UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVE ON RACE

+ + + + +

MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY BOARD

+ + + + +

Thursday, June 18, 1998

+ + + + +

The Board meeting was held in the Truman Room, White House Conference Center, 725 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Dr. John Hope Franklin, Chairman of the Advisory Board, presiding.

PRESIDING:

DR. JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN, Chairman

MS. LINDA CHAVEZ-THOMPSON

REV. DR. SUZAN JOHNSON COOK

GOVERNOR THOMAS KEAN

MS. ANGELA OH

MR. ROBERT THOMAS

MS. JUDITH WINSTON, Executive Director

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

		<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction by	Chairman Franklin	4
Presentation by	Rev. Suzan Johnson Cook	10
Presentation by	Angela Oh	13
Presentation by	Governor Thomas Kean	53
Presentation by	Linda Chavez-Thompson	58

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 | (9:03 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: I want to specify thanks to you for joining us this morning. I want to welcome you here today to the ninth session of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race.

Before I go any further, I'd like to take a moment to send our condolences to the family of James Byrd, Jr., in Jasper, Texas. The shocking and horrible circumstances of his death remind us of the reasons the President created this effort to address the troubling issues of racism.

This incident was a horrible example of the kind of violence that exists in our society. It has its roots in prejudice, hatred, and extremism that has no place in civil society.

I wish that I could say that this is an isolated, aberrant example or manifestation of this lack of civility, but I'm afraid that it has happened all too often, and I wish I could say that it will be the last time.

At any case, we applaud the people in the community who have stepped in to help the city join together in dialogue across racial lines to illustrate

that an act like this is not what this country is all about.

I think I speak on behalf of the members of the Board of the President's Initiative on Race when I say that our thoughts are with the Beard family and the people of Jasper as they seek to work out their problems in a civil manner.

When the President began this effort now a year ago, he set out to develop national policies and initiatives that would support the vision of America that respects our differences, but embraces our shared values. The President wanted to identify local communities around this nation that are making a difference with efforts of racial reconciliation and bridging racial divides.

And he wanted the American people to have a frank an open discussion about race in this country and how it affects our lives.

Over the past year, the Advisory Board members have been examining racial issues and our common future, looking at current laws and policies, and making recommendations that can help insure that we will become one America.

We have been talking to and hearing from

and listen to communities, businesses, government, community organizations and others at all levels in this effort. I believe that we have made significant strides in several important areas.

We have recommended from time to time new and important policies and public and private partnerships that will help to close the opportunity gap, improve access to education, health care and housing, and reduce racial disparities in areas such as crime and the administration of justice.

The Initiative has already identified some 200 examples around the country of local and national grassroots efforts to bring people of different races together. One example is the young Maryland high school student, Tom Manitux (phonetic), who organized students from other high schools for a town hall discussion on promoting racial harmony with other schools.

Another example is a program I visited in Los Angeles several months ago called STAR, Students Talk about Race. This program teaches college students to facilitate discussions on race with middle and high school students. College students receive professional facilitation training on discussing

issues of diversity and are then paired up to visit schools near their campuses.

This list of promising practices continues to grow. In Seattle, Washington, for example, there was a very extraordinary meeting a few weeks ago of a collection of community groups that had been meeting for several months, coming together, exchanging views, and making recommendations of how to lower racial tensions and improve their society.

The same thing is true in Oxen, Mississippi. There are large numbers of students at the University of Mississippi, as well as citizens from surrounding areas, who came together making reports on their own activities in this area of race, and suggesting that they were determined to eliminate the whole problem of race in the area.

And in Newark, New Jersey, just a few weeks ago, we had a very extensive and in depth meeting regarding housing not only in the New Jersey area, but throughout the country, and there we found that organizations were getting together for the purpose of eliminating discrimination in housing in New Jersey and elsewhere.

And we have elevated the issue of race on

the agenda through efforts like the very successful month of dialogue in April with over 600 colleges and universities, as well as the governors of 39 states and two territories, and 22 mayors participating in dialogues, service projects and other activities.

I believe that these efforts will have a lasting effect.

The charter for the Advisory Board expires in September, on September 30th. This winter the President will issue a report to the American people with recommendations for continuing to build on the achievements of this effort.

Yesterday Board members prepared short presentations for the full Advisory Board on four different topics: education, economic opportunity, leadership and values, and a vision for one America.

The purpose for these presentations is to help launch a discussion among Board members on these topics. Our plan for today, therefore, is to have a five-minute introduction of each of the topics and then Board discussion on the topics that we have covered.

During the course of the last year, various members of the Advisory Board have visited 35

states and almost every region of the country through
the efforts of the Board and the Initiative staff.
The opportunity to hear from all people in this
country has been invaluable to our experience.

Well, today's meeting is an attempt to synthesize some of the key points we have learned and options for ways in which we can continue to advance the goals of the Initiative.

We will also begin thinking about ideas that we may want to share with the President. I want to emphasize we are considering options. Think of this as a brainstorming session, if you will. We don't intend that the ideas discussed today to be in any way final or without opportunity for revision of recommendations.

I've asked the Executive Director, Judith Winston, to facilitate today's discussions so that the members of the Board can participate in full discussions. That includes the Chairman.

At this time I'd like to turn the conversation over to her.

MS. WINSTON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

There are, as you indicated, four areas in

which the Board members have indicated an interest in making presentations, and we wanted to start the presentations with a discussion regarding leadership and values and vision for one America, followed by general Board discussion of these issues.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you've asked Board Member Angela Oh --

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Yes.

MS. WINSTON: -- to provide a presentation on that component of the vision for one America discussion, addressing values, and the Reverend Dr. Suzan Johnson Cook will make a presentation, as well, on the vision for one America, a presentation regarding leadership issues.

So why don't we -- shall we start with the Reverend?

REV. DR. COOK: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Executive Director and all of my colleagues and each of you.

It was my pleasure to serve yesterday along with Governor Winter who unfortunately could not be here today and the rest of our subgroup, and we were looking at the leadership and values, and through the activities of the Advisory Board, which the

Chairman has outlined, and the Initiative staff, we have identified through this year thousands of potential leaders who can take responsibility for building on the foundation for racial reconciliation that we've created.

As you said, we have been to some 35 states in almost every region. It's been our pleasure to serve, and we see that much still remains to be done, and so to insure that the work of the Initiative continues, and again, this is in a proposal state, but we understand that there must be a government structure that will support cadre of leaders.

And the most appropriate structure to provide the support is a President's council, which would be appointed by the President with the clear imprimatur of the President and a clear mission and a staff to implement the mission and the authority to utilized resources from both the private sector and to build public-private partnerships to promote racial reconciliation.

We identified some priority goals of such a structure, and that would be to be in a positive and a proactive manner.

Number one would be to increase public

awareness and understanding of racial issues and dilemmas.

Number two would be to promote meaningful interracial interaction among individuals.

And number three would be to foster policies and procedures that would strengthen racial diversity in both government and nongovernmental institutions.

So to achieve these goals, it would require a set of strategies, which we spent a long time discussing, which would be implemented through partnerships with the private sector, focused on the design and execution of a public information campaign to promote racial reconciliation, the promotion of increased opportunities for interracial interaction by supporting people and institutions already involved in racial reconciliation, and that would be major for us because we feel that it is important to focus on people who are doing the work and give some increased priority to what is being done.

We saw many, many examples of people who are doing work all over this country.

And the third strategy would be the building of community and institutional momentum for

change in individual behavior and also on public policy, which both are necessary.

So we believe it's vitally important that strong efforts be made to fully engage the community of people who recognize the importance or racial reconciliation, and to certainly reach out beyond this community to those who are people of goodwill, but who don't recognize the need or don't feel a personal stake in bridling our racial divisions and narrowing the racial disparities.

So it's been a great year, and we look forward to the Initiative staff helping us to flesh out and help make these proposals much more concrete, but we suggest this to you from the leadership and values subgroup, and we thank you for your time and attention.

MS. WINSTON: Thank you, Reverend Johnson Cook.

Ms. Oh, do you want to make your presentation?

MS. OH: Yes. Good morning to all of our good members, and thank you, Dr. Franklin, for your leadership yesterday in our vision discussion.

I'd like to report back that the way we

looked at the framework for the future is that the core concern seems to be equality of opportunity. In almost every aspect it is important in people's daily lives.

So we're talking about economic, political, educational, housing, health. These are things that touch upon people's daily existence, and the challenge for the next period ahead is to look to that core concern in a multi-cultural context. We need to focus on policy initiatives with regard to this core concern, and that focus needs to be grounded in some fundamental principles that we believe are basic to our American democracy, those principles being justice, equality, respect, honor, integrity.

And more recently, in the last few years, I would say in the last three decades we were talking about this concept of inclusion, which is something that America is going to have to meet as its new challenge in the 21st Century, to approach the notion that Americans can begin to define themselves as a multi-cultural people functioning in a multi-cultural society.

The implications are tremendous because of our standing in the world community and the fact that

we have this vast human resource in this nation that is yet to be harnessed.

Right now we're going through confronting a change that we know is very real. Some of us can see it right in our backyards in terms of this multicultural, multi-racial context. We will see new and emerging populations. We will see more mixed race people who call themselves Americans, and the shared value set or set of principles are those that I referred to earlier.

We want to talk about developing strategies for creating this equality of opportunity with this new piece of inclusion being kept in mind. We understand that most of the information that we have at present is based on what we know about experiences of African Americans and Caucasians in this country, and we know that we will need to work hard to expand understanding the data that is available now and will be more available in the future on emerging populations in this country.

We've asked ourselves how will we know if things have improved, and fundamentally, we will know when the poor demonstrate or we can demonstrate that the poor at least have the same equality of opportunity in these areas that I call and we call deeply connected to our daily lives.

And I guess what we're hoping is that when the President turns to the work of putting together his report to the American people, that he will be bold, and we will encourage him to be bold, because we will in our recommendations set out a series of options that we think reflect truthfully what we've heard all across the country in this past year.

I think also what we're looking for is a way to express to him that we know that leadership capacity in the future rests on the ability of individuals to operate comfortably in a multi-cultural context, to begin to move away from a race based framework that might, might decrease our ability to meet this goal of inclusion.

We want to be able to continue to talk about inclusion in a real way, and we want to see it reflected in the policy initiatives that are put forward.

We're looking to other sectors to help us move this idea forward, and Reverend Johnson Cook mentioned those other sectors, who of course we all know. If you stop for just a minute and ask how do we

get this done, that is, improve or advance race relations, there is no one group that can get it done. There is no one political party; there's no one race or ethnic group. There's no one religious group. One gender can't do it. It must involve the business sector. It must involve nonprofits.

We have to look to the creativity that philanthropy has to offer. We have to look for the faith community to anchor the spiritual walk that we'll be talking, and we have to also look to representatives in important institutions, such as our justice system, local government, and institutions of higher education.

Governor Kean reported to us that he met with several people who are presidents of universities and colleges across this country, and they stand ready to do whatever it takes to take up this agenda for the future.

So the invitation has been extended by the President. The American people have responded in the past year in an overwhelming way, and we hear from important sectors in our society that they're prepared to do what it takes to follow a vision that is laid out.

MS. WINSTON: Thank you.

And now we would like to open for discussion among Board members this issue of the challenges that stand before you in terms of the vision that you are projecting for the 21st Century, one America, both in terms of leadership and values.

There was some discussion among the subgroups about some of the challenges that you've identified in both projecting the kind of multicultural approach to one America, and I wonder if you might want to just follow up on that discussion.

Governor Kean, did you want to talk a little bit about that?

GOVERNOR KEAN: I expect just to emphasize how very important we think this is. At the end of the last century and the beginning of this century, many of us, I suspect, who are in this room and outside had parents and great grandparents who immigrated to this country under the worst of all possible conditions.

There was no minimum wage. A number of them didn't know the English language. They had to take the most menial jobs imaginable. They lived sometimes ten to a room.

What kept them going is a very strong belief that even though they may never rise above the condition they were in, that in this country as opposed to where they came from, their children would. They had confidence in the common school. They had confidence in the American Dream, and that through all of that bitter time, that kept the flame of hope burning.

