

## Separate ≠ Equal: Mexican Americans Before *Brown v. Board*

by Philippa Strum

It was September 1943, more than a decade before *Brown v. Board of Education* was decided by the Supreme Court, when Soledad Vidaurri walked up to a schoolhouse door with five little children in her wake. American soldiers were still fighting overseas—almost two more years of battles lay ahead before World War II would end—but Orange County, California, in the heart of citrus-growing country, was peaceful and bustling economically because of the wartime demand for agricultural products and war factory materiel. Mrs. Vidaurri had come to the Westminster Main School to enroll her two daughters—Alice and Virginia Vidaurri—and her

niece and two nephews—Sylvia Méndez, Gonzalo Méndez Jr. and Jerome Méndez—in the neighborhood public school.

Mrs. Vidaurri was welcomed to the school and was told that her daughters could be registered. Their father had a French ancestor, and their last name sounded acceptably French or Belgian to the teacher in charge of admissions. Besides, the Vidaurri girls were light-skinned. The Méndez children, however, were visibly darker and, to the teacher, their last name was all too clearly Mexican. They would have to be taken to the “Mexican” school a few blocks away. Little Gonzalo Jr. would remember the teacher telling his aunt, “We’ll take those,” indicating the two Vidaurri girls, “but we won’t take those three.” “We were too dark,” Gonzalo recalled.

“No way,” an outraged Mrs. Vidaurri replied, and marched all the children home. Her equally outraged brother and sister-in-law, Gonzalo and Felicitas Méndez, simply refused to send their children to the “Mexican” school. Two years later, the Méndezes would lead a group of Mexican-American parents into federal court, challenging the segregation of their children, and *Mendez v. Westminster* would become the first case in which a federal court declared that “separate but equal” was not equal at all.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mexicans had migrated to the United States in large numbers in the first decades of the twentieth century, driven by Mexico’s political and economic turmoil and the promise of jobs up north. Historians estimate that more than 1 million Mexicans—one-eighth to one-tenth of the Mexican population—arrived between 1910 and 1930. They settled primarily in the Southwest. By the 1940s, Mexicans and Mexican-Americans constituted the entire picking force for California agriculture, which produced a major share of the state’s income.

Discrimination was endemic. Most of the workers and their families lived in wooden-shacked *colonias* on the outskirts of towns or farms, with no paved streets, sewers, toilets or re-

(Please turn to page 2)

*Philippa Strum (Philippa.Strum@wilsoncenter.org) is Senior Scholar and former Director of U.S. Studies at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, as well as the Broeklundian Professor of Political Science Emerita at the City University of New York.*

*Her previous books include biographies of Louis Dembitz Brandeis; When The Nazis Came to Skokie; Freedom for the Speech We Hate; and Women in the Barracks: The VMI Case and Women’s Rights.*

*This article is drawn from Strum’s book, Mendez v. Westminster: School Desegregation and Mexican-American Rights (University Press of Kansas, 2010).*

### CONTENTS:

**Mendez v. Westminster ..... 1**  
**Bill Taylor Excerpt .... 3**  
**Sandoval ..... 5**  
**Human Rights ..... 9**  
**Researchers’ Reports**  
**Tenant Screening . 10**  
**School Isolation ... 11**  
**School Discipline . 12**  
**Health Advocacy**  
**Curriculum ..... 15**  
**Resources ..... 16**

(SEPARATE: Continued. from page 1)

frigerators. Tuberculosis was a constant threat and affected the Mexican-American community at a rate three to five times that of the Anglo community. A survey of conditions in 1927 found that the average Mexican couple had buried two children, and many had buried three or more. Work was not always available. When it was, the average wage for men was 38¢ an hour; for women, 27¢. (The average wage for all male workers in the United States that year was 61¢; for women, 40¢.) Their wages, in other words, could not provide adequate food, shelter and clothing. There was no sick pay; no payment for injuries sustained on the job; no guarantee that even an underpaid job would be waiting for someone who had to stop working temporarily.

The children of the *colonias* were consigned to rundown schools that taught the boys gardening and wood-working and the girls sewing and housekeeping. The assumption of school authorities was that there was no point in grooming the students for anything other than low-paying jobs, and the curriculum followed in “Mexican” schools insured their being prepared for nothing else. One former Orange County student recalled the difference between the curriculum at the “white” Roosevelt School and that

at the “Mexican” Lincoln School in the town of El Modena: “I remember math . . . a little bit of biology, science, we’d never really heard of that at Lincoln and I know they were being taught stuff like that at Roosevelt.” Many of the “Mexican” schools opened at 7:30 in the morning and ended the day at 12:30, so the children could go to work in the citrus groves. Students were routinely permitted to miss school during the two weeks when the walnut harvest was in. The ostensible reason for the segregation was the children’s lack of English language skills, but in fact school districts simply directed children with Hispanic surnames to the “Mexican” schools without giving

---

### ***“We were too dark.”***

---

them language tests. Instruction was in English, provided by teachers who spoke no Spanish. Many students were kept in each grade for two years.

In 1928, two University of Southern California professors were asked by the Santa Ana school district in Orange County to conduct a survey of all its schools. The professors concluded that Delhi, one of the “Mexican” schools, was a wooden fire hazard. They reported that another, the Artesia School, “has a low single roof with no air space, which makes the temperature in many of the rooms almost unbearable. Since no artificial light is provided in the building, it is impossible to do satisfactory reading without serious eye strain on many days of the year.” Had they investigated Westminster, they would have found its “white” school surrounded by lawns and shrubs. The “Mexican” school was a simple building on bare earth next to a cow pasture, and the children sitting on the ground to eat their lunch (there was no lunchroom) would be covered by flies.

Discouraged, most Mexican-American students left school when they turned 16, bound for low-wage jobs.

The Méndezes, like other Latino families in southern California, knew

nonetheless that education was the way out of the life of the *colonias*—but not the kind of inferior education provided by the “Mexican” schools. They had moved to Westminster to live and work on a farm leased from Japanese Americans who were interned in Arizona during the war, and assumed that their children would go to the nearby public school. That turned out to be the “white” school. Told that the children would have to go elsewhere, the Méndezes repeatedly petitioned school authorities, to no effect.

## **Turning to Litigation**

The Méndezes then turned to attorney David C. Marcus, the Jewish-American son of immigrants who specialized in immigration and civil liberties law and was himself married to a Mexican American. Marcus had recently won an order from a federal court in nearby San Bernardino, admitting Mexican Americans to the city’s only public park and swimming pool. He believed that the Méndezes’ case would be stronger if they could document additional instances of educational discrimination in Orange County, and so for a year Gonzalo Méndez and Marcus drove from *colonia* to *colonia*, locating families in other school districts who had also tried to put their children into “white” schools.

Felicitas Méndez, who had migrated from Puerto Rico as a child and was insistent on her and her children’s rights as Americans, ran the 40-acre farm for that year. “We always tell our children they are Americans,” she would testify in court, “and we thought that they shouldn’t be segregated like that, they shouldn’t be treated the way they are. So we thought we were doing the right thing and just asking for the right thing, to put our children together with the rest of the children there.” She initiated 151 meetings with parents and helped turn their enthusiasm into a group, the *Asociacion de Padres de Niños*  
(Please turn to page 6)

*Poverty and Race* (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 1200 18th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036, 202/906-8023, fax: 202/842-2885, E-mail: info@prrac.org. Chester Hartman, Editor. Subscriptions are \$25/year, \$45/two years. Foreign postage extra. Articles, article suggestions, letters and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRRAC gives advance permission.

© Copyright 2010 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

---

## Title VI: In the Beginning

*We are pleased to print this excerpt of our late colleague Bill Taylor's engaging 2004 memoir, The Passion of My Times: An Advocate's Fifty-Year Journey in the Civil Rights Movement, which gives a fascinating inside-the-Beltway side of an important American story that started in the streets and churches of the Jim Crow South. Bill, who passed away in July of this year (see our tribute to him in the July/Aug. P&R at p. 5), was present in many of these Washington back rooms (as well as on the front lines) where our national civil rights policies were framed. His reflections on Title VI are particularly relevant to current efforts to re-energize enforcement of the 1964 Act and we follow his piece with an overview of the challenges and opportunities facing Title VI enforcement today.*

*The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, with whom Bill worked for decades, is holding a memorial service for him on Oct. 8, 10 am, at AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW, Washington, DC; if you would like to attend, please email Kat Milligan, milligan@civilrights.org or phone her (or Lisa Haywood) at 202/466-1884.*

*PRRAC also has a limited number of copies of Bill's 251-page book (Carroll & Graf Publishers). We'll be happy to send you a free copy, but do send us a check for \$2.70 to cover the (book-rate) postage cost.*

*— Phil Tegeler & Chester Hartman*

### The '64 Act

In the fall of 1963 I received a call from Senator Humphrey's office, asking me to meet with his legislative director, John Stewart, and Senator Javits's chief legislative aide, Steve Kurzman. Both were talented lawyers and legislative analysts. When we met, they told me that both senators were thinking of proposing a strong provision on federal funding that would require mandatory action against recipients that persisted in discrimination. To start the process moving, they wanted to draft a letter from their senators to the administration and every federal agency asking them what discriminatory practices existed in their grant programs at that time, whether they believed they had enough authority to deal with them, and what additional authority they needed from Congress to do the job.

What Kurzman and Stewart wanted from me was help in drafting the letters, as they considered me to be expert in this area. It took about ten days for me to put everything together, after which the senators sent the letters to the administration. About a week later, I got a call from Lee White, the chief White House aide on civil rights. "We have received letters from Senators Humphrey and Javits asking questions about federal funding and discrimination, and you are the only person who knows enough to answer them," he said. "Please take on this assignment," he added.

Thus I had the surprising opportunity to answer my own letter, writing in the name of the Kennedy administration to reply to the questions of two prominent senators that had been drafted by me. I had been in a similar situation in 1961. Harris Wofford got the idea that it would be good to have a report from the Civil Rights Commission reviewing progress made since Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, the centennial of which was coming up in January 1963. Harris asked me to draft a letter to the com-

---

***It would be good to have a report from the Civil Rights Commission reviewing progress made since Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.***

---

mission from the president asking that it undertake the project. The commission was receptive to the idea but thought the administration should make available special funds for the study. So I drafted a letter for John Hannah, chairman of the commission, asking for the funds. Top officials of the administration decided that funds could not be made available. So I drafted another letter from President Kennedy declining the request for funds but hoping the commission would undertake the report anyway. It did so.

But this new version of "I'm gonna sit right down and write myself a letter" had potentially more far-reaching consequences. During the weeks that followed Lee White's assignment, I contacted federal agencies throughout the government, asking them about practices of discrimination by their grantees, and whether they believed they had the legal authority to deny grants to discriminators, or whether legislation would be necessary before they could do so. In doing this, I compiled a large list of discriminatory practices throughout American society—segregation in hospitals that received funds under the federal Hill Burton law; exclusion of black people from federally sponsored employment training and apprenticeship programs; the continuation of segregation and discrimination in public schools—all assisted by federal funds. I had to swallow hard in dealing with the question of executive authority. Although I believed that the president had ample authority to issue executive orders and directives to bar discrimination in the use of federal funds, it was clear by now that many top federal officials held different views, whether based on the law or political considerations. Ironically, the administration's position that it had limited authority actually strengthened the case for legislation. By January 1964, all agencies had completed their responses except the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

*(Please turn to page 4)*

(HEW) and the Department of the Interior. At a subcabinet meeting, Lee White asked me to help expedite these replies.

By this time, public support for strong civil rights legislation had grown enormously in the wake of President Kennedy's assassination and his successor's call for a strong law. The two major additions in the House's pending legislation were a fair employment practices provision and a strengthened version of Title VI, the provision to withhold federal funds from institutions that practiced discrimination. As one example of the failure of civil rights opponents to understand the changing terrain, Howard Smith of Virginia, the chair of the Rules Committee, allowed an amendment to the fair employment section providing a remedy for sex discrimination. He thought the new provision would surely kill the bill. Instead it passed handily.

In the Senate, Richard Russell of Georgia was the leader of the opposition and was widely regarded by friend and foe as a superb tactician. But Russell focused almost all his energy on the fair employment section, while Senators Humphrey, Javits, and others were using the record we had compiled to make the case for Title VI, potentially a stronger tool in eradicating discrimination. In the end, Title VI and the rest of the law passed by a wide margin.

With the perspective of almost forty years of experience, it has become clear how central the enactment of Title VI was in protecting the rights of all Americans. Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of this came shortly after passage. For a decade after the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown*, Southern resistance had kept public schools rigidly segregated, with only about two percent of Negro children in the Old South attending schools with whites. A year after passage of the 1964 act, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, providing for the first time substantial federal aid to public edu-

cation.

