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San Francisco’s District 11 Neighborhoods: Cayuga Terrace, Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside (OMI), Excelsior, Crocker Amazon, New Mission Terrace, and Outer Mission

Executive Summary

Introduction
In 2009, SF State’s Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) and the City and County of San Francisco’s Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN) launched a new partnership, called NEN University (NENU). NENU connects the resources of local higher education institutions with the NEN to address critical issues as defined by residents in San Francisco’s diverse neighborhoods. After evaluating best practices in community sustainability nationwide, one of the first undertakings of NENU was to initiate an Engaged Learning Zone (ELZ) project in District 11 in San Francisco covering six distinct neighborhoods: Cayuga Terrace; Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside (OMI); Excelsior; Crocker Amazon; New Mission Terrace; and Outer Mission.

Goals and Methods
The overarchign goal of the ELZ is to determine whether building capacity of local networks can help San Francisco neighborhoods become more resilient. Overall analysis of the City of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina shows a stark contrast in the quality and speed of recovery in its neighborhoods. Specifically, neighborhoods that had pre-existing community-supported networks (i.e. “neighborhood associations”) were better able to re-purpose themselves and support their communities as they moved from restoration to recovery. These strong neighborhoods are also better able to address many other issues of local concern. District 11 was identified as a target for this project because of its diverse population and because a high percentage of families who live in its neighborhoods contain many vulnerable children and seniors. With strong support from San Francisco Supervisor John Avalos’ office (D 11) and the Mayor’s Office of Housing/Community Development Division (MOH/CDD), Phase I of the ELZ process consisted of analyzing neighborhood resources (assets), their needs, and aligning neighborhood projects with SF State Community Service Learning (CSL) students. A team of seven interviewers collected data for this report. Sampling technique enabled the team to identify 368 prospective interviewees—156 neighborhood stakeholders and 212 stakeholders from the business community. This project is being conducted in three phases between 2011 and 2016 in four of D11’s six neighborhoods.

Principal Findings
These findings suggest that there is a strong foundation for developing social capital in the D11 neighborhood, but that foundation needs to be nurtured as the neighborhood changes and continues to struggle with the impacts of the current financial crisis. Analysis indicates that there is a need for more effective communication strategies and leadership skills development in stakeholders, which would enhance collaborations. One important way neighborhood stakeholders, city agencies, and SF State can support the development of social capital is to ensure that neighborhood groups become more deliberate about outreach to non-English speaking populations, whether through translators, bilingual services, accessible print and online information (neighborhood newspapers, electronic newsletters, or websites), or by providing English language training and incentives for language diverse residents to participate. Neighborhood stakeholders said they benefitted in tangible ways from their relationship with SF State and its students—they were better able to understand neighborhood needs and to address those needs, and student(s) work facilitated cooperation between diverse groups, which helped build neighborhood capacity. Given these favorable viewpoints, we recommend developing more collaborative projects that involve students from higher education and neighborhood stakeholders.

---

1 Engaged Learning Zone (ELZ) project was previously known as the Alliance for Strong Inclusive Neighborhoods (ASIN) project.
I. INTRODUCTION

The inevitability of a major earthquake or other disaster occurring in San Francisco in the near future, coupled with lessons learned by the City of New Orleans in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, have had strong implications on the central concept of, impetus for, and approach to the Engaged Learning Zone (ELZ) project\(^2\) described in this report. Overall analysis of New Orleans’ recovery shows a stark contrast in the quality and speed of recovery in its neighborhoods. A key factor was that communities that have successfully recovered had established community-supported networks (i.e. “neighborhood associations”) before the hurricane. Such neighborhoods were able to support their residents after the disaster and help them move from restoration to recovery. The goal of the ELZ project is to nurture the development of strong, inclusive, and resilient networks (also known as “social capital”) in neighborhoods that have the capacity to not only support and address day-to-day challenges, but that can also be reorganized immediately after a major disaster, to provide the community with the stability and support it will most likely need. This capacity is best described as Resiliency.

In 2009, SF State’s Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) and the City and County of San Francisco’s Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN) launched a new partnership, called NEN University (NENu). NENu connects the resources of local higher education institutions with the NEN to address critical issues as defined by residents in San Francisco’s diverse neighborhoods. One of the first undertakings of the NENu was to initiate an ELZ project in District 11, which contains six distinct neighborhoods: Cayuga Terrace; Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside (OMI); Excelsior; Crocker Amazon; New Mission Terrace; and Outer Mission (collectively referred to as ‘the neighborhood’ throughout this report). The scope of phase I of the ELZ consisted of analyzing neighborhood resources (assets), their needs, and aligning neighborhood projects with City and SF State resources to determine whether local networks could help San Francisco neighborhoods become more resilient. San Francisco’s District 11 was selected for this project because of its diverse population, and because of the high number of families in its neighborhoods that contain vulnerable children and seniors. As the project progressed, lead staff became aware of other long-term initiatives in District 11, and collaborations were initiated with San Francisco Supervisor John Avalos’ office (D-11) and the Mayor’s Office of Housing/Community Development Division (MOH/CDD). Partnerships were created and each unit developed a plan of action that considered each other’s goals.

Methods
A logic model was developed to guide staff in the steps necessary to achieve project outcomes (see Appendix A). After reviewing the literature and collecting data from a variety of sources, ICCE staff used snowballing techniques to identify key neighborhood stakeholders—businesses, nonprofits, schools, faith-based organizations, and neighborhood residents—and then interviewed 98 people between November 2009 and June 2010 about their role in the community and perceived neighborhood needs. Furthermore, collaborations were established with San Francisco City Departments and nonprofits in the District.

---

\(^2\) Engaged Learning Zone (ELZ) project was previously known as the Alliance for Strong Inclusive Neighborhoods (ASIN).
Defining Concepts: Neighborhoods, Social Capital, & Resilience

**Neighborhoods** are often defined by different people in different ways, depending on their perspective and purpose. For example, residents may use natural boundaries, such as main streets, parks, or access to goods and services (grocery stores and banks) to describe the area in which they live, while scholars and researchers often use Census tracts, electoral districts, or other administratively-defined boundaries to describe that same area. Many have argued that *neighborhood* is a multi-scale concept that can take these various perspectives into account (Guo & Bhat, 2007). We have adopted Guo & Bhat’s multi-scale neighborhood concept, recognizing that a neighborhood is a geographic representation of a community (or groups of communities) within a larger city or town, and that neighborhoods may be overlapping or nested.

**Social capital** likewise can be defined several ways. Social networks represent the connections, both formal and informal, between individuals, groups, and organizations. These connections take many forms and can include membership in community groups, collaborative working relationships, and friendships, among other things. As interactions among members in a social network increase in frequency, a norm of generalized reciprocity is established, meaning that an individual does good things for others or for the larger community without expecting anything specific in return, driven by the belief that at an unspecified point in time, someone else will perform a reciprocal good deed (Putnam, 2000). The norm of generalized reciprocity is closely related to the concept of social trust (or trustworthiness) and can be seen as the central process social capital theory seeks to describe (Portes, 1998; Putnam, 2000). Trustworthiness can be understood as a thin, generalized norm of trust derived from an implicit bond that is rooted in common social networks and associated expectations of reciprocity, or is rooted in frequent, strong, and personalized interactions between individuals (Putnam, 2000), a kind of community goodwill.

Social capital varies from situation to situation, but groups having high levels of reciprocity (social capital) are able to accomplish things they could not do as effectively otherwise. Social capital may impact people in a given network, as well as those outside of it, but need not promote the common good (Putnam, 2007). Some forms of strong and effective social capital may be used for anti-social purposes (e.g., urban gangs, Ku Klux Klan). In other words, more and/or stronger social capital does not always promote a community’s well-being (Putnam, 2000). Distinguishing some of the characteristics of social capital can help shed light on whether creating more or stronger social capital is likely to contribute to the common good.

Social capital may “bond” people to one another, or build a “bridge” between disparate groups of people. **Bonding** social capital reinforces ties between individuals or groups who share a common identity or values, while **bridging** social capital spans perceived differences (e.g., racial, ethnic, religious, socio-economic, geographic). While ties can be weak or strong, bonding social capital is often associated with stronger connections, while bridging social capital is associated with weaker ones. It is important to emphasize that there is no clear relationship between bonding and bridging social capital—it is possible to have high levels of both, low levels of both, or some combination of the two (Putnam, 2007).
For example, high levels of bonding social capital without substantial bridging social capital may foster the development of ethnic enclaves and conflict. These distinctions and their relationships are especially important for understanding social capital in a city as racially and ethnically diverse as San Francisco.

