#### U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + +

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 2010

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m., GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman (via telephone)
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman
TODD F. GAZIANO, Commissioner
GAIL L. HERIOT, Commissioner
PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner (via telephone)
ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, Commissioner (via telephone)
MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

MARTIN DANNENFELSER, Staff Director

#### STAFF PRESENT:

DAVID BLACKWOOD, General Counsel, OGC
CHRISTOPHER BYRNES, Director, RPCU
DEBRA CARR
DEMITRIA DEAS
PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD
LATRICE FOSHEE
MAJA JWEIDE
ROBERT LERNER, Assistant Staff Director,
OCRE (via telephone)
EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor
LENORE OSTROWSKY, Acting Chief, PAU
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Chief, Budget and Finance
KIMBERLY TOLHURST
AUDREY WRIGHT
MICHELLE YORKMAN-RAMEY

#### COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

TIM FAY
JOHN MARTIN
ALISON SCHMAUCH

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGEND	A ITEM	PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda	5
II.	State Advisory Committee Issues	11
	<ul><li>Pennsylvania</li><li>Nevada SAC</li><li>Kansas SAC</li><li>Missouri SAC</li><li>District of Columbia SAC</li></ul>	11 15 17 20 30
II.	Program Planning	37
	- Approval of Briefing Report on Historically Black Colleges and Universities	37
	- Discussion of Immigration Report at Prior Meeting	54
	- Discussion of Letters to House of Representatives and Youngstown, O	
	- Discussion of Statement of Department of Education	81
	- Discussion of Commission Meeting Schedule in April	85
	- Discussion of Timelines for Consideration of Briefing Reports Scheduling of Briefings	88 &
	- Update on Status of the 2010 Enforcement Report and Related Hearing	98
	- Update on Status of Title IX Project	101
	- Update on Attack Against Asian-American Students at South Philadelphia High School	111
IV.	Management and Operations	122
	- Office of General Counsel Presentation Regarding Commissioner Terms	123
V.	Staff Director's Report	126

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

2	(9:34 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: The meeting
4	will come to order. This is a meeting of the U.S.
5	Commission on Civil Rights. It is 9:34 a.m.
6	Eastern Standard Time on March 12th, 2010.
7	Commissioner Kirsanow and I are participating by
8	phone. Vice Chair Thernstrom is in and out. She
9	hasn't arrived yet.
10	Commissioner Melendez, was that you
11	who just joined us?
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Good
13	morning.
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Very good.
15	Commissioner Melendez will also participate by
16	phone. Commissioners Heriot, Gaziano, and Yaki
17	are present at 624 9th Street, Northwest, Room 540
18	in Washington, D.C., where the meeting is being
19	held. Commissioners participating by phone,
20	please be sure to state your name before making a
21	statement or tasking a vote to make it easier on
22	our court reporter.
23	Before I begin, I would like to note

of former

the passing

24

Juanita

Commissioner

Goggins, who died last month at the age of 75.
She was a woman of many firsts, the first black
woman to serve on the U.S. Commission on Civil
Rights and the first black woman elected to the
South Carolina General Assembly.
She represented House District 49 in
Rock Hill, South Carolina from 1974 until 1980,
serving on the House Ways and Means Committee.
She was also the first black woman from South
Carolina elected to the Democratic National
Committee.
Today we celebrate her life and
acknowledge her contribution to this Commission.
I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: The first item
on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Is
there a motion to approve the agenda?
COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: So moved.
CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Second?
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is
COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki. When would the appropriate

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let's do that

1	now.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner
3	Melendez and I would like to have an item added to
4	the agenda to just discuss how the immigration
5	report findings and recommendations were handled
6	at the last teleconference meeting.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I'm sorry,
8	please repeat yourself.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner
10	Melendez and I would like to have an agenda item
11	added for discussion on how the immigration report
12	was handled at the last business meeting.
13	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. All
14	right. I second the motion. Discussion?
15	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Do you have
16	other agenda amendments yourself, Mr. Chair?
17	Should we vote them one at a time or all together?
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let's do it one
19	at a time. I anticipate there will be unanimity,
20	but I am not sure.
21	Commissioner Melendez, how do you
22	vote?
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS:

Commissioner

1	Kirsanow?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
4	Yaki?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
7	Heriot?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Aye.
9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
LO	Gaziano?
L1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Sure.
L2	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: And I vote for
L3	it also. So it passes unanimously.
L4	Next up, Commissioner Kirsanow, I
L5	understand that you have some amendments to the
L6	agenda.
L7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I do. Mr.
L8	Chair, I would move to amend the agenda to add
L9	consideration of the two letters I circulated
20	Wednesday and Thursday.
21	The first is advising the House of the
22	preferences in the Senate's version of the health
23	care bill, a letter that we sent out in December.
24	This one will go out to House members.

1	The second letter is a letter to
2	officials of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, who are
3	using a racially bifurcated hiring list in hiring
4	police and firefighters.
5	So I would move that we place those
6	two items on the agenda.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. I second
8	the motion. Discussion.
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
11	Melendez?
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
14	Kirsanow?
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
17	Yaki?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
20	Heriot?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
23	Gaziano?
24	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I vote for it
2	also. Commissioner Yaki votes against it. The
3	remaining commissioners vote for it. The motion
4	passes.
5	Okay. So now let's vote on the agenda
6	as amended. I move that we do so. Is there a
7	second?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Second.
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Could I add one
10	other agenda item?
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Just a
13	discussion item, really, on the Department of
14	Education's information, I suppose, or statement
15	that it may investigate schools for disparate
16	impact relating to discipline in AP courses and
17	related matters.
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: All right. I
19	second the motion. Discussion?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
22	Melendez, how do you vote?
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner

1	Kirsanow?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
4	Yaki?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
7	Heriot?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
10	Gaziano?
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I vote for it
13	also. Commissioner Yaki votes against the motion.
14	And the remaining commissioners voted for it. The
15	motion passes.
16	At this point we are going to vote for
17	the agenda as amended. Second?
18	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I am glad to
19	vote before, but will you tell us where on the
20	agenda you are going to place these different
21	items or do you want to do it after?
22	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's
23	see. I'll put them on the front end. Well, I'll
24	put them after the approval on the briefing report

1	on HBCUs.
2	And the order, I'll take the order as
3	we received them: immigration; then the two
4	letters; and, finally, issues related to OCR.
5	Okay. Commissioner Melendez, how do
6	you vote?
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
9	Kirsanow?
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
12	Yaki?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
15	Heriot?
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
18	Gaziano?
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. The
21	motion passes unanimously.
22	II. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES
23	- PENNSYLVANIA
24	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: First up will

be the State Advisory Committees. I move that the Commission recharter the Pennsylvania State Advisory Committee.

Under this motion, the Commission appoints the following individuals to that committee based on recommendations of the Staff Christopher Armstrong, Elisa Basnight, Richard Baulding, Alberrto Cardelle, ImJa Choi, Heather Heidelbaugh, James Frazier, Nancy Gippert, Patricia Hopson-Shelton, Craig Hymowitz, Irwin, Faye Ritter, William Rothman, Lawrence Tabas, and Connie Tarr. Pursuant to this motion, the Commission also appoints James Frazier as the of this rechartered Pennsylvania State Advisory Committee.

They will serve as uncompensated state government employees. And the Commission appreciates the hard work that they will no doubt contribute to the State Advisory Committee.

Under this motion, the Commission authorizes the Staff Director to execute the appropriate work for the appointment.

Is there a second? Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
3	Discussion?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
6	Melendez, how do you vote?
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Discussion.
8	This seems to be not real balanced. It's balanced
9	as far as women and men, but it seems to be there
LO	are more Republicans than Democrats on this one.
L1	It seems to be skewed way to the right.
L2	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Eight
L3	Republicans, five Democrats, two Independents. We
L4	also tried to tease out the viewpoints of the
L5	folks under consideration. And if you look at
L6	their viewpoints, their ideology, by my scorecard,
L7	we have seven individuals who lean to the left,
L8	five who lean to the right, and three unknown.
L9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Commissioner
20	Melendez?
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I assume,
22	Commissioner Melendez, that you are more
23	interested in their ideology. And, if I am right,

this is probably a balanced commission. I say

1	"probably" only because there are three
2	individuals where we were unable to tease out
3	their viewpoints.
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Commissioner
5	Melendez, I am concerned that it may lean to the
6	left. So I may abstain on lack of balance but
7	going the other way.
8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Any other
9	comments?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
12	Melendez, how do you vote?
13	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I vote no.
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
15	Kirsanow?
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
18	Yaki?
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
21	Heriot?
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
24	Gaziano?

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Pass.
2	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I am sorry?
3	Did you say "Pass"?
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Pass.
5	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I vote for it.
6	Commissioner Gaziano, how do you vote?
7	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: What is the
8	vote right now?
9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: It is three
10	votes for it, two votes against it.
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Where is
12	Commissioner Thernstrom? Can we get back? I
13	abstain. I abstain.
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
15	Okay. The motion passes: three votes for it, two
16	against, one abstention.
17	- NEVADA SAC
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Next up is the
19	Nevada State Advisory Committee. I move that the
20	Commission recharter the Nevada State Advisory
21	Committee.
22	Under this motion, the Commission
23	appoints the following individuals to that
24	committee based on the recommendations of the

	Stail Director: Robert Beers, Onle Cooper, Belen
2	Gabato, Kay Kindred, Peggy Micco-Koning, Theresa
3	Navarro, Michael Pennington, Dennis Perea, Devin
4	Reiss, Cheryl Russo-Campbell, Matthew Saltzman,
5	and Michael Spurlock. Pursuant to this motion,
6	the Commission also appoints Michael Pennington as
7	the chair of the rechartered Nevada State Advisory
8	Committee.
9	These committee members will also
10	serve as uncompensated state government employees.
11	Under this motion, the Commission authorizes the
12	Staff Director to execute the appropriate
13	paperwork.
14	Discussion? I'm sorry. Is there a
15	second?
16	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second.
17	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay.
20	Commissioner Melendez?
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: It looks okay
22	to me. I'll vote yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
24	Kirsanow?

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
3	Yaki?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Abstain.
5	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
6	Heriot?
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
9	Gaziano?
10	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I, too, vote
12	for it. One abstention. And the remaining
13	commissioners vote for it. It passes.
14	- KANSAS SAC
15	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Next up is the
16	Kansas State Advisory Committee. I move that the
17	Commission recharter the Kansas State Advisory
18	Committee.
19	Under this motion, the Commission
20	appoints the following individuals to that
21	committee: Michael Abrams, Laurie Bagby, Susan
22	Berson, Melanie Caro, Chiquita Coggs, Marsha Frey,
23	Michelle Johnson, Jennifer Kassebaum, Robert
24	Mandel, Sarah McIntosh, Phyllis Nolan, Kirk

Charles Scott, Kimberly Shankman, 1 2 Pursuant to this motion, the Commission Unoke. also appoints Kimberly Shankman as chair of the 3 4 rechartered State Advisory Committee. 5 These members will serve as uncompensated government employees. Under this 6 7 motion, the Commission authorizes the Staff Director to execute the appropriate paperwork for 8 9 the appointment. Is there a second? 10 11 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? 12 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki. 14 Kansas has had a rather 15 substantial and measurable growth in its Latino 16 population. I think it's almost ten percent of 17 the state. Were there any efforts directed 18 towards recruiting members of that community for inclusion on the SAC? 19 REYNOLDS: Staff 20 CHAIRPERSON Mr. 21 Director, please respond to Commissioner Yaki's 22 question. And also do you know if any of the 23 candidates are Hispanic?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER:

24

There

1	was outreach from the region to El Centro
2	Incorporated, which I believe was an Hispanic
3	organization in Kansas. I don't have a breakdown
4	in front of me on whether or not any of the
5	members themselves are Hispanics.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is
8	Commissioner Melendez here. Was anybody rejected?
9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Mr. Staff
10	Director?
11	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Well, I
12	don't believe so, not from the ones that were sent
13	from the regional office. Now, the regional
14	office does not necessarily include every
15	application that they receive. It's not someone
16	that they necessarily put forward. But I don't
17	recall dropping anybody that came from the
18	regional office on this particular SAC.
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Other
20	questions?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
23	Melendez, how do you vote?
24	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No.

