



# Family Engagement in California:

Strengths, Needs, and Trends Identified from the  
2019 Priority 3 Self-Reflection Tool

January 2021



# Acknowledgments

## Authors

The report was prepared for Parent Organization Network (PON) by Transformative Inquiry Designs for Effective Schools (TIDES). TIDES team members leading this project include Janet H. Chrispeels, Ed. D.; Margarita Gonzalez Zaske, Ph.D.; and Pamela Long, M.A.

This research brief was created by Araceli Simeón, PON Project Director, based on the TIDES report.

## Graphic Designer

Dominic Jackson

## Funders

Funding for this publication was provided through the generous support of The California Endowment and United Way of Greater Los Angeles.

## About PON

PON was founded in 2005 in Los Angeles. PON unites the power of underserved parents to break through barriers in public education, so parents and educators can effectively partner to ensure equity and excellence for all students.

## About TIDES

TIDES is a nonprofit organization founded in San Diego in 2009. TIDES enable districts, schools and education-focused organizations to transform leading and teaching through data-rich guided evaluations and professional development.



Dear Reader:

The Parent Organization Network (PON) and Transformative Inquiry Designs for Effective Schools (TIDES) partnered for this research project to analyze school district narrative responses of the 2019 Priority 3 Self-Reflection Tool. The purpose of the study is to provide educators and parent engagement leaders in California with a sense of how districts are working to meet the needs of families, fulfill the LCFF Priority 3, and identify promising practices and gaps or areas where districts may need more support.

This policy brief outlines six prominent strengths and six needs or focus areas that were identified for family engagement self-reports across school districts in California. Examples are shared to show how family engagement practices are evolving as it relates to the three self-reflection tool areas: relationship building between staff and families, partnerships for student outcomes, and seeking input for decision making.

Key takeaways from this research: **California school districts are slowly strengthening the practice of family engagement and recognize there is still work to do to see concrete benefits for short and long-term student outcomes.** For example, we learned that:

- **Districts are working in multiple ways to increase partnerships with families and increase engagement.** Districts should be recognized for their efforts, and those with promising practices can serve as valuable guides to others. Notably a few districts are focusing on the critical issue of equity, which is essential in achieving better student outcomes. Districts are recognizing the need to focus on professional development to address bias and inequities in family engagement policies and practices and to find ways to reach more underrepresented families.
- **Many school districts are hiring more family engagement staff at the school and district level and investing in training so staff can work effectively with families.** While research has demonstrated that family engagement has a connection to improved outcomes (e.g., attendance, academics, social emotional skills, graduation rates, teacher satisfaction, and school improvement) current engagement activities are not being directly or indirectly connected to student outcomes. Without clear outcomes, it will be difficult to measure progress and sustain these investments over time.

Still, we are hopeful for the future as the pandemic has increased educators' awareness about the importance of strong family-school partnerships to support student success. As a society, we know that in order to have healthy children we must have healthy families. We also see schools trying to meet the needs of the whole child, as well as address the ever-increasing levels of poverty in American communities. However, effective collaboration requires supporting families and school staff in every way possible and the state can and should play a more prominent role in this effort.

We urge the state to ensure that research-based frameworks and best practices are implemented with fidelity through the system (e.g., System of Support, county offices of education etc.) to expedite a shift toward culturally responsive, relationship-based engagement focused on impacting student learning and school improvement.

Sincerely,

Araceli Simeón  
Project Director  
Parent Organization Network

Janet H. Chrispeels, Ed.D.  
Director  
Transformative Inquiry Designs for Effective Schools

# Family Engagement in California: Strengths, Needs, and Trends Identified from the 2019 Priority 3 Self-Reflection Tool

## Background

In 2013 the passage of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) identified parent involvement, now referred to as parent engagement, as one of eight state priorities. All local education agencies (LEAs) such as school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education must address the state priorities in their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs), annually measure their progress, and report their results in the California School Dashboard. Some state priorities are measured through quantitative indicators and others, such as family engagement, are measured through self-reflection tools.

