So Many Fine Changes

JENNIFER BECKETT, PRESIDENT

Last March we held our 45th Annual Meeting at 2209 Van Ness Avenue. During the ensuing year, we have moved the San Francisco program to 657 Mission Street, joined a regional naturalization collaborative, started our new YouthCares Project, increased office space for the Redwood City program, established an endowment to help defray operating costs, and increased our budget (still balanced!) by ten percent. Our staff of 31 has served over 8,000 clients. Are you breathless yet? We certainly are!

Let me start at the beginning. In February of 1997 the sale of 2209 Van Ness closed, and on April 2nd the move to 657 Mission Street took place. Margi and the staff rose to the challenge of cleaning out the Institute from attic to basement, sending sixteen boxes of historical papers to the Immigration History Archive at the University of Minnesota for preservation. Although we miss the picturesque surroundings of our old location, the new offices are brighter, more convenient to our surroundings of our old location, the new

The Board counts two new members, Scott Wu and Manuel Santamaria, who bring unique skills and welcome enthusiasm. Our active committees are Public Relations, chaired by Michele Keith; Membership, chaired by Sue Taha; and Nominating, chaired by Kathleen Sullivan. We are all infused with new enthusiasm for the work that we are doing.

We have taken advantage of this spirit to conduct a new strategic planning exercise this Fall. The October 22nd day-long staff retreat set the tone for a follow-up Board retreat on January 10th. The outcome of both these sessions will be reflected in a new vision statement for the Institute, which will be presented at our Annual Meeting on March 23.

Although we still labor under the perpetual challenge of inadequate funding and staffing in the face of expanding need for our services, we do it with buoyant spirit and enthusiasm. We have many accomplishments of which to be proud, but also many goals yet unmet. If we all work together, we can certainly achieve our vision for the Institute and our community.
Our Own Migration

MARGI DUNLAP

As I write this, there are blossoms on Donald’s begonia. Last year at this time, the begonia sat, a bit droopily, on a round antique oak table in the entryway of an old mansion on Van Ness Avenue. What light it absorbed came through a massive window, with a frame so ancient that drafts in the winter required the receptionist to put an electric heater at her feet so she wouldn’t be too cold to work. Today, the plant sits on top of a lateral file cabinet in the central area of a big, warmly lit office on Mission Street. The Institute, like the begonia, is blossoming again.

We can’t compare our migration to the migration experience of our clients. Moving to a new country in another part of the world is very different from moving across town. But the impact of this move on the Institute, after spending 45 years in an imposing and drafty house, has been profound nonetheless.

First, there is the way it feels to be so much closer to other people who are doing similar work. Neighbors in our building include the Center for Youth Development, and Theater Bay Area. We’re only a block or two from The San Francisco Foundation, The S.H. Cowell Foundation, Northern California Grantmakers, the Family Support Bureau, the Asian Law Caucus, Catholic Charities, MALDEF, the Northern California Coalition for Immigrant Rights, the African Refugee and Immigrant Resource Center, the South of Market Problem Solving Council, and the Support Center.

This is a location that can enrich our spirit as well. We’re across the street from the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, the Museum of Modern Art, the Jewish Museum, the site for the new Mexican Museum, and the California Historical Society. The Downtown Center for City College is two blocks away, as well as the downtown campus of San Francisco State University. Golden Gate University, and the charter school Leadership High, are down the street. Because we’re so close to Academy of Art College, there are art supply stores and galleries close by, with provocative and frequently changing displays in the windows. At Yerba Buena Center, in the summer, there are literary readings, musical and theater groups performing outside at noon, and we can walk across the street with our sandwiches, sit on the grass and watch. Twenty years ago, the South of Market area was an undeveloped, somewhat undesirable location. A South of Market address was not an indicator of any kind of success. The transition of this area has not been without conflict and displacement. Much low income housing disappeared, spawning the formation of strong housing rights coalitions like TODCO, now a partner in our YouthCarea Project. Newcomers to the neighborhood, living in condominium developments to the South and East, near the Bay, are urban professionals with exercise equipment in their fitness centers. But the people who continue to live in this neighborhood, from the time before the development, are poor and predominantly foreign born. They speak Spanish and Tagalog, and Russian and Chinese.

Walking west on Mission Street, past the San Francisco Chronicle building at Fifth, we could be entering a war zone: welfare hotels, single-room-with-shared-bath structures, graffiti and litter and boarded-up storefronts. The older people who live in these rooms are afraid to go out. There is no supermarket in this neighborhood, no school. The Youth Center run by the Department of Recreation and Parks is surrounded by a big, high fence. When we were looking for a new space, we stopped to see one listing only to discover that immigrant families were living secretly on the top floor of an empty warehouse that had no kitchen or shower.

