

2.4.2026 – Meeting Minutes

Timestamp 6:07 PM – Item 1: Meeting called to order by Ashlee Jemmott (Adult Co-Chair). Seven members of the committee are present, making quorum. Attendance is as follows:

- Jessica Arline – D1, Adult
- Ashlee Jemmott – D2, Adult
- Ashley Tchanyoum – D2, Youth
- Sophie Mehouvelley – D3, Youth
- Emma Hiza – D5, Adult
- Madison Jackson – D4, Youth
- Eve Delfin – D7, Adult
- Also in attendance: Dr. Jason Lester (HSD Director), Robin Love (CYS Manager), Katie Kramer (The Bridging Group), Robyn Levinson (CYS Planner), and Annie Hines (OFCY Program Analyst)

Timestamp 6:09 PM – Item 3: Adoption of Agenda. Members review the agenda, JA motions to approve and SM seconds the motion. Motion passes with none abstaining and none opposed.

Timestamp 6:10 PM – Item 4: Approval of Minutes. Members review the minutes from the January 7, 2026 meeting. JA Motions to approve, MJ seconds the motion. Motion passes with none abstaining and none opposed. No members of the public are present for Public Forum.

Timestamp 6:12 PM – Item 6: POC Youth Co-Chair Selection. AJ asks RLL to introduce the selection of Youth Co-Chair for term.

- AJ nominates Madison Jackson.
- Ashley Tchanyoum self nominates.
- RLL provides an overview of the roles and responsibilities expected of the Youth Co-Chair.
- Youth Co-Chair nominees are asked to use the time during the evaluation report to prepare their remarks.

Timestamp 6:17 PM – AJ asks to amend the agenda in the following order: Add introduction and remarks from Dr. Jason Lester, the new HSD director; Review and approval of FY2425 Evaluation Report by The Bridging Group; Co-Chair Nominee speeches, before administrative updates and reminders.

- JA motions to approve amended agenda. MJ seconds the motion. The motion passes without abstention or opposition.

Timestamp 6:18 PM – Dr. Jason Lester addresses the POC, explaining his background and commitment to HSD and OFCY programs. Dr. JL reviews challenges in contracting, as well as his commitment to support vendors and staff in executing contracts to expedite payments.

- Commissioner Sadoskoy arrives at 6:20 PM
- Commissioner Henderson arrives at 6:27 PM
- Attendance is now as follows:
 - Jessica Arline – D1, Adult
 - Ashlee Jemmott – D2, Adult
 - Ashley Tchanyoum – D2, Youth
 - Sophie Mehouvelley – D3, Youth

- Emma Hiza – D5, Adult
- Madison Jackson – D4, Youth
- Eve Delfin – D7, Adult
- Natalie Sadoskoy – D6, Adult, Late
- Letitia Henderson – Mayor’s Seat, Adult, Late

Timestamp 7:00 PM – Item 7: Approval of the FY24-25 Evaluation Report. Dr. Katie Kramer presents on the evaluation report from the previous fiscal year. Slides are attached at the end of these minutes.

- ED motions to approve FY2425 Evaluation report, AT seconds the motion. The motion passes without abstention or opposition.

Timestamp 7:49 PM – Item 9: AJ introduces the Youth Co-Chair Nominees to present their candidate speeches.

- Madison Jackson presents her candidate speech.
- Ashley Tchanyoum presents her candidate speech.
- POC members vote with final tally: MJ – 4 Votes, AT – 3 Votes.
- 7:57 PM – AJ motions to accept the votes, JA seconds. Madison Jackson is the Youth Co-Chair for the remainder of this session (August 2026).

Timestamp 7:59 PM – Item 8: Administrative Updates. RLL and RML provide administrative updates regarding the RFP, upcoming RFQs and OFCY staffing.

Timestamp 8:11 PM – AJ adjourns the meeting.