In 2019, the State Board of Education approved a revised self-reflection tool for parent engagement. The tool requires LEAs to engage a diverse group of stakeholders in analyzing data and rating the school district's implementation level for family engagement and, then to identify strengths, needs, and improvement areas. [The self-reflection tool asks 12 questions in three sections: relationship building between families and school staff, building partnerships for student outcomes, and seeking input for decision making.](#) In each category questions are designed to assess best practices and training provided for staff and families to engage with each other. In addition, there is a narrative component to complete on strengths and areas for improvement. The self-reflection tool may be accessed at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/documents/priority3tool.pdf>

## Purpose

The purpose of this brief is to provide educators and parent engagement leaders in California with a sense of how districts are working to meet the needs of families, fulfill the LCFF Priority 3, and identify promising practices and gaps or areas where districts may need more support. It is important to note that while these district reports were completed before the pandemic, the examples of how they are supporting families, preparing staff to engage with families, and soliciting input from families are still relevant.

This report presents a qualitative analysis of the self-reflection tool narrative descriptions drawn from a stratified sample of 248 school districts. Twenty-four of these districts as well as eight county offices of education (COEs) that had been noted by PON, CDE and partners as having promising family engagement practices were also analyzed. For a list of the school districts, please see Appendix A.

## THE 248 SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPRESENT

**26.6%**

of all district self-reflection tool responses

**55%**

of students

**47 of 58**

counties

**11 of 11**

state regions

This stratified sample includes school districts from each of the 11 CCSESA-identified state regions. Within each region, all three types of districts were selected: elementary, secondary or high school, and unified, with attention given to selecting rural, suburban, and urban school districts.



## Six Strengths and Needs/Focus Areas in Family Engagement were Identified Across School Districts

The self-reflection tool instructed LEAs to "[b]riefly describe [their] current strengths and progress in this area, and identify a focus area for improvement, including how the LEA will improve the engagement of underrepresented families." In reading the narratives, strengths and areas for focus were categorized by major theme and the frequently mentioned ones are highlighted in this brief. We present six predominant strengths and needs or focus areas identified by districts.

### Six Strengths

1. Offered a wide variety of school led educational workshops for families.
2. Partnered with other agencies to offer multi-session programs to support parenting and leadership skills.
3. Provided professional development for administrators and teachers to help them learn how to partner with families.
4. Hired classified and certificated staff at district and site levels to provide more support for family engagement.
5. Identified having the required committees as a strength and mentioned special committees established to address unique student sub-group needs or issues.
6. Used surveys and a variety of other venues and means to solicit parent input and foster two-way communication.

### Six Needs or Focus Areas

1. Implementing a framework to guide family engagement.
2. Providing professional development to help staff build strong partnerships with families for student outcomes and address inequities and bias. Specific areas of need mentioned:
  - a. Addressing cultural responsiveness, bias, and racism;
  - b. Providing professional development for principals on how to engage families and staff in meaningful decision-making committees; and
  - c. Developing parent leadership and including parents from underrepresented groups.
3. Finding ways to engage more underserved and underrepresented families in all aspects of district and school activities from decision making to attending programs and events to support their children's learning at home.
4. Identifying ways that students can be more involved, and their voices and ideas incorporated into school and district LCAP plans and their implementation.
5. Examining and approaching family engagement with an equity lens focused on student outcomes
6. Implementing interactive tools and resources to enhance parent input and ensure effective two-way communication.

### Approach to Reviewing the Narratives

The TIDES team selected a sample of five districts to analyze the narrative data and identify emergent themes. Each team member read and analyzed the same five narratives. Then, the team members compared similarities and differences in coding the data to identify the dominant themes in the research and ensure consistency in the approach to coding. Each researcher then read approximately 82 district narratives.

## STRENGTHS

The strengths mentioned by districts across the three narratives suggest that leaders are working hard to find ways to meaningfully engage with families. The top six areas cited as strengths showed that districts:

1. **Offered a wide variety of school led educational workshops for families.** The workshops were primarily focused on academic topics such as literacy, reading, math, and STEM/STEAM to provide tools for parents to support learning at home.
  - a. **Trend:** 35 (14%) districts established Parent Universities or Academies to offer more extended learning opportunities for parents and sometimes staff. For secondary students, college and career awareness and readiness were important topics.
  - b. Parent activities were often listed in "*Narrative 1: Building Relationships between School Staff and Families*" but it was less clear how these build staff relationships with families in ways that affect student outcomes. **Four noteworthy trends are being implemented by a few districts that may enhance staff-parent relationships:**
    - i. Shifting parent-teacher conferences from a verbal report card to goal setting and partnership. To achieve this some mentioned establishing Academic Teacher-Parent Teams, with support from WestEd;
    - ii. Exploring digital tools that would foster more two-way communication;
    - iii. Developing parents as leaders and ambassadors to connect underrepresented families with teachers; and
    - iv. Increasing parents' understanding of their legal rights and how to advocate for their children.
2. **Partnered with other agencies to offer multi-session programs to support parenting and leadership skills.** Schools and districts recognized they could not do it alone, and 29% of districts reached out to other organizations and agencies for assistance in meeting the needs of families.
  - a. **Trend:** Districts cited partnerships with county offices of education or county social service agencies to offer workshops on parenting, nutrition and wellness, mental health, socio-emotional development, and drug use issues.
  - b. **Trend:** Family resource centers in schools, communities, or districts were not only places where parents could gather, attend workshops, and learn, but also where parents could collect needed clothing and food supplies. They are a testament to the ways districts are trying to meet the needs of the whole child as well as address the ever-increasing poverty in America.



- 3. Provided professional development for administrators and teachers to help them learn how to partner with families.** The professional development for 41% of districts focused primarily on helping staff develop positive working relationships with families; and for 27% on developing staff understanding and appreciation for family strengths, language, and culture. Others focused on supporting staff to implement family engagement frameworks (12%), or learning about trauma, poverty, and social emotional intelligence (14%). A few districts (7%) were also beginning to address equity issues, including looking at bias in instructional practices and policies.
- 4. Hired classified and certificated staff at district and site levels to provide more support for family engagement.** Hiring staff that speak the diverse languages of the community is often essential in building the bridges to underrepresented communities. Another category of staff being hired were those who have a background in social work, experience in engaging diverse families, or skills in managing resource centers. The positions filled also suggest districts are hiring additional staff to meet the needs of diverse families (e.g., English learners (ELs), homeless families, foster youth, and students in special education).
- Trends:**
- 36% of districts reported hiring site level staff positions: parent engagement specialists, facilitators interpreters/translators, EL Support & Assessment technicians, counselors, social workers, family and community engagement (FACE) liaisons.
  - 21% of districts reported hiring district staff positions: FACE directors or specialists, communications, community outreach, or social workers.
  - Math specialists, literacy specialists, bilingual coordinators, and counselors now often play a critical role in organizing parent education workshops and family nights.

The assignment of this staff to help parents better navigate the school system could yield enhanced student outcomes (e.g., attendance, staying in school, graduating). However, districts did not make explicit connections between providing professional development and hiring staff to support family engagement and student outcomes. Districts may need more support identifying outputs and outcomes.



5. **Identified having the required committees as a strength and mentioned special committees established to address unique student sub-group needs or issues.** Across the 11 regions, 75% of districts mentioned establishing the required committees at district and school levels. **Trend:** Establishing Non-Required Committees: These helped to include underrepresented groups such as Native Americans, African Americans, Mixtec, Punjabi, and students, or to fulfill special functions such as bond oversight. All these formally established groups are providing input into the LCAP process.
6. **Used surveys and a variety of other venues and means to solicit parent input and foster two-way communication.** Forty-two percent (42%) of districts reported using surveys to gather input from stakeholders. A common challenge is low response rates for surveys. To solicit input in general from parents, staff, students, and community members, districts are using forums, focus groups, informal gatherings (e.g., principal coffees/cafecitos, or teas if Asian parents), PTA/O roundtables, booster club meetings, and community and school events (e.g., special family fun events, student performances, sporting events or during Parent-Teacher Conference week). The use of these informal events is particularly noted in reports from small districts in rural areas where transportation is a barrier.



# NEEDS and/or FOCUS AREAS

There is considerable overlap in the needs and focus areas identified by districts, therefore in this summary, they are brought together. Examples of key districts that could serve as models for other districts that have a need or have chosen this theme as a focus area are shared.

## 1. Implementing a Framework for Family Engagement

Although this topic was not at the forefront of needs or areas of focus, it may be one of the most important for districts to address. The California Department of Education (CDE) has been at the forefront of encouraging home-school partnerships for many years. One district mentioned the *Six Types of Parent Involvement* developed by Dr. Joyce Epstein, which was shared with the CDE and other districts in the early 1990s. Currently, the CDE publications (i.e., CDE's Family Engagement Toolkit and self-reflection tool for family engagement) are influenced by the *Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships* (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013) yet not everyone in the field is familiar with it or has made a transition to integrate it in their work.

