



A project to  
promote local  
dedicated revenue  
streams for  
California's  
children, youth and  
families

**AN  
ASSESSMENT  
OF A NEW  
INVESTMENT  
STRATEGY**

**Re-thinking  
How to Support  
The Healthy  
Development of  
Children**

Creator and Lead  
**MARGARET  
BRODKIN AND  
ASSOCIATES**

Sponsor  
**FIRST 5 ASSOCIATION  
OF CALIFORNIA**

**November, 2013**

## **LEADERSHIP, PARTNERS AND ADVISERS**

### **Creator, Lead and Author**

Margaret Brodtkin and Associates

### **Sponsor**

First 5 Association of California, Moira Kenney, Executive Director

### **Collaborating partner organizations**

California Child Care Resource and Referral Network  
California Coverage and Health Initiatives  
California Network of Family Strengthening Networks  
California School-Age Consortium  
Children's Defense Fund California  
Children Now  
Kidango  
Prevent Child Abuse CA  
The Children's Partnership  
Youth Leadership Institute

### **Advisers**

Sheila Boxley, President and CEO of Child Abuse Prevention Center, sponsor of Prevent Child Abuse California  
CJ Callen, CEO, Youth Leadership Institute  
Aideen Gaidmore, Board of Directors, CA Child Care Resource & Referral Network  
Jim Keddy, Vice-President and Chief Learning Officer, The California Endowment  
Wendy Lazarus, Founder and Co-President, The Children's Partnership  
Ted Lempert, President, Children Now  
Dave Metz, Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates  
Paul Miller, Executive Director, Kidango  
Ruth Obel-Jorgensen, Executive Director, California School-Age Consortium  
Jennifer Peck, Executive Director, Partnership for Children and Youth  
Bonnie Politz, Global Youth and Community Strategy Consultant, Former VP Academy for Educational Development  
Nancy Rubin, Former CEO Edgewood Center for Children and Families and former Deputy Director of Health, Los Angeles County  
Kay Ruhstaller, Policy Chair, Board of Directors, CA Child Care R & R Network  
Andrew Russo, Co-chair, CA Network of Family Strengthening Networks  
Suzie Shupe, ED, California Coverage and Health Initiatives  
Patty Siegel, Founder and former Executive Director, CA Child Care Resource and Referral Network  
Larry Tramutola, Tramutola Advisors  
Jill Wynns, Chair of Cities Counties Schools Partnership (League of Cities, CSAC, CSBA), Immediate Past President of CSBA

### **Funders**

Sierra Health Foundation and Rosenberg Foundation



## FUNDING THE NEXT GENERATION

### *The potential of local dedicated funding for children in California*

#### UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY, URGENT CHALLENGE

---

California is facing both a unique once-a-generation opportunity and an urgent challenge: to marshal the resources needed to support the healthy development of its children. On one hand, with 25% of its children living in poverty, California has more poor children than any place in the nation – a reality made all the more troubling by the fact that the United States has more children in poverty than most developed countries in the world.<sup>i</sup> On the other hand, the state’s economy is the 9<sup>th</sup> largest in the world and is recovering with great potential for future growth;<sup>ii</sup> property values are escalating; and the state is beginning to modify its tax and budget policies to address its funding shortfalls.<sup>iii</sup> These factors combine to convince many interested in the future of California that increased revenue will be available, revenue that could be harnessed for the common good.

A strong community network of services to children, youth and families can provide the essential supports that will enable the next generation of Californians to lead productive, healthy and fulfilling lives and contribute to a robust economy and vibrant culture. Therefore, safeguarding the future will require increased and stable funding for services that support families; ensure health and safety for all children; prepare children for success in school and career; promote wholesome social development; and foster youth leadership, creativity and civic engagement.

Plans are already on drawing boards all over the state about how to appropriate anticipated new revenues for many competing issues and interest groups. It is imperative that our children be first in line: Economists agree that the state’s economic prosperity is seriously threatened unless we are able to fully prepare the next generation.<sup>iv</sup> Military leaders are decrying the dreadful state of readiness of our young people – with 75% being unable to enter the armed forces because they are too poorly educated, physically unfit, or have criminal records.<sup>v</sup> Economists and demographers have become proponents of preschool, drop-out prevention and health care. Furthermore pollsters are telling us that investing in children is one of the only issues around which a polarized public agrees.<sup>vi</sup> Simply put: We are significantly under-investing in supports and opportunities for our children. And for the first time, new allies and supporters are coming forth.