The funding was terribly important to school districts, and Lyndon Johnson, in an act of courage, told HEW secretary John Gardner that he was free to withhold federal funds from districts that would not desegregate their schools. Although the opponents of Title VI had claimed that Southern officials would spurn federal funds and that children would suffer the consequences, that is not what happened. Faced with losing the money, most school districts decided to obey the law. By the end of the

---

**Lyndon Johnson told HEW secretary John Gardner that he was free to withhold federal funds from districts that would not desegregate their schools.**

---

decade, with Title VI and Justice Department lawsuits, more than half of black children were attending desegregated public schools.

Title VI also helped end a debate about whether rules against discrimination should apply only to government or to other important institutions in our society. Those who took the government-only position pointed to the fact that the Fourteenth Amendment commanded only that "no state" should deny to people the equal protection of the laws. But with the growing involvement of government in what once had been thought to be private institutions—hospitals and private colleges, for example—making a principled distinction became harder. In the end it was recognized that race should not bar anyone from having access to all of American society's important institutions. And that recognition signaled an end to segregated waiting rooms and hospital wards and to so many other racial anomalies that prevailed before the 1960s.

Title VI also served as the model for similar legislation enacted in the 1970s to protect other groups from

discrimination. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 required that federal grants to educational institutions be conditioned on the elimination of sex discrimination. Title IX, although best known for ushering in a revolution in women's participation in athletics, also opened the way for breaking down barriers in academia that relegated women to stereotyped roles. The law is now so rooted in our society that when the second Bush administration tried to water down the regulations, a public outcry forced it to back down. So, too, enactment of Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act was one of the first steps to require major institutions to offer equal opportunity in jobs and services to people with disabilities. The law not only changed practices but helped break down the stereotype that people with disabilities could not be full participants in the life of the nation.

Finally, Title VI as it has been interpreted and administered over the last forty years has provided a lever for ending many needless practices that hurt minorities even if they were not intended to discriminate. When Title VI was enacted, it required that the president and all federal departments and agencies adopt regulations to implement the law. I was on the team that helped draft the regulations. Again, I profited from the experience of some of my friends and colleagues who had worked with state civil rights agencies. Proving that practices that harmed people of color were motivated by invidious racial intent was often difficult, they said, particularly as such blatant bias became less and less acceptable in polite company. Rather, they argued that it should be sufficient to establish that the practice worked to the disadvantage of minorities and could not be justified as necessary to the operations of the institution. With that reasoning, Pete Libassi [Bill's associate] and I were able to insert into the regulations a provision that said fund recipients may not "utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of race, color, or national

---

origin."

We did not realize at the time how important that brief sentence would turn out to be. As the Supreme Court became more conservative in the 1970s, a majority began to insist that, in order to prove a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, a showing of invidious intent was necessary. Because Title VI was viewed as a reflection of the Fourteenth Amendment it, too, was interpreted as requiring a demonstration of intent. But the Court

also said that it was legally appropriate for the Title VI regulations to go beyond the statute and bar practices that had a discriminatory effect, regardless of what was known about their intentions.

The importance of what came to be called the "disparate impact" standard can be seen in the fact it remains a battleground. For the last thirty years, I and others have been fighting with Senator Orrin Hatch to stave off his efforts to repeal the disparate im-

pact standard as it is reflected in civil rights laws and regulations. In 2001 Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia wrote an opinion holding that, while victims of discrimination have a right to sue in federal court to enforce Title VI, they have no right to sue to enforce the regulations. He also hinted broadly that the regulations could be repealed. The current Bush administration has not repealed the regulations, but neither has it brought proceedings to enforce the law. □

---

## Title VI Enforcement in the Post-Sandoval Era

by Philip Tegeler

Enforcement of our preeminent civil rights era statute, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, has been essentially sidelined since the Supreme Court's 2001 decision in *Alexander v. Sandoval*, holding that "disparate impact" liability claims under the Title VI regulations could not be filed by private parties in court. Racial impact claims against recipients of federal government funding could in theory still be filed administratively in the civil rights division of the responsible federal agency, but private Title VI cases filed in court were now limited to claims of intentional discrimination prohibited by the statute itself.

The scope of what civil rights advocates and their clients lost in *Sandoval* is staggering—in the decade or more prior to the decision, advocates and researchers had begun to develop a more complete understanding of the mechanisms of structural disadvantage built into policies and practices of a wide range of government-funded programs, and filed compelling impact litigation to reform

these systems. These claims addressed environmental justice, health equity, municipal services, transportation equity, law enforcement and K-12 education systems.

Just a few examples of these pre-*Sandoval* racial impact claims include *Linton v. Commissioner of Health and Environment* (1990), where the NAACP Legal Defense Fund brought a successful claim against a Tennes-

---

### **The scope of what civil rights advocates and their clients lost in Sandoval is staggering.**

---

see policy reducing the number of hospital beds for Medicaid recipients; *Labor/Community Strategy Center and Bus Riders Union et al. v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority* (consent decree 1996), a class action challenging a separate and unequal system of transportation for people of color in Los Angeles (arguing that MTA spent 70% of its operating budget on 6% of its ridership who are rail passengers, instead of their bus ridership who were 81% black, Latino and Asian and 60% poor); and *Mussington v. St. Luke's Roosevelt Hospital Center* (1994), a challenge to the relocation of in-patient maternal and child care services away from medically underserved ar-

eas of New York City.

After *Sandoval*, in theory, enforcement of such racial impact claims could have been taken up administratively by the federal government, in the civil rights offices of the appropriate federal agencies. However, the timing of the *Sandoval* decision (2001) coincided with the arrival of a new federal administration that had little interest in pursuing racial impact claims, and as a result virtually none were pursued during the next eight years.

At the same time, after 2001, advocates made repeated and unsuccessful efforts in Congress to "fix" *Sandoval* with an amendment to Title VI clarifying that racial impact claims can be brought directly in court. Barring a statutory amendment, advocates' focus is now turning back to the potential for administrative enforcement of the Title VI regulations.

For a federal administrative enforcement strategy for Title VI to succeed, several ingredients are necessary. First, social science researchers and Legal Services and civil rights advocates need to continue to work intentionally together to analyze the racial impacts of government policies affecting low-income families—and the precise mechanisms that create these impacts. Second, communities need to be educated and mobilized

(Please turn to page 6)

---

*Philip Tegeler (ptegeler@prrac.org) is Executive Director of PRRAC. Thanks to PRRAC Law & Policy Intern Betsy Gwin, who provided invaluable research assistance and contributed to a longer version of this article presented at the 2010 NLADA Litigation Directors Conference.*

---

(SANDOVAL: Continued. from page 5)

around these discriminatory impacts. Third, the capacity of state and local legal advocacy groups needs to be enhanced to support the prosecution of these complex claims over a period of years.

Finally, for a Title VI administrative enforcement strategy to succeed, the federal government's investigative and enforcement budget will need to be dramatically increased—impact claims are complex and time-consuming, and many agency Offices of Civil Rights (OCRs) are laboring under large backlogs, and not enough staff. In a series of reports from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission from 2002-2006 (before the Commission was taken over by opponents of civil rights), the Commission found that “insufficient funding and inefficient, thus ineffective, use of available funds” across agencies and departments were the “greatest hindrances to fulfilling... civil rights obligations.” Similarly, in *Rosemere Neighborhood Association v. EPA* (2009), the 9th Circuit observed that the “EPA failed to process a single complaint from

2006 or 2007 in accordance with its regulatory deadlines,” and showed a “pattern of delay.” (EPA's backlog of Title VI complaints has since then been significantly reduced.) And at least one federal agency—the Department of Treasury—still has no Title VI rules or enforcement mechanism.

In response to these concerns, the Obama Administration has begun the process of restoring Title VI investigative and enforcement capability across federal agencies. The Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice is taking a lead role in this process, through its federal Coordination and Compliance Section. The Division is also taking a more active role in its own Title VI enforcement work, exemplified by the recent complaint against the Maricopa County (AZ) Sheriff's Office for its failure to turn over documents in an investigation of the County's police practices and jail operations.

Most federal agencies have requested budget increases for 2011 for their OCRs—increases that would help agencies continue to reduce their investigative backlogs. And at least one administrative complaint—in *Urban*

*Habitat Program et al. v. Bay Area Rapid Transit* (2009), filed with the OCR at the Department of Transportation by the Public Advocates office in California, met with substantial success in redirecting federal transportation funding from a high-priced airport connector to uses benefiting low-income and minority residents of the region (see *Poverty & Race*, July/August 2010).

The political tensions that Bill Taylor describes at the inception of Title VI are still with us today, and preserving and enforcing the adverse impact standard is as important today as it was in 1964. Ultimately, the ruling in *Sandoval* needs to be reversed in Congress to restore the ability to file lawsuits to enforce the racial impact standard against state and local governments and other federal grantees (the Civil Rights Act of 2009 was the most recent legislative effort). In the meantime, advocates need to expand their use of the Title VI administrative process to attack structural discrimination embedded in government policies and practices. □

---

(SEPARATE: Continued from page 2)

*Mexico-Americans*, which provided moral support for the lawsuit.

Marcus filed the case in federal court, arguing that segregated schools for Mexican Americans violated the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection clause (“No State shall...deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws”). As with many clauses of the Constitution, the meaning of “equal protection of the laws” was not immediately apparent. The Supreme Court had held in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), however, that the demands of equal protection were met if states separated people on racial grounds but provided them with equal facilities. In 1945, when Marcus had to choose his strategy, it was so clear that the Supreme Court was not about to undo *Plessy* that the NAACP had adopted the approach of challeng-

ing segregated higher education on the grounds of unequal educational facilities. It hoped that if the South had to provide separate institutions that were truly equal, the additional cost would convince Southern legislatures that segregation was simply not worth the expense.

---

### **Discrimination was endemic.**

---

Marcus chose a different route. He could have emulated the NAACP strategy, or he could have focused on a California law that specifically permitted segregation of Asian-American and Indian students but made no mention of Mexican Americans. He was eager to attack segregation against Latinos frontally, however, and argued instead that the segregation itself resulted in an inferior education

and therefore constituted a violation of equal protection. In carrying out a “common plan, design and purpose” to keep the children from specific schools solely because of their “Mexican or Latin descent or extraction,” the four Orange County school districts named as defendants had caused the parents and their children “great and irreparable damage.” Segregation was hurting the Mexican-American students' ability to improve their language skills and become more knowledgeable about and more familiar with the larger society in which they lived. Marcus differentiated the case from *Plessy* by saying that it was not about race, because Mexicans and Mexican Americans were white—as they had been labeled in the 1940 Census. Rather, he asserted, this was intra-race discrimination. The litigation, in his formulation, was about ethnicity rather than race.

---

The case was assigned to federal District Court judge Paul J. McCormick, a prominent Los Angeles Irish Catholic Republican who had been appointed to the bench by President Calvin Coolidge in 1924. McCormick was initially skeptical about his court's jurisdiction over the case, as education was traditionally treated as a state matter rather than one appropriate for the intervention of federal officials and institutions. In addition, and bound by the Supreme Court's ruling in *Plessy* and subsequent cases, McCormick was far from certain that segregation was to be equated with discrimination and denial of equal protection of the laws.

At trial, Marcus had parents testify about the refusal of school authorities to move their children out of the "Mexican" schools and the officials' insistence that the children could not speak English and were dirty to boot. One of the mothers had tried to get her eight-year-old son into a Santa Ana "white" school. Denying her request, the school district's assistant superintendent had asked her why the Mexican people were so dirty. Joe, her oldest son, was in the U.S. Navy, stationed in the Philippines. "I told him that if our Mexican people were dirty, and all that," she testified, "why didn't they have all of our boys that are fighting overseas, and all that, why didn't they bring them back and let us have them home ... I told him if Joe wasn't qualified, why didn't they let me have him and not take him overseas, as he is right now."

Marcus then called Orange County school officials to the stand. James L. Kent, the superintendent of one of the districts, was prominent among them. Kent had written a master's thesis asserting that Mexicans were "an alien race that should be segregated socially." He wrote, in a belief shared by many educators of the time, that Mexican Americans were biologically distinct. "The schools are confronted with the problem of dealing with groups of children of different racial characteristics, with different intellects and different emotions," he declared. "Their racial language handicap seems

to be a severe liability to their advancement in school. This fact, coupled with the fact that the test intelligence of the average Mexican is below that of the average white child, makes it seem probable that a separate curriculum adjusted to them is advisable." It was apparent from their testimony that other school officials agreed.

