

## Race and Public Housing: Revisiting the Federal Role

by Richard Rothstein

**R**esidential racial segregation, accompanied by social and economic hardship, burdens the learning of many urban children. But school reformers often express hope that, harsh though these obstacles may be, children in high-poverty, racially isolated neighborhoods could typically still be successful if only they had better teachers, more orderly schools and more hours of instruction.

To support this hope, advocates seek examples of disadvantaged children who succeeded, overcoming great socioeconomic handicaps. Some such cases exist, of course—there is a range of outcomes for any human condition—but the reality that some who grew up in “truly disadvantaged” neighborhoods (Wilson 1987, 2012) beat the odds does not mean that many can. Frequently-cited examples of such success usually turn out, upon examination, to be chimeras (Rothstein 2001, 2002).

A claim by U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, referring to former New York City Schools Chancellor Joel Klein, is one. Mr. Duncan said: “Klein knows, as I do, that great

teachers can transform a child's life chances—and that poverty is not destiny. It's a belief deeply rooted in his childhood, as a kid growing up in public housing in Queens... He understands that education is ...the force that lifts children from public housing projects to first-generation college students....” (Duncan 2010).

Our credulity about Duncan's well-intentioned observation reveals a shocking loss of collective memory about how public policy created and remains responsible for the hopeless segregated ghettos in which too many children live today.

True, Joel Klein grew up in public housing. But from the Depression into the early 1950s, faced with housing shortages compounded by a flood of returning war veterans, cities constructed public housing for white working- and middle-class families. These projects, for stable white families like Joel Klein's, became highly-prized treasures, the most desirable housing available, their lucky residents the object of envy. The projects were located in mostly all-white neighborhoods, and admitted only a token few black residents, if any.

### NYC's Subsidized Housing

Meanwhile, cities also built projects for low-income African Americans in ghetto neighborhoods, or sometimes

in neighborhoods to which planners wanted to relocate a ghetto. Unlike projects for middle-class whites who paid market rents that fully covered construction and operating costs, projects for low-income blacks were heavily subsidized with federal and sometimes state and local funds.

There were also privately-built and -owned developments that were subsidized by public land clearance and tax breaks—such as the whites-only Stuyvesant Town in New York City. These remain today as middle-class urban islands, but forgotten have been the truly public projects—built, owned and operated by government—for working- and middle-class whites. The Woodside Houses in Queens, New York, where Joel Klein lived as a boy, was one of these.

The New York City Housing Authority carefully screened applicants for projects like Woodside. Preference

*(Please turn to page 2)*

### CONTENTS:

<b>Race and Public Housing .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Fisher v. Univ. TX .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Dual Immersion .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>San Francisco .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Resources .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Index to Vol. 21 .....</b>	<b>21</b>

*Richard Rothstein (rrothstein@epi.org) is a Research Associate at the Economic Policy Inst. and a Senior Fellow at the Chief Justice Earl Warren Inst. on Law & Social Policy at the Univ. of Calif. (Berkeley) School of Law.*

(PUBLIC HOUSING: Cont. from page 1)

was given to war veterans. Only two-parent families were accepted, and applicants had to produce marriage licenses to prove their status. Investigators visited potential tenants to verify they had good furniture and housekeeping habits, and well-behaved children. Stable post-war employment records, good credit, no teenage pregnant daughters and no alcohol or drug problems were also required (Bloom 2008). Tenants typically had civil service jobs (like Klein's father, a postal worker) or worked in trades or manufacturing. Some were small business owners.

When the unsubsidized Woodside project opened in 1949, its tenants were 92% white. In the surrounding neighborhood was nary a black face. Across the borough in South Jamaica, the Authority built a project for low-income tenants: 30% white when it opened pre-war and down to 12% white by the mid-1950s. Citywide, the Authority respected applicants' preferences regarding which project they wished to occupy, guided by a rule established during the New Deal by Harold Ickes, head of the Public Works Administration: public projects could not alter neighborhood racial composition.

As applied by New York City, the rule ensured that few low-income whites would live in South Jamaica, and few middle-income blacks would live in Woodside. Housing Authority

board minutes explain that the South Jamaica project should house minorities because it was "located in a neighborhood having a preponderance of colored people" (Bloom 2008). The project had lower income limits than Woodside, and rental rates were subsidized with federal funds, but not all projects designed for African Americans were low-income: A project the Housing Authority built contemporaneously with Woodside, also designed for stable higher-income working families where rents covered the full

---

### ***A shocking loss of collective memory.***

---

housing cost, was the Colonial Park Houses in Harlem—it was 92% black, 7% Puerto Rican, and 1% white.

But as projects like Woodside filled up with middle-class whites, other federal policies lured these families out of projects into even whiter suburbs. These were the mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the Veterans Administration (VA), from which black families were mostly excluded. In the 1950s, as single-family home construction accelerated, the housing shortage eased and white families took advantage of these guarantees to decamp from Woodside and similar projects for the suburbs. FHA- and VA-guaranteed mortgages were so favorable that monthly carrying charges were often less, for comparable rooms and square footage, than rents in the public projects.

Whether in the city or suburbs, the FHA required developers seeking its financing to include restrictive covenants in their homeowner deeds, prohibiting sales or re-sales to African Americans. For example, Levittown, a suburb just east of Queens, was built in 1947 with 17,500 mass-produced two-bedroom houses, requiring veterans to put nothing down and make monthly payments of only \$56. (Compare this to the \$75 unsubsidized charge in Woodside Houses for apartments of comparable size.) At the FHA's insistence, developer William

Levitt did not sell homes to blacks, and each deed included a prohibition of such re-sales in the future (TIME 1950; Jackson 1985).

Of 300 large private subdivisions built from 1935 to 1947 in New York's Queens, Nassau, and Westchester Counties, 83% had racially restrictive deeds, with preambles like, "Whereas the Federal Housing Administration requires that the existing mortgages on the said premises be subject and subordinated to the said [racial] restrictions ... [except for] domestic servants of a different race domiciled with an owner or tenant..." (Dean 1947).

As whites fled cities, public housing units were filled with lower-income African Americans. In 1968, New York City abandoned its middle-class public housing program, accepting federal subsidies for Woodside Houses and several other such projects. Long-term tenants with middle-class incomes who did not leave voluntarily were evicted. The Authority announced that it would abandon previous requirements of employment, stability and orderliness and would no longer consider "morals of the applicants." Many economically and socially distressed minority tenants, some with unruly teenagers, were funneled into once-middle-class projects. Changed population characteristics were accompanied by a deterioration in project upkeep. Students attending neighborhood schools now had drastically different, and greater, needs.

As public housing nationwide became racially identifiable and associated solely with poverty, public and media stereotypes of public housing changed. By 1973, President Richard Nixon could describe many public housing projects as "monstrous, depressing places—rundown, overcrowded, crime-ridden" (Nixon 1973).

These patterns were not unique to New York, but were repeated nationwide.

● **St. Louis:** In the 1960s, Pruitt-Igoe homes became a national symbol of dysfunctional public housing, high-rise towers packed with welfare-depen-

(Please turn to page 13)

*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 2012 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

---

# View from the Gallery – Oral Argument in *Fisher v. University of Texas–Austin*

by Rachel Godsil

**H**otly contested cases are a form of political theater. The primary actors are the lawyers for the parties and the Supreme Court Justices themselves. However, truly significant cases elicit broader participation akin to a Greek chorus in the form of *amici curiae* (defined as “friends” of the Court). *Fisher v. University of Texas*, the Court’s most recent challenge to affirmative action in higher education, appears to be one of those cases; it elicited an enormous number of amicus briefs from a wide range of perspectives.

At issue is Abigail Fisher’s claim that the University of Texas violated her rights under the Equal Protection Clause by considering race as one factor among many in its admissions policy. Ironically, perhaps, Ms. Fisher has already attended and graduated from Louisiana State University—so the harm to Ms. Fisher is speculative. The case compelled attention because it is seen as a potential challenge to *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003), in which the Court held in a Justice Sandra Day O’Connor opinion that a university may conclude that obtaining the educational benefits of diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, constitutes a compelling interest and therefore, so long as its means is narrowly tailored, is constitutional. The Court noted the constitutional tradition of granting “giving a degree of deference to a university’s academic decisions, within constitu-

tionally prescribed limits.” 539 U.S. at 328. And the Court affirmed the Law School’s goal of attaining a “critical mass” of underrepresented minority students in order to achieve the educational benefits that diversity is designed to produce.

The parties, Ms. Fisher and William Powers, the president of the University of Texas, were present in the gallery, but the courtroom was crowded with others equally concerned with the outcome of the case. Many were the lawyers who had authored amicus briefs in the case — myself included (I co-authored a brief on behalf of experimental social psychologists describing the “stereotype

---

## **Hotly contested cases are a form of political theater.**

---

threat” phenomena first identified by Claude Steele and Joshua Aronson in the mid-1990s, which explains the effect on performance of the anxiety that a person will confirm a negative stereotype about their identity group. Stereotype threat has been shown systematically to depress performance of minority students on tests such as the SAT, and, accordingly, we argued to the Court that a truly meritocratic admissions policy should take this effect into account.)

Others had unique connections to the role of race at the University of Texas, including the grandson and other members of Heman Sweatt’s family, who as amici shared the story of the brave man who successfully obtained admission of African Americans to the University of Texas Law School in *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U.S. 629, one of the important cases that paved the way for *Brown v. Board of Education*. Students from the Uni-

versity of Texas’ Black Student Association attended, as did one of my own students who, despite having spent all night in line in front of the Court, was thrilled to be sitting behind Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton. Most notable, perhaps, were the presence of both Cecilia Marshall, the wife of the late Thurgood Marshall, and former Justice Sandra Day O’Connor.

## **The Plan at Issue**

The University of Texas’ admissions plan that is at issue in *Fisher* has a tangled history. It is in large part a reaction to earlier litigation challenging the University of Texas’ use of race in admissions. Prior to the *Grutter* decision, in *Hopwood v. Texas*, 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir. 1996), the Fifth Circuit held unconstitutional the University of Texas School of Law’s consideration of race in admissions. In response, UT revised its admissions policy and excluded the consideration of race. (See generally Brief Submitted by Respondents University of Texas, pp. 6-10.) The new policy adopted a Personal Achievement In-

(Please turn to page 4)

### **Russell Means**

We dedicate this issue of *Poverty & Race* to Russell Means, who passed away in October, the charismatic Oglala Sioux who co-led (with Dennis Banks) the 1973 Wounded Knee protest and sustained activism throughout his life, calling attention, internationally as well as here at home, to the nation’s history of injustice against its indigenous peoples.

