Many of those who profess to want change “don’t care nothing about poor people...If they had poor people at heart, they could make it better.” Ethel Mae Mathews, president of the Atlanta chapter of the National Welfare Rights Organization, made this statement in 2000, after decades of community-based activism in Atlanta. Five decades after passage of the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts, Mathews critiqued policymakers who ignored the poor. The African-American woman directed special contempt at other African-American leaders, elected and self-appointed: “They forget about you, they forget about who they are and where they come from, and who helped them get where they is.”

Years of work in Atlanta’s impoverished neighborhoods informed Mathews’ assessment of civil rights and anti-poverty activism at the dawn of the 21st Century. The daughter of Alabama sharecroppers, Mathews had arrived in Atlanta penniless during the 1950s. She had a sixth-grade education. She found work as a housekeeper and lived in public housing, where she struggled to raise her children. Mathews found her political voice in the welfare rights movement. Budget cuts by federal and state legislators to programs to aid the poor angered her. Moreover, Congress had enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1965 Voting Rights Act—legislative landmarks—but neither law had cured her ills. Formal equality under the law had not changed her daily life; and the right to vote, alone, had not brought about a responsive government.

Mathews, together with Eva Davis, Emma Armour and other occupants of Atlanta’s housing projects, organized. They protested budget cuts and other policies that undermined the poor—in the streets, in the legislature, in the courts. The women demanded concrete changes for themselves and their children. They sought an adequate income, affordable housing and desegregated schools.

Ethel Mae Mathews and the searing critiques of the legal and social orders that she and fellow activists lodged during the late 1960s feature prominently in my book, Courage to Dissent: Atlanta and the Long History of the Civil Rights Movement. Mathews is just one of the book’s figures who answer the central question posed: What would the story of black Americans’ struggle for civil rights look like if legal historians shifted the focus from the work of the national NAACP, the legendary Thurgood Marshall and the U.S. Supreme Court, to local agents of change?

The book answers the question by shining a spotlight on unsung lawyers and activists who fought for equality in Atlanta from the 1940s through 1980. It shows that courageous local lawyers, organizers, negotiators, students and working-class men and women shook up the nation—and frequently clashed with the mandates of the national black leadership.

Courage to Dissent discusses three distinct waves of dissenters from the racial status quo at three different historical moments. All of the dissenters sought “equality,” but each wave of lawyers and activists imputed different meaning to the word and had different priorities and tactics for achieving equality.
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The book discusses “pragmatists,” dominant beginning in the late 1940s, “movement lawyers and demonstrators” who burst onto the scene during the 1960s, and “welfare rights activists,” prominent during the 1970s. Each wave of civil rights activists insisted on defining equality and the paths toward it in its own way, and each group gave rise to a new wave of activists with different priorities, strategies and tactics. The book discusses debates among these waves of dissenters over politics, housing, education and economic disparities—issues that continue to incite debate among activists.

The Pragmatists

The pragmatists sought to challenge Jim Crow laws incrementally, without destroying the social and economic capital the black middle class built during segregation. One of the South’s first African-American lawyers, Austin Thomas (“A.T.”) Walden, numbered among this group. Walden valued voting rights over litigation and rejected the idea that integration equaled equality—a cornerstone of the NAACP’s court battles. Like Walden, black college presidents, ministers, NAACP’s court battles. Like Walden, black college presidents, ministers, black teachers and contractors also championed racial reform through voting rights. But these professionals shied away from legal challenges to school and housing segregation. Both sorts of litigation posed financial threats to the pragmatists. Black teachers might lose their jobs if school desegregation occurred. Black builders, who enjoyed a captive market under segregation, would compete in a larger environment if Jim Crow fell in housing. The pragmatists also could cite community-interested rationales to support their choices. Pragmatists argued that black students might meet hostility in desegregated schools. And they noted that blacks prospered in same-race neighborhoods where they maintained cultural ties. If pragmatists accommodated segregation, they did so for good reasons, they believed.

The Movement Lawyers

Movement lawyers and the demonstrators challenged the incrementalism of the pragmatists, whom they dismissed as “Uncle Toms.” The demonstrators sought “Freedom Now.” They protested segregated public accommodations in the streets, staged rent strikes and demanded the right to vote. The students found allies in a new generation of the civil rights bar—trailblazing lawyers Len Holt and Howard Moore, Jr. Holt introduced the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) to “movement lawyering”—a style of civil rights litigation supportive of direct action. Moore, SNCC’s general counsel, litigated across a wide variety of cases—criminal, school desegregation and draft resistance actions, among others.

Moore eventually represented some of his clients when they took advantage of new opportunities created by the Voting Rights Act. In a bid to transition from “protest to politics,” student radicals ran for public office, and some won. By the early 1970s, Atlanta had elected a black mayor, a black Board of Education chairman, a black congressman, and blacks held half the seats on the School Board.

Welfare Rights Activists

These changes, however symbolically significant, did not satisfy the third wave of dissenters—welfare rights activists such as Ethel Mae Mathews, who emerged during the late 1960s and 1970s. This final wave of dissidents attacked economic and structural inequality in society—the same world that some middle-class blacks had helped to build and fought to preserve. Mathews and other anti-poverty activists also criticized the political structure—the same structure that some of the 1960s demonstrators had now embraced.

Thus, the disappointments that Mathews expressed in 2000 had deep roots; they rested in the unfinished struggles of the 1960s. Her critique persisted because the legacy of Jim Crow that she had identified—racialized poverty—remained.

Courage to Dissent illuminates the relationship between the past and the present. The story that it tells about Atlanta and its evolution over the post-war era is unique, but Atlanta’s post-war history is, in many ways, representative of urban America. And Ethel Mae Mathews stands in for many Americans, forgotten citizens who still seek a political voice and political power.

Lessons Learned

What lessons, then, does Courage to Dissent offer for today? Each reader can find something in the book that relates to his or her movement of choice—whether it is the continuing struggle for racial justice, women’s rights, environmental justice or gay rights. Above all else, this bottom-up history of legal activism teaches that people from all walks of life can be law shapers—if given the chance.
The Role of Teacher Union Locals in Advancing Racial Justice and Improving the Quality of Schooling in the United States

by Mark Simon

In 2005, a dozen or so progressive teacher union leaders created the Mooney Institute for Teacher and Union Leadership (MITUL), an outgrowth of the ten-year-old Teacher Union Reform Network (TURN). We created MITUL out of a deep understanding of just how difficult it is to lead a teacher union local in a progressive direction. We wanted to define what progressive unionism is, develop a curriculum through which our fellow unionists would deepen their understanding of the approach, and then institutionalize coaching and support for next-generation unionists to take their locals and the national unions in that direction. We wanted to cultivate bold, creative, reform-oriented union leaders and locals.

Tom Mooney, AFT Vice-President from Ohio, and a great reform leader as president of the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers (CFT) was one of our MITUL founders. When he passed away unexpectedly in 2006, we re-named the Institute after him. The MITUL web site includes descriptions of Tom’s life and work and why his view of teacher unionism has been a guiding light to many of us.