It is easy to keep focused on our Mission, on Mission Street. It’s all around us, in the music of many languages, in the restaurant on Third that features Filipino, Indian, Mexican, Korean, Afghan, Japanese, Chinese, Thai, and “American” food stands, with a central pavilion where people eat together.

We’re beginning a new chapter in the life of the International Institute. We’ve had a spectacular year of growth and change, much of which you’ll see described elsewhere in this report. And you can always learn more about us by visiting our website, www.iisf.org.

I want to say a special Thank You to the Institute’s superb staff, its dedicated Board members, and the enthusiastic interns and volunteers who make our programs possible. I know that in our new home, we’re not only moving forward, we’re going back to our roots at the same time.
I n the summer of 1996, we enjoyed a brief and refreshing positive change in the attitude of the INS toward citizenship applicants. Doris Meissner, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, had launched “Citizenship USA,” a national program that encouraged legal permanent resident aliens to become United States citizens. As part of this campaign, Meissner was working to diminish hostility within the agency toward immigrants seeking to exercise their rights. The INS initiated outreach to community-based organizations working with immigrants, and spoke of partnerships and collaboration.

But conservatives in Congress were not pleased, and became increasingly uneasy with the number of new citizens who were registering to vote. Charges were made. The INS was accused of conspiring to register Democrats before the 1996 elections. The INS was put on the defensive. The smiles and talk of partnership evaporated. Someone had evidence that thousands of naturalization applications had been processed before the FBI could make the required fingerprint checks on all the applicants. Congress mandated something called NQP, or naturalization quality procedures, as a bridge to what was to come next. NQP meant additional time delays, as mountains of applications had to be linked with even higher mountains of newly required supplemental documentation for each individual applicant.

As those of us who have been doing this for a while know, neither the FBI nor the INS was staffed to handle the flood of 1.7 million applications that have been submitted in the previous 18 months. We expected some delay. But when the dust settled from the scuffle in Congress about procedures, an independent audit was called for, and KPMG Peat Marwick was hired to do it.

As we respond daily to hundreds of phone calls from citizenship applicants who have been waiting between one and two years for word of their interview dates, we feel it is important to tell you what KPMG Peat Marwick found. Three hundred sixty-nine out of 1,050,000 individual naturalization applications reviewed failed to disclose information that, if known, would have made them ineligible for naturalization. Another 5,951 people (fewer than one half of one percent of total submissions) are likely to have lied on their applications, but not in a way that would exclude them from becoming citizens.

Because of these findings, and no doubt also because of the political stands taken during the discussions in Congress on the issue, the INS hired Coopers and Lybrand to design a new system for the naturalization process. They say the new procedures should provide the necessary security, cut the backlog, and make it possible for people to apply for and attain US citizenship within six months of application.

The result of your calculation will tell you the cost of punishing the INS and all pending citizenship applicants in the country for missing one bad apple. Ask yourself: Is it worth it? Is it fair?

Visit our website
www.iisf.org
The Institute’s Role in the Northern California Citizenship Project

STACY TOLCHIN

After the passage of Welfare Reform (the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996), the Institute joined the Northern California Citizenship Project, a collaboration of community-based organizations, local governments, and private foundations in 12 counties. At its inception, the project’s objective was to naturalize legal permanent residents in danger of losing their food stamps and Supplemental Security Income. With some exceptions, citizenship was the only way to ensure that thousands of elderly, disabled, and low-income immigrants and refugees would maintain what in many cases was their sole source of income. In San Francisco County, 23,000 legal resident immigrants were in danger of losing SSI, and in San Mateo County, 3,800 were likely to lose the benefit.

The possibility of the termination of SSI caused panic in immigrant and refugee communities. SSI recipients receive $645 per month, a small subsistence in Northern California’s costly communities. People who receive SSI are over 65 or disabled, a population that is considered unemployable. For most people in this group, there are no other options, SSI is the only way for individuals to support themselves. The threat of the termination of benefits produced fear, anxiety, and depression for many legal residents. There were threats of suicide throughout the country because of this issue, as well as instances of individuals who lost the will to keep on functioning. Mainstream and ethnic media unwittingly spread damaging misinformation among immigrant groups, and the situation became a critical issue in Northern California, where immigrants make up a larger part of the population than in most parts of the country.

