Volume 17, Nos. 1 & 2 January-February 1989

Special Combined Education Issue

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

Child Care: Building on What Works

Legislation Sponsored by the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee Calls for the Creative Use of Existing Programs

Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights

Study Shows President Reagan Deliberately Abandoned Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and Recommends How to Repair the Damage

Closing the Technology Gap at Black Colleges

A Collaboration Between Ohio State and Central State Universities May Provide a Model for Computer Education at Historically Black Colleges

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Bush and Education: Much Must Be Done

Over the past year, George Bush, first as a political candidate and now as occupant of the White House, proclaimed that he would be an education president. If this is a sincere aspiration, he will be aided by a First Lady who has had a long and genuine interest in eradicating illiteracy. All of this is good because America is in the midst of an education crisis. And that crisis is felt more acutely by black Americans than the rest of the population.

The Department of Education estimates that there are between 17 and 21 million illiterate adults in this country between the ages of 18 and 65. And each year one million high school dropouts are added to that number. Black inner-city youths, many of whom are ill equipped to hold down any but the most menial types of employment, make up a disproportionate number of the illiterate and undereducated.

This is nothing new. It is a situation that certainly existed in 1981 when Ronald Reagan took office. But President Reagan's response was to cut back on college student financial aid and reduce our national investment in other education programs. And all this while Japan and Germany were outdistancing the United States in graduating engineers and specialists in the physical sciences.

Reagan's short-sightedness has cost the nation dearly. Investment in education is essential not only to secure our economic future but to preserve a meaningful democracy based on full citizen participation. Education is also key to resolving the debilitating social problems that face the nation today—drug abuse, crime, and teen pregnancy.

Myopia, however, was not President Reagan's only failing in the field of education policy. As University of Chicago professor Gary Orfield reports in this issue of *Focus*, the Reagan administration deliberately abandoned civil rights laws and court orders that had been designed to improve access to higher education by the nation's minorities.

Two other features on education in this special issue of *Focus* also touch on the nation's educational needs. Congressman Augustus Hawkins, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, discusses his proposed Child Development and Education Act, which would add educational enrichment to child care programs. Another article reports on how Ohio State University is helping Central State University, a black institution, to establish its own academic program in the area of computer imagery. Officials at both institutions are seeking ways to enhance the curriculums at other historically black colleges through similar partnerships in computer technology.

Education at all levels is vital to our national interest. We eagerly anticipate the policies, actions, and, we hope successes of the Bush administration. The new president must undo the damage of past policies and also work to revitalize programs of proven value. Much vision and leadership will be required of him if he is to prove himself worthy of his claim to be "the education president." ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

FOCUS
Copyright © 1989 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights

Study Shows President Reagan Deliberately Abandoned Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and Recommends How to Repair the Damage

by Gary Orfield

Editor's Note: This article is based on the author's recent study of civil rights enforcement in higher education under the Reagan administration. A book based on the study will be published later this year by the Joint Center for Political Studies.

With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the nation made a commitment to open the doors of higher education to all students regardless of their race or income. For a brief time thereafter, in the mid-1970s, a black high school graduate was about as likely as his white counterpart to enroll in college. However, as a result of policies instituted during the two presidential terms of Ronald Reagan, minority access to higher education has declined rapidly.

This occurred even while the number and percentage of black and Hispanic high school graduates were growing and their scores on college admissions tests were rising. Census data show that between 1977 and 1987, black and Hispanic graduation rates rose nine percentage points and two percentage points, respectively. Furthermore, black SAT scores rose 41 points during that period.

Despite these facts, the Reagan administration regrettably chose to reverse established, bipartisan policy by halting federal pressure to increase black access to higher education. With the Bush administration just establishing its own policy priorities, now is an opportune time to assess the damage and consider how the situation can be improved.

Reagan's Retreat From Enforcement

When the civil rights records of the Departments of Education and Justice during the Reagan era are closely examined, a clear pattern of neglect emerges. The Civil Rights Act, long regarded as basic to remedying discrimination in higher education, was not enforced. Washington ignored many states' retreat from the implementation of comprehensive civil rights plans for higher education. Indeed, the federal government publicly praised the "progress" of certain states in spite of documentation proving the contrary.

The way the Reagan White House chose to handle the civil rights cases it inherited from past administrations proved to be emblematic of the policies it would pursue in the area of higher education for minorities. One case from the Carter administration involved the threatened withdrawal of federal aid from the North Carolina state university system for its non-compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. In 1981, then-Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell not only lifted the threat of a funding cutoff but allowed the university to comply with a far less demanding desegregation plan. Bell also expressed his "deep commitment to reducing the extent of federal intrusion in state affairs." Thus, a strong negative signal was sent to America's academic community early in the Reagan administration.

The administration reinforced this negative signal in its disposition of the *Adams v. Richardson* case. Initiated by civil right groups during the Nixon administration, the *Adams* decision of 1970 held that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (and now the Department of Education) must strictly enforce the Civil Rights Act in 10 southern and border states that maintained racially segregated public education systems. The states were required, by 1985, to upgrade instruction at historically black colleges, desegregate predominantly white schools, and integrate the faculties at all institutions in their systems.