**Defining Progressive Unionism**

Progressive unionism, as we defined it, included an equal emphasis on three frames: 1) traditional (industrial) unionism; 2) professional unionism; and 3) social justice unionism. The locals in our first cohort acknowledged right off the bat that their existing local activity fell almost entirely in the industrial frame, and that both the professional and social justice frames were underdeveloped. The work undertaken then was to develop plans for building community alliances, taking up strategies for improving teacher quality, and helping teachers to adopt approaches to teaching that enabled them to empower and be more successful with disadvantaged students. MITUL took up the need to re-think seniority rights, the need for the union to invest in peer review and other innovations to teacher evaluation. We viewed collaboration with management, not as a goal, but as a strategy for exerting teacher influence over the important decisions in our members’ work lives, those related to curriculum, assessment and instruction. We also discussed the need for the union to be connected with other movements for social justice and economic change to further what became known as the “broader, bolder approach” to education reform. The Mooney Institute authored two Opinion columns in *Ed Week*, and we looked forward to the change in the president in the White House but also the ones in both the NEA and the AFT, all in 2008.

The most well-meaning of elected local union leaders come into the job and feel immediately overwhelmed. It is an awesome responsibility to speak for thousands of hard-working teachers. The language, work styles and daily patterns of teacher unionism since the late 1960s have been defined by industrial unionism. Teacher unions are frequently largely reactive. They handle individual
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teacher complaints and grievances. They serve on management committees as the teacher voice. They periodically bargain pay rates, hours and working conditions. The daily routines of most union leaders are defined by others. We were trying through the Institute to help union leaders see that their mission needed to be to define the public education reform agenda — to fight for equity and justice through changes in curriculum, authentic assessment tools, improvements in instruction and teacher quality control. We wanted to change the community face and role of the union.

We found tremendous receptivity to our ideas among teacher unionists, but the main impediment to the work of the Institute has been the growing sense of crisis and being under siege that has become the norm in public education. The crisis is both fiscal and political. The sense of being embattled frequently brings out the worst of the industrial instincts and training of teacher unionists.

Now, more than two years into the Obama presidency—with the failure of the education jobs bill in Congress under the then-Democratic majority in both houses, the end of a brief foray into an attempt at economic stimulus, and then a devastating election in which Republicans gained a majority in the House of Representatives and the whole idea of government having a role in economic downturns was replaced by a new goal of deficit reduction—things have dramatically taken a turn for the worse. From the beginning of its term in office, the Obama Administration looked to some of the same foundations and think tanks that had brought corporate-style reform strategies to Bush Administration education policy development— the Gates Foundation, the New Schools Venture Fund, the Broad Foundation and the Ed Trust. As Diane Ravitch argues, we have a tsunami that has put teacher unions in the crosshairs. The economic downturn put pressure on state and district revenues, forcing districts to make massive cuts, which led many to target teacher pensions, health benefits and class sizes. The new Obama strategies have doubled down on Bush strategies—School Improvement Grants and Race to the Top funding conditioned on promoting charter schools; labeling schools in high-poverty neighborhoods as failures and closing them; evaluating teachers based on student test scores; firing half the teachers in low-performing schools as a condition of getting federal funds, and in some cases letting the whole teaching staff go when test scores are low. These “quick fix” prescriptions create a collision course with teachers and their unions, but avoid the tough work of improving schools in urban, high-poverty neighborhoods.

**Teacher unions must reclaim the agenda for school improvement.**

This is a pivotal moment for teacher unions in the United States. And it is a pivotal moment for community groups and organizers for racial justice to understand the role and potential of teacher unions.

There is a powerful, richly funded and well-orchestrated campaign afoot to fundamentally restructure public education on a corporate efficiency and privatization model. It uses the rhetoric of civil rights to intensify the sense of urgency for change that all parents feel, particularly the families of low-income students of color. The reform movement has attracted surprising spokespeople in the likes of Newt Gingrich, Al Sharpton, Joel Klein, Cory Booker and Michelle Rhee, none of whom had run a school or a school system or much of anything that involved teaching or learning when they jumped in as the enablers for these neo-liberal reform strategies. It also seems to have captured the Obama Administration’s Education Department. Funding for these reforms and the propagation of this powerful narrative comes from some of the largest education foundations, including Gates, Broad, hedge fund managers who bankroll Democrats for Education Reform, and from the federal government.

A primary purpose of this campaign is to disempower teacher unions and make public education cheaper by accelerating turnover in the teacher workforce—getting rid of older teachers, hiring younger ones who don’t plan to stay long, reducing legacy costs in the form of cutting pensions and teacher health care. The goal also seems to be to teacher-proof the curriculum, centralize the content and instructional methodologies in line with high-stakes assessments, and to de-professionalize teaching. To make these changes possible, editorial boards and foundation-supported think tanks have waged a tremendous PR effort to undermine teacher unions and label them the cause of what ails public education. In a sense, the frontal attacks by Wisconsin’s Scott Walker and Republican governors in Ohio and Michigan have been able to build on the fertile ground left by liberal corporate reformers.

**A False Narrative**

The dominant narrative that underlies the federal reform agenda goes something like this: Public education has failed to provide disadvantaged children with the opportunity for upward mobility, and has left middle-class children without the technological skills they need to compete in a world economy. Plenty of money has been spent on improving teaching and learning conditions, training teachers and ensuring that students are ready for school, which should have enabled the educational system to overcome differences in student background and preparation. The solution lies in high-stakes and test-based accountability and serious sanctions for failure, as measured by standardized exams. The stakes will be dramatically increased...
when teachers are evaluated not by their qualifications, experience, or overall competence and effectiveness, but by the basic-skills test score gains of their students. This view holds that schools and school systems need to be shaken up and required to compete with alternatives that include charter schools operated by private entities not bound by the restrictions that purportedly impede regular public schools. The status quo is so obviously broken, the purveyors of this narrative maintain, that any change, no matter how radical, can’t possibly make things worse.

The problem is that this simple narrative is false. From the perspective of students, parents and teachers, things can get worse. Community groups are rising up spontaneously in New York, Los Angeles, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland and elsewhere against school closings and consolidations in their neighborhoods. The common analysis by those community groups is that school closings and consolidations have more to do with opening new schools in gentrifying neighborhoods and closing schools in poor neighborhoods, furthering gentrification strategies of the banks and developers, than it does with real school improvement. In Chicago, Washington DC and Philadelphia, school consolidations led to gang violence predicted by community leaders. Research by the Consortium for Chicago School Research shows that low-income students forced to attend new schools in other neighborhoods did no better, or even a little worse. It turns out that improving schools is more complicated than the promoters of Chicago’s Renaissance 2010 and other quick turnaround efforts advertised. By and large, those efforts failed to deliver.

While individual charter schools sometimes offer a good education, the only large, national data-set study of charter schools, by Stanford University’s Margaret Raymond, showed that 83% of charter schools have produced no better results than the neighborhood schools those students would have attended. Notwithstanding the fictionalized but emotionally gripping accounts like “Waiting for Superman,” the success of some charters depends on selecting and attracting more highly motivated kids. In and of themselves, charters represent no reform strategy whatsoever. In fact, NY Daily News columnist Juan Gonzales warns of a coming avalanche of scandals of corruption and conflicts of interest by the corporate boards of loosely regulated, unaccountable charter schools.

We’ve had over a decade of No Child Left Behind and the achievement gap has not at all narrowed. NAEP scores have not improved over the past decade of NCLB, but were improving, it turns out, in the previous decades under different strategies. Test-driven reform is leading to epi-
demics of cheating, wasteful test-prep, narrowing of the curriculum, and educationally unsound practices in response to the high-stakes attached to standardized test scores. What test-driven reform has done is increase top-down management control, while narrowing and dumbing-down what is taught to what is tested in many schools and districts.