1	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
2	Kirsanow?
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
5	Yaki?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
8	Heriot?
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I am sorry?
11	Commissioner Heriot?
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
14	Gaziano?
15	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I vote for this
17	slate of candidates also. We have two votes:
18	Commissioners Melendez and Yaki. The remaining
19	commissioners voted for it. The motion passes.
20	- MISSOURI SAC
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Next up we have
22	the Missouri State Advisory Committee. I move
23	that the Commission recharter the Missouri State
24	Advisory Committee.

Under this motion, the Commission 1 2 following individuals appoints the to committee based on the recommendations of the 3 4 Staff Director: Michael Podgursky, Timothy Asher, 5 Joan Bergstrom, James Buford, Shamed Dogan, Eugene Dokes, Tyrone Flowers, John Grimwade, Sandra 6 7 Mayer, Jalesia McQueen, Ronnie Podolefsky, Beverly Randles, Steven Schieber, and Donayle Whitmore. 8 9 Pursuant this motion, the Commission also to 10 Podgursky appoints Michael as chair of the 11 rechartered Missouri State Advisory Committee. members will 12 These serve as 13 uncompensated government employees. Under this 14 motion, the Staff Director is authorized 15 execute the appropriate paperwork. Is there a second? 16 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 17 Second. 18 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki. 20 I have real concerns and 21 continuing concerns over the appointment 22 Timothy Asher to the Missouri State Advisory 23 Committee. I spoke against him prior.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

He is someone who has continued to --

has had three different ballot initiatives and was already struck down because they were misleading in terms of what they purported to say versus what they purported to do on the issue of affirmative action/civil rights.

He is someone who I think has the absolute wrong qualifications for a body related to this Commission. And I strongly oppose his inclusion in the SAC.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner

Yaki, if I understand you -- correct me if I am

wrong -- the primary reason you are opposing him

is his opposition to racial preferences?

about the fact that he has had three different ballot initiatives kicked out by courts of law because they were attempting to mislead the voters as to what he said he was doing versus what he is trying to do.

The fact that what he is doing is objectionable to me is interesting and salient in terms of my objection to his ideology, but the fact that he has three times been knocked down by the courts for attempting to mislead voters is

something that does trouble me. 1 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chairman? 2 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: 3 Did the court 4 conclude that he attempted to mislead the voters? 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: They knocked his stuff off the ballot because they said what it was 6 7 ascribed versus what it would do did not comport. COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 8 Mr. Chairman, 9 this is Commissioner Gaziano. The outrageousness the courts' rulings subject to appropriate 10 11 public commentary and review can -- certainly this Commission should not do further injury to this 12 gentleman by adopting court decisions that are 13 14 outrageous or implying that agree with we 15 outrageous and obnoxious court rulings that are against the real law of the State of Missouri and 16 17 the democratic process. 18 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I have not 19 reviewed the court opinion. And that is why I asked Commissioner Yaki whether 20 the court 21 concluded that Mr. Asher attempted to mislead the voters of Missouri. And if I understand --22 There was no --23 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO:

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS:

24

it right,

2	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. There was
3	no finding on intent, nor could there be. These
4	ballot initiatives were very close to those that
5	ran in California, Washington State, Colorado.
6	Most passed. The Colorado one failed. But the
7	ballot initiative was very close to Michigan and
8	all of those other states.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It may have been
10	close, but apparently it didn't hit muster.
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: So but for the
12	court's decision, Commissioner Yaki, would you
13	have an objection to him?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Of course, I would
15	have an objection to him. That goes without
16	saying.
17	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, no.
18	Actually
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: An objection, Mr.
20	Chair
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: it would be
22	helpful if you did say
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: An objection, Mr.
24	Chair, on ideology is one thing. An objection to
	1

the answer is no.

1	the fact that I think he is unfit to serve on the
2	SAC is another.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes. But I'm
4	trying to find out what is the basis for your
5	belief that he is unfit.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I believe that his
7	continued efforts that have met with successful
8	court challenges time after time on these issues,
9	where the lawsuits as they were filed were
10	alleging a number of serious substantive and
11	procedural errors
12	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: But for that,
13	you would support him?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. I didn't say
15	that. Why would you think
16	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: That was the
17	question.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would say
19	that? I am saying that those factors for me
20	there are a number of people on these commissions,
21	these State Advisory Committees, Mr. Chair, that I
22	object to.
23	I object to the fact that the majority
24	removed people with substantial institutional

memory in history who brought a lot of good things to the table.

I object to the fact that the State Advisory Committees have in many instances been skewed, both politically, demographically, and by gender.

I object to the fact that there are people on there who I believe in their hearts have no interest at all in civil rights other than the dismantling of the civil rights laws of this country. I object to the fact that this has been a continuing practice for five years, and I cannot wait for the moment when that ceases.

But I particularly object in this particular instance to this one individual, who I believe has shown time and again by his actions that his view of civil rights is contrary to the mission of this Commission.

And what people express in their writings, what people express in public versus what people have done time and again is to me worthy of at least some exceptional notice by me at this Commission.

But no. By no means does this mean

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	that absent his activities, I would object to his
2	inclusion on the Commission. I think the fact
3	that I abstain or have no votes on probably 90
4	percent of the SACs as they have been presented to
5	this Commission speaks for itself.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank
7	you. Thank you for the clarification. You raise
8	some interesting points. If I understood you
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You will never
10	understand me, Mr. Chair.
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, I thought
12	that I said "if." And I'm sure that you'll
13	correct if I get it wrong. But if I understood
14	you, Commissioner Kirsanow probably would not
15	qualify in your estimation to being on the
16	Commission because of his views.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am not going to
18	answer hypotheticals, but you can draw your own
19	conclusions.
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Any
21	other discussion?
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
23	Commissioner Melendez. It seems this one is
24	skewed to the right also. They've got two solid

	Dems, it seems like to me. And the rest are six
2	Republicans, five Independents. I just have a
3	problem with that.
4	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Just to
5	give you a better sense of how I approach it,
6	Commissioner Melendez, I don't pay all that much
7	attention to the party affiliations. I look at
8	the ideology. I am trying to ensure that there is
9	a diversity of viewpoint.
10	And so according to my view of their
11	ideology, we have three folks who have tagged to
12	the left, four who tag to the right, and seven
13	unknowns.
14	I guess we have a different method for
15	determining balance.
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: My other
17	comment let's just vote.
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
19	Melendez, how do you vote?
20	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No.
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
22	Kirsanow?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner

1	Yaki?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
4	Yaki?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, sorry. I
6	thought my mike was somewhere else. No.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
8	Heriot?
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote yes, but
10	I want to note that I am casting my vote
11	especially for Tim Asher, who has done more for
12	the principle of nondiscrimination and civil
13	rights than Commissioner Yaki has ever done.
14	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
15	Gaziano?
16	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes and for Tim
17	Asher.
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I, too, vote
19	for this slate, especially for Mr. Asher, who has
20	done some fine work in my view. And it's clear
21	that my view is not shared by all.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Therein lies the
23	difference.
24	- DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SAC

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: 1 Okay. 2 the Commission recharter the District of Columbia State Advisory Committee. 3 4 Under this motion, the Commission 5 appoints the following individuals to 6 committee based on the recommendations of the 7 Staff Director: Virginia Ford, Sonia Gutierrez, Clyde Hart, Vernon Dexter Ingram, Winona Lake 8 9 Scott, Daniel Lips, Alan Palmer, Laurence Pearl, 10 James Sandman, Denyse Sabagh, Gregory Squires, 11 Steven Wagner, Ken Weinstein. Pursuant to this 12 motion, the Commission also appoints Daniel Lips of the rechartered District of 13 the chair Columbia State Advisory Committee. 14 15 These committee members will serve as 16 uncompensated government employees. Under this Commission authorizes the 17 motion, the Staff 18 Director to execute the appropriate paperwork. Is there a second? 19 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Second. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, this is 23 Commissioner Yaki. Ιf beneath you qo the

D-R-I-unknown category, this is a commission that

is seriously out of whack.

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 would say nearly a third or more than a third of the members are concerned only in charter schools that are school choice. Three-quarters of the slate is male.

I mean, in any iteration of how you would have anything that would be roughly representative at all of the District of Columbia, this does not scour at all.

think that this is And Ι an interesting body considering the demographics and the characteristics of District of Columbia unless, of course, you are excluding the people who live here. So I am going to be voting a strong no on this.

And just a slight response to Commissioner Heriot, I would rather be known for doing no harm to civil rights and being seen as having done nothing, as apparently you seem to think, versus to be seen as someone who has actively sought to dismantle and destroy the gains made under the Civil Rights Act over the past 50 years. And if that is our point of difference, that certainly is our point of difference, I

think, between the two of us.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: And it is an extremely important difference. And, quite frankly, I think that we should seek opportunities to discuss this difference.

I think that Commissioner Heriot embraces the view of nondiscrimination. Now, that does not exclude supporting policies that would help the disadvantaged, but her view -- and I guess I shouldn't speak for her. I'm sure I'm going to pay a price for this. But her view of civil rights, arguably, is the traditional view of civil rights, that the government should not distribute burdens and benefits on the basis of race.

The civil rights movement fought for a long time to get this country in a position where the majority of Americans embrace the view that the government should not distribute burdens and benefits on the basis of race.

So it is an important difference. And I welcome opportunities to continue this dialogue.

And, Commissioner Yaki, maybe we should put our heads together to put something on the agenda

where we can have an expanded discussion of this point.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, Mr. Chair, it's Commissioner Yaki. I had thought that that was perhaps the intent of the national conference that you were doing. But, of course, I would always be glad to discuss this. I just will not do so in quite the same manner as perhaps some of my colleagues would.

Going on to the District of Columbia SAC, I would just again say I think this SAC, for lack of a better word, is out of whack. And we could have done a much better job.

I think it is a disservice to the District in which we sit, in which our offices are housed that we have a SAC that is so skewed out of the people who live, reside, and work here every day.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: You are right. This SAC is heavily weighted with people who have a strong interest in education reform. And, looking at the District's academic performance over an extended period of time, I think that that focus is appropriate.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Any other comments?
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
3	Commissioner Melendez. You know, I think we
4	wouldn't have such a problem if this were more of
5	a conservative state, you know. But when you
6	really look at the District of Columbia, you know,
7	the SAC really doesn't match up with that.
8	So I think it is skewed to the right,
9	and District of Columbia is not skewed to the
10	right. So I have a problem with this one. So I
11	will probably vote against it.
12	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Any
13	other comments?
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes. Mr.
15	Chairman? I don't have a mike. Hold on. I
16	didn't get my mike.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Are you still
18	driving? Do you still think you're driving?
19	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I feel as if I
20	am still driving. It took me close to two hours
21	to get in this morning, totally traumatized.
22	In any case, look, I don't think it is
23	fair to characterize the question here as a

division between those who are in favor of school

reform, which includes -- I mean, I happen to be a big charter advocate myself, but includes charter advocates and only charter advocates and those who are not are not in favor of school reform.

