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SYNOPSIS (Executive Summary)

In preparing for the 2010 Census, the U.S. Census Bureau identified San Diego as the eleventh “hardest-to-count” county in the nation. The prospect of an “undercount” threatened San Diego’s share of public sector funding and political representation at the state and federal level for the coming decade.

In response the San Diego-based Foundation for Change launched a program of census outreach called “Make Yourself Count / Hágase Contar.” The program included a competitive grants program plus a campaign of training, networking and mobilizing for community leaders within San Diego’s immigrant, border and refugee communities. The campaign’s aim: to inspire “cultural brokers” to serve as trusted messengers about the importance of census participation.

At the same time, funders from across California were beginning to identify San Diego County as a critical battleground for the state’s political future. With the collaboration of eight other funders, the Foundation for Change pooled funds totaling $235,000 and, across the course of a 9-month campaign:

- awarded over $148,000 in grants to twenty-one organizations who demonstrated: a) already established relationships of trust with hard-to-reach populations; and b) specific plans for integrating the promotion of census participation into their already existing programmatic work;
- helped to coordinate efforts among a half-dozen local networks, consortia and multi-agency collaboratives engaged in census outreach and;
- trained over 300 participants representing more than 60 organizations at a series of gatherings for “census advocates.”

Led by the Foundation for Change’s bi-lingual program and communications staff, all of these engagements were offered in both English and Spanish.

Final results of the 2010 Census will not be released until early 2011, but already the Foundation for Change has measured a critical “intermediate outcome” – after participating in the campaign’s training program, community leaders reported themselves to be more knowledgeable about the importance of the census, more committed to advocating for census participation among their constituents, and more interested to collaborate with others working to promote the civic participation of San Diego’s under-represented populations.

From the outset the Foundation for Change embraced the 2010 Census as an opportunity for organizing and a springboard to future work. The “Make Yourself Count / Hágase Contar” campaign created a broad stage on which a diverse cast of characters assembled – from human rights activists to staff at agencies providing social services; from school-based parent associations to faith-based community organizers.

By mobilizing hundreds of trusted community leaders and dozens of community-
based organizations as census advocates, the campaign made visible the depth and breadth of the network engaged with immigrant, refugee and border communities in San Diego County. On August 7, 2010 the Foundation for Change hosted 62 leaders representing 42 organizations at a gathering for leaders to de-brief the census outreach campaign and explore “next steps” in the work of civic participation.

The energy, interest and commitment to collaboration that were on evidence throughout the campaign bode well for future work ... and for the prospect of creating a democracy that works for all Californians.

John Fanestil
Executive Director

Participants drain the coffee containers at the Foundation for Change’s oversubscribed February 20, 2010 training for census advocates. Almost 300 leaders from over 60 organizations serving immigrant, border and refugee communities gathered at Hoover High School in the City Heights neighborhood of San Diego for this event. (Photograph: Jena Olson, Vantage Photography)
SETTING THE STAGE (Background)

THE 2010 CENSUS ... AND THE THREAT OF AN “UNDERCOUNT” IN SAN DIEGO

Democracy in the United States is, in many ways, built on the foundation of the decennial census, first established by an Act of Congress in 1790. To this day:

- *The census determines the level of federal and state funding*, with hundreds of billions of federal and state dollars apportioned to local communities based on census data.
- *The census affects community planning*, informing community decisions on where to invest in roads, hospitals, and businesses as well as schools, elderly care, workforce training, and more.
- *The census determines political influence*, with decisions about political representation at the federal, state, and local levels based on census data.
- *The census helps ensure civil rights*, as advocates use census data to measure civil rights compliance.

Yet impoverished communities – those that stand to benefit most from census participation – are routinely undercounted. Among the reasons why:

- Limited English skills, owing to second-language learning and/or lower levels of education and literacy,
- Residence in so-called “unusual” housing, that is, crowded, dilapidated housing units, often with no standard mail address.
- Limited language and cultural competencies among Census Bureau employees;
- Public mistrust of surveys of all kinds, on the rise with growing concerns about confidentiality of personal information;
- Underfunding of census promotion by state and local governments in difficult economic times.

On top of these more general concerns, San Diego’s border, immigrant and refugee communities presented unique challenges to the Census Bureau.

**Border Communities: San Diego is shaped by bi-national residency.**

Some 50,000 vehicles and 25,000 pedestrians cross from Tijuana into San Diego County each day via the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry. Approximately the same number cross southbound each day. The vast majority of these regular border-crossers are people living in extended bi-national families, with relatives living in both Mexico and the United States. Thousands of individuals – no one knows exactly how many – maintain residences in both...
countries, raising questions about whom heads of households would choose to identify as U.S. residents in the Census.

**Immigrant Communities: many San Diegans live in “mixed-status” families.** More than 20 percent of San Diego County residents are foreign born and San Diego residents speak more than 80 different languages. Counting immigrant San Diegans presented two unique concerns:

- Tens of thousands of San Diegans (no one knows exactly how many) live in “mixed-status” families, with some relatives claiming Mexican (or other) citizenship, some claiming U.S. citizenship, some claiming dual citizenship. Many members of these mixed-status families live as residents of Tijuana with valid documents for entering the United States, many live as authorized permanent residents in the U.S. and, of course, some live in the United States without authorization. Families like these were likely to go unreported or, at minimum, under-reported in the 2010 Census.

- Fear of immigration enforcement authorities was running high in San Diego’s immigrant communities in the period leading up to the 2010 Census, and it appeared probable that this fear would be “generalized” to a suspicion of all government authorities, thus biasing many San Diegans against census participation. (This turned out to be the case, as immigration enforcement activities throughout the County increased continually across the first six months of 2010, the critical period for Census participation.) Some immigrant rights advocates were going so far as to urge immigrant families to boycott the census altogether.

**Refugee Communities: San Diego is a key refugee destination.** Apart from the complex demographic profile created by its location on the border and its large immigrant population, San Diego is also the third most popular refugee resettlement location in California. Many refugees who are first immigrated through the San Diego Port of Entry choose to stay – the county is now home to more than 30,000 refugee families, coming predominantly from East Africa, Southeast Asia and the Middle East. As newer arrivals to the U.S., speaking less familiar languages, and in many instances having suffered emotional distress (or even trauma) through the process of resettlement, refugee populations presented their own distinct challenges to the U.S. Census Bureau.

As the 2010 Census drew near, San Diego was identified as the 11th “hardest-to-count” county in the nation and is second only to Los Angeles County in California. Almost 700,000 San Diegans – more than 20 percent of the population – met criteria suggesting that their participation in the census would be difficult to secure. Was San Diego going to be counted out yet again … or could San Diegans count on change?
THE RISE OF “SOUTHERN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA”

A growing number of funders from across California (and the nation) have begun to think strategically about the demographic trends sweeping the state of California. These trends are only accelerating and must be taken very seriously by anyone interested to advance a statewide agenda.

