2022 SUMMER LEARNING: TRENDS, ANALYSIS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY

THE GREATER LA
EDUCATION FOUNDATION

Los Angeles County
Office of Education

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Summer is a unique time for play and learning that looks different than the traditional school year. However, there has long been unequal access to these opportunities based on a family's ability to pay out of pocket and the very limited public resources for summer programs.

That has shifted dramatically in the last year or more as federal, state, and local leaders have invested millions to expand the depth and breadth of summer programs for all students, especially those most underserved, to combat the multiple negative impacts of the pandemic and school closures. In summer 2021, Los Angeles County school districts and their partners stepped up to serve more students than ever before and used this time to double down on reconnecting and re-engaging students, families, and staff in learning, fun, and community building.

To support school leaders and educators to create summer 2022 programs that are even more robust and impactful than last year, The Greater LA Education Foundation (GLA) and the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), Expanded Learning Technical Assistance Unit (ELTAU) conducted a survey of districts' plans. Analyses of the survey results can help to identify program and funding trends, needs, and priorities to help improve 2022 summer program implementation through capacity building, guidance, and investment support. This brief also uplifts potential opportunities and implications resulting from recent policy and funding shifts.

SUMMER POLICY AND FUNDING LANDSCAPE

Research has shown a broad array of benefits when children have access to summer learning programs—student skill and academic growth; staff and leadership development; improved public safety, health, and mental health outcomes; and parent employment.[1]

Schools operating and/or partnering with other agencies to operate a variety of summer programs is not a new practice. Historically, the most common type of summer school has been mandatory half-day programs for students to make up or catch up academically, and this is often what families think of when they hear this term. However, over the last decade, many schools and communities have moved toward a summer learning approach. Summer learning programs combine academics with whole-child development and enrichment activities to create learning opportunities that look and feel more like summer camp than traditional summer school.

Given all of the potential of summer programs to support students and communities, especially as a response to the pandemic, the state and federal governments have exponentially increased dedicated resources for local education agencies (LEAs) to invest in summer programs.

Most Common Funding Sources Cited in Summer 2022 Survey[2]

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	TARGETED STUDENTS	LACOE TOTALS	IMPLICATIONS
Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P/AB 130)	In July 2021, the state budget allocated $1.75 billion to LEAs, growing to up to $5 billion by 2025, for summer and expanded learning programs. Requires LEAs to offer 9 hours of programming (including instructional time) and 30 days of programming on non-school days.	Prioritizes TK-6 students who are classified as EL (English Learners), FRPM (free and reduced priced meals) or Foster youth.	Preliminary ELO-P entitlements total $539,339,168 across 74 districts and 265 charters. This will be the first summer for districts to leverage this ongoing funding source.	ELO-P is intended to be blended with existing funding sources such as After-School Safety and Education Program (ASES)/ 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) Program and to leverage community partnerships. Program requirements were suspended for 2021−22 school year; these are set to go into effect on July 1, 2022.

1 Summer Learning Loss: What We Know and What We're Learning, NWEA, 6/2021. This article has links to over a dozen research studies, some of which have shown mixed results on summer learning loss as a phenomenon.
2 See Appendix Table A.

