Civil SERVICE COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT TRANSMITTAL (FORM 22)

Refer to Civil Service Commission Procedure Number Two for Instructions on Completing and Processing this Form

	1.	Civil Service Commission Register Number:						
	2.	For Civil Service Commission Meeting of: December 15 th , 2025						
	3.	Check One:	Ratification Agenda					
			Consent Agenda					
			Regular Agenda	X				
		Human Resources Directorσ Report						
	4.	Subject: Review of Emergency Request for Approval of Proposed Personal Service						
Contract #DHRPSC0005960 – v0.01 from the Human Rights Commission								
	5.	Recommendation: Ad	lopt the report. Appro	ve the request for proposed Personal Service				
Contract; Notify the Office of the Controller and the Office of Contract Administration.								
	6.	Report prepared by:	Samuel Thomas	Telephone number: 415-252-2547				
	7.	Notifications: (Attach a list of the person(s) to be notified in the						
		format described in Civil Service Commission Procedure						
	Number Two).							
	8.	Reviewed and approv	ed for Civil Service C	Commission Agenda:				
		Human Resou	rces Director: Not rec	quired				
Date: NA								
	9.	Submit the original ti	ma stamped capy of t	his form and narran(s) to be notified				
	7.	Submit the original time-stamped copy of this form and person(s) to be notified (see Item 7 above) along with the required copies of the report to:						

Executive Officer Civil Service Commission 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 720 San Francisco, CA 94102

10.	Receipt-stamp this form in the ACSC RECEIPT STAMP≅ box to the right using the time-stamp in the CSC Office.	CSC RECEIPT STAMP
Attac	hment:	
1 Not	tifications List	

CSC-22 (11/97) Page 2 of 12

Attachment: 1 Notifications List

Mawuli. Tugbenyoh@sfgov.org; Phil. Kim@sfgov.org; Samuel. Thomas@sfgov.org; Eilia. Wong@sfgov.org; L21pscreview@ifpte21.org; agarza@ifpte21.org

City and County of San Francisco

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mawuli Tugbenyoh Executive Director

Daniel Lurie

Mayor

TO: Sandra Eng, Executive Director, San Francisco Civil Service Commission

FROM: Mawuli Tugbenyoh, Executive Director, San Francisco Human Rights Commission

DATE: 5 December 2025

RE: PSC Request – Empowerment and Capacity Building (ECB) Foundation Partner RFP

Purpose of Memo

This memo provides information requested by the Commission regarding HRC's proposed PSC submission to issue an RFP to support the Empowerment and Capacity Building (ECB) grant program.

1. Request justification

This request is being advanced as an emergency item because the ECB program is designed to support marginalized communities and intentionally align with the timing of the current HRC grant cycle. Many of the small and emerging organizations served through the Dream Keeper Initiative—who are anticipated beneficiaries of this program—were significantly affected by previous funding freezes. Delaying approval until late January would postpone the program's launch and slow the delivery of resources meant to repair those disruptions and reestablish support for communities that have experienced underinvestment. Advancing this item now is essential to uphold the City's equity commitments and ensure restoration of critical services.

2. Description of services

The selected foundation partner will provide specialized nonprofit-sector services that HRC does not have the staffing capacity or expertise to deliver, including:

- Designing and administering an equitable grant process tailored to small and emerging nonprofits.
- Delivering individualized, culturally responsive technical assistance, organizational development support, and fiscal guidance.
- Applying philanthropic-standard tools for nonprofit capacity-building, mentorship, and funder-readiness.
- Monitoring grantee progress consistent with City compliance requirements with support from HRC staff.
- Preparing a transition plan to help organizations maintain momentum after the grant ends.

These are external-facing nonprofit development services that complement, rather than duplicate, the City's internal roles.

3. Funding impacts without approval

Without CSC approval, HRC cannot move forward with contracting, which would delay the ECB program and directly affect the small, community-rooted organizations the program is designed to support. These groups—including but not limited to many serving Black, Indigenous, immigrant, LGBTQ+, and other marginalized communities—would lose access to capacity-building resources that help them strengthen operations, improve competitiveness, and build the runway needed to secure future City and private funding. The absence of these supports risks exacerbating inequities for health and well-being, education, and enhancing the structural barriers the program was designed to address.