Federal courts supervised the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights' (OCR) actions to ensure that the law was being enforced. The Reagan Justice Department, however, opposed the concept of federal court supervision of OCR. And Justice officials requested that the courts dismiss the *Adams* case on the technicality that the civil rights plaintiffs lacked standing, that is, that they were not the appropriate parties to bring the case to court. The Justice Department won a major victory in December 1987, when the federal District Court of the District of Columbia

(Continued on page 4)

Mr. Orfield is a professor of political science at The University of Chicago.

Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights

(Continued from page 3)

concurred and dismissed the case. The plaintiffs are appealing that decision.

Devastating Initiatives

The Reagan administration's own initiatives on civil rights were equally devastating. In 1981, the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division went before the U.S. Supreme Court to ask that tax exemptions be granted to an openly discriminatory institution, Bob Jones University in South Carolina. And in the 1984 *Grove City v. Bell* case, Justice officials argued that civil rights requirements should be limited to individual programs within a school receiving federal funds rather than to the entire institution. Justice lost the Bob Jones case but won on *Grove City,* an outcome that crippled higher education enforcement until 1988. That year, Congress passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act over Reagan's veto, explicitly expanding coverage to entire institutions.

The administration viewed the use of federal power to achieve integration and equal access in higher education as inappropriate interference in the local operations of colleges. Accordingly, statistical evidence of backward movement was ignored in Washington, even as disparities between the college attendance rates of blacks and whites *grew* in several states. In Virginia, for example, the disparity in college-attendance rates between black and white high school graduates jumped from nine percent in 1978 to 21 percent in 1985. But the administration opposed any numerical remedies to discrimination, and criticized measurable goals for integration as "reverse discrimination."

Instead of pursuing vigorous enforcement, the administration assumed good faith and expected colleges and universities to voluntarily comply with the law. Washington even remained blind to the adoption of new state policies harmful to minority access. For example, achievement tests instituted in Florida and Georgia, which screen students who wish to transfer from community colleges to four-year schools, have had negative effects on black student enrollment. Complaints about such policies were either rejected or not acted upon in Washington.

The Triumph of Ideology Over Competence

The Reagan administration also cut back heavily on the resources available to enforce antidiscrimination laws. Between 1981 and 1987, the staff at the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights was cut by one fourth, and the office's fiscal year 1987 budget, after adjusting for inflation, was 40 percent less than its 1980 appropriation. Surprisingly, even with these reductions, the office often *underspent* its budget and returned funds to the Treasury.

In confidential interviews, OCR staff members consistently reported that many of their professional coworkers had resigned from the agency after becoming demoralized by the tactics of Reagan appointees. Regional officials of OCR said they often spent their days filing reports to Washington which they knew would never be acted upon.

Top management of the agency tried to block public scrutiny of its operations. The current head of OCR, Assistant Secretary LeGree Daniels, refused to be interviewed for this study. Agency staff members were ordered not to provide information related to this research on threat of reprisal, and OCR even refused to respond to formal Freedom of Information Act requests. Much of the information for this study, therefore, had to be obtained in confidential meetings with current staff members, from documents obtained from Congress, and from OCR files subpoenaed by civil rights lawyers.

Recommendations

To build a comprehensive strategy for enforcing civil rights in the nation's institutions of higher learning, a number of basic steps need to be taken.

- The federal government must develop a clear set of civil rights standards and requirements for colleges and universities backed by a coherent strategy for enforcing them.
- The OCR needs to rebuild its battered staff and the agency must be provided with adequate funds.
- Enforcement agencies must seek the advice of professionals familiar with the inner workings of colleges and universities. The failure to understand how policies on admissions, faculty hiring, and curriculum are made and implemented has contributed to the failure of enforcement.
- The federal government must strengthen its data collection and monitoring capabilities and establish an effective system for quickly processing and using data on college enrollment and retention, faculty hiring, and other matters relevant to civil rights compliance.
- Finally, the federal government must adopt new procedures to assess the impact of major changes in federal or state policy on minority opportunities in higher education. This includes policy shifts in areas other than civil rights, such as the reduction of remedial programs at state universities and inadequate funding of recruitment and retention programs.

The retention by President Bush of a Hispanic former college president, Lauro F. Cavazos, as his Secretary of Education suggests that the new administration may be interested in changing the tenor of the federal role in education for minorities. Even so, it is vital that Congress use its oversight powers to hold Bush administration officials accountable for enforcing civil rights laws. Positive government action led to great strides in college access for minorities from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s. And experience shows that with a new commitment to enforcement, the pattern of decline in educational opportunity can be reversed and great strides can be made again. ■

January-February 1989

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **Ron Brown becomes the first black chairman of the Democratic National Committee.**
- **Richmond's minority business set-aside program is struck down by the Supreme Court.**
- **George Bush's federal budget proposal sounds kind but might not be gentle to the poor.**
- **Across the Nation looks at coming elections in Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, and Virginia.**

New DNC Chair—Ron Brown, the Negotiator

Widely recognized for his negotiating skills, RONALD BROWN, age 47, is the first black elected to chair a major political party in the United States. Brown won a heavily publicized race by acclamation when 404 members of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) met on February 10.