And I refer you to Diane Ravitch's new book, where she -- Diane Ravitch, of course, is the most distinguished educational historian in the country and has been a long supporter of both vouchers and charters and has changed her mind. These are very complicated issues, how one defines school reform. She has now come out in opposition to charters and vouchers.

And so I want us to be very careful in how we characterize people as pro or against trying to remediate the problem of schools that are failing to educate our kids.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you, Vice Chair Thernstrom. I just want to note I don't believe the issue is framed that way. Commissioner Melendez earlier -- and I don't know if you were present at the time.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No. I just walked in. So, you know, I just heard the end of this.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: All right. Any
2	other commen	ts?
3		(No response.)
4		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
5	Melendez, how	w do you vote?
6		COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No.
7		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
8	Kirsanow?	
9		COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
10		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
11	Thernstrom?	
12		VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I am
13	abstaining.	I wish I had been here for the
13 14		I wish I had been here for the I am terribly sorry.
	discussion.	
14	discussion.	I am terribly sorry.
14 15	discussion. Yaki?	I am terribly sorry.
14 15 16	discussion. Yaki?	I am terribly sorry.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
14 15 16 17	discussion. Yaki?	I am terribly sorry.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
14 15 16 17	discussion.  Yaki?  Heriot?	I am terribly sorry.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
14 15 16 17 18	discussion.  Yaki?  Heriot?	I am terribly sorry.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
14 15 16 17 18 19	discussion.  Yaki?  Heriot?	I am terribly sorry.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	discussion.  Yaki?  Heriot?  Gaziano?	I am terribly sorry.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.

it. So we have one abstentions, two nos, and four votes in favor of the motion. The motion passes.

### II. PROGRAM PLANNING

# - APPROVAL OF BRIEFING REPORT ON HISTORICALLY BACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up is the HBCU briefing report. I know that the Commission approved part A of this report on the educational effectiveness of historically black colleges and universities.

The report was based on a Commission briefing held on May 5th, 2006. It reflects commissioner and panelist input. Part A distributed in draft form to commissioners and contains a briefing overview and summary of the issue and why the Commission chose to conduct its briefing: a summary of the proceedings consisting of a synopsis of the panelists' full testimony and a synopsis of the question and answer session and, finally, copies of the panelists' written statements.

Under this motion, if the majority of the Commission votes to adopt part A of the briefing report, the Commission will then open

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

discussion of part B. If part A fails to obtain a 1 2 majority of votes, discussion of part B becomes 3 moot. This bifurcated vote was taken pursuant to 4 a policy adopted by commissioners at its April 5 13th, 2007 business meeting. Is there a second? 6 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? 8 9 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, I have got 10 one comment. 11 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes? COMMISSIONER HERIOT: On page 27 --12 this is just a minor comment, but we might as well 13 get it out here. Page 27, the last full line of 14 15 text, the word used, "sophistical," I believe they mean sophisticated. I don't think Dr. Kim would 16 17 appreciate his procedures being referred to as 18 sophistical. 19 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: If there are no objections, Mr. Staff Director, could you please 20 21 make that correction? 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait, Commissioner. This is Commissioner Yaki. 23 Hang Let me just look at this for a second. 24

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I'm 1 2 Does Commissioner Yaki have a comment? 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We may just want 4 to double check that. 5 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: While he is double checking, -- this is Commissioner Gaziano 6 7 -- I would ask if there is unanimous consent to change the -- we refer to HBCUs, which are defined 8 9 in statute. And then we have these other funny 10 terms, "TWIs," traditionally white institutions, 11 which I think is very awkward. Can't we just say 12 "compare HBCUs with non-HBCUs" and substitute "non-HBCUs" throughout in the report? 13 14 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. Mr. 15 Chairman, I would support that because I think there is a big difference between an institution 16 like Old Miss, which was segregated and, hence, 17 18 traditionally white, and a school like Oberlin or 19 Harvard, which accepted African American students going back very far. So I would say that Oberlin 20 21 and Harvard are traditionally open to all races 22 and not traditionally white. 23 So I think non-HBCU is probably the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

right term here.

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I am sorry.
2	Is the term "TWI" in all my reading on HBCU
3	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Pull your
4	microphone closer.
5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, I'm sorry.
6	In all my reading on HBCUs, I've actually never
7	seen the term "TWI."
8	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Nor have I.
9	Nor have I.
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: We don't like
11	it.
12	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: There's a
13	similar one, too, that I don't like, which is
14	"historically white colleges and universities." I
15	don't know that we need to be using that term
16	either.
17	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: If those terms
18	are never used
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Why don't we
20	just say "HBCUs" and "non-HBCUs"?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You get a school
22	like Dartmouth that historically was actively, you
23	know, Native American. So it's really not
24	appropriate to refer to the schools across the

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Is there any commissioner who objects to this approach?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki. I don't know if I necessarily object to the approach, but I do know and I have seen the literature term of arts for a descriptive that does use -- I think there were either elite or historical or what have you.

Ι just think that there is an historical context here that is important not to minimize. I doubt that TWI because I have actually never seen it either is the exact term of art, but I have been in statistical comparisons on admission rates, et cetera, and test scores that various sociologists and demographers and others have had some type of characterization for at least the elite institutions that have often been used as a measure of comparison.

I would just want to make sure that we are consistent with the scholarship on this. To the extent that we're inconsistent by using TWIs, I support the amendment, but I don't want us to substitute simply "non-HBCU" if there, in fact, is a substantial body of scholarship that uses a

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

different term of art as a measure of comparison? 1 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, 2 3 can we somehow -- I would be actually glad to look 4 at this question myself because I think that is a 5 legitimate statement on the part of Commissioner Yaki. There are distinctions between majority 6 7 white institutions. Ι mean, some different histories than others. 8 9 So I would be glad to look at what he common terminology is if people would like, but it 10 11 me we could vote on this and then seems to 12 subsequently amend the language slightly to reflect how the scholarship literature handles 13 14 this. 15 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner 16 Heriot, are you agreeable with that approach? COMMISSIONER HERIOT: 17 I would rather 18 just make the change to "non-HBCUs," but, I mean, 19 I am agreeable. COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: The text does 20 21 explain that there are different types 22 non-HBCUs. And so I think the -- I just don't 23 know that we need to use these two

"historically white colleges and universities" and

1	"traditionally white institutions," even if there
2	is some better term.
3	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The current
4	draft
5	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: For purposes of
6	this draft, there are some comparisons made
7	between HBCUs and others. And unless the
8	comparison is to some other group, I don't know
9	that we need to search for what those other
10	appropriate terms might be.
11	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I take it we
12	are in agreement Vice Chair Thernstrom will review
13	the literature and report back via e-mail?
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Absolutely.
15	That's fine.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That is fine.
17	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: That is fine.
18	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Any other
19	comments?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay.
22	Commissioner Melendez, how do you vote?
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is just
24	on the main body?

1		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: That's correct,
2	part A.	
3		COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I vote yes.
4		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
5	Kirsanow?	
6		COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is this part
7	of a reconci	liation vote?
8		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: No. No, it
9	isn't.	
10		COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Oh, okay.
11	Yes.	
12		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
13	Thernstrom?	
14		VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes.
15		CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
16	Yaki?	
	iant.	
17	TUNI.	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move for
17 18	reconciliati	
18		on. Aye.
18 19	reconciliati	on. Aye.
18 19 20	reconciliati	on. Aye.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
18 19 20 21	reconciliati	on. Aye.  CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner  COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: 1 That's a very 2 depressed yes. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I will take it. 5 Commissioner Gaziano? COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I will abstain 6 7 because I just have some other concerns about some legal statements that are summarized that kind of 8 9 just hang out there, but I'll probably join in the 10 findings and recs and statements. 11 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. I vote 12 in favor of the motion. We have one abstention from Commissioner Gaziano. The motion passes. 13 14 Next up, part B. Under this motion, 15 the Commission will vote individually on each finding and recommendation. Those findings and 16 17 recommendations receive a majority of 18 Receiving a majority of votes would be included in 19 the report with a vote tally and a sentence explaining any opposition vote for that item. 20 21 Okay. I am going to read each of the 22 findings and recommendations. 23 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Give me a page 24 number.

1	PARTICIPANT: Forty-five.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman, I
3	am not certain that we are ready to go through
4	these findings and recommendations now.
5	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay.
6	Commissioner Gaziano, how do you feel about that
7	point?
8	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I would prefer
9	some more time myself.
10	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
11	Thernstrom?
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, wait a
13	minute. Wait a minute. This briefing was held on
14	May 5th, 2006. I am really concerned that we just
15	keep kicking these reports down the road.
16	I mean, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you
17	agree with me there is an element of delinquency
18	here. I don't pin it on any one commissioner, but
19	it is. When we put out reports two years after
20	the actual briefing, three I'm sorry. Three
21	years. I've lost track of time here.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Four years,
23	actually. It is going to be four. May 5th, 2006.
24	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. That is

right. It will be four years. I mean, there is something troubling here. Would you agree with that?

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chair, one of the reasons I am not ready to go forward is I thought we agreed many, many, many, many, many, many times we would release this report with the STEM report. So I don't want to do findings and recommendations in isolation of the STEM report findings and recommendations.

I kind of think the two could have been bound together. There may be a majority that doesn't want them bound together, but I thought we agreed we were going to release them at the same time.

So I don't want to go through findings and recs. I will if there is a majority but --

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let me jump in for a moment. Vice Chair Thernstrom, as a general proposition, I do agree with you. I think that we have -- and "we," it's not just the commissioners. I think that it is the entire organization. We have contributed to this backlog of briefing reports. And I think that we need to have, yes,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

more discipline in moving these briefing reports 1 2 along. 3 think that we also need to be 4 mindful that objections based on non-substantive 5 grounds that we need to check ourselves -- but Todd does raise the point that I was going to 6 7 raise in that this report had been married and may have been a shotgun wedding but had been married 8 9 to the STEM briefing report. 10 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Was there a consensus on that, Mr. Chairman? 11 I thought we COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 12 had either an understanding or a vote, but --13 14 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Wе have discussed this issue on several occasions. 15 16 have not reviewed the transcripts. So I don't if 17 know there is а vote. But from mУ 18 recollection, STEMs and HBCU reports were going to 19 be dealt with at the same time. 20 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: In your view, 21 Mr. Chairman, is that really at this point, almost 22 four years later, a reason for holding this report I mean, you know, there is going to become a 23 up? 24 day at which all of this work of ours is basically moot. I mean, we're talking about, you know, a never never world in which things are promised, things don't materialize.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom, things are not as good as they need to be, but they're not that bad. In this particular issue, I don't think that this particular briefing report has a shelf life that is similar to, say, something that we did and the report that we did on health care, for example.