Here are just a few key indicators that point to the future shape of the public landscape in California:

- According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2008 American Community Survey, over 56 percent of all Californians are people of color and 36 percent of all Californians are of Hispanic descent.
- The population of Latino voters in California grew by more than 900,000 between 2004 and 2008 … and similar rates of growth are expected for the foreseeable future.\(^{vi}\)

California’s demographic transformation is most striking in the southern part of the state. If it ever was, it is now neither helpful nor accurate to think of the State’s population as split evenly between “Northern California” and “Southern California.” In fact, as of 2008, over 61 percent of the state’s population was found in Southern California, as seen in this map:
Even more striking is the distribution of the Southern California population: 27 percent of Californians reside in Los Angeles County and another 28 percent reside in just four other southern California Counties: San Diego, San Bernardino, Riverside and Orange. (Imperial County contains less than one tenth of one percent of the State’s population.)

If these four “southern Southern California” counties – excluding Los Angeles – were combined into a single state, its population of 9 million would make it the eleventh largest state in the Union, ranking just behind North Carolina and ahead of New Jersey. Taken together, the population of these four Southern California counties is larger than the population of the ten smallest states combined.

As is sure to be cast in dramatic relief when the results of the 2010 Census are released in early 2011, the growing weight of this southern anchor to California’s population will change the electoral map of California in the coming years. Some analysts believe that between 2008 and 2012 some 600,000 new immigrant voters will have participated in elections in these four counties alone.

Champions of progressive causes must begin to invest now in building up a movement of leaders, organizations and networks that can reach these growing segments of California’s population. It is no longer prudent of actors pursuing statewide agendas to pretend that a comprehensive strategy can be built on a “Northern California strategy” focused on the Bay Area and a “Southern California strategy” focused on Los Angeles. Effective strategies for outreach and organizing in “southern Southern California” must be developed, nurtured, and expanded now.

San Diego County presents an entirely representative snapshot of this strategically critical part of the state. In 2008 the county’s population was identified as “majority minority” by the San Diego Association of Governments, and the growth of its immigrant populations is changing the shape of the county’s public life.

As the 2010 Census drew near a critical challenge was identified: how could organizations serving these emerging demographic constituencies be mobilized to take seriously their constituencies’ participation in the future of California?
CAST OF CHARACTERS (Allies)

The Foundation for Change is a progressive community foundation serving the San Diego/Tijuana region. The Foundation is presently pursuing three major initiatives, which it calls Democracy for All, Health for All and Equality for All. In each of these areas the Foundation prioritizes the work of advocacy and organizing (“change”) over the provision of services (“charity”), while recognizing that in marginalized communities it is often difficult to draw this distinction sharply. Reflective of its long history in “planting seeds of change,” the Foundation for Change also remains committed to support emerging leaders and building the capacity of grassroots, community-based organizations. With established credibility in the ethnic minority populations of the region – and with a bilingual (English/Spanish) program and communications staff – the Foundation for Change was uniquely positioned to mobilize a broad, local effort of census outreach. (For more see: www.foundation4change.org.)

Aware of its own limited capacity the Foundation for Change sought from the outset to pursue its agenda by aligning diverse resources for census outreach:

National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO). By design the Foundation for Change selected the name of its campaign to coincide with the “Ya Es Hora/Hágase Contar” campaign of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO). This allowed the Foundation to piggy-back off communications from NALEO and invest its limited resources in areas other than external communications. (The Foundation’s own communications efforts produced a promotional video profiling select grantees, and an opinion piece published in The San Diego Union-Tribune – see Appendix A, “We owe it to Ourselves ...”) The Foundation for Change also established very early a productive working relationship with local staff to the NALEO campaign, sharing contact information and inviting participation in all campaign events.

U.S. Census Bureau. The “Make Yourself Count/Hágase Contar” campaign was designed to ensure close collaboration with the efforts of the U.S. Census Bureau without seeking a formal alignment that might make the campaign appear an arm of the federal government. Foundation for Change staff connected quickly with a Partnership Specialist from the U.S. Census Bureau, and two of the Partnership Assistants working with him. These relationships were professional, productive and collaborative throughout the period of the census. (For a description of challenges faced in working with the Census Bureau, see “Plot Twists and Ad Libs” below).

Local Partners. Most importantly, the Foundation for Change established partnerships with a number of local networks, each engaged in some fashion with census outreach:

- the San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium partnered with Foundation for Change on a grant from Public Interest Projects;
• the San Diego Refugee Forum awarded stipends to 26 individuals from 13 member organizations with funding received from The California Endowment, the Foundation for Change and the Alliance Healthcare Foundation;
• the North County Farmworker CARE Coalition mobilized over one hundred community leaders with funding from The California Endowment and the Foundation for Change;
• the Frontera Asset Building Network awarded micro-grants to five member organizations in San Diego County;
• the United Way of San Diego County supported four of its agencies in the work of census outreach.

Each of these networks subscribed participants in the Foundation for Change’s program of training, networking and mobilization.

Trainers. As part of its program of training, networking and mobilization the Foundation for Change enlisted the support of the following allies:
• National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights
• California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
• National Latino Research Center at Cal State San Marcos
• Employee Rights Center
• NALÉO
• Healthy City
• California Participation Project
• Alliance for Justice
• Luna Law Associates
SCRIPT (Foundation for Change Strategy)

The Foundation for Change advances progressive causes in the San Diego/Tijuana region by mobilizing donors, awarding grants, developing leaders and building networks, as seen in this simple graphic:

- **DONORS**: Our program of donor education mobilizes resources for progressive causes.
- **GRANTS**: Our grants program funds local groups serving hard-to-reach communities.
- **LEADERS**: Our program in leadership development builds groups' capacity for maximum impact.
- **NETWORKS**: Our networking program brings groups together to take action around common concerns.

Having identified its key target populations for census outreach – the immigrant, border and refugee communities of San Diego County – the Foundation for Change next determined to pursue a unique strategy: to identify, incentivize (with financial stipends), train and mobilize “cultural brokers” with already established relationships of trust and influence in identified hard-to-count populations.

In pursuit of this strategy the Foundation determined:
- first, to identify organizations with proven track records in working with specific hard-to-count populations;
- second, to invite them to name individual advocates as part of their grant application. Some grant applicants identified “organizers” as census advocates, others identified “promotoras,” still others identified “leaders,” each according to their own organizational and cultural context.
- third, to encourage grantee organizations to “integrate census outreach into their already existing programming and activities,” instead of creating a “census outreach program.”
- finally, to create a leadership program for census advocates with training, networking and mobilization components (see “Implementation” below).

This strategy was also crafted to meet the needs of non-profit organizations facing difficult economic times. Across the non-profit sector in 2009/2010, organizations were reducing staff, juggling staffing assignments and, in general, struggling to make their annual budgets. The capacity to take on additional programming was severely limited, and the Foundation for Change felt strongly that its strategy of incentivizing organizations to support and train census advocates, rather than launch census programs, was the best course of action.
PLOT TWISTS and AD LIBS (Implementation)

MOBILIZING DONORS

With the support of other funders interested in this changing shape of California’s demographic map, the Foundation for Change assembled a total of $235,000 for census outreach. As noted in this chart, supporters of the Foundation for Change contributed in varying proportions:

- to a pooled fund for grant-making;
- to the Foundation’s program of training, networking and mobilization;
- and to a partial (7.5 percent) underwriting of administrative costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Projects</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>received 11/1/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas Jr. Fund (via Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>received 12/1/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The California Endowment</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>received 2/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Healthcare Foundation</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>received 2/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>received 2/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Received 3/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation (via GCIR)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>received 4/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price-Galinson Charities</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>received 4/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>235,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>147,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,000</strong></td>
<td>Received 3/1/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For a comprehensive expense report of the overall campaign, see page 23 of this report.)

