

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

Social scientists and policymakers have long understood the harmful effects that living in high-poverty neighborhoods can have on children and adults. Numerous studies underscore the links between neighborhood disadvantage and a host of social problems, including high school dropout, infant mortality, cognitive difficulties, teenage childbearing and exposure to violence (Sampson et al., 2002; Brooks-Gunn, Duncan & Aber, 1997; Sharkey, 2010; Harding, 2003). These studies show that families living in high-poverty neighborhoods face burdens beyond their individual resource constraints in finding jobs, staying safe and raising children. After falling during the decade of the 1990s, both the number of neighborhoods of extreme concentrated poverty (i.e., those that are 40% poor or more) and the number of people living in such neighborhoods rose during the past

decade, such that 10% of poor people now live in extremely high-poverty neighborhoods (Kneebone et al., 2011).

Starting in the 1990s, the federal government significantly reshaped housing policy to address the problem of concentrated poverty. Recognizing that public housing projects were helping to create very high-poverty environments, Congress authorized the HOPE VI program in 1992. This program provided funding to demolish public housing complexes, in many cases replacing them with mixed-income communities. While these communities reduced poverty concentration by encouraging middle-class and poor families to share the same neighborhood, the HOPE VI program has contributed to a loss of almost one-fifth of the nation's supply of public housing since 1995, and many families who had lived in the projects were unable to return to the redeveloped sites.

The families who did not or could not return to public housing after HOPE VI joined the millions of poor families already participating in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. The Housing Choice Voucher program (formerly Section 8) is the largest housing program in the country, subsidiz-

ing over 2.2 million households, twice the number served by traditional public housing projects (Schwartz, 2010). The voucher program provides tenants with a rent subsidy which they can use to lease any private-market unit costing less than 40-50% of the metropolitan area median rent.

Because vouchers are not attached to specific developments, the HCV program should theoretically work to deconcentrate poverty by allowing poor families to move to more affluent neighborhoods than they would otherwise be able to afford. Yet, despite this potential, voucher holders often struggle to reach low-poverty areas—on the whole, they are no more likely

(Please turn to page 2)

Stefanie DeLuca (sdeluca@jhu.edu), a member of PRRAC's Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd., is Assoc. Professor of Sociology at Johns Hopkins University.

Philip M.E. Garboden (garboden@gmail.com) is a doctoral student in sociology at Johns Hopkins University.

Peter Rosenblatt (peterrosenblatt@gmail.com) is Asst. Prof. of Sociology at Loyola University Chicago.

CONTENTS:

Vouchers and Poverty Deconcentration	1
Public School Accountability	3
Haas Institute for an Equitable Society ..	5
Voting Rights Emergency	5
PRRAC Update	13
Resources	13

(VOUCHERS: *Cont. from page 1*)

to enter low-poverty communities than poor renters who do not receive housing assistance (McClure, 2008). There are also significant racial differences in the program. Minority voucher users are even less likely than whites to be living in low-poverty communities, and the proportion of voucher recipients in such neighborhoods shrinks when recipients are mostly black and unassisted households are mostly white (McClure, 2008; Pendall, 2000). In sum, the Housing Choice Voucher program falls short of its full potential to facilitate moves by low-income families into low-poverty neighborhoods. Why?

Mobile, Alabama Study

To answer this question, we embarked on a multi-year study of family dynamics and housing mobility in Mobile, Alabama. While the story of housing and segregation is well known in larger “rust belt” cities in the Northeast and Midwest, less is known about how these processes play out in smaller cities. While our research site differs from those better known to urban scholars, it shares with these cities familiar patterns of racial segregation, concentrated poverty and the distribution of voucher holders; almost a quarter of the HCV households in the Mobile area live in the highest-pov-

erty neighborhoods in the city. Between 2009 and 2012, we talked annually with over 100 low-income African-American families across Mobile about the places they had lived in the past, their reasons for moving, and their neighborhood characteristics, children, finances and family dynamics. Over the course of the study, we spent hundreds of hours with these families and their children, in their homes and in their communities. In order to get a fuller picture of the factors influencing mobility, we talked

Voucher holders struggle to reach low-poverty areas.

not only to voucher holders, but also to people in traditional public housing, and unassisted renters and some homeowners. Below we describe some highlights from the stories voucher families in our study shared with us about the strategies they use when trying to secure housing, and the challenges that some aspects of the housing voucher program create for them.

Findings

The Time Crunch

The difficulties begin before the families even receive their subsidy. Because the supply of vouchers lags far behind the demand (Rice & Sard, 2009 estimated that only one in four income-eligible families is served by the program), Housing Authorities often maintain waitlists that are thousands of names long. In many cities, the names on the waitlists are so old that administrators have abandoned a “first come, first served” policy and instead select families randomly when turnover vouchers become available.

In Mobile, families told us that their position on the list could change, depending on whether others deemed to be in greater need (such as those in homeless shelters) applied for a voucher, and that the waitlist would

often open and then close, leaving families in the dark about when they could add their name to the list and officially start waiting. This unpredictability made it hard for families to plan for when they might get a call notifying them that their voucher was available. “Strong,” a grandmother who lives in Northwest Mobile, where she helps raise her grandchildren, was at work the day the Housing Authority called to tell her that her waitlist number had come up. When she called back the next day with her paperwork, she was told that it was too late and she had lost her spot. On the whole, the high demand for vouchers means that families often move off of the waitlist seemingly at random, years after they put in an application, and without any time to prepare to move.

Once families receive their voucher, they are limited in the amount of time they have to search for a unit. With such a high demand, Housing Authorities are under pressure to rescind the voucher if a family can’t find another unit in time, in order to let the next person on the waitlist use it. Federal guidelines provide families with a window of 60 days to search for housing, after which time Housing Authorities can decide whether or not to grant users an extension. This limited window created a time crunch among our respondents; for single mothers juggling childcare schedules and erratic work schedules, often without a car, the search time limit created an acute panic for our respondents.

Mothers responded to this time crunch in a number of ways that reduced their chances of ending up in a low-poverty neighborhood. Some relied on their social networks to refer them to a landlord—this common practice eased anxiety about running out of search time and being left without housing, but often meant that families took a housing unit in a poor or segregated neighborhood, because a relative in such a neighborhood saw a “for rent” sign down the street, or were themselves renting from the same landlord. Others, such as “Red Gal,” believed that “all the good places, they

(Please turn to page 9)

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.

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

In 2011, for the first time, less than half of the babies born in the U.S. were white and non-Hispanic. Instead, the majority of newborns were Latino, African American, Asian and/or Native American, a sign that the identity of our nation is changing, as are the social and cultural skills needed to succeed here. In the coming years, when these babies go to school, a public educational system that is now about 54% white, non-Hispanic will be demographically very different from what it was only 35 years ago, when 78% of the students were white, non-Hispanic. How we prepare our children for the society they will inherit needs to be rethought.

The good news is that we know much more today about how best to educate children to thrive in a racially, ethnically and culturally diverse society than ever before. The bad news is that the policymakers who set the legislative and legal agenda in education appear to be paying little, if any, attention to either our new demographic reality or the knowledge base on what to do about it. In fact, for the last few decades, when these policymakers have addressed educational issues, they have mostly focused on testing and school choice—the two primary methods for holding the public schools accountable for better results. But the question that voters, advocates and, most impor-

tantly, parents need to ask is whether the current accountability system reflects the values and needs of our rapidly changing society, not to mention the educational needs of our children.

Evidence That We Need a Broader Focus in Educational Policy

A growing body of social science research explains why racial/ethnic diversity should be an important factor we consider when we are thinking about education policy. First of all, decades of research has shown the positive academic and long-term mobility outcomes for students of color who

The identity of our nation is changing.

attend racially diverse, as opposed to segregated, schools, in part because of the likelihood that they will have access to a more challenging curriculum, better prepared teachers, and more resources in schools that enroll affluent and white students.

Secondly, robust evidence suggests there are multiple short- and long-term benefits for students of all racial and ethnic backgrounds who attend racially diverse schools. In particular, both survey- and interview-based research finds that attending an integrated school has a strong positive effect on students' racial attitudes, cross-racial understanding and comfort levels in diverse settings. Furthermore, this research suggests that such effects are not fully realized until well after the students graduate and enter the workforce, where they are most likely

to interact with people of different cultural backgrounds, races and ethnicities as adults.

Another area of research suggests that racially diverse schools provide the contexts in which educators and students can and often do grapple with cultural differences in a way that will assist all students in grappling with complex issues and exploring deeper meanings. In sync with this research on “socio-cultural” issues in education is an expanding knowledge base among educational professionals who work in diverse schools and classrooms. If this professional knowledge were more widely disseminated, it would be clear that we have many more answers to questions about how to better teach students from diverse backgrounds, drawing on the strengths and insights each brings to the classroom. We also know from the evidence, common sense and parents' intuition that it is essential for the future of our democracy to create racially and ethnically diverse schools and classrooms in which this type of learning may occur.

