## DRAFT

## MIDWEST CIVIL RIGHTS LISTENING TOUR

Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska and Oklahoma Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Location: Four Points by Sheraton

Country Plaza

One East 45th Street (Main)

Kansas City, Missouri

Date: Thursday, May 27, 2004

Reporter: Sandra S. Sondag, CCR

Allen Reporting Services

SAC Members participating

Iowa Advisory Committee

Ms. Marcia Stasch

Kansas Advisory Committee

Mr. Will Burnett

Mr. Reynaldo Mesa

Ms. Nicketa Nevils

Mr. William Nulton

Missouri Advisory Committee

Dr. Alma Navato

Mr. George Parker

Ms. Mona Perry

Mr. Al Plummer

Dr. Cora Thompson

Ms. Rita Valenciano

W LIBRARY

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Nebraska Advisory Committee

Mr. Gary Hill

Mr. James Faimon

Mr. Glenn Freeman

Mr. Christopher Rodgers

Oklahoma Advisory Committee

Dr. Earl Mitchell

Dr. Donald Maletz

Ms. Lynn Powell

United States Commission on Civil Rights

Mr. Les Jin, Washington D.C.

Ms. Farella Robinson, Central Region

À

3 Meet. 360

CCR

215 West 18th Street Kansas City, MO 64108

Allen Reporting Services

Jennifer S. Barker 816-221-3441

## INDEX

		PAGE
	Opening Statement - Dr. Mitchell, Chair Introduction of Panel Continued Opening Statement - Dr. Mitchell Statement By Ms. Robinson, Civil Rights Analyst Statement By Mr. Jin, Staff Director Welcome Address By Honorable Kay Barnes, Mayor	4 5 8 9 11
	Session I - "No Child Left Behind" and Minority Children and Schools	
	Dr. Mary Davison-Cohen, Secretary of Education Regional Representative, Region VII Dr. Bernard Taylor, Jr., Superintendent, Kansas City, Missouri School District Dr. Ray Daniels, Superintendent, Kansas City,	13 42
	Kansas School District  Session II - "Foster Care and Adoption of African-American Children"	57
	Ms. Millicent Charles, Foster Care Parent, Wichita, Kansas Ms. Roberta Sue McKenna, Assistant Director for	74
	Child Welfare, Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Topeka, Kansas Ms. Robena Farrell, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Children's Issues; Director of	94
	Customer Service Division  Ms. Linda K. Lewis, Regional Administrator,  U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,	121
	Region VII, Kansas City, Missouri  Ms. Pat Brown, Administration of Children and Family, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Region VII, Kansas City, Missouri	125
	Session III - "Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka50th Anniversary Discussion"	
1	Dr. Norman Yetman, Chancellors Club Teaching Professor of American Studies and Sociology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas Mr. Charles Scott, Jr., Esq. (Son of lead Attorney for Kansas plaintiffs in Brown) Kansas	146
	City, Missouri	173

## I N D E X (continued)

7

Session IV - "Access to Health Care and Medical Services in Minority Communities"

Mr. Edward M. Galan, Regional Minority Health Coordinator, Office of Public Health and Social Science, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Kansas City, Missouri 196

Session V - "Fair Housing and Predatory Lending"

Ms. Natasha Watson, Civil Rights Analyst,
Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity,
Region VII, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development (HUD), Kansas City, Missouri 227

Session VI - "Immigrant Populations and Civil Rights in the Midwest"

Mr. Ed Leahy, Coordinator of Immigrant Rights
Network of Iowa and Nebraska, Omaha, Nebraska 244
Mr. Elias Garcia, Executive Director, Kansas
Advisory Committee on Hispanic Affairs, Topeka,
Kansas 254
Ms. Danielle Dempsey-Swopes, Executive Director
Kansas African-American Affairs, Commission,
Topeka, Kansas 263

Session VII - "Status of Civil Rights Legislation In the Midwest" A Panel Discussion

Mr. Steve Skolnick, Deputy Director, Missouri Commission of Human Rights, Jefferson City, Missouri 278 Mr. Ron Pothast, Executive officer and Legislative Liaison, Iowa Civil Rights Commission, Des Moines, Iowa 289 Ms. Kaye J. Crawford, Director, Salina Human Relations Department, Salina, Kansas 291 Ms. Sharon Red Deer, J.D. Director of Investigations, Nebraska Equal Opportunity Commission, Omaha, Nebraska 297 Mr. William V. Minner, Executive Director, Kansas Human Rights Commission, Topeka, Kansas 304 Closing Remarks/Adjournment 335

1	(Proceedings commenced at 9:03 a.m.)
2	
3	DR. MITCHELL: The meeting of the
4	Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska and Oklahoma
5	Advisor Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil
6	Rights shall come to order.
7	Good morning. My name is Earl Mitchell, and
8	I'm the chair of the Oklahoma State Advisory
9	Committee on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
10	I speak before you today on behalf of the Iowa,
11	Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma Advisory
12	Committees. With me today are other members of the
13	Advisory Committee. And I think I'll start at this
14	end and have each member state their name and where
15	they're from. To my left.
16	MR. MESA: Reynaldo Mesa, Garden City,
17	Kansas.
18	MR. FREEMAN: Glenn Freeman, Omaha,
19	Nebraska.
20	MS. POWELL: Lynn Powell, Tulsa.
21	MS. PERRY: Mona Perry with the American
22	Indian Council, North Kansas City, Missouri.
23	MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Columbia,
24	Missouri.
25	DR. MALETZ: Don Maletz from Norman,

1	Oklahoma.
2	DR. NAVATO: Alma Navato, St. Louis,
3	Missouri.
4	LES JIN: I'm Les Jin, staff director
5	from Washington D.C.
6	DR. MITCHELL: Let's start at the other
7	end.
8	MS. STASCH: I'm Marcia Stasch from Mason
9	City, Iowa.
10	MR. FAIMON: I'm James Faimon from
11	Lincoln, Nebraska.
12	MS. NEVILS: My name's Nicketa Nevils,
13	and I'm from Wichita, Kansas.
14	MR. PARKER: My name's George Parker, and
15	I'm from Columbia, Missouri.
16	MR. NULTON: Bill Nulton, Prairie
17	Village, Kansas.
18	MR. RODGERS: Chris Rodgers, Omaha,
19	Nebraska.
20	MR. HILL: Gary Hill, Lincoln, Nebraska.
21	DR. MITCHELL: And also with us are
22	Farella Robinson, Civil Rights Analyst;
23	administrative assistant, Joann Daniels; secretary,
24	Corine Sanders. She's outside. She's busy working
25	hard. And these are all from the Central Regional

Staff. And as you heard earlier, we have Mr. Les Jin, who's sitting on my left, the staff director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

I and my colleagues from the five advisory committees serve without compensation as the eyes and ears of the Commission. The Committees are mandated by statute to report on all civil rights developments in their respective states to the Commission in Washington D.C., based in part on the work of our committees and similar bodies in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

We report to the Commissions who report to the President and to the Congress of civil rights developments. The jurisdiction of the Commission includes discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws, or in the administration of justice based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin.

We're here today to conduct a public briefing titled "Midwest Civil Rights Listening Tour," with the purpose of identifying and planning future state advisory committee activities.

Issues of interest to the Committee are, the No Child Left Behind initiative as it relates to minority children in schools, foster care and

\_ -

adoption of African-American children in Kansas, fair housing and predatory landing, civil rights, and immigrant populations in the midwest. And, the status of state and local civil rights agencies in the Midwest. Information received will be recorded by a public stenographer and summarized for a report to the Commission and to the public.

At the outset, I want to remind everyone present of the ground rules. This is a public meeting, open to the media and to the general public. We have a very full schedule of people who will be making presentations within the limited time periods available.

The time allotted for each presentation must be strictly adhered to, and I have a gavel. This will include a five to ten-minute opening statement by each presenter, followed by questions from the committee members. And at that point I would ask each committee member, before you speak to please give your name, the stenographer needs to know who's speaking, so give your name first regardless of when -- every time you speak, give your name first.

To accommodate persons who have not been invited but who wish to make statements, we have

scheduled an opening period for limited remarks immediately following the last presentation.

Anyone wishing to make a statement during that period should contact a staff member, Corine or Joann or Farella for scheduling for the later time of the day.

We urge all persons, and this is very important, making presentations, to be judicious in their statements. Any person or organization that feels defamed or degraded by statements made in these proceedings shall contact our staff immediately so that during the meeting we can provide a chance for our response. We don't want to leave here with someone feeling defamed or degraded and doesn't let us know, and we find out later. This is very critical and very important for the Commission.

The Advisory Committee appreciates the willingness of all participants to share their views and experience with the Committee. At this moment I will turn things over to Farella for a minute.

MS. ROBINSON: Good morning and greetings from the Central Regional Office and our very knowledgeable SAC members in the Midwest. Thank

you for coming. We're very excited about the day. We have a very dynamic agenda.

Yesterday we completed a whole day of planning future SAC activities on civil rights in the Midwest. Stay tuned, you will hear more about us and be more involved in collaborating with community organizations, government agencies on civil rights issues in the Midwest.

I would like to turn over the mike to our staff director, Les Jin from Washington D.C. We're so privileged to have him. So many times Washington folk do not come into the vineyards, the field, and we are so grateful that he has taken the time out of his busy schedule to come join us today at this important meeting.

MR. JIN: Thanks, Farella. I like being in the vineyards, I'm glad to be here. First, let me thank Mayor Barnes for being here and taking the time to be with us. We appreciate that very much. I think for this country to be successful in our struggle for civil rights, we need to have a partnership, government officials at every level, along with advocates and activists working with ordinary citizens, and I want to thank Mayor Barnes for her contributions to this battle.

Let me also say that, like I just said, that I am very happy to be here. My duties in Washington D.C. does not allow me to get out to the field very much, but I particularly wanted to be here for today's public briefing as well as yesterday's five state advisory committee meetings for these three reasons: First, as Commission resources gets tighter every year, the design of yesterday's and today's program involving five state advisory committee is an economical, efficient and effective way to further civil rights.

Second, I am incredibly impressed by the topics and panelists in today's agenda. I look forward to adjoin and learning from these presentations, albeit how much is being covered today, I'll probably be exhausted before the day is over.

Coming in, I was looking forward to having a frank and productive exchange of ideas with representatives of our five state advisory committees. The discussion we had yesterday met all my expectations. Of course, talk is good, but not worth a whole lot unless we can convert it into positive action.

I am confident that we will be able to convert what we are doing here these two days with some

concrete, positive gains for civil rights. our staff members, panelists, our regional programs regional staff for their time, effort and contributions. And again, thank you, Mayor, for being here and making our opening comments. Let me turn the mike back over to Doctor Mitchell, and I'm just going to sit back and enjoy the rest of the day. Thank you. DR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Jin. always nice for the Commission SAC persons to be in a different city, different place, and to meet the local leaders. And it is especially delightful to have a mayor come before us, because sometimes we go to places and the mayors usually send their

second people to visit with us.

This says a lot about the mayor, and we greatly appreciate your presence, so -- and I'll do it in the form of The Tonight Show, here's Mayor Barnes.

MAYOR BARNES: Thank you, I like that introduction. I'm delighted and honored to be with you this morning and to welcome you to Kansas City for this very important gathering. I have a deep appreciation for what you do.

My own background includes a considerable amount of civil rights activities, going back to

24 25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the middle 1960s. So, certainly, your commitment at this point in the history of this country, your dedication, is very important to what we want to move forward in the future.

Kansas City is a typical community in the heart of America, as all of you also represent, in that we have made great strides in civil rights, and we still have additional changes that need to occur.

I'm certainly doing everything I can as mayor in my fifth year to do whatever is possible to create an inclusive environment. We have taken some stands on certain issues that I do believe illustrate that. We have great partners in the Kansas City area. Certainly, one of the best is renowned for his civil rights activities, and that is Mayor pro tem, Al Brooks.

So I do believe that at the elected official level, and also, throughout the rest of our community, there is a strong awareness of the journey we are on toward improved civil rights. So we welcome any of your input, your suggestions, your comments, your criticisms, anything of that nature, we will certainly take very seriously within our city government in Kansas City, Missouri.

Thank you, again, for the commitment that you have personally made to participate in this effort.

I salute you. We're delighted that you are here, and we'll try to keep the thunderstorms to a minimum. Thank you.

DR. MITCHELL: So we'll begin. First presentation. And this session No Child Left Behind in schools is a new initiative, and you can read the first statement, a very short formal statement. So we'd like to introduce and bring in Doctor Bernard Taylor. I'm sorry, I've skipped one. Sorry, I didn't mean to skip you. Looking you right in the face there. Mary Davison-Cohen, who is Secretary of Education Regional Representative, Region VII out of Kansas City. Doctor Cohen.

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I know civil rights is on the top burner today. I brought what we have in the department and sent out on civil rights so I have one of those for each of you. I also a have a sheet that I would be delighted -- we print a lot of materials in Spanish and English, we have a host of material. I would be delighted to submit -- and I just don't carry all of this stuff, so I would be delighted to send you something. We'll send each

of you a packet if you would tell me where to do

it. And I've also included one of my business

cards. And I answer my own phone, so if you would

like to talk with me at anytime, please, don't

hesitate.

I think the first statement that I need to make this morning is that the Department of Education has zero tolerance for any kind of discriminatory behavior, and I would like to make that absolutely clear. The Secretary would want me to do that. And so, I also would want to bring you greetings from Secretary of Education, Ron Page, and if he were here he would tell you that this is an extremely important event for me to attend, and if he could be here, I know he would.

This 50th year celebrates Brown versus the Board of Education, and we are extremely aware of that case because, as you know, Kansas was very high profile in that case. What Brown said was, with all deliberate speed, what No Child Left Behind says is now. And so the Secretary and the President have said, we can no longer tolerate not seeing to it that every child, not just some children, every child reaches his or her potential, and we cannot tolerate the fact that any child is

**1** 

- 22

left behind.

And so with that in mind, Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and they said, yes, there has been accountability in other reauthorizations, but states were not following that accountability. And so the cornerstone of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we call No Child Left Behind is accountability. The guaranty of results, not just for some children, but for all children. And in order to do this, the Congress, President and the Secretary said, we must crease to let any child hide behind the averages. And that's what they've been doing.

As I travel around to the states that I represent, they will say, we have a wonderful ACT average, or our children did really well on the reading test, the average was, and I say, well, some of your children did well, what did all of your children do.

And so because we cannot tolerate that anymore, the groups that have historically not done as well, because they have been ignored, are what we call disaggregated and looked at separately. And these are children of poverty. These are children of

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

These are children who do not speak English color. as their first language, and these are children that are special children. And so we look at those And if they do not improve, the states have not made their adequate yearly progress, and so there are teeth in the accountability portion of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we know as No Child Left Behind.

There is also flexibility. Local control is extremely important to our 50 states, and so each state, in order to commit themselves to the tenets of No Child Left Behind had to present to the Federal Government Department of Education an accountability plan.

Accountability keeps coming up in the No Child Left Behind Act, because the insistence upon looking at each and every child is paramount. so there were 50 plans, all of them are different, but the feeling was that each state knew best what they should do to be accountable for all of their children.

Parental options is another pillar of the No Child Left Behind Act. Parents, ladies and gentlemen, are, if not the key, the most important key to the success of educating not just some of

our children but all of our children. And that's why we print so many of our materials in Spanish, because it is so important.

I visited with the executive director of the Hispanic Economic Development Council yesterday, and I said it is so important to include and to touch the parents, our new Americans, we're all new Americans, and if we forget to consider those children of the newest American, then we have not done our job, but we have got to get them engaged.

And so parental options, constant communication with parents, many schools are having on their staff interpreters, not just in Spanish but in the myriad of languages that our children speak in this country. The differences make our country strong. If we were all alike, then we would not have come to this stage in the progression of our country.

The fourth pillar, Research Based Reforms. The Secretary and the President said, we must give our children annual assessment. And we must be sure that those assessments are proven to do what they say they're going to. One of the states that I represent had 400 different assessment tools that they were using. Many of those tools were locally constructed, and many of them had not been

2.5

validated. So the Department says, you can use whatever assessments you want, but the assessments that count must be proven to work. It must be validated and they must test that which they say they do and produce that which they say they can.

The data that comes from this research-based component is extremely important. You know, without data, we become just another person with an opinion. And so the data that is generated is extremely important, because it immediately identifies the low performers and the low performing schools so that something can be done right away to correct the curriculum, or to adjust the delivery system, or to contact the parents, or do whatever is necessary. The other side of that coin is that the assessments also find the high performers and the high performing schools so that best practices can be adopted immediately.

There's another pillar that I think should have been included, and so I also include it because I'm here. And that pillar is attention. And for the first time attention has been given to children that have not been attended to ever before.

I have been in education for -- I hate to tell you -- 45 years. This is the 45th year since I

started teaching school. And I can tell you that previously there were always groups of children that were not attended to. That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable to the Secretary, it is not acceptable to this President, and it is not acceptable to this Congress.

I'm also here to tell you that although it has generated a lot of controversy, No Child Left
Behind has done a number of things. It has caused people to focus on education to the extent that they never have in the past. Somebody said to me, we no longer have a focus on whether the buses run on time; the focus now is whether or not all of our children are learning, and that's so important.

School districts are making changes. One school district paid for an academic audit to be sure that every child in that district was receiving the best education that that district could provide. Some districts are redirecting Title I funds to schools that are in the greatest need.

Omaha, some of you are from Nebraska, and Omaha has John McKeel as the superintendent of Omaha, and he has redirected some funds, just temporarily, to districts. Central Park school in Omaha is a

wonderful example of that. And so they have cut the class size. They have found faculty with the appropriate commitment and focus and mindset to make some changes. And indeed, Central Park school has made some changes.

The Kansas City School District, and I almost got your job, Superintendent, because they said that I was to speak -- that you were to speak about my job, so I said, well I have to take, then, the superintendent's job.

The Kansas City School District has made great strides, and those of us who -- I'm a native Missourian -- and so those of us who take great pride in our state also take great pride in our superintendent because Superintendent Taylor works very hard at what he does and has made great strides in very positive directions and under very difficult circumstances. So I would be the first one to let you know that.

There are many, many things that are happening in education that are extremely positive, and we could be here all day talking about them, but I'm here to tell you that changes are being made. And they're being made at the local level. And they're being made by teachers and by superintendents who

have now and have also had a very strong commitment to education. And the No Child Left Behind Act simply has redirected and guided the commitment that has always been there. And so I would close by saying that educating some of our children is simply not good enough. And we must, we absolutely must turn it around, because if we do not, we may just get where we're going. And where we're going is turning out children who cannot read, often cannot do basic math, and cannot fit into the economy of our country. And all of our children need to have an education so they can contribute so that our country remains strong, so that we can compete in the world, and we can say, honestly, that we have

all of our children.

And so I thank you very much for having me this morning, and Doctor Mitchell, if there are any questions, I would be very happy to entertain those.

done our best, not by some of our children but by

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, 11 minutes exactly, pretty good.

> DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I made it.

DR. MITCHELL: That's very good. So

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	thank you very much.
2	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Thank you.
3	DR. MITCHELL: Are there any questions of
4	the panel?
5	MS. NEVILS: I have a question.
6	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes.
7	DR. MITCHELL: Your name first.
8	MS. NEVILS: Nicketa Nevils.
9	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes.
10	MS. NEVILS: In putting this No Child
11	Left Behind program together, will there be some
12	input from Hispanic, native Americans, Asians in
13	the testing, in putting the tests together?
14	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I am not sure what
15	the states did. Those tests that were chosen by
16	the states were chosen by the state, and so the
17	Federal Government did not intervene in how those
18	tests were chosen. I would have to surmise that
19	when the accountability plans were done I went
20	to the four of them, I don't represent Oklahoma,
21	sorry about that, but I represented I was at the
22	accountability plan conversation, and it was my
23	distinct impression that many people were asked.
24	The department is extremely interested in a
25	great cross section of people as well, and the

regional departments are in the position at the
moment of putting together community advisory
groups that represent all of those groups. So
can't answer your question directly because the
states made that decision.

MS. NEVILS: But I feel that if it's going to be a good test, it should have an overall view of different nationalities, how they live, questions and things that, you know, are -- how do I want to put it -- directed to them, because all of it is learning.

For instance, in Wichita, it is up to each school, their principal, the teacher, what they want, how they want to teach their class. There are many multiculture information out there, would say, for instance, in reading, but if she chooses not to pick any stories or whatever on Hispanics or African-Americans, that's up to her.

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I understand.

MS. NEVILS: And it's from school to school. So a child at one school may get a lot of information, you know, in that area, and another school, just because a teacher doesn't want to, it's not taught. Now for instance, my 4 and 5 year old, they love Dora the Explorer, and as they watch

that picture, they're learning all type of skills, 1 counting and going to the map, asking questions, 2 repetition, where they're going, but they're also 3 learning Spanish. I hear them at the table at breakfast time speaking Spanish, learning how to do 5 their numbers. I think that is a creative way of doing that. But, if that type of program is not 7 taught at this one school, then the children are 8 just -- they're not -- what I'm trying to say is 9 that they are not -- their mind has not been 10 invited to it. 11

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Well, you make two very important points that I think should be pulled out, because they're extremely important. One important point that you make is consistency across the district, and hopefully, some consistency across the state. I think you're absolutely right.

The other major threat that I think should be pulled out and discussed is cultural differences, because cultural differences are extremely important in curriculum and in testing.

Your comment is very, very important, and I
think -- ask it again when Doctor Taylor steps up,
because he really is in a much better position than
I, because the -- you know, it's really kind of

24

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

interesting because the Federal Government does not 1 really speak to individuals, it speaks to states. 2 And it requires the states to interpret the federal 3 policy and enact that, and so I, as a federal 4 employee, was not involved in those local and state 5 decisions, but Doctor Taylor was, and he'll be --6 but those two threads are extremely important, 7 8 consistency and culture differences, and so I applaud that comment. 9 MS. NEVILS: In your education, you all 10 11 have some wonderful books on multiculture --DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Oh, we do. And I 12 13 would be glad to send all of you a packet. 14 MS. NEVILS: I would love to receive one. 15 But if those teachers don't pick that, if it 16 doesn't mean anything to them, then that's it, you 17 know, that child will miss out for the rest of her 18 life on an opportunity to be able to bond and learn 19 more about their culture. 20 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Well I have to tell 21

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Well I have to tell you, this little old lady travels as fast as she possibly can, trying to get that federal information out. And I would appreciate -- and we didn't talk about this beforehand, so thank you for the compliment, but I would be glad to --

22

23

24

1	DR. MITCHELL: We have another question.
2	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes, please.
3	DR. MITCHELL: I would ask the panel to
4	please be specific to questions, and some of the
5	comments you make are testimony, and that's all
6	right, but limit it, please, we have only so much
7	time.
8	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes.
9	MR. RODGERS: I'm from Omaha,
10	specifically, and I attended that school district.
11	And I don't want to
12	DR. MITCHELL: You name, please.
13	MR. RODGERS: Chris Rodgers. And I don't
14	want to challenge you, but I know that one point
15	you made about the redirected funds, I think that
16	may have been not a continuous redirection because
17	a lot of the school districts get in that part
18	where they have discretionary funding.
19	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: That is correct.
20	MR. RODGERS: The question I have is a
21	statement you made
22	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: You are correct about
23	that.
24	MR. RODGERS: Oh. The statement you made
25	about No Child kind of steering the attention away

from buses and everything into the classroom, and I would be interested to see what the other superintendents say, because Doctor McKeel also states that No Child has made him have to add on a whole new group of staff, not to teach, but to maintain numbers, everything that comes across, so I don't know if it's so much helped to add resource to the classroom, but it helped to add -- they're adding staff you have to put on to keep track of everything that the government's requiring. And the law states to some extent that, it's what that whole philosophy of local control, putting more money in but somehow indirectly is picking up staff and increase costs.

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: And the point that Mr. Rogers makes is a point that I hear with some regularity. And I always say, there are certain things that school districts should be doing anyway. And when a law like this comes out -- and really, the truth of the matter is that the basic difference in the reauthorization in 2001, the basic difference between the '94 reauthorization and the 2001 reauthorization is that there are teeth in that accountability.

All of these things were there in '94. Testing

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Accountability was there. All of it was there. And so there are certain things that a was there. school district must do, should do, can do and are doing because they are school districts, and they get money other than from the federal government. And yes, some of them have had to put people on, and some of them have had to re-direct their funds. But I would submit to you that to say that a third grade student should read on the third grade level, not just some of them, but every single one of them that possibly has it within himself or herself to do that should be doing that. To me that's not a requirement that is out of the ordinary or outlandish or anything like that.

so, I think that I'm going to have to stick by my statement, that No Child Left Behind has re-focused, and rightly so. So -- and I understand what you're saying, but school districts have some responsibility, states have some responsibility, state legislatures have some responsibility, and I'm going to say that again, state legislatures have some responsibility, and the Federal Government has some responsibilities, and we have got to come to the point where we all have to do what we have to do whatever that may be to educate

1	all of our children.
2	MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Missouri.
3	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: From Columbia?
4	MR. PLUMMER: Yes.
5	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I'm an old Tiger.
6	MR. PLUMMER: Well I'm a blue Tiger, so,
7	in Jefferson City. Anyway, I root for both.
8	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Okay.
9	MR. PLUMMER: My question relates kind of
10	to what you were just focusing on in terms of the
11	reading level.
12	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes.
13	MR. PLUMMER: Many of the teachers that
14	I've talked with talk about the challenges of young
15	folks just entering into the elementary school
16	programs not being at the same level.
17	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Are you talking about
18	Title 1 children or children who don't speak
19	English?
20	MR. PLUMMER: Well, no
21	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Just in general,
22	okay.
23	MR. PLUMMER: I'm talking about
24	children from English-speaking homes who are not at
25	an appropriate reading level, et cetera, when they

come to school.

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Okay.

MR. PLUMMER: The question, though, is whether this, the No Child Left Behind initiative has any focus on preschool education programs?

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: No. Well, let me take that back a little bit. Head Start, Early Reading, there's a big component for early reading. Now Head Start, I must advise you, is not part of the Department of Education, it's part of Health and Human Services, so we have to set that aside.

But within the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act, which is basically K through 12,

there is an Early Reading component and a Reading

First component. The State of Missouri gets a

tremendous amount of money -- the figures kind of

escape me, but I think it's around \$10 million that

the State of Missouri got for -- don't quote me on

that figure because I can't remember -- for Reading

First. The state retains 20 percent of that grant

for professional development.

So to answer your question directly, the Act does not speak to pre-kindergarten other than the Reading First grants that are within that Act.

Does that answer the question?

MR. PLUMMER: Yeah. And I guess my 1 concern there is that, if we're talking about 2 raising reading levels to appropriate grade levels, 3 and you have some kids coming in, and they're 4 starting out behind, that there should be some 5 additional focus placed on --6 7 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Well, and others have said the same thing. It would take a change in the 8 9 Act, and the next reauthorization is 2006, and other people say the same thing you do, that there 10 needs to be a greater focus on pre-K reading and 11 12 school readiness, and that may be something that the Congress would like to consider, I don't know. 13 14 But at moment it's K through 12. DR. MITCHELL: I saw a hand on my right. 15 16 Yes. 17 MS. VALENCIANO: Rita Valenciano, 18 Missouri State Advisory Committee. DR. DAVISON-COHEN: 19 (Speaking in 20 Spanish). 21 MS. VALENCIANO: My question is, in all 22 the information I see and all that I've read, I don't see any indication about the drop-out rate. 23 24 And it's extremely hard for Latinos and 25 African-Americans, how is --

. 17

2.5

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: The drop-out rate is one of the criteria that states have chosen, and each state is different, and I can't remember what the percentage for the drop-out rate is for each state that they must meet. There is -- and the drop-out rate is a large part of this. And it is very high for Latinos, it's very high for African-Americans. Extremely high for native Americans.

And so, yes, that is a focus of the -- they are many of the act, and, you know, to bring them all out. But, there is a part of the act called the Safe Harbor. And the Safe Harbor says that these disaggregated groups, because some of them perform at an extremely low level, and they are not going to go from that extremely low level -- I mean, children who can't speak English don't do very well. So they can't be expected to go from that extremely low level to proficiency in a matter of a year, or a matter of two years sometimes.

And so the states have said, and the No Child

Left Behind Act has said, if that disaggregated

group does 10 percent better -- progress is the

operative word here -- 10 percent better than it

did last year, and the school district has met the

graduation rate and the drop-out rate that has been 1 mandated by the state accountability plan, then 2 that group shall be said to have achieved their 3 adequate yearly progress. So, yes, the drop-out 4 rate is being looked at -- is looked at in that 5 fact. 6 MS. VALENCIANO: Do you have any 7 statistics so far? 8 I don't. DR. DAVISON-COHEN: 9 MS. VALENCIANO: When do you expect 10 those? 11 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I would guess -- the 12 report cards will be out in July, so those 13 14 statistics should really begin to come to the top 15 this year. MS. VALENCIANO: Thank you. 16 17 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: And if I have your -we'll send you everything that we get. I get a lot 18 of stuff, so I'll be glad to keep you informed as 19 20 very best I can, because I think that you bring 21 forth an extremely important point, because if 22 we're going to educate children, we have to keep 23 them in school. And I have to go back to the 24 parents as a real key to doing that, and the 25 involvement of the parents in the school is

extremely important in decreasing that drop-out. 1 Thank you for asking. 2 MS. NEVILS: I have one last question to 3 ask you. 4 DR. MITCHELL: We have a question down 5 here first at this end. 6 MS. PERRY: You really need to monitor 7 the urban schools. We need more experienced 8 teachers there. We have a high percentage of our 9 minority students in these schools, and they need 10 some good teachers there. 11 And another thing, these urban schools need to 12 put down "Native American" instead of "Other." Our 13 Indian children are putting themselves under 14 "Other" and that does not need to happen in this 15 In the State of 16 day and time in these schools. Missouri, between the ages of 5 to 18, we have 17 13,928 Indian children in the State of Missouri in 18 19 that age bracket. They are not being counted. 20 these minority children are high risk children. 21 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes, they are. 22 MS. PERRY: They need to spend more time 23 on these children in these urban areas. 24 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Ms. Perry came to see 25 me and is extremely active in the native American

movement and very, very passionate about what she 1 does, and we're trying very hard. And what she 2 says is true, because many of these native American 3 children will have one native American parent and 4 one not, and so they're "Other," and they're hard 5 to find, and the drop-out rate is tremendous. 6 She's absolutely right. 7 When Doctor Taylor comes up -- I'm saving all 8 the good ones for you -- Doctor Taylor and I are 9 really very good friends -- and when he comes up, 10 Mona, when he comes up, bring that up again, talk 11 to him about it, because that is, you know, a local 12

issue and a school district issue but a very

important one.

DR. MITCHELL: Are there any more questions concerning the Federal aspect of No Child Left Behind, because some of the questions are local.

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Are not, and they are not in the purview of the Federal Government.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes, I see another hand. State your name.

MR. BURNETT: Will Burnett. A personal observation, and I hope this doesn't run true particularly with No Child Left Behind. I haven't

23 24 25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ĺ	seen a dollar amount put with this program and how
2	those dollars are allocated. And I'm just trying
3	to find out how the system worked, as it comes down
4	who's responsible for what, whatever, so that we
5	can get these programs in place.
6	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Mr. Burnett, what
7	state are you from?
8	MR. BURNETT: Kansas.
9	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Okay. I can I
10	just happen to have, and I would be glad to give it
11	to you. This is the final this is the final
12	one. Those are all four states, but you can have
13	that because somebody else might want one. And
14	Doctor Mitchell, I'll leave the rest of these with
15	you. I don't have Oklahoma, I'm sorry.
16	DR. MITCHELL: That's all right, I can
17	get Oklahoma.
18	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: And I'll leave this
19	with you. Now, these figures will vary slightly.
20	DR. MITCHELL: Would you use the
21	microphone, please.
22	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Yes. Sorry about
2.3	that.
24	These figure will vary slightly, depending on
25	which piece of paper you look at, because the

1	federal monies are allocated quarterly, and they
2	are allocated on the basis of head count, and that
3	head count changes slightly. So they will vary
4	only slightly but not very much.
5	MR. BURNETT: Let me extend this Will
6	Burnett again.
7	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Oh, yes.
8	MR. BURNETT: I see these figure, but I'm
9	trying to find out what federal funding that goes
10	to Kansas.
11	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: You have it in your
12	hand.
13	MR. BURNETT: Is this the level of
14	funding that comes from Federal Government prior to
15	No Child Left Behind Act?
16	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: What you have in your
17	hand goes back and forward, yes.
18	MR. BURNETT: That doesn't answer my
19	question.
20	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I'm sorry. Ask it
21	again and I'll try.
22	MR. BURNETT: The Federal Government also
23	was funding educational program to state prior to
24	No Child Left Behind?
25	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Correct, correct.

Since 1964. 1 MR. BURNETT: Okay. Now this particular 2 Act that came out, what additional funding --3 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Correct. 4 MR. BURNETT: -- that has been put in 5 place for allocation by the state -- from Federal 6 Government to state? 7 DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Correct. This is the 8 This may help a little bit. This is the 9 graph. trajectory of the increase of federal funding 10 that -- this is nationwide, not state-wide, but you 11 can see that the trajectory has gone steadily up. 12 And I'm not -- I can't remember, but I believe that 13 in 2005, Kansas will receive close to 50 percent 14 15 more than it received a little over three years in federal funding. 16 17 It's on your -- shown there. But this is the trajectory, and, yes, Mr. Burnett is quite correct 18 19 that federal funding to the states has gone up 20 steadily, since this one only shows since 90-91, 21 but you are quite correct, yes. 22 Did that answer your question, Mr. Burnett? 23 don't want to leave it unanswered but I'm not quite sure which direction I need to go. 24 25 DR. MITCHELL: Let me focus a little more

on that question, because I think the central issue 1 from states is not the amount of money that's 2 coming through the Federal Government but the 3 necessity to have more is not enough, and I think 4 that's what the issue is by most states is the No 5 Child Left Behind mandate has placed extra burdens, 6 financial, on states, in which the federal 7 differential is not enough. That's what the issue 8 9 really is. Am I correct? 10 MR. BURNETT: Well, and I think --DR. DAVISON-COHEN: 11 I guess the question would DR. MITCHELL: 12

be, is that a concern that the Federal Government looking at?

DR. DAVISON-COHEN: Of course. And I think when I addressed that concern, we have to separate special education out, because the major problem that states have is the amount of funding that they receive for special education. In the 2005 budget, it will be right at 20 percent.

Now you have to understand, too, that when the -- and the Special Education Act is separate from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and there's still -- that's in Congress. sure whether the Senate has finally decided or not.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But we all await the congressional decision on special education.

But the Congress decided that they would authorize that Act -- this is some years ago -- at 40 percent, which is an authorization level and not a funding level. So it does make a difference. And slowly but surely, that special education has come up.

Three years ago, three and a half years ago, it was about 9, 10 percent of that 40 percent, and in 2005 it will be right at 20 percent, which is about half, and that is an issue that the states do take up regularly with their congressional delegations, because any time they want to fully fund that, they certainly have the right to do that.

The other issue is that which is federally funded outside of special education. And many of the districts are saying that they do need more money. We all need more money. Part of the reason is that many -- and I cast no aspersions -- but many of the state legislatures have not stepped up and increased their state allocation per pupil, and that's necessary as well. Because, as you and I know, that the federal money, although there are pockets of money for other things, the federal

1	money is, a big percent of federal money that comes
2	into any state is basically a Title 1 money and
3	special education money. And of course the, you
4	know, the federal student aid. But that's in a
5	whole other category too.
6	DR. MITCHELL: I'm going to have to stop.
7	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I could stay as long
8	as you like.
9	DR. MITCHELL: I know, but we need to
10	move on.
11	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I know do you.
12	Please, if you have other questions, you can e-mail
13	me, we will get you an answer. You could call me.
14	We will certainly include you and we'll send
15	you'll hear from me very shortly. We'll send you
16	all a packet. If you have questions, don't
17	hesitate. I do go out on the road, so if I don't
18	get right back to you, I'm doing my best to spread
19	the word. But I will get back to you. And thank
20	you so much.
21	DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much. Next
22	is Doctor Bernard Taylor.
23	DR. DAVISON-COHEN: I have to give him a
24	hug first.
25	DR. MITCHELL: Yes, go ahead. He'll
į	

probably need it. Because you left a lot of questions for him to answer. Thank you, Doctor Taylor, for coming.