The most sustained challenge confronting the Foundation for Change was that of planning for the scale of the project given the uncertainty of funding. As seen in the chart above, funding allocations continued to roll in straight through the active
period of the “Make Yourself Count/Hágase Contar” campaign. These delays in funding caused considerable uncertainty, even as the Foundation’s leadership was making what was, for an organization of small scale, a major commitment to the work of census outreach.

AWARDING GRANTS

As part of the work of soliciting grant applications, Foundation for Change staff and Grant Making Committee volunteers had to become advocates for census participation themselves. Resistance to participation was high, especially among organizations (human rights organizations, advocacy organizations) that were positioned as opponents of federal immigration policies or were more accustomed to playing the role of “watchdog” to federal government agencies. Other organizations expressed interest in funding, yet their capacity to “connect” with marginalized communities required careful vetting.

Through the course of the grant-making program, the Foundation for Change:
- offered technical assistance to 42 individuals representing 28 organizations at a Grant Writing Workshop on October 24, 2009.
- offered technical assistance to 11 individuals representing 9 organizations in face-to-face meetings.
- Received 28 applications and conducted site visits to 22 applicant organizations, from which 16 were selected for initial grant awards.

All of these engagements – including all grant materials – were available to applicants in both English and Spanish.

Across the course of the campaign the Foundation for Change awarded over $148,000 in grants to twenty-one organizations, including:
- 6 organizations reaching North County San Diego populations (with a focus on farmworker and urban day laborer populations);
- 2 serving East County San Diego populations (with a focus on refugee resettlement populations);
- 5 serving South County San Diego populations (with a focus on border and bi-national populations);
- 8 serving Central San Diego populations (includes City Heights and Diamond neighborhoods of Southeast San Diego, plus student populations from San Diego State University and San Diego City College).

Organizations funded directly by the Foundation for Change are listed here:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantmaking Disbursements</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Fiscal Agent (if applies)</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Pilgrim United Church of Christ</td>
<td>Asociación de Jornaleros de San Diego</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Bayside Community Center</td>
<td>Center for Social Advocacy</td>
<td>7,437.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Chula Vista Community Collaborative</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Access Inc.</td>
<td>Família Indígena Unida</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo</td>
<td>Frente Indígena de Organizaciones Binacionales</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>License to Freedom</td>
<td>License to Freedom</td>
<td>6,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>University Auxiliary &amp; Research Services</td>
<td>National Latino Research center at Cal State University San Marcos</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Somali Youth United</td>
<td>Somali Youth United</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Vision y Compromiso</td>
<td>Vision y Compromiso</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/26/2010</td>
<td>Labor's Training &amp; Community Development Alliance (LTCDA)</td>
<td>Employee Rights Center</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/09/2010</td>
<td>LTCDA</td>
<td>Proyecto de Casas Saludables</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2010</td>
<td>Prime Motivation</td>
<td>Little Saigon Foundation</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/23/2010</td>
<td>Hoover High School Parents Association</td>
<td>3,950.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03/03/2010</td>
<td>Center For Social Advocacy</td>
<td>Comite de Derechos Humanos</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03/24/2010</td>
<td>Survivors of Torture</td>
<td>San Diego Refugee Forum</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/15/2010</td>
<td>Los Niños International</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/15/2010</td>
<td>Sun &amp; Moon Vision Productions</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Grantmaking Disbursements</td>
<td>148,138.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For a comprehensive revenue report, see page 11 of this report.)

Because grantee organizations were encouraged to “integrate census outreach into their already existing programming and activities,” Foundation for Change census grantees pursued a wide variety of strategies. (For an at-a-glance representation of different strategies pursued by grantees, see Appendix B, “Strategy Map ...”)

Data are not available that would allow a quantitative comparison of the effectiveness of these different strategies. Through the work of participant
evaluator Blanca Romero, the Foundation for Change was able to measure, however, an intermediate outcome: enhancing the capacity and confidence of community leaders to advocate for civic participation.

**DEVELOPING LEADERS**

In addition to awarding grants, the Foundation for Change staffed a capacity-building program of networking, training, and mobilization that engaged leaders from over 60 distinct organizations engaged in census outreach. Relationships were facilitated through a series of engagements.

Subsequent to the grant-writing workshops, technical assistance and site visits mentioned above, Foundation for Change staff and Grant Making Committee volunteers:

- hosted 28 participants representing 17 grantee organizations at an orientation and networking session on January 16, 2010.
- hosted 280 participants representing more than 50 organizations at a training and mobilization for leaders and census advocates from census outreach organizations throughout San Diego County on February 20, 2010.
- hosted three “focus group” gatherings of Foundation for Change grantees in regional clusters (March – May, 2010).
- hosted 62 participants representing 42 organizations at a final de-briefing, networking and “next steps” gathering for leaders from census outreach and other civic participation organizations on August 7, 2010.

(NOTE: All of these engagements, except the final gathering for organizational leaders on August 7, were offered in both English and Spanish.)

At the February 20 training a total of 188 of the over 250 participants completed a survey, which produced these results:

- Over 79 percent of respondents identified themselves as either “informed” or “very informed” about the PURPOSE of the census;
- But only 75 percent considered themselves “informed” or “very informed” about the BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING in the census;
- And only 69 percent considered themselves “informed” or “very informed” about the CONSEQUENCES OF NOT PARTICIPATING in the census.

By re-visiting a random sample (41 respondents) at the end of the census campaign we were able to track changes in leaders’ knowledge about and confidence for the work of census outreach. The table below offers a summary of results from this random sample of respondents, and indicates that by the end of the campaign 95 percent of participants in the training program considered themselves to be “informed” or “very informed” about the census – its purpose, benefits and consequences – and “confident” or “very confident” in their ability to advocate for census participation. In a separate question (not reflected in this
Over 80 percent of respondents identified themselves more capable for and more committed to the work of census outreach than they were at the beginning of the campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How informed are you ..</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Not Informed</th>
<th>Informed</th>
<th>Very Informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… about the PURPOSE of CENSUS</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>61 27</td>
<td>34 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… about the BENEFITS of PARTICIPATING</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>46 31</td>
<td>39 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… about the CONSEQUENCES OF NOT PARTICIPATING</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>20 0</td>
<td>44 36</td>
<td>34 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How confident are you ..</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… in your ABILITY TO ADVOCATE for participation in the Census?</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>41 33</td>
<td>51 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers, representing percentage of respondents, have been rounded to the nearest whole.