(Please turn to page 4)

Progressive Planning in the U.S. South

Progressive Planning, the quarterly magazine of Planners Network, the national organization of progressive urban/rural planners and community organizers, is soliciting short (2,000 words max.) essays/case studies on this theme. Send your abstract by mid-October to Pierre Clavel, pc29@cornell.edu

Amy Stuart Wells (Wells@exchange.tc.columbia.edu) is Professor of Sociology and Education and the Director of the Center for Understanding Race and Education (CURE) at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Policymakers, Our Demographic Future and Evidence on What We Should Do About It

Despite significant demographic changes in the U.S. and the mounting evidence about how we might address them in the K-12 public schools, most policymakers, on both sides of the political aisle, are focused elsewhere. They argue that the best way to improve the educational system and close the achievement gap (as defined by standardized tests alone) between white students and students of color is to hold schools accountable for “outcomes” (namely test scores) and offer parents the option to “vote with their feet” if the schools are not performing. That we have been trying these reforms with little measured success for almost 30 years is rarely mentioned. Also ignored is the mounting evidence that newer “school choice” plans, including charter schools and voucher plans, that rarely include transportation for students tend to lead to greater racial segregation. Add to that important research on the negative impact of test-based accountability systems on racially diverse schools. This scholarship shows that as schools are increasingly judged primarily based on narrow outcome data, more diverse schools are regularly deemed to be “worse” than more affluent and predominantly white or Asian schools with higher test scores, despite any dynamic teaching and learning that could be occurring in the more diverse environment.

Indeed, it appears that not only are policymakers ignoring the evidence about how and why they should support creation of more racially diverse schools, many policies they are advocating are, as currently constructed, pushing us in the opposite direction. Rarely—if ever—do current policymakers ponder whether they should be holding public schools accountable for preparing our next multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multi-cultural generation of children to navigate the complexity of

an increasingly diverse society.

Change From the Bottom Up?

Ironically, if you listen to many parents of school-age children—those who were born and raised in a post-Civil Rights era—they seem to know intuitively and intellectually that learning to get along with others of different backgrounds is an important life skill they would like their children to have. They also know that the current educational system, with its mostly racially

Policymakers are paying little attention to our new demographic realities.

and ethnically segregated schools and multitude of standardized tests, is not providing them with many options to achieve this goal.

In fact, a growing number of parents of school-age children in a U.S. public school are bemoaning the number of standardized tests their children take as they travel through different grade levels, developmental stages and subjects of our educational system. There is no escaping standardized tests in U.S. public schools, making our students some of the most “tested” students on the planet.

Meanwhile, our research on parents of school-age children suggests that many are conflicted between doing whatever they can to get their children in schools with high scores (and thus high status) and finding schools that better reflect their values and beliefs about education in a diverse society. Indeed, our center at Teachers College, Columbia University, the Center for Understanding Race and Education (CURE), is conducting cutting-edge research into these issues as they play out in demographically changing communities in both suburban and urban contexts. What we have learned is that today’s parents feel caught between an accountability system that is being imposed on them and their chil-

dren by policymakers and their own understanding of what matters to them as parents as they see the society become increasingly racially and ethnically diverse.

For instance, a recent study Allison Roda and I conducted and will publish next year in the *American Journal of Education* is of one New York City community school district—called “District Q”—that is racially diverse overall but extremely racially divided either at the school or classroom level. At the school level, neighborhood schools are divided by attendance zones that circumscribe racially divided pockets of private apartment buildings and public housing units. Despite the geographic proximity of the public and private housing in this district, the school boundaries, in most cases, lead to more separation between the children who live in the two different types of homes. As a result, almost all of District Q’s white elementary school students were enrolled in only 6 of the 18 elementary schools.

At the classroom level, students enrolled in the few public schools that are more diverse overall tend to be divided into special “gifted and talented” (G&T) versus “general education” classrooms based on testing and an application process that occurs when they are in pre-school. In these more “diverse” schools, G&T and general education classes are remarkably distinct racially and ethnically, with all the white and Asian students in the G&T classrooms and virtually all the black and Latino students in the general education classes. Of the six District Q elementary schools with student bodies that are 22% or more white, three house G&T programs that separate their students in this way.

Walking down the hallways of these schools evokes in researchers and parents alike a sense of racial apartheid. All of the parents we studied were uncomfortable with this within-school segregation. Many parents of school-age children today grew up believing that such stark racial segregation was a thing of the past, and many moved to New York City so that they could

(Please turn to page 12)

The Haas Institute for an Equitable Society

In the Nov./Dec. 2011 P&R, we noted that PRRAC Board Secretary (and founding PRRAC Board member) John Powell had left his long-time position as Executive Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity at The Ohio State University to head the new Haas Institute for an Equitable Society (formerly the Haas Diversity Research Center) at the University of California, Berkeley. P&R editor Chester Hartman was in the Bay Area in April and took the opportunity to interview John about his new work—what follows is a summary of his responses.

Building a Research Institute and an Activist Network

The Haas Institute will have at least seven different research clusters. Each cluster will have two full-time professors—one of them being an endowed

chairholder—plus another 10 professors who will do research around the cluster's themes.

The Institute will explore the similarities and differences between these foci, with a particular attentiveness to the underlying mechanisms that engender marginalization across each cleav-

age and that promote or retard belonging. The Institute will help support the work of each cluster while seeking opportunities to work in a multi- or trans-disciplinary way across clusters to address increasingly complex and intertwined issues holistically. The

(Please turn to page 6)

A State of Emergency on Voting Rights

As the world's leading democracy, our elections should always be free, fair and accessible. This Election Day, however, this core American value is under attack. Some politicians have manipulated the laws for their own gain by passing restrictions that could make it harder for millions of Americans to vote. The people most affected by the new rules are African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, young people, seniors and low-income people. Here's how it is being done:

- **Voter ID Laws:** Passed in 11 states, these laws require voters to present unexpired state-issued photo ID with a current address at the polls. Approximately 21 million Americans lack this ID, including 25% of African Americans and 16% of Latinos (compared to 8% of Whites). These laws also stand to disenfranchise Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, more than four million of whom do not speak English at all or less than very well and will face additional barriers to obtaining required documents.

- **Reductions to Early Voting:** Five states passed laws that reduce early-voting periods, which African-American and Latino citizens are twice more likely to use than Whites. This will make ballot access harder for working people.

- **Purges:** Several states are pursuing purges of registered voters from their voter rolls based on flawed suspicion of their citizenship status. Florida took the lead this year, creating a list of tens of thousands of voters to purge—mostly people of color, almost all of whom turned out to be eligible citizens. Now 13 other states are seeking to do similar inaccurate purges.

- **Disenfranchising People with Felony Convictions:** In 2011, Florida and Iowa joined Virginia and Kentucky as the only states that permanently strip people of their right to vote because of past felony convictions. In Florida, Kentucky and Virginia, the disenfranchisement of ex-offenders affects an astounding one in five African Americans—banned from the ballot box, despite having completed their sentences.

Collectively, we are witnessing the greatest assault on voting rights in more than a century—a true state of emergency. We know that Election Day is a day where we are all equal, whether rich or poor and regardless of race, we all have the same power when we walk into the voting booth. That is why we are fighting back—and we're winning.

As organizations representing communities of color we must strengthen our efforts to protect our right to vote and we must educate and invigorate our communities so we can increase our turnout and therefore amplify our voices.

Supporting organizations: Advancement Project; Applied Research Center; Asian American Justice Center; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Demos; Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies; NAACP; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans; National Council of La Raza; National Congress of American Indians; National Urban League; PICO Network

To find out how you can help these organizations in their efforts, go to www.prrac.org/vote

idea is to both understand and change these cleavages and stratifications in order to build toward a more inclusive society.

Race infuses these cleavages, but it's not just race. Researchers will be looking at race, gender, sexual orientation, immigration, religion, education, health and democratic practices. Race is a part of it, but it's really looking at cleavages in a much broader way.

Given the arrangement of the clusters, we could potentially garner a great deal of research power across the entire University of California system—upwards of a thousand researchers could become involved.

I don't want the clusters to be silos—people working just on sexual orientation or religion. What's the relationship between the two silos? The Institute will foster coherency and collaboration around the foci so that efforts are not siloed.

The Institute's clusters will be part of the hub of a network that will include researchers, community organizers, communication folks, as well as other stakeholders—all in a relationship with each other. This network will develop the necessary leverage that will enable these alliances to address intractable problems and create meaningful change. The hub will help set the research agenda as well as the strategic and communication focus through an iterative, multi-directional process. All of these efforts will be integrated. We will build a table for different sectors to have a voice.

While the research agenda will not be set by the hub, it will be influenced by the hub. Similarly, the strategy and policy directive will not be set by the hub, but substantially influenced by the entire hub and broader network.

The hub and the Institute will conduct and marshal research and other strategic interventions on behalf of the network. Yet the network will also have a role in shaping the agenda.

Ideally, we will be designing an agenda that is relevant and important to organizers, researchers, and to the

most important stakeholders from various communities. This is because they will all have a role in setting the agenda. If the research supports a particular strategy for using the results, there will already be a mechanism in place to use this research outside of academia. These alignments and relationships do not mean that one segment will dictate what another will do, such as particular research questions or a policy strategy, but certainly decisions will be informed by the larger interactions. This alignment will allow the network to scale up and leverage impact on difficult but critical game-changing issues. It will also allow us to direct research attention to issues that matter to communities on the ground, and have general real-world impact.