DR. TAYLOR: Good morning, welcome to

Kansas City, and on behalf of the Board of

Directors and everyone affiliated with our

district, welcome to Kansas City. My name is

Bernard Taylor and I'm superintendent of the Kansas

City, Missouri School District, and we are one of

the largest school districts in the region,

although our neighbors all around us have grown as

well.

The issue that you're discussing, the implications of No Child Left Behind for school districts such as mine, it has been an interesting journey in dealing with this legislation. I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Cohen, that this is legislation that is important. The term that I have used is laudable. Now this is an old joke, but we were on a radio program, and I said that, and the way it translated back is that, it seemed as if I said a lot of bull. I want to make sure that I'm clear. I want to make sure that it is laudable.

DR. MITCHELL: It's in the record there.

DR. TAYLOR: Thanks. Because of its intent. I mean, obviously, the focus needs to be on making sure that we education and education well all students who pass through our door, and regardless of their ethnicity, regardless of their scio-economic category, regardless of anything, we should all be focused as educators on doing what is fair, just, appropriate and educational.

Now, with that said, the challenge of this law is how we as an urban school district, in particular, look at how we use this law to continue to make progress but not be penalized for not making enough progress. And that is of a particular challenge for our school district, because, again, it is one of the most diverse in this region.

Every disaggregated category that there is that is associated with this legislation is present in our school district. Unlike my counter parts in surrounding school districts, we're not often able to capture or have a small category of students in the disaggregated data, so when you look at, say, the Harbor Provision, that's something that's never really going to be applicable in our situation because we are going to have more reportable cases

in each category than some of our counterparts will experience.

The thing that concerns me about that is that as states look at which schools and which school districts make adequate yearly progress, and sometime the information that comes back is surprising to them because it may be a school or a school district that they did not anticipate to be in that situation, that there may be attempts to say, well, how can we use the rules to preclude that from happening? That's not going to be a reality for a school district like mine. That is extremely diverse and will continue to be that way.

The other issue, again, is how we look at how we utilize resources. And I do think the point that was made about the resources and time that is needed to ensure compliance with the law is something that we are going to have to give some consideration to. I do believe a cottage industry is going to be created.

If I were going to law school, which I've seriously contemplated, my specialty would be No Child Left Behind compliance, because short of special ed law, I think that's going to be the next area of significant litigation in terms of

education in this country. Because people are going to be looking at the compliance issues and we are going to have to staff up to look at the compliance issues.

Many of the things that are associated with this law that I believe have lead to some positive facts is the focus on instruction, curriculum alignment and professional development. And I think those things have been present in many, many school districts. I mean, certainly our district, which just gained unitary status last year after being involved in one of the longest-running de-seg cases in the history of the United States, I mean one of the things that a significant investment was made in was professional development, and that is ongoing and that is continuing.

The notion about highly qualified teachers, I think there needs to be a more precise definition of what that is, because, quite frankly, just because you have a certification does not mean you are qualified to be a teacher. It means you went to school and someone conferred a degree upon you. It does not mean that you are highly qualified to work in every type of educational setting. And I think the challenge of No Child Left Behind also

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

has to be visited upon are institutions of higher education.

I don't produce teachers, we hire them. oftentimes we have to hire those who are willing to work in our environment or who come into our environments because, quite frankly, no one else will hire them. We have to start demanding of colleges and universities that they do a better job in preparing people to look at two things, not only pedagogical skills, but we also have to look at the aspect inside of education, the human relations aspect, the cross-cultural communication aspect of education. The empathy aspect of education and not the sympathy aspect. Because being poor or being whatever is not indeterminate of not being able to achieve.

So we have got to start looking at how this legislation can motivate others outside of the traditional K-12 realm to look at what needs to be done in order to improve the quality of education for all students. I do think that the way resources are disseminated to school districts is also something that's going to have to be looked at.

I know that the change in some formula may

is is because our rate of poverty has not declined, it's just that the rate of the percentage of increase is less than in some other areas. So you're going to re-distribute funds to some regions because their rate of poverty has increased faster than someone else's. It doesn't mean you have fewer poor families, it means you just don't have -- they're just not increasing at the same rate as in some other parts of the country. I think you've got to take a look at that. I mean, because being poor is being poor.

And so I'm not quite sure what that nuance is about, but it is something that is going to have an impact on what we're trying to do.

result in a decrease in Title 1 funding to the

State of Missouri, and my understanding of why that

The point about early childhood education, our school district pays for early childhood education out if its own operating budget. Exclusive of funds that are received for Head Start and early childhood special education, the district receives no state support for its early childhood program.

Now we are talking about transportation to and from, we're talking about a half-day experience, we're talking about serving, roughly, about 1700

students, that the district spends \$4 million plus to do each year.

The ramification of that is that as we are going through budget cuts, our board just adopted our operating budget for next year, we proposed — at one point we were proposing close to \$30 million in cuts. We have adopted a budget that calls for \$12 million in cuts, but we were able to maintain that program, but I submit to you that if we do not address this issue about how we are going to equitably and adequately fund education, then programs like early childhood education, which are not mandatory in this state, may be the first to go simply because we have to use those resources to pay for programs that are mandated.

So the issue that we are struggling with is how we comply with the myriad of requirements, both at the state level and federal level, and oftentimes they're competing with one another. Now the State of Missouri has a proficiency standard that is higher than most states. Because to be considered proficient in this state, you must be performing above grade level.

So when the state assessments are given in grades 3, 4, 7 and 8 and 10, 11, when we get our

results back, those students in the proficient and advanced categories are actually students who are performing above grade level. Our neighboring states around us may have a proficiency standard that says, if you are at grade level, then you are So it's those types of disparities proficient. that we also have to give consideration to, because if proficiency is not defined in the same way, then how can we truly know who is proficient.

> The other issue is, again, is how do we look at incremental cases? Do you say that someone has failed or has not met a standard. If you go to the doctor and you doctor says that you need to lose 20 pounds, and you lose 19, did you fail on your diet? That's what we're faced with here. And how do we say to our public, the schools are making progress, each year things are getting better, but we didn't reach nirvana so we're not -- we're not what we should be.

Now the issue becomes, as a superintendent in an urban school district, that they're going to be people who are going to say, your schools didn't meet adequate yearly progress. Your school district didn't meet adequate yearly progress. what I have to say to the students and the teachers

Allen Reporting Services

23 24 25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

816-221-3441

and the parents is, but look at what we did

accomplish. But are we still going to be viewed as

a failure? Now I'm realistic enough to know that

there are other issues that accompany this debate

about No Child Left Behind. I mean, obviously, there are those who see this as a way to make justification for vouchers, for charter schools, for all types of things, and I'm not a charter school opponent, and vouchers, I have just a little bit of a different nuance, because what I want a voucher for is the most exclusive private school that exists in America. I think if it's good for some it should be good for all. doubt very seriously we're talking about that level of voucher. But what I submit to you is that no matter what we do, in terms of how we fund education, be it in a traditional manner, be it with charters, be it through vouchers, there's going to be a need for a Kansas City, Missouri School District and a Kansas City, Kansas School District, and other public school districts, because there is one thing I do know. some children nobody wants to deal with. wants to educate them. And there's always got to

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be a place for those children to go to school.

there's going to be people there who will want to work with them and want to teach them. The issue is going to be, will there be sufficient resources to support those students?

So, I hope that if you take anything away from these remarks that I've made this morning, is know this, the only vehicle that we have in this country that ensures that there's an opportunity for everyone to have the best chance for upward mobility, it is a public education.

Now I went through -- I'm not a native of
Missouri, I grew up in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,
and I went through from K to 12 in the public
school district. And I think I got the best
education I could have possibly gotten. And I know
full well why that's the case. I went to a school,
number one, where people cared about you. I went
to schools, two, where the teachers taught and the
students wanted to be taught. I went to a school
where parents were involved and where parents who
couldn't be involved, other adults stepped to the
plate and said, you go to work, you tend to what
you need to tend to because we have this. I have
my children's back and I'm going to have yours,
too. And the other thing is that there was a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

collective on the community to say, let's do right by these kids, because we'll all be the better for it.

Again, I think that the intent behind the legislation is correct. Nobody should get a pass for doing well with some kids and, you know, those that just didn't do so well with, that's okay, it's their fault, because that's the other thing that troubles me about this.

When the first report about school districts and schools that failed to make adequate yearly progress came out, it was very interesting how this was covered in the media here, because had it just been my school district had been the case, I dare say that it would have been front page news and the lead story on every news station here. When it involves school districts and schools that nobody expected, it was a one-day story. And the thing that came out, and maybe this was inadvertent, is that it was said, well, if it weren't for this group of kids, we would have made it. And that is very, very troubling, if you think about it, because, how often is that sentiment thought, even though it may not be verbalized? So, I think we have to guard against the law of unattended

consequence and really focus on what this 1 legislation should be about, continuous progress 2 and support for what it takes for that progress to 3 be made. 4 I have a question. MS. NEVILS: 5 DR. TAYLOR: Yes, ma'am. 6 Okay, the No Child Left MS. NEVILS: 7 Behind initiative will not work unless you get the 8 preschool children. 9 DR. TAYLOR: Yes. 10 MS. NEVILS: I do not want to see the 11 school go in and grab up all the preschool kids 12 13 because you're knocking out people and jobs, the child care centers, child care homes, you're taking 14 15 jobs away. I think if, maybe even if the state takes it up, comes up with a program and write it 16 17 in the form of a grant and say to these daycare 18 teachers and the ones at home, and you also will be educating them, let's do a program where we're 19 20 going to really push hard for reading. 21 in your program if you want to get this money, 22 we'll do it on a trial basis --23 DR. TAYLOR: Uh-huh. 24 MS. NEVILS: -- reading. You will read 25 to your children at least 20 minutes a day.

can break it up 10 minutes here. Let them write 1 the creative program. Ten minutes in the morning, 2 ten minutes in the afternoon. You can also say, 3 sequencing is a good start into reading, you will 4 present a sequencing program for the children. 5 DR. MITCHELL: Let me cut into this. 6 of the things I think we need to be doing is asking 7 It's not our responsibility here to questions. 8 9

of the things I think we need to be doing is asking questions. It's not our responsibility here to provide testimony for the issue. I'm sorry to say that, but I think we need to ask questions, because some things have already been decided about what's happening, and we need to find out exactly what they're doing. While I appreciate the concerns that we all have, I have concerns, too, but I think we'd like to just ask questions of the persons.

DR. TAYLOR: Ms. Nevils, I think to your point, if you employ the Parents As Teachers program in Missouri --

MS. NEVILS: Thank you. I appreciate that.

DR. TAYLOR: The Missouri Parents As

Teachers program I think is an excellent example of
what it is that you're talking about. We're

cognizant of the fact -- first of all, we have

limited capacity for early childhood education.

Kansas City, MO 6 (108)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There are far more children that we could serve than we have the capacity to serve. So we know that we have to have conversation with individuals who work in daycare centers, with grandma who's watching the kids, things like that.

The point is is that we got to look at how we can move services or make people cognizant of some of the things that need to be going on in the homes, regardless of who the childcare provider is, that can help with those literacy activities that, again, that children should have an experience with before they come to school.

I don't think that is the role of government, necessarily, to provide daycare in such a way that it precludes any other option, but I do think that this issue about universal preschool is something that we need to talk about. I mean, it's interesting that there are people who -- this was a conversation I had with a state legislator, and I was a little surprised at the response, because there was a feeling that kids shouldn't be in school at that age, they should be home with their mothers. And I'm thinking, well, philosophically, you know, I may agree with that but that's just not reality that exists today.

So I think that we've got to devise ways in 1 which we can get information into the hands of the 2 childcare provider so that the type of experiences 3 that you're talking about become commonplace 4 regardless of who the childcare provider is. 5 MS. NEVILS: Thank you. 6 DR. MITCHELL: Yes. ' 7 8 MR. NULTON: Bill Nulton, Kansas --9 DR. DANIELS: I'm sorry, I want to 10 apologize. I'm Ray Daniels with the KCK School 11 District, and I'm going to have to leave, I'm sorry. This is a really busy day and I squeezed 12 13 this in, I thought I was going to go at 9:55 and 14 it's 10:15, and I have a meeting at 10:30 I have to 15 get back to, so I -- all I can say is I agree with 16 what Bernard said. He spoke eloquently, and I wish 17 I could stay with you. If you're meeting later this afternoon, I might be able come back, but I'm 18 19 sorry, I have to go ahead and leave. 20 DR. MITCHELL: You have to leave right 21 now? 22 DR. DANIELS: Yeah. I'm supposed to be

23

24

making another presentation at 10:30, and it's just

really one of those days for me, and I apologize.

five minutes.

DR. DANIELS: Okay, give me five. I would agree with a lot of what Bernard said. One thing I would focus on is the quality and positive intent of the law, and I think Bernard said that also. It is the right law, it is the right intent. For the first time the nation has said that we're not going to leave any child behind.

The focus is, it doesn't make any difference what you're economic background is, what your ethnic background is, whether you speak English or not, what your ZIP code is, you are going to get a quality education in the United States. That is exactly the right target, that's exactly what the conversation ought to be about.

Having said that, there are lots of concerns around No Child Left Behind. It is, probably, the largest federal intrusion at the public schools have ever been. And while there are a lot of things we like, we do get additional federal money from this program, and I will tell you, it's not anywhere near enough, because like Bernard says, you put the federal money in with the state money and we're cutting \$20 million over the last three years. We're going backwards rather than forwards

in providing quality education for children. And our fear is that once you start to lose, those programs that make a difference for the kids we're trying to address, you start losing your after-school programs, your alternative care programs, your pre-school programs, the kind of programs that are making a difference, smaller class sizes, hiring more teachers to work with smaller groups, we know those things make a difference, hiring instructional coaches, make a difference, we're going to start dismantling that in Kansas City, Kansas if this continues.

While we've seen gains in our academic scores and social areas, if this continues with the state and federal funding — and I don't want to place blame on either one, I think both of them have some culpability here — we're going to start dismantling what we've been doing to provide quality education for children.

The other thing I'm very concerned about is highly qualified teachers. Simply putting in a law that every student will have a high qualified teacher doesn't make it a fact. And urban school districts are facing quality issues right now around teachers. We're not able to find highly

23 24 25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

qualified teachers in high school math, high school chemistry, high school physics. We're struggling with that right now. I think you'll find even a lot of suburban districts are struggling right now in those kind of areas.

So simply to say there's a law out there that's going to start punishing school districts if you don't have highly qualified teachers doesn't mean there's going to be a lot of people suddenly appear on our horizon, our radar screen, ready to come in and teach those areas. We're going to struggle with that, because the baby boomers, they're just starting to leave. We had 90 some retirements in our school district this year. We normally have about 55 to 60. That's at the first of a flip that's going to start in our district for the next five or six years.

There was nothing in the law that was an incentive for people to go into education. If there had been some kind of thing around increased salaries, some kind of additional benefits, some tax credits, something that would have encouraged people to go into education in this state, it wasn't there. We would like to have seen some of that. High qualified teacher fees, we are very,

very concerned with those.

I also agree hardily with Doctor Taylor in the fact, there isn't an equity issue around urban schools and to urban schools. The level of -there are no many more sub-groups in the urban districts. When you look at our two districts, we have every sub-group. If you look at the Blue Valley District, they're going to have a handful of sub-groups. It's going to be much more difficult for the urban districts to meet all the requirements of all the sub-groups and all the things that have to be met, then it is the suburban districts. We're very concerned about the equity issue.

And finally, I would just say, also, that I, too, am concerned about labeling groups of kids. The groups of kids that are being labeled are the ones that have always been labeled. You know, those are the kids that show up in the newspaper when they put the test results out. It's those kids that can't learn, it's the kids that can't speak English, it's the African-American kids, it's the kids that we know traditionally get blamed for not being able to do the work.

Folks, it's a poverty issue, it's not an ethnic

20.

issue. So when you start talking about dealing with minority kids, we really need to start talking about dealing with kids that are living in poverty, no matter what their race is, because those are the kids that are struggling right now.

So I get concerned when a suburban school district doesn't make AYP last year, and the superintendent says, well the reason we didn't make it is because of those 56 Hispanic kids. Now he regretted that statement later, greatly. So that was out there, and we thought about what those kids think when they were identified as the reason the suburban districts didn't make it.

So, the kids that have already been labeled, the kids have already been identified, stereotyped as not being able to do this work, here's another instance where they're going to be lifted up in the press and the media as saying, well, the reason you didn't make it is because of these special ed kids, or because of this group of poor kids, or because of this African-American group or Spanish or whatever the sub-group is, they're going to be lifted up again as the reason that that school did not succeed.

We know at KCK, Bernard knows at KC, Missouri,

these kids can do the work, but they need
additional resources, need additional teachers,
additional time, additional finances if we're going
to take care of all the kids in this country. But
right now the financial piece is what we're
struggling with. And I do apologize, and thank
you.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much.

MR. NULTON: Dr. Taylor.

DR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MR. NULTON: Nulton, Kansas. I would appreciate it if you would share on the matter of the drop-out program of the Kansas City Missouri District. Could you tell us the -- briefly describe the program, and what I have found to be a very significant success story for the district in that regard.

DR. TAYLOR: And it is. I mean, I will tell you very much that the work that's been done around reducing the drop-out rate has probably been some of the best work that we have done, because our drop-out rate was close to 10 percent two years ago and we cut that in half over the course of the past two years. And part of it has been, we have a very aggressive truancy recovery program.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, literally, what this means is, we go to every one who leaves the district, and we find out why they left. And this is almost like private investigation work. We've found that students have moved out of the country, we've found that students are enrolled in other school districts.

Unfortunately, we found that some students are deceased. But what we literally do, is when we find them, we go out, we speak to them, personally, and it's a whole drop-out recovery process, where we try to give them a range of options for returning to school.

Some students are at a point where they dropped out where they had like maybe 22 credits and it only takes 26 to graduate, so it's almost like, okay, if you can make it -- we have night school, summer school, credit recovery through the Novanet program, but it's almost like tailor making a way for that student to get a high school diploma.

If they are adequate age-wise, it would take them longer to get a traditional diploma, meaning someone is 17 or 18, and they might have a few credits, we have a GED option program, relationships with Job Corp, places like that. The goal is to get them a GED. Now if they want to

persevere to get a high school diploma, we keep students until they're 21. So if someone wants to go that route, they have the opportunity to do so.

But it literally is, those who left, we find out where they are, and then we go after them to try to recover what we need. And the department that does this is relatively small, but last year, for example -- what is it -- it's classmates dot com. I mean, it is so elaborate what they do to find these students, it's almost like I think we could do a reality TV series. They leave no stone unturned. And in doing that, it has significantly reduced.

I mean, when we went through our most recent state review, there was some healthy skepticism about those numbers, because they said that it's just impossible to do this. But the team that works with this does an outstanding job, and that is one of the things that I do have to say that I'm proudest of is that we figured this out and we're aggressive about it.

MR. NULTON: About your prevention program, too, encourage the youngsters who are still in school to stay.

DR. TAYLOR: Well, what we've embarked

upon, which I think No Child Left Behind did spread it's thinking is we are involved in the high school reform initiative that's patterned after what was begun in Kansas City, Kansas with their First Things First initiative. Ours is called Achievement First.

What we've done is taken two service providers, Talent Development High School out of Johns Hopkins University for the curriculum piece, and the Institute for Reform and Research In Education to look at the infrastructure piece, asked those two programs to marry one another. And what we've used to do that is to re-organize how we deliver services at our high schools.

So we're looking at small learning communities, a family advocate system, professional development that's focused on quality instruction. And a different way of organizing the day. We have freshman academies now that are focused on getting kids acclimated to schools so that they persist to graduation.

So there are a whole host of things that we know we had to do. And part of that was the impetus behind SMOG, but, again, it's, as Ray said, it's trying to balance all of this and comply with

the provisions of the law. 1 MR. RODGERS: Real quickly, Doctor 2 Taylor. 3 DR. MITCHELL: Your name? 4 MR. RODGERS: Chris Rodgers, Omaha, 5 The point I want to ask you is, the 6 pre-paragraph that we have states that No Child 7 Left Behind is a complete reversal of the Federal 8 Government's guiding principle of the role of 9 public education being a state and local right. 10 And the fellow superintendent that was here said 11 that this was the biggest invasion the Federal 12 Government's made. 13 Give me your views, because I agree with you on 14 the inadequacy of funding, from a state's stand on 15 a level where they can't comply because of revenue. 16 What do you see as the Federal Government's role to 17 18 help you deal with funding? 19 DR. TAYLOR: I think that when you pass a 20 law that has specific mandates as well as specific 21 sanctions, I do think that there has to be a way of 22 looking at what you're asking people to do, and 23 whether or not the resources that you're giving 24 them to do it adequate.

25

Now in terms of Title 1 funding, yes, there has

been an increase in that funding, but there's also been an increase in the mandates with which you use those funds. Because, again, we have to make a set percentage available for choice options. We have to set aside, I believe it's 20 percent, has to be set aside for choice options.

The difficulty -- now, this is the law and then this is the practical application. We have to set aside that money, which means that money can't be distributed until people make their choices, we go through a very elaborate process to inform parents of their choice options. Last year we had four schools where choice options had to be presented. We went to each school, we had meetings, we had everything laid out, one person shows up.

You know, this is like one of those situations where people talk about, I hate Congress but I love my congressman. The reality of the situation is that most people, regardless of what others may think about that school, that school is right down the street from grandma's house and I know my child can get there and get back, and if something happens grandma can get to it.

So to address your question, the funding is not adequate because as these mandates increase, the

state mandates increase. Now our state monies are declining. We are at a point now where if we do not have a reserve, we would be making some very drastic cuts, based on our state funding.

This school district has not had a levy increase in 30 years. A bond issue has not been passed in 30 years. So you understand what my dilemma is. Now my dilemma is, there isn't any more, we're not getting any more, and if we keep spending what we have, we're not going to have any more.

So the point is is that this is about commitment to public education, and do you believe in it. And, you know, it's hard for me -- now I'm not a bleeding heart liberal, but, I mean, I do understand the importance of fiscal responsibility, especially after last night. If you'd been with us in the board meeting last night, it was a whole lesson in fiscal responsibility. But I do believe that if you're -- this is just like being a parent. If I tell you to do something, if I tell you I want you to go to college and everything like that, I don't tell you now how you go and how you pay for it is on you, this is what I'm prepared to do to help you. Now I don't have to pay for it all, but

I should pay for what it is that I believe is 1 important for you to get out of the experience. 2 And that's the same thing in this. 3 Now I think this is about mitigating some of 4 the other political factors that are a part of 5 6 this, too. If this is a segway to say, see how bad 7 these schools are, we've given them all this money 8 and they still can't get it right, then we need to 9 say that. We need to be that genuine about it. But if it really is about helping those who need 10 the most help, then what we've got to say is, you 11 12 have a concentration of poverty. And Doctor Daniels is absolutely correct, this is an issue 13 about poverty. 14 15 DR. MITCHELL: Another question. 16 MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Missouri. 17 Doctor Taylor, is Westinghouse still a high school 18 powerhouse? 19 DR. TAYLOR: Yes, it is. 20 MR. PLUMMER: I was just checking. 21 should have asked about Peabody. 22 DR. TAYLOR: That's pretty good. 23 MR. PLUMMER: I've had the privilege for 24 the last two years of travelling from Columbia, 25 Missouri to Kansas City, Council of Special Issues.

In fact, I've had the privilege of working with Ms. 1 Fisher and Doctor Butler over Chester Anderson and 2 Doctor Mitchell. I was wondering in relation to that whether, how is -- how are these alternative programs being impacted by the No Child Left Behind? Because as I see it, in terms of the council saying, you don't have it, you know, these kids are right on the edge of potentially some real troubling decisions, depending on what they decide.

> DR. TAYLOR: Well that's a really good question, because our districts has those alternative schools but we also contract with outside entities to work with our alternative education population. And the issue for that is that while we pay for the service, those scores that come from those schools count in the entire district's total.

So, for example, we have programs that have historically been in operation here, and they are separate entities, even though we're paying for seats. And we've had very pointed conversations about what they have to do to step up their level of performance because their student's results, their drop-out rates, their graduation rates, their attendance rates, their performance, those all

3

4

5

factor into the district. And that's another one of those nuances that our suburban counterparts don't have to deal with. Because we actually have to pay people in order to increase our capacity, and to be able to do it in a cost-efficient way.

The problem with that is often you're working with entities that have a view of what an alternative ed student should be, that, is it congruent with who the alternative ed student is. And so it's trying to look at how you change the face of all that while at the same time make these mandates.

I mean, you're dealing with psychological emotional issues. You're dealing with students who are involved in the criminial justice system.

Those are the things that are not taken into consideration in this law. You know, that's the reality that we're dealing with. Homeless students. I mean, the notion that you're supposed to be proficient on the state assessment, and you don't have a place to live. I just wondered who sat down and thought of these things when they put this together. I think it's a small feat that somebody is getting to school everyday and attending to what they need to if they don't have

some place stable to live.

\_\_

So it's those kinds of issues. Now make no mistake, those are no excuses for us not to do what we're supposed to do. We get paid to do this work, this isn't volunteer work. We get paid to do this. So you know that coming into it. But you're talking about a definition of who you are, what you do that doesn't take into consideration the myriad of factors it impacts.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. PERRY: On the GED plan, how many, sites, Doctor Taylor, do you have in the Kansas City area, particular GED sites? Is it six or seven?

DR. TAYLOR: I think that sounds to be about correct, but I know that we're trying to do more that's web based, so that there's more access. And we're trying to figure out ways to obtain more sites.

MS. PERRY: I think there needs to be more sites. Because a lot of these kids have to come from the northeast area, come to 2121.

DR. TAYLOR: Right.

MS. PERRY: You know.

DR. TAYLOR: Right.

1	MS. PERRY: I think that really needs to
2	be looked at. And you were talking about the
3	alternative schools
4	DR. TAYLOR: Uh-huh.
5	MS. PERRY: you've got everything in
6	these alternative schools. And like Deala
7	(phonetic) South, I mean, you know, you've got kids
8	that's court ordered there, and it's hard. At
9	Deala South they really work with them, and they
10	show the concern there.
11	DR. TAYLOR: That's right.
12	MS. PERRY: And they know where these
13	kids are coming from. Not all teachers sometimes
14	do that though.
15	DR. TAYLOR: That's right. Well I think
16	the point, again, is that's the kind of thing that
17	isn't measured on an assessment, you know.
18	DR. MITCHELL: I think we need to take a
19.	break. Thank you very much.
20	DR. TAYLOR: Oh, no, thank you all, it's
21	been my pleasure. Thank you.
22	
23	(Brief Recess)
24	
25	DR. MITCHELL: Reconvene to Session 2,

"Foster Care and Adoption of African-American Children." The first person on the agenda is Ms. Millicent Charles, foster care parent, Wichita Kansas. Is Ms. Charles here?

MS. CHARLES: Yes.

DR. MITCHELL: Oh, there you are, I'm sorry. You were here yesterday.

MS. CHARLES: My name is Millicent
Charles and I am from Wichita, Kansas. I'm a
foster parent, I have been for the last five years.
And I've had many good placements in the past years
but I do share some concern. And I would like to
start with, I share some concerns about the foster
care --

DR. MITCHELL: Please speak into the microphone.

MS. CHARLES: Again, I do share some concerns about the foster care system. The first one is there's a need for more resources for the natural parents to fulfill their court obligations. Most of them can't afford the classes. And this makes them, just throws them into a dilemma where they have to end up having their rights terminated because they haven't fulfilled everything that they were supposed to do.

The classes and everything, some of them are a hundred dollars apiece, and these people are making minimum wage and they don't have any money to do it. So I've seen a couple, two cases where the mother really tried to do everything she could to meet the obligations but there was just no funds for her.

The second one is, I was wondering why relative placements don't receive the same reimbursement for the relative placement. And I think it's very important for the children, that their relatives be (inaudible). If they are taken away from their natural parents that they're able to be put back with their, you know, relatives where their environment — where they are in a comfortable environment instead of placing them wherever in whose ever home that's available.

And I'm wondering, if we had any
Africian-American (inaudible) in the State of
Kansas. I know there is some in Wichita, Kansas,
and I do know of an attorney that has applied for
the position that works with SRS, and she also
worked as a substitute as a guardian ad litem, and
she never -- and she applied for the position and
she never received it.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And our minority children are being placed in rural areas is a culture shock. Their Medicaid to be contained, and then they're put on farms to I've seen this happen on several different occasions in a lot of different cases. People have shared this with me about their children, things they were going through. Lots of them end up Then they be put in these little running away. institutions where they keep them until they're 18 because they're so out of hand and they get so belligerent that they feel like, you know, they're not being treated fair, and they just don't want to deal with it, they just give up. And these are some of the children that are really not bad children, and they didn't ask for the situation that they were put it, but their mom took a different route in life and it made them end up in awful situations.

And I personally know of two children that was placed in a small town where there were no other African-American families, and only the foster children in the system were there. And they were made fun of, and it was a very uncomfortable situation for them. And the other African-American children there, too, the children made fun of them

because they knew that they were a foster child because there was no other families there.

This particular little guy, he ran away, and he was out on a dark street for a long time by himself until finally he got someone to come along and pick him up and bring him here. It's very dangerous how these -- you know, how -- how -- if you just think about how this could have ended up, thank God that it didn't, but these children are just not being treated fair. And I truly feel empathy for our children.

My question is, is this justice or just about the system? You know, they're not being treated fairly, I would say the minority children. I've been a foster parent for five years, and I have once yet to see a Caucasian child in an African-American home. Now maybes it's just me, maybe I just haven't seen that, but I have not. And I'm sure there are some placements somewhere, but I haven't seen it. So I'm open now for any questions from anybody.

DR. MITCHELL: Questions from the panel?

MS. NEVILS: Nicketa Nevils. Do you feel
that there is any biasness in the system against
African-American women, children, and the foster

parents, African-American foster parents?

MS. CHARLES: Well, I feel that they set the parents up for failure when they don't show the correct way to achieve, you know, the task.

MS. NEVILS: That's for the parents?

MS. CHARLES: Uh-huh.

MS. NEVILS: And what about foster parents, African-American foster parents? How were they treated in the system? Can you elaborate a little bit on that?

MS. CHARLES: Well, I think that they give long-term placements to -- they take -- I think they give long-term placements to Caucasian families. I think that they try to make the stipulations harder for us to try -- put it like this: In order to be able to become a foster parent, you have to, you know, do a KBI check and all this.

And there's a lot of African-American people, you know, that have not always had it easy all their lives, so somewhere down the line they've done something, but there may come a point in your life where you want to straighten your life up and you want to do better. And then, you know, they go all the way back and they bring up these issues

that happened maybe 20 or 30 years ago. There's not really nothing drastic, and then that eliminates you from being a foster parents. So, I think that that's something that needs to be addressed.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MS. ROBINSON: Ms. Charles, as a foster care parent, what has been your experience in terms of being treated differently? How have you been penalized in terms of your relationship with the foster care system and the child that is in your home?

MS. CHARLES: Well, I had a prior placement for two years, and they were in my home for two years, and they abruptly moved them out of my home in one week. The statute for the state says you have to give them a month's notice in order to reintegrate these kids in another home.

They took them out of my home, the children.

The oldest child was making straight As. At this

point — they took them out of my home to put them

in a potential adoptive home, and after they left

my home, after taking them out abruptly, the

potential adoptive home put them back in the system

after a week because they were crying and

everything. To this date they've been in three different ones.

And these children -- this particular young lady, she was a straight A student, and I was really going to adopt her, and they said that now she hates school, her hair's falling out. And I just think that they didn't take it under any consideration for me or the children, they just treated them like little animals, you know, to be tossed around, and they're not looking at it like they have little hearts and minds.

DR. MITCHELL: Question?

MS. PERRY: Yes. They do pass them around. I've worked with kids that have been in foster care, and they've been in 10 and 12 homes, just switching one home to the other. Well something happened here, something happened here. I think something needs to be done about that. And you're in Kansas?

MS. CHARLES: Uh-huh.

MS. PERRY: Well something needs to be done about it in Missouri, you know, because they do not need to switch these kids around, because they get in one foster care place, and they get used to it and everything, then come up, and it

.22

depends on the case manager, okay, so and so, or maybe they don't like that foster care home, I mean, the case manager. So there's a lot of things involved in that.

MS. CHARLES: That's right. There could be a personality conflict with the case manager. You know, I've had children to come to my home that have been in home after home after home, and I see no problem with them, all they want is love and affection. They want to know that they're cared about. They want to know that they have a voice. They want to know that they're in a home where it's not so structured, you do this, you do that, you do that.

When I let them into my home, most of them call me Aunt Meme. They come in, they're happy, they know that they're loved. When they come in I welcome them with a big hug and let them know, my motto is, you be nice, I be nice; you be bad, I be firm, you know, and we get that understanding from the beginning, and I -- you know, they send me the most terrible -- I've had some of the most terrible children, they said wouldn't do anything, and they went up and made straight As. And I've had those situations happen on several occasions.

These children are just looking for love, 1 because there's not been any stability in their 2 They're looking -- and if you're able to 3 show them a life style that they've never had 4 before, you know, they will appreciate it, you 5 And even though they may come from a house 6 that's, you know, filthy, and this and that and the 7 other, well when you bring them into your home and 8 you show them the way you live, they can get with 9 the program. 10

> But it's like they just toss these children It's like, they take them out -- like they around. took the three little children out of my home, and the little girl, the 10 year old, she was a straight A student, most likely to succeed, was in everything at school, and I was behind her with everything. I said, oh, you can be anything you want to be in life. And now they say she's making straight F's. The little child, it just destroyed Now they have her on medication. You know, that's their first alternative, medication, they're bipolar, they're, you know, they're chemically unbalanced, and instead of addressing the situation and putting these kids someplace where they're loved, you know, most of these people don't care

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about these children, all they're looking for is a paycheck.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Missouri.

Ms. Charles, I have two questions, I'll kind of combine them. One, do you see any difference between funding that is received for the foster care parents, say, white children -- or minority children versus white children? Are there differences in the funding that's received depending on the children coming in the home?

The other question I have is, if you were to change two things in the system, what would you like to see happen?

MS. CHARLES: Okay. First question, do I see any funding, difference in the funding with the children? No, not really, because it just depends on the level of the child that you have what, you know, what situation they be in.

As far as what I would like to see be accomplished, I would like to see more

African-American children or minority children put with their own race instead of put out on rural areas and, basically, taking them back to slavery, medicate them and making them do what they want

them to do.

And these children, like I say, at present we have two in my home that the one, he ran away from this particular city, and as I said, they were laughing at him in the school, they all knew that they were -- there were no African-American children families, period, in the whole town. But all the children were foster children and all the kids made fun of them, they wouldn't let them participate in anything.

And then this other little young man, he came to my home, and they said that he's 16 years old, they let him come to Kansas so he could go to independent living. He told me, where he was he was on a pig farm, and he had worked for a year and a half, he said, I couldn't stand the smell no more, I just wanted to get out of there. So when he came to my home he was so happy to receive his own room, his own TV, his bathroom and everything — I mean, everything was just set up for him, and so he was like, I don't want to go to independent living. And his mentality is not ready for independent living.

And so the social worker called the day before yesterday, and she told him, this is why we brought

1.3

you to Wichita, to be in independent living, you will go on independent living, and just really told the little boy off. And when he hung up the phone, his head down, I said, honey, what's wrong? She said they're going to make me go independent living. I just told them that because I wanted get away, I didn't want to be on that farm any longer. I'm like, you know, this is really sad, something needs to be done. Nobody seems to be addressing this issue. It's like, you're in the foster system now, we got you, we do what we want to do with you and that's it.

