

Nonprofits

The Good, The Bad, The Ugly

2008-09 Civil Grand Jury of San Francisco Report

The Purpose of the Civil Grand Jury

The Civil Grand Jury is a government watchdog made up of volunteers who serve for one year. The Civil Grand Jury reports with findings and recommendations resulting from its investigations. The investigated agencies, departments or officials are required by the California Penal Code to respond publicly within at most 90 days.

The nineteen members of the Civil Grand Jury are selected at random from a pool of thirty prospective jurors. San Francisco residents are invited to apply.

More information can be found at:

http://www.sfgov.org/site/courts_page.asp?id=3680, or by contacting the Civil Grand Jury at 400 McAllister Street, Room 008, San Francisco, CA 94102

State Law Requirement

Pursuant to state law, reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify the names or provide identifying information about individuals who spoke to the Civil Grand Jury.

Departments and agencies identified in the report must respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within the number of days specified, with a copy sent to the Board of Supervisors. For each finding of the Civil Grand Jury, the response must either (1) agree with the finding, (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why. Further, as to each recommendation made by the Civil Grand Jury, the responding party must report either that (1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented; (2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for the implementation; (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a time frame for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of the report); or (4) that recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why that is. (California Penal Code, sections 933, 933.05).

Nonprofit Report

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background	1
The Procurement Process	3
Addbacks	7
Back Office Operations	11
Monitoring and Performance Measurements	13
Endnotes	20
Appendices	21

Nonprofits, The Good, The Bad, The Ugly

Executive Summary

The 2008-09 Civil Grand Jury, (the Jury) investigated the nonprofit grant making process knowing the City and County of San Francisco (the City) had directed nearly \$500 million dollars to nonprofits last year, 41% of the discretionary budget.

The Jury conducted interviews primarily with the Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Human Services (HSA), and the Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF). The Jury selected these departments because they are the largest funders of nonprofits followed by the Mayor's Office.

The Jury interviewed relevant city departments regarding the procurement process, the City Budget process and the budget process known as "Addbacks", consolidation of grants, joint monitoring of grants and the corrective action process. The Jury's investigation and recommendations serve to underline the importance of the work of previous Civil Grand Juries, the Controller's Office and various other reports, as well as the need for administrative and legislative action.

The Jury's recommendations include:

- A citywide tracking and monitoring system for grants that are awarded by all City departments should be developed using DCYF's Contract Management System (CMS) as a model.
- Nonprofits that receive money from the City should be required to disclose in writing each time they meet with the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to discuss matters that may influence allocation of funds to their agencies.
- The Board of Supervisor's role in the budget process should be submitting budget proposals and funding priorities during a department's normal budget preparation process, e.g. hearings, commissions and/or citizen advisory committee meetings rather than last-minute adjustments through the add-back process.
- The Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel should develop a monitoring and performance measurement methodology for health and human services' programs provided by nonprofits.

Background

San Francisco looks to nonprofit agencies that reach deeper into the City fabric than many government offices to provide a myriad of

services to the public. City employees do not do all City functions. The City uses nonprofits because of their program effectiveness, comprising cultural competency, expertise, and smaller budgets. Of San Francisco's discretionary budget, which is approximately \$1.2 billion, almost \$500 million is distributed to nonprofits from the City's General Fund. The City also administered state and federal grants of nearly 1.1 billion during the 2007-2008 fiscal year.

In the course of this investigation, the Jury interviewed staff at all levels, primarily with the three departments that distribute the most money to nonprofits, Dept of Public Health (DPH), Human Services Agency (HSA) and the Dept of Children Youth and their Families (DCYF). The Mayor's Office is the next largest funder of nonprofits.

The Jury chose to review the entire procurement process as to how grants and contracts are awarded to nonprofits, what sort of efficiencies are evident, whether the process is fair to all parties and whether departments are making best use of city money. The Jury reviewed the extensive process that has developed in the larger departments, over many decades of distributing federal and state grants, with layers of fair practice rules, required public input, competitive bidding and much more. We reviewed many studies and reports on the crisis faced by nonprofit organizations during tough economic times. In the course of the Jury's investigation they examined oversight and monitoring practices, as well as how the city budget process relates to funding nonprofit agencies.

Many credible studies have recently made the same recommendations that grant "programs" be consolidated and coordinated across and within departments to reduce administration costs and minimize duplicate services or expenses. The City's per capita spending on public health services is more than double the average of our surveyed peer counties (see Controller's BIP report 2009¹). Spending is triple in support services, in large part, due to the City's ability to secure grant and other federal funding. The City's per capita discretionary General Fund spending is greatest in supportive housing, homeless services, and adult and aging services, when compared with our peer counties.

Individual departments of the City government have grown into multi-million dollar enterprises, rightfully territorial of the funding sources and programs they have developed over the years, and competing between themselves for limited public funds. The City Charter defines the powers of departments and their intended independence from elected officials. The Jury found that the City was not adequately

utilizing numeric performance management techniques. How the City distributes nonprofit grants is a great example of how complicated it can be without numeric tracking of performance and monies.

The Procurement Process

Procurement is the action or process of acquiring or obtaining materiel, property, or services, for example, purchasing, contracting, and negotiating directly with the source of supply.

The procurement process begins with a Community Needs Assessments and considerable public input. Federal, State and other funding agencies require and participate in these needs assessments. Some grants are on multi-year cycles, but each year commitments need to be reconsidered as a part of the City's annual Budget process. Contracts are supposed to be in place, ready to sign in time for the July budget.

Individual City departments have contract divisions that supervise and execute the mandatory, competitive bidding requirements and ensure all the special requirements of the Municipal Code are incorporated into the Request for Proposal (RFP) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ). Department have their own special requirements and they also include provisions to ensure compliance with their source of funds.

A Request for Proposal (RFP) is a formal competitive solicitation process used by City departments to obtain proposals from potential providers¹. A RFP or Request For Qualification (RFQ) defines the goals and criteria of the grant, and solicits evidence as to the capacity of applicants and the nonprofit's proposal. Some RFPs take months to a year to prepare because Federal funding have many restrictions. Once the RFP is issued, potential applicants have a relatively short time frame to respond, so nonprofits need to know when to expect RFPs.

A panel of "experts" is assembled for each solicitation and uses a numeric ranking system in evaluating the written proposals. The experts are generally at least three people drawn from the public or professionals familiar with the RFP's service area. Experience is not always a factor; "capacity," is the primary criterion when considering a proposal. Every attempt is made for the RFP process to be fair, competitive and transparent. The Departments try to be open for innovative approaches from local and or new organizations.

The upper management of departments that solicited the RFPs ultimately makes the selection of the winning grant. Once the nonprofit agency is selected, a contract including a scope of work and deliverables is negotiated between the department and the nonprofit.

An appeals process exists but is rarely used. The Jury learned that nonprofit agencies often turn to the Board of Supervisors when their applications are not selected. Last minute lobbying by nonprofits during the annual Budget hearing process has proven to be a winning strategy to secure funding for special programs, but creates many other problems for the City (see page 7 for Addback process).

The Department assigns a Program Manager after it's signed to oversee the contract, both fiscally and programmatically for each grant. Periodic site visits are scheduled to ensure contract compliance. Agencies with compliance problems are given considerable latitude and technical assistance from the departments to correct poor performance. Many of the program officers consider the nonprofit agencies to be their clients and work to correct problems and maintain funding.

Facts

1. City government has established a broad system of collecting community input, with opportunities to provide input regarding goals and priorities for funding of local discretionary dollars.
2. Each department has its own community meetings, sets its own priorities, in line with outside funding sources. Many have their own Commissions and Citizen Advisory Committees that bring diverse perspectives.
3. The City "leverages" local money to obtain more federal and state dollars. Many grants come from outside funding sources with their own priorities that may not be in line with local goals and objectives. Most federal and state grants require matching funds from the City.
4. The Controller maintains a database of nonprofits that do business with the City. Contracts with nonprofits fall under the jurisdiction of the Office of Contract Administration, whereas grants to nonprofits are not tracked citywide.
5. Only DPH has authority to issue Sole Source Waivers from the competitive bidding requirements of the City without previous consent of the City. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors has a list by department of the number of Sole Source Contracts.

6. A contract and scope of work are negotiated with the nonprofit after it has been selected to receive a grant
7. Past experience and performance on previous grants are not always considered during the selection process.
8. DPH has a billing method based upon a Unit of Service reimbursement, while other city departments operate under Line Item Cost reimbursement of actual expenses incurred.
9. The lack of coordination and different reporting and compliance procedures for each department (even within departments) was identified as a key problem in the report of the Nonprofit Contracting Task Force (2003) because it adds time and overhead to non-profit work. Progress was later made to make fiscal compliance methods more consistent between departments.
10. The Controller expressed concern about the procurement process in the 2003 report "Sole Source Contracts", page 5.

Findings

1. There is no coordinated effort to determine overall citywide needs or strategies for distributing funds to nonprofits, other than the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds distributed through the Mayor's Office.
2. There are no formal qualifications for individuals serving on the panels that rank competitive grant proposals.
3. Unlike contracts there is no systematic tracking of grants.
4. The magnitude of money and the lack of tracking and coordination of grants provide a potential for abuse in the allocation of grants.
5. Lack of coordination and different procedures for each department within and among departments adds to time and overhead for departments and nonprofits.
6. Billing by Unit of Service could allow budgeted costs, which were not actually spent, to be included in the invoice charged to the City, because the invoice is based on number of clients served (at agreed estimate of cost) not by the actual cost of serving those clients.

7. Sole Source Waivers issued are tracked by number of waivers issued to a department and not to whom the waivers were given or for what purpose.

Recommendations

1. The Mayor's Office of Budget and Policy should develop and coordinate a strategy for utilizing nonprofit services.
2. Each RFP should specify the qualifications for panel members selected to rank the proposals.
3. The Office of Contract Administration (OCA) should develop a tracking system for grants.
4. The Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel should develop with each Department a uniform set of procedures for nonprofit grant administration.
5. Departments should use Cost of Reimbursement instead of Units of Service as the method of payment in every RFP.
6. A database of sole source waivers including all cost should be maintained under the oversight of the OCA.

The Procurement Process

Findings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Board Of Supervisors				90 days			90 days
DPH	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
HSA	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
DCYF	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days

Recommendations	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mayor's Office	60 days					
DPH		60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
HSA		60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
DCYF		60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days

Addbacks

As part of the City's annual budget process, the Board of Supervisor's Budget Analyst recommends to the Board line-item cuts that could be made in various departments. Near the end of the budget process, the Board has the opportunity to add back to the budget the amount that has been cut. These additions have become known as "Addbacks".

In order to better understand the Jury's evaluation of the process of the Budget:

- The Mayor issues instructions to the departments for their budgets.
- The departments, after having decided on priorities and evaluating non-profits that best meet objectives, write a budget.
- The Controller unifies the departmental budgets.
- The Mayor makes changes.
- The BOS assesses cuts and, in response to political maneuvering, ignores the competitive process for non-profits and essentially orders sole-source contracts with the favored non-profits.

During this process and under the direction of the Board of Supervisors, the Budget and Legislative Analysts perform research and analysis on behalf of the Supervisors. While the hearings are underway the Board of Supervisors can and does amend the budget. These amendments are called Addbacks.

Supervisors have been able to restore funding which may have been cut, or add new funding to programs favored by the Supervisors by reallocating money from one budget category to another. This Addback process does not increase or decrease the overall dollar

amount of the budget. Before the July 1st deadline of the new budget year, the Board of Supervisors, concluding a seven-month process, approves the finalized budget.

In the City's 2007-08 budget, approximately \$42 Million was added back to the budget for nonprofit organizations. These Addbacks frequently occur due to intense last minute lobbying by the nonprofit or its clients that reside within a supervisor's district, without regard to the departmental Request for Proposal (RFP) process. The Supervisors are overriding a decision made by the City Department in the course of normal business with no recourse for that department. The potential risk is that a nonprofit is included in the budget because it used its political clout even though it has not been effective, dropped for poor performance, does not meet the department's greatest needs or another nonprofit was deemed more able to meet the grantors criteria. This sentiment was echoed by many of the individuals interviewed and in several reports. In fact the only positive feedback regarding Addbacks came from the nonprofit agencies that are beneficiaries of the monies that go directly to them.

Although the San Francisco Charter prohibits the Board from prescribing or making suggestions regarding any City contract, the Board sometimes specifies organizations to receive City funds when money saved through line-item cuts is added back into the budget. The City has a contracting system that relies on and gives much responsibility to departments to select and monitor contractors. Each department has contracting officers that make front-line decisions about the competitive solicitation process, and the selection of contracts to meet the department's specific needs. This level of contracting responsibility rightly belongs with City departments, not the Board.

When the BOS targets Addback funds for specific organizations, it circumvents the City's normal competitive solicitation process and the City loses the benefits that such process provides. The City Attorney's opinion states that, under Charter Section 2.114, the BOS may not direct or compel a City officer or department to contract with a particular person or organization as a part or condition of an Addback, but the Board may appropriate Addbacks to the various departments for general purposes or for specific programs. The BOS does this by not naming the nonprofit but by specifying a program at particular location or by providing a particular service. Further, if the Board identifies a particular contractor in an Addback, a department may not use this as an excuse not to allow other contractors to compete for a

contract where the law otherwise requires a competitive process. The City Attorney affirmed that violations of the Charter's non-interference provisions might constitute official misconduct. Although we now know that the Board's distribution of targeted Addbacks to specific organizations violates the Charter, this has been a long-standing practice in the City's budget process.

