

DRAFT
Budget and Policy Priorities
San Francisco Youth Commission
2015-16

1. Include 16 and 17 year olds in municipal elections and increase registration of young voters
2. Prioritize youth workforce development opportunities and engage youth when negotiating community benefit agreements
3. Invest in alternatives to building a new jail
4. Improve Services and Supports for Children with Incarcerated Parents
5. Increase services and supports for homeless youth and declare 2017 the year of recognizing homeless youth
6. Fund and complete the Transitional Age Youth Housing Plan
7. Increase supports for vital TAY services
8. Ensure police officers are trained on effectively interacting with youth
9. Implement efforts to track LGBTQ youth in city services and fund cultural competency training efforts
10. Continue the highly successful Free MUNI for youth program
11. Continue grants covering application fees for San Francisco DACA applicants
12. Increase supports for undocumented youth in city-funded employment programs
13. Increase supports for unaccompanied immigrant children
14. Support an Accessible and Robust City College of San Francisco
15. Stand in Solidarity with SFSU's College of Ethnic Studies

PRIORITY 1: LOWER SAN FRANCISCO'S LEGAL VOTING AGE TO SIXTEEN YEARS OF AGE

Urging the Mayor and San Francisco Board of Supervisors to invest in voter turnout and the civic and political development of young people by supporting a charter amendment lowering San Francisco's legal voting age to sixteen and by investing in efforts to increase voter pre-registrations among 16 and 17 year olds

BACKGROUND

Robust voter participation is at the core of a healthy democracy. However, the United States enjoys a far lower voter turnout rates than other established democracies, only 60% during presidential elections and 40% during midterm elections, as compared to 80% in Austria, Sweden, and Italy and 90% in Australia, Belgium, and Chile.¹ The 2014 elections showed the lowest voter turnout since World War II with the lowest numbers of all amongst voters under age 30. San Francisco is no exception to these trends. Our exciting November 2014 ballot won turnout from only 53% of registered voters. San Francisco's November 2013 ballot saw participation from less than 30% of registered voters.²

Democratic participation and political enfranchisement strengthen our democracy. Indeed, voters demonstrated their commitment to the ideals of democratic representation and participation when they voted to create the San Francisco Youth Commission over nineteen years ago. Since that time, the San Francisco Youth Commission has advised the City on the unmet needs of youth. We are currently witnessing an ongoing diminishment of the share of our City's population made up of youth and families. At the same time, we are staring down problems that were not of young people's making, but which we will be required to solve—from climate issues like water scarcity, to economic threats, like the rising costs of college tuition and housing. It is the Youth Commission's firm contention that we need all hands on deck to face these challenges—that means we need young people to begin developing their civic leadership and participation now—not later.

In January 2015, the San Francisco Youth Commission passed a resolution urging for the extension of voting rights to 16 and 17 year olds in municipal and school district elections. The 2015 resolution followed upon previous resolutions adopted in 2005 by both the San Francisco

¹Fair Vote, The Center for Voting and Democracy, "Voter Turnout," Retrieved from: <http://www.fairvote.org/research-and-analysis/voter-turnout/>.

² San Francisco Department of Elections, "Historical Voter Turnout," Retrieved from <http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=1670>.

Youth Commission³ and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors⁴ supporting the expansion of suffrage to citizens of 16 years and older in city and county elections. The Youth Commission's 2015 resolution was passed after months of research on how extending voting rights to 16 and 17 year olds will boost our democracy and increase voter turnout over the long term.

Extending voting rights to 16 and 17 year olds is an important investment in their civic and political development. Extending voting rights to 16- and 17-year-olds will mean more people can cast their first vote in a community where they have roots, are enrolled in school, where their parents are voters, and where they may be more interested in voting than those who are just two years older.

Research shows that voting is habitual, and that once a young person casts their first vote, they will continue voting.⁵ Additionally, the earlier someone starts voting, the more likely they are to be a lifelong voter.⁶ Many young people encounter major transitions at age 18, which can make it a challenging year to establish new voting habits. As a result, voter turnout among eligible voters under 30 is lower than any other age group. By contrast, when given the chance to vote, 16 and 17 year olds register and turn out at greater rates than older voters. This has been confirmed in other countries that allow teens to vote (Norway Germany, Argentina, the United Kingdom, Argentina, Brazil, and Austria) as well as in U.S. cities that have extended voting rights to 16 and 17 year olds like Takoma Park, Maryland and the Chicago 2014 primaries.⁷

16 and 17 year olds are absolutely capable of understanding politics. Research shows that 16-year-olds' political knowledge is about the same as 21-year-olds' and quite close to the average for all adults.⁸ Neurologically, 16 and 17 year olds have developed the ability to logically analyze information and make responsible and informed voting choices. Research consistently indicates 16-17 year-olds make voting decisions based on reasoned consideration of their own and larger interests in a fashion similar to older voters.⁹ The high school classroom is the perfect place to engage and inform young people about the local municipal issues that impact their lives. Expanding the vote to 16 and 17 year olds will be an opportunity to promote an even deeper engagement with the civics curriculum required in our local schools.

³ San Francisco Youth Commission Resolution 0405 – AL013. Resolution Urging the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to Recommend to State Legislators That They Allow Local Choice, For Which City or County Could Permit Persons 16 years of Age or Older to Vote In City or County Elections adopted June 6, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.sfbos.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=51216>

⁴ Board of Supervisor File No. 051215 – Urging State Legislators to Permit Persons 16 Years of Age or Older to Vote in City and County Elections, Passed on July 21, 2005. Retrieved from <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=2583879&GUID=7B2703EE-19B3-4EE2-8775-94A4BEB38779>.

⁵ Eric Plutzer, "Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth," *The American Political Science Review* 96/1 (March 2002), pp. 41-56.

⁶ Bhatti, Yosef, and Kasper Hansen. "Leaving the Nest and the Social Act of Voting: Turnout among First-Time Voters." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 22, no. 4 (2012).

⁷ Rick Pearson, "17-year-olds voted at higher rate than parents in primary," *Chicago Tribune*, May 17, 2014; And: J.B. Wogan, "Takoma Park sees high turnout among teens after election reform," *Governing Magazine*, Nov. 7, 2013

⁸ Daniel Hart and Robert Atkins, "American Sixteen- and Seventeen-Year-Olds are Ready to Vote," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 63 (January 2011), pp. 201-221.

⁹ Ibid.

We also know that 16 and 17 year olds are capable of forming independent ideas. In the Scottish independence referendum, 44% of teens voted differently than their parents.¹⁰ If 16 and 17 year olds are given the right to vote, families will engage in dialogue that will lead to a more informed and engaged electorate overall. In fact, evidence suggests there is a “trickle up” effect from youth civic participation. When 16 and 17 year olds engage in civics, conversations about politics and civic life are brought home, with a positive effect on voter turnout for parents and family members of all ages. This “trickle up” also extends to the roommates and peers of those same young voters after they reach age 18.¹¹

Age sixteen holds a special significance in our society. Upon turning 16, young people can drive, work without limitations on hours, pay taxes, take classes on government in school, and are frequently subject to adult criminal charges. Despite the civic responsibilities that accrue at age 16, 16 and 17 year olds are not able to vote. Given the current age demographics in San Francisco where the average age of the electorate has risen from 44.2 in 1980 to 45.8 and is projected to 47.6 by 2025, expanding the electorate is an essential step in counterbalancing this aging and ensure the interests of younger generations are protected. Many families have left San Francisco due to the increase in home prices and inability to afford the cost of living in the city. Between 2000 and 2013, San Francisco lost about 8,000 school age youth and now has the lowest percentage of kids of any major U.S. city.¹² The young people impacted by these trends are best positioned to identify solutions, and their political enfranchisement is a vital step toward combating family flight.