And that was like a breach of contract when they took those children away from me. I didn't even have time to prepare these children. They were just -- I'm sure they was just distraught, you know. This is why -- and this is the way they're doing our children.

MR. PLUMMER: You mentioned placing more African-American children in African-American homes. What do you think the reason for that, that's not happening as much? Is it because there aren't as many African-American foster care families? And if so, is that a recruiting problem by those entities that are responsible for getting

responsibile families to do foster care programs?

MS. CHARLES: Well, that's what I said. The stipulations are so tough at this point where they can't really -- a lot of them don't qualify when they do the KBIH, because somewhere along the line, we as a black race know that we've all had problems and we haven't always had it easy. And somewhere down the line, when you were 20 years old, maybe you did something wrong. Maybe you broke the law in some kind of way. Well that still lingers over your head. So that's a way of keeping the African-American foster parents out. So, most of them aren't given -- most, when they have the classes, they weed them out like that. And then they're able to place our kids in their home.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes. Quick question.

MS. PERRY: Okay. Quick one. I think the workers, the SRS workers, I won't say all, some, and DFS workers, they're all intimidating to the families and to the relatives --

MS. CHARLES: Yes, they are.

MS. PERRY: -- when they come in. And these families come in scared, afraid -- and I've been shot down a lot of times, when I talk about Indian child welfare. And they still don't get it

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about the cultural. They're not trained in that or anything. So that's it.

DR. MITCHELL: That was a statement.

MR. PARKER: George Parker. I've always thought that foster homes are difficult to supervise, especially if you've got hundreds and hundreds of them and so forth, but have you ever heard of boarding schools being talked about as some alternative in Kansas, for example?

In Missouri we had a legislator put in a bill one time for boarding schools. The rich people in England and America have been using boarding school for, what, 500 years? They're a proven way of children being educated and have manners and so forth. But I don't know that we've really explored it, except Newt Gingrich one time here about four. five years ago, he recommended orphanages, and when he used that word, it went over like a lead balloon. Nobody wants orphanages. But boarding schools are a proven way of doing children, and I wondered if you had any -- talk about it, has anybody ever tried to explore that in Kansas, I wonder, as an alternative or something additional to the foster homes.

MS. CHARLES: Well not to me, I'm just a

foster parent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROBINSON: Ms. Charles, I have a question. What are your rights as a foster parent in regards to children that are placed in your home, and you have a disagreement about some of the actions or the policies and procedures related to that child? What are your rights?

DR. MITCHELL: For example, when they took the kids from you without giving you notice, what rights do you have in terms of dealing with that?

MS. CHARLES: Right. Well, you're supposed, within seven days, if you disagree, you're supposed to be able to go through Judge Fragle, Al Fragle, and have a hearing. Well I wrote a letter to him and asked for a hearing, and I got no response. Then I went up there and I spoke with Jackie Hemway, his secretary. She said, I'll have you on the docket within a week. received no response. I informed her that I would be going on vacation for a month. She said, well, okay, I'll get you on before -- when are you leaving? I said in two weeks. She said, well I'll get you on before you leave. And we're supposed to -- they're supposed to give us a 30 day notice

1 to prepare the children.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You know, you can't take a child -- this baby that I had was a month old. He was two years old, and they just took him out of my home after a week. He was calling me mama, you know, and I took him to visit his mom, he would scream, he didn't want to bother with her. So I was all that he knew. then they took this child away. And from what the children, his mother was telling me, the children said they would put him in a room, shut the door and let him cry. And then, finally, after a week, they put him back into the system and said they didn't want him. And as I stated, it's been three different placements they've been in since they left my home. And they could have call me back, but they took my license away from me and said I was under investigation for no reason, they couldn't come up with no substantial evidence. They took my license away from me for a year, and I'm just now getting it back about a month ago. And I was asked -- I said, well, I want you to send me these allegations in the mail. Put them on paper, let me see what I was supposed to have done. I've received nothing to this day.

25

I have one follow-up.

DR. MITCHELL:

there any foster parent advocacy groups? 1 2 that support? MS. CHARLES: No. 3 MS. NEVILS: Ms. Charles, I want to thank 4 you for being a foster parent. That's very 5 courageous. I also am a foster parent and an 6 adoptive parent. When the agency that you work 7 for, when they gave you your materials and whatnot, 8 did you have a black map trainer? 9 MS. CHARLES: No. 10 MS. NEVILS: Did they give you any 11 information about black children, African-American 12 children as far as their skin, their hair or 13 anything of that nature; was that included? 14 15 MS. CHARLES: No. MS. NEVILS: When you go to workshops 16 17 that they offer, is there any workshop that you 18 have ever attended that had to do with 19 African-Americans? Their life-style, their family? 20 MS. CHARLES: No. Addressing their 21 culture, no. 22 MS. NEVILS: How are African-American 23 women treated with the white social worker? 24 MS. CHARLES: They're very arrogant 25 toward you. It seems like whenever there's a

It's like, instead of problem, it's all on you. 1 being appreciated, instead of them appreciating us 2 for the effort we're putting out, it's like there's 3 always something. They're always coming up with, 4 well, you did this, you didn't do this, I need you 5 to do this by a certain time and if you don't do 6 it, you know, then there will be consequences. 7 MS. NEVILS: Do they seem to be 8 9 combative? 10 MS. CHARLES: Right. Yes. MS. NEVILS: Do you know why it exists? 11 MS. CHARLES: No. I would just say it's .12 because I'm an African-American. 13 14 MS. VALENCIANO: Ms. Charles? 15 DR. MITCHELL: Yes, another questing. 16 MS. VALENCIANO: Rita Valenciano, 17 Missouri State Advisory Committee. I'm over here. 18 Do you ever have contact with other foster 19 parents and are you aware of them experiencing 20 these same things? 21 MS. CHARLES: Yes. I called a meeting at 22 my home and asked some foster parents to come over 23 so we could just sit and talk about the different 24 situations and the things that we were going 25 through. And none of these issues were addressed,

and, you know, we, like, say for instance, my . 1 social worker at the time, I was asking her about 2 my license. She couldn't tell me anything. And 3 then she was telling me that -- then when I called 4 this other agency, they couldn't tell me anything, 5 and then everybody was just going -- they just go 6 back and forth, you know, it's like nobody knows 7 nothing. 8 So therefore, you would say 9 MS. NEVILS: that there is possibly no accountability? MS. CHARLES: There isn't. MS. NEVILS: They keep you -- I don't

MS. NEVILS: They keep you -- I don't want to put words in your mouth, but do they keep you back and forth, bouncing, no accredibility at all?

MS. CHARLES: That's right. It's just, they send you to this person, that person. This person will have an answer, that person will have an answer. It's just like going back and forth, and it's whatever they want is going to be done.

There was this one incident with this young lady, there was a personality conflict, and every time I would call her, she would get upset with me. So she tried to make things really hard for me. And I told her, I said, you're not doing me a

Kansas City, MO 64108

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

favor, you know, I'm doing these children a favor.

I was living -- I've been married 30 years, and

I've been a foster parent for five years, and I

just wanted to open my home to give some love to

some needy children, I said, so why don't you

appreciate us instead of always trying to knock us

down. Sometime commend us for what we're doing.

DR. MITCHELL: Any other questions? One last thing.

What is it, if you could have your druthers, what would you like to see done?

MS. CHARLES: I would like to see more African-American minority foster parents. I would like to see -- I would like -- situation in the form where there's rural areas, cities, where there's no African-American minority families in the cities, I think it's wrong to send our children out there and work on their farms and stuff. think it's just another way of slavery. And I would like to see that really be addressed. would just like to see, you know, more African-Americans, make it be where more of them can be qualified for the position, because it's, you know, they've made the stipulations pretty tough.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think if a person is, you know, when they were young, if they broke some law and did some things, I think after 20 years of growing up -- you know, when you're a child you think as a child, but when you become a man, you put childish ways aside.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very, very much.

MS. CHARLES: Thank you.

DR. MITCHELL: Ms. Roberta Sue McKenna,
Assistant Director for Child Welfare. Thank you.
Would you pull that microphone down?

MS. McKENNA: Yes. That's a problem I often have. How's that, can you hear me? Quite frankly, people generally don't have a problem hearing me. I learned when my father was working the swing shift that I have a voice that carries and have found that to be helpful, but it wasn't helpful at that time.

I want to thank you, first, for the opportunity to be here and for including foster children and foster care on your agenda. It's a critically important area that is often overlooked by the general public and by panels like yours that address other social problems, and I think it's -- I'm just very grateful to be here and for this issue to be included in your agenda.

I expect to learn as much as I teach today, and part of what -- but what I'm not going to be doing is addressing specific case issues. However, because children are individuals, they come from families, they come from communities, and their concerns are individual, we do in the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services have a special assistant to the secretary whose responsibility is to handle customer concerns, particularly those arising out of concerns for children's welfare.

So I'd like to point out Robena Farrell is here today and is willing to talk to anyone who has concerns about a specifics case. She will take that information, will follow up on it and be glad to address those concerns.

Our approach is to address each individual concern in a way that resolves that concern, but also uses that concern and the process used to resolve it in a way that improves the system as a whole.

Now to our topic today. Historically,

African-American children have been

over-represented, this proportionately represented
in the foster care population. Currently in

Kansas, African-Americans are 6 percent of our 1 population, 20 percent of our foster care 2 population, and what's a bigger concern to me, 3 29 percent of the foster care population with the case plan goal of adoption. That tells me that 5 we're not doing -- we're not doing something right. 6 And it's especially a concern, because I look back 7 over time, and we haven't impacted those numbers 8 significantly. They've been static since about 9 10 1997, '98. I mean, it will go up a percentage 11 point or down a percentage point, but they've held 12 steady over that period of time.

Kansas was an early -- chose early on to move away from racial matching as a goal in placing children either in foster care or adoption. That was a big issue in the 70s and 80s, and when I first began working professionally in this field, it was still a major cause of dissension among child welfare advocates and the child welfare community.

The concerns are, exactly as described by Ms. Charles, the need for children to be with people they are comfortable with and identify with and who understand them in ways that are difficult to learn in a class.

23 24 25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The problem with that kind of matching is that we were identifying that as a reason that African-American children were staying in foster care longer and were not being placed in foster family homes as quickly as non African-American children.

That position was the one adopted by the court in, I think, 1997, racial matching of foster homes and racial matching for the purposes of foster care or adoption was prohibited by the United States Congress. And so it was fortunate that in Kansas we had begun moving away from that practice earlier in order to avoid the delays in permanence for African-American children.

Because it was such a controversial issue, say, passing a law doesn't change people's hearts.

We've all learned that. And because there were strong feelings in the social work profession and in the foster care community, it was a challenge to communicate those new requirements and monitor for compliance. And we wanted to do that in a way, just as when we address any individual problem, we wanted to do that in a way that would move the entire system toward improved practice and better meeting the needs of individual children and

families.

And I should mention here, I've added this to my notes, that monitoring for compliance and for continual improvement of our system takes place in the child welfare program through the Children and Family Service Review, which is a partnership between the state and our Federal Government and which assesses the state, identifies issues that need improvement, and then a program improvement plan is in place. And our program improvement plan includes the need to recruit and retain additional foster homes and to increase our -- I'm sorry, to decrease the number of moves each child in the system experiences.

The national standard for that is two moves within the first year of placement. That's two much for the child. The first move is too much for the child. And I'm going to add a personal note here, I grew up in the military. I wasn't in the military as a child, my father was in the military, and I experienced frequent moves. I actually went to 22 grade schools.

So the issue for me of children moving in foster care where they not only have to change schools but have to change families is personal. I

want as part as one of my career goals, to
eliminate that kind of trauma for a child; that
waking in the night and not knowing where the
bathroom is. That's not something any child should
have to experience.

What we're doing to address this and other concerns is a family center practice initiative.

What it means is that we approach each family, birth, foster and adoptive with an inquiry mind, respectfully asking that family to teach us who they are, what their values are, what their culture is, and what they see their strengths as being and how we can help them address the issues that have brought them to our attention.

The Family Center Practice Initiative is fairly new in Kansas, but it has begun in the first phase. We have had every social worker in both the public and the private sector go through the initial introduction to Family Center Practice, which tells them why we're doing this, and that we're doing this, that it's a long-term initiative, and what our expectations of staff are going to be.

At the same time, we've been -- and what that does is, that it allows us to get to know those families more quickly and more thoroughly so that

when a child must be separated from the people who are caring for them when they're introduced to us, they're more likely to be placed with a relative who is, of course, more likely to be part of the same culture and background and to know and diminish the trauma of the child's move from that family home of origin. It enables us to rally those supports around the family of origin so that even that temporary out-of-home placement is, we hope, less and less likely to happen.

As we moved into implementing the requirements of the inter-ethnic placement provision, financial requirement that we not delay or deny a placement based on race, we became aware — and one of the primary issues that people were saying is that white people don't know how to take care of black people. That was something that I didn't understand and very grateful to a black social worker who straightened me out quickly. And that white people tend not to understand the meaning of hair care and skin care for African-American children.

What I understand today is, that what my mother said, you can't go out looking like that, people will think no one loves you, is exactly what

African-Americans are telling us when they say, you can't allow a child's hair to be neglected.

And so in preparation for this and knowing that that was an issue, that having brought to the attention of the panel, I checked, and we did have, over the year ending June 30th, last year, we had 11 programs across the state for foster parents on cultural sensitivity, diversity, but only three of those addressed the specific issue of hair care and skin care.

And quite frankly, even if we'd had a great deal more, it wouldn't have been -- it wouldn't have met the need. Because, while 15 percent of our current foster parents are African-American, and that's -- 6 percent of Kansas is

African-American, so we're doing fairly well on that score, not good enough, but when you don't do racial matching in the placement, our expectation that a Caucasian foster parent would know enough to know that they needed that workshop, or that they knew enough to ask for that information was unacceptable.

What we've done is to review -- and I don't know how many of you understand that in Kansas we have a very rich system, a public private

partnership where the public resources are supplemented by contracts with private child placing agencies who are paid for their work, but also are not for profit agencies who do their own fund raising and are in a position to enrich our system in many ways.

Each of them is addressing this issue in their own way. We are in a position to choose the best. And it looks like our next step is to standardize this approach so that when an African-American child is placed in a non African-American home, the resource family receiving that child for care will receive a brochure or a CD which will provide them with, first, the information that there's something here they need to know; and second, what the information is; and third, resources on the Internet and in their community so they have some place to go for additional information.

Our experience has universally been that
African-American foster parents and community
members and professional hair people are willing to
volunteer their services to make sure that we're
meeting this need in the way that we need to so
that that is not an issue for children who are
already suffering the trauma of being in foster

4 5

care, and who definitely don't need another message that they're not loved. In fact, we need to send very strong messages.

I did want to say, too, that the rights of foster parents in Kansas are quite limited. They step up and open their hearts and their homes for children who desperately need that resource. And what Kansas law says is that they're entitled to information, as much information as we have or can gather before they make the decision to take that child into their home, and as much information as we have or can gather throughout that child's stay in their home. That is such a no-brainer, because we're asking these individuals to take care of children 24/7. In order to do that job they absolutely need as much information as we can provide to them.

The second is, that if a child has been in their home for six months or longer, they're entitled to written notice before the child is moved. Upon that written notice, they have the right to go to court and object to the notice.

The only exception to that is if they sign a waiver saying they don't need the notice, and everyone on that list, that's the quardian ad

litem, the foster parent, the judge, everybody has
to sign off on it in order to not have the notice.

Or there has to be an emergency. If there's an
emergency we need to inform the Court, and there's
not a firm time line on that.

I wish I could tell you that our staff complied

with that requirement a hundred percent of the time. I can tell you that we're working toward that, that it's a serious requirement, and our expectation is the staff comply with it, because it's the law, but also because we are asking — because children need for the adults in their lives to treat each other respectfully, and the least we can do, if we're going to move a child, is to say to the person who's been feeding them breakfast and putting them to bed at night, we've got other plans and we need to know what you think about it.

I stand for questions.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

DR. NAVATO: Alma Navato, St. Louis, Missouri.

In your department, how many, would you say, the number of African-American social service workers compared to the Caucasian workers?

MS. McKENNA: Approximately 11 percent of

our social workers are African-American, identify 1 themselves as African-American. 2 DR. NAVATO: And of those numbers, is the 3 criteria for them to continue as a social worker 4 higher, the standards to get in as a social worker 5 higher than the Caucasian? 6 MS. McKENNA: No. 7 DR. NAVATO: Applicants? 8 MS. McKENNA: No. 9 DR. NAVATO: And the second question I 10 have is, what would you say is the reason that 11 12 there is a major increase in the number of African-American or minority children that are 13 placed in foster homes or foster care? 14 MS. McKENNA: I don't think there is an 15 I think there's a disproportion --16 increase. African-Americans are disproportionately 17 18 represented in foster care. But that's not new 19 information. It's also not new that we haven't been able to address that. 20 I think the reasons for foster care are 21 22 complex, and the reason for the disproportionate 23 representation of African-Americans is complex. 24 haven't read a study that answers that definitively 25 for me, but I agreed with the gentleman earlier who

said that class and poverty are huge issues.

One of the studies that I was most interested in was one that addressed -- we've sought to recruit staff who look like the population we serve, and with the expectation that that would help us address the disproportionate representation, and what the study -- and I don't know that it's been replicated, but it was very well done and quite large, said, that, it doesn't change the decision-making or the approach of the social -- the social worker's race does not make a difference in the decision-making or the approach, and the conclusion of that study is that class plays a bigger role than does race in the decision-making.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

DR. MALETZ: Don Maletz from the Oklahoma SAC. One thing I just don't understand here, if there's no emergency, and the foster parent is still willing to care for the child, why is the child moved?

MS. McKENNA: TO be closer to their -- it could be any number of reasons. To be closer to family, to go back home, to be reunited with siblings.

DR. MALETZ: Well is there any assessment made of the child's readiness to move one more time, or is it just made essentially administratively, some sibling is available or what?

MS. McKENNA: All decisions should be made in a case planning — by the case planning team, which would include, and will in the future more often include the resource family, the person providing care for the child.

That's currently policy, but it's not one that's followed as completely as it needs to be. And it needs to be more than a paper compliance. We need -- when we bring people to the table, the biological family should be at that table, too.

When we bring people to the table, it needs to not be to give them a case plan and get their signature, it needs to be to get their input, to listen. And that's part of -- The Family Center Practice Initiative is to address that exact issue. But even though we're not doing as well on that as I want us to, I think it would be rare that a move would be without consideration for the impact on the child.

DR. MITCHELL: Mr. Plummer first, then

1	we'll come back down to you.
2	MR. PLUMMER: Yes, thank you, Doctor
3	Mitchell. Al Plummer, Columbia, Missouri.
4	Don and I are on the same wavelength here
5	because that was where my question was going,
6	because I think earlier in your presentation, and I
7	hope I didn't get this wrong, and you can correct
8	me, you said that the national standard is two
9	moves per year?
10	MS. McKENNA: In the first year.
11	MR. PLUMMER: In the first year.
12	MS. McKENNA: That's all we're measuring
13	right now, nationally. Am I right?
14	UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Two moves, total,
15	over the life.
16	MS. McKENNA: Okay. Two moves, total.
17	MR. PLUMMER: Oh, two moves, total. So
18	it's not I guess what I'm trying to assess, and
19	I know it might depend on the number of years a
20	child is in the program, but how frequently are
21	they moved?
22	MS. McKENNA: It depends on the length of
23	time they're in the program, and it depends a great
24	deal on the child. And I'm looking to see if I put
25	our moves down. We're not meeting the national

standard. 1 (Inaudible). UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: 2 MS. McKENNA: Pardon? 3 (Inaudible). UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: 4 MS. McKENNA: I know I didn't meet the 5 standard but I can't remember where we were. 6 Hold on. Let me back up, 7 MR. PLUMMER: I know you have it, and I don't want Ms. McKenna. 8 to interrupt your response to the question, why 9 does that standard exist, the two moves in the 10 first year; why is that? 11 MS. McKENNA: Because moves -- the 12 standard is two moves for the child's length of 13 14 out-of-home stay, that they would have no more than two placements in that time. And it exists because 15 moves are bad for children and we need -- if we're 16 17 going to remove them from their families to provide them with stability during that out-of-home stay. 18 19 The problem comes with what we count as a move, and when children come in to care and need a level 20 21 of structure that is not possible in a family 22 foster home, and those issues are addressed, it's 23 appropriate to move the child to a less restrictive 24 environment. 25 MR. PLUMMER: Okay, I think I'm grasping

I was thinking two moves per year was a 1 standard, a minimum standard as opposed to a 2 maximum standard. 3 MS. McKENNA: Oh. 4 So I'm clear on that. MR. PLUMMER: But 5 who -- how -- the determination, the rationale for 6 7 moving a child is, is that a standard -- the criteria, is that criteria established at the 8 federal level, state level, or local level? 9 10 MS. McKENNA: I'm going to start and see 11 if I'm answering your question. The decision is made at the local level by a case planning team. 12 13 And that needs to be so because they're the ones 14 who know the child and the family and the resources 15 in their community the best. That decision is made within a framework set by 16 17 state policy. The state policy is set within 18 guidelines and requirements from the Federal 19 Government. 20 MR. PLUMMER. Thank you. 21 DR. MITCHELL: First Doctor Thompson, and 22 then Ms. Powell. 23 DR. THOMPSON: What systems do you have to monitor the actions and the implementation of 24 25 these policies, not just moves, but policies in

general by the case managers and their supervisors?

MS. McKENNA: It's an overlay, and actually, one of the perceptions is that foster care is not monitored; the truth is that there's a great deal of monitoring. In each case, no child comes into custody for out-of-home placement without the involvement of a court. So court oversight is there for every child in every case. And in Kansas, that includes appointed representation for parents who cannot afford to retain counsel --

DR. THOMPSON: Excuse me. Let me interrupt you because that's not what I'm talking about. What I'm asking, is how does the federal system monitor those states that are receiving funds from the Federal Government for welfare, how do they monitor the abusive behavior of case managers on African-American foster homes, and other providers?

MS. McKENNA: We're monitored by our federal partners through the Children and Family Service Review. And that as a result of the review, a program improvement plan is developed, and we report quarterly on our progress or lack of progress on the specific issues in our program

improvement plan. 1 But that's not -- that doesn't monitor case 2 That's monitored by SRS through specific. 3 supervision and case reads, and reviewed by the 4 central office. 5 DR. THOMPSON: So if I understand you 6 correctly, that you don't have a mechanism that 7 really observes or has hands-on information about 8 9 what individual case managers and their supervisors do that is abusive toward foster parents and other 10 11 providers? 12 MS. McKENNA: No, that would not be what I was saying. 13 14 DR. THOMPSON: Oh, okay. 15 MS. McKENNA: We have for each, in 16 addition to the court system, there are supervisors and then data collection in terms of how cases are 17 18 moving and what decisions are being made, and then 19 a case review system to validate that information. 20 DR. THOMPSON: And that was the quarterly 21 review that you mentioned earlier? 22 MS. McKENNA: One of the results of that 23 process is a quarterly report to our federal 24 partners. 25

Ι

Okay.

Nicketa Nevils.

MS. NEVILS:

have three questions and I'll go through them quickly.

First of all, the statistics that you gave earlier about this hair and skin information, where was it showed at? I mean, where was the workshop at? There was certainly none in Wichita. There has never been anything like that taken place in southeast Kansas. So where are you getting your statistics from that you already have something like this of nature? And the workshop that you had, what people got this information?

MS. McKENNA: The Children's Alliance of Kansas is responsible for coordinating training for resource families, and the information is on their calendar.

MS. NEVILS: Servicing what area?

MS. McKENNA: The state. And it says where it is. And any foster parent can go to any training provided by any sponsoring agent.

MS. NEVILS: I have never seen anything like that from the Children's Alliance, because, you know, I would like to go to something like that. I have never seen anything like that in southeast Kansas been given.

It is obvious that this system that exists was,

**4** 

when it was put together, black Americans were not taken into consideration, when this was put together. I mean, that's obvious, anybody can see it. Because if it had been, some of the things that we're talking about would not exist.

Two, there is a conflict with African-American women and the white women in the system. They show more gratitude or they gravitate more to the black man if he's trying to -- maybe he wants to get his child back or whatever, they will play to that, but when it becomes an African-American woman, there is a conflict. I've had people over and over tell me, you know, the social worker doesn't like me, she talked to me rudely, she disrespects me. And this is happening over and over.

I know, if you pull, start a paper trail, you can find it over and over, and every woman will tell you that. And it's kind of hard because they don't know why it exists because we all women, but for some reason there's a vendetta, something going on, a secret order, that when it comes to black women dealing with white women and the children, they will gravitate more to a man if he's involved than a woman --

DR. MITCHELL: Let me see if I can ask a

question based on the comments.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25 complaints? Depends on the complaint, MS. MCKENNA:

What procedures do you have for handling

but if all else fails, Robena Farrell, the special assistant to the secretary gets involved and investigates and resolves it.

DR. MITCHELL: All right. I quess, being more specific, what rights do the foster parents have in terms of complaints with the agency as opposed to going to the court system, when it goes to the court system that's very different.

They can -- in Kansas, MS. McKENNA: foster parents are sponsored by private licensed child-placing agencies. So that agency is a resource to them. Because those agencies compete with each other for foster parents, they have the option, if that sponsoring agency isn't meeting their needs, they have the option of transferring to a different sponsoring agency. And then we, because we do business with those agencies, oversee their work and can follow up on concerns that aren't resolved within that.

The licensed child placing agencies and the foster parents are regulated by a different

executive branch agency, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, and they, too, will follow up on concerns.

DR. MITCHELL: Ms. Powell had a question.

MS. POWELL: Do you know what the percentage of your children are in the system because one or both of their parents are incarcerated, and if you know that, do you know what the ratio breakdown of those children are? And do those parents receive some kind of training or classes when they're coming back out of the system in order to help get their children back to them?

MS. McKENNA: I don't know the percentage of children whose parents are incarcerated. I do know that a long-term incarceration is one of the statutory criteria that can be considered in making a decision about termination of federal rights.

And that incarceration does not relieve staff of the obligation to maintain a child's connection to a birth parent, including visitation, and does not relieve staff of the obligation to provide the support necessary for a successful reintegration.

All of that will depend upon the reason for the incarceration and the length of time that

1	individual is expected to be in prison.
2	MS. POWELL: What do you consider the
3	long sentence for a parent to be terminated of
4	their rights?
5	MS. McKENNA: That would depend on the
6	age of the child and other circumstances in the
7	family, whether there were relatives available who
8	could care for the child. Many people who go to
9	prison are able to find substitute care for their
10	children that don't involve the state.
11	MS. NEVILS: I have one more question.
12	DR. MITCHELL: We have other people who
13	have questions. It's going into lunch. Mr.
14	Burnett.
15	MR. BURNETT: Couple of questions here.
16	And what I think is that
17	DR. MITCHELL: Let me make excuse me.
18	MR. BURNETT: My name is Will Burnett.
19	DR. MITCHELL: Excuse me, let me make one
20	statement. Let me address the panel. Please don't
21	force me to be rude and cut you off with testimony,
22	but please ask your questions.
23	Ask your question, please. Go ahead.
24	MR. BURNETT: Will Burnett. And to
25	moderator, I don't think I'm (inaudible) anyhow.

We really haven't asked a whole lot of questions, and I think we're not afraid but we don't want to offend anyone.

We have not come to grips with that of color with our level the administration, what we was talking about, and we do not have -- to me, this is me -- have the knowledge or the expertise to deal with all types of situations that you are confronted with.

My question to you is, how can we help to bring about the necessary changes from the administration all the way down to that of the social workers?

MS. McKENNA: I started out by saying how grateful I was that you were including us in the program, and I think that is what you can do. Being asked what you will do to help has kind of taken me aback, and I don't want to miss the opportunity. The light and the questions are helpful. I guess the other is to understand the complexity of child welfare, and the -- not -- and this, again, came up in the earlier, to not move to simple solutions or require simple solutions for very complicated problems.

MS. STASCH: I'm Marcia Stash, way down here.

DR. MITCHELL: Go ahead.

MS. STASCH: I have a question in that you spoke about training for your foster parents, and my question is, how do you — what method of notification do you have for these parents to find out about this training, where it is, what it is, and, also, oftentimes the training is not in the area in which they live, and, financially, this may be a hardship for them to get there, and if they're encouraged to go, what are your rulings or what do you do as far as financial assistance, also, because I'm hearing people say that they've never heard of this training; how do you get the word out?

MS. McKENNA: It goes out through the sponsoring agencies, and it's also available on the Children's Alliance website.

Foster parents are required to have a certain number of annual trainings a year, and each sponsoring agency works very hard to make sure that they each get that and they have opportunities that are convenient to them.

One of our sponsoring agencies host a conference every year where all the foster parents are brought in for the weekend to stay at a very

nice hotel, they're children are taken care of and 1 go to a separate conference, and they get their 2 annual hours, almost all of them in that weekend. 3 That's also rewards and luncheons and -- it's a 4 wonderful idea. But it varies, depending on the 5 sponsoring agency. And obviously, we need to do 6 7 better. MS. STASCH: I have just another 8 question, and this has to do with disabilities. 9 You have children that come in to your system that 10 have disabilities --11 MS. McKENNA: Yes. 12 MS. STASCH: -- of one form or another. 13 What do you do to train these foster parents on the 14 handling and dealing with children with various 15 disabilities? 16 MS. McKENNA: We actually recruit 17 specifically for that purpose, so that when a child 18 with disabilities comes in, the ideal is that we 19 have recruited someone with the skills needed to 20 meet that individual child's needs. 21 The other issue that comes up with disabilities 22 23 is parents with disabilities who are not parenting

24

25

in a way that -- who are parenting differently.

And that, too, is something that we need to work

with our staff about so that the disability itself 1 doesn't become the basis for removal, that we work 2 with the parent and provide support so that the 3 child and -- and this is not, there's not, in my mind, a competition between parent's rights and 5 children's rights. 6 7 Children need their parents, and we need to support children in remaining connected to those 8 9 parents. And right now we have two volunteers who are going through our training material for the 10 11 purpose of improving insensitivity to the needs and issues of disabled parents, parents with 12 13 disabilities. 14 DR. MITCHELL: We are running really 15 behind schedule so we need to move a little faster. 16 MS. FARRELL: I'm sorry for the 17 irregularity of this, but I work a little bit more with people that contact us and want to give input 18 19 into your system about things --20 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Would you speak 21 into the microphone? 22 DR. MITCHELL: You name, first. 23 MS. FARRELL: Yes. I'm Robena Farrell, 24 and I am the special assistant to the secretary, 25 Janet Shalonski (phonetic) for children's issues,

and I'm also the director of our customer service division.

And regarding just the concerns, the questions about what can people do to have input into our child welfare system, how can we work better together, I would just like to say that some of the concerns that are being expressed here today have been brought to our attention fairly recently, within the last couple of months, and I am very open to what has been told to me about things that we need to change. You know, the skin, education about skin, hair care, more cultural sensitivity. There's all kinds of things that we do need to learn and improve upon. And so we have different advisory boards and can receive input that way. We're considering that with some existing boards that we had.

We have the ability to connect people like Ms.

Nevils, I've talked to her about being a resource

for the Children's Alliance that does our training,

to learn from that, so there's all kinds of ways

that we can work together, and I think we need to

have some further discussions about the specifics

of that, and I'm certainly open to that.

We met with a group of disability advocates

that are concerned about how we are interacting 1 with parents with disabilities, you know, and that 2 we need more cultural sensitivity about that, and 3 we agree, that's something that's in our training a 4 little bit but not enough. So we're talking to 5 them about how to do those things. And we do have 6 to be open and continue to work with everybody that 7 has more information that we need to consider and 8 So, willing to talk more and utilize in our work. 9 set up more specifics is kind of a message I wanted 10 11 to convey. DR. MITCHELL: Yes. One more question. 12 We need to cut this off because there's a lunch. 13 14 MS. PERRY: In the state of Kansas, do they get legal advice from Legal Aid for the 15 parents and the grandmothers or grandfathers? 16 MS. FARRELL: Not necessarily from Legal 17 18 Aid. Parents have the right to have an appointed counsel, grandparents do not. 19 MS. PERRY: Grandparents do not? 20 21 MS. FARRELL: Grandparents are 22 automatically parties to the -- they're given 23 notice and the opportunity to appear and to retain counsel, but they don't -- they do not have the 24 25 right to appoint counsel in Kansas. Actually, it's

unusual, not all states appoint counsel for parents 1 from the very beginning. 2 DR. MITCHELL: Mr. Parker, do you have a 3 4 question? MR. PARKER: I'd like to ask one quick 5 thing here. Number one, how many total foster 6 homes do you have? And then, what's the routine, 7 the routine assignment for supervision? Is there 8 one supervisor for every 10 homes or 20 homes? 9 just want to know the routine thing. 10 11 MS. McKENNA: I don't have those numbers in my head or with me. 12 DR. MITCHELL: Could you provide them to 13 14 us? I certainly can. 15 MS. McKENNA: DR. MITCHELL: Yes, that will help. 16 17 We'll attach it to the record. Thank you very 18 much. 19 We're 20 minutes into our lunch schedule, so, 20 my suggestion is that we move on and press on, and 21 I will ask you, again, to please refrain from 22 testimony but ask your questions, and 23 presentations, please stay close to 10 minutes. We have one more before lunch, and that's Ms. 24 25 Linda Lewis.

MS. LEWIS: I'm getting hungry, too, so
I'll do my best to go rather quickly, but the
preceding presentations, I think, were
extraordinary in terms of bringing to light factors
that we are seeing across all of our states, so I
think that you're doing good work here bringing
these ideas forward.

My name is Linda Lewis, I'm the regional administrator for AFC here in Kansas City, and we're responsible for the child welfare programs in addition to a number of other programs.

We are also very grateful to be asked here today, and we hope that this discussion does help us, going to what the gentleman said at the end here, one of the best things that could happen out of this is somewhere along the line we figure out some way to work together, because we're dealing with a long-term problem here that is of great concern to us.

I've asked some people to join me because you may have some very practical question. Pat Brown works for ACF, she works for me. She's our regional expert on child welfare, and she's really our executive in charge of all of our state and tribal programs in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and

Nebraska. She was formally with the Missouri
Division of Family Services a number of years ago,
and we stole her because she knows an awful lot
about this stuff, and so we're very proud to have
her.

Fred Lang is my colleague who is the manager of the OCR's regional office. We may want to get into some discussion on the application of MEPA and Title 6 as they apply to this, and Fred's office is responsible for that and I'm very grateful he could come here today.

I think to move us along, let me give you, perhaps, just a couple of findings. I don't know how many of you looked at the Pew Commission report that came out this last week. If you haven't, I suggest you do that because it's a nice piece drawing together a whole lot of understandings about what's going on and, perhaps, some understandings of things that need to be done, generally, about foster care and adoption.

I was quite taken with it because it matches my knowledge and experience, and I've been in child welfare for 30 years. So for an old person, let me just tell you, this stuff makes some sense to me as I looked at it. It's a good report. I want to

send you to it.

When you look at that report, there's just a little piece of it that I think speaks to what we're worried about here today. First of all, the report tells us that kids, the number of kids in foster care has fairly stabilized. It's grown since the 1980s, but it's stabilized, and about a half a million of our nation's kids are in foster care, and that's just about a half a million too much if they're going to be there very long, for all kids. So just start with that.

The report went on with some statistics that I think framed the discussion in terms of, this is what really is out there, both nationally, and I want to tell you, it reflects a lot of what's going on in our four states of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska where we do our practice.

This report gives us a picture of disparity for children of color in foster care, especially
African-American kids. While children of color represent approximately 33 percent of all kids in the United States, they are 55 percent of the foster care population. Of these children,
African-American children face the gravest disparity. They are 15 percent of the national

Kansas City, MO 64108

population, and this is really hard to come to grips with. Yes, they are 38 percent of the foster care population.