In San Francisco County, the Institute became involved in the Mayor’s Welfare Reform Task Force Immigration Committee. We worked to develop advocacy recommendations and a city-wide project that would assist 10,000 legal residents to complete the citizenship process. With funding from the San Francisco Foundation, granted to the Foundation by George Soros’ Open Society Institute, the Institute served as a full-service naturalization hub. We worked with three other hub agencies in the project, as well as 15 partner agencies located throughout San Francisco. We established beneficial relationships with organizations serving primarily elderly and disabled populations, and helped to create a city-wide network of community organizations working to provide information and assistance to as many individuals as possible. We have expanded our number of citizenship classes, and with the help of volunteers we are able to offer classes at other community organizations in the city that have not been able to provide naturalization services to their clients until now.

In San Mateo County, the Institute worked with other community organizations, county government, and the Peninsula Community Foundation to develop a strategy to serve vulnerable immigrant groups. Early in 1997, the Institute’s monthly citizenship workshops were overwhelmed by clients concerned about the implications of Welfare Reform, serving up to 300 clients in one night. While changes in benefits eligibility were limited to SSI and food stamp recipients, fear spread throughout all immigrant groups.

Welfare Reform became law at the same time as Immigration Reform (Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996), and these two new laws added to our clients’ overall perception that they were unwelcome in the US. With the help of the Peninsula Community Foundation, with funding from private foundations and the Open Society Institute, the Institute’s San Mateo program was funded to provide comprehensive citizenship services in collaboration with other San Mateo agencies. Institute staff also provided technical training on citizenship and disability waivers for local government and community agencies.

Monica Regan, the Institute’s Citizenship Director, has been assigned the task of coordinating the San Mateo County collaborative, and representing the county in the Northern California Citizenship Project.

In September 1997, Congress voted to maintain SSI benefits for those immigrants who had arrived in this country prior to August 22, 1996, the day Welfare Reform was passed. Pressure from immigrant rights groups, many from Northern California, helped to convince Congress that taking away the sole source of income from disabled and elderly immigrants was inhumane and could potentially lead to increased homelessness, elder abuse, suicide, and other alarming societal consequences. The Institute participated in these intense advocacy efforts. We supported various immigrant rights initiatives, and in May 1997, Monica Regan testified in Sacramento before the State Assembly’s Superconference Committee hearings on Welfare Reform and Naturalization.

Immigrants arriving after August 1996 will not be eligible for SSI, unless they become disabled, and it will be up to local counties in California to support them if they are unable to support themselves. California voted not to create a State Supplemental Program for elderly immigrants who will be unable to collect SSI, but the County of San Francisco is developing a safety-net program for this population.

Food Stamps were also terminated for immigrants, but the California legislature voted to provide a state-funded supplemental food program for immigrants under 18 and over 65. San Francisco County has established food distribution points for individuals who may no longer receive food stamps. As many as 600 people per week are now receiving additional food through these sites.

Since federal “fix-it” legislation passed, we have experienced a decrease in the number of clients applying for citizenship in most populations. There is no longer the same “life or death” urgency about becoming a citizen. For elderly and disabled clients, applying for citizenship is a difficult process. For those not fluent in English, and those who are illiterate in...
The YouthCares Project: A Beginning.

JASON FELCH

From the start, the YouthCares Project has been a good idea. Hiring and training young people to assist the elderly—what a new and innovative way to address human needs of the South of Market community. It gives young people a productive activity to engage in after school, one that teaches them job skills, connects them to their community, and gives them an opportunity to earn some spending money. For the senior citizens, it provides just the kind of help they need: an energetic assistant to carry heavy groceries, translate confusing phone bills, decipher the mysteries and possibilities of the Internet. In a broader sense, it reconnects two ends of our community that have somehow become isolated from each other. Many of the people I’ve spoken to about the program have had a common reaction—what a good idea!

Since December, my job has been to transform this good idea into a functioning reality. In many ways it is similar to what I was doing in my previous job in Ecuador—starting a new school, beginning with a progressive philosophy about education and creating an actual place where learning happens. The skills I took away from that project, curriculum design, leading and empowering youth, chaos tolerance, quickly became applicable to the YouthCares Project. Now I was starting a new program in an unfamiliar neighborhood. There was much to be done.

I began making a reality of YouthCares by telling everybody I could about what we were doing. I realized early on that outreach to the community would be a key to the program. The challenge of YouthCares is that it seeks to help those who, by definition, are somewhat isolated. We want to find youth that are uninvolved and unemployed, but interested in changing that by learning skills that will help them in the future. We want to help seniors who need assistance and companionship because they live alone or have limited mobility. I began the outreach process by contacting everyone in the community who worked with or was involved with either of the two communities.

