

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 9, 1998

MEMORANDUM FOR SYLVIA MATHEWS

FROM: PETER RUNDLET PR

SUBJECT: Proposals Related to Higher Education and the Race Initiative
Scott Palmer
Chris Edley

cc: Judy Winston
Maria Echaveste
Elena Kagan
Mignon Moore
Karen Stelton
Dawn Chirwa
Eddie Correira
Mike Cohen
Mike Wenger
Julie Fernandez

What follows is a survey of the proposals that I was able to canvass from various individuals and offices that relate to higher education and race in general or the Race Initiative in particular. The only piece missing is an update from Mike Cohen of the DPC on the various proposals and projects he is pursuing in this regard. I was unable to make contact with him directly. I will update this once I speak with him.

As you know, Christopher and Maria have proposed of a four-part conceptual framework with which to approach our higher education agenda items for the Race Initiative:

- (1) Campus Dialogue: Activities and events designed to foster cross-racial dialogue and reconciliation on college campuses.
- (2) Validators: Identify people who can clearly articulate the value of diversity in higher education to the *broader general public*.
- (3) Higher Education Leadership: Encourage higher education leaders to work together and develop a comprehensive strategy to enhance inclusion and diversity *on their campuses*.
- (4) Policy Action: Vigorous Administration policy action that includes litigation, public education, race-neutral and race-conscious approaches to enhancing equal opportunity to higher education, inclusiveness, and diversity.

Although I will not attempt here to fit all of the following proposals into this framework, I believe it is helpful as a reference point, and will be useful once we sit down and determine which of the following we want to pursue, and how. The proposals identified thus far include:

Campus Week of Dialogue. Michael Wenger, in partnership with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), the Urban League, and the Department of Education, is leading the effort to organize a week of dialogues on campuses around the country from April 6-9.

Goals: To more fully engage the higher education community in the Race Initiative and to build bridges between college campuses and the communities in which they are located.

Cultural
center
house
etc

Process: AAC&U anticipates receiving a grant from the Ford Foundation to assist it in working with approximately 35 core campuses. In addition, PIR will reach out to hundreds of colleges and universities, including HBCUs (historically black colleges and universities), HSIs (Hispanic serving institutions), and Tribal Colleges.

Specific Events Proposed

- One day designated as National Day of Dialogue on college campuses, including Town Hall meetings on campuses, and discussions on race in classrooms.
- Meetings between campus and community leaders to institutionalize campus-community dialogue.
- Meetings on campus between student leaders from all racial and ethnic groups to discuss how students can work together to address the challenges of race.
- Film showings, cultural festivals, joint community service projects on and around campuses.
- A national Town Hall meeting with either the President or Vice President on the National Day of Dialogue (April 7 or 8), with college students and telecast by C-SPAN or provided by satellite to participating campuses.
- A national meeting of scholars on racial issues to discuss an appropriate research agenda. (Note: this idea is raised separately below; see the concerns raised there.)
- As part of or just prior to this week, a meeting between the President and higher education leaders. (Note: this idea is discussed in great detail, below.)

Next Steps: *Pulling all of this off will require an enormous amount of immediate work and coordination. Mike Wenger should nail down what burdens the AAC&U and the Department of Education can bear. Then, a meeting with PIR and WH staff needs to take place to discuss priorities and allocate responsibilities. As noted below, if a meeting with the POTUS is to take place, a date needs to be set aside immediately (since he is scheduled to be out of the country for much of March).*

Presidential Meeting with Higher Education Leaders. The President would convene a meeting with higher education leaders both to hear their ideas on the Race Initiative, campus diversity and inclusion, and to issue a call to action to them, as outlined below.

Goals

- (1) To encourage the establishment of a formal, coordinated campaign (analogous to the formation of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights due to President Kennedy's call to

action) within the higher education community designed to promote, through words and actions, the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and to recapture ownership of the public debate over affirmative action in higher education;

(2) To encourage leaders (and their campuses) to participate in the efforts of the PIR, especially the Week of Campus Dialogue;

(3) To solicit the leaders' ideas on creative, legal approaches toward enhancing inclusion and diversity on their campuses; and

(4) To initiate strategy discussions with leaders who will be affected by moves by Congress to curb affirmative action through the education reauthorization and appropriations processes.

Shrum

Process

Scott Palmer has drafted a detailed proposal on the goals and expected outcomes of such a meeting, much of which is included here. He has been working with Hector Garza at the American Council on Education (ACE), as well as other higher education leaders and associations. Mike Cohen would work with Scott to immediately create a core working group of six to ten college and university presidents that will take responsibility for the overall effort and who will help define the mission and process, as well as identify other leaders who should be a part of the larger campaign. Christopher Edley has identified some likely candidates (the presidents of Harvard, Duke, Penn, and the President of the College Board, Dan Stewart) and we have already established contacts through the creation of the High Hopes Program. The ACE and the Leadership Alliance are also likely to be very helpful. A date for the meeting with the President would have to be reserved immediately, as the meeting should take place before the Campus Week of Dialogue (April 6). Christopher Edley suggested that he would meet with Bob Shrum to coordinate a professional communications strategy for the leaders group.

Potential Outcomes

- A coordinated and ongoing campaign to clearly articulate to the American people the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and to positively address other tough questions of race in higher education, including the proper role of affirmative action.
- A coordinated research agenda on the educational value of diversity, as well as on methods to increase minority graduation rates and strategies to enhance the "pipeline."
- Creation of short- and long-term strategies to increase minority access to higher education, including both race-neutral and permissible race-conscious strategies.

- The development and promotion of on-campus programs designed to improve minority retention, promote positive racial climates, and create positive cross-racial interactions.
- Creation of partnerships between predominately white and minority-serving institutions.
- Greater participation by the whole higher education community -- college and university presidents, deans, faculty, students, and higher education associations and organizations -- in the President's Initiative on Race, including the Campus Week of Dialogue.

