

City of Sacramento
**Sacramento Children’s Fund Planning and Oversight
Commission Report**
915 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cityofsacramento.org

File ID: 2026-01127

6/4/2026

Sacramento Children’s Fund Target Populations

File ID: 2026-01127

Location: Citywide

Recommendation: Review the Strategic Investment Plan and Request for Proposals and discuss potential recommendations to align outcomes with the Measure L Target Populations.

Contact: Julie Garen, Program Specialist, (916) 808-1531, jgaren@cityofsacramento.org, Department of Youth, Parks, & Community Enrichment

Presenter: Nicole Kravitz-Wirtz, Sacramento Children’s Fund Commissioner

Attachments:

1-Description/Analysis

2-Sacramento Children’s Fund Target Population Presentation

Issue Detail: As part of the third year review of the Strategic Investment Plan, the Target Populations Ad Hoc Committee will present updates on their work including recommendations on how to approach the target populations in the second round of open grant funding.

The Sacramento Children’s Fund Planning and Oversight Commission will discuss the implementation updates and potential recommendations it may wish to make to better align outcomes with the five fund goals and the Sacramento Children’s Fund target populations. Sacramento Children’s Fund Commissioners will present multiple approaches to addressing the target populations in the competitive funding process.

Any recommendations to revise the competitive selection process must be consistent with the Commission’s powers and duties, as established in Section 120 of the City Charter, as well as the SIP approved by Council. Certain recommended revisions to the competitive selection process, and any revisions to the SIP, would require City Council approval.

Policy Considerations: Sacramento City Charter § 120 Sacramento Children’s Fund.

Economic Impacts: Not applicable.

Environmental Considerations: Not applicable.

Sustainability: Not applicable.

Commission/Committee Action: Not applicable.

Rationale for Recommendation: As outlined in Measure L, Sacramento City Charter § 120 Sacramento Children’s Fund, the Sacramento Children’s Fund Planning and Oversight Commission is charged with the power and duty to complete a third year review of the Strategic Investment Plan. The Commission may make recommendations on how to implement changes to the next round of open grant funding and/or the SIP after review and discussion of the implementation updates.

Financial Considerations: Not applicable.

Local Business Enterprise (LBE): Not applicable.

Strengthening the SCF RFP to Reach the Most Impacted Youth

June 4, 2026

SCF Planning & Oversight Commission

RFP Intent

- SCF aims to fund programs that serve youth **“most impacted by poverty, trauma, and violence”**
 - Priority populations clearly defined (p.17)
 - Includes expectation to:
 - Reach youth **“not otherwise connected to programs or services”** (p.8)
- **Key question:** Are current structures sufficient to ensure funds reach these youth?

Core Issue/Opportunity

- Priority populations:
 - Listed descriptively
 - Embedded within broader scoring categories
 - **Not independently scored**
- Implications:
 - “How services are delivered” is weighted more than “Who is actually reached”
- Result: Programs can score highly **without demonstrating meaningful reach to the most impacted**

Additional Gap

- **Access is referenced—but not operationalized**
 - RFP requires:
 - Reaching those “not otherwise connected to programs or services” (p.8)
 - But:
 - No clear criteria for:
 - What counts as “not connected”
 - How to demonstrate this
 - How it is evaluated in scoring
- Leaves room for **broad interpretation + minimal differentiation**

Consideration 1

- **Create a Dedicated “Priority Populations” Scoring Category**
 - Separate from Program Design
 - Assign meaningful weight (e.g., 15–25 points)
- **Evaluate:**
 - Depth of engagement with priority populations
 - Evidence of serving **highest-need subgroups**
 - Intersectionality (not just single-category inclusion)

Consideration 2

- Build on existing language by **requiring demonstrated reach to** “crossover” youth or “multiple service using” youth
 - Youth facing multiple, co-occurring challenges across life domains
 - Needs span several sectors (e.g., mental health, child welfare, youth justice)
 - Integrated (coherent, coordinated, continuous) support is essential
- Shift from:
 - “Eligible populations”
 - To: **Populations facing structural barriers to access**

Consideration 2 (cont.)

Applicants must address the needs of at least one of the following priority populations from each of the Multiple Marginalized Identities AND Socially Complex Needs [AND "Hard-to-Reach"] categories:

Multiple Marginalized Identities:	Socially Complex Needs:	"Hard-to-Reach":
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, youth, and families who are Black, Indigenous, Latino/e, Southeast Asian • Children and youth who identify as LGBTQ+ • Children and youth who are first generation immigrants or refugees • Children and youth with disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, youth, and families who are low-income • Youth in or transitioning out of foster care • Children or youth exposed to violence • Youth or families who are unhoused • Youth who are not in school or working • Children and youth who have been involved in the juvenile or criminal legal systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth or families who are unhoused • Youth who are not in school or working • Children and youth who have been involved in the juvenile or criminal legal systems

Consideration 3

- **Strengthen Access Expansion Requirement**
 - Add a scored question:
 - How will you reach youth **not currently connected to services?**
 - Require:
 - Specific strategies (not general outreach)
 - Evidence of:
 - Nontraditional entry points
 - Community-based engagement
 - Trusted messengers
- Must demonstrate a **clear break from the status quo**

Consideration 4

- **Differentiate Levels of Reach in Scoring**
 - Move from:
 - Binary ("serves priority populations")
 - To:
 - Tiered evaluation:
 - Level 1: General access
 - Level 2: Targeted outreach
 - Level 3: Deep engagement with "hardest-to-reach"
- Improves **reviewer consistency + funding precision**

What This Looks Like in Practice

- **Stronger applications will:**
- Identify *who is not being reached*
- Use:
 - Boots-on-the-ground ("street") outreach
 - Peer/credible messengers
 - Community-based entry points
- Demonstrate:
 - Past success reaching disconnected youth
 - Measurable strategies to expand access

Selected References

1. Veerman LCM, Nootboom LA, Mulder EA, Vermeiren RRJM. Dynamics that challenge the provision of integrated care for youth at-risk: a systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2026/04/01/ 2026;183:108778. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2026.108778>
2. https://aphsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/2025-01_Addressing-the-Complex-Needs-of-Youth.pdf
3. Bounds DT, Winiarski DA, Otwell CH, et al. Considerations for working with youth with socially complex needs. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*. 2020/11/01 2020;33(4):209-220. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcap.12288>
4. [Report_EffectiveServicesandSupports_report_2026.pdf](#)