I don't think that this report will be stale if we really pass part A and take care of the findings and recommendations at the next business meeting.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I would propose, Mr. Chairman, that we advance the STEM report. We are going to get to that, I think, later in the agenda but when we do that we advance the STEM report. But that is the way to act consistently with the understanding we have been operating on on these reports since I have joined the Commission.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: If we can discuss the findings and recommendations at the

next in-person meeting, I will be happy with that.

But I do want to mention, Mr. Chairman, that, actually, this is not a static world, the question of the HBCUs. There is a whole new issue in Mississippi once again about given the budget, state budget, crunch, about what to do with the HBCUs and whether to merge them, and what with the majority white institutions. And this is a very complicated issue. And things have changed since this report.

You know, yes and no on your point about its shelf life. I mean, this is a very fluid situation and actually a very emotional situation seen in Mississippi at the moment.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Mr. Chairman, this is Commissioner Melendez. Let's go ahead and decide whether we're going to postpone this or not.

I would concur that it happen at the next face-to-face meeting. I am sporadic on making the conference calls that are not the designated face-to-face meetings. So I hope that we could schedule it for the next face-to-face meeting.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr.
2	Staff Director, will the STEM report be ready by
3	the next in-person meeting?
4	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Yes, it
5	will. It is ready now. So we can have it at the
6	next meeting.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. All
8	right. I hear a consensus to postpone a vote on
9	the findings and recommendations until the next
LO	in-person meeting. That being the case
L1	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Mr.
L2	Chairman? Mr. Chairman?
L3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes?
L4	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER:
L5	Actually, the report was sent to commissioners for
L6	their consideration, but it has not actually been
L7	sent for their review. So we have not had the
L8	comment period on the STEM report. So we could do
L9	that
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let's start
21	that clock.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: We can
23	start that clock as soon as today if commissioners
24	are agreeable to it.

1	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes.
2	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: But it
3	was sent to commissioners, just for the point of
4	information, in September, I think September 25th.
5	But I can resend it again today to commissioners.
6	And then we can start the clock on the review
7	period.
8	Depending on the timing of the April
9	meeting, whether or not and the amount of the
10	review period commissioners would be agreeable to
11	a shorter than 30-day review period, then we could
12	certainly have it ready in April.
13	I think one of the things on the
14	agenda today is to also decide on the scheduling
15	of the meetings in April given that the new Black
16	Panther Party hearing is likely to be on April
17	23rd.
18	So that is another issue we have to
19	resolve. So that is something commissioners might
20	want to take into consideration in making that
21	decision on the date.
22	- DISCUSSION OF IMMIGRATION REPORT AT PRIOR
23	MEETING

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS:

24

Next up

Okay.

is the -- let's see. Commissioner Yaki, you had some questions regarding a recent briefing report?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

This has two parts. One is a general comment on the fact that it is very difficult, I believe, to with a high degree of scholastic integrity to vote for items that have been amended and for which the final amendments have not been circulated at least 24 hours prior to actual voting.

I refer to the fact that the findings and recommendations and the immigration reform report -- all we had in our packets, we thought, was the final, but, in fact, there was a final final that contained other comments and changes made by other commissioners.

And, by the way, I never even saw a circulated version of the modified final, even for circulation purposes, prior to the actual meeting, much less getting an e-mail during the meeting that would even enable me to follow along with any degree of certainty as to what changes were going to be made. That's number one.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Number two is that it also points out difficulty of having the any substantive discussion briefing on reports during teleconferences. I simply do not and cannot believe that we can fairly and adequately as a whole conduct an entire review of a briefing report simply by teleconference when documents and other things that may be required have to be e-mailed out.

E-mail has problems. The government server especially has been very actively weird lately. And I have been getting e-mails sent and receiving it two or three hours later.

Commissioner Kirsanow at one point said -- he had asked me -- he had e-mailed me the revised findings and recommendations, which I never ever saw at all. And I don't doubt that he did it, but I just don't know exactly where it ended up.

So I would simply say this is something -- and then we had a minor debacle about an e-mail vote, which I don't even want to bring up because I think it is not even worth bringing up other than to note it for the record that

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

someone didn't attempt but sort of attempted to 1 2 try and do an e-mail vote on it, that which I think leads us to far too much potential abuse. 3 4 I would simply state that I don't 5 believe that we should have briefing reports done via teleconference and that if there is a final 6 7 final final that apparently has been circulated amongst people with tacit support or agreement, 8 9 that common courtesy and transparency demand that that be released and circulated at least 24 hours 10 11 prior to our actual consideration of it at a 12 meeting. 13 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Comments? 14 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman, I 15 don't think it's possible for us to ever be voting on findings and recommendations under a rule that 16 17 changes can't be made in the meeting. 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I didn't say that. 19 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: That's not something that's possible. 20 21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not what I 22 Commissioner Heriot --23 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Anything that --24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- that's not what

I said. 1 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: -- converges on 2 that I don't think would work. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner 5 Yaki, what did you think? COURT REPORTER: We're not getting a 6 7 One person at a time, please. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki, 8 9 what did you say? What Commissioner 10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: 11 Heriot did not understand apparently, whether 12 intentionally or unintentionally, is that I was talking about the fact that we were there on the 13 teleconference considering a final version of the 14 15 findings and recommendations that apparently some people had and other people did not. 16 Of course, there are always going to 17 18 be amendments and changes at a meeting, but at least we would be working off the same text. 19 did not have that opportunity at the last meeting 20 21 because that final text with the changes 22 additions was not there. 23 So if there are any changes made to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that text which we did not have, then we were in a

position, such as myself and others, of having to try and figure out what changes had been made, what were the changes being made during the meeting to those changes, which we did not have.

And that will make --

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, you are essentially saying that the commissioners who did not receive a copy of the proposed changes -- and that would include me -- were at a disadvantage in terms of following the discussions.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think a substantial disadvantage given that it was being presented as a final recommendation. It would be much different and I fully understand and agree that we cannot simply vote up and down on a final at a meeting where there are always going to be changes.

People are going to discover typos.

There are going to be differences in wording, phrasing, shading, or tone. That is understandable. But when you don't have a set document to begin with, that becomes the problem.

And the problem at that last meeting

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

was that there was a final to be considered to which changes or amendments might have been or could be made or had been made that many of us did not have any clue as to what text we were working off of in the beginning.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Commissioner
Yaki --

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman, this is Todd Gaziano. I agree, I think, with the thrust of Commissioner Yaki's statement. And you don't need to say that's extraordinary because we did that last meeting.

It's obviously better if we can share our proposed drafts and changes with each other.

A week is best, but where we have busy day jobs, three days is better than two days. Two days is better than one day.

And commissioners who don't circulate such drafts early enough bear the burden that their draft will be rejected. And if people will object, they haven't had time to do so.

Where I think we come out is that I think we all agree that the earlier we can share our proposed drafts with each other, the better.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

And we all strive to do a good job on that.

But if push comes to shove, we should all also try to work with the text that is sent because even that is better than oral modifications during a meeting. And what went on last time, although not ideal, is better that sometimes us formulating recommendations orally.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that I had sent in some notions about how these things should be changed maybe a week before. I think maybe Commissioner Gaziano actually sent in some proposed changes.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. I don't remember whether I circulated mine. Mine were just more -- I understood that Pete was working on a version. And so, rather than have three different drafts going around, I think I sent some of my mostly grammatical changes to Pete.

Sometimes that is the most efficient way of doing it. But we all should then work to make sure that we circulate whatever it is we want to propose at a meeting as soon as we practicably can.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: The point is

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

whether I circulated mine broadly or just to the Chairman's special assistant, but they didn't get made. And that was just error. Ordinary office procedure, things don't always get put the way they should be.

You know, that's why there seemed to be more last minute changes at that meeting than were actually last minute. They were, in fact, changes that had been suggested earlier and I think were generally going to be noncontroversial.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, I think what I am hearing is that we are in agreement that there will be changes, but it is better that substantive changes be bound and circulated as soon as practicable.

Now, I think that we have always been in agreement on this point. And it's a good thing that Commissioner Yaki raised this issue. But should there be a penalty for failing to provide a written revision in a timely fashion in a substantive manner?

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Whenever they are shared, they are generally better than oral

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

modifications. So I don't think that we should try to have some sort of automatic penalty. They're still preferable to the kind of oral musings we sometimes come up with, which still improve the document from time to time.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki. The problem is not whether we as eight individuals can understand and follow one another's musings during a discussion. There is a greater principle here at stake involving the transparency of the actions that we take at the Commission.

My point about this was twofold, one which I have still not heard a response on. One, I don't believe that because of the nature of how we treat briefing reports and the kinds of things that go on and changes that get made that I would strongly, strongly believe that we should not be doing briefing reports during teleconferences, number one.

Number two is that if we are going to be working from a text that is deemed as final and understood by others -- and I am going to say it the way it is, that the majority has deemed to be

what it is to be their final document that they are working on or a majority of the commissioners, that there is some obligation to at least have that in a readily available format that is publicly available the day before. So when we are making changes the day of, there is a constant and consistent base of reference from which to view and read these changes.

When we do this on a teleconference, the public has no idea what it is that we're working off of. We cannot photocopy them and put them out here for the public to come and pick up during the course of a meeting.

We cannot e-mail it out to the general

-- to people who are on the line as a matter of

course or posted on our website immediately for

anyone to follow.

That is a serious I think transgression of part of our role, which is to do this openly, publicly, and in a way that inspires confidence in the integrity of our process.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
Yaki, you raise two points. The last one I don't
believe we have ever used that procedure where

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

_	proposed revisions to
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: reports of
4	
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: assumptions
7	at the meeting
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair? Mr.
9	Chair, I did not say prior to a meeting. Let's
LO	not confuse things here. With regard to the
L1	specifics of the immigration report, there was a
L2	final draft being worked off of in the position of
L3	Commissioner Kirsanow and some others, not you,
L4	not me and others, that I had issues with because
L5	we were working off the same
L6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: It wasn't a
L7	final draft.
L8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, whatever it
L9	is that
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: We had
21	revisions. Some people received copies of the
22	revisions prior to the meeting. Some
23	commissioners didn't. There was a discussion
24	regarding these revisions, and there was a vote.

Now, these revisions could have been 1 2 accepted or rejected. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: 3 Mr. Chairman, 4 see, I've got a problem with that statement. 5 commissioners received copies prior the meeting. I mean, I have had a general feeling 6 7 that there have been a number of instances in which chosen, trusted commissioners receive copies 8 of documents that I don't see, Commissioner Yaki 9 10 doesn't see, Commissioner Melendez doesn't see. **REYNOLDS:** 11 CHAIRPERSON Are you 12 referring to revisions because --13 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. Let me be I assume that --14 clear. 15 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, hold on a The point at play here is revisions. 16 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 17 Yes. 18 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I don't expect Yaki share his 19 Commissioner to confidential communications that he has with the Vice Chair or 20 21 any other commissioner with me. Now, as for 22 substantive changes that he is going to make at a 23 Commission meeting, I think that it's better. 24 think that there is a consensus of folks who believe that it's better if those issues were circulated.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: It is certainly better if they're -- Mr. Chairman, if I know Ashley is taking the lead on some issue and I don't feel strongly about it but I want to make some suggestions to him, it's certainly more efficient for me to share them, my thoughts and reactions, with him or with the Vice Chair if there is an issue I know she is working on a revision on.

So I doubt seriously that anyone is even claiming that our staff or the Staff Director is sending things out selectively. But if we want to confer with each other, that not only is -- there's nothing improper in that, but that's efficient.