For a detailed report of these evaluation findings, see Appendix C, “Survey Results …”

Knowledge and confidence notwithstanding, census advocates supported by Foundation for Change grantee organizations reported the following challenges to securing a complete count of San Diego’s immigrant, border and refugee communities:

- **Heightened immigration enforcement.** The expansion of immigration enforcement activities in San Diego County during the period of the census was reported consistently as a deterrent to census participation by many community advocates.
- **Language & Literacy Barriers.** These barriers limit some residents’ ability to understand and correctly fill out a form.
- **Frustrations with government.** These frustrations varied – from doubts that respondents would benefit from government programs to doubts about claims of future benefits in a current environment of cuts in government services.
- **Frustration over questions of ethnic identification.** To many immigrants and refugees, the categories of racial-ethnic identification
employed by the U.S. Census Bureau can appear partial, arbitrary and/or confusing. This presents a deterrent to completion of the form.

- **Coordinating with Census Bureau personnel.**
  - **Cutting Turf.** Only as the date of the February 20 training approached did the Foundation learn that, while staff had connected well with the partnership specialist assigned responsibility for central and southern portions of San Diego County, connections had not been well-established with census staff assigned responsibility for North County San Diego. As a funder of diverse groups we were working “across boundaries” and the (sometimes competing) agendas and jurisdictions of census staff were not always well understood by Foundation staff.
  - **Staffing assignments.** The roll-out of census staff resulted in a continual shuffling of assignments, especially at the level of Partnership Assistant, which is supposed to be the principal point of contact for community-based organizations. The game of musical chairs made it difficult for many Foundation for Change grantees to establish productive working relationships with the census.
  - **Quality of Staff.** The quality of staff participation from Census employees – with regard to public presentations, for instance – was variable. Second-language capacity (even in Spanish) was uneven and English-language materials were often used in second-language presentations.
  - **Availability of Language Materials.** The release of materials in additional languages (other than the early languages identified for translation) was delayed to the point that these were of little use. Challenges such as these notwithstanding, the Foundation for Change was, overall, impressed with the quality of local Census Bureau staff and resources and is grateful to the key staff who collaborated most closely with the “Make Yourself Count / Hágase Contar” Campaign.

**BUILDING NETWORKS**

Through its campaign promoting census outreach, the Foundation for Change was privileged to serve as a convener for a conversation that engaged a wide range of stakeholders – from human rights activists to social service providers; from school-based parent associations to faith-based community organizers. By mobilizing hundreds of trusted community leaders and dozens of community-based organizations as census advocates, the campaign made visible the depth and breadth of the network engaged with immigrant, refugee and border communities in San Diego County.

Of particular interest is the number of formal networks, consortia and multi-agency collaboratives that have been born in San Diego within the past five years. A number of these emerging collaborations engaged as formal partners in the “Make Yourself Count / Hágase Contar,” but there are many others which also share a stake in promoting strategies of civic participation in San Diego’s under-represented
communities. Further study of these multiple and overlapping networks is warranted.

Raul Martinez and Clare Nolan of Harder & Company Community Research have mapped the maturation of other networks through stages like this:

At this level partners are aware of other agencies, but do not define roles. Agencies communicate occasionally and make decisions independently.

At this level partners share information, communicate frequently, and there are some defined roles and some shared decision-making. Fewer interactions are reported than at the networking level.

At this level partners share information and resources, communicate frequently with mutual trust, and make decisions jointly. Partners report the fewest total interactions at any levels.

Within the immigrant, refugee and border communities of San Diego County, a broad movement from "networking" to "coordination" (using the above criteria) can be seen in the development in recent years of a number of collaborative organizations. These collaborative organizations show varied strength and depth, and varied levels of indigenous leadership capacity, but they each have sustained themselves now across several years and show signs of maturation. Some of these networks include (year of launch is listed in parenthesis): the North County Farm Worker CARE Coalition (2004) the Frontera Asset Building Network (2005), the San Diego Refugee Forum (2007), and the San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium (2007).

**FINAL NOTE: STAFFING**

As the scope and the scale of the campaign grew, the Foundation for Change staff found itself stretched to the limit. Uncertainty of funding had prevented the Foundation from hiring a half-time program officer dedicated uniquely to the campaign. As a result the Executive Director and existing Program Officer at the Foundation added the campaign’s direction to their plate. As funds were secured, part-time staff were added (grants management, communications, specifically), but this staffing strategy was not as efficient as dedicated staff would have been.
RESOLUTIONS (Findings)

Foundation for Change staff encourages funders and others promoting civic participation to consider these findings from the census outreach efforts in San Diego.

- **Invest in advocacy.** Upfront investments enabling organizations with cultural competencies in immigrant communities to help shape the content and contours of government programs – whether these are citizenship programs, voter registration, census outreach, or whatever – will pay dividends in the form of these programs’ cultural accessibility.

- **Align funding strategies early.** Alignment of funding strategies well ahead of proposed civic participation campaigns can assist local organizations in planning and implementing effectively for maximum impact. Commitments of funding in year A, for instance, can allow community-based organizations to include civic participation programming in their annual budgets and staffing plans for year B.

- **Assess Capacity Realistically.** Foundation for Change staff can see in the work of its grantees – and in the work of the Foundation itself – the price that is paid by expecting too much of small organizations with limited staffing capacity. By rewarding grantees for being realistic about their current capacity and by shaping program grants at an appropriate scale, funders can assist grantees in accomplishing realistic program outcomes and, simultaneously, build organizational capacity.

- **Focus on “cultural brokers.”** The focus on community leaders as cultural brokers for civic participation was deeply appreciated and uniformly endorsed by Foundation for Change grantees. One reported their experience in promoting census participation this way: "Only líderes, who represent their local neighborhoods, can serve as cultural and linguistic liaisons ... , bridging the information divide existing in the most disadvantaged and vulnerable communities."

- **Build Networks.** Bringing groups together across lines of race and ethnicity, geography and organizational type makes it possible for leaders to discover unexpected opportunities for collaboration and mutual support. In their final reports submitted to the Foundation for Change, census grantees consistently cited new relationships with allied leaders and organizations as a highly valued outcome of their work in census outreach.

- **Use campaigns as building blocks.** The experience of the Foundation for Change with census outreach in San Diego suggests that well-coordinated campaigns promoting specific civic participation efforts can advance the
commitment and capacity of leaders from marginalized communities to pursue the work of civic participation in other arenas. Civic participation efforts should not be organized as “one-off” campaigns, but as building blocks toward enhanced civic participation capacity for the long haul.

- **Measure differential outcomes.** With advance planning and a larger investment in evaluation resources, the Foundation for Change believes it possible to conduct a more outcomes-based assessment of its civic participation strategies. By targeting outreach efforts on select neighborhoods, for instance, while identifying like neighborhoods as a control group, differential outcomes could have been measured in the census outreach campaign in San Diego. Approaches like this may help to quantify the “return on investment” that can be expected from the strategy of mobilizing cultural brokers for civic participation.