Replacing **PAUL KIRK** as the party chairman, Brown will primarily be responsible for helping Democrats win elections. He will oversee the whole structure of the DNC—media relations, state party organizations, candidate services, and most importantly, fundraising. He will also oversee activities relating to reapportionment and redistricting and will coordinate party operations in the 1990 and 1992 federal elections.

In his quest to become chair of the DNC, Brown, who describes himself as a "mainstream progressive Democrat," was supported by prominent party liberals, including Sen. **EDWARD KENNEDY** (Mass.), Gov. **MARIO CUOMO** (N.Y.), and 1988 presidential candidate **JESSE L. JACKSON.** This liberal support worries some party conservatives and moderates, especially those from the South, who fear it will move the party to the left. Brown has addressed this issue head on, declaring, "I accept this responsibility beholden to no individual, afraid of no faction, and pledged to no institution except the Democratic party and its members." While Brown's critics asserted that their concerns were not based on race but on political philosophy, the issue of race had been an undercurrent in the campaign for party chair. "I did not run on the basis of race," Brown says in response to this matter, "... but I will not run away from it."

Brown's selection as chair was guaranteed when his chief opponents, **RICHARD N. WIENER,** chairman of the Michigan Democratic party, and former representative **JIM JONES** (D-Okla.) both withdrew their candidacy before the selection meeting.

Brown is not new to politics. A lawyer and lobbyist, he began his public career in the National Urban League under the tutelage of WHITNEY YOUNG and VERNON JORDAN, later serving as the organization's Washington representative. Brown was deputy national campaign manager of Senator Kennedy's 1980 presidential primary campaign against JIMMY CARTER; he served as deputy chairman of the DNC from 1982 to 1985, and as national convention manager for Jesse Jackson in 1988. Since 1981, Brown has been a partner at Patton, Boggs, and Blow, one of Washington's most politically active law firms.

As chair of the DNC, Brown must hold together the traditionally fractious Democratic coalition. And he must help his party expand its slim majority in the U.S. Senate, make sure Democrats come out on top in the redistricting process after the 1990 census, and somehow improve on the party's one-for-six record since 1968 in campaigns for the White House. One of the first items on Brown's agenda is establishing a consensus on what the party *is*. "We, as a party, have to develop a clear definition of ourselves based on traditional Democratic values," he says, "but we must also focus on national defense, crime, and protecting our children from drugs."

Considered by even his critics to be well qualified for the position, Brown is viewed by various party factions as a polished negotiator. Says Brown, "I share the view that our party needs to reach out more effectively to all voters, and as chair my primary goal will be to serve as a unifying force within the party."

Supreme Court Overturns Richmond's Minority Set-Aside Program

In a six-to-three decision, the United States Supreme Court dealt a blow in early February to minority business set-aside programs administered by state and local governments. In *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, the Court overturned a program that the city of Richmond, Virginia, had established in 1983 to remedy discrimination in municipal contracting. The Court decided that for the program to be lawful, it must be narrowly targeted to address proven discrimination within the Richmond area.

The plaintiff in the *Richmond* case was the Ohio-based J. A. Croson Company, the sole bidder for a contract to provide and install plumbing fixtures at the Richmond city jail. Richmond's set-aside plan required prime contractors to subcontract at least 30 percent of the dollar amount of each contract to minority business enterprises. The plan defined a minority business enterprise as a business from anywhere in the country that is at least 51 percent owned or controlled by persons who are black, Spanish speaking, Oriental, American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut.

The Croson Company requested a waiver from the 30 percent requirement, claiming that it could not find sufficient minority businesses to do the work. The city denied Croson's request, and Croson chose to sue the city. Federal district and appeals courts initially upheld the constitutionality of Richmond's set-aside ordinance, citing the Supreme Court's 1980 ruling in *Fullilove v. Klutznick*. In *Fullilove*, the Court had upheld a federal 10 percent minority set-aside law applying to federal public-works contracts, basing its decision on historical evidence of nationwide discrimination.

The Supreme Court agreed to review the case, but rather than making a ruling on its merits, sent the case back to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in July 1986. The lower court was instructed to reconsider the case in light of the high court's *Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education* decision that year. In the *Wygant* decision, the high court struck down a school district's affirmative action plan. On the basis of the *Wygant* case, the appeals court then reversed itself and in July 1987 ruled that the Richmond plan was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the appeals court in its *Richmond* ruling this February.

Defenders of the Richmond plan pointed out that between 1978 and 1983, less than one percent of Richmond's prime construction contracts had been awarded to minority businesses, even though the city is 50 percent black. To justify the plan's constitutionality, they cited the *Fullilove* decision.

