

Date of Hearing: April 24, 2019

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Patrick O'Donnell, Chair
AB 1196 (Gipson) – As Amended March 26, 2019

SUBJECT: Community schools: California Community Schools Act

SUMMARY: Establishes a grant program to support the planning of, and operation of community schools, subject to an appropriation for this purpose. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Establishes the California Community Schools Act.
- 2) Codifies findings and declarations regarding the effectiveness of community schools in addressing academic outcomes, the well-being of children, as well as other societal outcomes.
- 3) Defines a community school as a school that includes all of the following elements:
 - a) A curriculum that is engaging, culturally relevant, and challenging, including a robust selection of classes and after school programs in the arts, languages, ethnic studies, advanced placement and honors courses, as well as services to support English learners and special education pupils, GED preparation, career technical education, and job training.
 - b) An emphasis on high-quality teaching and not on high-stakes testing. Assessments are used to help teachers meet the needs of pupils, and educators have a real voice in professional development.
 - c) Wraparound supports such as health care, eye care, and social and emotional services that support academics that are available before, during, and after school, year-round, to the community with providers who are accountable and culturally competent.
 - d) An emphasis on positive discipline practices, such as restorative justice and social and emotional learning supports, so each pupil can grow and contribute to the school and community. Suspensions and harsh punishments are eliminated or greatly reduced.
 - e) Promotion of parent and community engagement so the community actively participates in planning and decision-making. This process recognizes the link between the success of the school and the development of the community as a whole.
 - f) Leadership that is committed to making the community school integral to the school's educational mandate and functioning and ensure that the community school coordinator is part of the leadership team.
- 4) Defines the following terms for the purposes of this act:
 - a) "Applicant" means a school maintained by a school district that applies to plan and operate a community school.

- b) “Classified staff” means nonsupervisory employees of a school, excluding teachers.
 - c) “Community organization” means a nonprofit organization that has been in existence for three years or more and has a verifiable track record of working with the community surrounding the covered schoolsite on education and other issues.
 - d) “Community partner” means a community stakeholder, including, but not limited to, parents and parent organizations, pupils and pupil organizations, early learning programs, the business community, health care providers, civil rights organizations, civic engagement organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, local governmental agencies, local school employee organizations, and postsecondary educational institutions.
 - e) “Covered schoolsite” means a schoolsite at which a school has proposed to operate a community school.
 - f) “Participating school” means a school that has received a community school operational grant and is participating in the community schools grant program.
 - g) “Planning grant recipient” means a school that has been awarded a community school planning grant, under this program.
 - h) “Program” means the community schools grant program established by this act.
- 5) Requires the CDE to make planning grants of an unspecified amount available to applicants; to use a request for proposal process; and to evaluate proposals on the basis of criteria established by each school district, consistent with this program.
- 6) Specifies that a proposal may be submitted by a school to the school district in whose geographic boundary the school is located for a covered schoolsite that is either of the following:
- a) A high-needs school that would benefit from the community school program, as determined by the school district.
 - b) A school that serves a higher than average share of high-needs pupils relative to the school district average of high-needs pupils served per schoolsite.
- 7) Requires the CDE to establish and enforce a policy prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, disability, sexual orientation, gender expression or identity, housing status, or immigration status in the development and administration of community school programming.
- 8) Requires the CDE to establish an Office of Community Schools to oversee the program.
- 9) Requires the CDE to provide technical assistance, including, but not limited to, grant writing and support for the design of nondiscriminatory community school programming. Technical assistance may be provided by the department directly or by a nonprofit organization with demonstrated experience with community schools planning in partnership with community

organizations or civic engagement organizations funded by the department through a request for proposal process to provide technical assistance. Specifies that an unspecified amount is to be allocated to the CDE to provide assistance to grantees, subject to appropriation by the Legislature for this purpose.

