

SDDT Funding Initiative Evaluation Fiscal Year 2018-19 Annual Report

Appendix Contents

Appendix A: City Agency Survey Results.....	2
Department of Public Health.....	2
Office of Economic and Workforce Development.....	35
Health Services Agency.....	40
Department of Recreation and Parks.....	57
San Francisco Unified School District.....	64
Appendix B: Complete RFP Survey Results.....	87
Healthy Communities Grant.....	87
Healthy Communities Support Grant.....	99
Food Purchasing Supplement Grant.....	111

Appendix A: City Agency Survey Results

Department of Public Health

Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 1,035,000.00

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement

Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Increase the number of San Franciscans that receive Healthy Food Purchasing Supplements; Increase the number of months that pregnant WIC clients receive HFPS from 6 months to 9 months; Expand the number of programs that will receive SDDT funds to make food more affordable.

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Support additional organizations and strategies to make food more affordable.

Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program.

- Food security is access by all people at all times to enough nutritious, culturally acceptable foods for an active, healthy life. Hunger and food insecurity are closely related, but distinct, concepts. Hunger refers to a personal, physical sensation of discomfort, while food insecurity refers to a lack of available financial resources for food at the level of the household. In 2014, San Francisco began investing in ways to increase the ability of low income San Franciscans to afford healthy food through funding Healthy Food Purchasing Supplements. Healthy Food Purchasing Supplements (further referred to as Supplement) are interventions designed to improve food security and dietary intake by increasing the ability of food insecure San Franciscans to purchase foods that contribute to a nutritious diet. Healthy Food Purchasing Supplements have been provided in several different ways, they include, vouchers, incentives,

coupons, and other programs designed to pay for healthy food. Supplement does not mean a gift or incentive to participate in another program.

How much funding was allocated to Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools in FY 2018-19?

- 1,035,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program?

- Improve food security
- Increase fruit and vegetable consumption

Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Vouchers must be used for healthy food
- Voucher system includes food vendors in SF neighborhoods with high health disparities
- Vendors to include food retail (Grocery stores) as well as farmers markets
- Voucher systems includes policies and procedures for securing unused vouchers, controlling for fraud, tracking usage/redemption of vouchers
- Voucher system will partner with existing programs currently serving the target populations
- Distribution sites will support EatSF participants in enrolling in all food assistance programs for which they are eligible
- 45-50% of the voucher value should go to pregnant women who are food insecure and on Medi- Cal.
- 30-35% of the voucher value should go to SSI, SSDI and SSI pending recipients who are food insecure
- 20-25% of the voucher value should go to other individuals who are food insecure

What were the main successes or highlights for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program?

- 32% of WIC EatSF Participants and 38% of SSI and other participants moved up at least one food security level while receiving vouchers. WIC participants increased their overall food security by 6% and others increased their overall food security by 9.6%
- Participants increased their F&V intake by 0.21 servings per day (SSI & other) and 0.26 servings per day (WIC) while in the program
- SSI and other participants also reported eating less junk food (87%); being more confident making healthy choices on a budget (97%); that they are more knowledgeable of the importance of F&V (95%); and that their health improved (90%) as a result of the program.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program?

- With additional funding in FY 18-19, SFPHF issued an RFP to seek additional vendors. The RFP was issued on June 20th 2019

Was the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- General Funds

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- Additional funds from SDDT allowed for additional organizations to be funded to expand the types of Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement programs funded. These programs directly address the need to increase the affordability of healthy food.

Did the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

q15, 16, 17, 18. Please provide the following information for each of the CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners.

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	SF Public Health Foundation	1,035,000	SFPHF provides project management services for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement	July 1, 2018

Did you hire any new staff for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Number of vouchers, unduplicated households
How well you did it	Retention rates, redemption rates, satisfaction ratings
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	Change in food security status; change in fruit and vegetable consumption

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Reports

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program reach or serve?

- 5,100

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other populations (<i>please specify</i>): |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>People on SSI</u> |

To what extent did the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations					X	
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					Increase food security by making food more affordable
Help people navigate government systems and services		X				
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training					X	
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):					X	

To what extent did the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding					X	
Dental caries					X	
Food security	X					Make healthy food affordable
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					Make healthy food affordable
Heart disease		X				Make healthy food affordable
Hypertension		X				Make healthy food affordable
Physical activity					X	
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption					X	
Tap water consumption					X	
Type 2 diabetes		X				Make healthy food affordable
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement schools program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development					X	
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach					X	
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)					X	
Other						

Community Based Grants and Infrastructure

Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

\$4,617,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Community Based Grants
- Infrastructure/ Research/ Support

Community Based Grants and Infrastructure

Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Reach out to the community; purchase SSB data; hire epidemiologist; lay foundation for evaluation

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Continue to support SDDT-AC and implement robust community based grants program

Community Based Grants

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Community Based Grants program.

- Funding program for community based grants

How much funding was allocated to community based grants in FY 2018-19?

- 3,817,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Community-Based Grants in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the community based grants program?

- Support long term sustainable changes that are health promoting, community building and equity focused
- Support delivery of chronic disease prevention programs
- Help build strong community organizations with financial and technical support so that priority communities can success fully implement innovative, community driven and community led initiatives

Community Based Grants: Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the community based grants program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- establish a contract with fiscal sponsor
- develop RFP for CBOs

What were the main successes or highlights for the community based grants program?

- 2 RFPs released for CBO grants

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the community based grants program?

- DPH contracts process

Was the community based grants program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

Don't Know

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the community based grants program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your community based grants program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	SF public health foundation	44187	developing/ promoting RFP	May 2019

Did you hire any new staff for the Community Based Grants program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Community Based Grants program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Community Based Grants:

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the community based grants program reach or serve?

- 0

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the community based grants program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other populations (please specify): <u>n/a</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the community based grants program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations					X	
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)					X	
Help people navigate government systems and services					X	
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training					X	
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):					X	

To what extent did the Community Based Grants program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding					X	
Dental caries					X	
Food security					X	
Fruit and vegetable consumption					X	
Heart disease					X	
Hypertension					X	
Physical activity					X	
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption					X	
Tap water consumption					X	
Type 2 diabetes					X	
Other (please specify)					X	

To what extent did the community based grants program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe how these were addressed.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services					X	
Collaborations and Partnerships					X	
Community-Led and Informed					X	
Culturally Relevant					X	
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas					X	
Leadership Development					X	
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach					X	
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)					X	
Other					X	

Infrastructure/Research/Support:

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the infrastructure/research/support program.

- funds to support data, evaluation, planning and staffing for SDDTAC

How much funding was allocated to infrastructure/research/support in FY 2018-19?

- 800,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for infrastructure/research/support in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the infrastructure/research/support program?

- evaluation of SDDTAC
- planning with SDDTAC
- SSB data for SDDTAC
- staffing for SDDTAC

Infrastructure/Research/Support:

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the infrastructure/research/support program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- develop eval framework/evaluation
- building SDDTAC infrastructure/committees
- hiring SDDTAC staff
- data purchase for SSB purchasing

What were the main successes or highlights for the infrastructure/research/support program?

- SDDTAC committee infrastructure developed; SDDTAC workplan; SDDT eval framework; epidemiologist hired

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the infrastructure/research/support program?

- challenges hiring SDDTAC staff

Was the infrastructure/research/support program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the infrastructure/research/support program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your infrastructure/research/support program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	RDA	85000	SDDTAC committee support	Jan 2019
Contractor 2	Harder and Co	90000	SDDTAC evaluation	Jun 2019

Did you hire any new staff for the infrastructure/research/support program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

- None
- 1 to 25%
- 26 to 50%
- 51 to 75%
- 76 to 100%
- Don't know

Did your agency do any evaluation of the infrastructure/research/support program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?
 This question was not displayed to the respondent.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?
 This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Infrastructure/Research/Support:
 Population Served

Approximately how many people did the infrastructure/research/support program reach or serve?

- 16

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the infrastructure/research/support program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Other populations (please specify)
Foster Youth Students, LGBTQ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the infrastructure/research/support program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)		X				
Help people navigate government systems and services		X				
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training				X		
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):					X	

To what extent did the infrastructure/research/support program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding					X	
Dental caries					X	
Food security					X	
Fruit and vegetable consumption					X	
Heart disease					X	
Hypertension					X	
Physical activity					X	
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption					X	
Tap water consumption					X	
Type 2 diabetes					X	
Other (please specify)					X	

To what extent did the infrastructure/research/support program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services					X	
Collaborations and Partnerships					X	
Community-Led and Informed					X	
Culturally Relevant					X	
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas					X	
Leadership Development					X	
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach					X	
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)					X	
Other					X	

HOPE SF Peer Leaders

Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 4,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Hope SF Peer Leaders

HOPE SF Peer Leaders

Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Professionalize a peer based program, allow high quality services to be delivered by trusted residents

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- none received this year

HOPE SF Peer Leaders

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program.

- Chronic disease and nutrition education for HopeSF residents

How much funding was allocated to HOPE SF Peer Leaders in FY 2018-19?

- 400,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for HOPE SF Peer Leaders in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program?

- identification of hypertensive pts
- linkage to clinical services
- improved nutrition knowledge

HOPE SF Peer Leaders

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Fairs
- 1:1 Engagement (Door to Door etc.)
- Health programs (yoga, etc.)

What were the main successes or highlights for the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program?

- community health worker training for all peers

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program?

- educational support needs, hiring

Was the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- DPH general fund, still is primarily

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- added staff hours

Did the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your HOPE SF Peer Leaders program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	YMCA	1,200,000	all services	

Did you hire any new staff for the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

- None
- 1 to 25%
- 26 to 50%
- 51 to 75%
- 76 to 100%
- Don't know

Did your agency do any evaluation of the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	program activity attendance, events
How well you did it	# of engagements (more sustained than contacts)
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	BP changes

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Logs, survey tools

HOPE SF Peer Leaders

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program reach or serve?

- 0

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program (please select all that apply)?

- Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL)
- Non-Chinese Asians
- Pregnant women
- Chinese
- Youth (aged 10-18 years)
- Native American/Native Indians
- Young adults (aged 18-24 years)
- Women and/or Girls
- Black/African Americans
- Men and/or Boys
- Latinx
- Unknown populations
- Filipinx
- Other populations (*please specify*)
- Pacific Islanders

To what extent did the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)		X				
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):		X				

To what extent did the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding					X	
Dental caries					X	
Food security	X					
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					
Heart disease	X					
Hypertension	X					
Physical activity	X					
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption		X				
Tap water consumption		X				
Type 2 diabetes		X				
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the HOPE SF Peer Leaders program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach	X					
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					
Other						

Mission, District 10, and Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce
Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 450,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce
- District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce
- Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Mission, District 10, and Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce
Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Sustainability and expansion of the development of the culturally appropriate messaging (able to hire a consultant next FY)
-

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Continue supporting the children's oral health taskforces in all three communities as dental decay is still a large issue, and mostly preventable.

Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce program.

- To support the development and implementation of a children's oral health taskforce impacting high-risk children of Latinx heritage.

How much funding was allocated to Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce schools in FY 2018-19?

- 150,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- Create a sustainable task force
- Implement activities to improve access to, awareness of, and understanding of early preventive oral health services
- Develop culturally appropriate messaging to promote children's oral health
- Communicate and coordinate with CavityFree SF regarding all activities, accomplishments and challenges

Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Identified key participants to be a part of the task force
- Provided additional funding through other source to develop media campaigns
- Developed administrative documents to assist in documentation of meetings
- Provided a consultant to develop a plan for sustainability
- Acted as technical assistance support for implementation
- Acted as advisory board for work plan development
- Held the IRB protocols for the Focus Group hosted in Fall 2018

What were the main successes or highlights for the Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- At least 5 community members are consistently attending the TF meetings monthly; the TF also was able to host their first community briefing; began to develop messaging as based on a focus group that occurred in Fall 2018.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Mission Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- The taskforces were not able to receive the SDDT funds as we were unable to open and close their contracts in a timely manner for effective use of funds.

Was the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- General Funds, Prop 56, and Dental Transformation Initiative

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- As a resource for future messaging campaign seed funding to improve children's oral health awareness and preventive care.

Did the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	CARECEN	150,000	Host agency	Not received, due to contracting delays

Did you hire any new staff for the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce
Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program reach or serve?

- 250

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Other populations (<i>please specify</i>) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					

To what extent did the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding	X					
Dental caries	X					
Food security	X					
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					
Heart disease			X			
Hypertension			X			
Physical activity			X			
Stroke			X			
Sugary drink consumption	X					
Tap water consumption	X					
Type 2 diabetes	X					
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Mission Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach	X					
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					
Other						

District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce program.

- To support the development and implementation of a children's oral health taskforce impacting high-risk children of African American decent.

How much funding was allocated to District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce schools in FY 2018-19?

- 150,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- Create a sustainable task force
- Implement activities to improve access to, awareness of, and understanding of early preventive oral health services
- Develop culturally appropriate messaging to promote children's oral health
- Communicate and coordinate with CavityFree SF regarding all activities, accomplishments and challenges

District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Identified key participants to be a part of the task force
- Provided additional funding through other source to develop media campaigns
- Developed administrative documents to assist in documentation of meetings
- Provided a consultant to develop a plan for sustainability
- Acted as technical assistance support for implementation
- Acted as advisory board for work plan development
- Held the IRB protocols for the Focus Group hosted in Fall 2018

What were the main successes or highlights for the District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- At least 12 community members are consistently attending the TF meetings monthly; began to develop messaging as based on a focus group that occurred in Fall 2018.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the District 10 Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- The taskforces were not able to receive the SDDT funds as we were unable to open and close their contracts in a timely manner for effective use of funds.

Was the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- General Funds, Prop 56, and Dental Transformation

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- As a resource for future messaging campaign seed funding to improve children's oral health awareness and preventive care.

Did the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	APAFSS	150,000	Host Agency	Not received due to contracting delays

Did you hire any new staff for the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce
Population Served

Approximately how many people did the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program reach or serve?

- 300

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Other populations (<i>please specify</i>) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					

To what extent did the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding	X					
Dental caries	X					
Food security		X				
Fruit and vegetable consumption		X				
Heart disease					X	
Hypertension					X	
Physical activity					X	
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption	X					
Tap water consumption	X					
Type 2 diabetes	X					
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the District 10 Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach		X				
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					
Other						

Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce program.

- To support the development and implementation of a children's oral health taskforce impacting high-risk children of Asian heritage.

How much funding was allocated to Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce schools in FY 2018-19?

- 150,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- Create a sustainable task force
- Implement activities to improve access to, awareness of, and understanding of early preventive oral health services
- Develop culturally appropriate messaging to promote children's oral health
- Communicate and coordinate with CavityFree SF regarding all activities, accomplishments and challenges

Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Identified key participants to be a part of the task force
- Provided additional funding through other source to develop media campaigns
- Developed administrative documents to assist in documentation of meetings
- Provided a consultant to develop a plan for sustainability
- Acted as technical assistance support for implementation
- Acted as advisory board for work plan development
- Held the IRB protocols for the Focus Group hosted in Fall 2018

What were the main successes or highlights for the Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- At least 7 community members are consistently attending the TF meetings monthly; began to develop messaging as based on a focus group that occurred in Fall 2018, and created PSAs on the radio.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Chinatown Children's Oral Health Taskforce program?

- The taskforces were not able to receive the SDDT funds as we were unable to open and close their contracts in a timely manner for effective use of funds.

Was the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- General Funds, Prop 56, and Dental Transformation Initiative

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- As a resource for future messaging campaign seed funding to improve children's oral health awareness and preventive care.

Did the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	NICOS	150,000	Host Agency	Not received due to contracting delays

Did you hire any new staff for the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program reach or serve?

- 500

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program (please select all that apply)?

- Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL)
- Pregnant women
- Youth (aged 10-18 years)
- Young adults (aged 18-24 years)
- Black/African Americans
- Latinx
- Filipinx
- Pacific Islanders
- Non-Chinese Asians
- Chinese
- Native American/Native Indians
- Women and/or Girls
- Men and/or Boys
- Unknown populations
- Other populations (*please specify*)

To what extent did the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					

To what extent did the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding		X				
Dental caries	X					
Food security	X					
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					
Heart disease	X					
Hypertension	X					
Physical activity		X				
Stroke		X				
Sugary drink consumption	X					
Tap water consumption	X					
Type 2 diabetes	X					
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Chinatown Children’s Oral Health Taskforce program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach	X					
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)			X			
Other						

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- \$150,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Healthy Retail

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Add a Community Engagement partner

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Stabilization of community engagement process and assist store owners/managers with POS, merchandising, staff training

Healthy Retail Program

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Healthy Retail program.

- SF Ordinance passed in October 2013, the Healthy Food Retailer Incentives Program Ordinance (in Admin Code), which created the HealthyRetailSF Program in 2014. HRSF Program is a partnership between SFDPH Community Health Equity & Promotion and the Mayor's Office of Economic & Workforce Development (OEWD). The program is a unique partnership, which addresses public health needs in SF around healthy and affordable food access, as well as limiting the influences of unhealthy products such as tobacco, alcohol and sugary beverages – with a lens of supporting SF's greatest small business community in neighborhoods of high-need.

How much funding was allocated to Healthy Retail schools in FY 2018-19?

- 150,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Healthy Retail schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Healthy Retail program?

- Increase access to healthy influences
- Increase small business sustainability
- Increase awareness of neighborhood healthy food

Healthy Retail Program

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Healthy Retail program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Upgrading POS systems for store owners
- Stabilization of community engagement process
- Create retail management training to assist store owners/managers with POS, merchandising, staff training
- Store mentorship program with alumna store owners
- Signage Program: Signage programs for marketing/promotion of healthy items.

What were the main successes or highlights for the Healthy Retail program?

- Supports 5 Community Leaders and adding 2 additional Community Leaders this year

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Healthy Retail program?

- HRSF Staff and consultant capacity

Was the Healthy Retail program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the Healthy Retail program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Healthy Retail program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	N/A		Water equipment and installation

Did you hire any new staff for the Healthy Retail program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Healthy Retail program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Identified which schools did not receive bottle filling stations
How well you did it	We are on schedule to install at all more most of the schools
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	Yes, more students will have access to water along with water education

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- We have assessment data collected in our spreadsheet, student survey's, meeting notes, student-led project-based work outline and photos

Healthy Retail Program

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Healthy Retail program reach or serve?

- 2000

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Healthy Retail program (please select all that apply)?

- Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL)
- Pregnant women
- Youth (aged 10-18 years)
- Young adults (aged 18-24 years)
- Black/African Americans
- Latinx
- Filipinox
- Pacific Islanders
- Non-Chinese Asians
- Chinese
- Native American/Native Indians
- Women and/or Girls
- Men and/or Boys
- Unknown populations
- Other populations (*please specify*): LGBTQ, Foster Youth, and students who are not having a sense of belonging at school

To what extent did the Healthy Retail program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					see other descriptions
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services					X	
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					

To what extent did the Healthy Retail program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding					X	
Dental caries	X					
Food security						
Fruit and vegetable consumption						
Heart disease						
Hypertension						
Physical activity		X				
Stroke						
Sugary drink consumption	X					
Tap water consumption	X					
Type 2 diabetes	X					
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Healthy Retail program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach	X					
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					
Other						

Health Services Agency

Health Services Agency

Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 1,047,00

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds?

Please list the title of each.

- Home Delivered Meals
- Congregate Meals
- Community Services (Fitness Focus)

Health Services Agency

Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Expand in demand nutrition services and continue popular fitness programs, which had no ongoing funding.

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Funding will continue in these service areas.

Home Delivered Meals

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Home Delivered Meals program.

- Delivers meals to homebound seniors and adults with disabilities who are unable to shop or prepare their own meals due to a physical or mental impairment.

How much funding was allocated to Home Delivered Meals schools in FY 2018-19?

- 477,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Home Delivered Meals schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Home Delivered Meals program?

- Consumers will report that the Home Delivered Meals program was beneficial to them
- Consumers will report that the Home Delivered Meals program allows them to live more independently
- Consumers will report that due to participation in the Home Delivered Meals program an increase in the consumption of fruits and vegetables
- Consumer rating of overall satisfaction with program

- Consumer rating of nutrition staff
- Consumer rating of quality of food, variety of menu, appearance of food, temperature of food
- Consumer will report feeling less isolated, more connected due to participation in the program

Home Delivered Meals

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Home Delivered Meals program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many)

- Expanded program capacity to meet demand for services.

What were the main successes or highlights for the Home Delivered Meals program?

- Expanded program capacity to meet demand for services

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Home Delivered Meals program?

- 90% of surveyed clients felt the program was beneficial to them; over 90% report being able to live more independently due to program participation; over 90% report eating more fruits and vegetables as a result of program participation.

Was the Home Delivered Meals program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- Combination of Fed/State funding (via the Older Americans Act) and local County General Funds

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- For 17/18, these funds served an additional approx. 525 clients and 203,000 home delivered meals. 18/19 results are still being compiled but should be comparable.

Did the Home Delivered Meals program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Home Delivered Meals program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	Meals on Wheels	Home Delivered Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 2	Self-Help for the Elderly	Home Delivered Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 3	Centro Latino de San Francisco	Home Delivered Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 4	On Lok Day Services	Home Delivered Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 5	Jewish Family and Children's Services	Home Delivered Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 6	Russian American Community Services	Home Delivered Meals	7/1/2018

Did you hire any new staff for the Home Delivered Meals program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Home Delivered Meals program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Unduplicated clients receiving services, meals delivered
How well you did it	Unduplicated clients receiving services, meals delivered
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	Unduplicated clients receiving services, meals delivered

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Database of client records and meals received, survey tools, reports based on the previous two resources

Home Delivered Meals
Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Home Delivered Meals program reach or serve?

- 5500

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Home Delivered Meals program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other populations (<i>please specify</i>)
<u>Older Adults (60+) and Adults aged 18-59 with a disability</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the Home Delivered Meals program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					Use of community based organizations drives ability to reach underserved populations
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					Program targets people who have difficulty getting out of their homes, which restricts access to healthy eating options
Help people navigate government systems and services		X				Focus is on delivery of meals, some social services assistance offered
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training		X				While not an explicit requirement, community based organizations will generally hire staff who reflect the population they intend to serve.
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):					X	

To what extent did the Home Delivered Meals program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries				X		
Food security	X					Provides access to healthy nutrition meal
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					Provides access to healthy nutritious meal and nutrition education
Heart disease		X				Via delivery of a healthy, nutritious meal
Hypertension		X				Via delivery of a healthy, nutritious meal
Physical activity				X		
Stroke					X	Via delivery of a healthy, nutritious meal
Sugary drink consumption		X				Via delivery of a healthy, nutritious meal
Tap water consumption						
Type 2 diabetes					X	
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Home Delivered Meals program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					Meal is free, with suggested donation
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					Via contract with community based organization for delivery of services
Community-Led and Informed	X					Via contract with community based organization for delivery of services
Culturally Relevant	X					Via contract with community based organization with focus on specific ethnic groups
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas		X				Ongoing identification of ways to use this program to connect this hard to reach population to other resources: dissemination of emergency preparedness info, referral to other resources
Leadership Development					X	
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach					X	
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)					X	
Other						

Congregate Meals

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Congregate Meals program.

- Congregate Meals, sometimes known as community dining programs, provide lunch every day at various locations throughout the City. This program not only supports nutrition by providing healthy meals, but also offers the opportunity to socialize with peers and engage in community activities at meal sites.

How much funding was allocated to Congregate Meals schools in FY 2018-19?

- 370,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Congregate Meals schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Congregate Meals program?

- Consumers report program is beneficial to them
- Consumers report that due to participation in congregate meal program, they are able to live more independently
- Consumers report that due to program participation, they eat more fruits and vegetables
- Consumer rating of the quality of the meal
- Consumer rating of the nutrition program staff
- Consumers report receiving the services needed from the agency
- Consumers reporting they would recommend the congregate meal program
- Consumer rating on the quality of the food, variety of menu, appearance of food, temperature of food
- Consumers reporting feeling less isolated and more connected as a result of program participation

Congregate Meals

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Congregate Meals program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many)

- Expand congregate meal opportunities in the community.

What were the main successes or highlights for the Congregate Meals program?

- Supported over 48,000 congregate meals, high reports of program being beneficial, supporting participants' independence, and encouraging increase consumption of fruits and vegetables.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Congregate Meals program?

- Finding appropriate space in the community to host congregate meal sites is always a challenge. Part of these funds were to support new congregate meal sites, however even with a location identified it turned out neither met accessibility or food safety requirements and new locations had to be found, delaying program starts.

Was the Congregate Meals program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- Combination of State/Fed funding (via Older Americans Act) and local County General Funds. Income received by contractors via suggested donations also provides some limited program support

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- Provides for approximately 48,000 additional meals annually

Did the Congregate Meals program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Congregate Meals program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	Self-Help for the Elderly		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 2	Project Open Hand		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 3	Bayview Senior Services		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 4	On Lok Day Services		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 5	Episcopal Community Services		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 6	Russian American Community Services		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 7	Glide		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018
Contractor 8	Centro Latino de San Francisco		Congregate Meals	7/1/2018

Did you hire any new staff for the Congregate Meals program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Congregate Meals program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Unduplicated clients receiving services, meals delivered
How well you did it	Via client survey
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	Via client survey

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Client records and meals served records in database system, client survey results, reports analyzing data from these two sources

Congregate Meals

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Congregate Meals program reach or serve?

- 19,500

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Congregate Meals program (please select all that apply)?

- Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL)
- Non-Chinese Asians
- Pregnant women
- Chinese
- Youth (aged 10-18 years)
- Native American/Native Indians
- Young adults (aged 18-24 years)
- Women and/or Girls
- Black/African Americans
- Men and/or Boys
- Latinx
- Unknown populations
- Filipinx
- Other populations (*please specify*)
Older Adults (60+) and Adults aged 18-59 with a disability
- Pacific Islanders

To what extent did the Congregate Meals program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					Via contract with community based organizations which focus on specific ethnic groups
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					Via provision of health, nutrition meal
Help people navigate government systems and services		X				Via ancillary services often co-located at congregate meal site
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training			X			Not explicitly required, however community based organizations tend to hire staff who are best reflect community to be serves
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):					X	

To what extent did the Congregate Meals program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries				X		
Food security	X					Provides regular, free, healthy, nutritious meal
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					Provides regular, free, healthy, nutritious meal and nutrition education
Heart disease		X				Provides regular, free, healthy, nutritious meal and nutrition education
Hypertension		X				Provides regular, free, healthy, nutritious meal and nutrition education
Physical activity			X			Via ancillary exercise opportunities co-located at many congregate meal sites
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption		X				Provides regular, free, healthy, nutritious meal and nutrition education
Tap water consumption	X					By providing water to drink, limiting non-water options at site, and providing healthy drink education
Type 2 diabetes		X				Provides regular, free, healthy, nutritious meal and nutrition education
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Congregate Meals program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					Meals are free, with optional suggested donation of \$2 per meal
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					Via contract with community based organization
Community-Led and Informed	X					Via contract with community based organization
Culturally Relevant	X					Sites are able to offer culturally appropriate menus, such as Asian, Western/American style, Latino, and other cuisine options
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas		X				Via contract with community based organizations, meal programs often co-located with other program opportunities for participants such as healthy activities, social services, technology labs
Leadership Development					X	
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach					X	
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)					X	
Other						

Community Services (Fitness Focus)

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program.

- Community Service Centers provide older adults and adults with disabilities with a wealth of social activities and other programs to promote their engagement and inclusion in the community. Across nearly 40 service sites

scattered throughout the City, people can participate in programs like tai chi, painting, computer access and literacy, English as a second language classes, exercise classes, and still many other events to participate meaningfully in their communities.

How much funding was allocated to Community Services (Fitness Focus) schools in FY 2018-19?

- 200,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Community Services (Fitness Focus) schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program?

- Report positive impact on health
- Report participating in one or more physical activities per week at Community Service Center

Community Services (Fitness Focus)

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many)

- Contracted with established Community Service Centers
- Centers developed or continued specialized programs focusing on fitness, such as Qi Jong, exercise classes, cooking classes, healthy living education programs

What were the main successes or highlights for the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program?

- High percentage of Community Services participants report positive impact on health; high percentage report participation in more than one physical activity per week at site

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program?

- Limited barriers as these were continuation of existing programs.

Was the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

- Via local County General Funds

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

- SDDT funds continued expiring funding for these particular programs

Did the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Community Services (Fitness Focus) program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	Bayview Senior Services	150,000	Continuation of existing fitness focused programming	7/1/2018
Contractor 2	I.T. Bookman Community Center	50,000	Continuation of existing fitness focused programming	7/1/2018

Did you hire any new staff for the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?
This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Unduplicated consumers, hours of programming offered
How well you did it	Client surveys
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	Client surveys, some programs are evidence based

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Client records and service level logs in database system, client survey results, reports based on these two sources of information

Community Services (Fitness Focus)

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program reach or serve?

- 1000

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other populations (<i>please specify</i>) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Older Adults (60+) and Adults aged 18-59 with a disability</u> |

To what extent did the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					Use of community based organizations drives ability to reach underserved populations
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					Program targets people who have difficulty getting out of their homes, which restricts access to healthy eating options
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					Focus is on delivery of meals, some social services assistance offered
Encourage		X				While not an explicit

workforce diversity through hiring or training

requirement, community based organizations will generally hire staff who reflect the population they intend to serve.

Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):

X

To what extent did the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries				X		
Food security			X			Via co-location with programs that did focus on food security
Fruit and vegetable consumption			X			Some healthy eating and cooking classes, but primarily via co-location with programs that provided meal services and nutrition education
Heart disease		X				Via fitness and exercise related classes
Hypertension		X				Via fitness and exercise related classes
Physical activity	X					Via fitness and exercise related classes
Stroke					X	
Sugary drink consumption			X			Via co-location at sites that provide meal services and nutrition education, sites encourage drinking of water on site and off
Tap water consumption			X			Via co-location at sites that provide meal services and nutrition education, sites encourage drinking of water on site and off
Type 2 diabetes		X				Via fitness and exercise related classes
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Community Services (Fitness Focus) program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					Programs are free
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					Delivered via contract with community based organization, some of which subcontracted to smaller local providers
Community-Led and Informed	X					Via contract with community based organizations which focus on population they serve
Culturally Relevant	X					Via contract with community based organizations which focus on population they serve, contractor ensures programs are culturally relevant and of interest to community
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas		X				Programs are co-located with a variety of other services, encouraging cross-participation
Leadership Development					X	
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach			X			Classes may be led by peers or local community members
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)					X	
Other						

Department of Recreation and Parks

Department of Recreation and Parks

Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 520,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Peace Parks

Department of Recreation and Parks

Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- The Peace Parks program has touched many lives in under-served communities, specifically with residents. We would not have been able to do this without this funding

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- To continue to support and develop the Peace Parks program. Our surveys showed that folks would like to see coding classes, more music options, resume building, tutoring and nutritional classes.

Peace Parks

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Peace Parks program.

- The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD), the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the San Francisco Street Violence Intervention Program (SVIP) are partnering together on a park activation and community engagement project called Peace Parks. This collaboration intends on providing a safe place for youth and families to engage in a variety of positive activities. By integrating neighborhood policing strategies along with national recreation best practices and appropriate programming, the partnership aims to build and strengthen positive and continuing relationships between the community, police and city agencies. The target population is Transitional Aged Youth (TAY), but open to all in the community.

How much funding was allocated to Peace Parks schools in FY 2018-19?

- \$520,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Peace Parks schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Peace Parks program?

- Promote pro-social behavior through caring and supportive services.
- Activate park properties with positive activities.

- Encourage education and reduce truancy.
- Increase number of teens/TAY in GED programs.
- Increase education around nutrition, diet and water consumption.
- Increase Opportunities for exercise in formal class environment.
- Increase safe passage for youth using parks for safe and healthy activities.
- Increase awareness of needs of the community.
- Build positive, continuing relationships between the community, SFPD and City Agencies.
- Encourage community residents to participate in new opportunities that will improve their lives and their community.

Peace Parks

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Peace Parks program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Healthy Habits Cooking Class at each site-weekly
- TAY Basketball League - weekly at Potrero Hill
- Drumming class with Loco Bloco - weekly at Herz Playground
- Family Night: Dinner and a Movie - bi-weekly at all three locations)
- Health and Hygiene - Barber and Beauty Shop - weekly at all three sites
- Digital Beats - Music learning - weekly at Potrero Hill
- Job Readiness and Housing workshops - weekly at YBC
- Physical Activities - Boxing, Martial Arts, Dance Class - at each site weekly
- Ladies Night - Weekly at Potrero Hill
- Tech Classes - Coding, Robotics - weekly at Potrero Hill and YBC)

What were the main successes or highlights for the Peace Parks program?

- Communities around Peace Parks feel safer and have a place to go to find recreation and respite. It's evident that relationships between SFPD and the community have strengthened, crime stats are showing decreased crime near Peace Parks locations.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Peace Parks program?

- Funding for food is our biggest challenge. As the programs continues to grow, we continue to need more money to provide healthy meals for our youth. In addition, building trust with residents in these communities are vital towards our long-term success, this requires expanded and continuous outreach and engagement. Staffing shortages are sometimes and issue, it is important that we have coverage when someone is unable to work so that our program is not disrupted. Lastly, Data Collection, being data-driven is important towards our efforts in understanding our successes and our gaps.

Was the Peace Parks program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the Peace Parks program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Peace Parks program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	Loco Bloco	0	Loco Bloco provided a drumming class	
Contractor 1	SVIP	0	SVIP provided transportation for participants between sites and to events	

Did you hire any new staff for the Peace Parks program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

- None
- 1 to 25%
- 26 to 50%
- 51 to 75%
- 76 to 100%
- Don't know

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Peace Parks program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement

How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)

Peace Parks has served over 600 families.

How well you did it

This is a new program, so we are constantly evaluating our programs and activities to see what is working and what is not. Some programs are highly successful, such as the Barber and beauty shop, and some need to be revamped. Our goal is to offer programs and activities that our enriching for our participants. We also involve the youth in deciding what programs and actives we should offer.

If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)

Yes. Peace Parks has been able to help 6 families get into housing. We have also provided over 25 jobs to folks from the community, which also inspires youth to attend our programs and trust us because they see that we are committed to hiring folks from their communities. In addition, we provide healthy dinners; more people are drinking water vs soda and sugary drinks. Neighbors, communities groups and businesses attest that the community is safer.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Our current evaluation tools: Surveys, daily attendance logs and staff reports.

Peace Parks

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Peace Parks program reach or serve?

- 1,000

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Peace Parks program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | Other populations (<i>please specify</i>): |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>San Francisco Public Housing residents</u> |

To what extent did the Peace Parks program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					Program designed to engage public housing and residents and adjacent community members
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					Healthy meals each night of program, transportation, physical activity programs
Help people navigate government systems and services		X				All program hires associated with the communities served
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training		X				Engage residents in programs outside of their neighborhoods
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):		X				Engage residents in programs outside of their neighborhoods

To what extent did the Peace Parks program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries				X		
Food security		X				Information regarding healthy food options in each community
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					Had both at all meals
Heart disease			X			Through our Healthy Habits cooking class
Hypertension			X			Through our Healthy Habits cooking class
Physical activity	X					With our program offerings, sports, dance, drumming, martial arts
Stroke				X		Through our Healthy Habits cooking class
Sugary drink consumption	X					Main objective with the youth. Have water at all meals and available at all times
Tap water consumption	X					Have water refilling station on location
Type 2 diabetes			X			Through our Healthy Habits cooking class
Other (please specify)						Have begun a community garden, two plots, teaching the youth how to grow food

To what extent did the Peace Parks program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					All Peace Parks programs are free
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					Work with other city agencies, CBO partners and local businesses
Community-Led and Informed	X					Constantly seeking input from community, community agencies and Housing partners
Culturally Relevant	X					Programs are designed to enhance the participants interests
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas		X				Using best practices to deliver programs
Leadership Development		X				Provide internal and external training opportunities
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach		X				Have built a team amongst the sites the staff at
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)		X				Have conducted workshops on site. Partnering this Fall with YCD and the Success Center to provide more workforce development trainings
Other						

San Francisco Unified School District

Student Nutrition Services and Student-Led Action School Health Programs Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

\$1,500,000

**What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds?
Please list the title of each.**

- Student Nutrition Services
- Student-Led Action School Health Programs

Student Nutrition Services and Student-Led Action School Health Programs Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- We were able to hire staff to improve our communications, increase professional development opportunities for cafeteria staff, increase relationships with local businesses and increase amount of in house prepared meals

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- We will expand in house prepared meals further including to elementary schools, we maintain and evolve communications and marketing, continue workforce development through professional development opportunities and finally increase amount of locally sources foods.

Student Nutrition Services Program: Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Student Nutrition Services program.

- Every day we nourish our students with food that enables them to live healthy lives and thrive inside and outside the classroom.

How much funding was allocated to Student Nutrition Services in FY 2018-19?

- 1,000,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Student Nutrition Services in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Student Nutrition Services program?

- Local Sourcing & Central Warehousing
- Teacher Outreach
- Professional Development for Cafeteria Staff

Student Nutrition Services Program

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Student Nutrition Services program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Over 20% of total food purchases are locally sourced
- Hired Culinary Supervisor that researches local food options and builds relationships with local supplies i.e. Straus Milk, Coke Farms & Mindful Meats
- 50% increase in production of Refresh (in house meals) increasing amount of freshly prepared food at middle and high schools
- Hired Communications & Design Strategist to develop communication and marketing tools for both adults and students
- Provided over 44 hours of professional development for Cafeteria Staff

What were the main successes or highlights for the Student Nutrition Services program?

- Strengthened our in house food preparation programs, provided additional Professional Development hours & opportunities for Dining Staff including guest speakers and hands on culinary technique training, and strengthened relationship with school site administrators.

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Student Nutrition Services program?

- Facilities at our schools continue to be a challenge for improving school meals and meal experience. Developing a plan to best leverage funds to move facilities work more quickly. Creating space for meaningful engagement with students and school site administrators.

Was the Student Nutrition Services program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the Student Nutrition Services program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Student Nutrition Services program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you hire any new staff for the Student Nutrition Services program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

- None
- 1 to 25%
- 26 to 50%
- 51 to 75%
- 76 to 100%
- Don't know

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Student Nutrition Services program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Good Food Purchasing Program Evaluation and participation data (both student meals and professional development)
How well you did it	Good Food Purchasing Program
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Good Food Purchasing Program report, meal claims and participation data, and sign in sheets for trainings population.

Student Nutrition Services Program

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Student Nutrition Services program reach or serve?

- 20,200

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Student Nutrition Services program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Other populations (please specify) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the Student Nutrition Services program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					We attend parent meetings including Samoan Family Center to provide information about nutrition and the school meal program throughout the year
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					We provide up to 3 meals per day during the school year and up to 2 meals per day during the summer to children throughout the city)
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					We help parents everyday to apply for school meal programs
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					We provided training to all employees to help with improved meal service as well as career advancement
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					We provide information to our families that show them how to gain access to programs like reduced PG & E bills as a result of their free/reduced lunch status

To what extent did the Student Nutrition Services program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries				X		
Food security	X					We provide meals each school day and during the summer
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					Fresh fruit & vegetables are available at each meal provided by SNS
Heart disease			X			We meet and exceed USDA menu program standards
Hypertension			X			We meet and exceed USDA menu program standards
Physical activity			X			We meet and exceed USDA menu program standards
Stroke					X	We meet and exceed USDA menu program standards
Sugary drink consumption	X					We do not offer any sugary drinks in our meal program.
Tap water consumption			X			We meet and exceed USDA menu program standards
Type 2 diabetes			X			We meet and exceed USDA menu program standards
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Student Nutrition Services program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					All students are able to consume school meals regardless of their ability to pay
Collaborations and Partnerships		X				We have partnerships within District i.e. Student Wellness, with City i.e. Food Security Task Force, and nationally i.e. Good Food Program
Community-Led and Informed		X				We have participated in several parent advisory groups, met with Student Advisory Council, and have a substantive student School Food Advisory
Culturally Relevant			X			This is something in development
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas			X			School meals offer this well as we are working to address food security while also supporting local economies, making decisions in support of the environment while also building a supported work force with decent wage and work stability.
Leadership Development		X				This has been part of our professional development work
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach				X		
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					See leadership development (workforce development)
Other						

Student-Led Action School Health Program

Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program.

- Support student led efforts to decrease consumption of sugary drinks and increase awareness of sugary drinks consumption among students, with focus on schools with the largest populations of high-risk students that are disproportionately targeted by the sugary drinks industry.

How much funding was allocated to Student-Led Action School Health Programs in FY 2018-19?

- \$500,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Student-Led Action School Health Programs in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program?

- Implement student-led projects in 3 - 7 schools, ultimately into 33 schools
- Present student-led findings from their projects, especially those supporting increase of drinking water consumption and decreasing SSB
- Present student-led findings from their projects, especially those supporting increase consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables
- Present student-led findings from their projects, especially those supporting increase physical activity

Student-Led Action School Health Program

Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Project-Based Learning activities per school
- Trained Staff and students in how to develop Project-Based Learning activities
- Assess schools and other community data

What were the main successes or highlights for the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program?

- Three Project Based Learning projects were implemented

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program?

- We did not immediately have the staff hired to implement this programming. Continued relationship building throughout the district and the city.

Was the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Student-Led Action School Health Programs program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	PBL Works	18,000	Started training our staff to provide project-based learning projects	June 2019

Did you hire any new staff for the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

- None
- 1 to 25%
- 26 to 50%
- 51 to 75%
- 76 to 100%
- Don't know

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	youth
How well you did it	Still measuring
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- logs, survey tools, and reports

Student-Led Action School Health Program

Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program reach or serve?

- 1,000

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program (please select all that apply)?

- Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL)
- Pregnant women
- Youth (aged 10-18 years)
- Young adults (aged 18-24 years)
- Black/African Americans
- Latinx
- Filipinx
- Pacific Islanders
- Non-Chinese Asians
- Chinese
- Native American/Native Indians
- Women and/or Girls
- Men and/or Boys
- Unknown populations
- Other populations (please specify)
Foster Youth Students, LGBTQ

To what extent did the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services			X			
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					We hired students to receive stipends
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					We hired students to receive stipends

To what extent did the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries	X					
Food security	X					
Fruit and vegetable consumption	X					
Heart disease		X				
Hypertension		X				
Physical activity			X			
Stroke				X		
Sugary drink consumption	X					
Tap water consumption	X					
Type 2 diabetes	X					
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Student-Led Action School Health Programs program include each of the following elements?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach	X					
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					
Other						

Water Access
Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 450,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Water Access at SFUSD schools

Water Access
Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- We were able to serve high need areas.

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Continue to provide education, promotion of nutrition and water, and maintain the bottle filling stations (maintenance will be needed)

Water Access
Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Water Access at SFUSD program.

- Free, safe, unflavored drinking water will be available to all students throughout the school day

How much funding was allocated to Water Access at SFUSD schools in FY 2018-19?

- 450,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Water Access at SFUSD schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Water Access at SFUSD program?

- Increase Percentage of Accessible Hydration Stations in Schools by Zip code in underserved areas
- Percentage of students self-reporting drinking more water by race/ethnicity to decrease health disparity gaps
- Percentage of students self-reporting drinking less SSB by race/ethnicity to decrease health disparity gaps
- Increase Percentage of student-led health activities to increase student attendance and sense of belonging
- Fund 30 - 35 Hydration Station installations (aka bottle filling station) in 15 - 19 schools meeting SFUSD's Silver or Gold Standard

Water Access
Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Water Access at SFUSD program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Met with all stakeholders for their input and guidance (20 - 30 people)
- Data assessment of district's currently bottle filling stations locations in the city (mapped locations 123 schools)
- Preparing Installation, Beautification schedule
- Preparing Whole School, Whole Community, Whole-Child Professional Development, Education Delivery for 15 - 19 schools (10+ cross departmental educators)
- Order Supplies / Materials needed
- Planned District's and City's Communications' Plan (Mayor's Office, Rec & Park, and various SFUSD departments)
- Scheduling Celebration (Ribbon Cutting)
- Implemented a Student-Led Project-Based Learning Water Project (20+ students)

What were the main successes or highlights for the Water Access at SFUSD program?

- Various Student-Led projects have been implemented in 3 schools

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Water Access at SFUSD program?

- It is not as easy as just putting in a Bottle Filling Station by making a call to the facilities department. This project required lots of coordination between lots of stakeholders, as well as actual building limitation, i.e. asbestos, tree roots growing under or near plumbing, orchestrating timing for installation and education, just to name a few challenges.

Was the Water Access at SFUSD program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the Water Access at SFUSD program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Water Access at SFUSD program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	Not sure... Facilities has those names		Water equipment and installation

Did you hire any new staff for the Water Access at SFUSD program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Water Access at SFUSD program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Identified which schools did not receive bottle filling stations
How well you did it	We are on schedule to install at all more most of the schools
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	Yes, more students will have access to water along with water education.

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- We have assessment data collected in our spreadsheet, student survey's, meeting notes, student-led project-based work outline and photos

Water Access
Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Water Access at SFUSD program reach or serve?

- 2,000

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Water Access at SFUSD program (please select all that apply)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Chinese Asians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth (aged 10-18 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American/Native Indians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Young adults (aged 18-24 years) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or Girls |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Black/African Americans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men and/or Boys |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown populations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filipinx | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other populations (<i>please specify</i>): <u>LGTBQ, Foster Youth, and students who are not having a sense of belonging at school</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islanders | |

To what extent did the Water Access at SFUSD program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					see other descriptions
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services					X	
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training	X					
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):	X					

To what extent did the Water Access at SFUSD program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding					X	
Dental caries	X					
Food security						
Fruit and vegetable consumption						
Heart disease						
Hypertension						
Physical activity		X				
Stroke						
Sugary drink consumption	X					
Tap water consumption	X					
Type 2 diabetes	X					
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Water Access at SFUSD program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed	X					
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development	X					
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach	X					
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)	X					
Other						

Oral Health
Funding Overview

How much was the total SDDT allocation for all of your agency/department programs in FY2018-19?

- 200,000

What program(s) did your agency/department finance with SDDT funds? Please list the title of each.

- Oral Health SFUSD

Oral Health
Reflections

What, if anything, did SDDT funds allow your agency to do that may not have been done without these funds?

- Expand into areas that we were not able to do.

How does your agency plan to use any anticipated SDDT funds in the future?

- Continue to support low-income families, especially with health disparities

Oral Health
Overview

Please provide a brief description of the Oral Health SFUSD program.

- Support school-based and school-linked preventive oral health programs within SFUSD schools serving high-risk target populations. This should also support SFUSD dedicated oral health staffing

How much funding was allocated to Oral Health SFUSD schools in FY 2018-19?

- 200,000

Were SDDT funds the only funding for Oral Health SFUSD schools in FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Please describe the desired outcomes or goals for the Oral Health SFUSD program?

- Increase number of Oral Health Case management post screening

Oral Health
Process

What activities did your organization do to accomplish the desired outcome(s) for the Oral Health SFUSD program? Please be descriptive and quantitative (e.g., how many).

- Outreach calls and letters to families in appropriate language
- Connect families to an Oral Health Care Provider
- Follow-up to see if families have attended their appointments

What were the main successes or highlights for the Oral Health SFUSD program?

- Hired a Health Worker and a Nurse Coordinator

What were the challenges or barriers implementing the Oral Health SFUSD program?

- Hiring process took longer than anticipated

Was the Oral Health SFUSD program a newly funded program for FY 2018-19?

- Yes
- No

How was the program funded before?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

How, if at all, did the SDDT funding expand the program?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Did the Oral Health SFUSD program use all of the SDDT allocated funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Did you use any CBOs, contractors, and/or associated partners to support your Oral Health SFUSD program work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

	Contractor	How much did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive?	What support or services did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners provide?	When did the CBO, contractors, and/or associated partners receive funds? If they have not yet received funds, why?
Contractor 1	SF Public Health Foundation	29,414	Oral Health Screening for Kindergarteners and New First Graders to the district	June 2019

Did you hire any new staff for the Oral Health SFUSD program using SDDT funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

What proportion of the newly hired staff lives in San Francisco?

- None
- 1 to 25%
- 26 to 50%
- 51 to 75%
- 76 to 100%
- Don't know

Did your agency do any evaluation of the Oral Health SFUSD program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

How did you measure each of the following?

Measurement	
How much you did (e.g., people served, program activities completed)	Will be done June 2020
How well you did it	
If anyone is better off because of the program (i.e., program outcomes)	

What evaluation documentation exists (e.g., databases, logs, survey tools, reports, etc.)?

- Database records semi-annually, sometimes quarterly to Dental Transformation Initiatives (DTI)

Oral Health
Population Served

Approximately how many people did the Oral Health SFUSD program reach or serve?

- 5342

Which of the following SDDT high priority populations were reached or served by the Oral Health SFUSD program (please select all that apply)?

- Low-Income San Franciscans (under 200% FPL)
- Non-Chinese Asians
- Pregnant women
- Chinese
- Youth (aged 10-18 years)
- Native American/Native Indians
- Young adults (aged 18-24 years)
- Women and/or Girls
- Black/African Americans
- Men and/or Boys
- Latinx
- Unknown populations
- Filipinx
- Other populations (*please specify*)
- Pacific Islanders

To what extent did the Oral Health SFUSD program do each of the following equity-related activities?

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe the activity
Outreach to underserved populations	X					
Improve access to healthy eating / active living activities for underserved populations (e.g., transportation, safe environments)	X					
Help people navigate government systems and services	X					
Encourage workforce diversity through hiring or training		X				
Improve economic and/or social equity in other ways (please specify):		X				

To what extent did the Oral Health SFUSD program address each of the following diet-sensitive chronic diseases and risk factors? Please describe how these were addressed.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe how these were addressed.
Breastfeeding				X		
Dental caries	X					
Food security				X		
Fruit and vegetable consumption				X		
Heart disease				X		
Hypertension				X		
Physical activity				X		
Stroke				X		
Sugary drink consumption				X		
Tap water consumption				X		
Type 2 diabetes				X		
Other (please specify)						

To what extent did the Oral Health SFUSD program include each of the following elements? Please describe this inclusion.

	To a significant extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	Not at all	Don't know	Please describe this inclusion.
Accessible (i.e., free or low cost) Services	X					
Collaborations and Partnerships	X					
Community-Led and Informed				X		
Culturally Relevant	X					
Intersection of Strategies and Program Areas	X					
Leadership Development				X		
Peer-Led / Promotora Approach				X		
Provides Training and Employment for Target Community Members (workforce development)				X		
Other						

Appendix B: Complete RFP Survey Results

Below is a complete set of tables from the RFP survey. A subset of these, along with summary text, is included in the report.

Healthy Communities Grant

Overall Description

Healthy Communities Grant		
	Frequency	Percent
Applied	24	35%
Considered Applying	7	10%
Neither Applied nor Considered	12	17%
Ineligible, Annual Budget Over \$1 million	26	38%
Total	69	100%

Organization Information by Application Status

Note: for all further information about the Healthy Communities grant, only eligible organizations were included, i.e., the 26 organizations with annual budgets greater than one million dollars were excluded.

What type of organization are you (please check all that apply)?				
Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant				
	Applied (n=24)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=7)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=12)	Total (n=43)
501(c)3 (nonprofit)	46%	43%	25%	40%
Faith based group	8%	0%	8%	7%
Private company	4%	0%	8%	5%
Neighborhood based organization	33%	29%	58%	40%
School or educational institution	0%	14%	8%	5%
Other (please specify)	17%	29%	17%	19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 501(c)4 • Advocacy group with fiscal agency • Fiscal sponsor • Health and Wellness advocate • Independent consultant • Retired LCSW who sits on several nonprofit boards 				

What is the approximate annual budget for the organization you represent?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=23)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=7)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=12)	Total (n=42)
Mean	\$353,104	\$428,786	\$162,083	\$311,140
Median	\$300,000	\$250,000	\$7,500	\$210,500
Std. Deviation	\$286,701	\$348,330	\$284,928	\$305,772
Minimum	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0
Maximum	\$920,000	\$1,000,000	\$800,000	\$1,000,000

How did you find out about the SDDT grants (please check all that apply)?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=23)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=7)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=11)	Total (n=41)
Email from the San Francisco Public Health Foundation (@sfphf.org)	57%	14%	36%	44%
Listserv	17%	14%	27%	20%
Email from someone else	30%	29%	9%	24%
Announcement at a meeting (e.g., Shape Up SF Coalition, BMAGIC)	39%	14%	36%	34%
Word of mouth (e.g., colleague, professional contact, friend)	35%	29%	18%	29%
Other (please specify)	0%	14%	18%	7%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board and Committee meetings • I wasn't aware of the grants • SF Food Bank 				

Applied or Considered Applying for Healthy Communities Grant (n=31)

Has your organization ever received a grant from the San Francisco Department of Public Health?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=20)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=4)	Total (n=24)
Yes	50%	0%	42%
No	45%	75%	50%
Don't Know	5%	25%	8%

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=20)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=4)	Total (n=24)
Yes (please describe why)	85%	50%	79%
Don't Know (please describe why)	15%	50%	21%

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT? - Yes (please describe why) - Text

- Agency would benefit for funding from SDDT and aligns with the mission.
- Building capacity within our organization
- Health disparities that fit with our target population
- Hoping to fund our unique project, b/c it addresses a community and type of support that no other program provides within SF
- I am fond of the organization and mission
- I hope so, but that also depends on the outcome of said grants
- If eligible and fits our programming
- If the values are aligned with our core values.
- Imprint City hosts projects in the Bayview Garden space that need funding support.
- Our organizational values and mission align with the SDDT funding
- Our State status is changing
- This process was great and the purpose of the money is in line with what we do.
- We are well aligned with SDDT mission and values
- We are working towards the same health, wellness and equity goals; I appreciate their approach and focus on community-based orgs and understanding that change takes time and longevity in a community.
- We feel uniquely qualified to serve the people in our communities
- We need financial support for our health programs
- We would like to expand our services

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT? - Don't Know (please describe why) - Text

- Depends on whether we get the 3 year HCG.
- Depends upon guidelines for payment and the amount
- Feeling very discouraged about rejection for the larger grant when it seemed that we qualified and needed capacity building, as that is what that grant said was the purpose of the grant
- Maybe - depends on amount, subject matter, etc.

When applying for grants, do you ever use a professional grant writer?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=20)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=4)	Total (n=24)
Yes	30%	0%	25%
No	70%	100%	75%

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply)

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=20)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=4)	Total (n=24)
Age			
Children 0-5 years	55%	25%	50%
Children 6-17 years	70%	25%	63%
Young Adults (age 18 to 24 years)	75%	50%	71%
Male Youth 10-24 years	55%	25%	50%
Adults 25-64	45%	50%	46%
Seniors 65+	40%	75%	46%
Race/Ethnicity			
Asians	65%	75%	67%
Black/African Americans	85%	75%	83%
Filipinx	30%	75%	38%
Latinx	65%	75%	67%
Native Americans	25%	75%	33%
Pacific Islanders	60%	75%	63%
Whites	40%	75%	46%
Gender			
Men / Boys	65%	50%	63%
Women / Girls	65%	50%	63%
Additional Priority Populations			
Pregnant Women	35%	25%	33%
Low Income Residents	80%	75%	79%
Specific Neighborhoods (please specify)	60%	75%	63%
Other (please specify)	5%	50%	13%

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply) - Specific Neighborhoods (please specify) - Text

- Bayview Hunters Point (n=7)
- Chinatown (n=1)
- District 10 (n=1)
- District 11 (n=1)
- Excelsior (n=1)
- Fillmore (n=2)
- Mission (n=2)
- Outer Mission (n=1)
- Potrero (n=1)
- SOMA (n=1)
- Sunnydale (n=1)
- Tenderloin (n=4)
- Visitacion Valley (n=1)
- Western Addition (n=2)

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply) - Other (please specify) - Text

- Don't have a client-based organization
- Immigrants
- People who have experienced trauma

What type(s) of work does your organization do? (please check all that apply)

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=20)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=4)	Total (n=24)
Active living / physical activity	80%	75%	79%
Adverse childhood experiences	20%	0%	17%
Chronic disease prevention education	70%	75%	71%
Food security	25%	25%	25%
Healthy eating	70%	50%	67%
Oral health	0%	0%	0%
Policy or systems changes	25%	50%	29%
Sugary drink consumption	30%	0%	25%
Supporting breastfeeding	20%	0%	17%
Water access	15%	0%	13%
Workforce development / local hiring	35%	0%	29%
Other (please specify)	25%	25%	25%
• Doula services			
• Education			
• Mass Incarceration			
• Maternal health care			
• Older adult recreation			
• Spiritual health			
• Tobacco control			

About how many grants does your organization apply for in an average year?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied (n=20)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=4)	Total (n=24)
Mean	9	10	10
Median	5	8	5
Std. Dev.	11	11	11
Minimum	2	1	1
Maximum	50	25	50

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied	Considered, But Did Not Apply	Total
--	---------	-------------------------------------	-------

Active living / physical activity

Mean	10	10	10
Median	7	6	6
Minimum	1	3	1
Maximum	25	20	25
N	16	3	19

Adverse childhood experiences

Mean	22	(none)	22
Median	20		20
Minimum	4		4
Maximum	42		42
N	4		4

Chronic disease prevention education

Mean	8	13	9
Median	5	10	5
Minimum	1	10	1
Maximum	30	20	30
N	14	3	17

Food security

Mean	9	20	11
Median	6	20	7
Minimum	5	20	5
Maximum	20	20	20
N	5	1	6

Healthy eating

Mean	7	12	7
Median	5	12	5
Minimum	1	3	1
Maximum	20	20	20
N	14	2	16

Policy or systems changes

Mean	4	13	7
Median	2	13	3
Minimum	1	10	1
Maximum	15	15	15
N	5	2	7

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Grant

	Applied	Considered, But Did Not Apply	Total
--	---------	-------------------------------------	-------

Sugary drink consumption

Mean	6	(none)	6
Median	4		4
Minimum	1		1
Maximum	20		20
N	6		6

Supporting breastfeeding

Mean	3	(none)	3
Median	3		3
Minimum	1		1
Maximum	4		4
N	4		4

Water access

Mean	4	(none)	4
Median	3		3
Minimum	2		2
Maximum	7		7
N	3		3

Workforce development / local hiring

Mean	14	(none)	14
Median	10		10
Minimum	1		1
Maximum	42		42
N	6		6

Other (please specify)

Mean	18	28	21
Median	15	28	23
Minimum	1	20	1
Maximum	42	35	42
N	4	2	6

Did you know about the Healthy Communities grant application information session?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	22	78.6
No	6	21.4
Don't Know	0	0.0
Total	28	100.0

Did you attend the Healthy Communities grant application information session meeting (either in person or remotely)?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	63.6
No	8	36.4
Total	22	100.0

How useful was the Healthy Communities grant informational session in helping you complete the application?		
	Frequency	Percent
Very helpful	8	57.1
Somewhat helpful	5	35.7
A little helpful	1	7.1
Total	14	100.0

- What, if anything, did you learn from the information session that helped you complete the Healthy Communities grant application?**
- Clarity on the process of the grant review, as well as got to see some of the other organizations who were also applying.
 - Consider the demographic information from the community of origin and not of residence
 - Fiscal sponsor questions
 - General sense of who else was applying, the level of emphasis on priority populations, clear sense of the process.
 - Having the notes published was huge to look back on without having to watch the whole session again. It answered my question about how much was available: \$500k overall or per org? Also, having staff share how they expected the process to go (having more grants than fully qualified applicants during the first round) was helpful to know in deciding whether or not to spend the hours preparing this application.
 - Just that our proposed program is fully aligned with the RFP.
 - Priorities
 - Priority areas, funding specifics
 - Provided a good overview and alerted us to what was expected in the application
 - That this was meant to be for smaller growing organizations, they relaxed many of the requirements.
 - Timelines

- What else would you have liked to learn in the Healthy Communities grant meeting?**
- Component breakdowns of requirements
 - If there were any DPH staff or mentors to help suggest edits
 - That even though this is a foundation grant, they have the same requirements as other government grants

Did you know about the question and answer page for the Healthy Communities grant?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	22	78.6
No	6	21.4
Total	28	100.0

Did you visit the question and answer page for the Healthy Communities grant?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	19	86.4
No	3	13.6
Total	22	100.0

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why?		
	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied (please describe why)	8	44.4
Mostly satisfied (please describe why)	9	50.0
Somewhat satisfied (please describe why)	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Very satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- I felt like the webpage with the questions and answers in reference to the grant were very helpful to refer to as we were starting to work on the application. Some of our questions were answered in reviewing that webpage.
- It answered the exact question I had
- They were common questions answered in simple language
- Very clear

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Mostly satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- Answered the questions
- Clear and concise
- I found out about the RFP on Thursday July 18, 2019 I had 3.5 days to complete it and almost all of my work on the grant was Friday night thru Monday at noon. So the Q&A was very helpful. I knew it had to be done in three days and the City's offices were closed so there wasn't anyone to ask questions to.
- It was difficult to find the webpage but once found, it was easy to submit a question and a response was timely.
- Met expectations
- Responded to applicants concerns
- There were 1 or 2 questions whose answers were still a bit confusing

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Somewhat satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- Just enough

What additional supporting information would have been helpful in completing the Healthy Communities grant application?

- A description of expected deliverables. Especially for the work plan. What kind of deliverables is the SDDT council looking for?
- Dates, times locations , etc. for anything connected to RAP
- I am fairly new at this (been taking a lot of seminar classes though). My big complaint is that I found out at the last minute and had to rush through the Application. I got it in on time but with only 12 minutes to spare. That is cutting it too close for my likes, but I got it done and in on time. Only other comment is that some of the questions were redundant, but there might have been a reason for the redundant questions.
- I felt that there was sufficient support
- I will read the supporting information now that I know about it.
- More detailed
- That even though this is a foundation grant, they have the same requirements as other government grants
- Very informative
- What additional resources would be available.
- What EXACTLY was PHF looking for in this grant

What tools or trainings would have been helpful in completing the Healthy Communities grant application?

- A workshop specifically to help non-professional grant writers understand more clearly how to promote our programs
- All the trainings were helpful
- For small organizations with small budgets but has experience implementing programs, it would've been equitable if a grant writer was delegated to them
- I thought it was fairly straightforward but I used to work in the Accounting field and I am well acquainted with reading complicated government publications. That being said I thought it was fairly easy, LONG but not that complicated.
- In the future it would be great to have some program highlights videos from funded programs/orgs so that we can see what type of programs this grant funding supports as well as impact.
- Online application
- Research
- Scored LOI
- Tools and information provided were adequate
- We would need specific training on how the organization would be reimbursed for monies spent. We had a bad experience with this several years ago, poor guidelines, poor follow up from the City. Not anxious to repeat that experience.

Considered Applying for the Healthy Communities Grant (n=6)

Why did you choose not to apply for the Healthy Communities grant? (please select all that apply)		
	Frequency	Percent
Didn't have time	2	33.3
Don't have a grant writer	2	33.3
We are not eligible	0	0
The amount of funding available was too small	0	0
The application process was too much work	1	16.7
The application process was too complicated	1	16.7
Our work does not fit within the scope	1	16.7
Other (please specify)	3	50.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not know about it • The amounts were more than we needed for a planned project. 		

What could we change so that you would apply for future SDDT funding?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add us to your list of RFP recipients • Better distribution of RFP • Could applicants ask for a smaller grant? \$5,000 to \$10000? Also, needed more information on how this is administered, receipts, who submitted to, etc. • Not have all the deadlines to close together • Provide a grants 101 course 	

Applied for the Health Communities Grant (n=24)

How clear and understandable were the application instructions for the Healthy Communities grant?		
	Frequency	Percent
Very clear	17	77.3
Somewhat clear	5	22.7
Total	22	100.0

In your opinion, the 6-week timeframe to complete the Healthy Communities grant application was:		
	Frequency	Percent
Too short	7	31.8
Just right	15	68.2
Total	22	100.0

The limit of 10 pages for the narrative section of the Healthy Communities grant application:		
	Frequency	Percent
Was too short; it did not provide us with enough space to answer all the questions	5	22.7
Was about the right length; it gave us enough space to answer all the questions	17	77.3
Total	22	100.0

How difficult was each of the following sections of the Healthy Communities grant application? (n=22)

	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Neither Easy nor Difficult	Somewhat Easy	Very Easy	n/a	Total
Budget	0%	14%	50%	14%	23%		100%
Fiscal agency organizational capacity	5%	5%	18%	27%	36%	9%	100%
Organizational capacity	0%	9%	36%	32%	23%		100%
Project description	9%	14%	32%	32%	14%		100%
Qualifications Statement	5%	5%	32%	23%	36%		100%
Workplan	5%	23%	41%	14%	18%		100%

Overall, how would you compare your experience with the SDDT Healthy Communities grant RFP to your experience with other grant applications?

	Frequency	Percent
The Healthy Communities grant RFP was easier to apply to than other grants	4	18.2
The Healthy Communities grant RFP was about the same as other grant applications	16	72.7
The Healthy Communities grant RFP was more difficult to apply to than others	2	9.1
Total	22	100.0

Is there anything else about your experience with the SDDT Healthy Communities grant RFP that you would like to share?

- Appreciate the opportunity to apply
- I appreciate the page limit in theory, however, there were SO many questions we had to answer in that space so I would have preferred less questions or larger page limit.
- I heard that we didn't make it to the interview round and we were upset, as this grant seems to be the best match for a grant that we have ever applied for. Also, we thought we met all the criteria for applicants
- I really appreciated the well laid out explanation of who qualifies to apply for the grant, the background and purpose of the grants, as well as the required elements for the grant submission.
- I wish there was more time between announcement of the RFPs and the due date.
- It would of been great to have an initial LOI process, before spending so much time on the full application.
- Many prompts were repetitive, which made it difficult — in ten pages — to give in-depth responses to questions that merited thoughtful answers. The need for brevity is understood — you'll be reading a lot of proposals; but, as I'm sure the SDDT council is aware, the barriers to health equity are complex and nuanced. In this case, the opportunity to more thoroughly convey our understanding and experience of the obstacles our communities face would have been welcome. Also, we would have liked to submit letters of support from partners in our community. The Healthy Communities grant is meant to support small/grassroots organizations. Quantifiable data does not fully capture the impact of these organizations. Testimonials tell the rest of the story, and in many cases speak more accurately of an organization's capacity and standing in the community.
- Some of the narrative questions had one main question with five follow up questions. Was hard to fully answer the questions in space allotted.
- The questions were better written than in other grants (less repetition and contradiction, more clear), which is in general why it felt easier. Nothing was mysterious or confusing, and the ability to ask questions via email over the course of the application period was extremely helpful!

Healthy Communities Support Grant

Overall Description

Healthy Communities SUPPORT Grant		
	Frequency	Percent
Applied	30	43.5
Considered Applying	16	23.2
Neither Applied nor Considered	23	33.3
Total	69	100.0

Organization Information by Application Status

What type of organization are you (please check all that apply)?				
Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant				
	Applied (n=30)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=16)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=23)	Total (n=69)
501(c)3 (nonprofit)	60%	56%	61%	59%
Faith based group	10%	0%	4%	6%
Private company	3%	6%	0%	3%
Neighborhood based organization	23%	19%	39%	28%
School or educational institution	3%	6%	9%	6%
Other (please specify)	17%	13%	9%	13%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 501(c)4 • Advocacy group with fiscal agency • Fiscal sponsor • FQHC • Health and Wellness advocate • Independent consultant • Retired LCSW who sits on several nonprofit boards 				

What is the approximate annual budget for the organization you represent?				
Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant				
	Applied (n=29)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=16)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=23)	Total (n=68)
Mean	\$5,242,931	\$3,323,844	\$8,732,235	\$5,971,587
Median	\$600,000	\$910,000	\$700,000	\$670,000
Std. Deviation	\$15,150,625	\$5,276,918	\$24,244,107	\$17,311,367
Minimum	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0
Maximum	\$80,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$115,000,000	\$115,000,000

How did you find out about the SDDT grants (please check all that apply)?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant				
	Applied (n=29)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=16)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=21)	Total (n=66)
Email from the San Francisco Public Health Foundation (@sfphf.org)	55%	38%	38%	45%
Listserv	28%	13%	14%	20%
Email from someone else	34%	25%	29%	30%
Announcement at a meeting (e.g., Shape Up SF Coalition, BMAGIC)	38%	13%	24%	27%
Word of mouth (e.g., colleague, professional contact, friend)	31%	13%	19%	23%
Other (please specify)	3%	0%	14%	6%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board and Committee meetings • Food Security Task Force • I wasn't aware of the grants • SF Food Bank 				

Applied or Considered Applying for the Healthy Communities Support Grant (n=46)

Has your organization ever received a grant from the San Francisco Department of Public Health?			
Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant			
	Applied (n=24)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=12)	Total (n=36)
Yes	58%	33%	50%
No	38%	58%	44%
Don't Know	4%	8%	6%

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant			
	Applied (n=23)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=12)	Total (n=35)
Yes (please describe why)	91%	83%	89%
Don't Know (please describe why)	9%	17%	11%

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT? - Yes (please describe why) - Text

- Agency would benefit for funding from SDDT and aligns with the mission.
- Because I think we would be a good fit for this type of funding.
- Building capacity within our organization
- Funding for programs
- Health disparities that fit with our target population
- Hoping to fund our unique project, b/c it addresses a community and type of support that no other program provides within SF
- I believe we mirror some of the same goals for the targeted communities
- I hope so, but that also depends on the outcome of said grants
- If appropriate for our work
- If eligible and fits our programming
- If the values are aligned with our core values.
- Imprint City hosts projects in the Bayview Garden space that need funding support.
- It is a fit for organizational priorities and needs
- Just waiting for the RFP for the larger orgs
- Looking for larger funding streams, potentially over multiple years, to expand or deepen existing programs that work.
- Organizations over \$1M
- Our nutrition/healthy eating funds have declined in recent years and we are struggling to keep our programming vibrant, responsive and innovative.
- Our organizational values and mission align with the SDDT funding
- Our State Status is changing
- This process was great and the purpose of the money is in line with what we do.
- We are always looking for new grant opportunities
- We are very interested in providing health, nutrition and physical activity programming to our public school families.
- We are well aligned with SDDT mission and values
- We are working towards the same health, wellness and equity goals, I appreciate their approach and focus on community-based orgs and understanding that change takes time and longevity in a community.
- We could use the support to help serve food insecure families.
- We feel uniquely qualified to serve the people in our communities
- We need financial support for our health programs
- We offer programs in line with SDDT grant priorities, and are waiting for the RFP for orgs over \$1 million.
- We would like to expand our services

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT? - Don't Know (please describe why) - Text

- Depends on whether we get the 3 year HCG.
- Depends upon guidelines for payment and the amount
- Feeling very discouraged about rejection for the larger grant when it seemed that we qualified and needed capacity building, as that is what that grant said was the purpose of the grant
- Maybe - depends on amount, subject matter, etc.

When applying for grants, do you ever use a professional grant writer?

	Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant		
	Applied (n=24)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=12)	Total (n=36)
Yes	33%	33%	33%
No	67%	67%	67%

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply)

	Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant		
	Applied (n=24)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=12)	Total (n=36)
Age			
Children 0-5 years	58%	42%	53%
Children 6-17 years	67%	75%	69%
Young Adults (age 18 to 24 years)	71%	58%	67%
Male Youth 10-24 years	63%	50%	58%
Adults 25-64	63%	75%	67%
Seniors 65+	58%	50%	56%
Race/Ethnicity			
Asians	71%	75%	72%
Black/African Americans	88%	83%	86%
Filipinx	63%	58%	61%
Latinx	92%	58%	81%
Native Americans	58%	58%	58%
Pacific Islanders	83%	67%	78%
Whites	67%	67%	67%
Gender			
Men / Boys	75%	67%	72%
Women / Girls	79%	75%	78%
Additional Priority Populations			
Pregnant Women	54%	33%	47%
Low Income Residents	92%	83%	89%
Specific Neighborhoods (please specify)	67%	75%	69%
Other (please specify)	13%	8%	11%

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply) - Specific Neighborhoods (please specify) - Text

- All San Francisco (n=2)
- Bayview Hunters Point (n=12)
- Chinatown (n=3)
- District 10 (n=2)
- District 11 (n=1)
- Excelsior (n=4)
- Fillmore (n=2)
- Fisherman's Wharf (n=1)
- Mission (n=6)
- North Beach (n=1)
- Outer Mission (n=2)
- Potrero (n=1)
- SOMA (n=2)
- Sunnydale (n=1)
- Tenderloin (n=8)
- Visitacion Valley (n=2)
- Western Addition (n=5)

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply) - Other (please specify) - Text

- Don't have a client-based organization
- English language learners
- Homeless
- Immigrants
- LGBTQ
- People who have experienced trauma

What type(s) of work does your organization do? (please check all that apply)

	Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant		
	Applied (n=24)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=12)	Total (n=36)
Active living / physical activity	79%	42%	67%
Adverse childhood experiences	21%	33%	25%
Chronic disease prevention education	54%	50%	53%
Food security	38%	25%	33%
Healthy eating	83%	42%	69%
Oral health	8%	8%	8%
Policy or systems changes	25%	42%	31%
Sugary drink consumption	38%	17%	31%
Supporting breastfeeding	25%	8%	19%
Water access	17%	0%	11%
Workforce development / local hiring	42%	33%	39%
Other (please specify)	25%	25%	25%
• Doula services			
• Education			
• Etiquette and Manners			
• Legal aid			
• Life Skills			
• Mass Incarceration			
• Maternal health care			
• Mental health			
• Older adult recreation			
• Services to public school families			
• Spiritual health			
• Tobacco control			
• Youth and Family Development			

About how many grants does your organization apply for in an average year?

	Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant		
	Applied (n=24)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=12)	Total (n=36)
Mean	16	9	14
Median	10	5	10
Std. Dev.	14	9	13
Minimum	2	1	1
Maximum	50	30	50

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant

Applied Considered, But Did Not Apply Total

Active living / physical activity

Mean	13	30	17
Median	11	5	7
Minimum	1	4	1
Maximum	45	130	130
N	19	5	24

Adverse childhood experiences

Mean	7	32	18
Median	5	31	12
Minimum	3	12	3
Maximum	20	55	55
N	5	4	9

Chronic disease prevention education

Mean	9	22	13
Median	5	16	10
Minimum	1	4	1
Maximum	20	55	55
N	12	6	18

Food security

Mean	18	8	16
Median	20	6	11
Minimum	5	5	5
Maximum	50	12	50
N	9	3	12

Healthy eating

Mean	12	7	11
Median	9	5	8
Minimum	1	2	1
Maximum	50	12	50
N	20	5	25

Oral health

Mean	17	10	15
Median	17	10	14
Minimum	14	10	10
Maximum	20	10	20
N	2	1	3

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Healthy Communities Support Grant

Applied Considered, But Did Not Apply Total

Policy or systems changes

Mean	8	14	11
Median	2	12	10
Minimum	1	10	1
Maximum	40	25	40
N	6	5	11

Sugary drink consumption

Mean	8	7	8
Median	5	7	5
Minimum	1	4	1
Maximum	20	10	20
N	9	2	11

Supporting breastfeeding

Mean	3	5	4
Median	4	5	4
Minimum	1	5	1
Maximum	5	5	5
N	6	1	7

Water access

Mean	9	(none)	9
Median	6		6
Minimum	3		3
Maximum	20		20
N	4		4

Workforce development / local hiring

Mean	8	17	10
Median	8	12	8
Minimum	1	1	1
Maximum	20	42	42
N	9	4	13

Other (please specify)

Mean	8	32	21
Median	3	35	20
Minimum	1	6	1
Maximum	25	55	55
N	4	5	9

Did you know about the question and answer page for the Healthy Communities Support grant?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	25	64.1
No	14	35.9
Total	39	100.0

Did you visit the question and answer page for the Healthy Communities Support grant?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	19	76.0
No	6	24.0
Total	25	100.0

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why?

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied (please describe why)	5	33.3
Mostly satisfied (please describe why)	8	53.3
Somewhat satisfied (please describe why)	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Very satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- Answered essential questions clearly
- Yes, it was a great resource as we were writing out application because it provided relevant answers to direct aspects of the grant.

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Mostly satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- Clear and to the point
- Enough
- It did not show the references material
- Made sense
- Straight forward
- The answers seemed to answer the questions
- Written concisely

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Somewhat satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- It did not address some questions I had. Also, many answers were literal from the RFP guidelines, which is not helpful. Often when the question is being asked, it's because the guidelines are not clear enough, so answering with the literal guidelines isn't very helpful.
- When I saw one response that indicated 10 pages, it was confusing about what was required.

What additional supporting information would have been helpful in completing the Healthy Communities Support grant application?

- For any grant, it is really helpful to have specific examples of the type of projects you are looking to fund.
- I believe there was enough information provided.
- It was a pretty straightforward application. We did not apply but helped a few other orgs apply.
- More explanation on some of the questions that seemed repetitive.
- More reference material, it's hard to remember all the information we come across
- RFP release date
- That even though this is a foundation grant, they have the same requirements as other government grants
- What not to request

What tools or trainings would have been helpful in completing the Healthy Communities Support grant application?

- A session to go over the grant application with a staff member who is clear what is necessary to qualify and stand a chance of getting a grant
- I believe all information needed was available to applicants.
- I have been attending the Grant Space seminars and webinars , they are good for me as I just started doing this
- It was pretty straightforward and well done
- Not sure, as our budget is too high.
- Ongoing with SF FOG and city and county cross department information sharing
- Online support
- Some language in the RFP was technical, and did not easily give reference (or spell out definitions) of terms. A glossary section would have been useful for organizations who do Community Health work outside of the formal health sector.
- Time necessary to write and gather all information

Considered Applying for the Healthy Communities Support Grant (n = 19)

Why did you choose not to apply for the Healthy Communities Support grant? (please select all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent
Didn't have time	3	21.4
Don't have a grant writer	3	21.4
Our work does not fit within the scope	1	7.1
The amount of funding available was too small	1	7.1
Application process was too complicated	0	0.0
Application process was too much work	0	0.0
Other (please specify)	2	14.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount was too large 		

What could we change so that you would apply for future SDDT funding?

- It was about organizational fit not the grants
- Nothing it was a good process
- Right fit and time to apply.
- SF should cover more costs that are related for indirect due to high rents
- Smaller grants, detailed information on pay out process, receipts needed, etc.
- Smaller organizations without professional/staff grant writer with a capacity grant to address health disparities in the community.

Applied for the Healthy Communities Support Grant (n=30)

How clear and understandable were the application instructions for the Healthy Communities Support grant?

	Frequency	Percent
Very clear	20	74.1
Somewhat clear	6	22.2
A little clear	1	3.7
Total	27	100.0

In your opinion, the 6-week timeframe to complete the Healthy Communities Support grant application was:

	Frequency	Percent
Too short	3	11.1
Just right	23	85.2
Too long	1	3.7
Total	27	100.0

The limit of 4 pages for the narrative section of the Healthy Communities Support grant application:

	Frequency	Percent
Was too short; it did not provide us with enough space to answer all the questions	8	29.6
Was about the right length and gave us enough space to answer all the questions	19	70.4
Total	27	100.0

How difficult was each of the following sections of the Healthy Communities Support grant application? (n=27)

	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Neither Easy nor Difficult	Somewhat Easy	Very Easy	n/a	Total
Budget	0%	11%	30%	26%	33%		100%
Fiscal Agency Capacity / Staff Qualifications	4%	0%	22%	30%	33%	11%	100%
Organizational Capacity	0%	11%	19%	41%	30%		100%
Project Description	0%	19%	19%	44%	19%		100%
Qualifications Statement & Cover Sheet	7%	4%	0%	11%	78%		100%

Was the maximum funding amount available (i.e., \$75,000) sufficient?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes (please describe why)	21	87.5
No (please describe why)	3	12.5
Total	24	100.0

Was the maximum funding amount available (i.e., \$75,000) sufficient? - Yes (please describe why) - Text

- Adequately funds our project
- As a PILOT program, it is right amount to start a project.
- Can cover a lot of support
- Does what it is intended for
- For a one-time support grant, this amount was adequate.
- For one-time funds, that was a good limit.
- I believe that this funding was sufficient for one-time funding cycle because it is enough to make a significant impact on our organization. It finally gave us the opportunity to have a leg up we need to really next level our programs, capacity, staff, and systems.
- I thought it was for 500k over 3 years
- It was enough to cover other expenses not covered in the program budget.
- Much needed type of grant to buy support equipment and consultation
- Oddly enough, our total budget was around \$72K
- The scope of our proposed project could be accomplished with this funding amount.
- This is a LOT of money for a capacity building grant - fantastic! To truly build capacity, grants need to be at least this big.
- We built our budget around the amount
- Yes
- Yes, for newer/smaller organization, this a is nice infusion of financial support
- Yes, if we were to have received the main grant
- Yes, with conservative planning, the project needs and budget came in under 70K.
- Yes. Fine

Was the maximum funding amount available (i.e., \$75,000) sufficient? - No (please describe why) - Text

- Needs are great
- No. Capacity funding needs to be more since the hope is it will have a much longer impact for years to come.
- Would make it difficult to meet all the RFP objectives.

Overall, how would you compare your experience with the SDDT Healthy Communities Support grant RFP to your experience with other grant applications?

	Frequency	Percent
The Healthy Communities Support grant RFP was easier to apply to than other grants	14	53.8
The Healthy Communities Support grant RFP was about the same as other grant applications	11	42.3
The Healthy Communities Support grant RFP was more difficult to apply to than others	1	3.8
Total	26	100.0

Is there anything else about your experience with the SDDT Healthy Communities Support grant RFP that you would like to share?

- Because it followed the HCG, it was fairly easy to write up. I appreciate the opportunity to apply for capacity building funds.
- Can you please add me to the list of people/organizations that get notification of RFPs Email is fine as a means of communication? Lastly sorry about not getting this back to you sooner, We have had staff out on vacation so I have been doing double duty.
- Compared to some RFPs, this was an easier and more streamlined application. That said, I've been responded to other RFPs that were simpler and easier to apply for.
- Excellent job creating a clear RFP. I have to admit I dreaded starting the grant because I have written many government grants, and most of them are a big headache, but this was super clear and easy! Just a cover sheet, a short narrative, and a budget? BRAVO!
- For both 4 and 6, asking us to include staff AND fiscal information (history and bios) within the page limit was really tough. We needed more space or to include that info in a supplemental (which I know we could have added resumes, but we still had to include in the narrative).
- It would have been better to include it as part of the main Community Grant
- Some of the questions were not clear (they seemed repetitive), and it was difficult to answer some of the details in such short space.
- THANK YOU for making it easy, brief and yet sufficient to make our case. So appreciated!
- There was conflicting information. We saw one correspondence that said a max of 4 pages, then another that said 10 pages max.

Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

Overall Description

Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement Grant		
	Frequency	Percent
Applied	6	8.7
Considered Applying	10	14.5
Neither Applied nor Considered	53	76.8
Total	69	100.0

Organization Information by Application Status

What type of organization are you (please check all that apply)?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant				
	Applied (n=6)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=10)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=53)	Total (n=69)
501(c)3 (nonprofit)	17%	60%	64%	59%
Faith based group	17%	0%	6%	6%
Private company	0%	0%	4%	3%
Neighborhood based organization	17%	30%	30%	28%
School or educational institution	33%	10%	2%	6%
Other (please specify)	17%	20%	11%	13%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 501(c)4 • Advocacy group with fiscal agency • Fiscal sponsor • FQHC • Health and Wellness advocate • Independent consultant • Retired LCSW who sits on several nonprofit boards 				

What is the approximate annual budget for the organization you represent?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant				
	Applied (n=6)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=10)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=53)	Total (n=69)
Mean	\$560,000	\$3,306,500	\$6,984,960	\$5,971,587
Median	\$600,000	\$375,000	\$700,000	\$670,000
Std. Deviation	\$427,785	\$6,604,591	\$19,321,964	\$17,311,367
Minimum	\$0	\$65,000	\$0	\$0
Maximum	\$1,100,000	\$20,000,000	\$115,000,000	\$115,000,000

How did you find out about the SDDT grants (please check all that apply)?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant				
	Applied (n=5)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=10)	Neither Applied nor Considered (n=51)	Total (n=66)
Email from the San Francisco Public Health Foundation (@sfphf.org)	20%	20%	53%	45%
Listserv	20%	10%	22%	20%
Email from someone else	60%	50%	24%	30%
Announcement at a meeting (e.g., Shape Up SF Coalition, BMAGIC)	20%	30%	27%	27%
Word of mouth (e.g., colleague, professional contact, friend)	60%	30%	18%	23%
Other (please specify)	0%	10%	6%	6%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board and Committee meetings • Food Security Task Force • I wasn't aware of the grants • SF food bank 				

Applied or Considered Applying for the Food Purchasing Supplement Grant (n=16)

Has your organization ever received a grant from the San Francisco Department of Public Health?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant			
	Applied (n=2)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6)	Total (n=8)
Yes	50%	33%	38%
No	50%	50%	50%
Don't Know	0%	17%	13%

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant			
	Applied (n=2)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6)	Total (n=8)
Yes (please describe why)	100%	100%	100%

Do you plan to apply for future grants from the SDDT? - Yes (please describe why) - Text

- Building capacity within our organization
- I am fond of the organization and mission
- I hope so, but that also depends on the outcome of said grants
- If eligible and fits our programming
- Our organizational values and mission align with the SDDT funding
- Our State Status is changing
- We could use the support to help serve food insecure families.

When applying for grants, do you ever use a professional grant writer?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

Applied (n=2) Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6) Total (n=8)

Yes	0%	50%	38%
No	100%	50%	63%

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply)

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

Applied (n=2) Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6) Total (n=8)

Age	Applied (n=2)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6)	Total (n=8)
Children 0-5 years	50%	50%	50%
Children 6-17 years	50%	33%	38%
Young Adults (age 18 to 24 years)	50%	50%	50%
Male Youth 10-24 years	50%	17%	25%
Adults 25-64	50%	67%	63%
Seniors 65+	100%	67%	75%
Race/Ethnicity			
Asians	100%	50%	63%
Black/African Americans	100%	83%	88%
Filipinx	50%	67%	63%
Latinx	50%	67%	63%
Native Americans	50%	50%	50%
Pacific Islanders	50%	83%	75%
Whites	50%	67%	63%
Gender			
Men / Boys	50%	67%	63%
Women / Girls	50%	67%	63%
Additional Priority Populations			
Pregnant Women	50%	33%	38%
Low Income Residents	100%	83%	88%
Specific Neighborhoods (please specify)	50%	83%	75%
Other (please specify)	0%	17%	13%

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply) - Specific Neighborhoods (please specify) - Text

- All San Francisco (n=1)
- Bayview Hunters Point (n=1)
- Chinatown (n=1)
- District 11 (n=1)
- Excelsior (n=1)
- Fillmore (n=1)
- Outer Mission (n=1)
- SOMA (n=1)
- Tenderloin (n=1)
- Visitacion Valley (n=1)
- Western Addition (n=1)

Which of the following populations are served by your organization? (please select all that apply) - Other (please specify) - Text

- Immigrants

What type(s) of work does your organization do? (please check all that apply)

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

	Applied (n=2)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6)	Total (n=8)
--	---------------	-------------------------------------	-------------

Active living / physical activity	0%	67%	50%
Adverse childhood experiences	0%	33%	25%
Chronic disease prevention education	50%	67%	63%
Food security	100%	50%	63%
Healthy eating	100%	50%	63%
Oral health	0%	17%	13%
Policy or systems changes	0%	17%	13%
Sugary drink consumption	0%	17%	13%
Supporting breastfeeding	0%	33%	25%
Water access	0%	0%	0%
Workforce development / local hiring	0%	0%	0%
Other (please specify)	50%	0%	13%

- Older adult recreation

About how many grants does your organization apply for in an average year?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

	Applied (n=2)	Considered, But Did Not Apply (n=6)	Total (n=8)
Mean	10	14	13
Median	10	10	10
Std. Dev.	0	11	10
Minimum	10	2	2
Maximum	10	30	30

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

	Applied for At Least 1 Grant	Considered, But Did Not Apply	Total
Active living / physical activity			
Mean	(none)	12	12
Median		12	12
Minimum		3	3
Maximum		20	20
N		4	4
Adverse childhood experiences			
Mean	(none)	16	16
Median		16	16
Minimum		12	12
Maximum		20	20
N		2	2
Chronic disease prevention education			
Mean	5	9	8
Median	5	8	5
Minimum	5	2	2
Maximum	5	20	20
N	1	4	5
Food security			
Mean	5	10	8
Median	5	6	5
Minimum	5	5	5
Maximum	5	20	20
N	2	3	5

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

Applied for At Least 1 Grant Considered, But Did Not Apply Total

Healthy eating

Mean	3	9	7
Median	3	4	4
Minimum	1	3	1
Maximum	5	20	20
N	2	3	5

Oral health

Mean	(none)	10	10
Median		10	10
Minimum		10	10
Maximum		10	10
N		1	1

Policy or systems changes

Mean	(none)	25	25
Median		25	25
Minimum		25	25
Maximum		25	25
N		1	1

Sugary drink consumption

Mean	(none)	1	1
Median		1	1
Minimum		1	1
Maximum		1	1
N		1	1

Supporting breastfeeding

Mean	(none)	5	5
Median		5	5
Minimum		4	4
Maximum		5	5
N		2	2

Water access

Mean	(none)	(none)	(none)
Median			
Minimum			
Maximum			
N			

For about how many years has your organization been doing each of these types of work?

Application Status: Food Purchasing Supplement Grant

Applied for At Least 1 Grant Considered, But Did Not Apply Total

Workforce development / local hiring

Mean	(none)	(none)	(none)
Median			
Minimum			
Maximum			
N			

Other (please specify)

Mean	(none)	(none)	(none)
Median			
Minimum			
Maximum			
N			

Did you know about the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant application information session?

Frequency Percent

Yes	4	44.4
No	4	44.4
Don't Know	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

Did you attend the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant application information session meeting?

Frequency Percent

Yes	2	50.0
No	2	50.0
Total	4	100.0

How useful was the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant informational session in helping you complete the application?

Frequency Percent

Somewhat helpful	1	50.0
A little helpful	1	50.0
Total	2	100.0

What, if anything, did you learn from the information session that helped you complete the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant application?

- That we could submit a budget over \$500k.

Did you know about the question and answer page for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	7	77.8
No	2	22.2
Total	9	100.0

Did you visit the question and answer page for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	57.1
No	3	42.9
Total	7	100.0

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why?

	Frequency	Percent
Mostly satisfied (please describe why)	2	66.7
Somewhat satisfied (please describe why)	1	33.3
Total	3	100.0

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Mostly satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- The Q&A contained a lot of important information

How satisfied were you with the responses to e-questions and why? - Somewhat satisfied (please describe why) - Text

- Did not fully understand about existing programming

What additional supporting information would have been helpful in completing the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant application?

- Better communications around the process as well as eligibility requirements for applying.
- Clearly state the idea needed to be fully operational and this grant opportunity was for expansion
- I wish I had known about the seminar/ meeting. I would have attended.
- There was no answer to why no indirect expenses are included or rationality behind 18% admin cost cap.

What tools or trainings would have been helpful in completing the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant application?

- All of them. There is a lot of material to cover and could confuse and overwhelm a person. So any and all seminars and or trainings would be helpful. Budget =Accounting, Healthy food = Nutritionist, Interoperability with target group = Psychology Sociology you cover a lot of territory with the Questions on the RFP
- Too long.

**Considered Applying for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplemental Grant
(n = 10)**

Why did you choose not to apply for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplemental grant? (please select all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent
Didn't have time	2	28.6
Don't have a grant writer	1	14.3
Our work does not fit within the scope	0	0.0
The amount of funding available was too small	1	14.3
The application process was too complicated	2	28.6
The application process was too much work	4	57.1
Other (please specify)	1	14.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not know about it 		

What could we change so that you would apply for future SDDT funding?

- Just add us to your list of orgs notified about the RFPs
- More flexibility, better communications about agency eligibility, etc.
- Nothing, it's more of having an organizational capacity to apply for it
- Providing guiding questions.
- Requirements
- Unsure
- Ways to integrate this into existing programming

Applied for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplemental Grant (n=6)

How clear and understandable were the application instructions for the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplemental grant?

	Frequency	Percent
Very clear	1	50.0
A little clear	1	50.0
Total	2	100.0

In your opinion, the 6-week timeframe to complete the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplemental grant application was:

	Frequency	Percent
Just right	2	100.0
Total	2	100.0

The limit of 10 pages for the narrative section of the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplemental grant application:

	Frequency	Percent
Was too short; it did not provide us with enough space to answer all the questions	2	100.0
Total	2	100.0

How difficult was each of the following sections of the Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant application? (n=2)

	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Neither Easy nor Difficult	Somewhat Easy	Very Easy	Total
Budget for FY 2019-2020	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Proposal Narrative	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Qualifications Statements	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Supporting Documents (i.e., two letters of recommendation)	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

Overall, how would you compare your experience with the SDDT Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant RFP to your experience with other grant applications?

The Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant RFP was easier to apply to than other grants	1	50.0
The Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant RFP was more difficult to apply to than others	1	50.0

Is there anything else about your experience with the SDDT Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement grant RFP that you would like to share?

- Did not realize program needed to be already existing.
- Too many questions - especially process questions. Many questions could have been more efficiently handled orally. Also some redundancy and overall too much.