Carlos Diaz of the OGMA Group, Inc. offers simultaneous interpretation (English/Spanish) at the February 20, 2010 training. *(Photograph: Jena Olson, Vantage Photography)*
SEQUELS (Next Steps)

The “Make Yourself Count/Hágase Contar” campaign became a centerpiece of the Foundation for Change’s work in 2010 … and is decisively shaping its work moving forward.

Following the lead of a number of its funding partners, the Foundation for Change pursued its census outreach campaign as the first “stepping stone” onto a path of continued work in the realm of civic participation. Opportunities for future engagement in this arena include: re-districting, immigrant integration, citizenship promotion, voter registration, voter education, and get-out-the-vote.

The values of the Foundation for Change (in particular the values of “justice” and “inclusivity”) lead us to seek the transformation of San Diego’s public landscape. While representation in elected office is not, in and of itself, a measure of democratic vitality, when the ethnic composition of a population and its elected leaders are as far out-of-whack as they are at present in San Diego County, there is, clearly, a “democratic disconnect.” Consider, for instance, the racial-ethnic composition of the most prominent San Diego officeholders at the County level at the time of this report’s release (September, 2010). x
Without intending any critique of the County’s current officeholders, it is clear that San Diego’s ethnic minority populations remain quite distinctly “under-represented.”

With the “Make Yourself Count/Hágase Contar” campaign now completed, the Foundation for Change is in active conversation with funders from across California about pursuing an ongoing agenda of civic participation. The Foundation’s leaders are interested to learn how this agenda intersects with the work of others investing in the future of San Diego and “southern Southern California.” Funders and allies interested to pursue this conversation should feel free to contact one of the following:

- Cathy Cha, Program Officer, Haas Jr. Fund - Cathy@haasjr.org
- John Fanestil, Executive Director, Foundation for Change - john@foundation4change.org
- Andrea Rocha, Program Officer, Foundation for Change - andrea@foundation4change.org

For now the Foundation for Change is looking forward to the early 2011 release of 2010 Census data. Numbers like the ones below (gathered from a variety of sources) give a glimpse of the future that 2010 census data are sure to suggest:

- More San Diegans under the age of 18 are of Hispanic ancestry (40 percent of the total) than are of white/Anglo heritage (39 percent).\textsuperscript{xi}
- Almost 150,000 San Diegans are eligible right now to apply for U.S. citizenship (this before the passage of any comprehensive immigration reform legislation).\textsuperscript{xii}
- Over 600,000 eligible San Diego County residents are not registered to vote.\textsuperscript{xiii}

More than ever, the Foundation for Change is committed to pursue a future for San Diego that is characterized by “Democracy for All.” To learn more about this initiative, please visit: http://foundation4change.org/causes-democracy.php.
# Budget

**Make Yourself Count**

November 1, 2009-August 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Executive Leadership (.1 FTE)</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Executive Director @ .25 FTE for 10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Organizer / Trainer (.5 FTE)</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Program Officer @ .25 FTE for 10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Admin. Support (.5 FTE)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>Grants Manager @ .25 FTE for 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communications Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Communications Manager @ .25 FTE for 10 months (instead of consultants below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits @ 25%</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>11,703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>58,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Graphic Design</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>See Communications Staff above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Communications/Video</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>See Communications Staff above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Translation</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>translation services Feb 20 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Evaluation / Reporting</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>Contract Participant Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Training</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>travel, honoraria to speakers for Feb 20, Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fiscal Agency</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Partnerships on grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Consultant(s)</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>16,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Expenses (i.e. copying/printing, postage, supplies, etc.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Postage/Printing</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>Grant Making Committee, Focus Groups, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Laptop computer (1)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>laptop plus network upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meetings Misc.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>includes staff travel, meals, expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office Expenses</strong></td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (i.e. conferences, meetings, travel, etc.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Grants</td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>148,138</td>
<td>total grants disbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transportation</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>buses for Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>300 meals /coffee for Feb 20; 90 for Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Facility Rentals</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>facilities for Feb 20, Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Costs</strong></td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>158,873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>237,434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIRECT COSTS (i.e. overhead) - rent, utilities, infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>in-kind from Foundation for Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For a comprehensive revenue report of the overall campaign, see page 12 of this report.)
CREDITS (Thank you!)

Alor Calderon, Employee Rights Center
Andrea Guerrero, Equality Alliance
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APPENDIX A – “We owe it to ourselves to count all.”

SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 2010

BY JOHN FANESTIL

As they do to people living elsewhere across the United States, the coming months present to those of us who call San Diego County home a once-in-a-decade opportunity to take an honest look at ourselves.

I refer, of course, to the 2010 Census.

From the time that Congress first mandated “the enumeration of the inhabitants of the United States” in 1790, Americans have understood that there is nothing more basic to our democracy than the notion that every individual counts. The decennial census gives us a chance to consider whether our democracy really works for all of us.

But this will be a difficult year to obtain an accurate count all of the region’s residents. Because San Diego County is home to so many immigrant, refugee and cross-border households, it has been ranked by the U.S. Census Bureau as the 11th “hardest-to-count” county in the United States.

Gaps of language and literacy are the most obvious obstacles to securing immigrant participation in the census, but there are many more: limited experience with, and sense of belonging to, the civic process; economic hardship and dislocation, from which immigrants suffer more than most; a sense of frustration and confusion over the limited choices offered by the census form for specifying racial and ethnic identity.

Worse, a generalized atmosphere of anti-immigrant sentiment and heightened enforcement of immigration law will make it even more difficult to convince many immigrants and refugees to participate. Some immigrant rights advocates have gone so far as to urge immigrants to boycott the census altogether. If even a single household member believes participation in the census may jeopardize his or her immigration status, the entire household may refuse to be enumerated.

We cannot afford to have our fellow residents go uncounted. If we allow this to happen, we stand to lose out on our political representation (states use census data to draw political boundaries), and on hundreds of millions of dollars in federal government disbursements. For each person not counted, according to the Brookings Institute, San Diego County will lose an estimated $12,000 over the next 10 years in federal funding alone. State, county and local governments also use census data in designing and funding public programs. In times like these, it just doesn’t make sense for San Diego County residents to leave money on the table for others to take.

Across the state, foundations are supporting outreach campaigns to promote immigrant participation in the census. Here in San Diego County, the Foundation for Change, working with the California Endowment and other local funders, is spearheading a campaign: “Make Yourself Count/Hágase Contar” to mobilize trusted community leaders as passionate advocates for census participation. (The slogan for the campaign is drawn from a national media campaign sponsored by NALEO, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials.)

Through this campaign, dozens of organizations with deep roots in San Diego County’s immigrant and refugee communities will receive grants totaling close to $150,000 to engage in the work of advocating for participation in the census. The campaign will supplement the work of the Census Bureau itself, whose capable staff is working hard to engage community-based organizations in hard-to-count neighborhoods as formal census partners.

Especially in the current environment, only credible leaders with already established relationships of trust will be able to persuade many immigrants that participating in the census is worthwhile.

Some San Diego County residents may feel unsettled by our region’s changing demographics. But I like to think of the census as truth-telling time. In the coming weeks and months we are being invited to step up to the mirror and consider who we really are as a community – who, in fact, we have always been.

