

FOCUS[®]

The magazine of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies

Resegregation Grows In Public Schools

Separate Is Still Unequal

By Erica Frankenberg
and Chungmei Lee

When America celebrates Martin Luther King, Jr. Day every January, students in schools named after him recite the "I have a dream" speech in auditoriums where there are no White people and almost everyone is poor enough to get a free lunch — the very kind of schools King fought to eliminate. In his immortal speech, King spoke of his dreams of integration, that "One day, right there in Alabama, little Black boys and Black girls will be able to join hands with little White boys and White girls as sisters and brothers."

Yet, today, our nation's public schools are becoming steadily less integrated, even as the minority student enrollment approaches 40 percent of all U.S. public school students, almost twice the share of minority school students during the 1960s. Nearly half of all public school students in the West and the South are minority students. —Continued on page 10

IN THIS ISSUE...

- 2 **Perspective**
Michigan Is Right
- 3 **'Invisible' Latino Youth Find Injustice in the Justice System**
Gross Disparities Tip of the Iceberg
- 9 **House Adopts Stricter Work Rules for Poor**
Federal Funding Would Freeze
- 12 **Living Positively with HIV in Botswana**
Videos Fight Stigma

IN TRENDLETTER...

- 5 **Political Report**
Bush Seeks Support in Africa on Iraq
- 7 **Economic Report**
*No Child Left Behind?
Federal Education Programs One Year Later*

Perspective

Michigan Is Right

It's gratifying, though no surprise, that so many corporations and organizations are supporting the University of Michigan in its Supreme Court battle to maintain the school's affirmative action admissions programs for its undergraduate and law schools.

At least 300 groups, including higher education organizations, multinational companies, state governments, religious bodies, labor unions, civil rights groups, members of Congress and former military leaders, have backed the university with more than 60 friend-of-the-court briefs.

This massive showing of support demonstrates that a broad cross-section of America understands the importance of employing effective tools to continue the unfinished business of achieving fairness, inclusion and diversity in this country.

Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity, also known as The Boulé, is among those supporting Michigan. When this group joined the brief filed by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, it marked an unprecedented act of public advocacy for this African American service fraternity. It also touched a very special place in my heart.

Like others, Sigma Pi Phi, to which I belong, believes affirmative action is an essential tool in helping America reach its goal of equal opportunity for all. Unlike President Bush, the 300 organizations that are "friends" of the Michigan programs know that these programs do not impose racial quotas.

But they do consider race. Suddenly becoming race-blind, an approach opponents of the university's programs claim to advocate, would allow entrenched patterns of White preference, the built-in virtual system of affirmative action for White people, to continue. Race must remain a factor because, quite simply, America is still ridding itself of the discrimination, bias and legacy of racism that remain a plague on the nation.

Moreover, in Michigan's admissions policies, the role race plays is that of one factor among many. Those policies do not mandate that a certain number or percentage of African Americans will be admitted. Admissions officers do not create set asides, nor do they create separate tracks for Black students.

But the policies do attempt to create what the university calls a "critical mass of students from underrepresented minority groups in order to achieve the educational benefits of diversity." Michigan correctly defines critical mass as an educational concept, not a target percentage or fixed number.

Michigan's undergraduate program essentially defines rural White students as a minority group too. Applicants from the state's Upper Peninsula, a mostly White region, get affirmative admissions points because the university wants to attract students from that region and other rural areas. Jennifer Gratz, the lead plaintiff against the university's undergraduate admissions program, is from Southgate, a working class suburb of Detroit. She might just as easily have sued the university because she didn't get the 16 points people who look like her in Upper Michigan did.

To me and my brothers in Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity, the Michigan system is a fair one and uses race in a minor way. The Supreme Court should uphold it.

But I feel a very personal sense of pride for yet another reason. In 1998-2000, I led a history-making effort to create the first Public Policy Committee in the Fraternity. The effort succeeded, and as the head of the fraternity, I had the honor of appointing the committee's first members. This committee, now headed by Dr. Bernard Anderson, Wharton professor of economics and former assistant secretary of labor, developed the Fraternity's affirmative policy statement which led to our public support for the friend-of-the-court brief prepared by the Lawyer's Committee.

For a 99-year-old organization that has been accustomed to doing its good deeds in private or behind the scenes, this was indeed a historic and precedent-setting action in support of civil rights. ■


PRESIDENT

FOCUS[®] MAGAZINE

Volume 31, Issue 2

Editor Joe Davidson
Senior Editor Marc DeFrancis
Creative Director David Farquharson
TrendLetter Researcher Alfred Baltimore

President Eddie N. Williams
Senior VP & Chief Financial Officer Brenda Watkins Noel
Senior VP Programs VP Communications & Marketing VP Development Margaret C. Simms
Denise L. Dugas
Chris Naylor

Board of Governors

Elliott S. Hall, Dykema Gossett, Chair
Norma Ketay Asnes, Vice Chair
W. Frank Fountain, DaimlerChrysler Corporation, Vice Chair
Hector M. Hyacinthe, Packard Frank Business and Corporate Interiors, Inc., Treasurer
Charles U. Daly, Secretary
Eddie N. Williams, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, President
Andrew F. Brimmer, Brimmer & Company, Inc.
A. Demetrius Brown, CMXchange.com
James P. Comer, Yale University Child Study Center
Wendell G. Freeland, Esq.
Mirian M. Graddick-Weir, AT&T
Glenn F. Ivey, Office of the State's Attorney for Prince George's County
Joyce A. Ladner, The Brookings Institution
Weldon H. Latham, Esq., Holland & Knight
Thelma Wyatt Cummings Moore, Superior Court of Fulton County, Atlanta Judicial Circuit
Stephen D. Peskoff, Underhill Investment Corporation
Charles E. Phillips, Morgan Stanley
Thomas B. Shropshire, Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity
Rodney E. Slater, Patton Boggs
Reg Weaver, National Education Association

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Kenneth B. Clark, James D. Wolfensohn

FOCUS is published by the Office of Communications and Marketing at the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies (JCPES). FOCUS welcomes submissions. E-mail articles to focuseditor@jointcenter.org. Copyright 2003. Opinions expressed in FOCUS are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff or governing board of the Joint Center.