I suspect, and I know, that it's very, very hard, for instance, for an African American parent who lives in very difficult conditions in this city or Detroit or Chicago, in Newark or Camden, to have that faith, and if they cannot have that faith, if they cannot have the hope perhaps for their children, even if not for themselves, if they don't feel the opportunity of the American Dream is out there, then this nation will not succeed in the coming century.

Many of you remember Randolph Langston Hughes and what happens to a dream deferred. Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun or does it explode? My suspicion is that if we don't do a lot more to recreate opportunity, equal opportunity for all people in this country, and break down the barriers to it,

then our children and us, if we're around, are in for a very difficult time in the coming century.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That's the vital importance of this work.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: One of the verv interesting things is that the concept of equality and particular equality of opportunity has been kept alive perhaps more by immigrants than by the older settlers, whether they were black or white. That is, with every wave of immigrants, we have a renewal of the object for which this country theoretically was established in the first place, and that even though the older settlers might be somewhat jaded and unenthusiastic about it, the view has come alive with every wave of immigrants. This is the land of opportunity. This is the place whether you're migrating across the country, as Brigham Young was doing, or whether you landed on Ellis Island as large numbers were doing. This is the This is the opportunity. place.

And the moment that we get some assimilation and some adjustment and some feeling that, well, everything is comfortable, another group will come in and say that we're not comfortable, but we believe that this is it. We believe this is the opportunity, and so this is the thing that has been

renewed with every generation, and this is, I think, an important factor in the growth and maturation of this country, the renewal of the hope that every generation has.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think that, if I may just veer for a moment from this discussion, I think that we -- I believe the Board members understand this. I'm sure they do, and I hope others do, that the Advisory Board is really a part of a larger initiative, of the Presidential Initiative on Race, which is on going, and that this Board, which has a life of only a year and now 15 months, may go off into the sunset, as it were, but that the Initiative on Race is something that's large and continuing. It's a White House initiative, and that what we're trying to do is to give that initiative the kind of impetus encouragement and stimulus and information and context for its own growth and development.

I think it's important for us to recognize this, and therefore, there might be limitations of the role and function of the Board, of the Advisory Board, but the Initiative is an ongoing effort that has a life of its own. This is very important, I think, that we all understand this.

1 2

3 4

5

6

7

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: What encourages me is that as we traveled across the country and as we visited universities and we met with young people, we found that they are having less problems than we did in the discussion of race or that some of them believe that there is no issue having to do with race because they're very comfortable in dealing with their peers no matter what the color of their skin.

Ιt doesn't mean that there It doesn't mean that we don't have a lot problems. more work to do, but I feel very strongly that whatever program, whatever recommendations and however they ultimately get formulated and reported, we must continue to emphasize the need of inclusion of our youth in this discussion, in whatever programs and whatever possibilities are for the continuance of any initiative on the dialogue on race because they are the young people who are going to make the difference in the 21st Century, to make sure that we abide by this multi-culturalism that we keep talking about because they're the ones that will concentrate on it. They're the teachers of tomorrow.

I see it every day. I have a nine year old grandson who has no concept of color. I don't owe

I have a daughter who has raised him, and he has no concept of color. He often wonders why he doesn't have a better suntan than some of the other children in school, but he considers it a suntan. He doesn't know that the child is an African American, that the child has a better suntan than he does, and he wants to know how he can get one himself.

So I just wonder, you know, if that is the kind of level -- of course, he's only nine years old.

I don't know what's going to happen in his future years, but hopefully that his mother's teachings will carry him further.

The problem here is that I see is we have so many golden opportunities to do something about this in our elementary schools, in our middle schools, in our high schools, and we had 600 colleges participating with us on a dialogue on race, doing something in these universities.

Sometimes I feel it's too late by then. We have to do more and concentrate at a lower level to get this issue talked about and resolved at a younger age for our young people in america.

MS. WINSTON: I want to -- oh, go ahead,

Bob.

MR. THOMAS: I just wanted to explore maybe a couple of things you talked about. It was unfortunate I couldn't be here yesterday, so I wanted to -- one of the things that happens to me when people ask me my or our opinions of how things are going, it comes to this issue of how will we know, and I was interested in the way that you phrased it, that when the poor have the same opportunities, and the discussion of a race based framework, because I've come to see poverty and race as two separate issues, and those who have opportunity still get affected by race and those who don't have opportunity still get affected by race.

And I just wanted to explore some of the dialogue on race as it affects how will we know when we've made headway. I've heard earlier a lot of dialogue about, you know, in audiences about this race neutrality or lack of race consciousness as being a measurement.

We'll get to that, but anyway, if you get the gist of the question, if I could just pick up on some of the dialogue as to how you played that off with race versus poverty.

GOVERNOR KEAN: In the dialogue yesterday one of the things we said, you know, we can tell things are happening if we moved around the country with hearings, and when we had a hearing on housing, we didn't have a bunch, a full room complaining about housing discrimination and how it's affected them.

We'll be getting somewhere when we don't have a hearing on justice and have to hear a lot about race profiling when people are stopped by law enforcement.

We'll be successful when we hear about the schools where they are no longer segregated and neighborhoods that are made by housing patterns.

You know, when all of these areas we identify as a Board start not to be problems, that's the dream, that there won't be problems anymore. That's one way of telling, you know, we're making progress.

MS. OH: I wanted to clarify that the concept of moving toward a multi-cultural way of thinking of ourselves, for all Americans, including Caucasians, which is something that I heard frequently among Caucasians, in particular, is that they felt sort of like they didn't have much of a role in this

discussion because they don't have a racial or ethnic or cultural identity to discuss here, and there's no room for them.

Well, that's ridiculous because all Americans can trace their roots back to a place that are far from the shores of this country. This is a country that is built on a multi-cultural and now more and more multi-racial reality as we move to the next century.

And I don't think when we say that we're talking about losing our identities. That's not at all what we're talking about. We're talking about a framework in which we can continue to honor our heritage, but do so in a way that doesn't tear away a the fabric of this society as we see it happening so often around issues that get racialized, one of the toughest being, for example, and it's one we talked about yesterday, was language, English language acquisition.

But before I leave the multi-cultural framework, I just want to say that that framework also permits us to acknowledge the first Americans, the Native Americans as part of this society because they are within this society and next to the society, and

we haven't been very successful, I don't think, in even a state-by-state effort, such as Minnesota, which now requires that if you want a teaching credential, you have to show competence about your knowledge of who the Native American nations are within your state.

It's a very interesting things that we're part of this in that state to make that a reality.

But on the language issue, you know, there's this debate that is brewing, and one of the things that happens on the language issue is there seems to be this subtext like immigrants or newcomers who are limited English proficient, don't have a desire and an appreciation for acquiring the English language, and that is so far off from what the data tell us in almost every survey, which is that immigrants place among their highest priorities language acquisition, if not for themselves, then their children, because they understand that you can't succeed in this society without mastering the English language.

But there is a concern that as emerging populations that are non-English speaking begin to grow that we will somehow lose our capacity to maintain a cultural cohesion, an American cultural

cohesion.

And there I think there's a solution, and that is that our initiatives should be advocating English language acquisition for everybody, you see, and that's a different approach than declaring English is the only language.

The reality is that if we are going to maintain our standing in the world community and be competitive in the 21st Century in markets that are international, we should be promoting the notion of being multi-lingual, not even bilingual.

You know, I have good friends that are in the State Department. I just met a friend who's been assigned to El Salvador. His wife is Lebanese. She speaks French, Portuguese, Arabic, English, and Spanish. They communicate in Portuguese.

We were in a Moroccan restaurant in Hollywood. We met up with a French and German woman. I only speak English and Korean to a limited degree. So I would talk to my friend in English who would then translate in Portuguese, and then she would come back in a little bit of English and a little bit of Spanish. She could also speak to the waiter who was Moroccan, and the woman sitting next to us said, "Oh,

1	you know, where are you from?" And so she explained
2	in French because that's the language that she taught
3	when she lived in Brazil.
4	I mean it's just this is the reality of
5	the future, you know, and so on the language agenda,
6	I think we move to a place where they're saying we
7	want to help all Americans or people who want to
8	become Americans to learn the English language, and we
9	approach it in that way.
10	You get rid then of this political wedge,
11	I think.
12	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Not to reject the
13	language
14	MS. OH: Exactly.
15	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: the old language.
16	MS. OH: Exactly.
17	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: But perhaps to acquire
18	some other language.
19	MS. OH: Exactly. It's a new thinking.
20	It's like this out-of-the-box thinking that people are
21	so afraid to do, but we have to be bold, and we have
22	to put these kinds of ideas in front of the President.
23	MR. THOMAS: It just seems like there's

things that rub against the mainstream, let's say,

maybe the Caucasian mainstream, the language being one of them, and that becomes a hot issue in electoral propositions and stuff.

But also I just wanted to bring it back also if I could to people of color. I mean, it's a racial issue, but it's also people of color. So, I mean, somebody who's different, and it can be differences in color; so between races there's also that issue.

And the thing that we were tasked with was really along the racial lines, and obviously the thing that we ran into was that there are poverty implications and a lot of issues that come up, but again, if I could, I want to drop back to the race comparison to poverty and how we resolve that.

Which is the greater emphasis, based on need/poverty -- here starting at the bottom -- or look at it through the race prism, people of color?

MS. OH: I don't think it's an either/or proposition. I think it's both. Everywhere we've gone --

MR. THOMAS: But I'm saying it's become an either/or in the perception of people because a lot of discussion started off on the race side, and because

of affirmative action and other things, people explored and looked for other ways and came up with based on need.

And also I think people promote the idea that I'm a person of color. I made it. Anybody can make it, and it just seems like all of the work we've done has found that's not true.

I mean, yes, people can make it, but people of race have a problem -- people of color have different problems, different hurdles.

Now, it's also true regardless of your race that if you are poor, you have problems, but that doesn't necessarily go up and down the economic strata. I mean it is true for people of poverty, but it's not true -- that's only -- I mean that's true regardless of your race. If you are poor, you've got problems in this country, but regardless of the economic position, if you're a person of color, you've got problems, and it just seems like that's the trump card.

MS. OH: Well, in our economic opportunities discussion, which we will get to, I think, yesterday we discussed that because we did look at data that seems to suggest that even if you control

for things like educational attainment, you still have this persistent problem of disparity when you compare whites against any other group.

And with Asian Americans it's disruptive because we throw into that racial classification people who suffer the highest levels of poverty, the Mong (phonetic), the Cambodian, Southeast Asia, and it gets masked because of the way they're lumped together by the racial categories.

So it's true that that persists, but again, I guess my response is it's not an either/or proposition. I think that you must deal with the poverty issue. I think that's fundamental because everywhere we've gone people have talked about poverty in relation to race relations, but it is a different magnitude of responsibility, I think, in being motivated about our policy to begin to address what we know to be persistent discrimination.

So that's why we have conducted -- in fact, communicated this already with the President -- supported that there be strong enforcement of anti-discrimination laws, and beyond that, we have spoken clearly that there's -- I think I'm correct in saying that all of the Board members anyway are supporters of

affirmative action as a tool.

Now, it's been decided in some states that they won't use it. That's fine, but that's not the reality for many parts of the country, and we hope that the discussion around affirmative action does not get so bogged down in what I believe is the natural reaction to the change that we're seeing where what have been traditionally called minority populations are going to grow in the next 50 years.

We know this. I think it's a natural reaction to sort of want to shut down if you feel that the competition is going to get rougher or there's going to be some favoritism here that isn't proper in some way.

But even when you look to California, which has had the most dramatic shifts demographically and the most dramatic reaction legislatively to those shifts -- and I believe 187, 209 and 227 represent a very natural reaction -- I think it will return because when you look at even the basis for 209, you know, 85 percent of the public contracts were going already to non-Hispanic whites, and in a climate where only 15 percent was being, you know, set there to try and target minority and women owned business

enterprise. You had 209 come forward saying this is unfair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Well, you know, I've never heard any real intelligent response to how is 15 percent of the total picture unfair here. It is more an emotional I think we have to deal with that in this new paradigm and be sensitive to it. That's why the faith based piece was so important, because it's a matter of people having faith that, you know, we don't have to repeat the mistakes of the past because we all know that we can look back over 200 years and see what policies the unjust laws were and and were institutions were that we intended.

