Some 25 years ago, James O. Gibson, Director of the Equal Opportunity Program at The Rockefeller Foundation, began a conversation with some of his institutional grantees, including John Powell, then National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, Alan Houseman, then Executive Director of the Center on Law & Social Policy, Florence Roisman, a leading light of the National Housing Law Project, and myself, Director of the Poverty & Justice Project initiated by the NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.’s director/counsel, Julius L. Chambers (and joined the following year by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law).

“Why aren’t you all talking more with each other?” Gibson challenged us. “I fund racial justice challenges under Title VI or Title VII at LDF and poverty-related challenges under federal HUD policies and regulations at the Housing Law Project, yet aren’t many to most of your clients both members of racial minority groups and lower-income?” “Isn’t it clear that they’re trapped both by their poverty and by racial or ethnic discrimination?” “Let me challenge you to bring together, regularly, members of all of the groups who are working on these and similar issues—including issues of gender inequality as they bear on lower-income women and families. You may find new ways to work together.”

The idea was a powerful one, echoing observations of scholars from Gunner Myrdal’s classic study, An American Dilemma (1944) to William Julius Wilson, whose insightful work, The Truly Disadvantaged (1987), was making its powerful case in the late 1980s about the insidious effects of urban poverty on African-American life. The “four founders” mentioned above took Gibson’s challenge seriously and began to conceive an organization comprised of leaders of 20 or 25 national civil rights, civil liberties and legal services groups who would gather at least twice a year to share ideas about “the intersection of race and poverty” and explore together the difficult problems that recurred in that always ill-defined intersection. The organization eventually took the name PRRAC—the Poverty & Race Research Action Council.

The commitment of the organization was always to become more than a semi-annual symposium. Instead, it saw its special role to stimulate and promulgate social scientific research aimed at exploring the “intersection of race and poverty” in ways that might be useful to ongoing advocacy efforts. It therefore early named a Social Science Advisory Board. It also aspired to circulate, in a pre-Internet era, meaningful research findings and legal/advocacy victories that bore on these issues. To give that effort some clout, Gibson granted some not-insignificant Rockefeller Foundation funds to PRRAC to be re-granted to advocacy groups throughout the nation who were pursuing important socio-eco-
cemic and racially integrative ends. Those organizations could apply to PRRAC for $5,000 to $15,000 grants to commission key social scientific studies that could inform their ongoing work.

Adequate that only through a permanent Executive Director might it effectively carry out these ends, PRRAC looked for a learned scholar-leader with deep social justice experience. It had the good fortune to find Chester Hartman, then a Fellow at the Washington, DC-based Institute for Policy Studies, who became PRRAC’s ED for its first fifteen years. Chester became a Washington insider on critical federal executive, legislative and administrative policy issues, a national spokesperson for PRRAC’s issues, and editor of the immensely useful Poverty & Race, the slim journal of opinion, information and bibliography about these issues that brought PRRAC to every corner of the nation.

PRRAC’s Board was a mix of continuity and change. Some of its members have never left the Board; others were replaced by other organizational successors as they moved from positions of leadership in their home organization. Efforts were made to assure that Legal Services members were regularly represented. At different times, representatives from various ethnic and racial justice groups served as members. PRRAC was one of the regular places in which African-American, Asian-American, Latino and occasionally Native-American representatives came together to share developing ideas and strategies. The pull between national-level issues and advocacy and local impact led to repeated efforts to add representatives from different geographical regions and a variety of groups concerned with poverty issues—churches, labor unions, and others.

Three continuing threads in PRRAC’s work have long been: (1) its commitment to attacking structural economic and social forces that perpetuate economic disadvantage for people of color; (2) its concentration on housing and educational policies as manifestations of those structural forces and, consequently, as arenas in which change is necessary; and (3) its belief that racial and socioeconomic integration, over time, are among the most promising strategies toward the goal of equality and justice. PRRAC has also continually pressed federal and state governmental agencies on their need to collect and disseminate data that would allow meaningful examination of the racial and socioeconomic impact of their own policies, and it has occasionally commissioned comprehensive scholarly examinations of federal policy choices that have helped to perpetuate or intensify racial and socioeconomic isolation.