However, Justice **SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR,** writing for the majority, drew a distinction between the broad authority of the federal government to use set-asides as a remedy for societal discrimination, as applied in the Fullilove case, and the more limited authority in this area held by states and local governments. The Court has ruled that the federal government has discretion, under the 14th Amendment, to devise remedies in federal procurement programs for historical discrimination against a number of ethnic groups. Nevertheless, the Court majority stated that it is improper for localities to justify set-aside programs on the basis of societal discrimination. State and local governments, it argued, must only address actual discrimination in their own jurisdictions, and their remedies must be narrowly tailored. The Court noted that there was no evidence of past discrimination in Richmond against minorities other than blacks—such as Eskimos and Aleuts—who had been included in Richmond's plan. And the 30 percent requirement was rejected as a "rigid, numerical quota" which did not take into account the actual number of the area's minority construction contractors.

In the dissenting opinion, Justices THURGOOD MARSHALL, WILLIAM BRENNAN, and HARRY BLACKMUN called the majority opinion "a deliberate and giant step backward in the Court's affirmative action jurisprudence," and added that the decision "will inevitably discourage or prevent governmental entities, particularly states and localities, from acting to rectify the scourge of past discrimination." This, they argued, "is the harsh reality of the majority's decision, but it is not the Constitution's command."

As a result, all race-conscious state and local measures designed to redress discrimination will now be subjected to a rigid legal test when reviewed by a court. Approximately 36 states and over 200 local governments now have set-aside programs in place, involving hundreds of millions of dollars. In Washington, D.C., alone, over $200 million is contracted each year to minority businesses through the city's 35 percent set-aside program.

While the Court's decision narrows the standards under which set-asides can be implemented, civil rights advocates and minority business leaders are consoled by the fact that the Court did affirm the right of communities to implement set-aside programs generally—given the appropriate findings of past discrimination.

Meanwhile, in the aftermath of the *Richmond* decision, the cities of Seattle (Washington) and Lakeland (Florida), the state of Delaware, and the school board of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, have fully dismantled their set-aside programs. And in Massachusetts, the Fairview Construction Company has cited the *Richmond* case in its own lawsuit against the city of Boston for being denied a contract.

Minority business leaders insist that the stampede away from affirmative action in state and local procurement is uncalled for. "The wholesale dismantling of set-aside programs by some localities is unnecessary, unwise, and bad public policy," says Anthony W. Robinson, president of the Washington, D.C.-based Minority Business Legal Defense and Education Fund. "The issue now for municipalities is to examine how they can reform existing programs to conform to the guidelines of the Richmond case."

Bush's Budget—Hope or Deception?

When President GEORGE BUSH presented his fiscal year 1990 federal budget before a joint session of Congress on February 9, he certainly conveyed his "kinder and gentler" intentions. His budget message contained requests for new investments in education, child development, Medicaid, and housing, which even impressed Capitol Hill Democrats.

But some congressional critics see Bush's budget as holding out hollow hope. While they welcome his call for new spending in critical domestic programs, they resent the fact that Bush, by failing to spell out his spending priorities, has left to Congress the job of deciding where the sacrifices will be made. They assert that hidden in Bush's proposal to place a "flexible freeze" on spending are cuts in other important social programs. For example, freezing $136 billion in domestic programs at FY '89 levels without allowing for inflation and normal program growth would result in major fund reductions in such programs as the WIC (Women's, Infant and Children) supplementary nutrition program; compensatory education for disadvantaged students; and child welfare services. **President Bush is also being charged, as RONALD REAGAN was, with basing his deficit projections on overly optimistic economic assumptions, underestimating the deficit by as much as $20 billion. (Bush figures the deficit at $95 billion, but the Congressional Budget Office sets the deficit at $115 billion given Bush's budget proposal).** The following summary of selected programs in the president's proposal is based on an analysis by staff members of the House and Senate budget committees:

- **Education.** The president proposes a $411 million increase in budget authority over 1989, primarily for new education programs, which include a Presidential Merit School program, federal support for city magnet schools, a new awards program for teacher excellence, and a National Science Scholars program. He also includes funding for grants to states and school districts to develop alternative teacher certification programs and experiments in educational innovation, as well as endowment matching grants for historically black colleges and universities. However, vocational and adult education, compensatory education, and college student financial assistance would all be subject to funding reductions as part of the president's flexible freeze.
- **Child Care Tax Credit.** A refundable tax credit for child care has also been proposed, equal to 14 percent of parents' wages, for each child under age four up to a maximum of $1,000 per child for families with incomes below $13,000 in 1990. The maximum $1,000 credit would only be available to families with incomes between $7,150 and $8,000 a year.
- **Medicaid.** Bush proposes to mandate Medicaid coverage for mothers with infants and pregnant women living on incomes within 130 percent of the poverty level; he also proposes to provide free immunizations for children through age five whose families are food stamp recipients.
- **Medicare.** He proposes a $5 billion cut for Medicare in 1990. This reduction would be achieved by limiting the increase in payments to hospitals and physicians.
- **Housing and Homelessness Programs. Bush proposes to fund an additional 109,000 housing starts through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, beginning in 1990 and continuing each year through 1994. He also proposes that the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act enacted in 1988 be funded at the authorized level of $746 million, which includes $676 million in discretionary funding. The budget also proposes a new $50 million initiative designed to reduce homelessness.**
- **Social Security.** Bush proposes full funding of Social Security, including a cost-of-living allowance estimated at 3.6 percent for January 1990.
- **Anti-Drug-Abuse Programs.** The president requests $5.97 billion in budget authority for anti-drug-abuse programs in 1990, a net increase of $635 million over the proposed 1989 level. Drug prevention programs would be funded at $1.09 billion, up from $941 million in 1989; and drug treatment would be funded at $735 million, up from $621 million in 1989. Nevertheless, the Bush budget would significantly underfund the new authorizations provided in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.
- **Enterprise Zones.** Bush proposes a new enterprise zone initiative, which would provide selected federal employment and investment tax incentives to economically distressed areas. These incentives would be offered in conjunction with federal, state, and local regulatory relief. Up to 70 zones would be selected between 1990 and 1993. Over the four-year period, the estimated cost of the program would be $1.05 billion.