Next Steps: Convene a meeting to determine whether this is a Presidential priority relative to other Race Initiative demands for the President's time. If so, secure a date on the President's schedule for a meeting with higher education leaders. Scott Palmer and Mike Cohen should confer with Christopher Edley and others and call a meeting as soon as possible with the core group of higher education leaders who will agree to take responsibility for coordinating the larger effort. Scott and Mike should convene a meeting with White House and PIR staff to create a strategy to carry this out -- to identify key issues for the meeting and to assign responsibilities for necessary staff work. In addition, Eddie Correia should begin to conceptualize a strategy for engaging Congressional leaders on these issues, as we prepare for battles over the DoEd's reauthorization and appropriations.

More Discrete Higher Education Events and Proposals:

Release of Affirmative Action in Higher Education Guidance Piece. Individuals from the Department of Education, Justice, the Counsel's office, and I have been working to finalize the Department of Education's Guide on Postsecondary Admissions and Financial Aid Affirmative Action programs. The final internal revisions are being made this week and we expect to solicit comments from outside friends before finally releasing it. The purpose of the guidance is to reinforce the continuing vitality of the *Bakke* opinion and to make clear what properly-constructed affirmative action requires in order to provide a greater comfort level to those institutions that may have become unduly cautious in their approaches to creating diversity.

Next Steps: Final drafts have been distributed internally. Comments are due by COB on Friday, February 13. A meeting should be held next week that includes relevant White House staff (Sylvia Mathews, Dawn Chirwa, Rob Weiner, Eddie Correia, Elena Kagan, Maria Echaveste, Judith Winston, Christopher Edley, Minyon Moore, and me), as well as Education and Justice officials, to discuss a roll-out strategy for the Guidance. Although the guidance will not be released in time for admissions offices to restructure their policies for this year, an earlier release may assist some institutions before all of their final admissions decisions are made this spring.

Litigation Strategy. Eddie Correia will begin to meet with counsel representing colleges and universities being sued for their inclusive admissions policies. The purpose of the meetings is twofold: (1) to identify cases in which the United States would participate as *amicus* or intervenor, and (2) to identify creative yet permissible strategies to encourage greater diversity.

Next Steps: Eddie plans to meet with Jane Sherburne, who represents the University of Michigan, soon. Similarly, Maria Echaveste will coordinate with Political Affairs to determine the status of the various state ballot initiatives designed to end affirmative action.

Identification of Race-Neutral/Opportunity-Gap/"Pipeline" Solutions. The Domestic Policy Council, with the assistance of Eddie Correia, Christopher Edley and Scott Palmer, will take the lead on identifying programs designed to increase the percentage of students who attend and complete college. Included in this would be programs designed to prepare students for college and help them pay for it (such as the High Hopes Initiative and Head Start), as well as creative, race-neutral admissions programs (such as aggressive recruitment and outreach and programs like the Texas 10% plan) that will likely increase the number of minorities that attend college.

Next Steps: I understand that Mike Cohen has been working with the Department of Education on producing a document that surveys a variety of inclusive, but race-neutral admissions practices. Pushing this project to a conclusion, vetting the ideas, and then sharing them with the higher education community should be our short-term goal. In any case, the DPC, together with Counsel and PIR, should aim to present a list of potential solutions that the Administration can promote or share with the higher education community.

Research Conference on the Value of Diversity. Some have proposed an academic conference similar to one that the Harvard Civil Rights Project held last spring to discuss current research demonstrating the educational value of diversity. Scott Palmer and Michael Wenger have suggested that such a conference be part of the Campus Week of Dialogue. Others, however, including Christopher Edley, have noted two significant limitations to such a conference: (1) there is little serious social and behavioral science research on the question of the benefits of diversity; and (2) such an event is unlikely to generate much attention. A less ambitious, though useful, goal would be to encourage educational leaders to support serious research in this area.

Next Step: Determine whether such a conference is desirable. Mike Wenger, Chris Edley, Elena Kagan, and Scott Palmer should make a recommendation on this question. If it is not, add to the Leadership agenda, above, the promotion of serious academic research on these issues.

California Minority Scholarship Fund. In order to counter the effects of Prop 209 in California, the Consumer Attorneys of California, together with the San Francisco Bar Association, have proposed to create a private scholarship fund to pay for outreach programs and minority scholarships. The details of the program are not completely clear (e.g., are the scholarships only for students residing in California? for UC schools only or private California schools? for law school only or for other graduate and undergraduate institutions?), but, if properly administered, would be a legal and effective means for increasing minority enrollment in higher education. Eddie Correia has determined that the program can pass Title VI muster, if the funds are completely privately administered. It has also been determined that the Vice President or a Cabinet Member could speak at a fundraising dinner, with some qualification.

Next Steps: Designate someone to work with the California organizers (Karen Skelton has been working with Ray Bourhis to date) to learn more details about the program and the timing. Then appropriate White House and PIR staff need to determine which Administration officials could attend fundraising dinners and to what extent we give White House or PIR imprimatur to the effort. There is no reason to delay with this effort. Finally, this should be recognized as a promising practice.

Meeting with the University of California President Richard Atkinson. We have received a request by Richard Atkinson for a meeting with the President this Friday, February 13. It has been determined that Maria Echaveste, Minyon Moore, Elena Kagan, Eddie Correia, and Karen Skelton should meet with him when he is here. If Chris Edley is in town, he should attend the meeting as well. Chris Edley says that even though Atkinson is in a difficult political situation with the Board of Regents' decision to end affirmative action, he is very much a supporter of the Administration's view on the issue. The purpose of the meeting is to learn more from him about the aggressive outreach program undertaken by UC as well as other insights learned from the recent changes in California.

Next Steps: The above-named individuals should meet with Richard Atkinson this Friday. I understand that Maria is taking the lead in organizing the meeting and coordinating with Atkinson.

The Leadership Alliance. The Leadership Alliance is an academic consortium of 24 colleges and universities, including the nation's most elite colleges and universities and historically black institutions, led by Brown University, that have come together to establish a professional development pipeline that gives minority students and professors access to advanced coursework and laboratories in order to encourage and support their efforts to become scientists, engineers and teachers. Essentially, this group is working to enhance inclusiveness and diversity in graduate school. The Alliance has indicated that it is interested in working with the Administration to jointly pursue this mission.

Next Steps: When we meet, we need to discuss ways in which we can collaborate with the Alliance and other higher education associations to make progress in enhancing inclusiveness and diversity in higher education. Mike Wenger and Scott Palmer should consider the Alliance's offer of help in fashioning outreach and leadership efforts.