Since 2004, under Philip Tegeler’s exemplary leadership, PRRAC has taken a leading role in national housing and education reform efforts, and has helped to support regional coalition efforts in Baltimore, Hartford and Philadelphia (and a series of research/advocacy grants in the greater Seattle area). More recently, PRRAC has joined colleagues working in the areas of environmental justice, transportation equity, and the housing-health intersection. As its small staff has grown, moreover, and as the digital age has made dissemination of ideas easier, PRRAC’s visibility has risen, though it operates below the radar of most Americans.

Indeed, PRRAC’s behind-the-scenes approach has more than occasionally led its Board members and friends to wonder about the effectiveness of its contributions. Rarely the lead actor in major public or legislative struggles, it has far more often served to remind its racial justice allies of the economic needs and deprivations of their client communities and vice versa, to remind poverty advocates about the racial discrimination that so often colors their clients’ circumstances. Yet in repeated studies of PRRAC’s work by outsider agents and consultants, back has come the confirming word that PRRAC plays a key role and that its “intersectional” mission is unique and highly valued by other active social justice organizations and by well-meaning federal governmental agencies.
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Megan Haberle

In the last week of August, while much of Washington, DC savored the Congressional recess, the United Nations delivered a sharp reminder to the government of the need for action on race discrimination. The U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination issued its concluding observations on the U.S.’s compliance with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), evaluating our nation’s progress and shortcomings in ensuring equality for all regardless of race (link available at www.prrac.org/projects/cerd.php).

The CERD treaty and the observations call for the government at all levels to do more in eliminating discrimination, both by assessing and revising its own programs and actions and by protecting against those of private actors. The concluding observations are issued periodically on a four-year cycle (for the U.S. as well as other state parties to the treaty), following a process in which U.N. committee members review a formal report submitted by the government, as well as shadow reports assembled by civil society, and then engage in briefings and questioning of both government and civil society representatives on the grounds of the United Nations offices in Geneva.

A reading of the observations can be a daunting reminder of the breadth and severity of race discrimination on multiple fronts, spanning criminal justice, environmental justice, education, housing, health, voting rights, and a gamut of other important issues. For those of us who participated in the review in Geneva, the process was both a powerful call for continuing advocacy and an affirmation of the valuable work being done by our civil rights colleagues throughout the country.

Civil Society Makes Diverse Voices Heard; Echoes of Grief from Home

Before the U.S. government’s delegates arrived for their formal consultation with the U.N. CERD Committee, members of civil society—experts and advocates working on a host of racial justices issues, many of whom were organized by the U.S. Human Rights Network—buzzed through the halls of the United Nations, engaging in intense collaboration. Engagement with the Committee members was fruitful but tightly condensed, as nonprofit professionals and directly-impacted victims of discrimination delivered prepared statements and clarified the problems illustrated by their shadow reports. Some of the most poignant of the stories told illustrated the high stakes that can result from racial bias. Trayvon Martin’s mother spoke about the death of her son. In the background, the news from home was also bleak: another shooting death, this time in Ferguson.

For participants, the panoply of issues presented could at times be exhausting. At the same time, the combined effect of the civil society briefings was to illustrate the intertwined and structural nature of race discrimination, including the undervaluing of minority lives and intergenerational access to opportunity.

CERD Questioning Underscores Structural Nature of Discrimination, Importance of Disparate Impact and “Special Measures”

The U.N. CERD Committee’s questioning of both civil society and the government illustrated the centrality of protection from discriminatory effects discrimination as an international norm in securing equality. The assessment of discriminatory effects was fundamental in fielding questions throughout the spectrum of issues (including, as just a handful of examples, access to counsel, criminalization of homelessness, the inadequacy of labor protections for child workers, and voting rights). Similarly, some of the government’s compelling examples of progress toward equality were drawn from its actions to eliminate activities with discriminatory effects, as in its pursuit of fair lending enforcement.

Questions also showcased the continuing need for the government to actively promote racial integration and equality. For example, Committee
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As we mark the 60th anniversary of the Brown v. Board of Education decision this year, promoting racial and socioeconomic integration in our schools remains an uphill battle. Research from the Civil Rights Project at UCLA shows that much of the progress made by legal desegregation was lost after court orders were lifted, and students of color increasingly face “double segregation” in racially isolated schools with high poverty concentrations.

There is so much work still to be done on the first level of integration, addressing disparities among schools, that it is easy to forget about the next frontier: addressing within-school segregation. Schools that look integrated from the outside based on aggregate demographics may be sharply segregated when you look at the classrooms, see who takes part in academic enrichment or support programs, or count the students that are not in the classroom because they have been suspended or expelled.