Marcus brought two students into court, demonstrating their facility in English. Finally, he presented the testimony of two educational experts who testified that, contrary to the Supreme

---

### **Boys were taught gardening and woodworking, girls sewing and housekeeping.**

---

Court's holding in *Plessy*, segregation did carry a stigma that affected the students' ability to learn. The Orange County counsel countered that the segregation was in the best interests of both "white" and "Mexican" students, because the great gap in the two groups' language abilities necessitated that they be taught differently. Segregation was not discrimination.

### **Fostering Antagonisms, Suggesting Inferiority**

Judge McCormick was unconvinced. In 1946, in a landmark opinion, he declared that "a paramount requisite in the American system of public education is social equality." He did not specifically cite the language of "separate but equal," but in effect he declared that separate could not possibly be equal. What segregation did, McCormick asserted, was "foster antagonisms in the children and suggest inferiority among them where none exists," and they were thereby deprived of an equal education.

The County appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting in San Francisco. In New York, NAACP Assistant Special Counsel Robert Carter, Thurgood Marshall's second-

in-command and later a federal District Court judge, expressed surprise that the NAACP had known nothing about the case. Marshall was ill, and Carter was temporarily in charge. He immediately understood that if the case reached the Supreme Court, it could be the one to attack segregated education on its face. He had come to believe that sociological evidence, illustrating the psychological and pedagogical effects of school segregation, could be a useful weapon in the litigation arsenal. Other lawyers who worked with the NAACP were less sanguine. The social sciences, they said, were not pure science, so their findings were too weak to use in court. Carter, however, considered the *Mendez* case too good an opportunity to ignore. The NAACP entered the case at the appeals level as an *amicus curiae*, and Carter drafted a brief that he later described as the NAACP's trial brief for *Brown v. Board of Education*.

The American Jewish Congress, the ACLU, the Japanese American Citizens League and Governor Earl Warren's Attorney General entered the case as well, all in support of the Méndezes. In 1947, the Ninth Circuit struck down the segregation based on California law, which, as noted above, permitted segregation of Indian and Asian-American children but made no mention of Mexican Americans. The California legislature decided that other children should not be segregated, either. They and Governor Warren quickly repealed the law. Orange County decided not to take the case further. Within a few months, its schools were integrated. Mexican Americans throughout the state were enheartened, as were others elsewhere in the Southwest. Parents brought cases and the threat of litigation to school boards throughout California as well as Texas, New Mexico and Arizona, achieving integration.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mexican Americans such as Gonzalo Méndez became politically  
(Please turn to page 8)

(SEPARATE: Continued from page 2)

active in the years during and following World War II, and found a society newly open to their claims. By the mid-1940s, there were more Mexican Americans—those born in the United States of immigrant parents or of parents themselves born in the United States—than Mexican non-citizens living in the United States. Many of them were ready to become politically involved. Hundreds of thousands of Mexican Americans fought in World War II, returning ready to battle the kind of injustice they had been fighting abroad. They and their compatriots at home reacted to *Méndez* by creating organizations that, among other activities, brought integration to schools throughout the Southwest.

The American legal elite's ideas had also been affected by the war, and it greeted Judge McCormick's ruling as a harbinger of things to come. His opinion, the *Yale Law Journal* wrote in June 1947, "has questioned the basic assumption of the *Plessy* case and may portend a complete reversal of the doctrine." Drawing on statistics in the NAACP's brief, the *Journal* declared that the facts that 34.5% of African Americans had failed to meet the 1943 minimum educational standards for military service, and that there were too few African-American physicians, dentists and lawyers, indicated that segregated education was counterproductive. The *Michigan Law Review* called the *Mendez* decision "a radical departure from the tacit assumption of the legality of racial segregation" and predicted that it, in concert with the education cases the NAACP had won in the Supreme Court, "may well force a reconsideration of the whole problem." The *Columbia Law Review* urged the Supreme Court to overturn *Plessy*, agreeing that "modern sociological investigation would appear to have conclusively demonstrated" that segregation implies inferiority. The *Southern California Law Review* called segregated education "anomalous" in "a nation priding itself on its solid foundation of basic tolerance and

equality of opportunity."

## International Relations Considerations

The societal climate was also affected by considerations of international relations. The Truman Administration, seeking allies in the Cold War, was concerned about the image of the United States in Mexico and other developing nations. "Eager eyes and attentive ears North and South of our borders await the result" of the *Mendez* case, David Marcus had told Judge McCormick. One of the Ninth Circuit judges wrote to Governor Warren after the *Méndez* decision was handed down, saying that if segregation of Mexican Americans was not

ended in California, the ambassadors of 20 Latin American nations would technically be excluded from public facilities. Warren in turn wrote, "I personally do not see how we can carry out the spirit of the United Nations if we deny fundamental rights to our Latin American neighbors."

*Mendez* both reflected and influenced the new thinking. It nonetheless remains largely unknown, perhaps because it did not go to the Supreme Court, but in 1954 Judge McCormick's language would be echoed by Chief Justice Earl Warren in *Brown v. Board*. It was the plaintiffs in *Méndez*, however, who first got a federal court to declare that the doctrine of "separate but equal" ran counter to American law and American values. □

### Mendez is Still With Us. . . .

The issues raised in *Mendez v. Westminster* are still with us, albeit in different form. For follow-up, these are useful resources:

Patricia Gándara and Gary Orfield, "A Return to the 'Mexican Room': The Segregation of Arizona's English Learners" (20 pp., July 2010), available from the UCLA Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, 310/267-5562, [www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu](http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu).

Patricia Gándara, *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policies* (Harvard University Press, 2009).

PRRAC Board member José Padilla ([jpadilla@crla.org](mailto:jpadilla@crla.org)) has information on related litigation and other work of California Rural Legal Assistance.

PRRAC Board member Cathi Tactaquin's ([ctactaquin@nnirr.org](http://ctactaquin@nnirr.org)) organization, the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, focuses on general concerns re impact/implications of educational access for immigrant children due to various state initiatives and immigration enforcement actions.

PRRAC Board member Maria Blanco's ([mblanco@law.berkeley.edu](mailto:mblanco@law.berkeley.edu)) recent article for the Immigration Policy Center, "The Lasting Impact of *Mendez v. Westminster* in the Struggle for Desegregation," was published in IPC's latest *Perspectives on Immigration*, and can be accessed at <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org>.

Nancy McArdle, Theresa Osypuk & Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, "Segregation and Exposure to High-Poverty Schools in Large Metropolitan Areas: 2008-09," available at [diversitydata.org](http://diversitydata.org).

Natl. Women's Law Ctr. and MALDEF, "Listening to Latinas: Barriers to High School Graduation" (2009), <http://maldef.org/assets/pdf/ListeningtoLatinas.pdf>.

The UCLA Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles also has current information on the *Horn v. Flores* case (Arizona Education Equity Project, education of ELL students) and the 9 reports prepared for the case. Reports can be found at <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/language-minority-students/>, or contact Laurie Russman ([larussman@gmail.com](mailto:larussman@gmail.com), 310/267-5562).

G. Orfield, G. Siegel-Hawley, J. Wang (forthcoming), "Intensifying School Segregation in the Epicenter of the U.S. Latino Community: Deepening Inequality in Southern California," from the UCLA Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles—part of a comprehensive look at segregation and inequality in the megalopolis that spans So. Calif. and Baja—a series of working papers will be released soon. Inf. from Genevieve Siegel-Hawley, [gsiegelhawley@gmail.com](mailto:gsiegelhawley@gmail.com).

---

# The United States Submits Its First-ever Report to the U.N. Human Rights Council

When the U.S. finally agreed to join the U.N. Human Rights Council in 2009, it was a significant acknowledgment that the U.S. is subject to the same treaties and conventions as the countries it routinely criticizes. One of the interesting aspects of international human rights compliance, however, is that countries are not simply compared to one another, they are compared to the aspirational goals of the treaties they have signed and ratified. Thus, even countries that claim a long history of respect for human rights can find themselves falling short.

The recent U.S. report on domestic human rights issues submitted by the State Department to the U.N. is part of the ongoing “Universal Periodic Review” (UPR) process conducted by the U.N. Human Rights Council periodically for all member countries. PRRAC, along with a wide range of NGOs (many working in coalition in the U.S. Human Rights Network), has participated in the UPR process during the past year, through consultations with the State Department and field hearings across the country.

PRRAC’s goal in this process has been to focus attention on the areas where the U.S. needs to improve on racial justice issues. In particular, in the areas of education, housing and health, the recent U.S. government report did not acknowledge serious problems already identified by the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (the CERD Committee) in its comprehensive review of U.S. policy in 2008.

**Education:** The U.S. report highlights the government’s initiatives to assist underserved students and acknowledges the existence of an ongoing racial achievement gap in American schools. However, the report fails to address underlying issues of segregation and to demonstrate clearly how the achievement gap is being ad-

ressed. The report ignores the findings of the CERD Committee, which specifically recommended that the U.S. government:

(1) “adopt all appropriate measures . . . to reduce the persistent ‘achievement gap’ between students belonging to racial, ethnic, or national minorities and white students . . . by improving the quality of education provided to these students;” and

(2) “undertake further studies to identify the underlying causes of de facto segregation and racial inequalities in education, with a view to elaborating effective strategies aimed at promoting school de-segregation and providing equal educational opportunity in integrated settings for all students.”

**Health:** The U.S. UPR report correctly noted the racial disparities that pervade health outcomes in the U.S. The report highlights the successful passage and signing into law of the Affordable Care Act, which the government states will “help our nation reduce disparities and discrimination in access to care that have contributed to poor health.” While we support the stated efforts to reduce such disparities, the Affordable Care Act will not eliminate obstacles to adequate health care for minorities, as addressed in the CERD Committee’s Concluding Observations (including “lack of available health insurance, unequal distribution of health care resources, persistent racial discrimination in the provision of health care and poor quality of public health care services”). Additionally, as discussed at length in our 2008 report to the CERD Committee, “Unequal Health Outcomes in the United States,” there is a strong link between health disparities and segregation within communities—including not only lack of local resources, but also increased environmental health risks. These issues were not addressed in the government’s report.

**Housing:** The U.S. report acknowledges the extreme need for affordable housing in all communities and the increase in illegal practices such as predatory and discriminatory lending following the recent economic crisis. However, the report ignores persistent residential segregation and concentration of racial, ethnic and national minorities in low-income, low-opportunity neighborhoods. Significantly, these issues were the focal point of the CERD Committee’s Concluding Observations in 2008, which have not yet been responded to by the U.S. government. The CERD Committee specifically urged the U.S. to:

intensify its efforts aimed at reducing the phenomenon of residential segregation based on racial, ethnic and national origin, as well as its negative consequences for the affected individuals and groups. In particular, the Committee recommends that the State party...support the development of public housing complexes outside poor, racially segregated areas...

**Conclusion:** While the U.S. report touches upon many of the concerns highlighted by civil society groups during the recent UPR process, the report failed to go far enough in acknowledging the current obstacles to full international human rights compliance in the United States. Chief among these obstacles are continuing policies of racial and economic segregation built into U.S. policy and that urgently need to be dismantled. We hope that the U.S. responds to these concerns when it appears before the U.N. Human Rights Council in Geneva in November.

**Resources:** For copies of the U.S. Report to the Human Rights Council, as well as detailed reports submitted by PRRAC and other domestic NGOs, please visit our webpage on CERD and the UPR, at [www.prrac.org/projects/CERD.php](http://www.prrac.org/projects/CERD.php). □

*Hanna Chouest & Philip Tegeler*

---

# PRRAC Researcher Reports

---

*One of PRRAC's signal programs is making small grants (\$10,000 maximum) for research on the intersection of race and poverty, such research designed to support a planned advocacy agenda (of any sort). Herewith, 4 reports of work done as a result of grants made in the 2008-09 period. A listing of the 100+ such grants PRRAC has made to date is on our website, [www.prrac.org/grants.php](http://www.prrac.org/grants.php) — CH*

## Impact of Tenant Screening Policies on People of Color in King County, Washington

Columbia Legal Services (CLS) received a PRRAC grant to address whether aspects of tenant screening are a form of unlawful discrimination under fair housing laws and to devise the best research protocols to obtain statistical evidence about these issues.

A research student, Zachary Howard, reviewed data and literature currently available on tenant screening practices that use evictions and criminal records history to determine tenant suitability. The researcher then developed several possible protocols for identifying, gathering and analyzing these data and developed cost estimates for implementing the protocols. The PRRAC grant did not fund implementation, but CLS worked with University of Washington graduate students to conduct a study based on these protocols.