FY 24/25 OFCY Evaluation Report

February 4, 2026

Presentation to the OFCY Public Oversight Committee (POC)

Dr. Katie Kramer
Co-Founder and CEO
The Bridging Group



**CITY OF
OAKLAND**





Kyrstal Jenkins
Site Visit Team and Analyst



Sharon McDonnell
Biostatistician / Data Manager




Dr. Katie Kramer
Project Director/PI



Lynda Murillo
Administrative Manager



Madeleine Fraux
Data Analyst



Danielle Motely-Lewis
Stakeholder Engagement, Site Visit



Summer Jackson
Group Facilitator

**OFCY
Evaluation
Team**

**THE
BRIDGING
GROUP**

OFCY Funding Areas, Strategies & Investments (pg.3)

Funding Area	Strategy (# of programs funded)	Investment Amount
 Healthy Development of Young Children	Social-Emotional Well-Being in Early Childhood (4)	\$775,000
	Family Resource Centers and Parent Engagement (10)	\$2,261,035
 Children's Success in School	Comprehensive School-Based Afterschool at Elementary Schools (39)	\$3,230,000
	Comprehensive School-Based Afterschool at Middle Schools (14)	\$1,500,000
	Middle School Engagement, Wellness, and Transitions (5)	\$710,000
	High School and Post-Secondary Student Success (11)	\$1,245,000
 Youth Development and Violence Prevention	Youth Leadership and Development (33)	\$4,645,347
	Summer Academic & Enrichment Programs (9) + Summer Youth Employment (3)	\$1,161,000
	Violence Prevention Programming (3)	\$655,000
 Transitions to Adulthood	Career Access and Employment for Opportunity Youth (9)	\$1,660,000
	Career Access and Employment for Youth in School (6)	\$995,000
TOTAL INVESTMENT		\$18,837,382

Roadmap of OFCY Evaluation Evolution

Descriptive Evaluation at Program Level

Pre 2024 – December 2024



Where we've been

Development of New Evaluation Plan

January – June 2025



Realignment of Evaluation with Oakland RBA Framework

July – December 2025



Where we are

Beta Test New Outcomes with Pilot Sites

January – June 2026



Where we are going


New Evaluation Implementation Under New RFP

July 2026 – June 2028



Collective Outcome Evaluation Across OFCY Portfolio

January – June 2026



Our North Star



OFCY Results-Based Accountability Framework (pg.4)

How Much Did We Do?

- Number of programs funded
- Number of people served
- Number of hours of service
- Who we served (demographics)

How Well Did We Do It?

- Actual compared to projected hours of service
- Actual compared to project number of people served
- Equity assessment (do people served represent communities with most disparities?)
- Participant satisfaction

Is Anyone Better Off?

- What quantity or quality of change for the better did we produce? (number or percent of people with improvement in skills, attitudes, behaviors, or circumstances)
- Participants across OCFY report, display, or demonstrate improvements, such as:
 - Percent (%) of youth participants reporting increased school readiness
 - Percent (%) of parents who report increased parenting skills
 - Number (#) of youth participants who gained paid internship or employment

Data Sources (pg.5)



Quantitative Administrative Records

- Hours of services, number of people served, & demographics



Qualitative Outcomes Records

- Programs defined their own outcomes
- Submitted self-reported descriptive outcome data & narratives




Surveys

- Collected from OFCY program participants to share their perspectives on program quality and individual outcomes + OUSD evaluation surveys

OFCY Participant Surveys (+OUSD Surveys) (pg. 6-7)

Survey Numbers by Strategy (n=9,448)



HOW MUCH DID WE DO?


Results-Based
Accountability




20,801 Children & Youth Served (unduplicated)

(pg.11)


**Race/Ethnicity
(n=20,801)**



**Age
(n=20,780*)**




**Gender
(n=20,801)**




*21 youth participants missing age data, not included in this figure.

2,591 Adults Served (unduplicated) (pg.12)

Race/Ethnicity (n=2,591)




Age (n=2,588)



*3 adult participants missing age data, not included in this figure.


Gender (n=2,584*)



*7 adult participants missing gender data, not included in this figure.

HOW WELL DID WE DO IT?