**Seize the day** - There has never been a more important time for us to work together to find new solutions to capturing the resources needed to invest in the children, youth and families of our state.

#### **Action needed at the local level**

There are many reasons to look to the local level for new, sustainable funding opportunities for services to children, youth and families.

- Local funding is required to complement state and federal resources, which are not sufficient to address community needs.
- Realignment and devolution of policy from the federal and state level require that many needs now be met through actions at the local level, such as the recently enacted Local Control Funding Formula for schools.
- Local funding streams offer greater flexibility, creativity and targeting of priority needs.
- Diverse sectors of local communities are often willing to come together to invest in their children when support for other policies is more polarized.

- Increasingly, members of the public want local control over their resources, and are more likely to support measures where they can see how funds will be spent.
- The local level is where most policy affecting children is implemented and where the building blocks of a state and national movement are created.

Most California counties and cities have not explored many local revenue options for children's services. Advocates, service providers, policy-makers, parents and young people themselves have not had the information, skills, organizational structure, and mobilized constituency to promote successful strategies.

## **FUNDING THE NEXT GENERATION: ASSESSING POSSIBILITIES**

---

### **Launching a new vision**

After 10 months of preliminary information gathering and outreach by Margaret Brodtkin and Associates (MB+A), Funding the Next Generation launched in May, 2013, under the auspice of the First 5 Association of California, with grants from the Sierra Health Foundation and the Rosenberg Foundation.

The goals of the project were two-fold:

- Strengthen and leverage local capacity and commitment for investing in children, youth and families so that the next generation becomes an ongoing community priority.
- Develop new dedicated revenue streams to fund effective services for children, youth and families in cities and counties throughout California.

The intent of the first phase of the project was to assess the potential of supporting the work to create local dedicated funding measures for children, youth and families in communities in the state.

The aspiration, but also the challenge, of the project was to create a new paradigm for resourcing services to children, youth and their families; and simultaneously inspire and empower many in the children's services field to adopt a new leadership role in promoting revenue policy in their local communities. Thus, establishing the credibility of the goals and the capacity to communicate with potential stakeholders was an essential first step.

The project successfully created the structure and tools to launch the new vision. This included branding the vision with a name, a logo, and a tagline that captured its essence as well as attention throughout the state. A strong infrastructure of partnering agencies, advisers, and experts was developed. This included 10 well-known statewide child policy organizations with either affiliates or close partners throughout the state representing all areas of children's services, and some of the leading policy, political, and legal experts in the country. This impressive group of collaborators helped give the new vision the momentum, credibility, information and ongoing input and advice that was needed. An Advisory Board of 17 members representing the collaborating organizations and experts was formed and met throughout the first phase of the project.

### **Gathering information and creating new resources**

Every effort was made to identify the information and models on local dedicated funding streams for children, youth and families. This included conducting interviews with 45 state and national experts, as well as the leaders of 5 of the major dedicated funding streams around the country for children's services (Portland, Seattle, Little Rock, Palm Beach and Oakland). Relevant materials from key policy organizations such as the Finance Project, First Focus, California League of Cities, and the Advancement Project were also reviewed. All personnel interviewed who currently manage children's funds were adamant about the value of the funds, but struggled with strategies to ensure accountability and strategic use of funds. This led to the development of criteria for effective revenue measures. The information

gathering also included collecting examples from around the state of children’s agendas, bills of rights, and Children’s Budgets – all of which can serve as preludes to dedicated funding measures.

One of the most valuable collaborations has been with the international law firm, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP. Orrick, a leader in finance, agreed to provide pro-bono legal support for this project. A team of lawyers from its Public Finance Group prepared a white paper entitled “Local Government Funding Options for California’s Children, Youth and Family Services” and a chart entitled “Requirements for Common Local Government Funding Sources for Services for Children, Youth and Families.” These are the first such documents of their kind, and have been enthusiastically received.

