

Supporting Policy Advocacy: CTFC's Involvement in Proposition 54



**Community
Technology
Foundation**
of California



Supporting Policy Advocacy: CTFC's Involvement in Proposition 54

CTFC Policy Report
2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I: The Process	1
Background	1
Why CTFC Took a Stand	2
Funding Decisions	3
Taking Action	5
CTFC Internal Efforts	5
ACLU of Northern California	5
Filipinos for Affirmative Action	6
Californians for Justice	6
CARECEN	6
The Labor/Community Strategy Center (Bus Riders Union)	7
Building Community Data Capacity	8
Part II: Impacts	10
Reaching CTFC's Target Population	10
Tapping the Potential of the Internet	11
Strengthening Grassroots Efforts	12
Setting an Example	13
Flexibility and Timeliness	13
Conclusions	14
CTFC Position Statement Against Proposition 54	
English	16
Spanish	17
Chinese	18
Tagalog	19
Vietnamese	20
Proposition 54 Flash® Ad	21

Supporting Policy Advocacy:

CTFC's Involvement in Proposition 54

PART I: THE PROCESS

Background

In the 1990s, a string of punitive ballot measures targeting immigrants, non-English speakers and people of color gained wide support among California voters. These measures faced surprisingly little opposition from communities most affected by them, despite strong opposition from civil rights and community leaders. Election results suggested that, if anything, community opposition to these racially motivated plebiscites was lessening over time. An analysis in the *Bilingual Educational Journal* revealed that ethnic opposition to Proposition 227, which eliminated bilingual education programs, was “considerably weaker” than minority opposition to the anti-immigrant Proposition 187 four years before.

Considered an effort to weaken Affirmative Action, Proposition 54 became a ballot initiative in 2003. It sought to prohibit state or local governments from collecting and using information on an individual's race, ethnicity, color, or national origin for the purposes of public education, public contracting, public employment or other government operations. It alarmed many community-based organizations that rely on such information to advocate for social change. Yet, few knew much about the proposition.

Early polling on Proposition 54, the so-called “Racial Privacy Act,” found about 48 percent of those contacted supporting the proposition, with about 34 percent opposed and 18 percent undecided. The poll showed deep divisions among Latinos (50 percent in favor and 33 percent opposed). African Americans supported the idea by a 42 percent to 41 percent margin. In racially diverse Los Angeles County, a surprising 55 percent leaned toward the measure with only 30 percent opposed.

Why CTFC Took a Stand

“We had to fight Prop 54,” says CTFC Board member Anni Chung, “because without the data, how do you know which community suffers the most? How do you target \$5 million in grants a year?”

Earlier in the year, at a January 2003 retreat, the CTFC Board of Directors discussed ways to become more active in public policy advocacy as part of its work to support community technology for access, equity and social justice. “This Foundation was born in advocacy,” says President and CEO Tessie Guillermo, “but over the first few years, we were setting up mechanisms for getting Foundation dollars out to the community. That did not allow us to do intensive public policy strategy work.” At its retreat, the Board identified three advocacy priorities:

- universal access to technology
- community empowerment/civic engagement
- preservation of human and civil rights

“The issue was so central to our work and that of our grantees,” says CTFC Board Chairman Jacquelyn Brand. “Being unable to gather data, to just be ignorant about information, would be a terrible threat to our effectiveness.”

Opponents of the measure knew it was in the offing since 2001. The success of the Governor Gray Davis recall, however, changed the timing of the vote from March 2004 to October 2003, forcing the anti-Prop 54 coalition to accelerate its opposition. “Our grantees and Board members were worried there wouldn’t be a cohesive voice opposing Prop 54,” says Guillermo. “All the momentum seemed to be with the initiative’s supporters.”

A scan of anti-Prop 54 activities by Laura Efurd, CTFC’s Director of Policy and Leadership Initiatives, revealed limited involvement by other foundations. Private foundations could not directly respond because of IRS restrictions on lobbying and advocacy. Because CTFC is a public foundation, it does not have the same restrictions. The few other foundations that were involved were also public foundations, mostly community foundations. Other funding organizations may have

shied away due to the initiative's apparent popularity. Still others did not have the internal flexibility to respond within the short time frame. "Many organizations with funding resources can't respond to the community quickly and nimbly," says Brand. Nor do they have the same capacity to target underserved communities. "CTFC knows where to find minority communities, seniors, the non-English speaking, immigrants, and small business organizations," says Chung.

Funding Decisions

As the Prop 54 threat loomed, Laura Efurd and Senior Program Officer Eugene Chan talked about getting involved. "I thought it might be too late," says Guillermo. "But Laura kept insisting, knowing that if she could offer a plan and work with groups that could move fast, she would have my support."

If CTFC did act, what precedent would it set for future activities? What kind of internal procedures would staff need to ensure due diligence given the accelerated timing of the election? How could the Foundation have the most impact? As these discussions unfolded, representatives of Californians for Justice, an active part of the anti-Prop 54 coalition met with CTFC staff and submitted a proposal for an Internet-based coalition strategy.

During an August 27 phone conference, the Board Policy Committee voted to recommend that CTFC officially oppose the initiative and come up with a plan to address the issue. Guillermo met with Efurd, Chief Operating Officer Gloria Rubio-Cortes and Director of Programs Timothy C. Wu to discuss options. Staff gathered information on the following questions:

- What grant making or advocacy were other foundations doing on Prop 54?
- What organizations were involved in opposition efforts and which were receiving foundation help?
- How was the media, especially the ethnic media, addressing the issue?