Another researcher, Dylan Orr, analyzed relevant disparate impact theories under Washington State and federal fair housing law. CLS and the researcher created a 40-page practice guide based on this research. Hopefully, this guide will encourage advocates across the country to utilize disparate impact or segregative effect claims under the fair housing law to stop landlords and tenant screeners from using criminal or evictions records as a reason to deny housing to tenants in protected classes.

### Possible Protocols

#### Design and conduct a survey of unlawful detainer defendants in King

#### County.

Such a survey would seek out demographic information. Staff should administer the survey to a random sample of defendants during or following their unlawful detainer proceedings. CLS and its partners can organize these data and compare them to current Census data to determine whether certain protected classes are appearing as defendants at a more significant rate than accounted for in the population. This methodology will provide a piece of the puzzle of who faces unlawful detainer actions in King County, but will not account for those who fail to attend their hearings.

#### Create a database containing demographic information of tenants facing eviction.

Legal Services programs and non-profits could coordinate to create a database containing information from all providers, but would need to protect tenants' privacy. A centralized database has the potential to be an important first step towards more robust data-gathering efforts.

#### Advocate for the inclusion of eviction-related information on state and federal housing surveys.

State and federal agencies conduct surveys on housing and reasons for housing turnover, but not to a degree that determines whether evictions disproportionately affect racial minorities. CLS can partner with other local housing and Legal Services providers to pool resources and lobby state and federal agencies to gather more

comprehensive data on eviction and its effect on renters. CLS should make contact with the American Housing Survey and other demographers at HUD to ensure the creation of a stronger data source on evictions.

#### Undertake a spatial analysis of the demographic characteristics of the neighborhoods where residential evictions take place in King County.

It is unknown whether the results of this analysis would provide statistically significant information regarding the impact of evictions on different racial groups. However, by combining the results of this methodology with the results of the above unlawful detainer survey, there would be a better understanding of the demographics of unlawful detainer defendants in King County.

#### Track Washington State demographic data on offenders by race and ethnic status.

The research suggests that tenant screening that includes criminal background checks disproportionately affects people of African-American heritage. However, to get a broader picture of this impact, a fuller source of data than that which is currently available should be identified. The recommendation is to seek out data sources from local and county law enforcement agencies, while monitoring the state-level data sources on corrections admissions.

## Implementation

Graduate students at the University of Washington, Bothell used two of the suggested methodologies to conduct a research study. The students' data set included 2,835 residential unlawful detainer (UD) filings in King County, Washington during 2008. In addition, monthly rental values were collected in 28 cities within King County's boundaries. Across 72 zip codes in King County a significant correlation exists between a tenant's race, as identified in the 2000 U.S. Census, and UD filing rates. Statistical analysis demonstrated a moderate positive correlation between percentage of African-American tenants and UD rates and a moderate negative correlation between percentage of White tenants and UD rates. These correlations illustrate that living in a predominantly African-American zip code area in King County increases a tenant's likelihood of facing eviction, while living in a predominantly White zip code area decreases a tenant's likelihood of facing eviction. The data also showed that this is true, to a lesser extent, for other ethnic minorities, including tenants identifying as Multi-Racial, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.

For further information, contact Merf Ehman at Columbia Legal Services, [Merf.Ehman@ColumbiaLegal.org](mailto:Merf.Ehman@ColumbiaLegal.org) □

### **Calling all DC-area Federal Employees!**

PRRAC is now a member of the **Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capitol Area**—the workplace giving drive for federal employees in the Capitol area.

PRRAC is listed under the "Local Independent Organization" section on the CFC website at [www.cfcna.org](http://www.cfcna.org)—our CFC number is 11710.

# The Effects of Racially and Economically Isolated Schools on Student Performance

Over the past two decades, the United States Supreme Court has issued rulings that severely limit the ability of school boards to use race as a factor in student assignment policies as one way to foster diversity. To increase our understanding of the impact of these rulings, PRRAC commissioned this study to address a single question:

*What is the effect on student performance of racially isolated schools?*

In answering this question, we recognized the need to also address the following:

*If the effect on student performance is negative, can better-qualified teachers and other resources make up for the effect of racial isolation?*

Using English I and Algebra I scores for 9th-grade North Carolina public school students on End-of-Course (EOC) exams for 2007-2008, we analyzed the performance of the population of North Carolina 9th graders as a whole (N=134,646) and a subpopulation of students in three counties (Pitt, Wayne and Halifax) with high levels of racial and economic isolation. The five school systems in these three counties comprise our "Focus Site" (N=3,625).

Our decision to study economic as well as racial isolation was based on North Carolina's high poverty levels (particularly in urban areas and in the coastal plain and mountains) and the significant impact of economic isolation on student performance.

We controlled for individual student race and ethnicity, economic disadvantage (eligibility for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, or FRPL), and designation as gifted. We also analyzed the effect of school-level characteristics, including teacher experience, teacher training (advanced degrees), teacher accreditation (fully licensed), the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, and the percentage of students who were Black

or Latino. The bivariate relationships between racial isolation and test scores provide a clear picture of the effects of racial and economic isolation and the academic cost to students who are enrolled in these schools.

More than 8,000 9th graders in North Carolina (and an estimated 100,000+ students in all grades) attend schools that are more than 75% Black, and most of these schools are also high-poverty and low-performing schools. We found that racial concentration, per se, had no significant effect, but that disparities in academic performance were tied to concentrations of poverty and the significant disparity in instructional resources (fully certified teachers and teachers with advanced degrees) present in the highly segregated schools. Analysis for a Focus Site subpopulation of systems that had a high percentage of high schools with severe levels of racial and economic isolation produced similar findings.

We found that fully licensed teachers and teachers with advanced degrees can improve student performance. We found that teachers in North Carolina's most segregated schools (more than 75% Black) were significantly less likely to be fully licensed and significantly less likely to have advanced degrees.

We also found that Black students are much less likely to be designated gifted, and that alternative schools (e.g., schools for exceptional or at-risk students) are likely to be severely segregated (more than 75% Black) and to have teachers who are poorly trained for their students' disabilities and in their subject areas.

We calculated the cost of racial and economic segregation on academic performance for one severely segregated North Carolina high school. Goldsboro High School, in Wayne County was 99.4% Black in a school  
*(Please turn to page 12)*

---

(PERFORMANCE: *Cont. from page 11*)

system that was 56% minority and 81% economically disadvantaged in a county that averages 65.8%. If an attempt was made to counterbalance such economic and racial isolation by improving resources (such as increased training and tenure of teachers) at this single school, the cost would be \$1,580 per student. As Goldsboro High School had 616 students (2007-2008), this equals \$970,000. (It should be noted that our previous research—funded by the Paul Green Foundation—in Wayne County schools showed that the county’s residential patterns did not necessitate racial or economic segregation. In that study, we used Geographic Information Systems to illustrate that school attendance zones could be designed to provide integrated neighborhood schools.)

Our analysis suggests three complementary strategies for improving academic performance in North Carolina’s high schools: (1) create school attendance areas that will create racially and economically balanced schools; (2) require teachers to be fully licensed; and (3) provide fund-

ing to hire teachers with advanced degrees in the subject area taught. In addition, we agree with the National Research Council’s 2002 recommendations that the state should undertake a thorough review of its policies toward gifted and “special needs” students, and that educators should be required to first provide special needs students with high-quality instruction and social support in a regular setting before determining whether special services are needed, in order to make sure that minority students who are poorly prepared for school are not assigned to special education for that reason.

In sum, investments to improve resources can increase academic performance, but these investments are not being made in North Carolina’s predominantly-Black schools. Moreover, such efforts can only mitigate some of the adverse academic impacts created by attendance at racially and economically isolated schools. Investments to improve resources and the quality of education programs that overcome the effects of economic disadvantages can increase academic performance in the short term and future employment opportunities in the long

term. Strong academic performance in our schools is critical to the state’s and nation’s competitiveness in a global economy.

This research is integral to advocacy provided for and by students and their families in highly segregated schools, as they attempt to demonstrate the harms of such hyper-segregation. The report has been submitted by the NAACP to the U.S. Justice Department—together with additional research by Ann Moss Joyner of the Cedar Grove Institute—to support a Title VI claim against Wayne County Board of Education. This Title VI complaint was the first such claim accepted by the Obama Administration’s Justice Department for investigation. It uses GIS to demonstrate that hypersegregated schools are not necessary to achieve “neighborhood” schools in Wayne County. More recently, the research has also been provided to groups opposing the elimination of Wake County’s Diversity Policy.

*Further information is available from Ann Moss Joyner, [ann@mcmoss.org](mailto:ann@mcmoss.org). □*

---

## Use of Force in a Washington State School District – Neither Reasonable nor Necessary

In 2008, after receiving complaints of continuing reliance on physical restraints and handcuffs at public schools in Washington State, and particularly in the Kent School District (20 miles south of Seattle, in King County), the ACLU of Washington requested public records, including redacted incident reports detailing the use of physical, mechanical and/or chemical restraints (i.e., physical force, handcuffs and/or pepper spray) against students. We reviewed more than 400 separate reports, which as a whole reflect inadequate training and oversight for school staff authorized to use force against students and resulting evidence of the unnecessary

use of force.

The Kent School District is not the only place in Washington where students are handcuffed, sprayed or forcefully “escorted” to the principal’s office. Unfortunately, we do not presently have the ability to review data from all districts around the state to see where the use of force is most common, because those data are not (yet) collected. They are generally not collected as part of discipline data, because schools are not allowed to use force as a means of discipline. Schools are allowed, however, to use “reasonable physical force” “as necessary to maintain order” or to prevent students from harming themselves, other stu-

dents or staff or school property.

This exception to the prohibition on physical force allows for wide variation in practice as schools and districts interpret the meaning of “reasonable physical force” that is “necessary” to maintain order. In 2008, the Washington state legislature considered but did not pass a bill that would have narrowed this exception by prohibiting the use of handcuffs and pepper spray in schools, except in emergency situations and by trained personnel. The legislature did allocate funding for the Washington State School Directors’ Association to facilitate a task force and develop a model policy regarding the use of

---

force in schools. That task force identified the lack of training, experience or oversight standards for school security staff as a problem warranting attention, and our review of narrative reports from one school district highlights the urgency of the problem.

Between 2006 and 2008, use of force reports show a total of 8 elementary school students in the Kent School District were handcuffed. Handcuffs were only applied to students in the first and second grade. Other physical restraints were used against a total of 30 students between grades 1 and 6. All of the students involved in the incident reports for elementary schools were boys.

## Elementary Schools

The reports from the elementary schools reflect a disturbing reliance on security officers to respond to students with mental illness or emotional or behavioral issues. In one incident, a security officer responded to a report of an “out of control student” in a room for students with behavioral disabilities. The student was yelling, and when he clenched his fists, the officer put him in handcuffs, for “safety reasons.” Several other reports reflect the use of prone restraints, in which students were forced to the floor and held down by an officer (or in some cases, a teacher).

In another incident, an officer called to assist an instructional assistant and a principal who were trying to catch up with an 8-year-old boy running away from school took hold of the student’s hand and “placed him in a palm forward escort technique.” While taking the student back to the school, the officer put him in handcuffs in order to “gain better control.” The student became very angry and agitated when he realized he was being taken to a “quiet room,” and when he tried to pull away, the officer stumbled, the student tripped and fell, and because he was in handcuffs, he could not catch himself with his hands and fell on his face. After falling, the boy started to cry and was then de-

scribed by the officer as no longer resisting.

## Middle Schools

The middle school reports, like those from the elementary schools, reflect a disturbing reliance on physical force and intervention by security officers to respond to students with emotional disturbances, as well as the apparent unnecessary escalation of minor incidents into situations where force was deemed appropriate.

In one incident, a student who refused his teacher’s request to remove his hat ended up in the vice-principal’s office with the teacher, two security officers and the vice-principal. When the student again refused to take off his hat, one of the officers took it off for him. When the student got angry and tried to leave, one officer grabbed his right arm, the other officer grabbed his left arm and the officers took him down, and held him face down on the floor until he agreed to comply. In another incident, a student who went to the lunch line when he was not supposed to ended up being taken to the ground by an officer, escorted to the office and suspended from school. The student was not handcuffed, but only because his hand was in a cast.