Early in the work, it became apparent that an important part of this phase of the project needed to be the development of fact sheets and tools to introduce people to new ideas, and assist them in understanding the steps involved in creating a dedicated revenue stream, as well as their community’s readiness to undertake the journey. While some materials exist about potential funding streams, almost no materials exist about the process of developing them. This cannot be over-emphasized. Therefore, during this time, an introductory package of new materials was developed - each piece in response to needs, questions and gaps in information identified through interviews and meetings with local stakeholders. For instance, many groups needed tools to assess their readiness to undertake this work; others had no experience in the budget process and needed guidance in that; and many wanted to know the steps involved in getting a dedicated funding measure.

The following new materials were developed as part of the first phase of the work:

- Fact sheet on the San Francisco Children’s Fund – Lessons Learned
- On Becoming a Budget Champion for Children: Getting started down the road to a sustainable funding stream (article)
- Decisions to Make in Developing a Revenue Measure (matrix)
- Creating a Dedicated Revenue Stream for Children, Youth and Families: Suggested Steps to Lay the Foundation (matrix and chart)
- The San Francisco Budget Story: Lessons Learned (article)
- Dedicated Funding Streams: An essential element of fiscal support for children, youth and families (fiscal sustainability framework)
- Community Discussion Guide (questions for discussion)
- Are You Ready to Explore a Dedicated Funding Stream? (criteria for readiness)
- Starting Your Journey as a Budget Champion: Criteria for selecting an issue (chart)
- Examples of Dedicated Revenue Streams for Children, Youth and Families (chart)

## **Educating and energizing leaders and stakeholders throughout the state**

**Contacting local leaders** - Hundreds of local advocates, service providers, and policy-makers in 44 of California’s 58 counties were contacted. Original outreach included e-mails to individuals and organizations in the children’s field describing the goals and asking those interested to contact the project directly – sent by statewide organizations to their members and partners. This resulted in dozens of responses. Throughout a several month period, material was sent to over 120 people, and phone interviews and in-person contacts were made with over 200 people in 40 counties. The interviews generally consisted of questions regarding their knowledge of budget-related issues, the status of coordination, planning and convening at a community-level, the history of fiscal measures in the county or city, the interest of high profile leaders in children’s services, and their interest in, and knowledge of, local public dedicated funding streams. Twenty-one in-person meetings were held throughout the state. The meetings were attended by anywhere from 2 – 30 people. This included meetings with 5 different groups in San Bernardino County, a presentation to the Children’s Network in Solano County, facilitating a planning session of the Cradle to Career Coalition in Sonoma County and similar sessions with a children’s network in Yolo and Shasta Counties. It also included technical assistance meetings with the

Santa Clara County Board of Education, the Merced Building Healthy Communities, a delegation from the LAUSD, and the Superintendent of Schools, First 5 Director and colleagues in Lake County.

**Role of First 5** - The First 5 Association of California was able to draw First 5 leaders from around the state into the project – twenty-one First 5’s were represented at the conference described below. Because First 5 has a statewide infrastructure, with elected officials on every First 5 Commission, and because all of the Commissions understand the importance of planning and the benefits of dedicated funding, they have been particularly effective partners in this work.

In order to improve the ability of the project to disseminate information and educate stakeholders about the potential and work involved in creating a dedicated funding stream for children, a web page with all materials was created on the Margaret Brodtkin and Associates website [www.margaretbrodtkin.com/projects](http://www.margaretbrodtkin.com/projects). In addition, a newsletter was developed, and 3 issues were sent out to over 500 people on a mailing list developed in this phase of the project. The mailing lists consists of people around the state interested in revenue policy and revenue measures, as well as some national experts and leaders interested in following the project.

**Statewide conference** - The high point of the outreach and networking was a conference on September 27 in Oakland, attended by over 200 people from 31 counties, and by 10 statewide organizations. Originally intended as a gathering for no more than 80 people, primarily in the Bay Area, it developed a life of its own, expanding to a “must-attend” statewide event that was seen by many participants as launching a movement. Evaluations of the event were effusive, using words like “inspiring, exciting, great, well-planned, valuable, informative, timely, relevant, engaging, energizing, well-paced, and motivating.” Attendees especially appreciated the real-life examples and the real world experience of the speakers, keeping it real with stories of failure as well as success, and the fact that it was practical. Twenty-one local teams submitted plans for future work, and follow-up requests for support, further information and a method for sharing progress among conference participants are ongoing.