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	TARGETED STUDENTS	LACOE TOTALS	IMPLICATIONS
Expanded Learning Opportunities Grants (ELO-G/ AB 86)	In March 2021, California provided LEAs with $4.6 billion in one-time funds. Uses include extending instructional learning time, summer and expanded learning programs, integrated pupil supports, community learning hubs, and more.	All students; funding was based on Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) + additional funds for homeless youth	$1,382,352,326— which must be used by 9/30/2024	Very flexible One-time funds that need to be spent. LEAs will have to consider how to maintain program sustainability.
ESSER II	In December 2020, Congress provided $6.7 billion in one-time funds to California; 90% directly to LEAs. Broad use; uses include summer learning and expanded learning programs, addressing the needs of learning loss and heavily impacted student groups.	All students; based on Title 1 proportions	LEAs have until 9/30/2023 to obligate funds.	Very flexible One-time funds that can be spent on summer programs. LEAs will have to consider how to maintain program sustainability.
ASES/21st CCLC	ASES passed in 2002 via Prop 49; 2020–21 state budget allocated nearly $900 million in total currently funded at a $10.18 per student/day rate. Provides low-income schools with funds to provide before- and expanded learning programs and summer programs. Programs must include an educational and literacy element, enrichment, physical activity, and a healthy snack or meal.	ASES serves TK–9 and 21st CCLC serves TK-12, 21st CCLC allocating 50% of the total funds to serve 9-12 grades. Prioritizes foster care, homeless, and free or reduced-priced meals (FRPM) students.	For 2021-22, Region 11 received $282,504,409. 189 grantees received ASES/21st CCLC funding (49 districts, 132 charters, 5 community-based organizations (CBOs), and 3 cities) serving TK–12.	SB 98 allowed program flexibility through Dec. 31, 2021. Many LEAs took advantage of this flexibility to use funds last summer.[3] The vast majority of ASES/21st CCLC funding is for before- and expanded learning programs only; less than 15% of LA County grantees have funds that can be used in the summer.

3 Flexibility ended Dec. 31, 2021.

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	TARGETED STUDENTS	LACOE TOTALS	IMPLICATIONS
American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act / ESSER III	In March 2021, Congress provided a $13.7 billion one-time allocation to California; 90% directly to LEAs. Broad use, but LEAs need to spend at least 20% on learning loss with academic and social and emotional support. Uses include summer learning, extended school year and school day, comprehensive expanded learning programs.	All students; based on Title 1 proportions	LEAs have until 9/30/2023 to obligate funds.	Very flexible One-time funds that can be spent on summer programs. LEAs will have to consider how to maintain program sustainability.

Prior to the pandemic, lack of funding was often cited by schools as the primary reason for not operating summer programs. While there are several federal programs, such as migrant education and special education, that require schools to offer some instruction during the summer, the other most common existing and ongoing sources of funding include:

- Federal: Title I, Special Education, Community Development Block Grant
- State: Local Control Supplemental and Concentration grants

2022 LA COUNTY SUMMER SURVEY SAMPLE BREAKDOWN

Between March and April 2022, 39 out of 80 Los Angeles County districts provided survey responses on their current summer plans—including capacity, funding, program goals, how plans compare to 2021 programs, and areas in need of support. Of the 39 responses, 36 were from districts and 3 were from charters[4]:

- 52% (21) serve students in grades TK/K–12; 42% (17) serve elementary and middle school students only; and one district serves high school students only.

- 14 of the districts serve more than 10,000 students; 12 districts serve between 5,000 and 10,000 students; and 12 districts serve less than 5,000 students (there was no data for one charter entity).

- Of the 352,535 students served across the 39 districts, an average of 61.74% qualify for free or reduced-priced meals (FRPM)[5]:
  - 75%–100% of students received FRPM in 11 of the districts;
  - 50%–75% of students receive FRPM in 15 districts; and
  - 50% or less of students qualify for FRPM in 11 districts.

Survey limitations: This was a voluntary, point-in-time survey and responses are limited by the knowledge of the respondent and their best estimates for next summer. Planning, funding, enrollment, and staffing are and will continue to be a moving target between now and the end of summer. Not all respondents completed the survey in full and many questions allowed for respondents to check all that apply.

GLA and the LACOE Expanded Learning Technical Assistance Unit also partnered in spring 2021 to convene eight LEAs in a professional learning community to support summer planning and implementation efforts. This survey builds off this effort to provide direct and actionable support and tools for districts across the region.

---

4 See Appendix Table B for list of LEAs.
5 Two of the LEAs did not have accessible data for FRL.

LA COUNTY SURVEY TRENDS, ANALYSIS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

Trends of Students Served
2022 student summer enrollment estimates are very similar to summer 2021 levels (see Table 1).

- On average, if the respondents hit their enrollment estimates, 19.5% of all of the students in the responding districts will be served by summer programming in 2022.[6] There is wide variation in proposed summer program enrollment figures—from 3% to 39%—as compared to a LEAs total student population.