- 10) Requires a planning grant recipient to hire a community school coordinator as a full-time member of the schoolsite staff to coordinate the planning process. Specifies that the coordinator must be a non-administrative certificated employee, and that the coordinator must be a bargaining unit member covered by a collective bargaining agreement with the school district, if applicable.
- 11) Requires a community school coordinator to work collaboratively with school leadership and the community school leadership team to identify and arrange for the provision of services and programs that meet school and community needs and priorities. Specifies that the role of the coordinator is to be limited to work related to fulfilling the priorities for the schoolsite as described in the community school plan.
- 12) Authorizes planning grant recipients to use community school planning grant funds for up to one year of planning, and at the end of this period, requires the recipient to submit a community school plan to the governing board of the school district, and if approved, to the CDE, as specified.
- 13) Requires a planning grant recipient to establish a community school leadership team responsible for developing school-specific programming goals, assessing program needs, and overseeing the process of implementing expanded programming at each covered schoolsite. Authorizes an existing schoolsite leadership body to assume the roles and responsibilities of a community school leadership team if it includes the community school coordinator as a voting member, and meets other specified requirements.
- 14) Requires the community school leadership team to include at least 12 people, but no more than 16 people, with at least three parents, three classroom teachers, one non-administrative certificated employee working outside of the classroom, one classified employee, and one principal, and include at least one representative from the following stakeholder groups:
 - a) The school principal must be a voting member, but may not serve as the chairperson, of the community school leadership team.
 - b) Community partners, selected by the leadership team.
 - c) Parents and residents elected annually.
 - d) Classroom teachers and other non-administrative certificated employees, as elected by an annual majority vote of the relevant employee organization, if applicable, or by a majority vote of the non-administrative certificated employees assigned to the school.
 - e) Classified employees as elected by members of the relevant employee organization if applicable, or by a majority of the classified employees assigned to the school.

- 15) Requires the community school leadership team to appoint two representatives from the community who are not parents, teachers, classified staff, or pupils to serve on the community leadership team; and to select a chairperson to guide the team's work.
- 16) Requires that the community school leadership team for a high school to be between 13 and 16 members, including two pupils, elected by the student body, to serve as voting members.
- 17) Requires the community school coordinator and leadership team to oversee the baseline analyses required and to monitor the development and implementation of community school operations and programming, and to issue recommendations to school leadership, the school district, and community partners, on a regular basis, and to summarize the recommendations in an annual report, which is to be made available at the schoolsite as well as on the school's website.
- 18) Requires the community school coordinator, in collaboration with the community school leadership team and relevant experts, to conduct a baseline analysis of assets and needs at the schoolsite, including all of the following elements:
 - a) Development of qualitative and quantitative needs/asset assessment surveys for each of the following stakeholder groups: pupils; parents and guardians; school staff; and community members and partners; as well as at least three forums with all stakeholders, and at least two focus groups with each stakeholder group. Requires that at least 75 percent of pupils, and parents/guardians, and all of school staff take part in the survey, and at least 45 percent take part in the forums and focus groups.
 - b) A needs/asset assessment that identifies the challenges facing the school and identifies school assets.
 - c) An analysis of the student body, including the enrollment of, retention rates, and specific needs of each of the following sub-groups: pupils with disabilities, English learners, foster youth, homeless pupils, and pupils eligible for free or reduced-price meals.
 - d) An analysis of suspension and expulsion data, and justification for disciplinary actions and the degree to which particular sub-groups are represented.
 - e) An analysis of school achievement data disaggregated by major demographic categories, including, race, ethnicity, English learner status, disability status, and eligibility for free or reduced-price meals.
 - f) An analysis of current parent engagement strategies and their success.
 - g) Evaluation of the need for, and availability of, wraparound services, including those to meet pupils' social, emotional, and physical health needs; strategies to create safe and secure school environments, and improve school climate; implementing a positive behavior support system; and anti-bullying efforts.
 - h) An analysis of the breadth and depth of community and school support for the school curriculum, and for changes to the school curriculum.