One of the most helpful consequences of this work has been the creation of a team of experts on many aspects of local dedicated funding for children, youth and families. Such a brain-trust has not existed before. The team consists of people with on-the-ground experience mounting revenue measures, administrators of children’s funds, organizers, and experts in messaging, public opinion, and coalition-building. The project has created a “faculty” for continued technical assistance, support and further study.

**Children’s Budget strategy** - Another important outcome of this phase of the work has been the development of what the project has labeled the “Children’s Budget strategy.” Recognizing that many communities were at an early phase of working on local revenues and that an entry point was needed, specifically an entry point that was non-controversial, the project began proposing that communities start by gathering information about expenditures for children, youth and families. This approach was based on the experience in San Francisco, as well as other communities around the country – and what was, for a time, a children’s budget movement in the 80’s and 90’s, spearheaded by the Children’s Defense Fund. It became important to define a Children’s Budget and begin to find examples and develop materials, a process that is ongoing. The Children’s Budget workshop at the September 27 conference was well-attended, especially by many communities that saw this approach as a viable and exciting start.

## WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

---

Key stakeholders in diverse areas of California are highly motivated to undertake new strategies to promote local public resources.

The underlying question of phase one of this project was: Is there sufficient motivation and readiness around the state to move forward with a project to promote local dedicated funding streams for children, youth and families. **The answer is a resounding and inspiring “yes.”** The most compelling indication

of the high level of interest in pursuing local dedicated revenue measures was the outpouring of interest and enthusiasm about the September 27 conference. That, combined with the steady increase of communities requesting information and help leading up to the conference, has led to the conclusion that many players in the children's field, as well as policy leaders and elected officials are ready to look at this strategy. The primary factors that appear to be contributing to this level of interest include optimism about the future of the economy, suffering from over a decade of budget cuts, exhaustion related to federal and state funding battles, and positive local experience working collaboratively across silos to achieve common goals.

It is important to note that there is a continuum of interest, including a third of the people who were initially sufficiently interested to engage in preliminary conversations, but are not interested in pursuing this strategy. Many felt the political environment of their counties or cities was so anti-government funding that pursuing new public funding was simply too unrealistic. Many did not have the leadership or infrastructure to coordinate their efforts, and had no history of working in a broad coalition. While all recognized the desperate need for more funding, they were not in a leadership position and did not know how to engage people who were or might be.

Generally, the size of a community was not a predictor of the level of interest, nor was the ethnic makeup, level of need, or whether the community was urban or rural. Counties and cities in and closest to the Bay Area appeared to be the most ready to take on the challenge of creating a dedicated revenue stream – in part because the most successful and well-known examples are in the Bay Area. As would be expected, the most conservative areas of the state were most hesitant and least experienced in the budget process and least knowledgeable about fiscal policy. However, an important thesis of this project is that the public is more likely to support funding measures that originate close to home, and where policy is made about how funds will be spent. Trust is developed at the local level, and organizing and direct person-to-person communication is most possible and most effective at the local level. Adding to that the changing demographics, and our conclusion is that there is great potential in so-called “conservative” areas.

### **New skills and supports are needed.**

Readiness to undertake the challenge of developing new local revenue measures is a continuum and assessing it is as much an art as a science. Nevertheless, the project developed readiness criteria and a tool to facilitate self-assessments. The criteria grew out of the first phase of interviews. The criteria were whether benchmarks existed in three categories – status of planning the service delivery system; capacity of the network and leadership; and the political and civic culture:

#### **CRITERIA FOR READINESS**

##### **Status of Planning for the Service System**

- Comprehensive assessment of needs, expenditures, and gaps in services.
- Community-wide goals and outcomes for children, youth and families.
- Agreement by core stakeholders about priorities for increased funding.

##### **Capacity of Network and Leadership**

- Network/coalition that works together across multiple areas of children's services and has overcome turf issues.
- Convening entity (organization, network or coalition) with credibility to organize meetings in early phase of work.
- Willingness and independence to speak out openly about unmet needs and funding options.
- Network members or partners beyond children's service providers, such as a large membership organization or organizing group, parent groups, youth, faith, labor.
- History of collaboration to increase local budgets for children's services.
- Members who are politically engaged and have credibility with elected officials and community.
- Funders to support early work, e.g. staff support.