---

*Rachel Godsil (rachel.godsil@shu.edu) is the Eleanor Bontecou Professor of Law at Seton Hall Univ. Law School and the Director of Research to the American Values Institute.*

*For a version of this article with detailed citations to the record, pls. contact the author.*



dex (PAI) to be used with its Academic Index (AI), which included a “holistic review of an applicant’s leadership qualities; extracurricular activities; awards/honors; work experience; service to school or community; and special circumstances.” “[S]pecial circumstances” included factors such as the “socio-economic status of a family,” “language spoken at home,” and “socio-economic status of school attended” (but not an applicant’s race). UT also devoted substantial efforts to developing race-neutral initiatives that it hoped would increase enrollment of underrepresented minorities, such as creating several scholarship programs aimed at recruiting highly qualified students of all races from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and students who would be the first in their family to attend college.

These efforts were unsuccessful. UT experienced an immediate and serious decline in enrollment among underrepresented minorities. Between 1995 and 1997, African-American enrollment dropped almost 40% (from 309 to 190 entering students) and Hispanic enrollment dropped by 5% (from 935 to 892 entering students). The Texas Legislature responded to *Hopwood* by enacting the top 10% law (House Bill 588), which guarantees admission to UT to any graduate of a Texas high school who is ranked in the top 10% of his or her high school class, beginning with the 1998 admissions cycle. Tex. Educ. Code § 51.803. An acknowledged purpose of the law was to increase minority admissions, given the loss of race-conscious admissions.

**Don't forget  
to send us items  
for our  
Resources  
Section.**

UT found that the top 10% law increased minority admissions, but at significant cost to educational objectives. It is atypical for a major university to base admissions decision solely on class rank, without regard to other standard markers of academic achievement and potential. And UT found that basing the admissions decision on “just a single criterion” undermined its efforts to achieve diversity in the broad sense.

Many have also argued that the racial diversity the law does add is mostly a product of the fact that Texas public high schools remain highly segregated in regions of the state—Latino

---

### **Even with other diversity initiatives Black and Latino enrollment remained low.**

---

students tend to live in the Rio Grande Valley, and Black students are isolated in urban areas such as Dallas and Houston. That limits the diversity that can be achieved within racial groups and creates “damaging incentives.”

The portion of the class admitted pursuant to the top 10% law has ranged from roughly 60 to 80%. To fill the remaining seats in its freshman class, UT used the full-file review process developed after *Hopwood*—which considered numerous individual characteristics (but not race).

With both the top 10% plan and the holistic review in place, even with other diversity initiatives, Black and Latino enrollment remained low. In Fall 2002, only 3.4% of the freshman class was African-American and 14.3% was Latino, below 1996 levels. The numbers were 4.5% and 16.9%, respectively, in 2004.

School officials were also concerned that the diversity they had attained failed to reach so many classrooms. They found that nearly 90% of undergraduate classes of the most common size at UT—sections with 10-24 students—enrolled zero or one African-American student in 2002,

and nearly 40% of those classes enrolled zero or one Latino student. Slightly larger classes were similarly constituted. In classes enrolling 25-49 students, over 70% had zero or one Black student enrolled. Classes of this sort are the most likely to allow for discussion or exchanges where the educational benefits of diversity are realized.

Following the Supreme Court’s decision in *Grutter*, UT added race and ethnicity as factors to be considered among the “special circumstances” criteria in the PAI. Beginning in 2005, UT has enrolled 4.5%-6% Black students and 15% and 25% Latino students. By comparison, Texas high schools graduate approximately 15% Black students, and the percent of Latino students has grown to 40%.

### **The Oral Argument as Theater**

The case was argued by Burt Rein for Abigail Fisher, Greg Garre for the University of Texas, and Solicitor General Donald Verilli, who appeared in support of UT. Missing was the voice of the underrepresented Black and Latino students.

Not surprisingly, the questioning reflected the sharp divisions on the Court. Justices Sotomayor, Ginsberg and Breyer’s questions reflected an adherence to the precedential value of *Grutter*, the view that the Texas plan is consistent with *Grutter* and thus should be upheld. Chief Justice Roberts, along with Justices Scalia and Alito, challenged whether an applicant’s race or ethnicity can be reasonably ascertained and whether the concept of “critical mass” has any meaning. Justice Kennedy’s position is less clear. His questions indicated that he is wrestling with what role race actually plays in the Texas plan. Justice Kagan was not physically present, since she recused herself from hearing the case. As a former Dean of a law school, her perspective would have added great value.

Summations of the gist of the Justices’ questions fail to convey the tenor

---

of the questions—and the degree of emotion presented by these far from dry legal issues. And perhaps most relevant, summations cannot provide a reader with a glimmer of whether the questions displayed an attempt to engage the lawyers in a genuine discussion of the issues or whether the questions were sound bites intended persuade.

## A Challenge to *Grutter*?

Justice Breyer early in the argument asked Fisher’s lawyer, Bert Rein, directly: “whether you want us to— or are asking us to overrule *Grutter*. *Grutter* said it would be good law for at least 25 years, and I know that time flies, but I think only nine of those years have passed. And so, are you? And, if so, why overrule a case into which so much thought and effort went and so many people across the country have depended on?”

Rein disclaimed that Fisher’s goal is for the Court to overrule *Grutter* altogether. Rather, he claimed, UT’s failure was its use of race in this particular plan—in light of other possible alternatives. Justice Ginsburg appeared unconvinced, asking Mr. Rein during his rebuttal how the UT plan differed from the “Harvard plan which —that started all this off in 1978, decided by Justice Powell? Is it any different from how race is used in our military academies?”

## Judges as Admissions Officers

Rein’s response elicited a new set of concerns from Justices Sotomayor and Breyer. Justice Sotomayor queried: “So now we’re going to tell the universities how to run and how to weigh qualifications, too?” And Justice Breyer remonstrated: “There are several thousand admissions officers in the United States, several thousand universities, and what is it we’re going to say here that wasn’t already said in *Grutter* that isn’t going to take hun-

dreds or thousands of these people and have Federal judges dictating the policy of admission of all these universities? The notion of institutional competence and the appropriate degree of intrusion of courts is common in constitutional litigation. Often, Justices contend that the Court should exercise “restraint” and refrain from inserting themselves into areas that are traditionally the domain of the states or private actors. Such an argument would seem persuasive, particularly in the realm of higher education.

## Who Counts?

Almost immediately after Greg Garre stood up to argue on behalf of UT, he was challenged to justify the University’s method of determining “who counts.” Chief Justice Roberts

---

***Likely more salient to the ultimate decision is the issue of what constitutes critical mass.***

---

questioned whether “someone who is one-quarter Hispanic check the Hispanic box or some different box?” In response to Garre’s contention that a student has an opportunity to check the multiracial box or to self-determine Hispanic, the Chief Justice shot back “What about one-eighth?”

Later, during a discussion of what constitutes a “critical mass” for purposes of satisfying *Grutter*, Justice Alito raised a similar challenge, asking how UT “justif[ies] lumping together all Asian Americans” rather than determining whether they have a “critical mass of Filipino Americans? Cambodian American?”

The issue of how people of color self-identify is generally seen as an internal challenge the individual experiences, as is the very real distinctions within the broad category of “Asian American.” However, in the context of the political theater of this case, the

questions seemed clearly to intend a very different effect—to suggest that self-identifying as a “Hispanic” would simply be a ploy to game a college admissions officer. However, the record provides no evidence that such “gaming” is occurring – in light of the fact that the number of Latinos has remained so far below the number of graduating students. This form of identification is commonplace—in the Census, k-12 education and virtually every other context.

## Defining Critical Mass

Likely most salient to the ultimate decision of the case is the issue of what constitutes a critical mass. In *Grutter*, the Court held that it was constitutional for a university to seek a critical mass of under-represented minority students and relied on the definition of critical mass used by the Michigan Law School’s Director of Admissions: “meaningful numbers” or “meaningful representation” that “encourages underrepresented minority students to participate in the classroom and not feel isolated.” However, during oral argument, Justice Alito made his position plain in his question to Rein, “Do you understand what the University of Texas thinks is the definition of a critical mass? Because I don’t.”

The following colloquy between Chief Justice Roberts and UT’s lawyer, Garre, best reflects the challenge:

*Mr. Garre:* Another is that we did look to enrollment data, which showed, for example, among African Americans, that African-American enrollment at the University of Texas dropped to 3 percent in 2002 under the percentage plan.

*Chief Justice Roberts:* At what level will it satisfy the critical mass?

*Mr. Garre:* Well, I think we all agree that 3 percent is not a critical mass. It’s well beyond that.

*Chief Justice Roberts:* Yes, but at what level will it satisfy the requirement of critical mass?

*Mr. Garre:* When we have an en-  
(Please turn to page 17)

---

# Have We Learned Our Language Lesson?

## *In Spite of Massachusetts' Decade-Old English-Only Law, Two-Way Bilingual Programs Demonstrate Promise and Enjoy Enduring Popularity*

by Susan Eaton

Nina and Lauren must decide quickly. Tuesday at the Barbieri Elementary School in Framingham, Massachusetts won't officially begin until the two fourth-graders make up their minds.

"English was first yesterday," Lauren reasons.

"Oh, right," Nina says, nodding. "OK. Then Spanish. Spanish is first today."

Suppressing nervous laughter, the girls hover over a microphone and begin. Their voices travel from the principal's office into classrooms, corridors, the library and cafeteria. Up on the second floor, first-graders stand with hands over hearts. The familiar words flow through the intercom.

*Prometo lealtad a la bandera  
de los Estados Unidos de América*

...

A few heartbeats later, the Pledge of Allegiance streams from the intercom again. This time it comes through in English.

The morning ritual over, the first-graders move from their desks and sit in a half-circle on the floor in front of their teacher, Ana María Chacón. Fragments of English and Spanish float through the air. Chacón settles in a child-size chair and leans forward.

"*Mírame a mí,*" (Look at me) Chacón says in a singsong voice. "*¡Mírame a mí!*" she repeats cheerily, pointing to her eyes. "*Ahora,*

*escuchen,*" (Now, listen) she implores, pointing to her ears. Speaking slowly in Spanish, Chacón explains that this morning, students will write captions (in Spanish) for illustrations they had started to draw yesterday. The captions will be miniature stories—"historias"—that narrate the drawings.

The children scramble back to their desks. A boy named José draws himself gripping the strings of three balloons. "*¡Mis globos!*" (my balloons), he explains. A girl named Katherine sketches several stick figures floating in a pool (piscina). Katherine turns to José, who speaks Spanish at home. "I can't remember," she tells him, "*Cómo*

---

### ***There are typically long waiting lists for dual immersion schools.***

---

*se dice* (how do you say?) 'swimming' en español?"

Chacón makes the rounds. "*¡Muy bueno!*" she enthuses over one drawing. She slides over to Katherine and José's table. She picks up Katherine's floating figures and studies them intently. "*¡Bueno!*" she exclaims again. Katherine beams. Then Chacón pushes her a bit: "*¿Pero, cual es la historia, Katherine?*" But what is the story?