One reason the dominant narrative and thoughtless reforms have caught hold is that educators, unions and community-based organizations never developed an alternative reform narrative that would have empowered teachers, parents and students. All was not right in many of this nation’s schools, but educators and even parents had become complacent. Indeed, local teacher unions did not help their cause by too often living the stereotype as obstructionists and defenders of the status quo. The response of NEA and AFT to the corporate reform models has been slow, complicated and a bit like deer-in-the-headlights over the past couple of years, and the national unions have had little impact on helping their locals to step up to lead alternatives to the dominant reforms.

Reclaiming the Agenda

Although we are now playing catch-up, teacher unions, parent and community groups, and progressive education researchers and activists must reclaim the agenda for school and public education improvement. Our focus must be on real education reform. That means serious support for teachers to teach better. Teaching better has very little to do with getting test scores up, although test score results do provide a marker for how far we have to go. It rather has to do with supports for teachers to expand our repertoire of strategies for making learning engaging and effective. It means broadening and enriching the curriculum. It means engaging families and building neighborhood communities of support around schools. It could mean parent visitation programs like that developed in Sacramento, CA. It certainly means helping communities resist simple-minded school turnaround and closing strategies in favor of programs that better address the real causes of low student achievement in poor communities.

A body of research is beginning to unfold from the work of the Chicago Consortium for Chicago School Research in their book, Organizing Schools for Improvement, and the Syracuse “Say Yes to Education” project, in the Promise Neighborhood strategies emerging in NY, NJ and elsewhere, and the work in developing Teacher Residencies that actually serve to build the profession of teaching. Teacher unions can be at the forefront of pushing for Peer Assistance and Review programs and other supports for new teachers. We have to get school districts to do justice to the complexity of the craft of teaching. We have to work with families and communities to identify strategies to ready students for learning.

Unions and community groups together can blow the whistle when ambitious Superintendents or Chancellors choose strategies that jeopardize the integrity of high-quality teaching and real learning, or when the real needs of communities are being ignored. Whether educators, parents and communities are going to have anything to say about the nature of public education depends on our ability to build alliances around a common vision of quality public education.

In this overview, I have attempted to present my sense of the challenges facing educators and community activists attempting to carve out a progressive agenda and perspective. I continue to think that the two national teacher unions, NEA and AFT, are sleeping giants with tremendous potential as allies of both teacher empowerment and grass-roots community-led support for better reforms. Given the severity of the economic attacks on working-class communities, the attacks on public education itself, and the more and more brazen attacks on teacher unions, nothing is more important than building those alliances.

---

**Resources**

The Teacher Union Reform Network (TURN) is online at: http://www.turnexchange.net/blog.html
The Mooney Institute is online at: http://www.mitul.org
The DC grassroots organization Teacher and Parents for Real Education Reform, which has been fighting for an alternative to Michelle Rhee’s brand of reform, is at: http://realeducationreformdc.blogspot.com/
NY Daily News columnist Juan Gonzalez has investigated how charter schools become unregulated money-making investments for hedge fund managers. One in a series of columns he has written on the subject is at: http://www.nydailynews.com/ny_local/education/2010/05/07/2010-05-07_albany_charter_cash_cow_big_banks_making_a_bundle_on_new_construction_as_schools.html
For a snapshot of the components of progressive unionism, view the Three Frames of Progressive Unionism tool at: http://www.mooneyinstitute.org/resources/tools/three-frames-progressive-unionism
To find out more about Urban Teacher Residencies based on the model pioneered in Boston and Chicago, go to: http://www.utrunited.org/about-us
Find out more about the Syracuse NY “Say Yes To Education” initiative at: http://www.sayestoeducation.org/syte/index.php
The Consortium On Chicago School Research can be found at: http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/content/page.php?
Mossville, Louisiana: A Community’s Fight for the Human Right to a Healthy Environment

by Michele Roberts

Mossville is not located on most U.S. maps. Yet some of America’s largest industrial corporations have found this unincorporated African-American community and exploit its natural resources and proximity to the Gulf of Mexico. Near Mossville, homes, churches and playgrounds, there are 14 industrial facilities and an extensive network of underground and elevated pipelines that carry flammable and hazardous materials. The fact that African Americans have lived in Mossville for the last three centuries is of no moment to the industrial corporations. Nor is it relevant to our government, which has approved environmental permitting, zoning and significant tax subsidies that allow millions of pounds of toxic pollution to engulf Mossville residents. More egregious is that our government has enacted environmental laws that deny Mossville residents the legal right to a remedy.

Mossville residents suffer, and some have died from severe health problems associated with industrial pollution that includes elevated levels of dioxins in their blood. The fertile land and rich biodiversity in Mossville have been replaced with contaminated soil, fish kills, as well as unhealthy levels of carcinogenic chemicals in the air and water. However, there is no court in the United States where Mossville residents can go to find a remedy. The significant industrial pollution in Mossville is not prohibited by the Constitution or federal and state law. It is legal for the environmental-permitted industrial facilities to harm the Mossville community.

“We have been told over and over again by the Environmental Protection Agency that the facilities have a right to the environmental permits. But what about our rights?,” asked Dorothy Felix, a resident of Mossville, who along with her neighbors organized Mossville Environmental Action Now.

**Petitioning the OAS**

On behalf of the Mossville group and residents, Advocates for Environmental Human Rights filed a petition with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States (OAS). The petition seeks non-monetary remedies—healthcare, residential relocation, environmental restoration and regulatory reform—from the U.S. government for establishing a deeply flawed system for environmental protection that violates the human rights of Mossville residents. As a member of the OAS, the United States has the legal obligation to protect human rights.

In March 2010, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights issued a ruling that the Mossville petition is admissible for a review on the merits, which marked the first time for an international human rights body to take jurisdiction over a case of environmental racism in the United States. The admissibility ruling is based on the finding that the U.S. legal system provides no remedy for the racially disproportionate pollution burdens and unequal environmental protection suffered by Mossville residents. The Commission’s decision opens the door to a human rights trial of the U.S. environmental regulatory system that not only condemns the historic African-American community of Mossville to industrial hazards, but systematically subjects people of color and poor communities across the country to unhealthy and unsafe environmental conditions.

For years, environmental justice communities have advocated for remedies. Governmental agencies have responded inadequately by issuing vague guidelines that do not have the force of law and by hosting dialogue sessions with community advocates, science and health experts, as well as representatives of industrial companies. The governmental response, however well-intentioned, shifts the focus away from developing a legal remedy for the injustice of racially disparate toxic health threats and recognizing a legal right to a healthy environment.

The Mossville human rights case compels a departure from the inadequate governmental response to environmental racism and injustice. This one community that is omitted from most U.S. maps is the place where people are pushing our country toward embracing a new vision for environmental protection that is based on human rights.

**No U.S. court can provide a remedy.**

*More information about the Mossville human rights case is available at www.ehumanrights.org.*

---

**Don’t forget to send us items for our Resources section.**
Why Are African Americans and Latinos Underrepresented Among Recipients of Unemployment Insurance and What Should We Do About It?

by Andrew Grant-Thomas

While the Great Recession left no group or community unmarked, it marked some more than others. African Americans and Latinos, for example, have endured much higher rates of unemployment than have non-Hispanic Whites—16%, 12% and 8%, respectively, in January 2011. African Americans are also especially prominent among the long-term unemployed. According to the Current Population Survey, Black workers were 11% of the U.S. labor force but 22% of workers unemployed for 27 weeks or longer in 2009. Latinos fared better, but not well: 15% of the workforce, they comprised 17% of the long-term unemployed.

