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Abstract

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals are largely overrepresented in the adolescent homeless population, as LGBT individuals account for roughly 10% or less of the total population, but nearly 40% of the homeless population (Durso & Gates, 2012). Compared to their non-LGBT homeless peers, LGBT homeless adolescents are at greater risk for mental and sexual health issues and chronic homelessness, which is considered an extreme form of poverty (Ofstenhage, Radday, & Stanzler, 2011). Extreme poverty is estimated to cost the US $500 billion a year (Holzer, Schanzenbach, Duncan, & Ludwig, 2007). Such a high economic burden threatens the economic vitality of the United States (US) and indicates an urgent need to intervene and reduce homelessness among the LGBT adolescent population. LGBT adolescents are at a greater risk of homelessness due to poor coping mechanisms during adolescent and sexual identity development and familial or peer conflict (Keuroghlian, Shtasel, & Bassuk, 2014). To meaningfully impact LGBT adolescent homelessness and reduce the national economic burden, the Self campaign was developed. Self is a social marketing campaign proposal to change San Francisco Unified School District’s middle and high school culture and curriculum such that all adolescents will learn, observe, and practice healthy psychosocial skills. The campaign includes modified disciplinary guidelines, a psychosocial skills development course, staff education, and modifications to counselor services.
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Background

Homelessness in the United States (U.S.) has become an increasing health concern and priority issue for the American public and for the American government. The federal government defines homelessness as “an individual who lacks housing (without regard to whether the individual is a member of a family), including an individual whose primary residency during the night is a supervised public or private facility (e.g., shelters) that provides temporary living accommodations, and an individual who is a resident in transitional housing” (National Health Care for the Homeless Council, 2015). In 2014, the rate of homelessness in the US was 18.3 individuals per 10,000 people (National Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d.). The government further defines a chronic homeless individual as “an unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has been continuously homeless for a year” or “has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years” (United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2007).

The federal government has attempted to address the concern of chronic homelessness through enactment of the 2010 Opening Doors legislation, which set out initiatives aimed at ending chronic homelessness by 2017 (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, n.d.). Although the federal government has been somewhat successful in decreasing the rate of homelessness, as seen from 2013 to 2014, homelessness persists at a rate above where it would need to be for chronic homelessness to end by 2017.

In recognition of the continued need to invest in initiatives to end homelessness the federal government spent $4.5 billion in 2014 towards homelessness interventions, the most the federal government has ever put toward homelessness (National Health Care for the Homeless Council, 2015). In addition to government spending, the American people also recognize the
urgent need to act. A 2014 Gallup poll showed that 69% of the American people believe “poverty and homelessness” is “extremely important” or “very important” for the US government to address (Newport & Wilke, 2014).

Most of the federal focus in the *Opening Doors Strategic Plan to End Homelessness* has been on veterans, families and youth (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, n.d.). Addressing the needs of these populations is critically important to improving homelessness. Unfortunately, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) adolescent homeless population, which is overrepresented in the youth homeless population, has not had nearly as much attention. To date, the *Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act (RHYTPA)* enacted by the US Interagency Council on Homelessness in 2010 and revised in 2014 has been the primary policy intervention to address LGBT adolescents. The policy includes three separate guidelines to reduce LGBT discrimination in homeless services. These initiatives have not been nearly enough to address homeless in the national LGBT population (True Colors Fund, n.d.).

Of the total US youth population (age unspecified) in 2010, only 5-10% of youth identified as LGBT (Center for American Progress, 2010). However, in 2012, agencies serving the homeless reported that 39% of their client base identified as LGBT (Durso & Gates, 2012). Additionally “drop-in centers” for homeless youth reported that 43% of their client base identified as LGBT and both “street outreach programs” and “housing programs” for homeless youth reported that 30% of their client base identified as LGBT (Durso & Gates, 2012). Not only are LGBT youth overrepresented among homeless youth in America, the risks for LGBT adolescents who are homeless are greater than the risks for non-LGBT adolescents, making the need to intervene even more critical. Homeless youth who identify as LGBT are more likely than
their non-LGBT peers to report mental health concerns such as depression, anxiety, family rejection, social isolation, LGBT-based harassment, school bullying, suicidal ideation and suicide attempts, and are more likely to begin early substance use and abuse (Bidel, 2014). LGBT homeless adolescents are also much more likely to engage in risky sexual behaviors and contract HIV than non-LGBT homeless youth (Bidel, 2014; Keuroghlian, Shtasel, & Bassuk, 2014). For instance, LGBT homeless adolescents age 10-25 are 70% more likely to engage in survival sex than homeless heterosexual youth (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). LGBT homeless youth age 13-21 are also more likely than non-LGBT homeless to “experience physical or sexual victimization, have a higher number of perpetrators, and have unprotected intercourse” (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). Lastly, LGBT homeless youth compared to non-LGBT homeless youth are more likely to “trade sex with a stranger, have more than 10 sexual partners who they consider to be a stranger, have sex with a stranger who uses intravenous drugs, have anal sex with a stranger, have unprotected sex with a stranger, and have sex with a stranger after using drugs” (Keuroghlian & Shtasel, 2014).

Homeless adolescents who identify as transgender can be even more vulnerable than lesbian, bisexual or gay homeless adolescents. Specific risks and issues to homeless individuals who identify as transgender include (a) humiliation and physical or sexual victimization at shelters; (b) requirement to stay in lodging and use facilities based on birth sex rather than the gender in which they identify; (c) being unwelcome in shelters; (d) health complications from unmonitored hormone levels; (e) increased likelihood to obtain silicone injections from street vendors rather than health professionals, which can lead to further health problems (Keuroghlian et al., 2014).
The LGBT homeless adolescent is also at greater risk for chronic homelessness than their non-LGBT peers. When compared to heterosexual homeless adolescents, lesbian, bisexual, and queer homeless youth are 61% more likely to experience homelessness for “longer periods” and transgender homeless youth are 79.9% more likely to experience homelessness for “longer periods” (Choi, Wilson, Shelton, & Gates, 2015). This increased likelihood to be chronically homeless for LGBT adolescents can have several implications for the entire nation. For instance, chronic homelessness is considered “an extreme form of poverty” (Ofstenhage, Radday, & Stanzler, 2011). Poverty, especially childhood poverty, is known to have a tremendous economic impact on society. Childhood poverty is estimated to cost the US $500 billion annually, which is roughly 4% of the GDP (Holzer, Schanzenbach, Duncan, & Ludwig, 2007). Costs included in this analysis include a loss in adult earnings, a loss in economic productivity, an increase in costs related to crime and an increase in costs related to a poorer health status later in life (Holzer et al., 2007). Given the enormous psychosocial and financial costs of chronic homelessness in LGBT adolescents, it is critical to the vitality of the American economy and society that the US make a greater investment in research, development and implementation of interventions to prevent first time homelessness among LGBT adolescents.