In addition, we will need a strategy for dissemination and communication—an effective way to move the public discourse. We know that on

We'll be looking at cleavages and stratification in the society.

some issues, it's not enough to have great research or powerful facts that move people; it's power. That is built into the structure from the very beginning. The hub will develop a communication plan that is informed by and in turn informs what the researchers are discovering and the organizers are advocating.

The plan will seek to engage different audiences in different settings, reaching both the explicit and implicit mind. This is especially true as issues become more complex and global. Yet there must be common ground. Our language must reverberate at local and national levels as well. We must make sure we are not having an inside-the-ballpark conversation but know how to communicate outside of our normal network.

The idea is to have an impact. How do you have impact in the world? A couple of things are needed: You have to be able to engage on multiple lev-

els, including upstream. We have to define what we do, not just our area of focus but the nature of the problem. Certainly research and analysis is an important part of this. But it is just a part. There may be times we are responding, but there will also be times we will need to be proactive in designing and creating. You can't do it with research alone, except in limited circumstances. You need to have "a theory of change." One way of thinking about it is that you need organized stakeholders or organizers or community groups. You need organized people who can generate pressure and power and have a different investment in the problems or issues. You need very sophisticated communication at every level—people who analyze how to communicate with audiences that are different from the one you hang around with in your daily practice. And you need to tackle big game-changing issues that affect all of us. If we are serious about changing the world, we have to be engaged in the world—not just in our subject matter or our local community. This does not mean we ignore our area of focus or our community, but rather link them to a more responsive network.

Consider the credit crisis. It is important for virtually every community. Yet many of the important decisions will be made not only outside of a community but also outside of the United States. We have only begun to adjust to the reality that globalization has important ramifications for social justice and inclusion.

The Civil Rights Movement was in part—not entirely, but in part—challenging and opening up public space. Both the Southern reactionaries and the modern Right Wing realized that one way to undermine integration is to divest public space and expand private (and corporate) space. During massive resistance. Southern leaders shuttered public schools and closed public pools rather than integrate. In the modern iteration, the thought is, "Okay, if we lose control of public space and who can be in the public, we'll abandon and attack the public. We'll create private schools, private hospitals, private

prisons.” So, if we lose public space, the language around this space is extremely racialized. The effect of it is to isolate, and ultimately pulverize, the whole country. It is to dissociate and control the racial other.

If we lose the public—it’s not just Blacks and Latinos—but whites who suffer tremendously. It would affect people whether they envision themselves focused on civil rights or whether they are focused on disability rights, immigration issues or something else entirely. We would lose the middle class as well as much of our democracy. The private sphere that the Right Wing offers in its place is not really private and would not be able to support opportunity for much of society. We have to be conscious about the structure of this space.

It will be important for the Institute and network to have some geographic diversity—for example, in the South. We will work with four or five organizations, possibly some unions, as well as stakeholders, who understand that power is important. We will seek to work internationally as well.

The full structure of the Haas Institute and network are in development because these efforts need to be driven by the nature of today’s problems in an increasingly complex, global world. This does not mean that we abandon the local, but that we are able to effectively work at all of the levels demanded by the problems. Think about foreclosures. Foreclosures directly affect our neighborhoods and communities, but cannot be adequately addressed without engaging national banking institutions and the global credit market and understanding how different communities are situated in relationship to this market.

While research is a centerpiece of the Institute, we want to be clear that it’s not just a research center. Some meetings will be situated in communities themselves, instead of everything being located in academic institutions.

With the amount of resources Berkeley and Haas are making available, we have a lot of fire power. But it’s not enough. There are 10 UC campuses—so there’s no reason to limit our

involvement just to UC-Berkeley. But why limit it to just UC, or even to California at all? We should build a network around the country, and eventually around the world. I think of a network as less rigid and formal than an organization, but more embedded and sustaining than a coalition.

What the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund has done is fund the core part of the research at a great research institution, making some of the best researchers in the world potentially available to work on important issues in a coordinated way. We are also seeking support for the communication specialists and the people who are doing policy work who are not on the academic track. My vision is to have the

Organizers and stakeholders should influence research. They should be part of the same table.

best in every field—the best communications people at every level and the best researchers at every level. We want to have as much fire power as possible—maybe not a huge number of people, but people who understand this stuff inside and out. We’ve done that.

Part of it will be trying to convince funders why this is a new paradigm for doing the work. We want to build a network that will help us play big and work at a different level. It is not just doing more research or advocacy, but creating a new paradigm for the work. Although there might be some overlap, I do not see the Haas Institute competing with other organizations. We want to support good work that is already taking place and help to build capacity for something that is largely absent. To do this right, we need a substantial amount of funding for those other two legs. But we also need to be in alignment with other institutions and organized stakeholders in order to have the reach we need. This alignment is more than collaboration and less than a new organization. It is a network, with the Insti-

tute as part of the central hub. We will also need funding for the network itself.

There’s very good data showing, for example, that inequality was largely not on the agenda for most Americans. What Occupy has done is change that. A majority of Americans think inequality is a problem. Occupy is a new movement. For the most part they’re young, and, with some exceptions, they don’t have sophisticated communication. They don’t realize how profoundly related to other movements this is, particularly race, to the environment. So it’s not just about inequality of income. It’s not just about people being rich. It’s actually a distortion of everything we consider important in the country.

Picking “Game-Changing” Issues:

We need to work at every level on hard, important “game-changing” issues. One potential game-changing issue is the role of corporations. That’s a huge issue. It’s a multinational, global issue, and no one current institution has the capacity to deal with it. The Haas network could have that capacity. Working on the issue, however, doesn’t mean just critiquing it. If at the G-20 meeting they are talking about rewriting financial rules, we would have the capacity to bring the best researchers in the world, not only to bear on that issue, but to bear on that issue starting with the sensitivity and interests of communities, the marginal communities—with the capacity to offer alternatives.

My idea is that you then pick three, four, no more than half a dozen issues like that, really big issues.

I like Deepak Bhargava’s lead piece in the May/June 2012 *Poverty & Race*, “Social Justice Movements in a Liminal Age.” I think he’s right about social movements. I think we’re in this fluid space, right? And it’s not just about who wins and who loses. At some point we are going to settle on some kind of structure/norms that will

(Please turn to page 8)

be harder to move away from. I don't know how long this space will stay open—if it's a matter of two years or ten years, but I know it's not forever.

I think this is an incredible opportunity. My own goal is not to, as they say, "build an empire," but to help be part of the movement that creates this different platform so then all the people can take it and run with it.

The Uses of History:

In some respects, our current moment resembles other historical moments, both during and after the Depression and the Gilded Age. Critical institutions were failing to address the needs of society as our economy changed. One of the most radical time periods in U.S. history was under the Populist Movement. What made it radical is that the Populists realized, even then, in the 1880s, that the excessive exercise of corporate power in politics and financial manipulation by Wall Street was endangering the country. These people were not college graduates. These were working-class, itinerant farmers, many of them white, many of them black. Teddy Roosevelt wrote about this. He said, "No state could regulate corporations. They're too fluid and too big, and they needed a federal platform." The equivalent of that today is a global platform.

What the leaders of that movement realized was that in order to actually challenge this concentration of power, they had to do two things. They had to make an attack on the economic structure of the country and the racial structure of the country, and they had to make both of them support each other. So one of the first things they did was come up with anti-lynching laws. The reason the movement dissi-

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

New on PRRAC's Website

"Potential Sources of Funding for Housing Mobility Counseling Programs" (August 2012): this new Policy Brief is excerpted from the forthcoming PRRAC/Urban Institute report and toolkit, *Expanding Choice: Practical Strategies for Building a Successful Housing Mobility Program*.

The National Coalition on School Diversity's "Status Report on Federal Support for School Integration" provides a comprehensive summary of the Department of Education's programmatic and funding support for school integration in nine key program areas, along with budget summaries from 2011-13.

pated is because the conservative elites were able to use race to trump some of the economic interests in the coalition between blacks and whites, and blacks and whites fell apart. However, that movement was successful for a number of years. We've had nothing like it since then. It's interesting— in

Occupy highlights what distorts everything we consider important.

1880, they were attacking corporations; they saw race as being critical, as a way of actually winning. In 2012, we don't see that. In today's environment, corporations can play on a global stage. They can play nations against each other. Nations are in many respects weaker in relationship to corporations. All this makes the task even more difficult than during the Gilded Age.

The Role of Communications:

The work that's been coming out in the last 35 years says that about 98% of our emotional and cognitive processes are unconscious. And the unconscious responds differently to messages and narratives than the conscious. In a sense, it has different language.

One of the keys is understanding how you communicate with the unconscious. Part of this involves develop-

ing analysis or research, identifying who you want to communicate to and the institutional structures that are present, and coming up with a set of communication insights informed by that. We already know a fair amount—so, for example, one thing that makes unconscious communication work is repetition.