TABLE 1

ENROLLMENT NUMBERS	2021 ENROLLMENT	2022 PLAN FOR ENROLLMENT
500 or less	25%	23%
501–1000	22%	15%
1001–2999	25%	20%
3000–5000	11%	10%
5001–6000	0%	5%
Other	3%	10%
Unknown	3%	10%

Similar to trends from last summer, elementary and middle school students remain the most commonly served age group, though a growing number of districts are also targeting younger learners (TK/K).

- 49% (18) of districts will be serving elementary and middle school students.
- 38% (14) of districts will be serving elementary through high school students.
- 29% (11) of districts will be serving TK/preschool students.
- 24% (9) of students will not be serving either TK or kindergarten.

---

6 There were 33 of 39 respondents who provided estimated student enrollment data. These calculations are based on enrollment data from those districts that responded versus all of LA County.

Takeaway: Districts are undertaking a huge expansion of Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK), and a part of this is leveraging and utilizing ELO-P funds to provide more full-day and full-year programs to younger learners. While some LEAs have experience offering summer learning for 4- and 5-year olds, many do not and may need more planning and capacity building to serve these students and families.

Most districts are serving a wide variety of targeted student groups, with English learners, students with special needs, and students performing below grade level at the top of the list.[7] (See Appendix Table B for a full list of student subgroups.)

- 47% (18) of districts will be serving all students served by the district.

- 89% will be serving 5 subgroups or more (including all students) and 11% (4) will be serving 3 or 4 student groups.

Districts are utilizing a range of recruitment strategies.

- While an increasing number of families communicate with schools online as a result of distance learning, best practices show that to ensure students and families who most need summer programs register and participate regularly, schools should conduct both live and individualized outreach including phone calls, community events, and home visits outside of traditional work hours.

RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES	COUNT OF RESPONSES (N = 38)	% OF DISTRICTS
Email blasts	36	95%
Information sessions	24	63%
Home mailings	21	55%
Targeted outreach through calls and texts	30	79%

Takeaway: There are many benefits to summer programs that serve a wide range of students and ages with a variety of different needs and backgrounds. LEAs will need to factor this diversity into program design and staffing. Additionally, recruitment and outreach for summer programs can be more effective with a diverse range of targeted messages and messengers representative of the diversity of languages spoken throughout the community. In their recruitment strategies, LEAs should encourage consistent attendance to maximize the impact of the program.

See the Summer Learning Recruitment Guide for key strategies from a national, multiyear summer learning project.

---

7 An individual student can be and is counted in multiple student subgroups.

Programming Trends

A majority of districts have operated summer programs in the past and will be operating voluntary, in-person programs this year.

- 74% of districts will be operating in-person programs, while 26% will be offering a hybrid program (a mix of distance learning and in-person learning). There are 2 districts that are operating new programs and both are on a smaller scale (less than 100 students), focusing on academic remediation and running half-day programs.

- Only 2 districts are operating mandatory programs.

Nearly all districts are offering some type of full-day (9 hours) programming.

- Approximately 38% (14) of districts stated they are offering either full-day or both full-day and half-day programs.

- Of the 62% (23) of districts that are providing half-day options (3 to 6 hours), every district that responded (versus left blank) stated that they would be "providing expanded learning programming."

Takeaway: Full-day summer programming is a big win that expands access for working families and is likely incentivized by the new program requirements of ELO-P (see the table "Most Common Funding Sources Cited in Summer 2022 Survey" earlier in the report). That said, most LEAs responded that they will be offering half-day programs coupled with the provision of expanded learning programs, which allows families some choice for what works best for their schedules. This also may imply that schools are offering two separate blocks of programming versus a full-day blended or seamless experience for students, staff, and program design. Research shows that program quality, staff development, and student learning outcomes can be improved with increased collaboration between LEAs and their partners and across the school-day programs and expanded learning and summer programs.[8]

Districts are using summer to meet a wide range of program goals, with academic remediation and enrichment as the top priorities.

- 50% (19) listed that their summer programs have six or more program goals (16 options listed).

- The most common program goals listed are academic remediation (84% [32]), enrichment (76% [29]), social emotional learning (71% [27]), and STEM/STEAM programs (58% [22]).