## Political and Civic Culture

- Civic culture that supports children, e.g. business, media, service organizations.
- Political leaders who have prioritized children and are current or potential allies or champions.
- Successful ballot measures that have funded education, children or human services.
- Base of private funding and volunteers who support children's services.
- History of success in "winning-over" opponents of public funding for kids.

## Tenacity, Passion and Humor

**Levels of readiness** - What emerged from this process was the conclusion that "readiness" could be divided into two levels: 1. Those with sufficient experience both working together on policy development and leadership, and with knowledge about, and experience with, the budget and political process (with over half of the criteria listed above in place); and 2. Those with a convening entity and network in place, but with less leadership and policy capacity. All communities interested in pursuing local dedicated funding strategies had some level of support from some policy-makers and community leaders, but all assessed their policy environment as challenging – though some more challenging than others. However, virtually none of the communities had clearly identified fiscal priorities around which a consensus among leaders in the children's services community had been developed.

Another important learning was that an essential element of readiness was the existence of what some call a "big table," i.e. a forum where all sectors of stakeholders in children's services come together and have a history of working together towards some common goals. It was heartening to discover just how common it was that such a "table" existed in communities throughout the state. It was also heartening to see how prevalent it was in smaller and rural communities, often made possible because of necessity and because the number of people involved was not that great. One observation has been that county offices of education are often the umbrella under which this type of coordination exists in rural communities.

While the existence of a "big table" or some coordinating forum appears to be essential for success, it is not as obvious whether it matters who or what organization is the actual convener. The project began with the expectation that the convener by necessity must be an outside government entity that would have greater flexibility and independence than an arm of government. However, this is certainly something that needs further exploration and has not been the case so far. Conveners have varied from government agencies, to quasi-government commissions, to non-profits, to coalitions from the public and private sector.

As stated previously, about a third of the communities where stakeholders were interviewed had no experience or knowledge of local budget issues, and did not believe they were ready to explore the possibilities any further.

**Support needed** - For the communities (mostly counties, and mostly in less populated areas of the state) at the earlier stage of readiness, the project proposed the idea of a Children's Budget as a place to start the journey. For the other group, there is a need to support an analysis of potential revenue strategies. It should be noted that this distinction between those interested in a Children's Budget strategy and those interested in a revenue measure strategy is not clear-cut – and that there are many common needs among these communities, such as the need to identify new allies, and the need to develop a consensus about fiscal priorities. This exists even with the county (Marin) already preparing for a ballot measure.

Community team were surveyed at the end of the September 27 conference, and asked what type of support they needed in undertaking their next steps. The results confirmed the analysis above: half of the respondents intended to pursue a children's budget strategy and wanted assistance with budget-related work; and half listed some type of dedicated funding specifically as a goal. People in both categories wanted help with planning, as well as help with specific skills, such as messaging and understanding public opinion.

What became apparent through the outreach to many communities is that two major supports are essential if communities (at any level of readiness) are to be successful:

1. Dedicated staff to do the hard work of researching, organizing, convening, and facilitating the process. The recommendation is that a full-time staff position would be ideal, and would allow the network that undertakes this work to leverage its resources.
2. Given that there is virtually no roadmap and very little material on how to do this work, communities will need technical assistance, tools and guidelines, and opportunities to share successes, ideas and challenges.

### **The potential to strengthen and leverage local capacity to increase public resources for children, youth and families is great.**

One premise of this project is that success will lead to success and create momentum around the state. Policy experts have observed that cities and counties often tend to want to copy (or replicate) what others are doing because they learn that it is feasible, and because they begin to want the benefits that they see in other communities. If, for instance, 6 communities form a cohort and are successful in achieving the goal of a dedicated funding stream; and 6 other communities successfully launch a Children’s Budget initiative, AND their efforts are made visible to others throughout the state, this will unlock ever increasing potential throughout the state.

One cautionary note: **This is a journey, not an overnight quick fix.** One of the most important “learnings” from this stage of the project is the importance of understanding that it takes time to build the capacity and organizational structure to achieve the goal of dedicated funding. Based on the experience of other communities, as well as an evaluation of the numerous interviews and visits conducted in phase one, the project estimates that the time will vary from 2 to 5 years.