Part of what we are trying to do is play upstream and create a different platform—a platform in a sense that we've never quite had—or haven't had in recent history—where you have really good analysis. As I always say, "Analysis is not the same as communication." Neither really good, smart communication nor excellent research can work without power. People understand organizing and power all in alignment together.

I remind my students that W.E.B. DuBois had a very radical analysis that linked race and economics, and that got him kicked out of the NAACP, and got him called a communist. He left the country as a result. Martin Luther King had a very radical analysis that linked race and economics. I think that may have even contributed to his assassination. But clearly, these towering figures at some point got it. And it's interesting because DuBois and King never even got the chance to effectively communicate this analysis to the American people. So we don't realize how much they saw—not only economics and race linked together in a national context, but globally. That perspective is especially necessary today. □

ain't gonna let you on Section 8," and did not attempt to spend their already limited time searching for scarce affordable housing in the less familiar, but more affluent, majority white parts of the city. In addition, like most places in the country, Mobile does not have a source of income protection law, which means that landlords can refuse to rent to voucher families.

Another significant factor that limits the geographic scope of the housing search is "the list," a sheet of available properties and participating landlords given to families by the Housing Authority. This list is notoriously inconsistent—as "Strawberry" explained, "sometimes the house [on the list] isn't even available. The house ain't been fixed up yet. I'll call people, wait on people two or three months, to fix on the house, and they haven't fixed it." In spite of its errors, many people told us the list was their primary resource during the housing search, and some believed (incorrectly) that they were not allowed to use their vouchers at places that weren't on the list. We obtained a copy of the list from the Mobile Housing Authority, and when we geocoded the nearly 200 properties on it, we found that all but nine were in segregated neighborhoods in the city, and only seven were in low-poverty (less than 10% poor) areas.

Keoma's story is especially instructive about how hard it is to find housing in the face of limited information and resources. We took Keoma, a recovering addict trying to escape public housing, to search for units when she was fortunate enough to get her voucher during our field period one summer. Using "the list," the newspaper and our cell phones, we drove Keoma all around the Mobile area, looking at houses on the list and calling at least a dozen others. Despite the benefit of having fieldworkers transport her for eight hours and make phone calls, we could not help Keoma even get a lead on an available unit that day, let alone one in a non-poor area. Most of the apartment complexes them-

selves had waitlists of several years, and the landlords of several other units would never call back to let her know either way. A year later, we found out that Keoma's voucher had expired and she was struggling severely, living paycheck-to-paycheck in a poor-quality, unassisted unit.

Residential Instability

The time crunch is not the only aspect of the voucher program that leads families to make panicked decisions about housing. When we asked families about their residential histories, the most common reason people moved was due to unit failure (DeLuca, Wood

There are significant racial differences in the program.

& Rosenblatt, 2011). These were cases when the housing families were paying for deteriorated to such a degree that they had to move, because the house could not pass the annual voucher inspection. The HCV program requires that all subsidized units be inspected every year, to provide some protection for families, encourage landlords to preserve valuable rental stock, and ensure that federal money is not being spent on uninhabitable places. Yet these inspections were also a major catalyst for mobility among families in our sample, as failing an inspection forced them to make an unplanned move, and again negotiate the voucher time crunch as they searched again for housing (see also Rosenblatt & DeLuca, Forthcoming for similar findings in Baltimore).

"Miss Jones" had lived in more than a dozen places since moving out of a public housing project with her voucher less than ten years ago. She recounted numerous unexpected moves that she and her four sons had to make because housing units they were living in failed inspections. She told us about gas leaks and mold growing on her bedroom walls, conditions that had

forced her to leave prior units and go through the search process again. During one of our visits with her, she had found a place in a northern suburb of Mobile, in a mostly white neighborhood where her children loved the local school and her sons had white friends for the first time. But plumbing problems were causing regular flooding in the house, and disputes with her landlord led him to shut off all power to the house. She contacted the Housing Authority about the problems with her landlord, but in the meantime, in order to make her house livable in the Alabama summer for her asthmatic son, she bought a generator to run an air conditioning unit. She explained to us that:

"I have NO power. I have no way of cooking. I have no way of keeping food cool. I have lost a lot of food because I was thinking I can go to the store and keep the generator [on]. Well, if I run the generator when I leave throughout the day, I still have to turn the generator off [later] to burn less gas. So that means you're leaving your FOOD in the refrigerator that's going to be getting hot and cold, hot and cold. And you going to lose. So we have been living like scavengers. Like refugees. In this house."

A month after our visit, Miss Jones' unit failed inspection. After living in her car while she waited for another place to pass the initial inspection, she moved her family into another apartment, but in a neighborhood outside of the previous school district. She reported that her son in middle school was making his ninth school change since first grade.

Stories of unit failures like these were pervasive through our interviews. We were shown cracks in the walls and windows, and warned to walk around collapsed portions of the floor. Families also gave us tours of their homes to point out evidence of water damage from a leaky roof and the charred walls that resulted from small fires due to electrical problems. Our respondents shared horror stories about waking up with large rats sitting next to them in bed, eating their

(Please turn to page 10)

food or jumping out of cabinets. Roaches crawled up and down the walls and tables of a number of homes we visited, and respondents reported a wide variety of techniques and poisons they employed to try and keep vermin away, many of which created a toxic breathing environment. All of these things contributed to more residential instability.

Even after finding a unit within the voucher search time crunch, families had trouble staying put. Faced with a shortage of affordable housing in Mobile, some families told us how they undertook repair jobs on their own, in order to prevent their unit from failing inspection, or to make sure a unit would pass the initial inspection that would allow them to move in. “Tyra” told us that “I try to fix [the house] myself because...if he don’t fix and fix it right, they go make me MOVE!” She was so worried that she would have to move after reporting housing problems that she preemptively packed up all of her family’s belongings—only to end up staying in the house. Families also talked about withholding rent in a desperate attempt to force landlords to fix up the unit. Yet this strategy was risky—Marie withheld rent and tried to explain to the housing inspector that her landlord “ain’t never come and fix nothing,” but she was terminated from the voucher program for non-payment, and now pays three times as much in rent, which stretches her wages as a part-time nursing assistant.

Lack of exposure to lower-poverty neighborhoods

As noted above, the time crunch experienced by voucher users and the sudden and unpredictable nature of the low-income rental market makes it difficult for families to undertake the thorough search needed to locate quality housing in low-poverty areas. But our interviews in Mobile also revealed how families lack information and

experience with low-poverty neighborhoods and as such do not necessarily view them as part of the “choice set” from which they selected where to live (see also Krysan & Bader, 2007; Rosenblatt & DeLuca, Forthcoming).

Many of our respondents saw the voucher primarily as a way to help them afford housing, and secondarily as a way to “get out of the projects,” or access neighborhoods with better-quality housing. While many differentiated between good and bad neighborhoods in the city, a few of our respondents expressed the belief that it did not matter where you live, or as “Ms. Blues,” a janitor who spent 30 years living in or near public housing, explained, “all neighborhoods are

HUD could also extend the voucher search time, especially for families who are trying to rent the difficult-to-find units in low-poverty neighborhoods.

bad.” This belief is similar to that expressed by low-income respondents in Baltimore, who told us that “it’s not where you live, it’s how you live,” or “we don’t live outside, we live in here” (Rosenblatt & DeLuca, Forthcoming). These attitudes are part of how families manage life in high-poverty, high-crime neighborhoods, both for themselves and their children. It is important to recognize that with this backdrop of limited information and experiences, families are not necessarily inclined to seek housing in more affluent, less segregated areas, especially when faced with the constraints on searching for housing. Without housing counseling or other incentives to help them learn about the potential benefits of a low-poverty neighborhood, families’ default strategies and resources are unlikely to help them escape the pattern of repeated mobility into poor, segregated neighborhoods.

Conclusion

These stories make it clear that families who use the Housing Choice Voucher program face a number of constraints that limit their ability to make a careful, calculated search for housing. Not only do they face difficulties finding affordable housing where landlords will take their voucher in the first place, but with the loud ticking clock on their voucher, they are often forced into desperate and last-minute choices about where to live. Landlord referrals, the Housing Authority’s limited property list and a general unfamiliarity with better-off neighborhoods helped channel families into other poor, segregated neighborhoods (cf. DeLuca, Wood & Rosenblatt, 2011). Under these circumstances, it would be misleading to say that many of the families we studied were affirmatively “choosing” their neighborhoods.

These barriers are reinforced by some aspects of the HCV program’s administration that reduce the capacity and incentive for Public Housing Authorities to implement programs that leverage vouchers to deconcentrate poverty. For example, the way HUD has traditionally chosen to set maximum “Fair Market Rents” (FMRs), at the 40th (or 50th) percentile of overall metropolitan rents, tends to place rental units in many higher-opportunity communities out of reach. Also, HUD’s tool for assessing the annual performance of each Public Housing Authority (PHA) in the country, the Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP), allocates only 10-15 out of 155 total points for efforts relating to deconcentrating poverty, meaning that PHAs have little incentive to build safeguards against further concentrations of poverty into their programs. Furthermore, the balkanized nature of voucher administration, with PHAs often assigned to administer housing programs within a jurisdiction rather than across a metropolitan area (Katz & Turner, 2001), means that families wishing to move between jurisdictions, such as from a center city to a surrounding county,

must go through additional time-consuming steps to arrange for the transfer of their voucher (a few of our families recounted how difficult this was). This process of portability provides little incentive for sending PHAs to encourage families to move to another jurisdiction, even though such mobility can dramatically improve families' chances of accessing housing in less poor, less segregated communities (see DeLuca, Garboden & Rosenblatt, Forthcoming for more details).