Results-Based
Accountability



Actuals Compared to Projections

(pg. 14-15)

Served **126% of the number of youth and adults** projected to serve

Provided **109% of the number of hours** projected to be provided

Priority Youth Populations (pg. 16)

OFCY Participants Compared to Overall Oakland Population

Race/Ethnicity	Overall Oakland Population*	OFCY Youth Participants	Difference +/-
African American/Black	19%	25%	↑6%
Latinx	30%	48%	↑18%
Two or More Races	6%	10%	↑4%
Asian/Asian Pacific Islander	16%	9%	↓7%
White	27%	3%	↓24%


*2023 American Community Survey/US Census

93% of OFCY Youth Participants from Priority Populations


High Focus Neighborhoods (pg. 17)

OFCY Youth Participants By Top Zip Codes			
Zip Code	Neighborhoods	Count	Percent
94601	Fruitvale	4,181	22%
94621	Webster Tract, Coliseum	3,051	16%
94603	Sobrante Park, Elmhurst	2,345	12%
94606	Highland Park, East Lake	2,157	11%
94605	Eastmont, Havenscourt	2,090	11%
94607	West Oakland, Chinatown	1,248	7%


2024 Oakland Community Stressors Map



FY 24-25 OFCY Youth Participants By Zip Code



OakDOT Geographic Equity Toolbox



IS ANYONE BETTER OFF?

Results-Based Accountability



Components of Effective Youth Programs

(based on research literature) (pg. 19)

1

They promote positive & sustained adult-youth relations

a relationship between a young person and an adult who is competent, caring, & continually available

2

They use positive support techniques

e.g., reward systems to improve motivation and discourage problem behaviors

3

They provide life-skill building activities

e.g., learning conflict resolution, problem solving, stress management, communicating effectively

4

They provide opportunity for youth participation in and leadership

at valued family, school, and community activities

5

They collaborate with other organizations

to develop a holistic approach to serving the youth's needs

Francis et al., 2020; Lipsey et al. 2010

OFCY Participant Survey Results Matched to Evidenced-Based PYD Practices (pgs. 20-22)

<p>Positive Adult-Youth Relationships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an adult in this program who notices when I am upset (n= 6,682) 	85%
<p>Positive Support Techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adults in the program tell me what I am doing well (n = 5,707) 	93%
<p>Life-Skill Building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because of this program, I know how to navigate a job search and interview process (n=394) I know more about how to keep my child healthy (n=460) 	80%
<p>Opportunities for Youth Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In this program, I have opportunities to lead others (n=6,544) 	85%
<p>Collaboration & Connections with Other Organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This program connected me with other programs and resources that can help my family (n=460) 	79%
<p>Collaboration & Connections with Other Organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This program connected me with other programs and resources that can help my family (n=460) 	88%


OFCY Expands Resources and Strengthens Results Through Collaborations (pgs. 22)




Full List of Collaborative Partners in Appendix 1




Academic Preparation (pg. 24)




Students **like to go to school**
(n=6,090)



Students **feel more motivated to learn in school** (n=4,818)



Elementary and middle school students **increase their interest in staying in school** (n=3,047)




College or a career feels attainable after graduation for high schoolers (n=1,149)





Employment/Economic Well-Being (pg. 25)



80%

Youth participating in career access & employment programs, who completed OFCY surveys, reported that they **now have a resume** (n=394)

1,412 youth placed in an internship or job through OFCY
\$15/hour average hourly stipend or wage




77%


Youth participating in career access & employment programs received **assistance getting a paid internship or job** (n=120)




Parent Engagement with their Children (n=460) (pg. 26)




Parents/Caregivers are better prepared to **stand up for or be an advocate for their child**



Parents/Caregivers are better able to **help their child be ready for school**



Parents/Caregivers **sing, read, or tell stories to their child more often**



Parents/Caregivers **spend more time playing, listening to, or talk with their child**





Belonging, Connections, and Safety (pg. 27)



90%

Youth feel like they **belong in their OFCY program** (n=6,682)



88%

Youth feel **more connected to their community** (n=1,373)



86%

When youth **feel unsafe, their program provides resources or someone to call for support** (n=2,522)



RESULTS-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARIES



Social-Emotional Well-Being in Early Childhood (pg. 29)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$775,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 4 programs funded	Hours of Service	10,760*	10,031	93%	
 127 youth participants served	Number of Participants	50**	76	152%	
 119 adult participants served	Adult Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 18,736 hours of service provided	Hours of Service	5,500*	5,948	108%	
	Number of Participants	45**	101	224%	

*1 program had errors with reported projected service hours; their data is not included in table.
 **2 programs had errors with reported projected number of people served; their data is not included in table.