Across the Nation

An Overview of Coming Elections:

In preparation for 1989 and 1990 campaigns, "Across the Nation" will periodically feature election updates on mayoral, gubernatorial, and congressional races where blacks are potential candidates, or where the black vote may be decisive.

GEORGIA: To fill the mayoral seat that will be vacated by **ANDREW YOUNG**, who is statutorily limited to two terms, Atlantans are preparing for a hotly contested election this October 3. The main contenders are Fulton County Commissioner **MICHAEL LOMAX** and former Atlanta mayor **MAYNARD JACKSON**, now a managing partner of the Atlanta office of the Chicago-based law firm, Chapman and Cutler.

Jackson served two terms as Young's immediate predecessor, making history as the city's first black mayor. Lomax was elected to the county commission in 1978 and has served as commission chairman since 1981. Ironically, Lomax got his start in politics when Jackson appointed him in 1975 to be the city's first director of cultural affairs.

Although early polls reveal that Jackson is the odds-on favorite, some local observers are not willing to write Lomax off. Meanwhile, Young is expected to enter the state's gubernatorial race in 1990.

ILLINOIS: The death of Mayor **HAROLD WASHINGTON** in the first year of his second term has caused the city of Chicago to hold a special mayoral election this year. The primaries are on February 28 and the general election is on April 4. After much wrangling, the once crowded field of contenders for the Democratic mayoral nomination in this predominantly Democratic city has been reduced to two candidates—black incumbent mayor **EUGENE SAWYER**, elected to succeed Washington by the city council in December 1987; and Cook County state's attorney **RICHARD M. DALEY**, the son of deceased city boss **RICHARD J. DALEY.**

Alderman TIMOTHY EVANS, who had opposed Sawyer for mayor in the 1987 selection, has decided to sit out the primary and run as an independent in the general election. Evans, who is also black, is pinning his hopes on Daley winning the Democratic primary, thereby removing Sawyer from the race. This would allow Evans to attempt to capture Harold Washington's coalition, comprising blacks, Hispanics, and progressive whites. This will not be easy since Daley, who is leading in the polls, has worked hard to woo some of these same voters. The main GOP candidate is Herb Sohn, a physician who has run unsuccessfully for Congress.

MICHIGAN: In this year's November mayoral race in Detroit, **COLEMAN YOUNG**, with his already well-financed campaign, is expected to easily win reelection to a fifth term. His principal challenger for the Democratic nomination in the September 12 primary is businessman **TOM BARROWS**, who had received about one-third of the vote when he was defeated by Young in 1985. If Young wins reelection and completes his term, he will extend his record from 20 to 24 years as the longest-serving black mayor of a major U.S. city.

Democratic senator **CARL LEVIN** will be a prime target of the GOP in 1990. Michigan's Republican party will try to convince voters that Levin is too liberal to continue representing the state in Washington. He is indeed one of the most liberal members of the Senate. Levin was a strong supporter of the Civil Rights Restoration Act, and he has backed Rep. **RONALD DELLUMS'** bill calling for a total trade embargo against South Africa and the complete divestment of U.S. corporate holdings there. He is expected to receive the endorsements of civil rights organizations this year, as he did in both his previous election bids.

Several Republicans are considering running against Levin. They include three-term congressman PAUL B. HENRY from Grand Rapids, former astronaut JACK LOUSMA, who opposed Levin in 1984, and three-term congressman BILL SCHUETTE, who represents a rural district in the state's lower peninsula. The Republican party leaders consider Levin vulnerable. He beat Lousma by a slim 52-to-47 percent margin in 1984, and to date he has only raised $200,000. He raised $3 million in 1984, and his own staff believes he may have to double that figure to win in 1990. To repeat his 1984 victory next year, Levin will once again have to win a strong majority of the black vote.

MISSISSIPPI: **DALE DANKS**, the four-term incumbent mayor of Jackson, will face a black challenger for his seat in the Democratic primary on May 2. The challenger, state representative **CREDELL CALHOUN**, currently represents a predominantly black constituency in West-Central Jackson. Calhoun, a former guidance counselor at Jackson State University, was once Danks' administrative assistant and has served in the legislature since 1979.

Calhoun has taken his campaign to the streets, making personal appearances at shopping malls and rallies. "He's a fighter," says **BILL SPELL JR.**, a campaign aide, adding that Calhoun was once a boxing coach for his company in the Marines.