4. Consequences of not receiving CSC approval

If approval is not granted:

- The ECB program cannot begin, and its intended social equity impacts will not be realized.
- Community organizations will miss a critical opportunity to build capacity that enables long-term sustainability and competitiveness in future funding cycles.
- The City would lack the specialized philanthropic-sector partner required to deliver the program.
- One-time funds may eventually be reallocated to other uses if contracting cannot proceed.

This would hinder the City's ability to deliver on its commitments to historically marginalized communities.

5. Why the HRC did not submit a request sooner

The program design, scope, and service model for this initiative were finalized after HRC completed its major solicitation, RFP 100, which relaunched The Dream Keeper Initiative grantmaking and required a significant, department-wide effort. Given the scale and urgency of RFP 100, staff capacity was fully dedicated to ensuring that process was executed accurately, compliantly, and on schedule, leaving no resources to run a parallel planning track for this separate, foundation-partner initiative.

Once RFP 100 was completed, staff were able to shift attention to finalizing the ECB program design and confirm with the City Attorney that a PSC was required for the specialized philanthropic-sector services involved. Upon making that determination, HRC immediately prepared and submitted the PSC for the earliest available Commission meeting.

Conclusion

Timely approval will allow HRC to advance a one-time equity initiative designed to reduce barriers, build organizational capacity, and support long-term competitiveness for nonprofits serving San Francisco's most marginalized communities. HRC stands ready to provide any additional information the Commission may require.

Personal Service Contract Summary (PSC Form 1)

PSC Basic Information

Submitting Department: HRC **ServiceNow Number:** DHRPSC0005960

Submitted By: Samuel Thomas **Version:** 0.01

Department Coordinator: Emilia Wong, **Version Type:** New

emilia.wong@sfgov.org

Project Manager: Samuel Thomas

Brief description of proposed work: The project requires a foundation partner with specialized expertise in community-based grant administration that extends beyond the City's traditional grantmaking role. The partner will design and implement an equitable small-grant process using philanthropic-sector practices that are uniquely effective for engaging small, emerging nonprofits—particularly those that have historically faced barriers within formal government contracting systems. In addition to distributing funds, the foundation will provide intensive, trust-based technical assistance, mentorship, and fiscal guidance that nonprofits are far more likely to access and internalize from a peer-sector entity than from an administrative and regulatory body. These services are deeply external-facing and grounded in nonprofit development methodologies, including coaching, organizational diagnostics, and funder-readiness tools that are standard in the philanthropic ecosystem but not part of City operations. The project also includes rigorous monitoring aligned with compliance standards and a structured transition plan designed to help organizations strengthen their internal infrastructure so they can sustain their programs independently after the grant cycle concludes.

Review Type and Reason

CSC Review Required: Yes CSC Review Reason(s):

- Requires CSC Approval by Amount

Amount

PSC Amount: \$7,000,000

Does contract include items other than services?: No

Duration

Is PSC by Duration or Continuing: Duration

PSC Duration (Months): 24

Funding

Funding Source: City Funds

Special circumstances related to funding: No

Scope of Work

Clearly describe scope and detail the services to be performed: The project will administer a specialized small-grant program designed to support small, emerging community-based organizations that face barriers to participating in traditional City funding processes. The selected partner will design and implement a competitive, transparent solicitation; manage the distribution of grant funds; and provide tailored technical assistance, mentorship, and fiscal guidance to strengthen grantee organizations. Services include external nonprofit-facing activities such as capacity-building workshops, leadership development support, financial health coaching, and guidance on operational best practices. The partner will also conduct structured monitoring and reporting to ensure alignment with City compliance standards and program goals. Finally, the project includes developing a transition plan to help organizations maintain stability and pursue future funding opportunities beyond the grant period.

Why are these services required and what are the consequences of denial?: These services are required to provide specialized support to small and emerging community-based organizations that meet City compliance requirements but often lack the internal infrastructure to compete effectively in a traditional grant environment. The project offers external-facing services—such as capacity building, mentorship, fiscal guidance, and organizational development—that complement, rather than replace, the City's compliance and oversight functions. This targeted support helps organizations strengthen their administrative and operational practices so they can successfully participate in City programs and maintain compliance throughout the grant term.