Based on this research, Efurd recommended a two-pronged effort: 1) a communications/outreach efforts by staff, and 2) voter outreach and education

(GOTV) grants to grassroots organizations. The goal was to fill the critical gaps in the anti-Prop 54 effort. She also suggested funding the coalition's Internet-based advocacy effort, which was now being coordinated by the ACLU of Northern California.

The strategy emphasized CTFC's strengths – its statewide connection to grassroots organizations among communities of color and limited English speakers and its expertise in technology. On September 5, the Board voted to accept the Policy Committee's recommendations and approved a \$50,000 allocation from unrestricted income for grants and outreach.

Deciding which organizations to fund with grants of \$5,000 for the GOTV and voter education efforts was a bigger challenge. Staff collected information on demographics and voting patterns among ethnic and racial groups in different parts of the state. An effort was made to target communities that were not being funded by other organizations. Staff sought groups with proven voter education skills that were already engaged in the Prop 54 fight. Staff also considered whether communities could be mobilized quickly and were likely to vote. This led the Foundation to focus primarily on the Central Valley and Southern California.

There was not enough time to perform the usual due diligence in reviewing financial information, governance, mission and records of accomplishment. CTFC therefore restricted funding to organizations from its existing pool of grantees.

Grants of \$5,000 each were awarded to Filipinos for Affirmative Action (San Francisco Bay Area), the Central American Resource Center (Los Angeles), Californians for Justice (Fresno and San Diego) and the Labor/Community Strategy Center, popularly known as the Bus Riders Union (inner-city Los Angeles). The ACLU of Northern California received \$20,000 on behalf of the anti-Prop 54 coalition for the Internet-based education campaign. Each organization would provide CTFC with a report outlining how the funds were used. The final \$5,000 was available for CTFC's communications/outreach efforts.

Taking Action

CTFC Internal Efforts

CTFC staff sent an e-letter to 300 grantees providing information about the impact of Prop 54. Educational materials were published on the Foundation's web site and staff provided resources for other web sites. CTFC's official position against Prop 54 was translated into Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Tagalog. Staff also interviewed Michael R. Peevey, President of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which opposed Prop 54. As a state agency, the CPUC could not expend state resources to publicize its position. CTFC helped to inform the public by publishing an online interview where Peevey detailed why the CPUC took a position against Prop 54.

ACLU of Northern California

The ACLU was a key organization in the statewide Coalition for an Informed California, the official anti-Prop 54 committee. Maya Harris, Northern California Political Director of the coalition, organized an Internet campaign, contracting with Grassroots Enterprise, a company that offers a "communication, mobilization advocacy platform for membership-based campaigns and organizations."

Grassroots Enterprise redesigned the coalition web site to be more engaging and "digitized" the coalition's TV commercial featuring former U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop for use in the e-mail campaign. Six "flash" messages, combining text with music and photos, were produced and disseminated within eleven days. Three of those messages were designed to appeal to communities of color that would be adversely impacted by Prop 54 including African Americans, Latinos or Asian and Pacific Islanders. Each of these three flash ads kept the platform of the mainstream "flash" message, but used ethnic-specific statistics, music, visual images, and themes to appeal to different ethnic communities. This culturally-competent advocacy message, delivered via flash email message, proved to be an innovation that resonated. These three ethnic-specific messages were viewed and forwarded at a much higher rate than the mainstream flash message. The e-mails and web site materials were interactive and encouraged recipients to contribute to the campaign or to provide the names of potentially interested contacts.

Filipinos for Affirmative Action

Filipinos for Affirmative Action focused on get-out-the-vote efforts and outreach to ethnic media. The money funded a direct mailing to frequent voters. "We only mailed to Filipinos identified as having been born in the Philippines, about 15,000 names. It didn't include Filipino-Americans," says Executive Director Lillian Galedo. "They are harder to find, because many have Spanish surnames, so they get lost in Latino pools." The group recruited 25 volunteer phone bankers, mostly students. During the final weekend, they hired 20 more phone-bankers. The organization produced a public service announcement featuring Filipino-American comedian Rex Navarrete, which aired a total of 12 times, six times on each of two ethnic cable TV channels.

Californians for Justice

A statewide organization that expands civic participation by young people, Californians for Justice used its grant to fund 300 presentations to community groups, college classes, churches, clinics and high schools and to set up literature tables at supermarkets. The group printed and distributed about 100,000 door hangers and 75,000 flyers.

CARECEN

The Central American Resource Center (Los Angeles) is a service and advocacy group which addresses the needs of Central American immigrants in Los Angeles' Pico/Westlake district. With the grant from CTFC, CARECEN produced an educational flyer in Spanish urging people to oppose the initiative. The flyers were passed out to clients at presentations on Prop 54 during the center's twice weekly discussion groups. CARECEN also mailed the flyer to 5,000 clients, organized a phone banking operation to target Spanish speakers and reached out to Spanish language media.