Perhaps someday future generations will look back on 2010 as the year we finally embraced San Diego County’s true identity as a border metropolis with a vast, diverse and vibrant population of immigrants and refugees.

Fanestil is executive director of the Foundation for Change in San Diego.
APPENDIX B – Foundation for Change Grantee Strategy Map

Overview
The purpose of these pages is to provide a visualization of the organizations involved in the Census 2010 Advocacy Campaign. In this page, you will find a Map Key of the San Diego locations of each mapped organization. Below are 5 General Census Advocacy Categories which generalize and place into categories the strategies connected to each organization. Please note that, even if not specifically stated, all organizations use “indigenous hiring” as part of their strategy. “Indigenous hiring” refers to the use of “promotoras” and “promotores”, or community volunteers, who 1) speak the language of the targeted group and 2) have the trust of the target group by either working for it, in it, or by being part of the community. In addition, these community members have a strong commitment to advocating for the participation of their community in the Census 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>North County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Linda Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>City Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>South Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 General Census Advocacy Categories

1. Events: This category refers to organized events that will be promoting community participation in the Census 2010. This category refers to events such as fundraisers, cultural events and other community events that are expected to draw large numbers of community members and/or high visibility. This category includes education, one-on-one, referrals, and promotions.

2. One-on-One: This category refers to activity in which advocates of community participation in the Census 2010 will be engaged on a one-on-one basis with an individual of the advocate’s respective community. This category includes, for example, door-to-door canvassing or specific home visits. This category includes education, referrals, and promotions.

3. Education: This category refers to 1) presentations that educate on the importance of the Census and that advise their respective community to participate in the Census 2010 and 2) trainings and workshops that will teach/train community advocates on how to promote the participation of their community in the Census 2010. This category can possibly include referrals, events, and one-on-one education and advocacy.

4. Referrals: This category refers to activity that will guide community members towards census sites, information, and educational resources, for example. This category can include education and one-on-on. The referee, however, would have been educated and trained in order to provide referrals.

5. Promotion: This category refers to advocating for community participation in the Census 2010 by promoting the Census through announcements, promotional materials, and literature. This category includes, to a smaller scale, education, one-on-one, referrals. This category may be part of the events and education categories.
APPENDIX C – Survey Results: Commitment and Capacity
AUGUST, 2010
BY BLANCA ROMERO


A survey was created for the February 20th Gathering; we were successful in surveying almost all of the attendees. The participants were very diverse in backgrounds, information, and roles in both communities and organizations.

GOAL

The goal of the survey was to measure the knowledge and attitude of all the participants.

QUESTIONS

There were four basic questions in the survey:

1. How informed are you on the PURPOSE of the Census 2010?
2. How informed are you on the BENEFITS of PARTICIPATING in the Census 2010?
3. How informed are you on the CONSEQUENCES of NOT participating in the Census 2010?
4. How confident are you on your ability to advocate in the Census 2010?

There were four basic answer choices for questions 1-3:

1. Don't Know
2. Not Informed
3. Informed
4. Very Informed

There were four similar answer choices for question 4:

1. Don't Know
2. Not Confident
3. Confident
4. Very Confident

OUTCOME

There was a total of 188 Survey Participants. See “Population Survey” for Results.

QUESTION 1: PURPOSE

Out of the 188 participants: 6.3% Responded Don't Know, 14.2% were Not Informed, 56.8% were Informed, and 22.7% were Very Informed. Together, 79.5% of the Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the PURPOSE of Census 2010.

QUESTION 2: BENEFITS

Out of the 188 participants: 8.0% Responded Don't Know, 17.0% were Not Informed, 47.7% were Informed, and 27.3% were Very Informed. Together, 75.0% of the Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the BENEFITS of participation in the Census 2010.

QUESTION 3: CONSEQUENCES

Out of the 188 participants: 6.7% Responded Don't Know, 24.2% were Not Informed, 46.1% were Informed, and 23.0% were Very Informed. Together, 69.1% of the Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the CONSEQUENCES of NOT participation in the Census 2010.

QUESTION 4: CONFIDENCE
Out of the 188 participants: 5.7% responded Don’t Know, 8.5% were Not Confident, 42.0% were Confident, and 43.8% were Very Confident. Together, 85.8% of the Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be CONFIDENT in their ability to advocate for participation in the Census 2010.

**KEY FINDINGS:**

- The most common category amongst the answer choices was the “Informed” category for Questions 1-3
- The highest category was “Very Confident” for Question 4.
- More participants were Informed, or Very Informed, of the Benefits of participating than of the Consequences of not participating in the Census 2010. (+ 5.9%)
- More participants were Informed, or Very Informed, of the Purpose of the Census 2010 than on the Benefits of Participating in the Census 2010. (+ 4.5%)
- More participants were Confident, or Very Confident, on their ability to advocate for participation in the Census 2010 than on their knowledge of Purpose (+6.3%), Benefits (+10.8%), and Consequences (+16.7%).

**SELECTED SAMPLE POPULATION: SURVEY PART 1**

Out of the 188 participants, those that had an e-mail address were invited to participate in a similar online survey. 41 participants responded to invitation. The responses of these 41 participants were then filtered from the 188 participants to create new population results (Part1) to compare to new results (Part 2). While the process of filtering out responses based on e-mail availability and online response is a drawback in that it filters out “community” participants, for the purpose of comparison, accessibility, and time, this method proved the most logistically possible.

**GOAL**

To create a Selected SAMPLE Population as the basis for comparison.

**QUESTIONS**

The question and answer choices remain the same.

**OUTCOME**

There was a total of 41 Sample Survey Participants (21.8% of the Population).

See "SampleSurveyPart1" for Results.

**QUESTION 1: PURPOSE**

Out of the 41 participants: 2.4% Responded Don’t Know, 2.4% were Not Informed, 61.0% were Informed, and 34.1% were Very Informed. Together, 94.1% of the Selected Sample Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the PURPOSE of Census 2010.

**QUESTION 2: BENEFITS**

Out of the 41 participants: 2.2% Responded Don’t Know, 12.2% were Not Informed, 46.3% were Informed, and 39.0% were Very Informed. Together, 85.3% of the Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the BENEFITS of participation in the Census 2010.

**QUESTION 3: CONSEQUENCES**

Out of the 41 participants: 2.4% Responded Don’t Know, 19.5% were Not Informed, 43.9% were Informed, and 34.1% were Very Informed. Together, 78.0% of the Selected Sample Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the CONSEQUENCES of NOT participation in the Census 2010.

**QUESTION 4: CONFIDENCE**

Out of the 41 participants: 0.0% responded Don’t Know, 7.7% were Not Confident, 41.0% were Confident, and 51.3% were Very Confident. Together, 92.3% of the Selected Sample Population present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be CONFIDENT in their ability to advocate for participation in the Census 2010.
KEY FINDINGS:

- The most common category amongst the answer choices was the “Informed” category for Questions 1-3.
- The highest category was “Very Confident” for Question 4.
- More participants were Informed, or Very Informed, of the Benefits of participating than of the Consequences of not participating in the Census 2010. (+7.3%)
- More participants were Informed, or Very Informed, of the Purpose of the Census 2010 than on the Benefits of Participating in the Census 2010. (±8.8%)
- Slightly fewer participants were Confident, or Very Confident, than participants knowledgeable of the purpose of the census 2010. (-1.8%)

SELECTED SAMPLE POPULATION: SURVEY PART 2

As mentioned before, 41 participants completed this survey.