\* \* \*

To hear Spanish in a public classroom in Massachusetts, to find it woven so seamlessly with English as it is at Barbieri, is quite a story in itself, or at least an anomaly. This is because in 2002, Massachusetts became one of three states—Arizona in 2001 and California in 1997 are the others—to effectively ban or greatly restrict bilingual education in their public schools. The new law required educators to use

an undefined method called "sheltered English immersion" (SEI) to teach English language learners. Under the SEI method, students still learning English are separated from English-fluent peers and taught all subjects exclusively in English, with special supports, until they are fluent enough to move into mainstream English-speaking classrooms.

Largely overlooked during the ideological battle that led to the still-contested policy was that the Massachusetts law exempted "dual immersion"—known interchangeably as "two-way bilingual"—schools and programs like Barbieri's. In such programs and schools, educators bring Spanish speakers and native English speakers together and teach all students in both languages, with the goal of producing bilingual, biliterate students. This meant that the handful of schools and programs using this specialized method could keep operating just as they were. (One program in Cambridge teaches in Portuguese and English and another there teaches in Mandarin and English. In all others, Spanish and English are the instructional languages.) As is true of all the state's dual immersion schools and programs, parents choose to put their children in such schools, and there are typically long waiting lists. In the nation at large, it is exceedingly rare that a student would be mandatorily assigned to a dual immersion school.

Ten years after the SEI referendum, interest in and support for dual immersion is growing both in Massachusetts and nationally as educators, parents and policymakers see it not only as an effective educational method, but also as a dynamic model of ethnic and cultural integration in a rapidly changing society. Ironically, this new nationwide interest in dual immersion comes at the same time that civil rights and educational concerns over English-only laws

---

Susan Eaton (seaton@law.harvard.edu) is Research Director for the Charles Hamilton Houston Inst. at Harvard Law School and Co-Director of One Nation Indivisible, which documents inclusive community-based responses to our society's increasing racial, ethnic and linguistic diversity. [www.onenationindivisible.org](http://www.onenationindivisible.org)

## **Please contribute to PRRAC's annual campaign!**

November, 2012

Dear friend of PRRAC,

As we go to press, we do not yet know the direction that the country will be turning on November 6. We do not know if we will be able to continue our successful civil rights advocacy in a (generally) receptive federal executive branch, or if we will need to more strongly emphasize the work we are doing to promote racial justice innovation in metropolitan areas and states across the country.

Either way, your support for PRRAC really matters. We are a small and effective civil rights policy organization that supports cutting-edge research and advocacy on the mechanisms of structural racial inequality—and we are making a difference in how federal housing and education policies are framed. We help to staff and support the expanding National Coalition on School Diversity, and we help to support a coalition that has pushed HUD to embrace more inclusive and affirmative fair housing policies.

Plus we will continue to bring you *Poverty & Race*, a unique forum that bridges academia and organizing, law and social science, for a bi-monthly glimpse of the best work that is underway in our extended public interest network.

Please consider making a generous donation to PRRAC this year. You can mail your tax deductible contribution to PRRAC at 1200 18th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036, or simply pay online at our website, [www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org).

Sincerely,



Philip Tegeler  
Executive Director  
[ptegeler@prrac.org](mailto:ptegeler@prrac.org)

re-emerge and intensify in Massachusetts. In September 2011, investigators from the U.S. Justice Department found that educators in 275 Massachusetts school districts—this equals 70% of districts in the state—had placed English learners in classrooms with inadequately trained teachers. Prior to this, other federal investigations had found violations in three local districts, including Boston. In contrast, many of the state's dual immersion schools and programs remain stable and popular. This includes Barbieri, with students in kindergarten through fifth grade, the celebrated Amigos School in Cambridge and the long-standing model, the Hernandez School and the newer Hurley School, both in Boston, which are all K-8th-grade schools. In 2012,

the state's Commissioner of Education, Mitchell Chester, visited and then praised Barbieri School, citing it as "a model" for the state and "a model, nationally."

---

### ***The Mass. Education Commr. praised Barbieri School as "a model, nationally."***

---

Under the dual immersion/two-way bilingual method, native English speakers and Spanish speakers share their classrooms in all subjects. Each lesson, whether in social studies, math or science, doubles as a language lesson, with students concurrently learning vocabulary and grammar as they

learn subject matter. Ideally, about half the students in such programs would be native English speakers and half native Spanish speakers, or at least nearly fluent Spanish speakers. Some schools, such as Barbieri, use an "80-20" model in which teachers and students in the early grades speak Spanish 80% and English 20% of the time. By grade 4 at Barbieri, classes are taught in English half the time and Spanish in the other half. The Amigos School in Cambridge uses a 50-50 model, in which teachers and students use both languages in roughly equal amounts in all grades.

As students grow into fluency in two languages, teachers use a lot of visual cues, including photographs and draw-

*(Please turn to page 8)*



ings. They also act out words and concepts. Barbieri's first-grade teacher Ana María Chacón pulls on her ears while requesting that students "escuchen" (listen). In reference to a "claxon" (horn), she pushes her hand out in front of her and lets out a loud "Ehhh. Beep. Ehh. Beep!"

\*\*\*

Like at Barbieri, the goal of educators at the Amigos School extends far beyond mere second-language acquisition. The ultimate aspiration is biculturalism. A bilingual person can indeed speak two languages, an obviously beneficial, practical skill. But a bicultural person, explains Amigos' long-time principal Deborah Sercombe, "crosses over into a different culture," uses language as a tool for "fostering friendship and working relationships across cultures and ultimately for playing a role in sustaining a peaceful, pluralistic society." This can only be achieved, Sercombe explains, if the status of the Spanish language and the status of Latin cultures are "consciously elevated" within a school.

"We put the language-majority kids in the position where they have to learn something from the Spanish-speaking kids," Sercombe explains. "And having students integrated together and being able to see and negotiate that...is at the basis of how you build a socially connected or interconnected group of students, and school community and society."

Each morning, parents and children saunter through Amigos' doors, greeting teachers and administrators with "Buenos días" and "¡Hola!" and "¿Cómo está?" From the Latino mothers, fathers and children, the routine greetings usually flow naturally. For some others, the greetings still sound a bit clumsy, accompanied by a bit of self-conscious laughter.

"It's important that when anyone walks into our school, they are aware that they are entering a Spanish-speaking environment and entering into a

particular culture that is valued here," Sercombe says. "It's a process of traveling a little bit of distance to meet us, to participate in that culture, to learn from whatever discomfort that might bring at first."

In the first month of the school year, Sercombe had peeked in on a Latin dance class offered as an elective. Several of the youngest students sat in the back, arms folded, Sercombe recalled, looking less than enthusiastic about moving their bodies to unfamiliar music.

"I looked in and see kids in there who have never done any Latin dance, maybe have never experienced this music," Sercombe recalls. "...So, we do things that make kids a little bit uncomfortable, but I put it to them: 'Part of what makes you uncomfortable in another culture is what's going to bring

---

### ***Each lesson doubles as a language lesson.***

---

you closer to understanding what it means to be a bicultural person in this world.' "

And indeed, on a Friday night in early March, the once hesitant novice dancers Sercombe had looked in on months before strolled with seemingly little trepidation onto the makeshift dance floor at the Amigos School's annual potluck dinner, community party and fundraiser, Noche Caribeña. In pairs, the Salsa dancers spun and twisted sharply to the syncopated beat. Live musicians sang Latin ballads and pop songs. They strummed guitars and invited students to accompany them on a conga drum. A long table at the back of the room held dishes from Trinidad, West Africa, the Dominican Republic, Brazil and Mexico. The homemade dishes mingled with boxes from the Pizza Ring ("you ring, we bring") around the corner and with organic chocolate cupcakes from the high-end market down the street.

"There are other methods for learning and for learning languages, and we could debate that all day," Sercombe explains. "To me, though, and I think to all of us here, the questions we ask

are not just about how to teach language, how to teach subject areas to get these test scores up. The questions go deeper than that: How do we challenge and engage kids as full participants in a shared community? . . . How do we have them meet very high expectations within a context of a healthy, diverse community, as active members of a community with the core value of bringing together students of many backgrounds to practice respect and negotiation for life?"

\*\*\*

Evaluations of dual immersion programs in California, Virginia and previous research at the Amigos School show that English language learners gained literacy in English better or as well as students in more traditional schools. The U.S. Department of Education commissioned one of the most comprehensive studies of dual immersion's effectiveness. Published in 2002 and conducted by Professors Virginia Collier and Wayne Thomas, the study analyzed data over 18 years in 23 school districts over 15 states. The dual immersion model, Collier and Thomas concluded, was strongly associated with the closing of the achievement gap between students learning English and native English speakers.

Conducting research on dual immersion, however, is tricky, as it is often complicated by self-selection bias. In other words, the very qualities that propelled a family to choose dual immersion—say, a passion for language and world cultures, motivation, etc.—may very well play a role in a student's success in such a program. Professors Collier and Thomas are in the midst of a large study based in North Carolina where the demographic make-up of dual immersion programs is similar to schools that do not use the method. In comparing achievement and attendance rates and behavior of otherwise similar students, Collier and Thomas find that students taught through dual immersion make far more progress as measured by test

(Please turn to page 16)



---

# From Urban Renewal and Displacement to Economic Inclusion: San Francisco Affordable Housing Policy, 1978-2012

by Marcia Rosen & Wendy Sullivan

Once notorious for urban renewal that diminished housing affordability and displaced residents, the City of San Francisco is now renowned nationally for its best practices in housing and community development. How did this “hot market” city with limited land for development, extremely low rental vacancy rates and high demand for housing move from archaic urban renewal practices to thoughtful policies designed to preserve and enhance housing opportunities for low-income families, prevent displacement of low-income families, and create inclusive communities?

The answer is not simple. In a city that consistently places amongst the highest in the nation for its housing costs and is largely built out, production and preservation of homes affordable to its residents is an ongoing challenge. The successful evolution of affordable housing programs in San Francisco cannot be understood by simply looking at the local codes and ordinances, policies, development requirements and restrictions separately; the whole is greater than the sum of

its parts. Moreover, the overall success of the housing system and policies employed is the result of an interaction of four key factors: dedicated community advocacy and strong coalitions; development of and access to substantial funding sources; a holistic vision of building “not just housing, but communities”; and constantly evolving housing programs that meet

---

## **San Francisco has severely constrained development potential.**

---

new challenges and opportunities. The interaction of these factors has allowed the City to take advantage of ever-changing markets and political forces to maintain and develop strong local communities. This article describes the development and interaction of each of these four key components of housing program and policy development since the late 1960s and how they have resulted in the current dynamic affordable housing system in San Francisco.

## **San Francisco’s Affordable Housing Movement and Community Vision**

San Francisco’s affordable housing and community development policies largely evolved during the late 1960s through the present day, spanning periods of rapid economic and demographic change, wide-scale commercial development, dramatic changes in land use, and exploding housing costs, which continue to threaten displacement of low-income residents. Prior to 1968, San Francisco’s affordable housing stock was limited to public housing and other federally-funded

housing that was developed as part of the City’s urban renewal program. While there was private market-rate housing affordable to low-income families, thousands of such units had been lost to urban renewal. No state or local funding sources were available for housing rehabilitation or development, and no community-based infrastructure existed to undertake this work.