**Resilience** is understood as a neighborhood’s capacity to “anticipate, withstand and/or judiciously engage with catastrophic events and/or experiences, actively making meaning out of adversity, with the goal of maintaining ‘normal’ function without fundamentally losing their identity” (Almedom & Tumwine, 2008, p. 51). Therefore, fostering the development of a friendlier, trustworthy, stable and tolerant democratic society, and building positive social capital in communities where it may be lacking, is becoming widely recognized as a way to build neighborhood resilience (Ahlers & Hummel, 2007; Ikeda & Gordon, 2007). The importance of this endeavour is not lost in the context of the ethnically diverse³, economically constrained City of San Francisco, where a neighborhood’s resilience will impact its ability to successfully recover from a catastrophic disaster.

**Why it Matters**

Data presented in this report will be used as a baseline to help determine whether collaborations initiated in the neighborhood during October 2010, are associated with a change in social capital between 2011 and 2016. In order to assess current levels and characteristics of social capital in the D11 neighborhood, interviews were conducted with neighborhood stakeholders. In this community profile we conducted an extensive literature review and analyzed neighborhood stakeholders’ awareness of and participation in a variety of opportunities, including cooperation and communication with others in their neighborhood, as well as their opinions about perceived neighborhood resources and needs. Specifically, we hope to determine whether and how collaborations between neighborhood stakeholders contribute to the development of social capital and/or to the neighborhood’s ability to collectively identify and address common needs, thereby increasing its resiliency.

### II. NEIGHBORHOOD PROFILES

District 11 is located in San Francisco’s southernmost area and consists of the following six neighborhoods: Cayuga Terrace; Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside (OMI); Excelsior; Croker Amazon; New Mission Terrace; and Outer Mission.

In order to better understand the findings and to discuss recommended interventions for D11, it helps to understand some particulars of each neighborhood. The best sources of information we were able to find about D11 were: The Western Neighborhoods Project (2010), funded by a grant from the California Council for the Humanities with support from the San Francisco Foundation, and District Information from the City and County of San Francisco’s Board of Supervisor John Avalos’ public website,

---

³ According to the US Census Bureau (2000 Summary File 3-P6, Race), the racial breakdown of San Francisco is: 49.8% White; 30.8% Asian; 7.6% Black or African American; and 14.8% other races. In addition, 14% are Hispanic or Latino of any race. Source: US Census Bureau. Retrieved November 2010 from http://factfinder.census.gov/
• **Cayuga**: The historic “Geneva Car Barn,” a historic railroad depot, and the award-winning Cayuga Park are located in this neighborhood. We did not study the Cayuga neighborhood because it is largely residential and residents go to the surrounding areas for services.

• **OMI (Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside)**: Oceanview was once a valley of dairy and vegetable farms, but because it was built around a railway station, it developed into a vital urban neighborhood. Like many areas of San Francisco, the demographics of the OMI changed drastically after WW II. In 1950, the African-American population in the OMI was only 5%, but by 1970 the percentage had increased to 62% (Western Neighborhoods, 2010, p. 40). Also by 1970, the OMI had matured into a middle-class district of single-family, owner-occupied homes; 76% was residential (compared to 100% in Ingleside Terraces), while Citywide it was 39%. The OMI neighborhood is one of the most ethnically diverse neighborhoods in San Francisco. As of the 2010 Census, 45% of the population identified itself as Asian American, 25% as African American, 18% as white, and 12% as other ethnicities. Furthermore, 14% of its residents identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino⁴.

• **Excelsior**: Many of the streets in the Excelsior were named for European countries and cities. Excelsior Street itself was originally named “Japan.” It was renamed during World War II, as was "Germany" Street (Supervisor Avalos’ website). In its earlier days, the Excelsior was predominantly Italian, Irish, and Swiss and mostly working class. During the 70s and 80s, low-income immigrants from China, Southeast Asia and Latin America moved into the neighborhood. During the 90s, middle and upper middle-class professionals moved into the affordable neighborhood when they were priced out from other parts of San Francisco. The neighborhood remains very family oriented; a high percentage of households contain children (Excelsior 23%, Citywide 15%).

• **Crocker Amazon**: The streets of this neighborhood straddle the border between San Francisco and Daly City. The neighborhood is slightly more affluent than the nearby Excelsior, but retains much of the same racial diversity, including a large Filipino community. The majority of the neighborhood consists of affordable single-family homes.

• **New Mission Terrace**: Also not studied in this report because it is mostly residential. Balboa Park and the Balboa Park BART Station are located in its southwest corner.

• **Outer Mission**: Developed in the 1920s, the Outer Mission was an extension of the nearby Mission District. During the 1960s–1980s, the demographics in this neighborhood shifted from Irish immigrants to its current composition of Latino, Chicano, and Central American families. Because of garages that have been converted into in-law units in this area, there is a higher population density than the neighborhood was built for or that the City might permit.

---

⁴The US Census bureau requests identification by race and ethnicity. Race and ethnicity are considered separate and distinct identities, with Hispanic or Latino origin asked as a separate question.
While each neighborhood has a distinct history, all of them share similar characteristics: Historically, District 11 is the most ethnically diverse in the City (73.9% people of color versus 50.3% Citywide average). See Figure 1 in page 10. Additionally, each neighborhood contains a high percentage of families whose households include a significant number of vulnerable children and seniors. In fact, according to a 2010 study by the Geneva Car Barn, a local nonprofit organization, “District 11 has the highest percentage of youth of any district in the City, yet the lowest amount of services for them” (retrieved from www.genevacarbart.org). According to the 2000 census, 40% of households in this district are those containing children⁵. Approximately 20% of those households are linguistically isolated, meaning English is not their primary language. According to the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), over half of the youth attending schools in these neighborhoods are classified as socioeconomically disadvantaged students—those whose families earn $37,000 or below annually⁶. In September 2009, the unemployment rate was 10.3%; 40% of the population over age 16 were not in the labor force; 36% of households were low income; and 9% of the households lived below the poverty level.

Figure 1. Demographics: Race (D11 and San Francisco County)

---


The Hispanic or Latino population in the neighborhood is also higher than it is in the rest of the City of San Francisco (25.7% vs. 14.1%)\(^7\).

**Figure 2. Demographics: Hispanic or Latino Population by Race (D11 and San Francisco County)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 11</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Pie chart showing Hispanic or Latino population" /></td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Pie chart showing Hispanic or Latino population" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health Issues in D11**

In a study recently published by the San Francisco Community Benefit Partnership (*Health Matters*, 2010), the two most pressing health issues affecting the D11 neighborhood are asthma and congestive heart failure. Asthma has become the most common long-term illness in children. Causes of asthma include exposure to air pollutants and stress, thus reducing those can help prevent asthma. Congestive heart failure is an illness in which the heart does not pump enough blood to organs. Congestive heart failure has many causes; however, the most prominent are poor diet, obesity, smoking, and long-term exposure to air pollution and noise. Additionally, social inequalities and environmental risk factors (e.g., poverty, crime, violence, chronic exposure to trauma etc.) can lead to increased levels of violence and instability in family units, which can pose challenges to the cohesion and health of a community. These issues could predict the future for families living in the D11 community unless effective interventions are put into practice.

However, other factors also contribute to the health of the community, such as community assets. Although the neighborhood has many needs/challenges, it also has many assets that can be used to build social capital and develop projects that will have a positive impact in the neighborhood. We will address those further in this report.

**Diversity and Social Capital**

Based on extensive empirical evidence, Putnam (2007, p. 147) concluded that the average level of social capital in any community is linked to its diversity. In San Francisco, there are low levels of inter-racial trust; only 30% of San Francisco residents reported that they trust their neighbors (as opposed to 70%-

---

\(^7\) The US Census bureau requests identification by race and ethnicity. Race and ethnicity are considered separate and distinct identities, with Hispanic or Latino origin asked as a separate question.
80% in more ethnically homogeneous places like North and South Dakota). As Putnam’s study indicates (2007, pp. 149-150), low levels of social trust is one of several indicators that suggest that ethnically diverse communities have low levels of social capital. Other indicators most relevant to our study include:

- Lack of confidence in local government officials, leaders, and the local news media;
- Perceived lack of personal influence on local politics;
- Little belief in the possibility of effective problem solving collectively;
- Lower levels of community work (Putnam 2007).