- i) A baseline analysis of community assets and a strategic plan for using and aligning identified assets, including a list of individuals, faith-based organizations, community and neighborhood associations, postsecondary educational institutions, hospitals, libraries, businesses, and social service agencies that may be able to provide support and resources.
 - j) A baseline analysis of the needs in the community surrounding the school for: high-quality, full-day childcare and early childhood education programs; physical and mental health care services for children and adults; job training and other adult education programming; before and after school programs and summer learning programs.
- 19) Requires that each planning grant recipient demonstrate, in their community school plan, how the school plans to support each of the following elements, and to provide measureable data at the beginning and end of each school year for each element:
- a) Positive disciplinary practices, such as restorative justice.
 - b) Curricula that is engaging, culturally and socially relevant, and academically rigorous.
 - c) Wraparound supports including physical and mental health services, social services, and academic enrichment programs.
 - d) An emphasis on high-quality teaching, not on high-stakes testing.
 - e) Parent and community engagement in an active decision making process.
 - f) Inclusive school leadership committed to making the community school program an integral part of the school's mandate and functioning.
- 20) Requires the community school plan to address all of the following:
- a) Maintenance of attendance records in all programming components.
 - b) Collection and reporting of measureable data demonstrating annual participation and the impact of programming on participating children and adults, subject to privacy restrictions.
 - c) Documentation of meaningful and sustained collaboration between the school and community stakeholders, as specified.
 - d) Ensuring compliance with nondiscrimination policy.
 - e) How the school will sustain the continuation of the community school after the expiration of the grant funding period.
- 21) Requires the CDE to make community school operational grants of an unspecified amount available to planning grant recipients for a period of five years, which may be renewed at the discretion of the CDE.

- 22) Requires the planning grant recipient to submit its community school plan to the governing board of the school district for approval, and requires the governing board to approve or deny the plan within 45 days.
- 23) Requires, upon approval by the governing board of the school district, the community school plan to be submitted to the CDE, who is required to approve or deny the plan within 45 days, and if approved to award a community school operational grant to the school; or if the plan is incomplete or inadequate, the CDE is required to notify the school and provide support so that the school is able to reach approval within 90 days of notice.
- 24) Authorizes the use of community school operational grant funds to support the following activities:
- a) Hiring a community school coordinator, or a program director for multiple schoolsites.
 - b) Hiring additional staff to fulfill needs identified in the needs assessment process.
 - c) Funding for nonprofit partner organizations to increase parent and community engagement.
 - d) Ongoing collaborations with institutional and community partners.
 - e) General coordination of programs within and between covered schoolsites.
 - f) Professional development for school staff.
 - g) Ongoing monitoring of the impact on participating children and adults.
 - h) Development of alternative funding strategies to guarantee the long-term sustainability of the community school.
 - i) Ongoing operation of the community school leadership team.
 - j) Other activities that assist in the implementation of the community school plan.
- 25) Requires the community school coordinator, in consultation with the community school leadership team, to report to the CDE annually during the grant period, and make available publicly, a report which includes an assessment of all of the following:
- a) The effectiveness of the school in implementing the community school plan.
 - b) Problems encountered in the design and execution of the plan, including the identification of any regulatory barriers.
 - c) The operation of the community school team and its contribution to the successful execution of the plan.
 - d) Recommendations for improving delivery of community school programming to pupils.

- e) The level of increases in access to services, and the number and percentage of pupils, and other community members, receiving community school programming who had not previously received services.
 - f) Any improvements in school retention, and academic achievement among pupils receiving community school programming.
 - g) Any changes in pupils' readiness to enter school, or their active involvement in school, their community; and their health.
 - h) Anticipated budget savings resulting from the implementation of the program.
 - i) Any improvements in the frequency or depth of family involvement with their children's education.
 - j) Community stakeholder and institutional partner satisfaction.
 - k) The ability of the school and community partners to sustain services beyond the availability of grant funding for this purpose.
 - l) The degree of increased collaboration among participating agencies and private partners.
- 26) Requires the CDE to develop criteria and evaluate each report submitted by a participating school based upon the factors listed above in (24).
- 27) Requires the CDE to submit a report to the Governor and the Legislature annually by August 30th, following the first full year of operation of the community school program, on the impact of the community school program, based upon specified metrics. The report is to be made available publicly and is to be posted on the CDE website. Requires the report to include analyses and recommendations on best practices for community schools, as well as a calculation or estimate of cost savings at the state, local, and federal levels, in the areas of public health, public safety, and public education resulting from investment in community school programming.
- 28) Specifies that this program will be implemented only if funds are appropriated for this purpose by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act or another statute.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the Learning Communities for School Success Program to implement the K–12 education portion of the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act (Proposition 47) as approved by the voters at the November 4, 2014 statewide general election. Requires the CDE to administer grants and coordinate assistance to LEAs in identifying and implementing evidence-based, non-punitive programs and practices designed to keep the most vulnerable pupils in school. (EC 33430 - 33436)
- 2) Federal law establishes the Full Services Community Schools Act of 2014, which encourages coordination of academic, social, and health services through partnerships among public

elementary and secondary schools, LEAs, and community-based organizations, non-profit organizations, and other public or private entities. (H.R. 5168 of the 113th Congress)

- 3) Federal law, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended, Title V, Part D, Subpart 1, authorizes the Fund for the Improvement of Education. Under this authority the U.S. Department of Education has established the Promise Neighborhoods, as a competitive grant program.