Subscriptions: Price U.S. \$15.00 per year. To subscribe, please send a check or money order to: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies and mail to FOCUS Subscriptions, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 1090 Vermont Avenue, Suite 1100, NW, Washington, DC. To purchase back issues or to obtain reprint permissions, contact the Joint Center's Office of Communications and Marketing at 202-789-3504.

Selected back issues of FOCUS are also available on-line at the Joint Center's web site: www.jointcenter.org. An index to the preceding year's articles is published in the December or January issue.

Printed in the United States of America.

1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW • SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

TELEPHONE (202) 789-3500
FACSIMILE (202) 789-6390
E-mail: focuseditor@jointcenter.org

www.jointcenter.org

‘Invisible’ Latino Youth Find Injustice in the Justice System

Gross Disparities Tip of the Iceberg

Over the years, FOCUS and other Joint Center publications have examined the unequal and unfair treatment of African Americans in the nation’s criminal justice system. Black youth, for example, are six times more likely to be incarcerated than White youth. Serious disparities also exist for Latinos, many of whom live in districts represented by Black elected officials. This article examines the inequities Latino youth face and why that problem frequently is hidden in official statistics.

BY FRANCISCO VILLARRUEL AND NANCY WALKER

During the 2000 presidential campaign, both political parties drew upon the motto of the Children’s Defense Fund: “Leave no child behind.” The stark reality is, however, that too many Latino youth are being left behind — behind bars, where they become “invisible.”

Yet, while Latino youth are often overlooked, they are overrepresented at every stage of the justice system. Compared to non-Latino White youth, Latino youth are arrested more often, detained more often, waived to criminal court as adults more often, and incarcerated more often and for longer periods of time, even when charged with the same crimes.

Our report, *¿Dónde está la justicia? A Call to Action on Behalf of Latino and Latina Youth in the U.S. Justice System*, documented that Latino youth in Los Angeles County in 1998 were 1.8 times as likely as White youth to be arrested for felony offenses. When charged with a drug offense, a Latino youth was 13 times more likely than a White youth with a similar history to be sentenced to prison — and likely to be incarcerated, on average, nearly five months longer for the same drug offense.

According to Human Rights Watch, Latino youth were confined in institutional placements at higher rates than Whites in 39 states during 2000. Among those states, the Latino rate was two to three times the White rate in nine states; three to six times the rates of White youth in eight states; and seven to 17 times the rates of White youth in four states. Further, between 1983 and

1991, the percentage of Latino youth in public detention centers increased by 84 percent, compared to an eight percent increase for White youth and 46 percent increase for youth overall.

While the available data indicate that there are gross disparities in the system, what we see is only the tip of the iceberg. If the United States required a uniform procedure across jurisdictions for calculating the number of Latino youth at every stage of the justice system, the results would be even more disturbing.

For example, in *Masking the Divide: How Officially Reported Prison Statistics Distort the Racial and Ethnic Realities of Prison Growth*, Barry Holman reported that separating race from ethnicity results in dramatic differences in prison demographics. With more than 47,000 Latino prisoners counted nationally as White in 1985, it appeared that there were 4 percent more White prisoners (52 percent) than non-White (48 percent), according to the report issued by the Alexandria, VA-based National Center on Institutions and Alternatives. However, when Latinos were removed from the White category, non-White prisoners outnumbered White prisoners by 15 percent. Moreover, between 1985 and 1997 the divide between the percent of the prison population that was White and non-White doubled to 30 percent.

National, state, and local data collection systems mask the divide in various ways. First, Latino youth are seriously undercounted in state databases because race is not separated from ethnicity. As a

result, approximately 96 percent of Latinos are categorized as “White” or “other,” thus inflating the number of “White” youth who are recorded as incarcerated and seriously masking the overrepresentation of Latino youth in the system.

Take Florida as an example: Latino youth constitute 15 percent of the state’s population. The state’s justice system intake forms provide five racial categories (“White,” “African-American,” “Native American,” “Asian,” and “Other”), but no category for ethnicity. ... Therefore, Latino youth are forced into one of the five racial categories provided by the state. The result? Only 2 percent of individuals are categorized as “Other,” with most Latinos disappearing into the “White” category. These youth thus become invisible in the state’s databases.

In addition, states use different procedures for identifying Latino youth, so conducting cross-state comparisons becomes difficult, if not impossible. Arizona and New Mexico allow youth to categorize themselves, using both race and ethnicity as defining variables. California and North Carolina require corrections professionals to assign youth to racial categories, with no clear guidelines for including information on ethnicity. In California, some state workers report using skin tone as the defining variable. In Ohio, Latino youth are considered biracial, but ethnicity is not considered separately from race. As a result, Latinos become invisible in these systems, hidden in race categories that do not recognize Latino or Hispanic heritage.