The city has seen fit to make investments in the leadership and civic engagement of young people through DCYF’s Youth Leadership and Organizing programs, the Youth Empowerment Fund, and the city’s annual Youth Advocacy Day, among other initiatives. Thousands of SFUSD high school students have cast votes in mock elections and ballot measures through the Youth Vote program, gaining exposure to the electoral process and civic norms and practices. In October 2014, 100 young people voluntarily attended a Young Voters Forum designed to educate youth on the various issues on the November ballot. A majority of the attendees at the Young Voters Forum were under 18, yet they came to reflect on how the ballot initiatives might impact their lives and those of their peers and family. The non-partisan event was put on by the San Francisco Youth Commission, TAYSF, San Francisco Youth Warriors, Youth Leadership Institute, Peer Resources, the Student Advisory Council, and Coleman Advocates. Staff from the San Francisco Department of Elections was on hand at the Young Voters Forum to register new voters and recruit young people to work the polls on Election Day.

These and many other efforts by engaged local youth leaders have been very fruitful, with the city benefiting from several policy and legislative campaigns initiated and led by young people all around the city, including most recently an ordinance amending the health code and

¹⁰ Eichhorn, Jan (2014). Will 16 and 17 year-olds make a difference in the referendum? Edinburgh: Scot Cen for Social Research. http://www.scotcen.org.uk/media/205540/131129_will-16-and-17-years-olds-make-a-difference.pdf

¹¹ Michael McDevitt and Spiro Kiouis, “Experiments in Political Socialization: Kids Voting USA as a Model for Civic Education Reform,” August 2006.

¹² Heather Knight, “Families’ exodus leaves S.F. whiter, less diverse,” The San Francisco Chronicle, June 10, 2013. Accessed December 12, 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Families-exodus-leaves-S-F-whiterless-diverse-3393637.php>

establishing limitations for the granting of new tobacco sales permits¹³, which was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2014.

Numerous countries—Austria, Argentina, Brazil, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom—have extended the right to vote to 16 year olds in national, state, and local elections or are considering doing so. 16 and 17 year old voting has begun in two Maryland cities and the Lowell, Massachusetts city council is petitioning the state legislature to allow them to lower the city’s voting age. In February of this year, Senator Kevin Mullin introduced a state constitutional amendment, co-authored by Senator Mark Leno, that would allow 17 year olds to vote in primary elections if they will turn 18 before the date of the general election. Senator Mullin stated the constitutional amendment “would increase political engagement and voter turnout, potentially increasing the likelihood of the individual to continue voting for years to come.” There is a national conversation building about the political enfranchisement of young people, particularly in response to some state’s enactment of laws designed to severely limit communities’ of color and young people’s voting rights. San Francisco has an opportunity to build on its reputation of innovation and commitment to participatory democracy by being the first major city to extend voting rights to 16 and 17 year olds.

On March 17, 2014, Supervisor Avalos, along with his co-sponsors Supervisors Kim, Campos, and Mar, introduced a charter amendment allowing citizens of 16 years of age and older to register and vote in municipal and school district elections held in the City and County of San Francisco.

On March 16, 2015 dozens of young people came out to a rally in support of the legislation. Since its introduction, the legislation has been the source of national news including the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and Bloomberg News. Teachers, school administrators, parent groups, elected officials, and young people have all reached out to express their support. Discussions with the Director of the Department of Elections (DOE) have confirmed that DOE is prepared to register 16 and 17 year old voters and prepare a special ballot with the department’s current staff allocations. The estimated cost associated with each new voter is approximately \$8.50 per election. A 2/5 estimate of the 2010 census figure on the number of 15-19 year olds in San Francisco amounts to approximately 13,000 16 and 17 year olds in the city and county of San Francisco. We do not yet have estimates of how many of these young people are citizens or how many would register to vote, if given the chance. However, initial cost projections provided by the Department of Elections indicate that preparing ballots for 5,000 new voters would cost \$42,278,24 per election. Assuming a nearly 100% turnout rate, 10,000 ballots would cost \$84,556.48 per election—indeed, a small price to pay for a big investment in our democracy. Youth commissioners have begun discussions with SFUSD administration and members of the Board of Education about how the school district might be able to assist with voter registration and residency verification efforts, as well as how the civics and social studies curricula in SFUSD classrooms can promote the informed and responsible exercise of voting rights.

¹³ San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Ordinance No. 259-14, Ordinance amending the Health Code by adding density, proximity, and sales establishment limitations on the granting of new tobacco sales permits, and renumbering all sections in Article 19H; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code by increasing the annual license and application fees; and making environmental finding, adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/ordinances14/o0259-14.pdf>.

2016 Updates

We've received dozens of community endorsements from every corner of the city, and endorsements from state legislators, the Board of Education, and the San Francisco Democratic Party. The Board of Education also passed a resolution committing to redoubling voter registration efforts in American Democracy classes. The 2015-16 student survey showed 80% of high school students want the right to register and vote. We have seen this effort engage and develop the leadership of dozens of new young leaders invested in helping shape the future of our city, and we have seen our local efforts ignite a national debate and inspire efforts in municipalities around the Bay Area and across the country.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Youth Commission urges the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to put to voters the question of whether to lower San Francisco's voting age to age 16 by supporting the charter amendment lowering the City's voting age to 16 years.

Youth commissioners urge the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lee to convene a task force to study ways to increase participation among young voters, and we urge the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lee to fund youth-led efforts to pre-register 16 and 17 year olds through the City's youth leadership and organizing and older teen funding strategies.

Priority 2: Prioritize youth workforce development opportunities and engage youth when negotiating community benefit agreements

BACKGROUND

According to SEC. 4.124 of the City's Charter, the Youth Commission has the function of developing and proposing plans that support or improve the existing social, economic, educational and recreational programs for children and youth, and advising about available sources of governmental and private funding for youth. The Youth Commission has a history of advocating the City to provide quality programs and employment opportunities for the city's youngest residents. Priority #6 of the Youth Commission's Policy & Budget Priorities for Fiscal Years 2012-2013 & 2013-2014 stressed the "Promotion of job experience and employment opportunities for San Francisco's young people by including Youth Involvement Plans when negotiating contracts with new businesses."⁶³ On March 12, 2012, the Youth Commission adopted Resolution 1112—AL 07 Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to Prioritize Youth Employment During Business Negotiations with the intent of encouraging youth involvement plans, to, at a minimum, increase the number of youth jobs and internships for the city's young people, so as to create a thriving workforce for the future of San Francisco. On March 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors adopted resolution file no.120293 Urging the Mayor and City Departments to Prioritize Youth Employment During Business Negotiations. The Youth Commission has also supported the Mayor around his priority to provide summer jobs for youth. The Mayor has focused on building partnerships between the city and private sector. Since the implementation of Summer Jobs+ in 2012, the Mayor has held an annual Corporate Challenge in City Hall where he calls on San Francisco's business leaders to join him in his efforts to create jobs or sponsor summer internships for youth to boost the local economy, and create meaningful employment opportunities for the city's young people that will help set them up for success.

This year, the Youth Commission's Economic Justice and Immigration Committee was committed to addressing this priority of increasing youth engagement with businesses and youth employment opportunities, and chose to do so through companies receiving tax breaks. Last year's committee began work looking at Community Benefit Agreements, a binding contract any company residing in the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area whose annual payroll expense exceeds one million dollars can enter with the City Administrator in order to receive a 1.5% payroll expense tax exclusion. Community Benefit Agreements may include commitments to engage in community activities and participate in workforce development opportunities in the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area. In the past, some of the companies engaged in CBAs have worked with community organizations such as Black Girls Code and Vietnamese Youth Development Center, contributing to small and large projects.

The Economic Justice and Immigration Committee researched CBAs, meeting with the Clerk of the Board as well as the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. While researching, the committee realized that companies beside those in CBAs also received tax breaks from the city but who do not have to perform community service. Seeing the ability of CBA companies like Twitter and Zoosk to provide job opportunities for youth, the committee wanted to take advantage of the potential of other San Franciscan businesses to provide youth workforce development — one of the main requests of the youth who attended the CBA town hall.