*While Putnam’s (2007) findings may appear troublesome, ethnically diverse communities can develop social capital by looking at interventions that reinforce reciprocity and trustworthiness.*

**District 11 Assets**

Because of the Institute’s work within District 11, we were able to identify numerous neighborhood assets: 719 businesses; 35 public and private schools; 80 faith-based organizations; 31 food pantries; 151 non-government/community-based organizations (NGO/CBOs); 18 parks, playgrounds, and open spaces; 6 healthcare clinics; and 9 government/municipal facilities. Additionally, 15 other NGO/CBOs are located outside of the neighborhood, but provide services to D11 residents.

**Figure 3. District 11 Assets**

District assets were categorized as follows:

**Business**: Any private, for-profit organization (excluding educational institutions and healthcare clinics), including but not limited to, utility companies, restaurants, professional services, retail shops, etc.

**Education**: All public and private K-12, university, vocational, medical or other learning institutions.

---

8 The City of San Francisco was included in Putnam’s study, with 500 individuals responding to the survey questions.
Faith Based: Organizations whose main purpose is religious practice and/or worship.

Food Pantry: Any organization that provides food for those in need.

NGO/CBO: All not-for-profit organizations whose primary funding is not directly allocated from the City and County of San Francisco, the State of California, or from the United States government, but comes primarily through grants and donations.

Parks/Playgrounds/Open Spaces: Open spaces used for public recreational purposes.

Health Clinics: Private, government funded, or non-profit clinics that provide primary healthcare or general health and wellness services.

Government Funded and Municipal Services: Any organization primarily funded by the City and County of San Francisco, the State of California, or the United States government. This includes, but is not limited to: post offices, fire and police stations, libraries, government buildings, etc.

Mapping community assets is very important step in developing social capital because through this process resources can be found and possible allies can be identified. Neighborhood stakeholders could consider developing a “map” of possible partners in order to implement campaigns that take into consideration all assets in the neighborhood. (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993)

Age distribution: There is a high concentration of children and youth (ages 0 to 18) and a high concentration of elderly people (ages 65+) in the D11 neighborhoods.

Figure 4. Percentages of Age Groups per Geographic Area (D11 and San Francisco County)

As previously noted, D11 has been and continues to be a highly diverse neighborhood; currently it is the most ethnically diverse in the City (73.9% people of color). It is also important to note that in the
Excelsior, Outer Mission, and Crocker Amazon neighborhoods, less than one-third of the households speak English as their primary language.

**Needs**

City departments make service decisions based on the age ranges of its residents as depicted in Figure 4 in page 13. Because age demographics in D11 include a high percentage of youth between the ages of 5 to 18, services are focused on and geared to these youth and their families. A significant number of organizations provide afterschool activities, tutoring and educational programs, parent education (language, parenting skills, etc.) and basic human services support, including housing and food assistance. However, there is a shortage of services for adolescents in the 11 to 18 age range, especially workforce-development programs, with the exception of the Geneva Car Barn and Powerhouse, which provides arts-related job training for underserved youth. Also underrepresented are services for D11’s elderly population (65+), with the exception of a few social clubs and ethnic centers for seniors. Finally, many San Francisco buildings are investment properties. In D11, the percentage of owner-occupied housing is 30–50% points higher that the Citywide average, making it more residential. Because of this, many services are geared towards improving neighborhood beautification and safety because such services lead to increased real-estate values and public safety.

Gaining a better understanding of neighborhood changes, such as age demographics, cultural diversity, and economic factors, can be used to develop interventions to help D11 residents build the bridging social capital they will need to address some of their existing challenges.

**III. STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS: METHODOLOGY**

Seven interviewers collected data for this study: two full-time staff members from SF State’s ICCE and five SF State students (four graduates and one undergraduate).

Potential interviewees were identified using two non-probability sampling techniques—purposive and snowball (McNabb, 2008). First, we received names and contact information of neighborhood stakeholders from the Mayor’s Office of Housing/Community Development Division, the Neighborhood Empowerment Network, and from the Institute’s Community Connections Database (CCDB). Information was updated or supplemented through internet research as needed. Second, we used a snowball sampling technique, meaning we asked each person we interviewed to refer us to other neighborhood stakeholders. These sampling techniques enabled us to identify 368 prospective interviewees—156 neighborhood stakeholders and 212 stakeholders from the business community. All the 156 nonprofits were contacted as prospective interviewees. Businesses were categorized by type of business and then randomly selected. Some small businesses were excluded because other nonprofit organizations had recently interviewed them, and some nonprofits were also omitted because they were already participating in the OMI Service Providers Cohort.\(^9\)

The sampling techniques we used were well-suited to this type of research because there was no easily

---

\(^9\) This project began in September 2009 with SF Supervisor John Avalos’ office, and the Community Development Division of the Mayor’s Office of Housing (MOH).
identified pre-existing population of neighborhood stakeholders from which we could draw a probability\textsuperscript{10} sample. Instead, we had to rely on the knowledge, expertise, contacts, and perceptions of those who work in and with the neighborhood to identify individuals most likely to have a stake in the well-being of the neighborhood. We recognize that using this approach has limitations—the sample may not be considered scientifically representative and as such, conclusions cannot be widely generalized (McNabb, 2008; Yanow, 2006). However, that had little impact on the goals of this project: (1) to determine whether D11 neighborhoods have developed social capital (social networks and connections) and if so, to what extent; (2) to identify barriers to potential partnerships, and to assess whether respondents could articulate a set of common needs and priorities for the neighborhood. Research conducted in this study will serve as a baseline assessment and will be replicated in 2015–2016, with the aim of understanding whether the collaborative work initiated by City agencies and SF State will help neighborhoods build social capital, develop sustained interactions, and share information that can help them build stronger, more resilient communities.

Between November 2009 and June 2010, we interviewed a total of 98 (26.6\%) of the 368 identified stakeholders. In this type of research, response rates can be influenced by a number of factors, most notably the time constraints of respondents and the historical or ongoing relationships with researchers and their institutions (McNabb, 2008). We suspect that the time constraints on staff and volunteers at small, community-based nonprofits, churches, businesses, and other neighborhood groups may have limited the number of people who were willing to be interviewed (sample size). Consequently, the process may have overlooked some important stakeholder perspectives and we cannot generalize the results of these stakeholder interviews to the entire D11 target population (Yanow, 2006).

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted in teams to ensure that interviewees’ responses were captured accurately and thoroughly. None of the interviews were tape recorded because of the additional time it would have taken to have the audio recordings transcribed. This technique has inherent shortcomings in that it limited our ability to provide direct quotations to illustrate themes that emerged, and it limited the analysts’ ability to assess whether stakeholders were using certain terms in similar or different ways. Therefore, this report often claims that “many,” “several,” or “a few” respondents had similar answers to open-ended questions, but does not provide an exact number, percentage, or interpretation of the discourses. Each of the sections that follow represents a theme and includes the key findings that pertain to that theme.

\textbf{IV. STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS: FINDINGS}

\textbf{Demographics of Interviewees}

Group 1 consisted of 156 neighborhood stakeholders, and Group 2 consisted of 212 stakeholders from the business community. In order to make it clear to which group we are referring in this report, we use the term \textit{neighborhood stakeholders} for the larger group of interview respondents (62) and \textit{business

\textsuperscript{10} “A probability sampling method is any method of sampling that utilizes some form of random selection. In order to have a random selection method, you must set up some process or procedure that assures that the different units in your population have equal probabilities of being chosen.” Trochim, W.M.K., (2006). Research methods knowledge base. Retrieved from March 10, 2011, from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/sampprob.php
community for the smaller group (36) of respondents from local businesses. The distinction in terminology is in no way meant to suggest that local businesses are not neighborhood stakeholders; indeed the vital roles they play in their neighborhoods are precisely why we included them in this study.

The findings from the business community are reported alongside the findings for the larger group of neighborhood stakeholders throughout this section of the report, but because different interview protocols were used, the two sets of findings are not combined. However, we did combined the findings in the neighborhood needs section starting in page 28 since both groups agreed on the same neighborhood needs. Additionally, caution should be used when comparing the responses of the Group 2 business community to the Group 1 neighborhood stakeholders because the interviewers experienced difficulties in having business respondents answer all of the questions.

Group 1 Neighborhood Stakeholders: The research team conducted interviews with 62 of the 156 originally identified neighborhood stakeholders (a response rate of 39.7%). Each interview lasted between 60–90 minutes and adhered to an interview protocol (See Appendix B).

Figure 5 illustrates the primary role of each stakeholder in D11, 40% of whom were employees from local nonprofit organizations. Volunteers from schools included heads of the local Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) and parent outreach coordinators. Volunteer community leaders/organizers included leaders of neighborhood associations, as well as individuals associated with neighborhood organizing and/or networking groups. The category “other” included librarians and people whose roles were connected to public agencies or community organizations. It should also be noted that several respondents assumed several roles within their neighborhood.

