

Date of Hearing: June 19, 2019

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Patrick O'Donnell, Chair

SB 686 (Allen) – As Amended May 17, 2019

SENATE VOTE: 32-4

SUBJECT: California Promise Neighborhoods Act of 2019

SUMMARY: Establishes the California Promise Neighborhood Grant Program, to be administered by the California Department of Education (CDE), for the purpose of awarding grants to implement a comprehensive, integrated continuum of cradle-to-college-to-career solutions, including academic, health, social programs, and family and community supports. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Establishes the California Promise Neighborhood Grant Program, to be administered by the CDE.
- 2) States that the purpose of the grant program is to award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to implement a comprehensive, integrated continuum of cradle-to-college-to-career solutions, including academic, health, social programs, and family and community supports, through a pipeline of coordinated services based on the best available evidence in neighborhoods with high concentrations of low-income families, schools identified for differentiated assistance or intensive intervention, and other indicators of at-risk youth or high need.
- 3) Defines the following terms:
 - a) “Cradle-to-college-to-career” means a system of integrated services, both public and private, which begins in the early years of a child’s life and leads to appropriate postsecondary success for all pupils and students that includes academic, occupational, and independent living that benefits the individual and community as a whole;
 - b) “Eligible entity” means a nonprofit organization, including faith-based organizations, an institution of higher education, or an Indian tribe or tribal organization, serving as a lead agency representative of the proposed geographic area to be served and in partnership with at least one public traditional or charter elementary or secondary school or school district located within the identified geographic area.
 - c) “Grant program” means the California Promise Neighborhood Grant Program; and
 - d) “Promise Neighborhood” means a specific geographic area that a selected eligible entity intends to serve that represents a community focused on revitalization through the establishment of a cradle-to-college-to-career network of services aimed at improving the health, safety, education, and economic development of the defined area.

- 4) Authorizes an eligible entity to include other entities in the partnership, including, but not limited to, any of the following entities, and prohibits these organizations from inhabiting the lead role:
 - a) A traditional or charter school, school district, or superintendent of a school district within the designated geographic boundary;
 - b) An institution of higher education;
 - c) The office of a chief elected official or a unit or agency of local government;
 - d) Health organizations within the designated geographic boundary; and
 - e) Social service agencies within the designated geographic boundary.
- 5) Requires the CDE to develop an application process for eligible entities to apply to become Promise Neighborhoods.
- 6) Requires the CDE to aim to achieve geographic equity through the selection process by increasing opportunities for remote communities, including rural and tribal communities.
- 7) Requires the CDE to establish performance standards to measure progress on indicators and results relevant to the evaluation of the grant program.
- 8) Requires the CDE to establish the following core set of academic results and indicators by which the Promise Neighborhood grant recipients will be measured, requires the indicators to align with the California School Dashboard, and requires grantees' project design and implementation of a cradle-to-college-to-career continuum of solutions to be subject to at least the academic results and indicators:
 - a) Children who benefit from a high-quality early learning education program and demonstrate school readiness skills, as measured by both of the following:
 - i) Children enter kindergarten ready for success as measured by the number and percentage of children who demonstrate age-appropriate functioning at the beginning of the program or school year, as demonstrated by key domains on an early learning developmentally appropriate instrument; and
 - ii) Children are provided with high-quality early learning experiences as measured by a quality rating instrument.
 - b) Pupils who are proficient in core academic subjects as measured by both of the following:
 - i) The number and percentage of pupils meeting standards in mathematics based on pupil performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments; and