The Labor/Community Strategy Center (Bus Riders Union)

The Bus Riders Union is a multiracial organization representing the interests of bus riders in Los Angeles County. The CTFC grant helped the organization produce flyers in English, Korean and Spanish. These flyers were distributed in daily organizing sessions on buses. “We sent the flyers in three languages with letters to 100 different organizations and activists,” says Damon Azali, the campaign coordinator. During the final two and a half weeks of the campaign, the Bus Riders Union was one of the few organizations doing daily door-to-door canvassing in south and southeast Los Angeles. Averaging about 15 precincts per week, they tried to reach each home three times.

BUILDING COMMUNITY DATA CAPACITY

While CTFC worked to preserve important data collection through involvement in the policy debate on Proposition 54, it also developed a grant-making strategy to give community organizations more control over their own data. During its fall 2003 grants cycle, the Foundation invested \$1.01 million to boost the capacity of nonprofit organizations to collect and manage information.

“Prop 54 showed the importance of communities having access to data on their own terms, rather than relying on other entities such as government,” explains CTFC Senior Program Officer Eugene Chan. “We want to ensure that community organizations can collect demographic information, analyze it and use it for advocacy, and to improve their services.”

One CTFC grant is helping a substance abuse treatment center to make information management more efficient and culturally sensitive to its Native American clientele. The Friendship House Association for Native Americans keeps scrupulous records to satisfy the reporting requirements of half a dozen funding agencies. However, without an in-house information management system, staff spends valuable hours pouring over hardcopy spreadsheets to glean needed data. The grant will simplify data storage and retrieval by creating one database.

Great Beginnings for Black Babies offers health counseling to pregnant African American women in Los Angeles. Currently, outreach workers carry around ten-pound binders of information on maternal/infant health during home visits. A CTFC grant will help convert these into electronic files that can be downloaded on laptop computers or PDAs and carried from home to home.

The National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights obtained a grant to build a database that other nonprofit groups can access to post information about violations against immigrants and refugees. This effort could create a valuable record of civil and human rights abuses.

Another organization, Community Development Technologies Center, is using CTFC funding to build a regional database on community economic development efforts and resources in the Los Angeles area. That database will provide access to real-time economic development data and tools.

The focus on data-collection in 2003 reflected the Foundation's integrated approach to grant-making, an approach that fosters peer learning among grantees and allows the Foundation to distribute resources more strategically. Building data capacity:

- Improves allocation of resources for program services.
- Facilitates collaboration with other providers.
- Measures social return on investment—improves evaluation of accomplishments and accountability for communities, funders, and other stakeholders.
- Expands and enhances social change strategies.

Building data capacity among community organizations poses challenges. The costs can be high and the learning curve for those who maintain the system can be steep. Nevertheless, Friendship House's Kathleen Gushoney says the emphasis on information technology has already changed her agency. "It has improved how we communicate and how we work together. It has created a better understanding of how everybody does their jobs."

By prohibiting collection and use of racial and ethnic data by state government, Prop 54 would have thwarted efforts to upgrade health care, education and economic opportunities in underserved communities. The initiative failed, but it underscored the value of community self-reliance in managing information. Sharpening that capacity is one way to fulfill CTFC's mission to promote social change by providing underserved communities with access to advanced technology.

PART II: IMPACTS

Field Poll results on Proposition 54 between July and the October election date showed a steady decline in support for the measure across all categories of voters. In July, the “no” vote was 29 percent. By August, it was up to 35 percent. At the end of September, the “no” votes rose to 49 percent and the “yes” votes went down to 35 percent.

“We had inklings that it wasn’t going to pass,” recalls Guillermo, “but we didn’t know how different groups were going to vote, or who was going to get out the vote. It was a large turnout and it was exciting. Prop 54 met an overwhelming defeat.”

Statewide, the initiative failed by a margin of 63.9 percent to 36.9 percent. The measure lost in all but four rural counties – Lassen, Placer, El Dorado and Sutter. The “no” vote in Los Angeles County was 70 percent; in San Francisco County, a whopping 80 percent, and in Alameda County, nearly 64 percent. According to a Los Angeles Times exit poll, African Americans opposed the measure by an 87 percent to 13 percent margin; Latinos, 75 percent to 25 percent; Asians 72 to 25 percent, and whites, 62 to 38 percent.

Prop 54’s defeat was an impressive victory for the civil rights community and a dramatic reversal of political fortunes. The campaign deftly reached mainstream voters, who opposed it decisively, and mobilized ethnic communities, which crushed the measure by a resounding margin -- all of this under a potentially damaging conservative groundswell to recall a Democratic governor.

Reaching CTFC’s Target Population

In a state the size of California, it would be difficult to judge the specific impact of \$40,000 in grants plus CTFC’s advocacy on the 8.6 million people who voted on the initiative. The statewide coalition was very successful in reaching a broad audience with a public health message, but it was critical for communities of color, underserved communities and diverse language groups to be mobilized based on their interests. “The statewide coalition targeted the mainstream population,” says

Laura Efur. "Everything on TV was about the health message. By using the Internet, we succeeded in revealing the civil rights and racial justice impact for specific communities."

Filipinos for Affirmative Action bought a list of frequent Filipino voters in San Francisco, Alameda and San Mateo counties. This may have been the first time such a narrowly targeted list was used by a grassroots GOTV campaign. "People seemed to like that attention was being paid to them," says Lillian Galedo. "These Filipinos were hungry to be reached out to."

CTFC focused strongly on underserved communities, but Anni Chung thinks next time there should be more attention on smaller linguistic groups. "These groups find it very hard to get money," she says. "We had limited resources and couldn't address all eleven language groups. But next time, we will probably allocate more resources there."