Figure 5. Group 1: Neighborhood Stakeholder Role

Figure 6 illustrates how long neighborhood stakeholders had been active in their current role. Responses varied from less than one year to 50 years, with a majority of interviewees (71%) saying they had been in their current role between one and nine years. All but six of the stakeholders had been in their current role for five years or less. Eight interviewees (13%) had been in their current role for more than 10 years, and six people reported that they had been in their current role more than 20 years. Only one person had been in the current role for less than one year; three people did not respond to the question. Given the large number of nonprofit staff in our sample, these numbers are not surprising.
Recent research on nonprofit organizations reveals that staff retention is a problem for many organizations in that sector. Turnover rates were 16% for the sector as a whole; 20% for employees who had been in the position for less than a year; and 50% for employees who held program services positions for less than 2 years (Opportunity Knocks, 2010).

**Figure 6. Group 1: Period of Time in Current Role**

![Figure 6. Group 1: Period of Time in Current Role](image)

**Group 2 Business Community**: The research team conducted interviews with 36 of the 212 business community stakeholders (a response rate of 16.98%). Of those, eight were from the OMI; 12 were from the Outer Mission; and 16 from Crocker Amazon. As Figure 7 below shows, most respondents (42%) identified themselves as business owners. The researchers encountered some difficulties in contacting local businesses by telephone or e-mail to schedule interviews in advance. In order to address that, the team first categorized the business by type of service they provided, randomly selected businesses by type of service, and then during June 2010, canvassed the neighborhood where those businesses were located. Given respondents’ time constraints, and their unique roles in the neighborhood, a modified protocol was developed (see Appendix C) to facilitate 30–60 minute onsite interviews during regular business hours. The team interviewed either the business owner, manager, or staff.

**Figure 7. Group 2: Role**

![Figure 7. Group 2: Role](image)
Figure 8 above depicts the length of time that respondents had worked in their current position. Responses ranged from 3 months to 40 years. One-half of the group reported that they had been in their current role between one and nine years, while only 8% had been in their current position for less than one year. When asked whether they also had other roles in the neighborhood, two-thirds (24) said no. Three indicated that they were also residents; two were local consumers; two reported that they attended community meetings; and one helped clean up graffiti and “other messes” in the neighborhood, which included trash and flood debris.

When asked about their customer bases, most business respondents (64%) reported that their customers lived in and commuted from neighborhoods outside of D11; only 15 stated that their customers lived in the local neighborhood. Business respondents also reported serving customers in languages other than English. As shown in Figure 9, 44% of business respondents said they served customers who spoke Spanish, and 41% served customers who spoke Chinese, Cantonese or Mandarin. Other languages spoken by customers included Arabic, Korean, and Mongolian.

Figure 9. Group 2: Percent of Businesses Serving Customers Who Speak Languages Other than English
Social Capital in the Community

1. Social Capital: Norms of Reciprocity and Trust

Most neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) work with other organizations or individual concerned citizens in their neighborhood at least several times a year, and they do so for a variety of reasons, including to organize events, enhance service delivery, or to access resources. More than 90% of neighborhood stakeholders (56) reported that they work with individual concerned citizens or organizations in their neighborhood at least several times per year. Table 1 shows the number of organizations or people that respondents worked with, as well as how often they met. More than half of the stakeholders (55%) said they work with others at least a few times a year, and nearly 25% said they work with others at least monthly.

Table 1. Group 1: Number and Frequency of Collaborations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Working Together</th>
<th>Number of Individuals or Organizations That Neighborhood Stakeholders Work With</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Once a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Group 2: Number and Frequency of Collaborations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Working Together</th>
<th>Number of Other Businesses or Organizations Business Respondents Work With</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Once a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2 above, only nine respondents (25%) from the business community said they regularly cooperate or work with other businesses or organizations in the neighborhood. Four people said they did so about once a year, and three said that they collaborated on a monthly basis.
Reasons Why Groups Work Together

Neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) reported that they worked with one another for a variety of reasons. As Figure 10 shows, the most frequent response was that stakeholders worked together to organize and participate in social events (e.g., street fairs, festivals for youth), followed by school-related services, doing outreach, and enhancing service delivery.

![Figure 10. Group 1: Reasons Neighborhood Stakeholders Work Together](image)

Businesses (Group 2) likewise indicated that they work with others for many reasons. As Figure 11 shows, 50% indicated that they work with others to receive referrals, 25% work together to reduce crime and enhance safety, and 25% participate in social/community events.

![Figure 11. Group 2: Reasons Businesses Work Together](image)

While collaboration suggests that a certain level of reciprocity and trust exists, it may be what Putnam (2000) would call specialized norms, those that exist between two people or groups because of their formal working relationship. Because frequent interactions can enhance and expand trust, it stands to reason that people who participate in public events and civic activities will experience higher levels of trust in others in their neighborhood; therefore, when these norms are generalized, they can enhance social capital.
Most neighborhood stakeholders knew about and participated in neighborhood gatherings, whether those gatherings were informally organized or part of a bigger event. When asked whether neighborhood members got together for informal events, 85% of the neighborhood stakeholders replied, “yes”. Of those, 55% indicated that neighborhood gatherings occurred “a few times a year;” 25% reported that they attended monthly gatherings; 11% said that they attended weekly gatherings; and 5% attended events “about once a year” (see Figure 12). When asked if they knew how long these events had been taking place—10 people did not answer the question, nine said they were unsure, and 34 thought that local events had been going on anywhere between a few to many years. It is possible that awareness about such events is related to how long the interviewee had been in their current role.

Figure 12. Group 1: Frequency of Neighborhood Gatherings

Ten of the business group (Group 2) respondents (28%) had heard about informal neighborhood gatherings: 40% attended a few times a year, 30% attended once a year, 20% went to monthly meetings, and 10% did not respond (Figure 13). The business community provided a few examples of the events they knew about—a barbeque in the park, the Excelsior Neighborhood Festival, events held by the Christian Center, the Outer Mission Business Association Meeting, and informal group walks. None of them knew how long those events had been taking place.

Figure 13. Group 2: Frequency of Neighborhood Gatherings
As part of our collaboration with departments from the City and County of San Francisco, we were asked to find out if stakeholders had heard about events/public gatherings sponsored by the City of San Francisco. Forty-eight respondents in the neighborhood stakeholder group (77%) said they had heard about public gatherings hosted by the City or one of its departments; but 23% had not. As Figure 14 illustrates, most respondents (39%) said they had heard about City-sponsored events, but could not specifically identify which ones. The City-sponsored event most stakeholders could name was “Sunday Streets” at (23%), then fairs and social gatherings (21%), followed by a Summer Resource Fair (17%).

Forty neighborhood stakeholders (65%) said they had participated in one or more City-sponsored public events, while ten did not, and twelve stakeholders did not respond. The gatherings people participated in most frequently were community social events (e.g., arts festival, children’s events, parade), followed by issue-focused events (e.g., health, safety) and finally enrichment events (listening or reading events).

**Figure 14. Group 1: Heard About City Events**

![Figure 14. Group 1: Heard About City Events](image)

Conversely, 24 respondents from the business community (67%) (Group 2) had not heard about City-sponsored public gatherings.

As Figure 15 below indicates, of the remaining 33% business respondents who had heard about City-sponsored events, 37% specifically heard about “Sunday Streets,” 25% heard about National Night Out, another 25% had heard about Supervisor Avalos’ town hall meetings, and 13% did not specify. Those who had heard about City-sponsored events did so through the media, other business owners, or saw them happening in the neighborhood. Of the 33% business respondents who had heard about the gatherings, 57% respondents actually participated in an event; and of those, 29% specifically mentioned that they had met with Supervisor Avalos, and 14% had attended a street fair.
It was clear from the business community (Group 2) that they considered community events helpful to their business and to the neighborhood, and that they would attend future City-sponsored events.

**Figure 15. Group 2: Heard About City Events**

These findings suggest that participation in public events may be associated with increased social capital, as evidenced by the norms of reciprocity and trust, especially if participation leads to meeting and working with new people.

2. Expanding and Strengthening Social Networks

*Neighborhood and Business stakeholders who participated in the above-mentioned public gatherings often expanded their social networks and capitalized on that expansion by maintaining communications with and sometimes working with those new contacts. Some stakeholders were able to strengthen relationships with existing contacts as a result of participating in public events. Moreover, they are now using those networks to get things done, whether by sharing information, coordinating services, or providing referrals.*

Of the 40 neighborhood stakeholders (65%) who had participated in one or more City-sponsored public event, 30 said they had been introduced to an agency or individual they did not previously know. Out of those 30 respondents, 50% indicated that they had been introduced to one or more new contacts (see Figure 16).