How much of a safety net does unemployment insurance (UI) provide for jobless workers of color and their families? Data on the racial and ethnic identities of workers who apply for and get unemployment benefits are not reported fully or consistently by the states, each of which runs its own unemployment program under a broad set of federal guidelines. Using data from the Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration (“Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed”), we found 15 states for which the sum of the percentages of unknown racial identity (Black, White, etc.) and ethnic identity data (Hispanic, non-Hispanic) of UI recipients did not exceed 10% in 2009. These states are Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Tennessee. Combined, those designated as unemployed in these states included 2.9 million White workers, 1.1 million African-American workers and 360,000 Latino workers. Although this sample is not as expansive as we might like, the findings it yields are suggestive.

A comparison between the racial and ethnic compositions of unemployed workers and UI recipients across all 15 states reveals that 43% of unemployed Whites, 39% of unemployed Blacks and only 32% of unemployed Latinos received UI benefits. This result is consistent with a National Urban League study finding that, in 2008, “17.5% of unemployed black workers received UI benefits as compared to 25.3% of white unemployed workers.” Allowing for the limitations of the data, it appears that African Americans are underrepresented, and Latinos very underrepresented, among UI recipients relative to Whites. In addition, given that solid majorities of workers in all three groups do not collect UI benefits, it is likely that many White, Black and Latino workers are foregoing benefits for which they are eligible.

The implications of these unemployment and UI recipiency figures for the well-being of people of color are grim in light of what we know about the financial resources available to Black and Latino families. In a recent presentation entitled “Social Security at 75: Building Economic Security, Closing the Racial Wealth Gap,” the Insight Center for Community and Economic Development provided data on racial differences in wealth that help put into relief the challenge many families of color face, especially when unemployment strikes.

Among married and cohabiting householders, the typical non-Hispanic White family ($193,400) had more than four times the wealth of its African-American counterpart ($46,900) and almost five times the wealth of its Latino counterpart ($39,100) in 2007. Among households led by single men and women, the disproportions were equally or more dramatic, but for our purposes what is perhaps more telling is the sheer wealth poverty of people of color. For example, whereas the median wealth of households led by single White women was $49,180 ($41,500 if we exclude the value of any vehicles owned), for single Black and Latino female-headed households those values were $5,000 and $2,680, respectively.

The underrepresentation of African Americans and Latinos among UI recipients is cause for alarm. This is so not simply because racial disparities in the distribution of important social benefits (and burdens) are in themselves suspect, but also because many African Americans and Latinos have little or no financial reserves with which to weather the storm of unemployment. No surprise, then, that local welfare offices and homeless shelters have seen a surge in people seeking help. Or that more and more people are turning for shelter and aid to families and friends, many of whom are struggling themselves. The costs of prolonged unemployment include health and mortality declines, marital conflict, and a rise in violent crime.

Andrew Grant-Thomas (grant-thomas.1@osu.edu) is Deputy Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at Ohio State Univ., where he oversees much of its U.S.-based and global justice programming.
poverty and debt. Extending UI coverage to more people, especially to more people of color, can help mitigate some of these costs.

Are Racial and Ethnic Disparities in UI Receipt Due to “Pre-existing” Conditions?

How can we account for the apparent underrepresentation of African Americans and Latinos among unemployment insurance beneficiaries? There are at least four possible answers, none of them exclusive of the others. First, it may be that Blacks and Latinos are less likely than Whites to apply for unemployment insurance. I am not aware of any good data that would allow us to evaluate that possibility effectively.

Second, it may be that Blacks and Latinos, but not Whites, happen to be most numerous in those states with the most restrictive UI eligibility criteria. This explanation has merit. I divided the 50 states and the District of Columbia into three tiers of 17 territories each according to the proportions of their unemployed workers receiving UI at the end of 2009. I then compared the distributions of the White, Black and Latino populations across these territories and found that Blacks and Latinos are unfavorably distributed with respect to state recipiency rates when compared to Whites. Whereas 35% of Whites lived in territories that fell into the least-generous third of the coverage distribution, 36% of African Americans and a sizable 53% of Latinos lived in such states. At the high end, 33% of Whites but only 27% of African Americans and 27% of Latinos lived in the most-generous third of states.

Third, it is also possible that African Americans and Latinos are more likely than Whites to fall into worker status categories that make them less likely to meet state UI eligibility criteria. This possibility also seems to bear some explanatory weight. Among the unemployed, African Americans were less likely than Whites to be “job losers” in fourth quarter, 2010: 58% of Blacks and 64% of Whites were “job losers.” We know from previous research that job losers are more likely to meet UI eligibility criteria than other categories of unemployed, including “new entrants” and “reentrants” to the job market.

Blacks and Latinos are also disproportionately low-income workers. The Economic Policy Institute estimated, for example, that in 2009 Blacks were 11% of the workforce, but 18% of workers whose incomes were low enough to be affected by the minimum wage increase to $7.25/hour in that year. Latinos were 14% of the workforce and 19% of workers affected. New entrants to the labor force, reentrants, and low-income workers are all less likely to meet state monetary eligibility criteria for unemployment benefits.

There are compelling reasons to federalize the UI system.

Are Racial and Ethnic Disparities in UI Receipt Also Due to Direct Racial Bias in the UI System?

A final possible reason for racial disparities in UI receipt is that the unemployment insurance program itself is racialized in ways that merit attention and redress. Of course, race and racial bias may actually play causal roles in the explanations outlined above as well.

It is possible that the original design of UI criteria was racialized and continues to do its racial work today. Note that the state-by-state distribution of the Black population has changed only moderately in the 75 years since passage of the Social Security Act that established the UI program. The same hand of states and territories that had the largest shares of Black Americans and included many of the most restrictive UI eligibility rules back in the 1930s—from the eastern half of Texas through the northern tip of Florida and up to the District of Columbia—still remain home to the country’s largest shares of African Americans and many of its most restrictive UI criteria. Race is hardly the only plausible reason for this convergence of geography and rule-making. That said, from the exclusion of agricultural and domestic workers from the original provisions of the Social Security Act itself to the mid-19th Century establishment of felon disenfranchisement laws in some states that attached the sharpest penalties to crimes thought to be committed most often by Blacks, many scholars have argued that brute racial bias accounts for much of the contemporary racialized impact of some of our most important social policies.

On a second front, a large and growing research literature on implicit cognitive bias provides a strong prima facie case for the role of racial bias in the distribution of UI benefits. Implicit or hidden biases refer to the automatic beliefs, attitudes and stereotypes we hold about categories of people or things. As Jerry Kang notes in his “primer” on implicit bias for the National Center for State Courts, researchers have found that implicit bias predicts how much more readily players will “shoot” African Americans compared to Whites in a videogame.
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simultation when given a split-second to decide whether the target represents a danger to oneself or others. Greater levels of implicit bias have been linked to more negative assessments of ambiguous actions taken by African Americans. Researchers have documented a positive association between medical doctors’ implicit racial attitudes and their unequal treatment for Latinos and Black patients compared to White patients. More or less implicit bias corresponds to comfort level and body language in interracial interactions. And so on.