GOAL

To measure changes in knowledge and attitude from the beginning of the campaign to the end of the campaign.

QUESTIONS

This survey contained 8 questions, 4 new questions, and 4 similar to the initial survey:

NEW QUESTIONS:

1. Since February 20th 2010, are you MORE informed on the PURPOSE of the Census 2010?
2. Since February 20th 2010, are you MORE informed on the BENEFITS of PARTICIPATING in the Census 2010?
3. Since February 20th 2010, are you MORE informed on the CONSEQUENCES of NOT participating in the Census 2010?
4. Since February 20th 2010, did you become MORE confident in your ability to advocate for participation in the Census 2010?

ANSWER CHOICES:

1. More
2. Less
3. Same
4. Don’t Know

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. How informed are you NOW on the PURPOSE of the Census 2010?
2. How informed are you NOW on the BENEFITS of PARTICIPATING in the Census 2010?
3. How informed are you NOW on the CONSEQUENCES of NOT participating in the Census 2010?
4. How confident are you NOW in your ability to have successfully advocated for participation in the Census 2010?

ANSWER CHOICES:

1. Don’t Know
2. Not Informed and Not Confident
3. Informed and Confident
4. Very Informed and Very Confident

OUTCOME

There was a total of **41 Sample Survey Participants** (21.8% of the Population).

See “SampleSurveyPart2” for Results.
NEW QUESTION 1: PURPOSE
Out of the 41 participants: **90.2% felt More Informed**, 0.0% felt Less Informed, 7.3% felt the Same and 2.4% Didn’t Know.

NEW QUESTION 2: BENEFITS
Out of the 41 participants: **76.9% felt More Informed**, 2.6% felt Less Informed, 20.5% felt the Same and 0.0% Didn’t Know.

NEW QUESTION 3: CONSEQUENCES
Out of the 41 participants: **82.1% felt More Informed**, 2.6% felt Less Informed, 12.8% felt the Same and 2.6% Didn’t Know.

NEW QUESTION 4: CONFIDENCE
Out of the 41 participants: **82.1% felt More Confident**, 2.6% felt Less Confident, 15.4% felt the Same and 0.0% Didn’t Know.

**KEY FINDINGS:**
- The majority of the selected sample participants felt more informed and more confident.
- We hope that this information suggests that, most of the February 20th 188 participants also felt more confident.

**SIMILAR QUESTION 1: PURPOSE**
Out of the 41 participants: 2.4% Responded Don’t Know, 2.4% were Not Informed, 26.8% were Informed, and **68.3% were Very Informed**. Together, **95.1% of the Selected Sample Population** present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the PURPOSE of Census 2010. (**+1.0% from Selected Sample Survey Part 1**)

**SIMILAR QUESTION 2: BENEFITS**
Out of the 41 participants: 2.6% Responded Don’t Know, 0.0% were Not Informed, 30.8% were Informed, and **66.7% were Very Informed**. Together, **97.5% of the Population** present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the BENEFITS of participation in the Census 2010. (**+12.2% from Selected Sample Survey Part 1**)

**SIMILAR QUESTION 3: CONSEQUENCES**
Out of the 41 participants: 2.6% Responded Don’t Know, 0.0% were Not Informed, 35.9% were Informed, and **61.5% were Very Informed**. Together, **97.4% of the Selected Sample Population** present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be Informed on the CONSEQUENCES of NOT participation in the Census 2010. (**+19.4% from Selected Sample Survey Part 1**)

**SIMILAR QUESTION 4: CONFIDENCE**
Out of the 41 participants: 2.6% responded Don’t Know, 2.6% were Not Confident, 33.3% were Confident, and **61.7% were Very Confident**. Together, **95.0% of the Selected Sample Population** present at the February 20th Gathering claimed to be CONFIDENT in their ability to advocate for participation in the Census 2010. (**+2.7% from Selected Sample Survey Part 1**)

**KEY FINDINGS:**
- The most common category went from “Informed” to “Very Informed” when comparing Survey Part 1 to Survey Part 2.
- Together, the Selected Sample Population was almost equally informed in Purpose, Benefits, and Consequences, and was almost as equally Confident.
- The Benefits and Consequences categories had the most significant increase in Informed and Very Informed results.
• We hope that these results suggest that the overall 188 participants became more knowledgeable than they originally were and that those that were less knowledgeable in some areas became more knowledgeable in them.
• We hope that this information suggest that those that were not informed or not confident became informed and confident throughout the course of the campaign.
• We also hope that this partially represents the work of the advocates in that they were able to transform a community member who was not informed into an informed one.
APPENDIX D – “Undercounting Latinos Again”
MAY, 2010
BY ARCELA NUNEZ-ALVAREZ AND FABIOLA GASTELUM

Latinos and immigrants in San Diego County have been greatly undercounted in previous decennials and it is happening again.

Hence, in an effort to improve access to 2010 census resources and information in Latino, immigrant and farmworker communities in North San Diego County, the National Latino Research Center (NLRC) at California State University San Marcos has partnered with The California Endowment, The Foundation for Change, National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund, Frontera Asset Building Network, Vista Community Clinic, Community Housing Works, the Farmworker CARE Coalition and dozens of community leaders representing Poder Popular para la Salud del Pueblo, a grassroots community-building initiative working to improve conditions of farmworkers and their families.

Outreach Via Cultural Liaisons
Building on a sophisticated community infrastructure of grassroots leadership sustained through Poder Popular para la Salud del Pueblo, NLRC and partner organizations have trained over one hundred community leaders known as Líderes Comunitarios. Líderes, who represent their local neighborhoods serve as cultural and linguistic liaisons transmitting news and information to families who live in remote regions of the county, bridging the information divide existing in the most disadvantaged and vulnerable communities. Líderes conduct informational presentations urging families to complete and return census questionnaires and assist families to complete census questionnaires whenever families solicit their support.

Persistent Challenges
Despite efforts to promote a complete and accurate 2010 census count, several challenges persist. NLRC has documented the following:

1) Pervasive anti-immigrant environment and climate throughout San Diego County perpetuates a culture of fear and intimidation. In some communities, such fear has paralyzed social activity and community interactions.

2) Methodology employed to count farmworkers and migrants in encampments is flawed and culturally and linguistically inappropriate. Information regarding location of where encampments are located is considered extremely sensitive information for many community-based organizations due to historical assaults against these individuals. Conflicting information has been provided regarding enumeration in these locations.

3) Methodology employed to count Latinos and farmworkers living on reservations is flawed and culturally inappropriate. Complex historical relations between Latinos and Native Americans/American Indians in the region limit information on Latinos living on reservations.