**Figure 16. Group 1: Reporting Number of New Contacts**
Of the 33% of business respondents (Group 2) who had participated in one or more City-sponsored public event, all said they would participate in again in the future, either to help others, to connect with neighborhood clients, or to meet socially with other merchants on the block. Three respondents said that the gatherings were a way to get introduced to other businesses or organizations they previously had not known about, and that they continued to work with new contacts on issues such as parking, graffiti, vandalism, and crime. Two respondents said they made between one to three new contacts and one person said they had established four to six new contacts from participating in City-sponsored public gatherings.

As might be expected, respondents indicated that they continue to communicate with some new contacts more frequently than others. For example, while nine stakeholders reported that they had established 10 or more new contacts, only five indicated that they communicated with those new contacts regularly. Presumably, the other four respondents communicated with some, but not all of their new contacts. In short, neighborhood stakeholders who participated in public events are building social capital and are fostering norms of reciprocity and trust. It is not clear if this social capital is the bonding or bridging type, or both.

Table 3. Group 1: Frequency of Communications with New Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Communications</th>
<th>Number of New Contacts Communicated With (Individuals or Organizations)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked why they communicated with other organizations and individuals in the neighborhood, most respondents indicated that they do so primarily to share information and leverage resources, either by combining efforts to provide services and trainings, or to collaborate on joint grant proposals, or to advocate for public funding. Several indicated that they work with others to coordinate or provide referrals to other services. One respondent noted that the reasons for communicating can range from sharing information to developing a more formal project-based collaboration; that person also said that it was difficult to say how often these communications occur, because it depends on the purpose.
As Figure 17 illustrates, 21 out of 30 neighborhood stakeholders (42% of Group 1) were introduced to new agencies and developed working relationships with them because they had participated in City-sponsored events.

**Figure 17. Group 1: Number of New Working Relationships**

3. **Constraints to Building Social Capital: Participation and Communication**

When asked what constraints they may have to staying connected with others in the community, neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) said that participating in local events and communicating with others was worthwhile and makes sense, but it is not always easy to do. The constraints experienced most often centered on a lack of information and advance notice about events, a lack of organizational capacity (staff or volunteers), and time. Other constraints included: transportation/mobility issues, safety concerns, language/cultural barriers, and lack of fit with organizational priorities. These constraints suggest that bridging social capital may be underdeveloped or utilized in the D11 neighborhood.

4. **Sources of Information about City Events or SF State Resources**

As illustrated in Figure 18, neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) generally heard about public gatherings, SF State community service learning projects, or student interns and volunteers from other organizations via word-of-mouth, through email or listserv communications, connections at SF State, telephone communications and direct mail, direct contact from the Mayor’s Office, and lastly from traditional media (some respondents said they got information from multiple sources). This is
important because the City is interested in strengthening connections with and building bridging social capital in local neighborhoods, but how they can better do that is the question.

Business stakeholders (Group 2) indicated that they heard about City-sponsored events through flyers. It is evident that more outreach should be done to this group since they are not as well connected as Group 1.

5. SF State May Be Well-Suited to Help Build Bridging Social Capital

*Neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) benefitted in tangible ways from their relationship with SF State and its students. Most stakeholders who were interviewed said that they were better able to understand neighborhood needs and to address those needs as a result of the work students did in their organizations. Moreover, stakeholders thought highly of SF State student volunteers’ skills, their level of commitment, and their enthusiasm. By facilitating cooperation and communication, the students were able to help the stakeholders build the capacity to identify and address neighborhood’s needs. Several stakeholders, however, also said that they encountered some difficulties in establishing working relationships with SF State faculty or departments.*

While 60% of neighborhood stakeholders said they had not heard about the CSL Program from SF State, 40% of the neighborhood stakeholders had. Of those that heard about the program, 42% of them have hosted SF State students at their organization. Furthermore, they had heard about SF State students interning or volunteering at other organizations in the neighborhood. Of those who had hosted SF State students or worked with faculty, they worked on a number of projects, either through ongoing relationships or through student groups. For example, one respondent gets the majority of their interns and student volunteers from an ongoing relationship they have with SF State’s Urban Studies Department. Those students help with outreach and database development. Other respondents said they had worked with SF State faculty on specific projects, such as tutoring. One mentioned, incorrectly, that CSL is required for all students. Several respondents received student help with a number of activities each semester, including conducting research, compiling information, assisting with grant writing, and writing and translating articles. One high school administrator mentioned that SF State
student interns help teachers achieve their academic goals for the year, but that those interns are not involved in the neighborhood or with parents.

Some of the neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) said they work directly with students or student groups, but have had difficulty establishing relationships with SF State faculty or departments. Similar findings were discussed in an assessment of SF State CSL program conducted in 2003 (Barrientos). According to both the assessment study and results from this report, community organizations attempted, but failed to establish collaborative relationships on multiple occasions, and remarked that faculty and staff seemed too busy or overworked to take on new projects. We asked if stakeholders knew which SF State College or Department students were affiliated with. The breakdown is shown in Table 4. The numbers in Table 4 may seem inaccurate; however, nonprofit sites may have had multiple students from multiple colleges.

Table 4. Group 1: SF State Students Interns/Volunteers and their College Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF State College</th>
<th>Total # of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (don’t know)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the roles that the various respondents have in their organizations (Figure 5, page 16), there are a relatively high percentage of potential sites that would be eligible to host student interns or service learning projects.

When asked to complete the sentence “As a result of working on a project with SF State, my organization is (or I am) . . .” and select the most appropriate answer from a list of pre-determined options, 21% of neighborhood stakeholders said they were better able to understand neighborhood needs and to address those needs, and 18% indicated they were better able to connect with other members in the community to identify common needs.

A number of respondents mentioned other ways that their organizations benefitted from working with SF State and its students: foreign language proficiency and translation capabilities and their ability to establish better connections with the populations the organizations served (e.g., immigrant communities, elderly). They also indicated that SF State students were skilled, committed, effective, and instrumental in helping them get their work done. SF State students:

- Fostered more trust among individuals/organizations
- Elicited more cooperation in identifying and addressing neighborhood needs

These benefits suggest that SF State students can contribute to the development of bridging social capital in the neighborhood.
When the Group 2 business community was asked whether they were aware that SF State students provided services to other businesses or nonprofits in the neighborhood, respondents said no, thus follow-up questions were not warranted.

However, the research team did ask business owners if they could think of projects that SF State students could work on to help improve their businesses. Forty-two percent indicated that students could help them develop print-based advertising or marketing media; design and develop websites; help them use social media effectively; conduct customer satisfaction surveys; measure neighborhood demographics so they could better understand their clientele; conduct training sessions for customers to help them with basic skills (e.g., literacy, financial literacy); provide translation services; and/or offer day care.

Collectively, these findings support that regular interactions between the community and SF State will foster norms of generalized reciprocity and trust, thus enhancing social capital for those who participate in neighborhood events, and for the neighborhood as a whole. These findings also suggest that there is room to improve and expand SF State’s role in business development, and that failure to do so may result in missed opportunities to help build bridging and bonding social capital in D11.

6. Identifying and Addressing Neighborhood Needs

We combined both neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) and business community (Group 2) in this section since both groups agreed on the same neighborhood needs. Within Group 1, 98% of respondents indicated that they did not think the City of San Francisco was doing enough to address their needs, a sentiment that was echoed by 58% of respondents in Group 2.

Stakeholders were asked to identify the top three needs in their neighborhoods that might benefit from collaborating with SF State or with the City and County of San Francisco. Stakeholders brainstormed and created list of needs and related problems or issues they thought should be addressed in their neighborhoods. Those specific needs and issues are contained in Table 5; many of the needs were mentioned multiple times (or in multiple ways) and some overlap with one another. Interestingly, respondents from the business community identified similar needs, although they emphasized needs that primarily fell into keeping the neighborhood clean and safe, supporting small businesses and employment development, need for translation services, programs for children and youth, and creating more public gathering spaces. Coincidentally, some of these same community needs were identified at the OMI Summit\textsuperscript{11} and by the OMI Community Collaborative.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} OMI Summit took place on April 24, 2010 and more than 100+ community residents were in attendance.