Tapping the Potential of the Internet

CTFC's support was critical in enabling the ACLU to organize a last minute internet strategy. "We found out in July that it would be on the October ballot, so everything accelerated and we had to raise money really fast," says Maya Harris. "We had to make sure the grassroots organizing piece was coming together. While there were people who recognized that we needed to upgrade our web site, it wasn't at the top of the list."

This relatively low priority for technology is not unusual for the civil rights community, according to David Chiu of Grassroots Enterprise. "I worked on the Proposition 187, 209 and 227 fights. None of those campaigns used technology very well," he says. "This was the first time I'm aware of that ethnic-specific internet messages were used in a political campaign."

The coalition internet effort, he says, reached an estimated 26,000 viewers of e-mails and web sites. The number of average page views per person for each targeted message varied widely: 20 page views for the African-American message, 60.7 page views for the Latino message, 7 page views for the Asian and Pacific

Islander views, and 2 page views for the general message. The page views include the number of times each person viewed the message or forwarded it. "We started to see a real 'hockey stick' exponential growth in the last few days," he says. "This was exciting and some indication of the potential. My guess is that if we'd had another three weeks, we would have seen really significant numbers and we could have shown that, per-person, per-dollar, internet advocacy is a very cost-efficient way to get a message out."

But Chiu says more work is needed to prepare the ground for future campaigns. "I thought the e-mail connectivity of ethnic community groups was more established," he says. "There were no repositories of e-mail lists or databases for all civil rights or Latino or Asian and Pacific Islander leaders in California, no massive e-mail networks. We ended up having to very quickly locate e-mail addresses. We are definitely in the early stages of 'tech' adoption."

Strengthening Grassroots Efforts

The \$5,000 grants from CTFC did not change the nature of the work of Californians for Justice, CARECEN, and the Bus Riders Union. They were already committed to the education effort on Prop 54. The money did allow them to be more aggressive and entrepreneurial. "In our organization, we decide what we are going to do and figure out how to raise the money later," says Abdi Soltani of Californians for Justice Education Fund. "If you wait until you have the funding, you won't get much done because things move so fast. Our board said we could work on this, hire some new people and then go raise funds. The grant helped us pay for people we'd brought on in Fresno."

CARECEN's Marvin Andrade tells a similar story. "We planned to have a huge phone bank with the Southwest Voter Registration Project, but at the last minute they pulled out because they didn't get funded," he says. "We were thinking about doing flyers and mailings, but it was going to take funds. The CTFC grant was our launching pad."

There is no doubt CARECEN's media outreach efforts made an impact. Andrade was quoted in an article in *La Opinion*, which has a circulation of several hundred thousand. Executive Director of CARECEN, Angela Sanbrano was interviewed during a broadcast on the Spanish language network, Telemundo, which reaches an audience of millions. "This was a live nationwide interview," says Andrade. "That was huge and, immediately we got phone calls from people who had seen it."

Setting an Example

Maya Harris applauds the courage of the Foundation in granting money as it did. "CTFC was not only willing to get into this ballot initiative," she says. "They gave money specifically for advocacy which gave us more room to use the funds effectively. Many foundations are not willing to give money that way."

Although it is too early to accurately assess the impact of the anti-Prop 54 campaign on other philanthropic organizations, at least one group is taking heed. The Northern Californian Grantmakers' Association scheduled a presentation on the CTFC efforts for its January 2004 meeting. CTFC may encourage other philanthropies to do the same.

"We showed foundations the benefits of investing in community actions like this," says Board vice chairman Roger Cázares. "We demonstrated that the returns are significant and that philanthropies can leverage their dollars, because communities get educated and build coalitions that can come together on other issues."

Flexibility and Timeliness

CTFC's ability to respond swiftly was instructive and critical to the goal of targeting neglected communities. "Usually foundations move slowly," says Lillian Galedo. All the grantees interviewed expressed gratitude for the foundation's speed and flexibility. "The quick turnaround enabled us to get materials translated quickly," says Damon Azali, "so we were one of the organizations that had materials others could borrow."

An important issue for CTFC is how to respond even more quickly. “What you typically see in online advocacy is exponential growth,” says David Chiu. “It takes a few weeks for a tipping point to occur, once you identify who the connectors are and get those folks to advocate. There were a bunch of networks we could have hit a little earlier.”

CTFC Policy Committee Chair Allen Solomon suggests setting up a monitoring process so that CTFC can be aware of potential issues as they arise. This might be as simple as regularly viewing the web sites of agencies like the CPUC or the California General Assembly that deal with issues of relevance to the Foundation.

Tessie Guillermo agrees, “The question is how to anticipate this kind of thing and how best to place our resources. We have to keep our ear to the ground and find out who in the community is paying attention to various issues.”

Conclusions

What were the key ingredients that enabled CTFC to successfully address the Prop 54 challenge? Guillermo says, “It took a Board with a clearly stated interest in public policy advocacy. It took staff that was in touch with our constituency and that would push for a plan even though time was short. It took decisive action by our Board.”

As Guillermo and others acknowledge, it would be difficult to assess the specific impact of CTFC’s efforts, but two observations are clear: 1) The civil rights community was far more successful than in the past in mobilizing opposition among communities of color, and 2) CTFC played a vital strategic role within the broader coalition.