RECENT UPDATES

The committee is committed to meeting further with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development to understand the legality of such an ask. After doing so, the committee will begin meeting with companies that benefit from such tax breaks to determine how they can help support youth workforce development and work with them to fulfill our goal of creating more internship and job training opportunities for San Franciscan youth.

BACKGROUND

The Youth Commission has always championed youth voice. The creation of the body itself is an act in favor of youth involvement in politics, and its continued existence — and success — is testament to the power of youth to spearhead change. Furthermore, SEC 4.124.c of the City's Charter calls on the Youth Commission to elicit mutual cooperation of private groups (such as fraternal orders, service clubs, associations, churches, businesses, and youth organizations) and City-wide neighborhood planning collaborative efforts for children, youth and families. In accordance with this duty, the Youth Commission is represented on the Our Children, Our Families Council, and has also consistently recommended youth seats on relevant councils.

Last year, the predecessor committee to this year's Economic Justice and Immigration Committee looked into Community Benefit Agreements, a binding contract any company residing in the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area whose annual payroll expense exceeds one million dollars can enter with the City Administrator in order to receive a 1.5% payroll expense tax exclusion. Community Benefit Agreements may include commitments to engage in community activities and participate in workforce development opportunities in the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area, and are drawn up by the companies, in conjunction with the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Central Market & Tenderloin Area. Currently, there are six companies engaged in CBAs: Twitter, Zendesk, Spotify, Zoosk, Yammer, and One Kings Lane. In order to determine how these companies could further benefit their community, especially the youth, the committee hosted a town hall with District 6 youth. Multiple needs and asks were brought up by the youth, ranging from affordable housing for transitional aged youth, to youth workforce development.

Although last year's committee intended to advise that the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor adjust the language on the Community Benefit Agreement legislation to encourage youth internships and jobs, the current committee, after meeting with the Clerk of the Board and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, came to the conclusion the strict rules guiding the original legislation is difficult to change. Instead, guided by the Youth Commission's emphasis on youth advocacy, and the fact that there are youth voices, present at the town hall, who are passionate about the subject, the current committee recommends that a youth seat be added on the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Central Market & Tenderloin Area.

RECENT UPDATES

The committee is meeting with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development to determine the logistics of adding a youth seat on to the Citizen's Advisory Committee. The committee is also considering the possibility of requesting a youth seat be added to not only the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the Central Market & Tenderloin Area, but for every Community Benefit District as well.

After consulting with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the committee plans to begin meeting with the Citizen's Advisory Committees of every Community Benefit District to bring to their attention the importance of having youth voice to guide the decisions they make to benefit the whole community.

Recommendations

Priority 3: Invest in alternatives to building a new jail

Background

- BOS Legislation
- State Funding
- Reasons for building new jail
- Youth Commission work on issues impacting CIP and TAY

Updates

- YC Opposed Jail
- BOS turned down funding for jail
- BOS created a work group to reenvision the jail replacement
- YC recommended youth for youth seat on work group
- TAY court

Recommendations

- Ensure youth are not overclassified in our city's jail system
- Continue to invest in alternatives to incarceration for mentally ill, TAY, and parents
- Support the TAY court
- Invest in providing people services outside of jail and non-deputized facilities

Priority 4: Improve Services and Supports for Children with Incarcerated Parents

Background

- 2014 hearing
- 2015 unaccompanied minor visiting policy for 16 and 17 year olds

Updates

- BOE committed to enhancing support
- Sheriff committed to implementation of policy
- Supported SB 1157

Recommendations

- Increase efforts to track CIP in city programs
- Explore ways to maintain family unity through visiting programs and reducing cost of phone calls
- Outreach for and Evaluate accessibility of visiting policy and partner with school district to make it a success

Priority 5: Increase services and supports for homeless youth and declare 2017 the year of recognizing homeless youth

Background: Congress and the Obama Administration set a federal goal of ending homelessness for youth, children, and families by 2020¹⁴. In the years of 2015-2016, Youth Commissioners collaborated with the Youth Advisory Board of Larkin Street to bring awareness to the City of the homeless youth population in San Francisco. Larkin Street is a service provider that caters to homeless youth in San Francisco, and provides varied types of assistance. Together, we then and continue to recognize despite the current investments in homeless youth in San Francisco, this growing population is often overlooked and underserved. With few services, youth have difficulty getting on the right track towards living a healthy life.

On any given day in the United States, there are between 353,000 - 503,000 youth ages 12- 24 who experience homelessness¹⁵, with only about 4,000 youth shelter beds available across the country¹⁶. In San Francisco alone there are approximately 3,200 homeless children under age nineteen live in San Francisco, a 94% increase over the homeless youth population in 2007¹⁷. Each year, approximately 5,000 young people die on the streets because of illness, assault, or suicide¹⁸. These youth are also susceptible to incarceration and the dangers accompanying living on the streets: One third of this population has involved with the juvenile justice system, 75% have used illegal substances, 20% of San Francisco youth traded sex for a place to stay compared to 5% in 2013, and one in three are approached by a recruiting “pimp” within the first forty-eight hours of being on the street¹⁹.

LGBT youth also face homophobic and transphobic discrimination, and are disproportionately represented in the homeless youth population. As many as 40 percent of the nation’s homeless youth identify as LGBT, while between 5-10 percent of the overall youth population is LGBT²⁰. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has required public agencies and service providers to conduct a Point in Time count of the homeless population in their cities every odd-numbered year since 2005. Beginning in 2007, San Francisco was among the first cities to count homeless youth as a distinct population from the adult homeless population²¹. In San Francisco’s 2013 Point-in-Time count, 1,902 homeless children and transitional age youth (TAY) were counted, accounting for more than one-fourth of all homeless individuals counted.

¹⁴ The United States Interagency on Homelessness; http://usich.gov/opening_doors/

¹⁵ Youth Homelessness in San Francisco: 2013 Report On Incidence and Needs, p. 1

¹⁶ O “National Campaign for Youth Shelter seeks Housing for homeless LGBT youth.” GLAAD. <http://www.glaad.org/blog/national-campaignyouth-shelter-seeks-housing-homeless-lgbt-youth>

¹⁷ Coalition on Homelessness, June 2015, The Roadmap: A 5 Five-Year Plan to End the Crisis of Family Homelessness in San Francisco

¹⁸ “Streetwork: Homeless Youth Facts.” Safe Horizon. <http://www.safehorizon.org/index/what-we-do-2/helping-youth-14/streetwork-homeless-youth-facts-220.html>

¹⁹ Applied Survey Research, January 2015, Homeless Unique Youth Count and Survey

²⁰ “National Campaign for Youth Shelter seeks Housing for homeless LGBT youth.” GLAAD. <http://www.glaad.org/blog/national-campaignyouth-shelter-seeks-housing-homeless-lgbt-youth>

²¹ IBID

The San Francisco homeless count had two primary components: a Point-in-Time enumeration of unsheltered homeless individuals and families (those sleeping outdoors, on the street, in parks, in vehicles, etc.) and a Point-in-Time enumeration of homeless individuals and families who have temporary shelter (those staying in an emergency shelter, transitional housing, or using stabilization rooms)²². Although while important, this Point-in-Time Count has proven to be extremely flawed in its mechanism of counting unsheltered homeless individuals and families. The current Point-In-Time San Francisco conducted two hours prior to the general unsheltered count the youth count was conducted between the hours of 5PM and 9PM, slightly earlier in the evening when unaccompanied children and transitional-age-youth were more likely to be visible. However this current count not only promotes profiling of individuals, but increases the stigma that all homeless youth are on the streets as well as look and act a particular way.