That is for all Americans to shoulder as a burden.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: I think that all of our discussion through the years has tied color and economic initiative in one way or another, poverty usually, believing that prosperity being the opposite of poverty was related in some way to color. The data seem to indicate that. Observations, casual and scientific observations seem to indicate that.

And I think it is one of the questions that that is a factor, and when one sees it very

dramatically that way in the Native American community, which I want to remind us that that's one group who was already here, and they ended up with much less the new arrivals, and it was, in part, because of color.

Certainly the baggage which the Europeans brought with them and which had a profound on the way in which they looked at their society and looked at the people who were involved in that society was a matter of color. We know that is a fact.

The consciousness was in Europe in the 16th Century, and they brought it with them, and the first time they had an opportunity to exercise it was with the Native Americans, and then later on with other groups of that they brought.

So I think the relationship is very clear. What we need to do is remember those things, is to search for ways in which we can eliminate that as a factor, and we eliminate it as a factor by creating conditions and circumstances and sometimes laws that will negate these practices and will work through some other more humane and democratic ways of looking at the problem.

GOVERNOR KEAN: You've got to look at

individuals, and it's very difficult, maybe even impossible, to escape from that. It's a very difficult task.

Then you add race on top of the task, and somebody who goes for a job feels that perhaps they didn't get that job not because of their ability, but because of the color of their skin, and somebody feels when you come for the panel that maybe they were discriminated against in that housing or maybe even in the courts and with the local policeman on the corner.

So when somebody's trying to escape from poverty and face that, combined with the fact that probably the schools their children go to are among the worst in the country and, therefore, not even giving their children the opportunity to get out, it makes it twice as hard for anybody to really claw out of poverty into the mainstream.

Some do it, and, God bless them, they're remarkable people, but if we remove -- hopefully start removing race as a factor, it's going to be a lot of easier for millions of Americans really to escape from the trap of poverty.

MR. THOMAS: Well, that gets to the heart of my question. Let me see if I can articulate it.

It's do we believe that solving the economic problem will solve racism or discrimination based on color or the effects of racism or discrimination on color.

You know, I mean I certainly come from the standpoint that, yes, we need to fix the economic side of it for a whole lot of reasons, but whether we do or don't, we are going to be faced with this racial issue that is overriding, and if we don't tackle that as a separate issue, we can solve the economic thing and we still haven't solved the racial thing, I guess, is --

MS. WINSTON: I think there was some discussion in the various subgroups that met yesterday that suggested that we really need to be talking about a multi-pronged strategy and that it's not an either/or.

I think that I wanted to suggest that we might want to return briefly to a point that several made yesterday and Dr. Franklin mentioned today, and that is the sense that perhaps our newest immigrants have a better sense of what it means to be an American than perhaps those of us who have been here and whose families have been here for generations, both in terms of their expectations, but perhaps most importantly in terms of our chartering documents, the Constitution

and the promise of America.

I think it might be, you know, in terms of the vision. Who do we want to be as a people? I think if you turn to the Constitution and you turn to the Declaration of Independence and you start thinking about those principles, many of them mentioned by Ms. Oh in her statement, there is this expectation that there is equality of opportunity here, that there is the kind of prospect that when you come in some instances with virtually nothing, that because if you work hard and follow the rules, that you will then be able to bring yourself up out of poverty.

We know that that promise has not been available for all of us on the same terms, and that race and ethnicity have often been the markers for, you know, reduced opportunity.

So it seems to me that, again, if we begin to talk about what we would want for all of us who are, in fact, Americans or who want to be Americans and then look at the impediments, historically the impediments that have kept some people from realizing and taking advantage of opportunity, then, you know, there would be, one, an understanding that education is key; economic opportunity is key; and then there

would be a desire, we would hope, through the conversations we've been having for those of us who believe in the American promise to want to have that promise available to all regardless of race and ethnicity.

But, you know, bringing that understanding to the public and to our leadership has been the challenge that you all certainly have been facing over the last 12 months, a challenge that we face in the Initiative.

And again, the question: how do you revive our understanding of the American promise and the principles that we say we believe in? How do we make those, in fact, work in practice in day-to-day living?

Maybe we could talk about the responsibility of leadership that I know both Reverend Johnson Cook and Bob Thomas have been working -- Mr. Thomas with the corporate business community, Susan with the community of faith, in trying to figure out how leadership -- what leadership's responsibility is for leading this discussion.

REV. DR. COOK: We had several faith forums around the country. The last was in

Louisville, and I think the, you know, echoing thought throughout was who was the promise for, and I think you raise an important question about our founding documents.

I guess what the faith community is looking at now is trying to, as we raise the question can there be one America, really make that promise for everybody, and so that the race and the poverty issues are not inseparable for most people, and particularly those at the grassroot level. The one directly affects the other.

And so the faith leaders are really, you know, hoping that the Initiative will continue beyond just what we've done this year because we're talking about a lifelong process of trying to rectify some things that have not been corrected and trying to get America to where it does deal with more than just those who were at the table when the founding documents were signed.

And so I think, you know, we've gotten a great response from all levels of leadership in the faith community, and the question is, you know, who was the promise for, and now can it be for everybody, and that's one of the questions we're raising.

MR. THOMAS: On the corporate forum, basically when we meet with groups, when we met across the country -- and our next meeting is in St. Louis -- and we have emphasized at one time or other one of three things, that the majority company's responsibility to its employees and vice versa, the whole labor issue.

We've looked at majority companies' responsibility to be part of the community and what that means, and also the majority company/minority company interrelationship.

So each meeting has taken its own turn on those issues, and by the very nature that most people in those discussions are employed or employers, it probably raised my sensitivity out of the poverty issue into even though you're not giving poverty issues, you're still dealing with issues of race. So that's probably one of my sensitivities, like that.

But I think the people involved are susceptible to leadership, and I think your idea of having a President's council as an after initiative, a post Initiative activity. It would be interesting to hear a little bit more discussion on how you conceive that, but I think that kind of lamp post for

leadership, I think, will be very well received by the business community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. WINSTON: Let me explain here about Linda. Ms. Thompson was in the session with us also.

Well, I think what MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: we talked about is what would make the better sense, you know, a council and office of the President, a commission, and we determined that the best approach would be to have a President's Council with staffing because it does several things, and I think primarily because it can operate as part of the President's direct -- appointed by the President, but can tackle on and provide some direction in several areas in trying to bring in what we talked about, the publicprivate sector partnerships, advocating and monitoring, we believe, areas where divisions of the government can implement programs and actually having someone on board at all times with their own direction of a council appointed rather than having someone in the office and kind of losing the scheme that we have built up over the past year's discussion.

REV. DR. COOK: Maybe I'll ask some of the groups that we've met with this year and who have responded to our work to help us carry out the

challenge beyond this group. So it's also about getting more persons than just this team of advisors.

I think causes me to have some problems with the relationship between, say, poverty and race or the fact that race is a factor in the minds of people with respect to others, and the type of profile or creative impression of an individual based on his race and nothing else, and I'm sure that anyone who is of color has that experience.

And it goes beyond those sort of economic levels or what have you. An example would be that here is an African American, in this case myself, standing in the lobby of a hotel waiting for someone to join him and to have dinner, and a white man comes in and sees me and already has profiled me as a member of the servant class.

I have a little problem with that, except that it has not to be a problem, and he approaches me and he says, "Go and get my automobile." He doesn't ask me if I work there or I'm anything. He has assumed that I am there to serve him, and he hands me his keys.

As I told you before, people say, "You

should have taken his keys."

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: But I told him I was not in the business of delivering cars, and he finally realized that I was not there to serve him.

Now, what I'm saying is that there's an age here, there's a problem here that is not solved by the problem of poverty as opposed to race or poverty problems. I'm somewhat above the poverty level, and this man assumed that I was not or that was working to stay above the poverty level, and so do you.

You've got this problem. It's not solved by just statistics or by saying that X number of African Americans are above the poverty level. Such a matter as the experience of mine has to be dealt with, and I think that we may have an opportunity to discuss this when Governor Kean talks about education and that sort of thing a little later, but it's a complex problem.

MR. THOMAS: It's a measurement of success, and one of the -- a measurement of the lack of success that we've met, and we would readily admit to it, that it's difficult to get anybody but the choir involved in the discussion.

So regardless of your race, if you're involved in working this issue, there's a lot of energy and discussion and particularly people of color are interested in this issue, but there's a number of people that aren't, and a lot of the people hold a whole variety of impressions of stereotypes and profiling of which you speak, and that was sort of the challenge I guess I was speaking of earlier.

A measurement of success is if we could engage those people in a meaningful discussion, and I see business councils as a way to do that through some leadership, but to engage them and change their mind so that when they see you, they have no different impression of you than another person standing in a lobby with a suit and tie on.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: There's a sequel to the story. I don't know whether this means that he got his education, but apparently he asked someone in the lobby or at the desk who I was, and they told him, and I waiting to have lunch at a book store, and preceding my going to the bookstore to pick up some books of my own, and when I was at the bookstore, and there was a line of at least a dozen people waiting to get my autograph for my book, this man appeared.

1 He came to the head of the line, just came 2 on up to the head of the line, which proved he didn't 3 quite have his manners --4 (Laughter.) 5 CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: -- he got in the head 6 of the line, and he said, "I want to apologize." He 7 brought his friend alone, and he said, "I had no idea who you were." 8 9 His friend said, "I guess you won't do 10 that again, will you?" 11 He said, "No." 12 While that was somewhat unusual, I thought 13 I suppose I would have been satisfied. It didn't satisfy me though because he had no business 14 15 prejudging, and I don't know --16 MR. THOMAS: Nor any business in saying 17 you were okay because you were somebody special. 18 CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: 19 That's no good either. MR. THOMAS: 20 CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: I just wanted to point 21 up -- mention to point up the context. 22 MS. WINSTON: Well, I think you've also

illustrated the power of education in that

Two men, both with the economic means to be

23

24

example.

in a hotel as guests; the other is the power of education so that this man has now -- now understands as a result of his exposure to you and to others that it was an inappropriate thing to do.

We've talked about the fact that our history has consequences, and probably 60 years ago, Dr. Franklin, if you had been standing in that hotel, you probably would have been the one to go get the car.

Times have changed. The Council on Economic Advisors published for the first time this year as part of their President's economic report a chapter on race statistics, and while it was -- the council was able to demonstrate that things are getting better in terms of the disparities that have existed along racial lines in economic opportunity, there is still a significant gap.

That is information, I think, that is useful for us to have on a regular basis and can be a measure of whether or not we are making progress.

We also know that there continues to be an awful lot of racial isolation within our schools, K to 12 and higher education. The extent to which there is the kind of exposure to others on college campuses,

for example, does have educational value.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Angela Oh and I participated in a panel discussion about a week and a half ago. I think, in this very room we were, and one of the panelists was white man who was in a corporation, corporation, but talked about his experience prior to his current responsibilities in which he was one of several partners in this business, all of graduates of the Harvard Business School, all of them white, and he talked about how few new ideas they came up with; that they basically were all were thinking alike, and he compared that to his experience, current experience, in which he has a very diverse group of people, racially and ethnically diverse, employing people who are also diverse in terms of their educational background, not all Harvard Business School graduates, and talked about the high level of creativity and new ideas that people are coming up with that are, you know, some of them, quite cutting edge.

So this idea of education not only for the benefit of people who have not been included, people of color in many instances, poor people who may not be people of color, is a benefit not only to those who

are coming to the table for the first time, but those who have been there who have not had the benefit of that exposure.

Again, these are things that are not new, but things that certainly have come out in lots of the dialogue that we've been exposed to or heard about, and again, this idea of racial reconciliation means people have to be talking to one another, sharing ideas, overcoming the stereotypes that you have in the absence of the direct exposure.