Remediating this internal segregation in schools and classrooms requires first identifying and understanding the problem. Adding to work on this front from scholars such as Gloria Ladson-Billings and Jeannie Oakes, R. L’Heureux Lewis-McCoy, Associate Professor of Sociology and Black Studies at The City College of New York, makes an important contribution with his new book, Inequality in the Promised Land: Race, Resources, and Suburban Schooling (Stanford Univ. Press, 2014, 232 pp.). The book provides a case study of the ways in which classrooms, schools and districts create unequal pathways to resources for families of different racial backgrounds and socioeconomic statuses. While the study is small-scale, focused on three fourth-grade classrooms in two schools in a single Midwestern district, the patterns and pitfalls Lewis-McCoy uncovers are no doubt common in many locations across the country. The book is a worthwhile read for researchers, stakeholders and activists, who should reflect on ways that other districts may share some of these dynamics of inequality.

A District Divided

Inequality in the Promised Land profiles an unidentified Midwestern suburban school district that Lewis-McCoy dubs Rolling Acres Public Schools. (Individual schools and interview subjects in the book are also given pseudonyms to preserve anonymity.) Rolling Acres has a reputation as a good school district, garnering national academic and extracurricular accolades. It is the kind of school district that families with means flock to when choosing where to live. The district that families with means flock to when choosing where to live. The district spends more than $10,000 per pupil each year, and just 20% of students receive free or reduced-price lunch. The largest racial/ethnic group in the district is white students, at 50% of the student population. Black students are the second largest group, at 15%. (Lewis-McCoy does not provide district-wide demographic data for other racial/ethnic groups.)

Over the past 60 years, the district went through a number of legal challenges and reforms to address de facto racial segregation of schools. The attitude of most white residents in the district, however, is that their schools are now well integrated. As one interviewee put it, “Our [Rolling Acres’] children are in the same classrooms. Children in the same classrooms have the same opportunity to learn” (p. 28).

Most black families, on the other hand, saw things differently. One middle-class black parent explained why her family chose to send their children to private schools instead of the generally well-regarded public schools. In Rolling Acres Public Schools, she declared, “there’s two systems. It’s an apartheid system” (p. 140).

“Same opportunity” or “an apartheid system”? Lewis-McCoy examines the relationships among students, families, teachers, administrators and politicians that yield such different views of the same school district. And from the picture that Lewis-McCoy paints, it is not at all the case that Rolling Acres children are in the same classrooms with the same opportunities. While elementary school classrooms in the district are not systematically segregated by race or class, and there is no ability tracking at that level, students’ opportunities varied according to their backgrounds.

Lewis-McCoy writes that “race and class are conjoined twins in a process of inequality production” in Rolling Acres (p. 172). The effects of race and class showed up in small and large ways in the district. Standardized test scores showed persistent race- and class-based achievement gaps. But most important, Lewis-McCoy argues, are the “gaps in everyday schooling experiences” (p. xi).

Three students who failed to get reading logs signed by parents received different responses and consequences from the same teacher, depending on her assessment of their socioeconomic status and home environment, and whether the families were “legitimately” or “illegitimately” busy. A middle-class black student received free breakfast because school staff mistakenly identify him for the program.
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Recent events make painfully clear the crucial importance of the mission PRRAC was created to achieve. The killing of Michael Brown (and its consequences) in Ferguson, MO and many other contemporary acts and conditions of injustice are toxins alerting everyone who is not willfully deaf to the necessity of addressing the intersections of race and poverty and uniting social science research with advocacy in the service of racial and economic justice.

In 1968, the Kerner Commission, charged with investigating the causes of the riots throughout the United States in 1965, 1966 and 1967, concluded by quoting the testimony of Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, who said:

I read that report . . . of the 1919 riot in Chicago, and it is as if I were reading the report of the investigating committee on the Harlem riot of ‘35, the report of the investigating committee on the Harlem riot of ‘43, the report of the McCone Commission on the Watts riot.

I must again in candor say to you members of the Commission—it is a kind of Alice in Wonderland—with the same moving picture re-shown over and over again, the same analysis, the same recommendations, and the same inaction. (Kerner Cmsn. Report p. 483.)