Geographic limitations further exacerbated the housing problem. San Francisco has severely constrained development potential: It has limited land capacity; is roughly 47 square miles on the tip of a peninsula; and has no ability to expand through Bay infill or annexation. It is “built out,” with almost all its available land developed. Consequently, as stated by Calvin Welch, San Francisco housing activist, lecturer in development politics, and former Co-Director of the Council of Community Housing Organizations, “development in the City is a zero sum game, with winners and losers. [With minor exceptions], new development in San Francisco, residential or commercial, means the demolition and displacement of what was there.” With each new proposed development in San Francisco being a battle between competing land uses, a strong community movement was needed to protect low-income residents from displacement and enhance neighborhoods as urban renewal, private development and market interests sought to transform the city.

Extensive changes in the economic base and escalating housing prices in the city during the 1970s spurred formation of neighborhood and tenant organizations, bringing resident housing needs to the City’s attention. These

*(Please turn to page 10)*

---

*Marcia Rosen (mrosen@nhlp.org) is Executive Director of the San Francisco-based National Housing Law Project (NHLP), former Director of the San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing, and former Executive Director of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.*

*Wendy Sullivan (wsullivan@nhlp.org) is an attorney and planning consultant.*

*This article is adapted from a longer report published by PRRAC and the National Housing Law Project, available at [www.prrac.org/pdf/SanFranAffHsing.pdf](http://www.prrac.org/pdf/SanFranAffHsing.pdf) and [www.nhlp.org/file/SanFranAFFHSING.pdf](http://www.nhlp.org/file/SanFranAFFHSING.pdf)*

groups were originally focused on maintaining housing affordability in their communities and preventing the displacement of families from neighborhoods disrupted by the City's urban renewal programs and private development interests. Their focus later expanded to include a community development mission—the preservation and development of affordable community housing and resident services to meet the changing demographic needs of families, maintain the city's diversity and mitigate the exclusive effects of the rising cost of market housing within the city.

### Funding San Francisco's Affordable Housing

Pivotal to the efforts and effectiveness of the community housing movement was access to significant financial resources. In San Francisco, affordable housing is primarily produced by three sectors: nonprofit housing developers who are funded in part by the (former) San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) and the Mayor's Office of Housing; the San Francisco Housing Authority; and market-rate developers operating in accordance with the inclusionary housing program or the jobs-housing linkage program. Spurred on by, and in partnership with, nonprofit developers and housing advocates, the City has implemented revenue strategies that have provided significant funding for the preservation, rehabilitation and development of affordable housing. Between FY 2002-03 and FY 2010-11, more than \$725 million was applied to affordable housing from City- and locally-controlled funding sources, over \$356 million from state sources and over \$829 million from federal sources, totaling just under \$2 billion. Community organizations were also instrumental in ensuring that, since 1990, up to 50% of local tax increment revenues and bond proceeds were allocated by the SFRA to affordable housing. As a result, over \$600 mil-

**Table 1. City, State and Federal Financing of San Francisco's Affordable Housing Projects: FY 2002-03 to FY 2010-11**

Source of Financing	Total Financing FY 2002-03 to FY 2010-11	Percent of Total
Tax Increment Revenues and Bond Proceeds	\$460,130,116	24%
City Affordable Housing Fund	\$95,961,640	5%
Developer Contributions and Housing Income	\$73,371,353	4%
City Hotel Tax or Contributions in Lieu of Tax	\$47,623,208	2%
City General Fund	\$30,000,000	2%
Proposition A Affordable Housing Bonds	\$18,053,081	1%
<b>City and Local Sources</b>	<b>\$725,139,398</b>	<b>38%</b>
State Propositions 46 and 1C Affordable Housing Bonds	\$286,129,994	15%
State Tax Credits	\$57,654,092	3%
California Dept. of Housing and Community Development	\$8,190,000	0%
California Housing Finance Agency	\$4,100,000	0%
<b>State Sources</b>	<b>\$356,074,086</b>	<b>19%*</b>
Federal Tax Credits	\$634,609,090	33%
Federal CDBG, HOME and HOPWA Grants	\$194,768,626	10%
<b>Federal sources</b>	<b>\$829,377,716</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,910,591,200</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst (Jan. 2012). Performance Audit of San Francisco's Affordable Housing Policies and Programs, p. ii. Prepared for Board of Supervisors for the City and County of San Francisco.

\* Discrepancy is due to rounding.

lion of tax increment financing has contributed to the development of more than 10,000 units of affordable hous-

### ***These forces have counteracted the detrimental effects of gentrification.***

ing for low- and moderate-income households throughout San Francisco. Other local initiatives established additional funding streams: changes to CDBG allocations that ensured community development organizations and

other creators of new affordable housing opportunities received their fair share; a permanent City hotel tax was instituted to help fund housing; and San Francisco voters passed Proposition A in 1996, a \$100 million general obligation bond dedicated for affordable housing. In total, almost 40% of housing funding in San Francisco has come from local sources. This exemplifies the concrete impacts that strong local advocacy can have on the development of housing policy and on the creation of available funding streams necessary to put policies into action.

## San Francisco's Affordable Housing Programs and Policies

Dedicated and zealous community advocacy, strategic development and allocation of funding sources, and responsiveness to market changes and political opportunities have resulted in a system of strong housing preservation and production policies, programs and organizations in San Francisco. By ensuring the creation and retention of a range of housing to serve diverse resident and community needs within the city, these forces have counteracted the detrimental effects of gentrification caused by market forces and have kept affordable community housing in the forefront of the City's development and redevelopment decisions.

In fact, by 2012, the housing and community development corporations that were formed in the early decades have developed, rehabilitated and preserved more than 26,000 permanently affordable housing units, mainly for families and seniors earning less than 50% of the city's median income. The community housing movement also influenced the adoption of key affordable housing policy and financing legislation, including the enactment of San Francisco's Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance in 1979 that now covers some 170,000 rental units. The movement also served as a catalyst to the City's inclusionary zoning ordinance, which has resulted in over 1,500 units of permanently affordable ownership and rental housing, as well as the Jobs-Housing Linkage program, which has contributed to the development of an additional 1,100 units. The more than 200,000 units of "price controlled" housing constitute approximately 53% of San Francisco's entire housing stock. Other substantive achievements include:

- In response to relentless advocacy by community and housing organizations, rejection by the City and the State of outmoded models of early federal urban renewal policies that targeted slum eradication and displaced

**Table 2. Comparison of California and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Requirements**

	State of California	SFRA
Affordable Housing Unit replacement requirement	One-for-one	One-for-one
Term of Affordability for units assisted with tax increment monies	55 years (rental); 45 years (owner)	55 years rental); 45 years (owner)
Inclusionary requirement	15% (non-agency developed) 30% (agency developed)	20% to 40%
Occupancy Preference to displaced residents	Yes	Yes
% Tax Increment dedicated to Housing	20%	Up to 50%
Residential condemnation powers	Yes	No - too controversial in development areas

low-income residents. Such efforts successfully pressed the City and the State to require redevelopment agencies to develop, preserve and revitalize new and existing housing affordable for low- and moderate-income households and prevent displacement. San Francisco advocates also influenced changes at the federal level, resulting

### ***San Francisco is demonstrating that the early urban renewal and displacement days are gone.***

in the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, requiring federally-funded projects to ensure that adequate relocation assistance and other protections are available for displaced persons.

- Adoption of a Residential Hotel Demolition and Conversion Ordinance in 1980 to stave off the significant loss of these affordable housing units that had occurred during the late 1960s through the 1970s. Thanks to this policy and replacement requirements, San Francisco has about 500 residential hotels with 19,120 rooms, about

one-fourth of which are maintained with a guaranteed level of affordability.

- Adoption of a Condominium Conversion Ordinance in 1979 that retains larger occupied rental properties for the housing purposes for which they were intended, helping to protect units covered by the 1979 Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance.

- Passage by voters of a groundbreaking ballot measure in 1986 (Proposition M), which capped the amount of office development that could be approved each year and established planning priorities that incorporated the development and preservation of affordable housing for residents in the downtown area.

- Adoption of a Downtown Plan policy and corresponding Planning Code amendment in the mid-1980s prohibiting the demolition of housing units in the downtown area without conditional use approval. Community-based neighborhood plans and zoning provisions for neighborhoods surrounding the downtown area were also developed, aimed at protecting existing housing from demolition or conversion and protecting and enhancing

*(Please turn to page 12)*



(SAN FRANCISCO: Cont. from page 11)

the residential quality and scale of the neighborhoods.

- Adoption of enhanced redevelopment plans in collaboration with residents, small business owners and

community organizations for the South of Market, Mission Bay and Hunters Point Shipyard redevelopment areas in the 1990s (with later modifications) to improve the neighborhoods without gentrification and displacement. Developments include substantial perma-

nently affordable housing and housing for a diverse range of needs, as well as such important services as childcare, health and social services, and amenities such as neighborhood-serving retail, parks, libraries and schools. Hunters Point in particular will be a transformative project to rebuild the community and the city and a true test of inclusive gentrification.

- Creation and adoption of a groundbreaking Housing Preservation Program in 1997 to preserve 8,000 units in 88 HUD-assisted housing developments in the city threatened with conversion to market-rate units as a result of changes in federal budget and policy priorities. At a time when the nation lost over 100,000 units of federally-assisted housing, San Francisco did not lose even one.

- Adoption of SB 2113 and SB 211 in 2000 and 2001, requiring the City to replace the 6,709 net loss of units that occurred during the early urban renewal period—i.e., before a one-for-one replacement requirement was placed on the SFRA. These bills permit tax increment revenues to be collected from some redevelopment areas for low- and moderate-income housing activities until all 6,709 units have been replaced. Significantly, these bills ensure that, even after the demise of the SFRA in 2012 (discussed below), the City will continue to receive some tax increment to replace the housing that was lost during the early urban renewal period.