Sometimes my suggestions are just in the form of a or my revisions are just in the form of a suggestion to the person whom I know is going to be circulating something to the rest of the group.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But if five people come into a meeting having seen a draft --

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 1 That was not 2 the case in the last time. I don't know how many 3 people saw it. I sent some things to --4 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: As I said, I 5 didn't receive the -- well, at least at the time of the meeting, I had not reviewed the revisions. 6 7 I'm not sure if they were sent to me or not, but the bottom line is sharing, having conversations 8 with like-minded commissioners, having discussions 9 10 with like-minded commissioners, that is 11 improper. We are prevented from making decisions 12 unless we follow the appropriate procedures. our procedures do not prevent us from having 13 discussions about substantive issues. 14 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, this is going way off my topic. That has --16 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. You know 17 what, let's --18 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: That has nothing, 20 nothing --21 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let's also talk 22 about the issue that you put on the table about 23 briefing reports being discussed and voted on 24 during teleconferences.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think it is part and parcel of the problem that we have here. Let's just review. Let's just review these facts so that we understand where it is I am coming from.

At the meeting, at the teleconference meeting, Commissioner Kirsanow starts reading from his latest draft of findings and recommendations.

Now, we had in our packet two sets of findings and recommendations, one proposed by staff, one proposed by Commissioner Kirsanow. It became quickly apparent as Commissioner Kirsanow was reading off of his proposed findings and recommendations that they were distinctly different than what we had in our agenda packets, number one.

Number two, we never got an e-mail of that beforehand when apparently some of these changes had been made.

Number three, we never got an e-mail during the entire meeting about any of these changes that were going on. So it was very difficult to follow along.

That was my concern. It is not about the conferring process. It is not about the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

sharing of notes. It is not about the fact that we need to have every single amendment in writing ahead of time before the Commission meeting published and in 30 copies or what have you.

It has everything to do with simply the fact that we were there. Commissioner Kirsanow was working off a final version for comment and for comment and amendment by others that many of us had never seen and never did see during the point of that.

That brings me, then, to the next question, which is it is difficult to do briefing reports under those sorts of conditions, because, unlike a situation where we could raise here, we could not say, "Well, that is a lot of changes. Could I see that in writing?" And we could kick it over toward later in the day, have someone type it up, make some copies. We'll have it for all of us to follow along.

We can't seem to do that, nor can we make those copies available to anyone here who wants to follow along and find out what it is that we're doing, which I think is part of what we should be able to do as well.

I mean, it should not just simply be a bunch of people sitting around stirring the magic brew and then presenting it to people as a fait accompli without understanding what went into it.

We should be able to if we need to

We should be able to if we need to give people the opportunity to understand and follow along what it is that we're doing. And that simply is not available in a teleconference.

E-mail. The e-mail system is inherently unreliable. There are time lags involved, et cetera, et cetera. And if you choose not to be here in person to do it, then you do so at your peril. But when we are all doing it in this way, it just becomes especially, I think, troublesome for efficiency, accuracy, integrity, and transparency reasons.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
Yaki?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman, this is Kirsanow. If I may? I think Commissioner Yaki makes a perfectly valid point. And I think a better practice is clearly to endeavor to do these things in person. And I share his concern.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I don't know that I would have been 1 2 able to follow along had I not had something in And even if you're doing it by 3 front of me. 4 phone, it's more difficult to do that, obviously, 5 than in person. Second, with respect to the e-mails, I 6 7 know that there was some type of a screw-up with respect to circulating revised versions. 8 that in the course of the teleconference itself. 9 10 e-mail had An that Ι sent to 11 Commissioner Yaki had bounced back a couple of 12 I am not sure, Commissioner Yaki, if it times. finally went through. You had given me another 13 e-mail address. But clearly that highlights the 14 difficulty with doing it by teleconference. 15 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Actually, Commissioner Kirsanow, it never went through on 17 18 any of the alternatives I gave you. 19 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. And that I think goes to the point that Commissioner Yaki 20 21 is making. I think that we tried to do our best 22 last time around. Yaki 23 Commissioner Ι think is

describing a best practice that we should endeavor

to follow. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. there a consensus that we will endeavor to discuss 3 4 vote on briefing reports at in-person 5 meetings? COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. 6 7 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes. 8 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I think that is 10 generally best, but I don't know that we should this 11 think of as any hard and fast 12 especially when we're talking about the backlog of reports. There might be some that are simpler and 13 14 we anticipate a large amount of agreement on that we can cover in a telephone meeting. 15 Okay. 16 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I think that we have a consensus around this issue. 17 Ι think that it is clear that we didn't vote on a 18 hard and fast rule, but that will be our default 19 position. 20 21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. 22 - DISCUSSION OF LETTERS TO HOUSE OF

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS:

REPRESENTATIVES AND YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

23

24

Next up, Pete,

health care letter and Youngstown, Ohio. 1 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I would 2 move that we adopt and send out these two letters. 3 4 I'll just make a brief point as to both. 5 the first letter, the health care letter, went out Wednesday. And Ι trust that that 6 on was 7 sufficient time for people to review it, especially since it is virtually identical to a 8 9 letter that had been considered a couple --10 Commissioner COMMISSIONER YAKI: 11 Kirsanow, this is Commissioner --12 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- a months 13 ago. It was simply sent to House members since they will be voting on the Senate version of the 14 15 bill that was the subject matter of the previous letter that we sent out. 16 17 The second letter only went out 18 yesterday, again because of e-mail an I don't know if commissioners 19 misunderstanding. have had sufficient time to review that. 20 21 And I would be more than willing to 22 defer consideration of that letter to the next 23 business meeting. However, I do think that that

is simple enough that maybe we could consider it

1	today. That letter is to the City of Youngstown.
2	That is maintaining the bifurcated hiring list for
3	police and fire in clear violation of Title VII
4	and the Ohio vice code and a host of the second
5	prong of Steelworkers versus Weber in its progeny,
6	Johnson versus Transportation, and even some equal
7	protection cases. And we would be inconsistent
8	with Grots and Grutter versus Bollinger in
9	addition to, let me see, City of Cleveland versus
10	Firefighters.
11	What is peculiar about it is that the
12	Seventh District Court of Appeals here in Ohio had
13	already ruled that the city officials would not
14	have sovereign immunity upon a final adjudication
15	on the merits of this matter. Yet, they are
16	proceeding to move forward with it.
17	So it alerts them as to the legal
18	perils involved and that this is in clear
19	violation of a considerable amount of precedent.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, this is
21	Commissioner Yaki.
22	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I did receive the

Youngstown letter. I did not receive the health

1	care letter.
2	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Neither did I.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And neither did
4	Commissioner Melendez, and neither did
5	Commissioner
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: It is
7	essentially one paragraph and one sentence long.
8	I think it has been distributed in this room. Is
9	it possible we could take 30 seconds for you all
LO	to read it?
L1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I'm
L2	sorry. This is Kirsanow again. There must be
L3	something really wrong with my computer, then. I
L4	sent this to everyone on, at least according I
L5	am looking at the e-mail right now.
L6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What date?
L7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: On Wednesday
L8	at 6:00 p.m. And the e-mail address that I sent
L9	it to and, again, I'm not disputing anything
20	that anyone is saying here.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wednesday at 6:00
22	p.m.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would like
24	to verify what the appropriate e-mail addresses

	are because I have here that I sent it to I'm
2	trying to determine what the e-mail is. I don't
3	want to waste all my time, but
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: John Martin
5	sent the health care letter out yesterday on your
6	behalf, Pete.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. And I
8	personally sent out the health care letter on
9	Wednesday at 6:09 p.m. Eastern time. And I did
10	send it to Commissioner Thernstrom at least
11	according to this and maybe my e-mail is
12	incorrect, but Commissioners Thernstrom, Yaki,
13	Melendez, in addition to the remaining
14	commissioners on the Commission.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am looking at my
16	e-mail right now for that date, and I don't show
17	it. I do have John's e-mail from yesterday, but I
18	did not get yours, Commissioner.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
20	Yaki, offline
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am going to
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: if I can
23	get your correct e-mail address?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I will send you my

1	e-mail online.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I have in the
3	past sent out e-mails to you that have not
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Maybe I just have
5	a spam filter for Kirsanow.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. This
7	letter, at least from my vantage point, which may
8	not be shared by others, is a letter that can be
9	reviewed in short order. The health care letter
10	is similar to one that we have already reviewed.
11	I mean, if commissioners would like to take time
12	to review that. Would that approach work?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, this is
14	Commissioner Yaki. Since this is essentially a
15	cover letter to a letter we have already sent and
16	it simply triggers the merry-go-round by which
17	Commissioner Melendez and I sent another letter,
18	that is fine. I am ready to deal with it.
19	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. That is
20	in connection with the health care. What about
21	the Youngstown letter?
22	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Why don't we
23	take them one at a time?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would like

1	more time on the Youngstown, as Commissioner
2	Kirsanow offered, to go over it more.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I
4	have absolutely no problem with that. This is not
5	a matter of greater urgency. This thing is going
6	to be pending for at least the next several weeks.
7	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. So in
8	connection with the health care letter,
9	Commissioner Melendez, how do you vote?
LO	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I vote no
L1	because I don't have it, but I'll try to read it
L2	later.
L3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
L4	Kirsanow?
L5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
L6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
L7	Thernstrom?
L8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No. I voted
L9	no on the original one. I am going to vote no on
20	this one, too.
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
22	Yaki?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Nope.
24	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Heriot?
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
4	Gaziano?
5	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I vote for it.
7	We have four votes for it and three against. The
8	motion passes.
9	We will postpone consideration of the
10	Youngstown letter.
11	Next up would be
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Wait, wait. Mr.
13	Chairman, I have a comment on the Youngstown
14	letter.
15	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes?
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And that is, has
17	any thought been given to whether or not this
18	would violate the race norming prohibitions of the
19	Civil Rights Act of 1991?
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
21	Heriot, I had given that some thought. I haven't
22	looked into it in any great detail, although I did
23	revisit it last night, in fact. I simply thought
24	that letter was fine as it stood. And if someone

wants to make an amendment to it in the interim between now and the next business meeting, I will be more than interested in receiving it.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.

## - DISCUSSION OF STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF

## EDUCATION

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up, recent developments on OCR. Who raised this issue? Was it Commissioner Gaziano?

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. And I don't know enough about the details to talk in any length. And that's I suppose the point that I want to raise. Unless other commissioners are that familiar and can talk on it, that's fine, but I was going to suggest that we instruct the Staff Director. And maybe he could task some of his attorney advisers to make some inquiries from the Department of Education, OCR, and elsewhere as to what exactly they have in mind.

The Commission has sent a letter to one school district, I believe it was, at the negative effect of trying to norm discipline, that that may cause them to give too little discipline to some students who need it and too much on

others.

The Department of Education's sort of threat that they may engage in disparate impact reviews of that issue and AP and other issues is just worthy of us looking into, I think.

So I don't know if other commissioners want to comment, but I at least want appropriate inquiries to be made so that we can discuss that at a future meeting.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that I think that this is a very important issue, particularly the disparate impact analysis used in school discipline. So I would very much like the Commission staff to look into this.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, for those of you who are not aware of it, although it was circulated this morning, I have a very long piece on the issue of disparate impact and discipline actions and the implications of the policy for that.