Why is this problem important? First and foremost, it matters because current data collection systems seriously undercount Latino youth, thus inappropriately minimizing the magnitude of disproportionality and disparate treatment.

Also, the Latino population is growing rapidly, particularly its youth. Census data reveal that the Latino population in the U.S. grew by 58 percent from 1990 to 2000. Given these trends, it seems more likely that the problems associated with Latino youth in the justice system will increase rather than diminish.

In spite of this steady population growth, as Martín M. Ahumada, founding president of the National Association for Hispanic Education (NAHE), points out, “Latinos still lack the clout to tout and act upon that demographic distinction.” With state-of-the-art technology to manage information systems and an alleged embracing of cultural diversity, “it is incomprehensible that our juvenile justice system continues to distort data and condone unfair treatment of Latino youths,” he adds.

In addition to the regular criminal justice system, the Immigration and Naturalization

Service incarcerates thousands of Latino youth each year, often for lengthy periods of time under punitive conditions, even though in most instances they are not charged with any crime other than being in the United States without proper documentation.

Example: Alfredo Lopez Sanchez, a 16-year-old from Guatemala, was locked alone in a hotel room for five weeks with no one to talk to, no change of clothes, and nothing to read while the INS worked to deport him. Alfredo had never been charged with any crime, but he was held in jails and other detention facilities in four states. He was shackled and handcuffed to chains around his waist because, as an illegal alien, he had been labeled a “threat risk.” Alfredo was moved eight times without prior notification of his lawyer.

Gross injustices for Latino youth are common in the criminal justice system, but it doesn't have to be this way. Bias and unfair practices can be changed, if the political will exists to do so. By methodically reforming their systems, increasing the use of alternatives to detention, adding bilingual and culturally competent staff,

including families in system-wide reform, and addressing the issue of racial and ethnic overrepresentation head on, officials in Santa Cruz, California, significantly reduced the number of Latino youth in detention. Similarly, despite the fact that in 1994 there was stark overrepresentation of youth of color in Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon, by 2000 these disparities had declined to the point where youth of all races were equally likely to be detained, and the overall detention rate had dropped by two-thirds to 22 percent.

These examples demonstrate what can be done when politicians and criminal justice officials target racial and ethnic bias in the system. It is possible for the justice system to live up to its name. ■

Francisco Villarruel is an associate professor of family and child ecology at Michigan State University. Nancy Walker is senior researcher for the Center on Youth Policy Research in Traverse City, Mich. ¿Dónde está la justicia? was commissioned by the Building Blocks for Youth Initiative and was prepared by the Institute for Children, Youth and Families at Michigan State University.

Rate of Confinement in Juvenile Detention Facilities By Race

State	White	Black	Latino	Black/ White Ratio	Latino/ White Ratio	State	White	Black	Latino	Black/ White Ratio	Latino/ White Ratio
AL	112	242	96	2.2	0.9	MT	128	434	245	3.4	1.9
AK	111	316	302	2.8	2.7	NE	222	1145	465	5.2	2.1
AZ	80	357	139	4.5	1.7	NV	163	473	126	2.9	0.8
AR	94	283	112	3.0	1.2	NH	129	551	205	4.3	1.6
CA	100	502	169	5.0	1.7	NJ	42	377	109	9.1	2.6
CO	121	453	296	3.7	2.5	NM	73	234	118	3.2	1.6
CT	56	334	208	6.0	3.8	NY	82	385	158	4.7	1.9
DE	23	127	15	5.5	0.6	NC	83	196	45	2.4	0.5
DC	7	51	9	7.0	1.2	ND	102	381	687	3.7	6.7
FL	141	337	101	2.4	0.7	OH	92	371	185	4.0	2.0
GA	135	314	72	2.3	0.5	OK	136	306	114	2.2	0.8
HI	61	68	88	1.1	1.5	OR	147	413	299	2.8	2.0
ID	156	263	179	1.7	1.1	PA	115	687	515	6.0	4.5
IL	89	285	67	3.2	0.8	RI	94	584	226	6.2	2.4
IN	143	489	196	3.4	1.4	SC	111	269	64	2.4	0.6
IA	138	762	275	5.5	2.0	SD	181	2667	1283	14.8	7.1
KS	117	587	210	5.0	1.8	TN	141	322	144	2.3	1.0
KY	120	470	244	3.9	2.0	TX	105	302	117	2.9	1.1
LA	82	372	55	4.5	0.7	UT	145	705	240	4.9	1.7
ME	125	272	279	2.2	2.2	VT	74	646	436	8.8	5.9
MD	73	261	79	3.6	1.1	VA	114	397	149	3.5	1.3
MA	113	393	276	3.5	2.4	WA	110	502	248	4.6	2.3
MI	89	369	647	4.1	7.2	WV	105	398	361	3.8	3.4
MN	97	491	198	5.0	2.0	WI	72	629	222	8.7	3.1
MS	126	233	224	1.8	1.8	WY	249	1092	515	4.4	2.1
MO	130	388	131	3.0	1.0	U.S.	105	350	159	3.3	1.5

Rates per 100,000 youths under age 18.
Source: Human Rights Watch, 2002, calculated from Census 2000 data

POLITICAL REPORT

Bush Seeks Support In Africa on Iraq

By Joe Davidson

As the Bush administration pushed the United Nations to sanction a U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, three African countries became central players in the tense international drama.

