to 19.5 million. In 2012, the share of young people employed in July was 50.2 percent (the month of July typically is the summertime peak in youth employment). However, unemployment among youth increased by 836,000 from April to July 2012, compared with an increase of 745,000 for the same period in 2011.[[7]](#footnote-7)

According to a SF Summer Jobs+ report, the initiative was successful in providing 5,204 work opportunities, with 3,466 of the opportunities in the public sector, and 1,738 in the private sector. [[8]](#footnote-8) Of the job opportunities, 39% of placements were permanent jobs and 53% were temporary placements. **(What about the other 8%)**

The Youth Commission is excited to hear that the initiative will continue with SF Summer Jobs+ 2013, and is especially enthused with the bigger overall goal of 6,000 jobs for youth ages 14 to 24 in San Francisco!

We know that SF Summer Jobs+ can be successful, because the City has done this before. The previous two Mayoral administrations have seen San Francisco successfully create public-private partnerships to provide summer youth workforce development programs. In May of 2000, former Mayor Willie Brown raised over $1 million for subsidized youth employment opportunities through local corporations that partnered with the City through the Say Youth Employment for the Summer (Say YES) campaign,[[9]](#footnote-9) and in 2004 former Mayor Gavin Newsom secured funding for over 120 youth jobs in his Mayor’s Vocational Program by making personal phone calls to local businesses.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**San Francisco’s Young People’s Desire for Jobs (Figure ##)**

****

**Youth Barriers to Employment Nationally (Figure 2.2)**

****

**Recommendation**

Working very closely with youth advocates and youth employment service providers—especially the youth employment provider consortium the San Francisco Youth Employment Coalition—the Youth Commission developed Youth Commission resolution 1213 - 05 *Calling on the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to Continue SF Summer Jobs+*, adopted January 13, 2013.

Firstly, this resolution commends the Mayor and the Board for the city’s implementation of SF Summer Jobs+ in 2012 and the continuation of SF Summer Jobs in 2013. This resolution also calls on the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to do the following things in the rollout of Summer Jobs+ 2013:

* communicate the importance and benefits of hiring disadvantaged, low income, and previously incarcerated youth to private sector partners;
* encourage a financial literacy workshop component for all Summer Jobs+ participants so that youth receiving stipends or wages understand their access to bank accounts and financial education;
* urge DCYF and OWED and partners involved in the rollout of SF Summer Jobs+ to include a pre and post survey for youth participants to provide feedback to the initiative
* meticulously document and track the demographics and outcomes of youth involved in the program
* prioritize disconnected transitional age youth

This resolution also urges the SF Summer Jobs+ initiative to prioritize the young people who need these jobs the most. In particular, the Youth Commission calls on the City Family to prioritize the more than 7,000 San Francisco youth and young adults, ages 16-24, who are: involved in public systems, dropped out of high school, homeless, living with a disability or special need and/or are pregnant or parenting. These are the “disconnected” youth who San Francisco City government calls “TAY” (transitional age youth), and these are the young people with the most barriers to employment.[[11]](#footnote-11)

# Fully Fund the Plan for Affordable Housing for Transitional Age Youth

**Background**

Transitional aged youth (TAY) make up approximately 80,000 of San Francisco’s population.  5-10% of this population - or between 5,000 and 8,000 young people - are estimated to find difficulty obtaining employment and housing.  These are at risk youth who may become homeless, jobless, and/or involved with the criminal justice system.  If their basic necessities such as shelter, food, and health are unmet, they will remain an economic and social challenge to the city.  On the contrary, the Youth Commission believes that they can become a positive asset to San Francisco’s local economy if TAYs’ basic physical, mental, and emotional needs are met.

In 2005, the San Francisco Youth Commission adopted a resolution urging the Mayor to ordain a taskforce to study and make recommendations regarding the issues that face transitional age youth.  A task force was created in 2006, and a report entitled *Disconnected Youth in San Francisco: A Roadmap to Improve the Life Chances of San Francisco’s Most Vulnerable Young Adults* was released by the task force in 2007.  Among the report’s 16 recommendations to the city’s policy makers, “more accessible housing for disconnected TAY” was a high priority.

Soon after, the Mayor’s Office of Housing picked up this issue and proposed the goal of providing 400 new housing units for TAY by 2015.  As of today, three years before the projected deadline, there are over 187 units to be identified.

The Youth Commission is concerned for multiple reasons: rising home prices and rent are a financial burden to TAY and those struggling to make ends meet; there was a 63% decline of new housing stock in the City over the previous years; *no* new housing units were constructed for populations categorized under “Extremely Low Income” - a group which youth transitioning out of the foster care system would most likely fall into; the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the institution that provided the vast majority of local affordable housing funding for the City, was eliminated at the end of 2011.

In November 6, 2012, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco passed Proposition C, also known as the Housing Trust Fund, which will set aside funding to acquire, create, and rehabilitate affordable housing over the next 30 years. This earmark will help address the housing needs of residents, including the TAY population.

**Recommendations**

The San Francisco Youth Commission encourages the Mayor’s Office of Housing, the Department of Public Health, and the Human Services Agency to implement the housing recommendations of the Transitional Youth Task Force.

The commission calls for the development of an evaluation tool that measures the quality and effectiveness of TAY housing and its supportive services.  The development of this evaluation should include feedback from youth, and the Youth Commission is open to helping with the formulation of such an evaluation.  The commission urges the Mayor’s Office of Housing and TAY housing and service providers to develop and implement an evaluation tool as a next step towards meeting the goal of providing 400 additional units of TAY housing by 2015, and is eager to contribute to the process.