At the same time you need to be looking at policies and institutional practices that have an impact on the extent to which opportunities are made available.

When I was talking about multi-pronged approaches, I was talking about basically these two tracks that have to be worked on, and probably in terms of future responsibilities, there has to be continued emphasis on both of those things.

It might be a useful thing at this point if we had the report out on both the discussions of education and economic opportunity because I think already the conversation is clearly focused, in part, at least on that.

So I would ask Governor Kean if you would provide us with the economic opportunity -- I'm sorry

-- the education piece.

GOVERNOR KEAN: We had a very fruitful discussion yesterday and came up with a number of substantial proposals, which I'll try to summarize in give minutes.

First of all, we believe that if we're going to build one America, we have to overcome racial disparities in educational opportunity and provide all children with the highest quality education, and we think we ought to do that emphasizing the earliest years.

We believe that if you can succeed on education, a lot of the other problems that we've been talking about are going to go away naturally.

We also believe that meeting our goals will require substantial commitment, and that as we spend for education at the federal government level, we must target those opportunities which need that spending the most.

It makes no sense at all to have schools for our poorest children be getting less resources. It should be just the other way around, and we really

must try to educate our children in high quality, integrated schools. Those of high quality and integration are not mutually exclusive, but they're complementary. You can obviously have a good education in a school that's not integrated, but not the kind of education you need to go into the next century of a multi-cultural democracy.

Integrated schools are always better with the same quality of teaching, always better than the schools that are not integrated. In effect, isolated schools in high poverty areas are our greatest educational problem.

And there's no excuse for failing to meet these goals for all our children. We know what to do now. It wasn't like the '80s when we had some questions about how to improve schools. In the '90s, there are a number of good schools that work and school districts that work around the country even in high poverty areas.

We have to have the courage and intelligence to follow suit and do those things so that those benefits are extended to all of our children.

There are four key areas that we

discussed. First of all, the school construction. Many of our children are going to school in buildings that are not adequate for teaching or for learning, and we believe that the federal government could explore additional funds for school construction in areas of urban and rural poverty, and that substantial federal funds should be provided in a matching grant for the states.

There are massive programs in this country for highway construction and for dams and for all of those things. We happen to think schools are probably even more important than those things.

Teacher preparation. We believe that the government and work with higher education leaders and the private sector to revamp and improve teacher education. There is no point really in the fact that our education schools are really the weak sister in every single higher educational university or college. They should be high quality programs. They should be rigorous, and the people that go through them should have the same respect as the people who go through any other rigorous program at the university, and we believe we must work with college presidents to insure in the future that that happens.

We now have tracking in a great number of schools. We think we can consult and share the best practices with school districts to insure that tracking is not implemented in a way that resegregates students.

Also, the way tracking is implemented now in a number of schools, it's really inconsistent with our idea in this country of all students, all students can learn if they're given an opportunity to do so and high quality teachers.

Also we believe in strengthening the pipeline, that we should explore efforts in addition to the High Hopes initiative to strengthen the pipelines in K-12 to higher education in the medium and short term. We simply have to find more ways of getting students who have the ability to do it into institutions of higher education.

A few other key issues. As far as American Indian schools, we have to insure adequate funding through the Bureau of Indian Affairs to schools that serve American Indian students. We don't always do that at this point.

We believe also that in the coming generation of technology, it's going to be important

for each and every student no matter what profession they go into, and therefore, we must include access to modern computers and other technologies, particularly, particularly in high poverty schools, and we have to make sure, by the way, the teachers know how to use them themselves so they can teach the students.

We believe nothing is more important than early childhood education, that there should be full day Head Start and kindergarten available to all students, and particularly, again, in high poverty areas there should be school available for all four year olds.

And we also believe on the expansion of school choice, school choice as part of public school choice. In a poor area, particularly in urban neighborhoods, we believe that parents ought to be able to make the decision as to which public school their children attend.

I don't know if I -- I tried to keep to five minutes, but there's a lot more here, but I think that may be something that we can start with.

MS. WINSTON: Let me ask would you like to go ahead and take the opportunity to have discussion?

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: I think we can go

through both subjects because I think they tie in.

MS. WINSTON: Okay.

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: I think we have talked about how the 1960 civil rights laws have had important effects on people of color and the same opportunities that -- I mean, the opportunity that those gave in regards to creating better jobs, a living wage, and providing minorities a life in the middle class of America, but in the following decade, the minority workers experienced a decline in the '80s, and the upswing in the 1970s certainly was a downswing in those '80s because of the proportionate number of minority people that benefitted from manufacturing jobs and from the benefits of civil rights law enforcement.

Unfortunately in the 1980s, the decline in manufacturing and the reduction of law enforcement set in, and of course, at that point, patterns of occupational segregation emerged, and unfortunately further solidified a weakening in labor market institutions, such as minimum wage protection, labor unions, and other protections, as well as a slow down in educational attainment, and weaker enforcement of anti-discrimination laws contributed to the increase

in racial disparities as seen in many of the attached charts that we looked at as a subcommittee.

People who served with me on that subcommittee were Angela Oh and Reverend Suzan Johnson Cook.

We found and identified what we believe are five challenges. By large numbers, minority workers earn, of course, poverty wages. African Americans, 40 percent of all; Latinos, 50 percent of all worker and jobs that are paying minimum wage; very poverty level wages that do not support a family of four, and for the most part those jobs do not have health insurance, pension coverage, benefits.

Our challenge comes to insure that minority workers have access to jobs that pay a living wage, not just minimum wage, but a living wage that includes those benefits.

We found that the wealth gap is even greater than the income gap. The wealth of a typical white family is ten times the wealth of an African American family or a Latino family. Of course, this is a substantial wealth gap of great concern as, of course, wealth determines whether you have health insurance, pension coverage, whether you can own a

home or start a business. It becomes a major factor.

This level of racial and economic inequality is a major part of the challenge facing our country, and in the next century will be an issue for all Americans including the private and public sector who must address this issue.

We believe that education alone is not enough. It is important. It is a major important factor in the lives of all of our children. While through the years there has been tremendous progress in education for most minority groups, it has not been fully or completely effective in closing the earnings gap between minority workers and whites. The gap persists at all educational levels, and unfortunately has increased since 1979.

The fifth challenge for us, of course, is that we emphatically state that the discrimination persists. There's clear and current evidence that active forms of racial and ethnic discrimination persist in employment, in housing, credit markets, and many other areas of social life. Eliminating these persistent forms of racial disadvantage needs to be a central commitment of the country to insure equal opportunity.

Now, we've identified five areas where we looked at for solutions. Tight labor markets are necessary, but not sufficient. The economic expansion over the last seven years has clearly increased job opportunities for minorities. Over 13 million new jobs have been created, and the unemployment rate of African Americans has dropped to its lowest since 1973.

The poverty rate dropped its fourth straight year in 1996, but the recent strong economic growth, while it has been very, very important and improved job opportunities and wages for people of color, we still see wide disparities that continue to exist, and that continuing the economic expansion is necessary, but not sufficient to create the opportunity to address racial disparities.

Labor market institutions need support.

Our experience from the 1980s tells us that without a strong labor market and labor market institutions in place, a rising tide cannot lift all boats.

Raising the minimum wage is the very key element to increase the living standards of low wage workers and, in particular, minority workers who hold these jobs. When the minimum wage was increased in

1996 and '97, 13 percent of all African American workers and 16 percent of Latino workers benefitted.

Collective bargaining and unions are important in reducing wage disparity between minority workers and white workers. Collective bargaining helps eliminate discrimination in pay and raise wages of low skill workers relative to high skill workers, expanding our institutionalized support mechanism, including the earned income tax credit for low income families, equal pay, national labor relations policies, and family and medical leave programs.

Strongly enforcing our anti-discrimination laws is another of our solutions. Numerous studies have shown that people of color continue to face discrimination in hiring, in the housing market, in the loan markets, and even from buying a car.

Expanding education and training will have little effect when employers pursue misguided restrictions on hiring, whether conscious or otherwise.

Community initiatives are, of course, very, very important. Programs and support are needed to help provide support for community and neighborhood associations or community associations based on

initiatives, reducing racial and economic disparities and segregation within our metropolitan areas.

We believe that nonprofit organizations will provide a major and indispensable tool for revitalizing our communities and in many cases reconciling our differences.

Another one of the issues and solutions is involving and addressing the youth of our country. Young people of color have simultaneously told us that they both are hopeful for a better future for themselves and their children, but also fearful that they do not have the same opportunities to succeed as whites. Even though they play by the rules, they have said to us that they will still not get ahead as fast or as far because of their race.

Young people of color have told us stories about the discrimination they face in education and in the job market and in their fears and legitimate concerns. We need to address them in a serious and sustained manner.

A final issue of concern to us, and I think it's been discussed as far as the entire Advisory Board, is that in regards to many key indicators, the country does not have adequate data

covering the experiences of all major racial and ethnic groups. I get it in every quarter that I go that there are no statistics for other racial groups, major statistics or African Americans and Latinos.

We, again, recommend that careful attention needs to be paid to improving the collection of regular data on the economic and social progress of this country's diverse populations.

MS. WINSTON: Well, I have received the two reports of the subgroups that met yesterday. Would you like to elaborate any further on how you see taking the concerns further into the future and how it relates also to the earlier discussion about doing post Initiative activities?

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: One of the things that always interests me in a discussion of education is that there's a fairly considerable segment of our population that feels that this is a local matter, that education is a local matter, and that the federal government's interests should be very limited and activities should be very limited in this.

I always had difficulty with that notion for several reasons. One is that there are other areas, as you've suggested, Governor Kean, that are

viewed just normally as national problems, highways, for example, and the movement of commerce generally. Of course, we've got some constitutional basis for that and support for it, but I think education must be conceived of as a national interest anyway.

How far we can go in that in supporting that idea without additional legislation is a problem, to be sure, but if we're going to have poor schools in one part of the country and good schools in another part of the country, it's not worse than having poor schools in one part of a city and good schools in another part of the city.

Our population moves all the time. We're a moving people. We're here today and gone tomorrow. We're in Maryland one day, and we're in Massachusetts another day and in Washington State another day.

If we bring to our life in, say, the State of Washington a poor education than we received in another state, then we are not going to be able to take advantage of the opportunities in our new location, and we do move. There's no population in the world that moves more than we do.

So it seems to me that's a natural national responsibility that cannot be shirked, and we

have to put that cast on any program we have in the area of education. To the extent that we can, we must make this a national obligation, a national activity so that regardless of where we end up living, we bring with us the kind of education with the possibilities to prosper in that community. I absolutely believe that we have to do that some way.

GOVERNOR KEAN: I don't think there's any question about the fact. The debate comes as to whether or not the federal government should get involved in the content of education, and most people feel they should not be involved in that area, other than to apply standards everywhere of what to learn.

But I know of no argument with anybody who wants to help with things like school construction. Nobody has ever suggested that the federal government can stay out of providing funds so that people have a decent place to go to school.

And the two areas that we're recommending most strongly for federal intervention is, first of all, that area, to help states rebuild schools that are no longer adequate not only from the point of view of teaching, but in many cases from the point of view of health and safety as well so that teachers have a

decent place to teach and students have a decent place to learn.

And the second area we're recommending is in teacher preparation, that it be rigorous, that it make sense, what you have to know to go into the schools, and that the emphasis be on the lower grades where every bit of research shows that the teacher is most important.

I don't know and don't believe that those people who object to federal intervention would object in those areas. In fact, I suspect many of them would be very supportive in both those areas.

So I don't see these as controversial recommendations. Everybody wants to improve teacher education. In many areas it's been a national scandal, and we obviously can't have poorly prepared teachers teaching our children, and everybody knows that children can't learn in totally inadequate schools, and yet for many of our poorest children, that's what they have to deal with.

And without that help, many of the other things we're talking about today just aren't coming up.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: There is a tendency

for policy to follow financial support. Would you expect the federal government to pour X number of billions of dollars into education without wanting to say that we think the money ought to be spent this way or that way? We think this ought to support a set of national standards, let's say, and make certain that the education in this state is similar to and has the same standards that education in Massachusetts has.