- ii) The number and percentage of pupils meeting standards in English language arts/literacy based on pupil performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments.
 - c) Chronic absenteeism, as measured by the percentage of pupils in kindergarten through grade eight who are absent 10% or more of the instructional days those pupils are enrolled;
 - d) Percentage of pupils who received a high school diploma within four years of entering grade nine or who complete their graduation requirements at an alternative school; and
 - e) High school graduates who obtain a postsecondary degree, certification, or credential as measured by all of the following:
 - i) Percentage of high school graduates who are placed in the “prepared” level on the college/career indicator;
 - ii) The number and percentage of students who enroll in a two-year or four-year college or university after graduation; and
 - iii) The number and percentage of students who graduate from a two-year or four-year college or university or complete vocational certification.
- 9) Requires the CDE to establish the following core set of family and community support results and indicators by which the Promise Neighborhood grant recipients will be measured. Requires a grantee to choose to measure and report on two or more family and community support results and indicators. Makes grantees’ project design and implementation of a whole community continuum of solutions subject to, but not limited to, the following family and community support results and indicators:
- a) Pupils who feel safe at school and connected to their school community, as measured by locally implemented school climate surveys, including those which measure the number and percentage of pupils who feel safe at school and traveling to and from school according to a school climate needs assessment or other instrument;
 - b) Pupils who live in stable communities as measured by pupil mobility rates in schools within the designated geographic boundary;
 - c) Families and community members who support learning in Promise Neighborhood schools, as measured by both of the following:
 - i) For children from birth through grade eight, the number and percentage of parents or family members who read to or encourage their children to read three or more times a week or that reported their child read to themselves three or more times a week; and
 - ii) For children from grades eight to 12, inclusive, the number and percentage of parents or family members who report talking about the importance of college and career with their children.

- d) Pupils who have access to 21st century learning tools as measured by the number and percentage of pupils who have school and home access to a high-speed broadband internet connected computing device.
- 10) Requires an eligible entity, in order to be eligible to receive a grant, to submit an application in the form and manner as the CDE may require.
- 11) Requires an application to include at least all of the following:
- a) A description of a plan to significantly improve the academic, health, and social outcomes of children living in an identified neighborhood and to support the healthy development and well-being of children and youth in the neighborhood by providing a continuum of cradle-to-college-to-career solutions. Requires that this plan address the needs of the whole child, whole family, and whole community, as identified by the required needs assessment. Requires that the continuum of solutions based on the best available evidence, including, where available, strong or moderately strong evidence. Requires that the plan ensure that, over time, pupils not living in the neighborhood who attend the target school or schools have access to services within the pipeline of services;
 - b) A description of the geographically defined area or neighborhood to be served and the level of distress in that area based on indicators of need and other relevant indicators. The statement of need in the neighborhood must be based, in part, on results of a comprehensive needs assessment and segmentation analysis. The application may propose to serve multiple, noncontiguous areas;
 - c) A description of the applicant's measurable short-term, long-term, and annual goals for expected outcomes of the grant, based on program and project indicators, as described above, that includes all of the following:
 - i) Performance goals for each year of the grant;
 - ii) Projected participation rates over time and any plans to expand the number of children served over time by the grant program; and
 - iii) Annual goals for evaluating progress in improving systems, such as changes in policies, environments, or organizations that affect children and youth in the neighborhood.
 - d) An analysis of the needs and assets of the neighborhood identified, including all of the following:
 - i) A description of the process through which the needs assessment and segmentation analysis was produced, including a description of how family and community members were engaged in the analysis;
 - ii) An explanation of how the applicant will use the needs assessment and segmentation analysis to determine the children with the highest needs and ensure

that those children receive the appropriate services from the continuum of cradle-to-college-to-career solutions; and

- iii) A description of both the academic indicators and the family and community support indicators that the applicant will use in conducting the needs assessment.
- e) A description of solutions that will be used in the continuum of cradle-to-college-to-career solutions based on data collected, including a description of solutions specifically targeting children, family members, community members, and children not attending schools or programs operated by the applicant and its partners;
- f) The process by which each solution will be implemented and an expected timeline for launching each solution;
- g) The estimated per child cost and cost projections over time, including administrative costs, to implement each solution;
- h) The estimated number of children, by age, in the neighborhood who will be served by each solution, including the percentage of all children of the same age group within the neighborhood proposed to be served with each solution and the annual targets required to increase the proportion of children served to reach scale over time;
- i) How the segmentation analysis was used to target the children and youth to be served;
- j) Financial projections of the cost of solutions over time;
- k) The best available evidence supporting each proposed solution;
- l) A description of the process used to develop the application, including the involvement of family and community members;
- m) A description of the process by which to develop, launch, and implement a longitudinal data system that integrates pupil-level data from multiple sources to measure progress on academic and family and community support indicators for all children in the neighborhood;
- n) A description of how the applicant has done all of the following:
 - i) Linked or is making progress to link the longitudinal data system to school-based, local educational agency, and state data systems;
 - ii) Made or will make data accessible to parents, families, community residents, program partners, researchers, and evaluators at either the individual or aggregate level as appropriate while abiding by federal, state, and other privacy laws and requirements; and
 - iii) Managed and maintained the system, and plans to manage and maintain the system over time.