FISCAL EFFECT: The Office of Legislative Counsel has keyed this bill as a possible state-mandated local program.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. According to the author, “Existing community schools effectively work toward becoming centers of the community and provide a role for everyone to participate in the academic achievement and social health of students and families within the community. In California and across the nation, the education system has time and time again had serious challenges with effectively educating poor and minority communities. The key to the issue is that the challenges often lie outside of the classroom, and are direct reflections of the environments and communities that youth come from. Many of these youth are exposed to gang violence, street crime, domestic abuse, drug abuse, poor health and a number of ills that become impediments to achievement in the classroom. These factors suggest that in order to effectively educate a child, one must bring together a holistic community-based solution. AB 1196 supports the community schools model in its mission aimed to improve outcomes for disadvantaged youth and their families.”

High rate of childhood poverty in California. According to the Public Policy Institute of California, 21 percent of children in California lived in families without enough resources to make ends meet in 2015, up from 17 percent in 2007. Additionally, 5 percent of California’s children were in deep poverty as they lived in families with less than half of the resources needed to make ends meet. The rates of child poverty vary by region and by ethnicity. The poverty rate for Latino children (31 percent) was more than double that of Asian American (13 percent) and white (12 percent) children in California in 2014.

The achievement gap between low-income children and youth and their higher-income peers has been well-documented. This gap is present when children enter school and often widens as the child progresses through the education system. Research has shown that children living in poverty are five times more likely to drop out of high school than their higher-income peers, and only 9 percent will obtain a college degree. A 2012 study, by the Annie Casey Foundation, noted “children who spend a year or more in poverty account for 38 percent of all children, but they account for 70 percent of all children who do not graduate from high school.”

Children living in poverty often fail to receive adequate medical care. Lack of preventative care and treatment for chronic conditions such as asthma or diabetes leads to frequent absences from school. Chronic absenteeism in the early school years has been proven to be a strong indicator of failure to graduate from high school or to attend college.

Students living in poverty may also lack access to enrichment opportunities through after-school programs or summer learning, further widening the achievement gap.

What is a community school? According to the Coalition for Community Schools, “a community school is both a place and a set of partnerships between the school and other community resources. Its integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and community engagement leads to improved student learning, stronger families, and healthier communities. Community schools offer a curriculum that emphasizes real-world learning and community problem-solving. Schools become centers of the community and are open to everyone – all day, every day, evenings, and weekends.”

The “Community Schools Playbook” authored by the Partnership for the Future of Learning, identifies four key pillars of community schools that create the conditions necessary for students to thrive:

- 1) Integrated student supports:
 - a) Mental and physical health services to support student success.
 - b) A dedicated staff member to coordinate support programs to address out-of-school learning barriers for students and families.
- 2) Expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities:
 - a) After-school, weekend, and summer programs which provide academic instruction and individualized support.
 - b) Enrichment activities which emphasize real-world learning and community problem solving.
- 3) Active family and community engagement:
 - a) Promotion of interaction among families, administration, and teachers to help families be more involved in the decisions about their children’s education.
 - b) The school functions as a neighborhood hub with educational opportunities for adults and family members to promote student success.
- 4) Collaborative leadership and practices:
 - a) Parents, students, teachers, principals, and community partners build a culture of professional learning, collective trust, and shared responsibility using strategies such as site-based leadership teams and professional learning communities.