This dual capacity framework is significant because it recognizes that it is insufficient to build the capacity of parents without simultaneously developing the capacity of staff to work with families. A review of the narratives clearly showed that districts are doing a great deal to support families and provide parent education (Narrative 1) compared to providing professional development for staff (Narrative 2). Nevertheless, as Narrative 2 strengths showed, steps are being made to provide professional development for staff, and districts recognize more must be done. Learning about and potentially implementing the *Dual Capacity-Building Framework* may serve as a pathway to addressing many of the needs and areas of focus surfaced by districts.

### Actions by school districts:

- Twelve districts have established a diverse, multi-stakeholder Family Engagement Team. An important task of this team is designing, implementing, and evaluating family engagement programs, which twenty-one districts noted was a need or area of focus.
- San Francisco Unified School District's Partnership Academy has created over 35 dual capacity modules and toolkits to support building the capacity of staff, community partners, and families in six best practice areas that are the foundation for the SFUSD Family Partnership Model. Forty-five leaders were trained, and four schools are implementing these practices to build effective partnerships at their sites.
- Chino Valley Unified School District has adopted the US Department of Education's Dual Capacity-Building Framework. The District Family Engagement Center has provided 43 dual capacity workshops for teachers, staff, and administrators. These workshops addressed how best to support parents and families with struggling students in core academic areas, and how to build and strengthen relationships with underrepresented families through effective home visits.

**The Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships**  
(Version 2)



**2. Providing professional development to help staff build strong partnerships with families for student outcomes and address inequities and bias.** District and school administrators, teachers, and classified staff are recognizing that successfully engaging underrepresented families is not possible unless they build staff capacity. This is very promising and suggests a potential turning point in family engagement that could significantly enhance student outcomes if this work is supported.

**a. Addressing cultural responsiveness, bias, and racism**

**Actions by school districts:**

- Mill Valley Elementary (K-8) has made equity a district-wide focus. All administrators have participated in equity oriented professional development. A two-day training on *Courageous Conversations* was attended by 125 stakeholders, including school board, district and school leaders, teachers, support staff and parents, followed by a 6-day training on equity attended by 25 teachers. Particularly important, teachers have begun reviewing instructional practices for racial bias.
- Oakland Unified School District engaged principals and teachers in Equity Social-Emotional Learning and developed Equity Frames including "integrating student and family linguistic and cultural assets" into the learning process.
- John Swett Unified has implemented a Racial Justice Task Force to engage in conversations with the entire community.
- East Side High School District implemented implicit bias training for staff, with 85% completing the course. Pajaro Valley Unified has conducted an *Educational Equity Audit*.
- Ontario-Montclair School District incorporates cultural proficiency learning into all professional development workshops for site and district leaders to build stronger relationships with staff and families.

**b. Provide professional development for principals on how to engage families and staff in meaningful decision-making committees.** Parent engagement quickly ebbs when parents perceive they are only rubber-stamping decisions that have already been made. Opportunities for district administrators and principals is a first step if the goal of building partnerships with families is to be achieved. Training parents as leaders may backfire if administrators are unwilling to be transparent about district and school data, especially the budget, and are not comfortable sharing decision making.



**Actions by school districts:**

- Vista Unified has implemented a shared governance model practiced in all its schools.
- Oakland Unified School District provides training and support of School Site Councils (SSCs) and English Learner Advisory Committees (ELACs). A Family Engagement liaison assists members by developing knowledge skills and leadership.
- San Diego Unified School District's Family Engagement Team builds capacity of parent committee members, trains chairs of committees, and attends meetings to provide support and share critical district updates and information.

- c. Developing parent leadership and including parents from under-represented groups.** Professional development or training is recommended for parents to fully participate in committees and have equal voice at the table, especially if they do not have prior experiences participating in these bodies.

**Actions by school districts:**

- Oxnard School District provides training for principals and parents on the SSC and ELACs and is developing parent leaders through Project 2 Inspire, which has created space for "open and honest communication between families and the school district and a deep understanding that we are a team focused on our students' and community's well-being."
- Hayward Unified School District has implemented a strong parent ambassador program, training parents as leaders who form a bridge between parents and school staff, helping parents and staff build positive relations.
- West Contra Costa School District has a robust stakeholder engagement process, which has resulted in strong parent leadership in four district-level advisory committees.
- Sacramento City Unified School District has created a Parent Leadership Pathway Program, which is a site-based series of workshops throughout the school year, where parents/guardians can progress over multiple Tiers 1, 2, and 3. Key topics include the core aspects of the educational system and factors that lead towards developing the skills to become leaders within their peer group. In the latter part of the series, parents/guardians acquire facilitation, communication, asset mapping, and data analysis skills linked to student achievement efforts.