Conclusion

We should convene a meeting with relevant White House and PIR staff to sort through the various proposals so that we may quickly act on the priorities. In particular, we will have to act quickly on the Campus Week of Dialogue and the Presidential meeting proposals, as they will require the most work.

Comments/Corrections on Rundlet Memo

Campus Week of Dialogue

Meeting with Higher Ed Leaders

Caution: Basic concepts are ok, but have some concerns that PIR would put POTUS in position of endorsing approaches such as multicultural curricula and cultural houses, that he may not want to get into. Also, not clear that the analogy of the formation of the Lawyers' Committee is quite right.

Shireman needs to be included in these discussions.

Release of Affirmative Action Self-Assessment

Memo omits DPC's role in working to finalize this guide (maybe Rundlet thinks I'm with counsel's office?). Depending on what comments we received internally, our next step was to convene a group of key higher ed and civil rights leaders here to review guidance with them. Elena has indicated that she thinks the "rollout" on this should be as low-key as possible, and that has been the approach I have been following. Is the recommended meeting necessary, and if so, who should take the lead on organizing it? Questions that will be included in the guidance were used at recent ACE conference, which went smoothly.

Identification of Solutions/Pipeline Programs

The paper that is being prepared by ED at the request of the DPC is focused specifically on outreach and recruitment strategies, largely so it will track with the High Hopes proposal, and to show that there are successful approaches in addition to affirmative action in admissions. In addition, many prominent retention strategies will meet with less consensus nationally, such as alternative teaching methods, multicultural curricula and cultural houses. The paper is emphatically not about alternative admissions processes, like the Texas 10% plan -- DPC has recommended that POTUS not become admissions dean in chief. PIR has expressed an interest in pursuing further research on retention, and over the long-term that is an issue worth addressing, but DPC focus has been on outreach and recruitment, which is what we indicated in memo to POTUS late last year. Thus far, I am not aware of any significant involvement of Eddie Correia or Chris Edley in this project, although I do think Theda Zawaiza at ED has spoken with Edley.

Value of Diversity

Memo omits that ED, at request of DPC, is having a paper developed on the topic of the value of diversity in postsecondary education.

California Minority Scholarship Fund.

Has Eddie Correia discussed his views on Title VI with ED? Is advocating private scholarship funds the way we want to go in this area?

A Moral Issue

One Philadelphia lawyer's role in the fight for civil rights

by Gerard J. St. John

The tide of civil rights ebbed and flowed for nearly three years after playing a critical role in the election of President John F. Kennedy. But in the spring of 1963, the mood became increasingly violent, and the focus of the nation was drawn south to Alabama. Racist elements resorted to explosives and death threats against African-American leaders. Law enforcement authorities not only refused to protect citizens who were conducting nonviolent marches in their quest for equal rights, but openly joined the opposition, using police dogs, night sticks and fire hoses to intimidate protesters.

Even the highest elected official in the state of Alabama, Governor George C. Wallace, announced that he would disregard the federal court order that prohibited interference with the admission of African-American students at the University of Alabama. Under the guise of testing the constitutionality of that order, Wallace vowed to stand in the doorway to prevent the integration of the university.

In many parts of the country, people viewed this sad series of events as a "Southern problem," one over which they had little influence and no control. However, some individuals saw it as their duty to speak out and to participate in the direction of government.

In Philadelphia, Geraldine Segal was not the least bit timid. "Well, what is

the bar of the nation doing about this? What should you be doing?" Geraldine asked her lawyer husband, Bernard G. Segal, who, for perhaps the first time in his nearly 56 years, was speechless.

Segal took Gerry's challenge seriously, but he also knew the enormity of the problem. He took stock of the resources available to him. He was a former Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association and an officer of the American Law Institute. He had been a key part of the effort that persuaded President Eisenhower to permit the ABA to pass on the qualifications of judicial candidates, and he had served as chairman of the ABA's Committee on the Federal Judiciary. During the Eisenhower years, he also struck up a friendship with Robert F. Kennedy, who was then working on the Senate investigation of the Teamsters. These activities had brought him into contact with many of the leaders of the legal community nationwide. But what could he do about the storm that was gathering in Alabama? It was Friday morning and Governor Wallace would be in the doorway of the Tuscaloosa campus the following Tuesday.

By the time he reached his office at 1719 Packard Building, Segal had a plan. He picked up his phone and called the two leading newspapers in Birmingham, Alabama. Would they reserve front-page space in Monday's edition for a statement endorsed by

acknowledged leaders of the bar and addressed to Governor Wallace with respect to the situation at the University of Alabama? Both editors promised to reserve the space. Segal then recruited his partner, Jerome J. Sheslack, and the two set about calling leaders of the bar across the country.

It was a long, arduous job. In the first instance, it took time to make personal contact. Friday soon faded into the weekend. Throughout the day Saturday, the calls continued. Over and over again the question was asked, "Would you join in a public statement to the effect that the governor of Alabama should comply with the lawful order of a federal court?" For many of those lawyers, the political and economic risks were enormous. Segal's heart and hopes occasionally plummeted as lawyers whom he had counted on to support the effort declined to participate. More often, however, spirits soared as increasing numbers of eminent lawyers joined the effort.

The last call was completed about 3 a.m. Sunday. A total of forty-six lawyers joined in the statement. Although they would issue the statement as individuals, they included the president of the American College of Trial Lawyers, three former attorneys general of the United States, the current president and six past presidents of the American Bar Association, the

deans of the law schools of Harvard, Mississippi, North Carolina, Notre Dame, Penn and Yale, and a brother and law partner of one of Governor Wallace's closest advisers. The statement read in part as follows:

"In a government of laws, the Governor is not free to flout the court's decree so long as it remains in force, particularly when the issues have been so recently and so frequently resolved by the highest court in the land.

"Lawyers have a special responsibility to support the rule of law in our society and to obey the fundamental legal principles that guarantee safety and justice for all. To this end, as lawyers, we ask Governor Wallace to refrain from defiance of a solemn court order. If he is present when the students present themselves for registration, we call upon him to stand aside."