Is Anyone Better Off?

75% (3 of 4 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Early Childhood Mental Health Collaborative (Lincoln)

- 100% of parents/caregivers reported observing positive changes in their child’s behavior since gaining support from collaborative team.

Example 2: Nurturing Relationships and Strengths of 0-5 Children and Their Families (Through the Looking Glass)

- Based on Early Childhood Parent Scale: 63% reported positive changes in flexibility, 75% reported positive changes in frustration tolerance.

Example 3: Project Pride (LifeLong Medical Care)

- 71% of participants have made positive progress toward reunification with their children.

Family Resource Centers and Parent Engagement (pg. 31)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$2,261,035 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 10 programs funded	Hours of Service	28,248	31,400	111%	
 1,446 youth participants served	Number of Participants	1,217	1,446	119%	
 2,493 adult participants served	Adult Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 71,557 hours of service provided	Hours of Service	32,177	40,157	125%	
	Number of Participants	1,871	2,493	133%	

Is Anyone Better Off?

100% (10 of 10 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Dads Evoking Change (Dads Evoking Change)

- 84% of participants experienced positive changes in their legal situation since receiving consultation.

Example 2: Parent Tot Initiative (Refugee & Immigrant Transitions)

- 84% of participants successfully connected to the resource beyond the program.

Example 3: Hathorne Family Resource Center (East Bay Agency for Children)

- 95% of clients maintained or improved their parenting domain scores on the Protective Factors Survey (PFS).

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$3,230,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 39 programs funded	Hours of Service	1,835,754	2,294,793	125%	
 5,895 youth participants served	Number of Participants	4,191	5,895	141%	
 2,294,793 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

90% (35 of 39 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Manzanita Community School (East Bay Asian Youth Center)

- 81% of students reported they feel motivated to learn in school.
- 87% of students participated in activities that help them build positive relationships with their peers.

Example 2: Allendale Elementary (Girls Inc of Alameda County)

- 70% of 1st – 5th grade participants completed a minimum of 1 DIEBLS literacy assessment throughout the 2024-25 year.

Example 3: International Community Elementary (Oakland Leaf Foundation)

- 75% of students reported that the after-school program is a safe and supportive space.
- 75% of 5th-grade students took on leadership roles or increased responsibilities within the program.

Comprehensive School-Based Afterschool – Middle (pg. 36)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$1,500,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 14 programs funded	Hours of Service	818,333	708,683	87%	
 2,863 youth participants served	Number of Participants	1,780	2,863	161%	
 708,683 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

100% (14 of 14 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Roosevelt Middle School (East Bay Asian Youth Center)

- 81% of students reported feeling motivated to do well academically.
- 89% of students said it's important to get good grades.

Example 2: Bret Harte Middle (Oakland Leaf Foundation)

- 48% of students had leadership opportunities such as serving as a teacher's assistant, timekeeper, bathroom monitor, or helping younger students.

Example 3: Madison Park Academy 6-8 (Bay Area Community Resources)

- 85% of youth reported feeling supported.

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$710,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 5 programs funded	Hours of Service	80,887	59,873	74%	
 968 youth participants served	Number of Participants	475	968	204%	
 59,873 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

100% (5 of 5 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: The Unity Council Latino Men & Boys Program (Refugee & Immigrant Transitions)

- 84% of youth have participated in extracurricular enrichment activities, including college visits.

Example 2: East Oakland Boxing Association (EOBA)

- 100% of youth engaged in academic programming and a full spectrum of health and wellness activities.
- 6 students were accepted into a leadership program, and 3 additional participants became student body presidents.

Example 3: FLY Middle School Program for Oakland Youth (Fresh Lifelines for Youth, Inc.)

- 80% of youth increased school engagement.
- 100% of youth were promoted to the next grade level.

High School and Post-Secondary Student Success (pg. 40)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$1,245,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 11 programs funded	Hours of Service	92,469	137,379	149%	
 3,650 youth participants served	Number of Participants	3,864	3,650	94%	
 137,379 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

100% (11 of 11 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: College Track Oakland: Democratizing High School & College Success For Low-income, First-generation Oakland Youth

- 100% of Class of 2025 seniors were accepted to a four-year college.
- 100% of Class of 2024 seniors matriculated to a two- or four-year college in Fall 2024.
- 91% of high school scholars achieved 3.0+ GPA.

Example 2: Community Connections (The Center for Independent Living)

- 88% of youth reported that they know better what their strengths are, 100% reported that they know what they need help with, and 100% reported that they can better speak up for and advocate for themselves.

Example 3: Newcomer Youth Wellness & Leadership Initiative (Oakland Unified School District)

- 81% of students reported they feel their culture and identity are respected at OIHS all or most of the time.
- 69% of participants said they have a trusted adult they can go to if they have a problem.

Leadership and Development (pg. 42)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
	\$4,645,347 Investment	Youth Participants			
			Projected	Actual	% Achieved
	32 programs operational	Hours of Service	450,824	414,876	92%
	6,047 youth participants served	Number of Participants	4,878	6,047	124%
	414,876 hours of service provided				

Is Anyone Better Off?

91% (29 of 32 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: FLY Programs for Young Leaders (Fresh Lifelines for Youth, Inc.)

- 71% of youth were promoted to the next grade level, graduated from high school, or earned a GED.
- 100% of youth report feeling confident in their ability to resist negative peer pressure.
- 100% of youth report having the ability not to break the law.

Example 2: Oakland Lacrosse: Leadership Development, Academic Counseling, Wellness Education (Oakland Lacrosse Club)

- 87% of participants felt connected to their teammates.
- 85% of participants reported that their lacrosse community allows them to be their authentic self.

Example 3: Youth Beat Media Arts & Leadership Development (Oakland Public Education Fund)

- 83% of youth reported they were proud of the work they accomplished.
- 71% of youth reported they were more comfortable working with a team since joining the program.

Summer Academic & Enrichment/Youth Employment (pg. 45)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$1,161,000 Investment \$861,000 Academic & Enrichment + \$300,000 Youth Employment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 12 programs funded 9 Academic & Enrichment + 3 Summer Youth Employment	Hours of Service	154,596	154,359	100%	
 1,274 youth participants served	Number of Participants	1,252	1,274	102%	
 154,359 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Summer Jobs for Successful Futures (The Youth Employment Partnership, Inc.)

- 148 youth received case management.
- 145 youth received job readiness training.

Example 2: Youth on the Move Summer Program (Lao Family Community Development, Inc)

- 71 youth attended the annual youth leadership summit.
- 112 youth received job coaching.
- 112 youth received employment placement.

Violence Prevention (pg. 47)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$655,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 3 programs funded	Hours of Service	16,201	24,267	150%	
 340 youth participants served	Number of Participants	189	340	180%	
 24,267 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

100% (3 of 3 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Teens on Target (Youth ALIVE!)

- 63% of youth surveyed reported helping resolve or mediate a conflict in the last six months that would have otherwise led to a fight or violence.
- 60% of youth surveyed reported that they would try to talk a friend out of carrying a gun (a 23% increase from baseline survey).
- 100% of seniors graduated on time.

Example 2: Healthy Wealthy Wise (The Youth Employment Partnership, Inc.)

- 19 young adult trainees were placed into unsubsidized jobs.
- 100% of youth who had dropped out of school were re-enrolled in school and 47% obtained their high school diploma.
- 100% of students remained in school.

Career Access and Employment for Opportunity Youth (pg. 48)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$1,660,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 9 programs funded	Hours of Service	87,212	111,972	1128%	
 713 youth participants served	Number of Participants	525	713	136%	
 111,972 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

89% (8 of 9 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: Comprehensive Job Training and Employment Program for Oakland Opportunity Youth (New Door Ventures)

- 90%+ of youth scored 90% in our enabling conditions category, 87% in our building assets category, and 93% in our promoting agency category.
- 64% of youth were employed at program exit.

Example 2: Siblings on the Rise Economic Empowerment Program (Center for Young Women's Development)

- 90% of goals from participants' life self-determination plans were obtained.
- 90%+ of youth completed their training and paid apprenticeships.

Example 3: Civicorps' Conservation Career Pathways Program (Civicorps)

- 6 youth attained their Class C Permits.

Career Access and Employment Youth in School, (pg. 50)

How Much Did We Do?		How Well Did We Do It?			
 \$995,000 Investment	Youth Participants				
		Projected	Actual	% Achieved	
 6 programs funded	Hours of Service	149,298	104,780	70%	
 942 youth participants served	Number of Participants	1,017	942	93%	
 104,780 hours of service provided					

Is Anyone Better Off?

50% (3 of 6 programs) MET AT LEAST 1 of their Outcomes by Q4

Sample Site-Specific Measurable Data

Example 1: AHS - Health Excellence & Academic Leadership-High School Healthcare Internship

- 90% of youth reported being more motivated to pursue their education seriously because of the program.
- 77% of youth reported having a clear idea of the educational path they needed to pursue to achieve their career goals.

Example 2: Pathways to College and Career Success for Oakland's High School Students through Genesys Works

- 93% of participants completed their internship.
- 100% of program participants who completed their internship graduated from high school.
- 100% of program participants are pursuing post-secondary education (81% in a four-year college or university and 19% in a two-year college).

Strengths and Successes (pgs. 52-55)

- Youth Empowerment, Leadership, and Voice
- Community, Family, and Cultural Connections
- Holistic Academic, Career, & College Readiness and Support
- Prioritizing Well-Being, Basic Needs, Resources, and Inclusive Supports



“I'm grateful to the students before me that did this work. I did not know how much work this [Youth Vote] was. But it's pretty rewarding to see folks be able to vote since they have been waiting for so long.”

-OFCY Youth Leadership Program Participant

Challenges (pgs. 56-57)

- Programs Should Continue to Prioritize Trauma-Informed Support During Challenging Times for Oakland Families
- Resource Restraints Hinder Smooth Program Functioning
- Participant Engagement and Retention is a Persistent Challenge

“Post the election, there has been much fear and confusion as to what is going to happen, and we have seen an increase in the need for mental health services. We are connecting with local partners to promote their services and workshops, as we know many of our families are being impacted.”

-OFCY Provider

Appendix 2: Program Profiles



Program-Level Profiles for All 145 programs

(Appendix 2)



Program Profile FY 2023-2024
OFCY Strategy: Family Resource Centers and Parent Engagement

Agency Name:
Program:
Annual Grant Funding: \$248,993

Program Summary:

Program Score Card


These select performance measures were identified by program staff, OFCY, and the evaluation team as indicative of programs' quality and success in working towards the strategic objectives for the Youth Development and Leadership strategy.

Program Achievements: *How much did we do?*

Projected Number of Youth Served:	62
Actual Number of Youth Served:	191
- <i>Percent Achieved Toward Goal of Total Youth Served:</i>	308%
Total Hours of Service Provided:	4,638
- <i>Average Hours of Service per Youth Served:</i>	24
Projected Number of Adults Served:	62
Actual Number of Adults Served:	178
- <i>Percent Achieved Toward Goal of Total Adults Served:</i>	287%
Total Hours of Service Provided:	4,018
- <i>Average Hours of Service per Adult Served:</i>	23


Adult Demographics

Race/Ethnicity (N = 178)




Categories with 0%: Afro-Caribbean or Afro-Latin(o/a), Afro-Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian

Gender Identity (N = 178)



Categories with 0%: Non-Binary, Other

Age (N = 178)




Program-Level Profiles for All 145 programs

(Appendix 2)

Distribution of Adult Participants by Oakland Zip Code

(N = 178)




Categories with 0%: 94613, 94704, 94705, 94720, Homeless/Transitioning

Parents/Caregiver Survey Results


Participant Outcomes: *Is anyone better off?*

Percentages presented reflect how often parents/caregivers agreed or strongly agreed with each statement below.

Child Development, Health, and Wellbeing Percent of Youth in Agreement (N = 33)



Parenting and Leadership Skills Percent of Youth in Agreement (N = 33)



Thank You!



**CITY OF
OAKLAND**