I decided, for once, to use the American Enterprise Institute website, instead of my usual, since that is my ostensible home. And I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

believe that that has been circulated. It is, as I said, quite a long article exploring that whole issue. COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I take it, Vice Chair Thernstrom, that you would agree this is something that we need to look into further at the Commission?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I see that Tim has copies of it right here. Yes, sure. I know a lot about this issue, some of which is in this and some of which is in my book No Excuses, which has a very close statistical analysis of disciplinary problems, as correlated with, for instance, single parent households and so forth, but I always welcome more work on it.

But it is important to say that a little head start, there is a little head start, here in this, you know, as blog articles go are rather extensive, piece of mine.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up is a discussion of our schedule for April.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Could I just ask, Mr. Chair -- I don't think we need a vote, Staff Director but from the whether that's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

acceptable to you to begin a review of this and to 1 2 ask for appropriate information from OCR. STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 3 Yes. We 4 will do that. I guess just a clarification, if you would like us to request a meeting or to see 5 what kind of information we get through telephone 6 inquiries and so on and then perhaps follow-up 7 meeting once we can get some information. 8 9 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: At this point I would leave it to your discretion as to what is 10 11 reasonable and necessary. STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 12 Okay. 13 Thank you. - DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE IN 14 15 APRIL CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: 16 Okay. 17 October 30th, 2009 meeting, the commissioners 18 voted to hold a business meeting, an in-person 19 business meeting, on April 16th and a telephonic business meeting on April the 30th, 2010. 20 21 At the February 26th, 2010 telephonic 22 meeting, the commissioners agreed to reschedule 23 the hearing date for the new Black Panther Party 24 investigation to April 23rd, of

course,

witnesses if their circumstances changed on a date 1 2 that would secure the participation of a critical mass of both witnesses and commissioners. 3 4 Because a hearing and 5 meeting the same month might necessitate commissioners to travel to D.C. twice, I want to 6 7 open up for discussion whether commissioners are happy with the existing meeting schedule for that 8 9 month. 10 I would just add that we have a lot of 11 work to do. And I would recommend that we keep 12 the current schedule, but I wanted to open it up for discussion. 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, this is 14 15 Commissioner Yaki. I am fine with it. COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Commissioner 16 Melendez here. On the 16th if we hold -- I can't 17 18 come out twice, you know, on the 16th and the 19 following week. So if we take the 16th, I'm going to call in again on that date and then come for 20 21 the hearing the following week. So that is kind 22 of my schedule. 23 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT:

24

Mr. Chairman, I

1	am fine with it.
2	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
3	Thernstrom?
4	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I am sorry. I
5	got distracted. What are we fine with?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Vice Chair
7	Thernstrom, I am fine with the fact that there are
8	two in-person business meetings in April: on the
9	16th and on the 23rd.
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I have to look
11	at my calendar here. I will be back to you in a
12	minute.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And the
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The 16th?
15	That's
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The Western
17	contingent seems to be okay.
18	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The 16th and
19	23rd?
20	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: A question.
21	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes?
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: On the 23rd,
23	how solid is that date? You know, are we saying
24	there's a 50/50 chance that that could change?

1	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, unless we
2	have another snowstorm, I think that it's up above
3	98 percent.
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. Sounds
5	good.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Now, before we
7	go on
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Hurricanes,
9	earthquakes, and tsunamis.
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman,
11	I am fine with the 16th and 23rd. It's okay,
12	works.
13	- DISCUSSION OF TIMELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF
14	BRIEFING REPORTS & SCHEDULING OF BRIEFINGS
15	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up
16	is a discussion of timelines for consideration on
17	briefing reports and scheduling of briefings.
18	Yesterday the Staff Director e-mailed a list of
19	many of the Commission's pending projects.
20	Several briefing reports are currently
21	available for commissioner review. Others are in
22	final stages of staff preparation. The Staff
23	Director's list also contains currently scheduled
24	due dates for certain projects and proposed dates

for others.

Mr. Staff Director, please provide us with an update on the status of these and other pending briefing reports. Also please discuss your suggestion for scheduling the pending briefing on age discrimination and employment.

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the most immediate thing would be the STEM report that we discussed a little while ago, the decision out to have the meeting on April 16th in person, which is five weeks from today.

We have to allow for the commissioners to review the draft, then to send comments back to staff or staff to make appropriate changes and then send the report back out to commissioners so that they can review it, usually a week in advance of the meeting.

If we factor in that week of review for the commissioners and a week for the staff to incorporate the changes that come from the commissioner comments, that would leave three weeks from today for the review period.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And so I would just put on the table 1 2 the idea of if commissioners would approve a three-week review period to submit their comments 3 4 on the STEM report. 5 And if so, I think we could accommodate making that report available for 6 7 consideration at the April 16th meeting. CHAIRPERSON **REYNOLDS:** 8 Is that 9 acceptable to everyone? 10 (No response.) 11 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. I'11 12 take silence as yes, that's fine. STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 13 Okay. Right now you did make note of the list I sent out 14 15 yesterday. Let me just review that and then go to some of these questions that were raised. 16 Just a reminder that the rebuttals on 17 18 the MEPA report are due Monday evening at midnight Pacific Time and that we also then have 19 20 statements, commissioner statements, the on 21 illegal immigration report due on March 30th. 22 I believe that the May 14th meeting 23 would be a good time to do the age discrimination

I think that if we make that

and employment.

decision today, that would give staff enough time 1 2 to contact panelists and to put a meeting, a 3 briefing binder together and get that out to 4 commissioners. So that would be --5 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Mr. Staff Director, what was that date? 6 7 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: May 14th. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you. The 10 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 11 other report that is out there right now is the 12 Native Americans in border towns that was sent out on March 2nd. And commissioners were asked to 13 submit comments by April 1st. 14 15 The statements on the HBCU report 16 would be postponed from this April 11th date. 17 That was based on the premise that the report would be finalized today. 18 19 But since we are going to presumably do the findings and recommendations at the April 20 21 16th meeting, I guess we would have to agree on a 22 timetable of perhaps 30 days from that point if 23 the findings and recommendations are approved at

that point, that by the middle of May perhaps the

1	statements could be due.
2	And, therefore, the rebuttals on the
3	HBCU, which is now listed as May 12th, would
4	presumably be pushed back to the second week or
5	the third week in June.
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Staff
7	Director, if you don't mind me going back to the
8	age discrimination and employment briefing? I do
9	remember we discussed that topic. Did we vote to
10	approve that briefing? I just don't remember.
11	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: That was
12	the one that, yes, commissioners did vote to
13	approve that as the first choice.
14	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And, if you
15	don't mind, I will have someone request the
16	concept paper for that one. Which commissioner
17	took the lead on that if he or she won't own up?
18	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I know.
19	Yes, Commissioner Melendez had
20	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That's right.
21	That's right. Okay.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER:
23	proposed that, right. And it was one that
24	produced a good deal of consensus, but I believe

Commissioner Melendez is the one who proposed it. 1 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: 2 COMMISSIONER YAKI: He was nice. 3 4 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That was the 5 tie-breaker. He was nice. STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: The 6 7 Blaine Amendments report is one I sent out Tuesday of this week, on March 9th. 8 So that is is 9 another report that available for 10 commissioners. That would be one that we have to 11 set a timetable for review on that. But I think 12 with some of these other things going on right that commissioners might want to wait a 13 little while on that but hopefully not too long. 14 The health disparities report is one 15 16 that I know the commissioners are very anxious to 17 consider that very soon. And there was 18 discussion today about that being a time-sensitive 19 report. And I would concur with that description. So the editorial and legal sufficiency 20 21 reviews are now being conducted. I have received, 22 actually, one editorial review has been submitted. 23 And legal sufficiency review the has

are waiting on two of

submitted.

So

we

editorial reviews to come back on the health disparities report.

I did give people a deadline of March 19th. And perhaps they will be able to get those back a few days before that date.

So we will give that a high priority at the staff level once we get all the comments on the health disparities report to get that one ready for commissioners' consideration. But that would be one I think that might be considered in June. We'll look at that as a possibility to do in June.

The English in the workplace draft, I got the final draft submitted from the Office of General Counsel this morning. And that has received some review.

We still need a legal sufficiency review on that particular report, but that one will be available for commissioners' consideration very soon as well.

There is also a question of whether we might have a hearing on the college admissions project. I know the General Counsel will be speaking to that subject in a few minutes, but

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that is another topic that we have to consider if 1 2 we are going to have a briefing or a hearing on 3 that particular topic. 4 And, of course, the other major item 5 that will be scheduled is the National Civil Rights Conference. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. prior meeting Commissioner Yaki asked for 8 9 update on that. I sent Commissioner Yaki 10 e-mail yesterday letting him know that I wasn't 11 ready to discuss it. I apologized. There is one variable that I need to 12 nail down before I am comfortable going forward 13 with the discussion. But whether that variable is 14 15 nailed down by the next in-person business meeting or not, you will receive a report at the next 16 17 in-person business meeting. 18 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Mr. 19 Chairman, I guess would there be a consensus, then, amongst commissioners to plan on the age 20 21 discrimination for the May 14th meeting, that we 22 have a briefing at that time? 23 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I am checking

my calendar. We have a business meeting scheduled

on that date. Is that correct? 1 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 2 Yes. 3 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Yes. 4 Then I've already afforded that the time. 5 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay. So I will start the clock. I will resend the STEM 6 7 report to commissioners today with the 8 understanding that we are starting the clock on 9 commissioner review of that today and that 10 commissioner comments would be due three weeks 11 from today, which I don't have a calendar in front 12 of me now but that would be the beginning of That would be April 2nd, I believe, would 13 be when those comments would be due. And then we 14 15 would work to get that out to commissioners by April 9th in advance of the meeting on April 16th. 16 GAZIANO: 17 COMMISSIONER Mr. Staff 18 Director, I didn't even learn until a few days ago 19 that the STEM report had been sent out. Apparently one theory is that it bounced back 20 21 because it's got a lot of charts because when 22 someone else tried to send it, forward it, to me, it bounced back. 23

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And so just be
2	aware of that. If things would bounce back, maybe
3	commissioners, like me, like printed copies
4	anyway.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: So, for the
7	record, I always want a printed copy on
8	three-hole. You can save the binders. I've got
9	binders. If that happens, then mail might be
10	best.
11	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: That has
12	happened in a number of occasions with some of the
13	larger reports that most of the commissioners'
14	servers have not been able to handle. And the
15	special assistants have received them internally,
16	but in a number of cases, that hasn't happened
17	with the commissioners.
18	We will make that all available by
19	hard copy and dig that out to anyone.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Can you break it
21	up into separate .pdfs?
22	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: We can
23	try that.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Actually, not pdfs

1 because we can't --2 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I think it's 3 the attachments and charts that are very important 4 in that particular --5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: The charts you can probably do as a .pdf because I think we're --6 7 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I will I will have to check with our IT people 8 check. 9 and see what we can do in that regard. - UPDATE ON STATUS OF THE 2010 ENFORCEMENT REPORT 10 11 AND RELATED HEARING 12 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Next is the update on the status of the 2010 enforcement 13 report and related hearings. Mr. General Counsel, 14 15 please provide us with an update on the project. Yes, sir. 16 MR. BLACKWOOD: This is David Blackwood for the record. 17 As all the commissioners received on 18 additional 19 February 26, have received we 20 information from the Department of Justice. 21 information was useful as background information 22 relating to other intimidation cases and 11(b) matters but did not address the main focus of the 23

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

report.