While these constraints are daunting, there are policy changes that can directly impact them, some of which are currently under consideration at HUD. We should encourage HUD to strengthen the deconcentration factor in the SEMAP rule, streamline the

portability process, and experiment with smaller area FMR limits (which would set voucher rents by zip code rather than metropolitan area, thus increasing the rent limit in low-poverty areas while decreasing it in high-poverty ones). The findings highlighted here suggest that HUD could also extend the voucher search time, especially for families who are trying to rent the difficult to find units in low-poverty neighborhoods.

There are also a number of special "mobility programs" that have been implemented in several metropolitan areas across the country. These programs, often resulting from desegregation lawsuits, provide counseling to low-income, minority families to help them find housing in low-poverty or

non-segregated neighborhoods. These programs—which include Chicago's Gautreaux program and Baltimore's Thompson program—provide a wealth of knowledge on the benefits and problems associated with helping families overcome the constraints outlined here (see DeLuca & Dayton, 2009; DeLuca, Wood & Rosenblatt, 2011). Our findings and the lessons from mobility demonstrations suggest that a combination of policy revisions designed to help Housing Authorities administer the program more effectively, alongside concerted mobility counseling for families, could open our metropolitan regions for the over 2 million households who use this program to secure housing for themselves and their families. □

Works Cited

- Brooks-Gunn, J. Duncan, G. & Aber, J.L. (Eds.), 1997. *Neighborhood Poverty I: Context and Consequences for Children*. New York: Russell Sage
- DeLuca, Stefanie & Elizabeth Dayton. 2009. "Switching Social Contexts: The Effects of Housing Mobility and School Choice Programs on Youth Outcomes" *Annual Review of Sociology* 35(1): 457-491
- DeLuca, Stefanie, Philip M.E. Garboden & Peter Rosenblatt, Forthcoming. "Segregating Shelter: How Housing Policies Shape the Residential Locations of Low-Income Minority Families" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Special Volume, "Rethinking Urban Disadvantage: The Role of Systems, Institutions, and Organizations" (Mario Small & Scott Allard, Eds.)
- DeLuca, Stefanie, Holly Wood & Peter Rosenblatt, 2011. "Why Poor People Move (and Where They Go): Residential Mobility, Selection, and Stratification" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Las Vegas, NV, August 22
- DeLuca, Stefanie & Peter Rosenblatt, 2009. "Walking Away from *The Wire*: Residential Mobility and Opportunity in Baltimore" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco
- Harding, David J., 2003. "Counterfactual Models of Neighborhood Effects: The Effect of Neighborhood Poverty on Dropping Out and Teenage Pregnancy" *American Journal of Sociology* 109(3): 676-719
- Katz, Bruce J. & Austin Turner, 2001. "Who Should Run the Housing Voucher Program? A Reform Proposal" *Housing Policy Debate* 12(2): 239-262
- Kneebone, Elizabeth, Carey Nadeau, & Alan Berube. 2011. *The Re-Emergence of Concentrated Poverty: Metropolitan Trends in the 2000s*. Washington, DC: Brookings
- Krysan, Maria & Michael Bader, 2007. "Perceiving the Metropolis: Seeing the City Through a Prism of Race" *Social Forces* 86(2): 699-733
- McClure, Kirk, 2008. "Deconcentrating Poverty with Housing Programs" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 74(1): 90-99
- Pendall, Rolf. 2000. "Why Voucher and Certificate Users Live in Distressed Neighborhoods" *Housing Policy Debate* 11(4): 881-910
- Rice, Douglas & Barbara Sard, 2009. *Decade of Neglect Has Weakened Federal Low-Income Housing Programs*. Washington, DC.: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
- Rosenblatt, Peter & Stefanie DeLuca. Forthcoming. "'We Don't Live Outside, We Live In Here': Residential Mobility Decisions Among Low-Income Families." *City and Community* 11(3): 254-284
- Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff & Thomas Gannon Rowley, 2002. "Assessing 'Neighborhood Effects': Social Processes and New Directions in Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443-478
- Schwartz, Alex F., 2010. *Housing Policy in the United States, Second Edition*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Sharkey, Patrick, 2010. "The Acute Effect of Local Homicides on Children's Cognitive Performance" *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 11733-11738.

(DIVERSITY: Cont. from page 4)

raise their children in a more diverse and cosmopolitan city. They did not anticipate choosing among public school programs that resemble those in the deep South prior to the *Brown* decision and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Yet what was painfully clear about the findings to emerge from our study of mostly white and middle- or upper-middle-class parents who were choosing elementary schools for their children in this district is that giving parents only the choice of racially and socio-economically separate and unequal schools and programs despite overall district demographics that are very diverse is basically no choice at all. In other words, the way in which the school choice policies are written, regulated and implemented had huge implications for the kinds of outcomes they foster—both in terms of their short-term effects on school-level racial diversity and their long-term effects on political support for public education. Thus, despite the history of NYC’s public school system, to use the separate and unequal G&T programs to keep white, middle-class families from leaving the public schools, our interview data strongly suggest that more diverse and undivided options would ultimately help keep more of these parents in public, as opposed to private, schools for kindergarten. In fact, there was a waitlist of such parents for the only elementary school in the district that is far more racially and ethnically diverse at both the school and the classroom level

than the other schools in the district.

We believe that public school officials in New York City and elsewhere could learn from our analysis of how white parents in District Q make sense of their school choices. For instance, our findings suggest that it’s not surprising, given the lack of racially diverse schools and programs available in District Q, that these parents struggle with the choices they make. Given their lousy options of putting their children in segregated almost all-white or segregated almost all African-American and/or Latino classrooms, they usually end up making the choice to be with other families like theirs, a choice that reinforces the segregation and inequality.

Given the lack of other options, these race-driven parental choices are logical at some level, especially for white and more affluent parents, given what we know about the relationship between racial segregation, educational inequality and concentrated poverty. If the burden to ending racial apartheid in District Q schools and classrooms is left entirely up to them, it will most likely never happen. Yet when we examine this sense-making in progress, on the ground, we see the missed opportunities in school choice policies that could have tapped into parents’ interest and demand for more diverse, equal and challenging educational environments for their children.

Even small amendments to school choice policies could appeal to white parents’ intuition about the importance of school-level diversity and work against some of the forces that continue to push the system toward more

segregation. But those with the power to make change within District Q and thousands of school districts across this country with racially segregated schools and G&T programs within schools must be open to learning from the parents we studied and their understandings of the missed opportunities for providing better choices for all children within an increasingly diverse society.

Questions our Policymakers Should Answer: Holding Those in Power Accountable

How did we end up with an increasingly diverse society and increasingly racially and ethnically homogeneous public schools? How did our system become one in which students, educators and communities are not held accountable for teaching and learning life skills that a silent majority of Americans know matter in the day-to-day reality of our increasingly diverse society? Why do we have an educational system in which so much time, energy and resources are spent on achieving narrow educational outcomes—e.g., those measured by standardized tests—while ignoring key goals that are important to our children and our future?

While testing students in reading and math skills is not necessarily a bad idea, we need to question whether or not we have gone overboard in terms of the amount of time, energy and resources currently spent on testing, test prep and organizing an educational system around the consequences of test scores. It could well be that the more time our children spend on tests—which only measure some of knowledge we want them to gain by going to school—the less they learn about how to make their way in the real world with the diverse mix of people who will be their future co-workers and fellow citizens. Thus, the central question we should be asking is whether we can hold our policymakers accountable for a different set of results to better meet the challenge and promise of our increasing diversity. □

Parent advocacy for diverse and open schools in NYC: Parents in at least 2 NYC Community School Districts (Districts 1 & 3) have come together to promote more equitable and accessible admissions policies. As part of this organizing effort, parents have created the Community Controlled Choice Project, with the goal of ensuring a fair and equitable way to assign students to public schools, and changing policies that lead to racial and economic segregation and exclusion. This effort is community-based, with leadership from families who have been most marginalized by the system. The Participatory Action Research Center for Education Organizing (PARCEO) and Appleseed NY have partnered with parents in this effort. For more information, see www.parceo.org/what-is-parceo/collaborative-work/community-controlled-choice-project. — *The Editors*

PRRAC Update

● PRRAC Board member **John Powell** has just published *Racing to Justice: Transforming Our Conceptions of Self & Others to Build an Inclusive Society* (Indiana Univ. Press).

● PRRAC Soc. Sci. Advisory Board member **Gregory Squires** has been elected Chair of the Urban Affairs Association.

● PRRAC Soc. Sci. Advisory Board member **Stefanie DeLuca** was recently appointed to a research network at the MacArthur Foundation that focuses on the role of housing in the lives of families with

young children.

● Board Member **S. M. Miller** has completed a book manuscript on *The Fourth Way: Politics, Policy and Persuasion* that moves progressive thinking and action into new directions and actions.

● Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. member **Paul Ong** recently helped prepare a comprehensive Fair Housing report under contract with the State of California. The HUD-required report, "Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing," covers 165 jurisdictions and includes analyses of structural inequality, segregation, and access to

opportunity for different racial and ethnic groups, people with limited English proficiency, people with disabilities, and other protected classes under the Fair Housing Act.

● PRRAC Fellows: With this issue we say goodbye to our 2012 Congressional Hunger Fellow, **Samantha Hodges**, who is moving to the Bay Area to work with the Jewish Coalition for Literacy in San Francisco, and we welcome our new Law & Policy Fellow **Michael Hilton**, a recent Columbia Law School graduate, who will specialize in education policy during his fellowship.

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.

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

● *The Wrong Complexion for Protection: How the Government Response to Disaster Endangers African American Communities*, by Robert D. Bullard & Beverly Wright (304 pp., 2012, \$35), has been published by NYU Press, 212/992-9991, betsy.steve@nyu.edu [13564]

● *Endgame: AIDS in Black America* was a Frontline documentary shown on PBS stations July 10, 2012. [13567]

● *Freeman*, by Leonard Pitts, Jr. (401 pp., 2012, \$16), has been published by Agate Bolden. A very positive review appeared in the July 7, 2012 *Washington Post*, p. C1. [13569]

● *Representing the Race: The Creation of the Civil Rights Lawyer*,

by Kenneth W. Mack (352 pp., 2012, \$35), has been published by Harvard Univ. Press, 617/495-2600. [13581]

● *People Wasn't Made to Burn: A True Story of Race, Murder, and Justice in Chicago*, by Joe Allen (211 pp., 2011, \$22.95), published by Haymarket Books (www.haymarketbooks.org), details the murder of a slum landlord by a tenant whose four children were killed by a fire caused by dangerous conditions the tenant had pressed the landlord to remedy, and the resultant organizing to support the tenant.

● "Segregation Hits Historic Low," by Edward Glaeser & Jacob Vigdor (Jan. 2012), is available (free) from The Manhattan Inst., 52 Vanderbilt Ave., NYC, NY 10017, 212/599-7000. [13583]

● "Lasting Damage in Loan Fallout: Long-term effect on credit scores is feared" was a front-page article in the July 9, 2012 *Washington Post*, pointing out the broad impact credit scores have on automobile purchase, owning a home, financing a college education. If you can't find it on the Internet, we can mail you a copy with a SASE. [13608]

● *Civil Rights Journey: The Story of a White Southerner Coming of Age During the Civil Rights Revolution*, by Joseph Howell (200 pp.), was self-published in 2011. [13618]

● Tougaloo College in Jackson, MS is in the process of funding a Mississippi Civil Rights Movement Chair. Inf. from Jim Loewen, who taught there in the 60s --

jloewen@uvm.edu
[13619]

- **How to Be Black**, by Baratunde Thurston (272 pp., 2012, \$24.99), has been published by Harper Collins. [13626]

- **It Has Always Been About Voting**, by Robert J. Brand, is a limited edition portfolio (48 pp., Heartfield Editions, 2012), containing 22 black-and-white images of the historic Meredith March in 1966 through Mississippi into the state capitol, with quotes that document the conflict over who can vote and who will be excluded since the inception of this country. Available at: www.robertjbrand.com

- **What's the Matter With White People? Longing for a Golden Age The Never Was**, by Joan Walsh (261 pp., 2012, \$25.95), has been published by John Wiley & Sons.

- **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 and Melanie De La Cruz-Viesca, 310/206-7738.

- **Charles H. Houston: An Interdisciplinary Study of Civil Rights Leadership**, ed. James L. Conyers, Jr. (302 pp., July 2012, \$75), has been published by Lexington Books. Included among the essay 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*.

- **"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>

- **"Title VI Enforcement Rights"** is a July 2012 publication of the US Dept. of Education Office of Civil Rights; available at www.ed.gov

- **Racing to Justice: Transforming Our Conceptions of Self and Other to Build an Inclusive Society**, by PRRAC Bd. member John a. powell (336 pp., Aug. 2012, \$32), has been published by Indiana Univ. Press.

- **ADC Law Review** is a brand new legal journal from the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm. Research Inst. Deadline for submissions for first issue is Nov. 5, 2012. Guidelines for submissions (rather complex) available from alyaa@adc.org. ADC is at 1900 M St. NW, #610. Wash., DC 20036, 202/244-2990, www.adc.org

- **"2012 (Veinte Doce): The Latino Election?"** was a July 9, 2012 event, held at and by the New America Foundation. Inf. from Stephanie Gunter, 202/596-3367, gunter@newamerica.net [13597]

- **"Ensuring that the Ladder of Opportunity Remains Strong for the Latino Community"** took place Aug. 7, 2012 at the Center for American Progress. Among speakers was Labor Sec. Hilda

Solis. Inf. from events@americanprogress.org

- **"Facing Race"** is The Applied Research Center's **Nov. 15-17, 2012** conf. in Baltimore. Inf. from ARC, 32 Broadway, #1801, NYC, NY 10004, arc@arc.org

Poverty/ Welfare

- **"The Poverty Issue"** is the theme of the 88-page July/Aug. 2012 *The American Prospect*. Among the authors: Peter Edelman, Harry J. Holzer, (former PRRAC Bd. member) Angela Glover Blackwell, Ron Haskins, (former PRRAC Bd. member) Robert Greenstein, Harold Meyerson. \$5.99 from TAP, 1710 Rhode Island Ave. NW, 12th fl., Wash., DC 20036. [13576]

- **"We don't do banks': Financial Lives of Families on Public Assistance,"** by Rourke L. O'Brian (13 pp.), appeared in the Summer 2012 *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*. [13579]

- **"Rising Share of Americans See Conflict Between Rich and Poor,"** by Richard Morin (Jan. 2012), is available (free) from The Pew Research Center, 1615 L St. NW, #700, Wash., DC 20036, 202/419-4300. [13582]

- **This Week in Poverty** is a regular weekly (Fridays) posting by Greg Kaufmann of *The Nation*. Get items to him at greg@thenation.com; he's contactable at 202/363-1540, 202/550-3633. [13623]

- **Poverty Map**: The Housing Assistance Council has published a large (36" x 24") map of Poverty in the United States, showing every county, persistent poverty, rural/suburban/urban location and other breakdowns. Available (possibly free) from HAC, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, #606, Wash., DC 20005, 202/842-8600, www.ruralhome.org [13587]

- **"Temporary Assistance for Needy Families: Update on Program Performance"** is a June 2012 GAO report: <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-812T> [13622]

- **"Income, Poverty and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2011"** (Sept. 2012), a Census Bureau report, is available through their Public Information Office, 301/763-3030

- **"50 Years Since The Other America: Understanding and Addressing Poverty in the 21st Century,"** organized by Demos, the Georgetown Ctr. on Poverty, Inequality and Public Policy, the Ctr. on Budget and Policy Priorities and *The American Prospect*, took place July 10, 2012 in Washington, DC. Inf. from Demos, 200 Fifth Ave, 2nd fl., NYC, NY 10001, 212/633-1405. [13577]

- **"William Julius Wilson's The Truly Disadvantaged 50 Years Later,"** sponsored by The Century Foundation, will take place **Sept. 28, 2012** in Wash., DC. Among the impressive array of speakers are Claudio Sanchez, Paul Jargowsky, Robert Sampson, (PRRAC Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. member) Stefanie

DeLuca, David Rusk,
Douglas Massey, Kathryn
Edin & Clarence Page.
Inf. from events@tcf.org

Community Organizing

- **"Community Organizing As Job Creator: An Investment That Works For All"** (20 pp., Sept. 2012) is available (possibly free) from Gamaliel, 221 N. LaSalle St., #1320, Chicago, IL 60601, 312/357-2629, www.gamaliel.org
- **"The RTTC [Right to the City] LA Urban Congress"** took place Sept. 12-14, 2012 in Los Angeles. Inf. from tony@righttothecity.org, 323/604-1958. [13574]
- **"Bridges of Solidarity, a celebration of Just Causes"** took place Sept. 20, 2012 at the Islamic Cultural Center in downtown Oakland, CA -- marking two years since the successful merger of Just Cause Oakland and St. Peter's Housing Committee. Inf. from Adam Gold, 510/763-5877, x301. [13586]

Criminal Justice

- **"State-Level Estimates of Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States, 2010,"** by Christopher Uggen, Sarah Shannon & Jeff Manza (21 pp., July 2012), is available (possibly free) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871 [13620]
- **"The Price to Call Home: State-Sanctioned Monopolization In The**

Prison Phone Industry," by Drew Kukorowski (Sept. 2012), is available from the author, 413/527-0845, dkukorowski@prisonpolicy.org

- **"Dollars and Detainees: The Growth of For-Profit Detention,"** by Cody Mason (28 pp., July 2012), is available (possibly free) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871
- **"Unlocking Justice: Felony Disenfranchisement and State-Level Advocacy,"** a Webinar organized by The Sentencing Project, will occur on **Sept. 27, 2012**. Inf. from the Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871. Register at advocacy@sentencingproject.org