Especially at a time when the number of contested UI benefit claims have soared—56,000 in the year ending June 2010 in Maryland alone, according to the Baltimore Sun—the workings of the UI system rely substantially on human judgment. Does the evidence support the claimant’s argument that she was fired rather than the employer’s contention that she quit? Is ambiguity in this or that regulation best resolved in the claimant’s favor or not? On the strength of the rapidly mounting evidence of the real-world effects of implicit bias, it is not cynical to suppose that bias, implicit and otherwise, might play a systematic role in how UI bureaucrats (i.e., human beings) answer these questions. Arguably, it would be naïve to suppose otherwise.

If racial and ethnic biases help produce racial and ethnic disparities in the receipt of unemployment benefits, one might expect, for example, a negative association between state recipiency rates and the proportion of the state population that is African-American or Latino. On the assumption that racial biases will most often operate against Blacks and Latinos, the logic here is that states with larger proportions—not numbers, but proportions—of Blacks or Latinos will also have lower recipiency rates. That is what we see: a negative association for African Americans (correlation coefficient of -.40) and Latinos (correlation coefficient of -.16), but a positive association for Whites (correlation coefficient of .22). This I take to be fairly compelling evidence for the bias claim.

It is possible that the original design of UI criteria was racialized and continues to do its racial work today.

By a similar logic, if bias were systematically skewing outcomes against Blacks and Latinos, we would expect to see an association between the proportion of cases in which UI benefits are denied in error and the proportion of claimants who are Black or Latino. Using data from the Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration’s Benefit Accuracy Measurement Report for 2009, we found that states’ shares of African Americans and Latinos were indeed positively associated with the rates of one kind of improper denial (improper monetary denial rates, correlation coefficient of .27), but not with either of the other two kinds (improper separation and non-separation error rates).

Is It Time to Fully Federalize the Unemployment Insurance System?

There are several compelling reasons to federalize unemployment insurance. Perhaps most compelling is the matter of funding, the “elephant in the room” with respect to UI. The huge number of unemployed workers receiving regular and extended federally-funded benefits makes the program de facto a federal one already. As noted in a February 9, 2011 New York Times editorial (“Relief for States and Businesses”), UI trust funds in 32 states are currently insolvent; those states are $42 billion in debt to the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011. In the 1980s, a similar crisis led 44 states to depend on the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011. In the 1980s, a similar crisis led 44 states to depend on the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011. In the 1980s, a similar crisis led 44 states to depend on the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011. In the 1980s, a similar crisis led 44 states to depend on the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011. In the 1980s, a similar crisis led 44 states to depend on the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011. In the 1980s, a similar crisis led 44 states to depend on the federal government, with more states likely to follow suit in 2011.

Given the limits of the states’ ability or willingness to manage their trust funds effectively, it may make sense now to hand over the program entirely to the federal government. If the “modernization” reforms recently adopted by a majority of states are to
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be made permanent, federal control makes even more sense.

As of December 2010, 18 states had left unclaimed some or all of the federal funds available to them if they modernize their UI systems. The main thrust of the modernization reforms has been to extend coverage to previously excluded workers, including part-time and low-wage workers. As we have seen, people of color feature prominently among those too often left out before the recent wave of modernization. Governors and some legislators in the holdout states express concern about the conditions attached to the federal dollars. Some, like Texas Governor Rick Perry, worry that the demand for a more inclusive UI system will remain in place long after the federal funding to support it has dried up.

In light of such resistance, those concerned to see more vulnerable workers of color covered now and in the future, as needed, should hope to see the program federalized and modernization reforms extended to more states and made permanent. Our analyses show that for both Blacks and Latinos, modernization measures enacted in 2009 and 2010 mitigated the relationships between racial proportionality and recipiency rate at the state level. As recent work by Wayne Vroman and Jacob Benus demonstrates, because unemployment insurance dollars are typically spent, rather than saved, states with higher UI recipiency rates also provide greater boosts to their economies than states with lower recipiency rates. More extensive modernization efforts, then, would likely be a boon for the economies in affected states, as well as for unemployed workers of color in those states.

The key caveat to the claim that UI is effectively a federal program is this: The federal government can only “incentivize” certain state-level choices, as it did in the case of modernization. It lacks the authority to make efficient programmatic decisions. The federal government cannot easily make mandatory the collection of racial and ethnic identity data for UI claimants and recipients, though this would greatly improve our ability to assess the program’s fairness. The federal government can conduct audit tests of bias in claims processing, and should do so, but how readily it could provide de-biasing training in those places showing evidence of bias is unclear.

Finally, placing the unemployment insurance system under federal control would make it much more possible to meet the challenge of creating greater equity across states, as well as within them. As discussed above, both African Americans and Latinos are substantially underrepresented, relative to White workers, in the least restrictive UI states. Relative to White workers, Latinos are also greatly over-represented in the most restrictive states. These “horizontal” inequities extend to other important dimensions of the system, such as large state variation in the portion of the weekly paycheck replaced by the UI benefit and the degree to which unemployed workers have exhausted their benefits.

Conclusion

It was only a short while ago that unemployment insurance was national news. The occasion was President Obama’s agreement with his political opponents to extend “tax cuts for the wealthy” as well as unemployment benefits. Little attention was paid then, before or since to questions of racial equity in the disbursement of UI benefits. The suggestive findings reported here regarding the underrepresentation of African Americans and Latinos receiving UI benefits, coupled with the undeniable social and economic vulnerability of many members of those two groups, make it imperative that much more attention be paid to the matter of UI equity.

Given the scarcity and other limitations of the data, some energy should be devoted to data-gathering and fact-finding. Not least, we need rigorous collection of racial data on who applies for and receives UI across all 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. We also need to understand why so many potential claimants do not file for UI benefits in the first place. Beyond this, the UI system needs higher levels of sustainable funding; greater “vertical” equity across worker status categories within states; and greater “horizontal” equity to bridge disparities in payment amounts, exhaustion rates and worker status treatment across states. In sum, from funding to operations, the unemployment system needs the resources and coordination capacity that only the federal government can provide.
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PRRAC Update

- Gregory Squires, a member of PRRAC’s Social Science Advisory Board, has received The Robert and Helen Lynd Lifetime Achievement Award from the Community and Urban Sociology Section of the American Sociological Association.
- PRRAC Director of Research Chester Hartman gave the annual Marcia Marker Feld Social Justice and the City Lecture at the Univ. of Rhode Island (Providence Campus) on April 6.
The imperatives of the poor mattered. Shaped legal and political agendas. Based protest and ideas from below. Movement’s finest hours, community-bred grassroots. During the movement’s finest hours, community-based protest and ideas from below shaped legal and political agendas. The imperatives of the poor mattered.
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Race/Racism


- Dorm Room Dealers: Drugs and the Privileges of Race and Class, by A. Rafik Mohamed & Erik D. Frisvold (199 pp., 2009, $49.95), has been published by Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1800 30th St., #314, Boulder, CO 80301, 303/444-2011 [12668]

- How Racism Takes Place, by George Lipsitz (310 pp., 2011, $26.95), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 215/926-2154. [12674]

- Civil Rights Monitor (Fall 2010, Vol. 20, 40 pp.) is available (no price listed) from The Leadership Conference Education Fund (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Wade Henderson), 1629 K St. NW, 10th flr., Wash., DC 20006, 202/466-3434. [12675]

- "Color Blinded - Do Americans See Race Too Much -- Or Not Enough?" is a 23-page Special Report in the April 2011 issue of The American Prospect, co-produced with Demos. Among the authors of the 13 articles: Shirley Sherrod, William Julius Wilson (interviewed), David Moberg, Mark Warren, Randall Kennedy. Available (no price given) at 888/687-8732. [12686]