- 3. Finding ways to engage more underserved and underrepresented families in all aspects of district and school activities from decision making to attending programs and events to support their children's learning at home.** The surveys being used by many districts to solicit input as well as the focus groups and forums may be the best tools for finding out what parents, students, and staff want and need to be able to work together and ensure better student outcomes. Addressing barriers that have been identified is also key.

**Actions by school districts:**

- Chula Vista Elementary School District learned from its survey that scheduling conflicts were a major reason for "no shows." Parents have busy lives.
- Ventura COE noted it is important to recognize family limitations (and not be judgmental).
- San Diego COE doubled its participation of stakeholders.

- 4. Identifying ways that students can be more involved, and their voices and ideas incorporated into school and district LCAP plans and their implementation.** At the secondary level, student engagement can enhance self-esteem, life skills, social skills, democratic and citizenship skills, student-adult relationships, and school ethos (Mager & Nowak, 2012).

**Actions by school districts:**

- San Francisco Unified established a Student Advisory Council that meets twice monthly, actively participates in the LCAP process, provides recommendations to the board of education on policies, and solicits student input from throughout the district.
- East Side Union High School District established a Student Advisory LCAP committee and has a Student Advisory Council that surveys students.

- 5. Examining and approaching family engagement with an equity lens focused on student outcomes.** To re-enforce an asset-based approach when assessing strengths or deciding on an area of focus, give more attention to how the strengths are impacting student outcomes and how an area of focus can be designed to enhance family engagement practices that indirectly or directly impact student outcomes.

**Action by a school district:**

Cajon Valley Union School District analyzed the results from the Gallop surveys for parents, students, and staff, as well as local assessment data. The data showed strong evidence of building positive relationships with parents to improve student outcomes, which they found was directly related to the expansion of their Family Teacher Teams. As a result, the district is re-imagining parent conferences to be more interactive with joint goal setting, tips for home support. Teacher Teams have now been expanded to six elementary schools.

- 6. Implementing interactive tools and resources to enhance parent input and ensure effective two-way communication.** In addition to traditional paper or electronic communications (e.g., newsletters, marquees, automatic phone messages, etc.), districts can use interactive tools that are parent-friendly and provide both information and opportunities for two-way interactions between users, such as school mobile apps, social media, school portals, and other digital platforms that can be downloaded from the district/school website. Provide training for parents, students, community members, and staff for the tools to be effective.

**Action by a school district:**

Ontario-Montclair School District is successfully using the "Thought-Exchange," a portal designed to provide parents, students, community members, and staff a vehicle to give input and collaborate with one another, as they rate one another's "thoughts." As a result of this interactive process among all stakeholder participants, the highest rated "thoughts" were highlighted, and themes emerged giving the district critical and relevant information for decision making.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in bold font denote greater importance or urgency for adoption.

1. **Explore the feasibility of the *Dual Capacity-Building Framework and other CDE family engagement tools* as a guiding model for reaching district and LCFF goals.**
2. **Continue offering professional development to help staff build strong partnerships with families for student outcomes and address inequities and bias.** As a general recommendation, professional development needs to begin with administrators and boards of education, then teaching and classified staff, parents, students, and community.
  - Take steps to have courageous conversations needed to address inequities and systemic bias in educational policies and practices.
  - Provide professional development for principals on how to engage families and staff in meaningful decision-making committees.
  - Develop parent leadership and include parents from underrepresented groups.
  - Share promising practices on how to effectively reach, engage and serve underrepresented families and students.
3. **Ask parents and students how they want to be engaged and address identified barriers.**
  - Identify ways that students can be more involved, and their voices and ideas incorporated into school and district LCAP plans and their implementation.
  - Strengthen parent-teacher conferences to be goal focused, action oriented to enhance student outcomes, and true partnerships.
4. **Use a strengths-based focus when designing family engagement activities or practices.** In assessing strengths or deciding on an area of focus, pay attention to how the strengths are impacting student outcomes and how an area of focus can be designed to enhance family engagement practices that indirectly or directly impact student outcomes.
5. **Simplify the self-reflection tool for LCFF Priority 3 to make it easier for districts and encourage thoughtful analysis about accomplishments and next steps.**
  - List 1-3 accomplishments that have strengthened staff-family relationships, built partnerships for student outcomes, sought input for decision-making.
  - Provide one next step needed to continue progress.