GOVERNOR KEAN: I have always been a believer in national standards personally. The difficulty has been arriving at those national standards outside of math and science. People debate what the history standards ought to be, and they get quite irritated with each other.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Every man thinks he's his own historian.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Yeah, exactly, and some of the other standards. I believe if we can agree on certain standards, then it's very important to install those standards so that we can measure what a student in Mississippi is learning compared to a student in California or New York, and if the Mississippi student is learning considerably less, then I think there's an obligation to let the parents and the state know that

so that they can upgrade. Parents could demand at that point that they upgrade if they had that kind of information and knowledge.

But I think this -- I've always been for that, but I think I would hate to see anything substantial tied to monies for school construction at the moment. The need is so great, and the difficulty in doing it may be so great, as well, that I just -- it has to be done economically.

I mean to keep it in line, it's got to be school construction funds. I don't think it can be spent in areas of poverty, new poverty or old poverty, but with that one stricture, I would just like to see matching funds made available to the states the same as they have been made available for highways and a number of other priorities so that students can learn and we can make progress.

MS. WINSTON: I just wanted to just take a moment remind particularly our audience that this is a brainstorming session, and I think we mentioned explicitly earlier that the reporting out is basically for Board members to consider, and there may, indeed, be some interest in having us do a little bit more research on some of these areas, generating more ideas

for the President, but that what have been called recommendations, as I understand it at this point, are not recommendations yet from the Board, but recommendations from the subgroups for the rest of the Board's consideration.

MR. THOMAS: I just wanted to ask a couple of questions. One was, again, -- supports on the dialogue that we had in the other -- in the first one, but one of the things that we've noticed as we've gone around and visited either individually or collectively, and there seems to be a public-private issue discussion at a lot of schools, particularly in smaller communities that have had a lot of success in the public schools.

They feel -- and I would say it's a perception -- that because there's great community support for the public schools rather than the community largely supporting private schools and the public schools being a stepchild, and I just wanted to ask you, you know, if you discussed anything about that in the subcommittee.

And then the other thing was just as you left politics and reentered the education field, from your vantage point, I just was interested in what your

biggest surprise was, what you saw in this area that kind of surprised you as being a major impact in this area.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Well, I don't think -- I went, of course, to higher education, and most of my life has been involved in K through 12. So I wasn't surprised a lot.

I did visit a number of schools, particularly schools that were educating children in areas that were very difficult to try and determine why it was that the school here worked and ten blocks away was a school with a 50 percent dropout rate and kids just not getting educated.

And I tried to identify the elements, and generally it was a great principal, a man or woman who just inspired that school, and parent involvement. Those seem to me to be the only two real keys of seeing what really worked in a difficult area.

And of course, a third element is teachers. Where you don't have trained teachers, where you don't have good teachers particularly in the lower grades, children don't succeed, and where you do and they have classes that they can handle instead of mammoth classes -- smallness in education will get --

you some of the best educational experiments that I've seen cut down these huge schools into livable units. In fact, in one experiment the principal is supposed to know every student and not just come to the football game, but actually know every student, visit classes, look and see what the teachers are doing and be thoroughly involved in the life at the school, and that's something, again, that works.

When you do that kids respond, and that's why I said, you know, there are a lot of examples all over the country of schools that work.

REV. DR. COOK: I think that parent involvement goes back to what you were saying in terms of whether the parents feel they have hope in this society, whether there are opportunities there for that next generation, and usually when there's a ray of that, they tend to be more involved, and it's directly related to that race-poverty issue because if we feel that there's nothing to fight for, we kind of just leave it to the system to do for your children.

And so they really are all intertwined. The base of education, the heart of education brings us back to our discussion where we started here a year ago, that economics and education are the key factors

and the issue of race, and that they're the inseparable trio in a sense. They all really walk together.

GOVERNOR KEAN: And in many ways schools, urban schools, the teachers are so committed that they will go visit children at home. If the parents don't come to the school, the teacher will go to the home.

In one school I talked about, it's practice, for instance, that every term the teachers at least call if they don't visit each and every parent in the school and any student they have in school because the connection, we know, between home and school that is absolutely vital. The school can't substitute for everything going on in the home. The parent has got to be brought in.

And when they are brought in, education appears.

MS. WINSTON: One of the consistent comments that we heard not just here this morning, but in most of the discussions that the Board has had at its meetings and outside of its meetings is the degree of similarity in aspirations around the country regardless of who you're talking to in terms of race or ethnicity, either social class even, and I wonder

that, you know, given that experience -- and I think I'm correct in saying that we were all in this to a person, and I think to a person have made that response -- I'm wondering what, in light of the common set of aspirations that people have, what is it that is preventing these common goals from being the source of action for policy making and diagram for producing and to achieve that.

What should the Advisory Board and others be looking for in terms of overcoming some of the challenges without trying to harness those --

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Resources, resources, it seems to me. I'm not at all certain that this nation is committed in terms of providing facilities, physical facilities. We're not really talking about hundreds of millions of dollars or going into billions of dollars to shore up our schools, the dilapidated conditions that we see in many parts of the country.

I just think that that's a hard, cold fact that we have not yet been willing to commit ourselves to the expenditure of resources to make it possible for our children to have decent physical facilities.

I know that in some parts of the country they are sent home when it's too hot. They don't have

any air conditioning, and they're sent home when it's too cold. They don't have enough heat, and somehow they just make it through the school year on what they call good days, days in which they don't have -- when it's not too hot and not too cold.

That, it seems to me, is not a satisfactory basis for establishing and maintaining the educational system in the country that's the richest country in the world. It just doesn't make any sense to me.

GOVERNOR KEAN: If we turn things -you're absolutely right -- things on its head also, I
mean, any kind of logic, I mean, anything people would
think as logical, where should you put the most
dollars?

You should put the most dollars where the children have the greatest need because they need more resources in order to bring themselves up to the starting line and get that educational opportunity, the opportunity we've all been talking about.

That's not what we do. We spend more dollars on the students who need it less, and the richer districts are the ones that have the greater resources. It makes no sense at all.

And we know from the research also that the most important years are the earlier years. If you start in school at four years old and go through kindergarten, those elementary years are the most important. If you can give kids a start there, they can go on and have a good chance of succeeding.

And yet we pay people more in high school. We recognize high school teachers more. People in the elementary school are in and out all of the time, are not as well trained. Most kids don't even have the same teacher for the entire year.

So, again, the research shows one thing. We do the opposite, and all we have to do really in the area of education now -- and this is what's frustrating when it gets into education reform -- all we have to do now is follow the practices which the research shows we ought to be doing.

There are a number of good educators who have done this. It's being done with a number of schools in Baltimore. The same thing is happening in Chicago and Detroit, things that work.

All right. Why can't we scale it up? It works there. It can work in other places, and it's a matter of will now. It's not a matter of knowledge.

We know what to do to make a school that's failing into a good school. Whether or not we have the political will to do it is another question.

We also know, by the way, that resources —— we can't do it without resources. We also know that's not enough. We've got to get into these other areas of in a sense reorganizing the school for learning, making sure that teachers are well trained, making sure that we have a principal who knows how to run a school, making sure of parent involvement, making sure that there are standards for kids.

All of these things enter into it, with the resources, but together we know how to do it.

We're just not doing it. We know how to do it.

REV. DR. COOK: That's where the faith institutions are feeling the most weight because as the children are sent home on those cold days or those hot days and the parents aren't home, you know, they go to the faith based institutions, and then because their resources are so limited, you find the faith institutions having to set up the after school programs, trying to catch up what they didn't learn that day in school.

So it's a tremendous load, and that's

where the pressure is being felt because the resources haven't been adequately given to the institutions either in terms of making it available for them to do the right kind of program.

So they're trying to play catch-up with people whose lives are at stake. It's a real issue in terms of what's happening, and we do know what to do.

MR. THOMAS: Another thing is it's a little bit of the chicken and egg, but I'll take the chicken approach here, and that's salaries. If you take a matrix of payment of an educator in California where they max out in education and years of service, that approximates from the training level salary that people get when they enter industry.

And so when people come out of college en masse, it's where do they head. They head to the jobs which pay 40, 50, \$60,000 a year, and there are jobs that do that and more, and yet the education jobs don't.

So if we were to say that the most important thing for this country is to educate our children, we don't reflect it in the way we compensate those who do, and we rely on their self-generosity and self-sacrifice to make it happen, and it's just not

1 the right thing. 2 MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: Robert, would you 3 like a job with the union with me? 4 (Laughter.) 5 MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: I just made that 6 statement. I don't know how we can afford you though. 7 (Laughter.) MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: 8 But, you know, 9 that's also very clear and important when it comes to 10 tying in the education piece to the economic situation 11 when you provide living wages, the opportunity to live 12 in a better neighborhood, the opportunity to provide 13 your children with a college education. You're bringing the economic factor into 14 15 the equation of education. I rode to Brookings, South 16 I told this story yesterday, and sitting next to me was this very, very young baby. I mean he was 17 18 years old, but he had such a baby face and so 18 19 polite, "yes, ma'am," "no, ma'am." He was from Texas 20 like I was, a very polite young man, and he was 21 qoing --22 (Laughter.)

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: -- he was going to
a job with IBM, a full-time job straight out of high

school with the computer software program in IBM.

And I said, "So you're not going to college?"

He says, "Maybe later on."

And I said, "So this is a full-time job. This is not a summer job?"

And he says, "No."

And someone -- I can't remember -- one of my panel members said, "Yes, but what kind of opportunities did that young man have in his high school," you know, availability of computer, maybe a computer in the home, and when we lack that kind of resource in the home for the child or the resource in the schools, and it's absolutely amazing. I've been involved with the Net Day hook-ups across the country and the empowerment of impoverished areas in schools.

And they say, "Our school is hooked up." Well, the school may be hooked up to one computer in the library. So the opportunity for those children is not there where there should be computers in every school room, not just in the library, and maybe if the kids get there at six o'clock in the morning, they'll get a chance to get on that computer and get a job when they're 18 years of age to go to a 50, \$60,000

job automatically out of high school.

So economics is so tied into it because the opportunities will not be there, because it's going to depend on where you live and what you're able to afford to give your children, unless you have good paying jobs, good benefits that can provide above poverty wages in this country.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: How much for that young man?

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: I didn't ask him, but he said he was going to be living in a hotel for a while. So the company's going to pay his hotel room. I would imagine that they are, but absolutely at 18 years of age going into computer software.

And I think there was a story even in the <u>Post</u> where there was a 17 year old senior who was not going to college and was earning \$50,000 a year part time working in computer software during his last year of high school.

I can just imagine what he would pull in, and like I said, he wasn't going to go to college. He was going to walk out of there with the possibility of a job close to \$100,000 a year, full time.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Let's hope later on he'll

go on to college.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Laughter.)

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: The young man that I sat next to said, yes, he hoped he picked up, but even if he doesn't, you don't think that that company is going to continue to provide him some continuing education in that field? And I think that's one of the things that we'd like to see, is more and more companies investing in the workers that they have on training and education programs to provide them upward mobility because we now have the argument of workers that are being asked to come into this country because of the skill factor when, in fact, we haven't provided the opportunity of training our own, sort of like growing them ourselves from the current work force and providing the opportunity that they can move up within their company without seeing those better paying jobs going to someone else.

GOVERNOR KEAN: It's not only that problem, but I didn't realize this a couple of years ago. We always look at corporations that are going overseas to get low wages for their workers. Well, that's not the only problem. I've found out now that some of the high tech companies you're talking about

are going overseas because there are more skilled workers.

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: More skilled workers?

GOVERNOR KEAN: And they cannot find the workers they need in this country, so they go to a place like Singapore where they know people getting out of school are trained to take the kind of jobs they need.

And when you're seeing people move out of this country because we don't have enough skilled young people in this country, that is a terrible sign for our future.

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: But in addition to that, we're burning them out. In Silicon Valley, when we did a town hall meeting in San Jose, we had workers who were working 80 and 90 hours a week earning big money because they earned — it was contract work. I mean they were out there as private, individually contracted folks working in that industry and earning a lot of money. Unfortunately no benefits, no days off, no anything, and they were burning themselves out because we're not training companies or wanting to bring in outside workers, to pay them less.