At this point, in response to that letter, I did contact the Department of Justice again, specifically with regard to the issue of whether they would allow Mr. Coats, Mr. Adams, and other Department of Justice officials to testify.

This was the fifth time I have asked them to address that issue and asked that they give us a response by today. Typically those responses do come in late on Friday. If and when I receive that, I will forward it to the commissioners.

Nonetheless, it is my intention to try to bring matters to a head with regard to the Department of Justice so they clarify this matter so we know well before April 23rd whether the department will participate.

The only other matter outstanding is with regard to the enforcement of the subpoena with regard to Malik Zulu Shabazz. This has been referred to the U.S. Attorney's office in the District of Columbia. And I am dealing with an assistant U.S. attorney with regard to that enforcement. It is not scheduled. It has not been filed yet. But I have no education that we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

With regard to a small matter, but I 2 want others to be aware of it since our last 3 4 hearing did get canceled. One of the suggestions 5 was that we put an alternative date in our hearing notice. 6 7 The hearing notice has not gone to the but have 8 Federal Register yet, it will 9 alternative date of May 14th. And that is our next meeting after April 23rd. 10 11 I would view that as a placeholder. don't expect another 100-year storm, but I wanted 12 13 you people to be aware that that is why there is an alternative date on there. 14 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: You just jinxed it right there, Mr. General Counsel. 16 17 MR. BLACKWOOD: Maybe so. Right when the hurricane comes, we're headed to your place. 18 - UPDATE ON STATUS OF TITLE IX PROJECT 19 20 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. 21 General Counsel, please provide us with an update 22 on the response to the subpoena sent out for documents pertaining to the Title IX project. 23 24 MR. BLACKWOOD: Yes, sir. Fourteen of

are having any difficulty with that.

the 19 schools have provided the data information that we requested. As I indicated before, we were contacted by numerous schools that requested that we bifurcate the discovery process, specifically that the data information under document request number 7 be separated from the other requests.

We agreed to that in an overwhelming number of cases and actually extended additional time to some schools. But 14 out of the 19 have provided the data. One will provide data today. So that brings us 15 out of 19 have had no difficulty providing the data information that we have requested.

Four schools, however, specifically Johns Hopkins, Georgetown University, Gettysburg College, and Messiah College, have indicated that they are refusing to provide the data. They have objected to providing this information for a variety of reasons, which I will read into the record in just a minute. But I do want to indicate, too, that they have offered what they believe is a viable alternative, which is to provide information in an aggregate form but not on an individualized format.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

We have discussed this matter with these schools on several occasions. I've had phone calls with the individual general counsels on the matter and have consulted with Dr. Lerner about the formats and potential information that can be received and whether that was a viable alternative. The short answer is it is not.

As indicated by the 15 schools that have responded, we do not believe that providing the individualized data is in any way a violation

have responded, we do not believe that providing the individualized data is in any way a violation of any privilege. We have indicated that we will preserve the confidentiality of the individual identities, but 15 out of 19 schools have no difficulty in providing the information.

Now I will read a short --

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Mr. General Counsel?

MR. BLACKWOOD: Yes, sir?

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let's be clear.

We're not asking for personally identifying information from the schools. Is that correct?

We don't want names. We don't want birth dates.

We don't want Social Security numbers. Is that right?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. BLACKWOOD: That is absolutely
2	correct.
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: So when you say
4	that we are looking for individual data, what do
5	you mean by that?
6	MR. BLACKWOOD: Well, perhaps if Dr.
7	Lerner were on the phone, maybe he could best
8	speak to it. But I can give my layman's
9	understanding of it.
10	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, let's
11	turn to the doctor if he is available. Dr.
12	Lerner, are you on the line?
13	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: He was
14	not able to make it, Mr. Chairman. He had some
15	logistical issues that came up, and he was not
16	able to be on the line.
17	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Well,
18	then, Mr. General Counsel, I will have to rely on
19	your layman's view.
20	MR. BLACKWOOD: When I use the term
21	"individualized data," it is done on a
22	student-by-student basis. As you pointed out, it
23	is not that each student can be identified but
24	that certain characteristics of each student can

be identified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

These are necessary as control factors to focus them on the largest issue of gender disparities at the schools. This is a standard technique. Dr. Lerner has used it in other analyses. He has indicated to me that it is something that is provided as a matter of course in many public schools to the Department of Education. And, as I say, 15 of the 19 schools did not have any difficulty in providing it.

The four schools that I did mention seem to be coordinating their responses. I in a very short way can indicate the following. letter I received from Georgetown from a University yesterday, which narrows down some of the broad-brush objections that they made. of objections those have now faded to the background as many other schools responded.

This is from Georgetown, who indicated, "The university believes that providing the information in the form requested by the Commission would undermine sensitive and proprietary business practices, interfere with academic decision-making, create confusion about

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

in which the university 1 the manner undergraduate admission decisions, and place the 2 3 university at a competitive disadvantage." 4 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Did they cite 5 any case law to defend their position? BLACKWOOD: No, they have not. 6 MR. 7 And our discovery request, part procedures or the instructions request, "If you 8 9 object to things, please on a matter of privilege or otherwise, that you identify any specific cases 10 11 or case law that you are relying upon." None of these schools has provided any 12 basis other than basically the summary that I just 13 14 gave you. 15 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: So 15 out of the 19 schools managed to provide the information 16 17 manner that doesn't release personally in а They released it in a 18 identifying information. 19 that doesn't disrupt their admission manner 20 But Georgetown, Johns Hopkins, and -process. 21 What are the names of the two other I'm sorry. 22 schools? 23 MR. BLACKWOOD: Gettysburg College and

Messiah College.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: So these four 1 2 institutions had not been able to figure out how 3 to do this. Have you recommended that these 4 schools consult with the other 15 schools that 5 managed to do this to get some direction? MR. BLACKWOOD: I didn't have to make 6 7 that suggestion. They have indicated all along that all of these schools are in contact with each 8 been very clear 9 other. And it has in 10 communications that they absolutely are aware that 11 the other schools have provided the data. 12 Especially Georgetown and Johns 13 Hopkins have indicated they simply have a very strong objection to providing the information. 14 15 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: 16 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: 17 I just want to 18 note that this looks very bad for these schools to be resisting an effort to look into the issue of 19 I am quite surprised that 20 sex discrimination. 21 they are putting up this kind of a fight. 22 may well be that many Americans will be 23 interested in this, but I think that this should

the Department of

referred

to

24

Justice

enforce the subpoena reasonably promptly here.

If you believe there is still some room for negotiation, you know, I am willing to defer to that. But I think we need to move reasonably rapidly on this in order to get the data that we need.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner
Heriot, I would ask for your indulgence. I would
like to have some additional interactions with
these four schools to get a better understanding
of what their objections are.

If they have a legitimate basis for refusing to provide the information, if they can distinguish themselves from the other 15 institutions that have provided the information, then I think that they deserve to be heard.

But after that, after we have met and discussed this issue, if they don't put something on the table that demonstrates that they have a legal basis for their position, then I fully support your recommendation that refer this to the Department of Justice.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I have got a hunch on this that I think I can talk to the

General Counsel about after the meeting, but, you 1 2 know, my bottom line is we need to be prepared to move very quickly on this in referring this to the 3 4 Department of Justice. 5 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes? 6 7 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I also want the record to reflect my view that this is very sad 8 9 and doesn't speak highly of these very universities who do want to hide their information 10 11 on possible discrimination matters. 12 Particularly there are two 13 which particularly are bothersome to The first is that they throw in the kitchen sink. 14 15 most of their objections are completely frivolous. 16 With regard to this revealing 17 proprietary information, it's somewhat odd when 18 we're just asking for a list of the applicants and some of their criteria. 19 20 But, even if this may reveal in some 21 someone some sort οf proprietary 22 information, that can't be а defense 23 investigating government agency not only

any

but

other

law

discrimination

24

enforcement

matter. There are many firms, of course, that would rather keep their practices that may be illegal from the public scrutiny.

You know, something again, I would like to think that if the public finds out which universities are doing it, that may be bring additional pressure. And that may help you and the General Counsel convince them to do the right thing so that they don't need to be sued by the U.S. government.

But prior to that, I think it ought to be emphasized that these are shameful excuses that they are raising. If they had some legal reason or if they had some other accommodation, reasonable accommodation, they were requesting, I would be much more favorably disposed to them. But this is really unacceptable.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Yaki. I just think that before we go uttering potential libelous statements about at least two institutions with which I am very familiar with, Georgetown and Johns Hopkins, who have great reputations for educational excellence and integrity, that I agree with you we should

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

explore as much as possible the nature of their 1 2 objections. Quite frankly, if I were in their 3 4 shoes, I don't know what I would do other than 5 judging by the statements made by some of the commissioners here today, I would be very worried 6 7 about what would happen to the data I provide to this Commission. 8 Well, 9 CHAIRPERSON **REYNOLDS:** 10 Commissioner Yaki, I am in agreement with you to 11 the extent that you said that we need to engage 12 with them some more to get a better understanding of the bases of their positions. 13 I believe we have a consensus. 14 15 is the approach we will take. - UPDATE ON ATTACK AGAINST ASIAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS 16 AT SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL 17 18 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up. 19 At our last two meetings, we discussed and I asked staff to track developments in what appears 20 21 to have been racial violence directed against 22 Asian American students at South Philadelphia High 23 School by black students. Information related to

the incident was included in the meeting binder

that was sent to the commissioners by the Staff 1 2 Director on March 4th. I would also like to note that Vice 3 4 Chair Thernstrom and a special assistant, Tim Fay, 5 they have a recent piece on this very issue in AEI, the American publication. 6 7 Mr. Staff Director, please provide us update on staff's efforts 8 with an to obtain 9 additional information. 10 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Thank 11 you, Mr. Chairman. 12 Pursuant to your request the February 26th meeting, I sent commissioners a memo 13 on March 4th with the meeting binders summarizing 14 15 the developments in the South Philadelphia High School matter to date, including a conversation 16 between a member of my staff and the lawyer for 17 18 the Asian American Legal Defense and Education 19 Fund, known as AALDEF. Her name is Ms. Cecilia Chen. 20 I also sent commissioners statements 21 22 by involved students and the executive director of Asian Americans United that we obtained from the 23 24 AAU website as well as a copy of the report by

U.S. District Court Judge James Giles, former U.S. District Court Judge James Giles, whose law firm was commissioned to conduct an independent investigation to ascertain causative events and circumstances surrounding the attacks on Asian students last December.

Ms. Chen declined our request for a copy of the complaint that AALDEF sent to the Department of Justice but said she is willing to speak with our commissioners about the incident.

Ms. Chen alleged that the students are still being harassed. Local human relations commissions are involved at both the state and extent. city level to some Α local Human Relations had voted to а general open investigation on December 28, 2009, but on January 5th, 2010, in a meeting in which the school was supposed to address the problem, only third students called "ambassadors," not the parties, students involved, appeared with school representatives, according to Ms. Chen.

She stated that the school claimed that the assaulted students could not be allowed to miss classes, unlike apparently the ambassador

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

students, who did miss classes. Ms. Chen viewed this as inadequate.

Ms. Chen felt that the students had never been given a chance to present their accounts of what had happened. She also noted the school had hired an independent investigator, former District Judge James Giles, who conducted what the students called a perfunctory hearing to determine facts.