## References

- DeLeon, Richard E. (1992). *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975-1991* (p. 46). Univ. Press of Kansas.
- Galle, Brian (Oct. 1999). "Preserving Federally Assisted Housing at the State and Local Level: A Legislative Toolkit." *29 Hous. Law Bulletin* 183.
- Gray, Deb Goldberg (Sept. 2000). *Resident Participation in Affordable Housing Preservation Projects: What Works?* (p. 36). Univ. Ctr. For Cooperatives.
- Habal, Estella (2007). *San Francisco's International Hotel: Mobilizing the Filipino American Community in the Anti-Eviction Movement* (pp. 167-69). Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
- Hartman, Chester (1984). *The Transformation of San Francisco* (pp. 2, 3, 6-7, 262). Totawa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Housing Element: Part I: Data and Needs Analysis* (Mar. 2011). Adopted by SF Planning Commission.
- Interview with Calvin Welch, San Francisco housing activist, lecturer in development politics, and former longtime Co-Director of the Council of Community Housing Organizations, July 20, 2012.
- Interview with Olson Lee, Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing, former Chief Financial Officer at the Mayor's Office of Housing and former Deputy Director for Housing of the SFRA, July 25, 2012.
- Jacobson, Daniel & Stallworth, Chris (2009). "Bayview-Hunters Point: Urban Transformations and Community Cooptation." *Urbanist*, 161, 9-13.
- Kelly, Dan (Nov. 2009). "Fiscal and Policy Implications for Single Room Occupancy Hotels". Report to SF-HAS Managers/City Department Representatives, at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org).
- Non-Profit Housing Assn. of California (2007). *Affordable by Choice: Trends in California Inclusionary Housing Programs*, at <http://www.nonprohousing.org/pages/publications-and-press-room/publications.html>.
- Rubin, Gayle (1997). "The Miracle Mile, South of Market and Gay Male Leather 1962-1997." In *Reclaiming San Francisco: History, Politics, Culture*. San Francisco: City Lights Books (1998). Retrieved Sept. 27, 2012 from FoundSF website: <http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=Redevelopment>.
- San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst (Jan. 2012). "Performance Audit of San Francisco's Affordable Housing Policies and Programs." Prepared for Board of Supervisors for the City and County of San Francisco.
- San Francisco Planning Department (June 2011). "25-Years: Downtown Plan Monitoring Report: 1985-2009."
- "Update on the Housing Preservation Program. San Francisco: A City Committed to Preservation, Policy" Link case study, at [http://www.policylink.org/site/c.lkIXLbMNJrE/b.5136999/k.7DA7/Case\\_Studies.htm](http://www.policylink.org/site/c.lkIXLbMNJrE/b.5136999/k.7DA7/Case_Studies.htm).
- Welch, Calvin (2011). "The Fight to Stay: The Creation of the Community Housing Movement in San Francisco, 1968-1978." In Chris Carlsson & Lisa Ruth Elliott (Eds.), *Ten Years that Shook the City: San Francisco 1968-1978* (pp. 154-162). San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- "Western Addition A-1." Retrieved Sept. 27, 2012, from City and County of San Francisco as Successor to Redevelopment Agency website: <http://www.sfdevelopment.org/index.aspx?page=64>.
- Wright, James & Rubin, Beth (1997). "Is Homelessness a Housing Problem?" In *Understanding Homelessness: New Policy and Research Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Fannie Mae Foundation, at [http://content.knowledgeplex.org/kp2/kp/report/report/relfiles/homeless\\_1997\\_wright.pdf](http://content.knowledgeplex.org/kp2/kp/report/report/relfiles/homeless_1997_wright.pdf).

## Conclusion

San Francisco continues to face tough challenges in providing the affordable, quality housing that its residents and workforce need, but the City is demonstrating a solid commitment to addressing those challenges. A significant blow to financing opportunities occurred earlier this year when California dissolved all 400 of its redevelopment agencies, including the SFRA, to redirect redevelopment revenues away from housing and toward the \$25 billion deficit in the state budget. An assessment of housing needs



in San Francisco by the regional planning association, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), also shows that the City did a good job meeting its very-low-income and market-rate housing needs between 1999 and 2006, but fell woefully short in meeting its housing needs for low- and moderate-income households—those earning between about 50% and 120% of AMI. In response to these obstacles, a proposed Housing Trust Fund, which has broad community, government, and business support, is being placed before the San Francisco voters in November 2012, which, if approved, will more than replace the lost redevelopment revenues. Also, the Mayor's Office of Housing has been exploring options to produce housing for low- to moderate-income households through various programs and funding modifications. Despite the quick response, however, it is evident that San Francisco will continue to need to be inventive and its housing advocates strong in order to meet the challenges ahead.

## New on PRRAC's Website

*Do Federally Assisted Households Have Access to High Performing Public Schools?* by Ingrid Gould Ellen & Keren Mertens Horn (a 50-state analysis of the location of family housing units in the four largest federally-assisted housing programs)

*An Early Assessment of Off-Site Replacement Housing, Relocation Planning and Housing Mobility Counseling in HUD's Choice Neighborhoods Initiative*, by Martha Galvez (is the Choice Neighborhoods program living up to its fair housing commitments?)

*"Why socio-economic integration alone is not enough – a statement on Fisher v. Texas"*

visit [www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org)

San Francisco must continue to evolve its policy to fill in the gaps in its housing needs and find creative and substantial sources of funding to develop and maintain affordable housing in one of the nation's most expensive housing markets. By also ensuring that the needs of local residents are heard, San Francisco is demonstrating

that the early urban renewal and displacement days are gone and have been replaced with a vision of creating the housing, jobs and services required to maintain and build thriving, diverse and inclusive communities within the city. □

*(PUBLIC HOUSING: Cont. from page 2)*

dent families, many of which were headed by barely literate single parents. Youth gang activity became more frequent. A combination of deteriorating social conditions and public disinvestment made life in the projects so untenable that the federal government evicted all residents and dynamited the 33 towers in 1972.

But few knew another side of St. Louis history. When federal housing funds became available during the New Deal, St. Louis proposed to raze a racially integrated low-income neighborhood whose population was about ¾ white and ¼ black, to construct on that land a whites-only low-rise project for two-parent families with steady employment. When Washington objected, St. Louis proposed an additional blacks-only project removed from the white one, but also in a previously integrated area. This met the federal government's conditions, insisted upon by liberals and civil rights

leaders, for non-discriminatory funding. The segregated projects were opened in 1945 with preference for veterans. The white project remained predominantly so until the late 1950s, when most early residents had relocated to suburbs, many with FHA- and VA-guaranteed mortgages and restrictive covenants (Heathcott 2011).

● **Cleveland:** Public housing constructed during WW II was open only to white workers, at the insistence of the Ohio Congressional delegation. Towards the war's end, a few African

### ***Only two-parent families were accepted.***

Americans were admitted to previously white-only projects, in token compliance with nominal (but unenforced) federal non-discrimination policy. By 1945, black presence in Cleveland's four designated-for-whites projects ranged from 0.3% to 3% (Weaver 1948, 1967).

● **Detroit:** In 1941, the govern-

ment built the Ford Willow Run bomber plant in a previously undeveloped suburb without pre-existing racial housing patterns. The Federal Public Housing Agency then built housing for white workers only. Thus, the workforce necessarily was overwhelmingly white, in contrast to Ford's city operations. By 1944, as whites left public housing for FHA-subsidized single-family suburban homes, 3,000 Detroit public housing units were vacant, while black workers in desperate need of housing were barred from occupancy in the city as well as from employment opportunities in the suburbs (Weaver 1948, 1967).

As the post-war housing shortage eased, whites' opposition to public housing grew. In 1948-49, the Detroit City Council proposed 12 projects in white areas. The mayor vetoed them all; only housing in predominantly black areas was approved (Sugrue 1995).

● **Los Angeles:** Over 10,000 Af-  
*(Please turn to page 14)*

rican-American families migrated during WW II for work in shipyards, aircraft plants and other war industries that, desperately in need of labor, hired blacks for the first time. But little or no adequate housing was open to blacks. Public housing was built in

white neighborhoods, and the city's Housing Authority did not permit blacks to reside there. African Americans eligible for public housing remained homeless while units set aside for whites remained vacant. The Housing Authority chairman explained in 1943 that "the Authority selects its residents by following the previous racial

pattern of the neighborhoods in which [projects] are located" (California Eagle 1943).

But faced with a growing housing crisis and civil rights protests, the Los Angeles Housing Authority soon reversed itself and adopted a non-discrimination policy for all projects. It even adopted a lease clause that promised eviction for those who contributed to a disturbance based on "racial intolerance." The new policy was swiftly implemented, and by 1947 Los Angeles public housing was extensively integrated. But this was only temporary. As white tenants left the projects for homes in more solidly middle-class suburbs, blacks—for whom housing elsewhere was barred—disproportionately remained. Whereas in 1947 Los Angeles public housing tenants were 55% white and 30% black, by 1959, they were only 14% white and 65% black, with Mexican-origin tenants another 19%. Los Angeles public housing came to be perceived as "Negro housing," and whites began to protest the location of new projects in their neighborhoods. Public officials caved in, and projects initially designated for white areas were relocated to Watts. A project designated for Santa Monica, for example, was cancelled after such protests and relocated to Watts. Three new projects were built in Watts between 1953 and 1955 alone, turning Watts from an area where some blacks were already residing to an impoverished and racially isolated ghetto.

But best known in Los Angeles' public housing history was an attempt to build a racially integrated project in Chavez Ravine, northwest of downtown and far from Watts. By the end of 1951, land had been cleared and construction begun. But the City Council called an emergency meeting and cancelled the project. The California Supreme Court voided the cancellation, but the Council sponsored a 1952 referendum and voters overwhelmingly rejected the public housing. The city then sold the land that had been cleared to the Dodgers baseball team for its stadium (Sides 2003).

● **Boston:** In the late 1930s, the city razed a dilapidated, overcrowded

## Works Cited:

In most cases and except for direct quotations, only books and easily accessible magazine, journal and newspaper articles have been cited. For archival and less easily accessible documentation of other claims in this article, contact the author at rrothstein@epi.org.

Bloom, Nicholas Dagen. 2008. *Public Housing that Worked. New York in the Twentieth Century*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

California Eagle. 1943. "Housing Authority Vows 'Liberalization'." *California Eagle* 63 (39), January 8: 1, 5. [http://www.archive.org/details/la\\_caleagle\\_reel25](http://www.archive.org/details/la_caleagle_reel25)

Dean, John P. 1947. "Only Caucasian: A Study of Race Covenants." *The Journal of Land & Public Utility Economics* 23 (4), November: 428-432

Duncan, Arne. 2010. "Joel Klein's Legacy, Cathie Black's Challenge: Secretary of Ed. Arne Duncan Grades N.Y. Schools Big." *New York Daily News*, November 14

Heathcott, Joseph. 2011. "'In the Nature of a Clinic.' The Design of Early Public Housing in St. Louis." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 70 (1), March: 82-103

Jackson, Kenneth T. 1985. *Crabgrass Frontier*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Nixon, Richard M. 1970. "The President's News Conference," December 10. *The American Presidency Project*, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=2840#axzz1y8oEdhy5>

Nixon, Richard. 1973. "Special Message to the Congress Proposing Legislation and Outlining Administration Actions To Deal With Federal Housing Policy," September 19. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3968>

Polikoff, Alexander. 2006. *Waiting for Gautreaux*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press

Rothstein, Richard, 2001. "Poverty and Achievement, And Great Misconceptions." *The New York Times*, January 3

Rothstein, Richard, 2002. "Schools, Accountability and a Sheaf of Fuzzy Math." *The New York Times*, April 10

Sides, Josh. 2003. *L.A. City Limits: African American Los Angeles from the Great Depression to the Present*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press

Sugrue, Thomas J. 1995. "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the Urban North, 1940-1964." *The Journal of American History* 82 (2), September: 551-578

TIME. 1950. "Up From the Potato Fields." *TIME* 56, July 3

Vale, Lawrence J. 2002. *Reclaiming Public Housing*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press

Weaver, Robert C. 1948, 1967. *The Negro Ghetto*. New York: Russell & Russell

Wilson, William Julius. 1987, 2012. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press

and low-cost neighborhood, to replace it with public housing for white middle-class families. Slum dwellers whose homes were demolished could not afford to live in the new public units with their relatively high rents. When the first project, Old Harbor, was opened in 1938, median monthly rent of \$26 was only \$3 below the citywide median. In 1940, only 9% of project residents were unemployed, compared to 30% in the surrounding neighborhood who were either unemployed or on public work relief; neighborhood median rent was \$15. The project accepted families whose income was five times the citywide median rent (six times for families with three or more children). Another nearby development, the D Street Project, opened in 1949, mostly for veterans; tenants' median education level included some college, considerably higher than typical levels at the time.