4) Methodology to count Latinos in rural communities is flawed. Specifically, Latinos who live on farms and groves are reporting not having received questionnaires from their employers nor are they being counted by their employers. Since they do not have individual home addresses it will be difficult to verify their residence even if they mail-in questionnaires. Hence, an undercount of farmworkers living on farms is very likely.

5) Information regarding Questionnaire Assistance Centers has not been readily available for organizations and community leaders to disseminate during outreach presentations. Líderes encounter language problems and cultural insensitivity from staff at QACs.

6) Census questions asking about race and ethnicity are very confusing, especially for immigrants who are not as familiar with the history of race and ethnic relations in the United States. Census needs to more clearly and scientifically define terminology to make it more understandable and provide a guide describing the meaning of each category.
APPENDIX E – “Focus Group Findings”

JULY, 2010

BY BLANCA ROMERO

INTRODUCTION

Goal

To learn of the achievements and challenges in the “census participation advocacy” efforts, as well as provide an opportunity to share strategies that could help overcome the challenges.

Structure

17 Organizations were asked to have two members represent their organization in a focus group. The focus groups were defined by region for a total of four focus group clusters: 1) North County, 2) City Heights, 3) South Bay, and 4) East County.

60 minutes were allocated for the focus group discussion and an official Census Representative used 30 minutes for a presentation. Organizations that were unable to attend the focus group scheduled for their cluster were urged to participate in an over the phone interview. There was an organizational attempt at bringing these organizations together for a final focus group. Due to conflict in schedules, it was logistically beneficial to conduct the phone interviews only. Interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes.

Both the focus groups and the interviews were semi-structured and were guided by the following questions, which were defined as primary, secondary, and tertiary due to limits in time but are all equally important in evaluating the Census Advocacy Campaign.

Primary Questions:

• What is the most common response you have experienced to date?
• What is one achievement in your “census participation advocacy” efforts?
• What is one challenge in your “census participation advocacy” efforts?

Secondary Questions:

• What is one strategy, or opportunity, that could help us overcome the challenges mentioned?
• What have you learned that is helpful to your work or the work of other organizations present here?

Tertiary Question:

• Have you any formal partnerships with the Census? Please explain why or why not.

Outcome

There were a total of three focus groups gatherings, the East County Organizations were unable to send representatives due to conflicts in schedules. Interviews, however, are available for the East County Organizations.

• The three focus groups had a total of 21 participants, representing 12 organizations.
• There were 5 interviews conducted for 5 organizations.
• There were a total of 26 participants representing 17 organizations.

KEY FINDINGS

Reasons for Not Participating in Census

• **Questionnaire Discarded or Never Received**
• **1+ Household:** There was more than one household living at a given residence. Secondary households were unsure if primary household had counted additional residents.
• **Government and Immigration:** There was a fear of government due to immigration status and ICE “raids.” Census is a government entity.
• **NO Benefits:** Seeing NO benefits for individual or community, since not all may “qualify” for government benefits due to immigration status.
Language & Literacy Barriers: Beyond the ability to comprehend the language, there is the ability to understand and correctly fill out a form. Community members could not understand the questionnaire nor had they the literacy skills required to complete the form.

HARM Potential: Community members are afraid that completing the questionnaire has the potential to harm individuals and entire communities.

CURRENT budget cuts: Ironic to “Claimed” FUTURE benefits with CURRENT budget cuts.

Reasons for Participating in Census

- **Trust:** In Human Rights Organizations
- **Adequate Literature & Education:** Literature, Information, Language, and Education by human rights organizations adequate for target community.
- **Legitimacy of Census:** Passive Acceptance of Census because Legitimate under Government.
- **Awareness:** Many people were not aware of the census.

Challenges in Census Outreach

- **Census Staff:** Some Census Staff gave wrong or inadequate information, some were inaccessible, and some caused frustration for community organizers. Community felt like some Census staff lacked concern for community and had their own agendas.
- **Infrastructure:** Lack of office support, lack of staff, volunteers, and time. Lack of better-defined structure/organization.
- **Materials:** Lack of Materials.
- **Adequate Literature:** Lack of Literature in Language.
- **Race and Ethnicity:** Race and Ethnicity created much confusion.
- **ICE “Raids”:** ICE raids or false alarms during Census Campaign.

Achievements in Census Outreach

- **Network and Visibility:** Campaign gave organizations the ability to expand their network and become more visible in the community. Trust also increased.
- **Education→Civic Engagement:** Success in educating community indicates as a step towards civic engagement.
- **Census Staff Support:** Positive census support correlated with ability to communicate with individual census leaders. No support from census staff resulted in lack of materials, which mostly affected the Official Census but not the work of the organizations (in advocating for census participation because organizations created their own material).
- **Trust:** Grassroots outreach advocacy efforts proved successful due to the organizations’ established trust within specific populations/communities.
- **Funding:** Funding provided for this campaign allowed organizations to advocate for civic participation since it allowed the use of “Census” as an entry theme to larger themes.

LESSONS LEARNED IN CENSUS OUTREACH CAMPAIGN

- **Planning & Resources:** In the structured timeline, more time for the campaign would have been beneficial. Learning about and planning to use resources also beneficial to do before beginning of actual advocacy and not during.
- **Communication and Collaboration:** Attempt to communicate and collaborate with other organizations before and not during advocacy efforts.
- **TRUST:** Proved extremely important in advocacy.
- **Civic Engagement:** Commitment to Civic Engagement has lead organization to advocate for participation in census questionnaire and an opportunity to hear the voices of “hard to count” communities. Participation is a step towards civic engagement. Unprecedented Census advocacy for “hard to count” communities in San Diego border; important to prepare for future civic engagement and civic responsibility.
- **Fear versus Benefits:** Tensions between fear of government and the potential of participation to harm communities versus future funds for children. Especially in mixed-status (immigration status) families.
- **Limited Resources & Infrastructure:** Lack of staff, office, and funding resource, especially when campaign as “attachment” to organizations’ current work.
ENDNOTES

i From a “Census Coordination Concept Paper” prepared by Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees (GCIR).

ii Among the factors affecting “the most undercounted groups,” Kissam and Jacobs cite “limited-English, lower levels of educational attainment and literacy, … living in what is referred to as ‘unusual’ housing, that is, crowded, dilapidated housing units, often with no standard mail address.” Edward Kissam and Ilene Jacobs, in a paper prepared for California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA).

iii http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06073.html


v Los Angeles County was estimated to have 4.4 million hard-to-count individuals and San Diego County has 676,357. The numbers were generated by the Brookings Institution and are available at www.thecensusproject.org.

vi Source: Andrew Wong, PowerPAC. http://powerpac.org/.

vii Source: Andrew Wong, PowerPAC. http://powerpac.org/.


x Offices surveyed for this assessment of “County-wide” offices include U.S. House of Representatives, San Diego County Supervisor, California State Assembly and California State Senate.


xii In a 2008 GCIR report that can be found at http://www.gcir.org/publications/gcirpubs/voters), there were 145,662 immigrant in SD County eligible to apply for citizenship.

xiii California Secretary of State, see: http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/elections_u.htm.