Angola, Cameroon and Guinea are three of the six swing votes on the 15-member UN Security Council, which, as of early March, the U.S. was pressing to support a resolution that would declare that Saddam Hussein has no more time to produce what Washington believes are hidden stocks of forbidden weapons. Nine votes are required to approve resolutions.

Whether the Bush administration could pull the African countries to the U.S. position was uncertain. The three recently stood with 49 other African countries at a Paris summit in a unanimous vote to support France's opposition to Washington's demand to end inspections and open the way for war. "There is an alternative to war," the summit participants said in a February 20 statement.

Immediately after that summit, the White House dispatched Walter Kansteiner, the assistant secretary of state for African affairs, to Africa to woo the three African nations, all of them non-permanent members of the Security Council. Guinea took over the rotating chairmanship of the Council in March.

The increased attention to these countries comes as a new poll indicates the American public supports stronger engagement with Africa in general. Particularly relevant to the

current concern over terrorism, 71 percent of those polled said the U.S. should increase military and police training and intelligence exchange with African nations.

"Given all of the international concerns that are competing for Americans' attention—including terrorism, Iraq and North Korea—it would be easy to assume that Americans have lost interest in Africa," said Steven Kull, director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA), which cosponsored the survey. "The poll, however, shows that this is not the case. Americans do see important links between developments in Africa and their own interests and values." Nearly three-quarters of the respondents rejected the notion that "the U.S. has no vital interests in Africa."

The poll of 1,146 Americans was conducted from December 19 through January 1 by PIPA and Knowledge Networks.

Americans apparently have a strong willingness to increase aid to Africa, especially if it gets to the people and not corrupt dictators. When asked, "How many of your tax dollars would you be willing to have go to economic and

humanitarian aid for African countries?" the median response from those polled was \$20. In fact, only about \$3 of the median taxpayer's taxes goes to the continent.

Among the poll's other key findings:

- About half to three-fourths of the respondents support President Bush's proposed Millennium Challenge Account, which would result in increased aid to Africa and other regions. The degree of approval rose when more information was given to respondents.
- Support for aid to Africa is seriously undermined by the assumption that most of the aid money is snatched up by corrupt officials. Eighty percent would favor greater assistance if it came with greater assurances that the truly needy would get it.
- An overwhelming 86 percent said that Washington should not interfere with African countries that attempt to develop generic AIDS drugs, as has been the case.
- There is a significant lack of understanding that democracy is growing in Africa. Only 18 percent of those polled knew that the number of African democracies had increased in the last decade.
- Nearly two-thirds said the U.S. should have intervened in Rwanda in 1994 to stop genocide there. Over half, 55 percent, believe Americans have a moral responsibility to intervene militarily to

Vital Interests in Africa?

The "Americans on Africa" poll indicated strong agreement that the U.S. has vital interests in Africa. Respondents were asked if they found the following statements *convincing* or *unconvincing*. "The U.S. has no vital interests in Africa. Therefore the U.S. should make Africa a lower priority when deciding where to distribute its aid."

Convincing

23%

Unconvincing

74%

Source: "Americans on Africa," January 2003, Program on International Policy Attitudes/Knowledge Networks.

Attitudes Toward Proportion of Foreign Aid Going to Africa

—Median Answers—

“I would like you to think about all of the money the U.S. spends on foreign aid. Just based on what you know, what is your best guess about what percentage of this money goes to economic and humanitarian aid for African countries?”



“What do you think would be the appropriate percentage for African countries, if any?”



Actual percentage of U.S. aid to Africa:



Note: According to the World Bank, 26 percent of the world’s population living on less than \$1 per day live in Africa.

Attitudes Toward Tax Dollars for Aid to Africa

“Thinking about the amount you pay each year in taxes, how many of your tax dollars would you be willing to have go to economic and humanitarian aid for African countries?” (Median estimate)



Actual amount of median taxpayer’s tax bill that goes to Africa:



Willingness to Increase Aid

“If I had more confidence that the aid we give to African countries would really help the people who need it, I would be willing to increase the amount that we spend on aid to Africa.”

Agree



Disagree



prevent genocide. Fifty-nine percent support U.S. training of a multinational African force that would deploy in cases of ethnic killings.

This poll is consistent with others that demonstrate a poor understanding among Americans on foreign assistance issues. When those polled were asked to estimate how much of U.S. international aid goes to Africa, the median estimate was 15 percent. Asked how much should go to that continent, the median proposed amount was 20 percent, a third more than the estimate. In fact, however, 20 percent would be nearly twice the actual portion—11 percent—of U.S. foreign aid that goes to Africa. But the amount American respondents want allocated does correspond more closely to the way poverty is spread across the globe: According to the World Bank, 26 percent of the world’s population living on less than \$1 a day lives on the continent.

The poll was presented at a press conference co-organized by the Africa Society of the National Summit on Africa. “There is a need for the American public to know where Africa stands in U.S. foreign policy determinations,” said Leonard H. Robinson, Jr., the Society’s president and CEO. “No matter what our priorities are, Africa must be factored into them—whether it is the war on terrorism or our engagement in the United Nations or trade or the economy. There is no way that an entire continent can be pushed to the back of the world stage. Africa remains relevant, even though Iraq, North Korea, and other hot spots dominate the headlines.” ■

The entire PIPA poll is on the Internet at www.pipa.org. Additional information is available on the Africa Summit website at www.africasummit.org.