As in New York, Boston disqualified prospective tenants for cohabitation, out-of-wedlock children, excessive drinking and unsanitary house-keeping. Inspectors entered prospective tenants' apartments without notice (or permission) to evaluate their household habits. Applicants had to provide references from previous landlords and prove stable employment histories. After WW II, veterans were given preference.

Also like New York, Boston assigned a token number of African Americans to Old Harbor and D Street, while maintaining other projects where few whites resided. But a 1962 discrimination complaint forced the city to assign additional black tenants to the middle-class projects. Initially, only middle-class families were assigned, but as more whites took advantage of FHA and VA subsidies to move, earlier residents were gradually replaced by much lower-income minorities.

D Street had initially accepted only two-parent families, but by 1960, there were 50% more adult females than males. It had opened with higher rents than those in the surrounding distressed area, but by 1970, rents were below those in any nearby community. Early

tenants had more than high school education, but by 1975 the median adult level was 10th grade (Vale 2002).

● **And Elsewhere:** Examples nationwide abound of how public housing was used by federal, state and local governments to create the segregated metropolitan areas we know today. In 1960, Savannah (Georgia) evicted all white residents from its Francis Bartow Place project, creating an all-black neighborhood where integration previously existed. The Housing Authority asserted that with national (and local) housing shortages abating, whites could easily find housing elsewhere and blacks needed the housing more. In Miami, where black tenants had been assigned to segregated projects while whites were given vouchers to subsidize private apartment rentals, it was not until 1998 that a legal settlement required that vouchers also be offered to blacks. The remedy was insufficient to undo the segregation that public policy had created and abetted.

In 1984, *The Dallas Morning News* investigated federally-funded projects in 47 cities, reporting that the nation's nearly 10 million public housing residents were still almost always segregated by race. The few remaining predominantly white projects had superior facilities, amenities, services and maintenance in comparison to predominantly black ones.

In 1976, the Supreme Court found that the Chicago Housing Authority, collaborating with federal agencies, had unconstitutionally selected sites to maintain segregation. Mayor Richard Daley had stated, in rejecting projects for predominantly white neighborhoods, that public housing should only go "where this kind of housing is most needed and accepted" (Polikoff 2006). President Richard Nixon told a news conference: "I believe that forced integration of the suburbs is not in the national interest," and then followed up with a formal policy pledging not to require any suburb to accept public housing over the suburb's protest (Nixon 1970). In the Chicago case, President Gerald Ford's Solicitor General Robert Bork stated the

## Thanks

As is my custom, and pleasure, at the end of each year, I want to thank the various folks who assist in getting *P&R* out: our numerous short-term policy and law interns, but especially **Angela Parker** of the Center for Law & Policy staff, who devotes a portion of her time to PRRAC and is particularly helpful in putting together our Resources Sections, **Michelle Vinson**, who tirelessly updates our mailing list, and **Teri Grimwood**, who for lots and lots of years has assisted me with all kinds of projects—in this instance, creating the layout for each issue.

- CH

government's opposition to public housing in white communities: "There will be an enormous practical impact on innocent communities who have to bear the burden of the housing, who will have to house a plaintiff class from Chicago, which they wronged in no way" (Polikoff 2006). The federal government thus defined nondiscriminatory housing as punishment visited on innocent suburbanites.

Other court decisions, for example in Baltimore, Yonkers and Dallas, have also confirmed that the federal government created or perpetuated ghettos with its public housing site location and tenant assignment policies.

## The Government's One-Two Punch

The result has been a one-two punch. With public housing, federal and local government increased African Americans' isolation in urban ghettos. An with mortgage guarantees, the government subsidized whites to abandon urban areas for suburbs. The combination contributed heavily to creation of the segregated neighborhoods and schools we know today, with truly disadvantaged minority students isolated in poverty-concentrated schools where

(Please turn to page 16)



---

(PUBLIC HOUSING: Cont. from page 15)

teachers struggle unsuccessfully to overcome families' multiple needs. Without these public policies, the racial achievement gap that has been so daunting to educators would be a very different, and lesser, challenge. That gap can't be addressed by nostalgia for a fanciful past when whites grew up in public housing and succeeded solely by benefiting from good teachers.

---

(IMMERSION: Continued from page 8)

scores, have better attendance records, and get referred for behavior problems far less frequently. English language learners, English-speaking Latino children, African-American students and white students all performed better in dual immersion schools.

Dual immersion schools also enjoy enduring popularity among parents from a variety of racial and economic backgrounds. Under Cambridge's controlled choice policy designed to ensure socioeconomic diversity, parents list schools in order of preference. Consistently, for several years, Amigos is among the top three choices of parents. Every year, at Barbieri, at Boston's schools and the Amigos School, the requests for admission far outnumber the available seats.

"I didn't know anything about the research," says Kristen Jelstrup, whose two sons attend Amigos. Breathless, Jelstrup's first-grader, Alex, shows off his robot drawings and then runs back to his friends on the playground after school.

"We had visited other schools and then we came here to Amigos and it was a no-brainer. It just felt right, and then my husband and I talked about it and for our kids to graduate fluent in a second language? It was an unbelievable opportunity."

Jelstrup is learning Spanish bit by bit with help from Yanina Hillion, a native of Argentina whose four children attend Amigos. Hillion offers Spanish classes for parents and also provides advice in how to assist kids with homework and adjust to a bilin-

The conventional idea that we now suffer from "de facto" segregation, created by vague market and demographic forces (Justice Potter Stewart once termed them "unknown and perhaps unknowable") is urban mythology. Residential segregation was as much the product of purposeful public policy as was "de jure" school segregation. The legacy of both endures. □

gual school.

"I have seen a genuine interest among parents to learn Spanish," Hillion says. "There is a completely open attitude and desire to really embrace Latin cultures.... But you know it is challenging. It is not easy to have your child learning in two languages

---

### ***The ultimate aspiration is biculturalism.***

---

when you do not know one of them. It is a true commitment."

Like Jelstrup, Lisa Downing, who also has two sons at Amigos, praises the school's high academic standards. The mothers agree, however, that they could not have predicted and cannot quantify some of school's most important benefits.

"I do think that the kids here develop an incredible empathy that comes from having to learn a second language and being so immersed with other cultures," Downing says. "Maybe that's because when you have to learn a second language, you do need to take risks.... go out on a limb."

\*\*\*

The dual immersion model has long been common in the border states of Texas and New Mexico and in regions of California. But more recently it has spread to other states, including, most notably, Utah, where 11 school districts maintain dual immersion programs. Though there is no official accounting of dual immersion programs in the nation, Rosa Molina, executive director of the Two-Way California Association of Bilingual Educators

(CABE), which provides technical assistance to two-way bilingual educators, estimates that there are more than 900 of what she defines as "true" dual immersion programs in 46 states, with about 400 in Texas and 300 in California. To give some sense of the method's increased popularity, in 1990 the Center for Applied Linguistics estimated that just 35 two-way immersion programs were operating across the nation. Molina and other experts caution, though, that it is difficult to determine how many such programs exist because increasingly educators in recent years have started "Spanish" or "Chinese" immersion schools that do not enroll a significant share of native Spanish or Chinese students.

"That's not what the original idea of two-way bilingual is," Molina explains. "It involves, at its heart, sharing language. When you do not see any other language but English represented in the enrollment, we don't see this as a two-way program."

Molina cautions educators against allowing dual immersion to become dominated by middle-class, English-speaking families as its popularity grows. "... How we design these programs should ensure that it is English language learners getting to benefit from this method just as much as English-speaking students who want to learn another language and learn about another culture," she says.

\*\*\*

The research on the benefits of bilingualism is increasingly clear. The cognitive neuroscientist Ellen Bialystok of York University in Toronto has published some of the most convincing findings. In repeated studies, Bialystok finds that bilingual children tend to master letters and numbers more quickly than monolingual children. Also, she finds that children who have been exposed to stories in two languages tend to have advantages as they learn to read. More recently, Bialystok has studied bilingual adults, finding that they tend to be less prone to cognitive decline in their older years and more efficient multi-taskers, likely



because using two languages exercises the prefrontal cortex section of the brain.

Meanwhile, outcomes from the restrictive language policies of Arizona, California and Massachusetts, which move away from or else effectively ban bilingual education, have been discouraging.

In their edited volume of research studies and research reviews, *Forbidden Language: English Learners and Restrictive Language Policies*, UCLA Professor Patricia Gándara and Northwestern University researcher Megan Hopkins find that, contrary to what English-only proponents had promised, the evidence fails to show that English-only policies resulted in improved educational programming or better educational outcomes for English language learners. Gándara and Hopkins recommend increased use of methods and programs such as dual immersion in which students' home languages are respected as assets and where English learners are fully incorporated into schools rather than separated from other students.

Dual immersion provides a small counterweight to a trend Patricia Gándara terms "triple segregation." Research by Gándara and other experts shows Latino students disproportionately concentrated and separated by ethnicity, by economic class and by language. Latinos are now the nation's largest "minority" group and are more

## Resources

The Center for Applied Linguistics: A wealth of information and resources, particularly for educators, related to two-way immersion programs across the nation.  
<http://www.cal.org/topics/ell/immersion.html>

Bialystok, E., Craik, F., & Luk, G. (2012). "Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(4), 240-250.

Collier, V.P. & Thomas, W.P. (2009, November). *Educating English Learners For a Transformed World*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press. Go to [www.dlenm.org](http://www.dlenm.org) and click on Fuente Press for a book description and sample material.

likely than even African-American students to attend often overwhelmed, unstable high-poverty schools.