**Literature Review**

**Overview and Methods**

Before making any recommendations on how to prevent first-time homelessness in LGBT adolescents, it is critical to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the causes. A literature review was conducted to evaluate factors associated with first time homelessness in LGBT adolescents. Article searches were conducted using two databases, PubMed and CINAHL, as well as through reference list searches from articles included in the literature review
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data analysis. Keywords for database searches included homeless, homelessness, LGBT, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, gay, sexual minority, street youth, and runaway. Inclusion criteria included (a) study population within the US; (b) article publication between 2006 and present; (c) topic focus on homelessness in the LGBT population; (d) emphasis or discussion on risks, health outcomes, or behaviors believed to cause or contribute to first time homelessness; (e) concentration on youth homelessness. There is currently limited evidentiary research on causal analysis for LGBT homeless adolescents, therefore a causal analysis was not required for an article to be included. Exclusion criteria included (a) study population outside of the US; (b) article publication prior to 2006; (c) irrelevant topic; (d) repeat article; (e) concentration on adult homelessness; (f) topic focus on homelessness non-specific to LGBT population; (g) focus on homelessness, but not on risks, health outcomes, or behaviors believed to cause or contribute to first time homelessness; (h) non-peer reviewed report or article; (i) focus on exiting or chronic homelessness, not first time homelessness.

Results

A total of 128 articles were identified; 85 articles from PubMed, 14 articles from CINAHL and 29 articles from journal references. A total of 6 articles were included, 5 from PubMed, 0 from CINAHL, and 1 from journal references. A total of 123 articles were excluded, 81 from PubMed, 14 from CINAHL, and 28 from journal references. Seven articles were excluded due to a population outside of the US. Thirty-two articles were excluded for being a repeat article. Eighty articles were excluded due to irrelevance or focus on homelessness, but not on risks, health outcomes, or behaviors believed to cause or contribute to first time homelessness. Two articles were excluded for focus on factors associated with exiting or chronic
homelessness, rather than first time homelessness. One article was excluded for being published prior to 2006 and one article was excluded for being a non-peer reviewed report or article.

**Article Characteristics**

**Geographic focus.**

Not all studies had a geographic focus more specific than the US. For studies that did have a more specific geographic focus, 2 reviewed New York City, New York, 1 reviewed Chicago, Illinois, and 1 reviewed areas of the Midwest, West, Northeast, and South.

**Study type.**

Three articles were literature reviews, two were retrospective cohort studies, one was an ethnographic study and one was a prospective cohort study.

**Methods.**

Methods are only summarized for the three articles that are not primary literature reviews. One article used qualitative interviews, another used surveys, and the remaining used a combination of qualitative interviews and surveys.

**Population focus.**

Article population focuses included: (a) staff at homeless facility or foster care; (b) men who have sex with men (MSM); (c) ninth-twelfth graders who were exclusively heterosexual, heterosexual with same sex partners, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or unsure; (d) lesbian, bisexual, or gay youth age 14-21; (e) homeless gay and bisexual Latino men, age 19-24.

**Discussion**

There were four main pathways or factors associated with homelessness: (1) conflict layering between adolescent and sexual identity development; (2) family conflict; (3) lack of familial acceptance for LGBT status; (4) foster care.
Conflict layering.

The primary pathway to homelessness for LGBT youth was an overlap of conflict between adolescent development and sexual identity development (Castellanos, 2015). Sexual identity development in particular appeared to play an important role in first time homelessness. When compared to non-homeless lesbian, bisexual and gay (LBG) individuals, homeless LGB youth developed their sexual orientation at an earlier age and reported more sexual activity (Rosario, Schrimshaw, & Hunter, 2012). LGB youth were also at least one year younger than non-homeless LGB youth when they first became aware of their same-sex desires, had sex (with same or other sex) for first time, and first thought they were lesbian, bisexual, or gay (Rosario et al., 2012). Additionally, LGBT homeless youth reported that homelessness provided an opportunity for self-identity development and freedom for exploration of their sexual and personal identity (Castellanos, 2015).

Family conflict.

Family conflict was another commonly identified factor related to first time LGB homelessness. When compared to non-homeless LGB individuals, LGB homeless youth were more likely to experience verbal and physical abuse, substance use, and psychological symptoms (Rosario et al., 2012). Since substance began most often after the first episode of homelessness, substance abuse was likely a result, not a cause of homelessness (Rosario et al., 2012). The other three factors on average occurred prior to first episode of homelessness indicating they were causally associated with first time homelessness (Rosario et al., 2012).

Additionally, 61% of LGB homeless reported sexual abuse at some point during their childhood compared to only 47% of LGB non-homeless youth (Rosario et al., 2012). It was unclear whether the sexual abuse was from individuals inside of or outside of the person’s home.
or family. First age of sexual abuse did not appear to impact age at first sexual contact or age of puberty initiation for LGB youth (Rosario et al., 2012).

Other family conflicts that LGBT homeless youth identified as reasons for their homelessness were substance use within the family, mental illness within the family, and the parental perception that the child was disobedient and irresponsible (Castellanos, 2015; Corliss, Goodenow, Nichols, & Austin, 2011).

**Lack of familial acceptance.**

Many articles cited familial rejection for sexual or gender orientation as a main cause for first time homelessness among LGBT youth (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). Most often when there was a lack of familial acceptance or blatant rejection, LGBT youth would opt to run away leading to their status as homeless. However, some LGBT youth remained at home despite rejection, but were instead forced out by their families (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). In some cases, LGBT youth were forced out of their home by their families even if a formal disclosure of sexual or gender identity had not occurred (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). In these scenarios, the family often suspected their child to be non-heterosexual or transgender due to “gender non-conforming behavior,” which resulted in the family prophylactically forcing the child from their home (Corliss et al., 2011). Surprisingly however, age at first disclosure of sexual identity did not appear to have an impact on homelessness. Nonetheless, more LGB homeless youth did appear to have disclosed their sexual identity than non-homeless LGB youth (Rosario et al., 2012).