CTFC’s support demonstrated the internet’s potential for mobilizing a civil rights community that has not always been savvy about technology. David Chiu says the internet campaign, however abbreviated, “created a good buzz” within the civil rights coalition and communities of color. “In this case, CTFC really accomplished its goal of educating progressive communities about the uses of technology.”

CTFC's support assisted groups like CARECEN, the Bus Riders Union and Californians for Justice to be more aggressive in their efforts to educate their communities about the proposition. Finally, CTFC demonstrated one way a philanthropic organization can be more active in public policy advocacy and how technology can be a vital strategic tool to achieve social justice.

"For me, it confirms that we as a funding organization need to remain flexible and agile," says Guillermo. "We have to take risks as a foundation and not be so concerned about what our peer group is doing, so we can be first forward on some of these issues."

Says Jacquelyn Brand, "I'm very proud of this effort. It was the first real test of the community feeling under threat and needing us to do the right thing fast. We built some good partnerships and showed our ability to respond. To me it says the community can have higher expectations for us in the future. It is a challenge to live up to."



The Community Technology Foundation of California Position Against Proposition 54

The Community Technology Foundation of California (CTFC) strongly opposes Proposition 54, the "Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color or National Origin (CRECNO)" initiative. Proposition 54 serves only to deepen the societal inequities faced by immigrants, the disabled, the poor, and minority communities. The proposition would hamper CTFC's ability to develop programs and policies to help these underserved populations, and to evaluate the impact of its work. At the most fundamental level, the proposition goes against CTFC's core mission of promoting social justice, social change, and equal rights for all through the use of telecommunications and technology. – CTFC Board of Directors.

On October 7, 2003, in an unprecedented election, Californians will vote on ballot initiative Proposition 54, which will prohibit the state and its political subdivisions from collecting or classifying any information based on race, ethnicity, color, or national origin.

The Board of Directors of the Community Technology Foundation of California believes that this proposition **MUST BE DEFEATED**. The right to gather this data is critical to the ability of government, the private and non-profit sectors to understand and address the needs of all Californians. This is particularly true for immigrants and communities of color, which have historically been – and continue to be – underserved.

The overall impact of Proposition 54 would be a severe blow to the identification and redress of inequities in health, education, housing, employment and a number of other basic human rights. The type of data collection that Proposition 54 seeks to ban is exactly the type of data that is most needed to help create solutions for the problems faced by the poor, the disabled, immigrants, and communities of color. Without good data, we cannot create effective solutions. Without good data, we are left only with the problems themselves, and with no way to solve them. Proposition 54 would make it almost impossible for California to create effective policies on a wide range of social issues including health disparities, equal employment opportunities, hate crimes, discrimination cases, educational equity, and technology access issues.

Proposition 54 would also make it difficult for Foundations like CTFC to engage in effective program planning, policy development, and evaluation. Restrictions on collection and use of data by state and local governments will reduce the data available to non-governmental entities as well. Proposition 54 would destroy our ability to target our programs and policies towards serving the neediest communities in the State of California.

The Community Technology Foundation was established to address the inequities which exist in California with regard to the availability and use of telecommunications and information technologies. Our programs also help underserved communities by using technology to address other inequities in such areas as health care, education, and economic development. Passage of Proposition 54 would deliver a severe blow to the work of the Community Technology Foundation of California.

Proposition 54 -- in the false guise of creating a "color blind" society -- will in reality have the opposite effect of weakening the ability of our institutions, both government and non-government, to address the social and economic realities of racial and ethnic inequities in the diverse State of California.

The Community Technology Foundation of California is a public foundation promoting social justice, access and equity through community technology. The board is comprised of community leaders representing California's diverse populations.

La postura de la *Community Technology Foundation of California* en contra de la **Proposición 54**

La Community Technology Foundation of California (CTFC) se opone enérgicamente a la Proposición 54, la iniciativa de "Clasificación por raza, etnia, color u origen nacional (CRECNO por sus siglas en inglés)". La Proposición 54 sirve solamente para ahondar las injusticias sociales que confrontan los inmigrantes, incapacitados, carenciados y comunidades minoritarias. La proposición dificultaría la capacidad de la CTFC de elaborar programas y formular normas para ayudar a estos sectores subatendidos de la población, así como para evaluar el impacto de su labor. A un nivel más fundamental, la proposición va en contra del objetivo primordial de la CTFC de promover la justicia social, el cambio social y la igualdad de derechos para todos a través del uso de las telecomunicaciones y la tecnología. -- Consejo de Administración de la CTFC

El 7 de octubre de 2003, en elecciones sin precedentes, los californianos votarán por la iniciativa llamada Proposición 54 que prohibirá al estado y a sus subdivisiones políticas recabar datos o clasificar toda información basándose en la raza, etnia, color u origen nacional de las personas.

El Consejo de Administración de la Community Technology Foundation of California cree fehacientemente que SE DEBE RECHAZAR esta proposición. El derecho a recabar datos basándose en la raza, etnia, color u origen nacional es crucial para la capacidad del gobierno, los sectores privados y sin fines de lucro de tener un buen conocimiento de las necesidades de todos los californianos y abordarlas en forma acorde, especialmente en el caso de los inmigrantes y las comunidades de color que, históricamente, han sido subatendidas y siguen siéndolo.