\textsuperscript{12} Report Titled "Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside (OMI) Service Providers Planning and Capacity Building Process 2009-2010 dated 2/11
Table 5. Group 1 and Group 2: Stakeholder-Identified Neighborhood Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes: ESL, computer, and parenting skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services: healthcare, homeless, legal advice, and translation (Spanish, Tagalog, and Chinese)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for Children and Teens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic support: mentors, retention services, scholarship funds, and college pathways for youth (SAT workshops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for children and teens: Preschool/daycare/afterschool/weekend programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for teens/young adults: career counseling, health services, and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth crime prevention programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better community-police relationships through outreach to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services: community newspaper/media and more community events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime, Safety, Traffic, and Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime: Bus, street safety, theft, graffiti, and violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes: Emergency preparedness and public safety training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation: increase transit/public transportation, deal with noise from I-280 and BART trains, and traffic control standard (such as to deal with speeding on residential streets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Training, Business Development, and Job Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disparity in development of business areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job development, training, and employment opportunities for adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote more environmentally-friendly businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable family and senior housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legalize in-law units to provide better protection to low-income families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior support, activities, meeting spaces, and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior support and counseling for care-givers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness and Overall Quality of Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beautification and street/sidewalk cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services/counseling services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance for Service Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help connect to: young immigrant families, additional SF agencies, and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help seek funding opportunities and more volunteers/students for local service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote more coordination among agencies/service providers in D-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings: diversity training (sensitivity and cultural training), development of culturally-competent outreach materials, and website development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who were highly critical of the City and some of its departments, also thought that the reason the City had failed to address their problems was a result of the current budget crisis, adding that the City's budget shortfall impacted their organizations directly, thereby hampering their ability to provide services in the face of increased demand from the community. One respondent specifically mentioned that the eligibility requirements for publicly-subsidized housing are out-of-line with local
realities; moreover, even if a family did qualify, the waiting lists to move into housing units are unbelievably long. Another respondent said they did not trust the City to deliver culturally sensitive services to diverse youth and seniors.

There were several highly critical comments about the City’s lack of funding to community-based organizations that were providing services that the City was either unable or unwilling to provide, suggesting that this might be part of a plan to eliminate smaller organizations and bolster the position of larger, more established nonprofits. Some respondents also saw this as part of a funding pattern and public posturing around the City’s commitment to serve immigrant and homeless populations. While one member of the business community complained about a lack of responsiveness by police after a robbery, they did acknowledge that the City had addressed the problem of trash on sidewalks. One respondent from the business community complained that it took the City four years to address a flooding problem.

Several other neighborhood stakeholders said they could not address the City’s responsiveness since they were not aware of what services the City provided or to whom. One respondent thought that the lack of agreement and collaboration in the OMI neighborhood reflected an inability of the City and County of San Francisco and the Community Convener groups to create a cohesive vision with residents.

On the positive side, a few neighborhood stakeholders were pleased with the SF Promise Program, and a few people mentioned that while the process of getting things done through the City is long and slow, things do get done; a recently installed traffic signal was cited as an example. By far, the most frequently made favorable comment was about Supervisor John Avalos’ role in working to meet neighborhood needs since he took office.

7. Neighborhood Assets: Diversity, Space and Infrastructure

Both stakeholder groups (Group 1 and Group 2) appreciated the diversity in their neighborhoods and genuinely liked their neighbors, suggesting that these neighborhoods already have relatively high levels of social capital. They also appreciated the green spaces that their neighborhoods had created.

Most respondents thought that the residents in their neighborhoods were its greatest assets—that they are friendly, warm, and committed to the neighborhood. As a result, residents are willing and able to work together toward common goals and there is a strong sense of community and cohesiveness. The neighborhood’s diversity (particularly its ethnic and cultural diversity) was considered a particular strength, as were the contributions of seniors, who have strong ties to the neighborhood’s history.

The next two most frequently cited neighborhood assets were physical spaces and infrastructure. Physical space referred primarily to green spaces and parks, as well as accessibility to outdoor recreation activities (e.g., sailing) and views. Neighborhood infrastructure referred to the myriad of organizations located in and working with the neighborhood: schools, community-based nonprofits, police, libraries, recreation centers, small businesses, and public transit. Several neighborhood respondents said that organizations often work collaboratively, whether to deliver services, advocate for change, or to access funding, and that the public transit system was effective in helping them stay connected with the rest of the City.
Responses from the business community (Group 2) largely mirrored those of the neighborhood stakeholder group, with one exception. While neighborhood stakeholders seemed to be able to identify neighborhood assets, seven respondents from the business community (19%) said they could not identify any neighborhood assets.

When asked what activities or projects would help strengthen relationships among stakeholders in their neighborhood, most respondents suggested one or more of the following: enhancing communications, with a specific concern for reaching speakers of languages other than English; holding community events for the purpose of collectively sharing information and experiences; promoting more activities that target specific groups like youth or seniors; and fostering collaborations among service providers. One respondent thought that interfaith-based activities or promoting volunteerism would help build relationships. Again, responses from the business community mirrored the neighborhood stakeholders, although a few wanted to create activities that would unite businesses and create a more business-friendly environment in the neighborhood.

8. Demand for Workshops or Training

Towards the end of the interviews, neighborhood stakeholders (Group 1) were asked if they or others they knew would be interested in taking free leadership development courses in any of five specific areas. There was a high level of interest, particularly in the area of cross-cultural communications, and in volunteer recruitment and management (see Figure 19). The numbers in Figure 19 may seem inaccurate; however, respondents choose several areas that they were interested in getting trainings on.

![Figure 19. Group 1 - Interest in Free Leadership Development Trainings](image)

Respondents from the business community (Group 2) were also asked to identify workshop topics they would be interested in attending if such workshops were provided free-of-charge. This was an open-ended question, from which five topics emerged: (1) marketing/advertising; (2) small business development/strategic planning; (3) outreach and networking; (4) job search and interviewing skills; and (5) management training (see Figure 20). The numbers in Figure 20 may seem inaccurate; however, not all respondents in Group 2 identified training needs.
The interest that neighborhood stakeholders and members of the business community had in training suggests that there is an opportunity to help the neighborhood develop bonding and bridging social capital if norms of generalized reciprocity and trustworthiness among diverse groups can be further developed and enhanced.

V. COLLABORATIONS AND COALITION BUILDING

In September of 2009, San Francisco Supervisor John Avalos (District 11) and MOH/CDD began discussing a model in which a planning process would take place that would increase the capacity of the OMI service providers to address community needs and that could lead to an on-going partnership between the City and OMI nonprofit agencies. Thirty-two OMI service providers were selected to be part of this capacity building model. This group was called the OMI Service Providers Cohort and it met from December 2009 to October 2010. This capacity building model was lead by MOH/CDD and its consulting firm, CompassPoint13. As ICCE became informed about this collaboration, its staff met with Supervisor Avalos, MOH/CDD, and Compass point to discuss the possibility of collaborating with them.

ICCE staff began meeting monthly with the leading team members to provide feedback on the project design and at the same time started attending bi-weekly OMI Cohort meetings to provide logistical support to its members. Throughout the ensuing ten months, the Cohort went through a process of community-building exercises in order to develop a working network that would represent and engage the OMI community. In October 2010, the group decided to merge with a larger group of OMI service providers and a new coalition emerged, which was named the “OMI Community Collaborative” (OMICC). Previously, organizations in this group had conflicting event dates, did not advocate jointly for City

---

13 CompassPoint Nonprofit Services, a long-time partner to the Community Development Division of the Mayor’s Office of Housing, was brought in to design, facilitate, and document the OMI Service Provider Cohort planning process.
funds, and did not communicate with each other in a consistent manner. Now, this group has a steering committee, is developing joint events, is thinking strategically about how to advocate for OMI residents, and is developing mechanisms for ongoing communications with each other, OMI residents, and City officials. MOH/CDD has drafted a report on the process, which will be available by the summer of 2011.

From November 2009 to June 2010, the ICCE the team was reaching out to 360 D11 neighborhood representatives to gather neighborhood data; finalize a thorough analysis of its physical assets; help organize community events, and provide logistical support to service providers by analyzing the City’s budget to determine how allocations and reductions were related to neighborhood census data. Simultaneously, ICCE staff worked closely with six youth organizations in D11 to attract 356 individuals (youth, parents, teachers, and public officials) to two Town Hall forums on “Education Equity;” matched 30 short-term CSL projects with neighborhood organizations—which resulted in 109 CSL students performing 14,715 hours of service in D11; recruited 55 long-term and 25 one-time community volunteers (not SF State students) to work on the two Town Hall meetings; provided funding to six CSL faculty so they could develop long-term projects in the district; and worked very closely with several City departments, the D-11 supervisor’s office, and neighborhood leaders to coordinate activities. The collective projects provided services to approximately 361 economically disadvantaged D11 youths.