Takeaway: Districts and schools are bought into a summer learning approach that offers a blend of academics and whole child development. A strength of summer is that it provides time and space for both structured and unstructured learning, and districts should consider focusing on a few key program goals for the success of program delivery and student impact.

---

8 A summary of one such study in California, Examining Alignment Afterschool and the Impact on Academic Achievement, was developed by THINK Together. Priscilla Little, one of the leading experts on school and expanded learning partnerships to improve student outcomes, provides additional evidence in Partnerships for Learning: Promising Practices in Integrating School and Out-of-School Time Program Supports, Harvard Family Research Project, 2010.

Los Angeles County Office of Education, Expanded Learning Technical Assistance Unit resources:

Summer Learning Toolkit User Guide link: https://www.dropbox.com/s/5l9m3e3p1xsqees/Summer%20Learning%20Toolkit%20User%20Guide.pdf?dl=0

CQI Toolkit User Guide link: https://www.dropbox.com/s/1vim6yzvfb82j3i/CQI%20Toolkit%20User%20Guide.pdf?dl=0

While the numbers of students projected to be served might not be expanding significantly, districts are providing new types of offerings and some are increasing the number of school sites.

- 63% (closer to 80% if including the "maybes") of districts are providing new programming in 2022.
- 32% of districts are or may be increasing the number of school sites.

USES FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING	COUNT OF RESPONSES (N = 35)	% OF DISTRICTS
Waiving fees	7	20%
Expanded program offerings	27	77%
New partnerships	12	34%
Additional internal staff	21	60%
Other	5	14%

Both expanded program offerings and new partnerships are top priorities for districts' uses of new funding and districts seem to be still in the partnership decision-making process.

- 41% of districts answered that they are unsure or may be partnering with community-based organizations to provide services.
- 62% of districts are or may be planning to partner with community-based organizations.
- 34% of districts do not plan to partner with community-based organizations.

Takeaway: Many school boards have vendor/partnership approval deadlines that should be factored into the need to solidify Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) in the next month or so. While partnerships can increase a district's capacity on multiple levels (staffing, number of students served, array of program offerings), they also require a lot of time, planning, and ongoing coordination. Districts should invest in and make clear a lead partnership coordinator role versus leaving it up to each school site.

Funding Trends

Most districts are funding summer programs from multiple sources, and the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (70%) and Expanded Learning Opportunities Grant (59%) are the most commonly cited.

- There is a range of how many funding streams districts are utilizing—from 21% (8) of districts listing one funding source to 26% of districts (10) utilizing four or more.

- Approximately 64% (24) of districts are taking advantage of the flexible federal stimulus funds to support summer programs, 46% (17) of districts are utilizing ESSSR II, and 19% (7) of districts are utilizing American Rescue Plan funding.

Takeaway: ELO-G and federal stimulus funding (ARP and ESSSR II) are extremely flexible resources that allow schools to spend funds almost any way they want as long as they are serving targeted student groups (which the survey implies they are). Schools should get creative, think outside the box, and experiment with new activities and formats this summer while these flexible dollars are available.

> See Summer 2021: How California Educators Met the Moment With Re-engagement, Reconnection, and Reimagined Learning for new approaches districts were able to put in place with these new flexible resources.

EXPANSION FUND TYPE: ELO-P AND/OR ELO-G	COUNT OF RESPONSES (N = 33)	% OF DISTRICTS
Both ELO-P and ELO-G	15	45%
ELO-P only	11	33%
ELO-G only	7	21%

- Of the 26 districts that have ELO-P funding, 42% (11) also have either ASES or 21st CCLC, which can be blended during the school year[9]; 58% (15) of districts with ELO-P funding have no existing expanded learning funds.

Takeaway: With the expansion of ELO-P, there is a program operations and design learning curve for districts that have never had publicly funded expanded learning and summer programs (vs. fee-based programs). Districts that have had ASES/21st CCLC likely have more experience and infrastructure operating subsidized expanded learning programs versus traditional summer school. Systems of support should take a tiered approach to assistance provided to meet the variety of district needs and levels of experience.

---

9 Of those LEAs that responded, none have existing ASES/21st CCLC that can be used in the summer months.

WHAT SUPPORT DO DISTRICTS NEED THIS SUMMER?