Calhoun will not be Danks' only Democratic challenger. Freshman state representative KANE DITTO, who comes from an affluent white neighborhood of Jackson, will also take on the incumbent and has gotten an early start in fundraising.

Political observers expect a tight race among the contenders. There is growing sentiment among the citizens of Jackson that it may be time for a change. During Danks' administration, the city has experienced serious financial problems and has had to borrow to cover significant budget deficits.

In addition, Danks has begun to alienate many blacks who supported him in the past. For example, some black community leaders feel that he has dealt inadequately with incidents of police brutality in black neighborhoods. Nevertheless, although blacks are nearly a majority of Jackson's population, this may not prove decisive in the election, since only about one-third of the city's blacks are registered to vote. A primary run-off, if necessary, will be held on May 16.

VIRGINIA: Lieutenant Governor **DOUGLAS WILDER** is likely to be picked as the Democratic gubernatorial candidate without opposition at the party's convention in June. If he wins the general election, he will be the first black elected governor in the United States (P.B.S. Pinchback, the only black American to serve as governor, was actually appointed to be acting governor of Louisiana in 1873 and only served for 43 days.)

It remains unclear which Republican Wilder would face in the November election. U.S. representative **STAN PARRIS** of northern Virginia, former U.S. senator **PAUL TRIBLE**, and former attorney general **MARSHALL COLEMAN** (who ran for the office in 1981) are all vying for the GOP nomination. The Republican nominee will be chosen in a June 13 primary.

When Wilder was elected to the state senate in 1969, he became the first black legislator to serve in Richmond since Reconstruction. In 1985, after campaigning around the state in a borrowed station wagon, he was elected lieutenant governor with 51.8 percent of the vote. **Today, off to a strong start, he has already raised $1 million in his race for governor, and he projects that the campaign may eventually cost $5 million.**

Republican U.S. senator **JOHN WARNER** is heavily favored to win reelection in 1990, though he is expected to meet some opposition. Democratic congressman **RICK BOUCHER**, from the 9th District in southwest Virginia, is considered a potential candidate for the seat, as is incumbent Democratic governor **GERALD BALILES.** State law prohibits Baliles from running for a second term in the statehouse. If Baliles runs for the Senate, Boucher may decide to quit the contest. In both statewide races, Virginia's 18 percent black voting-age population will be a significant factor.

Closing the Technology Gap at Black Colleges

A Collaboration Between Ohio State and Central State Universities May Provide a Model for Computer Education at Historically Black Colleges

by Jack R. Marchbanks

The three dimensional image of a complex molecule is rotated on a computer screen. Within minutes, the researcher at the screen sifts through dozens of computer simulations of the molecule. Computer graphics allows him to eliminate hundreds of hypothetical molecular structures that won't be usable. The researcher, at the end of his labors, will have a manageable list of potential compounds that can be chemically synthesized and tested. He will also cut weeks or even months from the time it would have taken to synthesize the multiple structural variations of the molecule in a laboratory, and save perhaps millions of dollars.

Today, specialists skilled in computer graphics and computer-aided imagery are performing tasks like these in laboratories, universities, and high-tech firms across the country. Computer imagery is being used to design pharmaceuticals, to engineer buildings, to forecast natural disasters, and to search for cures for cancer and AIDS.

And while an increasing number of institutions of higher learning are training their students in the computer skills needed to pursue professions in this growing field, few historically black colleges and universities today are equipped to be among them. While eighty of the nation's universities offer two or more levels of computer graphics courses in art, architecture, and design, only two black institutions, Spelman College in Atlanta, Georgia, and Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio, even offer an introductory course in the subject. And neither institution offers a degree major in the field.

Nevertheless, Central State is striving to narrow this technology gap. It has recently teamed up with Ohio State University in a creative partnership designed to establish a computer graphics curriculum at Central State. In addition to training Central State undergraduates, the partnership offers opportunities for graduate study and professional careers. Even though this collaboration is only in its genesis, its founders are already planning to replicate this model at other historically black colleges and universities.

Mr. Marchbanks serves as development consultant to Central State University.

A Unique Collaboration

In January, 1987, the Ohio State University Advanced Computing Center for Art and Design, a national leader in the field, agreed to assist Central State in the creation of its own academic program of computer graphics. To accomplish this goal, Ohio State committed to share its teaching expertise, specialized curriculum, and software.

"I see this partnership as an effective way to train more young people to take advantage of the new career opportunities brought on by the tremendous expansion of the computer graphics industry," says Professor Charles Csuri, the head of Ohio State's Advanced Computing Center and an internationally acclaimed pioneer in computer graphics.

Csuri's counterpart is Willis (Bing) Davis, Chairman of Central State's Art Department. Davis is directing that institution's effort to upgrade its curriculum and train its faculty to establish a free-standing course of instruction in computer graphics and imaging. Courses during this pioneering phase are offered in a workshop format. Next year, a formal academic program will be fashioned to address the university's needs discovered through this year's experience. Meanwhile, members of Central State's arts faculty are participating in a specially designed enrichment program at Ohio State which will enable them to assume responsibility for teaching the courses. Both universities benefit from this reciprocal relationship. Central State is developing a new computer graphics program while assisting with Ohio State's minority outreach by encouraging its own undergraduates to move on to the graduate program at Ohio State's design center.