Ms. Chen also charged that with the exception of hiring temporary guards and installing some security cameras, no changes have been made in the school to address the problems brought to light by the incident.

According to accounts, the news attacks against Asian students at South Philadelphia High School began December 2nd, 2009, when a Vietnamese student was jumped by students across the street from the school.

On December 3rd, 2009, news reports indicate that "large groups of African American and Asian students" attacked 26 Asian students. Victims and witnesses state that attackers roamed the halls of the school searching for victims to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The attacks included punching 1 target. 2 kicking. victims 3 Seven were treated at 4 Methodist Hospital for scrapes and bruises. 5 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Excuse me. Mr. Staff Director, did you say that black and Asian 6 7 students attacked another group of Asian students? STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 8 9 That was an allegation, that there were African American and some Asian students involved in the 10 11 attack on the 26th. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I believe that 12 the allegation is that there was one Cambodian 13 14 student, not Asian students, plural. 15 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. 16 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: But, look, the 17 18 facts, as I repeatedly point out in my article, 19 the facts are not 100 percent clear. It's not clear whether as charged, the black students were 20 21 roaming the school looking for Asian students, 22 rushing up to the second floor, whether lunchroom 23 personnel were basically egging them on,

cetera, et cetera.

This is a very -- I mean, I gave the 1 2 facts to the best of my ability by going through a lot of material. And Tim did as well. 3 In fact, 4 Tim did the primary research on what the basic 5 facts were. This is a very confused story and 6 7 worth a briefing, by the way. COMMISSIONER This 8 YAKI: is 9 Commissioner Yaki. Ι just wanted to second Commissioner Thernstrom's comment that this could 10 11 require a briefing. 12 think this is an issue that think isolated 13 certainly I don't to I think that there are a lot of 14 Philadelphia. 15 urban centers where this kind of activity may be 16 occurring. It is serious. It is something that 17 18 needs to be addressed in a very proactive way. I think the Commission is one of the ideal, formerly 19 used to be one of the ideal, candidates to try and 20 21 deal with these types of issues. 22 I would also just raise, although it 23 the agenda, the allegations is not on

actually, not allegations, the racial incidents at

1	UC-San Diego that have been in the news lately
2	regarding the Compton cookout connected by a
3	fraternity during
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I think it was
5	a black comedian who conducted the cookout.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, whatever the
7	fraternity was, it certainly got
8	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I don't think
9	it was a fraternity.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Whatever it was.
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: There was one
12	story, but I think that that has been clarified
13	that it was not a fraternity.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I think it's
15	something that you and I have different facts
16	about. And it is something that I have described
17	as something that has been a problem on college
18	campuses and is continuing to be to this day.
19	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: And let me say
20	that this Philadelphia incident was a long time in
21	coming. And Commissioner Yaki is perfectly right
22	to say there is nothing unique about it. It is
23	part of a larger picture of disorder and violence

in too many inner city schools. And sometimes it

1	has a racist aspect to it. Sometimes it does not.
2	And, again, this is no kind of
3	isolated little story here. And it is one of the
4	few topics in which factions in this Commission
5	could get together and work together. And I think
6	there would be a lot of agreement on what the
7	chief concerns would be.
8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: What factions?
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: What factions?
10	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Think of this
11	as an attempt at humor.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Right.
13	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
14	Thernstrom, I agree with you. And I think that,
15	if you wouldn't mind, you are working with, for
16	example, Commissioner Kirsanow and involve other
17	commissioners. Let's have a discussion and see if
18	we can come up with a game plan to address this
19	issue.
20	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. I would
21	actually like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that
22	we schedule a briefing when we can manage to fit
23	it in.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COMMISSIONER YAKI: It would probably

Τ	be a briefing.
2	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Do you want to
3	try a concept paper first? Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is
5	Commissioner Yaki.
6	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I think that we
7	need to do a little more leg work before we vote.
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: That's fine.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would also
10	suggest that if we were going to do something,
11	given the nature of the individuals involved, that
12	this is more appropriate for a site hearing than a
13	briefing in D.C.
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It is
15	appropriate for a site hearing, actually. There's
16	very strong sentiment on the part of a lot of
17	Asian students that they have not been properly
18	heard.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Especially if you
20	want the students, then I think, then, going there
21	would make it a lot easier than
22	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Right. And
23	there is very strong sentiment that the Giles
24	report really is totally inadequate in reviewing

this story.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I think these are good ideas. And we just need to get this stuff poured into a concept paper so that we can review it and have a vote.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: That is fine.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I don't know that I necessarily want to have a vote of this in isolation, as opposed to some other ideas. There was one concept paper that related to this that got a lot of support.

I also am hearing from the Vice Chair that some of the facts as reported aren't true.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No. They are just in dispute. Basic facts here are in dispute.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: For instance, did the principal of the school walk the Asian students out of the school in order to protect them when there was a group, a large group, of black students seemingly in wait for those students? And did she turn around very quickly and basically deliver those Asian students to the black students who were waiting for them or did

she lose control of the situation because 1 2 Asian students got frightened and started to run, at which point -- and they weren't able to escape 3 4 those who were waiting to attack them. 5 You know, there are very basic questions about the conduct of the authorities 6 7 within the school here that are worth exploring. COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I understand. 8 9 And maybe I'll think that a site visit and a 10 hearing specifically on this -- there seem to be 11 two suggestions. 12 One is that we ought to do something on the larger issue, in which case I am not sure a 13 site visit is necessary. Whether it is important 14 15 enough that we look into this particular incident would depend, in part, in my mind as to how the 16 authorities have responded. 17 18 Our primary responsibility is not to 19 investigate the facts of a particular incident unless there is some law enforcement or other 20 21 problem involved that merits it. 22 So I'm not opposed to it, but my other 23 suggestion is I don't know that we necessarily

should vote on the next briefing in isolation of

1	other issues that other commissioners have
2	proposed. But I suppose we can take that up
3	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Let's get to
4	first base as the initial step. The Vice Chair
5	will work in consultation with the Staff Director
6	to put together a concept paper. And we'll take a
7	look at it. And then we will go from there.
8	IV. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
9	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Next up the
10	General Counsel has prepared a written opinion on
11	the terms of office of the current commissioners
12	in light of United State versus Wilson. And this
13	opinion was included in the meeting binders that
14	were sent to the commissioners.
15	In Wilson, the court examined the
16	method by which such appointments should be
17	calculated, focusing on the relevant provision of
18	the agency's enabling legislation.
19	Mr. General Counsel, would you please
20	discuss your findings and the consequences of your
21	findings?
22	- OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL PRESENTATION REGARDING
23	COMMISSIONER TERMS
24	MR. BLACKWOOD: Again, this is David

Blackwood for the record.

I have circulated previously, about six weeks ago and then before that, a memo dated June 25, 2007, which I think is nothing more than a factual description of the decision in United States versus Wilson. There were two opposing ways to calculate the commissioners' terms. And the court came down and clarified the issue that the way the White House had been designating commissioners' terms was accurate.

This causes a bit of confusion here, however, because Congress, even after the decision, even after cert was denied, continued to name commissioners' terms that were directly contrary to Wilson.

We are bound by the decision. I wanted to bring this to the attention of commissioners again so that there is time to take corrective action.

In this case, on December 5th, the terms of Commissioners Reynolds and Taylor end.

They were both presidential appointments. I don't see any difficulty there. The White House under all sorts of administrations has taken a

consistent view of how these appointments should be measured.

The two congressional appointments,

Commissioner Yaki and Commissioner Melendez, do

need to be acted on prior to in Commissioner

Yaki's case December 15th and Commissioner

Melendez December 12th.

just wanted to bring that everybody's attention so that action is taken There will probably be some resistance by Congress along the lines of, "Well, we really don't care what Wilson said." And I say that specifically because, for example, in Commissioner Yaki's case, in 2005, three years after Wilson, they put a term description on his term that it 3rd, 2011, wouldn't end until May which directly contrary to the way you should calculate the terms in Wilson.

So I will say that the Commission is going to be taking a position that Wilson controls. And I urge the other commissioners to take action.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki. I just wanted to state

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

regarding that, my appointment, at the time, we 1 2 were actually told that my term expired May 3rd, 2005 by the Commission. 3 4 The Commission formally sent a letter 5 to the Speaker saying that -- because I remember I had been appointed on February 15th. And then 6 7 they said, "Well, your term actually is up May 3rd, 2005." And so the Commission actually sent a 8 9 letter to the Speaker, which generated the 10 reappointment of me on May 3rd. 11 So if we are going to be consistent, 12 we at least ought to own up to the fact that we were inconsistent beforehand. I think there will 13 be no problem, but we should note that this was 14 15 not a congressional issue. This was in direct 16 response to a letter sent by Ken Marcus to the 17 Speaker stating that my appointment was ending on 18 May 3rd, 2005. 19 MR. BLACKWOOD: It is actually 2011. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Whatever. But no. 20 21 That is why they had to reappoint me on May 3rd, 22 2005, because they said that Chris Edley was 23 expiring in May 3rd, 2005.

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

MR. BLACKWOOD: All I can say is since

1	2007, the Commission has taken a consistent point
2	of view.
3	I have nothing further.
4	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank
5	you.
6	Mr. Staff Director, please provide
7	your report.
8	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Thank
9	you, Mr. Chairman.
LO	V. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
L1	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: A copy
L2	of the report was included in the binders. And
L3	there were some details about a number of
L4	activities that have been taking place in the
L5	Public Affairs Unit. And commissioners have been
L6	receiving frequent updates on news reports about
L7	the Commission.
L8	Also, there is a reference to the
L9	Office of Civil Rights Evaluation and the
20	complaints processing, that during this particular
21	period noted, that OCRE received 74 written
22	complaints, one walk-in complaint, 11 e-mail
23	complaints, 2 faxed complaints, and 161 telephone

complaints, of which 63 were repeat calls.

total, staff received and processed 249 complaints during the reporting period.

We have received a recent mock-up from National Technical Information Service regarding the clearinghouse project. And the review from the Office of the Staff Director is that it looks good. There are a few very minor technical changes that we think need to be made. And we will be communicating those very soon.

We had a meeting scheduled for this afternoon with the EEOC to discuss their response to us pertaining to our request. But we are presently rescheduling that meeting. We hope to get that rescheduled soon.

Regarding library statistics, the library staff received 97 telephone inquiries. completed 65 simple reference requests, They performed 33 research projects of various sizes, and an additional 84 research services. were 201 written requests and 193 e-mail requests for publications. And 376 publications mailed, and 41 different publications were requested.

Getting Uncle Sam to Enforce Your

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	Civil Rights and A Compilation with Civil Rights
2	Laws continue to be the most requested
3	publications. And there are currently 50 requests
4	for publications in process.
5	Staff has sent the F.Y. 2012 budget
6	call to office heads. And they are presently in
7	the process of putting together their proposed
8	2012 budgets.
9	We have also forwarded the 2011
LO	congressional appropriations request to the House
L1	and Senate Appropriations and Judiciary
L2	Committees. We also recently sent a report that
L3	had been requested by the Appropriations
L4	Committees pertaining to the status of the SAC
L5	charters and the activities of the SACs.
L6	And that is my report at this time,
L7	Mr. Chairman.
L8	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Any questions?
L9	(No response.)
20	CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. Hearing
21	none, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you, folks.
22	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
23	concluded at 11:45 a.m.)

# **NEAL R. GROSS**