On Monday, June 10, 1963, the two Birmingham newspapers not only published the statement and the names of the forty-six prestigious lawyers, but also one of the papers, the *Birmingham News*, published a favorable editorial. The Associated Press

carried the statement to newspapers nationwide.

On Tuesday, June 11, 1963, Governor Wallace took his position in the doorway at the University of Alabama. For a while, it was a game of cat and mouse in which neither side forced the issue. In the early afternoon, Deputy U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach approached with two African-American students. After making a brief statement for the news media, Governor Wallace stepped aside and a confrontation was avoided. Katzenbach, along with Attorney General Robert Kennedy and President John F. Kennedy, later said that the forty-six-lawyer protest was a significant influence in weakening Governor Wallace's resistance.

That evening, President Kennedy went on television to report on the status of civil rights. Kennedy bluntly told the country: "We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is as clear as the American Constitution. ... We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people."

The President asked for the help of all citizens "to provide the kind of equality of treatment which we would want ourselves, to give a chance for every child to be educated to the limits of his talents."

Several days afterward, Robert Kennedy called Segal to thank the leaders of the bar for their active help in the crisis at the University of Alabama. During the conversation, Segal noted that President Kennedy had already reached out for support from leaders of other key groups, such as labor leaders, educators and businessmen, and he suggested that lawyers would also respond to such a call. Thirty minutes later, Segal received a call from Lee White, a member of the White House staff. White asked Segal to prepare a list of 250 lawyers, at least one from every state, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, including the forty-six who had joined in the statement to Governor Wallace, and including at least fifty members of minority groups. They were to be invited to attend a White House conference for lawyers on the subject of civil rights.

Robert Kennedy later told Segal that President Kennedy would create a lawyers' committee for civil rights and that he wanted to appoint Segal as one of its co-chairmen. Segal was honored, but he declined the offer. It would be impossible. He had just completed an extensive period of service to the ABA, and the private practice of law created insuperable demands on his time.

On June 21, 1963, attendance at the conference in the East Room of the White House exceeded all expectations. Despite only four days' notice, 244 leaders of the bar from all areas of the country attended the session. Bernard Segal was among them. He stayed at the rear of the room, intending to return to Philadelphia at the close of the meeting. From his position, he felt almost detached from the important occasion that unfolded before him.

President Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy spoke to the assembled lawyers. President Kennedy emphasized the seriousness of the racial unrest pervading the nation in "this hour of moral and constitutional crisis." The President announced that

DAVIDYAN & NICHOLS

Real Estate, Inc. Gladwyne

Philadelphia, Pa. 19134

Member of Equal Housing

With years of commercial real estate experience in sales and

leasing

and investment services

(610) 896-HOME(4663)



VILLANOVA



\$890,000

Unique country manor residence on 1.2 acres. The highlights are a Great Room with beamed ceiling, french doors to the Boxwood garden, large dining room, flagstone terrace and in-ground pool. There are 6 bedrooms, 4 1/2 baths and 5 fireplaces in the main house. A beautiful spacious garage apartment with separate entrance containing living room, dining area with doors leading to deck, kitchenette, and bedroom with full bath.

DAVIDYAN & NICHOLS WHOSE PRINCIPALS ARE G. KURT DAVIDYAN AND CAROL NICHOLS IS STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL REAL ESTATE AGENTS. SEVERAL OF THESE AGENTS JOINED WHEN THE FIRM OF CROZZER & CROZZER, AN OLD NAME IN MAIN LINE REAL ESTATE, RETIRED. PROPERTIES RANGE FROM TOWN-HOUSES TO ESTATES IN MONTGOMERY, DELAWARE AND CHESTER COUNTIES. THE DAVIDYAN AND NICHOLS CLIENT LIST INCLUDES INCOMING EXECUTIVES AT SEVERAL MAJOR FIRMS, MEMBERS OF SPORT TEAMS, FAMILIES UP-GRADING THEIR HOMES, AS WELL AS FIRST-TIME BUYERS.

DAVIDYAN & NICHOLS OFFERS COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, AND LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THEIR SPECIALIST, MR. BENNETT BLUM. THE ABILITY TO ARRANGE FOR A COMMERCIAL OR RESIDENTIAL APPRAISAL AS WELL AS A FREE MARKET ANALYSIS IS ANOTHER SERVICE OFFERED BY DAVIDYAN & NICHOLS REAL ESTATE, INC.

he was creating a committee that would be known as the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. The co-chairmen of the new committee would be "Harrison Tweed of New York City and Bernard G. Segal of Philadelphia."

Segal felt as though a bolt of lightning had coursed through him. He wanted to stand up and scream that he had said "No!" He could not possibly accept such an appointment.

When the meeting ended, Segal hurriedly made his way to the front of the room and sought out President Kennedy. He explained that there had been a mistake, that he had told Bobby that he could not accept the appointment, that he simply did not have enough time.

Kennedy responded that Bobby had reported those exact words. But Bobby also told the President about a visit to Segal's home, where he saw among Segal's memorabilia a note dating back to the third or fourth grade when Segal had won an essay contest. The unsigned note had been on his desk when Bernie came back to the classroom after receiving the award. On it was written: "You Sheeny, you didn't win it—you stole it."

"Mr. Segal," said the President, "I want someone at the head of this committee who has experienced and lived with prejudice."

"But, Mr. President," Segal stammered, "that incident occurred a long time ago."

"Yes," the President replied, "but you kept that note all this time."

For the second time in his life, Bernard G. Segal was speechless.

Under the leadership of Segal and Tweed, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law was a singular success. Its call for peaceful compliance with court orders had an immediate and persuasive impact. The committee also sent volunteer lawyers to

Mississippi at the request of the National Council of Churches. Later, the committee opened an office in Jackson, Mississippi, and under very difficult circumstances, lawyers from all parts of the country, many of them from Philadelphia, participated in the higher calling of the bar.

John F. Kennedy was right. The civil rights crisis of 1963 was a moral issue, one that demanded a distinction between right and wrong. In his televised address to the American people

in June 1963, Kennedy also said, "Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality."

The ability of each individual to make a difference in society, and the obligation of all persons to participate in a democratic government were recurring themes underlying the Kennedy administration. Those themes are also well known to Philadelphia lawyers.