- o) An explanation of how the applicant will continuously evaluate and improve the continuum of cradle-to-college-to-career solutions, including both of the following:
 - i) A description of the metrics that will be used to inform each solution of the pipeline; and
 - ii) The processes for using data to improve instruction, optimize integrated pupil supports, provide for continuous program improvement, and hold staff and partner organizations accountable.
 - p) An identification of the fiscal agent, which may be any eligible entity; and
 - q) A list of federal, state, local, and private sources of funding that the applicant will secure to comply with the matching funds requirement.
- 12) Requires an applicant to do all of the following before receiving a grant:
- a) Collect data, including publicly available data, for the academic indicators and use them as program and project indicators;
 - b) Collect data, including publicly available data, for the family and community support indicators and use them as program and project indicators;
 - c) Perform an analysis of community assets within, or accessible to, the neighborhood, including, at least all of the following:
 - i) Early learning programs and networks, including home visiting, high-quality child care, Early Head Start programs, Head Start programs, and prekindergarten programs;
 - ii) Community centers, afterschool programs, and other opportunities for activities outside of school hours;
 - iii) Transportation;
 - iv) Parks;
 - v) The availability of healthy food options and opportunities for physical activity;
 - vi) Existing family and pupil supports;
 - vii) Businesses and employers located in the community; and
 - viii) Institutions of higher education.
 - d) Provide evidence of successful collaboration that has led to changes in child outcomes within the neighborhood;

- 13) Requires an eligible entity, as part of the application, to submit a preliminary memorandum of understanding, signed by each partner entity or agency. Requires the preliminary memorandum of understanding to describe, at a minimum, all of the following:
 - a) Each partner's commitment and contribution toward achieving each result at population level by using a backbone agency to coordinate a collective impact initiative;
 - b) Each partner's financial and programmatic commitment toward the strategies described in the application, including an identification of the fiscal agent;
 - c) The governance structure proposed for the Promise Neighborhood, including a system for how the lead entity will serve as a backbone agency and hold partners accountable, representation of the geographic area on the eligible entity's governing and advisory boards, and resident engagement from the neighborhood in the organization's decisionmaking;
 - d) Each partner's long-term commitment to providing cradle-to-college-to-career pipeline services that, at a minimum, accounts for the cost of supporting the pipeline, including the period after grant funds are no longer available, and potential changes in local government;
 - e) Each partner's mission and plan that will govern the work that partners do together, including an aligned theory of improvement;
 - f) Each partner's long-term commitment to supporting the pipeline through data-driven decisionmaking, including data collection, monitoring, reporting, and sharing;
 - g) Each partner's commitment to ensuring sound fiscal management and controls, including evidence of a system of supports and personnel; and
 - h) Each partner's commitment to mobilizing local government service integration to improve outcomes for families and children in the neighborhood as measured by increased employment, improved education, decreased poverty, reduced crime, and improved health status.
- 14) Requires the CDE, contingent on an appropriation, to competitively award grants, each not to exceed \$5 million each, to up to 20 eligible entities across the state.
- 15) Requires each grant recipient to contribute matching funds in an amount equal to not less than 100 percent of the grant award, but authorizes an applicant proposing a project for a Promise Neighborhood in a rural community or in tribal community to provide matching funds or in-kind donations equal to at least 50 percent of the grant award.
- 16) Authorizes the required matching funds to come from federal, state, local, or nonpublic, nongovernmental, or other private sources, with at least 10 percent coming from private sources, except for an applicant proposing a project for a Promise Neighborhood in a rural community or in tribal community, with at least five percent coming from private sources.