El impacto global de la Proposición 54 constituiría un golpe de consecuencias catastróficas para la identificación y el resarcimiento de las injusticias en materia de salud, educación, vivienda, empleo y una serie de otros derechos humanos básicos. El tipo de recolección de datos que la Proposición 54 procura prohibir es exactamente el tipo de datos que más sirve para crear soluciones para los problemas que confrontan los carenciados, incapacitados, inmigrantes y las comunidades de color. Sin buenos datos no se puede crear soluciones eficaces. Sin buenos datos, nos quedamos únicamente los problemas en sí y ninguna manera de solucionarlos. La Proposición 54 prácticamente imposibilitaría la creación de normas eficaces en una amplia serie de aspectos o asuntos en California, incluidas las disparidades en materia de salud, las mismas oportunidades de empleo, los actos delictivos provocados por el odio, los casos de discriminación, la igualdad educativa y los aspectos relativos al acceso a la tecnología.

La Proposición 54 dificultaría también la labor de fundaciones como la CTFC para efectuar una planificación eficaz de programas, formulación de políticas y evaluación. Las restricciones para la recolección y el uso de datos de parte de los gobiernos estatales y local reducirán la información que tengan a su disposición las entidades no gubernamentales también. La Proposición 54 destruiría nuestra capacidad de orientar nuestros programas y políticas hacia las comunidades más necesitadas del Estado de California.

La Community Technology Foundation fue fundada para ocuparse de las injusticias que existen en California con respecto a la disponibilidad y el uso de las telecomunicaciones y tecnologías informáticas. Nuestros programas ayudan también a las comunidades subatendidas mediante el uso de tecnología para abordar otras injusticias en esferas tales como la atención de la salud, educación y desarrollo económico. La aprobación de la Proposición 54 constituiría un golpe grave para la labor que realiza la Community Technology Foundation of California.

La Proposición 54, falsamente disfrazada de iniciativa para crear una sociedad "daltónica", tendrá por cierto el efecto opuesto al debilitar la capacidad de nuestras instituciones, tanto gubernamentales como no, de abordar las realidades sociales y económicas de las injusticias raciales y étnicas en los diversos sectores del Estado de California.

La Community Technology Foundation of California es una fundación pública que promueve la justicia social, el acceso y la igualdad a través de la tecnología para la comunidad. El consejo de administración está formado por líderes comunitarios que representan a los diversos sectores de la población de California.

Community Technology Foundation of California

加州社區技術基金會堅決反對第 54 號提案

“加州社區科技基金會 (The Community Technology Foundation of California 簡稱“CTFC”) 強烈反對“禁止以族裔、膚色或原來國籍分類”的第 54 號提案。該提案加深移民、傷殘、貧窮、和少數族裔社區所受到的社會不公平待遇，嚴重妨礙 CTFC 幫助那些未獲周全服務的人的發展計劃和政策，並評價其工作影響的能力。總體而言，該提案與 CTFC 提高社會公平、社會改革及全面使用電訊和科技平等權利的中心任務背道而馳。”

—加州社區科技基金會董事會

2003 年 10 月 7 日，加州選民將在一項特別選舉中對第 54 號提案進行表決，該提案禁止加州政府和所屬機構對民眾的族裔、膚色或原來國籍的背景資料進行收集或分類。

加州社區科技基金會董事會認為，必須終止該項提案。收集統計資料的權，方便政府、私人和非牟利組織對加州居民的了解及解決他們的需求。而這一點在服務方面一直被忽視，並且繼續被忽視的移民及少數族裔社區尤其顯著。

第 54 號提案的影響至為深遠，它將削弱有關方面對公共衛生、教育、房屋、就業及其它基本人權不公待遇的辨識和救援。它所禁止收集的統計資料，正是擬訂幫助貧困、傷殘、移民及少數族裔社區解決方案所需的資料。沒有完整的統計資料，就無法擬訂有效的解決方案，難題繼續存在，無方解決。第 54 號提案令到加州幾乎沒有可能推行普及而有效的政策，其中包括醫療質量、平等就業機會、仇視罪行、歧視案件、教育公平和學習科技等。

第 54 號提案亦會使一些基金會諸如加州社區技術基金會無法推行有效的計劃、政策發展及評價工作。限制州和地方政府收集和使用統計資料，同樣減少非政府組織對統計資料的使用。該提案勢將摧毀我們致力服務加州最貧困社區的能力。

加州社區科技基金會的成立表明加州仍存在使用電訊和資訊科技的不公平。我們的計劃幫助未獲周全服務社區使用科技來表達其它方面如公共衛生、教育、及經濟發展的不公平。若第 54 號提案獲得通過，將嚴重打擊加州社區科技基金會的工作。

因誤導而創造一個“色盲”社會的第 54 提案，實際上是削弱政府及非牟利等公共機構在加州多元社會從事族裔社會及經濟的實體和種族不公的能力。

加州社區科技基金會是一個透過社區科技提昇社會正義、容易存取和公平的公共基金會。董事會由代表加州多元人口的社區領袖組成。

Ang Paninindigan ng Community Technology Foundation of California Laban sa Prop 54

Hindi sang-ayon ang Community Technology Foundation ng California (CTFC) sa Proposition 54 na kilala rin sa pangalang “CRECNO -Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color or National Origin”. Ang Proposition 54 ay magdudulot ng mas malubhang diskriminasyon laban sa mga taong imigrante, may kapinsanan, mahihirap, at mga maynoridad sa California. Ang proposisyong ito ay magiging balakid sa CTFC para gampanan ang mga programa at mga patakaran na inilahad para sa kabutihan ng mga mamayang kasalukuyang di nakakatanggap ng sapat na serbisyong pampubliko. Ang Proposition 54 ay magiging hadlang din sa pagsusuri ng CTFC kung epektibo ng kanilang mga serbisyo. Ang proposisyong ito ay labag sa misyon ng CTFC na palaganapin ang panlipunang katarungan, pag-asenso, at pantay na mga karapatan sa lahat sa pamamagitan ng makabagong telekomunikasyon at teknolohiya.