For information on international and other Joint Center programs, visit our website.

ECONOMIC REPORT

No Child Left Behind? Federal Education Programs One Year Later

By Margaret C. Simms

In the fiscal year 2004 budget that President Bush sent to Congress earlier this year, the administration stressed its continued support of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), passed into law in January 2002. Moreover, the proposed budget showed the president's interest in expanding the concept to cover vocational and adult education, as well as special education programs. NCLB places greater emphasis on accountability, as reflected in the requirement that each state have an annual testing program in place no later than the 2005-2006 school year and the explicit sanction through reduced funding for schools that fail to meet standards.

A second basic premise of the Bush administration's education programs is parental choice. Funds were included in the proposed FY 2004 budget to support charter schools, magnet schools, and a new program known as, the Choice Incentive Fund. Also included, over the protest of local officials, was explicit funding for a voucher program in the District of Columbia.

Given the federal government's heavy emphasis on accountability and school choice, now seems an appropriate time to review recent studies and reports on these issues. This issue's Economic Report summarizes a few studies, one by an academic and several released by organizations of school officials and advocates.

School choice is based on an economic argument that when consumers have more

choices, producers of products and services are forced to perform better in order to keep their customers from switching to a new company. In the context of education, the premise is that individual schools will be more effective if parents can take their children out of failing schools and place them in schools with a proven record of performance. These so-called "market-based" approaches, which include charter schools, school vouchers, public school choice, and school-site management, are examined in a book published by the Economic Policy Institute in 2002.

Helen F. Ladd, the author of *Market-Based Reforms in Urban Education*, provides a framework for understanding the options

Within the public system, pricing has no effective role as assignment to different schools is an administrative task, with popular schools being subject to some form of "rationing," such as a lottery. In the private sector, not all parents have the same choices, even with vouchers, due to selective admission's criteria and tuitions far beyond the value of the voucher.

and reviews the research and evaluation evidence on these various programs. As the introduction says, "policy discussions about such reforms tend to be highly charged, with some people so strongly in favor of them and others so strongly opposed that no appeal to evidence is likely to change their views. This paper is not for them." If you are interested in some of the economic arguments and how the evidence stacks up against them, you may gain a few very good insights from this book.

In her review of the choice theory, Ladd points out that several requirements must be in place in order for the "market" to work. First, the consumers (in this case, parents) must have information about the options available to them and be able to use that information effectively. In other words, they should be able to go to the school with the educational product they have identified as the best one and have the funds to pay the tuition. Second, the supply should adjust over time to fit shifts in the demand. So producers of products in high demand should expand production (in this case, slots in "good" schools) and producers whose product fades away should go out of business. The educational marketplace does not work that way.

Within the public system, pricing has no effective role as assignment to different schools is an administrative task, with popular schools being subject to some form of "rationing," such as a lottery. In the private sector, not all parents have the same choices, even with vouchers, due to selective admission criteria and tuitions far beyond the value of the voucher. On the supply side, good schools are rarely replicated and the evidence suggests that the poor performers have little incentive to improve. In fact, Ladd reports, "the international evidence shows not only that competition is unlikely to improve such schools, but also that it is likely to exacerbate their problems."

One reason for this, Ladd asserts, is the fact that the students themselves become a resource. In other words, both parents and

teachers include the socioeconomic status of students in their assessment of school quality. Schools that lose students with higher socioeconomic status, also lose status in the eyes of parents and teachers. Thus, the poor performing schools will lose the students with other options and they will find it harder to compete for new students and for the higher quality teachers they may need to improve educational services.

Ladd spends a considerable amount of time discussing charter schools, schools that receive public funding but operate without the restrictions that many government-run schools face. She notes that there are two very different types of charter schools: non-profit, usually community-based schools, and those run by for-profit ventures. The enrollments and the characteristics of these two school types vary substantially. The for-profit schools seem to have fewer special needs students. Ladd also reports on a study which found that students of color are more likely to be enrolled in charter schools with fewer resources and less challenging curriculums.

Market-Based Reforms Weak

The book discusses the policy implications of her findings. Ladd notes that evidence for significant educational gains from these market-based reforms is weak, but she does suggest some ways in which choice could be increased while minimizing the negative impacts that might occur in an unconstrained system. These include assigning students to schools not only on the basis of student and parental preferences, but also with attention to socioeconomic balance. Less economically advantaged students should have transportation subsidies and their parents should have information about the quality of different schools. She also suggests strong accountability for both public and private schools (at least those who take public funds) and some salary incentives for teachers to work in the more difficult schools.

District-wide Accountability

A better alternative to the NCLB's school-based approach to assessment and choice would be a district-wide approach, according to Michael Casserly, head of the Council of the Great City Schools. The Council, a coalition of nearly 50 of the largest urban, central city school districts of the nation, has been collaborating with the Manpower Development Research Corporation (MDRC) on a study of several large urban school districts in order to understand their success in raising student achievement and reducing racial disparities in educational outcomes. In a recent issue of *Education Week*, Casserly said the findings from the study show that educational performance can be improved by using the type of accountability promoted in NCLB, only at the district level.

A 2002 report on this collaborative effort, *Foundations for Success*, examines the experiences of three districts—Houston Independent School District, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Sacramento City Unified School District—and a portion of the Chancellor's District in New York City. The approaches of these districts were compared with those of similar districts that had been less successful in improving student performance. The findings include the preconditions that are necessary for success and the strategies that worked.