Positive impacts of community schools. The Coalition for Community Schools identifies research showing that students attending community schools:

- Enter school more fully prepared to learn as a result of participation in high quality early care and education programs;
- Have improved work habits, efforts and attitudes toward learning through participation in extended learning opportunities and other support services;
- Experience improved grades and test scores, and are more likely to graduate from high school, due in part, to access to tutoring, mentoring, and after school activities;
- Are healthier due to access to health services including nurses, dentists, and mental health practitioners at school;

- Have families who are more engaged with the school and their children's education;
- Are less likely to be absent from school;
- Face fewer discipline referrals and are less likely to be suspended from school.

The Community Schools Playbook identifies further benefits of community schools:

- Community schools are a vital component of an equity strategy. They create the conditions necessary for students to thrive by focusing attention, time, and resources on a shared vision for student and school success. They also help make society more fair by investing in communities that have been marginalized by historic disinvestment.
- In community schools, educators work with local companies, nonprofits, and higher education institutions to offer students real-world projects that make learning more relevant and engaging. They build connections that can open the door to future opportunities.
- Community schools are a time-tested, century-old strategy for connecting students to the services and supports they need to thrive.
- Community schools are efficient and cost-effective. They coordinate the delivery of services to avoid duplication and maximize student supports. Studies find that every \$1 invested in a community schools strategy results in up to a \$15 return to the community.
- Community schools qualify as an evidence-based approach to improving chronically low-performing schools under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Federal funding for community schools. The U.S. Department of Education has two programs offering funding to schools and communities to establish partnerships to deliver integrated services to children and families.

- 1) The Full-Service Community Schools program has provided \$72.5 million in funding since 2009 to encourage coordination of academic, social, and health services through partnerships among LEAs, and community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other public or private entities.

\$17.5 million was available in 2018 and seven LEAs and community organizations in California received grants, including the Lost Hills Elementary School District, the Los Angeles Education Partnership (2 grants, one for East L.A. Community Schools and one for South L.A. Community Schools), YMCA Long Beach, Oakland Unified School District, Youth Policy Institute (L.A.), and Green Dot Public Schools. All of these grantees, with the exception of Green Dot, received an initial allocation of \$500,000 with expected funding of \$2.5 million each over the five year life of the grant. The Green Dot charter school organization received an initial allocation of \$102,800 with an expected allocation of \$1.85 million over five years. The application period for 2019 grants closed on April 15, 2019.

- 2) In 2010, the Obama Administration launched the Promise Neighborhood Initiative, which is modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone. In the first year, the Promise Neighborhoods

program awarded one-year grants to support the development of a plan to implement a Promise Neighborhood in 21 communities across the country. At the conclusion of the planning grant period, grantees were expected to have a feasible plan to implement a continuum of solutions that will significantly improve results for children in the community being served. The number of grant awards has declined significantly from 21 in 2010 to 3 in 2018.

California received two of the three grants awarded in 2018: the Chula Vista Promise Neighborhood received a one-time grant of \$6 million, and the Mission Promise Neighborhood in San Francisco also received \$6 million. In 2017, the CSU East Bay Foundation received \$6 million in initial funds and an expectation of \$30 million over five years on behalf of the Hayward Promise Neighborhood. In 2017, the Youth Policy Institute also received \$6 million initial and \$30 million total funds for the L.A. Promise Neighborhood.

State funding for community schools. At this time, there is no dedicated education funding stream specifically designated for community schools. School districts have the discretion to use their Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), including supplemental and concentration funds, to serve the best interests of students, particularly high-needs students, and this could include the establishment of community schools.

California voters passed Proposition 47, the Safe Neighborhood and Schools Act (SNSA), in November 2014. The SNSA reduced the penalties for certain non-violent, non-serious drug and property crimes. Twenty five percent of the funds available through criminal justice system savings are to be allocated to the CDE for administration of a grant program to reduce truancy and support pupils who are at risk of dropping out of school or who are victims of crime. The CDE administers the “Learning Communities for School Success Program”. The grants are to be annually awarded using continuously appropriated funds arising out of the annual savings resulting from Proposition 47. According to the CDE, the first three cohorts have been funded for three year grants as follows:

- Cohort 1 for 2017 through 2020: \$37 million to 35 LEAs
- Cohort 2 for 2018 through 2021: \$13.6 million to 17 LEAs
- Cohort 3 for 2019 through 2022: \$18.1 million to 14 LEAs

Existing law further specifies that an LEA that receives a grant through this program must use the grant funds for planning, implementation, and evaluation of activities in support of evidence-based, non-punitive programs and practices to keep the state’s most vulnerable pupils in school, and that this may include the establishment of a community school.