Langford Management Associates can help you win more cases.



☞ Choosing the right expert can sometimes make or break your case. ☞

Dennis Langford
President of LMA

Law firms across the Philadelphia area are using Langford Management Associates (LMA) as their technical expert to examine, confirm and develop case evidence. The result is highly successful, cost-efficient litigation.

Only LMA offers all of the following capabilities:

- Expert witness testimony/technical support
- Staff of engineers and construction experts.
- Coordination of other technical experts on the case.
- Lump sum or not to exceed fees.
- Broad level of legal industry experience.
- Document management utilizing state-of-the-art imaging from our Scantech Division.

For more information on LMA's comprehensive litigation support capabilities, call John Girard at 215-561-1960.

LANGFORD

Langford Management Associates, Inc.

The Graham Building - Suite 1200
15th & Ranstead Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19102

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gerard J. St. John is partner in the firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal and Lewis.



**PIR Project Proposal:
POTUS Meeting with Higher Education Leaders**

Project: The President would convene a White House meeting with higher education leaders to discuss what the higher education community can do to promote the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and to further the goals of the President's Initiative on Race (PIR). At the meeting, the President would issue a call to action to higher education leaders that would include concrete recommendations and yield concrete outcomes (described below).

Goals: The proposed meeting between the President and higher education leaders would promote at least two related goals:

- The meeting would lead to the establishment of a formal, coordinated campaign within the higher education community designed to promote, through words and actions, the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and to recapture ownership of the debate over affirmative action in higher education.
- The meeting would encourage leaders to participate in the efforts of PIR, especially the week of campus dialogue on race.

Background: Regardless of opposing views concerning the use of affirmative action in higher education, there is widespread agreement that increasing minority access and promoting diversity in higher education are valuable ends to be pursued. Furthermore, most leaders in higher education (and perhaps business) support affirmative action, properly constructed, as one tool to promote access and diversity in higher education. However, the public debate over affirmative action and its ends has become confused and misdirected. Furthermore, the higher education community has not come together to correct public misunderstandings about such issues as the definition of merit, the role of inclusion, the value of diversity, the meaning of affirmative action, and the mission of higher education. The higher education community has an important role to play in both defining and creating One America. What is needed is a coordinated, public campaign within the higher education community to promote, through words and actions, the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and the role of colleges and universities in bridging America's racial divides.

Project Description:

During or prior to the week of April 6, 1998, the President would convene a meeting at the White House with higher education (and select business and perhaps foundation) leaders to discuss the values of inclusion and diversity in

higher education and what the higher education community can do to promote those values on campus and with the American people. (The meeting with the President would perhaps follow other meetings on the same day with White House/PIR staff.) The meeting would include a challenge by the President to higher education leaders to come together and promote, through words and actions, the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and to further the goals of PIR. The meeting would end with a public announcement by higher education leaders reaffirming the values of inclusion and diversity and formally establishing an inter-university (or inter-higher education organization) task force to promote those values in concrete ways. (The task force would be constructed prior to the meeting and would perhaps include financial support from corporations and/or foundations.) The analogy for this effort is President Kennedy's meeting with leaders from the legal community in 1963, which led to the creation of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

In his call to action, the President could challenge the higher education community through its newly created inter-university task force and more widely to do several concrete things, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Launch a coordinated campaign to clearly articulate and communicate to the American people the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and to positively address other tough questions of race in higher education, including the proper role of affirmative action.
- Coordinate and promote the research agenda concerning the value of diversity and other issues of race in higher education.
- Develop and champion short- and long-term programs designed to increase minority access and, thereby, diversity in higher education.
- Develop and champion campus programs designed to maximize the benefits of diversity in higher education, including retention programs, programs to promote positive racial climates on campus, and programs to promote positive cross-racial interactions.
- Promote creative partnerships between predominantly white and minority-serving institutions to maximize the benefits of diversity.

The President would also challenge the greater higher education community to participate in other PIR activities, including the April 6-9 week of university dialogue on race, which PIR and several higher education and community organizations are sponsoring.

Concrete Outcomes:

The most obvious outcomes from the proposed White House meeting are the following:

- A strong, public endorsement by the higher education community of the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education. (The American Council on Education (ACE) already possesses such a statement endorsed by literally dozens of higher education (and business) organizations representing countless colleges and universities. We have spoken informally with ACE about the possibility of releasing the statement in conjunction with this proposed White House meeting.)
- The creation of a formal, inter-university task force to promote the values of inclusion and diversity in higher education and, thereby, the role of colleges and universities in creating One America. (Some models for this task force exist within the higher education community, and we are working with select higher education organizations to identify the most appropriate structure for the task force.)
- Increased participation by the higher education community in PIR activities, including the April 6-9 university week of dialogue on race.

Next Steps:

- Secure a date for the proposed White House meeting with the President and higher education leaders.
- Work with a core set of higher education leaders to identify (1) the most appropriate meeting participants from the higher education community, (2) the key issues to be discussed at the meeting, and (3) the concrete outcomes from the meeting, including the form and makeup of the proposed inter-university task force. (We have initiated informal conversations and meetings with a few key higher education leaders about these issues. For example, we are meeting on Thursday, February 5, 1998, with Hector Garza of ACE, who has developed a proposed list of the most appropriate participants for a White House meeting.)
- Assist select higher education organizations, college and university leaders, and foundations in constructing and commissioning the task force that would emerge from the White House meeting with the President.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

EQUAL JUSTICE
UNDER LAW

FAX: 202-401-5391

TELECOPIER COVER SHEET

Number of Pages Including This Cover Sheet: _____

Telephone Number of Receiving Telecopier: 456-5581**ADDRESSEE:**Name: Bill KainardOrganization: WhitellbaseTelephone Number: 456-2857**FROM:**Name: John Winkler

Organization: _____

Telephone Number: 401-6233

DATE: _____ TIME: _____

IN THE EVENT OF PROBLEMS IN TRANSMISSION:

Call: _____ Telephone Number: _____

MESSAGE:

Bill - Thanks for your help -
Please let me know if this works
on ED generated document.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THIS TRANSMISSION IS INTENDED FOR AND RESTRICTED TO THE NAMED ADDRESSEE ONLY. IT MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU RECEIVE THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR, YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, COPYING, OR DISSEMINATING THE TRANSMISSION. PLEASE CALL (202) 401-8340 TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN OF ANY TRANSMISSION SENT IN ERROR. THANK YOU

600 INDEPENDENCE AVE., S.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-2110

Our mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the Nation.