Sa ika-7 ng Oktubre 2003, sa espesyal na eleksyon sa California, kalakip sa balotan ang Proposition 54. Ipinagbabawal nito ang gobyerno ng California estado at mga kalakip na ahensiya at departamento na magkolekta at magsuri ng mga impormasyong may kinalaman sa lahi, kulay, ninuno, angkan at lupang tinubuan.

Naniniwala ang Board ng Community Technology Foundation ng California na DAPAT LABANAN AT TALUNIN ANG PROPOSISYONG ITO. Ang karapatang kumuha ng impormasyong ito ay mahalaga sa kakayanan ang pamahalaan at ng mga pribadong non-profit sektor para alamin at sagutin ang mga pangangailangan ng lahat ng mga naninirahan sa California. Higit na may katuturan ito sa mga imigrante at sa mga menoridad na mahabang panahon ang pagtitiis – at hanggang ngayon dumananas pa rin – ng di sapat o kawalan ng mahahalagang serbisyo.

Ang kabuuang epekto ng Proposition 54 ay malakas na dagok sa pangangailangang alamin at bigyang lunas ang diskriminasyong umiiral sa mga serbisyong pangkalusugan, pag-aaral, pamamahay, paghahanap-buhay, at iba pang mga karapatang pantao. Ang ipinagbabawal ng Proposition 54 ay siyang kaalamang kinakailangan para maisagawa nang tama ang mga programang makakatulong sa mga taong mahihirap, may kapinsanan, imigrante, at komunidad ng may kulay. Kung walang tamang impormasyon hindi natin maisagawa ang mga epektibong solusyon. Kung walang tamang impormasyon ang mananatili ay ang mga problema at walang pamamaraang lunasan ang mga ito. Gagawing imposible ng Proposition 54 ang pagsasagawa ng mabibisang mga patakaran tungkol sa mga problemang panglipunan, diskriminasyon sa serbisyong pangkalusugan, pantay na pagkakataon sa paghahanapbuhay, pag-aaral, pagbibigay lunas sa diskriminasyon, at pag-gamit ng teknolohiya.

Pahihirapan din ng Prop 54 ang mga Foundations, gaya ng CTFC sa paggawa ng mga epektibong program planning, pagbubuo ng mga patakaran (policy development) at pagsusuri tungkol sa epekto ng serbiyo (evaluation). Ang mga kabawalan sa pagtitipon at paggamit ng mga datos sa mga local at estadong pamahalaan ay magpapaliit rin ng mga datos na magagamit ng mga di-pang-gobyernong mga grupo. Wawasakin ng Prop 54 ang ating kakayahan na patamain ang ating mga programa at mga patakaran sa paglilingkod sa mga komunidad na higit na nangangailangan sa estado ng California.

Ang Community Technology Foundation ay itinatag upang sugpuin ang kakulangan ng katarungan na umiiral sa California tungkol sa maaaring magagamit at paggamit ng telekomunikasyon at teknolohiya sa impormasyon. Ang aming mga programa ay tumutulong din sa mga komunidad na hindi tumatanggap ng sapat na serbisyo sa paggamit ng teknolohiya upang sagutin ang iba pang kakulangan sa health care, edukasyon at economic development. Ang pagpapatibay ng Prop 54 ay magiging isang dagok sa gawain ng CTFC.

Ang Prop 54 – sa pagkunwaring lilikha ng isang color blind society- sa katunayan ay lilikha ng kabaligtaran na epekto at pahihinain ang kakayahan ng ating mga institusyon, pang-gobyerno at di-panggobyerno, sa pagsagot sa mga katunayang panlipunan at pangekonomiya at ang kakulangan ng katarungan nito sa larangan ng lahi sa magkaibang estado ng California.

Ang Community Technology Foundation of California ay isang pangpublikong foundation na nagtataguyod ng panlipunang katarungan, access at katarungan sa pamamagitan ng teknolohiyang panlipunan. Ang mga miyembro ng Board ay kumakatawan ng magkaibang mga populasyon ng California.

TỔ CHỨC KỸ THUẬT CỘNG ĐỒNG tại CALIFORNIA Chống Đối Dự Luật 54

Tổ Chức Kỹ Thuật Cộng Đồng tại California (CTFC) cương quyết chống lại Dự luật 54, có tên gọi là "Đề án xếp hạng theo chủng tộc, sắc tộc, màu da, nguyên quán (CRECNO)". Dự luật 54 chỉ giúp làm tăng thêm những bất công xã hội mà người di dân, người tàn tật, người nghèo và các cộng đồng thiểu số phải chịu đựng. Dự luật ấy sẽ làm trở ngại khả năng của CTFC trong việc phát họa các chương trình và chính sách ngõ hầu giúp đỡ những người bị thiệt thòi, và lượng giá công tác của Tổ Chức. Trên phương diện căn bản, dự luật đã đi ngược lại nhiệm vụ chủ yếu của CTFC là khuyến khích sự công bằng xã hội, cải thiện xã hội và cân bằng quyền lợi qua việc sử dụng vô tuyến truyền thông và kỹ thuật học. – Ban Quản Trị CTFC.