The homeless youth population is not homogenous, representing many different needs. However, all homeless youth need shelter, food, water, and clothing. Indeed, we have seen that when these needs are addressed, these youth take the lead and graduate from intensive training programs²³ and serve the City as policy advisors, youth commissioners and community advocates. When given the opportunity, many homeless and formerly homeless youth contribute meaningfully to San Francisco.

Recommendations: As the nation aims to eradicate youth homelessness by 2020, the Youth Commission, along with the Youth Advisory Board of Larkin Street, urge the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to declare 2015 the Year of Recognizing Homeless Youth.

We urge the City to complete the 2015 TAY Housing Plan, and establish a new TAY Housing goal after the TAY Housing Assessment is completed during the summer of 2015. We also urge the City to set aside funding in the 2015-16 budget to support residential on-site counseling services, intensive case management, substance abuse treatment and outpatient medical health crisis services, education reengagement programs and job placement programs for homeless and transitionally housed youth.

In addition we urge the City to conduct a more comprehensive and accurate homeless count so the City and the Greater Bay has an accurate idea of the size of the population and can therefore further address it properly. The City of San Francisco has multiple homeless counts conducted by numerous different organizations which all vary substantially, including: The 2015 Point-In-Time Count, Larkin Street Youth Services, , The Roadmap: A 5 Five-Year Plan to End the Crisis of Family Homelessness in San Francisco, and many others.

Ending youth homelessness in San Francisco is a necessary step towards the nation’s goal of ending youth homelessness, as well as San Francisco’s 10-Year Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness.

²² IBID

²³ Year Up; <<http://www.yearup.org/>>

Priority 6: Fund and complete the Transitional Age Youth Housing Plan

Priority: Increase the Availability and Accessibility of TAY Housing

Background: In San Francisco, it is estimated that there are near 8,000 disconnected transitional-aged youth – youth between the ages of 16 and 24 who will not make a successful transition into adulthood²⁴: 7,700 TAY lack a high school diploma, 6,000 are completely uninsured and 9,000 neither work nor go to school²⁵. As a result, many TAY experience substantial periods of unemployment, homelessness, and a disproportionately high number of these young people have some degree of involvement with the criminal justice system. These numbers however are likely even higher as homeless individuals often stray away from often shy away from self-reporting to government entities for fear of food stamp reductions, due to shame, and much more²⁶.

In response to these numbers, the Youth Commission adopted a resolution in 2005 calling on then-Mayor Gavin Newsom to create a task force that would propose methods to better serve this population²⁷. Mayor Newsom created this task force in 2006 and after a year of intensive, collaborative work between City officials, community-based service providers, and TAY, the Mayor’s Transitional Youth Task Force (TYTF) released its report in October 2007, *Disconnected Youth in San Francisco: A Roadmap to Improve the Life Chances of San Francisco’s Most Vulnerable Young Adults*. This document contained 16 comprehensive recommendations for City agencies “to address the problem of the current fragmented policies and programs, with a comprehensive, integrated approach towards disconnected transitional age youth.”²⁸ Among the report’s 16 recommendations to the city’s policy makers, “more accessible housing for disconnected TAY” was a high priority. However the severity of homelessness of San Francisco, especially for TAY has not only increased in number but also in severity.

In addition San Francisco’s youth homeless population is at an all-time high, in current equivalence in severity of the youth state of homeless of San Francisco during the great depression²⁹. San Francisco Citizens were quick to voice their concerns to this ongoing epidemic, and in June of 2016 it was announced that homelessness was the number one concern of all citizens and housing affordability coming in a strong second in June of 2015³⁰. In response

²⁴ Policy Priorities for Transitional Aged Youth, Vision and Goals 2014-2016

²⁵ IBID

²⁶ Coalition on Homelessness, June 2015, *The Roadmap: A 5 Five-Year Plan to End the Crisis of Family Homelessness in San Francisco*

²⁷ Youth Commission Resolution 0405—005, Resolution urging the Mayor to Ordain a Transitional Youth Task Force. (2005).

²⁸ *Disconnected Youth in San Francisco*, p. 50

²⁹ IBID

³⁰ SF Chronicle: Homelessness Soars to No. 1 Concern in SF, New Poll Finds. 2016, March 16.

<<http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Most-see-SF-moving-in-wrong-direction-poll-finds-6892152.php>>

to this, numerous Supervisors including Supervisors Campos and Kim announced a possibility of declaring of a state of emergency but instead came up with a general idea to increase the number of Navigation Centers in the City of San Francisco, however the TAY. However San Francisco only has one TAY Designated Housing Facility, Larkin Inn, which only houses 45 individuals. Unfortunately, due to stigma against TAY and homeless youth, some proposed affordable housing projects that would include TAY units have faced considerable neighborhood opposition, as was the case of the Booker T. Washington project which took years to officially become approved.

However the current Navigation Centers in place right now do not have designated areas for TAY Youth and the number is only increasing. While Supervisors Campos's plan calls for the designation of Navigation Centers, only one would have a priority to TAY Youth and the Navigation Center has a 75 person maximum capacity, not nearly satisfying the need of TAY Youth. Adding to this, the Unemployment Rate of TAY ages 20-24 is double that rate of homeless adults³¹ and 72% of youth said they wish to attend school³². In April of 2016, Youth Commissioners met with Navigation Director Julie Leadbetter and Emily Cohen, Deputy Director at Mayor's Office of Housing Opportunity, Partnership & Engagement to discuss these issues further in depth in creating designated areas within Navigation Centers.

Recommendations:

The San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to urge the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Department of Public Health, and the Human Services Agency to implement designated Transitional Aged Youth housing and services to all Navigation Centers.

Finally, while we recognize the paramount importance of creating housing units for our City's most disconnected and extremely low-income young people, we recommend analyzing housing outcomes for TAY who would not normally be eligible for TAY housing programs, and consider additional less resource-intensive supports for them achieving positive housing outcomes, including financial education, move-in costs or rental subsidies, apartment-hunting support, and tenants' rights education.

³¹ Larkin Street, June 2014, Youth Homelessness in San Francisco: 2014 Report on Incident and Needs

³² IBID

Priority 7: Increase supports for vital TAY services in the new Children and Youth Fund

Background:

- TAY needs not included until 2014 Children and Youth fund reauthorization
- Fund was increased and TAY were included
- YC Request for two year funding bridge before approval

Updates:

- RFP released by DCYF
- OAC seated

Recommendations:

- BOS hold hearing on planning for TAY inclusion
- Commit firm percentage of growth of fund to phasing in TAY inclusion in advance of next RFP cycle

Priority 8: Ensure police officers are trained on effectively interacting with youth and continue evaluation of parental time of arrest protocols and training

BACKGROUND

For much of its 17 year history, the Youth Commission has focused its attention on the arena of youth-police interactions--from sponsoring two Citywide hearings in June of 2000 regarding the 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 the Police Department (SFPD) and the Office of Citizen Complaints staff to develop revisions adopted by the Police Commission in September 2008 to the SFPD's protocol on youth detention, arrest, and interrogation codified in Department General Order (DGO) 7.01; to holding the first ever joint Youth- and Police Commission on March 7, 2012 where over 70 speakers shared their testimony.

At many points in its history, the public--including youth, service providers, teachers, and parents--have offered Youth Commissioners their riveting testimony of personal experiences with police officers. At the March 2012 joint hearing, community members discussed the positive and life-changing work SFPD is involved in each day. There were also numerous stories of miscommunication and seemingly unnecessary escalations between police officers and youth. Gathering all of the input and research provided, Youth Commissioners shared a formal memo with Chief Suhr and the Police Commission on March 19, 2012 recommending policy changes to improve relations with youth.

These recommendations included: 1) Providing a new training for all police officers addressing topics and policing tactics unique to juveniles; 2) Ensure widespread and regular distribution of SFPD Juvenile Know Your Rights pamphlets through all City agencies, the school district, and social media; and 3) Establish an active Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFPD and SFUSD.