As the weeks passed, YouthCares became more and more of a reality. I met with leaders in the youth and elderly communities who showed interest in the program. I formed collaborations with other organizations that had similar goals as ours. Two important examples are TODCO and Zeum. TODCO is the Tenants and Owners Development Corporation, which owns and manages a number of low-cost senior housing facilities in the neighborhood. Zeum is a new Technology and Arts Studio for youth in the Yerba Buena Center. It has excellent multimedia facilities and programs. These relationships, along with others in the city government and local high schools, helped establish a place for YouthCares in the community.

Today, YouthCares is still a good idea. We have recruited many of the youth participants and are enrolling every day. We have identified more seniors in need of assistance than we will be able to help, though we’ll try. We have convened an Advisory Board of experts in the youth and senior communities, as well as youth and seniors themselves. We have developed a training program to teach the young people how they can best help seniors. We have hired a high school aged Project Assistant, Carlo De Guzman, to help with future outreach and coordination of the program. We have sought out and applied for future funding to keep the program alive. In short, we have taken the steps necessary to make YouthCares more than just a good idea, but a great program that helps people.
With special gratitude to our San Francisco Interns and Administrative Volunteers:

Maria Battista, from San Francisco State University • Dana Gaye, English in Action • Ida DeRosa, from Williams Sonoma • Clemencia Dedet, from the National Council on Aging • Marie DeGuzman, from volunteer opportunities listed on her in-office e-mail • Stacia Eyerly, from Smith Barney • Gail Fiaudtrone, from UC Berkeley TESL Certificate Program • Jackie Kaun, Volunteer Attorney • Katherine Kimball, Volunteer Attorney • Natasha Kouaren, from English in Action • Mary Ann La Torres, from University of San Francisco • Sallie Lu, from the National Council on Aging • Felicia Mello, from Oberlin College • Camelia Naghib, from Oberlin College • Silyen Nhoi, Caseworker Emeritus, from the Department of Human Services • Kevin Pimentel, from University of Michigan Law School • Suzanne Plank, from University of San Francisco TESL Program • Rebecca Rich, from Oberlin College • Jennifer Thompson, Volunteer • Jenny Tran, from San Francisco State University • Dawn Wenzel, from University of San Francisco TESL Program • Emily Willits, from Swarthmore College

To Our San Mateo County Citizenship Volunteers: Many Thanks!

Agueda Alvarado, new citizen and former client • Giovanni Alvarado, new citizen and former client • Angela Ayala, heard about us from a friend • Margaret Barber, from the Volunteer Center • Carmen Callejas, referred by the Fair Oaks Community Center • Salvador Callejas, also referred by Fair Oaks • Giancarlo Campagna, poet, learned about us from a friend • Orlando Cardona, new citizen and former client • Jeremiah Crowell, wanted to practice his Spanish and learn about immigration • Marcelo Diaz, new citizen and former client • Julio Garcia, Fair Oaks Center employee and community activist, now on staff • Sue Graham, referred from another agency • Penelope Guajardo, new citizen and former client • Carlos Jalpa, Centro Bilingue board member • Candice Lee, from the Volunteer Center • Alicia Loffler, heard about us from friends • Daniel Loffler, heard about us from friends, now a candidate for the Institute Board • Octavio Magana, county employee • Letitia McLane, new citizen and former client • Arturo Medina, new citizen and former client • Linda Mino, referred by another agency • Memo Morantes, community leader, activist, and mentor for new citizens • Evangelina Nevarez, recruited by another volunteer, now on staff • Luis Perez, from the Volunteer Center • Tim Regan, paterfamilias and dedicated volunteer • Robert Smith, heard about us from friends • Jay Steinman, English in Action Volunteer and HSF Member • Laura Turborgh, recruited by another volunteer • Laura Wolff, a Vista Volunteer at Habitat for Humanity, found us in the phone book, now staff