The Pew Commission says that these disparities exist despite evidence that there are no differences in the incidence of child abuse and neglect, according to racial group. What we're really talking about here is when you look at foster care you can't look at it over here as a piece.

In front of foster care is what happens when children are in their own home, the entryway, and who has to go through that entryway, and that's something I don't want you to lose as you go through your work on this issue. These disparities exist at every stage of a child's journey through the foster care system. Children of color enter foster care at a higher rate, they stay longer, and they leave at a slower rate than white children. Children of color are also far less likely to be reunified with their parents. And this is something we have to think about.

Furthermore, there have been studies that indicates that children of color in foster care receive fewer services, are less likely to have

service plans, and visit with their parents less often. These children and their families receive fewer services prior to placement.

The question always is why is this going on, and I have to say, as was said before me, this particular picture, the numbers change but the proportions don't. And since the 80s, this has been sort of what we have seen as a basic picture.

The Pew Commission says that studies suggest varied and complex reasons, including limits on the use of kinship permanency option. I think

Ms. Charles referred to permanency or guardianship as one of the things that needs to be thought about, and the State of Illinois has done some tremendous work in that regard that has made a lot of difference for kids. It is not a common practice in our region.

The other issues, and I think we've touched on them, are the economic and social vulnerability of families of color. And then there's the issue of possible bias and certainly lack of cultural competence on the part of the staff. In this regard we're talking across all children of color, and that is something that we're seeing in our work.

MEPA, and I think some of the earlier presenters were referring to state and federal statutes, MEPA was enacted in '94, and it was amended by the Inter-Ethnic Adoption Provision, Section 1808 of the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996. This amendment, it removed some, what turned out to be somewhat misleading language in the original provision that spoke to the use of certain things as the sole purpose of different decisions.

In any event, what it really did was make quite clear that discrimination is not to be tolerated.

It also strengthened compliance and enforcement procedures, including withholding of federal funds and the right of the aggrieved individuals to seek relief in federal court.

The three mandates we have under MEPA do talk a little bit, it prohibits federally-funded agencies from delaying or denying a child's foster or adoptive placement on the basis of race, color, national origin of the child or the respective parent. It prohibits these agencies from denying prospective parents the opportunity to be foster parents or adopt a child on the basis of the respective parents and child's race, color or

national origin.

And this is the part that we've been talking about a lot, and it's the part that I think we tend to gravitate to in ACF. It requires states to diligently recruit foster and adoptive parents reflecting the racial and ethnic diversity of the children in the state who need foster and adoptive homes in order to remain eligible for federal child welfare assistance. And this has got to be part of the whole puzzle, otherwise this whole thing doesn't make an awful lot of sense.

Basically, the goal is decreasing the length of time. Anyone with a child knows you're only a child so long. You know, keeping a child in foster care without a sense of permanence until the age of 18, and God knows, it's probably going to be more than two moves along the path, is a horrendous fate for any child. And so this law is taking a look, and it is directing us to actually use this as a way to decrease the length of time to seek permanence.

It is also intended to help us really improve the matter of recruitment and retention of foster parents, and certainly, to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin of

the child or the prospective parents. And this goes back to how decisions are made. I'd like to just bring it to your attention. To be consistent with constitutional strict scrutiny standards for any racial or ethnic classification as well as MEPA, a child's race, color and national origin cannot be routinely considered as a relevant factor in assessing the child's best interest. Only in narrow and exceptional circumstances arising out of the specific needs of an individual child could these factors lawfully be taken into account. And this is the law that we must apply because it is the law.

MEPA, OCR and ACF have roles, which is why I was grateful Fred could be down here with me today. ACF administers the Title 4 Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Program, and that is about \$4.8 billion a year in our states, and it represents about 48 percent of all federal funding for child welfare.

The Delay and Deny Prohibitions are titled for E plan requirements. OCR has the authority, both under Title 6, and under MEPA, to pursue violations under MEPA and Section 1808.

Basically, how it works, OCR does predict

potential violations of the law upon referral from us, and we will refer, or from other sources.

Based on their investigation, ACF determines whether a violation under MEPA under Section 1808 has occurred. If it is, ACF assesses penalties against the state or requires the state to enter into a corrective action plan to change the illegal practice, or both, as we are required under regulation of law.

In closing, the best things that I think we started talking about today was perhaps the CFSR, the Children of Family Service Review. I have to say that you can't look at a piece of this system and try to fix only a part of it because the other part goes nuts. You know, you have to deal with this whole thing.

The CFSR, in my years of being with the federal and the state government, this is the first time I've felt fortunate enough to be part of something where I think we will have some change. This is a very powerful and intensive review, and we're real lucky I have with me a member of my staff, Roslyn Wilson, who is a member of the National Review Team that goes across the country reviewing states.

We've seen the beginning of change, kicking and

screaming, and sometimes very eagerly among our states, in response to this review. States have to give us a report. If they fail to meet their improvement goals, there's a penalty. We will go in after the two years, and you know, really

re-check and monitor what's going on.

I would say to you, and we are now, also, we're also the ones that set these stand rds we were talking about a little bit earlier. There's not a state in that country that has passed the CFSR. My boss, Wade Horn has said that we're not after C+ systems, we're after A systems. And I think maybe this is a place where the Commission could be a part of the action to help us try to think through these issues.

Anyway, all of our states have been reviewed, we reviewed all of the state in the country and we reviewed all the territories. We would be happy to share information on this and anything else that would help you.

Pat and Fred know a lot of more of the day-to-day advents, so they may be the ones who will be responding to a lot of your questions.

Thanks a lot, and we're open for anything you want to ask us.

DR. MITCHELL: Open for questions. 1 I have a question related MS. ROBINSON: 2 to probably Fred's jurisdiction. 3 Fred, what is the nature and extent of Title 6 4 complaints filed in regard to foster care issues? 5 Okay. By foster care, you're MR. LANG: 6 talking about the whole gamut, the removal of 7 children from their parents, or are you just 8 9 talking about --Just foster care. 10 MS. ROBINSON: Just foster care, period. MR. LANG: 11 We have not had -- once MEPA, the Multi-Ethnic 12 Placement Act of 1994 went into affect, we did not 13 receive any complaints until this past year. Prior 14 to that time we received all kinds of foster care 15 16 and adoption complaints, but once the law was, you know, passed, we guit receiving them. 17 18 MS. ROBINSON: What is that due to? MR. LANG: A lot of it is due to 19 20 outreach, a lot of it was related to the 21 frustration at the time. But prior to MEPA, of 22 course, race was a predominant consideration, and 23 we received a lot of complaints on that basis, but 24 at that time it was okay and the complainants did 25 not much appreciate that.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MS. PERRY: How did Kansas come out on the review, and how did the State of Missouri come out on the review?

THE COURT REPORTER: And what's your name?

MS. BROWN: My name's Pat Brown with the Administration of Children and Family. Actually, what Linda said, no state in the country passed their review. Kansas fared as well as the rest of the states in the nation, and better than the other states in our region. They met, I think, at least two of the national outcomes.

Of course, there was concerns about having a pool of diverse foster parents to meet the needs of kids, searching for relatives early on to make sure we're making appropriate placements up front.

Looking for fathers, absent fathers, not custodial fathers so that we can determine if those fathers could be potential placement for children. Those were some of the concerns that I remember as a part of the review. I was on the team in Wyandotte

County, and those are the ones that stick out in my mind. Roslyn, probably, knows some other big issues.

I think they're making great progress in their program improvement plan, as Roberta said, they're working on family centered issues. We were concerned about the lack of parents' involvement in their own case planning, you know, a worker bringing a plan to the parent and saying sign it, and the parent not being involved in determining what should be in that plan or the children being involved.

I can say that we interviewed -- when we do
these reviews, we actually interview everybody
that's involved in the case. So in Wyandotte
County we had 20 cases. We interviewed the foster
parents, the parents, the children, the school
system, the counselors, everyone that was involved
in the life of that child so we could determine any
problems that were there and any kind of issues
that we needed to deal with from the Federal
Government.

MS. PERRY: What about Missouri?

MS. BROWN: Missouri, we just completed. Missouri, I don't think, had any of the national outcomes that I'm aware of. We're in the process of working with them on development of a program improvement plan, so I can't talk more about it

because we've not even seen their -- I think we

just got the draft of their plan in.

DR. MITCHELL: Mr. Plummer.

MR. PLUMMER: Yes. Al Plummer, Missouri.

Ms. Lewis said, and you also said that no state

has passed the outcomes. What's the general reason

MS. BROWN: The standards are really strict, and they're strict because the state serves at a parent for the children, and we want the states to do a better job. I think a big problem in a lot of the states is they don't have enough workers, they don't have enough money, they don't have services, the right services for the parents to access so that the children can come home. But I don't think it's something we can let them off the hook on. It's something that's required to be able to move children for permanency and to ensure that they can become self sufficient adults.

for that? And what can be done to get that turned

MR. PLUMMER: Does the Department of
Health and Human Services and/or the Federal
Government provide any type of funding to help
states rise to the level to meet these initiatives?

MS. BROWN: Well, we have quite a bit of

Kansas City, MO 64108

around?

money going into the state. We have, first, the Title 4 refunds, and those funds can't be used for services, but they're the funds that are used to reimburse foster parents maintenance costs and incidental costs for children in care, so it's the room and board payments for children in care.

In addition, states get 4-B dollars from the Federal Government, and these 4-B dollars can be used for any type of services they deem appropriate in their child welfare system. They also receive adoption -- we call them Family Preservation Funds to work with parents, to keep parents, to keep families intact. They get child abuse treatment dollars to help with child abuse and neglect investigations and training of staff. So there is many, many funding streams of dollars that go into the state. Not as many dollars for treatment as there are for maintenance of children in the system.

MR. PLUMMER: One more question.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MR. PLUMMER: Where I'm going with this is, and maybe my question should have been more specific. Since these outcome initiatives have been implemented, has the Federal Government added

additional money to help with the implementation at the state and local level? And my rationale goes, oh, for the last 20 some odd years now, the Federal Government has been telling us about how well they're doing in cutting the federal budget, passing the responsibility down to state and local government and not providing any funds for those responsibilities.

MS. LEWIS: Let me help you out on this one. I understand where you're going. First, they have to understand, the open-ended fund. It is about the last remaining open-ended fund, and we certainly hope it remains that take way. That means that we will match, on a certain percent basis, whatever a state is spending. So that's not affected by any budgetary decisions, and that's really rather critical.

That money also pays for training. And it also pays for a lot of the work of case workers, although not service, actual therapeutic types of services. It's a really key thing, so that's a really important piece of funding. And all of the child welfare stuff is federal, state, you know, to the degree to which states put up money, except for Title 4, to the degree to which states put up

money, we will match their money. We do not see the need to add additional money, per se, to say this is money to fix what's wrong. We have money there that needs to be invested. There's a lot -- like I said, there's \$4.8 billion, nationally, on foster care.

I pointed to the PEW Commission report because one of the things that I think would help on money is a different way of using Title 4-E. The money right now is at the back end of the system. If I were to say what's important is you have to create more money at the front end. You know, you got to do things so parents don't go to jail. You got to do things so that kids can stay home. You certainly got to do things so kids got families to go home to, if at all possible. The best thing for any kid is to be with their own family, that's where we have to start. We have to guard that with all our might. That's the part of this that's really very important.

The administration had a proposal in congress, it's still floating around there, to create a type of thing like this. However, it would close the end of Title 4-E, make it a closed-ended fund, and so therefore that's very contentious.

The PEW Commission is proposing that we as states do better. We take the differences between what they used to spend on foster care and what they're currently spending and let them use that money for the prevention type of services. That's a thing we did in the 80s. I was familiar with it and I worked under that particular paradigm and it worked quite well.

But to talk to funding, that's really where we have to go, I think. We have to have a stable, not just a quick fix kind of thing, we have to have a stable way of really meeting the needs of families. And families have a tough time out there, you know.

If you're a single mom, your chances of making it through in today's world, it's only through God's good grace that things work out as well as they do, and there's work that we have to do to really help families stay families. And after 30 years I've got to tell you, fix broken things, you're not always going to succeed real well. Your best chance is, don't let it get broke, and that's what I want to turn to.

DR. MITCHELL: What is the penalty for non-compliance?

MS. BROWN: Right now there are seven

outcomes and seven systemic factors. And for each outcome that they're out of compliance is 1 percent of their 4-E dollars and 4-B dollars. And so there's seven -- so they can be out of compliance, if they're out of compliance with everything it would be 14 percent of their money.

DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

DR. THOMPSON: I have a question about — this is the third time in about 10 years that the area where I'm a provider has gone through a rash of closing African-American foster homes. And I was wondering, do you have anything in the federal system that triggers that, okay, Missouri is closing, and there are so many foster homes, and these are African-American homes, what's going on here.

Do you have anything that triggers that kind of statistic, because once the Social Services decides to act out against a foster home or any other kind of provider, there seems to be like there is no recourse. And so I was wondering if anything on the federal level allows some oversight for that.

MS. BROWN: No, we don't get any statistics. The only thing we do have on the

federal level is the adoption and foster care 1 reporting system, and that mainly tracks all kids 2 that come into the system and the movement of those 3 children and their case plans and --Just the children? DR. THOMPSON: 5 MS. NEVILS: I have a question. 6 7 MR. LANG: Well that is one thing that we would be interested in. That's discrimination. 8 mean, if they're just doing it to the families of 9 10 color and not to the majority families, then, yeah, that's something we would be most interested in. 11 I hate to say this, and people hate me for 12 13 saying it, but we don't care how bad the treatment 14 is or the service is, what we want to say is that 15 there is equal treatment in it. So if you're going 16 to start cutting black families, then there better 17 be majority families being cut out, too. MS. NEVILS: I have a question. 18 Nevils from Wichita, Kansas. 19 20 You know, with the Brown versus the Board of 21 Education, it was a great change for children, and 22 Kansas was in the forefront. I'm only saying, with 23 the system, that Kansas appears to be a

24

25

child-friendly state. Let's keep it like that, you

know, instead of having all these things that are

happening that should not happen. But, I also want 1 to ask the question. 2 I understand that the president signed into 3 existence a bill about adoption, that he's doing 4 some new things in adoption, some new incentives. 5 Are you aware of what they are yet, in adoption. 6 7 MR. LANG: I bet they are. I'm not. Let 8 me back up. Luckily, we are on the same MS. BROWN: 9 floor so we can talk to each other. 10 MR. LANG: Yes. 11 MS. BROWN: Yes, for some time we've had 12 13 an adoption incentive. Actually, it was five years 14 ago, and gave the states incentives for adopting children with special needs and children who were 15 16 4-E eligible. And with the current bill, it also 17 now provides incentives to the states for adopting 18 older children. So a state can get up to, probably 19 about \$6000, based on, you know, if that's a 20 special needs child or an older child, per child. 21 MS. NEVILS: Where can you get that 22 information from? 23 MS. BROWN: You can request it. We can 24 send it to you. 25 MS. NEVILS: I would really like that. Ι

just think there are answers to the questions that 1 are happening right now in the system. It can be 2 fixed, everybody wants it to be fixed, but the way 3 it's going right now, it's really hard on 4 African-Americans to really get a fair -- I mean, 5 to get a fair shot. I mean, with the parents, the 6 7 foster parents, the system's broke. That's a good ending 8 DR. MITCHELL:

statement. I think we need to go to lunch. Thank you very much.

11

12

10

9

## (Lunch Recess)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. MITCHELL: Call the session to order. Session 3. To commemorate the 1954 Brown versus Board of Education, we'll have a discussion on the decision and it's influence/impact on public education today. It is one of the major concerns of most of us, is that after 50 years, we still ask questions.

So the first person this afternoon is Doctor Normal Yetman, Chancellors Club Teaching Professor of American Studies and Sociology, University of

Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. Doctor Yetman.

24

DR. YETMAN: Thank you. It's a pleasure

and honor for me to be here. This is my first time before the Civil Rights Commission. I have attended a number of meetings of the National Civil Rights Commission in Washington, so it's a real honor for me to participate. I'm also honored to be able to at least be paired with Charles Scott, who I knew 40 years ago. Well, 30, 35 years ago. DR. MITCHELL: He must have been just a pup.

DR. YETMAN: 35 years ago when he was a student at K.U. and we were involved together in trying to pressure the administration to create a black studies department, which today is the Department of African American studies. And I also want to acknowledge Charles. I know he can speak on his own, but I would acknowledge the legacy that he bears with that name, the importance of the struggle for equality in the 20th Century that ultimately lead to Brown.

I've asked myself, what can I add that hasn't been said, especially with the kind of celebrations been going on all over the country, and in particular, I've seen several things on C-Span, we had a national conference at Lawrence on the subject, we had the commemoration at Monroe School

in Topeka last week, so what could I add to all
this? And I'm still not sure. So my comments -- I
notice that you wanted to keep the comments to

10 minutes, I had prepared a 40-minute
presentation, so I'll try to reduce it to

10 minutes today, but I want to make a few
comments. Maybe I can take it really out of -- put
it in the context of the course that I taught this
semester.

A couple years ago when I recognized that this was going to mark the 50th anniversary of the Brown decision, I decided, as I do in most of my courses, to try to take materials that are in the news every day. And so I thought, during this semester, this last spring semester, the nature of Brown is going to be in the news all the time, so why not capitalize on that and offer a course simply on Brown versus Board of Education. And so that's what I spent this semester doing.

And I want to acknowledge here, I have one of the young men who worked with me on this course, Cornelious Minor (phonetic), who was -- we had about 300 students in this class. I had discussion sessions with the upper-division students and he was one of the graduate teaching assistantship

assistants who had discussions with undergraduates, and we worked very closely on the course throughout the semester.

The course is organized, basically -- and it's not simply a course but I think that it will raise some questions about what the real meaning and implications of Brown are. I organized the course, really, kind of as Ted Shaw, the head of the NAACP Liberal Defense fund put it, I raised questions about organizing it BC and AD, before Brown and after Brown.

So the before Brown treatment of the historical social cultural and legal background of the case and the case itself was the first half of the semester. Then we had the national conference in March, and then the second half dealt with the subsequent 50 years in trying to assess what the legacy and impact of that was.

Now the experience of teaching this class of over 300 overwhelmingly white students, and one of the things that we've talked about is why the number of white students, and students of color, in general, in African-American studies, in particular, was as low as it is. And I have been teaching it as African-American Relations at KU for

now 38 years, so I do have some experience and have had some contacts, and we were curious as to why there weren't more. But at any rate, there were over 300 overwhelmingly white students in this class. Or I should say there were a class of 300 students that was overwhelming white.

Most of the students, I'm sure, came into the class with some notion of Jim Crow, of slavery and Jim Crow. And as a matter of fact, many of those had exaggerated notions of what was involved. But they were aware that it was the immorality, the tragedy, the moral depravity of slavery, and Jim Crow, and the political disenfranchisement of the humiliation and violence that undergirded the system.

And I think that they were able to comprehend that relatively easily, although I think our discussion of it elaborated their understanding of it, because I always put it in the context of trying to see the people in the 19th Century who were slave owners, let's say, and ask the question, how could moral people accept that form of inequality? Was it because they were more amoral than we are? Or is there parallels to our moral sense in the 20th century? In other words, how can

2

3

4

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we accept the social inequalities that exist in

American society today? What enables us to do this

without them violating our sense of conscious?

The fact that the system of Jim Crow was so unequivocally wrong, unambiguously wrong, I think was relatively easy for them to comprehend. was difficult for them to comprehend the morality of such a system. And therefore, most were prepared, I believe, to fully embrace what can only be called, what I think can be called, the triumphalist narrative of Brown. Not simply a simplistic solution that Oliver Brown was angered that his young daughter couldn't attend a school right next door, and so he went out and single-handedly began the campaign that ultimately led to Brown, which incidentally is not a distorted -- which is a distorted notion, but is not a notion that is not widely held.

I saw a program here in Kansas City on one of the local stations that was a feature on Brown about two weeks before the commemoration on May 17th, and that is exactly what they did. They focused all of their time on Oliver Brown and his family. Not even Cheryl Brown Henderson, his daughter, today, would argue that. As a matter of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fact, she argues precisely the opposite. And that is, what is significant about the Brown case in terms of African-American participation was the fact that it was a collective enterprise, it was a collective phenomen. It had involved nearly 200 plaintiffs. It had involved -- responses of violence and terrorism. It was not simply one man who went out and tried to change the world on behalf of his daughter.

They were able to see the complexity, I think, of that. But it seems to me that one of the things that's wrong with the way in which we see this case, in many respects, is that it becomes a heroic story of incremental and inexorable progress, almost a steady trajectory, as though things are always getting better, and there is a notion that we're going to project that trajectory into the future. And in many respects, it reenforces for students who came in my class this, I think, sometimes unconscious and unquestioned faith in American values and in the American democratic system, the American democratic process, and especially in the American judicial process, and the belief that at sometime down the road, in some undefinite future, the dream of a racially

egalitarian society is going to be realized.

It also enables them to think, to have a sense of their own -- and I should say our own, my own -- essential goodness, and a recognition where they can recognize the contradictions between their professions of equality, brotherhood and commitment to social justice that lead them to embrace it, ultimately.

Unfortunately, it seems to me that this triumphalist narrative conveys this impression of a steady, if at times, hesitant movement, but ignores many of the realities that have occurred both during that process leading up to Brown, but also in the subsequent years, but it also contributes, I think, very importantly, to the notion that many of them embraced, coming into the class, and we had some feedback from them, this is one of the beliefs that they had, was that when Brown was handed down, suddenly and miraculously and almost overnight, the racial landscape of American society changed, and that discrimination and segregation were no longer realities in American society.

It contributes, therefore, this kind of celebratory narrative, contributes to the notion that because the courts had outlawed the most

egregious, horrific forms of de jure segregation, blacks had equal opportunities made available to them, and therefore -- and this becomes important, I want to talk about it in a few moments -- therefore, any gaps that remain, any inequalities that remain between black and white or other minority groups and the mainstream white population, quote, unquote, mainstream white population, are attributable primarily to the failures of the minority rule. And this is an issue that I wanted to try to engage with them throughout the semester.

Now, real quickly, and the issue that I discussed with Farella when she finally twisted my arm to talk was, when we were creating the conference that we had at K.U. on Brown, talking about its planning, in the course of the conversation someone said, "Well we have to focus on education," and someone else responded to that by saying, "No, the Brown case wasn't about education, per se, it was about race." And I'm going to take that a little bit further, to certainly acknowledge, in fact, that it really was about race, about the enduring and continuing significance of race in American Life.

But for most -- and here again, I was able to preach to that 294 student population in my class who were white, for most white Americans, race means other folks. It means black folks, in particular, but other folk. It doesn't mean us. And for at least those who aren't white for most of American history, race problems, quote, unquote, as in the subtitle Gunner Myrdal's classic, American Dilemma, was the Negro problem. You can go on and on and on, and I have a number of examples that I can cite of people who are talking about, quote, unquote, looking at the racial minority as being the problem when what I would try to argue with them is that it is really a white problem.

Derick Bell, the Harvard, now, I think, NYU or Columbia law professor, in response to the commission that Bill Clinton appointed to try to begin an engagement, and you're probably all familiar with that engagement attempt, that Bill Clinton had to have an engagement on the issues of race. When he created that commission, Derick Bell said, the really critical question that the commission, and by application, all Americans should address is, "What does it mean to be white?"

as economic and social facts of life.

So this is the thrust of what I attempted to do, is to turn this around. Not certainly look essentially about the way in which African-Americans, in particular, played this absolutely critical role, almost uniquely critical role in the development of the Brown decision, and the declaration that segregated facilities are inherently unequal, but I also wanted to look about the ways in which the role that whites had played in resisting that notion and have resisted since that time, the ways in which whites had created the majority, I'm really talking about, and my book is entitled Majority and Minority, which I really look at majority groups as being the source of the

A lot of examples of that, and I won't belabor them, you go all through American history, but one of the ones I think that we could look at was the way in which the notion of how "the people" are pictured.

problem in this society, not the minority groups.

Time and time and time again, the resistence in the post-Brown era, the resistence to Brown was, the assertion was made that, well, the people won't accept it. It seems to me that that notion of the

people never, prior to that time, prior to recently, has involved non-white people. And what is significant about Brown is that it forced us to recognize that phenomenon.

Now even Brown itself, however, it seems to me, acquiesce to the definition of whites, or deferred to Whites, particularly in Brown 2. And that is in the 1955, with all deliberate speed, assertion. In other words, they were advocating to the perceived response that whites would have rather than going ahead and saying, if there is a wrong here, it must be righted.

I think there's a legal principal, at least there should be, that if there's no right, if there is no remedy, there is no right. And yet, when in Brown 2, what the court in deferring to white southerners refused to implement their decision on segregated facilities were inherently unequal and did it with all deliberate slowness, it seems to me, they, therefore, denied an entire generation of students, of black students of their legal rights, and that the enduring effects of this are persist. Now that's one of the main things I talk about.

The second half of the course was designed to do, first, two things. First of all, to challenge

white student normalizing of their own experiences, what could be called their unconscious assumption of their whiteness. In other words, most students are -- most white students are totally aware of the fact that they are the ones who are part of the definition of the standards in society. They see themselves -- they see people other than themselves as different and not conforming to the norm.

I also wanted them to look about their assumptions of social inequalities that continue today. And to trace the changes in American Life in the post Brown era and to access the extent to which the promise of Brown had been realized.

Critical to both of these objectives was to get them to confront the significance of the Brown issue and for raising the idea of quality to preeminence of American Life. One of the things I think Brown did, critical thing, and it almost seems self evident, but Brown was not simply about education or even about race, it was about the meaning of equality, the meaning of equality that was found in the declaration of independence, in —certainly in Lincoln's Gettysburg address, it's bringing that notion to the fore and serving as a dominant principle.

Brown was a historic decision, it seems to me, not only for blacks but the notion after equality and the idea of equality under the law, and therefore raise the question of how we're going to continue to implement

Now, in his talk at K.U., Ted Shaw also talked about, when he was asked to assess the present, he used the quote -- I love this and I couldn't improve upon it so I've appropriated it, as I do with many things. He appropriated from Charles Dickens the beginning of a Tale of Two Cities. "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times."

There have been, and I don't think there's any doubt there have been dramatic changes in American life. And most apologists would point to these. But, it seems to me, Brown did not eliminate the dramatic inequalities that exist between racial categories in American Life. Instead, the notion of de jure segregation, and we all know this, and discrimination has been replaced by de facto segregation and discrimination.

Issues have become much more complex, more ambiguous, more subtle. And the explanations for, the persistence of what Jonathan Kozol in his powerful book, Savage Inequalities, have become

framed in some of the most cherished of American 1 ideals, such as the equality of opportunity, 2 freedom, autonomy and democracy.

> In many respects, given the kind of savage inequality that continues to exist in American Life today, 50 years after Brown, we're not simply back to pleasant, and separate but equal. At least at that time one could look and see that there -there was an explanation for the savage inequalities, dramatic differences between the conditions of income, education, wealth among black and white in American society.

> Today, it seems to me, we live in a situation that's more damming and more devastating, in many ways, because the reality today is separate and unequal, continues to be separate and unequal, only we now live with a fiction of equality. words, the fiction of equality -- I shouldn't say the fiction, the ideal of equality that was pronounced in Brown is now accepted, I believe, by the vast majority of the American people.

So separate and unequal today are more devastating precisely because the causes of de facto segregation and discrimination aren't so apparent. They're hidden, they're not

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

acknowledged. And the inequalities that exist 1 don't elicit the same sense of moral outrage and 2 compassion that was directed by critics at the Jim 3 Crow system if at the time, and certainly in 4 retrospect. My students become morally outraged by 5 the Jim Crow system, and yet they cannot see the 6 realities of discrimination in American society 7 today. How do Americans come to accepted these 8 dramatic social inequalities? 9 I want to just introduce very quickly, then 10

I want to just introduce very quickly, then
I'll quit, and we'll talk about your assignment for
today. These are questions I put on my final exam.
I think they'll be useful as a way of getting at
some of these issues.

One of the things that I tried to argue was that all systems of social inequality require an etiology, a set of ideas, a system of ideas to explain or justify, to legitimate these inequalities.

Slavery, for instance, was justified both biblically and by science, a way of saying, this is the way God intended it or this is just scientifically the way it should be, or the way it is.

Today, how do we explain the continuation of

25

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the law lon acc

these inequalities? We can't attribute them to the law, quote, unquote. The de jure segregation is no longer constitutional, they must, therefore, according to this logic, be the responsibility or the result of individual responsibility, or the individuals or the groups that are, themselves, the minorities.

This notion is known as a meritocratic etiology. And a meritocratic etiology invokes notions of equality to explain inequality. It asserts that a society or a social system characterized by equality of opportunity exists. So it takes the whole notion of equality and says that we live in a society of equality of opportunity and, therefore, the folks who haven't made it have the same opportunities as everybody else but they just ain't trying out there. It's their fault, in other words. So translated to an explanation for racial inequality, this meritocratic etiology includes several assumptions.

First of all, that discrimination no longer exists. And secondly, that minorities are responsible for their own disadvantage. And thirdly, that any kind of special programs, such as I was discussing with one of my colleagues here

today, any kind of special programs, such as hiring your son to succeed you as the head coach of the Oklahoma state basketball team --

DR. MITCHELL: Stop there.

DR. THOMPSON: Or the president of the United States.

DR. YETMAN: -- is no longer necessary.

At any rate, this meritocratic etiology is widespread in American society, particularly among the white students that I have in my classes. And what I try to do in my class, therefore, is to directly address the realities of those assumptions.

It's interesting going. For a number of students it has been extraordinarily rewarding, because you suddenly see that light go off over their head. And I've seen, in one particular student, Corni and I had one particular student who came in to the right of a Till of the Hun, and she, she was adamant about the fact that her dad had made it on his own, and by dam, even though he had — he worked his way up, you know, from nothing, pulled himself by his own book straps, he was, therefore, able to send her to that private school so she didn't have to go to Wichita —

North, is it? I don't know. East or north. 1 therefore, by dam, she deserved it. That notion is 2 widespread in American society. 3 It seems to me it's one of the issues that we 4 have to address. But we have to address it, it 5 seems to me, in what I'm arguing, we have to 6 address it genuinely in multi-racial kinds of 7 settings. Not situations of which black folk are 8. 9 there -- minority people are there to tell whites, to educate whites. But rather, to have us whites 10 be in a position of trying to educate other whites. 11 And that's why I think human relations commissions 12 13 should have special sessions that they devote 14 specifically to educating the community to the realities of these kinds of things in America. 15 16 I'll quit now, because I've gone on longer than 17 I had anticipated, but I hope that -- well we can 18 talk about your exam, okay? Thank you very, very 19 much. 20 DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 21 DR. MITCHELL: Yes. 22 DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm Doctor 23 Cora Thompson from Missouri. 24 DR. YETMAN: Hi.

25

DR. THOMPSON: And I was listening to the

discoveries that you made among your students, and 1 I have two question. The first is, did you find 2 that the arrogance and assumptions of white 3 supremacy combined with calling America as a 4 reference to the United States, as if it were the 5 whole deposit of America? 6 DR. YETMAN: I think that that's part of 7 the -- I think that's part of the whole notion of 8 what I'm talking about, is that notion that when we 9 define ourselves -- when we define America, we're 10 defining white Americans as representing it. 11 DR. THOMPSON: But you're talking about 12 it as -- it seems to me you're really talking about 13 the United States rather than America, and --14 DR. YETMAN: Yeah, I'm talking about --15 16 DR. THOMPSON: -- I would challenge that the rest of the countries in America would have 17 18 these same notions. DR. YETMAN: No, I'm talking about the 19 20 United States. No, I'm talking about the United 21 States. 22 DR. THOMPSON: And my other question is, 23 are you aware of or do you have knowledge of the 24 retention rates for African-American students at

25

K.U. and the graduation rates as opposed to the

T	admission races:
2	DR. YETMAN: I know that the the only
3	thing I know, and I don't have the most recent
4	data, I know that this has been an issue that has
5	been of great concern at K.U., as in many other
6	universities throughout the country.
7	The latest report that I saw and, again, it's
8	not very clear in my own mind, was that the
9	administration, and this is the administration's
10	line, that they were crowing about the fact that
11	they had improved their potential rates rather
12	dramatically.
13	DR. THOMPSON: Is that no?
14	DR. YETMAN: I don't know. No, it's
15	either yes nor no. All I'm saying is I don't know
16	the specific data. I do know that it's not an
17	insignificant problem, put it that way.
18	DR. THOMPSON: And what about your own
19	department, the Chancellors Club, Professor of
20	American Studies and Sociology
21	DR. YETMAN: Correct.
22	DR. THOMPSON: are there
23	African-American teachers who are members of this
24	club?
25	DR. YETMAN: No. And you point,

specifically, to an area that we have been very 1 concerned about that we have sought to address. 2 have -- in our department we have a native American 3 and we have, next year we will have an Asian 5 American. Other questions? DR. MITCHELL: 6 MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Missouri.

> Doctor Yetman, now that we've had some 50 odd years or so to play Monday morning quarterback on Brown, if you were to go back and implement the changes that came out of the decision, what would you do differently?

DR. YETMAN: I should have written a book called "What Brown Should Have Said." Implicit in one of the comments that I made was, that I think that the Brown 2 decision should have been immediate; that it should not have called for all deliberate speed. Because, although it would have raised the fire storm, it still created a fire It simply enabled many school districts to put off desegregation for 15 years, if not till 1969, that many of the school districts were fully desegregated. That would be one thing. I think that would be the major thing that I would do.

> DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

25

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 MR. PARKER: George Parker, Columbia,
2 Missouri.

DR. YETMAN:

Have you seen that movie, Separate But Equal?

Don't know if I have.

MR. PARKER: I just happened to accidentally tune in on it. It was the story of the Supreme Court making the decision on Brown, and I thought it was so good. I couldn't remember where I saw it 20 years ago or what, it's an old movie, but it was such a good story I wanted all my grandkids to see what happened there. It was telling how the old southern judge said that if he voted for it that it would cause a revolution, and they held out until they got a unanimous vote, and

so on. But it's a tremendous story, I thought, and

I wanted to get a copy so my grandkids could all

DR. YETMAN: Well I recommended the book by Richard Kluger that we used in my course this semester that talks about the way in which Earl Warren, who did not have a particularly stellar record civil liberties when he assumed that the chief justiceship. It talked about the way in which he used his own personal power. He wasn't a great lawyer, he wasn't a great intellect or a

see it.

great thinker, but he used his own personal charm,
political persuasion, to get a unanimous court,
which was not easy because four of the justices
were southerners.

MR. PARKER: I wonder if anybody in the room had seen that movie?

DR. YETMAN: Well there have been a number of those like that. Let me just say that I gave out that exam to you, these are questions I had on my final exam, simply because I'd be interested in your responses to it. And I might say that one of my colleges who's extremely knowledgeable in black history didn't get any of them. This is simply because I think that the issues that are addressed there are continuing ones.

The first question: "Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on an equal basis." This could well have been, it is not but it could well have been taken from Terry Bullock's decision in Kansas within the last month, which he handed down a decision saying that the manner -- the distribution of funds -- and this gets to the wonderful comments that were made this

morning by the two superintendents of schools, I thought that they were outstanding, an I said to some friends, I feel intimidated because of the quality of their presentation, because they addressed precisely the kinds of issues that come out of Brown. Those are issues that are emanating from Brown. But the issue is that the way in which funds are distributed at the state level, which is the primary place in which education in our society — public education, K through 12 is undertaken, is at the state level, that's where the responsibility lies.

Primary mechanism for the inequalities that emerge is the system of the distribution of funds, which is based upon local property taxes. And to the extent to which the state -- and I praise, what's her name -- Ms. Davison-Cohen, she did say -- well the one thing, couple things she said. She said, well, districts are providing the best education that that district could provide. And my argument is, that education is not simply a district responsibility, it's a state responsibility. And I did praise her when she said, and I wrote this down, state governments have responsibilities.