- "2011 Statistical Portrait of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders" is available (likely free) from the UCLA Asian American Studies Center (formerly headed by PRRAC Bd. member Don Nakanishi), 310/825-2974, dkyoo@ucla.edu, www.aasc.ucla.edu [12701]

- “Race: Are We So Different?” is an exhibit that has been traveling around the country. Still-to-come locations (contact them for dates) include DC, Santa Barbara, New
Orleans, Houston, Durham, Columbus, St. Paul, Cedar Falls, Portland(OR), Burlington & Rochester.
www.understandingrace.org/about/tour.html [12725]

- “Baltimore: Open City,” an exhibit by and at the Maryland Institute College of Art, lasts through May 15. MICA is at 16 W. North Ave. in Baltimore. Inf. at www.baltimopencity.com [12731]

- Harlem is Nowhere: A Journey to the Mecca of Black America, by Sharifa Rhodes-Pitts (296 pp., 2011, $24.99), has been published by Little Brown & Co. [12747]


- The Assassination of Fred Hampton: How the FBI and the Chicago Police Murdered a Black Panther, by Jeffrey Haas (424 pp., 2009, $26.95), was published by Lawrence Hill Books in Chicago. [12749]

- The Agitator’s Daughter, by (PRRAC Bd. member) Sheryll Cashin (288 pp., 2008, $26), has been published by Public Affairs Books.

- The Invisible Line: Three American Families and the Secret Journey from Black to White, by Daniel J. Sharfstein (396 pp., 2011, $27.95), has been published by The Penguin Press.


- “Race and Racism in America: Are We Now a Color Blind Society?” was held by and at The Hudson Institute in DC, April 15, 2011. Among the presenters were Gail Christopher and Sterling Speirn of the Kellogg Foundation and Harvard History Prof. Stephan Thernstrom. A complete, edited transcript of the discussion is available at http://pcre.hudson.org. Further inf. from 202/974-2424, kmcintyre@hudson.org

- Organizations That Fight Discrimination and Stigma: A list of some two dozen such (dealing with race well as other issues) is available at http://uhweb.hartford.edu/owahl/stigma.org.htm


- “2010 Census Data Reveal Changing Racial and Ethnic Compositions for Both Total and Child Populations” (April 2011) is available at Diversity data.org. They’re reachable at the Harvard School of Public Health, 677 Huntington Ave., Boston, MA 02115, diversity@diversitydata.org

- "American Race Relations in Transnational Perspective" was an April 23, 2010 discussion, sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson Center’s United States Studies Program, featuring the authors of 3 books: Remenbering Scottsboro: The Legacy of the Infamous Trial, by James Miller; From Scottsboro to Munich: Race and Political Culture in 1930’s Britain, by Susan Pennybacker; and Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire and the Globalization of the New South, by Andrew Zimmerman. Inf. from usstudies@wilsoncenter.org. [12753]

- "Freedom Riders 50th Anniversary Celebration" was held April 29-May 2 in Chicago. Inf. from committee@freedomriders50th.com [12696]

- "John Brown: Trumpet of Freedom" will be performed by its author, Norman Thomas Marshall, May 9, 2011, 7pm in NYC (as a benefit for the Lynne Stewart Defense Fund). Inf. from 203/453-2036, johnbrown1859@sbcglobal.net, www.wbworks.com/johnbrown [12712]

Poverty/Welfare

- "The Assets Agenda 2011: Policy Options to Promote Savings and Asset Development," by Reid Cramer, Alejandara Lopez-Fernandini, Lindsay Guge, Justin King & Jamie Zimmerman (47 pp., Sept. 2010), is available (no price listed) from The New America Foundation, 1899 L St. NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/986-2700, cramer@newamerica.net, www.newamerica.net [12672]


- Separate Societies: Poverty and Inequality in US Cities (2nd ed.), by William Goldsmith & Edward Blakely (260 pp., 2011), Foreword by Pres. Bill Clinton, has been published by Temple Univ. Press. [12737]

- "Illegal Trailer Park Grows Into a Community," a June 5, 2011 Los Angeles Times feature by David Kelly, describes the positive development at the Duroville trailer park in Riverside County, CA, saved from destruction/ mass evictions by a marvelous Federal court ruling featured in the May/June 2009 P&R. If you can’t locate the article via the Internet, we’ll be happy to mail you a copy if you furnish a SASE. [12608]

- "How Can You Fight Poverty? The Intersection Between Legal Education and Poverty Law" was a March 18, 2011 Symposium organized by the Georgetown Journal of Poverty Law. Inf. from vks7@law.georgetown.edu [12681]

- "Measuring Our Progress in Reducing U.S. Poverty: Challenges,
Benchmarks, and Opportunities for Cross-Agency and Community Collaboration," co-sponsored by The Center for American Progress Action Fund & NYU’s Women of Color Policy Network, took place March 29, 2011. Inf. from 202/682-1611, events@americanprogressaction.org [12724]

"The National Center for Law and Economic Justice" is holding its Benefits Award Dinner May 26, 2011 in NYC. Inf. at 212/633-6967. [12680]


Criminal Justice

- "Fixing Prison-Based Gerrymandering After the 2010 Census: A 50 state guide," by Peter Wagner, Aleks Kajstura, Elena Lavarreda, Christian de Ocejo & Sheila Vennell O’Rourke, is available (no price listed) from The Prison Policy Initiative, PO Box 127, Northampton, MA 01027, www.prisonpolicy.org [12654]


- Testimony on Last Year’s Reform of Federal Crack Cocaine Sentencing Policy: Marc Mauer, Exec. Dir. of The Sentencing Project, testified on March 17, 2011 before the U.S. Sentencing Commission. Copies of his testimony are available from him: Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871, staff@sentencingproject.org [12695]

- "Cracked Justice," by Nicole D. Porter & Valerie Wright (14 pp., March 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871, nporter@sentencingproject.org. It addresses disparities in cocaine sentencing in 13 states and documents efforts at the federal and state level to correct these injustices. [12700]

- "State Trends: Legislative Victories from 2005 to 2010 Removing Youth from the Adult Criminal Justice System" (48 pp. March 2011?) is available (no price given) from the Campaign for Youth Justice, 1012 14th St. NW, #610, Wash., DC 20005, 202/558-3580, info@cfyj.org. It examines 27 positive pieces of legislation enacted in 15 states during the last five years, as well as highlighting active reform efforts underway. www.cfyj.org [12740]

- "Drug Courts Are Not the Answer: Toward a Health-Centered Approach to Drug Use" (March 2011) is available (possibly free) from the Drug Policy Alliance, 70 W. 36 St., 16th flr., NYC, NY 10018, 212/613-8020. [12743]

- "Addicted to the Courts: Hows a Growing Dependence on Drug Courts Impacts People and Communities," by Nazstassia Walsh (March 2011), is available (no price given) from The Justice Policy Institute, 1012 14th St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/558-7974, www.justicepolicy.org [12744]


Economic/Community Development

- "The Rise and Fall of New Left Urbanism," by Christopher Klemek, is a 10-page article that appeared in the Spring 2009 issue of Daedalus. Reprints may be available from the author, klemek@gwu.edu [12685]


- "Dead or Alive at Fifty? Reading Jane Jacobs on Her Golden Anniversary," by Christopher Klemek, appeared in the Spring 2011 issue of Dissent. Reprints of the 5-page article likely available from the author, klemek@gwu.edu [12745]