You know, we have the reverse, not just companies going over and trying to find cheap work, but companies that are here that want to keep the work here importing skilled workers so that they can pay them less in this country rather than training their own.

GOVERNOR KEAN: We've got a choice in this country which we've got to make either consciously or subconsciously in the next five years. We are either going to become a low wage, low skill economy, much like some of what we call the Third World countries, and that's going to be our future, or we're going to become a high skilled, high wage country.

And the difference is going to depend on what we do in education and training. If we don't do some of the things that we are talking about here and some of the things that some of the school reformers are talking about around the country, I will tell you our future for our children in this country is not going to be great. Low skilled, low wage economies don't do very well for their citizens.

Plus which I think in that kind of society it's going to have implications for the preservation of democracy. It's that serious.

2 3

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: And even less -- in my report I mentioned the wealth gap. We're talking about African Americans versus whites, Latinos versus whites. White are at the level of \$47,740 versus Latinos at 46 -- I mean 4,656, and African Americans at \$4,418, ten time, ten times a higher, and by a proportionate number minorities are way at the bottom of the barrel in regards to that issue.

MS. WINSTON: I think it would be very important to point out at this point that this Board has, in fact, made some recommendations to the President on this score that offer, I think, great promise.

One particularly important is the support and recommendation with respect to the Hispanic education program. We know, of course, that we are looking at demographic changes that suggest that the percentage of Hispanic Americans will almost double in the 21st Century at the same time that the situation where Hispanic students are experiencing extraordinarily high dropout rate, being pushed out in many instances from schools.

The Hispanic education program is targeted as a result of a study, many of the recommendations,

but also recognition from some of the experts that you talked to at several of our meetings.

The other program, of course, the high wage program which Dr. Franklin mentioned earlier, which is designed to insure that children in middle schools, high schools get early counseling, mentoring, as well as information about the financial assistance available to them to go on to college.

And come close to closing the gap in high school graduation rates between white and black students, there's still a fairly substantial gap, as I've indicated, with Hispanic students, and we have all too limited information about other groups.

So I think that this is something that perhaps the Advisory Board may want to think about how those particular recommendations could be built upon in light of today's discussion and additional research that we would have the staff look at for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Well, I think that these education initiatives, which we've undertaken and which the President has stated will take long, are important. Since we're mentioning it, I think we ought to remind ourselves that quite early on the

question of the President to increase the corporations and, of course, to put in enforcement of civil rights, the EEOC and other civil rights agencies, and that has become part of his budget, and also the whole matter of enforcement of housing which is related in some ways to what we've been talking about. That's gone on, too.

So already our recommendations are taken on by the President. He's proceeded to initiate programs as we've requested that he do so, and I would think that we would be, Governor Kean, one of the persons most interested in picking up on education since he's already involved in the high school Hispanic education, but there would be others that would be pushed on his desk, and we will certainly do that.

REV. DR. COOK: I think early childhood and the child care issues, those are very important because we do have to come to it earlier, and if a parent has been in poverty, they're going to need the child care help to be able to get on their feet. As we look at the welfare-to-work programs and all of those, it's very important in terms of all of the transitional pieces to help get the child in school

and help get the parent on their feet.

So those early childhood initiatives are going to be really critical.

knows it, but it's worth saying that what we are spending now on people with a failed education is an enormous cost to our society, but what we are spending on welfare, we are spending in prisons, what we are spending in health care, what we are spending on all the kind of costs that a person brings about when they don't have an education, can't get a good job, not developing any social behavior, that's an enormous cost to us each and every year.

And it goes without saying that if we can do what is right and what the research shows is right in the educational area, particularly for those first four years, a lot of those people in the future will be leading productive lives and be contributing to our society instead of costing our society..

REV. DR. COOK: And trained for a skill that is needed today so that they won't end up back in an institution.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: We have a very basic philosophical difference in our country with respect

to how you handle this in our society, and this is what's clear, that is, that there are people who believe that jails are more effective in arresting the problems of society than educational programs. They simply believe it, and they're in the position to do something about it.

The big five star hotels in our big cities

-- and my own city has spent more for jails in the

last five or eight years than they've spent on hotels

or than on education, that is, increased and improved

education.

And I don't know what we can do, but surely we need to use part of this education to educate the community on the very point that you make, that the greatest returns can come from improvement of the conditions of our young people.

GOVERNOR KEAN: I don't know if people really focus in on the numbers, but we couldn't even get spending per child in a lot of our poverty areas up to 10,000 per child. It costs five times that to keep somebody in prison. You know, we're spending \$50,000 later on for the kid that we wouldn't spend \$10,000 on early on, and it doesn't make any economic sense.

And if you want to get even the human tax on what that child could be if properly educated and properly trained, look at the economics of it. It's going to be enormously costly, and those funds could be better spent in other ways.

REV. DR. COOK: There was a great line at the last faith forum. We were talking about how we give what's not asked for in the community, how we always respond with what we feel they need as opposed to what the need is, and he was sharing that a lot of the African American men in the Philadelphia area were hanging out. They would come to a church and, you know, they would ask, "What do you need?"

And it's a job. So they create a council, et cetera, and then they come back next year and they said, "What do you need?" Jobs, and the create midnight basketball.

(Laughter.)

REV. DR. COOK: You know, so it's always something that will pacify you or say that we did something, but not the response that's needed, and so we've got to really, as we go towards the 21st Century, respond to the needs as they actually are. Don't just pour money where it's not needed, and

respond to the actual needs: jobs, race issues, and education. Those are the issues.

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: My only addition to that is let's make sure that they're quality jobs.

REV. DR. COOK: Exactly.

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: You know, years ago when people showed up for a job, it was an expectation that that job would have health insurance; that it would provide a pension; have days off, you know, vacation, build up sick leave.

Now you show up for a job, and you're lucky to get a salary for that and above minimum wage slightly or at minimum wage, no health insurance, no pension plan. They will give you a 401(k), but it's your money that you're saving for yourself rather than perhaps a contribution. You can have all the days off that you want. You may not have a job when you come back because you probably did get paid for those days off, and you'll have no sick leave, et cetera.

It's also the quality of the jobs that provide, again -- you know, people say, "Well, if you have a job, you can pull yourself up by the bootstraps."

Not necessarily, because on many occasions

1	people are holding down two jobs to make one because
2	the salaries just are not being paid. We're talking
3	living wages, jobs, not midnight basketball, but
4	quality jobs as well.
5	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: This Board has two
6	senior consultants. Laura Harris, who was
7	unfortunately unable to be here this morning, was here
8	yesterday, and the other is Professor Christopher

moving.

any comments that he would like to make since he is sitting here and looks very willing to-
MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: I see his face

Edley, who is here and who I feel is invited to make

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: -- participate.

(Laughter.)

DR. EDLEY: I would make just a couple of suggestions. One is that I think it would be very valuable, albeit difficult, for you to in giving your advice to the President to try to suggest some priorities.

My own view, and there can be disagreement about this, and maybe you ought to talk about it, but my own view is that it's going to be very difficult for your advice to him, much less for his book, his

report to the American people to have as much impact as we would like if it's a laundry list, if it is so comprehensive that it is lacking in focus.

And I think, you know, those of us who have been in or around politics appreciate that you've got to have a fairly focused message if you're going to break through all of the noise and get people's attention.

So while appreciating that it's a very difficult discipline both intellectually and politically to pick priorities, I think you would be doing him a great service if you would suggest to him what you believe those might be.

If there's a short list that he is going to emphasize in what he says to the nation on this issue, what should be on that short list?

Now, there may be then a follow-on of how to fill out his portfolio, how to fill out the set of recommendations, the work plan, if you will, but focus. That's point number one.

Point number two is on the education issue specifically, I think it would be very useful if you would wrestle either now or later a little bit more with this question of federalism and input of the

federal government simply because it will, of course, be said, you know, by the folks that reporters call up to respond to what you've been talking about; they will say, of course, "Well, the federal government doesn't have a role, that big of a role in education and shouldn't."

To stay in local responsibility, the federal government will spend six cents on every dollar to spend on education, and all of the rest of that.

about what it is that you see the federal role ought to be, but also since the President wants to talk to the nation not simply about what the federal government's agenda should be, but on what the work plan is for everyone, federal, state, and local, public, private, et cetera, what the pieces of this education agenda that you've been talking that you think ought to be put as challenges to other actors.

So this whole federalism issue, the public-private issue, I think your thoughts on the division of labor would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Do you see it only in the area of education or other areas?

DR. EDLEY: Well, other areas, but I mean, I sensed from you -- I mean, my guess is, just listening to your conversation -- my sense is that that's one where you think really a qualitatively greater kind of attention and energy is needed by society to get us on track in closing the opportunity gap.

And I don't know that the other recommendations that you're talking about pose as sharp a challenge to what people perceive as the existing set of responsibilities, arrangements.

We all know that there's federal, state, public, private roles in job creation and job training and many of these other things, b ut I think for the kind of boldness that you're talking about in the education agenda, you're really suggesting -- it sounds as though you may really be suggesting a rethinking of roles, and I just want to get out on the table what you mean by that.

There are many, for example, who would say, "Look. If this is going to continue to be primarily a state and local responsibility, the President's role is really quite limited and ought to be quite limited, that he shouldn't be climbing into

the bully pulpit unless he's going to put scores of billions of dollars of federal money into it."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Do you agree with that? Are you suggesting scores of billions of dollars of new federal money? Are you suggesting that the President ought to climb up in the bully pulpit even if all he's trying to do is exercise political leadership, moral leadership in encouraging state, local, private sector to do what they ought to be doing?

GOVERNOR KEAN: I'll take a crack at that because I think in many discussions yesterday we're not suggesting a change in the federal role as far as the content of what children learn. We were the federal government suggesting that has obligation in areas that have nothing to do with what children learn, but the place in which they learn; that those people who are scared of the federal government and think the federal government has a secret plan to get things into kids' heads that local communities might not wan should not be troubled by that because it will disturb the basic not relationship between state and local and the federal government, and have matching construction funds available.

The other area we thought the federal government should be involved, perhaps through the reauthorization of a Higher Education Act, the federal responsibility, and there are a lot of federal funds going to higher education, is teacher preparation.

Again, that should be a federal role to insure that our institutions of higher education are not neglecting what should be one of their prime responsibilities, and in many cases they are. They're putting it off and sending this to the side and it's not important at our institution and that's not a school with value.

And the people who go there are of less quality, as are the teachers. The federal government has a right to say we can't tolerate that, and we're giving so many federal funds and so much help to a number of these institutions.

Some of the other things we talked about,

I think the whole area of tracking is to my mind

almost a moral presentation. I think the President

can talk about that.

One of the roles I always thought of the states, the states are the ones who had to follow that through. I always thought one of the main roles for

the Department of Education was in research because that's one thing the states don't do. They don't do really a lot of research on what works, and the federal government and the department can do that based on national examples.

And I would suggest that for the President in his bully pulpit and for the Secretary of Education to say that research clearly shows that we're putting the emphasis in the wrong place, that it should be in the early years.

That's the job of the federal government. The states don't do that.

As I said, I don't think we're talking about a fundamental change in the others. We are suggesting that the President use the bully pulpit to articulate the research which everybody really basically acknowledge, and to provide funds for what is a clearly terrible mess and in need right now because they're not getting met, which is the rebuilding of crumbling schools without which all of the other things we're trying to do can't happen.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: The Congress, and unfortunately it's the upper house, has a somewhat different view about its role for it has commented on

content in every way and insists that not merely that if it's going to put money into something that it has something to say about the content, but even if it doesn't put any money in it.

Note what they did last year with respect to the national history standards. They voted 99 to one to disapprove the national history standards established by the historical profession itself, and the one person who voted against it, he voted against it because it wasn't strong enough, not that he was opposed to it. He was in favor of voting it down, but he thought it wasn't strong enough.