## Alternatives to Force

Reviewing the reports over time, it becomes apparent that reliance on physical force, or the threat of it, is not the only option for security officers. Seven different officers submitted incident reports for middle schools in 2007-08. Four of those officers did not use physical restraints or handcuffs in any of the reported incidents for that year. One officer used physical restraints on one occasion. One officer used handcuffs twice and physical restraints another time. One officer used handcuffs in five different incidents and used physical restraints in 11 different incidents. Comparing the incident reports from two different semesters at one middle

school further illustrates this point. During one semester at a middle school, the security officer reported on eleven incidents. In four of those incidents, the officer used force against a student. During a different semester at the same school, a different security officer reported on thirty-four incidents and force was not used in any of them.

## The Apparent Pattern

The most readily apparent pattern in the incident reports from all of the schools was security officers’ reliance on physical restraints and handcuffs to gain control of students with disabilities identified as “non-compliant” or “out of control.” One middle school girl was forced into a “Fishbowl” with physical restraints; another student ended up on the ground and in handcuffs when an officer saw him punch his teacher’s arm. Another student with disabilities was threatened with “OC [pepper] spray,” handcuffed and emergency-expelled when he threatened an officer with a piece of wood. Another student ended up on the ground in handcuffs after he sought refuge in the “Student Adjustment Room.” The most disturbing of those reports were the ones that told an ongoing narrative of repeated reliance on security officers, and the officers’ repeated reliance on physical restraints and handcuffs to respond to the same students. In a series of incidents, a security officer’s reports explain the situations in which the officer used physical restraints to control a seventh grade student with autism. The series of reports, recounting nine different incidents over the course of five months, raises serious and very troubling questions. It reveals a student, his teacher and a security officer left to deal with difficult situations without adequate support, training or supervision. The first reported incident occurred in September. The last was in January, and ended when the student was disciplined after reportedly hitting another student. In that span

*(Please turn to page 14)*

(FORCE: Continued from page 13)

of time, the student was handcuffed four different times and taken to the ground five different times.

## High Schools

At the high schools, students were handcuffed and forced to the ground for similarly minor offenses, and the use of force again appeared to be more commonly used to intervene with students with disabilities. One girl was handcuffed three times in one month. The first time, the security officer was called by an instructional assistant to help when the girl got “out of control.” The student was handcuffed when she “continued to swing her arms and pull away” from the officer. The second time, she was handcuffed and escorted to the security office after kicking and hitting at an instructional assistant. Once in the office, the student “continued to act out, by hitting her head on the copy machine. She eventually fell asleep and when she woke up, she was calm and compliant.” The third time, the instructional assistant brought the student to the security office when the student was “unwilling to behave in class.” When the student again began banging her head and hands on the copy machine, the officer moved her away from it. She then started hitting the arms of the chair; the officer, concerned that “she was going to injure herself or escalate in violence,” then “placed her in handcuffs.”

## Kent in Relation to the State

The Kent School District’s policies on corporal punishment and use of “reasonable force” mirror the state law. And, while their reports indicate an urgent need for additional training and supervision, the District’s security program is likely one of the most developed among school districts in the state. The District employs several security officers directly and has

developed a detailed Security Department manual and job descriptions for each security officer position. However, among the various officer positions, only the Security Supervisor, responsible for planning, organizing and directing the security program, requires graduation from a police training academy or five years’ experience as a police officer, security officer or in a “closely-related law enforcement field.” The District also provides its officers with training, but the only reference to de-escalation techniques in the training materials explains that “the use of handcuffs and how to de-escalate a situation by applying restraints will be reviewed.” Additionally, in response to prior complaints, the District has developed the detailed reporting requirements that made this review possible.

Relying on handcuffs, pepper spray and physical restraints to control children who are identified as “non-compliant” is not sustainable and fails to ensure safety. In order to ensure safety and respect each student’s rights, the District should again review its policies relating to the use of force, and this time it should be a leader not just in reporting on the use of force but in reducing or eliminating it.

The results from this research project are being used to bolster our policy advocacy around issues of use of force in schools and school discipline. We are continuing to lobby our state legislature to act on critical ques-

tions relating to use of force in schools, including restrictions on the use of handcuffs by school officials, and whether school security officers should be required to meet any minimum training or certification requirements. This research project will provide important detail and context to policy discussions we are involved in around best practices for these concerns. In addition, the results of this research will also support our advocacy for improvements in discipline data collection needed to give school administrators the tools to reduce and eliminate racial disparities. We will provide our results to administrators in the Kent School District and use our findings to support ongoing efforts of local community advocates to increase transparency around discipline data in the Kent School District and reduce the use of force against their students.

The ACLU of Washington is grateful to the Poverty & Race Research & Action Council for its generous support of this report. We also express our thanks to the University of Washington Department of Sociology students who, under the instruction of Nika Kabiri and Gretchen Ludwig, provided invaluable research and analysis on the project.

*For further information, contact Rose Spidell (spidell@aclu-wa.org), 206/624-2184, x275. Source notes for various items cited are available from her. □*

## Two Important Conferences

“The Unfinished Work’: Advancing New Strategies in the Struggle for Civil Rights” will be held Nov. 1-2 at the UNC-Chapel Hill School of Law, co-convened by the School’s Center for Civil Rights, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the UCLA Proyecto Derechos Civiles and others, and honoring the long, fine career of Julius Chambers. Full agenda and registration at [http://www.law.unc.edu/centers/civil\\_rights/conferences/current/](http://www.law.unc.edu/centers/civil_rights/conferences/current/), 919/843-3921.

“The 2010 National Inclusionary Housing Conference” will be held Nov. 3-5 in Wash., DC, co-sponsored by the Innovative Housing Inst., the National Housing Conference, PolicyLink & Business and Professional People for the Public Interest. Inf. from Patrick Maier, pmaier@ihbalto.org, [www.inhousing.org](http://www.inhousing.org).

---

## How Racism Is Embodied: A New Health Advocacy Curriculum

*I really already knew that racism was bad but I didn't know it could affect health or that it has affected how babies are when they are born.*

Quote from a 7th grader from Seattle Girls School, Seattle, Washington

While the unfortunate realities of racial health inequities in the U.S. are indisputable, the mechanisms by which such inequities occur are hotly debated. However, there is now substantial evidence that racism and discrimination produce health inequities through socially-induced biological changes *in utero* and throughout the life course. Unfortunately, actions towards eliminating racial health inequities are hindered by popularly held explanations for racial health differences, such as intrinsic genetic differences and poor health behaviors, despite the lack of sufficient scientific evidence to support them. Furthermore, the current focus of health education on individualized medical treatment and an absence of teaching models for a societal/systematic understanding of health are barriers to teaching health advocacy at the broader community or societal level.

Just Health Action (JHA) is a non-profit organization ([www.justhealthaction.org](http://www.justhealthaction.org)) based in Seattle, Washington, that has developed unique curricula to teach the social determinants of health (SDOH) as a means to address the overarching factors that produce health equity. Social determinants include, but are not limited to, income, early life experiences, education, food security, employment, health care, social cohesion and political empowerment. Even more broadly, racism, classism and sexism—identified as the social determinants of equity—drive inequities in the SDOH. These determinants are sometimes referred to as the “causes of the causes” because they are an “upstream” source of “downstream” in-

dividual behaviors and biological traits. Understanding these determinants is essential for taking decisive action to improve health.

JHA has been working since 2004 to develop and teach students to understand the SDOH as well as the skills to take action on root causes of poor health both for individuals and populations. JHA's pedagogy is interactive and encourages critical analysis and reflection, similar to empowerment education or education for “critical consciousness” advocated by Paulo Freire.

JHA believes that eliminating racial health inequities also requires a new empowerment approach that focuses on teaching evidence-based scientific concepts alongside strategies to inspire students towards collective action to reduce racism. Thanks to funding from PRRAC, JHA developed a new racism and health curriculum that was piloted at Seattle Girls School (SGS) in Spring, 2010. SGS is a private middle school located in a historically redlined district of Seattle that has made a firm commitment to ensuring a socio-economically and culturally diverse academic community. It shows through its student body: Over 40% of the girls self-report as students of color and at least 30% of the students receive need-based financial aid.

JHA worked with three post-baccalaureate interns to develop curriculum and then taught six lessons (totaling seven hours) at SGS over a two-week period. The six lesson titles were: 1. Three levels of racism; 2. What is a health inequity?; 3. Effects of racism-related chronic stress on disease; 4. Effects of racism on maternal and child health outcomes; 5. Intergenerational effects of racism expressed through the life course; and 6. Racism-advocacy brainstorming. The lessons consisted of interactive activities, including learning the evidence through the interpretation of

graphs, exercises that explore the mechanisms of racism, and exercises designed to elicit empathy about racism and health inequities.

We employed JHA's pedagogical framework in the design of our pre- and post-test instrument for this pilot project. In our evaluation, we measure students' change along JHA's 4 part framework: 1) *Knowledge of the SDOH* (in this case focusing on racism) and health disparities; 2) *Compass*—attitudes regarding the SDOH (again, focusing on racism) and activism; 3) *Skills*—empowerment to use new skills to take action on the SDOH/racism; and 4) *Action*—future intentions to take action on the SDOH/racism. We believe and have had previous teaching successes indicating that these four steps are absolutely essential to produce health activism.

Generally, we were very pleased with the evaluation results for this pilot curriculum. In post-tests, students were able to explain the dynamics of racism by discussing the inequitable distribution of “resources or opportunities” as well as the societal effects of racism. Post-test responses to students' feelings about racism added rationale to moral claims about racism, as exemplified in the lead quote to this article. We noted a statistically significant difference in a question which asked students how capable (or empowered) do they think they are to change the effects of racism in their lives and/or community compared to the beginning of these classes on racism. One student wrote, “...now I know that racism can effect [sic] people's health and I don't want that to happen anymore.” Not surprisingly, some students' capability score went down as they came to the realization that changing the effects of racism is “harder than I thought.”

We have received positive reviews from teachers, including advice on curriculum refinement and a recommendation that JHA present its pedagogy at

*(Please turn to page 16)*

(CURRICULUM: Continued from page 15)

teacher training workshops and teacher conferences. Since the pilot, we have re-developed our *How Racism Is Embodied* curriculum into eleven lesson plans.

JHA believes that our curriculum is unique not only in its pedagogical method of focusing education on health

advocacy, but also in the content focus: the biological foundations of racial health inequities alongside the science that negates genetic and behavioral explanations for racial inequities. We believe that our curriculum can be a critical step in developing a societal understanding for the need to redress social inequities to improve health. We hope that our activities will complement work

by other institutions, such as King County's and Seattle's Equity and Social Justice Initiative. JHA envisions being an important educational and advocacy bridge between policymakers and community efforts to reduce racial health inequities in our society.

For further information, contact Linn Gould, 206/324-0297, [gouldjha@gmail.com](mailto:gouldjha@gmail.com) □

## Resources

Most Resources are available directly from the issuing organization, either on their website (if given) or via other contact information listed. Materials published by PRRAC are available through our website: [www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org). Prices include the shipping/handling (s/h) charge when this information is provided to PRRAC. "No price listed" items often are free.

When ordering items from PRRAC: SASE = self-addressed stamped envelope (44¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

### Race/Racism

- "State of Metropolitan America: On the Front Lines of Demographic Transformation" (168 pp., 2010) is available (no price given) from The Brookings Institution, 1775 Mass. Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/797-8000, [www.brookings.edu/metro/StateOfMetroAmerica.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/metro/StateOfMetroAmerica.aspx) [12053]

- *Challenge: A Journal of Research on African American Men*, a peer-reviewed journal, is published semi-annually by

the Morehouse Research Institute. Subs: \$20/yr. for indivs., \$40 for libraries, institutions. The Inst. is at 830 Westview Dr. SW, Atlanta, GA 30314-3773, 404/215-2746. [12082]

- **SNCC History:** [www.crmvet.org](http://www.crmvet.org) contains extensive historical material on SNCC. [12103]

- "Shining the Light: Revealing Our Choice" (20 pp., May 2010), spotlighting the impact of structural racism within Minnesota, is available (possibly free) from the Kirwan Institute (headed by PRRAC Bd. member John Powell), 433 Mendenhall Laboratory, Ohio State Univ., 125 So. Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210, [kirwaninstitute@osu.edu](mailto:kirwaninstitute@osu.edu) [12142]

- *The Political Economy of Racism*, by Melvin Leiman (420 pp., \$22), has been reprinted by Haymarket Books, 4015 N. Rockwell St., Chicago, IL 60618, 773/583-7884, [www.haymarketbooks.org](http://www.haymarketbooks.org) [12153]

- "Leadership and Race: How to Develop and Support Leadership that Contributes to Racial Justice," by Terry Keleher, Sally Leiderman, Deborah

Meehan, Elissa Perry, Maggie Potapchuk, John A. Powell & Hanh Cao Yu, is a Sept. 2010 report from the Leadership Learning Community. Inf. from co-author Potapchuk, 410/566-0390, Downloadable at [mpotapchuk@mpassociates.us](mailto:mpotapchuk@mpassociates.us). [12171]

- *Floodlines: Community Resistance from Katrina to the Jena Six*, by Jordan Flaherty (303 pp., 2010, \$16), Foreword by Amy Goodman, has been published by Haymarket Books, PO Box 180165, Chicago, IL 60618, 773/583-7884, [info@haymarketbooks.org](mailto:info@haymarketbooks.org), [www.haymarketbooks.org](http://www.haymarketbooks.org) [12182]

- *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*, by Joe R. Feagin (2nd edition, 2010), has been published by Routledge.