During the Jury investigation several department heads and city officials stated that the targeted Addback process has increased and become a problem since district elections were again instituted in 2000. With district elections, members of the Board of Supervisors are more susceptible to political pressure from specific district voting blocks that may not represent citywide interests. The nonprofits that provide services to local communities are able to marshal constituents to lobby a Supervisor of their district without regard to the impact such lobbying could have on citywide needs. And, since Board members most often wish to be re-elected or have higher political aspirations, they respond to the pressure by adding money to the budget targeting a particular program or nonprofit. All of this is done, not by naming a specific nonprofit or contract, which is not permitted under the City Charter, but by increasing the money to the department with an informal understanding of where the additional monies should be spent.

The Community Budget Reform Council (CBRC), among others, in their draft report dated 2/26/09, recommends that before funding for a nonprofit is added back to the budget, it should go through a formal review process by the relevant department. The Jury does not agree with this approach because of the cumbersome process of approving grants. The Jury agrees with the Draft Recommendations of the Budget Reform Council dated February 6th 2009, section I.1.a which recommends to "Shift the focus from a one-month cut and addback role in June to a four month collaborative role driven by values, public input and long term-policy goals". The Addback Process delays, thwarts or stops the Budget Process. In addition, the departmental review process initiated by Addbacks can take months to complete and can sometimes cost more than the grant itself in administrative expenses.

Facts

1. Targeted Addbacks continue to be part of and contribute to the delay of the budget process.
2. Targeted Addbacks violate City Charter rules.

3. Targeted Addbacks circumvent the selection of nonprofits by City Departments.
4. Targeted Addbacks bypass competitive bidding.
5. Targeted Addbacks do not allow weeding out poor performing nonprofits.

Findings

8. Targeted Addbacks to the city budget are taking place, even though they are against Procurement Rules: City Charter (2.114. Non Interference in Administration)
9. Targeted Addbacks are often a result of lobbying by special interest groups.
10. Targeted Addbacks circumvent the contract process established by the city departments.
11. Targeted Addbacks negate the expertise of the city departments.
12. Targeted Addbacks do not follow the budget amendment process established by the City Charter and circumvent the regular competitive solicitation processes that City departments must follow, sometimes causing departments enter sole source contracts.
13. Targeted Addbacks impede the ability of city departments to hold nonprofit contractors accountable for poor performance. (Partnering with Nonprofits in Tough Times: Recommendations from SF Community Based Task Force, April 2009)
14. The Board of Supervisors has violated the Charter by making direct contracting decisions through targeted Addbacks. Through this procedure, the Board of Supervisors has continued the longstanding practice of allocating some City funds directly to specific contractors.

Recommendations

7. The practice of targeted Addbacks should be stopped.
8. The City Charter (2.114. Non-Interference in Administration) should be enforced to prevent district supervisors from directing funds to specific nonprofits through circuitous means. (For example, naming a street where a nonprofit exists or specifying a service offered only by a specific nonprofit).
9. The Supervisors can have a greater role, in the process, by submitting budget proposals and funding priorities during a department's normal budget preparation process, e.g. hearings, commissions and/or citizen advisory committee meetings rather

than last-minute adjustments through the targeted add-back process.

10. To comply with the San Francisco Charter and encourage the use of competitive processes, and to strengthen the requirements for the content of City contracts, the Board of Supervisors should no longer direct funds toward specific City contracts or contractors through the targeted addback process or otherwise.

Addbacks

Findings	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Board Of Supervisors	90 days	90 days		90 days	90 days	90 days	90 days
DPH			60 days	60 days		60 days	
HSA			60 days	60 days		60 days	
DCYF			60 days	60 days		60 days	

Recommendations	7	8	9	10
Board Of Supervisors	90 days	90 days	90 days	90 days
DPH			60 days	
HSA			60 days	
DCYF			60 days	

Back Office Operations

Back office operations refer to any non-program functions performed by the nonprofit, such as payroll, accounting and purchasing.

Nonprofit grants may require all or some of these non-program functions. The size of the grant and the number of functions may require only a part-time staff position at each nonprofit, some large and small.

If back office operations of nonprofits were consolidated by centralizing payroll, purchasing and accounting for nonprofits, assuming administrative costs of 10% of the present \$487M in grants to nonprofits there would be a significant saving to the City.

Fact

1. Interviews with a variety of city officials by the Civil Grand Jury and the report "Partnering with Nonprofits in Tough Times"¹ published in April 2009 by the Mayor's Community Based Organizations Task Force support the idea of the consolidation of back-office operations.

Finding

15. Consolidation of backroom operations would save the City money.

Recommendation

11. A Consolidated Backroom Unit should be set up with the Office of Contract Administration (OCA) to provide back-office operations for nonprofits.

Back Office Operations

Findings	15
DPH	60 days
HSA	60 days
DCYF	60 days

Recommendations	11
DPH	60 days
HSA	60 days
DCYF	60 days

Monitoring and Performance Measurement

The Jury investigated the monitoring and performance measurement of nonprofits, both fiscally and programmatically. It is crucial that city residents' taxes and fees are being spent both efficiently (fiscally sound) and effectively (programmatically meeting service goals).

Fiscal Monitoring

The Jury chronology of fiscal monitoring began with a report by the 2000-2001 Civil Grand Jury. It found that the contract systems at the time were too decentralized and placed heavy administrative burdens on nonprofit organizations, often to the detriment of services to the City's residents.¹ In October 2001, the City Nonprofit Contracting Task Force was created by the Board of Supervisors in response to the request by the SF Human Services Network, a coalition of health and human services nonprofits serving the City, to address the issues raised in the 2000-01 report.

In September 2002, the Task Force submitted its report to the Board of Supervisors. Its recommendations focused on improving contracting procedures for nonprofit human and health services. The Board of Supervisors approved the Task Force's recommendation that it be extended until June 30, 2003 to provide time to develop an implementation plan for the recommendations.

The following are two of the Task Force's recommendations (See Appendix A) and the ensuing results:

- To create a review/appellate process to implement and oversee substantive changes in standardized requirements.
 - The Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel consisting of City departments and representatives from nonprofit organizations was created to oversee the implementation of the Task Force milestones.
 - By November 2006, 29 out of 41 established milestones were completed with 8 in process (See Appendix A).
- To consolidate contracts, where appropriate, across or within departments.
 - The Interdepartmental Working Group consisting of representatives from the DPHP, HSA, DCYF and the Mayor's Office of Community Development drafted best practices for the consolidation of grant agreements both internally and across departments. Their best practices

recommendations were submitted to the Review/Appellate Panel.

- In September 2007 a letter (See Appendix B) was issued to other non-participating City departments urging implementation of these procedures; to do fiscal monitoring of programs jointly when a nonprofit is receiving grants from more than one City department. Such action has been a good start toward needed reform in contracts with nonprofits.
- There appears to be a spotty response to this recommendation for consolidation according to those city department and nonprofit staff interviewed by the Jury.

Many of the City department staff who were interviewed spoke highly of DCYF's computer-based Contract Management System (CMS) and stated that, when joint monitoring is needed for a nonprofit also receiving funds from DCFY, they rely on the CMS.

In addition to questions related to grant goals and objectives, the monthly CMS report tracks the following fiscal information: payment of staff, line item expenses, year to date expenses and the balance on line items (See Appendix C) This system enables DCYF to monitor fiscal matters on a monthly basis and to identify problems early and as they develop in the management of the funds related to the grants.

Facts

1. The Board of Supervisors responded positively to the recommendations of the 2000-2001 Civil Grand Jury by establishing the City Nonprofit Task Force.
2. The City Nonprofit Task Force's recommendations were accepted by the Board of Supervisors with the establishment of the Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel.
3. Seventy percent of milestones of the Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel were completed and 19.5% were in progress by November 2006.
4. Documentation of contract consolidation among departments is not apparent.
5. Joint monitoring by the Controller's Office is limited to the fiscal portion of the grant and compliance monitoring.

6. Multiple nonprofits receive multiple grants or contracts with and among multiple City departments. (See Appendix D)
7. In response to the Nonprofit Contracting Task Force recommendation a letter from the Mayor was sent to departments not participating in joint monitoring recommending they comply with the findings.
8. Program managers using the web interface of DCYF's CMS system can identify fiscal problems on a monthly basis.

Findings

16. The monitoring/oversight of the fiscal component of contract/grants between the City departments and nonprofits has improved since the 2000-01 recommendations identified the problems.
17. The City Nonprofit Task Force focused on the fiscal monitoring of the contracts/grants between the City departments and nonprofits. Joint monitoring of nonprofits in fiscal matters is efficient for both the City departments and the nonprofits in that staff time utilized is reduced.
18. The Office of Contract Administration does not track grants made to nonprofit organization.
19. DCYF's CMS is admired by other departments and could be incorporated into their monitoring of nonprofits.

Recommendations

12. The Office of Contract Administration should be given the task of tracking the compliance rate on nonprofit grant consolidation across all City departments.
13. The Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel should be given the directive to study the compliance rate on joint monitoring within and among all City departments and to make recommendations to bring compliance to 100%.
14. The City should develop a comprehensive software system (modeled on DCYF's CMS) that can monitor and track all grants and contracts citywide. At a minimum, the system should contain three functions: fiscal tracking, program tracking and

performance metric tracking. Fiscal tracking and program tracking should be administered by departments but accessible citywide. Metric tracking should be the function of the Mayor's Office.

Program Monitoring

*"For most stakeholders in the nonprofit sector, measuring performance is elusive. ...there is increasing pressure on nonprofits to account for and improve results."*²

Much attention has been given by the City to fiscal management since the 2000-01 Civil Grand Jury Report. The current Jury decided it was as important to investigate what monitoring and evaluation (performance measurement) were being done on the service goals and objectives of each grant given out by the City departments to nonprofit organizations. If money is being given out for human and health services, taxpayers, as well as recipients of the services, should be able to evaluate whether the monies are being spent on effective programs.

DCYF again appears to be the City department that is most effective in monitoring the programs on which it is spending monies. The Contract Management System (CMS), which is completed monthly by each nonprofit, tracks the following items: activities that took place, any organizational changes, progress related to communication, strategies and accessibility goals and the number of "clients" served and their demographics (Appendix C).

In addition, DCYF has each nonprofit complete a yearly self assessment "Minimum Program Compliance Standards." The Out-of-School Time Minimum Program Compliance Standards describe what DCYF wants children, youth and families to experience in a program: safety, relationship building, youth participation, community involvement, skill building and special needs inclusion with 8 standards and 16 indicators. All nonprofits evaluate themselves in how each indicator is met by their programs. In addition, they can add how they are meeting a standard that is not captured by an indicator (Appendix E). Five sets of minimum standards were developed through partnership with an advisory group of funded agencies. Agencies represented five groups of nonprofits within clusters of nonprofits providing early childhood education, family support, health and wellness, youth workforce development and out of school time. Once nonprofits submit their self-assessment, their responses are reviewed

by their Program Officer, discussed at a site visit, and if, necessary, a plan is created to meet the standards not achieved.

These two monitoring and evaluation systems, CMS and Minimum Program Compliance Standards, produce the greater likelihood that comparing nonprofits can take place. The Department of Public Health Community Behavioral Health Services has the Community Program Corrective Action Policy and Procedure which is triggered when a nonprofit's standardized monitoring scores are lower than three in any monitoring category. (This process is done for nonprofit issues that are not related to the Controller's Citywide Fiscal and Compliance Monitoring.) The tracking report covers governance and operations, both fiscally and programmatically. It does not contain standards by which all nonprofits providing similar services are evaluated. The report is created by first identifying the problem areas of a specific nonprofit.

The Urban Institute and The Center for What Works jointly issued a paper in December 2006, "The Nonprofit Taxonomy of Outcomes: Creating a Common Language for the Sector". It provides a resource for identifying quality indicators to assist nonprofits in developing outcome indicators and collecting outcome data.³

Basic criteria for quality indicators were identified as:

- Specific: unique, unambiguous
- Observable: achievable, practical, cost effective to collect, measurable
- Understandable: comprehensible
- Relevant: measure important dimension, valid, appropriate, related to program, of significance, predictive, timely
- Time bound
- Reliable: accurate, unbiased, consistent, verifiable

Too often quality indicators measure information (proxy) but not behavior change (outcome). " For example, while tracking the extent to which avoidance of a certain kind of behavior has occurred can be difficult, a client can be tested about the client's level of knowledge about why someone should avoid that behavior. However, the degree to which increased knowledge leads to the desired change in behavior needs to be known before this increased knowledge can be deemed a "good" indicator of the desired change in behavior. Without documentation that when knowledge increases, a behavioral change follows, a proxy may not be a useful and appropriate indicator of the outcome."⁴

Following the department's collection of outcomes and indicators for 14 different program areas, ranging from adult education and family literacy to prisoner re-entry, the taxonomy was developed⁵. The Jury read the Office of Controller's report *City Performance Measurement System* that identifies performance measures that each City department develops each year to evaluate its own performance. The report found that not one of the departments distributing grants to nonprofits was measuring its own performance in relationship to nonprofits.