Now, this is the temperament you have. They aren't going to put that much money that we're talking about, that you're talking about unless there's something to say about what this house is to be used for that you're going to be making so beautiful.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Although my memory of the particular thought in the history standards, that that was a vote against a federal role because they looked at the history standards and speakers on the floor said that, you know, a lot of people and things that we think are very important in American history are

1	not part of the standards. Children will not be
2	learning this and that and the other.
3	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Well, that's the whole
4	point.
5	GOVERNOR KEAN: And therefore, we're not
6	going to try to establish we're not going to try to
7	intrude ourselves. What we're going to do is say that
8	the federal government is not allowed to intrude
9	itself in this area at least until they come back with
10	standards
11	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: That we want.
12	GOVERNOR KEAN: that we want.
13	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: It will be what we
14	want. So they're intruding themselves.
15	GOVERNOR KEAN: But I think the first vote
16	was not to intrude because they didn't approve of the
17	intrusion.
18	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: I think the first vote
19	was to disapprove of the content.
20	GOVERNOR KEAN: Well, it went to
21	disapprove of the content, but this content wasn't
22	done at the state and local level. This content was
23	done at the federal level.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: It was national.

GOVERNOR KEAN: But some people even in the area of math and science, where people agree on the standards in Congress, are just against any national standards, that they all ought to be state and local.

What I'm saying is that some of the things we're suggesting don't get into that. It has nothing to do with standards or content or anything else to say that the child should be able to live or go to school in a building that's got a fire alarm and that there's fresh running water.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Heating.

GOVERNOR KEAN: And have got a classroom they can sit in without discomfort, and water is not dripping on their head every time it rains.

So I don't think we get into that debate, but that's a very thorny debate you're talking about, but I don't think we have to get into that one.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: We don't have to get into that, but I think if we ask for X number of hundreds of millions of dollars to house the program, they might want to know.

MR. THOMAS: The part of the discussion that I couldn't understand, and I think I can ask it

in a way that doesn't require you to state your personal opinions --

GOVERNOR KEAN: I've never had a problem with that.

(Laughter.)

MR. THOMAS: But I guess for some people.

When I look at this issue, the way corporations would address an issue like this, they would say it is of such a scope and such a magnitude that we have to have a national approach to it. So let's say we have many outlets across the country, and they would acknowledge that there certainly is local interpretation to a certain degree, but they would still have output standards and input standards -- reverse that: input and output standards -- and there would be a culture that would be expected to be maintained and on and on.

And I would submit that not knowing the argument against it, when I first came into this Initiative and we started thinking and talking about education, I started out with exactly the same position as the Chairman, and that was this is such a societal issue, and it's probably one of the more overriding things facing this country. Therefore,

society has the obligation to step it up and be responsible in total for it, which means then that it is elevated to a centralized -- and I don't want to attribute it to -- but it's elevated to a centralized control, measurement, assessment, nurturing, et cetera, et cetera.

And yet, as we got into it, we ran headstrong into this, "Yes, but the states feel absolutely mandated and morally and every other way that that's their issue."

Could you just state the rationale against the societal responsibility, the rationale?

at the state level, but at the local level. Every parent in a sense like to insure that they have some control over the way their children are educated and the way that's supposed to be whether it's through the school boards, through PTAs and all of that. It doesn't always work, but at least the philosophy is there.

Most states have in their constitutions the responsibility for the education of children in the state, some of them to their sorrow because they've never been sued because they weren't

performing their function properly.

So it's always the federal government provides a very small amount of the money, five or six percent, for education. States and locals provide the rest. So from all of these points of view, it's always thought to be state and local responsibility.

States are like people. Some of them are rich states. Some of them are poor states. It's much harder for states that don't have the economic power to put the necessary resources into the education of children, and therefore, we have poor states that don't have very well educated children.

I've always thought the federal government should try to even up the playing field in that area -- that's my personal point of view -- with some help, but I guess what I'm arguing is that we don't have to -- and the Congress, every time the federal government talks about standards, doesn't think of it in terms that you and I do perhaps that we could have a standard for excellence, but a lot of them think, well, they're going to use these standards to say our children should learn this and our children should learn that.

And that's not what we want in this

community. We would rather have them learn math and reading and so on rather than this or that which might or might not be commanded by the federal government. Therefore, let's keep local control of education, and that's something that's very deeply ingrained in this country, an we're not going to turn that around, and maybe we shouldn't.

But there's no way that the states and local governments can come up with the necessary resources in many cases to deal with such a massive program such as the rebuilding of urban schools and schools in rural poverty. That becomes a different matter because you're not intruding in local control.

The federal government obviously who's going to supply a lot of the money has a right to say certain standards have to be met in construction. You have to have certain things written into the bill to make sure that the money doesn't go into somebody's pocket and really goes to the children in those schools to build the schools.

But it doesn't get into content. It doesn't get into the federal government mandating anything, except hopefully that you follow certain logical procedures in building the schools to make

sure the taxpayers' money is well spent.

But this whole question of what's local and what's state and what's federal is something we're going to be talking about in this country, I think, for a long time to come.

Some of us believe that you can end some places on that spectrum and some believe others, but I don't think -- I may be totally wrong -- but I don't think that you're going to get into that argument when you provide funds for school construction.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: That doesn't go with the point that I raised quite some time ago, namely, that the population right now is going to be moving around; that perhaps would be desirable to have some kind of common set of, common bond of knowledge that would make it possible to live a couple of years in Arkansas or in New York or in -- on and on, because people just move all the time, move from here to there, stay ten years here, maybe five years somewhere else and so forth.

And in the same way that we need to speak the common language, we need to have a set of body of information that is common to us, and if we don't have similar educational programs in Arkansas to what we

have in Massachusetts, then we won't have equal that have a common body of knowledge and can negotiate in one community as well as in another.

It seems to me to be very important.

GOVERNOR KEAN: I think it's very important, and I think it should be. The argument has come over what those should be. Even within those who believe as I do that there should be national standards, there's great argument over the content of those standards.

And I think if we ever get beyond that and resolve it and get a general agreement, as we have in math and science, by the way, for some of the humanities, then I think we can move on national standards, but until that kind of fight, such as the one you described in the history standards, gets resolved, no, I think it's going to be too contentious.

By the way, one of the other things among states that's, I think, terrible is the teachers can't move their credentials around. If you're a teacher and I'm certified in New York to teach, and I'm certified in New Jersey to teach, I can't teach in Pennsylvania. So if there's some reason for my family

to move from Texas, from California or anyplace else,

I'd have to go right back and take courses or whatever

to presumably teach whatever.

And I think teacher's credentials ought to be movable also because as families move, you've got to be able to pursue your livelihood in whatever state you go to. If you're a great teacher in one state, certified, you ought to be able to teach in other states as well. That's not the way it is.

MR. THOMAS: It just seems like, again, if we could tackle the issue and solve it once, it would be more productive to the country than tacking 100,000 or a million situations across the country.

If we avoid it, somebody has to resolve it and we leave it to be resolved, I think we never get to that pipeline issue. So if we expect the pipeline to result in something and yet it's a random process to establish what that pipeline is, and yet there's that expectation that there's going to be people coming out of the pipeline qualified to go into this school, how do we --

GOVERNOR KEAN: And, you know, again, the shame is that it isn't what it used to be. We questioned seriously what you should do ten years ago.

We didn't know. So we tried a whole bunch of school reforms then, some of which worked, some of which didn't.

But out of that era of experimentation, a number of governors, one of whom was Bill Clinton, out of all of that experimentation came the sort of things that do work, and the researchers are now agreed as to what you should do and what you have to do if you want to create a good school, no matter where that school is, rural, urban, whatever, what you have to do.

So we know what to do. We have the path laid out for us, and shame on us if we don't do it. That's the question right now. Do we have the political will to do it.

Some of it costs money. A great part of it doesn't cost anymore money.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Well, we have done a lot when we've explored this whole problem of federalism as opposed to local content and control. We haven't said very much about the other matter that our consultant suggested, namely, the priorities. I mean, in our recommendation perhaps we ought to think about that and make some suggestions there.

I want to call our attention to the fact

1 that we have not done much. We've got a lot of things 2 on the table, but to put it in the order that is advertised, perhaps we may do that. 3 4 Well, we've been going back and forth for a good portion of the morning, and I think that we 5 6 ought to give each member of the Advisory Board an 7 opportunity to make some kind of final wrap-up statement on the issues. 8 9 Where's Angela? 10 MS. WINSTON: I hope she will return 11 shortly. Her computer says she shortly will return. 12 CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Robert, do you want to 13 Any final statements you want to make? start? MR. THOMAS: Yes, I'd be happy to. Would 14 15 you like to limit the comments to the assessment of 16 this meeting? 17 CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: No, no. MR. THOMAS: Well, maybe you'd like me to 18 19 tell you about my summer vacation. No. 20 (Laughter.) 21 My thoughts go from this MR. THOMAS: 22 meeting to the summation of our efforts in the form of 23 recommendations to the President, and I think that

we've done a lot of good work in exploring and

24

exposing some of these important areas, and we've got the germs of some good ideas in here.

And I think that between now and the next meeting, you know, we can play out with the Initiative staff and the consultants -- they've really put some good work towards maybe tracking some of those and coming up with a list of priorities that maybe we can talk about next time.

I believe that there's a lot of expectation for what we'd come out with as people have talked to us individually about where we're going. I think there's a great deal of expectation, but I think in many ways perhaps when it's all said and done, I think we can meet a lot of the expectations.

So I remain that our form of recommendations will yet address a lot of the issues, and our priorities will yet focus in on some of the key things that the President can bring up to society, the American people.

So I would just state that probably my overriding comment here would just be in the face of a very strong reality that there are problems and issue out there, that I think we can participate in the great movement forward on those issues.

REV. DR. COOK: I think that this has been great. The expectations have been high in terms of what is expected, but I think that one of the highlights for me was going to Oxford, Mississippi, where years ago African American students could not cross the common areas, and to see an entire community working together and saying, "We want to live together, we want to work together."

So I think what our Initiative has done is pique the consciousness of American. The promises and practices that we've seen have heightened my hope to show that America is more hopeful than not.

But it would be a shame for the year that we've had to not be preserved, all of the experiences, all of the activities we've participated in. We need to not just pique the consciousness. We need to go forward.

And so I just hope that we'll have a larger discussion on the formation of the recommendation to the President on appointing a council because I think it's going to be important to go beyond what we've done and to continue the discussion and the solutions to, you know, really making America one America in the 21st Century.

MS. CHAVEZ-THOMPSON: I share both the same optimism, the same views that Suzan and, I think, the rest of the Board, and Robert share.

I end by saying very much what I started out in saying a year ago, and that is that economic opportunities for workers to work themselves out of poverty, to work their children into an education and provide a level of prosperity for their families depends on their economic conditions.

Having spent the last year talking and looking at the opinions of so many Americans, whether it's on the issue of poverty or stereotyping or education, work place discrimination, and hearing the stories as we traveled across the country has made me a bigger advocate of having a continuance of our dialogue.

This Advisory Board having been formed and ending its job on September 30th has absolutely nothing to do with what we continue to do as individuals, whether we represent organizations or whether we represent ethnic minorities or whoever we represent. This dialogue has to continue. This conversation needs to continue.

We need to do our part whether it's at the

educational level in creating a conscience for America that we must deal with the issue of race in this country, and we must provide the better tomorrow that we all hope to have for our children, and most especially in the future generations, of our grandchildren.

So I feel very optimistic that we've done the beginning, and I've always said that this is Phase 1. What ultimately will be Phase 2 and Phase 3 is up to the people, not just perhaps the people in this room representing their organizations, but the people across America representing their interests and their generation in what happens in America tomorrow.

GOVERNOR KEAN: I think as we start to wrap up our work, we've got to remember where we began. I used to say -- well, as Dr. Franklin used to say, this is a problem that has affected America since, I think, the Constitution, and he has educated me that it was a problem in this country 100 years before that.

So I now say quite accurate it's been a 300 year experience, the problem of race and ethnicity in this country, and it has been the one stain going across an otherwise glorious history.

We have made a start. We have talked to a number of people, visited with a number of people individually and collectively, tried to get a national conversation started in a number of areas.