Staff of the International Institute of San Francisco

Nara Alikakos, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Kathy Boden, Public Health Nurse, Newcomer Program • Nina Boyd, Health Worker and Nutrition Specialist, Newcomer Program • Wendy Cahnsch, Administrative Assistant, Redwood City • Anna Castillo, Immigration Caseworker, Accredited Representative, Redwood City • Marina Castillo, Immigration Caseworker, Accredited Representative, San Francisco • Samira Causevic, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Carla DeGuzman, YouthCares Student Assistant, San Francisco • Greg Desnica, Receptionist, Refugio Program Assistant, San Francisco • Margi Dunlap, Directora, Executive Director • Jason Felch, YouthCares Program Manager, San Francisco • Carlota Garcia, Clerical Assistant, San Francisco • Julio Garcia, Citizenship Outreach Coordinator, Redwood City • Edin Handan, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Monica Huynh, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Freeda Luu, Administrative Assistant, Newcomer Program • Elba Mata, Receptionist, Casework Trainee, San Francisco • Bella Mogilen, Health Worker and Team Leader, Newcomer Program • Florence Nacamu, Fiscal Coordinator • Evangelina Nevarez, Citizenship Program Assistant, Redwood City • Olga Radom, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Monica Regan, Citizenship Program Director, Redwood City • Carlos Rodas, Clerical Assistant, Redwood City • Ella Rozman, Refugee Acculturation and Citizenship Project, San Francisco • Irisa Rudol, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Phyllis Silva, Immigration Caseworker, Accredited Representative, San Francisco • Lorette Tamayo, Casework Supervisor, Accredited Representative, San Francisco • Enstatine Thai, Health Worker, Newcomer Program • Stacy Tolchin, Executive Assistant, Citizenship Program Manager, San Francisco • Jacqueline Winant, Casework Supervisor, Accredited Representative, Redwood City • Laura Wolff, Immigration Caseworker, Redwood City

We Couldn’t Have Done It Without You!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>CLIENTS SERVED</th>
<th>CLIENTS COME FROM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Citizenship Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>Africa: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>Asia: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Americas: 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Europe: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Health</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Africa: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>Asia: 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Europe: 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English in Action</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Asia: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Americas: 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Europe: 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Programs: 8,145

Note:
1. "Asia" includes Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian, LAo, Tibetan, Mien, Filipinos, Burmese, and other immigrant groups.
2. "Africa" includes Ethiopian, Eritrean, Iraqi, Liberian, Sudanese, and other immigrant groups.
3. "Americas" includes Mexican, Brazilian, Cuban, Haitian, Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Peruvian, Colombian, and other immigrant groups.
4. "Europe" includes Russian, Bosnian, Ukrainian, Armenian, Polish, Bulgarian, Romanian, Hungarian, Czech, Iranian, Afghan, British, Irish, and other immigrant groups.

Financial Status

INCOME
Federal, State, and Other Government Grants 357,645.
Immigration and Refugee Services of America 6,075.
Other Revenue (Grants, Fees, Memberships) 387,110.
Proceeds from Building Sale for Moving Costs 12,499.
TOTAL INCOME 763,329.

EXPENSES
Staff to Service Programs 632,022.
Financial Aid to Refugees 3,250.
Operating Expenses (Utilities, Insurance, Supplies) 128,057.
TOTAL EXPENSES 763,329.

Immigration Law Services Provided

JULY 1, 1996 – JUNE 30, 1997
Attendance at workshops & training 3,554
Naturalization applications filed 1,042
Documents translated 676
Declarations prepared 612
Affidavits of support filed 550
Work authorization obtained 470
Adjustments of status completed 435
Visa petitions filed 427
Consular processing completed 246
Family unity applications filed 84
Advance parole requested 77

With Continuing Appreciation for the Support and Contributions of:

Bank of the Orient
Bruno’s Hauling
The Centers for Disease Control
Coast Property Management
Preston Cook and Jay Pon
Chipman United
Cooper White & Cooper
The Compton Foundation
The S.H. Cowell Foundation
County of San Mateo
English Speaking Union
Fair Oaks Community Center
The Walter and Elise Haas Foundation
Hanson Investment Management
The Immigrant Legal Resource Center
Immigration and Refugee Services of America
The Jewish Community Endowment Fund
The Law Offices of Zuzana Goldstein
Mayor’s Office of Community Development
Miller Freeman Publications
Montgomery Securities
Northern California Coalition for Immigrant Rights
The Peninsula Community Foundation
Private Industry Council
Oberlin College
Raychem Corporation
The San Francisco Foundation
San Francisco Department of Public Health
San Francisco Department of Human Services
San Francisco General Hospital
Charles Schwab and Co.
Side By Side Studios
State of California Department of Health Services
Swarthmore College
The US Committee for Refugees
University of Michigan Law School
Volunteer Center of San Francisco
Volunteer Center of San Mateo
Wells Fargo Bank
David K. Yamakawa, Jr.
And our Members, Donors, and Friends
MISSION AND GOALS STATEMENT

The purpose of the International Institute of San Francisco is to enable immigrants, refugees, and their families to become effective, responsible participants in community life.

GOALS:

1. To promote, protect, and advocate for the rights of refugees and immigrants.
2. To facilitate the reunion of refugee and immigrant families.
3. To assure that immigrants and refugees have access to public and private resources.
4. To educate the public about the social and economic contributions made by refugees and immigrants.
5. To create awareness in the community of the dynamic, positive impact of immigration.
6. To bridge ethnic and cultural differences, and increase understanding of cultural pluralism.