Ngày 7 tháng 10, 2003, trong một cuộc bầu cử chưa từng có, người dân California sẽ đi bỏ phiếu về một đề án dự luật 54, và dự luật này sẽ ngăn cấm tiểu bang và các đơn vị chính trị cấp dưới không được thấu thập hay xếp hạng các dữ kiện căn cứ vào chủng tộc, sắc tộc, màu da và nguyên quán.

Ban Quản Trị của Tổ Chức Kỹ Thuật Cộng Đồng tại California nghĩ rằng dự luật ấy cần phải được đánh bại. Việc thấu thập các dữ kiện ấy rất cần thiết cho khả năng của chính quyền, các tổ chức tư nhân và bất vụ lợi để hiểu rõ và giải quyết những nhu cầu của người dân California. Sự cần thiết ấy lại càng rõ rệt đối với những người di dân và các cộng đồng da màu mà từ trước cũng như hiện tại các nhu cầu của họ không được đáp ứng đúng mức.

Ảnh hưởng tổng quát của dự luật 54 sẽ là một đòn đánh mạnh vào việc phát giác và sửa chữa những bất bình đẳng về y tế, giáo dục, gia cư, việc làm và một số nhân quyền căn bản khác. Loại dữ kiện mà dự luật 54 ngăn cấm thấu thập lại chính là loại cần thiết nhất để giúp tìm ra giải pháp cho các trở ngại mà người nghèo khó, tàn tật, di dân và các cộng đồng da màu thường gặp phải. Không có các dữ kiện thì chúng ta không thể tìm ra giải pháp thích đáng. Dự luật 54 sẽ làm cho California không thể đặt ra chính sách có hiệu quả đối với các vấn đề rộng lớn gồm có sự khác biệt về sức khỏe, sự đồng đều trên việc làm, phạm pháp vì thù oán và kỳ thị, công bằng về giáo dục và hội nhập vào kỹ thuật.

Dự luật 54 cũng sẽ gây khó khăn cho các tổ chức như CTFC được tham dự vào việc soạn thảo chương trình, chính sách phát triển và lượng giá công việc. Hạn chế việc thấu thập các dữ kiện bởi chính quyền tiểu bang và địa phương cũng sẽ giảm bớt các dữ kiện mà các tổ chức ngoài chính phủ có thể sử dụng. Dự luật 54 sẽ làm tiêu tan khả năng của chúng ta nhằm hướng các chương trình và chính sách vào mục đích phục vụ các cộng đồng cần sự giúp đỡ nhiều nhất tại tiểu bang California.

Tổ Chức Kỹ Thuật Cộng Đồng được thành lập để nêu lên sự bất bình đẳng tại California liên hệ đến sự hiện hữu và việc sử dụng kỹ thuật vô tuyến truyền thông và thông tin. Chương trình của chúng tôi cũng giúp cho các cộng đồng còn thiếu sự giúp đỡ bằng cách sử dụng kỹ thuật để giải quyết những bất công trong các lãnh vực như chăm sóc y tế, giáo dục, và phát triển kinh tế. Nếu được thông qua, dự luật 54 sẽ đánh một đòn mạnh vào công việc của Tổ Chức Kỹ Thuật Cộng Đồng California.

Dự luật 54 - trong lớp vỏ một "xã hội không màu da" - sự thật sẽ có hậu quả trái ngược làm suy yếu khả năng của các cơ cấu của chúng ta, trong chính phủ cũng như ngoài chính phủ, giúp trình bày những thực trạng xã hội và kinh tế thuộc về sự bất công giữa các chủng tộc và sắc tộc của tiểu bang California đa dạng.

Tổ Chức Kỹ Thuật Cộng Đồng California là một Tổ chức công cộng nhận vào việc cải thiện sự công bằng xã hội, sự hội nhập và cân bằng xuyên qua kỹ thuật cộng đồng. Ban Quản Trị gồm các lãnh tụ cộng đồng đại diện cho toàn thể các sắc dân khác nhau của California.

Proposition 54 Flash® Ad

41% Latino adults uninsured



La Salud: Today, Latinos still have serious health risks.



PROP 54 BANS DATA THAT SAVES LIVES




18% Latino dropout rate in California

La Educación: Today, Latino children still have limited access to quality education.


PROP 54: BANS DATA THAT HELPS OUR CHILDREN TO SUCCEED



43% Latinos do not own homes



El Trabajo y La Vivienda: Many Latinos still have difficulty finding good jobs and affordable housing.



PROP 54: BANS DATA RELATED TO JOBS AND HOUSING

**Community Technology Foundation
of California**

One Rincon Center
101 Spear Street, Suite 218
San Francisco, CA 94105

TEL 415/371-8808
FAX 415/371-8818
TTY 415/371-8823

info@ZeroDivide.org
www.ZeroDivide.org