Tragically, Dr. Clark’s testimony would be equally appropriate today, for anyone reviewing the more than 100 riots in 1968 and those in the following 16 years, with major explosions in Miami (1980), Crown Point (1991), Los Angeles and Harlem (1992), St. Petersburg (1995), Cincinnati (2001), Toledo (2005), and Oakland, CA (2009). The catalysts often are the same: the beating or murder of a Black person by the police and the acquittal of the perpetrators; the underlying causes are those identified by the Kerner Commission in 1968 and utterly disregarded by those who make and enforce policy and law in the United States:

Segregation and poverty have created in the racial ghetto a destructive environment totally unknown to most white Americans.

What white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto, white institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it. (Kerner Cmsn. Report p. 2.)

Residential racial segregation, particularly for African Americans, still is pervasive in the United States; its most extreme form, hypersegregation, prevails where many African Americans live, generally isolated from decent jobs, healthy environments, successful schools, and every other form of opportunity: cultural, recreational, educational and economic. Forty-five years after the enactment of the Fair Housing Act, we rely on individual complaints rather than strategic, institutional enforcement, and federal, state and local governments actively exacerbate segregation rather than try to end it.

From its start, PRRAC has worked to bring research and advocacy together to address problems at the intersection of race and poverty. The lessons must be re-taught and re-learned every day, by every generation. Some of PRRAC’s first projects supported research by Arnold Hirsch, Raymond Mohl, David Freund and others detailing federal insistence on racial segregation in housing programs at least from 1934 into the 1960s. PRRAC supported critically important research into the effectiveness of housing mobility remedies in Baltimore and elsewhere, and played a crucial convening role in the series of housing mobility conferences. PRRAC helps to focus on the grave public health consequences of residential racial segregation.

PRRAC fights a continuing battle against those who ignore the history and the impact of current programs.

(Please turn to page 6)
HUD recently published praise for the Federal Housing Administration: “80 Years Young and going Strong” (HUD PD&R, Message from PD&R Senior Leadership). Outrageously, this proclaimed FHA “one of the Federal Government’s greatest success stories,” ignoring the established judgment, reflected in Kenneth T. Jackson’s classic book, Crabgrass Frontier: “the government’s leading housing agency openly exhorted segregation throughout the first thirty years of its operation.” (p. 213.) As Charles Abrams wrote in Forbidden Neighbors, “FHA adopted a racial policy that could well have been culled from the Nuremberg laws.” (p. 229.) HUD and the Treasury Department continue to push the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program—today’s largest subsidized rental development and rehabilitation program (really, we should call it a pogrom)—which perpetuates segregation and confines poor people of color to high-poverty, low-opportunity, racially impacted neighborhoods. PRRAC has provided research and advocacy support in the effort to end this federally imposed discrimination and segregation.

PPRAC has been fortunate in its brilliant, effective, creative and consistent leadership. As Executive Directors and Director of Research, Phil Tegeler and Chester Hartman have kept everyone’s “eyes on the prize,” and have brought civil rights, anti-poverty and social science experts together for fruitful collaborations. PRRAC’s publications—P&R (this Poverty and Race newsletter), four books, numerous research reports—have been essential tools. The Board has had the remarkable good fortune of being led, for twenty-five years, by the wise, dedicated, calm Jack Boger (who is also the best notetaker known to human history). Board meetings always have been notable for being insightful and inciting participants to new heights of innovation and productivity.

It’s a shame that PRRAC still is needed, but it’s fortunate that PRRAC still exists to promote true inclusion, choice, equality and opportunity.

---

SEGREGATION: Continued from page 4

based on race. All students brought home optional forms soliciting parent input on classroom assignments for the next year, but affluent white families were most likely to return the forms. In one classroom, some of the black families were missing from the parent-run email listserv. Black students were also overrepresented in special education and were more likely to spend considerable portions of their day in separate classrooms for pull-out services. The cumulative effects of these differences created stratified educational opportunities and outcomes for students.

A number of racial and socioeconomic dynamics contributed to these differences in schooling experiences. Middle-class and affluent families hired housekeepers and babysitters to allow them to rearrange schedules in order to take advantage of parent volunteer opportunities and afford time to sort through information about school and extracurricular offerings. And affluent families often held out the threat of exiting the public school system as leverage for getting their child into a particular classroom or program. Social networks were also crucial pathways for finding out information about school opportunities, and these networks were highly stratified by race and class. For example, parents in an affluent, mostly white subdivision circulated a petition to keep their children out of the classroom of an African-American teacher with a bad reputation, while families in other neighborhoods—and a multiethnic family within the subdivision—were left unaware of these efforts. Middle-class and affluent white parents were often able to act as “consumers,” customizing education for their children through frequent feedback and requests, while most black families, including some who were middle-class, were pushed into the roles of “beneficiaries,” with little influence in their children’s schooling.