# Expand Implementation of 12N Sensitivity Training and Efforts to Track LGBT Youth in City Services

**Priority #X: Assure that youth-serving City Departments follow the lead of the Department of Public Health**

**Background**

Adopted in June of 1999, Chapter 12N of the San Francisco Administrative Code—entitled *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Questioning Youth: Youth Services Sensitivity Training*—mandates training with very specific criteria regarding Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning (LGBTQ) youth sensitivity of all City employees who work with youth and all City contractors who receive $50,000 or more in City (or City-administered) funds.[[12]](#footnote-12)

For the past thirteen years, this well-intentioned mandate that was designed to help queer youth access culturally competent services has been an unfunded mandate. In 2012, the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Human Rights Commission, and the Youth Commission prepared a training tool which is being piloted at DPH sites. However, there are few resources to support other departments in developing relevant staff trainings, developing capacity to make appropriate referrals for LGBTQ youth, or identifying administrative barriers that keep queer and transgender youth from equally accessing their services.

Notably, most city departments and contractors do not currently collect information regarding the sexual orientation or gender identity of youth they serve.[[13]](#footnote-13) As a result, there are few means of determining how and whether queer and trans youth are accessing services, let alone determining what outcomes they experience.

San Francisco’s LGBTQ youth are still very in need of excellent services. Queer youth are harassed more (Figure 8.1)[[14]](#footnote-14) and are more likely to consider suicide (Figure 8.2)[[15]](#footnote-15) than their heterosexual peers.

**School-Based Harassment Due to Sexual Orientation (Figure 8.1)**

During the past 12 months, have you ever been harassed because someone thought you were gay, lesbian or bisexual?



**Suicide Risk (Figure 8.2**



**Recommendation**

The Youth Commission urges Mayor Lee, the Board of Supervisors and youth-serving City departments, to develop a timeline for implementing Chapter 12N, as well as identify funding sources to support planning and implementation. The Commission additionally requests that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors call on City departments to begin collecting information on sexual orientation and gender identity in intake forms, beginning in the upcoming fiscal year.

# Evaluating Credit Recovery Programs at SFUSD

Priority # : Evaluating credit recovery programs with student feedback
Background

“The mission of the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) is to provide each student with an equal opportunity to succeed by promoting intellectual growth, creativity, self-discipline, cultural and linguistic sensitivity, democratic responsibility, economic competence, and physical and mental health so that each student can achieve his or her maximum potential”, as states on its website.[[16]](#footnote-16)The SFUSD’s mission statement further states that, “Every student who enrolls in our schools will graduate from high school ready for college and careers and equipped with the skills, capacities, and dispositions necessary for 21st century success”. Students must be educated in a rigorous high school curriculum in order to compete and be successful in today’s job market and society. The future of San Francisco depends on having an educated workforce and citizenry to maintain the vitality of the city.

In accordance with their mission statement, in December 2008, the SFUSD raised their graduation requirements to A-G requirements.[[17]](#footnote-17) A-G courses are the high school classes necessary for students to take and pass to be able to enroll in any University of California or California State University. The previous graduation requirements did not fully prepare students for college it was possible to graduate and pass and not to be eligible for admission to UCs and CSUs. The Class of 2014 is the first graduating class to go through high school under the new A-G requirements. Recently released data from the SFUSD shows that almost half of students from Class of 2014 are not on track to graduate, with 45% of students not on track to graduate and be eligible for UCs and CSUs.[[18]](#footnote-18)3

Credit recovery programs are defined as programs that “aim to help schools graduate more students by giving students who have fallen behind a chance to ‘recover’ credits through a multitude of different strategies”, thereby increasing the number of high school graduates and their future opportunities.[[19]](#footnote-19)4 Budget cuts in recent years have reduced the amount of funding given to recovery programs, including summer school, severely impacting the amount of opportunities students have to get back on track to graduating if they miss or fail a class .[[20]](#footnote-20)5There are currently online credit recovery opportunities for students in the San Francisco Unified School District, including CyberHigh, Aventa, and OdysseyWare. [[21]](#footnote-21)6 Credit recovery programs, such as the online options, are the main platform for off track students to regain credits to graduate in a timely manner. It is imperative that the SFUSD prioritize current credit recovery programs for students who are not on track to graduate. Credit recovery programs are not being used to their fullest potential due to questionable student satisfaction and lack of information for English language learners.

Recommendations
We feel that an evaluation of current credit recovery programs offered would identify the problems that inhibit its current use and provide robust guidance for the expenditure of limited SFUSD funds. The Youth Commission and the Student Advisory Council have both passed similar resolutions urging the SFUSD to evaluate current credit recovery programs offered with youth feedback to improve the quality and accessibility of these aforementioned programs. We also urge the continued communication between the city of San Francisco, the SFUSD, and community based organizations regarding student achievement and the reduction of the achievement gap.

# Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to Urge SF JPD not to Equip SOP Unit Probation Officers with Firearms

Priority # : Urging Juvenile Probation Department not to equip SOP Unit Probation Officers with Firearms

Background

At the January 9, 2013 meeting of the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Commission, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer William P. Siffermann announced, subsequent to a presentation by Assistant Chief Allan Nance entitled “Juvenile Probation Officer Field Safety and Monitoring Compliance: The Changing Landscape of Community Corrections and Supervisor of High Risk Offenders,” that he was “examining those existing safety measures provided to Juvenile Probation Officers” who work with the most violent and highest-risk youth, and that he planned to develop a revised safety protocol for the Juvenile Probation Department’s (JPD) probation officers to be announced sometime in April 2013, and it has been reported# that one possible such revision will be equipping probation officers in the Serious Offender Program (SOP) unit with firearms.