Among the key preconditions are a shared vision between the school superintendent and the school board regarding goals and strategies and a matching of new resources to support the vision for reform. In the more successful districts, goals were clearly defined and quantified, with a set schedule for achievement. These districts established district-wide curricula and instructional approaches, rather than letting individual schools set their own. They provided strong support from the district level and gave each school assessment data on a regular basis. They also focused on the lowest performing schools, providing additional resources.

Casserly says that the results of this study suggest that NCLB “is actually a solid framework within which to think about reforming America's public schools. The legislation's emphasis on results, accountability, regular assessments, coherent professional development, supplemental services, and teacher quality are clearly on the mark.” He also notes that adequate funding is essential for success.

First Year of Law

Adequate funding of NCLB over the first few years is of great concern to the Center on Education Policy, a national advocacy organization for public education and more effective public schools. The Center's report, *From the Capital to the Classroom*, summarizes its analysis of the first year of NCLB's implementation. While the Center found that the states were generally committed to the Act's goals, the combination of the current fiscal crisis and the prospect of limited additional federal aid form a major obstacle to successful implementation. In his introductory commentary in the report, Center president Jack Jennings compares NCLB and the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act (passed in 1965). He notes that while ESEA was criticized as “money without accountability,” NCLB is “heavy accountability with not much greater federal financial and technical assistance—an approach no more likely to succeed.” ■

For additional information see: www.epinet.org for information on Helen Ladd book; www.mdrc.org or www.cgcs.org for information on “Foundations for Success”; www.ctredpol.org for information on “From the Capital to the Classroom.” The website of the American Association of School Administrators, www.aasa.org, has links to many reports and updates on the No Child Left Behind Act and its implementation.

HOUSE ADOPTS STRICTER WORK RULES FOR POOR

FEDERAL FUNDING WOULD FREEZE

By KAVAN PETERSON

Stricter work requirements for poor parents, a funding freeze on cash assistance, and new money for “marriage strengthening” programs are all elements in a welfare bill recently passed by the U.S. House.

The changes would increase the required level of work for poor parents from 30 hours to 40 hours a week, and would require states to increase the percentage of welfare recipients who hold jobs from 50 percent to 70 percent by 2008. Welfare recipients would no longer be able to count education as a “work activity” under this bill, although it would allow up to 16 hours a week for job training or drug treatment.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the increased work requirements would cost states a total of between \$8 billion and \$11 billion to implement, even though the Republican bill would freeze federal welfare spending at the 1996 level, about \$16.5 billion a year, and would increase funding for childcare by only \$2 billion.

Congressional Democrats and state officials have strongly opposed tightening work requirements without increasing federal spending for childcare and support services. The House defeated a Democratic proposal that would have increased childcare spending by \$15 billion.

Republicans said that the success of the landmark welfare reform law of 1996 has been due to the reforms they championed that emphasized putting poor people to work. Since the federal government ended welfare as an entitlement program by creating the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant in

1996, states have reduced welfare rolls by 59 percent, from 12 million recipients to less than 5 million. And despite a two-year recession and the loss of over 180,000 jobs last year, welfare rolls continued to decline, falling by 6.2 percent in 2002, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) reported.

The new House bill also includes \$300 million a year in new money for states to create programs to “promote healthy marriages,” and \$50 million in yearly subsidies to encourage sexual abstinence, provisions proposed by the president.

Congress also extended temporary funding for the welfare law that expired October 1, giving the Senate until the end

“We’re very concerned that on top of state deficits, states will have to cut social programs even more because they won’t know what to expect from the federal government.”

— Sheri Steisel, human services director for the National Conference of State Legislatures

of June to pass a new five-year bill. With a slim Republican majority in the Senate, it is not clear if they have enough votes to pass the House bill.

If Senate action comes after April, it would be too late to help lawmakers in 18 states prepare for new welfare requirements.

Legislatures in those states recess in April, and six of them — Arkansas, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, and Texas — will not reconvene until 2005.

“We’re very concerned that on top of state deficits, states will have to cut social programs even more because they won’t know what to expect from the federal government,” said Sheri Steisel, human services director for the National Conference of State Legislatures.

The measure is nearly identical to a GOP bill that died in the Senate last year after Congress adjourned without renewing the 1996 welfare law. The bill passed the House largely on party lines after Republicans pushed the measure to a vote without sending it to committee for debate, which sparked protest from Democrats.

Rep. Benjamin L. Cardin (D-MD), ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means subcommittee that oversees welfare issues, said the Republican bill “sabotages the 1996 welfare reform effort by making it much harder for states to provide education and job training to welfare recipients.” Cardin added that “states may be forced to cut services for low-income families to pay for these new, unfunded welfare requirements.” Republican Rep. Melissa Hart, of Pennsylvania, complained, “the Democratic alternative does not provide the work incentives that recipients need to become independent [of cash assistance].”

Although the Bush Administration does not dispute CBO’s estimate that stricter work requirements could cost states up to \$11 billion, HHS Assistant Secretary Wade F. Horn said that because of the dramatic decline in welfare caseloads, the question was not whether states get more money, but whether they should get less. “We resisted the calls to cut the block grant,” Horn said, “and in fact fully funded the block grant despite the reductions in caseloads.” ■

Kavan Peterson is a staff writer with Stateline.org, which provided permission to reprint this article.