**Foster care.**

Foster care enrollment was also associated with first time homelessness among LGBT youth. Seventeen percent of LGBT adolescents became homeless simply by “aging out” of foster care (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). Other LGBT youth voluntarily leave foster care and choose
homelessness because they felt the staff was biased against them and this bias led to LGBT youth feeling unprotected when peer discrimination occurred in their foster home (McHaelen, 2006). Additionally, early placement in foster care limited the youth’s access to familial networks and resources that narrowed their options and increased the likelihood for homelessness after leaving foster care (Castellanos, 2015).

**Conclusion.**

Although each of the four main factors contributing to first time homelessness among LGBT adolescents appears to be independent, they are unified by an underlying principle. LGBT youth that become homeless through any of the above pathways do so from a lack of ability to cope with powerful adolescent emotions, adolescent and sexual identity development, and familial and peer conflict (Keuroghlian et al., 2014). A lack of coping mechanisms and poor conflict management strategies is not a unique issue to LGBT adolescents. However, on top of the fragile and increasingly complex identity development process, the lack of these skills has a much stronger impact on LGBT adolescents putting them at a greater risk of becoming homeless. Therefore, to have the greatest impact, homelessness initiatives aimed at reducing first time homelessness among LGBT adolescents should target adolescent skill building related to conflict management and coping.

**Program Overview**

To meet the psychosocial needs of the LGBT adolescent community and impact chronic homelessness, the social marketing campaign *Self* was developed. *Self* is a program proposal for changing the curriculum and culture of the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) middle and high schools to emulate an environment where adolescents can learn, observe, and practice healthy psychosocial, life and conflict management skills.
Frameworks and Theories Behind *Self*

*Self* was designed using a social marketing framework, theories from the peaceable school model, and current initiatives in the SFUSD. A social marketing campaign is a framework for a public health program that utilizes marketing techniques, such as the four Ps (product, price, place, and promotion) to influence a target audience to engage in the desired behavior in exchange for some perceived or actual benefit (Lee & Kotler, 2011). To successfully accomplish this exchange, the program developers must complete a thorough formative research process that includes a situational analysis, selection of a target audience, and investigation into the core values of this audience (Lee & Kotler, 2011). Such values will help the developers refine the target audience’s perceived barriers and benefits to the both the desired behavior and competing behaviors (Lee & Kotler, 2011). This refinement process allows the social marketer to tailor the four Ps of the social marketing campaign directly to the core values of the target audience, while targeting the multifactorial processes that influence the target audience’s behavior. For these reasons, social marketing frameworks are known to be logical, comprehensive, and proven very effective in eliciting sustained behavior change in a target audience and was therefore chosen as the framework for the *Self* initiative (Community Tool Box, 2015).

Within the context of the social marketing framework, *Self* applies the concepts of the peaceable school model and adapts the model to fit the unique needs of SFUSD middle and high school students and current SFUSD initiatives. The peaceable school model is a school-based conflict management approach that teaches children to resolve conflict using “problem-solving processes of negotiation, mediation, and consensus decision-making” (Olive, 2006). Although the approach does include coursework on conflict management, the approach goes beyond
coursework to change the school’s culture and curriculum to enable youth to observe, practice, and embody the principles of healthy conflict resolution and communication (Olive, 2006).

**Target Audience**

**Primary Target Audience**

The primary target audience for *Self* will be youth between sixth and 12th grade (roughly age eight-18) enrolled in one of the 24 middle schools and 18 high schools in the SFUSD school system (SFUSD, 2015).

The target audience was selected using geographic and demographic market segmentation. Only urban communities were considered since they offer a greater likelihood for campaign success. Urban, compared to rural, communities provide a more supportive environment for gay individuals, which can facilitate sexual identity development and relationship building (Boso, 2012). Scientists and researchers are also more involved in LGBT issues in urban areas, thus in urban areas LGBT issues are already focal points (Boso, 2012).

SFUSD middle and high school students in San Francisco (SF), California (CA) were chosen as the target audience because SF has a growing need for LGBT homeless interventions and appears open to addressing LGBT issues. For instance, from 2005 to 2015, SF had a 7% increase in “point-in-time” homelessness, despite several initiatives to impact homelessness (Connery et al., 2015). There was also a 2% growth in homelessness among 18-24 year olds from 2013 to 2015 (Connery et al., 2015). Additionally, LGBT or queer individuals comprised 29% of the 2015 SF homeless population, even though LGBT or queer individuals make up only 15% of the SF general population (Connery et al., 2015). Of any US metropolitan city, SF also had the highest percentage of individuals who identify as LGBT (Newport & Gates, 2015). Of large cities in the US, SF was ranked as having the most same-sex couples per 1000 households
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with an incident rate of 30.25 per 1000 and was ranked the sixth most Democratic state in 2014 (Gates & Cooke, 2010; Jones, 2015). Since 66% of Democrats and 79% of individuals who identify as liberal support same-sex marriage, having a high percentage of residents who identify as Democrats may facilitate greater campaign support (Pew Research, 2015).

Lastly, the SFUSD school system and SF non-profit organizations, which will be integral parts of the campaign, have also demonstrated support for LGBT adolescents. For instance, the Larkin Street Youth initiative in SF is over a decade old and assists homeless LGBT adolescents gain necessary life skills to exit homeless (Larkin Street Youth Services, 2014).

Simultaneously, in 2011, CA State implemented a new law that required that all CA public school “social studies courses” cover information on LGBT individuals who contributed in any way to American history (Tintocalis, 2011). SFUSD have also made several recent changes to the curriculum overhauling tradition for innovative ways to meet the changing needs of youth, which indicates SFUSD is open to innovation and large structural changes (SFSUD, 2015).

Perceived barriers.

The target audience’s potential barriers to using healthy conflict management skills include (a) being unaware of resources; (b) fear that discussion of conflict could lead to isolation from peers; (c) current involvement in an unstable or unhealthy relationship that prevents the youth from seeking further assistance or behavior changes; (d) feeling confident and comfortable with pre-established unhealthy conflict management behaviors; (e) fear that honest communication will lead to discrimination or hatred. These barriers are assumptions based upon the information gathered from the literature review.

Perceived benefits.
The target audience may perceive the benefits of using healthy conflict management skills to be (a) an ability to develop more stable relationships; (b) a greater sense of belonging; (c) an ability to openly explore and discuss sexual identity with self, peers and family; (d) a sense of empowerment; (e) improved self-confidence; (f) a positive resolution at the end of a disagreement, rather than resentment or termination of the relationship; (e) a stronger identity and sense of independence. These benefits are assumptions based upon the information gathered from the literature review.

**Competing behaviors.**

The two primary competing behaviors to healthy conflict management include conflict avoidance and the use of passive aggressive or aggressive behavior in conflict or otherwise. The target audience may choose to engage in the competing behaviors because these behaviors (a) reduce vulnerability during a conflict; (b) can make a person feel a false sense of power or control over another. The target audience may choose not to engage in the competing behaviors because these behaviors (a) may leave them feeling invalidated or unheard when they express their needs; (b) may cause them to feel guilt or shame after a disagreement; (c) can increase insecurity or a lack of self-confidence; (d) may make the person isolated or alienated from others; (e) lead the person to feel disempowered after an argument; (f) have previously experienced negative repercussions from engaging in competing behaviors.

**Secondary Target Audience**

The secondary target audience is the SFUSD leadership and educators, as they are the individuals implementing the program initiatives. In particular, the SFUSD leadership will be important decisions makers regarding whether or not SFUSD even adopts *Self* and if so, in orchestrating the implementation process. On the other hand, the educators will be the main
individuals interacting directly with the students and will have a large potential to impact or influence student’s authentic participation in the program. There are currently 17 members of the SFUSD leadership team, eight men and nine women, and seven members of the board of education, five women and two men. The board members are re-elected every four years (SFUSD, 2015). This paper will operate under the assumption that the SFUSD leadership and educators will buy-in and support this proposal. However, if SFUSD leadership was not on board, additional focus would be taken to address the concerns of the board and will enlist SFUSD leadership and educator support.

**Campaign Purpose and Focus**

The purpose of *Self* is to prevent episodes of first time homelessness among adolescents (age 12-24) who identify as LGBT, have a history of same-sex attraction or behavior, or are unsure. *Self* will aim to accomplish this by implementing a social marketing campaign that builds on current SFUSD wellness initiatives and utilizes theories underlying the peacable school approach. Specifically, the campaign will include modified disciplinary guidelines, a *Project You* course, staff education, changes to counselor services, and opportunities for student autonomy and recognition through generation of a campaign name and various social media promotions.

**Program Leadership**

The *Self* leadership team will consist of Larkin Street Youth and the SFUSD leadership team. *Self* intends to partner with Larkin Street Youth, since their mission to reduce LGBT adolescent homelessness aligns with *Self’s* mission. *Self’s* leadership team will be responsible for all oversight and evaluation components of the initiative. Specifically, the leadership team will be responsible for the (a) *Project You* curriculum; (b) development and initiation of staff training; (c) initiation and maintenance of the counselor services; (d) program staffing; (e)
solicitation of funding and financial management; (f) completion and communication of all evaluation data; (g) modifications to disciplinary action within SFUSD middle and high schools; (h) campaign name development; (i) social media communication.

Of particular note, Self’s leadership and the SFUSD social workers will be asked to collaborate with the creators of the Harvard Negotiation Program, the program the peaceable school model is based upon, to brainstorm new disciplinary guidelines that fit with peaceable school ideals (Olive, 2006). The new guidelines will be disseminated in all SFUSD middle and high schools.

**Product**

**Counselor Services**

SFUSD middle and high schools currently offer optional counseling services to their students (SFUSD, 2015). Self will build upon this approach by requiring that all students at each high school see the school therapist or social worker least once per year. The courses will be mandatory to normalize seeing counselors and reduce peer stigma associated with the use of a counselor. The sessions will center on family conflict, identity development, psychological wellbeing and coping mechanisms, all of which impact homelessness among LGBT individuals. The session will not include a formal standardized assessment so the therapist can tailor methods to the needs of each student.

At the completion of the annual session, students may request to see the therapist weekly during any school year or be assigned to see the counselor as part of a disciplinary action plan. If the therapist deems a student to be high risk for homelessness, they will strongly encourage weekly sessions, however continual sessions will always be optional.

**Project You**
SFUSD recently implemented a *Wellness Initiative*. This is an optional program that SFUSD high school students can participate in to “gain the skills they need to cope with complex issues such as stress, trauma, suicide, bullying, depression, self-esteem, drug and alcohol use, sexual health and relationships” (SFUSD, 2015). *Self* intends to modify the initiative to become a mandatory class called *Project You* that facilitates development of interpersonal skills that may be used both in and outside of school.

**Curriculum.**

The course material itself will center around skill development in the current focus areas of the *Wellness Initiative* as well as additional skill building on conflict management, diversity and acceptance, goal setting, and problem-solving. At the beginning of each year, every student will be required to develop at least three annual goals with a plan of action, including specific activities, to achieve each goal. On a monthly basis, the instructor will guide students in a self-evaluation of their goals and modify plans as needed.

**Resolution.**

Four times a year, each class will also dedicate one course period to a course called *Resolution*, which will provide students with an opportunity to practice problem-solving in a group setting by addressing student-raised issues within the school.

A tab will be added to each school’s website for the campaign. Underneath this tab will be a hyperlink for students to provide structured feedback on issues within the school. In order to submit any complaint, the student will be required to submit background information and a solution proposal. Students will use a template to fill in specific information about both the background and solution. The template will be structured free text and will be formatted in such a way that facilitates the student’s ability to evaluate an issue comprehensively, develop practical
solutions, and provide concise feedback. Students will also be counseled on which issues should not be targeted, particularly those that require long-term structural changes.

A staff member will then compile the anonymous feedback into one document and provide this document to all students in each class one week prior to Resolution. If students submit an issue that does not meet criteria, the instructor will use discretion and exclude concerns accordingly. The students will then use this document to guide, as a starting point, the selection of three issues and develop plans to solve them. If no issues were submitted to the website, the student group must brainstorm at least three issues to discuss and address.

Students will guide the discussion using the Six Hats methodology, an effective problem-solving model that promotes parallel thinking by breaking down the problem identification and solution process into six different components (De Bono, 1999). There are “six hats,” each of which represents a different phase or stage of the problem-solving process (De Bono, 1999). Two students will voluntarily co-lead each meeting and two other students will voluntarily serve as scribes. The co-leaders will lead the entire Project You class of students with a predetermined chronology for the order of the Six Hats, to select three priority issues and develop a formalized proposal to address each concern. One of the scribes will document key points from the discussion on a white board or poster, which will serve as an easy reference point for the student’s during the discussion. The second will document and finalize the proposals in Microsoft Word. All other students in the class will be problem solvers. Students cannot serve as a scribe or leader more than once in a school year. During this process, the instructor will act primarily as a facilitator to provide space for students to practice diversity of thought and problem solving independent of authority figures. The instructor will use written guidelines with clear delineations for when to intervene and only do so if the criteria are met.
At the end of Resolution, students will use a pre-determined template to summarize, modify, and prioritize the three issues and solutions, which will then be presented to their school’s administrator. The template will include a (a) summary of the issue; (b) potential causative factors related to the concern; (c) feasible solution that addresses the contributing factors. The administration will have three weeks to review all proposals and choose at least one issue and solution from each Project You class to address. For each issue, the administration must use at least one component of the solution proposal the students submitted. However, the administration will be encouraged to utilize the entire or large portions of the solution proposals, as feasible.

Staff Education

Staff behavior modeling is one of the main components of the peaceable school model (Olive, 2006). Adolescents learn behavior not only with coursework or practice, but also with observation of authority figures (Olive, 2006). Therefore, Self will have a strong emphasis on ensuring that SFUSD middle and high school staff model behavior consistent with the Project You course material.

SFUSD staff involved in the campaign will be asked to attend an optional training session. Training content will include (a) self-evaluation of leadership strengths and weaknesses; (b) conflict management strategies and behaviors; (c) the Six Hats method; (d) diversity and acceptance, including specific training on working with LGBT or unsure students; (e) implementation of the new disciplinary guidelines. The first day of class will be divided into content and a series of role-playing scenarios where the staff practices the desired behavior. Scenarios will include both one-on-one and classroom scenarios. The second or final day of the course, each staff member will be required to complete a thirty-minute practical exam in which
they must meet certain criteria that demonstrate an ability to successfully model the desired behaviors. The leadership team will develop the practical exam layout and criteria for passing.

**Place**

**Counselor Services**

The annual counselor visits will be held throughout the first two months of the school year and will occur during the *Project You* course period. If a student opts for weekly therapy sessions, these will also be held during the student’s *Project You* course. It is up to the discretion of each school to choose the location for these sessions, which should be held in a private enclosed room to create trust between the counselor and the adolescents.

**Project You**

Currently, as part of the *Wellness Initiative* each high school has a wellness center (SFUSD, 2015). Each school will work with their wellness center to find an appropriate location for the course either within the center or in another location throughout the school. Current staff employed as part of the *Wellness Initiative* will serve as instructors for the course.

Students will be enrolled in the course only with other students in their grade. This will allow students to focus on similar developmental issues to their peers and permit curriculum progression throughout high school and eventually from middle to high school. Curriculum progression will keep students freshly engaged and believe that each successive course has additional value.

**Staff Training**

Since the implementation plan will occur in phases, staff will be asked to participate the calendar year their school will be incorporated into the program. Training will be held one week after the last day of school of each school year. There will also be two additional training
sessions, in July and August that will be available to new staff unable to attend the regular meeting. All new staff members have the same requirements as returning staff for the initial course. Once a staff member has passed the exam, they will only be asked to repeat the staff training course once every four years to refrain from being overly redundant.

Price

Incentives

Campaign name.

The campaign name, for purposes of this framework, will be Self. However, to individualize the campaign to a school district and incentivize students to engage in the program, SFUSD high and middle school students will be given the freedom to develop the campaign name, slogan, and logo. As previously discussed, LGBT adolescents often feel disempowered and lost as they attempt to discover their identity during adolescence. The ability to contribute to the campaign name will provide LGBT adolescents with an opportunity to vocalize their opinion making them feel empowered and therefore connected with this campaign.

In the spring of 2016, prior to campaign initiation, SFUSD middle and high school students will be given an opportunity to submit a name for a new campaign that inspires strength, courage, confidence, empowerment, and independence. Students will have two weeks to submit names through a link on the SFUSD website. During the two week period, the adolescents will be given 5 minutes at the end of each English class to go to the website and submit a name. At the end of the two weeks, the top 20 names will be selected by campaign leadership staff and republished to the SFUSD website. Students will have one week during the last 5 minutes of their English class to vote on the SFUSD website for their favorite name. The name with the
majority of votes will be published as the campaign name. Once the name is chosen, the same process will be repeated simultaneously for the campaign slogan and logo.

To incentivize students to participate, the student whose name, logo, or slogan was chosen will have their picture and a 500-word biographical write up published in the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Additionally, the students’ photos and verbal recognition will be placed on the SFUSD website, Twitter, and Instagram accounts. The photo and verbal recognition will remain on the SFUSD website for the duration of the campaign.

Once students determine a campaign name, slogan, and logo, then each school will disseminate information to the SFUSD system on the final campaign name, slogan, and logo and the campaign itself. Then at the beginning of the school year, students in all SFUSD schools involved in the current implementation phase will be required to attend a school-wide assembly to learn about *Self* and upcoming changes to their school.

*Project You course.*

Once a month, as part of the *Project You* course, students will be asked to voluntarily submit a one-page (maximum length) story involving a personal conflict where the student used something learned through the *Project You* course to resolve it with a positive result. Each school’s *Project You* instructor will have one week to read and evaluate each story and submit one to the campaign leadership. A single student may not have their story chosen more than once in a school year. The campaign leadership will then post all selected stories to the *Self* blog. A hyperlink to the blog will be included on the school’s website and in their Twitter and Instagram accounts. In the last month of school, students will be able to go to the school website and cast a vote for their favorite blog post from the past year. The winning blog post will be published in the *San Francisco Chronicle*. To protect individual privacy, during the selection and final
publication process, students may choose to remain anonymous or include their name and school.

Adolescents often compete with one another and look for opportunities to vocalize their opinions in attempts to feel empowered. Providing an outlet to do this through the *Project You* course with outward recognition in both the course and on the *Self* social media outlets will make students feel empowered and ultimately connected to the course. The more connected students feel, the more students will become engaged and influence their peers to engage, leading to authentic participation in the course material.

**Staff training.**

To incentivize SFUSD staff to participate in the training, the campaign will complete the necessary requirements to ensure the course is approved as a continuing education credit for teachers in CA. In order for the staff member to receive credit, they must pass the exam at the end of the training session.

To further encourage staff to not just participate in the training, but also routinely model the behavior for the students, staff behavior modeling will be linked to annual raises during annual staff evaluations. Each school administration will determine the exact raise amounts. To facilitate this change, staff may also utilize the campaign counselor services to assist them. Please refer to the Goals and the Evaluation section below for more detailed information on staff evaluations.

**Disincentives**

Disincentives will not be used for this campaign. LGBT adolescent’s already have conflict with their identity and feel a sense of disempowerment. The campaign does not want to use nonmonetary disincentives, as they could possibly worsen these sentiments and negatively
impact LGBT adolescents. Additionally, monetary disincentives will not be used because they are not appropriate in the school setting.

Promotion

Social Media

Since 55% of teenagers use social networking sites, Twitter, and Instagram, a Self blog will be incorporated into the Self campaign in order to promote adoption of the behaviors in the students’ personal life outside of the school environment (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2012). SFUSD leadership and Larkin Street Youth staff will be responsible for development and maintenance of the Self campaign websites.

Positive peer influence can lead teenagers to conform to desired behaviors (CDC, 2012). To encourage peer support in favor of the desired behaviors, students will be able to submit pictures and tag-lines that represent their success in any of the topic areas covered in the Project You course on the SFUSD website underneath the Self campaign tab. On a monthly basis a Larkin Street Youth media staff member will review submissions and post the final copies to the Twitter and Instagram accounts. Any inappropriate submissions will be not posted and will be dealt with through the campaign’s disciplinary action plan. Twitter and Instagram will also be used to communicate evaluation data, campaign successes, and blog publications as social networking and media sights appear to be a growing method of communication for a majority of Americans (CDC, 2012).

Parental Notification

One week prior to the first day of school year each year, parents and guardians of any students attending SFUSD middle and high schools involved in the current implementation phase will be notified of the adoption of Self through e-mail. Parents and guardians may also find
additional information on the SFUSD website. According to most recent data, mothers “go online” at least once a day or 20 times per week, therefore the campaign use only these electronic notifications to increase the likelihood of effectively communicating with SFUSD parents (CDC, 2012).

**Partnerships**

The campaign will need to recruit Larkin Street Youth staff, SFUSD leadership, and creators of the *Harvard Negotiation Program* for a successful *Self* campaign. An in-person pitch will be made to each stakeholder using an infographic outlining the program and its potential impact. A full project proposal will be provided with each infographic. The in-person proposal will center on the relevance to the organization and the benefits to each stakeholder. For Larkin Street Youth staff and the *Harvard Negotiation Program* the main benefit will be an additional opportunity for recognition and promotion through partnership activities with the *Self* campaign. Since Larkin Street Youth will share in any grant funding for the program, the potential increase in access to funding and resources for Larkin Street Youth will also be emphasized. For SDUSD leadership, the campaign will focus on how the campaign will help SFUSD achieve their current goals of health, wellness, improved graduation rates, and employment for students post high school graduation (SFUSD, 2015).

Two days after each proposal, each stakeholder will receive a follow-up phone call, and a week after the proposal each stakeholder will receive a follow-up e-mail to address any questions or concerns. Warranted the stakeholders agree to participate, the organizations and any members may view updates and evaluation data on the campaign through the SFUSD website or Twitter account. The SFUSD will dedicate one tab on their current website to the campaign.

**Implementation Phases**
Self will take place over five years from 2016 to 2021. There will be four phases. The first three phases will last for one calendar year and the last phase will last for two calendar years. Phase one will be implementation in one SFUSD high school in SF, CA. SFUSD may choose the high school for phase one based on the following criteria: (a) at least 3% of the student population has already identified as LGBT or is unsure; (b) the high school is not the largest nor the smallest in the SFUSD district. Phase two will progress with implementation in all SFUSD high schools. Phase three will progress onto implementation in all SFUSD middle schools. Phase four will use data from phases one through three to develop a Self-framework that can be applied in other school districts.

Campaign Goals

Since the campaign implementation phases will not include all SFUSD schools in the early phases, the five-year behavior, knowledge, and belief goals below are cumulative campaign goals. The annual targets listed below will apply only to the schools that have participated prior to the point of the evaluation.

Impact Goals

1. To reduce the percentage of LGBT adolescents between 12 and 24 years of age who are homeless in San Francisco by 15% in 5 years (3% annually).

2. To reduce the estimated “governmental costs of homelessness” (medical care, insurance, welfare, housing stipends) in San Francisco by 10% in five years (2% annually).

3. Within five years, have the cost-effectiveness of the campaign be equivalent to a return of five dollars saved for every one dollar spent.

Behavior Goals
1. At least 90% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will self-report application of conflict management strategy that resulted in safe resolution for all parties at least 5 times within past year.

2. At least 90% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will self-report that their communication in peer relationships was non-judgmental, clear, and assertive.

3. At least 90% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will self-report that their communication in relationships with authority figures, including parents, was non-judgmental, clear, and assertive.

4. At least 90% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will have achieved at least 2 of their self-identified goals from the mediation course at end of year.

5. At least 75% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will voluntarily use the counselor service at least 3 times throughout the school year.

6. In all SFUSD middle and high schools, the number of total recorded violent incidents will decrease by 50% within the 5 years (10% decrease annually).

7. Only 10% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will report being bullied one or more times within the past year.

8. Only 10% of students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will have felt discriminated against one or more times within the past year.
9. For each SFUSD middle and high school, at the end of each campaign phase, each school’s Twitter account will have at least 5,000 or more SFUSD middle and high school student followers for the Self campaign Twitter account.

10. For each SFUSD middle and high school, at the end of each campaign phase, each school’s Instagram account will have at least 5,000 or more SFUSD middle and high school student followers for the Self campaign Instagram account.

11. For each SFUSD middle and high school, at the end of each campaign phase, each school’s Self blog will have a total number of site views equivalent to at least 50% of the total number of their SFUSD middle or high school student body.

Knowledge Goals

1. At least 90% of students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will be able to identify at least 5 signs that a relationship may be abusive physically, sexually, or psychologically.

2. At least 90% of students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will be able to identify at least 5 strategies to safely exit a relationship that exhibits signs of abuse.

Belief Goals

1. Within five years (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4), at least 90% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years of age) will believe it is safe to communicate feelings, including feelings about sexual identity, to peers.

2. Within five years (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4), at least 90% of SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years
of age) will believe that feelings can be communicated safely, including feelings about
sexual identity, to authority figures (including parents).

3. Within five years (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4), at least 90% of
SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years
of age) will believe that the more capable you are at handling conflict, the more
independent you will be.

4. Within five years (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4), at least 90% of
SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years
of age) will believe that the Self program has made them feel empowered.

5. Within five years (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4), at least 90% of
SFUSD middle and high students between 6th grade and 12th grade (roughly 8 to 18 years
of age) will feel that the Self program has helped them to become more independent.

Staff Goals

Staff goals will be divided into individual and school-based goals. Individual staff goals
will be used for annual raises and school-based staff goals will be used for campaign evaluation
purposes.

Individual teacher.

1. Within the past year, 75% of students who have worked with a given SFUSD middle or
high school teacher will report that the teacher modeled behavior consistent with the
information learned through their Project You course.

2. Within the past year 75% of students within the SFUSD middle or high school of the
teacher’s employment believe that feelings could be safely communicated, including
feelings about sexual identity, with this teacher.
3. Within the past year 75% of other staff members (both teacher and non-teacher) within the SFUSD middle or high school of the teacher’s employment report that this teacher modeled behavior consistent with the material taught in the staff training.

4. Within the past year, 75% of administrative staff within the SFUSD middle or high school of the teacher’s employment report that this teacher modeled behavior consistent with the material taught in the staff training.

**Individual staff member, non-teacher.**

1. Within the past year, 75% of other staff members (both teacher and non-teacher) within the SFUSD middle or high school of the teacher’s employment report that this teacher modeled behavior consistent with the material taught in the staff training.

2. Within the past year, 75% of administrative staff within the SFUSD middle or high school of the teacher’s employment, report that this teacher modeled behavior consistent with the material taught in the staff training.

**School-based.**

1. Within five years, 75% of SFUSD middle and high school students will report that all staff and administrators within their school modeled behavior consistent with the information learned through their *Project You* course.

2. Within five years, 75% of SFUSD middle and high school students will believe that it was safe to communicate feelings, including feelings about sexual identity, to at least 75% of their school’s staff and administration.

3. Within five years, at least 90% (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4) of SFUSD middle and high school staff, including administrators, will believe that *Self* has improved their ability to communicate with peers.
4. Within five years, at least 90% (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4) of SFUSD middle and high school staff, including administrators, will believe that Self has improved their ability to communicate with students.

5. Within five years, at least 90% (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4) of SFUSD middle and high school staff, including administrators, will believe that Self has made their school a safer place for students.

6. Within five years, at least 90% (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4) of SFUSD middle and high school staff, including administrators, will believe that Self has helped students become more independent.

7. Within five years, at least 90% (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4) of SFUSD middle and high school staff, including administrators, will believe that Self has helped their students become more confident.

8. Within five years, at least 90% (18% Year 1; 36% Year 2; 54% Year 3; 72% Year 4) of SFUSD middle and high school staff, including administrators, will believe that Self has helped their students develop their personal identities.

Evaluation

Evaluation methods.

Impact evaluations.

Impact evaluations will be completed on an annual basis (except for the cost-effectiveness which will be calculated at the end of the five year campaign) through partnerships with Larkin Street Youth and the Applied Survey Research (ASR) non-profit, which already conducts annual and bi-annual homelessness reports for the SF area (Connery et al., 2015). Although campaign phases will occur from July to August, the current ASR analysis occurs by
calendar year analysis. To apply the ASR data to the Self impact evaluation, the ASR evaluation data from the previous calendar year will be used for the end of the campaign year impact evaluation.

Questions that will be added to the intake form will include (a) sexual identity (defined as lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual with past same-sex behavior or attraction, or unsure); (b) gender identity (male, female, transgender male, transgender female, unsure); (c) first episode of homelessness. All questions will be added in the exact same format to ensure consistency of results.

For the cost related impact evaluations, the campaign will partner with the National Alliance to End Homelessness to collect, complete, and submit the finalized data to SFUSD. The National Alliance to End Homelessness has previously completed cost effectiveness evaluations for homeless interventions and is therefore already equipped to calculate the data. The organization will be asked to report, analyze, and summarize governmental costs and savings (if applicable) related to homelessness in SF on an annual basis. At the end of the five-year campaign, the National Alliance to End Homelessness will be asked to complete a cost-effectiveness evaluation for the SF area.

**Outcome and process evaluations.**

Outcome evaluations will occur annually and evaluate the behavior, knowledge, beliefs, and school-based goals. SFUSD currently collects annual evaluations with the School Quality Improvement Index that includes measurements of “social-emotional learning and school culture” (SFUSD, 2015). SFUSD leadership team and Larkin Street Youth staff will review the questions in the School Quality Improvement Index and modify or add questions as applicable to ensure that the questionnaire includes questions that will provide the campaign with the ability to
evaluate outcome goals. Data from the questionnaire will be evaluated annually with the final analysis completed by July 31 of each year. Results from the outcome evaluations will be compared to the process evaluation results to gain a comprehensive overview of the campaign successes and failures. Additionally, comparison of these results will permit a diagnostic evaluation of the campaign failures and will identify target areas for improvement.

Process evaluations will be used to evaluate the processes for (a) feedback through the each school’s website; (b) SFUSD website tab dedicated to the campaign; (c) social media sites; (d) incentives; (e) course material for Project You; (f) staff training; (g) counselor services. This information will facilitate campaign leadership in modifying campaign components to better meet needs of the target audiences, understand outcome evaluation results, and help the campaign achieve their impact and outcome goals. Process evaluation questions will be added to the School Quality Improvement Index and be evaluated simultaneously with the outcome evaluations.

**Individual teacher and non-teacher staff evaluations.**

Individual teacher and non-teacher staff evaluations will consist of student, staff and self-evaluations completed within the last week of school. Student evaluations will be administered during the final Project You course. As a class, students will go to the library to complete the electronic evaluations. To complete the evaluation, each student will go to the Self tab on their school’s website and click on the student survey link. The course instructor will provide each student with a one-time login to access the surveys. On the student’s login screen, there will be a link to a five-question survey for each teacher they had within the past year. Once the student has electronically submitted each survey, the student will print the certificate of completion and provide it to the Project You instructor. Students must complete the survey to pass the course. If
a student is absent due to illness or an emergency, they are waived from this requirement and the *Project You* instructor will have specific instructions for accounting for the missed survey.

The *Project You* instructor, school counselors, and library staff for each school will be responsible for set-up and distribution of survey login information and individualization of teacher evaluations for each student.