## Appendix A: List of Districts Reviewed

### REGION 1

1. Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified
2. Geyserville Unified
3. Dunham Elementary
4. Guerneville Elementary
5. Healdsburg Unified
6. Konocti Unified
7. Lakeport Unified
8. McKinleyville Union Elementary
9. Mendocino Unified
10. Petaluma City Elem/Joint Union High
11. Santa Rosa City Schools
12. Sebastopol Union Elementary
13. Sonoma Valley Unified
14. Trinidad Union Elementary
15. Ukiah Unified

### REGION 2

16. Black Butte Union Elementary
17. Chico Unified
18. Durham Unified
19. Fall River Joint Unified
20. Grenada Elementary
21. Lake Elementary
22. Manzanita Elementary
23. McCloud Union Elementary
24. Pacheco Union Elementary
25. Palermo Union Elementary
26. Paradise Unified
27. Red Bluff Union Elementary
28. Shasta Union High
29. Tulelake Basin Joint Unified
30. Westwood Unified
31. Willows Unified

### REGION 3

32. Black Oak Mine Unified
33. Dry Creek Joint Elementary
34. Elk Grove Unified
35. Folsom-Cordova Unified
36. Gold Trail Union Elementary
37. Natomas Unified
38. Pioneer Union Elementary
39. Placer Union High
40. Placerville Union Elementary
41. Rocklin Unified
42. Roseville City Elementary

43. Roseville Joint Union High
44. Sacramento City Unified
45. San Juan Unified
46. Twin Rivers Unified
47. Western Placer Unified
48. Williams Unified
49. Yuba City Unified

### REGION 4

50. Alameda Unified
51. Antioch Unified
52. Benicia Unified
53. Burlingame Elementary
54. Byron Union Elementary
55. Castro Valley Unified
56. Dixon Unified
57. Fremont Unified
58. Hayward Unified
59. John Swett Unified
60. Las Lomas Elementary
61. Mill Valley Elementary
62. Millbrae Elementary
63. Mt. Diablo Unified
64. Napa Valley Unified
65. New Haven Unified
66. Oakland Unified
67. Portola Valley Elementary
68. San Bruno Park Elementary
69. San Carlos Elementary
70. San Francisco Unified
71. San Rafael City High
72. San Ramon Valley Unified
73. Sausalito Marin County
74. Sequoia Union High
75. Vacaville Unified
76. Vallejo City Unified
77. West Contra Costa Unified

### REGION 5

78. Alum Rock Union Elementary
79. Franklin-McKinley Elementary
80. Gilroy Unified
81. Greenfield Union Elementary
82. Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary

- 83. Oak Grove Elementary
- 84. Live Oak Elementary
- 85. Campbell Union High
- 86. East Side Union High
- 87. Fremont Union High
- 88. Monterey Peninsula Unified
- 89. Morgan Hill Unified
- 90. Mountain View-Los Altos Union High
- 91. Pajaro Valley Unified
- 92. Palo Alto Unified
- 93. Salinas City Elementary
- 94. Salinas Union High
- 95. San Benito High
- 96. San Jose Unified
- 97. San Lorenzo Valley Unified
- 98. San Lucas Union Elementary
- 99. Santa Clara Unified
- 100. South Monterey County Joint Union High
- 101. Sunnyvale

#### REGION 6

- 102. Calaveras Unified
- 103. Ceres Unified
- 104. Denair Unified
- 105. Keyes Union
- 106. Lincoln Unified
- 107. Lodi Unified
- 108. Manteca Unified
- 109. Modesto City Elementary
- 110. Modesto City High
- 111. New Hope Elementary
- 112. Newman-Crows Landing Unified
- 113. Patterson Joint Unified
- 114. Stockton Unified
- 115. Summerville Union High
- 116. Tracy Joint Unified
- 117. Turlock Unified

#### REGION 7

- 118. Atwater Elementary
- 119. Bass Lake Joint Union Elementary
- 120. Central Unified
- 121. Chowchilla Union High
- 122. Clovis Unified
- 123. Dinuba Unified
- 124. Fresno Unified
- 125. Kings Canyon Joint Unified
- 126. Kings River-Hardwick Union Elementary