And in the state of Kansas right now, my state, the state legislature has been ignoring, just ignoring completely that responsibility. And so then it falls by default, in the same way it did with the Brown case, if the legislature and the executive had come along and done their job, there would have been no need for Brown. And the same way now that judiciary in Kansas is attempting to write the inequities that characterize the differences between Wyandotte County, Kansas City schools, and Blue Valley North, or Blue Valley and Shawnee Mission Districts.

So those words were not taken from Terry
Bullock, those words were taken from Brown versus
Board of Education. And I think it's critical,
this is the law of the land, according to the 54
case, where the state has taken to provide the
opportunity for education, it is a right which must
be made available to all on an equal basis, and
that gets to my notions of equality.

DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes. Question, yes,

DR. THOMPSON: I have one more question.

You mentioned in your text of your presentation

please.

that it was incumbant, using my own words, not trying to quote you, it was incumbant upon good white folk to teach and train other white folks so that they would have some kind of conscious raising and change of attitude. How do you propose that happen?

DR. YETMAN: I think — it was interesting at the Brown conference, at the Brown commemoration, I sat way in the back, I wasn't one of those VIP's that got their tickets through the two senators and congressmen and that kind of thing, but anyway, I sat, and I tried to ask people why they were there, to find out what their motivation was for coming. A lot of people came to that because the president of the United States was there, and they had their "Four More Years" buttons on.

One of the couples I talked to were both educators, and they were both educators in secondary schools. And without any prompting, they talked about the ways in which the kind of materials that they were using in their schools to try to address this. I think it's got to be something that begins in nursery school, and not just as I'm doing, and I've been trying to do for

the last 38 years at the university level. 1 it's got to be something that is done as an 2 integral part of the curriculum, that it's a 3 required part of the curriculum, to try to address 4 these issues in the most sophisticated and pathetic 5 way as possible, and that's a very general kind of 6 7 I don't know if I could be any more specific than that. But I know that there are 8 programs at the Southern Poverty Law Center where 9 10 the publication that they have called Teaching 11 Tolerance is one of the sources of materials that I 12 think is excellent for that kind of thing. DR. MITCHELL: Okay, well thank you very 13 14 much. 15 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Could we get an 16 answer to the other two question? 17 DR. YETMAN: You bet. The second one was 18 part of the Brown case from Clarendon County, South 19 Carolina, but I think it could be equally 20 applicable to any of those school districts you 21 talk about. 22 And the final one was the dissent in the Plessy 23 versus Ferguson decision. 24 DR. MITCHELL: Mr. Charles Scott. 25 MS. SCOTT: Okay, thank you.

I wish to give thanks to the Commission for inviting me to this event, and I'm truly honored and pleased to be here. Quite frankly, I'm here because Charles Scott, Senior could not be here.

And that's the only reason that I am here. In fact, I would prefer, for a personal reason, I wish he was here to speak to you directly.

So in any event, when I speak about Brown, I have to speak about Brown from the historical prospective from both Charles Scott, Senior, my father and my grandfather, Elija Scott. I'm here to give you some legal, historical prospective and what I would contend Brown portends for the future.

I can stand before you, unequivocally, and state that, had it not been for the life and career of Elija Scott, Senior and Charles Scott, Senior, that the case we know of Brown v. Board of Education simply would not have occurred. I mean, there would not have been a Brown v. Board of Education decision. Because the Brown decision was the natural and inevitable progression of the career of Elija Scott and Charles Scott, Senior.

Elija Scott began his legal career in 1916, when he graduated from law school. And at that time he dedicated his entire career, life, if you

will, to combatting segregation and discrimination and securing justice and equality not only for African-Americans, but all historically disenfranchised people in Kansas and throughout the country.

He took on cases that constituted personal danger to himself, quite frankly, no other attorney would take, white or black. And many of those cases were in the deepest part of the south, South Carolina, Texas, deepist part of Texas.

I say that because Brown case, the decision that -- I'm talking about the case that was filed in Topeka, was built upon the legacy and the cases that he had litigated decades before Brown, the Brown decision. I want to say a lot about Brown because there's been a lot of misinformation, quite frankly, which Doctor Yetman touched on a few.

But in any event, one of the early cases that was the precursor or laid the foundation for the Brown, or at least had laid the momentum, not necessarily the legal precedent, but laid the momentum for the Brown case that was filed in.

Topeka, that was the case of Webb V School District of Merriam, Kansas, which is just a few miles to the west of here. And that was a case where Elija

Scott and my father, Charles Scott, had brought against the School District of Merriam, Kansas to gain access for the black children to the South Park Elementary School.

In 1948, the School District of Merriam had constructed a state-of-the-art brand new school district, grade one through eight, with a gymnasium, music room, even a science room, a teacher for each class, and whereas the 50-some black students in the school district were required to attend, literally, a one-room shack with outdoor bathroom and had two teachers teaching eight grades, and they were not college educated. In fact, one of the teachers didn't even have a high school education.

Well when a lady named Ester Brown and the citizens approached Elija Scott and my father, their initial request was to bring some type of legal action just to propel the school district to repair the school that was provided for black children to attend.

Well, Elija Scott and Charles Scott made the decision to challenge the legality of segregating the students by race in the school district itself. So they brought an action in 1948 which found that

the Merriam School District had unlawfully, contrary to Kansas law at that time, segregated the students by race, and the following year the Supreme Court of Kansas ordered the admission of the black students to that school.

Now, the Brown case was filed for years at Topeka. When I say years, from 1948 all the way until the case was filed in 1951, the local NAACP had made numerous pleas with the local school district of Topeka to integrate the school system. There were petitions to the school board, but those pleas, like Moses' plea, "Let My People Go" fell on deaf ears.

The decision in 1951 was made to mount a legal challenge to the segregation of the public schools. The matter was referred over to the Scott Law Firm of Elija Scott, my father, Charles Scott, his Uncle John Scott, and attorney named Charles Bledso.

There were three theories that were initially put forth in the Brown case that was filed in Topeka. One was that black children were denied an equal education under the doctrine of separate but equal enunciated under the Plessy. And as all of you know is that, in Plessy, the Supreme Court in 1896 declared that a state can provide separate

facilities on the basis of race so long as those facilities are, quote, comparably equal.

Well that argument was actually made in the Brown case in Topeka. And the inequality of education on that basis, as it was argued, was that black children had to endure burdens and hardships to receive an education that were not imposed upon white children, because black children were required to attend schools outside of their neighborhood at a great distance, provide their own transportation, whereas white children did not.

I mean, there was extensive testimony that black children had to arrive to their designated school two hours before school started and got home two or three hours after school was out on public transportation by themselves. I can't imagine that any parent today would allow a 6 or 7 year old to ride a bus by themselves clear across town, but that's what the children had to endure at that time. And there were some other discrepancies.

The other argument was that black children were denied an equal education under the equal protection clause as the court had historically interpreted the equal protection clause. That is, that a state cannot differentiate or classify its

citizens unless their classification of

differentiation is rationally based and serves some

legitimate state interest. Obviously, segregation

and education on the basis of race was clearly

irrational, and it serves no legitimate interest

except prejudice against the Negro children, as

they were described.

However, the argument that carried the day, and that has merited much debate and discussions since then, was that segregation imposed by law, sanctioned by law, imposed a bad inferiority upon the black child, or as they were called then, the Negro child, and had feelings of inferiority with psychologically detrimental or retard the learning and personal development of the child. A child that feels inferior is not motivated to learn, thus, will not learn. That was the argument.

However, as you know, the Supreme Court found that since the facilities were comparably equal, and the school board had agreed to provide school transportation for the black children to attend their designated school -- oh, let me know. Of course you know. If you raise your hand -- if you start raising your hand, I'll think you're telling me to go right on.

So anyway, the three-judge panel in Topeka
found that the facilities were comparably equal,
the that school district was permitted to have

segregated schools for black and white children.

I would also like to, again, address some myths, misconceptions about the Brown case. The case bears a name of Oliver Brown and Linda Brown. And I cannot only tell you how that occurred, as Charles Scott, Senior, who prepared the pleadings referred, but if there's any argument about that, don't argue it with me, just, unfortunately, you can't argue with the person who actually prepared the complaint. It was purely fortuitous, quirk of fate, if you will, as was the custom then, as it is the custom now, the parties are listed in alphabetical order.

Now, one might say -- and the plaintiffs, keep in mind, are the children. The plaintiffs in the case are the children, and the parents are their representees. Anytime you bring a legal action on behalf of a child, it's Child A by his or her parent and next of kin or next of friend.

The pleadings were listed in alphabetical order, thus say Charles Scott, Senior, and the name Linda Brown was first in the alphabetical order.

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was another child named, Sondria Dor Stella (phonetic) Brown, and she was commonly -- and people would refer to her or call her by Dor Stella. They didn't know Sondria was her first name. However, if they had used Dor Stella Brown, the case could have very well been named Dor Stella brown and her mother, which was Darlene Brown at that time. That's what Charles Scott, Senior has said, that's of record. I have a transcript where he gave an interview back in 1972 at the Eisenhower Museum, and that's what he stated there. So that's that.

And secondly, I want to comment why -- but anyway, the case has been portrayed this myth. And this is no reflection upon the Brown family at all because they're wonderful people and I have the greatest admiration and respect for them. But since the decision was issued in 1954, this case have been packaged and portrayed as the struggles of this minister, black minister and his little girl to attend the school in their neighborhood. And that's where it began and that's where it ends. And not that it was a decision that eradicated segregation, or that decision was to eradicate segregation and discrimination in this country.

I think it's very comforting, particularly to those who were responsibile for segregation, historically, to know that this was just a little case about a little girl who wanted to go to school in her neighborhood. It's more powerful. And that's how it's been packaged, even right after the decision was announced, Life magazine came on the scene, and they didn't take a picture of anybody else but this little girl, Linda Brown. She was on the cover of Life magazine in 1954, and that image has been burned in the memory, minds of people ever since.

I think -- and quite frankly, it's a sacrilege, really, not to the case or to the struggle and the sacrifice of not only the 200 other plaintiffs involved in the case nationwide, but to the attorneys who put their careers on the line in undertaking that case.

That was not a popular case at the time, not even in Topeka. There was no support from either the white or black community in that case. There was only a handful of people in the NAACP who even attended the meeting to discuss the case. So I think it is — that image has been portrayed, or has been faltered just to cloud the true purpose of

impact of the case. And that's how it's been portrayed.

Also, what is -- again, there are many stories I'd like to talk about Brown, but I have to get to this. In addition to Oliver Brown and Linda Brown, there were 13 other parents and 27 other children in the case. And Oliver Brown was the only man in the case. And these 13 other mothers, I think it's interesting that the mothers brought this case on behalf of their children, because historically, and even today, it's been the mothers and the women who have been the most devoted to their children, and particularly, their education.

They brought that case, these women, as they've stated on numerous occasions, to provide a better life for their children. A better life -- a life that they knew they could not obtain in a segregated -- in America where they had to sit at the back of the bus, where they were excluded from various institutions in America. That, in my mind, is probably one of the most untold stories, and there is clearly a story there about the women in the Brown case, and I'm speaking in Topeka, who brought that case. And many of these woman were single parents back then, back in the day, and the

sole breadwinner for the home. And most of them were domestic workers, they worked in hotels or they worked with families. But these are the women who laid their lives on the line, like a mother does. We all have mothers, and we know. So anyway, that's a story that's been untold.

Now I'd like to make a comment about what was the significance of the Topeka case, Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. Again, as I said earlier, if it had not been for a Brown v. Board of Education in Topeka, the challenge to segregation may have been put off for years, if not decades. All of the other — there were, as you know, and most of you know, not all, but there were four other cases in conjunction with Brown that the Supreme Court decided that was in Delaware, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington D.C.

In all of those four other cases, there was a gross disparity in the educational facilities. The facilities in Clarendon, South Carolina at the time would make a schoolhouse in Ethiopia look like a palace. It was deplorable. But in any event, there were gross disparities, and not only in the physical facilities but also the quality of instruction. And that was not really the case in

Δ

Topeka, quite frankly, the schoolteachers in Topeka were rated first rate. I'm a product of that segregated element, primary education, I went to an integrated school when I attended junior high and high school.

So, and the buildings were fairly descent, there were some minor -- but in any event, the bottom line is separation. What is segregation? In other words, what are separation or segregation in the field of public education, per se, was unconstitutional, could only be challenged in Topeka, in the Topeka case, because all the other cases, literally, could have been started in Plessy v. Ferguson and ruled by Plessy v. Ferguson. They could have been -- Plessy v. Ferguson could have been upheld in those other cases.

The Supreme Court found that the education that was provided in the -- clearly was being provided in all the other cases were clearly not equal to that received by whites, in terms of the tangible measurable factors of education.

However, that was not the case. As the three-judge panel in the Topeka case structured the case so that the Supreme Court could not avoid the question of whether segregation on the basis of

race, notwithstanding that the tangible measures of education were equal, violates the equal protection clause of the 14 Amendment.

But in any event, the case was, as you know, the case was filed, and it went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court declared that the doctrine of separate but equal has no place in public education. And separation of students on the basis of race, notwithstanding equality of facility, another measurable factor of education, violates the equal protection of the black children.

And as a basis and rationale for their decision, they cited the specific finding of fact in the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, which was that segregation sanctioned by law had a psychologically detrimental impact upon the educational and personal development of the Negro child.

Well, the question, as we celebrate today,
Brown v. Board of Education, has the promise of
Brown been fulfilled? As you know, as Doctor
Yetman mentioned, that in 1955, the Supreme Court
issued an order that school districts are to
integrate their school systems with all deliberate

speed.

Of course, 50 years later, and after decades of desegregation litigation, we're still asking the question, what all deliberate speed means? And, of course, my father commented at the time that all deliberate speed meant forever, which is the case today. And I guess, it was the goal, the hope of Brown, it was the hope that the goal of Brown was not only to integrate public education, or break down segregation in public education, but it was to integrate and desegregate America. So, for the first time, African-Americans and all people who have been denied their rights would have access to all the opportunities and benefits of the mainstream of American Life, starting with education.

And of course, we know today that the schools, you don't have to do a statistical study, you can go to any school in any city, major city, and realize that the schools are as segregated today as they were at the time of Brown. And we get to the question of, is it necessary or essential or beneficial, even, for African-American children, Hispanic or minority children, in order for them to receive a quality education, that they attend

schools with white children? Well, obviously -- of course one thing I would say, we don't know what our educational system would be today if the Supreme Court had implemented the decision immediately, fort with, as all other court orders are issued. I don't know why they essentially allowed the school districts for the past 50 years to establish new segregated school districts. They gave them time, I guess, gave them time to reestablish segregation, the fact of segregation.

But the question is, again, that segregation is an evil that had to be eradicated. Thurman Marshall and his argument before the Supreme Court said that segregation had excluded black people or Negros at that time from the main stream of American society. And Doctor Yetman quoted Gunner Myrdal in his book, The American Dilemma, Gunner Myrdal said that, segregation has made the black man an alien in his own country without the means or knowledge to sufficiently function in that country.

Segregation is just another word for exclusion. Fifty years ago, the court said that segregation sanctioned by law imposed a badge of inferiority upon black children. It sent a message to black

children, and by extension, all black people, that you are inferior.

Your government, United States of America, says that you are inferior and incapable of learning and achieving in this society. And quite frankly, we felt that way for a long time. Thus, we had to have — thus lead to black pride. Blacks once and for all had to assert themselves that we are a people of worth; that we are not second-class citizens, even though you may regard us as such.

So in any event, the question is where are we today, and my only comment is, like you said, the schools are segregated. Now we certainly, in this country, profess that we want to achieve a diverse and inclusive society in all institutions of America, in our political system, our economic system and our educational system.

Certainly that has been a goal, professed goal of institution of higher learning at our universities and colleges, we want to foster diversity and inclusion in our government, as in all walks of life. And of course, the question is, when do those people empower, who are in a position to make those decisions, whether they are going to have a diverse inclusive institution, when do those

people learn what that is.

Obviously, will they ever learn or value that -- well, will they ever value or cherish that value of diversity and inclusiveness if they did not learn it when they were children? I agree with Doctor Yetman, there has to be some form by which white people, white people can learn, or at least be confronted with the self worth and value of people of different cultures and different races. And I suggest that has to be started when they're young.

Now whether we like it or not, and for the foreseeable future, probably for my lifetime anyway, the person that will be making a bank loan, admissions officer at a university, or any other decision-maker that will affect your life is going to be a white person. Probably nine out of ten.

Occasionally -- fortunate, at least I have been so fortunate.

But anyway, so what values is that person who's going to make that decision be making his decision on? He's going to judge you a person who is not like him on values in which he was raised. And that was really the goal of Brown, to integrate America through the public education system where

children would learn to interact and function appropriately if not constructively with people of different races and different cultures.

Now 50 years later, I contend the educational system has made that interest virtually impossible for the foreseeable future. The courts have abandoned any efforts to desegregate the schools. In fact, there have been actions, legal actions brought to challenge voluntary desegregation plans. So I hold out little hope about whether that constructive engagement between children of different races and different cultures will ever occur in the public education system.

So, I clearly do not have the answers, and I'm not an educational expert, although I'm getting educational questions, but that as a lawyer I feel helpless to address the problem. All I can say is that on this 50th year, 50th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education, I believe that we as individuals and as communities and as citizens of this country, need to recommit ourselves to develop and create ways, or that we can develop a climate by which people of different races and different cultures can, particularly children, can interact in a constructive and meaningful way.

21

22

23

24

25

I tell a story in many of my talks about Brown. Elija Scott, my grandfather, he and his family migrated from Mervinborrow (phonetic), Tennessee in the late 1880s and early 1890s with a hope of coming to Kansas for a better life, as was promised by the governor at that time, to come to Kansas, to yourself and your family a quality of life. of course when they got there, all was not what had been promised. But in any event, when he arrived in Kansas, Topeka, Kansas, he encountered a pastor named -- a famous pastor named Doctor Monore Sheldon, who wrote the famous book, In His Steps. Doctor Sheldon had established a kindergarten for the area town that Elija Scott lived in. was called Tennessee Town. And one of those students was a young lad named Elija Scott, and he embraced Elija Scott and became his mentor and friend for life, in fact, financed his education. And my grandfather was forever indebted to him for In fact, he named his son, my dad, Charles Monroe Sheldon Scott.

So I say, just as one humble white pastor then reached out to a young black boy named Elija Scott, we have that same opportunity today, to the best of our ability, to reach out to not only an

1	African-American or minority child, but any child
2	who's been excluded or disrespected with the
3	general society, and empower them to achieve their
4	God-given gifts. So, I'll conclude on that note.
5	Thank you.
6	MS. NEVILS: Mr. Chairman.
7	DR. MITCHELL: Two questions at the most.
8	Thank you.
9	MS. NEVILS: When I was going to school,
10	working on my degree in elementary ed in
11	Pittsburgh, Kansas, I happened to be the only black
12	in my class. And I'm going to tell you, of the
13	people that took that class, about 25 of us
14	MS. SCOTT: Is this a college, Pittsburgh
15	College?
16	MS. NEVILS: Pittsburgh University,
17	Pittsburgh, Kansas.
18	MS. SCOTT: Oh, okay.
19	MS. NEVILS: I was treated like a
20	stepchild in that class. I did a lot of my
21	assignments by myself, and when it came to group
22	discussions, it was like I was almost a group of
23	one.
24	Now, if people that are learning to be teachers
25	would treat me like that, and they're adults, and

excludes me, it bothered me about what they would do to my child. And there was a saying that was going on for awhile, well, you can bring them into our classrooms but we don't have to teach them.

And I'm wondering, is that some of the problems why our children are not learning at a level that they should? But as an adult, I mean one black in a class full of whites, they treated me really bad.

But, you know, I didn't have a problem with it. I went ahead and did what I needed to do. But I was an adult. This was new teachers that were getting ready to come out. And I would not want any of them to teach my child, because I know how they treated me.

MS. SCOTT: I agree. There's clearly -there's segregation even within integrated school
systems. I think that's a lack of leadership at
the top from the school board on down to the
leadership of that particular school. And my
daughter attends Shawnee Mission Northwest. She's
a junior. But black kids are -- children are
segregated within that school system. There's a
book out, why do black children -- why do black
kids sit at the lunch table by themselves? But
that's because many of the black children feel

1	isolated even in an integrated school.
2	You had a question, Doctor Thomas.
3	DR. THOMPSON: Nice to see you,
4	Mr. Scott.
5	MS. SCOTT: Nice to see you, Doctor.
6	DR. THOMPSON: And I want to thank you
7	for coming and sharing with us your personal
8	experience from your family, and which is my
9	question. I wanted to ask two questions. First,
10	what law school did your grandfather attend?
11	MS. SCOTT: Washburn University.
12	DR. THOMPSON: Washburn.
13	MS. SCOTT: Washburn Law School. So did
14	my father.
15	DR. THOMPSON: And there was rumor around
16	Topeka that you are publishing about your
17	grandfather's journey; is this correct?
18	MS. SCOTT: Well, I've certainly talked
19	about it for years. I have not taken any formal
20	steps to see that happen. I have written some
21	newspaper articles over the years, but nothing I
22	certainly wish I could. That's certainly my dream
23	and goal, one of these days, hopefully before too
24	long.
25	DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much.

Let's take a break. Three minutes.

(Brief Recess)

DR. MITCHELL: I'd like to get started,
please. Our next person is Mr. Eric Galan, who is
Regional Minority Health Coordinator, Public Health
Service. Nice to see a commissioned officer.
Thank you.

MR. GALAN: Thank you. Again, like everyone else, I need to express sincere thanks for inviting me, you folks inviting me to come and just share a little bit with you about some of the dilemmas that we have as a nation regarding access to healthcare.

We do know that it's a big deal, it's a big problem, something that we can't just try to sweep under the rug, so to speak, as many people would like, if you ignore something, it will go away eventually. Kind of like the bathroom in here. I was just commenting, there weren't any paper towels or anything, but I had just noticed that someone was in there, you know, checking, had his little clipboard and everything, but there were no paper towels and other things in there that, you know,

Δ

probably could have helped.

So it's kind of like a matter of what you see or what you don't see. And if you don't see it, it's not a problem. And we were kind of just joking a little bit about that. There still aren't any things in there like that, so don't go in that bathroom.

We do know that reform in our health care system is desperately needed. You folks have amongst you health care providers that are sitting with you as colleagues that can attest to this.

Over 44 million people uninsured in the United States. That's not a small number, by any means.

When you think of access problems, even for people who are insured, if they have problems, if people that speak English also have problems accessing good health care, if people who don't have disabilities, physical, cognitive, still have problems accessing health care, and even, there may be people who can read, and they might have trouble that you might expect of someone who is illiterate. And at times, even if you were to have individuals like a U.S. employed white male, if an individual like that could have access to health care issues, how much more so for those who don't fit in those

categories?

We lump them up in the categories of being disadvantaged, under-represented, disparate population groups, you name it, there's all kinds. Some folks that I deal with are very explicit and they'll tell me, don't categorize me in that group of minority or whatever, and you know, don't do that, and so, therefore, you know, okay, that's fine.

Essentially, if I were to borrow some of the terminology that the two gentlemen that just finished speaking before me, we know that a lot of these problems that take place that we are facing as a nation with health care access issues really stem from the inequities that take place in society all around us. They haven't gone away.

We've been talking about and listening to the things that plagued our country back in the 30s, 40s, 50s. Well, guess what, it's probably like the wide neckties. They kind of were in style at one moment, and then they went away, well, they're back. The wide lapels are back.

None of these things, really, have gone away.

And if we talk about access, or the opposite of access, access denied, no access would mean

215 West 18th Street

Kansas City, MO 64108

exclusion, to borrow one of Mr. Scott's terms there. An exclusion is just something that we really as a country can't tolerate. When we think of these complexities related to access to health care, they really are just many of the same old things, the same, and maybe even new social ills that are besetting us nowadays.

Some of the factors that I think that we all know about do pertain to literacy. People who can't read, whether black, white, Hispanic, Asian, are going to have more difficult times taking care of themselves, much less, you know, even more so, even more of a problem to try to gain entry into the health care system, accessing it for the right things. Race, ethnicity, gender can be barriers and factors. One's sexual preference, their insurability, whether they have employment or not, whether they have income or not, because sometimes just because you're employed doesn't mean one really has true significant income.

The education level, the color of the skin, and accent to one's speech, language and cultural barriers, a lack of prepared providers. And I don't mean, you know, talking about incompetent health care providers, I'm talking about, perhaps,

health care providers who are not culturally competent, or who are not in tune with some of these very important and germane essentials in order to really take care of a population group that needs that.

Immigrant status. A lack of basic simple information. Did you know that this service was available to you over here? No, I didn't. Simple things like that. And then today, nowadays, we're confronted with even other issues that are, you know, at one time maybe were foreign to us. When we think of the term terrorism, that brings along with it the national security issues, the homeland defense quandary, and anything that's related to that that might draw in discrimination.

We've all heard of some of the legislative proposals that were being entertained recently about how health care providers, hospitals had to report if something, this or that happens, or someone comes in, you know, that might be suspicious or whatever, and than you report them. Well, you know, when you have to ask someone what their nationality is or their immigration status is before they can get their health care needs met, you're going to have even a more complex and

\_

difficult dilemma in the health care arena.

Because the problems are just simply going to multiply and really fester and blow up and really become a problem, economically and socially. Thank God that some of that legislative thinking has kind of gone by the wayside, at least for now. Terrible to think that something like that would happen in America, but, nonetheless, the realities.

Some of these other factors definitely pertain to politics, legislation, laws, whether they exist or whether they don't, because sometimes we can have good laws or bad laws, but sometimes the absence of something also can really create big problems. And when you have laws, sometimes they can even compete against each other.

Senator Frist, as recent as February of this year came up with the proposed bill, Senate bill, I think it's Number 2091, Closing the Health Care Gap Act of 2004. But, as politics, you know, tends to do, it's just a fact of life in the political arena, there are prevailing attitudes that also get in the way. Attitudes of my version of this bill could be better. My way is better than your way, Senator, or whatever. And than that comes into that quandary of locking horns, and the

loggerheads, and just running into problems where nothing gets done then.

Demographics, this is a country that's just changing so rapidly at any given moment at any given time. Very dynamic, very fluid, and it's constantly changing. Than you have government dissent or disagreements, sometimes internal, within a certain agency, or amongst other agencies. We saw it with the homeland defense issues that prevailed between this agency under the Department of Justice and then another one like that. An example in health care was when we had the ARC Report, the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality report, December, 2003.

It came out, and, you know, trying to elaborate on problems related to the disparities, related to the health care issues that we face as a nation.

But then there were problems that you wouldn't expect that surfaced, also, that had to deal with rhetoric, of all things, our own words. There were accusations of problems taking place with the report where it was really doctored up and maybe kind of purged of this or that, and then, really, taking on the shape and the form of something else other than what it originally was. And then you

had problems. Terms were eliminated, supposedly, like the national problems. The term disparity was hardly used, supposedly, or taking on a tone of minimizing the significance, undermining, really, what it was set out to do, which was convey a strong sense of urgency about the real problems that this country's facing regarding the disparities in health care.

Then you have other things, like the overall poor quality of care that really everyone faces, whether we're Hispanic, black, Asian or white. And that came out. Well, it's actually been out in several studies and reports, but one that comes to mind was the Journal of Health Affairs publication made, the fourth this year. I think Doctor Elizabeth A. McLinn was the one who helped author that.

There are problems that we have to face, but along with those we need to think about the solutions. And just really quickly, some of the solutions are found in the lists that we don't have. They rest with people like you folks here, like you and I. The ones that we haven't thought about yet. Well, Senator Frist had come up with the Closing the Health Care Gap Act. If something

like that were to come through, then, maybe it may help somewhat.

It includes more substantive efforts and awareness being thrown at in the area of a need for data collection, improved access, being equitable for everybody across the board. Professional training for people. Health leadership, even amongst the federal ranks. And then, also, it included a component, if it were to go through, on grants for community health centers. And then expanding the mission, the overall mission of my office, the Office of Minority Health under the Secretary of Health and Human Services domain.

New federal dollars for work force training.

And by that we mean, helping to get a work force that mirrors more of what our health care consumers are up there. Having an opportunity to engage more minority students to go to medical school, nursing school and other health care disciplines, so that they can also been in tune with a lot of the things that they know play their particular population groups, or those around them that they're interested in.

The Health Care Equality and Accountability Act was one, I think it was Senate Bill 1833, came out

or was proposed in November of 2003 by Senator Daschle. Again, it includes something similar, too, but it was something that came up just as slightly a few months before Senator Frist's.

Again, with the intent of helping minority population groups, via more of the same that we just mentioned, if you don't have the data collected, you don't have the numbers, then the bean counters aren't going to pay attention either. You need that substantive information to come up with more information via evidence-based scientific studies and reports that are really showing something of substance and that might mean or lead to better outcomes for quality care for others.

. Non governmental solution might be for people like each one of us here, whether behind that table or sitting out here in the chairs. Staying informed. And holding the system and the policy makers and leaders all accountable. I tell that to people everywhere I go. Hold me accountable.

Well I've only been in this position maybe four and a half months right now and been desperately trying to make new connections, relink up communication lines that maybe were broken and fragmented the last few years, and it's a tough

thing, to try and establish a little bit of credibility again, especially when people are tired of hearing the same ole, same ole all the time.

Education, more education, whether it's for people like us, because that's what we're doing here. We're trying to become a little bit more acquainted with some of the issues that plague us in these important areas. But education, also, to help give the right tools to make for culturally competent providers, health care providers, whatever race or ethnic background they may be.

I love it when I see health care providers that maybe are Anglo that are really desperately trying to learn Vietnamese or Spanish. Or I have a couple of colleagues that are African-American, and they're fluent in Spanish. Some of them are even good at Thigalas, and things like this. They have taken the steps and gone into the unknown, because we're all comfortable with our own ethnic central type of thinking. And that's a big deal right there in itself, a big barrier. If we're comfortable with it, we don't want to step out and go beyond to try and learn something about someone else.

I believe in that, wholeheartedly. If we can

215 West 18th Street

Kansas City MO 64108

21

22

23

24

25

do more to find more interpretive services for hospitals or clinics, anything like that, exchanging relationships between governments and universities. I was really pleased. Last week, I was invited to the Mexican Consolate here in town, and it was interesting to hear the Under Secretary For Exterior Affairs' from Mexico speaking about how he had tried to engage the university chancellor here at the University of Missouri in Kansas City about plans for seeing about exchanging students in the medical school and in the nursing school, so that each other would have -- each of those schools, perhaps, might have an opportunity to really grow and learn something new from each other and then apply it here, and share it with each of these faculties, respective academic settings. think that that's outstanding, and maybe we can be a facilitator for something like that. Little things like that.

In conclusion, I would say there is no conclusion when it comes to health care disparities. We've heard that, also, with the previous speakers here. These things have lingered for a long time. And I don't mean to be sounding pessimistic or apathetic by no mean, because it

would be morally and ethically wrong for me as a health care provider, or any of the others in the health care disciplines to just say, well, it's there, the problem is there, and, you know, such is life.

The challenge still is there for me and those out there to continue doing our best to reeducate minds, slowly. But reeducate these erroneous belief systems that may be out there feeding this monster of the health care disparity issue, that maybe, also, aren't any longer valid or appropriate for today.

Now I'm not trying to advocate that we go out and intrude on someone else's cultural significance, someone else's mores that are really valuable to them, but I am here to say that there's nothing wrong with challenging, tactfully challenging some of these things that may be a little antiquated, and saying, why, why are we doing it this way? Just because? The old just because thing, you know, doesn't really fly anymore, or at least it shouldn't with us.

We need to be courageous enough to ask the tough questions. We need to be able to stick out our professional, are very elegant professional

Я

leadership nix during the moments of the -- the do or die moments like, when people are trying to make the important decisions about budgets, whether at a local county level, whether at a municipal level, whether at a state level. We need to ask the tough questions. Why do we want to wait for the bandaid approach? Well, we got a problem here, let's see, we got these immigrants that are coming here now, and they are -- yep, they're here to help our community socially, economically. Nobody really wants to do this work or that work in agriculture or with the meat-packing plants or this or that, but you know what, we really don't need to be so concerned about how we're going to prepare our school system for the kids that are coming along the way, or how we're going to meet their health care needs when these communities, these immigrant communities come in.

Those, sometimes, unfortunately, are bandaid approaches, or crises management outright, if we as leaders don't take time to be pro-active and think ahead. If we want folks to come and help, or if we want to have this population group here or that one over here to do this or that for us, then we also need to be prepared, better prepared.

25

24

20

21

22

And lastly, I would say that everybody here is an intelligent individual. I really don't need to be up here speaking about this because all the answers rest with everyone who's listening right now. I really believe that. And I'm happy to say that, because it makes me -- it gives me some comfort in knowing that I'm not in this alone, or that my fellow health care colleagues are in this type of a dilemma, a quandary alone.

If we are not able to come together via dialogue forms like this, venues of this sort here in a collaborative nature, taking the time to learn a little bit about the issues, even though it may be something very remotely, you know, of interest to us or whatever, you know, we have that responsibility to do that. And I would just challenge us to think seriously about these things. I'm going to shut up, because it's long overdue, and I'll take a couple of questions if anybody has any.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

DR. NAVATO: Alma Navato from Missouri.

I know you probably don't know all the statistics yet, being in the position for the last four months, but as you've been here for the

Department of Health Services for Kansas City,

Missouri, how many public health clinics are

available just in the Kansas City area that are

open up to minority or under-privileged patients.

MR. GALAN: In the Kansas City metro

area, if we were to say that we had, I don't know, maybe, what, 1.8 million, 1.7, depending which way the statistic needs to be tilted for a little higher number or less, I would say, just off the top of my head, that — and there has to be more, but, at least six or seven of them come to mind right now, that I know that exist out there that are really doing something significant in the population base of what I just mentioned right now.

It could be more, and I wouldn't be surprised, because sometimes other little groups pop up -- sometimes there are sole physician practitioners out there that are really doing some neat things, and they're not even touting it, or people don't know about it, but they're out there doing real significant things without charging individuals.

And helping like that. But there are at least half a dozen or better that I can think of in this area.

DR. NAVATO: Would the immigrant population coming in, and I don't know what the

statistics are, but from some of the presenters
here it's a very big increase in the minorities and
immigrant population over the next five for ten
years, how are we going to be prepared to accept
all those and how are we going to disseminate
information to them that there is help needed and
that there is care provided for it?

MR. GALAN: Doctor Navato, that's an excellent question, questions. There's a couple in there, I think. But those are questions that I never get tired of asking wherever I go, whether it's discussing something with the governor. Ι particularly deal with four of your states, Iowa Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and if I have to deal with the health department at the state level, counterparts there, I don't -- I'm not shy about asking things like that, because these are things that need to be asked in order to be pro-active, in order to have that foresite and to do the strategic planning that's really required instead of just some kind of a haphazard recipe that was thrown together that we know as crises management, or worse yet, the bandaid approach, you know, for some gaping wounds that really needed more definitive type of interventions.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We need to do more, and I'm saying that at the federal level, I'm saying that at the state level, I'm saying that at the county and the local municipalities. I think about all the attention that's being drawn now to emergency preparedness and the monies that are going into those coffers right now and being shared with the states and county health departments and things like that.

But I ask them, what are you doing to include some of the groups that feel invisible, like some of the native American populations in these states, some of the Asian populations. What about the largest Sudanese population base that we have here in the United States that's located in Nebraska? Somebody correct me if I'm wrong. You know, we need to take care of individuals that normally aren't in our day-to-day thinking, agenda. We need to think outside, and I hate that term, outside the box, or let's color outside the lines, and all of those little idioms or colloquialisms, but we do need to think in a different, new and a fresh way, and not be shy about it.

I like the fact that you asked the question because, again, it's heightening the awareness, and we need to do that. So I'll continue to echo that.