## **FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

---

### **An Institute to Promote Local Dedicated Funding Strategies For Children, Youth and Families**

In order to maximize this unique window in time to address funding issues for children at the local level, there needs to be an organized structure through which to provide technical assistance, facilitate communication, document lessons learned, and provide policy leadership based on those lessons - hence the idea of an “Institute” which would build a learning community and take on these functions.

#### **Two levels of support for communities**

When attendees at the September 27 conference were asked what support they needed next, almost all said they wanted technical assistance for their county teams and that they wanted opportunities to share ideas, experiences and next steps with their colleagues. Other issues participants said they would like to see addressed in as part of the follow-up, and could be part of the Institute’s curriculum were:

- Strategies for rural areas
- Challenges and opportunities of building a coalition
- How to create a Children’s Budget
- How to launch an initiative
- Step-by-step examples of successful efforts
- Criteria for selecting dedicated revenue options
- Messaging that resonates
- Legal issues
- Fundraising
- Complexities of local government – cities and counties
- How to engage high level policy-makers
- Youth voice
- Implementation of existing dedicated funds
- Role of non-profits
- How to assess public opinion

As stated earlier, the project has put interested communities into two primary categories: those that are motivated and prepared to begin to pursue a revenue measure, and those eager to begin the journey, but will likely want to start further back in the process, with the creation of a Children’s Budget. At the risk of second-guessing local communities, what follows is a partial list of how some interested communities are starting to identify their focus:

#### Focus on Children’s Budget

- Del Norte
- Napa
- Humboldt
- Nevada
- Shasta
- Sonoma
- Merced
- Lake
- Tehama
- San Mateo

#### Focus on Revenue Measure

- Richmond (city)
- Santa Clara County
- LA (school district)
- Fremont
- Hayward (Promise Neighborhood)
- Yolo
- Solano
- E. Coachella
- Marin
- Berkeley (city)

The proposed Institute would therefore consist of two strands of technical assistance in order to respond to the two levels of readiness, as well as training common to both levels.

### Documenting and disseminating lessons learned

Given the importance of this work, combined with the lack of information about how to achieve success, an essential part of the project moving forward is learning from the experiences of communities around the state. Some of the issues that beg for further information and exploration are:

- How much funding do communities assess is needed to achieve their most important goals and make a meaningful difference?
- Where can the greatest impact be felt and greatest success be possible – at the county or city level? Is there any potential to work at a regional level?
- What type of organization can be most effective in leading an effort – advocacy, public agency, ad-hoc coalition, other?
- Is a Children’s Budget an effective entry point for developing dedicated revenue?
- Can service providers be an effective core group of the effort?
- What types of “allies” are most helpful, or are most essential?
- What barriers and challenges do communities confront and how are they overcome?
- What messages work best, particularly in small, conservative and/or rural communities?
- What is the time frame for achieving these goals; how does it vary; and what can be done to avoid dead-ends and steps that are not productive?

Tracking and documenting the work of communities that would participate in the Institute, as well as other counties that are independently working on revenue measures would be a unique and valuable contribution to the body of knowledge about increasing resources and implementing public policy.

### Developing statewide policy to facilitate local revenue generation

There are potentially statewide policies that can be enacted that would facilitate revenue-raising for services to children, youth and families. As a result of discussions with legislators and the project’s legal team, two such policies have already been identified:

- Amending the Community Facilities Act (aka Mello Roos) to apply to children’s services. The Act currently allows special taxing districts to be established for a variety of public services including the operation and maintenance of museums and cultural facilities, flood and storm protection, and jail and detention facilities. An expansion of the authorized expenditures could be feasible.

- Changing the voter threshold for a parcel tax that would fund schools and children’s services. There is already interest by policy leaders in this strategy.

Currently, there is no organization in the state with the mission of identifying and researching these potential policies, and educating decision-makers about their benefits.