ICCE was able to write and submit grant proposals that resulted in a $67,000 award for the capacity building project in D-11. This money was used to fund different projects within D-11, including the Town Hall events and to hire and pay graduate student assistants, etc. When student services are calculated at the minimum wage rate of $9.75/hr, the initial grant generated a total of $239,405 in services for the District. This does not include faculty and staff time spent on projects.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While these findings suggest that there is a strong foundation for developing social capital in the D11 neighborhood, it is evident that there is also a need to foster collaboration among all stakeholders as the neighborhood changes and continues to struggle with the impacts of the current financial crisis. Additionally, while the data suggests that these neighborhoods have relatively high levels of social capital, it also suggests that it is of the bonding kind that reinforces ties between groups having similar characteristics. Neighborhood stakeholders who participated in public gatherings often expanded their social networks and capitalized on that expansion by maintaining communications with, and sometimes working with, new contacts. Some were able to strengthen relationships with existing contacts as a result of participating in public events. The stakeholders reported that they liked residents in the D11 neighborhoods, recognizing that they were “good working class families.” Together these can be taken as indicators of the norms of reciprocity and social trust that are seen as the fabric of social capital.

At the same time, while many respondents said they appreciated the diversity in their neighborhoods, their responses also indicated that there is a need for bridging social capital. Neighborhood stakeholders often said they need help developing their capacities, particularly in the areas of cross-cultural and multilingual communications, which could help remove constraints to participating in
neighborhood events and collaborative efforts, and which could contribute to the development of both bonding and bridging social capital. In fact, when asked about neighborhood needs in general, many of the stakeholders identified a need for more culturally competent programming and immigrant services. When we consider the various aspects of diversity—racial and ethnic backgrounds, income levels, cultural differences, living conditions, communication styles and expectations—the challenges seem daunting. However, bridging social capital could improve the capacity of individuals, the groups with which they are affiliated, and the neighborhood as a whole.

The literature review and the people we interviewed for this study often referred to the presence and number of working class, home-owning families in the neighborhood, suggesting that many people in the neighborhood have an affinity for neighbors who are similar to them. Also mentioned was the need to be able to communicate in languages other than English. Given the linguistic and cultural diversity in the D11 neighborhoods, it is important to nurture the development of bridging social capital in particular. It may be possible to help bridge language and cultural gaps by making connections that build on a common working class identity.

The data also suggests that members of the business community may need to connect purposely with neighborhood events, services, and other organizations. This merits further exploration, especially since there are a lot of small businesses in the district. The data also suggests that SF State and neighborhood groups may be missing important and worthwhile opportunities to collaborate because of differences in communication styles, organizational structures, and timelines. Again, this is an issue that merits further exploration, but collaborations might be easier to create if SF State could establish clearer access points (including contact information and scheduling requirements) and provide that information to neighborhood groups.

In many ways, these findings are not surprising and reinforce Putnam’s (2007) policy implications: (1) there is a need to invest more in common public spaces such as parks, athletic fields, and community centers in order to foster the development of a shared identity in diverse communities; (2) there is a need for more language training that brings together diverse cultures—most likely in the form of English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, which could also help native English speakers improve their foreign language skills; and (3) religious and ethnically-defined social groups should be encouraged to continue their historically important roles of incorporating immigrant communities and fostering mutual learning with native-born populations. Furthermore, a 2009 study requested by Supervisor Avalos indicates that one strategy for strengthening community development is to build social capital. It recommends that “Programs and activities should work in concert to produce desired outcomes while also being connected to the larger economic environment and context” (page 2) and that the strategy should include: affordable housing development, economic development, and the development of “social capital” (e.g., fostering relationships and developing capacity for effective organizing).

It may be possible to help bridge language and cultural gaps by making connections that build on a common working class identity (bridging social capital). Given the favorable views neighborhood stakeholders expressed about SF State and its students, we recommend developing more collaborative projects that involve SF State students and neighborhood stakeholders. One important way

---

14 A Foundation to Build On: Strengthening Community Development in San Francisco. June 2009, Draft
neighborhood stakeholders, City agencies, and SF State can support the development of bridging social capital is to ensure that neighborhood groups have the capacity to be more purposeful about connecting with non-English speaking populations, whether through translators, bilingual services, printed information in other languages, or by providing English language training.

The need for more effective communication strategies and enhanced capacities is an opportunity for residents to work collaboratively, thus creating the potential to build and enhance their social capital. Communication building strategies may include: support for neighborhood newspapers or electronic newsletters, website development, or incentives for residents to participate in public gatherings (given plenty of advance notice for scheduling) so that neighborhood and community groups can connect more effectively with one another, with City agencies, and with the university.

The D11 neighborhood has a solid foundation of social capital on which to build. Consistent, targeted, collaborative projects that bring together culturally and linguistically diverse neighborhood stakeholders can go a long way to help develop bridging social capital. In order for such projects to be successful, they must be communicated appropriately, which means that the neighborhood’s collective capacity for communications must be promoted, especially cross-cultural communications. As social capital in the neighborhood develops, so will its resiliency. A San Francisco comprised of diverse, resilient neighborhoods is a city well-prepared to face its next major challenge or disaster.
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Situation: In 2009, SF State’s Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) and the City and County of San Francisco’s Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN) launched a new partnership, called NEN University (NENu). NENu connects the resources of local higher education institutions with the NEN to address critical issues as defined by residents in San Francisco’s diverse neighborhoods. After evaluating best practices in community sustainability nationwide, one of the first undertakings of NENu was to initiate an Engaged Learning Zone (ELZ) project in District 11 in San Francisco covering six distinct neighborhoods: Cayuga Terrace; Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside (OMI); Excelsior; Crocker Amazon; New Mission Terrace; and Outer Mission.

ELZ relies on the development of social capital (strong, inclusive, and resilient networks citywide) in neighborhoods that have the capacity to not only support and address day-to-day challenges, but that can also be reconstituted immediately after an earthquake or similar disaster to provide the community with the post-disaster support. This capacity is best described as Resiliency. The D11 neighborhood organizations and residents currently are not organized to work together if a major disaster occurs; however, neighborhood has a foundation for social capital from which build resiliency. Residents lack the knowledge how to become involved in neighborhood programs and organizations lack the staffing to do outreach and engage all residents in neighborhood organizing efforts.
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15 Engaged Learning Zone (ELZ) project was previously known as the Alliance for Strong Inclusive Neighborhoods (ASIN) project.
APPENDIX B
NEIGHBORHOOD STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR INTERVIEWERS

Overarching Assessment Goal

To determine if the social capital of four neighborhoods: The Excelsior; Crocker Amazon; Outer Mission; and the Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside District, has increased as a result of collaborations initiated by San Francisco State University.

Research Questions

1. Do the following university-initiated collaborations (community service learning projects and Town Hall meetings sponsored by SF State) help (a) bond social capital and/or (b) bridge social capital in neighborhoods where they are employed? [Note: Bonding social capital strengthens existing ties, or those between similar groups; bridging social capital spans cleavages – racial, ethnic, socio-economic, and geographic, etc. These ties can be weak or strong.]

2. Do the SF State/neighborhood collaborations help community members (a) identify and/or (b) address neighborhood needs?

Key Concepts Defined

Social Capital: Although there are many definitions of social capital, we prefer Putnam and Feldstein’s, which states that social capital is a web of “social networks, norms of reciprocity, mutual assistance, and trustworthiness.” Social networks represent the connections between individuals, groups, and organizations. These connections form as norms of reciprocity are established when individuals perform acts that benefit others, with the expectation that someone else will return the favor at an unspecified point in time—known as the “norm of generalized reciprocity.” Some people consider the norm of generalized reciprocity as the central process social capital theory seeks to describe. Participation in this system of norms represents membership in a social network. Once individuals are members of this network, a sense of mutual obligation and assistance, along with trustworthiness, begins to develop.

This study examines patterns of communication and cooperation between stakeholder organizations, local associations, and government agencies that the interviewees represent in order to assess the level of social capital.

Neighborhood Stakeholders: All stakeholders in a community, including residents, neighborhood associations, community-based organizations, city departments (police, fire, etc.), churches, schools, and small business owners.

Neighborhood Needs: Issues identified by neighborhood stakeholders as needing to be addressed at the neighborhood level.

University-Initiated Collaborations: Any project(s) that is initiated by a SF State faculty member or a product of a SF State community-based program, such as community-service learning projects, or a public gathering that has been sponsored by SF State, such as a Town Hall meeting.