We've covered a number of the problems that we know have been around this problem of racism, from discrimination in housing to education, to law enforcement. We have not covered one that I think the Commission agrees with me that we ought to cover before we adjourn, and that's the problem of the media

Almost every group we've gone to has said the media is a problem that has to be addressed. Children get more information from the media unfortunately than they do from schools. So how they treat the problem of race is very, very important, and I think we must address that before we give our report to the President.

But to me what's vital here is the following. We are simply at the beginning. In fact, if I can quote Churchill, this is not the beginning of the end, but should be properly the end of the beginning.

That is where we should be right now, and all of us are going to be writing and helping on the

report, but not only is there a strong follow-up by the President and the administration, that the Congress becomes involved in the debate, and that it's going to take that kind of a massive effort if a 300 year problem is going to start to be put under control.

So my wish, hope and, I guess being an optimist, expectation is that following the work of this commission there will be a major follow-up work at all levels of the government.

MS. OH: I want to make my closing remarks first to acknowledge the very hard work of our staff, who I think we assembled -- Judy, you assembled an extraordinarily talented group of people to come together from all disciplines and walks of life, who under an enormous amount of pressure had to perform in ways that I think none of us could predict when this started, and it's been really a pleasure working with them.

They've been professional; they've been dedicated; they've been committed. They have hung in with us during periods of real doubt at least in my mind that there was even a point at which I thought what am I even doing here; maybe I should depart, and

that's how rough I think it has been.

And I also want to thank the rest of you on the Advisory Board because, you know, yesterday really was the first time in many months that we had the chance to talk to one another in a substantive way, and I'm sorry Governor Winter isn't here because throughout I think he and I have traveled the most together in doing the outreach to the public, and it's been a really growing experience for me.

I came to this task with a very serious mind about I believe -- you know, Sun Tzu wrote a book thousands of years ago that people who do a lot of organizing in the community have read. It's called The Art of War, and it is truly an art.

I think we are in a war, you know, against racism in this country. I take it very seriously. When I was a young person, you know, I did all kinds of things which my parents, who were immigrants and who really believed in the promise of America, couldn't understand at all. I mean I stepped so far out of bounds I went so far as to even find myself being arrested for public protest and refusing to enter a plea and forcing the D.A. and the county to take us to trial because what was it about? It was

about, you know, the investment of our funds at the University of California in the government of South Africa.

And as a lawyer I've tried, you know, when I first started out to be very committed to understanding my craft and my responsibility to the system, this government, our Constitution, my clients in the first instance, but I always felt strongly that we had a role as attorneys in this society to bridge a gap to the community.

And as a person who sits on this Advisory Board, I can't say it's been a pleasure. It's only been a pleasure knowing you and getting to know the staff that we work with, but the media, I think, is cruel. I think they're full of doubt and derision and distrust, partly cultivated, I think, by the political climate here in what you call "the Beltway."

It's plenty for me to come here and see it once a month and experience it, you know, once a month, but I have learned that there is this huge not just racial divide, but there are regional divides. I've always understood the class divides, and yet I feel like I belong to this country, and I have an important role to play as a second generation woman of

Korean descent to articulate the stories from people
that look like me, but know that she's as American as
anybody sitting in this audience.

And some of the things I say are perceived to be outrageous. They're not outrageous. I'm exploring possibilities with people.

John Hope Franklin and I -- this is a man who's twice my age, lived twice my life, and had ten times the experiences that I will ever encounter, I think, in the area of race and racism in this country, and I was so hurt to see that the very first headline about our meeting was that there's a divide.

Nobody ever asked me what was going through my mind when John Hope pointed out that in the late 1600s there was a case, and we learned about this disparate treatment even then, and I have to tell you that in my mind I really perceived it not as an African American man speaking to an ethnic Korean woman, but as an elder reminding a youngster -- I think I'm one of the youngest. Maybe Suzan and I are about the same -- to say, you know, "Don't forget, child, where you're coming from and what this country is about."

And I've actually kept that in my heart as

I've gone from place to place to place. I do believe we're engaged in a task that's about reaching the hearts, not just the minds, of America, and when we started, I think we've started.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Thank you.

I think that our Executive Director has some comments that she would like to make.

MS. WINSTON: I would. Thank you very much.

I thank you all for your comments, especially your comments about the work of the staff, which has been extraordinary. It's a wonderful staff.

We're not finished yet. We have some distance to go. This has been a very important meeting to begin to collect your thoughts, your preliminary recommendations which we will be working with you on this summary as you compile your recommendations and your report to the President to complete your advice giving responsibilities.

I think that we all are now even more chastened than we began with understanding how huge an issue we've taken on, you've taken on certainly, and you all have done it in addition to all of your other responsibilities in life, and I think that is

very important for everyone to under that you took on essentially at least two or three additional jobs to the one that you came to this Advisory Board with in which you continue to occupy.

The one thing that I think is important to say, as well, is that this is an educational process. It has been an educational process for everyone, and we've all done a lot of learning, and I think that will be reflected at the end of this as we do come to the end of the beginning and learn how this effort will be taken forward.

I do want to say there is some interest in knowing what is next. This meeting we have been calling the last regular meeting of the Board in that we have planned over the next several weeks some special engagements for you in which there will be an opportunity, I think, for you at least in some groupings to talk about, to continue to talk about these issues.

The President, of course, is going to be participating in a round table discussion on race on July 8th on PBS as part of the Lehrer New Hour, and members of the Board have been invited to participate in a discussion of race and health issues, which the

Department of Health and Human Services is going to be hosting in Boston on July 10th. That will provide an opportunity for some continued discussion.

July 13th, the Carnegie Endowment is hosting a meeting for this Board to discuss the immigrant experience, which will, of course, provide an opportunity to continue to learn about and to discuss some of the very issues we started out this meeting with.

The corporate business community will meet again on -- I think the new date we're looking at is July 23rd in St. Louis to discuss, again, a number of the issues that have been mentioned here.

There will also be a meeting of the Board, a culminating event, in September -- the date is still to be determined -- which will provide perhaps the last opportunity to continue this discussion before the charter of the Advisory Board ends.

So I just wanted to make clear that there will be other opportunities, perhaps not in this particular kind of configuration, and I wanted to take this opportunity again to -- a point of personal privilege -- to thank you for being so accessible.

We have, I think, helped to run you

1	ragged, but I also have to say that each of you has
2	indicated at some point that as tired as you are from
3	your travels, that you've found them quite rewarding
4	and understanding that there is a high level of common
5	hopes and dreams among people of all races,
6	ethnicities, classes, et cetera, in this country, and
7	the question we have to figure out is how to harness
8	those hopes in a way that makes it clear that we need
9	to move as one towards fulfilling the promise of
10	America.
11	Dr. Franklin, thank you for this
12	opportunity, and let me turn this back to you.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Well, thank you very much.

Let me say, first of all, that since we perhaps will not be meeting again in this setting, I want first to extend -- yes?

MS. WINSTON: I'm sorry. There is one thing --

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Please.

MS. WINSTON: -- I did forget to say that is very important for me to remind this audience and this group, and that is that we are also pleased to say that the American Indian community is going to be

participating on August the 5th and 6th in a White House conference on economic development I will not be able to speak to the details.

It is a conference that is the result of a collaboration between many agencies within the federal government and Indian Country. That does, I think, require also a statement to the effect that this Initiative, the President's Initiative, has been very concerned about making sure that and discussing inclusion, and in working towards inclusion we have reached out to Indian Country, and members of this Board have traveled to Indian Country and have participated in several meetings with tribal leaders.

Angela Oh will be participating tomorrow in a discussion with the American Indian journalists in Phoenix, Arizona.

The challenge that we have faced is to recognize the unique status of American Indians in this country and the special sovereignty relationship with the federal government, at the same time recognizing that American Indians, like other communities of color, have faced racism and are as concerned about the way in which their status had been affected by racism in this country.

That discussion will continue as well, and
I just thought it was important to make that as clear
as possible particularly since Laura Harris, who is
our senior consultant, was unable to be with us today,
and I think that she would have wanted to make a
statement. This is certainly no substitute for a
statement that she would have made, but I think it was
important to raise it.

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

First of all, since perhaps we will not be meeting in this setting again, I want to thank the Executive Director without whom I could not have functioned as effectively, if that's the word you use, as I have been able to, and I certainly would want you to know that I'm deeply grateful, first, for your giving up your position temporarily with the Department of Education to come to lead us, and the leadership you've provided.

And similarly, I would say that with the great staff that we have had, without whom we couldn't have worked, they've called me at nine o'clock some evenings and given me a new assignment, and I've said, "Well, where are you?"

"We're in the office." 1 2 And they sometimes ask for my assistance, and I say, "Sure, from nine to five." 3 4 (Laughter.) 5 CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: She's fortunate, I 6 guess. 7 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: But you have been so 8 9 generous with your time and your effort to import your 10 resources and your great talents that I could not have 11 functioned without you. 12 Now, this meeting today has taken on a 13 slightly different form from some of our other meetings, but this has been important, particularly 14 15 for those of us who are members of the Advisory Board 16 to have the opportunity to exchange our views, ideas, and notions about where we go from here. 17 18 We haven't had these opportunities very 19 Some of them say we haven't really had this 20 opportunity since we sat around the fish tank in San 21 Diego last June, but we hope that this won't be the 22 last time. 23 We also hope that this has stimulated the

members of the Board so that the suggestions now that

24

they've made will be taking shape so that we can enjoy your contributions to the final report that we'll be making to the President.

I think this meeting presented challenges that we as a Board and as individual members need to continue to work over the next few months in order to bring about the kind of conclusions and recommendations that we need to make.

I think it's quite clear -- certainly it's clear to me and I think clear to my colleagues on the Board -- that in these last 12 months we have been able to stimulate discussion, to urge rather successfully in some instances, for the nation to look at the problems of race and the related persistent problems of education and economic disparities, and to think of the ways in which we might tackle these problems and make some recommendations to the President for a continued effort to resolve them.

The President himself has taken a very great leadership in this areas in this period of time, this last 12 months, particularly in addressing matters of education, matters of economic opportunity. I'd like to remind ourselves that each month I have written to the President and talked about the problems

that we face, reported to him about the results, made recommendations and suggestions to him, and that each and every month he has responded and has put in place suggestions that were made, whether they had to do with problems of housing, problems with enforcement, legislation, whatever. He has acceded to our requests, accepted our recommendations, responded generously, and has carried forward the recommendations that we have given him.

We should be giving more extensive recommendations as we draw up our report to him, and I have no doubt that these will be received in the same spirit and the same manner that he has received our periodic recommendations.

I believe that this year we have succeeded in some of the efforts, not all of them, but some of the efforts that we have made to bring about an awareness of the problem to the nation and to various parts of institutions.

I hope that we can persuade the country and certainly the President that this effort must be carried on. It must be institutionalized in some way so that it will continue long after those of us who have been participating the last few months have

passed off the scene.

We know that there are several important directions that we must go, and we will articulate to the President directions that we think we ought to go or the country ought to go.

There are on miraculous solutions to these problems. As an historian, I am quite aware of the way in which the long stretch of history shows change even when it's not discernable to the naked eye. There are changes, and there will be changes from here on out, and I believe that if we work diligently and hard in the next few months and weeks, we can bring about some recommendations and some suggestions that will make the things that we have seen this year flower into really important and significant changes.

So I want to thank all of you for your cooperation. I want to thank the audience for its cooperation and its goodness. I want to thank all of you for your forbearance.

 $\mbox{ GOVERNOR KEAN: } \mbox{ Mr. Chairman, let me just} \\ \mbox{ say one thing before we } -- \mbox{ }$

CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: Yes.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Your leadership is extraordinary because you have taught us that you can

Τ	nave great passion for a subject and nevertheless
2	exhibit grace and tolerance and civility, and that
3	should carry through more of our public debate.
4	Thank you, sir.
5	(Applause.)
6	CHAIRMAN FRANKLIN: The meeting is
7	adjourned.
8	(Whereupon, at 11:56 a.m., the Advisory
9	Board meeting was concluded.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	