While one of the stated values and beliefs of the JPD is that “data-driven decision-making ensures positive outcomes,”# the necessity of equipping juvenile probation officers with firearms has not yet been substantiated by any body of evidence, nor has evidence been presented suggesting that arming juvenile probation officers with firearms will lead to a reduction in violent incidents or an enhancement of public safety.  One of the main premises behind making the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) an entity separate and distinct from other adult law enforcement agencies—an act that distinguishes San Francisco from all other counties in the state of California—was the importance of differentiating JPD from an armed approach to juvenile justice, and also to provide a more specialized focus on youth rehabilitative service needs.

Chief Siffermann has repeatedly argued that revisions to JPD’s safety protocol are a result of state criminal and juvenile justice realignment, and he has repeatedly referred to a potentially fatal incident on September 20, 2012 in which juvenile probation officers, working in tandem with San Francisco Police Department police officers, encountered a violent youth probationer, as an example of the need for a revised safety protocol.

There is a lack of clarity on the need for JPD probation officers to participate in operations that would seem to categorically fall under the purview of the City’s law enforcement strategies (like the September 20, 2012 incident) and the participation of JPD probation officers in such operations would seem to expose these officers to unnecessary risks and dangers.

The Deputy Probation Officers Association (DPOA), the labor organization representing the interests of the Probation Officers whose caseloads include these high risk juveniles, has recommended that a “renewed focus on training of officers for these new, more dangerous situations, should be emphasized”. #

Recommendations

The Youth Commission acknowledges and appreciates Chief Siffermann responsibility to ensure that the men and women under his command are safe and that revisions to the probation officer safety protocol are likely necessary. We call on the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to urge the Juvenile Probation Department not to begin arming juvenile probation officers with firearms as part of any revised probation officer safety protocol. We also urge the Juvenile Probation Department to identify practical tools and alternative practices other than firearms that will help to address the personal safety concerns for probation officers whose caseloads include high-risk juveniles. Lastly, the Youth Commission urges the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to urge the Juvenile Probation Department, per the DPOA’s recommendation, to provide new training of probation officers who will supervise high-risk juveniles.

# Fully Implement the Crisis- Intervention-Team Model in SFPD and Ensure a Taser-free Police Force and City

**Priority #X: Support the implementation of a crisis-intervention model in local policing, rather than the issuance of ‘less-than-lethal’ weaponry**

**Background**

Among the Youth Commission’s chartered responsibilities is a requirement to submit recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about juvenile crime prevention. The commission believes this responsibility entails ensuring local law enforcement institutions employ a dignified and rehabilitiative approach to policing and to working with justice-system-involved youth.

Stun weapons, or “Tasers,” are commonly branded as a ‘less than lethal’ alternative to the use of firearms. However, research on the use of Tasers in other cities shows that Tasers can be lethal and often lead to unnecessary deaths. Data collected by Amnesty International shows that since 2001, at least 500 people in the U.S. have died after being shocked by Tasers during arrests or while in custody. At least 92 of these deaths were in California, the highest number of any state.

Tasers pose particular dangers to individuals who are mentally ill, thin, pregnant, old, young, or living with heart conditions. The high cost of purchasing Tasers, ammunition, defibrillators, re-calibration, and police training are only a fraction of the likely overall costs to the City when the costs of potential liability from those harmed by the use of Tasers are considered. Additionally, the purchase of Tasers would violate the City’s economic boycott of Arizona.

The San Francisco Police Commission passed a 2011 resolution calling for full implementation of San Francisco Police Department’s Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) model, which would train officers in non-lethal de-escalation and community-policing techniques. The same 2011 resolution called on SFPD to work with a mental health working group and the Dept. of Emergency Management to design new procedures and training for 911 dispatchers, allowing them to identify mental health crisis calls and dispatch CIT officers. To date, only 5 of approximately 150 911 dispatchers have been trained. The resolution also required SFPD to ensure 20-25% of patrol officers undergo CIT-training. However, only 118 officers have been trained. The Youth Commission believes the CIT techniques and dispatcher trainings, once fully implemented, offer a more effective way to avoid injuries to officers and citizens than the use of ‘non-lethal’ weaponry, such as Tasers.

The Youth Commission commends the police department’s desire to reduce the use of lethal force, however the commission does not believe that Tasers are a safe alternative, and would feel a profound concern for the safety of young people experiencing mental health crises and psychiatric distress if officers were armed with Tasers. Thus, the commission passed a resolution against the issuance of Tasers at their February 19, 2013 meeting and participated in several community forums thereafter.

At the Police Commission meeting of April 10, 2013, Police Chief Suhr announced that he was rescinding the proposal to arm officers with Tasers, citing community opposition and overly-restrictive recommendations that were being imposed on the proposed use of Tasers. The Youth Commission would like to thank the public for the series of well-organized community forums that gave community members a chance to share their concerns with police commissioners, and especially highlight the work of groups like the Coalition on Homelessness that supported the advocacy of disenfranchised groups who would have been heavily affected by the use of Tasers.

It should be noted that the proposal to arm officers with Tasers was the third such proposal by a San Francisco Police Chief. Chief Suhr’s proposal followed recently-concluded community processes in which the public had similarly voiced strong opposition to the use of Tasers in San Francisco.