- 127. Lemoore Union Elementary
- 128. Lemoore Union High
- 129. Los Banos Unified
- 130. Madera Unified
- 131. Merced City Elementary
- 132. Merced River Union Elementary
- 133. Porterville Unified
- 134. Sanger Unified
- 135. Selma Unified
- 136. Strathmore Union Elementary
- 137. Tulare Joint Union High
- 138. Visalia Unified
- 139. Waukena Joint Union Elementary

#### REGION 8

- 140. Arvin Union
- 141. Bakersfield City
- 142. Conejo Valley Unified
- 143. Delano Union Elementary
- 144. Delano Joint Union High
- 145. Greenfield Union
- 146. Kern High
- 147. Lakeside Union
- 148. Lamont Elementary
- 149. Lompoc Unified
- 150. Lucia Mar Unified
- 151. Maricopa Unified
- 152. Moorpark Unified
- 153. Oxnard School District
- 154. Paso Robles Joint Unified
- 155. Pleasant Valley
- 156. Richland Union Elementary
- 157. San Luis Coastal Unified
- 158. Santa Barbara Unified
- 159. Santa Maria-Bonita
- 160. Santa Maria Joint Union High
- 161. Santa Paula Unified
- 162. Simi Valley Unified
- 163. Somis Union
- 164. Ventura Unified
- 165. Wasco Union Elementary

## REGION 9

- 166. Anaheim Union High
- 167. Buena Park Elementary
- 168. Cajon Valley Union
- 169. Centralia Elementary
- 170. Chula Vista Elementary
- 171. Cypress Elementary
- 172. Dehesa Elementary
- 173. El Centro Elementary
- 174. Escondido Union
- 175. Escondido Union High
- 176. Fallbrook Union High
- 177. Fountain Valley Elementary
- 178. Fullerton Elementary
- 179. Heber Elementary
- 180. Huntington Beach Elementary
- 181. Jamul-Dulzura Union Elementary
- 182. Julian Union High
- 183. Irvine Unified
- 184. La Habra City Elementary
- 185. La Mesa-Spring Valley
- 186. McCabe Union Elementary
- 187. Magnolia Elementary
- 188. Meadows Union Elementary
- 189. Mulberry Elementary
- 190. National Elementary
- 191. Newport-Mesa Unified
- 192. Ocean View
- 193. Oceanside Unified
- 194. Orange Unified
- 195. Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified
- 196. San Diego Unified
- 197. San Marcos Unified
- 198. San Pasqual Union Elementary
- 199. San Ysidro Elementary
- 200. Santa Ana Unified
- 201. Santee Elementary
- 202. Savanna Elementary
- 203. Seeley Union Elementary
- 204. Solana Beach Elementary
- 205. South Bay Elementary
- 206. Vista Unified

## REGION 10

- 207. Alvord Unified
- 208. Chaffey Joint Union High
- 209. Chino Valley Unified
- 210. Corona-Norco Unified
- 211. Hesperia Unified
- 212. Jurupa Unified
- 213. Lake Elsinore Unified
- 214. Menifee Union Elementary
- 215. Mountain View Elementary
- 216. Moreno Valley Unified
- 217. Murrieta Valley Unified
- 218. Ontario-Montclair
- 219. Palm Springs Unified
- 220. Perris Union High
- 221. Riverside Unified
- 222. San Bernardino City Unified
- 223. Val Verde Unified
- 224. Victor Elementary

## REGION 11

- 225. ABC Unified
- 226. Alhambra Unified
- 227. Azusa Unified
- 228. Bonita Unified
- 229. Burbank Unified
- 230. Centinela Valley Union High
- 231. Compton Unified
- 232. Downey Unified
- 233. East Whittier City Elementary
- 234. El Monte City
- 235. Glendale Unified
- 236. Hacienda la Puente Unified
- 237. Hermosa Beach City Elementary
- 238. Lancaster Elementary
- 239. Lawndale Elementary
- 240. Long Beach Unified
- 241. Los Angeles Unified
- 242. Montebello Unified
- 243. Norwalk-La Mirada Unified
- 244. Palmdale Elementary
- 245. Pasadena Unified
- 246. Pomona Unified
- 247. South Whittier Elementary
- 248. Torrance Unified