My answer to you is, I realize it's a big need on 1 the federal side. I tried to instill that in any 2 of the communities that I go to. I think about 3 Garden City. I haven't visited Garden City yet but I plan to, and other communities in this region 5 that I keep finding out have extraordinary bits of 6 information there about new immigrant populations 8 or about some needy community that somebody has basically just left them by the wayside, and they 9 become one of the invisibles, one of the invisible 10 11 groups. 12 DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 13 DR. MITCHELL: Yes. 14 DR. THOMPSON: I'm Cora Thompson from 15 Missouri. I am concerned, and I realize you've 16 only been in this spot for four and a half 17 months --18 MR. GALAN: But you'll put me on the spot 19 anyway. That's okay. 20 Well, not necessarily. DR. THOMPSON: 21 MR. GALAN: I appreciate that. 22 DR. THOMPSON: But is it possible that we 23 could ask you to prioritize the health care for 24 native Americans in your regional responsibility

25

and give us some information? Why is it that the

Department of Health in Kansas City, Missouri tells native Americans that, number one, that they're not responsible for their health care? That's from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And Number 2, that their numbers aren't significant enough to be concerned about their health care. I mean, those are things that are happening today. And if you could kind of put that on your list of 100 things to do.

MR. GALAN: I appreciate that, Doctor
Thompson. I have heard comments like that before,
and, specifically, about -- I don't think Missouri
has any federally recognized tribes; correct? And
therefore, does that mean that they -- if they're
not recognized that they don't exist, or that they
just aren't there?

Again, are they one of the invisible population groups that we're talking about? Well, guaranteed a thousand percent, these folks probably feel that way, and rightly so, you know, when I look at some of the reports. I know that Ms. Perry came to our office a while back with one of her colleagues, and she was pointing out some things. And you know, honestly, sometimes we in the professional or scientific community, we shoot ourselves in the " "foot or feet, or in the mouth sometimes because of..."

the way that we portray information.

I remember her showing us some of the reports that she had, and it said that there was like a little asterisk by some figure or something like that, and it would say, of no statistical significance or something like that.

Well, in the scientific communities, you know, when you talk about something that doesn't have any statistical significance, it doesn't mean that, literally, that the native American community is not significant or any like that. I think it was a poor choice of words, but nonetheless, it was just nomenclature, that's standard, okay, to try and explain that it didn't have a real bearing of any magnitude that would impact something one way or another.

And it did come out, though, to give the impression that, wow, your numbers are really, you know, nothing, of no consequence, so therefore, kind of like brushing the native American community aside here. Well, we tried to explain that a little bit, and, you know, clarify that, although I'm not speaking for those folks who did come up with those, generated those reports and authored those studies.

Things like that are on our list. They are on 1 our radar screen. I've been trying desperately to 2 make good connections with the native American 3 communities, the tribal elders, the chairmen of the 4 different tribes, and made some good in-roads. 5 Things like that don't come overnight by any means, 6 but I really am pleased to say that I feel as 7 though we've got a communication link established, 8 and that awareness that we, you know, mutually 9 exist is there. And so we're going to try and 10 continue to foster a good relationship and help 11 out. I've been trying to send information to 12 13 everybody. 14 DR. MITCHELL: Ms. Perry. Ms. Perry has 15 a question. 16 MS. PERRY: I just have one question. 17 State your name first. DR. MITCHELL: 18 MS. PERRY: Mona Perry. I'm worried 19 about the data part. Who does the data? It's 20 different. Like the state and mental health system ... 21 do not, they do not count native Americans, we're 22 under "Other." And some of the health department

MR. GALAN: Definitely. I know that I

data needs to be looked at.

23

24

here, we're under "Other." And so I think that

have, and some of my superiors have also been 1 taunting and pushing for this, advocating for more 2 data, not just, you know, specifics, but it's 3 really hard, you'd be surprised that there's data 4 that you think would be out there, but it isn't. 5 6 It just isn't being collected. And then we don't 7 want to just encourage because, because it's costly, right, a data collection for the sake of a 8 data collection. What are we going to do with it? 9 10 How is it going to be analyzed and utilized effectively for real solutions? We can get all 11 kinds of information from that, but we're trying to 12 take the baby steps with the folks that need that, 13 14 that type of approach, and for others we're being a 15 little bit more aggressive. Some folks, you know 16 very commendably are just, you know, really out 17 ahead by leaps and bounds in data collection, but 18 we need to do more. We do. And we'll keep 19 pressing on with that message. 20

MS. NEVILS: Mr. Chairman.

DR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MS. NEVILS: May I ask one short question? Nicketa Nevils, Wichita, Kansas. Ι would like to know what contingency plan do you have with the thought that there are more people

21

22

23

24

that are unemployed, so there goes their insurance, 1 and since their -- and these are some of the same 2 people that would help donate and give monies to 3 the food banks. So here we have food -- and how 4 are these people going to get it, because the food 5 banks are not getting as many donations, you have 6 people that have been working, and now they're laid 7 off, and they do not have insurance, and we know 8 that at the bottom of the list will be the 9 minorities, because they're the first ones that are 10 let go on a job, unless they're really high up in 11 management. The Hispanic, the Asians, 12 African-Americans, native Americans, what are these 13 people going to do? What contingency plan do you 14 all have in place to service the needs of the 15 16 people? MR. GALAN: Well, I think that your 17 question and the issues that you raise are really 18 important and valid. 19 20 21

Number one, part of the way that I like to address that issue, because economics, obviously, plays into this, also. I mean, we talked about politics and the social issues behind it, but economics, also, is a big factor that we can't ignore.

22

23

24

One of the things that I love to try and do is to raise some conscious awareness with the business community, also. I don't know of any employer or any businessman or woman anywhere in this country or in the world that, you know, that does not want to have a more productive and able-bodied work force and to really be able to produce and generate and everything. Well, in order to have that, sometimes it requires them, as big business leaders or even small business leader, to be able to invest a little bit in the health care of their people.

Now, mind you, I'm not saying invest in their insurance or something like that. I'm not even going that far, although that's the ultimate goal, obviously. But I believe in simple things, like educating their supervisors on how to treat people so that you don't impose so much stress on people that are there so that maybe you have less accidents so that you have people that are cheerful about coming to work.

It's already kind of a drudgery, anyway, for most of us, you know, who have to go to work. I love work, though, actually. My wife hates that. But I enjoy it. I enjoy going to work. And I think that if I can raise an awareness like that in

the business community, that's important.

Is it important, or the solution and the answer to your questions one that could be found at the federal level? I don't think so. Is the answer something that can be found in a collective way, the feds with the states with the counties with the business community, with everybody included to come together and dialogue on how to do it? Yeah.

I went to a meeting recently, here, that was sponsored by one of the health care networks in town on cover the uninsured week. Well it was gratifying to see how this money-making, although they're not for profit entity, hospital corporation took the time to do this, to convene people together from different community-based organizations, from different state and local entities, that got together to brainstorm how to promote and heighten an awareness about this dilemma and issue, and how, maybe, to come up with some solutions.

Did they come up with a solution for giving, you know, insurance to 44 million Americans, or let's say 44,000 here in Kansas City, even? No. But they came up with some other ideas that stimulated more dialogue and more thought into the

process. And that's what I mean by baby steps. I don't know. The short answer to that is, I don't know that such a strategic plans exists for something that complex.

MS. NEVILS: Well I think it should. In Wichita we have the Boeing, we have the Leer Jet, a lot of those jobs are going overseas. And when these people are laid off, and they've given good years, even Coleman, I think, some part of it has been cut back, it's a very real situation to us in Wichita.

MR. GALAN: Sedgwick County, pardon me for -- not to cut you off, I have been to Sedgwick County, and I took the time to visit about eight or nine clinics over there that were community-based, taking care, addressing the needs for the uninsured and indigent or anyone who just needed help like that. It was fabulous, some of the clinics really doing a whole lot more than others because they had, maybe, a little bit more money. But I was so impressed.

What would I concede for something like that, you know, because it's hard to take care of the whole world, folks, but if you take a group like the Sedgwick County area, I was trying to envision

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bringing people together like them to tell the business community, the Boeings and the McDonnell Douglases of your area there, and other leaders, look, this is what we're doing.

They don't have a clue what those clinics are doing. Honestly, they don't. And people need to know, and they need to be touted, their horns need to be tooted a little bit more so that they can come together. That's what I mean by these collaborative type of relationships. I quaranty you that if any of those corporate executives were to know and see for themselves what some of those magnificent places -- and I'm not talking about illustrious buildings or anything, mind you, I'm talking about really run-down physical structures, but they're doing such magnificent things. Those people would also be inspired and inspiring. be willing, then, to give to that community, because it's going to help their community. Instead of being a cycle of the vicious or self-perpetuation of the problem, and maybe even eroding and ulcerating even further into a real festering issue, it would maybe do something better to try and help itself, you know, and I believe in that.

I don't think that there are easy answers, and of I'm not here to say that -- or to paint the picture all rosy and all of that. I can't do that in all honesty and then look at myself in the morning when I wake up. I can't. It's bleak. But at the same time, the moral and ethically correct thing for any health care provider, any leader that's in here today, is to continue seeking out answers solutions, dialoguing, and trying to work together where we can, as much as possible.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much.

MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Missouri.

What are you seeing, or what kind of information are you getting, if any, on disparity quality of health care, and if so, where do you see those major problems, and are there any initiatives or anything being done to try to overcome those issues?

MR. GALAN: Good question. I think that for a number of years, maybe the last, I'd say, five to ten years, significant reports and studies have come forward highlighting and underscoring the very same things that you just talked about, but, sadly to say, showing us a lot of the things we already knew. That there are disparate ways of

It all treating our health care consumers. depends. I can tell you examples, vivid examples of people, and I cover the four state area, I won't tell you where, but one major teaching hospital, somebody gets ordered, physician orders -- let's say Doctor Navato orders a couple of tests and you need to get this MRI. The person, Maria Gomez, will present herself there to the hospital, and the receptionist, right from the beginning, will take the stereotypical approach in thinking, well, now, you know, and take it upon herself or himself to be a policeman or policewoman and say, you don't deserve this, mentally, and not verbally like that, but you don't really deserve to have health care benefits here in my country or whatever. And basically, steering them in the wrong direction so that that test that Doctor Navato ordered would not get done. That's happened, I know it has. you get someone else walking in there, right immediately after Maria Gomez, Mondalia Acabar, from Sudan, but black, and walking in and confronting the same receptionist, and again, the same thing. Well, it turned out that the receptionist involved in that particular incident was African-American, but taking it upon herself to

say, in her own philosophy, her own way of 1 thinking, you folks don't deserve -- by you folks 2 being here, you're taking away health care dollars 3 that belong to my aunt or to my uncle or to me or, 4 you know, you know what I mean? And we take on the 5 6 responsibility that we really shouldn't be doing. 7 Well, the disparities are there, inequities are there. We know that African-American patients, 8 Hispanic patients are not getting the same types of 9 tests offered to them, like if you have chest pain, 10 11 some type of a diagnostic procedure --12 DR. MITCHELL: We've got to move on. 13 MR. GALAN: -- or something like that, 14 and we know that. We know that's happening. 15 heightening that awareness. 16 DR. MITCHELL: Thank you. 17 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you very much. 18 DR. MITCHELL: We need to move a little 19 faster because we're way behind schedule, but I 20 want you to know that former Congressmen Wendall 21 Bailey. 22 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Thank you, 23 Mr. Chairman. I'd like to leave business cards 24 with you for your members of your commission. 25 work for the small business administration, and I'd

like to give you one quick fact. Our loans to minorities are up 35 percent this year due to the leadership of Hector Beretto (phonetic) from Kansas City who's done a magnificent job with Outreach. And thank you very much for the recognition, Mr. Chairman.

DR. MITCHELL: The next phase is Natasha Watson, Civil Rights Analyst. I ask you to really be as brief as you can with your questions.

MS. WATSON: Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me to make my presentation. I'm going to as brief as possible. In fact, I brought some handout materials that would expedite my presentation, to take with you.

My name is Natasha Watson. I'm a civil right investigator or an analysts, depending on who's in the office at that time, they make those decisions. I work with the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity for the state in Kansas City, Kansas.

Lately, we have been embarking on some complaints of investigation that are fairy new, and those complaints are predatory lending complaints. Everybody wants to be a homeowner. It's important to be a homeowner. They tell you that there is self worth in homeownership. But a lot of times

people trying to achieve that American dream, it often becomes a nightmare. And when it becomes a nightmare it ends up in our office.

Predatory lending, as I said, is fairly new to our office. We've been doing it for about five years. It's been around for hundreds of years, I'm assuming, as long as people could buy homes they've been taken advantage of. But we have just got into it in the last five years. Where there is not a definition for predatory loans, predatory lending, it's an unfair credit practice that supports a credit system that promotes inequality in poverty.

Generally, what it is is abusive, it's manipulative, it's fraudulent, it's cohesive, and it takes advantage. A lot of times takes advantage of minorities. And that's when we get involved.

When we're investigating complaints, we have to investigate complaints based on the protected classes. Predatory loans, predatory lending falls under the Fair Housing Act when it becomes discriminatory. It becomes discriminatory when it targets African-Americans and other minorities, when it treats them differently than it does non-minorities. When they have policies and practices that are unfair, when they treat people

differently based on credit history, based on credit reports, it becomes a predatory loan, that's when we can investigate it.

Unfortunately, it's very hard. A lot of times people do not realize their loans are predatory for five and six years down the line. Our time frame for investigating complaints of discrimination is one year.

Every other weekend, as my bio states, I talk to a group of potential homeowners. Out of those homeowners, one or two people have had loans for five, six, sometimes ten years, and after my presentation they realize that their loans are predatory. They realize that they've been taken advantage of. They realize that their fees are high, that they were charged fees at the beginning of the loan, that they were told, no down payment, you don't need a down payment, but the down payment's been built inside of the loan and they're paying on a down payment for 30, sometimes 40, I've seen 50 year loans.

So a lot of times, it's really -- the education part is important, and it's really hard for a lot of folks to realize that their loans are predatory until they -- you know, at the beginning, they just

2.5

want to get into that home, they just want to get there.

To identify a predatory loan, I'm just going to kind of go through some of the red flags. One of the red flags, you have prepayment penalties. Lot of times they're up to 5 percent of the loan.

Sometimes you have balloon payments. Now I know a lot of times they will tell you that, well, you go ahead and come on in and we'll get you into this loan, and about five years, you know, if you keep your credit, if you keep your payments on time, you can come back in and get it refinanced, and then in five years, you'll have a balloon payment of 15, 20, \$30,000, but don't worry about that, because you can come in and get that loan refinanced.

Well a lot of times in five years, if you can't make that loan at the very beginning, in five years you're not going to be able to go out and get it refinanced. A lot of people fall into that hole, that deep hole and say, I'm okay, I can go out and get it refinanced in five or six years, but they can't, because at the very beginning of the loan they end up with a 40 or \$50,000 loan with a \$20,000 balloon payment, and in five years, nothing's changed. Sometimes they fall behind on

their mortgage. The interest rate is always sky
high. They can't get that loan refinanced. And
then they come to a balloon payment in five years,
what are they going to do? They get in trouble,
and it leads to foreclosure.

The next one is loan flitting. That's when they keep refinancing over and over and over and over and over and over again. I know of a case where a loan was refinanced 20 times in 10 years, just over and over and over and over. And each time they refinanced their loan, they packed those fees, they keep packing those fees.

Another red flag is steering. And this is going on right now as I speak. Well, I can't help you, but I know somebody that can. And they will ride you right on into that B market, into that C market. And a lot of times the person can qualify for a loan, but they ride them into a B or C loan. And sometimes they can be misconstrued as steering.

Another term is packing. That's what I said earlier, they pack those fees. They keep packing and packing and packing.

Another is a mandatory arbitration clause.

They tell you that you don't -- they make you think that you don't have a right to file suit. A lot of

times, if you're sitting in that loan office, and 1 you are 35 years old and you have four kids and 2 you're becoming a homeowner, or you're single and 3 you're becoming a homeowner for the first time, you 4 really don't care what you sign, you just want to 5 They say sign here and sign here and sign 6 sign. And you start initialing, initialing, 7 initialing, and you're just happy. 8 They say congratulations and they go on. Then you go home 9 and you realize you've given up your right to sue. 10 Your loan is all jacked up and you don't know what 11 You have no rights whatsoever. 12 to do.

The effect of predatory lending is foreclosure. That is the biggest effect right now. In your packet there is a -- there was a study done by the Legal Aid Society of Kansas City, Missouri in 2000, that showed a lot of subprime lenders.

Now subprime lenders are good, we need them in some areas, for people who are having credit issues and they're trying to get up on the mark, subprimes are fine, but a lot -- in this packet, there's some subprime lenders in there that shows the foreclosure rate -- not foreclosure rate, but how many homes are foreclosed on. They've actually got addresses in there. And if you know anything about

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the Kansas City cord area, a lot of the addresses are concentrated in the minority area. They give out maybe 75 loans, and 15 or 20 of them are foreclosed on. That's in your packet.

What can we do as fair housing? We are trying as much as we can. Every two weeks, on Saturdays I spent from 10:00 to 2:00 on talking to homeowners about predatory loans.

Outreach, we do as much outreach at humanly possible. Like I said, we're fairly new in this, five years. And the banks are way ahead of us. We're drowning in loan documents. All we know is what's wrong is wrong. We look at these little tale tell signs and we go out and we try to get them to change. And that's what we're trying to do.

But the biggest thing is education, letting people know that a lot of times, you have the power. Even if your credit rating is saying 620, it's called subprime, anything below on the FICA score is 620 is considered a subprime loan.

Even if your credit score is 550, you have rights to negotiate. People do not realize they have the right to negotiate. You don't have to sign anything. And that's what I tell people.

Well I want this house, and they tell me if I don't sign, if I don't close today then I lose it.

You're not going to lose it because you shouldn't have had it in the first place. And a lot of people don't want to admit that a lot of times these loans are not for them, and they need to continue looking for something betters. That's what we're trying to tell them. But you know what? The banks are far ahead of us.

Our secretary is pushing, our new secretary,
Alfonz Jackson is pushing home ownership, and
that's good. But we have to keep educating people
and letting theme know, read your documents. You
have the power to do anything that you want to do.
I tell the story that I was raised in the church,
and I know everything is negotiable, even death.
And I tell them that you can negotiate that loan.
You have the power to negotiate. And I don't mean
to go really fast, but a lot of this stuff that I'm
telling you, it's in your packet. It's a lot of
information.

Let me go back to my quick notes. Statistics, national statistics, just go to the web site, and click in predatory loan, and you will hit thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands of sites.

The HUD data is in for 2002. You can pull up HUD

data and see how many foreclosure -- just assume

10 percent of those loans were predatory loans.

That's a good figure, that's what we're looking at,

10 to 15 percent are predatory loans.

In our office, we took the forefront in investigating complaints of discrimination with predatory loans. In the last year alone, in our office, we have had 107 complaints of predatory lending in the Kansas City area. Kansas City, Kansas, Kansas City, Missouri area. Of those 107 complaints, 45 were settled.

Now bank loans are the hardest loans to investigate because here I am, coming into your institution, asking to see your records, and you're not going to let me see them. So I have to go get a subpoena, and then your office is in some place in Las Vegas, Nevada, so then I have to wait. And a lot of times they just make a lot of paperwork for us. But a lot of times they settle.

So we have 45 settlements out of 107 loans that total \$561,000 loan amounts being forgiven. That's over a half million in loans in the Kansas City area alone that were forgiven because of predatory lenders. Now they're not going to admit that

they're predatory loans, but they forgave those loans.

One other thing that I tell my people, and I say to my people, everyone who's been taken advantage of is my people, I tell them, when you are getting ready to sign those documents, when you are ready to look for a home, when you are even thinking about looking for a home, know what your rights are. Know what you can and cannot do. Know what the -- find out what that lending institution is saying. Get knowledge. Knowledge is power. If you have that knowledge you have the power to do whatever you want to do.

I have a case in question, I was working on a case last year with one of our lenders in the area. And it was a lady, they live on 26th and Benton. I don't know if a lot of you are familiar with that area. Well her house was sold to her for \$114,000, and her house was over 45 years old. It was a three-story home on 26th and Benton. If any of you all just drive down, there's not too many homes worth \$114,000 on 26th and Benton, but it was financed. She had a interest rate at that time of Someone came -- a lender came back with 7 percent. her high loan, her interest rate, and somehow she

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

She had a

When they

got flipped so many times, she was flipped into 11 percent interest rate. She was flipped and flipped and flipped. She had no idea what they They was just -- you should be happy were doing. you got a loan. And she just signed that document. She just kept signing and kept signing. mortgage payment of \$1400, and she was trying, struggling, she and her husband were trying to make that payment. She came to our office, she didn't know who we were, she didn't know we existed, she just happened to come to a session, gave me her loan documents, we looked over them. I contacted the bank, I began to talk to them about what I was going to do and what we can do. Now we don't have a lot of people, we talk a good game. We talk a good game. So I began to talk to them. got through with her they came back with a settlement. Her loan payments are now, on a \$114,000 loan, they wrote off about \$40,000 worth. Her payments are \$500. Her interest rate is .04 percent.

Now you tell me, if that wasn't a predatory loan in the beginning, why in the world are you reducing this woman's interest rates that much? And they just, we just want to work with her, we

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

just want to work with her.

So that's kind of an overview of what we do. We do have other investigations that we do, but predatory lending complaints have just kind of taken over our office, and we've been real aggressive how what we do and how we do it.

We did have -- we were instrumental in that task force in 2000 that was the Kansas City, Missouri, the mayor enforced that task force. So that's in your package. We were instrumental in getting that started. That's when we really kind of got involved.

A lot of you all read the Pitch Weekly back in 2000. There was a builder that we went after, and because of that builder, that's kind of what initiated that. That was our initiation, initiated by fire. And that's how we got involved in this.

So if you have any questions, you know, you can ask them. Like I said, there's a lot of information in that packet. I hope I didn't take you too fast, I just kind of wanted to give you a summary.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very, very much. You have given us, really, a lot of information in a short time, and I wish you would have been first.

Ouestions? Yes. 1 MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer, Missouri. 2 Natasha. 3 MS. WATSON: Yes. 4 MR. PLUMMER: Can HUD or has HUD 5 attempted to get any help on these issues from 6 7 FDIC, Fanny Mae, some of these folks that, as well as some of the other programs within HUD itself, 8 seem would be able to yield some leverage? Is that 9 10 going on? MS. WATSON: Yes. What happens, when you 11 file a complaint in our office, we not only send 12 you a letter that you have filed a complaint, but a 13 14 copy goes to the Federal Trade Commission and the other agencies that enforce some of the 15 16 regulations. So, yes, we do, we do work with them. 17 In fact, they've been responding -- a lot of times 18 they'll respond back to us. We say, yes, we do 19 have problems, or, yes, we do know of this lender 20 and so forth. 21 DR. MITCHELL: Are there some groups that 22 are more involved in predatory loans than others? 23 MS. WATSON: You mean as far as mortgage 24 companies? 25 DR. MITCHELL: Yeah, right.

MS. WATSON: Yes, it's in your packet. 1 DR. MITCHELL: The reason why I asked 2 that question, is there a possibility for a class 3 action suit? 4 MS. WATSON: Actually, a lot of the non 5 profits -- in fact, one in Wichita, I was just down 6 there last week, Sunflower Act Organizations are 7 8 non profit, and they just negotiated a large settlement with the Fairbanks Capital Mortgage 9 Company. So a lot of the non profits are doing 10 that. 11 There was another non profit that negotiated a 12 settlement with Citicorp. So they are -- the non 13 14 profits are getting involved and they are doing 15 things. 16 What we've found out is a lot of the prime 17 lenders own the subprime lenders. So, for 18 instance, I think Bank of America owns a lot of subprime lenders. So, even though they're 19 20 negotiating with the subprime lenders, we have to 21 start negotiating with the prime lenders, too. 22 that's what's going on now. 23 DR. NAVATO: I have a question. Alma Navato, Missouri. 24 25

Of these predatory lending institutions that

have been found, do unfair practices and that have settled in favor of the client, has any of these institutions been penalized for their practice of predatory lending, even if they did not agree or acknowledge that they did do the deed?

MS. WATSON: Unfortunately, no. The only thing -- the only document that we have to monitor is that agreement that we have between a lender and the complainant that we represent. There is no legislation to do anything with predatory loans. Government doesn't -- the banking institution is so mighty and so strong, they just brush it under the carpet and they go on. Okay, we got caught.

We're not strong enough, and that's our problem, we're not strong enough to go after them and make them change. That's why it's important for us to come out and talk to people and that you folks, who are strong enough, who work mighty in numbers, to go out and change.

And what happens is, for instance, we'll have the same predatory lender, you know, where one person will have a complaint, and then we'll go on, and then somebody else will have a complaint, and we'll have seven negotiated settlements with the same lender.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. NAVATO: So the other part of the question would be, of those institutions that tend to perform these deeds, has there been any statistics as to how many more loans that they have continued to make after that one incident?

MS. WATSON: Only on home HUD data. what happens, is once they have made a complaint of discrimination, there is a settlement. instance, Fairbanks was one of the biggest predatory lenders in our area. Fairbanks was in bed with Equa-Credit, so, which was owned by Bank of America. So they were in bed together. And what ends up what happens is once they started filing complaints of discrimination, that person told that person, and that went back to a non profit. And then non profit went back to Fairbanks and negotiated a settlement with these Fairbanks, and now what happens is, any time a person files, has a loan with Fairbanks, they have to be told of the agreement of the settlement. They also have to sign that they're aware of predatory lending. have to be educated prior to signing those documents. And that's every Fairbanks loan in that area. So things happen, they just happen slowly. And it may not -- we may just be the catalyst but

1 it happens around.
2 DR. NAVATO:

MR. PLUMMER: What's your phone number?

Thank you.

MS. WATSON: 913-551-6847. And on a final note, I would like for you to tell, a lot of times, a lot of the people I talk to find that bankruptcy is the way out when they're in trouble, when it comes to foreclosure. And I want you to share that bankruptcy is not the way out when it comes to — when they get behind in their loans. Contact the bank. And a lot of folks don't even realize, contact the bank and let them know that you're having problems, and once you contact the bank, if the bank refuses to work with you, then you contact our office.

Banks will do -- they have all types of forbearance agreements, modification agreements.

Banks will do up to -- this is something they will not tell you but I'm going to tell you. They will do up to four and five modification agreements, up to four and five forbearance agreements.

If you get into trouble, you never have to lose your home. You can just talk to the bank and make them work with you, make them help you with your loan. Make them lower the payments, make them

aware that you know something's not right, and this loan is not right and I need you to help me to keep my house.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you, thank you. Mr. Ed Leahy.

MR. LEAHY: Thank you, everyone, and what an inspiration Natasha was. I'll try to be equally brief. If any of the public is interested, there's handouts here as well.

It is indeed an honor to be here with you today to discuss the impact of civil rights issues in the immigrant communities that have just exploded through our region in the past few years.

One thing we might misunderstand right from the start is that issues about immigration, immigration status, reform of immigration is not number one in immigrant communities. The number one issues in immigrant communities is discrimination. That's what immigrants themselves are most concerned with, discrimination.

The Number two issue is education. The number three issue is jobs. Way down on the list is the reform of immigration. And I think that's important to know. It gives me a difficulty in my job in organizing immigrant communities, because

they want to know, can I educate my children, keep my job without suffering too much discrimination?

But I think the reform of immigration laws and policies is imminently important, nonetheless, to both immigrants and to those of us who are citizens.

The last census period was a very instructive time for our region. We began to have to forceably recognize the elephants in the room. For ten years we've known that our communities were growing, that our demographics were changing, and yet there was very little public policy engagement of these communities and very little preparedness for the issues. Captain Galan did an excellent job of addressing that prospective, so I'll let that point go.

One of the sheets that you have before you shows a circle, and within that circle are the various factors of a human being's life, the concerns that we have for work, for family, for health, for social life, political life, education, et cetera. Within each of those segments of an immigrant's life there are so many issues, especially since 2001, that just surround them, that has made their lives immensely more

complicated.

Among these are the most egregious issues, and we'll center around civil liberties and civil rights. So it's just that we are focusing on this today, and I applaud you for making this a particular focus of your listen session.

A couple of incidents just from our region. In Dubuque, Iowa, there was an incident at the Coliseum night club; actually, it's in east Dubuque, Illinois, sin city, you know, where all the college kids go and relax on Friday night. Well, this thing happened one time, this man, person of color, Hispanic got up from the group of his friends, went to the wash room. Four or five white men followed him in and beat him up. Horrible thing. Crime, boys will be boys. Not a lot happened as a result of that.

Same thing happened the next week to another kid. Same kind of operation. Bar owner didn't want anything to do with it. Police chief wasn't all that interested in it. The college president wasn't all that interested in making an announcement to students, be careful, you know, don't be hanging out at the Coliseum.

Happened again. This time neither police chief

Kansas Cay, MO 64108

on either side of the river was interested. The Mexican-American Defense in Education Fund in Chicago wasn't interested, and neither was the Consolate. The Bishop wasn't all that interested. Then the fourth time it happened to Steven, he was beaten to the point of death. He didn't die, but he was badly beaten. That incident happened in September '02.

In December '02 the FBI reported that within our region, we experienced a 1,600 percent increase in hate crimes, reported hate crimes. We all know that hate crimes are a violation of our human dignity, that it's impossible, sometimes, to even recognize and deal with and admit, I have been hated simply for who I am, for the color of my skin, for the sound of my voice, for where I live. 1,600 percent increase.

Norfolk, Nebraska. Bank robbery committed by four U.S. citizens, just happened to be Hispanics. The repercussions throughout the community were equally great. People had difficulty getting their utility bills paid. There was a great division happening within that community. Been great healing, there's been great progress with each of these, but it's always just below the surface.

2

3

**4** 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Someone mentioned earlier the fliers being put out by the National Alliance. White supremacist group. They frequently target immigration. They target anything that might make a headline that has to do with a person of color. And this group has been prolific in that, and what they really want is more headlines, more reaction to them.

We saw during the Immigrant Worker Freedom Rights, an interesting collaboration between the white supremacist groups and the restrictionist groups, people who don't want to see immigration reform, people who think that the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform Act and Immigrant Responsibility Act, better known as IRAIRA is actually a good law. It is not. It is a Jacobin, ridiculous, racist, evil piece of legislation, slipped into an appropriates bill on Page 546 to 725, right after the Umslot (phonetic) River Land Exchange Study and Small Business Programs Investment Act. And of course, nobody read it, because that was an appropriations bill that went to funding agencies and commissions, although evidently, not your own, and to raising salaries, and to funding wherever the Umcuar (phonetic) River is. And yet, we changed major policy that dealt with human beings

in a bill like that.

\_ -

We saw the special registrations happen to groups of Muslim men from particular countries, while in our region, in the Iowa, Nebraska region, the Homeland Security Department, only some 400 people were involved in those special registrations and only one of them ended up in deportation proceedings; it, nonetheless, had the effect on the rest of us, reenforcing that idea that if you're different, if you worship differently, you dress differently, you sound differently, you look in any way, shape or form, quote, unquote, un-American, that you are a threat. It's unacceptable.

There's great confusion created, often coming out of the Department of Justice, and Attorney General Ashcroft, in particular, who likes to suggest where we need to go to increase our security, and what we see is that things that are not policy and are not law and are not approved are being practiced. Good example, the Clear Act. The Clear Act is the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Removal Act, which would deputize local police departments with the authority to enforce federal immigration laws. That is not the law. And yet it frequently is the practice, as people stop and

departments begin certain procedures to inspect and to trap immigrants and to ask questions that they're not trained for and that they have no right to ask.

I'm glad that we spent a lot of time on the health and human services issues, because that's a disaster for our immigrant communities in our region as well. Recently we won a case in Nebraska in the Supreme Court that restored the parental rights of a Guatemalan woman whose children were removed, not because of abuse, but simply out of prejudice. She was deported, and the children were put up for a adoption. The children no longer speak their native language, which is not Spanish, it was a Mayan language, and had no relationship with their mother, who came back, who fought for them, and who, gratefully, justice prevailed.

So, civil rights is still a big issue for all of us. It's an issue not only for people of color, it's an issue not only for citizens. No matter what side of the comments of Mr. Cosby you fall on, there's work to be done. And, there's critical work for your commission, for your advisory committees.

There is progress, however. Glad to say that

the FBI in one of its responses was to add agents who especially investigate hate crimes and who are looking into that issue. And the agent in our district, Jeremy Knudsen, has been marvelous about reaching out to community groups. He appears at absolutely everything, and he is there and has said, you know, we're on your side. I applaud that. That's a healthy and proper attitude.

The Hate Crimes Community Counsel in Omaha has been especially active and has been creating rapid response teams, and even more, inviting other agencies into it. Several state agencies in Iowa and Nebraska, and I'm sure in these other states as well, have been reaching out and holding conferences and trying to educate and reach into these newcomer communities, finally, this has happened. We see it within organized labor, and we see it within the plethora of the development of new groups such as my own. Again, ten years too late, but nonetheless, funding was made available, interest was there, and, you know, there is progress.

The progress has lead to some significant legislation that is positive and pro-active. Among them, the Dream Act, which would give children of

undocumented parents, who have grown up here, who 1 have attended our schools, live in our communities, 2 are truly bilingual, and who graduate from high 3 school, the opportunity to continue their studies, 4 to continue to be a contributing member of our communities. It's a reasonable piece of 6 There are some 47 senators that have legislation. 7 co-sponsored in it, most of the senators in our own 8 region, and there's similar state legislation in 9 most of the states here. And gratefully, Kansas 10 just recently passed their own version of that for 11 But that is a piece of the state level. 12 legislation that, despite all of the support and 13 14 reasonableness of it, and has moved through the legislative process, has not come up for a vote 15 yet. And that's something that we need to continue 16 17 to promote. 18

You have before you another sheet that lists the various areas of immigration law that need reflection and reform. There are seven principles on that sheet. The interesting thing is that sheet is coordinated by a group called Firm Fair Immigration Reform Movement, which is a new agency and a new collaboration between traditional national advocate groups and local grassroots

19

20

21

22

23

24

groups.

That vehicle shows us that the key is not only a legislative reform, yes, there are very practical things we can do, but also a community reform. An attitude adjustment. Real sense of creating a new fabric in which we are integrating, not assimilating, but integrating these new communities and communicating with them, sharing with them our finest democratic values and traditions, the things that have made us strong, and learning from them.

It's no secret that salsa outsells catsup.

More people eat tortillas than Wonder Bread. And that's great. I often access the culture through its food as well. But we have to move yet even farther. So there's work to be done, there is progress.

All of us benefit from having a fair, generous, orderly, and secure immigration system. In the words of President Bush, the system is broke. And it's high time now that we begin to seriously look at this. And, with great pride, our region has seen the first introduction of a bill to talk about that from one of our own regional senators, Senator Hagel and Senator Daschle.

That won't pass this year, it's a posture bill,

it's the beginning, it's the floating of the ideas, 1 but that progress is not stoppable. What it will 2 require to see the success in the legislation will 3 be a whole movement not unlike the civil rights It's going to take the churches. 5 going to take the communities. It's going to take each and every one of us, versing ourselves in these issues and elevating them to the level of importance that they bear, because we are a nation of immigrants. That is our proudest heritage. at the best times in our history, we have risen above the competing agendas to actually define our laws and build our laws and structure our society based on rights. From the very beginning it was that way, even though everybody wasn't included, at the very beginning. But at those very moments when we can rise above the individual agendas and look at the rights of individuals is when we truly know what freedom is. Thank you.

DR. MITCHELL: I'll ask Mr. Garcia to come up as the panel assembles. Before we have questions, I wanted Mr. Garcia to make a short presentation and then the panel will assemble.