- 17) Requires an applicant that is unable to meet the matching requirements to include in its application a request to the CDE to reduce the matching requirement, including the amount of the requested reduction, the total remaining match contribution, and a statement of the basis for the request.
- 18) Authorizes the CDE to grant a request if it finds the request reasonable and that doing so would further the purposes of the act.
- 19) Authorizes the CDE to award technical assistance funding to an entity with the expertise required to support all awarded Promise Neighborhoods throughout the grant period. Requires that support include the formation and coordination of professional learning communities to share data and best practices between Promise Neighborhoods and inform state and local policy.
- 20) Requires each grant recipient to use the grant funds for both of the following purposes:
 - a) To implement the pipeline services based on results of the needs analysis described in the application and plans to build organizational capacity; and
 - b) To continuously evaluate the success of the program and improve the program based on data and outcomes.
- 21) Authorizes each grant recipient to use grant funds to develop the administrative capacity necessary to successfully implement a continuum of solutions, such as managing partnerships, integrating multiple funding sources, supporting a longitudinal data system, and accessing technical assistance.
- 22) Prohibits each grant recipient and its partners from expending more than 20 percent on administrative and capacity building costs.
- 23) Requires each grant recipient to prepare and submit an annual report to the CDE that includes all of the following:
 - a) Information about the number and percentage of children, family members, and community members in the Promise Neighborhood who are served by the grant recipient, including a description of the number and percentage of children accessing each of the pipeline services, and the number of family and community members served by each program;
 - b) Disaggregated data at population and program levels related to the grant recipient's programs' success in annual growth along program and project indicators, disaggregated by all of the following:
 - i) Gender;
 - ii) Major racial and ethnic groups;
 - iii) English proficiency status;

- iv) Migrant status;
- v) Disability status;
- vi) Economic disadvantage status;
- vii) Information relating to the performance metrics; and
- viii) Other indicators that may be required by the CDE.

24) States that the operation of these provisions are contingent upon the enactment of an appropriation in the annual Budget Act for these purposes.

EXISTING LAW:

Federal law establishes the Promise Neighborhoods program as a comprehensive, effective continuum of coordinated services in neighborhoods with high concentrations of low-income individuals, multiple signs of distress, which may include high rates of poverty, childhood obesity, academic failure, and juvenile delinquency, adjudication, or incarceration; and schools implementing comprehensive and targeted support. (United States Code Title 20, Section 4623).

FISCAL EFFECT:

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee: The proposed program would be contingent upon an appropriation. However, this bill could result in one-time General Fund cost pressure of up to \$100 million to award the grants. The CDE estimates one-time General Fund costs ranging from \$350,000 to \$500,000 to develop and administer the application process. The CDE also indicates there would be additional, unknown General Fund costs to award technical assistance funding and develop performance standards that are likely to be significant, potentially in the millions of dollars.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. According to the author, “Children living in California’s most distressed communities lack access to opportunities that will ensure adequate health, social, and academic preparation for achieving success to end the cycle of poverty. Across California, 17 percent of children live in communities of concentrated poverty and over 1.6 million children live in poverty.

Innovative and comprehensive approaches to lift children out of poverty are necessary for creating opportunities for children to succeed and ultimately help transform poor neighborhoods. Promise Neighborhoods began as a federal program in 2010 and provides an evidence-based model to transform schools and neighborhoods. A high-quality education is at the center of the Promise Neighborhoods concept, as evidence demonstrates that graduating from high school and college are key to moving out of poverty.

According to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), youth growing up in these neighborhoods have access to strong systems of community support by which family members

are involved in their children's academic performance such as reading and discussing with them the importance of college and career development. This involvement would assist the students in achieving academic excellence and successfully transitioning to college and later on establishing a career.

Since 2010, the USDOE has awarded 21 Promise Neighborhoods to communities around the country. Currently five California cities have operating Promising Neighborhoods including Chula Vista, Hayward, Los Angeles, Mission District (San Francisco), and Corning-Paskenta Tribal Community (Everett Freeman Promise Neighborhood). These neighborhoods serve more than 30,000 students and their families annually, working through 52 individual school sites, and 64 nonprofit organizations and government entities.

The vision of this program is to ensure all children and youth growing up in Promise Neighborhoods have access to high quality early childhood programs, schools, health services, social services, and strong systems of family and community support that will prepare them to attain an excellent education, reach full health and social development, and successfully transition to college and a career.

The Promise Neighborhoods across California rely heavily on funding from the federal government and despite their effectiveness and significant impact, several will not have sufficient funding when the current grants expire.