Youth Commissioners recommended and still believe that this training should:

- Include de-escalation skills and strategies for asserting authority effectively with youth.
- Incorporate scenarios of real life police-youth interactions and include youth in training components.
- Offer officers an opportunity to practice and apply their skills.
- Address the issue of racial profiling and disproportionate police contact with youth of color.
- 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.

- 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.
- Be prioritized for sergeants and patrol officers.

We believed and still believe that efforts towards increasing police training on youth development, adolescent cognitive development, de-escalation, and positively interacting with youth will help to create a productive and consistent dialogue between youth and police in addressing youth-culturally competent issues within law enforcement.

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).

RECENT UPDATES

When we talk about trust between police and members of the community, it is our contention that young people should be at the center of the discussion. In 2014, we saw increased national attention on the issues of racial profiling, police-community relations, and indeed, youth-police relations with the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO. What was made clear through these discussions in San Francisco and beyond, is that tensions between community members and police departments across the country are strained to the breaking point and are in dire need of dedicated efforts to enhance mutual understanding, trust, transparency, and accountability.

In 2014, there were a number of strides towards the ends of improving youth-police relations in San Francisco. The Police Commission and SFUSD Board of Education mutually passed a memorandum of understanding outlining the role of police on school campuses. The MOU is one of the strongest of its type in the nation, and provides clear guidelines to assist SFUSD administrators in distinguishing between school discipline issues and criminal issues which warrant a call to the police; For police, the MOU clearly defines when and how arrests should be made on school campuses and outlines several of the key provisions of DGO 7.01, the juvenile policing code, in the context of school campuses.

The police department, SFUSD, students, and community advocates have formed a MOU implementation and oversight committee which includes youth seats. We look forward to working with SFPD and SFUSD to ensure positive and meaningful collaboration between police and schools to support students in their educational goals and avoid the unnecessary criminalization of student behavior.

In 2014, the Police Commission also passed department general order 7.04 “Children of Arrested Parents” which outlines guidelines for police officers making arrests of parents, both in the presence and absence of their children. SFPD worked with youth and advocates on this policy, including youth who had witnessed their parent’s arrest or even been left without a guardian after their parent’s arrest. The new general order includes provisions for planning arrests when

children are less likely to be in the care of their parent; making arrests outside the sight of children, when possible; inquiring about the parental status of people being placed under arrest; allowing parents to make care and custody arrangements for their child; and allowing parents to personally assure their child before they are taken into custody.

SFPD worked with Project WHAT and the Office of Citizen Complaints to create a DGO 7.04 roll call training video that includes demonstrations of the protocols using real life scenarios, as well as the voices and perspectives of youth who have witnessed their parent's arrest. On January 5, 2015, youth commissioners passed a resolution commending the Francisco Police Department, the Office of Citizen Complaints, and community partners on the establishment of the DGO 7.04 officer training.

Along with these gains, comprehensive police training on youth-police interactions remains an important outstanding need in avoiding unnecessary escalations between police and youth, and is a strong priority for the San Francisco Youth Commission. Such training has already been implemented successfully in other police departments, including Sacramento, Portland, Oregon and with school resource officers in San Diego.

In 2014, the police department confirmed they were working with a trainer to pilot an officer training on adverse childhood experiences and toxic stress. After feedback sessions, youth commissioners and youth advocates recognize an outstanding need for dedicated youth-police training that focuses on adolescent development and de-escalation, and is consistent with how police officers are trained, i.e. is skill-based and scenario-based. Recent incidents continue to underscore the need for this training to help avoid unnecessary escalation between youth and police. Youth commissioners and youth advocates are continuing to work with members of the Police Commission and Chief Suhr towards the institution of such a training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Youth Commission is calling upon the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Police Chief Suhr and the Police Commission to follow through on the youth-police training recommendations. This effort has been a long time in the making and we believe now is a critical time to make this change.

The Youth Commission is calling upon the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to support and urge the police department to implement this 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 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, recognizing and interacting with traumatized youth, and disproportionate police contact with youth of color. The training should include de-escalation skills and strategies for asserting authority effectively with youth; incorporate scenarios of real life police-youth interactions which include youth in those training components; and offer officers an opportunity to practice and apply their new skills.

Priority 9: Implement efforts to track LGBTQ youth in city services and fund cultural competency training efforts

Dedicate support to ensure that youth-serving City Departments are undertaking efforts to identify the needs of LGBTQ youth, use inclusive intakes, assume best practices, and train staff in accordance with section 12(N) of the San Francisco admin code

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.³³

For the past sixteen 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 (HRC), and the Youth Commission prepared a training tool which is being piloted at DPH sites. However, there are

Figure 1. Suicide Risk

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 trans 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.³⁴ 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. Fifteen years after the passage of 12N, San Francisco's LGBTQ youth are still very in need of excellent services. Nationally, 20-40% of homeless youth identify as LGBTQ.³⁵ LGBTQ youth in San Francisco are harassed more (Figure 4) and are more likely to consider suicide (Figure 3) than their heterosexual peers. There is a lack of

³³ San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 12N: *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Questioning Youth: Youth Services Sensitivity Training*. Retrieved at: [http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter12nlesbiangaybisexualtransgenderq?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter12nlesbiangaybisexualtransgenderq?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca)

³⁴ As of 2014, DPH was revising intakes to collect this demographic data. Other departments, such as the Juvenile Probation Department, may ask the question during interviews, but do not collect or store the information as a retrievable data point. April 17, 2014 Personal Communication with Michael Baxter, MSW, Director of Family Planning (MCAH) and Youth Programs (COPC), San Francisco Department of Public Health; and February 19, 2014 Personal Communication with Allen Nance, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department

³⁵ Gay and Transgender Youth Homelessness by the numbers. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/news/2010/06/21/7980/gay-and-transgender-youth-homelessness-by-the-numbers/> >

Figure 2. School-Based Harassment Due to Sexual Orientation

research on how suicide risk affects transgender youth, but one study among adults and young adults found that 30.1 percent of transgender individuals surveyed reported having ever attempted suicide; this is 6-7 times higher than the general young adult population.³⁶

UPDATES

In June 2013, Supervisor Avalos, along with co-sponsoring Supervisors Campos and Wiener, sponsored a hearing in Neighborhood Services and Safety regarding various city departments' efforts to implement 12N. DPH, HRC, DCYF, DHR, JPD, and HSA were all in attendance. Several departments had initiated notable efforts to create supportive environments for LGBTQIQ youth. However, no departments had means of tracking service outcomes for LGBTQIQ youth. Save for DPH's pilot training, none of these efforts were specifically aligned with the scope of the ordinance.

This hearing made clear both the willingness and enthusiasm of the City family to address the needs of LGBTQ youth, as well as the need for a well-supported implementation plan for the ordinance. In January 2014, Youth Commissioners, Supervisor Avalos' office, and staff from the Human Rights Commission, DPH, and DCYF teamed up to begin hosting working group meetings with members of key youth-serving city departments. To date, staff from the Juvenile Probation Department, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, Department of Public Health, Human Services Agency, Recreation and Parks Department, San Francisco Public Library,

the Human Rights Commission, TAY SF, the Youth Commission, and Supervisor Avalos' office have participated in these meetings to discuss their respective efforts to implement best practices for serving LGBTQ youth as well as to share insights about what types of competency trainings would be most supportive of staff in their departments.

Several departments submitted questionnaires detailing the nature, scope, and setting of youth services they provide, including providing key insights regarding gender-segregated, residential, detention, and contracted services. These insights will be critical in ensuring that the ordinance is implemented in a way that substantively impacts the lives of LGBTQIQ youth. We commend all participating departments for their effort and look forward to our continued work together.