At each school, peer and self-evaluations will be completed for all employees, including administrators, who interact with students. One week prior to the last day of school, each staff member will receive an e-mail notifying them that their survey link is now available. Each employee will have until the end of the last day of school to complete their peer and self-evaluations. SFUSD leadership will create an algorithm that assigns every staff member at each school five peers (three within their department and two outside their department) to evaluate. The set-up and link will be identical to the student evaluations.

To reduce bias, SFUSD leadership (rather than each school’s leadership) will analyze and review all results and provide all applicable non-administrative employee results to each school’s administration. SFUSD leadership will retain and be responsible for each school’s annual administrator evaluations.

**Evaluation Distribution**

In August of each campaign phase, campaign leadership will compile impact and outcome evaluation results into a long-form written report and a summary infographic. Each SFUSD middle and high school involved in the evaluations will also publish any of their individual school’s successes and overall campaign success to their school’s Twitter account.

Infographics of key campaign successes will distributed electronically to (a) local and state government officials and political representatives; (b) SFUSD school board members; (c)
SFUSD middle and high school administration and staff; (d) partner organizations; (e) potential financial donors. Infographics will be used over more formal summary reports for their enhanced visual appeal, ease of interpretation, and applicability to an audience with a wide variety of literacy levels. The full written reports will be available on the SFUSD website, but will only be used by campaign leadership to make internal campaign modifications.

Major program plan modifications will be applied to all schools involved in the campaign. However, minor modifications may be made for each school, on a case-by-case basis, as long as the changes do not interfere with the primary structural framework of the campaign. Changes will be communicated to relevant stakeholders via the SFUSD website, an email to parents, and through e-mail to SFUSD middle and high school administration and staff.

**Budget**

**Expense Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Expenses: Year 1</th>
<th>Expenses: Year 2</th>
<th>Expenses: Year 3</th>
<th>Expenses: Year 4</th>
<th>Expenses: Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, Supplies, and Evaluation</td>
<td>$2,217.44</td>
<td>$9,492.56</td>
<td>$10,010</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$23,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$342,217.4</td>
<td>$349,492.5</td>
<td>$350,010.0</td>
<td>$340,700.0</td>
<td>$340,700.0</td>
<td>$1,723,120.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Training**

To support Larkin Street Youth’s additional responsibilities and involvement with the campaign, four paid staff members will be added to the Larkin Street Youth team that will be solely dedicated to *Self*. Indeed (n.d.) estimates the average “professional public health worker”
salary in SF, CA to be $76,000 annually. Based on this average estimate, the starting salary for the four new staff members will be $76,000. In addition to their annual salary, each new member will also be given $7,500 in annual benefits. Benefits will include partial health, vision, and dental insurance coverage. Dependent on program success and expansion, additional benefits may be added. However, for the purposes of this budget estimate, expansion estimates will not be included.

To provide additional support to Larkin Street Youth staff for the evaluation process and social media management, two paid summer graduate interns will be recruited annually. Each intern will receive $3,000 compensation for 20 hours of weekly service from June 1 to August 1. Students will be recruited from the Master’s in Public Health program at the University of San Francisco (USFCA). Self will additionally seek a partnership with the University of San Francisco to arrange for students to receive course credit for participation in the internship.

No estimated costs will be associated with staff training rental space, since SFUSD middle and high schools will be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Expense per Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Salary</td>
<td>$304,000</td>
<td>$1,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Staff Benefits</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Rental Space</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$340,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equipment, Supplies, and Evaluation**

The Qualtrix Survey Software will cost an estimated $3,000 per year and will be used for all survey and feedback not completed in the *School Quality Improvement Index*. The cost
estimate for Qualtrix was not available online, so the estimate was based on prices of similar survey software data.

SAS offers a SAS University Edition software package that can be downloaded for free from the SAS website (SAS Institute Inc., n.d.). The campaign will utilize SAS and Excel to complete all evaluation data analysis and eliminate software analysis costs. However, the campaign will need to purchase four computers for the four Larkin Youth Street staff members. Computers will be purchased for a discounted price using the *TechSoup* website for discounted purchase of computers for non-profit organizations (TechSoup Global, 2016). Two hundred and fifty dollars will be allocated for each computer purchase. The estimate is based on listed prices for current refurbished laptops and desktops on the *TechSoup* website (TechSoup Global, 2016). The campaign will also solicit free software donations and technical support through the Microsoft Software Donation program for non-profit organizations (Microsoft, 2015).

There will also be no estimated costs for publication in the newspapers, as the campaign will work with the paper to seek voluntarily publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment, supplies, and evaluation summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtrix Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding

For the first two to three years of the campaign, Self will aim to solicit all program funding from donations and grants. Self will seek out organizations likely to invest in initiatives that address LGBT adolescent homelessness. Examples of potential donors include RHYTPA, the National Alliance to End Homelessness, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, Center for American Progress, the Sexual Minority Youth Assistance League, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation donated $500,000 to initiatives that support gay marriage in 2012 and may therefore also be willing to donate to other LGBT initiatives, such as Self (Associated Press, 2012).

After the first two to three years of the campaign, Self will advocate for local and state government funds to be allocated to the program. Social marketing principles and strategies will be used to develop the most effective marketing pitch to persuade the government to allocate these resources to Self.

Future Recommendations

Although this project proposal was developed based on thorough formative research, additional work and research must be completed prior to establishment of a final initial project proposal. To complete this final step, it is recommended that first partnerships and a willingness to participate between SFUSD, Larkin Street Youth, and the National Alliance to End Homelessness, be secured.

Additionally, SFUSD leadership, middle and high school staff and students should be recruited to participate in the campaign development process. Although much of the information was based on theoretical formative research or information from the SFUSD website, input from actual individuals will be more valuable and specific. Better formative research will provide a
more comprehensive overview for a more successful campaign. Additionally, SFUSD stakeholders will know current initiatives more thoroughly and can provide targeted input on how to better incorporate those initiatives into this program.

Conclusion

*Self* aims to reduce homelessness among LGBT adolescents and reduce the economic costs of chronic homelessness in America. *Self* targets the root causes underlying LGBT adolescent homelessness and uses strategic public health and conflict management frameworks to design the campaign. As a result, *Self* will have a high likelihood of success and will impact not only LGBT adolescents, but also broader society on both an economic and psychosocial level. Investment in *Self* or similar programs is critical to ending chronic homelessness and to maintaining the economic vitality of America.
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