Affluent white parents were most likely to write letters to the editor, spark local news stories, or advocate for policy changes with school board members. And while some affluent black families would have been well-positioned to contribute to this discussion, Rolling Acres Public Schools’ mixed record of providing strong educational opportunities for black students created a vicious downward cycle that marginalized black voices. Concern about the public schools caused many black middle-class and affluent families to choose private, parochial or charter schools. As a result, the voices of the black middle class were largely absent from advocacy for the traditional district schools. Where they were present, middle-class black voices were less effective when advocates did not themselves have children enrolled in the public schools. As a result, programs targeting disadvantaged students seldom garnered much political support in Rolling Acres.
Restoring Opportunity

While Lewis-McCoy describes in general terms a few potential strategies for addressing educational inequality, and he affirms “this outcome is not inevitable,” the book is heavy on diagnosis and light on cure (p. 94). The conversation shouldn’t stop there. After recognizing symptoms and diagnosing causes of educational inequality within classrooms, schools and districts, the next step is to begin treating the problem with proven strategies.

Lewis-McCoy found that a relentless focus on achievement gaps in standardized tests backfired in terms of promoting equity in Rolling Acres Public Schools. People began to view the gap as intractable rather than motivating, and they saw students rather than schools as failing. “The single most significant gap in Rolling Acres was not the achievement gap,” Lewis-McCoy writes. “It was the gap between the citizens who acknowledged their role and responsibility in contributing to educational inequality and those who did not” (p. 161).

Instead of merely looking at standardized test scores, districts should pay attention to the demographic breakdown of students in different educational services, extracurricular programs and academic tracks, working towards having representative demographics in each slice. The nonprofit organization Equal Opportunity Schools (EOS) provides one strong example for approaching this work. EOS partners with high schools to find the “missing students” in their Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) classes—students of color and low-income students who would rise to the challenge if given access to these high-level courses. EOS helps schools identify these students, build staff support and capacity, and expand their AP or IB programs, with the goal that demographics in these courses reflect demographics of the school as a whole, while exam pass rates remain high. EOS has worked with almost 150 high schools and is continuing to expand. According to EOS founder and director Reid Saaris, San Jose Unified School District, one of their first partners, is now the largest school district in the country to have AP/IB enrollment that fully reflects the racial and socioeconomic diversity of their student body. San Jose more than doubled low-income and Latino participation in AP and IB courses without seeing a decline in percentage of students passing exams.

At the same time that they take a hard look at data on student participation and outcomes, schools can also target and change the specific social and institutional inputs that propagate many of these inequalities in opportunity.

**Most important are the gaps in everyday schooling experiences.**

School actions that may seem race- and class-neutral—such as sending families important information in the mail or establishing parent volunteer hours during the day—can in practice privilege some groups over others. But intentional planning can help replace these power imbalances with more inclusive pathways of participation.

In our book *A Smarter Charter: Finding What Works for Charter Schools and Public Education* (Teachers College Press, 2014, 240 pp.) Richard Kahlenberg and I profile a number of successful charter schools with innovative strategies for enrolling diverse student bodies and promoting equity within the school. At Community Roots Charter School in Brooklyn, New York, for example, school leaders have developed a variety of programs, from strategically grouped play dates to community workshops, designed to create integrated social networks among families. Opening lines of communication between families of different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds may help reduce the information gaps created by homogeneous parent networks like those seen in Rolling Acres. Similarly, at Blackstone Valley Prep Mayoral Academy in Rhode Island, a regional charter network serving urban and suburban communities, the Family Leadership Council (similar to a Parent Teacher Organization) has been co-chaired by one urban and one suburban parent to promote family engagement across backgrounds. At E. L. Haynes Public Charter School in Washington, DC, all staff members take part in a Race and Equity Education Seminar series that goes far beyond cultural sensitivity training to help participants develop the skill, will and courage to fight institutional racism.