In a recent survey of about 900 Arizona teachers, 85% of them said they felt that segregating English learners from English-speaking students in

### ***All students performed better in dual immersion schools.***

school is harmful to education. Other research indicates that those Arizona teachers have good instincts. For example, in a 2010 study, Russ Rumberger and Loan Tran of the University of California-Santa Barbara analyzed data on segregation levels and achievement in 50 states. They concluded that increasing integration of English language learners with native English speakers would be the most effective thing policymakers could do to improve overall achievement of English language learners. Rumberger

and Tran find that the degree of segregation within a school explains most of the variation in English language learners' achievement. In other words, the more integrated English language learners are with English speakers, the better the English language learners tend to do in school.

\*\*\*

Deborah Sercombe stands amid students opening lunch boxes, eating sandwiches and munching on chips in the din of the school cafeteria. She offers a simple and obvious but necessary observation:

"You enable those friendships, you enable integration by putting kids together," she says. "You put kids together in classrooms, and just like this, right here, you put them together just eating lunch. You get them working together with equal status, throughout the day every day. That's the foundation right there." □

(FISHER: Cont. from page 5)

environment in which African Americans do not --

*Chief Justice Roberts:* When—how am I supposed to decide whether you have an environment within particular minorities who don't feel isolated?

*Mr. Garre:* Your Honor, part of this is a— is a judgment that the admi

*Chief Justice Roberts:* So, I see— when you tell me, that's good enough.

The Chief Justice's questions make a mockery of the thoughtful words of Justice O'Connor in *Grutter*, which reflect directly Justice Powell's reason-

ing in *Bakke*: "Our conclusion that the Law School has a compelling interest in a diverse student body is informed by our view that attaining a diverse student body is at the heart of the Law School's proper institutional mission, and that 'good faith' on the part of a university is 'presumed,' absent "a showing to the contrary.") .

\* \* \*

From a perspective of viewer in the gallery who is of the view that UT's plan should be upheld as consistent with *Grutter*, perhaps the highlight of

the argument was the final words of Solicitor General Verrilli: "I think it is important, Your Honors, not just to the government, but to the country, that our universities have the flexibility to shape their environments and their educational experience to make a reality of the principle that Justice Kennedy has identified in, that our strength comes from people of different races, different creeds, different cultures, uniting in a commitment to freedom, and to a more perfect union. That's what the University of Texas is trying to do with its admissions policy, and it should be upheld." □

# 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 (45¢ 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

- **What's the Matter With White People? Longing for a Golden Age That Never Was**, by Joan Walsh (261 pp., 2012, \$25.95), has been published by John Wiley & Sons. [13648]
- **Controversy Over Pew Research Center Report on Asian Americans:** Criticized for being "highly biased" and "damaging" by leading scholars; a June 25, 2012 Press Release detailing these objections is available from (PRRAC Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. member) Paul Ong, [pmong.ucla.edu](mailto:pmong.ucla.edu) and Melanie De La Cruz-Viesca, 310/206-7738. [13649]
- **Charles H. Houston: An Interdisciplinary Study of Civil Rights Lawyers**, ed. James L. Conyers, Jr. (302 pp.,

July 2012, \$75), has been published by Lexington Books. Included in the essays are those by PRRAC Bd. member John Brittain & Howard U. Law Prof. Derek Black (author of the article on Middle-Income Peers in the May/June 2012 P&R). [13650]

- **"The Racial Impact of Voter Identification Laws in the 2012 Election,"** by Jon C. Rogowski & Cathy J. Cohen (21 pp., mid-2012), is available (possibly free) from The Black Youth Project, <http://www.blackyouthproject.com> [13651]
- **"Title VI Enforcement Rights"** is a July 2012 publication of the U.S. Dept. of Education Office of Civil Rights, available at [www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov) [13652]
- **Racing to Justice: Transforming Our Conceptions of Self and Other to Build an Inclusive Society**, by John A. Powell, a PRRAC Bd. member (336 pp., Aug. 2012, \$32), has been published by Indiana Univ. Press. [13653]
- **ADC Law Review** is a brand new legal journal from the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm. Guidelines for submissions available from [alyaa@adc.org](mailto:alyaa@adc.org). ADC is at 1900 M St. NW, #610, Wash., DC 20036, 202/244-2990. [13656]
- **Conservatism in the Black Community: To the Right and Misunderstood**, by Angela K. Lewis (160 pp., Dec.

2012), has been published by Routledge. [13673]

- **"Ensuring that the Ladder of Opportunity Remains Strong for the Latino Community"** took place Aug. 7, 2012 at The Center for American Progress. Among the speakers was Labor Sec. Hilda Solis. Inf. from [events@americanprogress.org](mailto:events@americanprogress.org) [13655]
- **The Institute of American Cultures** is holding its inaugural conference, "Super diversity California Style: New Approaches to Race, Civil Rights, Governance and Cultural Production," **Feb. 28-March 1, 2013** at UCLA. Inf. from PRRAC Bd. member Don Nakanishi, [dtn@ucla.edu](mailto:dtn@ucla.edu) [13676]

## Poverty/Welfare

- **Vibrant Communities** is a poverty reduction program, for across Canada and beyond, organized by Tamarack-An Institute for Community Engagement. Contact them at [www.tamarackcommunity.ca](http://www.tamarackcommunity.ca) [13662]
- **Poor Kids** is a new Frontline film on child poverty. Will be shown **Nov. 13, 2012** at the National Press Club in Wash., DC, along with a panel discussion with Ray Suarez and others. Inf. from 617/300-5382. [13663]
- **"Eviction and Reproduction of Urban Poverty"** (46 pp.), by Matthew Desmond, appeared in Vol. 118,

No. 1 (July 2012) of *The American Journal of Sociology* [13644]

## Criminal Justice

- **Unequal Justice: The Relentless Rise of the 1% Court** is a new (2012) documentary from The Alliance for Justice. Contact them at [NAaron@afj.org](mailto:NAaron@afj.org) [13665]
- **"Video Visits for Children Whose Parents are Incarcerated: In Whose Best Interest?,"** ed. Susan D. Phillips (14 pp., Oct. 2012), is available (no price listed) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871, [staff@sentencingproject.org](mailto:staff@sentencingproject.org) [13671]
- **Invisible Men: Mass Incarceration and the Myth of Black Progress**, by Becky Pettit (June 2012, 156 pp., \$29.95), has been published by The Russell Sage Fdn. [13684]
- **"Race, Gender and the School-to-Prison Pipeline: Expanding Our Discussion to Include Black Girls,"** by Monique Morris (23 pp., Aug. 2012), from the African-American Policy Forum, is available at <http://aapf.org/wp-content/uploads/ads/2012/08/Morris-Race-Gender-and-the-School-to-Prison-Pipeline.pdf> [13685]
- **"Race and Juvenile Incarceration Propensity Score Matching Examination,"** by George E. Higgins, Melissa L.

Ricketts, James D. Griffith & Stephanie A. Jirard, appeared in the March 2012 *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. [13693]

- **"Race Influences Criminal Sentences, Research Indicates"** is the heading of an article describing a recent study by David Abrams, using data from Cook County, IL, that appeared in the Aug. 22, 2012 *National Law Journal*. [13694]

- **"Life Sentence in America"** was an Oct. 24, 2012 event, held at the Open Society Fdns. in DC, sponsored by The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871, staff@sentencingproject.org [13669]

## Education

- **"Millions of Students Locked Out of Classrooms"** (Aug. 2012) is available (possibly free) from the National Opportunity to Learn Campaign, 675 Mass. Ave., 8th flr., Cambridge, MA 02139, 617/876-7700. [13642]

- **"The Urgency of Now: The Schott Foundation 50-State Report on Public Education and Black Males"** is available (no price listed) from the Foundation, 675 Mass. Ave., 8th flr., Cambridge, MA 02139, 617/876-7700, www.blackboystrepor.org [13692]

- **"Segregation Prominent in Schools, Study Finds"** was the headline in a Sept. 20, 2012 *NY Times* story, reporting on a new analysis of Dept. of Education data. Author of the study is (PRRAC Soc.

Sci. Adv. Bd. member) Gary Orfield, reachable at the UCLA Civil Rights Project, 8370 Math Sciences Bldg., Box 951521, LA, CA 90095-1521, 310/267-5562, crp@ucla.edu

- **"Digital Strategy for Increasing Access and Opportunity in Rural Schools"** was an Oct. 25, 2012 webinar put on by the Alliance for Excellent Education. Inf. from jamos@all4ed.org [13664]

- **"The Coalition of Essential Schools Fall Forum 2012"** will be held **Nov. 9-10, 2012** at Met School in Providence, RI. Inf. from 740/662-0503, info@forumforeducation.org, www.forumforeducation.org [13678]

## Families/ Women/ Children

- **"Kids Count - 2012 Data Book"** shows that, over a 5-yr. period, economic well-being of children declined, while health & education outcomes improved. The 60-page report is available (likely free) from the Annie E. Casey Fdn., 701 St. Paul St., Baltimore, MD 21202, 410/547-6600, bit.ly/NqXfyf, www.aecf.org [13666]

- **"America's Report Card 2012: Children in the U.S."** (32 pp., Oct. 2012), from First Focus and Save the Children, is available (possibly free) from First Focus, 1110 Vermont Ave. NW, #900, Wash., DC 20005, 202/657-0670. [13668]

## Food/ Nutrition/ Hunger

- **"Hunger and Poverty Hurt African-American Women and Children Fact Sheet"** (2 pp., Feb. 2012) is available from Bread for the World at www.bread.org/what-we-do/resources/fact-sheets/african-american-2012.pdf [13647]

- **"Growing Urban Agriculture: Equitable Strategies for Improving Access to Healthy Food & Revitalizing Communities,"** by Allison Hagey, Solana Rice & Rebecca Flournoy (52 pp., 2012), is available (no price listed) from PolicyLink, 55 W. 39th St., 11th flr, NYC, NY 10018, 212/629-9570.