If approval is denied, the City would lack a mechanism to equitably distribute these capacity-building funds and to ensure that smaller, community-rooted organizations are adequately prepared to manage grants in alignment with City standards. The result would likely be reduced participation from historically marginalized neighborhoods, diminished effectiveness of the Dream Keeper Initiative, and fewer organizations able to meet the City's expectations for sustainability and performance. Approval enables the City to advance equity goals by ensuring that community organizations receive the specialized, non-civil-service support required to fulfill compliance obligations and deliver strong outcomes.

Has your department contracted out these services in the last three years?: No

Board and Commission Approvals

Will any contracts under this PSC require department Commission approval: Yes

Provide details related to contracts for which dept comm approval required: All HRC contracts are approved by our Commission

Will any contracts under this PSC require Board of Supervisors approval: No

Justification

- Q1 Are there any regulatory or legal requirements supporting outsourcing of this work?: No
- Q2 Does performing these services cause a conflict of interest?: No
- Q3 Are these proprietary services City is not authorized to do?: No
- Q4 Does City lacks necessary facilities/equipment?: No
- **Q5 Are the services required on a temporary basis or on a long-term basis?:** Temporary Basis
- **Q5a) Explain the Temporary basis of the services:** Services needed to address a transitional or short-term situation
- **Q5b) Why do you believe this to be a transitional or short-term situation?:** This work is transitional because it is tied directly to a time-limited grant program with a defined funding window and specific capacity-building objectives for a cohort of emerging community-based organizations. The services required are front-loaded and episodic: they support organizations during the initial launch, implementation, and maturation of the Empowerment and Capacity Building grant cycle, and then taper off as grantees strengthen their administrative, fiscal, and operational practices. Once organizations complete this cycle and develop the infrastructure needed to participate more independently in future City or private funding opportunities, the need for these intensive, specialized services diminishes.

Additionally, the program is not a standing City function and does not represent ongoing operational work of the department. Its purpose is to bridge a temporary gap—helping organizations build readiness and stability during a finite period—after which the City can return to its standard grantmaking and compliance processes. For these reasons, the need for these services is limited to the duration of the grant cycle and does not create continuing work that would fall within the scope of permanent civil service positions.

- **Q5c)** How will you ensure the services aren't needed once this PSC request has ended?: The services will not continue beyond the PSC term because they are supported by one-time funds dedicated to a specific, time-limited grant cycle. When these funds expire, the scope of work ends, and there is no ongoing budget authority to continue the services. Participating organization will be able to apply under the HRC's standard grantmaking process, and no external provider will be engaged once the one-time initiative concludes.
- **Q5d)** Describe the required skills and expertise needed to perform the services: The services require a foundation partner with a specialized set of philanthropic-sector competencies that are fundamentally different from the City's oversight and administrative functions. This includes deep experience delivering hands-on, trust-based capacity-building to small and emerging nonprofits; sector-standard coaching and mentorship models; and the ability to provide intensive, day-to-day organizational strengthening that foundations routinely perform but public agencies do not. The partner must bring established grantmaking infrastructure, cultivated community credibility, and longstanding relationships within the nonprofit ecosystem—elements that enable organizations to engage openly about internal challenges, operational gaps, and development needs in ways that would not occur within a regulatory or funder-oversight relationship. These

are specialized external-facing skills tailored to nonprofit development, distinct from the City's role, and essential to achieving the goals of a one-time, capacity-building initiative.

Q5e) Does the Department have employees with the required skills and expertise?: No Q5f) not needed

Q5g) Will the services terminate upon resolution of the situation?: Yes

Additional information to support your request (Optional): Yes. The services will end once the one-time grant cycle and its defined capacity-building activities are completed. There is no ongoing scope, no continuing need beyond this period, and no authority or funding to extend the work.

Union Notifications

Job Class(es): 1824 - Pr Administrative Analyst **Labor Unions:** 021 - Prof & Tech Eng, Local 21

Labor Union Email Addresses: L21pscreview@ifpte21.org

Union Review Sent On: 12/8/2025 Union Review End Date: 12/18/2025 Union Review Duration Met On:



Re: HRC Waiver Request - PSC #DHRPSC0005960 (ECB Foundation Partner)

From Audrey Garza <agarza@ifpte21.org>

Date Wed 12/10/2025 4:33 PM

To Eng, Sandra (CSC) <sandra.eng@sfgov.org>

Cc Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRC) <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>; Kim, Phil (HRC) <phil.kim@sfgov.org>; Thomas, Samuel (HRC) <samuel.thomas@sfgov.org>

Hi Sandra.

The IFPTE Local 21 waives it's 10-day requirement and support HRC's efforts on the ECB.

Hopefully, this makes it on time and you can still add to the agenda.

Hope you are well.

For the Union,

Audrey Garza
Pronouns: she/they
Representative/Organizer
IFPTE Local 21
agarza@ifpte21.org
www.ifpte21.org

From: Thomas, Samuel (HRC) < samuel.thomas@sfgov.org>

Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 at 9:07 AM

To: Emily Wallace < ewallace@ifpte21.org>

Cc: Eng, Sandra (CSC) < sandra.eng@sfgov.org >, Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRC) < mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org >, Kim, Phil (HRC)

<phil.kim@sfgov.org>

Subject: Re: HRC Waiver Request – PSC #DHRPSC0005960 (ECB Foundation Partner)

Hello Emily, I am checking back to see if you have had a chance to evaluate our PSC and request. Sandra has informed us that the 12/15 meeting agenda must be posted today.

Thank you again for your consideration.





Personal Service Contracts (PSC) Request Form

Effective July 1, 2024, all PSC requests must be submitted using the ServiceNow PSC Application. For additional information, see below.

- · PSC Policy Guidance:
 - Review the 2023 PSC Policy.
 - Use the <u>Civil Service and Prop J Requirements and Applicability</u> guidance to learn how to apply the 2023 PSC Policy to contracts for services.
 - Check the <u>Personal Services Contracts (PSC) Notification and Submission Deadlines 2025 Calendar</u> and make note of the deadlines for submitting PSC received.
- · How to use the PSC ServiceNow application:
 - Use the ServiceNow PSC Management User Guide or this recorded training video to learn how to submit requests in the PSC ServiceNow Application.
 - Watch this video to learn how to generate PSC Form 1: PSC How to Generate Form 1
- · Questions:
 - Email questions or support needs to <u>adm.contracting.in.servicenow@sfgov.org.</u>

Number	DHRPSC0005960		
* Requester	Samuel Thomas	Q	0
* Submitting Department	HRC		0
* Dept PSC Coordinator	Emilia Wong	Q	0
* Dept Project Manager	Samuel Thomas	Q	(i)

Samuel Thomas

Human Rights Commission CFO

415-252-2547

Disclaimer: Artificial Intelligence lent a hand in crafting this email. If it reads particularly well, you know who to thank—but any errors are entirely my doing.

From: Emily Wallace < ewallace@ifpte21.org Sent: Monday, December 8, 2025 1:41 PM

To: Thomas, Samuel (HRC) < samuel.thomas@sfgov.org>

Cc: Eng, Sandra (CSC) <sandra.eng@sfgov.org>; Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRC) <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>; Kim, Phil (HRC) <phil.kim@sfgov.org>

Subject: Re: HRC Waiver Request - PSC #DHRPSC0005960 (ECB Foundation Partner)

Hi Samuel,

I still do not see this PSC reflected in the City's database, and we still have not received the PSC submission notice. We can't consider a request for a waiver without first receiving a copy of the Department's PSC.

We'll certainly keep an eye out for this PSC to come through on our end.

Thanks, Emily

From: Thomas, Samuel (HRC) < samuel.thomas@sfgov.org>

Date: Monday, December 8, 2025 at 1:38 PM **To:** Emily Wallace <ewallace@ifpte21.org>

Cc: Eng, Sandra (CSC) < sandra.eng@sfgov.org >, Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRC) < mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org >, Kim, Phil (HRC)

hil.kim@sfgov.org>

Subject: Re: HRC Waiver Request – PSC #DHRPSC0005960 (ECB Foundation Partner)

Thank you for your quick response. I believe our Coordinator recently approved it so you should see it now. Status in the header shows "Union Review".

Obliged

Samuel Thomas

Human Rights Commission CFO

415-252-2547

Disclaimer: Artificial Intelligence lent a hand in crafting this email. If it reads particularly well, you know who to thank—but any errors are entirely my doing.

From: Emily Wallace < ewallace@ifpte21.org>

Sent: Monday, December 8, 2025 1:15 PM

To: Thomas, Samuel (HRC) < samuel.thomas@sfgov.org>

 $\textbf{Cc:} \ Eng, Sandra\ (CSC) < \underline{sandra.eng@sfgov.org} >; \ Tugbenyoh, \ Mawuli\ (HRC) < \underline{mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org} >; \ Kim, \ Phil\ (HRC) < \underline{phil.kim@sfgov.org} >; \ Andra \ (CSC) < \underline{mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org} >; \ Andra \ (CSC) < \underline{mawuli.tugbenyoh@sf$

Subject: Re: HRC Waiver Request – PSC #DHRPSC0005960 (ECB Foundation Partner)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Samuel,

Local 21 does not have a record of receiving PSC5960. In looking at the City's PSC database, it appears the most recent PSC has a record number of 5959, so it's unclear if PSC5960 has been submitted yet.

Can you confirm when this PSC was submitted, and if the PSC notice was issued to the impacted labor groups? If so, please forward us the relevant PSC posting notice.

Thanks, Emily

From: Thomas, Samuel (HRC) < samuel.thomas@sfgov.org >

Date: Monday, December 8, 2025 at 12:30 PM **To:** Emily Wallace <<u>ewallace@ifpte21.org</u>>

Cc: Eng, Sandra (CSC) < sandra.eng@sfgov.org >, Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRC) < mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org >, Kim, Phil (HRC)

<phil.kim@sfgov.org>

Subject: HRC Waiver Request - PSC #DHRPSC0005960 (ECB Foundation Partner)

Dear Emily,

I hope you're doing well. I'm reaching out regarding **PSC #DHRPSC0005960**, which supports the Human Rights Commission's (HRC) *Empowerment and Capacity Building (ECB)* program. The ECB program is a one-time initiative that provides small grants and short-term capacity-building support to help emerging community-based organizations strengthen their internal systems and funder readiness.

I'm writing to respectfully request a waiver of the 10-day notification requirement so that the PSC item may be placed on the Civil Service Commission's 12/15 agenda. I've attached a memo for context as to the emergency nature of the request, and Sandra is cc'd.

This PSC approval would allow HRC to move forward with issuing an RFP. Because the ECB program is tied to the HRC's grant cycle and uses one-time funds, the timing is important for ensuring that participating community-based organizations that are expected to apply—many of which experienced disruption during last year's funding freeze—receive the interpretation of the int

Additional detail that may be helpful to L21's review

The services contemplated under the RFP draw heavily on philanthropic-sector practices, such as trust-based technical assistance, mentorship, funder-readiness coaching, and organizational development support delivered in a hands-on, peer-sector manner. These approaches require competencies that HRC does not currently have the staffing, experience, or infrastructure to provide at the scale and depth required for this initiative.

Because L21 may wish to assess potential overlap with City classifications, I want to acknowledge a few points proactively:

- City classifications: The particular combination of philanthropic expertise, sector-standard coaching, and deep, community-embedded technical assistance is not something HRC currently has capacity or training to deliver.
- Future transition to City staff: Because this is a one-time initiative with no ongoing scope of work after the grant cycle ends, there is no continuing need that would support developing long-term internal capacity for these specialized tasks.
- Requirement to contract out: The funding does not require contracting with a foundation, but the program design relies on philanthropic-sector competencies and credibility that are central to achieving the intended capacity-building outcomes for this specific cohort.

Time-limited nature of the work

The ECB initiative is finite (two, supported by one-time funding, and structured around a discrete capacity-building cycle. There is no ongoing function created under this PSC, and no expectation of continuing work after the program concludes.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this waiver request. HRC leadership is happy to meet at your asap at your convenience or provide any additional detail that would be helpful as you review the PSC.

Regards,



Disclaimer: Artificial Intelligence lent a hand in crafting this email. If it reads particularly well, you know who to thank—but any errors are entirely my doing.