## SUMMARY

---

The first phase of Funding the Next Generation has demonstrated that there is both a need, as well as a cohort of interested and capable communities, to build on the momentum that has been created – a compelling rationale to develop a mechanism to support these communities in promoting local dedicated funding streams. Furthermore, building local capacity is certainly one of the most effective strategies to create sustainable support for children, youth and families. And developing a learning community does more than provide place-based technical assistance; it creates a process through which to stitch together local activities into a broader movement that allows local leaders to learn from one another and builds momentum statewide. In addition, there is a need to learn much more about how this work can be done and what new policies the state might put in place, so as to inform and inspire many more communities in the state and in the country to take on this challenge. An Institute on promoting local dedicated funding for children, youth and their families would be an effective vehicle to address these needs, and would result in one of the most promising opportunities to improve the outcomes for California’s future.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

---

### 1. TOOLS CREATED TO SUPPORT LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Available at [www.margaretbrodtkin.com/projects](http://www.margaretbrodtkin.com/projects)

### 2. LOCAL LEVEL OUTREACH COMPLETED THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA

#### COMMUNITIES CONTACTED IN PHASE ONE (partial list)

Location	Convening/point organization (contacts ranged from individual interviews, to meetings of up to 50 people.)
<b>Alameda County</b>	First 5 Parent Voices Health Department
<b>Berkeley</b>	City Council League of Women voters
<b>Butte</b>	Child abuse prevention council First 5
<b>Del Norte</b>	First 5 Building Healthy Communities Three Rivers Foundation
<b>E. Coachella</b>	Building Healthy Communities
<b>Contra Costa County</b>	Board of Supervisors
<b>Fremont</b>	City government Leading after-school provider
<b>Fresno</b>	The Children’s Movement Youth Leadership Institute First 5
<b>Glenn</b>	Interagency Coordinating Council

<b>Hayward</b>	Promise Neighborhood Local government
<b>Humboldt</b>	First 5 Family support agency Humboldt Area Foundation
<b>Imperial</b>	First 5 County Office of Education Interagency Steering Committee
<b>Kings</b>	Kings County Action Organization
<b>LA - USD</b>	LAUSD Board of Education LA's Best
<b>Lake</b>	County Superintendent of Schools First 5 Family support agency
<b>Lassen</b>	County office of Education
<b>Long Beach</b>	YMCA
<b>Madera</b>	Child Abuse Prevention lead agency
<b>Marin</b>	MarinKids – broad-based coalition
<b>Mendocino</b>	First 5
<b>Merced</b>	Building Healthy Communities
<b>Monterey</b>	First 5
<b>Napa</b>	Health department First 5 Non-profit coalition Board of Supervisors
<b>Nevada</b>	First 5 Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation
<b>Orange</b>	After-school collaborative
<b>Placer</b>	Consultant
<b>Richmond</b>	Building Healthy Communities Mayor's Office
<b>Sacramento</b>	Child Abuse Prevention Council
<b>San Beneto</b>	First 5
<b>San Bernardino</b>	California Calls agencies Child care referral First 5 Children's Fund Children's Network Policy Council
<b>San Diego</b>	The Children's Initiative
<b>San Francisco</b>	Board of Supervisors
<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	Susan Hughes, Director First 5
<b>San Mateo</b>	Peninsula Partnership Leadership Council Big Lift Coalition Silicon Valley Community Foundation
<b>San Joaquin</b>	Child care resource and referral Family support leadership First 5

<b>Santa Barbara</b>	Santa Barbara Foundation Children's health initiative
<b>Santa Clara</b>	County Board of Education
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	United Way of Santa Cruz County
<b>Shasta</b>	Child abuse prevention council First 5
<b>Siskiyou</b>	First 5
<b>Solano</b>	Children's Network of Solano County
<b>Sonoma</b>	Cradle to Career network (under United Way)
<b>Stanislaus</b>	Multiple contacts – non-profits
<b>Tehama</b>	First 5
<b>Ventura</b>	First 5
<b>West Contra Costa</b>	WCC Education Fund
<b>Yolo</b>	Yolo County Children's Alliance