Expanding Opportunities in a Growing Field

Careers for those trained in computer visual arts are growing annually in a variety of fields. For example, many of the printed and televised graphic and animated images in the United States are either computer-generated or computer-enhanced. But computer-aided imaging goes

(Continued on page 6)

Closing the Technology Gap

(Continued from page 5)

beyond simply serving as an illustrator's tool. The technique now has numerous applications in industry, science, medicine, architecture, and the military. Some examples follow:

- The design of automobile bodies and aircraft fuselages used to require expensive, time-consuming drafting and construction of full-sized three-dimensional models. Today, everything from space shuttles to sailboats is designed through less expensive and more precise computer modeling—in a fraction of the time.
- Technicians at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado, are using supercomputers to predict how the burning of fossil fuels will increase the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and therefore contribute to the widely hypothesized "greenhouse" effect. With the computer's modeling programs, they are sketching a global map on which the areas projected to be warmer, cooler, wetter, and dryer under greenhouse conditions 30 to 50 years from now are vividly illustrated.
- Through the use of digital computer technology, two-dimensional satellite photographs can now be converted into three-dimensional terrain models. This technology enables Pentagon planners to rehearse air combat operations with flight simulators that recreate the surface features of actual locations.

Central State University's founding class in computer graphics has already begun to seek practical applications of newly learned imaging techniques. The school's fledgling Computing Center for the Arts is arranging to assist the University's Department of Manufacturing and Engineering in developing a mechanical hand for NASA needed to perform delicate and dangerous tasks in space. Similar collaborations with the departments of Computer Science, Mathematics, and Music, are also being planned.

The Computing Center's hard-won success, while substantial, is still not sufficient to ensure its future growth. It must capture corporate support if it is to succeed. Bing Davis is negotiating with one of the university's most successful alumni, Joshua Smith, CEO of the Maryland-based Maxima Corporation, to secure donations of additional microcomputers and a high-density visual display monitor for the computer graphics lab. Davis also plans to approach television stations and corporations in the Dayton area for the placement of Central State student interns in computer graphics positions.

Replicating the Model

After nearly two years of conceiving, planning, and getting the partnership under way, the principal figures from the two universities convened a meeting at Spelman College in August 1988 to explore ways to build similar partnerships at other institutions. In attendance were Csuri and Davis as well as representatives from other universities and from Pixar, a major computer graphics software and hardware manufacturer located in California.

VIC:TOR's Founders

The founding members of VIC:TOR who will participate in this summer's strategy conference on how to replicate computer graphics partnerships at other historically black institutions are listed below:

Professor Willis (Bing) Davis–Central State University

Professor Le Roi Porter–Central State University

Professor Charles Csuri–Ohio State University

Professor Thomas Linehan–Ohio State University

Professor Lev Mills–Spelman College

Professor Carl Latimore–Barry College

Mr. George Cagle, manager, customer support–Pixar

The group resolved to work toward eliminating the gap between large, wealthy universities and historically black institutions in all academic disciplines that utilize computer graphics. The group further agreed to develop approaches that other educational institutions, government, and the business community can use to expand educational opportunities for minorities in computer technologies.

Dubbing itself Visualization in Computing: Team Organized Resources (VIC:TOR), the group developed a set of principles to be followed in establishing new partnerships. The following are some of those principles:

- Computer graphics programs should be multidisciplinary and should service several academic departments.
- At the high school and undergraduate levels, educators and business people should stress the proliferating vocational, educational, and professional opportunities in the computer graphics field.
- To assist in the creation of self-sufficient computer graphics programs at historically black institutions, local corporations and major computer graphic firms must be willing to donate or sell at significantly subsidized prices the necessary computer hardware to institutions with limited financial resources.

To advance the goals of replicating the Central State-Ohio State partnership, VIC:TOR is planning a national visualization in computing conference aimed specifically at bringing representatives of 35 historically black institutions together with research, education, and corporate leaders. The conference will be held during the summer of 1989 on either the Central State University or the Ohio State University campus. It is hoped that the growth of computer graphics programs at historically black colleges nationwide will be among the fruits of the conference. ■

Gaye F. Banks, a librarian at the Franklin County (Ohio) Municipal Library, assisted with this article.

Child Care: Building on What Works

Legislation Sponsored by the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee Calls for the Creative Use of Existing Programs

by Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins

In the 100th Congress and during the 1988 political campaigns, child care became a visible national issue. Presidential hopefuls proposed programs, members of the House and Senate debated the merits of establishing a national child care policy, and promises were made to help the millions of working parents find decent, affordable care for their children. As we begin a new Congress and a new administration, the challenge to establish a bipartisan child care policy remains before us (see *Focus,* November-December 1988).