MR. GARCIA: We were kind of hoping that --

25

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. MITCHELL: You want to do it with the 1 panel? 2 That my colleague, the MR. GARCIA: 3 Director of African-American Affairs for the State 4 of Kansas and I do our equal time or shared time at 5 this juncture. We're kind of in a time schedule 6 and we need to get back. So we thought if we could 7 come up here and do our thing, maybe we can take 8 off, if that's okay. 9 DR. MITCHELL: Yes. 10 MR. GARCIA: So, with that I appreciate 11 that, and thank you very much for the invitation to 12 come and speak today. 13 First of all, let me thank each and every one 14 of you for the work that you're doing. It is not 15 easy, it's a thankless job that you're doing, and 16 we appreciate that, we recognize that and 17 congratulate you for your efforts, and thank you, 18 19 again, on behalf of the community of people who 20 don't always get the chance to say thank you, so we want to do that right off the bat. 21 22 I am the director of the Kansas Hispanic and Latino American Affairs Commission. Now that is 23 24 different than it was two weeks ago. 25 actually, it began in January, legislative session.

We are a creature of the legislature with this
Advisory Committee on Hispanic Affairs, which it
was formerly known as the Kansas Advisory on
Hispanic Affairs. We're a creature of the
legislature, therefore any changes made to any
organization or verbiage in that legislation, we
have to go back to the legislature and change.

With that in mind, we rewrote a bill, submitted it to the legislature, lobbied it and got it passed. It was House Bill 2435. But also with that was the African-American affairs. Together we drafted this bill and pushed it to the legislature. They also are a creature of the legislature. We had changes, all of us needed to make some positive changes.

I'm new to this position. Ms. Swopes,

Dempsey-Swopes is new to this position, so we
thought, since we were new, we might as well go in
there and reorganize, which is what people often
do. So we are the Kansas Hispanic and Latino and
African-American Affairs Commission. That's the
three changes we made. First of all, we changed
the name. Second one, was we moved to the
governor's office. We're no longer under the
Department of Human Resources.

Я

The third change was we became a commission as opposed to an advisory committee. So those three changes were in the legislation and we got them passed. I say two weeks ago, because the governor just signed it last week. So we are officially in the books. So we're very happy about that.

I was going to talk about immigrant rights in Kansas, and, again, I compliment my colleague here for the excellent job that he did in his presentation. But I want to note and make it, especially highlights for you that immigrant, the term itself, has taken on a new meaning post 911.

We all grew up with that term, especially myself. I come from an immigrant home. My parents are farm workers from Mexico, undocumented, so we grew up with this kind of environment or community, et cetera, et cetera, Spanish speaking. Spanish was my first language. To this day I don't know how to speak English very well but I give it a shot. In any case, we try.

But immigrants since post 911 has taken a whole different tone. It is a negative connotation that we apply to this term that has been with us for years and years. Many of us, myself included, don't understand what the big deal is.

Immigrants, the first Hispanic was in Kansas in 1541. Who was the immigrant? We were here, we've been here. My father is one of the people that will tell you, I didn't cross the border, the border crossed me, and many people feel that way.

So with Coronado leading the way back in 1541, and since that time we've had a lot of people immigrate to Kansas and the Midwest. But after 911, that took a totally different spin to it. And since that time we've been trying to redefine and find ourselves and find that medium again that we can live with, and that is the hardest thing for us to do in this day and age, for all Americans to do, is come to terms with that immigration policy.

Politically, we are a political organization.

No doubt about it. We are appointed by the governor, we have to go through the legislature, and everything we do has to go through some sort of process and procedure in the government system.

So this legislative session we tracked many bills dealing with immigration and laws pertaining to Hispanic community. When people talk about immigrants in the legislature, we found, and many times it's on the record for many of the legislators, meant terrorists. And they acted that

caveat whenever they did discuss immigrant issues. We're talking about terrorists.

So when we put forth a couple of bills, one of them was mentioned, our version of the Dream Act, it was House Bill 2145, that allowed our students to go to school, higher education at the same rate as other students. The national is the Dream Act. If that would have passed, our bill would have been moved. It would have been a done deal. But we pushed that bill and we pushed that bill and we got it through. And when I say to all my minorities in this room that minorities have to do things twice as good, and we have to be twice as smart, and we have to be twice this and twice that, when it came to passage of this immigration tuition bill, we had to pass it twice. That's the irony of this whole bill we passed.

We passed it through the House, the senate. It was kicked back to the House because it was ulteriorly, says the interpretation the House speaker put to it, so we had to start over again. So we had to start over with another bill. Luckily we ran two bills at the same, anticipating some kind of maneuver like this, so we just transferred all the information into another bill and had it

passed, got the votes again, so we had to pass it twice.

Right now we have a Wisconsin-based organization called FAIR on the Internet, if you look on the Internet, telling all the students in Kansas, if you want to challenge that law we will help you challenge that law. Kansas is the eighth state in the country to pass this particular bill. We're not the first, we're the eighth, and we're proud of it, actually. But yet, there's still challenges to something that's a no-brainer. I mean, who is against education for the kids? They're out there, I guess, I don't know what it is.

There's 43 million Hispanics in the United
States, 43 million. Half of those 43 million are
under the age of 25. Now think about that. When
we talk about the government and entitlement
programs like Social Security, like all these
entitlement programs that we have, who is going to,
in the next 20 years, pay into that if we don't get
the population to start paying into the tax basis
and start paying into those entitlement programs.
I certainly want to see my social security. I'm
not that far away, by the way.

So, I think it's only common sense to get our immigrant populations, who are right now viewed as terrorists, even by our legislators, to not only get acclimated into the system, but matriculate it, legally metriculate it. And we have to do everything we can to make that process easier.

The education bill was one, we tried to get a driver's license passed. That was House Bill 2039. That never went anywhere. We had hearings in January, and never came out. Again, on the floor of the House one of our distinguished representatives got up and said, "If we pass this bill we have just opened the door to terrorists in Kansas." We're talking about driver's license. But yet, the subject, because of immigrant, has turned, so we're fighting not only historical racial types of battles and struggles, we're taking on new battles and struggles, global battles and struggles that include and are defined by the actions of a few terrorists.

So our message, our struggle, our focus is clear to us. We need to keep fighting every day.

And I'm glad that my friend here is doing the same.

And I'm glad that you guys are doing the same. We have to every day come out and not get beaten down

б

by that, because we've been beaten down all our life. We're used to it. If it doesn't happen we wonder if something is wrong with this world. But we have to keep our focus, and we have to go above and beyond some of these definitions that are placed on us and imposed by us, or on us.

So we have to go through the process and procedure, and sometimes that's difficult to do. Because we are part of governor's office now, we represent the governor in many ways, in many venues, but, also, we have to take back new ways, new ideas, new programs, new policies, and we have to draft them and try to make them systemic that's going to help our community.

Our community is the future. The Hispanic and Latino community is the future. There is no way around that. And change is a very hard thing to do for anybody. The African-American community knows that better than anybody else. Now the change is going around again, the circle's going around again, and now change is getting more difficult and layered and more difficult, and it is not an easy thing to do, and the only thing that why people change is because they need to change. And the United States at this point in time is beginning to

see that we need to do something, and that something is change.

So, we are here, my office is here to help educate, to help collaborate, and to help form coalitions for the future that's going to help change this community for the better. And this is why I am proud to serve with my colleague here in African-American Affairs because that's what we're all about, we're trying to make coalitions. So with that I will give it to Danielle Dempsey-Swopes.

DR. MITCHELL: You need to state your name and your position for the record.

MS. DEMPSEY-SWOPES: I am Danielle

Dempsey-Swopes. I'm the Executive Director of the

Kansas African-American Affairs Commission. And

again, thank you very much for allowing me to take

my turn out of order. I apologize, we are on a

little bit of a time constraint. I also have a

little bit of a sinus allergy problem, I will try

not to sneeze through my presentation.

As Mr. Garcia said, we are very pleased to now be a part of the office of the governor, and for our state that means a great deal of change. For our organization what it means is, when the

Department of Transportation is talking about their 1 challenges to hire people from our community who 2 will be at the table to help them do that better, 3 when SRS is talking about these new changes in 4 5 their system of foster care and issues with children, particularly children of color, families 6 7 of color and joblessness, homelessness, all of those issues, we are now at the table with the 8 9 Secretary of SRS, to be a part of their new committees, their new boards, and dialogue with 10 11 them about what we can do to change and what we can 12 do to be proactive, and what we can do better. 13

Before, that didn't happen. There were not -those kind of representatives were not at that
table, they did not have the authority as a
representative of the office of the governor's
office. So we have, now, to serve in that
capacity, so I'm very pleased.

One of the most important things that we did this past four, five months, we've really been very focused on getting the change in our structure and our physical location done. The only other thing that I really wanted to mention, to add, is that we worked very hard to deal with a bill on racial profiling in Kansas.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Many of you know that the state of Kansas, the legislature funded a study on racial profiling on highways in Kansas. And the study came back with results that were really not good. Particularly, the agency that had a lot -- that probably did not come out looking so well as a conclusion of that report was the Kansas Highway Patrol.

Well because of the position that we are now in, and because the Kansas Highway Patrol now has new leadership that is very concerned about this issue, we've been able to work with them to talk about the training programs for the highway patrol, to talk about how officers are disciplined, how racial profiling issues are addressed, and that didn't happen before. So we're grateful for that study, and we're grateful to be a part of supporting a bill that would make the practice of racial profiling a misdemeanor type act and carry with it misdemeanor type penalties.

That bill also mandated changes to all law enforcement agencies, not just the Kansas Highway Patrol. So for example, if the Kansas City, Kansas Law Enforcement Agency had problems, they don't necessarily have to pay any attention to this report, they don't necessarily have to do anything

В

about that, but this particular bill, Senate Bill 2008, Senate Bill 513 and House Bill 2875 would make those changes. And so we were very pleased to work to support that bill. Both of those bills died, but we are not daunted. We will pick up the gauntlet next session, and before the session starts, even, and we'll work again to see if we can make those changes in Kansas.

In the fiscal year 2003, our Commission -- I wasn't in this role, but my predecessor and commissioners on our board at that time conducted town hall meetings throughout the state. They wanted to find out what were the concerns of African-Americans in Kansas, particularly issues of equity.

At that time Kansas African-Americans said that their top three concerns really were education, corrections issues, corrections policies, health care, and then jobs. So our commission has now then focused, and particularly in light of riding this tide, this wave in celebration of the 50th anniversary of Brown versus Topeka, and we are really taking a hard look at equity issues in education.

We're working with faculty from both K.U. and K

State to have them conduct some more formal studies 1 on education in Kansas. We hope that that formal 2 study will get our legislature moving again real 3 soon and get them focused, again, on that agenda 4 and, hopefully, have the education finance bill, 5 some education finance change that is sorely needed 6 in our state. So we're working to do that. Again, my head is full of sinus and allergy 8 9 medicine, but I think I've pretty much covered everything, and I wanted to be brief. I hope that gives you at least an overview of who we are and what we were doing and how we are involved in equity and civil rights issues for African-Americans in the State of Kansas. DR. MITCHELL: Panel, do you have any questions you want to ask the panelists right now, before we move to the final phase?

MS. VALENCIANO: Rita Valenciano, Missouri State Advisory Committee.

Mr. Garcia, I understand that FAIR, you say that they've been soliciting Kansas students to join with them. Could you elaborate a little bit more on that, and, also, could you tell us what FAIR means, if you do know?

> They're out of Wisconsin, MR. GARCIA:

25

24

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

and it's something about immigration reform, the first two is Federation for America -- Federation for American Immigration Reform. They testified in the hearings against the passage of the student tuition bill, immigrant tuition bill, they testified.

And again, they were one of ones that were saying, you know, terrorists are going to come in — and they actually had pictures of the terrorists, of the 911 terrorists that they brought. It was pretty dramatic. It was pretty striking testimony, I got to admit. But one of the things that was even more striking was one of the terrorists went to Wichita State University. And that's the whole point that they were trying to make, is that, you know, in passing this bill we allowed the access into Kansas.

What they're doing is on the Internet, just an open letter to everybody, students, that's saying that they oppose this, they still oppose it, they think it's bad for Kansas, it's bad for the United States, and they are willing to help whatever student is interested in fighting this, they would be glad to pick up the legal gauntlet and file a class action suit. They're trying to get people to

join a class action suit. 1 MS. VALENCIANO: One more comment, Mr. 2 Speaker. 3 I heard that their concern with this was that 4 it would disenfranchise Kansas students who want to 5 go to college, is that? 6 MR. GARCIA: For some reason they think 7 that this is an entitlement of some sort to our 8 community to immigrant students, that they are 9 10 getting special treatment or something like that, that they are going to get subsidies or something. 11 None of that could be further from the truth. 12 13 MS. DEMPSEY-SWOPES: There was a 14 representative from the Kansas House who said, why 15 should my children who have been here pay more to 16 go to school than those people who just come here? And -- but it's awful, and what it shows is that he 17 18 completely does not understand even how the process 19 works. 20 These kids have been here and gone to school. 21 They have met all the requirements for graduates, 22 graduation of the Kansas high schools, just like any other kids. What it does is level the playing 23 24 field. It doesn't give them any advantage. But 25 they're members of the legislature, and they

clearly don't understand that.

MR. GARCIA: I failed to introduce and to say how proud we are -- we always talk about bringing up our youth and being mentors and having them in the next generation of leadership, I forgot to mention our intern out of my office, Mr. Wakef Zamia (phonetic) Wakef, do you want to stand up here?

(APPLAUSE)

MR. GARCIA: Wakef is one of the next generation Latino leaders in Kansas. And if you read in some of the publications, the newspapers here in the next week, you're going to see an editorial by him regarding this very issue of reform, and I thought it was pretty poignant and very strong, and I'm really proud of the work that

he's doing for our office.

With that, I would say that the whole immigrant context and definition in the legislature has been that of dealing, first of all, not only on the merits of the legislation and the value of that legislation, but we have to start off by saying, we are not terrorists, and that is a sad state of

1	affairs.
2	DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much.
3	MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir.
4	MR. NULTON: Mr. Chairman.
5	DR. MITCHELL: Sorry. Yes.
6	MR. NULTON: Bill Nulton from Kansas.
7	This is a little off the subject, but you brought
8	up the matter of the efforts to get additional
9	education funding. To demonstrate the degree of
10	the problem and the lack of attention to the
11	solution, could you give us the figures as to what
12	the legislative, a year or two ago, they made a
13	request for a study to be made by an expert who
14	came in and studied under Kansas what the fair
15	amount for the state to pay under the constitution,
16	what was that figure?
17	MS. DEMPSEY-SWOPES: I'm sorry, I don't
18	know what it was.
19	MR. NULTON: I believe it was
20	\$871 million. What was the highest proposal either
21	in the senate or the house to fund education in
22	this last session?
23	MS. DEMPSEY-SWOPES: The highest proposal
24	$was_r$ the governor's proposal took a three-year
25	approach. The highest proposal that the

legislature came up with is they would fund about 1 one year of her three-year approach. And I'm 2 sorry, I don't have the figures for that, but they 3 only got so far, as really a third of what was 4 And I do know that the governor's 5 recommendation did take a careful look at that 6 study and proposed pretty close to it, the amount 7 that that study recommended, but I don't know the 8 exact figure. 9 MR. NULTON: Okay. 10 Thank you very much. 11 DR. MITCHELL: Yes. MR. PLUMMER: Question for Mr. Leahy. 12 You mentioned in your presentation that the 13 14

You mentioned in your presentation that the immigration population has increased by over a thousand percent; is that in the State of Iowa or the Dubuque area?

MR. LEAHY: If I said a thousand percent,
I misspoke. I said it has grown quite a bit.
Actual figures placed Nebraska 7th in the nation in
terms of overall growth. Attributed to
immigration, that came in at about 155 percent
growth. Iowa would be about 12. Kansas, Colorado,
Oklahoma are all around those same areas.

The statistics also would illuminate, kind of, all their unusual things. In the southern corridor

Kansas Cay MO 6(108)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 |

of Iowa that borders with Missouri, more than a 300 percent increase in immigrant populations in that area.

MR. PLUMMER: Is that eastern or western?

MR. LEAHY: From east to west.

MR. PLUMMER: All the way across?

MR. LEAHY: Yeah. From Red Oak to Shennandoah, Ottumwa to Burlington, 300 percent increase. Yet, that area lost adult populations still. And that statistical anomaly is due to the fact that immigrants are young and have a lot of children. And still, within that entire area, there wasn't more than about -- we're not talking more than about 3000 people. Because we're largely rural states, we don't have the numbers. You know, this isn't Chicago. The actual numbers of people is not that great. But the percentage and the change and the dramatic impact of reshaping the color of our states is tremendous.

There are several cities in Nebraska that have a 50 or 60 percent Latino population. Within 10 years, that's a dramatic change. Our states, Iowa and Nebraska I know best because that's where I work, you know, before 1990 were 98 percent white. We're still in the 90 percentiles. But the

dramatic change in smaller areas is tremendous.

Another example I frequently give to illustrate that impact is if you're driving to West Point,

Nebraska along Highway 275, the first thing you see is the IBP meat packing plant. The next thing you see is a nursing home. Then there's a funeral parlor, another nursing home, two more funeral parlors, a McDonald's, and you're out of town. 275 is not Main Street in West Point, Nebraska, it's a block south. And on Main Street you find

LeLanderes restaurantes, Asapata Ria, (speaking Spanish) --

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

MR. LEAHY: You'll find Hispanic assistance. We're make that a verbal assault for the committee.

DR. MITCHELL: But for the record you might put in Spanish restaurants.

MR. LEAHY: Yeah. And Hispanic businesses. Really. And the schools in that town are at capacity, at capacity. It's not a dying town whose principal business is meat packing and funerals. It is a town that has a future and is going to be around. And that's why we must bring public policy to these issues. We have got to

acknowledge, as I say, the elephant in the room, 1 because it's there. 2 DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 3 DR. MITCHELL: Yes. 4 I'm Cora Thompson from 5 DR. THOMPSON: Missouri with a little bit of background in Iowa. 6 And I wanted to know about the Thai Dom 7 Resettlement that happened in the early 1970s. Has 8 there been an increase in immigrants due to that 9 resettlement or has there been an increase in 10 immigrants from Vietnam and Laos from that? 11 MR. LEAHY: Well, for agent and Pacific 12 Islander communities, current immigration laws make 13 14 it very difficult to reunite families. 15 long lists of waiting periods. The resettlement in those, in that time, in the 70's, when I did not 16 17 live here, and I'm not aware of all the issues of 18 that, has stabilized and they've become a vibrant 19 part of the communities. 20 They've tended to concentrate, so that would be 21 in Sioux City, there's still a large community, and Crete, in eastern Iowa, Muscatine area. 22 23 these communities have, you know, become part of 24 the fabric of American life, as will the 25 communities that we're seeing today. It's going to

take generations. But the difficulty for the 1 resettlement of those people is that they are That is a different class of immigrant refugees. 3 that we should be aware of.

> In the 1980s, the United States accepted about 280,000 refugees per year. This past year, it has been less than 25,000. So refugee families have a very difficult time reuniting. The other thing about that is that is -- a refugee receives their status from the United Nations, and then countries, member countries of the United Nations accept the refugees. The refugees don't get to decide where They are told where they will go they will go. based on available space. So for example, our Sudanese community may have family members who are resettled in France, and then can't come here to be with their family member resettled in Lincoln or Des Moines. And those are tremendous other barriers.

MR. PLUMMER: Al Plummer. I stand corrected, you did not misspeak, I believe the thousand percent that I was referring to, which is an increase in hate crimes.

MR. LEAHY: In hate crimes, yes. That was a 1,600 percent increase.

24

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. PLUMMER: Right. Now was that the 1 Dubuque area or the state of Iowa? 2 MR. LEAHY: Actually, that was 3 nationally, but that same percentile increase we 4 would see almost locally as well. 5 MR. PLUMMER: Locally being the state of 6 7 Iowa or Iowa and Nebraska? MR. LEAHY: Regionally. Within the You know, that's why we have to have 9 region. police cars, even still today, parked in the mosque 10 parking lots on Fridays. That's why there are nude 11 12 slogans, graffiti done to walls, and the handouts, these fliers that are flown into people's yards. 13 14 That's why we've seen any number of hostilities 15 happen. One badge of honor that I wear was the Grand 16 17 Island Tribune published an article or a letter to the editor in which I was labelled a shameless 18 19 apologist for criminals. I'm proud of that, 20 because I'm a shameless apologist, but the people 21 are not criminals. 22 DR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Will the panel 23 please assemble. 24 25 (Brief Recess)

DR. MITCHELL: We will start with the, as they're listed in the panel on this program. So Mr. Steve Skolnick, Deputy Director first.

MR. SKOLNICK: I'm Steve Skolnick, I'm the Deputy Executive Director of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights. I'm here today on behalf of my executive director Donna Cavet (phonetic) who is in Washington D.C. at a HUD event.

HUD has a new housing training for all housing investigators out of Howard University, and they have invited most of the directors to attend that and to see what the Fair Housing Academy is going to be about and how they're going to be doing their training. So she sends her best regards and wishes and thinks this is a very important event.

Basically, I was told you wanted to know about the relationship that we have with the Federal Government, our federal partners, how that's evolved through the years and how that's helping us through these very difficult times.

Well, the good news is that, you know, through the funding and support of EEOC and HUD, we're able to do many things that we could not do otherwise. The bad news is that it's a very tough time for

•

state budgets and for funding.

So for example, approximately six years ago, seven years ago, we had approximately 53 FGE employees working for the State Human Rights Commission, and today we have approximately 44 FGE employees working for the state in the Human Rights Commission, and that's in spite of an increase in funding from our federal partners.

Just to give you an idea of what's going on in this society in terms of the enforcement side of what we do, from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2003, and our physical years in Missouri go from July, I should say from July 1 through June 30th, we've had an increase in 225 additional cases.

So that is a very significant increase in case load and there doesn't seem to be any end to that pattern, that's been the pattern in the, oh, approximately 11 years I've been with the Commission, and when I talk to people like my director, Donna Cavet who's been there over 30 years, that's been the consistent pattern, increased responsibilites and increased need for our services. And yet, you know, resources are very difficult to maintain.

In terms of what we're able to do because of

that federal funding, I think that's very critical,
and in terms of our emphasis, one of the things
besides enforcement that we think is very, very
critical is to get the word out, to let people know
that we're there, and to also talk to people about
their rights and responsibilities under civil
rights law.

To that effort, our education and outreach over the past year, we've conducted approximately 159 education outreach training sessions. And I will point out that that's part of a working, kind of, we're trying to work smarter and harder with the same resources, so the way we do training is there is no training staff specifically on any training slots that we have at the Commission.

What we've done is our executive director, who does training, has offered to any staff who's willing to do this, above and beyond their responsibility, the opportunity to go through a train the trainer session and go out and train individuals. And that's how we maintain a high training function. There's no training unit, no training positions.

We've done 159 trainings, education outreach in the last year. 22 percent or 35 of those trainings

have been with schools, and one of the things I'm going to emphasis as I talk about the federal partnership, we think that one of the best ways to reach the parents, the diverse groups of individuals that we want to serve is through their children. So that has been a real emphasis for us, outreach to children, outreach to schools.

We've done 41 trainings, 26 percent with government entities, 83 trainings or 52 percent of our trainings with private businesses. And we've, you know, overall trained in those 159 trainings, we've had direct contact with 5,300 citizens of the State of Missouri, or residents of the State of Missouri, to be more accurate, to tell them about what we do: 43 percent of those trainings are in the area of sexual harassment. 40 percent cultural sensitivity.

As you've talked a lot about the different issues around the change of demographics in our country, that has been, in any venues, be it the schools, be it in government or be it in the private sector, they are aware of that and they're saying, we have different people coming from different cultures with different customs. How we want to have a harmonious effect at the workplace,

and we know we need to have diversity in order to be competitive.

We can't afford to have -- to say that this group is not going to have equal access to employment, we need the best, brightest people we can get. How do we help them understand each other and get along better? I think that's represented in the high percentage of trainings we're doing in cultural sensitivity. It's only 3 percent less than sexual harassment, which, since the time of the Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas hearing has been our number one area of training. So I think that's, you know, very interesting and does show how the trends are going.

Now in terms of what we're able to do, one of the things that's really helped us in terms of our partnership besides the fact that both EEOC and HUD have tried to maximize the kinds of dollars and technical support they've given us, is HUD has a partnership initiative program, and that's been critical in these tough times to do really creative, important good work. And what that does is that provides us money to a partner and sometimes to directly outreach with various groups in our community to talk about civil rights and to

do training.

So some of the projects we've had, and they've been pretty acceptable is under that last, not this session but the prior round of private initiative partnership funding, HUD did a national survey to look at people's knowledge of fair housing laws, how they work, what was legal and illegal, and what barriers there may be to utilizing HUD in terms of putting in complaints of discrimination, because we know there's severe under-utilization in terms of the people out there who says, I'm discriminated against, and that we actually then translated to complaints of discrimination, you know there's a problem.

So they did a national survey out of -- and the survey was done by the Michigan Institute of Social Research out of the University of Michigan, one of the top social research, if it is not the top agency that does social research survey research, specifically in this country.

We backtracked on that, we developed a local survey for the City of Jefferson City with CURE, which was a local group that was looking to deal with racial equity and racial issues in Jefferson City, and we piggy-backed onto that national

survey, asking the same questions to local people in Jefferson City, the need for a human rights agency within city government. And there had been an old ordinance, they had taken it off the books kind of quietly without telling anybody because there had never been an active civil rights, there hadn't been in anybody's memory, at least in a couple of decades.

And in the survey, we asked people, do they think there was a Human Rights Commission or some other government entity to deal with human rights in city government? And if there wasn't, do they think there should be. And basically, people thought there was, and there was not, but if there wasn't they strongly thought there should be. I wish I could give you the exact percentage now but I know it was over 90 percent. And the citizens in CURE, along with other groups in Jefferson City were able to leverage that and come up the, which is now the Jefferson City Human Relations Commission.

They're not a full enforcement agency, but they are emphasizing the education training side, and as they do their work utilizing us and acting as a referral source to us for complaints of

discrimination. But we think from a project that that's really major progress, that the city government in Jeff City reversed its stand and said, yes, it is important that we have an official government entity that deals with trying to help and make increased cultural awareness, create harmony between diverse groups, really let us deal with those kind of issues and have somebody that you can go in and talk to and help you find the correct resources to deal with problems along those lines.

So that to me was major progress. It would not have happened, I don't think, without that survey, which has also helped us look at some of those barriers.

In addition to that, we've got some projects that we've done this year that I think are quite exciting. We've had an essay and poster contest, and we're going to try and make that an annual event for the children for the State of Missouri, from 7th through 12th grade.

At this point we'd like to extend it down to the younger ones. That means that we sent out information about their housing to 900 schools in the State of Missouri. We had many participants in

that event and, you know, some winners in the poster contest, in the essay contest. We're now asking HUD for the money to make that into a calendar with the essays and the posters so that we can really kind of take that, disseminate that with information about fair housing. And we know that by reaching the young ones, they're the ones that are going to reach their parents and often talk to their parents, and we think that's critical.

Very quickly, we also have done an outreach with families and individuals in distress, what's normally called the homeless. What we've done is we're really looking at populations that are vulnerable and might be at risk. And the homeless is a diverse group, there's not one ethnicity in the homeless, not one national origin, not one race. I mean, the homeless make up all, you know, really reflect the demographic of society in some significant ways. So we've ran a project with the local Salvation Army, Harbor House in Columbia, Missouri as a pilot. And part of that's been, again, because of HUD monies.

Now what we've done is we come in there, we come in there once a month every other month. One month we do housing discrimination, the other we

cover the other kinds of discrimination in employment and public accommodation. We make an investigator available through the case managers there to come into that site and to take complaints at the site. And the case managers, one of the parts of the model that HUD has helped us with is we wanted to train staff, so that they can really identify when their clientele is having problems and help them learn about our systems and interact with our systems and get to us.

And what we did this year is we had a training on a day in which there was flash floods all over.

25 people showed up from social service agencies and Salvation Army staff throughout mid Missouri to learn about fair housing and what fair housing was about and how the laws worked and how to file complaints of discrimination.

So now we have 25 staff people who have expertise in social service agencies throughout mid Missouri on fair housing, and of course we also put in some of the other kinds of — the other protected areas that we have in public accommodation and employment who are going to act as individuals, who are going to identify that with their clientele, help educate their clientele, and,

again, any of those agencies that asks us and has a client and needs our services, we will come on site, and we will take that complaint. We think that's, you know, important. We also, just in passing -- and that training was because of HUD money -- have a video. Wrap it up -- five minutes.

This video that's going to be coming out soon is based on a comic book we have. We have the "Win Team" that kind of looks like guys and gals from Matrix, and they're going to teach kids about fair housing, and, hopefully, their parents will be watching the video too. So those are the kind of things we do.

Finally, what I want to say, I know time is short, is that if you ask me what we can do for the federal, state relationship, EEOC, we really think very highly of. They do their best to have a really good relationship with us. Their budget is at risk. That is a critical issue for us.

In addition, in terms of their relationship with us, it has been over 10 years since they have been able to increase the amount of money they pay us to assist us in processing cases of employment discrimination. We're still getting \$500. With the crises in state government, some of which,

unfortunately, I think are the responsibility of the Federal Government, we need to support EEOC, and I would urge you as an advisory committee and your commission to do everything you can to support EEOC in terms of the budget for their staff and to see if there's anything that can be done to give us a more realistic reimbursement than that \$500. Thank you so much.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Super. Can you wait with your questions? I'm sorry, can you pronounce your name for me?

MR. POTHAST: Pothast. I'm Ron Pothast with the Iowa Civil Rights Commission. I'm executive Officer and Legislative Liaison. I'm here on behalf of Ralph Rosenberg who is a new director as of about, just a little over a month, almost two months now. He had a meeting, a retreat with the governor today, so he asked me to come.

We have somewhat of a similar situation as
Missouri as far as budget going on the state level.
We've dropped about 34 percent in the last
three years. We've dropped from 38 staff to 27.
So that's very similar there to what you had. Our
federal funding has gone from being 40 percent of
our budget to now it's 60 percent, and that has

really helped to have the funding from EEOC and HUD.

I wanted to talk a little bit about some issues. This kind of goes along with what Ed talked about a little bit ago. There's a need for increased accepted diversity in the State of Iowa. The state has a population demographic of 97 percent, 3 non white, but the growth in Iowa is a non white population. So demographics are being changed and people need to be more aware of that, legislature needs to be aware of it and needs to change some of the thinking.

I wanted to talk about some of the legislation that was somewhat successful this year. There was a resolution in the state senate, it was going to be in the House, also, but it was defeated in the senate, and the resolution was going to be an amendment to the Iowa constitution. It was going to state only marriage between a man and a woman shall be valid or recognized in the state of Iowa. And that lost by one vote in the senate. The majority party voted with the minority parties to stop that.

Another success was the enactment of a bill authorizing the Commission of Latino Affairs to

ensure qualification of the Spanish language
interpreters and to provide lists of qualified
interpreters to courts, administrative agencies,
social service agencies and health agencies.

The legislature also passed a bill for the establishment of the commission and the status of Iowans of Asian and specific Islander heritage, within this State Department of Human Rights. That was a major accomplishment, they've been working on that for several years.

Another what we thought was an encouraging piece of legislation was the Iowa version of the Dream Act. It passed the House, it was very late in the session, the senate didn't take it up, but supporters feel like that is definitely going to be, have a good chance to be passed in the next session. The other information I have was pretty much similar to Missouri so I'm going to pass this on.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

MS. CRAWFORD: Hi, my name is Kaye

Crawford, and I appreciate the opportunity to come

and talk to you all here, some of you whom I've met

in the past. Sometimes state agencies, you hear

from state agencies but you don't hear from locals,

2

3

4

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

so you're going to hear from a local agency.

centrally located at the crossroads of I-70 and

Salina is in the center of Kansas and is

It has a population of approximately 47,000.

The Salina Human Relations Commission was 5

established by ordinance in 1974, so it's been 6

around for a long time, and that was created from a

grassroots effort. People met in church basements

and in people's homes and that kind of thing and

got the ordinance going. 10

Resources Department.

The department now can boast that it is a stand-alone department and reports directly to the city manager, so -- and in many areas that's not true, if often times comes through the Human

Our Equal Opportunity Ordinance has gone through many amendments, but each one has given our ordinance more power to do its work and to enforce its law. The City of Salina Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Ordinance was patterned after our State Human Rights Commission.

The Salina Commission covers the protected classes of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, ancestry, and for purposes of housing only, the urban status or family status.

The Human Relations Commission Ordinance has
been determined substantially equivalent to the
Federal Fair Housing Law, and we do participate in
the Fair Housing Law under a memorandum agreement
with the Department of HUD.

I was also asked to submit just a little bit about what our agency does, but, also, what some of the State of Kansas civil rights issues are, as well as recent civil rights legislation.

I thought I would discuss some of the disability issues that came up this last session, and also previous sessions, because Kansas does have very strong disability rights advocacy group, and they put up the big tent and they have a big tent coalition and really have pushed through some legislation.

The coverage of the Kansas Act, of course, and I know Mr. Minner will talk about that a little bit later, but it is greater than the Americans with disability Act in that employers in the State of Kansas who employ four or more are subject to the Act, whereas, of course under Americans With Disabilities Act it covers just 15.

The HAVA (phonetic) is a new bill, also that was signed by Governor Sebelius that requires that

all voting places must be made accessible. It also
intends for Help America Vote Act. It's going to
involve operating voting machines, increasing poll
worker training and voter education efforts as well
as improving accessibility and usability by those
persons with disabilities.

Again, with regard to disability legislation, the State of Kansas passed the visitability legislation, it was 581406, and I think they passed that in 2002. That legislation covers certain accessibility standards for dwellings, certain dwellings, and at a minimum, visitability -- and you'll hear more and more about this, I'm sure, but at minimum it enables people with limited mobility to enter a home to visit, to use a bathroom, to have a meal with a friend. It's just a very small step forward for people with disabilities.

Racial profiling was, I think, covered just a little bit already, but the State of Kansas commissioned a study on racial profiling during the 2000 year, and that study and ensuing report in 2003, and I have a copy of that report in my office if anyone would be interested in looking at that.

It reported that the State of Kansas is experiencing racial profiling of black and Hispanic

motorists. That's not any real surprise to a lot of us. In three of the seven jurisdictions, there's evidence of profiling. Those jurisdictions that participated in the study did so on a voluntary basis.

Several of our Human Relations Commission, commissioners on my Human Relation Commission and myself met with the Kansas Highway Patrol on November 21st, 2003 to form an advisory group for the State of Kansas to dialogue on the issues of racial profiling. And there has been one meeting since that meeting, and I was not able to attend that but some of my commissioners were. The governor attended, also, that first meeting with the Kansas Highway Patrol. Superintendent Sack (phonetic) is the name of the new superintendent of the Highway Patrol in Kansas, and he seems to be very serious about the issue of racial profiling.

The State of Kansas has also grappled with some other civil rights issues, as many other states have. One was gay marriage. During this year's legislative session, conservative leaders resurrected a proposed amendment to the Kansas constitution to ban gay marriage and other civil union between couples, and the major proposed

amendment to the Kansas constitution won senate approval but failed in the House, and it appears to be dead at least for a while on gay marriage.

The immigrant issue, I think, has been pretty well covered by Elias Garcia. It is interesting we are experiencing a large group of folks who are struggling. The limited English proficiency population has grown tremendously in Kansas, as well as all over the region. Limited English proficiency, of course, refers to people age 5 and above who report speaking English less than very well, which is the standard.

In Kansas, according to the latest census, the percentage of population with limited English deficiency or LEP in 2000 was 3.9 percent, but what is most interesting in that is that the change in LEP population from 1990 to 2000 is 103.2 percent. So that's pretty interesting. So we are attempting to come to a lot of -- we're trying to come to grips with a lot of issues. On my case load docket in our agency, I have six complaints right now from people who can speak no English at all. So if I didn't have an interpreter on staff, we wouldn't be able to deal with those complainants.

We did talk, I think, already a little bit, Mr.