**Talking Points in Opposition to Congressman Gallegly's
Amendment to H.R. 2202, Authorizing States to Deny
Public Education Benefits to Undocumented Aliens**

This amendment is an attempt to circumvent the Supreme Court's decision in *Plyler v. Doe* and authorize States to exclude undocumented children from public elementary and secondary schools. Not only does this amendment raise serious Constitutional issues, it is fundamentally shortsighted and wrong to punish children for the conduct of their parents by depriving them of the education needed to become self-sufficient and participate in society. Excluding undocumented children would harm communities, burden schools, and frustrate attempts to increase family involvement in education – without reducing illegal immigration.

THIS IS NOT ABOUT IMMIGRATION. THIS IS NOT ABOUT STATES' RIGHTS. THIS IS ABOUT EDUCATING KIDS.

- **UNFAIRLY PENALIZES CHILDREN.** Excluding undocumented children from basic K-12 education services would unfairly penalize such children for the conduct of their parents, depriving them of a chance to get a good education and make the best of their lives.
- **COSTLY TO THE CHILD AND THE NATION.** Allowing states to bar the school door against undocumented children is against our nation's best interests, reducing the likelihood that these kids will grow up self-sufficient and able to participate in society. Instead, exclusion makes it more likely that undocumented children will become involved in unlawful activity, or otherwise burden their communities. Educating such children may cost money, but the alternative is far costlier.
- **INEFFECTIVE IMMIGRATION STRATEGY.** It's important to protect our borders, but preventing blameless children from attending school is a poor strategy for combating illegal immigration. Moreover, this amendment would encourage a "crazy quilt" immigration policy from state to state.
- **BURDENS LOCAL SCHOOLS.** States that exclude undocumented children would force schools to screen for the immigration status of all students, creating substantial (and uncompensated) administrative and financial burdens at the local level. Busy teachers and principals would have to double as immigration officials.
- **HARMS ALL STUDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES.** Moreover, excluding undocumented children would potentially harm other students and their families, including the families of legal immigrants. Anxious parents could be forced to send their children off to school bearing proof of citizenship. Children born in the U.S. – *citizens* – might not be allowed to attend school with their undocumented siblings. Overall, such a policy would undermine efforts to increase family involvement in education.
- **NOT "STATES' RIGHTS."** This is not an issue of "states' rights." Congress should never authorize such an unwise policy to the detriment of innocent children, our communities, and our country.
- **RAISES SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES.** In light of the *Plyler* decision, this amendment, if enacted, would raise very serious constitutional issues under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Q's & A's
on the Gallegly Amendment to H.R. 2202 Authorizing States to Deny
Undocumented Children a Public Education

Question: *We have to stop illegal immigrants from entering the United States. A free education is one of the magnets that draws illegal immigrants to this country so why not allow States to prohibit illegal immigrants from receiving education benefits as a way of curtailing illegal immigration?*

Answer: We all agree that the United States needs to do a better job of protecting the integrity of its borders. But jobs are the real immigration magnet; denying children an education will not stem illegal immigration.

Trying to use education as a tool for enforcing immigration laws will succeed only in punishing innocent children. These children did not choose to come here, their parents did. And their parents came here not for the public schools, but for employment. The issue is are we going to punish innocent children -- by denying them an education and the chance to improve their lives -- because of the transgressions of their parents?

In any event, these children are here and are likely to stay here. It is in the best interest of the children, the community and the Nation that these kids be given the opportunity to become contributing members of society.

Question: *It is the State that has to provide illegal immigrants an education. It is the State that has to pay for providing those benefits. Why shouldn't we leave it up to the States to decide whether they will or will not do so?*

Answer: First, the issue here is not federalism or states' rights. The issue is educating KIDS. This is about providing all kids with an education and with the opportunity and tools necessary to become self-sufficient, contributing members of society and to make the best of their lives. We cannot punish innocent kids in the name of federalism -- that's what this amendment would do.

Second, allowing states to exclude kids from schools is against our national

interest. All of us have -- at the Federal, State, and local level -- a stake in educating our children and improving our communities -- and we have a responsibility to do so. These children are here and are likely to remain here. It would be fundamentally short-sighted to deprive undocumented children of the education needed to become self-sufficient and participate in modern society.

Third, exclusion would harm communities, burden schools, and frustrate attempts to increase family involvement in education. It would raise serious constitutional questions. *And it would do all this without reducing illegal immigration.* Why authorize the States to implement such an unwise policy?

Question: *The costs of educating illegal immigrants drain States of scarce and much-needed resources -- especially in States like California or Texas. How can the Federal government justify requiring States to provide education to these individuals without providing them the resources to do so?*

Answer: First, the Federal government does provide States with funds that help to educate undocumented children, through the Emergency Immigrant Education program, ESEA Title I assistance, and other education programs. The Administration has, in fact, urged a greater investment in education. Unfortunately, the majority in Congress wants to CUT education funds.

Furthermore, the costs of NOT educating these children are far more serious. Where will these kids go once they are banned from school? Will they wind up on the streets? Will they simply go uneducated? What will happen to these children and the communities they live in? Will these children engage in unlawful behavior or otherwise burden their communities? As the Supreme Court argued in *Plyler v. Doe*: "By denying [undocumented] children a basic education, we deny them the ability to live within the structure of our civic institutions, and foreclose any realistic possibility that they will contribute in even the smallest way to the progress of our Nation."

Question: *How can we expect schools to continue to provide quality education to students who are citizens when they are burdened with the responsibility of educating illegal immigrants?*

Answer: Authorizing states to exclude undocumented children will not improve education. First, local schools would be forced to bear enormous economic and administrative burdens in order to carry out such a policy. School teachers and administrators will have to take on the additional role of serving as immigration officers, screening all children and trying to verify their legal status. Schools and/or States will have to establish -- most likely uncompensated -- a system or means of verifying immigration status. What happens when mistakes are made and children are wrongly identified as being undocumented?