Recommended amendments. Staff recommend the bill be amended as follows:

- 1) Uncodify the findings and declarations.
- 2) Clarify the elements of a community school.
- 3) Clarify that the applicant for a grant under this program be an LEA, on behalf of one or more eligible schools within its jurisdiction, and defines an LEA as a school district, county office of education, or charter school.

- 4) Define an eligible school as a school that is identified for differentiated assistance under the State's accountability system.
- 5) Specify that grants are to be based upon pupil enrollment and that funded applicants may receive up to an unspecified amount per pupil enrolled for a three-year grant period, with minimum and maximum grant awards to be established by the CDE.
- 6) Require that recipients provide a local match of at least 20 percent of the grant award.
- 7) Authorize the CDE to retain up to one percent of total grant funds to support implementation of the program, including the provision of technical assistance.
- 8) Specify the timeline and requirements for the needs and asset assessment, and the development of the community school plan by the grantee.
- 9) Specify allowable expenditures for funds received under this program.
- 10) Specify reporting requirements and timelines for grantees as well as for the department upon conclusion of the three-year grant period.

Similar and prior legislation. AB 875 (Wicks) of this Session updates the Healthy Start Support Services for Children Grant Program, previously administered by CDE, and identifies potential funding sources for the program. This bill is pending before this Committee.

AB 258 (Jones-Sawyer) of this Session, establishes the School-Based Pupil Support Services Program Act, to provide grants to local educational agencies for increasing the presence of school health professionals at schoolsites and providing programs that prevent and reduce substance abuse among pupils. The source of the state funding for the grants awarded under the program would be an appropriation from the Youth Education, Prevention, Early Intervention and Treatment Account established pursuant to the Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act (Proposition 64). This bill is pending before the Assembly Health Committee.

AB 8 (Chu) of this Session, requires schools to have one mental health professional for every 400 pupils accessible on campus during school hours, and for schools of less than 400 pupils, to employ at least one mental health professional for one or more schools or enter into an agreement with a county agency or community-based organization to provide mental health services to pupils. This bill is pending before the Assembly Health Committee.

AB 842 (Gipson) of the 2017-18 Session would have required the CDE, contingent upon an appropriation for this purpose, to establish an Office of Community Schools, and to allocate planning and five-year operational grants to local educational agencies to plan and operate community schools. Specified the elements of a community school plan as well as the composition of the community school leadership team, and requires annual reporting by the community schools, as well as by the CDE on a statewide basis. This bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1014 (Thurmond) Chapter 397 and SB 527 (Liu), Chapter 533, Statutes of 2016, establish a grant program to implement the Proposition 47 (2016) requirement to direct 25 percent of the funds to K-12 schools to reduce truancy and support students who are at risk of dropping out of

school or are victims of crime. LEAs are eligible to apply for three years of grant funding for planning, implementation, and evaluation of activities in support of evidence-based, non-punitive programs and practices to keep students in school, consistent with the LEA's goals established in their local control and accountability plan. Authorizes funds to be used to establish a community school, implement activities or programs to improve attendance and reduce chronic absenteeism, implement restorative justice models to keep students in school and reduce referrals to law enforcement agencies, implement activities that promote social-emotional and positive learning environments, establishing partnerships with community-based organizations to support implementation of evidence-based, non-punitive approaches, and adding or increasing staff whose primary purpose is to address attendance issues.

SB 403 (Liu) of the 2015-16 Session would have authorized a LEA or schools, in collaboration with community partners, to form a community consortium to establish a California community school to coordinate academic, social, and health services for students, families, and community members. The bill would also have required the SPI to make grants available to fund community schools, to the extent that funds were allocated for this purpose. This bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 2555 (Bocanegra) of the 2013-14 Session would have required the SPI, in collaboration with various other state agencies and private organizations, to develop a five-year plan for expanding cradle-to-career initiatives in California including full-service community schools, promise neighborhoods, wraparound programs, wellness centers, and healthy communities efforts. This bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**Support**

California Federation of Teachers

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Debbie Look / ED. / (916) 319-2087