### 3. ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED FOR GENERAL INFORMATION (partial list)

- Advancement Project – John Kim
- Afterschool Alliance – Janelle Cousino
- Annie E. Casey Foundation – Mike Laracy, Jann Jackson, Dennis Campa, Rafael Lopez
- Baltimore Safe and Sound – Hathaway Ferebee
- CA Coverage and Health Initiatives – Suzie Shupe
- CA Tax Reform Association – Lenny Goldberg
- California Afterschool Alliance – Frank Pisi
- California Association of Non-profits – Jan Masaoka
- California Center for Public Health Advocacy – Stefan Harvey
- California Child Care Resource and Referral Network – Linda Asato
- California Children's Roundtable – Melanie Delgado
- California Endowment – Jim Keddy
- California Network of Family Strengthening Networks – Andrew Russo
- California School Age Consortium – Ruth Obel-Jorgenson
- California School Board Association – Jill Wynns
- Center for Public Health Advocacy – Harold Goldstein
- Change Lab Solutions – Martha Ashe, Founder and CEO, and leadership staff
- Children's Advocacy Institute – Bob Fellmeth
- Children's Defense Fund CA – Michelle Stillwell-Parvensky
- Children's Partnership – Wendy Lazarus
- Cities Counties Schools Partnership –
- Color of Democracy – Ludovic Blain
- Community School Intermediary group – presentation to group
- DC Fiscal Policy Institute – Sounya Bhat
- EdSource – Louis Freedberg
- Fairbank, Maulin, Maslin, Metz and Associates – David Metz
- 50+1 Strategies – Nicole Derse
- Fight Crime, Invest in Kids – Brian Lee
- The Finance Project – Cheryl Hayes
- Institute for Local Government – Randi Kay Stephens and JoAnn Speers

- Irvine Foundation – Amy Rodriguez-Arms
- John Gardner Center, Stanford University – Mibrey McLaughlin
- Mark Leno, Senator CA Legislature
- Little Rock dedicated fund – Dorothy Nayles
- Oakland Fund for Children and Youth – Andrea Youngdahl and Sandy Taylor
- Orrick, Herrington, Sutcliffe, LLP, Public Finance Division, Don Field and team
- Portland Children’s Levy – Lisa Pellegrino
- National League of Cities – Cliff Johnson
- Partnership for Children and Youth – Deanna Neibuhr, Jennifer Peck
- PICO California – Roberta Furger
- Prevent Child Abuse California – Sheila Boxley, Brooke Allison, Rosemary Kennedy
- Promise Neighborhood Institute – Michael McAfee
- Richmond soda tax campaign – Jeff Ritterman, MD
- San Francisco Controller (former) – Ed Harrington
- Seattle Education Levy – Holly Miller
- Supervisor Joe Simitian – Santa Clara County, former CA Legislature
- Social Entrepreneurs Inc. – Kelly Marschall
- Tramutola Advisors – Larry Tramutola
- UCSF – Roberto Vargas (on soda tax)
- United Way of the Bay Area – Lorne Needle,
- Voices for America’s Children – Marlo Nash, Bill Bentley, Lori Dorfman
- Youth Leadership Institute – CJ Callen

---

<sup>i</sup> “Child Poverty in California,” by Sarah Bohn and Matt Levin, published by Public Policy Institute of California, August, 2013; “Child Well-being in Rich Countries: A Comparative Overview,” United Nations Children’s Fund, Office of Research, Florence, Italy, 2013; “Prosperity Threatened: Perspectives in Childhood Poverty in California,” by Rey Fuentes, Ann O’Leary, James Barba, published by the Center for the Next Generation, Jan, 2013

<sup>ii</sup> “Numbers in the News,” article published by the Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy, July, 2013, “The California Economy: Challenges of Growth and Competition,” power point by Stephen Levy, June, 2012, also Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy.

<sup>iii</sup> The passage of Proposition 30 in November, 2012, increased taxes, and reflected a shift in public opinion and public policy.

<sup>iv</sup> “Suffer the Children, Suffer the Country,” Jeffrey Sachs, article in Project Syndicate: A World of Ideas, April, 2013, New York, New York; “Immigrants and Boomers: Forging a New Social Contract for the Future of America,” Dowell Myers, Russell Sage Foundation, 2007 and “Children, Immigrants and Boomers: Implications of California’s Changing Population,” Dowell Myers speech at annual conference of California Budget Project, March 14, 2013

<sup>v</sup> “Ready, Willing, and Unable to Serve,” by Mission: Readiness, Military Leaders for Kids, 2009

<sup>vi</sup> “What Polling Tells Us About Investing in Children and Youth,” power point by Dave Metz, Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates, Oakland, CA, September 27, 2013