Facts

1. DCYF has CMS that permits monitoring of nonprofit activities on a monthly basis, tracking progress towards goals and objectives.
2. DCYF has developed the Minimum Program Compliance Standards that enables it to evaluate nonprofits using common indicators.
3. Program monitoring and performance measurement is being done in other City departments.
4. No monitoring and performance measurement systems are in use citywide.
5. A taxonomy system has been developed to monitor and evaluate nonprofits.

Findings

20. There are few performance measurement systems being used by City departments to monitor and evaluate nonprofits' goals and objectives.
21. DCYF has a system that tracks program goals and objectives on a monthly basis.
22. Systems have been developed that enable nonprofit performance to be evaluated using common outcome indicators.

Recommendations

15. The Board of Supervisors should give the Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel responsibility for developing a monitoring and performance measurement system based on a

taxonomy of nonprofit outcomes for human and health services' programs provided by nonprofits and their indicators as developed by the Urban Institute/The Center for What Works or a similar system.

16. The City should develop a comprehensive software system (modeled on DCYF's CMS) that can monitor and track all grants and contracts citywide. At a minimum, the system should contain three functions: fiscal tracking, program tracking and performance metric tracking. Fiscal tracking and program tracking should be administered by departments but accessible citywide. Metric tracking should be a function of the Office of the Mayor.

Monitoring and Performance Measurement

Finding	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Controller's Office		60 days					
Mayor's Office							60 days
Office Contract Adm.			60 days				
DPH	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
HSA	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
DCYF	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days

Recommendations	12	13	14	15	16
Mayor's Office			60 days		60 days
Office of Contract Adm.	60 days				
Board Of Supervisors		90 days		90 days	
DPH	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
HSA	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days
DCYF	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days

Endnotes

Background

1. Office of the Controller, "Budget Improvement Project Report", March, 2009: http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/controller/BIP_Report_3-16-09_FINAL.pdf

Procurement Process

1. A Request for Proposal (RFP) is a formal competitive solicitation process used by City departments to obtain proposals from potential vendors or providers of needed services and to make a selection of a provider. Once the service provider is selected a contact price and Scope of Work is negotiated. The RFP or RFQ defines and outlines the goals and criteria of the grant and solicits evidence as to the capacity of applicants and the proposals themselves.

Addbacks

1. Office of the Controller, Sole Source Contracts, April 2003

Back Office Operations

1. Community Based Organizations Task Force, "Partnering with Nonprofits in Tough Times", April 2009
http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/mayor/PolicyFinance/CBO_Task_Force_Report.pdf

Monitoring and Performance Measurement

1. 2000-01 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury Report, "Nonprofit Contracting", http://www.sfgov.org/site/courts_page.asp?id=3726
2. "Building a Common Outcome Framework To Measure Nonprofit Performance": <http://www.urban.org/publications/411404.html>
3. "The Nonprofit Taxonomy of Outcomes: Creating a Common Language for the Sector":
http://www.urban.org/center/met/projects/upload/taxonomy_of_outcomes.pdf
4. See Endnote 2
5. See Endnote 3

Appendix A

Attachment A
11/03/06

MILESTONES FOR CITY NONPROFIT CONTRACTING TASK FORCE'S
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **CONSOLIDATE CONTRACTS, WHERE APPROPRIATE, ACROSS OR WITHIN DEPARTMENTS (CONSOLIDATE CONTRACTS)**

Milestone: May 2006

- ✓ • HSA/Aging, DPH, DCYF, MOCD ("Interdepartmental Working Group") will report on the number of contracts consolidated to date within department and across departments. **(Completed)**
- ✓ • Identify additional consolidations that are appropriate. **(This item is separated from the above bullet point for this report.) (In Process)**
- ✓ **Milestone: Summer 2006 (Completed)**
 - DPH will provide separate timelines report for consolidation within department, and across divisions.
- ✓ **Milestone: TBD by Interdepartmental Working Group (Completed)**
 - Interdepartmental Working Group will begin meeting to evaluate departments' procedures to consolidate contracts and begin to draft a best practice model.
- ✓ **Milestone: September 2006 (In Process)**
 - The Review/Appellate Panel will evaluate draft best practice model and consider nonprofit feedback.
- ✓ **Milestone: April 2006 (In Process)**
 - Mayor's Office and OCA will send letter to nonprofit contracting departments that did not participate in the City Nonprofit Contracting Task Force, notifying these departments of the efforts to streamline the contracting process and encouraging them to adopt recommendations put forth by the Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel. These departments include Sheriff, Juvenile Probation, Mayor's Criminal Justice Council, Mayor's Office of Housing, Department on the Status of Women,
- ✓ • OCA will send e-mail to nonprofits requesting nonprofits to (1) provide view point on City's efforts to consolidate contracts across and within departments, (2) give specific examples of late certification, (3) give specific examples of unnecessary requirements, and (4) give examples of what the City is doing right to streamline the contracting process. **(Completed)**
- ✓ **Milestone: Fall 2006 (Completed)**
 - HSN will review with contractors and report back to the Review/Appellate Panel on evaluation of progress for the next report to the Board of Supervisors.

2. DEVELOP METHODS TO STREAMLINE CONTRACT APPROVALS AND INCREASE AUTOMATION (STREAMLINE CONTRACT APPROVALS)

✓ Milestone: February 2006 (Completed)

- OCA will widely distribute an e-mail update to nonprofits and City's contracting staff regarding the use of DPH's contracts online system (COOL) as a central data repository for shared nonprofit related documents. Only DPH, DCYF, HSA and Controller's Office staff have access to this system at this time. A standard list of compliance documents and monitoring documents will be posted for shared use among departments for their nonprofit contractors. Additionally, the City's Risk Manager established guidelines and procedures to allow non-profits to obtain a blanket insurance certificate from the non-profits insurance underwriter to indemnify the City and County of San Francisco as additionally insured.
- ✓ • DTIS and OCA will present a cost/benefits analysis exploring the options for providing an enterprise-wide contract management system and/or contract development system, similar in concept to the DPH's COOL System. **(In Process)**

Milestone: February/March 2006 (Completed)

- ✓ • DTIS and OCA will present a budget proposal to Mayor's Office and Board of Supervisors for a citywide central data repository. The next milestone will depend on the political process. **(Completed)**
- OCA will develop additional milestones after the FY 06-07 budget process. **(This item is separated from the above bullet point for this report.)**

✓ Milestone: April 2006 (Completed)

- Controller will revise existing policies and procedures for electronic signatures to permit online submissions and approvals of required documents.

✓ Milestone: June 2006 (Completed)

- DPH/HSA will facilitate refresher training for City staff regarding COOL's central data repository functions, and OCA will send an e-mail reminder to all nonprofit contractors to submit information electronically.

✓ Milestone: Summer 2006 (Completed)

- Controller will explore the feasibility of electronic fund transfers to facilitate payments directly to contractors' bank accounts.

✓ Milestone: To Be Determined (Completed)

- The Controller's Office will facilitate a training of health and human service contracting staff regarding new and existing insurance procedures.
- Individual departments will develop their own systems for on-line submissions and approvals.

✓ Milestone: Fall, 2006 (Completed)

- HSN will review with contractors and report back to the Review/Appellate Panel on evaluation of progress for the next report to the Board of Supervisors.

3. DEVELOP AND PROCESS CONTRACT DOCUMENTS EARLY IN THE CYCLE TO ASSURE TIMELY PAYMENT (TIMELY PAYMENT)

Milestone: May 2006

- ✓ • Nonprofits and HSN will submit Review/Appellate Panel documented examples of late certification and late payments by City departments. **(Completed)**

- The Review/Appellate Panel will begin to invite other City administrative/regulatory agencies (HRC, Risk Management, Civil Service Commission, etc.) to develop policies to streamline and facilitate timely contract certification or create exceptions for human services providers.
- ✓ • The Review/Appellate Panel will convene a working group to review nonprofit reports and samples of nonprofit contracts to identify problems with late certification and payment. **(Completed)**

Milestone: Fall 2006 (In Process)

- The Review/Appellate Panel will review recommendations and procedures to streamline contracts certification payments.

4. CREATE A REVIEW/APPELLATE PROCESS TO IMPLEMENT AND OVERSEE SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO STANDARDIZATION (REVIEW/APPELLATE PROCESS)

✓ **Completed in January 2005: (Completed)**

- OCA created the Review/Appellate Panel with City and nonprofit representation in January 2005. In its oversight role, the Panel has made a tremendous difference in ensuring that City departments continue to move forward with implementation and to communicate across departments to share ideas and standardize processes. This task has been completed and is ongoing, with some departments responding quickly and some not.

✓ **Completed in Summer 2005: (Completed)**

- Health and human services departments completed draft formal grievance procedures.

✓ **Milestone: April 2006 (Completed)**

- HSN will review health and human services draft formal grievance procedures.
- The Review/Appellate Panel will review all drafts and proposals for a formal grievance procedure.
- The Review/Appellate Panel will approve model grievance procedures.

✓ **Milestone: May 2006 (Completed)**

- OCA will work with City Attorney to determine appropriate place for model grievance procedure. Upon determining the final procedures, OCA will post the document on the Intranet web site at <http://intranet/> under Forms Center, with a strong recommendation that all departments use the model grievance procedures.

✓ **Milestone: June 2006 (Completed)**

- OCA will e-mail update on new grievance procedures to nonprofits.

✓ **Milestone: Fall, 2006 (Completed)**

- HSN will review with contractors and report back to the Review/Appellate Panel on evaluation of progress for the next report to the Board of Supervisors.

5. ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED ON CONTRACTORS (ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY REQUIREMENTS)

✓ **Milestone: March 2006 (Completed)**

- Departments will report to Review/Appellate Panel its plan to meet with contractors to discuss and identify requirements that may be unnecessary. This will occur upon contract renewal.

✓ **Milestone: April 2006 (Completed)**

- OCA will send e-mail to nonprofits requesting nonprofits to (1) provide view point on City's efforts to consolidate contracts across and within departments, (2) give specific examples of late certification, (3) give specific examples of unnecessary requirements, and (4) give examples of what the City is doing right to streamline the contracting process.

Milestone: Spring 2006

- Mayor will send letter to nonprofit contracting Commissions requesting that they assist the Task Force objective to eliminate unnecessary requirements imposed on contractors.

✓ **Milestone: Summer 2006 (Completed)**

- Departments will develop and submit a plan to the Review/Appellate Panel to eliminate requirements that may be unnecessary.

✓ **Milestone: Fall 2006 (Completed)**

- HSN will review with contractors and report back to the Review/Appellate Panel on evaluation of progress for the next report to the Board of Supervisors.

26
6. **DEVELOP METHODS TO FACILITATE ELECTRONIC PROCESSING OF CONTRACTS AND PAYMENTS (ELECTRONIC PROCESSING)**

- The tasks and milestones for achieving Recommendation #6 is the same for Recommendation #2.

7. **CREATE STANDARDIZED AND SIMPLIFIED CONTRACT FORMS (STANDARDIZED AND SIMPLIFIED FORMS)**

✓ **Milestone: TBD by Interdepartmental Working Group (In Process)**

- Interdepartmental Working Group will meet to begin evaluating standardized forms (scope of work, budget, invoice, monitoring reports), and begin drafting best practice models to be distributed to other City departments and posted on OCA's website.
- The Interdepartmental Working Group will develop contract format and forms for outcome driven services that define: (1) language and service definitions; (2) monitoring protocols; and (3) reporting requirements (recommendation #10).

✓ **Milestone: Fall 2006 (In Process)**

- The Review/Appellate Panel will review the progress of implementing standardized forms (or development of alternative standardized forms) by other City departments.

✓ **Milestone: September 2006 (In Process)**

- The Review/Appellate Panel will evaluate draft best practice model and consider nonprofit feedback. (Done, but need NP feedback.)

✓ **Milestone: To Be Determined: (In Process)**

- The Interdepartmental Working Group will develop form for contractors to provide feedback on definitions and monitoring of outcome driven services (recommendation #10).

✓ 8. **ESTABLISH ACCOUNTING STANDARDS FOR NONPROFITS CONTRACTORS (ACCOUNTING STANDARDS) - Completed**

The Controller's Office has published and disseminated a *Finance Guide for Nonprofits*

in November of 2004 and provided two training sessions on the *Finance Guide* for approximately 70 nonprofit contractors in April 2005. In June of 2005, the Controller's Office coordinated another training session on cost allocation procedures, which was attended by over 100 nonprofits. As a follow up to this training, and to further clarify the City's expectations regarding cost allocation practices, the Controller's Office has developed written cost allocation guidelines for nonprofits contracting with the City. The *Cost Allocation Guidelines*, the *Finance Guide* and all related materials from these trainings are available online at www.sfgov.com/controller (see *Resources for Nonprofits*).

9. COORDINATE JOINT PROGRAM MONITORING (JOINT PROGRAM MONITORING)

✓ Completed in September 2005 (Completed)

- Since September 2005, the Controller's Office has been facilitating monthly working group meetings with representatives from DCYF, DPH and HSA to discuss monitoring results and refine standard monitoring procedures. This process is ongoing.

Milestone: June 2006

- ✓ • Sixty-seven organizations with multiple contracts across DCYF, DPH and HSA will undergo a standard fiscal and compliance monitoring by June 30, 2006. (Completed)
- A similar or greater number of contractors will experience this standard monitoring in FY 06-07 with expanded participation from other City departments who were not participating in the efforts this fiscal year. (This item is separated from the above bullet point for this report.)