**Recommendation**

The San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to urge the San Francisco Police Department to honor the community’s calls for a focus on crisis intervention by fully implementing the Crisis Intervention Team model, and demonstrate leadership in changing the culture and practices of treating mentally ill, homeless, and psychiatrically-distressed people in San Francisco.
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# Three Changes at Police Department

**Priority #X: Assist and assure that the Police Department follow- through on the three policy recommendations to which Chief Suhr and the Police Commission have agreed**

**Background**

Among the policy areas named in the Youth Commission’s Charter language on which the Commission should focus is “juvenile crime prevention.” And, indeed, for much of its 15 year history, the Commission has turned its attention to the arena of youth-police interactions—from sponsoring two Citywide hearings in June of 2000 regarding the recently adopted state Constitutional Amendment and statute on Juvenile Crime known as Proposition 21; to putting on a town hall in December 2002 that drew over 200 youth, many of whom spoke about their experiences with police in schools; to working with Police Department (SFPD) and Office of Citizen Complaints staff to develop revisions adopted by the Police Commission in September 2008 to the SFPD’s protocol on youth detention and arrest and interrogation codified in Department General Order (DFO) 7.01.

On March 7th, 2012, the Youth Commission furthered its focus on improving youth-police relations by initiating and holding the first ever joint hearing with the Police Commission. This successful hearing, held in the Legislative Chamber of the Board of Supervisors, included presentations from experts in youth and criminal justice and staff from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC). There was also lengthy public comment testimony from over seventy speakers (the meeting itself lasted for over four hours). At least forty of these speakers were youth—a great many of whom offered passionate, compelling stories—and the balance was mostly youth service providers, principals, teachers, and parents.

At the joint hearing, commissioners heard inspiring stories as well of heart-felt suggestions for improving youth/police relations. Many community members and department staff discussed the positive and positively life changing work in which SFPD is involved each day. There were also numerous stories of miscommunication and seemingly unnecessary escalations between police officers and youth.

Synthesizing both the information gathered during the March 7th hearing and months of earlier research, on March 19, 2012, the Youth Commission’s Youth Justice Committee provided the Police Commission and Chief Suhr with a formal memo that requested the Police Department implement three policy changes to improve relations with youth. These recommendations were:

1. To provide a new training for all police officers, with a priority for sergeants and patrol officers that address topics and policing tactics unique to juveniles. This training should include topics such as adolescent cognitive development, mental health issues for youth, asserting authority effectively with juveniles, recognizing and interacting with traumatized youth and responding to accusations of racial profiling. The Youth Commission Youth Justice Committee strongly suggests that the training incorporate scenarios of real life police-youth interactions and emphasize effective communication and de-escalation tactics during police interactions with youth;
2. To ensure there is widespread and regular distribution of SFPD Juvenile *Know Your Rights* pamphlets through all City agencies, the school district, and social media, including delivery of pamphlets at the beginning of each fiscal year to the Department of Children Youth and Their Families (DCYF) for distribution to nonprofit contractors, and at the beginning of each school year to the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD); and
3. To establish an active Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFPD and SFUSD, which at minimum states the procedures for arresting and interrogating students on campus, the manner in which police will notify parents or guardians when a student has been taken into custody by the police, and how the student will be informed of her or his rights and responsibilities.

At the April 4, 2012 meeting of the Police Commission, Chief Suhr indicated his desire to implement all three of these recommendations, and to stay in communication with the Youth Commission about implementation. Chief Suhr articulated the following timelines: SFPD would prepare a draft of its new training module with the characteristics described above in 90 days (i.e., July , 2012) and roll out the training for incoming Police Academy classes and Advanced Officer training within six months (i.e., September 2012); SFPD would begin annual distribution of Juvenile *Know Your Rights* pamphlets to DCYF and SFUSD at the beginning of the next fiscal and school years (i.e., July 2012 and August 2012, respectively). SFPD would work with the SFUSD to develop an active MOU.

**2013 Updates**

**Police Training**

In 2013, the Police Department confirmed that newly hired officers had begun volunteering with youth organizations throughout their training period at the police academy. Additionally, the police department is involved in drop-out prevention efforts and encourages ongoing youth athletic coaching commitments among its officers. We applaud the police department’s commitment to developing relationships with youth-serving organizations, especially the Boys and Girls Clubs. We also appreciate the department’s commitment to achieving public safety through prevention strategies, such as encouraging school success.

Comprehensive police training on youth-police interactions remains an important factor in avoiding unnecessary escalations between police and juveniles, and is a strong priority for the San Francisco Youth Commission. Such training has already been implemented, with great success, in other police departments, including Portland, Oregon and San Diego.[[22]](#footnote-22)

**Youth Commissioners believe this training should:**

1. Be provided to new hires, as well as be incorporated into advanced officer training.
2. Be prioritized for sergeants and patrol officers.
3. Focus on policing tactics unique to juveniles, and offer a comprehensive overview of the department’s policies surrounding juvenile policing outlined in the Department General Order 7.01.
4. Offer practical communication skills and best practices for working with youth that are grounded in developmental psychology. Topics that should be included are: adolescent cognitive development, mental health issues among youth, and recognizing and interacting with traumatized youth.
5. Include de-escalation skills and strategies for asserting authority effectively with juveniles.
6. Address the issue of racial profiling and disproportionate police contact with youth of color.
7. Incorporate scenarios of real life police-youth interactions and include youth in training components.
8. Offer officers an opportunity to practice and apply their skills.

**The SFUSD and SFPD MOU**

Since 2004, there has not been an active memorandum of understanding between the police department and the school district. As school safety concerns are increasingly a matter of local, state, and national attention, changes in the availability of extra-local funds are shifting the scope and nature of school resource officer programs. The Youth Commission believes that an MOU will serve as an important historical document that can guide the relationship between school sites and SRO’s and delineate the respective roles of the school district and police department in the handling of school related offenses.

The establishment of a joint document between the school district and police department should in turn, serve as the basis for respective department orders and administrative regulations. The Youth Commission’s specific recommendations regarding the establishment and content of an SFPD-SFUSD MOU, based on previous drafts of a potential MOU, are as follows:

**Youth Commission’s 2013 Recommendations on the SFUSD-SFPD MOU**

1. Use binding language, i.e. “shall” rather than “should” when specifying the roles of SFPD officers and SFUSD administrators.
2. Make clear the respective and separate roles of involved entities (SFUSD and SFPD) in each section of the MOU.
3. Include excerpted language from SFPD’s DGO 7.01.
4. Both parties undertake concerted efforts to inform students of their rights.
5. Plan to provide School Resource Officers with quality training.

**Specific Priorities and Recommended Inclusions to the MOU**

|  |
| --- |
| **General Suggestion** |
| **SFPD** |
| **SFUSD** |

**ARREST:**

* Non-conditional language clarifying when it is necessary for police to come on campus, when it is necessary for them to make an arrest, and who makes the decision.
* Non-conditional language specifying that officers *shall* collaborate with school site staff and that principals *must* be informed when police are coming on campus.
* Specify that SFPD must read students their Miranda rights, and in the student’s primary language.[[23]](#footnote-23)
* Clarify where SFPD should be taking students once arrested (i.e., to CARC, not to a police station, except in exceptional circumstances).[[24]](#footnote-24)
* SFUSD develop and forward guidelines for site procedures to principals.

**Goal:** MOU makes clear under what circumstances an arrest on school is necessary, and specifies that principals *must* be informed. Officers inform students of their rights in accordance with the specifications in DGO 7.01

**PARENTAL NOTIFICATION:**

* Specify that parental notification is necessary for all incidents involving police contact on campus (questioning, interrogation, being pulled out of class, arrests).
* Clarify that SFPD is responsible for immediately notifying parents (and cannot assume school site staff are doing so).[[25]](#footnote-25)
* Specify that students will be allowed to speak with parents once a parent is reached.
* Specify that SFPD ‘must permit a parent to be present during an interrogation.’ (In addition to the current specification that students will be advised they can request a parent to be present).
* Specify that school site staff will notify parents as soon as notice is given that a student will be interrogated or arrested.

**Goal:** Parents are immediately notified when police will have contact with their child. It is clear which entity is responsible for establishing contact with parents. Students know that they are permitted to speak with their parents and have a parent present during an interrogation. Police will permit the presence of parents during interrogations.

**INTERROGATION:**

* Make clear which entity will provide an interpreter for students.
* Specify that police must audio-tape an interrogation.[[26]](#footnote-26)
* Specify students must not be interrogated by more than 2 officers.[[27]](#footnote-27)
* Specify that Miranda rights must be read, and in student’s primary language.[[28]](#footnote-28)
* Specify that school site staff shall be allowed to be present during police interviews with witnesses and victims, as well as interrogations with suspects.
* Specify that school site staff will inform SFPD of a student’s primary language.
* SFUSD should provide an interpreter *for parents* for on-site interrogations related to a school-based offense.

**Goal:** Police conduct juvenile interrogations in accordance with the General Order 7.01. Appropriate interpretation is provided for students and parents during interrogations. School site staff are permitted to be present during all forms of questioning by police.

**KNOW YOUR RIGHTS:**

* Specify school site staff shall give “Know Your Rights” pamphlets to a student when they are notified police are coming on campus to question or arrest a student.
* Include “Know Your Rights” pamphlets in the 2013-14 Student Handbook.
* Post “Know Your Rights” in multiple languages on the school district website.
* Put “KYR” pamphlets in administrators’ offices and Wellness Centers.
* Ensure deans and assistant principals have been trained in “KYR” material, have pamphlets in offices, and can advise students on how to file a complaint.

**Goal:** Students have consistent opportunities to become aware of their rights regarding police contact, and can easily learn how to file a complaint regarding police contact.

**TRAINING:**

* The draft MOU specifies that SFUSD will provide SRO’s with training. The Youth Commission would like to see training for SRO’s that includes a focus on: special education law, juvenile law, adolescent development, asserting authority effectively, de-escalation, and the district’s restorative practices, and that includes examples of real-life scenarios, as well as youth-led training components. The Youth Commission is enthusiastic about supporting the development of these trainings.

**Goal:** SRO’s are provided model training regarding youth-police interactions on school campuses, as have been conducted in other school districts, including San Diego.[[29]](#footnote-29)

**GRADUATED OFFENSES:**

* Clarify the plan for institutionalizing the use of graduated offenses, including how officers will be trained, and how graduated offense policies will interface with existing police orders.
* Determine and specify how school-based offenses will be documented to ensure arrests are happening on a students’ third, rather than first or second, offenses.

**Goal:** The graduated offense model is applied successfully, consistently, and fairly, in collaboration with the school district.

**OTHER RECOMMENDED INCLUSIONS:**

* Specify what constitutes “exigent circumstances” in the MOU.[[30]](#footnote-30)

**Goal:** Circumstances requiring exceptions to the guidelines set forth in the MOU are clearly defined within the body of the MOU using language in accordance with DGO 7.01.

**Recommendation**

The Youth Commission calls on Mayor Lee, the Board of Supervisors, Chief Suhr and the Police Commission to follow through on the implementation of the above three recommendations.

# Following up with JPD on Full Access to Outdoor Recreation Area at Juvenile Hall

**Background**

On December 31, 2006, the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) opened a newly constructed juvenile hall (officially the “Juvenile Justice Center” (JJC) previously the “Youth Guidance Center” (YGC)). This newly renovated structure was a result of a $47.4 million capital investment on the part of the City.[[31]](#footnote-31)

The remodeled JJC includes an expansive outdoor recreation area replete with a natural grass soccer pitch, an amphitheater, and tetherball, volleyball and basketball courts. However, as the Youth Commission has documented in resolution 1112—AL06 *Urging Access to the Juvenile Justice Center's Outdoor Recreation Areas* (adopted on March 6, 2012), and as was reported by the *Bay Citizen* in the February 25 Bay Area edition of the *New York* *Times*,[[32]](#footnote-32) this recreation area has been tremendously underutilized for the past five years.

In JPD’s discussions with the Youth Commission during the development of this resolution in February of 2012, the Department agreed to begin providing detainees with access to two of the basketball courts in the outdoor recreation area—but not, however, access the full recreation area. Indeed, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer William P. Siffermann has made clear that providing detainees with safe and secure access to the full recreation area cannot happen without additional capital funds (and, subsequently, staffing increases).

However, after five years of almost total disuse—and given the fact that JPD has not included the capital improvements necessary for full access to the recreation areas in the Department’s 10 Year Capital Plan (Figure 3.1)—the Youth Commission is worried about detainees *ever* having access to the full recreation area. Will San Francisco’s young people really have to wait another decade-plus to use this recreation area at the JJC?

**JPD’s *10 Year Capital Plan* – No Budget for Recreation Area Improvements (Figure 3.1)**



**Recommendation**

The Youth Commission recommends that Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors provide JPD with the necessary resources to make the recreation area at Juvenile Hall fully accessible as soon as possible. We ask that JPD develop and propose a timeline for full accessibility.

Finally, we want to remind the City Family of statewide changes to the juvenile justice system that might contribute an added sense of urgency to this priority—that is, on top of the fact that the recreation areas have already been dormant for five years.

# Free Youth Transportation

Priority# : Free MUNI fares for all San Francisco Young people currently enrolled in Kindergarten-through-12th grades (or high school equivalency), who use a Clipper Card.

**Background**

Accessibility and class are deeply entangled.  The Youth Commission became distressingly concerned when the cost of San Francisco’s public transit, a supposedly affordable mode of transportation, evolved into a cause of greater social and economic segregation.

The price for the youth fast pass rose from $10 in May 2009 to $15 in December 2009 to $20 in May 2010 to $21 in July of 2011. (Figure 1.2)  At the same time, youth pass purchases declined by XX%from XX,XXX to XX,XXX during this period.  Youth and their families could not afford public transportation.

Additionally, policy decisions at the SFUSD have resulted in severe cuts to yellow school bus services for non-special education students in recent years.  Students have increasingly observed their counterparts resort to sneaking on the bus because they cannot afford the cost.

<http://abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=news/local/san_francisco&id=9009963>

The Youth Commission and subsequently the Board of Supervisors adopted resolutions that prompted action from the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) Board of Directors to address the need of San Francisco’s youth for accessible public transportation.

Although the MTA Board approved budgeting revenue losses in FY 10-11 and 11-12 for the purpose of selling discounted (Youth Lifeline) fast passes to low-income youth through SFUSD, these passes were never sold due to numerous administrative challenges identified by the MTA and SFUSD.

Seeing San Francisco youth’s continued struggle to access MUNI, and the failure of the MTA to implement the Youth Lifeline fast pass prompted the Youth Commission (and subsequently the Board of Supervisors) to once again adopt resolutions in the winter of 2011 that called for action from the MTA Board.  On March 1, 2011, the MTA Board authorized providing up to 12,000 free MUNI youth fast passes to the SFUSD for distribution to low-income students from April through June 2011.  However, “the SFUSD was unable to implement the program due to a variety of issues related to distribution and collection of cash.”

<http://www.sfmta.com/cms/cmta/documents/4-3-12Item14Youthtransitfares.pdf>

The Youth Commission, the Board of Education, the Board of Supervisors, and a coalition of community based organizations continued to urge SFMTA to consider providing additional free transit passes to youth for a pilot period based on funds identified to replace the lost revenue to the SFMTA.

On October 24, 2012, The Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved a new Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) INcentive Grant Program under the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP), which allocated $6.7 million to SFMTA for FY2012-13.  These funds can be used by transit agencies to fund projects focused on increasing ridership and/or productivity, including for free transit service for youth pilot programs.

<http://www.sfmta.com/cms/cmta/documents/12-4-12item10.3mtcgrantforfreemuniforyouth.pdf>

Originally approved by the SFMTA Board on April 17, 2012, the Free Muni for Youth Pilot Program kicked off in March, 2013.  Applications were opened to San Francisco youth in January 2013 and are accepted by SFMTA on a continuing, rolling basis.  The 16-month pilot program will be funded until June 2014 with the option to extend should additional funding be identified in the future.

After a month, about 24,000 youth have applied for the program and the numbers of participants are steadily increasing.  (An additional 7,000 youth have registered from original 10,000)

**Recommendations**

Working with a coalition comprised of community organizations and the office of Supervisor David Campos, staff at the MTA, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Youth Commission is working to identify potential funding sources  to make the program permanent.

As the Youth Commission and coalition continue to conduct outreach for the Free Muni for Youth Pilot Program, we are designing a specific outreach strategy to reach children, youth, and families who have not applied for the program.

We wish to note that the Youth Commission is extremely grateful for the implementation of the pilot program after we addressed the issue in 2010.  The commission will continue to be involved in the discussion of how SFMTA will evaluate the program and define its success.

*{Thesis: The research in question was to determine how free transit affects youth travel, school attendance, and participation in after school activities.  Methodology: before and after surveys, interviews, focus groups, and ridership analysis. Conclusion: Findings after one year of program implementation indicate that free bus pass program has not uniformly affected buys ridership, attendance, or program participation*

*Previous research indicates that student travel is affected by time and distance, vehicle availiability, weather, safety concerns, and preferences of parents as well as students.*

*McDonald, Noreen; Librera, Sally; & Deakin, Elizabeth. (2006). Free transit for low-income youth: Experience in the San Francisco Bay Area. UC Berkeley: University of California Transportation Center. Retrieved from:****<http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/61t5s372>*** *}*

{Insert London Study: longitudinal study}

San Francisco’s public transportation system can become a true public space, a social and common wealth for all young people.  The Youth Commission believes that the Free Muni For Youth program can strengthen the function of public transportation as a social hub and space that contributes to the growth of San Francisco’s future generation.

# Urging SFUSD and City & County to Assist Undocumented Students File for Deferred Action

Priority #\_\_\_: to create a centralized process and facilitating the application process for students eligible for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to work together with the SFUSD to support our undocumented students and transitionally aged youth.

**Background**

According to the Immigration Policy Center, roughly 936,930 immigrants between the ages of 15 and 30 might immediately meet the requirements of the deferred action initiative, with California leading with 412, 560 potentially qualified youth and adults, followed by Texas (226,700), Florida (85,750), New York (70, 170), and Illinois (67, 460). [[33]](#footnote-33)

On June 15, 2012, the Obama administration via the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), announced the implementation of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which began on August 15, 2012.[[34]](#footnote-34) DACA is a program that allows for the discretionary determination to defer removal action of an individual as an act of prosecutorial discretion in addition to providing potential eligibility for employment authorization for youth under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012. [[35]](#footnote-35) The DACA program offers “deferred action” to undocumented youth who were brought to the United States as children and who meet other specific requirements as indicated on the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) website.[[36]](#footnote-36)
We know that to apply for DACA there are multiple lengthy forms that are necessary to fill out, which includes providing proof of: enrollment in school, graduation from high school or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, entrance to the country prior to 16 years of age, residency in the country for continuous 5 years prior to June 15, 2012, and be present in the county on June 15, 2012.[[37]](#footnote-37) Amidst these requirements, there is also the $465 in application fees.

Requesting an official school transcript is necessary to prove a person’s educational history and current residency in the country for this program. However, due to the arduous application process, many undocumented youth and families seek resources and legal counsel for assistance. Law enforcement and legal officials have sent out warnings against scammers as so-called “notaries” are operating in Spanish speaking communities hiding under the guise of travel agencies, translation services and other businesses are offering to help undocumented immigrants navigate the process of applying for relief under the Obama program, but can charge hefty fees for services that are unnecessary or that are not even legally authorized to provide. [[38]](#footnote-38)

On September 17, 2012, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) implemented a centralized process to help provide verification to current and former students who are applying for DACA.[[39]](#footnote-39) The LAUSD Students Record Center has created a webpage dedicated to DACA, in which it explicitly states that there is no cost to obtain documentation such as transcripts.[[40]](#footnote-40) The LAUSD has already helped thousands of DACA eligible students apply for deferred action through this effective, streamlined process for requesting official transcripts.

Upon researching this, youth commissioners reached out to LAUSD in November 2012 to learn more about the district’s Students Record Center’s resource page for DACA. We also started meeting with San Francisco’s Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) to learn more about the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between OCEIA and the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (DCYF) to work collaboratively to inform and assist the city’s potential applicants for DACA. This MOU established a grants program to fund community based organizations providing legal services, cultural and linguistically competent application assistance, outreach and education, and other services to eligible applicants for DACA.

Recommendations

Working very closely with OCEIA, the Immigrant Rights Commission, and student delegates on the Student Advisory Council—the Youth Commission developed resolution 1213—10 *Urging the SFUSD and City & County to Assist Undocumented Students File for Deferred Action,* adopted February 19, 2013. This in turn resulted in the Immigrant Rights Commission adopting a joint resolution with the Youth Commission on March 11, 2013; and the Student Advisory Council’s support of the resolution.

Members of the commission and the Student Advisory Council have been working together with OCEIA staff and Christina Wong, Special Assistant to the Superintendent at SFUSD to provide feedback on building a webpage, similar to LAUSD, on the SFUSD website that would support DACA eligible students, include a list of the DACA grantees under OCEIA and DCYF’s MOU, provide resources for DACA eligible students, and publicize that the $5 transcript fees will be waived for DACA eligible former SFUSD students.

The Youth Commission commends OCEIA and DCYF for their work in funding agencies such as Catholic Charities CYO, Legal Services for Children, Asian Law Caucus, API Legal Outreach, CARECEN, Dolores Street Community Services and La Raza Centro Legal to aid undocumented youth and families. These organizations are valuable and vital in aiding our communities.

The Youth Commission also commends the SFUSD for already starting the DACA resources webpage for students on its website; and commends the district for providing the information in both Spanish and Chinese. The Youth Commission is grateful that the SFUSD has started the work of creating a centralized process such as that of the LAUSD to streamline the process for DACA eligible students to apply for the DACA program.

We recommend and urge the SFUSD to continue to support the OCEIA in publicizing and connecting eligible SFUSD students with the OCEIA and DCYF grant funded legal services and application assistance services for DACA; to continue to work on developing a centralized process for qualifying current and former SF students to apply for their transcripts and enrollment history forms online; and to uphold the confidentiality of DACA applicants information. We also recommend and urge the SFUSD’s transcript office to waive all fees associated with obtaining school documentation for DACA in light of the $465 in DACA application fees; and to provide outreach of this information to students.

We also call on the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to work together with the SFUSD to support our undocumented students and undocumented transitionally aged youth in their process of applying for DACA; and in helping with publicizing any DACA related resources

# Support City College of San Francisco

**Priority #X: Support for a diverse, democratic, affordable, accessible, and financially stable City College.**

**Background**

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) is one the largest community colleges in the country, with a proud record of successfully helping students complete their GEDs, preparing students to transfer to 4-year colleges, and graduating students in the fields of food preparation, nursing, radiology, fire fighting, health education, and many more.[[41]](#footnote-41) It is also the largest community college in California, serving nearly 90,000 students,[[42]](#footnote-42) and employing many Bay Area residents as instructors, faculty, and administrative staff.

Since opening its doors in 1935, CCSF has played an active role in the lives and educational achievements of Bay Area residents of all ages, ethnic, academic, and socio-economic backgrounds, and plays a particularly vital role in providing high-quality, affordable instruction to San Francisco’s working class and immigrant communities of color. Including its main campus on Ocean Avenue in San Francisco’s seventh supervisorial district, CCSF currently has nine campuses, as well as other additional sites that serve the diverse neighborhoods of San Francisco and demonstrate CCSF’s investment in the educational well being of *all* San Francisco residents.

California students are currently facing rising tuition costs and reductions to in-state enrollment within the California State University and University of California systems, leaving many young people in San Francisco and throughout the state increasingly dependent on the educational opportunities provided by community colleges.[[43]](#footnote-43) CCSF educates a large number of students from the San Francisco Unified School District.

In early July, 2012, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) released a devastating report that calls into question the future viability of CCSF and demands that CCSF institute changes to address over a dozen major structural issues.[[44]](#footnote-44) The ACCJC has placed CCSF’s academic accreditation under threat despite the fact that City College maintains a consistently high level of instructional quality.[[45]](#footnote-45) The ACCJC’s recommendations have focused on building the college’s financial reserves, restructuring its governance, and hiring more administrators, and these recommendations will result in cuts to faculty and staff wages and benefits, cuts to classes, and the consolidation of academic departments in such a way as will reduce the diversity of programs and course offerings, especially courses like ethnic, women’s, and LGBT studies.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Members of the ACCJC maintain significant ties to for-profit educational ventures[[47]](#footnote-47) and conduct their investigations and meetings in a non-transparent manner.[[48]](#footnote-48) The state’s for-profit post-secondary institutions with much lower graduation and career success rates have not been sanctioned by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, ACCJC’s parent organization, at a rate nearly commensurate with the accelerated sanctioning of California’s public colleges.[[49]](#footnote-49) Meanwhile, ACCJC has placed 37% of California community colleges on sanctions during a period of intense state budget cuts,[[50]](#footnote-50) and the commission has maintained its sanctioning of the college following the passage of Proposition A, inhibiting the democratic allocation of voter-approved supplemental funds; and

The voters of San Francisco approved Proposition A to save City College of San Francisco from budget threats and class cuts. According to Alisa Messer, Faculty Union President at City College, Funds from Prop A that were supposed to be used for programs, maintaining classes, preventing layoffs, and offsetting state budget cuts are now being used to cover outstanding obligations to retiree health benefits and build college financial reserves.[[51]](#footnote-51)

Assembly Bill 1199 was introduced for the adoption of a stabilization formula for making the calculations of a community college district’s revenue level for each fiscal year, providing for revenue adjustments if certain conditions are met, including that the community college district or a campus is subject to a probation or a “show cause” accreditation sanction and the district develops an improvement plan certified by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.[[52]](#footnote-52) Supervisors Eric Mar and David Campos jointly sponsored a resolution in support of AB 1199, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 12, 2013.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Diverse groups of students, faculty, staff, and the community members have responded to the accreditation threat by questioning the legitimacy and nature of the sanctions placed on City College of San Francisco and authority of the ACCJC to determine the use of voter-approved Prop A funds.

**Recommendations**

The San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to urge the CCSF administration to use Proposition A funds as intended by voters. The Commission is thankful for the leadership of Supervisor Cohen and Supervisor Mar in their legislation introduced on April 2, 2013 that called on the college’s administration “to preserve the quality and diversity of education that has served San Francisco well” and for the City to “consider additional support for CCSF by evaluating fees currently charge by the City to CCSF, the possibility of providing more in-kind services, and exploring long term local support structures.” The Youth Commission also urges the City’s leadership to call on the Department of Education to question the rate and nature of the sanctioning of California’s community college system.
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