In January 2015, youth commissioners passed a resolution (1415-RC-01) commending the Department of Public Health for its leadership in implementing a training on Chapter 12N of the city's administrative code, and recognizing the department's commitment to providing excellent services to LGBTQ youth.³⁷

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Youth Commission would like to thank members of the Board of Supervisors for attention to this matter, as well as key youth-serving city departments for participating in working group meetings, especially the Department of Public Health.

The Youth Commission respectfully urges Mayor Lee, the Board of Supervisors, and City Departments to identify and dedicate funding sources to support implementation of 12N competency trainings and to support

³⁶ San Francisco Unified School District, Student Support Services for LGBTQ Youth. <<http://www.healthiersf.org/LGBTQ/index.php>>

³⁷ <http://www.sfbos.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=51213>

planning and coordination of 12N
implementation efforts.

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.

Priority 10: Continue the highly successful Free MUNI for youth program

Extending funding to ensure a permanent commitment to the Free Muni For Youth program.

BACKGROUND

Since 2013, the Youth Commission has been making recommendations to continue and expand the Free Muni For Youth program (FMFY). The program supports youths ages from five through eighteen, and nineteen through twenty-two enrolled in SFUSD Special Education Services and English Learner programs with family incomes below 100% of the Bay Area median income.

Youths in San Francisco are dependent on the municipal system (SFMTA) to commute to school, to work, and to extra curricular activities. A survey conducted by SFUSD Commute Study in 2014 indicates that nearly 70 percent of SFUSD high school students commute by public transportation to and from school.¹ Furthermore, nearly 60 percent of SFUSD middle school students commute to and from school by the municipal system.²

Despite the high youth ridership rate, the increasing fare of youth passes may discourage youths to ride the SFMTA. The price for youth passes rose from \$10 in May 2009 to \$24 in September 2015. This is a significant 140% increase of fare in 6 years.³

With Google's donation of \$6.8 million to the FMFY program in February 2014, the FMFY program is able to continue for two and a half more years. However, the donation will end in June 2016.⁴ From 2013 to now, FMFY has successfully assist youths with their needs to transport to destinations. In addition, there are positive feedbacks from Mayor Ed Lee, SFUSD superintendent Richard Carranza, and SFMTA Board Chairman Tom Nolan on the FMFY program.

UPDATES

FMFY program has successfully increase transit ridership among youth and enroll a generous amount of qualified youth to the program.

As of February 13, 2014, 78.2% of eligible youth in San Francisco were registered for the FMFY programs (31,262 registered of an estimated 40,000 eligible), which is a 13.9% increase in registered participants from the previous year.⁵ Of the 31,262 registered participants, 85% are youths age from five to seventeen, 12.4% are youths age 18 years old, 2% are SFUSD English Learners Program, and 0.6% are SFUSD Special Education Services Program.⁶

As of October 1, 2015, over seventeen million unique rides have been taken by FMFY Program pass holders, proving the enormous participation from youth riding the City's municipal system.⁷ Furthermore, Clipper card data indicates that there were 266,025 more Clipper card tags by youth riders in May 2013, an increase of 41.1% from previous year. Clipper card tags by youth represented 9.2% of all Clipper card tags in May 2013, compared to 7.1% of all Clipper card tags in May 2012.⁸

Lastly, a 2014 Policy Analysis Report conducted a survey which states 45% of FMFY program riders indicated that they plan to ride public transportation regularly as adults, and 70% of respondents would recommend SFMTA to their friends.⁹

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Youth Commission recommends the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to extend a permanent funding for the Free Muni For Youth program to ensure youths with financial struggles to commute to and from school without doubt of not having enough to pay.

The Youth Commission is extremely grateful for the support from the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency in previous years that makes it possible for youths to enjoy free MUNI today. However, with the end of Google's donation in June 2016, the Youth Commission encourages the continued support of the program.

¹ "San Francisco Unified School District Student Commute Study." (2014): n. pag. *Safe Routes to School*. University of California, Berkeley. Web. <http://sfsaferoutes.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Final-report_SFUSD_2013-14_2.3.14.pdf>.

² IBID

³ "Monthly Passes." *SFMTA*. N.p., n.d. Web. 10 Mar. 2016. <<https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/transit/fares-passes/monthly-passes>>.

⁴ "Mayor Lee, Supervisors & SFMTA Announce \$6.8 Million Gift from Google to Fund Free Muni for Low Income Youth." *Office of the Mayor*. N.p., 27 Feb. 2014. Web. <<http://www.sfmayor.org/index.aspx?recordid=527&page=846>>.

⁵ City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Budget and Legislative Analysis- Policy Analyst Report. Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office. 2014. February. <<http://www.sfbos.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=47980>>

⁶ Youth Commission Presentation: Free MUNI for Youth. <<http://www.sfbos.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=54301>>

⁷ IBID

⁸ IBID

⁹ "City and County of San Francisco: Policy Analyst Report." *City and County of San Francisco*. Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office, n.d. Web. <<http://www.sfbos.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=47980>>.

Priority 11: Continue grants covering application fees for San Francisco DACA applicants

Francisco Board of Supervisors and Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) to Provide Application Fee Grants for Eligible San Francisco DACA Applicants

BACKGROUND

In San Francisco, roughly 30,000 of San Francisco's 809,000 residents are undocumented immigrants,³⁸ and over 5,000 of San Francisco's undocumented residents are youth ages 14-24.³⁹ Undocumented youth have historically faced barriers in accessing employment, scholarships, loans, state and federal services, and other opportunities. On June 15, 2012 the Obama administration, via the Department of Homeland Security, announced the implementation of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which began on August 15, 2012.⁴⁰ 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 qualified

individuals as of June 15, 2012.⁴¹ 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.⁴²

In 2012, about 1.2 million immigrants were eligible for DACA, and only about 600,000 have signed up so far. Of 539,774 DACA eligible youth in California, only 157,182 (29.1%) have applied for the program.⁴³ The DACA program has been quite successful in providing employment and financial opportunities; for example, approximately 61% of DACA recipients surveyed have obtained a new job since receiving DACA, over 50% have

³⁸ Begin, Brent. "Illegal immigrants leaving San Francisco for cheaper pastures." San Francisco Examiner. Last modified July 21, 2011. Accessed April 13, 2014. <http://www.sfexaminer.com/sanfrancisco/illegal-immigrants-leaving-san-francisco-for-cheaper-pastures/Content?oid=2178492>.

³⁹ Coleman Advocates for Children & Youth. "SF Summer Jobs Program Will Include Opportunities for Undocumented Youth." Coleman Advocates for Children & Youth. Last modified May 28, 2013. Accessed April 13, 2014. <http://colemanadvocates.org/blog/sf-summer-jobs-program-will-include-opportunities-for-undocumented-youth/>.

⁴⁰ US Department of Homeland Security. "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Who Can Be Considered?"

US Department of Homeland Security. Last modified August 15, 2012. Accessed May 12, 2014. <http://www.dhs.gov/blog/2012/08/15/deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-who-can-be-considered>.

⁴¹ US Citizenship and Immigration Services. "Frequently Asked Questions." US Citizenship and Immigration Services. Last modified January 18, 2013. Accessed May 12, 2014. <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-process/frequently-asked-questions>.

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Center for American Progress. "Undocumented No More." Center for American Progress. Accessed May 12, 2014. <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/DACAReportCC-2-1.pdf>.

opened their first bank account, and 38% have obtained their first credit card.⁴⁴

On November 20, 2014, President Obama announced an Executive Action to protect unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. from deportation, expanding DACA and introducing a new program, Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA). Under the President's new expanded plan, DACA recipients would renew their statuses and work authorization every three years instead of two.⁴⁵ In addition, Immigrants who entered the U.S. before January 1, 2010, and who have at least one child who is a U.S. citizen or a green-card holder, are also protected under this executive action and may be eligible for DAPA. Because DACA and DAPA were executive actions that were not associated with a congressional approval for funding, the need to cover legal support, outreach, administrative fees, and other costs associated with applying for the programs has largely fallen to states, municipalities, and immigrants themselves.

These actions go a long way in supporting our immigrant families, however, there are costs associated with applying for DACA. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services charges an application fee of \$465 to apply and reapply, a \$380 fee for the I-765 Form and an additional \$85 in biometric service fees.⁴⁶ These fees impose a significant barrier to eligible

applicants; for example, according to Migration Policy Institute's one year DACA mark study, 35% of eligible DACA applicants are under 100% of the Federal Poverty level, with 66% under 199% of the Federal Poverty level.⁴⁷ 60.5% of all DACA applications received from August 2012 to July 2013 were in the months of August, September, October, and November (the first four months of the program) and were up for re-application this year,⁴⁸ increasing the need for financial aid at the beginning of the 2014-2015 fiscal year. The financial need is even more apparent in San Francisco, a city consistently ranked as one of the most expensive cities in the United States, currently second only to New York City.⁴⁹

RECENT UPDATES

On April 13, 2015 the Youth Commission co-hosted a DACA convener meeting alongside Supervisor Yee's office, wherein immigrant-youth serving organizations and legal providers were invited to come give feedback on the best way to administrate the provision of DACA application fee grants. There were two primary strategies for meeting the needs of DACA-eligible and DACA-renewing residents that community members recommended at this meeting:

- Providing an intensive internship in which participants earns salary amounts in the

⁴⁴ Gonzales, Roberto G., and Veronica Terriquez. "How DACA is Impacting the Lives of Those Who are Now DACAdmented." Immigration Policy Center. Accessed May 12, 2014. <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/how-daca-impacting-lives-those-who-are-now-dacamented>.

⁴⁵ Ibid

⁴⁶ United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. "I-765, Application for Employment Authorization." United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. Last modified January 18, 2013. Accessed May 12, 2014. <http://www.uscis.gov/i-765>

⁴⁷ Migration Policy Institute. "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals at the One-Year Mark." Migration

Policy Institute. Accessed May 12, 2014.

<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/DACA2013-FINAL.pdf>.

⁴⁸ United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals." United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. Accessed November 24, 2014.

<http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca-13-8-15.pdf>.

⁴⁹ Expatistan. "Expatistan's Cost of Living World Map." Expatistan. Accessed May 12, 2014.

<http://www.expatisitan.com/cost-of-living/index>.

form of a stipend to cover application fees. The internship would largely consist of outreaching about DACA and other city/state resources for immigrant youth and families.

- DACA applicants complete a project or training involving outreach to other immigrant youth about DACA and workforce development opportunities.

The Youth Commission’s Immigration and Employment Committee worked closely with the SFUSD Student Advisory Council during the 2015-16 school term to create a survey focusing on the needs of immigrant students. The goal of the survey is to identify outstanding needs in the immigrant student population. The survey is designed to investigate immigrant students’ experiences with SFUSD, the City, and other non-profit organizations regarding youth services and programs available to them, including DACA, AB540, and AB 60. Once the data from the survey is collected and analyzed, youth commissioners will provide the Board of Supervisors with analysis on how services and programs can be best advertised. This will provide valuable information for consideration in the development of DACA outreach projects that might be linked to the provision of the application fee grants.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Following President Barack Obama’s Executive Action, Mayor Edwin Lee immediately authorized \$500,000 in new funding for the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) to provide citywide DACA and DAPA outreach, education, fraud prevention and language assistance.⁵⁰ The

Youth Commission commends Mayor Lee’s commitment to funding the DreamSF Initiative through 2019. Youth commissioners recommend expanding the number of slots on OCEIA’s DreamSF Fellowship program which offers DACA-approved youth the opportunity to serve the city’s immigrant communities through professional experience and training. Reducing financial barriers for undocumented youth to apply for DACA is still an unmet need in San Francisco. The Youth Commission urges the City to provide additional funding and offer application fee grants to San Francisco’s DACA applicants who face barriers paying applicable application fee(s) in applying for the DACA program. Ensuring DACA-eligible San Franciscans are able to apply will allow DACA-eligible San Franciscans to make use of the full range of opportunities the City endeavors to provide its families and young people, including our youth employment and workforce development programs, educational opportunities, and others.

While the new and expanded DACA and DAPA are being temporarily held up in court, the Youth Commission looks forward to working with the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), and community organizations serving undocumented youth to ensure that San Francisco is ready to fully support DACA-eligible youth once the injunction to remove the DACA programs is settled.

On May 7, 2015, Mayor Lee announced in a press release \$10 million in total budget funding over two years to support San Francisco’s immigrant community.⁵¹ The

⁵⁰ Mayor Lee Announces Funding to Strengthen San Francisco’s Immigration Action. <http://sfmayor.org/index.aspx?page=846&recordid=73>

[5&returnURL=%2Findex.aspx>](#)

⁵¹ Mayor Lee Announces Increased Funding to Strengthen San Francisco’s immigrant Community.

funding is dedicated to additional legal services, financial education, a new labor center, and multiple initiatives like DreamSF, SF Pathways to Citizenship, and Obama’s DACA program. Mayor Lee specifically committed \$1 million in funding for OCEIA to strengthen its efforts to support and implement President Obama’s immigration relief efforts. To extend the reach and complement OCEIA’s initiatives, the Mayor announced funding for a fee assistance pilot for immigrant youth and families eligible for the DACA program and Pathways to Citizenship. The Youth Commission is pleased to hear this announcement, and commends Mayor Lee for this commitment to undocumented youth and their families. The Youth Commission looks forward to seeing these funds translate into application fee grants for eligible DACA applicant.

2016 Updates and Further Recommendations

<<http://sfmayor.org/index.aspx?page=846&recordid=73>

[5&returnURL=%2Findex.aspx](#)>

Priority 12: Increase supports for undocumented youth in city-funded employment programs

Background:

Updates:

Recommendations:

Priority 13: Increase supports for unaccompanied immigrant children

Background:

Updates:

Recommendations:

Priority 14: Support an Accessible and Robust City College of San Francisco

Support a diverse, democratically-run, affordable, accessible, and financially stable City College that serves all students well

BACKGROUND

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) is one the largest community colleges in the country and enjoys 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. 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 through its open-access mission.

City College boasts a progress rate for an ELL students that is double that of California community colleges in general, a high student completion rate, and stronger-than-average outcomes for students transferring to CSU's.[1] City College of San Francisco is known for providing model programs supporting students who did not complete high school or who are veterans, former prisoners, working parents, and/or English language-learners. Additionally, CCSF educates a large number of students from the San Francisco Unified School District. California students have faced rising tuition costs and reductions to in-state enrollment within the California State University and University of California systems over the last several years, leaving many young people in San Francisco and throughout the state increasingly dependent on the educational opportunities provided by community colleges.[2]

In early July, 2012, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) released a devastating report calling into question the future financial viability of CCSF and demanding that CCSF institute changes to address over a dozen structural issues.[3] The ACCJC placed CCSF's academic accreditation under threat despite the fact that City College maintained a consistently high level of instructional quality.[4] The ACCJC's recommendations focused on building the college's financial reserves, restructuring its governance, and hiring more administrators, with resulting cuts to faculty and staff wages and benefits, cuts to classes, and the consolidation of academic departments and streamlining of course offerings in such a way as had the potential to reduce the diversity of programs at the college, especially courses like ethnic, women's, and LGBT studies, as well as course offerings for non-traditional students and English Language Learners.[5] Despite the college's efforts to comply with recommendations, the commission ruled to revoke the College's accreditation, effective July 2014.

California'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.[6] Meanwhile, ACCJC placed 37% of California community colleges on sanctions during a period of intense state budget cuts,[7] and the commission maintained its sanctioning of City College of San Francisco following the passage of Proposition A, inhibiting the democratic allocation of voter-approved supplemental funds for the college. Indeed, in a suit later filed by the city attorney against the accrediting commission substantiated that the ACCJ's had aggressively advocated for a junior-college, degree-focused community-college model in

such a way as would limit broad educational offerings and remedial courses that benefit underserved communities and ELL students, and would limit fee-waivers for non-traditional students.[8] The City Attorney also found that members of the ACCJC maintain significant ties to for-profit educational ventures and student lender interests that have a stake in narrowing the open-access mission of California Community colleges.[9]

In Spring and Summer 2013, AFT 2121 and California Federation of Teachers filed a series of complaints against the ACCJC, resulting in an investigation by the U.S. Dept. of Education. In August 2013, the federal DOE found that the ACCJC had violated standards required of accreditation bodies throughout the course of the commission’s review of CCSF in the following ways: 1) Failing to provide an evaluation team with a balanced composition of academicians and administrators 2) By failing to adhere to a policy preventing conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest 3) By failing to differentiate between compliance indicators and recommended areas for improvement, or lay out clear compliance guidelines the college would need to adhere to in order to retain accreditation 4) By failing to enforce previously-noted areas of non-compliance—later cited as reasons for issuing a show-cause status to the college—within accordance with the required two-year enforcement timeline.[10]

In August 2013, City Attorney, Dennis Herrera, filed suit against the accrediting commission to prevent the closure of CCSF and to compel “the state governing board charged with evaluating college standards and eligibility for public funding to resume its legal duties.”[11] Mr. Herrera asserted conflicts of interest and unfair political bias had affected accreditation evaluations; that the ACCJC had engaged in political retaliation against the college; and that the State Board of Governors had unlawfully delegated public duties to an unaccountable private agency.[12] State legislators approved an audit of the commission and introduced several pieces of legislation to aid the college, including establishing more just and transparent accrediting processes, reestablishing the elected Board of Trustees, and stabilizing funding amidst enrollment drops that have occurred throughout the accreditation crisis.[13]

Following the disempowerment of the democratically elected Board of Trustees and the installation of the special trustee with extraordinary powers, decisions as to the college’s educational future have become less transparent and student and faculty leadership and voice have been undermined. In July 2013, student trustee, Shanell Williams, was barred from the chancellor search committee meeting. In March 2014, student protesters were pepper-sprayed and arrested while protesting a new student payment policy and a proposed 19% raise for top administrators.

Seeing that the lack of democratic governance had neither appeased the demands of the accrediting commission, nor sustained the unique abilities of the college to serve the needs of San Francisco’s diverse communities, the Youth Commission supported a resolution by Supervisor Campos, later unanimously passed by the Board of Supervisors in March 2014, calling for the re-instatement of City College’s duly elected Board of Trustees (File No. 140123). Since the Youth Commission initially passed a resolution (1213-14) on these issues in March 2013, a number of City leaders have continued to mobilize around this issue. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution (File No. 130303) in April 2013 in support of the utilization of Prop A funds in accordance with the language of the proposition; in support of preserving the quality and diversity of education at the college; and considering in-kind and other support of the college. City Attorney, Dennis Herrera, also demonstrated courageous leadership by taking action to halt the impending closure of the college. Mayor Lee and other

elected leaders[14] called on the accrediting commission to grant an extension on the deadline for revoking the college's accreditation.[15]

In January 2014, Superior Court Judge Karnow granted an injunction blocking the commission's decision to revoke the college's accreditation. In January 2015, the ACCJC announced it would grant City College two more years to come into compliance, two days before Judge Karnow let the commission's accrediting decision stand, but ruled that the commission had illegally withheld explanations of some findings and failed to let the college defend itself, and ordered the commission to provide the explanations and hear the college's defense.

In early 2015, current state Assemblyman David Chiu introduced legislation aiming to increase accountability for community college accrediting agencies by enabling community colleges to provide feedback on an accrediting agency's performance without fear of retribution. In February 2015, California Community Colleges Chancellor Brice Harris appointed Guy Lease as the new special trustee with extraordinary powers" amid student calls for the reinstatement of the elected Board of Trustees. Harris confirmed the elected trustees will reassume full authority around July 1, 2015.

After surviving immediate accreditation threats, the college has moved on to looking at other issues, including facilities management. After the abrupt closure of the Civic Center campus shortly before Spring classes were set to begin, students were left without alternative course offerings and no academic or transition plan. Youth Commissioners unanimously supported Supervisor Kim's resolution (File No. 150251) urging the administration of CCSF to restore neighborhood classes displaced by the closure of the Civic Center campus, later passed by the Board of Supervisors.

2016 UPDATES

....

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are few issues that have such an impact of young San Franciscans' ability to develop as engaged and critical citizens; achieve equal access to the economic opportunities San Francisco has to offer; or remain and work in the city they call home as the presence of a affordable, accessible City College that is dedicated to serving the needs of diverse students. Given the stake young people and the community at-large have in the college's future, as a City, we must continue to stand for and ensure the continuance of the college's open-access mission.

We further urge the City to continue to explore means of supporting the college, especially by investigating ways to reduce and reverse drops in enrollment. We would like to thank members of the Board of Supervisors, and further encourage and support them, in their efforts to ensure transparency and transition-planning in cases where the College conducts any facility closures, renovations, or cancels classes or programs. We urge the maintenance of quality student services, and we urge your ongoing support to ensure that students, especially non-traditional students including undocumented, immigrant, and disabled students, as well as students at the College's satellite campuses, are well-served and their academic futures secure.

Finally, nothing has proved to be out of the bounds of the now-embattled ACCJC's determination to discredit City College of San Francisco. As a City, we must 'sleep with one eye open' on this issue. We encourage members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to 'begin considering a plan for the College's and City's response in the case of another decision to either revoke the college's accreditation or to recommend changes that would diminish the College's open access mission after the restoration period is up.

[1] City Attorney Dennis Herrera News Release, August 22, 2013; Retrieved at:

<http://www.sfcityattorney.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=1335>

[2] Asimov, Nanette. "Cal State to Close Door on Spring 2013 Enrollment." *SFGate*. SF Gate, 20 Mar. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

[3] Koskey, Andrea. "City College of San Francisco Working to Keep Accreditation, Avoid Closure." *San Francisco Examiner*. San Francisco Examiner, 10 July 2012. Web. 14 Mar. 2013. Retrieved at: <http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/education/2012/07/city-college-san-francisco-working-keep-accreditation-avoid-closure>.

[4] By the accrediting commission's own account, CCSF's instructional quality and commitment to its mission were high. See the accrediting commission's report: *CCSF Evaluation Team Report May 2012*. ACCJC, n.d. Web.

PRIORITY 15: STAND IN SOLIDARITY WITH SFSU'S COLLEGE OF ETHNIC STUDIES

College of Ethnic Studies, SFSU: William

Background:

San Francisco State University's College of Ethnic Studies is the product of the organizing efforts of 1968 coalition of students of color and other organizations in response to the widespread racism and discrimination on campus. Furthermore, SFSU is the only university in the entire nation with a college dedicated to Ethnic Studies.

Recent Updates:

San Francisco State University prides itself on diversity and activism, however the the College of Ethnic Studies is treated like the lower hanging fruit. In 2008 the college's budget took a devastating blow. 7 years later the college has experienced an overall 15% budget cuts. To make matters worse, at the beginning of 2016 the administration once again targeted the college for budget cuts, with an estimate of 500,000\$ in cuts. The cuts will effectively decimate the College by removing lecturers, programs like the Cesar Chavez Policy Institute, and cutting over 40 % of courses.

Recommendation:

As the Youth Commission we have taken a stance on the issue, and we are standing in solidarity with SFSU's College of Ethnic Studies. We also urge the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to stand in solidarity with the college of Ethnic Studies and adopt a formal resolution on this matter.