Last summer, many districts were not able to begin planning until late spring (due to school reopening planning), and for many students and staff, summer 2021 was their first time spent in-person at school sites. This year, while schools have had more time for planning and have had a full year back on school campuses, staffing challenges have persisted. There are significant staffing shortages across the board—teachers, social workers, childcare and youth workers, administrators—in Los Angeles County and across the state.

To help summer programs succeed, our shared goal should be to reduce the burden on overwhelmed district and site leaders. Key questions to consider for schools and their wide array of partners in the collaborative summer planning process include the following:

- What types of actions, activities, and investments lend themselves to be more easily outsourced and/or led by external partners versus having to be done by the district?

- What types of actions, activities, and investments lend themselves to be more successful with a regional approach versus having to be done by the district?

- How can district and partner planning, staffing, and investments in the summer enhance and blend into school-year learning to help districts work smarter and not harder?

TOP PRIORITIES RANKED BY LEAS[10]	IMPLICATIONS/ACTIONS TO TAKE
Partnerships, Staffing, and Professional Development[11]: Staff recruitment and training, best practices, and processes for partnerships	Intermediaries should consider taking a regional approach with one another to staff recruitment events, outreach, and messaging. Partnership cultivation and coordination may also be an area intermediaries want to prioritize time and resources. Higher education institutions could also play a more coordinated and central role in staff recruitment and training.
Program Content and Instruction: Academic curriculum, instructional approaches, enrichment activities, equitable and inclusive learning experiences	There are a lot of existing summer curriculum and program design resources. A centralized resource hub of summer curriculum and instructional approaches may be useful to LEAs. School leaders should consider how summer curriculum and instructional approaches support school-year learning and are therefore essential for LEA staff and administration leadership and buy-in.
Health, Wellness, Outdoor Education, and Student Supports: Students' physical and mental health and well-being, trauma-informed approaches, outdoor opportunities	Private funders should consider investing in external partners and public institutions that can provide more field trips, access to private camps, and outdoor learning opportunities. Ideally, the logistics and coordination (including transportation) are included/factored into these investments to relieve LEA planning burnout.

Summer Learning Toolkit: Over 50 evidence-based tools and resources, including customizable tools, sample documents from actual summer programs, and tip sheets, as well as guidance documents that provide the connection to research.

10 The descriptions on the right side of the table are pulled directly from the survey.
11 Respondents were also able to describe other needs, and of the twelve that answered, nearly half named overwhelmed staff and staff shortages.

LOOKING FORWARD:
ALL HANDS ON DECK

Summer learning is at its best when it is a team sport, requiring a wide variety of skills and strengths, settings, and collaborators as well as short- and longer-term mindsets focused on a collective goal of making summer programs impactful and creating spaces where all students can thrive. School districts are grappling with unprecedented staffing challenges, lasting academic and health disparities exacerbated by the pandemic, and program implementation overload. Successful summer programming should not be the responsibility of school districts and overwhelmed educators alone. Summer programs have required, and will continue to require, that schools, parents, communities, municipalities, and community partners work together to make the most of summer.

ABOUT US

The Greater LA Education Foundation (GLA) is the philanthropic, knowledge and action arm of the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), which houses 80 independent, autonomous districts from Los Angeles Unified to the Antelope Valley. GLA was launched in 2019 as an independent non-profit, intended to operate autonomously from LACOE, but in the service of defining and supporting LACOE's regional agenda. GLA's mission is to advance equity and innovation in education across LA County.

As a new organization, GLA aspires to lead out of the gate by engaging partners in the region and establishing credibility as a thought leader on critical issues aligned to its focus areas and affecting the education and lives of students across the region's 80 school districts. GLA has launched an equity series of white papers, of which this will be the second.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PARTNERSHIP FOR CHILDREN & YOUTH

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Expanded Learning Technical Assistance

APENDIX

TABLE A – FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Count of Responses (n = 37)	% of Districts
ESSER II	17	46%
American Rescue Plan/ ESSER III	7	19%
After-School Safety and Education (ASES) Program	11	30%
21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) Program	5	14%
Expanded Learning Opportunity Program (ELO-P)	26	70%
Expanded Learning Opportunity Grant (ELO-G)	22	59%
LCAP	4	11%
Title I	4	11%
Other*	5	14%