Second, think of the impact on families. If a state decides to require proof of immigration status for enrollment, such documentation would have to be required for all families. What will happen when busy Mom or Dad can't find the birth certificate on the first day of school? What about a family where a citizen child can't attend school with his or her undocumented sibling? And how likely are families composed of legal immigrants, but uncertain of their status, to send their children to school? This amendment is hostile to efforts to improve education by encouraging more family involvement in education; in fact, it would do just the opposite, driving many parents away.

Finally, federal programs such as Title I can help meet the needs of immigrant students -- if the funds aren't cut.



William R. Kincaid
08/19/97 06:44:48 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP
cc: Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP, Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP
Subject: Race Data

Here are suggested additions/modifications (**in bold**) to the data collection project on education from Mike and me; Allison is also bringing you marked up hard copies:

2. Educational status

a. Early childhood

-- access to **/participation in** kindergarten/early childhood programs

b. Enrollment

-- dropout/**graduation** rates

-- **years to college degree; full-time/part-time college-going**

-- receive **postsecondary** student aid (federal, private)

c. Quality of Schooling

-- **Enrollment in college prep/core academic courses**

d. Achievement

-- **Access to/participation in Advanced Placement (AP) programs**

[It might be worthwhile looking at performance on a few states' assessments, but it would be hard to do something like this nationwide]

Possible Resources: National Center for Education Statistics -- **Pat Forgione/Maureen Treacy/Marty Orland 219-1828**

Department of Education Planning and Evaluation Service-- **Val Plisko 401-1958**

Also, under economic status, we should note that it's the Small Business Administration (not "Association.")



ONE AMERICA IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The President's Initiative on Race

The New Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20503
202/395-1010

MEMORANDUM

To: Data Collection Working Group
From: Judith Winston *JW*
Date: August 13, 1997
Re: Data collection needs

*Common to
E/na k.*

*- adds/cuts
- but contacts*

Thank you for your help collecting data for the President's Initiative on Race. In addition to the data requests in this document, we would also like you to provide us with basic demographic data including:

- the racial composition of the U.S. population, including origin of recent immigrants
- the geographic distribution of races, ethnicities, immigrants
 - distribution among rural, suburban, and urban areas
- components of change, including birth, death, immigration and migration
- projections for the future

as well as any other data you deem useful.

We have identified eight broad categories that require researching. Suggested data elements for each of these categories are outlined on the attached sheets. For each of these categories, it would be helpful for you to identify the following information:

1. Key indicators of progress
2. Trends in disparities among races
 - where have positive changes occurred (especially those where government intervention has made a difference)
 - where are disparities growing
 - where are disparities due to race and where are they due to class
 - what are the effects of urban/rural location
3. Costs of discrimination
4. Data sources, upcoming studies, other sources of information

We assume that you will work with relevant federal agencies to obtain this information. We would like to have a first draft of the statistics by the end of the month. Please contact Michele Cavataio at 395-1013 if you need assistance.

Thank you very much.

*① 50 pgs CEA report (Addendum)
② "A Common Destiny"*

1. Economic status

a. Income, poverty, child poverty

b. Labor markets

- employment (specified for age/sex), unemployment, non-employment
- hours (and number of jobs held)
- wages and non-wage compensation (health benefits, pension)
- occupation/industry (manufacturing vs. service)
- non-wage characteristics of jobs (e.g. working conditions, health risks)
- impact of immigration on labor markets
- promotion/mobility/leadership positions
- segregation
- access/enrollment in job training
- success rates of job training
- access to transportation to jobs
- access to child care
- is there some way to measure social networks?

c. Wealth/credit

- wealth
- business ownership
- home ownership
- retirement wealth
- access to credit and credit institutions
- AFDC/food stamps/ other forms of assistance

Possible Resources:

DOL Glass Ceiling Reports

Small Business Association Administration

Bureau of Labor Statistics

EEOC, Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry

2. Educational status

a. Early childhood education

- family reading to young children
- access to kindergarten/early childhood programs

participation in

b. Enrollment

- grade retention
- expulsion/suspension rates
- remedial education, tracking, special education
- dropout rates
- detached youth (youth neither in school nor working)
- post-secondary enrollment
- immediate transition from high school to college
- college completion (2 year, 4 year)
- enrollment in vocational schools
- graduate schooling
- access to after-school programs
- education attainment levels
- receive student aid (federal, private)
- receive school breakfasts/lunches

graduation

postsecondary

c. Quality of schooling

- access to technology
- teacher quality (% teachers with degree in subject they are teaching)
- teacher/student ratios; class size
- funding
- facilities
- parental involvement
- perception of safety at school
- parent perception of school quality
- desegregation; impact of desegregation (successes and failures)

d. Achievement

- NAEP math, science and reading at 4, 8, 12 grades
- achievement gaps between high and low poverty schools
- SATs/ACTs

state assessments?

e. LEP

- children with difficulty speaking English
- children who speak something besides English at home
- access to/quality of bilingual education

years to degree /
full-time / part-time
college-going

Overlaid in
college prep / core course

f. Civil Rights Complaints

Possible Resources:

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics

National Center for Education Statistics: - Pat Fargione/Maurice Treacy/
Mary Orland 219-1828

Youth Indicators 1996

Digest of Education Statistics

The Condition of Education 1997

Department of Education Planning and Evaluation Service - Val Pliske 401-

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant

Secretary for Planning and Evaluation

1958

Children's Defense Fund

3. Health Status and Health Care

a. Pregnancy and Infancy

- access to early prenatal care
- infant mortality
- low birthweight

b. Childhood and young adulthood

- child mortality rates
- homicide rates/victims of violent crimes
- Prime killers of children and youth (e.g. motor vehicles, firearms)
- immunization
- children in households reporting "not enough to eat"
- teen birth rates

c. Adulthood

d. Older ages

e. Specific diseases or conditions

f. Health Care

- access to insurance
- availability of health services
- comparative costs of health services
- quality of health services

g. Health behaviors

- drug, alcohol, tobacco use
- fire arm access

Possible Resources:

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics

National Center for Education Statistics, Youth Indicators 1996

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation

Centers for Disease Control

Children's Defense Fund

4. Civic Behavior and Attitudes

a. Political Behavior

- voting, by age cohort
- holding public office, by different levels and rural vs. urban
- impact of having minorities in public office
- causes of transitions in big cities from black to white mayors
- redistricting
- other political participation

b. Religious behavior

- church attendance
- political/educational activity through church
- church segregation/integration

c. Social behavior

- peer influence
- TV watching
- computer use
- civic disengagement

Possible Resources:

Southwest Voter Research Institute

Midwest/Northeast Voter Education Project

LEAP

Native American Law Center, Boulder, CO

National Indian Youth Council, Albuquerque, NM

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies 1997 National Opinion Poll
Gallup Poll

University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research

Professor Robert Putnam, Harvard (civic disengagement)

5. Criminal Justice

- a. Nature and distribution of offenses, offenders
- b. Bias in criminal justice system (sentencing, death row, probation)
- c. Characteristics of offenders/victims
- d. Recidivism
- e. Literacy of prisoners/ prisoner education opportunities
- f. Public attitudes towards criminal justice system
- g. Jury participation by race
- h. Police brutality
- i. Hate crimes
 - violent crimes
 - vandalism

Possible Resources:

Bureau of Justice Statistics Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics
Anti-Defamation League
U.S. Sentencing Commission
DOJ Study on Police Brutality

6. Kinship Relationships

- a. 2 parent vs. single parent
- b. female-headed households
- c. multi-generational households
- d. family size
- e. foster care/adoption
 - inter-racial adoptions
- f. care of elderly
- g. child care patterns
- h. child support

Possible Resources:

Census

7 . Housing and Residential Patterns

- a. homelessness
- b. residential stability
- c. % in poor neighborhoods
- d. quality of housing
- e. segregation
- f. impact of change in neighborhood composition on property values

Possible Resources:

HUD

Lawyers Committee on Civil Rights

Professor Massey, U. Penn (residential segregation)

8. Race Relations

- a. Racial attitudes (intergenerational differences)
- b. Developments in the 1990's
 - Rodney King beating, trials, and riots
 - OJ Simpson trials
 - The Bell Curve Controversy
 - Challenges to Affirmative Action in California
 - Immigration Scapegoating
 - Positive developments, for example:
 - responses to hate crimes (e.g. Boise, ID)
 - inter-racial, inter-denominational rebuilding of burned churches
 - US military

Possible Resources:

ACD?

Harvard/ Kaiser Washington Post Polling Data

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies 1997 National Opinion Poll

Gallup Poll

National Conference- Louis Harris

Time

Newsweek

Children's Defense Fund

USA Today/CNN poll on affirmative action

Community Relations Service

US Commission on Civil Rights

Race Initiative**Brainstorming Meeting Notes: President's Race Initiative**
August 9, 1997**Getting started**

1. 5 goals:
 - a. Articulate the President's vision of a just, unified America
 - b. Educate all Americans about the facts of race
 - c. Promote a constructive dialogue
 - d. Encourage leadership
 - e. Identify and disseminate solutions
2. study-dialogue-action
3. Need a common language to build one America / can we agree on shared values?
 - a. common ground
 - b. opportunity
 - c. family
 - d. race has impeded building of one America

Measures of success

1. Nation is better educated
 - a. Number of blacks in the US is not 50 percent
 - b. Percentage of minorities in America is changing so that there will be no majority race in a few decades
 - c. Discrimination exists
2. Judicial system
 - a. Vigorously enforce civil rights' laws/ commit adequate resources
 - b. Tie federal funds to training
3. Education system
 - a. Broad support for testing
 - b. What kind of public education system do we want? Consider resources, access.
 - c. Admission's criteria -- how to help schools measure all characteristics of a candidate and value diversity
 - d. Quality education at lower levels ensures qualified students in the pipeline

Dialogue

1. Don't let debate focus only on affirmative action
 - a. We need to treat the symptoms until we cure the disease, but we also need to focus on the disease.
2. Debate should move us to acknowledge racial tensions in our history
3. Debate should move from English only to English plus

4. Difference between prejudice which is a belief and racism which is acting on prejudice
5. America needs to agree on common values / aspirations
6. We need to educate Americans on the facts e.g. why are there haves and have nots? What are impediments to equal opportunity?
7. Recognize that not everyone will be starting in the same place
8. Should group membership include people from different races in proportion to population?
 - a. What adjustments do we need to bring about this result?
9. Helpful to understand what majority thinks.
 - a. Whites don't recognize their own privilege
 - b. Where do poor whites fit in the discussion?

Outcomes

1. Is the nation better educated about racism?
2. Do they care?
3. Are they willing to do something about it?

Strategies for realizing outcomes

1. Convince folks that diversity is important. Why?
 - a. Enlightened self interest, globalization of the economy
 - b. We don't have a person to waste
 - c. Reality: whites aren't majority in the future
 - d. Cost of discrimination (need to measure)
2. Use the bully pulpit (President, Cabinet)
3. Bring together CEOs from majority and minority communities
4. Get kids to talk to each other
5. Sponsor a Race for the Races - footrace before town meetings
6. Identify what works and share this information broadly
7. Involve public officials e.g. U.S. Conference of Mayors
8. Involve the media
 - a. Challenge networks to hold their own town meetings
 - b. Create PSAs/ Network sponsorship of primetime PSAs
 - c. Encourage commercials rather than lengthy specials
 - d. Need to educate media, too
9. Sponsor unity concerts

Audience

1. White soccer moms
2. Internet users
 - a. Email (85% has been very positive)
 - b. Capture best practices on website
 - c. Sponsor interactive dialogues
3. Folks who aren't invested

4. People who don't believe that racism exists
 - a. Mystery shopper testing is a good way to demonstrate existence of racism
5. Whites and other races - need to measure changes in attitudes
6. Policy makers
7. Corporate America -- believes in traditional meritocracy, need to broaden vision of what merit is
8. Federal Government must model behavior
 - a. E.g. military believes every person can achieve with adequate support/training
 - b. How to respond to the culture of entitlement, especially for non-performers

Concluding remarks

1. Year long initiative needs to lay foundation for continued progress
2. Need to narrow focus of initiative to concrete goals