Federal Promise Neighborhood Initiative. In 2010, the Obama Administration launched the Promise Neighborhood Initiative, which is modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone in New York City.

According to the USDOE, the vision of the program is that all children and youth growing up in Promise Neighborhoods have access to great schools and strong systems of family and community support that will prepare them to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career. The purpose of the program is to significantly improve the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in the most distressed communities, and to transform those communities by:

- Identifying and increasing the capacity of eligible entities that are focused on achieving results for children and youth throughout an entire neighborhood;
- Building a complete continuum of cradle-to-career solutions of both educational programs and family and community supports, with great schools at the center;
- Integrating programs and breaking down agency "silos" so that solutions are implemented effectively and efficiently across agencies;
- Developing the local infrastructure of systems and resources needed to sustain and scale up proven, effective solutions across the broader region beyond the initial neighborhood; and
- Learning about the overall impact of the Promise Neighborhoods program and about the relationship between particular strategies in Promise Neighborhoods and student outcomes, including through a rigorous evaluation of the program.

In 2010, 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.

In 2011, the USDOE awarded a second round of planning grants and a first round of implementation grants. The five implementation grants and 15 planning grants reached an additional 16 communities throughout the United States in order to help revitalize disadvantaged neighborhoods. In 2012, a third round of planning grants and a second round of implementation grants were awarded. The 7 implementation grants and 10 planning grants reached an additional 11 new communities throughout the country. Promise Neighborhoods are now in 20 states and the District of Columbia.

The grants awarded in 2011 included implementation grants for three California cities: Fresno, San Diego, and Hayward. The maximum award for an implementation grant was \$6 million per year for five years. In 2012, implementation grants were awarded in three more California cities: Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chula Vista.

Diverse strategies used by California Promise Neighborhood grantees. According to materials provided by the author, the California recipients of federal Promise Neighborhood grants use funds for a variety of programs to serve communities.

According to the author, Chula Vista uses a Promotora model to improve student achievement in grades K-3 by focusing on parent engagement. In Hayward, Promise Interns work as tutors and mentors to improve high school graduation rates and increase access and retention to post-secondary education. In Los Angeles, the Community Schools model promotes student-centered learning by turning schools into community centers that offer services addressing all aspects of students' academic, physical, social, and emotional development. In San Francisco's Mission District, an Early Learning Network supports both parents and children with kindergarten readiness programs.

Program outcomes. According to the author, various metrics are used to track outcomes in Promise Neighborhood programs, including kindergarten readiness, proficiency in core K-12 subjects, family economic resiliency and support towards child, and the student's access to healthy living. According to the author, at Hayward High School, graduation rates have significantly improved, rising from 76 percent in 2011 to 89 percent in 2016. In Los Angeles, participating high schools have more than doubled the percentage of students who graduate "college ready" from 31 percent in 2013 up to 68 percent in 2017. The Mission Economic Development Agency of San Francisco reports the following outcomes:

- Latino graduation rates increased from 63% to 88%
- African American graduation rates increased from 46% to 93%
- 94% of elementary school families feel a sense of belonging at their schools
- Rate at which students change school mid-year decreased from 13.9% to 7.9%
- 80% of all Latino 4 year olds in the Mission are now enrolled in preschool
- Social emotional development scores for 3 year olds jumped from 24% to 82%

A study of the Northside Achievement Zone, a Promise Neighborhood in Minneapolis (Diaz, 2015), found that for every \$1 invested into a Promise Neighborhood, there was a \$6.12 return on investment due to increased earning potential, increased tax revenues, lower health costs, lower need for special education, reduced crime, and reduced need for public assistance.

Task force recommendation for 20 new Promise Neighborhoods. Assembly Bill 1520 (Chapter 415, Statutes of 2016) directed the California Department of Social Services to convene the Lifting Children and Families Out of Poverty Task Force to recommend comprehensive strategies to achieve the reduction of “deep poverty” – families with income below half of the federal poverty level – among children and reduce the overall child poverty rate in the state. The task force’s November 2018 report, *Lifting Children and Families Out of Poverty Task Force Report: Recommended Strategies to Address Deep Child Poverty and Child Poverty in California* noted that “California has the highest number of children and highest percentage of children living in poverty of any state in the nation. In carrying out the Legislative directive, the Task Force established the goals of ending deep child poverty as soon as possible and reducing overall child poverty by 50 percent.” Among its recommendations, the task force recommended the creation of 20 new Promise Neighborhoods with a focus on children and families in poverty and deep poverty but that would also have positive impacts on other children and families in the designated neighborhoods, without regard to poverty status. This recommendation was identified as having a foundational impact.