- Progressive Cities: Pierre Clavel of Cornell has a website on that topic (which, among other things, describes his "Progressive Cities and Neighborhood Planning" project) -- www.progressivecities.org [12751]

- "Healthy Communities, Strong Regions, A Prosperous America" is PolicyLink’s 2011 Equity Summit. Nov. 8-11, 2011 in Detroit. Inf./registration at www.PolicyLink.org/Summit
Education

- The U.S. Dept. of Education Equity and Excellence Commission has announced appointment of its 28 members, among whom are UC-Berkeley Law Dean Christopher Edley (Co-Chair), Mike Casserly, Linda Darling-Hammond, (former PRRAC Bd. member) Kati Haycock, Ben Jealous, Thomas Saenz & Randi Weingarten. In addition are 7 ex-officio members from the Department, OMB and the Domestic Policy Council. Further inf. from 202/401-1576. [12653]


- The Teaching Tolerance Award for Excellence in Culturally Responsive Teaching is given by the Southern Poverty Law Center. Five winners will be chosen, each to receive $1000 at an awards ceremony in Washington in late 2011. June 1 application deadline. Inf. from wdh@umd.edu [12682]

- "Charter Schools That Work: Economically Integrated Schools With Teacher Voice" (15 pp., 2010) is available (possibly free) from The Century Foundation, 1333 H St. NW, Wash., DC 20005, 202/387-0400. [12688]

- "Federally Funded Charter Schools Should Foster Diversity" (6 pp., 2011?), an Issue Brief from the National Coalition on School Diversity, is available (as is inf. about the Coalition) on PRRAC’s website: www.prrac.org/projects/schooldiversity.php [12689]

- "Information Age Publishing" has a 2010 Education Catalog listing many useful titles. Contact them at PO Box 79049, Charlotte, NC 28217, 704/752-9125, www.infoagepub.com [12499]

- "Breaking New Ground," by Heather Weiss, M. Elena Lopez & Deborah R. Stark, is the 2nd issue in the Harvard Family Research Project’s policy briefs, citing 6 case studies [Denver, Reno, Phoenix, San Diego, 2 NYC], from across the country that reveal innovative efforts by early childhood programs and school districts to use student data systems to improve family engagement. Available (no price given) from the Project, Harvard Grad. School of Educ., 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108, hfrp@gse.harvard.edu [12534]

- The National Coalition on School Diversity has updated its website: school-diversity.org [12723]

- "Kipp Schools and Achievement: Do Differences in Student Characteristics and Funding Influence the Results?", by Gary Miron, Jessica L. Urschel & Nicholas Saxton, a March 2011(?) Occasional Paper from the National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education, is available (possibly free) from 212/678-3259, ncspe@columbia.edu [12730]

- "The Same Starting Line: How School Boards Can Erase the Opportunity Gap Between Poor and Middle-Class Children" (49 pp., Jan. 2011) is an Appleseed report. Available at appleseednetwork.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=u7mSqiKjK%3d&tabid=522 [12733]

- The Open Education Journal is an online journal that publishes research articles, reviews and short articles in all areas of education research, contemporary education issues, learning and special education. For submissions/further inf., editorial@toeduj.org, www.toeduj.org [12572]


- "Beyond Random Acts: Family, School, and Community Engagement as an Integral Part of Education Reform," by Heather Weiss, M. Elena Lopez & Heidi Rosenberg (16 pp., Dec. 2010), is available (possibly free) from the Harvard Family Research Project, 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108, hfrp@gse.harvard.edu, www.hfrp.org [12617]

- Common Core Standards: The National PTA has put out a series of excellent guides for families and community members about the new common core standards. Available at www.pta.org/4446.htm [12750]

- "Community Schools: Effectively and Efficiently Investing in Our Youth" was a March 31 Coalition for Community Schools Webinar. Inf. from the Coalition, 4455 Conn. Ave. NW, #310, Wash., DC 20008, 202/822-8405, www.communityschools.org [12708]

- "Understanding Extended-Year Graduation Rates: Lessons Learned by States" was an April 26, 2011 webinar sponsored by the American Youth Policy Forum. Inf. from 202/775-9731, www.aypf.org/Webinars/wb042611.htm [12732]

- "Informing the Debate: Bringing Civil Rights Research to Bear on the Reauthorization of the ESEA" was a April 21, 2011 Policy Briefing, held at the Senate Visitors Center in DC, sponsored by The Civil Rights Project at UCLA (headed by PRRAC Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. member Gary Orfield). Among the presenters/respondents (in addn. to Orfield) were (PRRAC Bd. member) Damon Hewitt, Erica Frankenberg and Daniel Losen. Inf. from Russman@gseis.ucla.edu

- “Breaking New Ground: Final Report of the Governor’s Task Force on Transforming Education in Kentucky” (64 pp., Feb. 2011) is available (possibly free) from The Prichard Committee, 167 W. Main St., #301, Lexington, KY 40507, admin@prichardcommittee.org
Advancement Project,” Employment Retention and Findings from the Em-
• Paths to Advancement for Single Parents,” by Cynthia Miller, Victoria Deitch & Aaron Hill (66 pp., Nov. 2010), is available (possibly free) from MDRC, 16 E. 34 St., NYC, NY 10016-4326, www.mdrc.org/publications/582/overview.html [12660]

Environment

• Environmental Health and Racial Equity in the United States: Building Environmentally Just, Sustainable and Living Communities, by Robert Bullard, Glenn S. Johnson & Angel O. Torres (450 pp., 2011, $70), has been published by APHA Press. Inf. at apha@pbd.com

Families/ Women/ Children

• "Paths to Advancement for Single Parents,” by Cynthia Miller, Victoria Deitch & Aaron Hill (66 pp., Nov. 2010), is available (possibly free) from MDRC, 16 E. 34 St., NYC, NY 10016-4326, www.mdrc.org/publications/584/overview.html [12659]


• Restoring the Power of Unions: It Takes a Movement, by Julius G. Getman (381 pp., 2010, $55), has been published by Yale Univ. Press. [12679]


• "Preventing Youth Violence in Communities: What Does the Evidence Tell Us?" was a Feb. 24, 2011 Public Policy Forum in Chicago, co-sponsored by The Urban Institute and Chapin Hall. Inf. from Chapin Hall, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637, info@chaphinhall.org [12671]

Health

• Social work with African American Males: Health, Mental Health and Social Policy, ed. Waldo E. Johnson (348 pp., 2011, $45), has been published by Oxford Univ. Press. 18 chapters. [12694]

• "Vision: Looking Back, Looking Forward" is the 2009-2010 Annual Report of the National Assembly on School-Based Health Care. Available (possibly free) from info@nasbhc.org [12697]

• "Why Place & Race Matter: Impacting Health Through a Focus on Race and Place,” by Judith Bell & Mary Lee (113 pp., 2011), is available (no price given) from PolicyLink (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Angela Blackwell), 1438 Webster St., #303, Oakland, CA 94612, 510/663-2333.