Milestone: FY 06-07

- ✓ • The Controller's Office will transition the leadership/facilitation of the monthly working group meetings to the departments during FY 06-07. (In Process)
- ✓ • HSN will assist to provide feedback to the Review/Appellate Panel from the contractors' perspective, on the experience and efficacy of the shared monitoring process. (Completed)
- ✓ • Coordinated monitoring will be further enhanced by a shared master calendar and shared access to monitoring forms and reports on COOL. (Completed and On-going)
- ✓ • Departments will provide timely written notice of at least 14 days prior to the monitoring visit date as well as a timely written report back on the results of the monitoring visit back to the contractor within 30 days, if possible, but not beyond 90 days. If the program report is not completed within 30 days, then the department conducting the monitoring will issue a notice indicating that the program report was not completed as scheduled. (Completed, developed new timelines and procedures)

10. DEVELOP STANDARD MONITORING PROTOCOLS, LANGUAGE AND DEFINITIONS TO CLEARLY DEFINE CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS (STANDARD MONITORING PROTOCOLS)

✓ **Milestone: FY 06-07 (In Process)**

- Upon renewal, each contract will be revised to include clear language and service definitions, clearly defined monitoring protocols (specifically what will be monitored and when), and clearly specified reporting requirements.

The above will be contained in the scope of services document and will be mutually agreed upon by both the funding agency and the service provider. During the period following the renewal (fiscal year) the above revisions will be analyzed to develop outcome driven services to be implemented in subsequent renewals or RFPs. The lengthy service objectives narratives currently contained in many scopes of services shall be streamlined to contain the mutually agreed upon outcomes and methodology for measuring progress towards meeting those outcomes.

Protocols for standard fiscal & compliance monitoring were completed and are being used with multi-departmental contractors in FY 05-06; ongoing efforts are focused on program monitoring protocols.

The contract renewal/negotiation process should allow departments and contractors to determine what will be monitored and how. Departments should focus monitoring on what is specifically agreed to in the contract, and will adopt findings of Federal or State monitoring, when appropriate.

11. PROVIDE TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL WHO MONITOR CONTRACTS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF PROGRAMS, SERVICES AND MUTUALLY AGREED UPON PROTOCOLS (TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL)

✓ **Milestone: June 2006 (Completed)**

- The Controller's Office, in collaboration with the monitoring working group, will conduct a year-end survey of the 67 multi-departmental contractors to get their feedback on their fiscal, compliance and program monitoring experience in FY 05-06. Findings from this survey will inform future trainings for City staff and/or contractors.

✓ **Milestone: FY 06-07 (In Process)**

- Upon implementation of recommendation #10 (standard monitoring protocols) and results from surveys, Agency staff that perform monitoring activities will be instructed and trained at the department level during the first quarter of FY 06-07 to insure understanding of monitoring roles under the revised scopes of services.

Milestone: To Be Determined

- Departments will adopt Controller's year-end survey of 67 multi-departmental contractors on the three areas of monitoring (Fiscal, Compliance, and Program) to solicit similar feedback from their other contractors, to ensure that their staff has adequate knowledge of the programs they monitor.

12. CONDUCT TIERED ASSESSMENTS OF PROGRAMS TO EFFICIENTLY EVALUATE PROGRAM PERFORMANCE (TIERED ASSESSMENTS)

✓ Milestone: June 2006 (Completed)

- Before June 30, 2006, each department will adopt the Controller's Office Risk Assessment Policy and format procedure for each jointly monitored contract and all other contracts that are applicable. Each fiscal year during the first quarter (July through September) the risk assessments for each department's contracted services will be performed and the monitoring schedules will be established as a result of the risk assessments. These criteria will be shared with contractors to facilitate ongoing dialogue between the City and nonprofits.

Service providers with no findings from the prior year's monitoring will be relieved of subsequent monitoring of a period of 1-2 years, or may be subject to a self-monitoring report.

This does not apply where State, Federal or other funding sources require more frequent monitoring.

At a minimum, all contractors will receive at least one physical site visit every three years.. Contractor may request justification of risk assessments and subsequent scheduled monitoring at any time.

Departments will continue to identify opportunities and resources for technical assistance for contractors. The Controller's Office coordinated several trainings in FY 04-05 (Finance Guide, Cost Allocation Procedures), and also maintains a *Resources for Nonprofits* link on its website. DCYF and MOCD also contract with Compass Point Nonprofit Services to provide further technical assistance to contractors.

13. COST OF LIVING INCREASES

In 2005, the Mayor approved a 2% cost of doing business increase for general fund contractors. Any future COLA's is a policy decision for the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

Appendix B



September 26, 2007

Dear Department Heads:

As you may be aware, the Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel comprised of City departments and nonprofit representatives, and led by the Office of Contract Administration (OCA), is overseeing the implementation of contract streamlining in the City departments. Specifically, this Panel is helping to implement the City Nonprofit Contracting Task Force's recommendations adopted by the Board of Supervisors in February 2004. The City, in collaboration with the nonprofits, has made tremendous progress in ensuring that City departments continue to move forward with the implementation and communicate across departments to share ideas and standardize processes.

The City's largest health and human services nonprofit contracting departments (HSA, DPH, DCYF, and MOCD) have been involved with the process to date. However, other relevant department have not yet been included in the process to streamline the City's contracting process. In an effort to be inclusive and foster cooperation across departmental boundaries, I am asking that your department learn what the City has done to achieve the Task Force's objectives and to apply the recommendations to your department's contracting policies.

I am requesting that your department become informed about the original Task Force's report of thirteen recommendations (dated June 26, 2003) and the progress reports of the Nonprofit Review/Appellate Panel (dated April 6, 2005) and (October 20, 2005). On September 1, 2006, the Panel issued the Dispute Resolution Procedure, which is attached. Please adopt the recommendations put forth by the Panel that are applicable to your department and include the Dispute Resolution Procedure in your health and human services contracts. The reports, recommendations, and the Dispute Resolution Procedure can be found on OCA/Purchasing's website at www.sfgov.org/oca (under Nonprofit Contracting Task Force).

A meeting will be held with members of the Panel to provide an overview of the recommendations of the Review/Appellate Panel. I ask that your department be represented, through your attendance or a representative.

Date: Monday, October 22
Time: 2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Location: City Hall, Room 421

Should you have questions about the Task Force's recommendations or the Panel's adopted policies, please contact Naomi Kelly, Director of the Office of Contract Administration, at (415) 554-7738.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gavin Newsom", written over a horizontal line.

Gavin Newsom

Appendix C

at&t

CMS tracking information

Wednesday, June 10, 2009 9:19 AM

OST Pre-Assessment Forms.doc (177KB)

DCYF uses the Contract Management System to track the following items:

Narrative:

- 1. Activities that happened during the month
- 2. Organizational changes, board issues, staffing and challenges

Goals:

- 1. Program communicates with parents/caregivers on a regular basis and offers opportunities for them to participate in the program
- 2. Program has strategies to provide information about other resources to participants, parents and caregivers
- 3. Agency makes program accessible to potential participants and their families

Units:

- 1. How many youth were served this month
- 2. How many youth were served to date

Demographics

What were the demographics of the participants by age, ethnicity and zip code

Fiscal:

Which staff members were paid from the DCYF contract. How much?

All of the line item expenses paid out during the month (personnel, fringe, professional, materials and supplies, other program costs and admin costs)

Year to date expenses

Balance of the line items

I'm also attaching a copy of our minimum standards assessment document. Each agency received an assessment this fiscal year.

If you have other questions, please let me know.

Thanks.

[Redacted]
 [Redacted]
 Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
 1390 Market Street, Ste 900
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 [Redacted]

Appendix D

VENDOR NAME	NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING GRANTS	TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS PROVIDED TO VENDORS
FRED PRYOR SEMINARS/CAREERTRACK	17	19
MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS	15	18
THE SAN FRANCISCO LGBT COMMUNITY CENTER	15	19
AMERICAN RED CROSS BAY AREA CHAPTER	14	21
BERNAL HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER	14	16
LIGHTHOUSE FOR THE BLIND & VISUALLY IMPA	13	19
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY	13	19
SKILLPATH SEMINARS/COMPUMASTER	13	16
COMMUNITY INITIATIVES	12	13
SPUR	11	16
CHINATOWN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CENTER	10	13
DELANCEY STREET FOUNDATION	10	12
TIDES CENTER	10	11
AMERICAN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION	9	10
CORO CTR FOR CIVIC LEADERSHIP-NTHRN CAL	9	9
VISITACION VALLEY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	9	10
Y M C A OF SAN FRANCISCO	9	10
ASIAN NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN	8	10
EDGEWOOD CENTER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES	8	9
FILIPINO-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION	8	10
GIRLS 2000	8	8
GOODWILL INDUST OF S F SAN MATEO & MARIN	8	11
INSTITUTO FAMILIAR DE LA RAZA INC	8	10
LARKIN STREET YOUTH CENTER	8	8
POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE	8	9
SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	8	12
SAN FRANCISCO STUDY CENTER INC	8	9
AFRICAN AMERICAN ART & CULTURE COMPLEX	7	8
ALLEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORP	7	8
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS INC	7	12
BAY VIEW HUNTERS PT FNDTN FOR COMM IMPROV	7	7
COMMUNITY YOUTH CENTER SAN FRANCISCO	7	8
COMPASSPOINT NONPROFIT SERVICES	7	12
FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY OF SAN FRANCISCO	7	8
FORT MASON FOUNDATION	7	8
GLIDE FOUNDATION	7	7
MISSION LANGUAGE & VOCATIONAL SCHOOL INC	7	11
RENAISSANCE PARENTS OF SUCCESS	7	7
SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL ALLIANCE	7	8
SOMARTS	7	9
SUNSET YOUTH SERVICES	7	9
TENDERLOIN HOUSING CLINIC INC	7	8
URBAN RESOURCE SYS DBA NGHBRHD PRKS CNCL	7	8
ASHBURY IMAGES	6	11
ASIAN WOMEN'S SHELTER	6	6
BAR ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO	6	10
BAY VIEW HUNTERS PT CTR FOR ARTS & TECH	6	8
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY DISPUTE SERVICES	6	6
CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	6	8
FILIPINO AMERICAN ARTS EXPOSTION	6	8
HAIGHT ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL	6	6
INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL & ELEC ENGRS	6	7
JAPANESE COMMUNITY YOUTH COUNCIL	6	6
JEWISH VOC & CAREER COUNSELING SVC (JVS)	6	6
LA RAZA CENTRO LEGAL INC	6	7
LAVENDER YOUTH RECREATION & INFO CTR	6	6
NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL	6	9
PORTOLA FAMILY CONNECTIONS INC	6	7
SAGE PROJECT INC	6	6
SAN FRANCISCO CONSERVATION CORPS	6	7
SAN FRANCISCO PARAMEDIC ASSOCIATION	6	8
SAN FRANCISCO SAFE INC	6	7
SWORDS TO PLOWSHARES	6	7
WALDEN HOUSE INC	6	9
YOUNG COMMUNITY DEVELOPERS INC	6	6

VENDOR NAME	NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING GRANTS	TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS PROVIDED TO VENDORS
BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS OF SAN FRANCISCO	5	5
BROTHERS AGAINST GUNS INC	5	5
C V E INC	5	8
CAPPO INC	5	7
CASTRO STREET FAIR	5	5
CASTRO STREET FAIR	5	5
CELLSPACE	5	6
CENTRAL AMERICAN RESOURCE CENTER	5	5
CHARITY CULTURAL SERVICES CENTER	5	5
CHILDREN'S COUNCIL OF SAN FRANCISCO	5	6
ELLA HILL HUTCH COMMUNITY CENTER	5	5
EPISCOPAL COMMUNITY SVCS OF S F INC	5	6
HEARING & SPEECH CENTER OF NORTHERN CALI	5	9
HOMELESS PRENATAL PROGRAM	5	6
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF THE BAY AREA	5	5
JEWISH FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES	5	6
MISSION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOC	5	6
NORTHERN CALIF SERVICE LEAGUE	5	5
PACIFIC NEWS SERVICE	5	5
PRECITA EYES MURALISTS ASSOCIATION	5	6
S F CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU	5	11
S F STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION INC	5	5
SAN FRANCISCO APARTMENT ASSOC	5	7
SAN FRANCISCO FOOD BANK	5	5
SAN FRANCISCO PARKS TRUST	5	5
SAN FRANCISCO WOMEN'S CTR/WOMEN'S BLDG	5	5
SELF HELP FOR THE ELDERLY	5	6
SPECIAL SERVICE FOR GROUPS	5	5
STATIONARY ENGINEERS LOCAL 39 TRNG DEPT	5	5
SUPPORT FOR FAMS OF CHILDRN W DISABILITIE	5	7
TENDERLOIN NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT CORP	5	6
UNITED WAY OF THE BAY AREA	5	5
VISITACION VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTER	5	5
ABADA CAPOEIRA SAN FRANCISCO	4	4
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION	4	5
APA FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES	4	4
ARAB CULTURAL & COMMUNITY CENTER	4	4
ARRIBA JUNTOS - IAL	4	5
ASIAN WOMEN'S RESOURCE CENTER	4	4
BAY AREA VIDEO COALITION	4	4
BRAVA FOR THE WOMEN IN THE ARTS	4	5
CALIFORNIA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES	4	6
CALIFORNIA PACIFIC MEDICAL CENTER	4	5
CATHOLIC CHARITIES CYO	4	4
CATHOLIC HLTHCR WST DBA ST MARYS MED CTR	4	5
CENTER FOR YOUNG WOMEN'S DEVELOPMENT	4	5
CENTER ON JUVENILE & CRIMINAL JUSTICE	4	4
CENTRAL CITY HOSPITALITY HOUSE	4	4
CHINESE NEWCOMERS SERVICE CENTER	4	5
CITY CARSHARE	4	5
COMMUNITY WORKS	4	4
COMPASS COMMUNITY SERVICE	4	4
DONALDINA CAMERON HOUSE	4	4
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL OF S F INC	4	5
FOLSOM STREET EVENTS	4	4
FRIENDS OF THE URBAN FOREST	4	5
GUM MOON RESIDENCE HALL	4	4
HAMILTON FAMILY CENTER	4	4
HOMELESS CHILDREN'S NETWORK	4	4
HUCKLEBERRY YOUTH PROGRAMS INC	4	4
INSTITUTE ON AGING	4	5
INTERNATIONAL CHILD RESOURCE INSTITUTE	4	5
INTERSECTION FOR THE ARTS	4	5
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF S F	4	5
LA CASA DE LAS MADRES	4	4
LEGAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN INC	4	4
LOCO BLOCO DRUM & DANCE ENSEMBLE	4	4
MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCIS	4	6