Arguments in support. The Mission Economic Development Agency writes, “We know through first-hand experience, supported by data that the Promise Neighborhood model works. Over the six-plus years of our initiative, we used a shared case-management tool to connect 2,744 families with 5,590 different program referrals, ranging from housing and tenants’ rights to job readiness and health care. We were a collaborative of 20 community organizations aligning our efforts to provide wraparound services to our students and families to work toward common goals. We broke through silos and shared data along the way. Together, we hold ourselves accountable to turning the curve on community indicators.

California’s existing Promise Neighborhoods are some of the most preeminent in the nation. Yet, despite their excellent results, continued federal funding for all 15 Promise Neighborhoods nationwide is not assured and has been marked for termination in the most recent federal budget talks. We applaud that the program envisioned by SB 686 would be administered by the CDE to award eligible entities grants to implement Promise Neighborhoods.”

Related legislation. AB 1196 (Gipson) of this Session would establish a grant program to support the planning and operation of community schools, subject to an appropriation for this purpose.

SB 403 (Liu) of the 2015-16 Session would have authorized a local educational agency or schools to coordinate academic, social and health services for students, families and community members in collaboration with community partners to establish California Community Schools (CCS), and required the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to make grants available to qualified recipients to enhance and expand CCS, to the extent funds were allocated for that purpose. SB 403 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 that may include full-service community schools, promise neighborhoods, wraparound programs, wellness centers, and healthy communities efforts. AB 2555 was held in the Assembly Appropriations committee.

AB 1178 (Bocanegra) of the 2013-14 Session would have established the California Promise Neighborhood (CPN) Initiative to develop a system of up to 40 promise neighborhoods throughout the state with the purpose of supporting a child's development from cradle to career. AB 1178 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1072 (Fuentes) of the 2011-12 Session would have established the California Promise Neighborhoods Initiative in the Office of Economic Development and required the office to establish 40 promise neighborhoods throughout the state. AB 1072 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

826LA

Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle

Barrio Station

CafeJ: Community Alliance for Family and Justice Education

California Emerging Technology Fund

California Global Education Project

Casa Familiar

Chabot College

Chicano Federation of San Diego County

Child Care Planning and Advisory Council of San Francisco

City of Hayward

City of Sacramento

City of Salinas

City Year, Los Angeles

Clinica Monseñor Oscar A. Romero

Community Child Care Council of Alameda County

Eden Youth and Family Center

Eric Garcetti, Mayor of Los Angeles

Families In Schools

Felton Institute, Family Service Agency of San Francisco

First 5 Alameda County

Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission

Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission

Good Samaritan Family Resource Center

GRACE

Hayward Promise Neighborhoods

Hayward Unified School District

Heart of Los Angeles

Hermandad Mexicana Nacional

Homeless Prenatal Program

Instituto Familiar De La Raza

La Familia Counseling Service
Los Angeles Unified School District
Manpower San Diego
Mission Economic Development Agency
Mission Graduates
Mission Neighborhood Centers, Inc.
Mission Neighborhood Health Center
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter
Pacoima Beautiful
Parents For Public Schools of San Francisco
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians
PolicyLink
San Diego Futures Foundation
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Unified School District
San Ysidro Health
South Bay Community Services
St. John's Well Child and Family Center
Support for Families of Children with Disabilities
Tandem, Partners In Early Learning
Thai Community Development Center
The Center for Equity For English Learners, Loyola Marymount University
The Jamestown Community Center
The Princeton Review
The Salvadoran American Leadership and Educational Fund
Tiburcio Vasquez Health Center, Inc.
UCLA Community Based Learning
United Ways of California
USC Sol Price Center for Social Innovation
Youth Policy Institute
Youth Policy Institute Charter Schools

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Tanya Lieberman / ED. / (916) 319-2087