RESEGREGATION

Continued from cover

The desegregation of Black students, which advanced continuously from the 1950s to the late 1980s, has now receded to levels not seen in three decades. Black students are experiencing the most rapid resegregation in the South, triggered by Supreme Court decisions in the 1990s, and have now lost all progress recorded since the 1960s.

However, the most dramatic resegregation growth is among Latino students. They are the most segregated minority group, with steadily rising segregation since federal data was first collected a third of a century ago. Latinos are segregated both by race and poverty, and a pattern of linguistic segregation is also developing. Latinos have by far the highest high school dropout rates. Asians are the most integrated and the most educationally successful group in American schools. White students are the most segregated — they have little contact with non-White students except in the South and Southwest.

The desegregation of our public schools has been a substantial accomplishment and is linked to important gains for all students — Black, Hispanic and White. Yet even as more and more convincing evidence of those gains is accumulating, school systems are actually being ordered by the courts to end the successful desegregation plans they would prefer to continue. This is not driven by public opinion, which has become more supportive of desegregated schools (most of which have been achieved through choice mechanisms in the past two decades). The persisting high levels of residential segregation for Black families and increasing levels for Latinos, as reported in the 2000 Census, indicate that desegregated education will not happen without plans to make it happen.

American public schools are now 12 years into the process of continuous resegregation. “Martin Luther King’s dream is being honored in theory and dishonored in the decisions and practices that are turning our schools back to

College Percent Plans Produce Little Diversity

This article is adapted from the Harvard University Civil Rights Project’s Percent Plans in College Admissions: A Comparative Analysis of Three States’ Experiences, by Catherine L. Horn and Stella M. Flores.

Percent plans — admitting a certain percent of the highest performing graduates of each high school to public universities in a state — have emerged as a basic response to the end of race-conscious affirmative action in three of the country’s most populous states: Texas, California, and Florida.

The Texas program has drawn particular attention in part because George W. Bush, the former governor and current president, promotes policies like that in opposition to the University of Michigan’s affirmative action practices. Texas guarantees students, who graduate in the top 10 percent of their class, admission to their campus of choice. The Florida and California percent plans guarantee admission only to the main state university system.

Although these plans have been presented as effective alternatives to race-conscious affirmative action, the Civil Rights Project’s research shows that it is incorrect to attribute any significant increase in campus diversity to a percent plan alone. A variety of race-conscious recruitment, financial aid, and support programs appears to be central to the ability of some campuses to even partially recover from the loss of minority students that follows the abolition of affirmative action. In almost every case, however, even with these additional efforts in place, institutions have not been successful in maintaining racially/ethnically diverse campuses through percent plans. And relative to the current college-age population in each of these states, none of the campuses’ student populations reflect the populations they are intended to serve.

Among the Project’s major findings:

- Percent plans do not address admissions to private colleges or to graduate or

professional programs. They also do not apply to out-of-state students.

- Targeting a specific set of traditionally underrepresented high schools in communities where large shares of Blacks and Hispanics live results in these efforts being functionally race-attentive.
- At Texas A&M, the 10 percent plan has not led to diversity at nearly the levels achieved through the use of affirmative action.

Affirmative action must try to cope with the system of educational inequality in the three states. Texas, California, and Florida had low levels of minority access to higher education even before losing race-conscious affirmative action. Each of the states has deeply unequal educational K-12 outcomes when measured by race and ethnicity, and serious increases in racial segregation. In all three states, the applications, admissions, and enrollments of first-time college students to the states’ university systems and to their premier campuses shows a substantial racial gap relative to the college-age populations. The gap has grown even as the states have rapidly become more diverse.

Percent plans alone will not serve as effective alternatives to affirmative action. In the best of circumstances, they have only been able to promote racial and ethnic diversity on campuses when they are coupled with recruitment, outreach, financial aid, and support programs targeted at underrepresented communities with large minority student populations — all elements of solid race-conscious affirmative action plans.

Race-conscious affirmative action remains a stronger and more effective strategy for achieving racially and ethnically diverse campuses, particularly if bolstered by some of the resources and policies developed in an attempt to eliminate it. ■

segregation,” says Gary Orfield, education and social policy professor and co-director of Harvard University’s Civil Rights Project.

School integration brings real and measurable education benefits that go far beyond simply having a Black child sit next to a White one.

Research regarding desegregation shows:

- Segregated schools have much higher concentrations of poverty and other problems and much lower average test scores, levels of teacher qualifications and advanced courses. With few exceptions, separate schools are still unequal schools. Ending desegregation plans tends to produce a rapid increase of such schools within a district, and more qualified teachers tend to leave these segregated schools.
- In systems with desegregation plans, particularly those in areas with substantial White enrollment, minority students tend to transfer to better schools and to learn more, though a racial achievement gap remains. Going to desegregated schools improves students’ chances for a desegregated future life, for going to college and succeeding in college, and for living and working in interracial settings.
- When teachers are trained and use techniques to create positive academic interactions in racially diverse schools, the benefits of desegregated schools increase substantially.

Orfield criticized decisions by the federal courts and school officials that “send minority children back to inferior schools, then punish them for their inferior education, and ... leave young Whites deeply isolated and unprepared for the multiracial society they will live and work in.”

Although the South remains the nation’s most integrated region for both Blacks and Whites, it is the region that is most rapidly going backwards as the courts terminate many major and successful desegregation orders.