MISSION HIRING HALL	4	4
MISSION NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTER	4	4
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME & DELINQUENCY	4	9
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAW INSTITUTE	4	4
NIHONMACHI LEGAL OUTREACH DBA API LEGAL	4	4
NORTHERN CALIF GRANTMAKERS	4	6
OMEGA BOYS CLUB	4	4
PUBLIC HEALTH INSTITUTE	4	5
RICHMOND DISTRICT NEIGHBORHOOD CTR INC	4	5
S F NEIGHBORHOOD NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION	4	4
SAMOAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CENTER INC	4	5
SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE COALITION	4	5
SAN FRANCISCO CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION CTR	4	5
SAN FRANCISCO CLEAN CITY COALITION	4	7
SOUTHWEST COMMUNITY CORP	4	4
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	4	5
TENANTS & OWNERS DEVELOPMENT CORP	4	5
THE ARC SAN FRANCISCO	4	5
THE DANCE BRIGADE	4	4
THE MARSH	4	4
VOLUNTEER CTR SRVNG SF & SAN MATEO COUNT	4	4
WESTSIDE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CTR INC	4	4
Y W C A OF SAN FRANCISCO & MARIN	4	4
YOUTH GUIDANCE CTR IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE	4	4
YOUTH LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE	4	5
APCO INTERNATIONAL INC	3	10
ARK OF REFUGE INC	3	3
ASIAN ART MUSEUM FOUNDATION	3	4
ASIAN LAW CAUCUS INC	3	3
ASIANWEEK FOUNDATION	3	4
BAKER PLACES INC	3	4
BAY AREA COMMUNICATION ACCESS	3	3
BAY AREA COUNCIL	3	6
BAY AREA LEGAL AID	3	3
BAYVIEW HUNTERS PT SENIOR CITIZENS CTR	3	3
BAYVIEW OPERA HOUSE	3	4
BLACK ROCK ARTS FOUNDATION	3	3
BOOKER T WASHINGTON COMMUNITY SVCS CTR	3	3
CALIFORNIA C P A EDUCATION FOUNDATION	3	3
CALIFORNIA LAWYERS FOR THE ARTS	3	3
CALIFORNIA PRESERVATION FOUNDATION	3	4
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES	3	4
CALIFORNIA YOUTH CONNECTION	3	3
CARTOON ART MUSEUM	3	3
CATHEDRAL OF ST MARY OF THE ASSUMPTION	3	3
CHAMBER MUSIC PARTNERSHIP	3	3
CHINATOWN MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION	3	5
COMMUNITY AWARENESS & TREATMENT SVCS INC	3	3
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE	3	4
COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES	3	3
COMMUNITY HOUSING PARTNERSHIP	3	3
COMMUNITY NETWORK FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT	3	3
COMMUNITY UNJTED AGAINST VIOLENCE	3	3
CORPORATION OF THE FINE ARTS MUSEUMS	3	5
COUNTERPULSE	3	4
CULTURAL ODYSSEY	3	3
DANCERS' GROUP	3	3
DOLORES STREET COMMUNITY CENTER	3	3
EXITHEATRE	3	3
FLORENCE CRITTENTON SERVICES	3	4
FOOTLOOSE DANCE CO INC	3	3
FRIENDSHIP HOUSE ASSOC OF AMERICAN INDIA	3	5
GALERIA DE LA RAZA/STUDIO 24	3	3
GIRLS AFTER SCHOOL ACADEMY	3	3
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	3	3
GOOD SAMARITAN FAMILY RESOURCE CTR INC	3	3
HORIZONS UNLIMITED OF SF	3	4
HSA OF BERNAL HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD	3	3

CNTR		
INDUSTRIAL EMERGENCY COUNCIL	3	5
INNER CITY YOUTH	3	3
JANET POMEROY CENTER	3	3
JELANI HOUSE INC	3	3
JUMA VENTURES	3	3
KEARNY ST WORKSHOP INC	3	3
KID SERVE YOUTH MURALS	3	3
LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO THE ELDERLY INC	3	3
LITERACY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	3	5
MANILATOWN HERITAGE FOUNDATION	3	4
MARGARET JENKINS DANCE STUDIO, INC.	3	3
MARY ELIZABETH INN	3	3
NEW LANGTON ARTS	3	3
NEW LEAF SERVICES FOR OUR COMMUNITY	3	4
NEXTARTS	3	3
NIHONMACHI ST FAIR/JAPANTOWN ART MVMNT	3	3
NINTH STREET INDEPENDENT FILM CENTER	3	3
NO OF MARKET/TENDERLOIN COM BENEFIT CORP	3	3
NORTHERN CALIF PRESBYTERIAN HOMES	3	3
O C L C ONLINE COMPUTER LIBRARY CTR INC	3	5
O D C THEATER	3	4
ON LOK DAY SERVICES	3	3
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS	3	3
PERFORMING ARTS WORKSHOP	3	3
PETS UNLIMITED	3	3
POSITIVE DIRECTIONS EQUALS CHANGE INC	3	3
PROJECT OPEN HAND	3	3
PROVIDENCE FOUNDATION OF SAN FRANCISCO	3	3
REBUILDING TOGETHER-SF	3	3
RENAISSANCE ENTREPRENEURSHIP CENTER	3	4
RICHMOND AREA MULTI-SERVICES INC	3	4
S F BAR ASSOCS VOLUNTEER LEGAL SVCS PGM	3	3
S F COMMUNITY CLINIC CONSORTIUM	3	4
SAINT FRANCIS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL	3	4
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY TELEVISION CORP	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC	3	4
SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL SOCIETY	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO MIME TROUPE	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZING PROJECT	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY FNDTN INC	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO WOMEN'S CENTERS INC	3	3
SAN FRANCISCO ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	3	3
SENIOR ACTION NETWORK	3	4
SHANTI PROJECT	3	3
SOUTHERN EXPOSURE	3	3
ST VINCENT DE PAUL SOCIETY OF SAN FRANCI	3	3
TENDERLOIN HEALTH	3	3
THE FAMILY SCHOOL	3	3
THE GARDEN PROJECT	3	4
THE NEW CONSERVATORY THEATRE CENTER	3	3
THE OMI CULTURAL PARTICIPATION PROJECT	3	4
THE SLAVONIC CULTURAL CENTER	3	3
THEATRE OF YUGEN	3	3
TOOLWORKS INC	3	3
TREASURE ISLAND HOMELESS DEV INITIATIVE	3	4
UNITED COUNCIL OF HUMAN SERVICES INC	3	3
VIETNAMESE COMM CTR SF	3	3
VIETNAMESE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3	3
WESTERN CHAPTER ISA	3	4
WU YEE CHILDREN'S SERVICES	3	3
YERBA BUENA CENTER FOR THE ARTS	3	3
YOSEMITE NATIONAL INSTITUTES	3	7
YOUTH SPEAKS INC	3	4
ZACCHO DANCE THEATRE	3	3
3RD I SOUTH ASIAN FILMS	2	2
509 CULTURAL CENTER	2	2
826 VALENCIA	2	2
A HOME AWAY FROM HOMELESSNESS	2	2
A HOME WITHIN	2	2
A TRAVELING JEWISH THEATRE	2	2
ACCION LATINA	2	2
ACORN INSTITUTE	2	2

AGUILAS INC	2	2	EVICTON DEFENSE COLLABORATIVE INC	2	2
AIDS LEGAL REFERRAL PANEL OF THE S F BAY	2	2	EXPLORATORIUM	2	2
AMER CHEM SOC CHEMICAL ABSTRACTS SVC DIV	2	6	FAITHFUL FOOLS STREET MINISTRY	2	2
AMERICAN ASSOC OF STATE HGHWY & TRNSPRTN	2	3	FAMILY RESTORATION HOUSE	2	2
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS	2	2	FILM ARTS FOUNDATION	2	2
AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION	2	4	FIRST VOICE	2	2
AMERICAN INDIAN FILM INSTITUTE	2	3	FLYAWAY PRODUCTIONS	2	2
AMERICAN WATER WRKS ASSOC/CAL-NEVADA SEC	2	2	FRANDELIA ENRICHMENT CENTER	2	2
AMERICANS FOR THE ARTS	2	6	FRIENDS OF MINT PLAZA	2	2
ARAB FILM FESTIVAL	2	2	FRIENDS OF SCRAP	2	3
ARC ECOLOGY	2	2	FRIENDS OF THE PORT	2	3
ART FOR HEALING	2	2	G P TODCO INC	2	2
ART OF THE MATTER PERFORMANCE FOUNDATION	2	2	GASTINELL'S SUPPORTIVE HOUSING	2	2
ARTISTS TELEVISION ACCESS	2	2	GAY & LESBIAN HISTORICAL SCTY OF NOR CAL	2	2
ARTSPAN/OPEN STUDIOS OF SAN FRANCISCO	2	3	GLIDE MEMORIAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH	2	2
ASIAN & PACIFIC ISLANDER WELLNESS CENTER	2	2	GLOBAL EXCHANGE	2	2
ASIAN AMERICAN THEATRE COMPANY	2	2	GOKID.ORG INC	2	2
ASIAN IMPROV ARTS	2	2	GOLDEN GATE CNCL OF AMER YOUTH HOSTELS	2	2
ASIAN INC	2	2	GOLDEN THREAD PRODUCTIONS	2	2
ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER CULTURAL CENTER	2	2	GROWTH & LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES	2	2
ASOCIACION MAYAB	2	2	HAIGHT ASHBURY FOOD PROGRAM	2	2
ASPIRANET	2	3	HAIGHT ASHBURY FREE CLINIC INC	2	3
ASSOC OF MIDNIGHT BASKETBALL LEAGUE PRGM	2	2	HARM REDUCTION COALITION	2	3
BAY AREA COMMUNITY RESOURCES	2	2	HEALTH INITIATIVES FOR YOUTH	2	2
BAY AREA THEATRESORTS	2	2	HOLY FAMILY DAY HOME INC	2	2
BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT HERC	2	2	HOMELESS ADVOCACY PROJECT	2	2
BETH ABRAMS CTR FOR PEACE ART JSTCE & EN	2	2	HUNTER'S POINT COMMUNITY YOUTH PRK FNDRN	2	2
BETHANY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH	2	2	INDEPENDENT LIVING RESRC CENTER OF S F	2	2
BINDLESTIFF STUDIO	2	2	INDOCHINESE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORP	2	2
BRIDGE HOUSING CORP	2	3	INGLESIDE COMMUNITY CENTER	2	2
C O M T O	2	3	INSURANCE EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION	2	3
C S U L B FOUNDATION	2	3	INTER-CITY FAMILY SPRT & RSRCE NTWK INC	2	2
CALIFORNIA DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATIO	2	4	INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION OF BENEFIT PLAN	2	6
CALIFORNIA WORKERS COMPENSATION INSTITUT	2	4	JANICE GARRETT & DANCERS	2	2
CENTER FOR ASIAN AMERICAN MEDIA	2	2	JAPANESE CULTURAL & COMM CTR OF NOR CAL	2	2
CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP	2	3	JOE GOODE PERFORMANCE GROUP	2	2
CENTER FOR CULTURAL INNOVATION	2	3	JOHN W KING SENIOR CENTER	2	2
CENTRO LATINO DE SAN FRANCISCO INC	2	2	JUMPSTART FOR YOUNG CHILDREN INC	2	2
CHHANDAM CHITRESH DANCE CO	2	2	KIMACHI INC	2	3
CHILD CARE LAW CENTER	2	2	KLIMM APARTMENTS LP	2	2
CHILDREN'S BOOK PRESS	2	2	KOREAN AMERICAN WOMEN ARTS & WRTRS ASSOC	2	2
CHINESE COMMUNITY CULTURAL ASSOCIATION	2	2	KULINTANG ARTS, INC.	2	2
CHINESE CULTURAL FOUNDATION OF SF	2	2	LA POCHA NOSTRA	2	2
CHINESE CULTURAL PRODUCTIONS	2	2	LA RAZA COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER INC	2	2
CHINESE CULTURE FOUNDATION OF SAN FRANCI	2	2	LIFE FRAMES INC	2	2
CHINESE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA	2	2	LINES CONTEMPORARY BALLET	2	2
CHINESE PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION	2	2	LOBSTER THEATER PROJECT INC	2	2
CIRCUIT NETWORK	2	2	LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT CORP	2	4
CIRCUS CENTER	2	2	LOW INCOME INVESTMENT FUND	2	2
COLEMAN CHILDREN & YOUTH SERVICES	2	2	LUTHERAN SOCIAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CAL	2	2
COMEDY CELEBRATION DAY INC	2	3	LYON-MARTIN WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICES	2	2
COMMUNITY ALLIANCE FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION	2	2	MAGIC THEATRE INC	2	2
COMMUNITY BOARD PROGRAM	2	2	MARKET STREET RAILWAY CO	2	5
CONARD HOUSE INC	2	2	MELODY OF CHINA INC	2	2
CONSCIOUS YOUTH MEDIA CREW	2	2	MERCY COMMERCIAL CALIFORNIA	2	2
CREATIVITY EXPLORED OF SAN FRANCISCO	2	2	MISSION CREEK SENIOR COMMUNITY	2	2
CROWDED FIRE THEATRE CO	2	2	MISSION CULTURAL CENTER FOR LATINO ARTS	2	3
CUTTING BALL THEATER	2	2	MISSION EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS INC	2	2
CYPRESS STRING QUARTET	2	2	MISSION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORP.	2	2
DANCEART INC	2	2	MISSION LEARNING CENTER	2	2
DEL SOL PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATION	2	2	MORRISANIA WEST INC	2	3
DOOR DOG MUSIC PRODUCTIONS	2	2	MSA - PEOPLE IN PLAZAS	2	2
E T R ASSOCIATES	2	6	MT ST JOSEPH-ST ELIZABETH	2	2
EARNED ASSETS RESOURCE NETWORK	2	2	MUJERES UNIDAS Y ACTIVAS	2	2
EARPLAY	2	2	MUSEO ITALO AMERICANO	2	2
ELDERGIVERS	2	2	MUSEUM OF PERFORMANCE & DESIGN	2	2
ENTERPRISE FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	2	2	NA LEI HULU I KA WEKIU	2	2
EPIPHANY PRODUCTIONS SONIC DANCE THEATER	2	2	NATIONAL JAPANESE AMERICAN HISTRCAL SCTY	2	2
ETH-NOH-TEC	2	2	NETWORK FOR ELDER	2	2
EUREKA THEATRE COMPANY	2	2	NEW DOOR VENTURES	2	2
			NICOS CHINESE HEALTH COALITION	2	2
			NOE VALLEY ASSOCIATION	2	2

NOR CAL MUSIC & ART CULTURE CENTER INC	2	2	THE PLAYHOUSE	2	2
NORTH OF MARKET SENIOR SVC DBA CURRY SEN	2	2	THE SAN FRANCISCO SILENT FILM FESTIVAL	2	2
NORTHWEST BERNAL ALLIANCE	2	2	THEATRE BAY AREA	2	2
O M I NEIGHBORS IN ACTION	2	2	THEATRE FLAMENCO OF SAN FRANCISCO INC	2	2
ON LOK SENIOR HEALTH SERVICES	2	2	THEATRE RHINOCEROS	2	2
OTHER MINDS INC	2	2	THIRD BAPTIST CHURCH INC	2	2
OUR FAMILY COALITION	2	2	THUNDER ROAD	2	2
PHOENIX ARTS ASSN THEATER	2	2	TIDES FOUNDATION/THE HOUSING COMMITTEE	2	2
PHOTOALLIANCE	2	3	TURF	2	2
PLANNING FOR ELDERLY IN THE CENTRAL CITY PLAYGROUND	2	3	VIETNAMESE ELDERLY MUTL ASSTNCE ASSC INC	2	2
PLAYWRIGHTS FOUNDATION	2	2	VOLTI	2	2
POLK CORRIDOR BUSINESS ASSOCIATION	2	2	WALLER STREET ACADEMY	2	2
POSITIVE RESOURCE CENTER	2	2	WEST BAY CONFERENCE CENTER	2	2
PRACTISING LAW INSTITUTE	2	3	WEST BAY PILIPINO MULTI-SERVICE CENTER	2	2
PURPLE MOON DANCE PROJECT	2	2	WORLD ARTS WEST	2	2
QUAN YIN HEALING ARTS CENTER	2	2	YOUTH ENVIRONMENT STUDY INC	2	2
QUEER CULTURAL CENTER	2	3	YOUTH TREATMENT & EDUCATION CENTER	2	2
RANDALL MUSEUM FRIENDS	2	2	Z SPACE STUDIO	2	2
ROBERT MOSES' KIN	2	2	ZYZZYVA	2	2
ROYA SAXAPHONE QUARTET	2	2	1036 MISSION ASSOCIATES LP	1	1
RUBICON PROGRAMS INC	2	2	42ND STREET MOON	1	1
RUBY'S CLAY STUDIO & GALLERY	2	2	9-1-1 FOR KIDS INC	1	1
S F BROWN BOMBERS POP WARNER CLUB	2	2	A BETTER WAY INC	1	1
S F NETWORK MINISTRIES HOUSING CORP	2	2	A PHILIP RANDOLPH EDUCATIONAL FUND	1	1
SAKURA MATSURI INC/N CA CHERRY BLISM FEST	2	4	ACTORS THEATRE OF SF	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO ADULT DAY HEALTH NETWORK	2	2	AFTER SCHOOL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE	2	2	AIDS COMMUNITY RESEARCH CONSORTIUM	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO ARTS EDUCATION PROJECT	2	2	AIDS EMERGENCY FUND	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO BEAUTIFUL	2	2	AIDS HOUSING ALLIANCE SF	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO BOTANICAL GARDEN SOCIETY	2	2	AIM HIGH FOR HIGH SCHOOL	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CAMERAWORK	2	2	ALABAMA STREET SENIOR HOUSING ASSOC LP	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CASA	2	2	ALISA ANN RUCH BURN FOUNDATION	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CENTER FOR THE BOOK	2	2	ALLIANCE FOR CALIFORNIA TRADITIONAL ARTS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CINEMATHEQUE	2	2	ALSET	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO FILM SOCIETY	2	2	ALTERNATIVE FAMILY SVCS INC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO FRIENDS MEETING INC	2	2	AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION INC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL HOSPITAL FNDTN	2	3	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF BIOANALYSTS	1	2
SAN FRANCISCO GIRLS CHORUS ASSOC	2	2	AMERICAN BACH SOLOISTS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO HOST COMMITTEE	2	2	AMERICAN CHINESE CULTURAL & ARTS ASSOC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPOR	2	2	AMERICAN CONSERVATORY THEATRE	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO INTL ARTS FESTIVAL	2	2	AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO JEWISH FILM FESTIVAL	2	2	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF HLTH-SYS PHARMACISTS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO LIVE ARTS	2	2	ANNE BLUETHENTHAL & DANCERS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO MARITIME NATIONAL PRK ASSN	2	2	ARUP LABORATORIES INC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM & HISTORICAL SOCTY	2	2	ASIAN AMERICAN DANCE PERFORMANCES	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO OPERA ASSN	2	2	ASIAN AMERICAN DONOR PROGRAM	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO PRETRIAL DIVERSION PROJECT	2	2	ASIAN AMERICAN RECOVERY SERVICES INC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO SUICIDE PREVENTION	2	2	ASIAN AMERICAN WOMEN ARTISTS ASSOCIATION	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO URBAN SERVICE PROJECT	2	4	ASPIRATION	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO WOMEN AGAINST RAPE	2	2	ASSOC OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACLTYS OFCRS	1	1
SEW PRODUCTIONS LORRAINE HANSBERRY THTR	2	2	ASTHMA RESOURCE CENTER OF SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
SHADOWLIGHT PRODUCTIONS	2	2	AU CO VIETNAMESE CULTURAL CENTER	1	1
SKILLPATH SEMINARS & COMPUMASTER	2	2	AUNT LUTE FOUNDATION / AUNT LUTE BOOKS	1	1
SKILLPATH SEMINARS & COMPUMASTER & HUMAN	2	2	BAART COMMUNITY HEALTHCARE (BCH)	1	1
SKILLPATH SEMINARS AND COMPUMASTER	2	2	BACK ON TRACK	1	1
SMALL PRESS TRAFFIC LITERARY ARTS CENTER	2	2	BAY AREA ECONOMIC FORUM/BAYTRADE	1	1
SOCIETY FOR ART PUBLCTN OF THE AMERICAS	2	2	BAY AREA LIBRARY & INFORMATION SYS	1	3
SOUTH OF MARKET CHILDCARE INC	2	2	BAY AREA OMNI FNDTN FOR THE PERFORM ARTS	1	1
SOUTH OF MARKET FOUNDATION	2	2	BAY AREA SCORES	1	1
SPORTS4KIDS	2	2	BAY AREA WILDERNESS TRAINING	1	1
ST JOHNS EDUCATIONAL THRESHOLDS CENTER	2	2	BAY AREA WORLD TRADE CENTER	1	2
ST VINCENT DE PAUL SOCIETY	2	2	BAY AREA YOUNG POSITIVES INC	1	1
STEOLOGY	2	2	BAYVIEW ASSOCIATION FOR YOUTH	1	1
STREETSIDE STORIES	2	2	BAYVIEW HUNTERS PT COMMUNITY ADVOCYS INC	1	1
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS ASSOC OF NOR CALIF	2	5	BIKE HUT FOUNDATION	1	2
TABERNACLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORP	2	2	BLACK ADOPTION PLACEMENT & RESEARCH CTR	1	1
TELEGRAPH HILL NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOC INC	2	3	BLACK COALITION ON AIDS	1	1
TENDERLOIN AIDS RESOURCE CENTER	2	2	BLOOD CENTERS OF THE PACIFIC	1	2
THE ART RE GRUP INC/THE LAB	2	2	BLUE BEAR SCHOOL OF MUSIC	1	1
			BOOK CLUB OF CALIFORNIA	1	1
			BOOMERANG HOUSING CORPORATION	1	1

BOYS & GIRLS CLUB NORTH SAN MATEO COUNTY	1	1
BREATHE CALIF, GOLDEN GATE PUB HLTH PRTN	1	1
BROTHERS FOR CHANGE	1	1
BURNS INSTITUTE	1	1
BURT CHILDRENS CTR	1	1
C A R F	1	1
C H W WEST BAY	1	1
CA ASSOC OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADMNSTR	1	3
CADUCEUS OUTREACH SERVICES	1	1
CAEAR COALITION INC	1	3
CAL FIRE CHIEF ASSN/CALCHIEFS BOOKSTORE	1	1
CAL STATE UNIVERSITY SACRAMENTO FNDYN	1	1
CALAPRS	1	3
CALIFA GROUP	1	1
CALIFORNIA CHINESE ORCHESTRA	1	1
CALIFORNIA COLLEGE OF THE ARTS	1	1
CALIFORNIA FAMILY HEALTH COUNCIL INC	1	3
CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY	1	1
CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOC	1	3
CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGY INTERNSHIP COUNCIL	1	2
CALIFORNIA RURAL WATER ASSOCIATION	1	2
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL-AGE CONSORTIUM	1	1
CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY FOUNDATION	1	1
CALIFORNIA WIC ASSOCIATION	1	4
CAMINOS/PATHWAYS LEARNING CENTER	1	1
CAPACITOR PERFORMANCE	1	1
CAREER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT CENTER	1	1
CAROLYN SWEARINGEN PHD	1	1
CASTRO UPPER MARKET CMNTY BENEFIT DIST	1	1
CATHOLIC YOUTH ORG - ARCHDIOCESE OF S F	1	1
CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY	1	1
CENTER FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	1	1
CENTER POINT INC	1	1
CENTERFORCE INC	1	1
CETOS RESEARCH ORGANIZATION	1	1
CHAMBER MUSIC SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
CHILD DEVELOPMENT POLICY INST ED FUND	1	1
CHILDHOOD MATTERS INC	1	1
CHILDREN'S BOOK PROJECT	1	1
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL - OAKLAND	1	1
CHINESE FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	1	1
CHINESE HOSPITAL	1	2
CINE ACCION	1	1
CITIZENS HOUSING CORP	1	1
CITY ARTS & LECTURES, INC.	1	1
COLLEGE TRACK	1	1
COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATION	1	1
COMMUNITIES IN HRMNY ADVCTNG FOR LEARN&K	1	1
COMMUNITY ALLIANCE WITH FAMILY FARMERS	1	1
COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOUNDATION	1	1
COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTER	1	1
COMMUNITY MUSIC CENTER SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
COMMUNITY WORKS WEST INC	1	1
COMPANY CHADDICK	1	1
COMPOSERS INC	1	1
COMPUMENTOR	1	1
COMPUTER RECYCLING CENTER	1	1
CONTRABAND	1	2
COSIPA	1	2
CROSS CULTURAL FAMILY CENTER	1	1
DANCE THROUGH TIME	1	1
DELTA DENTAL PLAN OF CALIFORNIA	1	1
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES	1	1
DRESS FOR SUCCESS SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
E C R I	1	2
EACH ONE REACH ONE INC	1	1
ECOLOGY ACTION	1	1
EL TEATRO DE LA ESPERANZA INC.	1	1
ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE (EPRI)	1	2
ENCORE THEATRE CO	1	1
ENCUENTRO / ACCION LATINA	1	1
ENVIRONMENTAL TRAVELING COMPANIONS	1	2
EVERGREEN CEMETERY ASSOCIATION	1	2
FAMILIESFIRST INC	1	1

FAMILY BUILDERS BY ADOPTION	1	1
FAMILY SUPPORT SVCS OF THE BAY AREA	1	1
FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION FUND	1	1
FARALLONES MARINE SANCTUARY ASSOCIATION	1	1
FEED THE CHILDREN INC	1	1
FIFTH STREAM MUSIC	1	1
FIL - NATIONAL	1	1
FIRST 5 ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA	1	2
FOOLSFURY THEATER	1	1
FORT HELP	1	1
FRED FINCH YOUTH CENTER	1	1
FRIENDS OF ST FRANCIS CHILDCARE CENTER	1	1
FRIENDS OF SUPPORT SERVICES FOR THE ARTS	1	1
FRIENDS OF THE CHILDREN SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
FRIENDS OF THE FLEET FOUNDATION	1	1
FRIENDS OF THE S F PUBLIC LIBRARY	1	1
FRIENDS OUTSIDE	1	1
GIRL FEST BAY AREA	1	1
GIRLSOURCE INC	1	1
GIRLVENTURES	1	1
GIVE A DOG A BONE	1	1
GLIDE COMMUNITY HOUSING INC	1	1
GLOBAL WOMEN INTACT INC	1	1
GOLDEN GATE AUDUBON SOCIETY	1	1
GOLDEN GATE MEN'S CHORUS	1	1
GOLDEN GATE PERFORMING ARTS DBA SF GAY M	1	1
GOLDEN GATE SENIOR SRVS	1	1
GREENACTION FOR HEALTH & ENVIRON JUSTICE	1	1
GREENINFO NETWORK	1	1
GRID ALTERNATIVES	1	1
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY	1	1
HARM REDUCTION THERAPY CENTER	1	1
HAZELDEN	1	1
HELLENIC FEDERATION OF NORTHERN CALIF	1	1
HENRY OHLHOFF HOUSE	1	1
HOMEBASE THE CTR FOR COMMON CONCERNS INC	1	1
HOPE PRESERVATION INC	1	1
HUAYI PERFORMING GROUP	1	1
HUMANITIES WEST	1	1
HUNTERS POINT BOYS & GIRLS CLUB	1	1
HYDE STREET COMMUNITY SERVICES INC	1	1
I E D A	1	1
ILLUMINATING ENGINEERING SOC OF NOR AMER	1	1
IMMIRGRANT LEGAL RESOURCE CENTER	1	1
IMMUNE ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	1	1
INDUSTRIAL CLAIMS ASSOC	1	1
IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SVCS CONSORTIUM (IHSS)	1	1
INNER CITY ADOLESCENT NETWORK INC	1	1
INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH OUTREACH	1	1
INSTITUTO LABORAL DE LA RAZA	1	1
INSTITUTO PRO MUSICA DE CALIFORNIA	1	1
INTERCULTURAL INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA	1	1
INTERNET ARCHIVE	1	1
INTERNET SEXUALITY INFORMATION SVCS INC	1	1
IOANNIS ADONIOU	1	1
IRIS CTR: WOMEN'S COUNSLNG & RECVRY SVC	1	1
IRISH ARTS FOUNDATION	1	1
JAMESTOWN COMMUNITY CENTER	1	1
JAPANESE COMMUNITY YTH CTR/NEW WAYS WRKR	1	1
JAPANTOWN MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION	1	1
JAPANTOWN TASK FORCE INC	1	1
JESS CURTIS/GRAVITY INC	1	1
JOBTRAIN	1	1
JOINT COMMISSION	1	4
JONES MEMORIAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH	1	1
K P O O - FM RADIO	1	1
KHADRA INTERNATIONAL DANCE THEATRE	1	1
KIDANGO INC	1	1
KINSHIP CENTER	1	1
KOREAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY CENTER	1	1
KOREAN CENTER INC	1	1
KRONOS QUARTET KRONOS PERF ARTS ASSOC	1	1

LA PLAYA APARTMENTS	1	1
LAMPLIGHTERS THEATRE- OPERA WEST FOUNDAT	1	1
LATINO COMMISSION	1	1
LEAP IMAGINATION IN LEARNING	1	1
LEARNING SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	1	1
LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR SENIORS	1	1
LESBIAN/GAY CHORUS OF SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
LEVYDANCE INC	1	1
LIFETIME	1	1
LINCOLN CHILD CENTER	1	1
LITTLE BROTHERS	1	1
LITTLE CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER	1	1
LLOYD'S REGISTER OF SHIPPING	1	1
LYRIC HOUSING ASSOCIATES	1	1
MACCANDO TENDERLOIN YOUTH TRACK CLUB	1	1
MADCAT WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL	1	1
MAGNIFICAT	1	1
MAITRI AIDS HOSPICE	1	1
MANALIVE VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS	1	1
MANDARIN LANGUAGE & CULTURAL CENTER	1	1
MARCH OF DIMES BIRTH DEFECTS FOUNDATION	1	2
MARIN DAY SCHOOLS	1	1
MARINE EXCHANGE OF THE S F BAY REGION	1	2
MARKET STREET ASSOCIATION	1	1
MARRIOTT FOUNDATION	1	1
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	1	1
MATTER OF TRUST INC	1	2
MAYBECK FOUNDATION	1	1
MEALS ON WHEELS	1	1
MERCY SERVICES CORP	1	1
METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY FOUNDATION	1	1
MEXICAN MUSEUM	1	1
MIDSUMMER MOZART FESTIVAL	1	1
MINDANAO LILANG-LILANG	1	1
MIRALOMA EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT PRGM INC	1	1
MISSION COMMUNITY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	1	1
MISSION COUNCIL ON ALCOHOL ABUSE/SPANISH	1	1
MISSION CREEK HARBOR ASSOCIATION INC	1	1
MISSION MIRACLE MILE INC	1	1
MISSION YOUTH SOCCER LEAGUE	1	1
MMG FOUNDATION	1	1
MOBILIZATION AGAINST AIDS INTL INC	1	1
MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL ASSOC OF CALIF	1	1
MUSCULOSKELETAL TRANSPLANT FNDTN (MTF)	1	2
MUSEUM OF CRAFT & FOLK ART	1	1
NACE INTERNATIONAL	1	1
NATIONAL ASSOC OF CLEAN WATER AGENCIES	1	2
NATIONAL ASSOC OF PUBLIC PENSION ATTYS	1	2
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ADA COORDINATORS	1	2
NATIONAL COMMUNITY DEV INSTITUTE (NCDI)	1	1
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON ALCOHOLISM	1	1
NATIONAL SAMOAN CHIEFS' COUNCIL	1	1
NATIONAL SOCIETY OF BLACK ENGINEERS	1	4
NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH INSTITUTE	1	1
NATIVE AMERICAN AIDS PROJECT	1	1
NATIVE AMERICAN HEALTH CENTER	1	1
NATL FNDTN FOR TEACHING ENTREPRENEURSHIP	1	1
NATL NTWK FOR IMMIGRANT & REFUGEE RIGHTS	1	1
NEERHS DBA SEASHORE TROLLEY MUSEUM	1	2
NETWORK FOR GOOD POWERED BY GROUNDSRING	1	1
NEW ARTS FOUNDATION	1	1
NEW CENTURY CHAMBER ORCHESTRA	1	1
NIHONMACHI LITTLE FRIENDS	1	1
NOE VALLEY CHAMBER MUSIC SERIES	1	1
NONPROFIT FINANCE FUND	1	1
NON-PROFIT HOUSING ASSOC OF NORTHERN	1	2

CAL		
NOONTIME CONCERTS	1	1
NORTH & SOUTH MARKET ADULT DAY HLTH CORP	1	1
NORTH EAST MEDICAL SERVICES	1	1
NORTH OF MARKET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROV CORP	1	1
NORTHERN CA & WESTERN NEVADA CHAPTER-ACI	1	1
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA PSYCHIATRIC SOCIETY	1	2
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY TRAFFIC INSTITUT	1	1
O D C SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
OAKES CHILDREN'S CENTER INC	1	1
OAKLAND ATHLETICS COMMUNITY FUND	1	1
OFARRELL SENIOR HOUSING INC	1	1
OHLHOFF RECOVERY PROGRAMS	1	1
OLD FIRST CONCERTS	1	1
OPNET COMMUNITY VENTURES	1	1
OUR KIDS FIRST	1	1
OUT OF THE CLOSET THRIFT STORES	1	1
P H F E MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS	1	1
PACIFIC CHAMBER SYMPHONY	1	1
PACIFIC INDUSTRIAL & BUSINESS ASSOCIATIO	1	1
PACIFIC INSTITUTE	1	1
PACIFIC ISLANDERS' CULTURAL ASSOCIATION	1	1
PARENTS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF S F INC	1	1
PAUL DRESHER ENSEMBLE	1	1
PELICAN MEDIA	1	2
PENINSULA HUMANE SOCIETY	1	1
PEOPLE ORGANIZED TO WIN EMPLOYMENT RIGHT	1	1
PETS ARE WONDERFUL SUPPORT	1	1
PHILHARMONIA BAROQUE ORCHESTRA	1	1
PHYSICIAN FOUNDATION - CAL PAC MED CTR	1	1
PLANET DRUM FOUNDATION	1	1
POCKET OPERA CO THE	1	1
POINTS OF LIGHT FOUNDATION	1	1
POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM	1	1
POOR MAGAZINE	1	1
PORTLAND CEMENT ASSOC	1	1
POWER ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	1	1
PREVENT BLINDNESS NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	1	1
PRISON MATCH	1	1
PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL OF S F INC	1	3
PRO ARTS INC	1	1
PRODUCT POLICY INSTITUTE	1	1
PROGRESS FOUNDATION	1	1
PUBLIC GLASS	1	1
PUBLIC INTEREST CLEARINGHOUSE	1	1
RAIL-VOLUTION	1	1
RAINBOW ADULT COMMUNITY HOUSING	1	1
REBEKAH CHILDREN'S SERVICES	1	1
RECLAIMING COLLECTIVE	1	2
REFUGEE TRANSITIONS	1	1
RUSSIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICES	1	1
RUSSIAN CENTER OF SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
S F AFRICAN AMER HISTORCL & CULTURAL SOC	1	1
S F BAR ASSOC VOLNTR LGL SVCS PGM/CROC	1	1
S F BAR ASSOCIATION VOLUNTEER LEGAL SVCS	1	1
S F BOYS CHORUS CALIFORNIA HALL	1	1
S F EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC	1	1
S F FIRE FIGHTERS LOCAL 798 DUES (28)	1	1
S F INDEPENDENT FILM FESTIVAL INC	1	1
S F LESBIAN/GAY FREEDOM BAND INC	1	1
S F LESBIAN/GAY FREEDOM DAY CELEBRATION	1	1
S F MENTAL HEALTH EDUCATIONAL FUNDS	1	1
SALVATION ARMY SILVERCREST SR RESIDENCE	1	1
SAMUEL MERRITT COLLEGE	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO ART INSTITUTE	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO BACH CHOIR	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO BALLET ASSO	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO BLACK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	1	2
SAN FRANCISCO CENTER FOR PSYCHOANALYSIS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER ORCHESTRA	1	1

SAN FRANCISCO CHANTICLEER INC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CHORAL ARTISTS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CHORAL SOCIETY	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY POWER	1	2
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY RECYCLERS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO CONTEMPORARY MUSIC PLAYERS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO EDUCATION FUND	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO FRIENDS OF CHAMBER MUSIC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO GU-ZHENG MUSIC SOCIETY	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO LIGHTHOUSE	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO LOVEFEST	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO LYRIC OPERA	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF CRAFT & DESIGN	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF MODERN ART	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO NETWORK MINISTRIES	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE ACTIVITIES LEAGUE	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO SENIOR CITIZENS CENTER	1	1
SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS EQUITY CENTER	1	1
SAN MATEO COUNTY CVB	1	1
SAN MATEO COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVLPMNT ASSOC	1	2
SCHOOLS OF THE SACRED HEART - SF	1	1
SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS WEST & JT	1	1
SENECA CENTER	1	1
SEROLOGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE	1	5
SF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CONSORTIUM	1	1
SF WOMEN'S SOCCER CLUB DBA SF NIGHTHAWKS	1	1
SFIJAZZ	1	1
SFSINGS	1	1
SHILOH FULL GOSPEL CHURCH	1	1
SMUIN BALLETS	1	1
SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENTREPRENEURS	1	1
SOCIETY OF CALIFORNIA ARCHIVISTS INC	1	1
SPECIALTY VEHICLE INSTITUTE OF AMERICA	1	1
ST BONIFACE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER INC	1	1
ST FRANCIS LIVING ROOM FOUNDATION	1	1
ST JAMES INFIRMARY	1	1
ST LUKE'S HEALTH CARE CENTER	1	1
ST LUKE'S HOSPITAL	1	1
STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS	1	1
STATE HUMANE ASSOC OF CAL	1	2
STEINHART AQUARIUM CAL ACAD OF SCIENCES	1	1
STERN GROVE FESTIVAL ASSOCIATION	1	1
STOP AIDS PROJECT INC	1	1
SUNNY HILLS SERVICES	1	1
SUNSET PARKSIDE EDUCATION & ACTION COMM	1	1
SUNSET RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	1	1
SURFRIDER FOUNDATION	1	1
SURVIVORS INTERNATIONAL	1	1
SUSTAINABLE SILICON VALLEY	1	2
TAPROOT FOUNDATION	1	1
TEAM-UP FOR YOUTH INC	1	1
TEMPLE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH	1	1
THE BAY INSTITUTE OF SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
THE BLUES AND R & B MUSIC FOUNDATION INC	1	1
THE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY LEGAL EDUCATION	1	1
THE CENTER TO PROMOTE HEALTHCARE ACCESS	1	1
THE CONTEMPORARY JEWISH MUSEUM	1	1
THE CULTURAL CONSERVANCY	1	1
THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION BOARD FNDTN INC	1	2
THE ELECTRICITY INNOVATION INSTITUTE	1	1

THE EXPANDING YOUR HORIZONS NETWORK	1	1
THE FIRST PLACE FUND FOR YOUTH	1	1
THE IMAGINE BUS PROJECT	1	1
THE LANGUAGE BANK	1	1
THE NEW YORK FIREFIGHTERS SKIN BANK	1	2
THE SAN FRANCISCO SPCA	1	1
THE WATERSHED PROJECT	1	1
THE WOMEN'S FOUNDATION	1	1
THE YOSEMITE FUND	1	1
THICK DESCRIPTION	1	1
THIRD BAPTIST FOUNDATION INC (TBF)	1	1
TIDES FOUNDATION/ST PETER'S HOUSING COMM	1	1
TISSUE BANKS INTERNATIONAL	1	1
TRANSGENDER LAW CENTER	1	1
TRAVELERS AID INTERNATIONAL INC	1	1
TUOLUMNE COUNTY CHIEFS ASSOCIATION	1	1
TUOLUMNE RIVER PRESERVATION TRUST	1	1
UNDER ONE ROOF INC	1	1
UNION SQUARE ASSOCIATION	1	1
UNION SQUARE BUSINESS IMPROVMNT DISTRICT	1	1
UNITED CAMPS, CONFERENCES & RETREATS	1	1
UNITED IRISH SOCIETIES OF SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND INC	1	1
UNIV OF THE PACIFIC SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY	1	3
UP ON TOP	1	1
UPRISING COMMUNITY PLUS	1	1
URBAN LAND INSTITUTE PUBLICATION SALES	1	3
USO OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.	1	1
V I D A	1	1
VANGUARD PUBLIC FOUNDATION	1	1
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL INC	1	1
VICTOR TREATMENT CENTERS INC	1	1
VISITACION VALLEY JOBS EDUCATION & TRAIN	1	1
VISITACION VALLEY JOBS EDUCATION & TRNG	1	1
VISUAL AID	1	1
VOLUNTEER CENTER OF SILICON VALLEY	1	1
VOLUNTEERS TO SF GEN HOSPITAL MED CTR	1	1
WALK SAN FRANCISCO	1	1
WASHINGTON TOXICS COALITION	1	2
WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC	1	1
WESTERN ADDITION SENIOR CITIZENS SVC CTR	1	1
WESTERN NEIGHBORHOODS PROJECT	1	1
WESTERN PENSION & BENEFITS CONFERENCE	1	2
WESTWOOD PARK ASSOCIATION	1	1
WHITNEY YOUNG CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	1	1
WOMAN INC	1	1
WOMEN IN DIALOGUE	1	1
WOMEN'S AUDIO MISSION	1	1
WOMEN'S INITIATIVE FOR SELF-EMPLOYMENT	1	1
WORKER RIGHTS CONSORTIUM	1	1
WORLD SAVVY	1	1
WORLD TRADE CLUB	1	1
YANNIS ADONIOU'S KUNST-STOFF	1	1
YERBA BUENA ALLIANCE	1	1
YERBA BUENA ARTS & EVENTS	1	1
YOUNG AUDIENCES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	1	1
YOUNG SCHOLARS PROGRAM	1	1
YOUTH IN FOCUS	1	1
YOUTH YOGA DHARMA	1	1
ZEUM	1	1

Appendix E

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME MINIMUM PROGRAM COMPLIANCE STANDARDS, SELF ASSESSMENT

FOR DCYF PROGRAM OFFICERS ONLY Enter Code: _____

Program Officers Double Click Here to Reveal Forms

Program Officers Double Click Here to Hide Forms

AGENCY NAME:

PROGRAM NAME:

LEAD PROGRAM CONTACT:

Phone:

Email:

SECONDARY PRGM. CONTACT:

Phone:

Email:

DCYF PROGRAM OFFICER:

BACKGROUND

The Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) developed the following high quality program standards to support the continuous improvement of its funded Afterschool programs. These standards were developed in partnership with an Advisory Group of funded agencies representing the group of programs in the Afterschool Cluster. These standards are rooted in a youth develop framework, which is a research-based framework that focuses on five supports and opportunities related to positive youth development.

These five supports and opportunities create an environment in which children and youth can learn and grow. They include: Safety, Relationship Building, Youth Participation, Community Involvement, and Skill Building. Each of the supports and opportunities in section I through V of this document include a list of standards and indicators that will allow you to reflect on your program's quality from a youth development lens.

DEFINITIONS

Youth Development

Youth development is the physical, social, and emotional process all young people experience as they transition from childhood to adulthood. During this time, young people seek ways to meet their basic needs and gain the knowledge and skills necessary to lead a healthy life.

Youth Development Practices

Youth development practices are the practices which youth-serving organizations can implement to ensure that the young people in their programs receive the support they need to learn and grow. These practices are: providing physical and emotional safety, creating environments where young people build supportive relationships with adults and their peers, providing opportunities for meaningful youth participation, community engagement, and skill-building.

Standard

A standard describes what we want children, youth and families to experience at a program. It is a practice or essential element of programming that is widely recognized or employed especially because it reflects program excellence. Standards provide a foundation for program quality and a benchmark for professionalism in the service delivered.

Indicators

Indicators are the practices and behaviors that signal progress towards a standard. Programs that want to work towards developing a standard should develop activities, practices or policies that would lead to consistency in the indicators linked to the standards.

This is an opportunity for you to self-assess how your program is currently meeting the updated *Out of School Time Minimum Standards*.

There are a total of 8 Out-of-School Time Minimum Program Compliance Standards, with one or more indicators for each standard. Please take the time to carefully read the Standards and reflect on what your program is currently doing to meet or exceed those Standards. Then explain clearly and explicitly how your program is meeting each of the indicators as prompted below. If you believe that your program is meeting the Standards in any way not reflected by the indicators, please explain how in the space provided.

Your responses will be carefully reviewed by your Program Officer in preparation for the upcoming site visit where they will meet with you and your staff to assess your program's meeting of the Minimum Program Compliance Standards. They will be following up on the responses that you provide here, so please accurately reflect how your program is currently meeting the Standards. There is no need to exaggerate your program's current ability to meet the Standards, because the Program Officers will be working with each program to create a plan to meet those Standards not currently achieved.

STEP BY STEP DIRECTIONS:

1. Save this file onto your computer with a file name that includes both your program & agency name. For example: the *Afterschool Program* funded by the *SF Family Connections* agency can save the file as: *SF Family Connections-Afterschool Program.doc*
2. Enter what your program is doing to meet the Standards and indicators where prompted. There are fixed spaces for your responses, and although you can type beyond the borders, your Program Officer will not review any text that exceeds the available space (Approximately 200 words for each response).
3. Once the Self Assessment Form is complete, attach it to an email, and send it to your Program Officer. You can complete this form in more than one sitting, only don't forget to save your file after each time you add or make any changes to the form.

The Deadline for this Pre-Visit Standards Self-Assessment is September 29th. We highly encourage you to return this completed self-assessment as soon as possible. This will provide your Program Officers ample time to conduct site visits and work with you on meeting these standards. If you questions on how to complete this self-assessment, please contact your program officer directly.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME MINIMUM PROGRAM COMPLIANCE STANDARDS, SELF ASSESSMENT

Safety (Emotional & Physical): Ensuring a program environment where participants are physically and emotionally secure respected and accepted for who they are.

Standard OST.1	Program promotes a peaceful environment within the program by using strategies and interventions for addressing violence, negative comments, and/or physical or verbal harassment; including but not limited to a young person's culture, language, ethnicity, national background, gender, disability or sexual orientation when it does occur.
-----------------------	--

<i>Indicator OST.1.1</i>	Program rules and/or expectations are formally communicated to participants on a regular basis.
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

<i>Indicator OST.1.2</i>	Staff are trained on how to appropriately intervene when program rules or expectations are not followed.
--------------------------	--

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

Enter any other ways you are meeting **Standard OST.1** that are not captured by the indicators:

Relationship Building: Promoting trust and confidence between participants and staff in a supportive environment so that young people can experience guidance and emotional and practical support.

Standard OST.2	Staff are trained on how to appropriately intervene when program rules or expectations are not followed.
-----------------------	--

<i>Indicator OST.2.1</i>	The program has an organized system for staff to communicate about participants, such as staff meetings, daily check-ins, shared participant notes.
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

Enter any other ways you are meeting **Standard OST.2** that is not captured by the indicator:

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME MINIMUM PROGRAM COMPLIANCE STANDARDS, SELF ASSESSMENT

Standard OST.3	Program has strategies and resources to ensure effective communication, through relevant language and culture, of information about the program and community resources with youth and families.
<i>Indicator OST.3.1</i>	All program information, such as applications, rules, schedules and brochures are translated into the languages of the community served.
Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:	
<i>Indicator OST.3.2</i>	Program activities, events, and environment show an understanding and respect for the cultures of the program participants.
Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:	
Enter any other ways you are meeting Standard OST.3 that are not captured by the indicators:	
<hr/> Youth Participation: Giving participants an opportunity to play a meaningful, active role in their program so that young people can have input into decision-making, opportunities for responsibility and leadership, and feel a sense of ownership.	
Standard OST.4	Staff provide participants with opportunities to have input into what they will do in the program and during activities.
<i>Indicator OST.4.1</i>	Program schedules allow for participants to make choices about how they will spend some of their time while in program.
Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:	
<i>Indicator OST.4.2</i>	The program has structured opportunities for youth to share their interests, preferences, and/or satisfaction to influence the format or content of program services.
Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:	
Enter any other ways you are meeting Standard OST.4 that are not captured by the indicators:	

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME MINIMUM PROGRAM COMPLIANCE STANDARDS, SELF ASSESSMENT

Community Involvement: Promoting knowledge building, interaction & communication with the community so that young people gain an understanding of the greater community and a sense of being able to make a positive contribution to their community.

Standard OST.5	Staff utilize community assets and resources (volunteers, neighborhood business, local parks, neighborhood leaders, other service providers) to strengthen and enhance the program.
-----------------------	--

<i>Indicator OST.5.1</i>	Community residents and/or family members participate in the program as presenters, instructors, volunteers, mentors and in other ways.
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

<i>Indicator OST.5.2</i>	Program has formal strategies to inform parents and youth of other available community resources.
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

<i>Indicator OST.5.3</i>	Staff schedules allow for time to participate in community meetings and connect with other institutions and events in the neighborhood.
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

Enter any other ways you are meeting **Standard OST.5** that are not captured by the indicators:

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME MINIMUM PROGRAM COMPLIANCE STANDARDS, SELF ASSESSMENT

Skill Building: Giving participants opportunities to strengthen, explore, and practice new and existing skills so that young people can acquire a wide array of skills and experience a sense of growth and progress.

Standard OST.6	Staff consistently communicate high expectations and challenge young people to do their best.
-----------------------	--

<i>Indicator OST.6.1</i>	Staff use a range of approaches to promote the exploration of ideas and the practice of new skills.
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

<i>Indicator OST.6.2</i>	Program identifies (formally or informally) the skill that youth want to achieve in the program.
--------------------------	--

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

<i>Indicator OST.6.3</i>	Program has strategies to assess youth progress in developing identified skills.
--------------------------	--

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

<i>Indicator OST.6.4</i>	The program provides structured opportunities to acknowledge the achievements, contributions, and responsibilities of youth (e.g. group presentations, reflections, exhibitions, performances, celebrations).
--------------------------	---

Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:

Enter any other ways you are meeting **Standard OST.6** that are not captured by the indicators:

Special Needs Inclusion	
Standard OST.7	Participation in Inclusion Training Program Representative participates in an inclusion training provided by DCYF and/or its community partners on an annual basis.
Enter how OST.7 is being met by your program:	
Standard OST.8	Practice of Inclusion Program has a process for determining the reasonable accommodations needed by children and youth with disabilities to participate in its activities.
<i>Indicator OST.8.1</i>	Program has a documented process for receiving and assessing accommodation requests.
Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:	
<i>Indicator OST.8.2</i>	Staff is aware of the legal requirements for providing reasonable accommodations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Legal requirements for reasonable accommodations are included in new staff orientation. ▪ Annual staff development activities include training about reasonable accommodations.
Enter how the above Indicator is being met by your program:	
Enter any other ways you are meeting Standard OST.8 that are not captured by the indicators:	