- **"Survival Pending Revolution: What the Black Panthers Can Teach the US Food Movement,"** by Raj Patel, is a 3-page article in the Summer 2012 *Food First Backgrounder*, available (likely free) from Food First Inst. for Food and Development Policy, 398 60th St., Oakland, CA 94618, 510/654-4400, foodfirst@foodfirst.org

## Health

- **"Safe, Stable Homes Lead to Healthier Children and Families"** are 2 Research Briefs, about Boston and Baltimore, available (possibly free) from Children's Health Care Watch, 88 E. Newton St., Vose Hall, 4th flr., Boston, MA 02118, childrenshealthcarewatch@childrenshealthcarewatch.org [13675]

- **"Addressing Health Disparities Through Civil Rights Compliance and Enforcement"** was a recent webcast from the HHS Office of Civil Rights. It's archived/available at services.choruscall.com/links/hrsa/20919.html [13677]

- **"Health Action 2013"** is Families USA's 18th annual conference, Wash., DC. Inf. from info@familiesusa.org [13658]

## Homelessness

- **"Report on 2010 Census Emergency & Transitional Shelter Programs"** is available via The Bureau of the Census, 301/763-3000. [13681]

## Housing

- **"The Rise of Residential Segregation by Income"** (22 pp., Aug. 2012) is available (possibly free) from Pew Social & Demographic Trends, 1615 L St. NW, #700, Wash., DC 20036, 202/419-4372. www.pewsocialtrends.org [13645]

- **"The State of Fair Housing in Northeast Ohio"** (35 pp., April 2012) is available (possibly free) from Krissie Wells, kwells@thehousingcenter.org, of the Housing Research & Advocacy Center, 3631 Perkins Ave., #3A-2, Cleveland, OH 44114, 216/361-9240. Available as well on their website, www.thehousingcenter.org [13646]

- ***The House We Live In*** skillfully documents the history of housing discrimination and the



role of government & other players in reinforcing residential segregation and unequal investment in communities. (PRRAC Bd. member John Powell appears in it.) Inf. from Calif. Newsreel, 877/811-7495, www.newsreel.org [13672]

- **"Protecting Tenants Displaced by Redevelopment Projects"** was an Oct. 26, 2012 forum at the LBJ School of Public Affairs, part of its Gentrification Series. For this and future Series events: opportunity forum@law.utexas.edu [13683]

## Immigration

- **"Tailoring Place-based Services to Immigrant Families in Portland, Oregon,"** by Molly M. Scott (2012), is available (no price given) from the author, MScott@urban.org and is downloadable at <http://blog.metrotrends.org/2012/08/tailoring-place-based-services-immigrant-families-portland-oregon/> [13635]

- **"Workers' Rights Are Human Rights: South Asian Immigrant Workers in New York City"** (32 pp., July 2012) is a report by Desis Rising Up & the Community Development Project of The Urban Justice Center. Available at [info@drumnyc.org](mailto:info@drumnyc.org) [13638]

- ***The Multicultural Dilemma: Migration, Ethnic Politics and State Intervention***, ed. Michelle Williams (264 pp., Nov. 2012), has been published by Routledge. [13674]

- **"Disentangling Immigration and International Development in**

**the United States,"** by Aaron Matteo Terrazas (Oct. 2012), is available (possibly free) from The Migration Policy Inst., 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, source@migrationpolicy.org [13686]

- **"Refugees and Asylees in the United States,"** by Joseph Russell & Jeanne Batalova (2012), is available (possibly free) from The Migration Policy Inst., 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, source@migrationpolicy.org [13688]

- **"The Immigrant Workforce and the Future of U.S. Policy"** was a July 31, 2012 Forum held at the Brookings Institution's Metropolitan Program. A video of the event, audio and transcript are available from [metro@brookings.edu](mailto:metro@brookings.edu) [13636]

- **"Immigration Enforcement: How Children, Families and Communities Are Impacted"** was a Aug. 20, 2012 event sponsored by The Center for American Progress. Inf. from [events@americanprogress.org](mailto:events@americanprogress.org) [13641]

- **"The 9th Annual Immigration Law and Policy Conference,"** co-sponsored by The Migration Policy Inst., Catholic Immigration Network & Georgetown's Center for Migration Studies, was held Oct. 1, 2012. Inf. from [events@migrationpolicy.org](mailto:events@migrationpolicy.org) [13637]

- **"Rethinking National Identity in the Age of Migration"** was an Oct. 24, 2012 event sponsored by the Migration Policy

Inst. Inf. from [events@migrationpolicy.org](mailto:events@migrationpolicy.org) [13667]

## Transportation

- **"Transporting Black Men to Good Jobs, Transportation Infrastructure, Transportation Jobs & Public Transit"** was a Sept. 26, 2012 event held at the Rayburn House Office Bldg. by The Economic Policy Inst. Inf. from EPI, 1333 H St. NW, #300 E. Tower, Wash., DC 20005, [newsletter@epi.org](mailto:newsletter@epi.org) [13691]

## Miscellaneous

- **"It Has Always Been About Voting"** is a photo exhibit by Robert Brand. Contact him at [rbrand@solutionsforprogress.com](mailto:rbrand@solutionsforprogress.com), 215/701-6102. [13657]

- ***My Storm: Managing the Recovery of New Orleans in the Wake of Katrina (the City in the 21st Century)***, by Edward Blakely (177 pp., 2012), has been published by Univ. Penn. Press. [13659]

- ***Driving Detroit: The Quest for Respect in the Motor City***, by George Galster (328 pp., 2012, \$45 -- but 20% discount available: 800/537-5487), has been published by Univ. Penn. Press [13661]

**arrow Newsletter** is published by Policy Link (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Angela Glover Blackwell). Available at [AmericasTomorrow@policylink.org](mailto:AmericasTomorrow@policylink.org) [13679]

- **"Benefit of Living in High-Opportunity Neighborhood,"** by Margery Austin Turner,

Austin Nichols & Jennifer T. Comey (7 pp., Sept. 2010), is available (likely free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200, [13680]

- **"Millions to the Middle: 14 Big Ideas to Build a Strong and Diverse Middle Class"** is available from Demos, 200 Fifth Ave., 2nd Fl., NYC, NY 10001, 212/633-1405, [info@demos.org](mailto:info@demos.org) [13682]

## Job Opportunities/Fellowships/Grants

- **The Center for Law & Social Policy (DC)** (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Alan Houseman) is seeking a **Development Director**. Resume/writing sample/thoughtful cover ltr. to [ahouse@clasp.org](mailto:ahouse@clasp.org) [13634]

- **The Southern Poverty Law Center** is seeking a **Deputy Legal Director** for its Immigrant Justice Project. Atlanta base. Ltr./salary reqs./resume in one document to <https://home.eea.se.com/recruit2/?id=1968681&C=1> [13689]

- **"Poverty, Inequality & Mobility among Hispanics":** The Stanford Ctr. on Poverty & Inequality, with funds from the Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation of HHS' Administration for Children and Families, will fund up to 5 projects (maximum grant: \$25,000). Proposals due by Dec. 15, 2012 to [inequality@stanford.edu](mailto:inequality@stanford.edu). Further inf. from Alice Chou, 650/724-6912.



---

## Poverty & Race Index, Vol. 21 (2012)

*This Index includes the major articles in the six 2012 issues of Poverty & Race (Vol. 21). The categories used frequently overlap, so a careful look at the entire Index is recommended. Each issue also contains an extensive Resources Section, not in the Index below, but available in database form for all 21 volumes. We can send an Index for any or all of the first 20 Volumes of P&R; please provide a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Articles are on our website, [www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org)*

### Race/Racism

- 642. "Count Them One by One: Black Mississippians Fighting for the Right to Vote," by Gordon A. Martin, Jr., Jan./Feb.
- 643. "Promoting Diversity and Reducing Racial Isolation in Ohio," by Stephen Menendian, July/Aug.
- 644. "Race Reporting in the 21st Century," by Craig Flournoy, July/Aug.
- 645. "View from the Gallery: Oral Argument in *Fisher v. University of Texas-Austin*," by Rachel Godsil, Nov./Dec.

### Poverty/Welfare

- 646. "Criminalization of Poverty," Jan./Feb.
- 647. "Why Don't Vouchers Do a Better Job of Deconcentrating Poverty? Insights from Fieldwork with Poor Families," by Stefanie DeLuca, Philip M.E. Garboden & Peter Rosenblatt, Sept./Oct.

### Education

- 648. "Middle-Income Peers As Educational Resources and the Constitutional Right to Equal Access," by Derek W. Black, May/June
- 649. "What Are We Holding Our Public Schools Accountable For? The Gap Between What is Measured and What is Needed to Prepare Children for an Increasingly Diverse Society," by Amy Stuart Wells, Sept./Oct.
- 650. "Have We Learned Our Language Lesson?," by Susan Eaton, Nov./Dec.

### Homelessness

- 651. "The Criminalization of Homelessness," Jan./Feb.

### Housing

- 652. "Causa Justa :: Just Cause: Multi-Racial Movement-Building for Housing Rights," by Maria Poblet & Dawn Phillips, March/April
- 653. "Lessons from Mount Laurel: The Benefits of Affordable Housing for All Concerned," by Douglas S. Massey, May/June
- 654. "Race and Public Housing: Revisiting the Federal Role," by Richard Rothstein, Nov./Dec.
- 655. "From Urban Renewal and Displacement to Economic Inclusion: San Francisco Affordable Housing Policy, 1978-2012," by Marcia Rosen & Wendy Sullivan

### Immigration

- 656. "The Other Side of Immigration: Humane, Sensible & Replicable Responses in a Changing Nation," by Susan Eaton, March/April
- 657. "One Nation Indivisible," March/April

### Miscellaneous

- 658. "Reshaping the Social Contract: Demographic Distance and Our Fiscal Future," by Manuel Pastor & Vanessa Carter, Jan./Feb.
- 659. "*The Help*," Association of Black Women Historians, Jan./Feb.
- 660. "Fighting Today's Voter Suppression Laws," Jan./Feb.
- 661. "Occupy Wall Street, SLATE & SNCC: Lessons?," by Mike Miller, March/April
- 662. "Social Justice Movements in a Liminal Age," by Deepak Bhargava, May/June
- 663. "The Haas Institute for an Equitable Society," Sept./Oct.
- 664. "A State of Emergency on Voting Rights," Sept./Oct.

---

## **PRRAC'S SOCIAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD**

*Dolores Acevedo-Garcia*  
Brandeis Univ.

*Xavier de Souza Briggs*  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

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

*Stefanie DeLuca*  
Johns Hopkins Univ.

*Ingrid Gould Ellen*  
New York Univ.  
Wagner School of Public Service

*Lance Freeman*  
Columbia Univ. School of Architecture,  
Planning and Preservation

*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 Dept. of Sociology

*Fernando Mendoza*  
Dept. of Pediatrics, Stanford Univ.

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

*Pedro Noguera*  
New York Univ. School of Education

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

*Gary Orfield*  
UCLA Civil Rights Project

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

*Margery Austin Turner*  
The Urban Institute (Wash., DC)

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

*David Williams*  
Harvard School of Public Health

---

**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  
Website: www.prrac.org

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

Address Service Requested

11-12/12

## 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**  
*Haas Institute for a  
Fair and Inclusive Society  
University of California-  
Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA*

### TREASURER

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

### 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*

### Craig Flournoy

*Southern Methodist  
University  
Dallas, TX*

### Damon Hewitt

*NAACP Legal Defense  
and Educational  
Fund, Inc.  
New York, NY*

### 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 Holmes Wood

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

*[Organizations listed for  
identification purposes only]*

### Philip Tegeler

*President/Executive Director*

### Chester Hartman

*Director of Research*

### Megan Haberle

*Policy Counsel*

### Gina Chirichigno

*Co-Director  
One Nation Indivisible*

### Ebony Gayles

*Law & Policy Fellow*

### Michael Hilton

*Law & Policy Fellow*

### Silva Mathema

*Research Fellow*

### Dierra Luckett

*Law & Policy Intern*