Economic/Community Development

- **The Opportunity Finance Network** held its Southeast Regional Meeting/Southeastern Community Development Finance Conference July 18-19, 2012 in Charlotte. Inf. from Donna Fabiani, 202/250-5519, dfabiani@opportunityfinance.net, www.opportunityfinance.net [13588]
- **"The Back-To-The-City Movement and Processes of Political and Cultural Displacement in Washington, DC's Shaw/U Street Neighborhood,"** a presentation by Prof. Derek Hyra of Virginia Tech, will take place **Sept. 25, 2012** at HUD's Brooke-Mondale Auditorium in DC. Inf. from

TuesdaySpeakerSeries
@hud.gov

- **"Resilience and Rebuilding for Low-Income Communities: Research to Inform Policy and Practice,"** sponsored by The Federal Reserve, will be held **April 11-12, 2013** in Wash., DC. Conf. call for papers has an Oct. 1, 2012 deadline. Inf. from Karen Leone de Nie, karen.leonedeniw@atl.frb.org

Education

- **"Developing the Capacity of Faculty to Become Institutional Agents for Latinos in STEM [science/technology/engineering/mathematics],"** by Estela Mara Bensimon & Alicia C. Dowd (20 pp., June 2012), is available (no price listed) from The Center for Urban Education, Univ. So. Calif., WPH #702, Los Angeles, CA 90089, 213/740-5202, rsoecue@usc.edu [13573]
- **"School Desegregation: From Topeka, Kansas to Wake County, North Carolina -- Changing the Path, but Staying the Course,"** by Dana Russo (25 pp.), appeared in the Summer 2012 *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*. [13580]
- **"Unequal Education: Federal Loophole Enables Lower Spending on Students of Color,"** by Ary Spatig-Amerikaner (Aug. 2012), from the Center for American Progress, is available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2012/08/22/29002/unequal-educ...>
- **"Changing Demographics at a Glance"** is a May 2012 brief, available (possibly free) from the Center for Public Education, 1680 Duke St., Alexandria, VA 22314, 703/838-6722, centerforpubliced@nsba.org [13589]
- **"Effective Schools in New Orleans: From Conception to Manifestation,"** by Cornelle D. Carney (4 pp., June[?] 2012), is available (possibly free) from the author at The Gated Community, 400 Park Blvd., #B, New Orleans, LA 70114, 504/383-5099, cornelle.tgc@gmail.com [13599]
- **News You Can Use** is a quarterly compendium of stories about research, curriculum development, policy work and community outreach emanating from Teachers College, Columbia Univ. Contact them at their Office of External Affairs, 525 W. 120 St., Box 308, NYC, NY 10027, 212/678-3412, views@tc.columbia.edu [13605]
- **"Student Mobility: Exploring the Impacts of Frequent Moves on Achievement"** (82 pp., 2010) summarizes a National Academies workshop. Available (possibly free) from Wendy Keenan, The Natl. Academies, 500 Fifth St. NW, Keck-711, Wash., DC 20001. [13610]
- **"Student Voice in Improving Teacher Practice and Student Engagement"** was held July 10, 2012 by and at the Center for American Progress. Inf. from them, 1333 H St. NW, 10th fl., Wash., DC 20005, 202/682-1611. [13596]

- "Spatial Inequality in Boston, Massachusetts: Implications for Neighborhood Schools" was a July 17, 2012 presentation at HUD by Prof. James Jennings of Tufts Univ. Inf. From james.jennings@tufts.edu, 617/627-4625 [13598]

- "Federal Policy Update" was a Webinar, held July 19, 2012, by the Alliance for Excellent Education. Inf. from them, 1201 Conn. Ave. NW, #901, Wash., DC 20036, alliance@all4ed.org [13595]

- "Education Redlining: How Children Across America are Denied an Opportunity to Learn --and What You Can Do" was a July 24, 2012 Webinar held by Opportunity to Learn. Inf. from the Natl. Opportunity to Learn Campaign, 675 Mass. Ave., 8th flr., Cambridge, MA 02139, 617/876-7700, info@otlcampaign.org, www.otlcampaign.org [13614]

- "Stealth Inequities of School Funding: How State and Local School Finance Systems Perpetuate Inequitable School Spending" was a Sept. 19, 2012 event sponsored by the Center for American Progress, 1333 H St. NW, 10th flr., Wash., DC 20005, 202/682-1611, events@americanprogress.org

- "A National Conference on Education for Liberation" will take place June 27-30, 2013 in Salt Lake City. Inf. from www.fmp.org [13629]

Employment/ Labor/Jobs Policy

- "The State of Working America, 12th ed." is available online and in printed form from The Economic Policy Inst., 1333 H St. NW, #300 E. Tower, Wash., DC 20005, www.epi.org

Families/ Women/ Children

- "Growing Up Under a Foreboding Budget Cloud: The Forecast for Government Spending on Children" was an Urban Inst. event, held July 19, 2012. Inf. from PublicAffairs@urban.org [13594]

- "The Implications of Complex Families for Poverty and Child Support Policy" was a Sept. 19, 2012 Webinar put on by the Univ. of Wisconsin Inst. for Research on Poverty. Inf. from 608/262-6358, www.irp.wisc.edu

- "Profiles of Risk: Father Involvement" (6 pp., Aug. 2012), Research Brief No. 10, is available (no price listed) from the Inst. for Children, Poverty & Homelessness, 44 Cooper Square, New York, NY 10003, 212/358-8086, www.ICPHusa.org

Food/ Nutrition/ Hunger

- "Good Food and Good Jobs for All" (34 pp., July 2012), by Yvonne Yen Liu, is available (no price listed)

from the Applied Research Ctr., 32 Broadway, #1801, NYC, NY 10004. [13572]

- "U.S. Department of Agriculture: Progress toward Implementing GAO's Civil Rights Recommendations," an August 2012 GAO report, is available at <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-976R>

- "Interracial Dynamics in Urban Agriculture or (How) Race Matters in Urban Agriculture" is the theme of the April 2013 Assn. of American Geographers conf. in Los Angeles. Abstracts by Sept. 20 to aalkon@pacific.edu and julian.agyeman@tufts.edu. Inf. from the aalkon address.

Health

- "Profiles of Risk: Child Health" is a 4-page, June 2012 Research Brief, available (likely free) from the Inst. for Children, Poverty & Homelessness, 44 Cooper Sq., NYC, NY 10003, 212/358-8086, www.ICPHusa.org [13562]

- "2012 International Conference on Health in the African Diaspora" was held July 5-8, 2012 at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Speakers included Congresswoman Donna Christensen, Gail Christopher of the Kellogg Foundation & poet Sonia Sanchez. Inf. from www.ICHAD.com [13601]

- "The Affordable Care Act: Implications for Public Safety and Corrections Populations," by Susan D. Phillips (14 pp., Sept. 2012), is available (no

price listed) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871

- "The Ethics of Human Subjects: Research With Minority Populations" is an upcoming *Amer. J. Public Health* theme issue. Submissions due by Oct. 12, 2012. Article guidelines/submission instructions at <http://www.ajph.org>

- "National Health Equity Conference," organized by The Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies Health Policy Inst., was held Sept. 5, 2012 in Washington, DC. Inf. from the Inst., 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005-4928. [13571]

- A National Conference on Using Data to Promote Health Equity and Address Disparities will be held Nov. 13-14, 2012 in Silver Spring, MD (right outside DC). Inf. from Kathryn Pettit at The Urban Inst., 202/261-5670.

Homelessness

- *These Storied Streets: Profiles of America's Homeless* is an about-to-be-released documentary produced by Tom Morgan. Inf. from him, 704/236-0324, me@justtommorgan.com, www.justtommorgan.com [13611]

- "Alone Without a Home: A State-By-State Review of Laws Affecting Unaccompanied Youth" (251 pp., Sept. 2012) is available (no price listed) from the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, 1411 K St. NW, #1400,

Wash., DC 20005, 202/638-2535

● **"25 Years After McKinney-Vento: The State of Homelessness and Poverty in America"** was a July 19, 2012 event in Washington, DC, organized by the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, co-sponsored by several other organizations. Inf. from 202/638-2535 [13612]

Housing

● **"Imagining a Right to Housing, Lying in the Interstices,"** by Shelby D. Green (51 pp.), appeared in the Summer 2012 issue of *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*. [13578]

● **"The Housing Assistance Council Annual Report 2011"** (13 pp.) is available (likely free) from HAC, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, #606, Wash., DC 20005, 202/842-8600, hac@ruralhome.org [13585]

● **"Experience of People of Color, Women, and Low-Income Homeowners in the Home Affordable Modification Program,"** by Neil Mayer & Matt Piven (June[?] 2012), is available (possibly free) from the Urban Inst. Metropolitan Housing and Communities Ctr., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200 [13591]

● **"Analyzing Foreclosures Among High-Income Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino Borrowers in Prince George's County, Maryland,"** by Katrin B. Anacker, James H. Carr & Archana Pradhan (28 pp.), appeared in Vol.

39:1 (2012) of *Housing and Society*. [13603]

● **"Predicting the Impact of the Housing Crisis and the 'Great Recession' on the Revenues of the Nation's Largest Central Cities,"** by Howard Chernick, Adam Langley & Andrew Reschovsky (2012[?]), is a working paper available (possibly free) from the Lincoln Inst. of Land Policy, 113 Brattle St., Cambridge, MA 02138-3400, 800/526-3873, www.lincolninst.edu [13609]

● **"Expanding Choice: Potential Strategies for Building a Successful Housing Mobility Program"** is a forthcoming PRRAC/Urban Institute Policy Brief.

● **"What Can We Learn About the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program by Looking at Tenants?,"** by Katherine M. O'Regan & Karen M. Hom (43 pp., July 2012), is available (no price listed) from NYU's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy, New York University, 139 MacDougal Street, 2nd Floor, New York, NY 10012, 212/998-6713.

● **"Housing Can Complement Community Revitalization for Children with Serious Health Challenges,"** by Phillip Tegeler & Salimah Hankins, appeared in the Spring 2012 issue of *Shelterforce*, available from The National Housing Institute, 60 S. Fullerton Ave., #202, Montclair, NJ 07042, 973/509-1600

● **"America's Racially Divided Suburbs: Opportunities & Challenges,"** by Myron Orfield &

Thomas Luce (43 pp., July 2012), is available (no price listed) from the Univ. of Minnesota Law School's Institute for Metropolitan Opportunity, N150 Walter Mondale Hall, 229 S. 19th Ave., Minneapolis, MN 55455, 612/625-8071, www.law.umn.edu/metro

● **"Renters' Tax Credit Would Promote Equity and Advance Balanced Housing Policy,"** by Barbara Sard & Will Fisher (43 pp., July 2012), is available (possibly free) from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Robert Greenstein), 820 First St. NE, #510, Wash., DC 20002, 202/408-1080. [13615]

● **"Investors: The Missing Piece in the Foreclosure Racial Gap Debate,"** by John I. Gilderbloom, Joshua D. Ambrosius (PRRAC Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. Member) Gregory D. Squires, Matthew J. Hanka & Zachery E. Kenitzer, will appear in the Dec. 2012 issue of *Journal of Urban Affairs* -- available now on line. [13616]

● **Under Tents: Housing Rights in Haiti** is dealing with the fact that 2 1/2 years after the massive earthquake there, nearly 400,000 people remain in displacement camps. It is demanding socially just housing policy from their government and support from donor countries. Inf. from Deepa Panchang, deepa.otherworlds@gmail.com, www.UnderTentsHaiti.com [13617]

● *The Encyclopedia of Housing, 2nd ed* has been published by Sage. Editor is Andrew T. Carswell,

and among the 13-member Editorial Advisory Bd. Is PRRAC Research Dir. Chester Hartman. In 2 vols, 928 pp. in all, \$375.

● **"Fostering Equitable Foreclosure Recovery"** is a Jan. 2012 PolicyLink research brief, downloadable at www.nhi.org/go/FosteringEquitableForeclosureRecovery [13627]

● **"Is the Foreclosure Making Us Sick?,"** by Janet Currie & Erdal Tekin, an Aug. 2011 Natl. Bureau of Economic Research study, is available at www.nber.org/papers/w17310 [13628]

● **"Building Community, Building Opportunity: Municipal Guidebook to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing"** (16 pp., 2012[?]) is available (no price listed) from The Oak Park Regional Housing Center, 1041 S. Blvd., Oak Park, IL 60302, 708/848-7150, www.phc.org

● **"The AIDS 2012 International Leadership Summit on Housing"** was held July 21, 2012 at the World Bank in Wash., DC. Inf. from the Natl. AIDS Housing Coalition, 727 15th St. NW, #210, Wash., DC 20005, 202/347-0333. [13590]

● **"From Foreclosure to Fair Lending: Advocacy, Organizing and the Pursuit of Equitable Access to Credit,"** a Sept. 7-8, 2012 conference, was held at John Marshall Law School's Fair Housing Legal Support Center in Chicago, co-sponsored by PRRAC and the George Washington Univ. Dept. of Sociology. Inf. from Michael Seng,

7seng@jmls.edu. A volume of conference presentation essays, co-edited by PRRAC Research Director Chester Hartman and Prof. Gregory Squires of the GWU Soc. Dept. (and a member of PRRAC's Soc. Sci. Advi. Bd.) will be published by New Village Press in 2013. [13613]

Immigration

- "City of Refuge, City of Survival Struggles: Contradictions of San Francisco for Low-Wage Latino Immigrants," by Susanne Jonas, appeared in the Spring 2012 *LASA Forum*. Downloadable at <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/forum/files/vol143-issue2/Debates.pdf> Author reachable at sjonas@ucsc.edu [13624]
- "The Economic Value of Citizenship for Immigrants in the United States," by Madeleine Sumption & Sarah Flamm (19 pp., Sept. 2012), is available (no price listed) from The Migration Policy Inst., 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940
- "Geography of H-1B Workers," a Brookings Institution event, was held July 18, 2012. Inf. from 202/797-6105, events@brookings.edu [13593]
- A Congressional Briefing on Operation Streamline and Private Detention of Immigrants was held by The Sentencing Project on Sept. 13, 2012 at Rayburn House Office Bldg. Inf. from them at 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871
- "Building and Unlocking Immigrant

Skills" was a Sept. 20, 2012 Brookings Institution event. Inf. from events@brookings.edu

- **The 5th Annual Immigration Integration Conference** was held Sept. 22-25 in Baltimore. Inf. from <http://www.intergrationconference.org>

Rural

- "A Commitment to Capacity: 40 Years of Building Rural Communities" (25 pp.) is a report on the Housing Assistance Council Loan Fund, 1972-2012. Available (possibly free) from HAC, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, #606, Wash., DC 20005, 202/842-8600, hac@ruralhome.org [13584]

Miscellaneous

- "A Toolkit for Urban Resilience in Situations of Chronic Violence" (21 pp., 2012) is available (no price listed) from the MIT Ctr. for Internat'l. Studies, 1 Amherst St., E40-400, Cambridge, MA 02139. [13566]
- *Beyond Zucotti Park: Freedom of Assembly and the Occupation of Public Space* has just been published by New Village Press, PO Box 3049, Oakland, CA 94609, 510/420-1361. [13575]
- "Latino Urbanism: Placemaking in 21st Century American Cities" is the theme of a special 2012 issue (Vol. 5, Issue 2-3) of *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*. [13592]
- *The 100 Greatest Americans of the 20th*

Century, by Peter Dreier (408 pp., 2012), has been published by Nation Books/Perseus. [13607]

- *Land of Opportunity* is a 2011 documentary, directed by Luisa Dantas, taking an intimate look at post-Katrina New Orleans. Available at www.landofopportunitymovie.com [13625]

- "Urban Resilience in Situations of Chronic Violence" was a July 11, 2012 presentation (by Diane E. Davis & John Tirman) at the Woodrow Wilson Internat'l. Ctr. for Scholars. Inf. from 202/691-4000, www.wilsoncenter.org [13565]

- "Bullies at the Ballot Box: Protecting the Freedom to Vote Against Wrongful Challenges and Intimidation," by Liz Kennedy, Anthony Kammer, Stephen Spaulding & Jenny Flanagan (23 pp., Sept. 2012), is available (no price listed) from Demos, 200 Fifth Ave., 2nd fl., NYC, NY 10001, 212/633-1405, info@demos.org

- "URBAN" is a new entity, "a diverse network of activist scholars working with community groups." They met on Aug. 19, 2012 at Denver conf. of the Amer. Sociological Assn. Their 8-page concept paper is available at http://www.mit.edu/colab/pdf/work/URBAN_concept_paper_2-0.pdf. Further inf. from Mark Warren, Mark.Warren@umb.edu [13604]

- "Cities Promote Opportunity" was a Sept. 20, 2012 Audio Conference put on by The Center for Law and Social

Policy. Inf. from Jodie@clasp.org

- "The Politics of Voter Suppression: Defending and Expanding Americans' Right to Vote," sponsored by Demos, will be held Sept. 19, 2012 at AFL-CIO hq. in Wash., DC. Inf. from Demos, 200 Fifth Ave., 2nd fl., NYC, NY 10001, 212/633-1405, info@demos.org

- "First Interdisciplinary Leadership Summit: Building Capacity, Building Bridges across Diverse Communities," will be held Sept. 28-29, 2012 at Washington Univ. in St. Louis. Inf. from 314/935-7767, [13602]

Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants

- The US Human Rights Network is hiring a **National Education Coordinator**, based in Atlanta or NYC. Ltr./ resume+ writing samples including resource/ curriculum/workshop agendas you've developed to USHRN, Attn. Job Search Comm., 250 Georgia Ave., #330, Atlanta, GA 30312, rfowler@ushrnetwork.org [13606]
- The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's Office of Fair Lending & Equal Opportunity is hiring for attorney positions in SF, Chicago & DC Hqs. Application inf. from Chris.Vaeth@cfpb.gov

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 Department 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

9-10/12

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 Center for Diversity
& Inclusion
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

Sorisa Lewis

Law & Policy Intern