- *Hands on the Freedom Plow: Personal Accounts by Women of SNCC*, eds. Faith S. Holsaert, Martha Prescod Norman Noonan, Judy Richardson, Betty Garman Robinson, Jean Smith Young & Dorothy M. Zellner (632 pp., October 2010, \$34.95), has been published by University of Illinois Press, 1325 South Oak St., Champaign,

IL 61820-6903, 217/244-4689, [mrroux@uillinois.edu](mailto:mrroux@uillinois.edu).

- *Katrina's Imprint: Race and Vulnerability in America*, eds. Keith Wailoo, Karen M. O'Neill, Jeffrey Dowd & Roland Anglin (2010, \$24.95), has been published by Rutgers University Press.

- "Developing Culturally Competent Professionals: Meeting the Needs of Puerto Rican/Latino Communities" was held last May by the NYC-based Centro De Estudios Puertorriqueños. Inf. from [centroev@hunter.cuny.edu](mailto:centroev@hunter.cuny.edu) [mcsv20.net](http://mcsv20.net), [www.centropr.org](http://www.centropr.org) [12186]

- "Securing the Dream" is the Statewide Latino Public Policy Conf. 2010, **Sept. 17, 2010** in Worcester, MA (probably already taken place by the time this issue of P&R arrives). Inf. from the sponsor, Gaston Inst. of U. Mass.-Boston, [gsston2010@umb.edu](mailto:gsston2010@umb.edu) [12175]

- "Facing Race," a national conference sponsored by the Applied Research Center, will take place **Sept. 23-25, 2010** in Chicago. Inf. at [facingrace@arc.org](mailto:facingrace@arc.org), [www.arc.org/facingrace](http://www.arc.org/facingrace) [12185]

- **"The Unfinished Work': Advancing New Strategies in the Struggle for Civil Rights,"** sponsored by the Univ. No. Carolina Center for Civil Rights, honoring the long career of Julius Chambers, will be held **Nov. 1-2, 2010** at UNC-Chapel Hill. Inf./registration: 919/843-3921, [civilrights@unc.edu](mailto:civilrights@unc.edu) [12167]

- **"Black California Dreamin': Social Vision and the Crisis of California's African American Communities,"** sponsored by the Univ. of California Santa Barbara's Center for Black Studies, will be held **May 2011**. Abstracts for papers and other work (max. 500 words) should be submitted before Nov. 15 to Prof. Clyde Woods, [cwoods@cbs.ucsb.edu](mailto:cwoods@cbs.ucsb.edu), [research.ucsb.edu/cbs/](http://research.ucsb.edu/cbs/) [12144]

## Poverty/ Welfare

- **"The Latent and Sequential Costs of Being Poor: An Exploration of Housing, Poverty & Public Policy,"** by Joanna Duke-Lucio, Laura R. Peck & Elizabeth A. Segal (2010), is available at [www.psocommons.org/vol2/iss2/art4](http://www.psocommons.org/vol2/iss2/art4) [12063]

- **"Child Poverty Persistence: Facts and Consequences,"** by Caroline Ratcliffe & Signe-Mary McKernan (10 pp., June 2010), is available (possibly free) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5283, [skantor@urban.org](mailto:skantor@urban.org) [12065]

- ***BROKE, USA: from Pawnshops to Poverty, Inc. -- How the Working Poor Became Big Business,*** by Gary Rivlin (358 pp.,

2010, \$26.99), has been published by HarperBusiness. Covers well the payday loans, check-cashing rip-offs, pawn shops, auto title loans, rent-to-own schemes, subprime mortgages and other "equity stripping" means of getting poor people into debt they can't carry, then taking their houses and cars while derivatives backed by those bad loans are sold to investors. [12076]

- **"The Worst of Times: Children in Extreme Poverty in the South and Nation"** is a 4-page, June 2010 Special Summary of a Southern Educational Foundation report. Available (likely free) from the Foundation, 135 Auburn Ave. NE, 2nd fl., Atlanta, GA 30303. The complete report is downloadable, free, at [www.southerneducation.org](http://www.southerneducation.org) [12080]

- **"The Wealth Gap Increases Fourfold,"** by Thomas M. Shapiro, Tatjana Meschede & Laura Sullivan, is a 3-page, May 2010 Research & Policy Brief, available (possibly free) from the Institute on Assets and Social Policy, Heller School for Social Policy & Management, Brandeis Univ. Mailstop 035, Waltham, MA 02454-9110, [meschede@brandeis.edu](mailto:meschede@brandeis.edu) [12087]

- **"Severe Financial Insecurity Among African American and Latino Seniors,"** by Tatjana Meschede, Thomas M. Shapiro, Laura Sullivan & Jennifer Wheary (15 pp., May 2010), from Demos and the Brandeis Univ. Institute on Assets and Social Policy, is available (possibly free) from Demos, 220 Fifth Ave., 5th fl., NYC, NY 10001. [12088]

- **"Unrestricted Savings: Their Role in Household Economic Security and the Case for Policy Action,"** by Alejandra Lopez-Fernandini, a 19-page, Feb. 2010 Working Paper, is available (possibly free) from the New American Foundation, 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, 202/986-2700. [12091]

- **Census Poverty Numbers:** In response to the Census Bureau's September 16 release of new income, poverty and health data, staff members at the Center for Law and Social Policy (Jodie Levin-Epstein, Hannah Matthews, Danielle Ewen, Rhonda Tsou-A-Fatt) provided varying commentary on the numbers. [claspmailing@clasp.org](mailto:claspmailing@clasp.org) for copies.

- **"The Assets Report 2010: An Assessment of President Obama's 2011 Budget and the Changing Policy Landscape for Asset Building Opportunities,"** by Reid Cramer, Mark Huelsman, Justin King, Alejandra Lopez-Fernandini & David Newville, a 24-page, April 2010 report, is available (possibly free) from the New America Foundation, 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, 202/986-2700. [12092]

- **"Reducing Poverty and Economic Distress after ARRA: Next Steps for Short-Term Recovery and Long-Term Economic Security,"** by Peter Edelman, Olivia Golden & Harry Holzer, is an 11-page, July 2010 Brief, available (possibly free) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-8200, [pubs@urban.org](mailto:pubs@urban.org) [12095]

- **"Economic Security at Risk: Findings from the Economic Security**

**Index,"** by Jacob S. Hacker, Gregory A. Huber, Philipp Rehm, Mark Schlesinger & Rob Valletta (25 pp., July 2010), is available (likely free) from The Rockefeller Foundation, 420 Fifth Ave., #22, NYC, NY 10018-2711, 212/869-8500. [12100]

- **"Combating Poverty and Inequality: Structural Change, Social Policy and Politics,"** a Sept. 2010 UN report, is available at [www.unriscd.org/80256B3C005BB128/%28httpProjects%29/791B1580AoFFF8E5C12574670042C091?OpenDocument](http://www.unriscd.org/80256B3C005BB128/%28httpProjects%29/791B1580AoFFF8E5C12574670042C091?OpenDocument) [12139]

- **The Fourteenth Annual Welfare Research and Evaluation Conference,** sponsored by The Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation in the Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, will be held **June 1-3, 2011** in Washington, DC. Deadline for proposals October 29. Inf. from Seth Chamberlain [@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:@acf.hhs.gov) or Erica Zielewski, Erica. [Zielewski@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:Zielewski@acf.hhs.gov), [WREC@esi-dc.com](mailto:WREC@esi-dc.com).

## Community Organizing

- **"Shining the Light: A Practical Guide to Co-Creating Health Communities"** (34 pp., May 2010) is available (possibly free) from the Kirwan Institute (headed by PRRAC Bd. member John Powell), 433 Mendenhall Laboratory, Ohio State Univ., 125 So. Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210, [kirwaninstitute@osu.edu](mailto:kirwaninstitute@osu.edu) [12141]

- **"Community Organizing: Building toward Long-Term Change,"** sponsored by The Praxis Project, will be held **Oct.**

21-23, 2010 at the National Labor College outside Wash., DC. Inf. from 202/234-5921. [12169]

## Criminal Justice

- **State Recidivism Studies** is a new (June 2010) database, from The Sentencing Project, providing references for 99 recidivism studies conducted between 1995-2009 in all 50 states and DC. Contact the Project at 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871. [12067]
- **"Illegal Racial Discrimination in Jury Selection: A Continuing Legacy"** (61 pp., Aug. 2010) is available (no price listed) from the Equal Justice Initiative, 122 Commerce St., Montgomery, AL 36104, 334/269-1803, raceandjury@ejl.org, www.ejl.org [12071]
- **The Enemy in Our Hands: America's Treatment of Prisoners of War from the Revolution to the War on Terror**, by Robert C. Doyle (496 pp., 2010, \$34.95), has been published by University Press of Kentucky, 663 S. Limestone St., Lexington, KY 40508-4008, 859/257-4249, jhussey@uky.edu [12086]
- **Trial and Error in Criminal Justice Reform: Learning from Failure**, by Greg Berman & Aubrey Fox (2010), has been issued by Urban Institute Press, burpen@urban.org [12005]
- **"14 Shocking Facts That Prove the Criminal Justice System Is Racist,"** by Bill Quigley, is a July 30, 2010 Alternet article. If you can't find it on the Internet, we'll be happy to mail you a copy if you send us a SASE. [12152]

- **"Community Oriented Defense: Stronger Public Defenders,"** by Malanca Clark & Emily Savner (61 pp., Aug. 2010), is available (no price given) from the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, 161 Ave. of the Americas, 12th fl., NYC, NY 10013, www.brennancenter.org [12183]

## Economic/Community Development

- **The National Neighborhood Alliance** has just been launched, founded by 18 organizations supporting work in communities of concentrated poverty (Center for the Study of Social Policy, Coalition of Community Schools, Harlem Children's Zone, LISC, PolicyLink and others). Inf. and to add your organization, contact Patrick Lester, plester@unca.org
- **"Building Community within a Multiracial Nation"** is the 11th annual National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development Conference, **Sept. 26-29, 2010** in Washington, DC. Invited speakers include Sen. Daniel Akaka, Rep. Michael Honda, HUD Sec. Shawn Donovan & Melody Barnes. www.nationalcapacd.org [12147]
- **"The 2010 Opportunity Finance Network Conference"** will be held **Nov. 2-5, 2010** in San Francisco. Inf. from the Network, 620 Chestnut St., #572, Philadelphia, PA 19106, 215/923-4754. [12190]

## Education

- **"Learning From Leadership: Investigating**

**the Links to Improved Student Learning,"** by Karen Seashore Louis, Kenneth Leithwood, Kyla L. Wahlstrom & Stephen E. Anderson (334 pp., July 2010), is available (no price listed) from The Wallace Foundation, 5 Penn Plaza, NYC, NY 10001, 212/251-9700, wallace@xmr3.com [12077]

- **"The State of State Standards -- and the Common Core -- in 2010"** is a 370 pp., July 2010 report from the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, available (no price given) from Kari Hudnell, 202/955-9450, x318, khudnell@commworkslc.com. Possibly downloadable at edexcellenc.net/index.cfm/news\_the-state-of-state-standards-and-the-common-good-in-2010. [12096]
- **"Black flight' Changing the Makeup of Dallas Schools,"** by Holly K. Hacker & Tawnell D. Hobbs, was a long article (part of a series) in the June 9, 2010 *Dallas Morning News*. If you can't find it on the Internet, we'll be happy to mail you a copy if you send us a SASE. [12146]
- **"How High Schools Become Exemplary: Ways That Leadership Raises Achievement and Narrows Gaps by Improving Instruction in 15 Public High Schools"** (207 pp., July 2010) is available from the Harvard Achievement Gap Initiative. Print copies available from the AGI website, www.agi.harvard.edu [12149]
- **"A Tale of Two Schools: Race and Education on Long Island"** is a new documentary from Erase Racism. Available via Hofstra Univ., 6800 Jericho Pike, #109W, Syosset, NY 11791-4401, 516/921-4863,

x16, chanelle@eraseracism.org, www.eraseracismny.org [11975]

- **"Driving Dramatic School Improvement: Strategies for Turning Around Our Nation's Failing Schools,"** a podcast of a 2010(?) event co-hosted by the Stanford *Social Innovation Review*. For a copy, contact them at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, 518 Memorial Way, Stanford, CA 94305-5015, info@ssireview.org [12168]
- **"The Long Downturn: The Roots of the Crisis in the Real Economy,"** by Robert Brenner (13 pp., April 2010), is available (possibly free) from the New America Foundation, 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, 202/986-2700, www.newamerica.net [11966]
- **Affirmative Action for the Rich: Legacy Preferences in College Admissions**, ed. Richard D. Kahlenberg (304 pp., Sept. 2010, \$19.95), has been published by The Century Foundation Press, 800/537-5487. Among the authors of the ten chapters is PRRAC Bd. member John Brittain. [12181]
- **"The Road Less Traveled: How the Development Sciences Can Prepare Educators to Improve Student Achievement"** (Sept. 2010) is available (no price given) from The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010 Mass. Ave. NW, #500, Wash., DC 20036, 202/466-7496, www.ncate.org [12191]
- **"Segregation and Exposure to High-Poverty Schools in Large Metropolitan Areas: 2008-09,"** by Nancy McArdle,

Theresa Osypuk & (PRRAC Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. member) Dolores Acevedo-Garcia (23 pp., Sept. 2010), is available from [diversitydata.org](http://diversitydata.org), Harvard School of Public Health, 677 Huntington Ave., Boston, MA 02115.

● **"Transforming the High School Experience: Lessons from the New York Small Schools Initiative,"** by Howard S. Bloom, Saskia Levy Thompson & Rebecca Unterman, with Corinne Herlihy & Colin F. Payne (159 pp., June 2010), is available (no price listed) from MDRC, [www.mdrc.org](http://www.mdrc.org).

● **The National Education Policy Center** has been established at the University of Colorado-Boulder School of Education, designed to bring the highest quality education policy research to bear on policymaking and public understanding of key schooling issues. More inf. at <http://nepc.colorado.edu/>

● **"Building Bridges: From Parent Involvement to Student Achievement,"** sponsored by the Center for Parent Leadership, will be held **Nov. 9-10, 2010** in Lexington, KY. Inf. from the Prichard Comm., 167 W. Main St., #310, Lexington, KY 40507, 859/233-9849, x226, [mtoney@prichardcommittee.org](mailto:mtoney@prichardcommittee.org), [www.centerforparentleadership.org](http://www.centerforparentleadership.org) [12189]

● **"Future Forward"** is the 45th annual National Community Education Assn. conference, **Dec. 1-3, 2010** in Phoenix. July 31 was deadline for Presenter Forms, but you can see if they're flexible. Inf. from John Myers, ED, NCEA, 3929 Old Lee Hwy., #91-A, Fairfax, VA 22030,

303/961-8248, [www.NCEA.com](http://www.NCEA.com) [12075]

● **The National AfterSchool Association's 2011 Conference** will be held **April 16-18, 2011** in Orlando. Workshop applications due by October 1. Contact NAA at 8400 Westpark Drive, 2nd fl., McLean, VA 22102, [naaconvention.org](http://naaconvention.org).

## Employment/ Labor/Jobs Policy

● **"Shifting Gears: State Innovation to Advance Workers and the Economy in the Midwest,"** by Julie Strawn (29 pp., July 2010), is available (possibly free) from Marcie Foster, CLASP (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Alan Houseman), 1200 18th St. NW, #200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/906-8033, [mwfoster@clasp.org](mailto:mwfoster@clasp.org) [12062]

● ***The Civil Wars in U.S. Labor: Birth of a New Workers' Movement or Death Throes of the Old?***, by Steve Early (320 pp., Dec. 2010), has been published by Haymarket Books, PO Box 180165, Chicago, IL 60618, 773/583-7884, [www.haymarketbooks.org](http://www.haymarketbooks.org) [12158]

● ***Live Working or Die Fighting: How the Working Class Went Global***, by Paul Mason (320 pp., May 2010 - updated 2010 edition), has been published by Haymarket Books, PO Box 180165, Chicago, IL 60618, 773/583-7884, [www.haymarketbooks.org](http://www.haymarketbooks.org) [12160]

● **"Jobs With Justice 2009 Annual Report"** is available from them (likely free): 1325 Mass. Ave.

NW, #200, Wash., DC 20005, 202/393-1044, [jwjnational@jwj.org](mailto:jwjnational@jwj.org), [www.jwj.org](http://www.jwj.org) [12161]

● **"The Front Line of Defense: Building a New Unemployment Insurance System,"** by Steven Attewell, a June 2010 Policy Paper, is available (possibly free) from the New America Foundation, 1899 L St. NW, 4th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/213-7051, [brown@newamerica.net](mailto:brown@newamerica.net)

● **"LaborFest 2010"** was the very impressive July 3-31 17th annual film/tours/forums/music/etc. Bay Area event. Details from them, PO Box 40993, San Francisco, CA 94140, 415/642-8066, [laborfest@laborfest.net](mailto:laborfest@laborfest.net), [www.laborfest.net](http://www.laborfest.net)

## Families/ Women/ Children

● **"Sample State Legislation to Extend Foster Care, Adoption and Guardianship Protections, Services and Payments to Young Adults Age 18 and Older"** (36 pp., June 2010), from the American Bar Assn. Ctr. on Children and the Law, Ctr. for Law and Social Policy, Children's Defense Fund, and Juvenile Law Center, is available (possibly free) from the ABA Ctr., 740 15th St. NW, Wash., DC 20005, [www.abanet.org/child/empowerment](http://www.abanet.org/child/empowerment) [12070]

● **"The National Commission on Children and Disasters Final Report"** will be available in October. Further inf. about the work of the Commission and its subsequent life is available from Pamela Carter-

[birken@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:birken@acf.hhs.gov) [12173]

● **"The First Annual Fatherhood Conference,"** sponsored by the United Christian Fellowship, will take place **Sept. 25, 2010** in Palmdale, Calif. Inf. from 661/273-1800. [12140]

## Food/ Nutrition/ Hunger

● **"Millions Left Waiting for Food Stamps,"** by Justin Juozapavicius & Michelle Roberts, appeared in the June 10, 2010 *Washington Post*. If you are unable to locate it via the Internet, we'll be happy to mail you a copy if you send us a SASE. [12155]

## Health

● **"An Examination of the Social and Physical Environment of Public Housing Developments in Two Chicago Developments in Transition"** is a 2010 Urban Inst. study linking distressed public housing to poor mental health. Available at [www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412134-chicago-public-housing.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412134-chicago-public-housing.pdf) [12094]

● **"The Role and Value of School-Based Healthcare"** is the theme of the Sept. 2010 issue of *American Journal of Public Health*. \$30 from APHA, 800 I St. NW, Wash., DC 20001-3710, 202/777-APHA. [12135]

● **"Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act of 2010: Advancing Health Equity for Racially and Ethnically Diverse Populations,"** by Dennis Andrulis, Nadia

Siddiqui, Jonathan Purtle & Lisa Duchon (Aug. 2010), is available (possibly free) from the Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies, 202/789-3519, bawilliams@jointcenter.org, and on their website, www.jointcenter.org/hpi [12138]

- "The First Annual Saving Hearts for Generations Gala," sponsored by the Association of Black Cardiologists, will be held Oct. 22, 2010 in Wash., DC. Inf./sponsorship from the Assn., 2400 N St.NW, #604, Wash., DC 20037, 800/753-9222, prclient@deborahhardnett.com, www.abcardio.org [12090]

- "The 2011 Annual Conf. of the Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs" will take place Feb. 12-15, 2011 in Wash., DC. Deadline for proposal submissions was Aug. 23, but you can see if they're flexible. Inf. from Colleen Campbell, 703/964-1240, x16, ccampbell@conferencemanagers.com, communications@amchp.org [12064]

- The 2011 National School-Based Health Care Convention ("School-based health care and the community: A Partnership that works") will be held June 26-29, 2011 in Chicago. Deadline for submission of abstracts is October 29. www.nasbhc.org/abstracts, info@nasbhc.org.

## Homelessness

- "Boomerang Homeless Families: Aggressive Rehousing Policies in New York City" (3 pp., Summer 2010) is available (possibly free) from the Institute for Children, Poverty & Homelessness, www.icpny.org [12072]

- **Uncensored: American Family Experience with Poverty and Homelessness** is a new (the 25-page Vol. I, Issue 2 was Summer 2010) publication (possibly free) from the Institute for Children, Poverty & Homelessness, 44 Cooper Sq., flr. 4, NYC, NY 10003, 212/358-8086, www.icpny.org [12102]

## Housing

- "Why Affordable Housing Isn't Enough" (7 pp., June (?) 2010) is available (possibly free) from Housing Rights, Inc., PO Box 12895, Berkeley, CA 94712, 510/548-8776. [12068]

- "The Preservation Guide: Federal Housing and Homelessness Plans -- Potential Tools in the Affordable Housing Preservation Toolbox" (58 pp., April 2010) is available (possibly free) from the National Low Income Housing Coalition (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Sheila Crowley), 727 15th St., NW, 6th flr., Wash., DC 20005, 202/662-1530, www.nlihc.org [12073]

- *Residents' Journal* is a quarterly (?) publication distributed free to all Chicago low-income residents, including public housing tenants, \$25/yr. for others: 4859 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, IL 60615, 773/726-5780. The Spring 2010 issue contains a special report on New Orleans in the years after Hurricane Katrina. ethan@wethepeoplemedia.org [12074]

- "The Anti-Chinese Cubic Air Ordinance," by Joshua S. Yang, is a 1-page article in the March 2009 *American Journal of Public Health*, on use of public health arguments to support anti-immigrant, racist

motivations in late 19th Century San Francisco. Reprint available from Dr. Yang, 530 Parnassus Ave, #360, SF, CA 94143, joshua.yang@ucsf.edu [12078]

- *The Community Land Trust Reader*, ed. John Emmeus Davis (616 pp., 2010, \$35), is available from the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 113 Brattle St., Cambridge, MA 02138, www.lincolninstitute.edu [12098]

- "More Than Just a Roof Over My Head: Housing for People Living with HIV/AIDS around the World" (54 pp., July 2010) has been released by the International AIDS Housing Roundtable. Inf./copies from 202/347-0333, lola@nationalaidshousing.org [12101]

- "Who Can Afford to Live in Delaware?" (2010) is available (possibly free) from the Delaware Housing Coalition, PO Box 1633, Dover, DE 19903-1633, 302/678-2286; downloadable at www.housingforall.org [12137]

- "Evictions in Milwaukee County 2008-2009: Estimating the Impact of Aid from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act," by Matthew Desmond, a 4-page, July 2010 Policy Report prepared for Community Advocates of Milwaukee, is available (likely free) from the author, Harvard Univ. Society of Fellows, 78 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 608/335-3101, mdesmond@ssc.wisc.edu [12151]

- "Foreclosures by Race and Ethnicity: The Demographics of a Crisis" (June 2010), from the Center for Responsible Lending, is available from

Nikitra Bailey at the Center, 302 W. Main St., Durham, NC 27701, 919/313-8511, http://www.responsiblelending.org/mortgage-lending/research-analysis/foreclosures-by-race-and-ethnicity.html

- "No Certification, No Money: The Revival of Civil Rights Obligations Under HUD Funding Programs," by Michael Allen, appeared in *Planning Commissioners Journal*, and is available at http://www.relmanlaw.com/docs/WestchesterArticle.pdf

- 2009 American Housing Survey data, collected every 2 yrs. by the Census Bureau and HUD, are available in print or disk at 301/763-4636 and are online at www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/ahs/ahsdata09.html [12154]

- *Preserving Public Housing: Issues and Options*, a recent policy discussion series held by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Robert Greenstein), is available, in audio highlight form, from Douglas Rice at the Center, 202/408-1080, and is on the Center's website, www.cbpp.org [12172]

- "From Foreclosure to Redlining: How America's Largest Financial Institutions Devastated California Communities" (Feb. 2010) is available (no price listed) from the California Reinvestment Coalition, 474 Valencia St., #230, SF, CA 94103, 415/864-3980. [12174]

- "The 7th Annual Upstate NY Conference," sponsored by the NYS Assoc. for Affordable Housing (450 7th Ave., #2401, NYC, NY 10123),

will be held **Oct. 6, 2010** in Buffalo. Inf. at [www.nysafah.org/buffalo](http://www.nysafah.org/buffalo) [12192]

- **"Race, Place, and Fair Housing,"** a statewide conference, will take place **Oct. 15, 2010** at the Univ. of Texas School of Law (Austin). Inf./registration at [www.utlawjusticecenter.org/activities/fairhousing.html](http://www.utlawjusticecenter.org/activities/fairhousing.html) [12069]

- **"Housing 2010,"** the annual Connecticut Fair Housing Center conference, will be held **Oct. 27, 2010** in Hartford. Inf. from 860/563-2943, x15, conference [@ct-housing.org](mailto:@ct-housing.org).

- **"The National Inclusionary Housing Conference"** will be held **Nov. 3-5, 2010** in DC. Inf. from Laura Nickle, 703/698-8151, [community@cox.net](mailto:community@cox.net) [12104]

## Immigration

- ***Growing Up Hispanic: Health and Development of Children of Immigrants,*** eds. Nancy S. Landale, Susan McHale & Alan Booth (368 pp., June 2010), has been published by Urban Inst. Press, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200. [12089]

- **"Children of Immigrants: Family and Parental Characteristics,"** by Ajay Chaudry & Karina Fortuny, is a 6-page, May 2010 Research Brief, available (possibly free) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709, [publicaffairs@urban.org](mailto:publicaffairs@urban.org), [www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org) [12055]

- **"7 Myths That Have Clouded the Immigration Debate,"** by Darrell M. West, appeared as an op-ed in the Sept. 1, 2010 *USA Today*. If you can't find it

on the Internet, we'll be happy to mail you a copy if you send us a SASE. [12143]

- **"The Impact of Immigrants in Recession and Economic Expansion,"** by Giovanni Peri (24 pp., June 2010), is available (possibly free) from the Migration Policy Institute, 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, [mmittelstadt@migrationpolicy.org](mailto:mmittelstadt@migrationpolicy.org) [12000]

- **"Young Children of Immigrants: The Leading Edge of America's Future,"** by Katrina Fortuny, Donald J. Hernandez & Ajay Chaudry (13 pp., Sept. 2010), is available (possibly free) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037-1231, 202/833-7200, [www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org).

- **"Still an Hourglass? Immigrant Workers in Middle-Skilled Jobs,"** by Randy Capps, Michael Fix & Serena Yi-Ying Lin (17 pp., September 2010), is available (possibly free) from the Migration Policy Institute, 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, [www.migrapolicy.org](http://www.migrapolicy.org).

- **Children of Immigrants Data Tool** is a project of The Urban Institute's Low-Income Working Families Project. Further inf. from [publicaffairs@urban.org](mailto:publicaffairs@urban.org), 202/261-5709, [www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org).

- **"Welcome to Shelbyville"** is a new hour-long film about immigration and change in a new destination (in this case, a small rural town near Nashville, Tenn.) Inf. about it, Active Voice and The BeCause Foundation from

[www.WelcomeToShelbyvilleOnline.org](http://www.WelcomeToShelbyvilleOnline.org), [www.becausefoundation.org/films](http://www.becausefoundation.org/films).

- **"Crossing Boundaries, Connecting Communities: Alliance Building for Immigrant Rights and Racial Justice"** (67 pp., July 2010) is available (possibly free) from Melanie Cervantes, Akonadi Foundation, 436 14th St., #1417, Oakland, CA 94612, 510/663-3867, [melanie@akonadi.org](mailto:melanie@akonadi.org) [12145]

## Rural

- ***Fields of Resistance: The Struggle of Florida's Farmworkers for Justice,*** by Silvia Giagnoni (260 pp., Feb. 2010), has been published by Haymarket Books, PO Box 180165, Chicago, IL 60618, 773/583-7884, [www.haymarketbooks.org](http://www.haymarketbooks.org) [12159]

- **69th Annual MPSA [Midwest Political Science Assn.] Conf.** will be held **March 31-April 3, 2011** in Chicago. Oct. 8 paper submission deadline, Dec. 3 poster submission deadline. Inf. at [www.mpsa.org](http://www.mpsa.org) [12187]

## Transportation

- **"The Hidden Health Costs of Transportation"** (19 pp., March 2010) is available (no price listed) from the American Public Health Assn., 800 I St. NW, Wash., DC 20001, 202/777-2742, [www.apha.org](http://www.apha.org) [12165]

- **"More Transit = More Jobs"** (30 pp., Sept. 2010) has been published by Transportation Equity. Ordering inf. from [www.transportationequity.org](http://www.transportationequity.org) [12188]

## Miscellaneous

- **"Out of Sight, Out of Mind: The Fight for Justice & Community against the Double Storm of Katrina and the BP Oil Disaster,"** a 21-minute documentary, will be shown (with discussion) **Sept. 30, 2010, 6:30 pm**, at the Letelier Theater in Georgetown, DC, by Advancement Project and The Leadership Conf. on Civil and Human Rights. RSVP to [pcurry@advancementproject.org](mailto:pcurry@advancementproject.org) [12179]

- **Massive March on Washington, Oct. 2: "One Nation Working Together,"** sponsored by some 170 progressive groups, turnout will be in the tens of thousands, focusing on renewing the American Dream for everyone: good jobs, fair jobs, safe jobs, more jobs; reforming Wall St.; repairing our immigration system; quality education for every child. Further inf. from DC office, 1825 K St. NW, #201, Wash., DC 20006, 202/263-4568.

- **"The 19th Annual Consumer Rights Litigation Conference,"** organized by the National Consumer Law Center, will take place **Nov. 11-14, 2010** in Boston. Inf./registration from the Center, 7 Winthrop Sq., 4th fl., Boston, MA 02110, 617/542-8010, [conference@nclc.org](mailto:conference@nclc.org), [www.nclc.org](http://www.nclc.org) [12083]

- **"Improving the Quality of Public Services: A Multinational Conference"** will take place **June 28-29, 2011** in Moscow. Deadline for submission of abstracts is December 13, to be submitted through APPAM website: <https://www.appam.org/conferences/international/moscow2011/index.asp>.

## Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants

- **The National Low Income Housing Coalition** (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Sheila Crowley) is seeking **Fall Interns** (Communications, Policy, Outreach, Research). Ltr. specifying preferred position/s + resume to Bill Shields at the Coalition, 727 15th St. NW, 6th flr., Wash., DC 20005, or email to bill@nlihc.org, or fax to 202/393-1973. Qs? 202/662-1530, x232. [12056]
- **The Economic Policy Inst.** (Wash., DC) seeks a **National Coordinator** for its "Broader, Bolder

Approach to Education" project. Ltr./c.v./refs./writing sample to boldapproach@epi.org [12124]

- **The Connecticut Housing Coalition** is hiring an **Executive Director**. Ltr./resume/salary history, preferably by October 1, to Executive Director Search, Connecticut Housing Coalition, 3 Jordan Lane, Wethersfield, CT 06109, jeff@ct-housing.org.
- **Director, UNC Law Ctr. for Civil Rights/Professorship** Fall 2011 starting date. Ltr./c.v./contact inf. for 4 refs. to agirod@email.unc.edu, 919/962-0357, www.law.unc.edu/centers/civilrights/default.aspx [12134]

- **The American Youth Policy Forum** (Wash., DC) is accepting applications for **Fall Internships** Resume/detailed cover ltr./5-page writing sample real soon to Lgoodwin@aypf.org, www.aypf.org [12150]
- **Community Legal Aid Society, Delaware** seeks to fill its **Executive Director** position. Submit resume, right away, to clasijobposting@gmail.com [12162]
- **The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** - DC (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Robert Greenstein) is seeking a **Director of Housing Policy**. Resume/ltr. to owens@cbpp.org [12166]

- **Advancement Project**, a national civil organization, is hiring a **Communications Manager**. Resume/ltr./writing samples/3 refs. to Sabrina Williams, Advancement Project, 1220 L St. NW, #850, Wash., DC 20005, bjanifer@advancementproject.org [12184]
- **Public Campaign**, a DC-based national organization working for systemic change in the arena of money and politics, is hiring a **VP for Outreach and Operations**. Resume/ltr./3 refs./writing sample to bglass@publiccampaign.org, 651/295-8284, www.publiccampaign.org [12177]

### PRRAC'S SOCIAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

*Dolores Acevedo-Garcia*  
Bouvé College of Health Sciences, Northeastern Univ.

*Frank Bonilla*  
CUNY Department of Sociology

*Camille Zubrinsky Charles*  
Department of Sociology, Univ. of Pennsylvania

*John Goering*  
Baruch College, City Univ. of New York

*Heidi Hartmann*  
Inst. for Women's Policy Research (Wash., DC)

*William Kornblum*  
CUNY Center for Social Research

*Harriette McAdoo*  
Michigan State Department of Sociology

*Fernando Mendoza*  
Department of Pediatrics, Stanford Univ.

*Roslyn Arlin Mickelson*  
Univ. of No. Carolina-Charlotte

*Paul Ong*  
UCLA School of Public Policy  
& Social Research

*Gary Orfield*  
UCLA Civil Rights Project

*Gary Sandefur*  
Univ. Wisconsin Inst. for Poverty Research

*Gregory D. Squires*  
Department of Sociology, George Washington Univ.

*Margery Austin Turner*  
The Urban Institute

*Margaret Weir*  
Department of Political Science  
Univ. of California, Berkeley

---

**If You Are Not Already a *P&R* Subscriber,  
Please Use the Coupon Below.**

**Sign Me Up!**     1 year (\$25)    or     2 years (\$45)

*Please enclose check made out to PRRAC or a purchase order from your institution.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Address Line 2 \_\_\_\_\_

City, State, Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_                      email: \_\_\_\_\_

*Mail to: Poverty & Race Research Action Council  
1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200 • Washington, DC 20036*

# Poverty & Race Research Action Council

1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20036  
202/906-8023 FAX: 202/842-2885  
E-mail: [info@prrac.org](mailto:info@prrac.org)  
Website: [www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org)

Nonprofit  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Jefferson City, MO  
Permit No. 210

Address Service Requested

9-10/10

## POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL

### Board of Directors/Staff

#### CHAIR

**John Charles Boger**  
*University of North Carolina  
School of Law  
Chapel Hill, NC*

#### VICE-CHAIR

**José Padilla**  
*California Rural Legal  
Assistance  
San Francisco, CA*

#### SECRETARY

**john powell**  
*Kirwan Institute for the Study  
of Race & Ethnicity  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH*

#### TREASURER

**Spence Limbocker**  
*Neighborhood Funders  
Group  
Annandale, VA*

#### Maria Blanco

*Institute on Race, Ethnicity  
and Diversity  
University of California  
Law School  
Berkeley, CA*

#### Janis Bowdler

*National Council  
of La Raza  
Washington, DC*

#### John Brittain

*University of the District  
of Columbia School of  
Law  
Washington, DC*

#### Sheryll Cashin

*Georgetown University  
Law Center  
Washington, DC*

#### Sheila Crowley

*National Low Income  
Housing Coalition  
Washington, DC*

#### Craig Flournoy

*Southern Methodist  
University  
Dallas, TX*

#### Olati Johnson

*Columbia Law School  
New York, NY*

#### Elizabeth Julian

*Inclusive Communities  
Project  
Dallas, TX*

#### Demetria McCain

*Inclusive Communities  
Project  
Dallas, TX*

#### S.M. Miller

*The Commonwealth Institute  
Cambridge, MA*

#### Don Nakanishi

*University of California  
Los Angeles, CA*

#### Dennis Parker

*American Civil Liberties  
Union  
New York, NY*

#### Anthony Sarmiento

*Senior Service America  
Silver Spring, MD*

#### Theodore Shaw

*Columbia Law School  
New York, NY*

#### Brian Smedley

*Health Policy Institute  
Joint Center for Political and  
Economic Studies  
Washington, DC*

#### Catherine Tactaquin

*National Network for  
Immigrant & Refugee Rights  
Oakland, CA*

#### Camille Wood

*National Legal Aid &  
Defender Assn.  
Washington, DC*

*[Organizations listed for  
identification purposes only]*

#### Philip Tegeler

*President/Executive Director*

#### Chester Hartman

*Director of Research*

#### Kami Kruckenberg

*Policy Associate*

#### Lauren Hill

*Development & Government  
Relations Associate*

#### Hanna Chouest

*Law & Policy Fellow*

#### Anequa Campbell

*Law & Policy Intern*