Note. Other: Partnership with Mt. Sac for some high school courses/in collaboration with Mt. Sac (2); California State Preschool Program (CSPP)/General Child Care and Development (CCTR)(2); refugee grant (1); Title III (1)

TABLE B – SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Redondo Beach Unified School District

ABC Unified School District

Little Lake City School District

Rosemead School District

El Segundo Unified School District

Bellflower Unified School District

Lancaster School District

Walnut Valley Unified School District

Glendora Unified School District

East Whittier Unified School District

Palmdale School District

Hughes Elizabeth Lakes Union School District

Hacienda La Puente Unified School District

Temple City Unified School District

Charter Oak Unified School District

Glendale Unified School District

Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District

Saugus Union School District

La Cañada Unified School District

Downey Unified School District

Duarte Unified School District

Westside Union School District

Compton Unified School District

Whittier Union High School District

Wilsona School District

Think Together (Azusa & Baldwin Park Unified School Districts)

Pasadena Unified School District

Valiente College Preparatory Charter School

Claremont Unified School District

ISANA Academies

New Heights Charter School

Monrovia Unified School District

South Whittier School District

Eastside Union School District

Woodcraft Rangers, on behalf of Garvey School District

Mountain View School District

Lawndale Elementary School District

Lynwood Unified School District

El Monte City School District

TABLE C – TARGETED POPULATIONS OF STUDENTS

Student Population	Count of Responses (n = 38)	% of Districts
All students served by district/LEA	18	47%
Students eligible to receive free or reduced-priced meals (FRPM)	21	55%
English learners	39	76%
Students experiencing homelessness	25	66%
Foster youth	25	66%
Students with special needs	28	74%
Chronically disengaged students	20	53%
Students in the child welfare or justice system	13	34%
Students performing below grade level, including—but not limited to—those who did not enroll in kindergarten in the 2020–21 school year, credit-deficient students, high school students at risk of not graduating, and other students identified by certified staff	29	76%
Other	2	5%

TABLE D - STUDENTS SERVED RELATIVE TO FUNDING TYPES

Students Served	Recovery Funds	%	Existing Funds	%	Expansion Funds	%
All students served by district	7	18%	7	18%	16	42%
Students eligible to receive free or reduced-priced meals (FRPM)	10	26%	8	21%	19	50%
English learners	16	42%	11	29%	27	71%
Students experiencing homelessness	13	34%	11	29%	24	63%
Foster youth	13	34%	11	29%	24	63%
Students with special needs	16	42%	10	26%	26	68%
Chronically disengaged students	10	26%	5	13%	19	50%
Students in the child welfare or justice system	5	13%	5	13%	12	32%
Students performing below grade level, including—but not limited to—those who did not enroll in kindergarten in the 2020–21 school year, credit-deficient students, high school students at risk of not graduating, and other students identified by certified staff	16	42%	11	29%	28	74%
Other	1	3%		0%	1	3%

Chart key:
Recovery funds = Federal stimulus funds
Existing expanded learning funds = ASES and 21st CCLC
Expansion funds = ELO-P and ELO-G

TABLE E - GOALS OF PROGRAMMING

Goals	Count of Responses (n = 38)	% of Districts
School readiness (transition from PK to TK/K)	11	29%
Academic remediation	32	84%
Academic acceleration	20	50%
STEM/STEAM programs	22	58%
Social–emotional learning	27	71%
Mental health and wellness	18	42%
Physical health and wellness	14	37%
Enrichment (e.g., arts, theater, dance, graphic design, etc.)	29	76%
College and career exposure/ development	8	21%
Outdoor learning and education	8	21%
Experiential-/project-based learning	10	26%
Community service	2	5%
"Ramp up"/"jumpstart" to the school year	13	34%
Supporting chronically disengaged students	12	32%
Reboot/re-engage following remote learning	9	24%
Family engagement/building relationships	7	18%
Other	1	3%

THE GREATER LA
EDUCATION FOUNDATION

Los Angeles County
Office of Education

PARTNERSHIP FOR
CHILDREN & YOUTH