• VOICES 2011, sponsored by the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum, will take place May 16-17, 2011 in Arlington, VA, right outside Wash., DC. Inf./registration from the Forum, 1818 L St. NW, #802, Wash., DC 20036, 202/466-7772, info@apiahf.org

Homelessness

• "Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to End Homelessness" (ca. 65 pp., 2010) is available (likely free) from the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, 409 3rd St. SW, #310, Wash., DC 20024, communications@usich.gov [12656]

Housing


• "The Role of Affordable Housing in Creating Jobs and Stimulating Economic Growth: Evidence in Brief," by
Keith Wardrip, Laura Williams & Suzanne Hague (4 pp., Jan. 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Center for Housing Policy, 1900 M St. NW, #200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/466-2121, chp-feedback@nhc.org. A companion, 20-page, Jan. 2011 "Review of the Literature," by the same 3 authors, is also available. www.nhc.org [12664]

- "Forging a New Housing Policy: Opportunity in the Wake of Crisis," eds. Christopher Niedt & Marc Silver (70 pp., 2011), is available (no price listed) from the National Center for Suburban Studies at Hofstra Univ., 516/463-6600. [12687]

- "Housing in America: The Next Decade," by John K. McIlwain (29 pp., March [?] 2011), is available (no price given) from The Urban Land Institute, 1025 Thomas Jefferson St. NW, #500W, Wash., DC 20007-5201. [12746]

- "Housing WorksRI [Rhode Island] Fact Book" (59 pp.) is available (possibly free) from the organization, One Union Station, Providence, RI 02903, 401/274-4564, www.HousingWorksRI.org. They also have a 12-page, Winter 2011 Special Report, "Foreclosures in Rhode Island."

- "Foreclosing the Dream: How America’s Housing Crisis Is Reshaping Our Cities and Suburbs," by William Lucy (208 pp., 2010, $52.95), has been published by APA Planners Press, APA PlanningBooks.com

- "Federal Budget Threats and Low Income Housing Programs" was a April 13, 2011 webinar sponsored by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Robert Greenstein). Inf. from the Center, 820 First St. NE, #510, Wash., DC 20002, Shaunya_Owens@mail.vresp.com


- "Should I Stay or Should I Go? Exploring the Effects of Housing Instability and Mobility on Children," by Rebecca Cohen & Keith Wardrip (19 pp., Feb. 2011), is available (possibly free) from the Center for Housing Policy. 1900 M St. NW, #200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/466-2121, x236, rcohen@nhc.org.

- "The National Forum on the Human Right to Housing," organized by the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, will take place June 7-8, 2011 in DC. Inf. from the Center, 1411 K St. NW, Wash., DC 20005, 202/392-0298, etars@nlchp.org, www.nlchp.org [12600]

**Immigration**

- "Drop the I-Word" is a new campaign from the Applied Research Center and Colorlines, about people demanding respect and rejecting "illegals" as a way to describe their neighbors, children, families and themselves. To take the Pledge, text "I Word" to 69866, mnova@arc.org. droptheiword.com [12704]


- "Executive Action on Immigration: Six Ways to Make the System Work Better," by Donald Kerwin, Doris Meissner & Margie McHugh (30 pp., March 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Migration Policy Institute, 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, www.migrationpolicy.org [12710]

- "Lessons from the 2007 Legal Arizona Workers Act," by Magnus Lofstrom, Sarah Bohn & Steven Raphael (31 pp., March 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Public Policy Institute of California, 500 Washington St., #600, SF, CA 94111, 415/291-4400, www.ppic.org [12711]

- "Immigrant Legalization in the United States and European Union: Policy Goals and Program Design," by Marc Rosenblum (15 pp., Dec. 2010), is available (possibly free) from the Migration Policy Institute, 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940. [12521]

- "Children of Immigrants: 2008 State Trends Update," by Karina Fortuny (7 pp., Sept. 2010) is available (possibly free) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037-1231, 202/833-7200, pubs@urban.org

- "The Integration of Immigrants and Their Families in Maryland," by Karina Fortuny, Ajay Chaudry, Margaret Simms & Randolph Capps (68 pp., June 2010), is available (possibly free) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037-1231, 202/833-7200, pubs@urban.org

- The AAPI Nexus Journal, a peer-reviewed national journal published by UCLA’s Asian American Studies Center (formerly headed by PRRAC Bd. member Don Nakanishi), has issued a call for papers for a special issue on immigration. June 15, 2011 deadline for Letter of Intent—to nexus@aasc.ucla.edu.

- "Welfare Use by Immigrant Households with Children: A Look at Cash, Medicaid, Housing, and Food Programs," by Steven A. Camarota (April 2011), is available (possibly free) from the author, 202/466-8185, sac@cis.org [12720]

- "Working with Immigrant, Refugee Students and Families To Help Them Understand School Transportation..."
Rural

- "Out-of-School Times Programs in Rural Areas," by Erin Harris, Helen Malone & Tai Sunnannnon (12 pp., March 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Harvard Family Research Project, 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108, hfrp_pubs@gse.harvard.edu [12738]

- "Digital Learning and Technology: Improving Education in Rural America," sponsored by the Alliance for Excellent Education, was held April 19, 2011 at the Dirksen Senate Office Bldg. in Wash., DC. Inf. from all4ed@all4ed.org [12736]

- Frank Bonilla Memorial: The Hunter College Center for Puerto Rican Studies (for which he was founder and long-time Director) is holding a memorial for him, June 9, 2011. Inf. /tickets (space is limited) from 212/772-5714. [12658]

Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants

- CFED (Wash., DC), a 32-year-old national organization with a mission of expanding economic opportunity, particularly for low- and moderate-income and historically disadvantaged communities, is seeking a Director of Affordable Housing Initiatives. Ltr./resume to jobs@policylink.org, with “Your Name, Dir. of Legislative Affairs” in subject line. [12716]

- The NAACP (DC office) is hiring a Director of Legislative Affairs (DC office). Ltr./resume to jobs@policylink.org, with “Your Name, Dir. of Legislative Affairs” in subject line, or fax to 510/663-4358.

- The Kellogg Foundation (Battle Creek, MI) is hiring a Program Officer in the area of Racial Equity. Full description and application instructions at http://www.NonprofitProfessionals.com/searches/kf-pre.htm

International Human Rights and U.S. Civil Rights Policy

- "US Releases Flawed UPR Report to UN Human Rights Council" is a 2-page article appearing in the Sept. 2010 issue of Human Rights Now!, the newsletter of The Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute, PO Box 673, Berkeley, CA 94701-0673, 510/848-0599, mcli@mcli.org, www.mcli.org [12670]

- "The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights Voting Record -11th Congress" (78 pp., Oct. 2010) is available (no price listed) from The Leadership Conference, 1629 K St. NW, 10th flr., Wash., DC 20006, 202/466-3311. [12676]

- Activists in City Hall: The Progressive Response to the Reagan Era in Boston and Chicago, by Pierre Clavel (2011), has been published by Cornell Univ. Press. [12691]

- Land of Opportunity, by Luisa Dantas is a 2011(?) documentary that follows people from different walks of life through the first 5 years of post-Katrina New Orleans. Inf. from co-producer Evan Casper-Futterman, 646/872-5746, evancf@jolu productions.com [12539]

- A National Teach-In on Austerity, Debt, Corporate Greed & What YOU Can Do About It," conceptualized by Frances Fox Piven and Cornel West, took place on April 5, 2011 on campuses all over the country. Inf. from www.fightbackteachin.org [12722]

Miscellaneous

- "Out-of-School Times Programs in Rural Areas," by Erin Harris, Helen Malone & Tai Sunnannnon (12 pp., March 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Harvard Family Research Project, 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108, hfrp_pubs@gse.harvard.edu [12738]

- "Digital Learning and Technology: Improving Education in Rural America," sponsored by the Alliance for Excellent Education, was held April 19, 2011 at the Dirksen Senate Office Bldg. in Wash., DC. Inf. from all4ed@all4ed.org [12736]
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