The Civil Rights Project studied patterns of racial enrollment and segregation in public schools at the national, regional, state, and district levels for students of all

racial groups. The research indicates:

- Whites are the most segregated group in the nation’s public schools; on average, they attend schools where eighty percent of the student body is White. The two regions where White students are more likely to attend substantially interracial schools are the South and West.
- At the aggregate level, Asians live in the nation’s most integrated communities, are the most integrated in schools, and experience less linguistic segregation than Latinos. Asians are the nation’s most highly educated racial group; the rate of college graduation for Asians is almost double the national average and four times higher than for Latinos.
- The emergence of a substantial group of American schools that are virtually all non-White, which we call apartheid schools. These schools educate one-sixth of the nation’s Black students, and in the Northeast and Midwest one-fourth of Black students. These are often schools where enormous poverty, limited resources, and social and health problems of many types are concentrated.
- The nation’s largest city school systems account for a shrinking share of the total enrollment and are, almost without exception, overwhelmingly non-White and increasingly segregated internally.
- In 1967 the nation’s largest suburban systems were virtually all White. Despite a huge increase in minority students in suburban school districts, serious patterns of segregation have emerged in some sectors of suburbia as this transition takes place. Many of the most rapidly resegregating school systems since the mid-1980s are suburban.
- Southern states, with about half the enrollment of the big cities, had far more extensive and long-lasting desegregation and far more opportunity for minority students to cross both race and class barriers for their education.
- Many of the nation’s decisions in the courts have changed from being on the leading edge of desegregation activity to

being its greatest obstacle. Since the Supreme Court changed desegregation law in three major decisions between 1991 and 1995, the momentum of desegregation for Black students has clearly reversed in the South, where the movement had by far achieved its greatest success.

- During the 1990s, the proportion of Black students in majority-White schools has decreased by 13 percentage points, to a level lower than in any year since 1968.

Race matters very much, and segregation is a failed educational policy. Any policy framework must explicitly recognize the importance of integrated education not only as a basic education goal but also as a compelling social interest. Specific policies to address this include:

- Continuing desegregation plans
- Amending transfer policies in the federal No Child Left Behind Act to give students a real choice of better integrated schools
- Designing educational choice plans that diminish segregation
- Linking housing mobility programs with educational counseling, and
- Increasing city-suburban transfer options in metropolitan areas.

A great deal of long-lasting progress was achieved when this issue was last seriously addressed, a third of a century ago. If we are not to lose those gains and if we are to be ready for a profoundly multiracial society with no racial majority, we must begin to face the trends documented here and devise solutions that will work. ■

This article was adapted from a report written by Erica Frankenberg, Chungmei Lee and Gary Orfield of The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. The full report may be found at www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu.

For information about residential segregation, see FOCUS, "The Status of Residential Segregation," July/August 2001.

LIVING POSITIVELY WITH HIV IN BOTSWANA

VIDEOS FIGHT STIGMA

JOHANNESBURG - In a move considered a breakthrough for a country with high levels of stigma and discrimination, people in neighboring Botswana who use antiretroviral (ARV) drugs are now telling their stories in a series of new educational videos.

The Patient Education videos are a collection of three 15-minute documentaries designed to educate people about the impact of HIV/AIDS and antiretroviral therapy on their lives. They will be played in patient waiting areas and used in health education presentations in hospitals and clinics.

The Botswanan government has a campaign to provide the antiretroviral drugs to all of its HIV-positive citizens who need them. Since the campaign's inception in January 2002, however, only four percent of the estimated 110,000 people currently eligible for the therapy have enrolled in "Masa," as the campaign is called. Health system professionals say many infected people don't participate in treatment programs because of the disease's stigma leads them to behave in denial.

"The videos are addressing the issue of stigma. These real-life stories will encourage more and more people to feel a part of what we are doing and then come forward," said Prathima Naidoo, Masa's information and

education consultant. According to Naidoo, the videos also inform people about treatment and the importance of adherence to medication regimens. The videos focus on the importance of patients' knowing their HIV/AIDS status, the need to always use a condom when having sex, the hope antiretroviral therapy offers, and the responsibility to adhere to the therapy regimen for the rest of the patient's life.

The videos complement the African oral tradition of communicating and educating. "It makes a difference when you see a person from your own culture, speaking in Setswana and telling you how you can get support for living with HIV/AIDS, because this is how we as Batswana are used to getting our information," said Stephen Ssebagala, of the Botswana Network of AIDS Service Organizations.

Tiny Mmotlano is a 37-year-old mother who was diagnosed as HIV-positive in 1996. She decided to appear on the video after seeing people dying from HIV/AIDS without any support. "I want to help people understand what HIV is and show them that they can live with it," she said.

"I've been taking the pills since February 2002. But you need food to take them. If you don't have food the government can help you."



Before deciding to participate, Tiny told her parents, her child and all her relatives about living with HIV/AIDS. "They gave me the love and support, even though they didn't really understand," she added.

For Ssebagala and many of the organizations he represents, the videos are a symbol of hope. "Ordinary Batswana like us," he said, "are saying 'we have a problem and we can do something about it.'" ■

IRIN, the Integrated Regional Information Networks of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, provided reprint permission for this story.



Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies
1090 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-4928
202-789-3500

PO Box 23881, Joubert Park 2044
12th Floor, Auckland House
185 Smit Street
Braamfontein 2017, South Africa

ADDRESS
SERVICE
REQUESTED

Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested



IMPORTANT!

NOTICE TO READERS: Please send address or title changes to FOCUS, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. Thank you.

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