---

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Please tell me a little bit about the primary role you currently play in this neighborhood (e.g., are you the head of a neighborhood association; a police officer, or a member of the clergy)? What are your primary activities and goals in that role?

2. How long have you held your current primary role in this neighborhood (as identified in question 1 above, whether as a resident, service provider, etc.)?

3. Does your neighborhood get together for informal events, such as parties, fairs, cultural celebrations, etc.?
   a. If yes, how often (choose one)?
      - Monthly
      - A few times a year
      - About once a year
   b. If yes, do you know how long these gatherings have been held (e.g., they just started; a few years ago; “forever”)?

4. Do you usually work with other individuals and organizations in the neighborhood? YES/NO
   a. If yes, how many (choose a range)?: 1-3 4-6 7-9 10 or more
   b. If yes, how often do you usually work with them (choose one)?
      - Weekly
      - Bi-weekly
      - Monthly
      - A few times a year
      - About once a year
   c. If yes, why do you work with them (interviewer should try to discover context and specific projects, if any)?

5. Have you ever heard of the following?
   a. Public gatherings hosted by the City or one of its departments (for example, Growing Resilience Bay, Sunday Streets)? YES/NO
   b. SF State Community Service Learning Projects (for example, students producing advertisements (PSAs), newsletter designs, teaching children to dance, website design, etc.) YES/NO
   c. SF State students placed as interns or volunteers
      i. with your organization? YES/NO
      ii. with some other organization in the neighborhood? YES/NO
      iii. If yes, and you know the department or faculty (professor) affiliated with those students, please name the professor or department.

If the response to any of q's 5.a. – 5.c. is yes, please continue to question 6. If no, skip to question 12.

6. How did you hear about the (interviewer chooses, based on response to question 5): public gathering, service learning project, or student interns/volunteers?

7. Have you (or has your organization) ever participated in one or more of those opportunities? YES/NO
   a. If yes, which ones? Why? How often?
      i. Would you participate in a similar event/service in the future? Why or Why Not?
   b. If not, what prevented you from participating?
8. As a result of your participation of those opportunities, did you:
   a. Get introduced to agencies or individuals that you did not know before? YES/NO
      i. If yes, how many (choose range)?  1-3   4-6   7-9   10 or more
   b. Start communicating with agencies/individuals that you did not know before? YES/NO
      i. If yes, how many (choose range)?     1-3   4-6   7-9   10 or more
      ii. If yes, how often do you usually communicate with them?
          Weekly   Bi-weekly   Monthly   A few times a year   About once a year
      iii. If yes, why did you communicate with them (interviewer should try to understand context and specific purpose, if any)?
   c. Establish working relationships with agencies/individuals you did not know before? YES/NO
      i. If yes, how many (choose one)?     1-3   4-6   7-9   10 or more
      ii. If yes, how often do you usually work with them?
          Weekly   Bi-weekly   Monthly   A few times a year   About once a year
      iii. If yes, why did you work with them (interviewer should try to understand context and specific projects, if any)?
   d. Strengthen/reinvigorate working relationships with agencies/individuals with whom you previously worked? YES/NO
      i. If yes, how many (choose range)?     1-3   4-6   7-9   10 or more
      ii. If yes, in what ways were those working relationships strengthened?
   e. Stop working with an individual or organization with whom you previously worked? YES/NO
      i. If yes, why?

The next sets of questions are about volunteer opportunities and neighborhood needs

9. If you worked directly with students/faculty on a project, please describe the project, including goals and outcomes, if possible.
   a. As a result of that project, are you or your organization:
      i. Better able to identify community needs;
      ii. Better able to connect with others in the community to identify common needs;
      iii. Better able to articulate common needs to government agencies or representatives;
      iv. Better able to identify/access resources available to the community;
      v. Better able to address neighborhood needs;
      vi. Better able to work with others in the community to address neighborhood needs; or
      vii. Better able to ensure neighborhood needs were address by government agencies or representatives?

10. Do you feel that you/your organization has benefitted from these SF State collaborations in ways not mentioned previously? If so, please explain.
11. Do you feel that your neighborhood as a whole has benefitted from these SF State collaborations? If so, please indicate in which ways:
   a. More trust among individuals/organizations;
   b. More cooperation in identifying and addressing neighborhood needs;
   c. More capacity to identify and address neighborhood needs;
   d. It feels safer;
   e. It looks cleaner;
   f. It feels friendlier.

12. What would you identify as your neighborhood’s three greatest service needs that might benefit from collaborating with SF State or with the City & County of SF?
   a. Do you feel that the City & County of SF is addressing those needs?

14. What would you identify as your neighborhood’s three greatest assets?

15. What activities or projects would help strengthen relationships among stakeholders in this neighborhood?

15. Would you or other members of your community be interested in taking free leadership development workshops from SF State in any of the following areas:
   a. Recruiting, training, and retaining volunteers;
   b. Cross-cultural communications
   c. Conflict management / resolution
   d. Team building activities
   e. Strategic planning and Facilitation

16. Can you provide us with the name and contact information for others in the neighborhood who might be able to help inform us about the strengths and assets in this neighborhood?
APPENDIX C
BUSINESS INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Do you know if this neighborhood businesses, organizations, residents get together for informal events, such as parties, fairs, cultural celebrations, etc.?
   If yes, how often (choose one)?
   Monthly A few times a year About once a year
   If yes, do you know how long these gatherings have been held (e.g., they just started; a few years ago; “forever”)?

2. Do you usually cooperate/work with other businesses or organizations in the neighborhood? YES/NO
   If yes, how many (choose a range)?: 1-3 4-6 7-9 10 or more
   If yes, how often do you usually work with them (choose one)?
   Weekly Bi-weekly Monthly A few times a year About once a year
   If yes, why do you work with them (interviewer should try to discover context and specific projects, if any)?

3. Have you ever heard of the following?
   Public gatherings hosted by the City or one of its departments (for example, Growing Resilience Bay, Sunday Streets)? Yes/No

4. How did you hear about the public gathering?

   If the response to any of question 3.a. is YES, continue to question 5.
   If NO, skip to question 7.

5. Have you (or your business) ever participated in one or more of those opportunities? YES/NO
   a. If yes, which ones? Why? How often?
      i. Would you participate in a similar event/service in the future? Why or Why Not?
   b. If not, what prevented you from participating?

6. As a result of your participation of those opportunities, did you:
   a. Get introduced to other businesses or organizations that you did not know before? YES/NO
      If yes, how many (choose range)? 1-3 4-6 7-9 10 or more
   b. Start communicating with these businesses or organizations that you did not know before? YES/NO
      If yes, how many (choose range)? 1-3 4-6 7-9 10 or more
      If yes, how often do you usually communicate with them?
      Weekly Bi-weekly Monthly A few times a year About once a year
      If yes, why did you communicate with them (interviewer should try to understand context and specific purpose, if any)?
c. Establish working relationships with these businesses or organizations you did not know before?  
YES/NO  
If yes, how many (choose one)?  
1-3  4-6  7-9  10 or more  
If yes, how often do you usually work with them?  
Weekly  Bi-weekly  Monthly  A few times a year  About once a year  
If yes, why did you work with them (interviewer should try to understand context and specific projects, if any)?  
d. Strengthen/reinvigorate working relationships with other businesses and/or organizations with whom you previously worked?  
YES/NO  
If yes, how many (choose range)?  
1-3  4-6  7-9  10 or more  
If yes, in what ways were those working relationships strengthened?  
e. Stop working with other businesses or organization with whom you previously worked?  
YES/NO  
If yes, why?  

The next sets of questions are about neighborhood opportunities and needs.  

7. What would you identify as your neighborhood’s three greatest service needs that might benefit from collaborating with SF State or with the City & County of SF?  
   a. Do you feel that the City & County of SF is addressing those needs?  

8. What would you identify as your neighborhood’s three greatest assets?  

9. What activities or projects, do you think, would help strengthen relationships among stakeholders in this neighborhood?  

10. If you had the opportunity to take free workshops to improve your business, what topics would be beneficial for you or your employees?  Please list three  

11. How long have you owned this business or being a manager of this establishment?  

12. Do you play any other role in this neighborhood besides being a business owner or manager of this establishment?  What are your primary activities in that role?  

13. Do you happen to know where your clients are coming from?  
   a. Local/neighborhood  
   b. City-wide  

14. Do you serve clients in other languages?  If so, please name top two.  

15. Are there any projects that that you feel that SF State students may be able to assist with to improve your business?  For example, past activities include business majors developing sales and marketing plans for small local businesses.