The lack of affordable child care options for working parents is an ongoing crisis, not only for single-parent families but even for households with two wage earners. Today, nearly 60 percent of women with children under the age of six have jobs outside the home, and many of them are single heads of households. Unfortunately, most newly created jobs are in the low-paying service sector, so the average weekly wage of women heading households is falling. And these wages are already inadequate to cover day care costs. Yet the median cost of quality child care for only one child is at least $3,000, an amount that would leave few single mothers with enough income to cover basic living costs.

Aware of these hardships for a large number of American families, and mindful of the fact that the work force of the future will consist largely of women, minorities, and immigrants, Congress is now moving to address the national child care crisis. Last year, more than 100 bills were introduced on child care (none were passed), and this year the House Committee on Education and Labor will be holding early hearings on the Child Development and Eduction Act (H.R.3), which I have sponsored. We expect Congress to take action on child care legislation this spring.

Tax Credits Aren't Enough

For the most part, the Child Development and Education Act would broaden existing law to make child care services available to more families with working parents. The Act would permit existing public educational facilities to be used more creatively and expand successful, cost-effective federal programs including Head Start.

The Act would target resources to the lowest-income families; increase the availability of day care options; offer businesses incentives to provide child care at or near the workplace; and establish minimum federal standards for the operation of care facilities.

This legislation contrasts sharply with President Bush's $1,000 child care tax-credit proposal. (See summary of Bush's budget proposal on page three of *TrendLetter.*) The Bush proposal would help few low-income working families to afford child care, since it would provide only about a third of the real cost of care. Further, the credit would only be available to families at the end of the year and not when they really need it. Nor would the credit expand the number of child care facilities in the country or improve standards.

A New Legislative Approach

The Child Development and Education Act contains three components. Each component would receive equal amounts of funding.

- **Expansion of Head Start.** The centerpiece of the Act is an expansion of the highly effective preschool education program, Head Start, with which the federal government as well as state and local agencies have had more than 20 years' experience. The Act would enable Head Start agencies to extend their programs to full-day operation, thereby helping to meet the needs of working parents of three- and four-year-olds. These programs would also be extended to run during the summer months, effectively transforming Head Start into a full-year educational/child care program.

Another goal is to insure that Head Start serves an expanded number of low-income working parents, while also making the program available to moderate-income families (earning up to $27,450) who would pay fees based on a sliding scale.

A study conducted by the University of North Carolina showed that developmentally enriched day care programs for children of low-income families, similar to Head Start, helped children adapt better to school, increased I.Q. scores, and lowered high school drop-out rates. And according to a 1985 report by the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, for every dollar invested in early childhood development programs, about five dollars are returned in social savings. Children who participate in such programs, the report noted, have improved self esteem, and as adults they will have better chances for employment and be less likely to resort to crime or require public assistance.

(Continued on page 8)

Rep. Hawkins is chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Child Care

(Continued from page 7)

• **School Based Programs.** Millions of children, many of them very young, return home from school every day to empty houses. These youth, known as "latchkey children," are on their own until a parent gets home from work. After-school care is sometimes available, but its cost is usually well beyond the reach of low-income families. Demographic trends point to a huge rise in the population of school-age children into the 1990s. Already, there are about 15 million children ages six to nine in school, and most of them have mothers in the work force.

The Act would support before- and after- school programs for children of low-income working families. And, as with the expanded Head Start programs, children from moderate-income families would also be eligible to participate, for a sliding fee. These programs would be administered by state education agencies, the same governmental bodies responsible for the public school systems. Funds provided by the Act could be used to create child development programs and teacher training courses, and to build or renovate classrooms to handle the increased enrollment.

Recent studies show that after-school programs can relieve the distress of children who must otherwise stay by themselves after school, and can help reduce the pressures on parents of latchkey children stemming from work/family conflicts. Children attending after-school programs also show a considerable improvement in academic test scores and in self-esteem.

• **Infant and Toddler Programs.** There is evidence that the supply of day care providers for infants and toddlers is not keeping pace with demand. In some states, the state-legislated standards are weak, and in others the standards are not enforced. Few states have the resources to regulate and inspect child care facilities. The third section of the Act would provide grants to states so that they could contract out child care for infants and toddlers. Funds could also be made available for matching grants with corporations and foundations. Those agencies eligible to provide such services would include community-based organizations, both public and private (such as the YWCA and the Urban League), as well as individual family care providers. Once again, working families with incomes below the poverty level would receive free day care, while moderate-income families would be charged a sliding fee. Funds would be set aside to encourage businesses to provide employees with child care services on or near the job site. The growing number of women in the labor force with young children makes this an efficient use of resources.

Toward a Bipartisan Policy

The Child Development and Education Act was drafted to serve as one approach toward the development of a child care policy. I believe that by working closely with other members of Congress, representatives of the Bush administration, and state and local governments—as well as with citizens' groups—bipartisan legislation can be passed this year that would provide more child care services to children of low-income working families. ■

Aside from Congressman Hawkins' bill and President Bush's tax credit proposal, mentioned in this article, other major initiatives on child care include the "ABC" bills. The Act for Better Child Care (ABC) program, encompassed in H.R.30 and S.5, is being championed by Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund, and a coalition of child care advocates. The ABC approach is outlined in an article by Edelman published in the November-December issue of *Focus*.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested