

**CITY OF OAKLAND**  
**AGENDA REPORT**

FILED  
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
OAKLAND  
2005 OCT 27 PM 12:07

TO: Office of the City Administrator  
ATTN: Deborah Edgerly  
FROM: Department of Human Services  
DATE: November 1, 2005

RE: **SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT RESPONDING TO THE LIFE ENRICHMENT COMMITTEE TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS IN THE OAKLAND FUND FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH FINAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-2005**

---

**SUMMARY**

At the Life Enrichment Committee of October 25, 2005, committee members requested additional demographic information and explanation of the results data presented in the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth Final Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 2004-2005 and powerpoint presentation prepared by the evaluator, Community Crime Prevention Associates. The following attachments are included in response:

- Powerpoint presented to the Life Enrichment Committee
- Intermediate Results of OUSD School Data
- Summary of Demographics of OFCY Children and Youth Customers

Staff recommends that the City Council accept this supplemental report and attachments in response to the request from the Life Enrichment Committee.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

This supplemental report will have no fiscal impact on the General Fund.

Item: \_\_\_\_\_  
City Council  
November 1, 2005

**ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

Staff recommends that the City Council accept the supplemental report responding to the Life Enrichment Committee to include the following attachments in the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth Final Evaluation report for Fiscal Year 2004-2005.

Respectfully submitted,



**ANDREA YOUNGDahl**  
Director, Department of Human Services

Prepared by:  
Sandra Taylor, Manager  
Children and Youth Services

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE  
CITY COUNCIL:

  
**OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR**



# Effort: Overview

- 81 contracts for \$9.5 million.
- Matched by \$10.7 million for a total of \$20 million in funds.
- Served 23,818 unduplicated child and youth customers with 3.7 million hours of service.
- Cost per hour = \$5.38 for total funds and \$2.52 for OFCY grant funds.



## **Effort: Leveraging Funds (Page 7)**

- Over the last five years, the amount of OFCY funds leveraged has increased by 114%.
- The amount of service (hours of direct service) delivered to Oakland children and youth has increased by 84%.

## **Growth in Efficiency and Effectiveness (Page 8)**

- Over the last five years, OFCY has increased its efficiency (cost per hour of service by) 6%.
- Similarly, OFCY has increased its effectiveness by 33%, as measured by service productivity.



# Effect: Overview

- Child and youth customers = 86% satisfaction rating.
- Parents of child and youth customers = 89% satisfaction rating.
- OFCY grantees achieved over two-thirds of their targeted changes, as reported by child and youth customers.
- Children, youth, parents, and staff provided 32,669 survey reports.

# Performance for FY 04-05

Percent of Grantees that Met Goal	Goal
83%	Met contracted service delivery plan.
99%	Met targeted child/youth satisfaction rate
83%	Achieve targeted changes in developmental assets



# OUSD-Related Results

<b>OFCY Youth Improvement vs. Average Improvement for All OUSD Youth</b>	
<b>Percent</b>	<b>Measure</b>
78%	Attendance
54%	GPA
37%	Math
37%	Reading
37%	Language





# Overall Findings

- OFCY is in compliance with Measure K.
- Continue to collect intermediate results to strengthen the OFCY performance-logic model evaluation system.
- Keep the POC at full capacity - minimize vacancies.
- Full recommendations on page 102 and 103.

## Intermediate Results of OUSD School Data

The following table indicates the percentage of OFCY students who improved above the mean for Oakland Unified School District Students for school year 2004-05.

Percentage of OFCY Youth Above the Mean for OUSD Students for School Year 2004-05							
% above OUSD mean for:	Fall GPA	Spring GPA	CAT6 Reading	CAT6 Lang	CAT6 Math	Days Suspended	Attendance Rate for year
RFP	70.1	69.4	45.9	41.1	49.7	96.2	84.5
RFQ	46.7	52.0	36.0	36.0	35.4	87.9	75.9
AVERAGE All OFCY	50.2	54.6	37.3	36.7	37.2	90	78.1
OUSD mean score	2.54	2.43	34.37	35.89	41.44	0.3	90.99
OFCY Students Tallied	1,232	1,263	1,037	1,037	1,032	5,048	5,048
OUSD Students Tallied	17,083	17,762	6,864	6,864	6,843	47,569	47,569

Note to the reader:

- ✓ The first three lines of this table are the percentage of OFCY students who were above the mean of all OUSD students. For example 78% of OFCY students attendance was better than the mean attendance of OUSD, which was 90.99%.
- ✓ The last two lines is the number of student records tallied for each measurement area.
- ✓ CAT6 means are percentile rank scores.
- ✓ GPA means are on a scale of 0 to 4 with A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, and F=0.
- ✓ Days suspended mean for OUSD is 0.3 days with 90% of OFCY youth having less days suspended.

# Summary of Demographics OFCY -FY 2004-05

## Summary of Demographics of OFCY 23,818 Children and Youth Customers

OFCY Grantees served 23,818 unduplicated registered customers with ongoing services this year. This is a one page summary of data found on pages 27-31 in the OFCY Final Evaluation Report. Additional demographic data is found in the appendix pages 443 -450 of the final report. Registered customers were those customers who are reported in the OFCY Grant Monitoring and Evaluation System Participant I.D. Report Form. The Evaluation Team removed any duplicates of customers in order to develop a count of unduplicated customers.

The OFCY Performance Logic Model Evaluation System uses the following factors to report on the 23,818 child and youth customers served this year:

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Age
- Council Districts Where Youth Customers Live

### Gender

Gender of OFCY Customers		
	Number	Percent
Male	11,266	47.3%
Female	12,338	51.8%
Transgende	48	0.2%
Unknown	167	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,818</b>	

### Ethnicity

Ethnicity of OFCY Customers		
Ethnicity	Number	Percent
African American	11,004	46%
Latino American	7,002	29%
Asian/PI American	3,763	16%
Native American	405	2%
White American	595	3%
Multiracial American	715	3%
Unknown	214	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,818</b>	

### Age

Age of OFCY Customers		
Age	Number	Percent
0-5 yrs	3,430	14%
6-10 yrs	6,121	26%
11-14 yrs	6,431	27%
15-20 yrs	6,883	29%
Unknown	977	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,818</b>	

## Age of Youth in Oakland

Total Population City of Oakland by Age, 2000, 2003 and 2004						
Age Range	2000	% of total population	2003	% of total population	2004	% of total population
Total population	399,484		382,369		365,266	
Population under 20	109,592		101,187		93,651	
Under 5 years	28,292	26%	33,774	33%	24,859	26.54%
5 to 9 years	30,134	27%	18,917	19%	23,492	25.08%
10 to 14 years	26,502	24%	24,692	24%	22,782	24.33%
15 to 19 years	24,664	23%	23,804	24%	22,518	24.04%

## Number of OFCY Youth Customers Compared to Schools and Census

Number of OFCY Customers Compared to U.S.Census and OUSD Enrollment					
	FY 04-05 Actual	2004 Census Under 20 year olds	Percent of Under 20 year olds	OUSD 2004-05 Enrollment	Percent of OUSD Students
Total Unduplicated Youth Served by OFCY	23,818	93,651	25%	49,214	48%

**N**ote: OFCY served 25% of the youth in Oakland under 20 years old and served 48% of the number of youth attending Oakland Unified School District (OUSD). These percentages are given to allow the reader to get an estimate of the percentage of Oakland Youth who are taking advantage of Measure K funding.

## Council Districts Where OFCY Youth Customers Live

Council districts were assigned with zip codes except when zip codes were in more than one council district. In these cases evaluators randomly assigned youth participants with these zip codes based on the geographic size of the zip code in the affected district. Therefore, the table below is a statistical approximation. Table also shows 2000 Census for children and children in poverty.

OFCY Customers by Oakland City Council District FY 2003-05								
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	Outside Oakland
FY 2003-04	6%	13%	16%	7%	23%	13%	17%	6%
FY 2004-05	7%	12%	17%	6%	22%	13%	19%	5%
2000 Census	9%	13%	18%	6%	20%	14%	19%	
2000 Census Poverty	7%	10%	17%	5%	22%	17%	22%	