Lewis-McCoy’s slender book does not go into detail about these or other methods of promoting equal opportunity and integration at the classroom or program level—nor, perhaps, does it need to. But the danger in focusing on the problem of within-school inequality without giving equal weight to potential remedies is that it risks giving fuel to opponents of school integration policies, who are quick to point out the failings of integrated schools. Rather, integration advocates should be clear from the outset that the goal is integrated schools, integrated classrooms, and equal opportunity for each student—nothing less.
members volleyed multiple questions regarding educational opportunity. Committee members sought to understand the current state of affirmative action jurisprudence, and asked for an explanation of the continuing degree of segregation in primary and secondary schools.

**Concluding Observations a Sharp Call to Action**

The resonance of civil society’s participation in the CERD review permeated the Concluding Observations, which should be viewed as a serious call to action for our government. On both housing and education, the Observations pointedly critiqued the continuing failure to promote racial integration. In both areas, they called for concrete steps, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s implementation of a final regulation on affirmatively furthering fair housing, dedication of increased resources for fair housing enforcement, and the adoption of a comprehensive, timeline-driven plan for school desegregation. Back on American soil, with the Committee’s report in hand, our colleagues working on these and other issues can expect a busy four years until the next review.

---

**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 a 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 (49¢ 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**

- **Waking from a Dream: The Struggle for Civil Rights in the Shadow of Martin Luther King, Jr.**, by David Chappell (2014), has been published by Random House.

- **Within Our Lifetime** is an emerging network of racial equity & racial healing activists. Inf. at www.withinourlifetime.net


**Poverty/Welfare**

- **Centro Voices** is being launched, newly reissued and completely reimagined e-magazine, scheduled to be published twice monthly with essays, fiction, memorias, research, opinion, history, poetry & visual art produced for and about Puerto Ricans on the US mainland.


---

**New on PRRAC’s Website**

Coalition comments on HUD proposed Public Housing Agency Consortium Rule (September 2014)

“Using RAD to Support Access to High-Opportunity Areas” (August 2014)

National Coalition on School Diversity, comments on Department of Education revised diversity priority (July 2014)
• “A bipartisan approach to preventing poverty’s impact and persistence,” by Diana Fishbein, Neil Wollman & Anthony Biglun (Sept. 5, 2014), is available from Prof Wollman, NWOLLMAN@bentley.edu

Criminal Justice


• “Race & Punishment: Racial Perceptions of Crime and Support for Punitive Policies,” by Nazgol Ghandour (Sept. 2014, 40 pp.), is available (no price given) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871, sentencingsproject.org


Economic/Community Development


Education


Employment/Labor/Jobs Policy

• With Liberty and Dividends for All, by Peter Barnes (Berrett-Koehler, 2014), argues that jobs alone can’t sustain a middle class any longer; income must be supplemented by non-labor income.

Environment


Families/Women/Children


• “Growing Number of Dads Home with the Kids: Biggest Increase among Those Caring for Family,”


Health


Homelessness

• “Education of Homeless Students: Improved Program Oversight Needed,” GAO-14-465l July 31, 2014, 65 pp., is available (likely free) from Kay Brown, 202/512-7215, brownke@gao.gov

Housing


Immigration


Miscellaneous


Jobs/Opportunities/Fellowships/Grants

• The Ctr. for Responsible Lending (Durham, NC) is seeking a Policy Counsel and a Policy Associate. Resume/lttr. by Sept. 16 to hiringmanager@selfhelp-org

• The Tufts Urban & Env. Policy & Planning Dept. is hiring a tenure track Asst. Prof. Submit Ltr./c.v./2 representative scholarly pubs./research plan/statement of teaching philosophy/names of 3 refs. to http://apply.interfolio.com/25846

• The Southern Policy Law Ctr. is seeking a Research Analyst to work with its Children at Risk practice group, in either their New Orleans of Montgomery, AL office. Resume/lttr./3 refs. to https://home.eease.com/recruit/?id=1048711

• The Natl. Employment Lawyers Assn. is seeking a Legal & Public Policy Director. DC office, but main one is in SF Bay Area. Resume/lttr. to ED Terisa Chaw, nelahq@nelahq.org

• The Ctr. for the Study of Social Policy (DC, but offices in NYC and LA) is seeking an Assoc. Dir. for Community Change. Resume/lttr./salary reqs./writing sample to jobs@cssp.org – Assoc. Dir. for Comm. Change in subject line.
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