Kansas did approve House bill 2145 this year, a bill for immigrants to qualify for in-state tuition, and we've talked about that already, rather than having to pay the higher out-of-state tuition. They must attend a Kansas high school for, I think, it's three years and graduate, or earn a GED. And they must also declare an intent to apply for legal status. That bill, I believe, has already been signed by Governor Sebelius.

And as Elias Garcia reported, they did try to

And as Elias Garcia reported, they did try to get through some licensing, and our region Executive Council on Civil Rights, a four-state region organization sent a letter of support and supported that. However, that seems to have died, also.

I hope part of what I've presented here to the Advisory Commission gives you some food for thought from a local standpoint. I do think that we need to get our advocacy groups together and to really push forward on civil rights. I see sort of a developing on a lot of those rights. Thank you very much for having me.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

MS. RED DEER: Well good afternoon, or

evening. It's after 5:00. I'm going to be merciful. I'm Sharon Red Deer, I'm with the Nebraska Equal Opportunity Commission. I'm here because my boss, Al Witicker (phonetic), is with your boss.

Now, I don't know if you want the good news or the bad news first. Everybody else had all this cheery news and I don't. I'm going to give you the good news first. The good news is, that we're doing a lot in public education. We're trying to educate those white folks out there.

Gretchen Uri (phonetic), I don't know if you know Gretchen Uri or not, but she goes out at least once a week to different organizations, businesses, clubs, and does her presentations, and she's a dynamo. We couldn't live without Gretchen.

We, too, participate in the HUD poster contest. We got some great responses for that. We even have some interesting rap videos on fair housing with some interesting lyrics. One of them did win though.

Let's see, what else are we doing? We're doing the -- we had a -- no surprise but Ed did mention that we had a wonderful first annual, hopefully, immigration conference in Lincoln two weeks ago.

We made provisions to bring all of the Sudanese from Grand Island to Lincoln and we had significant numbers of the Hispanic community. We were able to find the interpreters we needed and we had a whole day's presentation on everyone's rights, civil rights throughout the day from different presenters. It went over well. Hopefully, we'll have funding to do that again next year.

Let's see, I need my glasses on here. See, he stole all my stuff. We have the same things. Okay, well here's the bad news on the legislation. Last year, someone, who's going to remain nameless, I don't know who it was and it's not important now -- well I do know who it is: Legislative Bill 805 was put before our legislature. It was narrowly defeated. And I will read it to you, the pertinent part to you, "After June 30th, 2004, no new charges or complaints shall be filed with the Equal Opportunity Commission. The Commission shall continue with charges and complaints filed before such date. All charges and complaints will be heard of, disposed of by the Commission before September 30th, 2004. Appeals in progress may be continued to be heard. The Commission shall cease to exist on September 30, 2004."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Narrowly defeated. Guess who came to our rescue at the last minute? Baret Home (phonetic), the big legal firm, the legal employment law firm.

Why? Because they don't want to clog up the title three-fourths with those complaints. It was purely practical on their part.

DR. MITCHELL: Self interest selfish prevails.

MS. RED DEER: Absolutely. Can you imagine the burden that would put on the small businesses that responded? Can you imagine the

burden on the complainants?

We also have, right now, that has been approved, unfortunately, it did pass, which is 635, that's State Bill 635 that impacts our housing. The first draft of the bill we got on an e-mail campaign right away when we found out it was ready for final reading. And what that bill did, is require our investigators to provide work product and all documents on housing investigations from day one, from the day it was filed, not to wait until after the determination.

I know, in 30 years in the justice system, that I don't know of another investigatory agency, civil or criminal, that's required to provide work

product to an opposing party. And now that has -it has been reformed to only have to provide that
same information on cases that were tested by fair
housing centers, for instance, and that did pass.

We are in jeopardy of losing our substantial equivalency from HUD over it. So, more bad news. We have attorney general's opinion that our state employment FEBA (phonetic) needs to be amended to include — their opinion is, and I don't agree with it, I will say, that it doesn't include retaliation for filing complaints with us or any other agency on civil rights for future employers. So the future employers can discriminate, if you file complaints.

Also, the worst news this week -- I'm

Cassandra, the voice of doom -- the worst news this

week is, we found out that we not only don't get

paid to investigate any public accommodations cases

from anyone, we knew that, of course, but if we

lose a case, if our attorney general takes the case

and we lose it, we have to pay the legal fees of

the opposing party. That is correct. So, if we

take a PA case, for instance, let's pick on

Wal-Mart, since everybody does, we would have to

pay Wal-Mart's legal fees if we lose. The State of

Nebraska would. I almost bet a paycheck that wasn't true, because I've never heard of that. I don't know who abrogated our sovereign immunity on this, but it's unbelievable.

But anyway, I'm going to move on to -- also, one thing I would like to mention, that the EEOC, we, too, have a great relationship with them. Ron Hauser in Denver is a peach of a guy. He's always there to help us with technical assistance, but we, too, we have the same money as they do, everybody gets the same \$500 to investigate a claim, a Title 7 claim, a claim that could take an investigator a year, a solid year, we get \$500. That's it. And you know, folks, an attorney on the respondent's side of that, on that same year-long claim, is probably looking at 50,000.

So, here's our wish list. We need an increase in that \$500 stipend. We need some moneys, some kind of money from state, federal, from grants, some way to investigate and prosecute these PA cases.

Public accommodations is the underpaying of civil rights. Without that, you know, and I don't want to be overly trial lawyer dramatic, but we're going to have Ms. Parks to have to move to the back

of the bus again. Okay, we can't allow this to continue.

At this point in time, when my people bring me a PA case, I just look at them. What are we going to do? We don't have the manpower to investigate them, we don't get paid by any agency for these, and on top of that if we do find reasonable cause, our attorney general's not liable to want to take this to an Article 3 court.

My wish list is, I wish for the EEOC to create a partnership with the university like HUD has done for their housing school so we can send our EEOC investigators to investigatory school. That's a doable thing. That's a very doable thing. I don't know what the new situation was at Howard University and HUD's going to be, but it sounds great, because housing is kind of a mystery to some investigators, and we need — what they're doing is a wonderful idea.

We need more hands-on advice from the Federal Government. I'd like to see the Department of Justice in our office occasionally. I'd like to work in partnership with them. These cases that we have to turn over to them, above age 70, for instance, I would like to have some sort of a

passing the baton so we don't drop it. I'd like to talk to them, myself, personally.

We'd like to have some legislative assistance. We'd like to have somebody be a legislative liaison for the NEOC so we don't get this legislation like this going in under the radar.

I don't -- Mr. Witiker doesn't have time for that, I don't have time, but we do need someone, we need a friend out there somewhere. We need money for legal research. Baret Home and the legal firms, we're the little David fighting Goliath out there. They've got tons of very, very good employment law attorneys, and I've got investigators that have had 15 hours of training. And getting a subpoena on some of these things is three months before the subpoena is even issued. And I think that's all I have. Thank you.

DR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much.

MR. MINNER: My name is William Minner, and I'm the Director for the Kansas Human Rights Commission, and given the time constraints, I'm going to jump father here. But I do want to thank the Commission for this opportunity to appear before you. I, again, applaud you. This is a fightless kind of work, I recognize that. I've

been on the firing line for 32 long years with the State Human Rights Commission so I can attest to the merit of things that you have to deal with. I have been there.

I started out as an investigator in the agency back in 1972. I progressed to a manager, and then I now occupy the top seat. So I've seen a lot of things in our agency, but one thing that I'm very proud of is that, in Kansas, we have been fortunate to have both the executive and the legislative branch of our state in support of our work. That is very important. And that comes from democrats and republicans and independents.

We reached sort of a crisis in 1995, and I think that you need to hear this because I think this further cemented our support. In '95 -- and by the way, one of your commissioners is a former commissioner, Theodore Tory (phonetic) is on your commission, so he is one of our former commissioners, and he can certainty attest some of the things I'm going to tell you. But we had a backlog, we have an open inventory of 2,760 some complaints awaiting investigation in 1995. We had complainants calling the legislature demanding to know why was it taking so long to have their case

investigated. We had employers calling, demanding to know why, what was taking so long. We have attorneys on retainer, why are we having to pay, what is wrong with the commission.

We had been sort of married to a concept that, it was just a way we'd always done it. We did not do anything differently. We would collect the complaint. The complaint would basically sit and collect dust while we would await to have an investigator free to investigate it. We weren't pro-active. We barely, just merely doing things the way we had always done them. And I'm sure Al Plummer, a former director can probably also speak to this because I'm sure those are some of the things that he had to confront, but we had to find a different way to do things. So we had to face some tough medicine in '95.

The legislature, basically, told us that, look, if you don't find a better and more efficient way to do your work, we're going to have to look at the possibility of placing you into another state agency, perhaps in the office of the attorney general, perhaps in the Human Resources Department, or maybe abolish you and just start over. So we had to begin to do some things differently.

At that time the person who was basically in charge and who really set the tone as to how we were going to address these issues was a former director at that time, Robert Lahey (phonetic).

Some of you may have known Mr. Lahey. Robert Lahey is now retired.

But what Mr. Lahey did was to take a complete look at our entire system. We had to come up with different concepts and different ways to approach investigations. Several things that were basically looked at that had a real good focus was, how are we dealing with the complaints that are coming in initially? What are we taking? Are we investigating or doing some kind of preinvestigation for persons who come in? So technically, the law states that any person who feels aggrieved may file a complaint. But there should be some kind of evaluation of what that person tells you at the beginning.

For example, we had a lot of complaints in our system that were complaints that were filed out of time. People come in and said, look, I was mistreated, I want to file a complaint. Well, we take the information of those individuals would state an allegation that they were discriminated

against. We asked no questions in terms of what they were complaining about. But we were shocked at a complaint that perhaps was of non merit from the very beginning, so that case would basically sit and collect dust, but it was a statistic, it was a number.

So what we began doing was to talk to that potential complainant. What happened? Tell us about it. And in many instances we learned that, well, in some cases, what we were dealing with were individuals who in some cases had personality differences. They really — they were angry because of certain things, a conflict with a worker. They didn't get a particular kind of satisfaction with what they were talking about in terms of their issue.

In some cases the person would relate something to us that had happened over a year ago. We have a six month statute of limitation, so you wouldn't have a basis for a complaint if you're talking about something that happened a year ago, and you're beyond the six months statute of limitation. So we were able to prevent cases that would come into the system that perhaps had no merit from the very beginning.

Then we looked at, another concept was, those cases that would appear to meet all of the standards. They were timely. The person was able to state a prima fascia case in which they would allege, I'm of this race, I applied for a job, I was qualified, I was rejected, and someone else was hired. That case would meet the basic standards to file a complaint. So what we were interested in doing was to find a way to quickly get on that complaint while it is fresh.

We developed a partnership with the Kansas

Legal Services to do mediation. A lot of you heard
of mediation, a new concept in which you bring the
parties together, and you have a discussion to try
to get that complaint resolved, which could result
in an individual receiving their job back, getting
a financial settlement, or getting some other
benefits in terms of that complaint. That
complaint is taken off the books at the early
stage. If it is not resolved, then we have some
basic information from that conference in terms of
the investigation itself.

Another thing that we were able to do was to better train our investigators to be able to focus more astutely to the allegation rather than to just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

run all over the charts, but to focus on what needed to be investigated in the allegation for a complete and thorough investigation. So better training, more focus on the allegations, which was very helpful.

With that, we began to see a shift in the open inventory of cases. As I sit here now, this past April, we had an open inventory of 578 cases, 578 cases that are awaiting investigation, but that is a tremendous shift from the larger backlog of cases that we had in the early 90s. We were basically hand-tied and sort of waited on a system that was most unproductive. And because of this new procedure, we have been applauded by the legislature, we have been funded, even though we know that there are various crises in funding in various states, and Kansas does have some financial concerns, but because of our work and the relationship that we have established with both the executive branch and the legislative branch, we are highly respected. We are looked upon more favorably than at the time when we had all of these grievances, people complaining, calling the legislature. So that's sort of, I would say that we were given a new lease on life.

I want to just go over some numbers because I think this is important. In the big scheme of things, money talks, money talks. For example, in fiscal year, as we move toward the more productive years, in fiscal year '97, the Commission recovered \$773,824 for complainants. Now that is a combination of conciliations, proratable cause rendered by the Commissioner, and also, with the settlements that were obtained by the Kansas legal services, which was the mediation project.

Let's move to fiscal year 1998. The Commission recovered 1,542,101 for complainants. Fiscal year '99, 620,103 for complainants. Fiscal year 2000, 1,059,066 for complainants. Fiscal year 2002, \$712,437 for complainants.

Now, in this current fiscal year, we have a few more months to go here. So far, as of April 30th, the Commission has recovered \$1,333,380 for complainants. This does not include restoration of seniority, pay raises, and other kinds of benefits that some of those conciliations required.

The leading basis for complaints in '03, and I think it's pretty much true in this current fiscal year, in Kansas, continues to be a complaint filed on the basis of sex. Number two, the issue of

retaliation. Number three is race. The bulk of the employment, the bulk of the complainant, it is an employment case, and it is a complaint alleging termination and differential treatment covering all of those categories.

It is very seldom a complaint alleging a denial of employment. And of course, housing, we also cover housing. We get very few complaints in housing discrimination. We also get complaints in places of public accommodations but we are fortunate that if we have such complaints, and we have had them, we have been very successful in getting the practice stopped and getting relief of the complainant.

If we have a complaint alleging discrimination in public accommodations, that complaint is treated the same as we would treat a complaint in employment. If it does not resolve, we go to an administrative hearing in which the complainant and the fees are covered by our budget.

The complainant would also have the option of opting out of the administrative process and file their case directly in district court. So we are very fortunate, and I certainly -- I pain at what I've heard about what our colleague in Nebraska is

having to confront, because to have something like that, as far as I'm concerned, is a stain on the required enforcement.

So I don't want to take up too much more of your time, but I think I can stand here before you and to report to this commission that we are very pleased with what we're doing in Kansas in enforcement. We have a committed executive branch, a legislature has been very supportive of us.

My budget person and assistant director, Mr.

Halam (phonetic), I want to introduce Mr. Halam,

Mike Halam, the assistant director, and he has
informed me that, not to be too, too gleeful here.

He said that we may have some slight heartburn in
'05 but he thinks we'll be okay. We may have to
shift a couple of funds around, but he reported to

me that we're going to be okay but we may have to
be a little careful in terms of some of our
funding. But with that, given all things that we
have heard, I think we're in good hands. Thank you
very much.

DR. MITCHELL: Mr. Plummer, first question.

MR. PLUMMER: Yes. To Steve and other panel members, maybe the exception of Sharon. I

215 West 18 Street

Kansas Cay, MO 6 (108)

think you've already answered this question. One of the concerns that we discussed in having this session was at least a perception, anyway, that a lot of folks have kind of taken their eyes off the prize. In this case by reference to the prize is state, federal and local civil rights agencies.

I know, for example, in the State of Missouri this past session, there was a house bill introduced, and I can't remember the number, I think it was 785, you might know what I'm talking about, a two liner that seemed to be fairly innocent that I think had passed would have had a negative impact on the authority of the Human Rights Commission and Human Rights Act as well as other entities, whatever that means, in the State of Missouri, receiving the state funds, the bill was designed to minimize their authority granted under federal law, and out of it grew kind of a question for me.

Are there -- have there been proposed legislation, or even past legislation, that is designed to minimize the authority of state and/or local civil rights commissions?

I know Sharon kind of alluded to that, and I was wondering, Steve, if anything happens, that

bill, if you're familiar with the one I'm talking about, or anything else that may have popped up in this legislative session?

MR. SKOLNICK: Our biggest legislative issues, a lot of time, Al, what the problem tends to be, and that specific legislation is not one we track, but I've not heard that it passed either, is allowing issues of substantial equivalence with our federal sources. Because oft times the legislature will pass — will have proposed legislation, sometimes it's on a track to be passed, and we're just not part of the equation.

So we have situations in which bills might be passed but really not thinking about civil rights one way or the other, but could affect us. For example, the way Missouri law works, there's been a lot of talk about passing tort reform bills in Missouri, and that's the term that those bills have been given.

That attempt has been vetoed by the governor; however, there is an open question under Missouri. law of whether that bill would cover civil rights acts as tort cases. If they did, those bills put a cap on civil rights. Now HUD has made very clear to us that any cap on housing remedies, any fiscal

cap will put substantial equivalence in jeopardy.

I assure you when the teams were getting together to put that together, they didn't really think about that. And we had to, you know, engage in appropriate lobbying efforts to let folks know, we have a problem here and we don't think it is your intention. So those are the kind of situations we usually come across.

Sometimes, though, I think there might be a real concerns that if legislation is really being pushed and have strong backing, and we're inadvertently, you know, in the path of that legislation, it's going to effect us, I'm not sure that we would always have the clout to say, hey, don't forget about us, you know.

Like I say, well, you weren't really our intention, but, sorry, if it's going to affect you it's going to affect you. And that's something that's a concern. I think the overall concern is in these very tough budget times, beyond the legislation, when you've got so many issues that state legislatures are dealing with, Missouri is basically dealing with issues of, are the children of the State of Missouri going to be in classes with 35 kids to one teacher? Are we going to have

2

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

health care for children? Are they going have health insurance or any access to health care? And those issues are so prevalent, you know.

People forget that receiving those services, getting a good education, getting health care happens within the context of civil rights. And it's kind of hard when you're dealing with those almost life or death issues to remind folks that, even if we preserve those resources, if we don't have civil rights agencies acting as a watchdog, are the people who deserve those services, have a right to them, really going to get those services? And sometimes that message gets overlooked. there is a problem getting groups out there to advocate. When we talk to people on the grassroots, when we talk to the disenfranchised, we know that the civil rights issue has not been solved, but getting that into the public eye is difficult.

MR. PLUMMER: And I think just as a kind of a follow-up comment, the bill I'm referring to is the, could have been, hopefully, detached, but I think it was targeted to deal with issues related to sexual orientation.

MR. SKOLNICK: No bills around sexual

I did track That bill did not pass. orientation. 1 the bill, and no, it did not pass. That was the 2 one with special rights bill. As far as, the last 3 thing I heard, unless something that I didn't hear at the end of the session, no bills -- of course, 5 you do know, and I did not mention, that the 6 constitutional amendment bill did pass, in terms of 7 same sex marriage. And of course, I didn't mention 8 that but anyone who reads the paper knows about 9 10 that. DR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 11 DR. MITCHELL: He's still answering the 12 13 first question. 14 MR. POTHAST: Ron Pothast from Iowa. 15 DR. MITCHELL: I have two people before 16 you. 17 MR. POTHAST: About a year ago there was 18 a, it's called a Legislative Oversite Committee 19 decided they were going to do a study of anything 20 that had to do with advocacy. And the idea was to 21 put all advocacy agencies together. 22 So, we were one of the agencies that was asked 23 to come before the committee. And our director was 24 able to get the point across that we are a law 25 enforcement agency much more than we are advocacy,

and so that sort of stopped that there.

But this year during the budget session, there was an amendment that one of the legislators proposed that would have taken some money, cut our budget, which isn't real large anyway, and funded a prisoner visit type study. And I don't know how much it was.

One thing that kind of helped us is our new director is a former member of the legislature. He was in the House of Representatives, in the senate, so some of the people he worked with are still there and they alerted him to that and was able to do something about that. But that was probably because of his personal relationship. We could have lost some more money.

MR. PLUMMER: Thanks.

MR. MINNER: And I'm not aware of any legislation that would have been attempting in the legislature, that would have affected my agency or that would have been some sort of assault on us.

We've been very fortunate. And as far as advocacy,

I, too, would agree that there appears to be some kind of a, I don't know if it's burnout or just where people are perhaps not as engaged as they were at a given time. And it certainly is a

1	concern, because in this kind of work, you cannot
2	predict what might suddenly come on the horizon,
3	and if you don't have a corp of constituents or
4	someone that you can quickly gather, the storm will
5	have hit and gone on before you can even find
6	someone. And that's a troubling aspect, but I
7	think that with what battles I think that we have
8	had to fight and the daily struggle with families
9	just really trying to hang on to their dear lives
10	to make end meet, I certainly can sympathize, and
11	I'm not going to hold that against them.
12	DR. MITCHELL: Next question.
13	MR. RODGERS: Sharon, this to you.
14	DR. MITCHELL: Name?
15	MR. RODGERS: Chris Rodgers, Omaha,
16	Nebraska.
17	This is the first time and everything you
18	said I take it just went through this year?
19	MS. RED DEER: 803 was killed in the 98
20	legislature.
21	MR. RODGERS: 98?
22	MS. RED DEER: The 98, last year.
23	MR. RODGERS: Okay.
24	MS. RED DEER: So we sweated it right up
25	until December.

MR. RODGERS: That's the one that was the whole elimination?

MS. RED DEER: Correct.

MR. RODGERS: And I guess from my understanding of an inside story on that, the legislature, it was used — the department was used as a ploy to make the governor raise taxes. He pleaded he was not going to raise taxes. This is my understanding of the story. And the bill was introduced to gen up enough ground swell to make people get up off their seat and come up there and do something about it.

Eventually some things were overridden, and I think that might have been one of the folks because they got pulled. But from the other stuff you said, when that attack went on last year, as I understand the issue with the money, I guess I don't understand how somebody wasn't watching everything that went through there to let that go after what happened last year. A legislative aid or anything. And I got to some degree, and I don't know the side of the story and I don't want to say, but, anyway, it comes off most of the time, but the director is watching. And I don't know how Al let it get through or not, but I guess that's my

frustration. After that attack happened last year,

I would think somebody would be watching.

DR. MITCHELL: Your question?

MR. RODGERS: Why wasn't someone -- who was -- why wasn't somebody watching?

MS. RED DEER: Well, you know, I want to keep my job, so, I -- okay, the truth of this is, truthfully, I think, now I'm not -- I'm director of investigations, so I'm going to tell you what I know about this.

I understand we're supposed to have a liaison, a legislative liaison in Lincoln that does our bill tracking for us. And that person dropped the ball. We found out about 6:25 Thursday before the final reading on a Friday, if you can believe that. And Gretchen Uri and some other people got right on e-mail and started making phone calls and said, hey, this needs some reconsideration. And as a result of our last-minute intervention, it got tabled for revision but it also, the Nebraska relators board, which is the one that was sponsoring this bill, is hugely angry at us and has had some confrontations at the commission meetings over that. And I'm not telling any tales out of school because commission meetings are open to the

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

public. So, it's just -- now, there's like all
disasters, there's a chain of events rather than
just one person dropping the ball. But, you know,
it's a tragedy.

Hopefully, the HUD attorneys have it now. And hopefully, they're going to see that, possibly, it won't -- hopefully, you know, we're keeping our fingers crossed. Otherwise we're in trouble.

Because HUD, as everybody here knows, pays much more than \$500 for investigations, that we rely on, and we do take a lot of housing cases. And we're going take more with the immigrant populations that this is revolving around here.

That's why I'm so concerned for the PA situation, too, because the Sudanese are already having trouble getting service in restaurants and getting taxi rides and getting everything. And I guess if I was going to use Ms. Parks, I should have said Ms. Parks will move to the back of the bus, but she'll be Sudanese, perhaps. And that's why we're going to need some money. We need some support.

DR. MITCHELL: Ms. Perry and then Doctor Thompson.

MS. PERRY: My name is Mona Perry, I want

to talk to the person from the State of Missouri.

Who receives this cultural sensitivity training,
and how often do you do this?

MR. SKOLNICK: Well, my breakdown doesn't go further than, you know, I don't have it broken down. On this particular sheet I have between schools, government and business, but we have those three groups, and it will be available -- and I know we've done training with all three of those broad categories of entities. They receive it when they ask for it. It's a service that we provide. If any entity says to us, we would like this training, then we make arrangements to provide it.

MS. PERRY: But they have to ask you for it?

MR. SKOLNICK: They would ask us for it.

Well the only exception to that would be that when
we create remedies, especially in our processes of
early resolution, which is a process before we have
an investigation where there's a complaint to
settle that complaint, or a settlement during an
investigation, a settlement during conciliation,
after we've found probable cause for
discrimination, or sometimes as an ordered remedy
after a hearing, training can be part of that

remedy. And in that particular case, the people 1 would receive it. Anything but a commission order, 2 they would voluntarily say, like, the complainant, 3 we're looking -- when we're working with them and 4 saying, what would it take for you to settle your 5 complaint of discrimination? 6 Let's say that complaint is national origin 7 discrimination. We would bring up some 8 9

Let's say that complaint is national origin discrimination. We would bring up some possibilities for them, we say, one of the things that we know is a potential remedy besides a monetary one that other people have used is ask that these people receive cultural sensitivity training. So that would be another context in which the person might just not request it but it might be suggested.

DR. MITCHELL: Doctor Thompson.

DR. THOMPSON: Yes, thank you.

I was wondering if any of your agencies -- I'm asking all of you -- run into this issue that comes up from time to time regarding English only, because of the immigrants that come into our states, and I was just wondering if that has resurfaced?

MR. MINNER: There have been several attempts in the Kansas legislature to introduce

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

such a requirement, but in each instance it has failed.

MR. POTHAST: In Iowa, it was about five, six years ago, the first attempt was really a very strongly worded English only bill. And we just happened to be in an appropriation subcommittee meeting, and one of the representatives asked us for an opinion on that bill. So we didn't have to answer right then but we were able to send an answer to the committee. And our opinion was as to what it really was, that it was really discriminatory, we thought.

It was kind of interesting because the governor's office looked at it and didn't notice that, so we called it to their attention. And we were kind of, I would go to a meeting every week, and usually there would be kind of a routine for that meeting, but that particular one, the next one, I was the first person called on, said why do you think that? So we explained that.

Later on they did eventually pass an English only bill that was quite a bit watered down. We weren't able to get that completely stopped. That was done about a year or two ago.

MS. RED DEER: Ed Lehy would have been

the person to ask more about that because that's 1 his area of expertise, but I will -- my answer to 2 that is that we take charges of discrimination 3 based on national origin. Should that issue come 4 up in the workplace under a Title 7, unless it's a 5 bonafied occupational requirement. And ironically, 6 7 we had a case not too long ago, the parties will remain unnamed, of course, but they hired a person 8 because they spoke Spanish and then gave them a 9 corrective interview for speaking Spanish when they 10 weren't interpreting. So, also, I would remind 11 everyone that Title 6, I don't know if anybody here 12 knows Title 6? Okay. Well, that answers a lot of 13 14 that question, doesn't it, so... 15 DR. MITCHELL: Mr. Jin has a question to 16 ask. 17 MR. JIN: Thank you. Les Jin, J-i-n. 18 19 Mr. Skolnik will want to take a shot at this.

I have a question for the panel but I'm sure

My understanding of the Equal Fund Opportunity Commission is either thinking about or in the process of closing some of its district offices, and I don't think it's closing any regional offices, but I'm just wondering whether any such -how such closures would affect the relationship

20

21

22

23

24

that each of your organizations have with the EEOC,
either, generally, the quality of relationship, or
the extent that you have inter-agency agreements
with them, how it effects that. And I guess what
I'd like particular comment on is in terms of the
number of cases you might have and things like
that.

MR. SKOLNICK: Okay. Now that is, you know, we had heard on our side of it that they haven't been able to replace staff. We know that they're trying to go to some new expedited procedures because they are under such strain. You've given me new information that I personally have not been aware of in terms of closing offices.

MR. JIN: I just want to make clear that I heard.

MR. SKOLNICK: Heard, yes, okay. But even that hearing is new information for me, personally, and certainly concern. You know, EEOC, in terms of their relationship with us, and I don't have that exact figure off the top of my head, but in terms of our cooperative relationship, we're probably doing for them somewhere -- and this is very approximate, I'm going to say about 16 to 1700 -- I'll say about 1600 cases a year. Well,

actually, in terms of the formal quality of relationship I'm now thinking about the numbers we receive contract dollars for, it's a little over 1300 cases, the last time I looked, and it's been awhile, I would have to have these statistics pulled, they probably processed 3000 cases, if I remember correctly. I think it's that high, but again, I hope I'm right, so this is not a statistic you can hold me to.

If the EEOC is not able to continue to work on their side, and that work goes back to the State of Missouri, given all of the strains we're already experiencing in terms of budgetary issues, that would really be devastating. And while I certainly agree, there are legitimate ways you can work smarter, faster, and there are legitimate things you can do to expedite when appropriate, there are ultimately diminishing returns.

I feel we run a very efficient operation at this point, and for us to come up with a procedure with current staffing to take on even double the current case load, it would take a lot less than that, I don't know what the percentage, another 25 percent, I can't give you an exact, and to still do credible work, to be able to feel proud of that

work product that we do and say we have done an active and thorough investigation. There's going to be a point where we're not going to be able to make that statements. So that is a concern.

In terms of their organization and its physically closing offices in terms of where their office is, geographically, is not the concern. Having their staff that can continue to have the time to interact with us, provide mutual interaction, technical assistance, work on outreach projects together, that's what's critical. And I already have a sense, and I'm not -- I do some liaison with them, but our Director of Investigations is our primary lead on EEOC, and I'm already hearing from him and already getting a sense that these are staff people under a tremendous strain, to try to do their job with who's left.

We've had a very similar thing with the state that's been with the commission. Every time somebody leaves, we just smile and say, how are we going to do the work that they used to do. And the EEOC seems to be experiencing that. Somebody leaves, there's nobody to replace them, how do we redivide the work? Again, diminishing returns.

So it is a concern. Kaye kind of indicated, she had already heard out of the grapevine, I had not till now, but that is a concern.

MS. RED DEER: I've had feelings like that, also. I think that we need the technical assistance. The physical location of offices is not as important except that they can't get to us as readily. And we need some hands-on visits. I've been with the NEOC for almost five months and I still physically haven't seen anybody from EEOC, so, and I need them in there. When we get cutting edge stuff on seminal cases, I need them in the office there to guide us through these things, because they're the ones that are going to ultimately determine everything, so...

DR. MITCHELL: Are there other questions? Sorry, you need to answer.

MR. POTHAST: Ron Pothast from Iowa.

We're in a different regions, in Iowa, than the other states here, and we had heard something about this. We're with the Milwaukee office, and we definitely heard something about this, and we have the same effects that the other agencies have.

MR. MINNER: I had not heard this but I would also amplify that we wouldn't be too much

concerned about the possibility of certain closures and mergers, but we would still want to have the technical assistance and the contact with the EEOC, that they are very helpful. We don't have any complaints with that agency. They truly are our big brother, big sister.

Lynn Bruner (phonetic), the area director is a marvelous, dedicated foot soldier, and we love her. She does and excellent job, and we would certainly want to do all that we can in our individual agency capacity to see to it that they are adequately funded. That's very important. And I didn't say this earlier, but I think it's time for them to have an increase in payment to locals for their work. I believe, Mr. Plumber, we were talking about this earlier. We haven't had an increase since maybe in 30 years, maybe longer.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Probably ten to 15.

DR. MITCHELL: Seems like 30.

MR. SKOLNICK: And I would just like to say, even though the question was answered, because I would like to go on the record with this. When you talk about the relationship with federal and state entities, and since the 80s, wanting to develop that into a cooperative relationship, I

want to go on record that no one could have, in my 1 experience, no one in my experience has done a 2 better job than Lynn Bruner to really have 3 effective partnership with the state agencies, to really make us feel like it's not -- if it's big 5 brother or big sister, it's in a good sense, that 6 7 we really feel that we have a good partnership, and it's a give and take both ways, and I think her 8 leadership in this region has really been critical 9 to that effort, and I would just like to go on 10 11 record and say that. DR. MITCHELL: Very good, thank you. 12 more question. 13 14 MR. NULTON: Bill Nulton, Kansas.

To the extent that any of you have experienced over the last two fiscal years a reduction in funding, how many of you have? Could I see hands on that?

(Indicating)

20

21

22

23

24

15

16

17

18

19

MR. NULTON: Okay. Follow-up question.

Is that reduction in funding just because, generally, your agencies within the state have suffered a reduction in general because of economic slow-down, tax returns, whatever, or is it in any

4 5

case attributable to a benevolent attitude towards your agency on the part of the legislature?

Anybody feel that there's benevolence?

MS. RED DEER: Yes. Okay. And I'm going to qualify that by saying, sure, everybody has budget concerns and money's always an issue. No matter how prosperous we are in this country, money's always an issue. But I can tell you from my experience in the upper Midwest that, truly, the dominant culture does not believe there's discrimination that exists today. Even Gretchen Uri will tell you, when she goes out and does pro-active education, people are shocked, adult people are shocked that there's still housing discrimination, quote, "They don't still do that, do they?"

So people really, truly believe that there's equal opportunity out there. It's just like Doctor Yetman, when he said, yes, it's very subtle, but it's still out there and it's still debilitating. But it's not overt. And because they don't see the oversion every day like they did in the 50s, they believe it's gone and we're not necessary. And in fact, we've been called wolves lately by several big, large business

organizations. Oh, you work for the wolves. 1 You're the wolf pack. You're always on us. You're 2 hurting our organization. You cause us pain and 3 embarrassment and time and money and lawyer fees, 4 unnecessarily. So, yes, there is some benevolence, 5 6 yes. MR. NULTON: Now, and this would -- I'd 7 ask this of each of you. If you have the figures 8 you could provide them now or mail them to our very 9 10 efficient --DR. MITCHELL: Mail them. 11 MR. NULTON: -- regional office? 12 Specifically, I would like this data: The 13 complaint for the last two completed fiscal years, 14 the complaints filed. You don't need to give me a 15 breakdown, just the total number of complaints 16 filed. And then for the same last two completed 17 fiscal years, the cases pending at year end. 18 MR. MINNER: We'll do that. 19 DR. MITCHELL: Okay. I want to thank the 20 21 panel very much, especially Ms. Red Deer who waited all day to be on the last, the panel, since 22 yesterday, so I appreciate your patience. 23 MS. RED DEER: You're quite welcome. 24 DR. MITCHELL: We appreciate the panel 25

very much. So thank you very much.

Well since we do not have anyone that wants to testify, we'll move right to the adjournment, and just a few statements on adjournment, because I have to leave pretty fast. And the closing remarks is that, we've had a full day. We have lots of good testimony, information that we sought. The panel asked good questions, and we were provided answers.

All this information will be assembled, first the transcript that's provided, and then a report will come from this. So, I think we have enough information for a very excellent report. It's probably more than I think the staff thought we would get. And so I'll give everybody a chance to make one final comment. You got 30 seconds.

Doctor Thompson.

DR. THOMPSON: In the meantime, could we forward recommendations that we've already gleaned from the information that they have given us? Can we go ahead and just forward that so the -- the regional office can keep it on file when it's time to present the report?

DR. MITCHELL: Yes. Let me follow with that statement. I think each of us on the panel,

if we have some recommendations that we want to make from anything we've heard today, please send those to the staff, and they will keep them on file. So I think it's very important, a very good

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: I think we should express a thank you to our transcriber or reporter who's tirelessly pounding away on that machine.

DR. MITCHELL: As we close up, let me make another comment. I would like to thank the panel, because I think most of you have done a very excellent job in terms of following and being present. Even though it might have been tough for some of you to stay here that long, this is not unusual, I'll tell you that, for most hearings.

We try to be sure that those we invite to come have an opportunity to tell us what they want to tell us. Even though we put time constraints on them, it's very difficult to not let them tell us what they want to tell us. And it's also important that the panel members ask their questions. So I want to give you an applause from me to you for your patience and your work, so it's been a very good panel, and it's been something that I think we'll all remember for a long time.

point.

Yes.

1	MR. PLUMMER: While we're doing thanks,
2	Doctor Mitchell, you!re getting ready to raise the
3	gavel, lets' not forget our staff.
4	DR. MITCHELL: Absolutely.
5	MR. PLUMMER: That includes the staff
6	director, who endured the entire process with us.
7	That's commendable.
8	DR. MITCHELL: Thank you. On that basis,
9	I say we're adjourned.
10	
11	(Proceedings concluded at 6:00 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	•
15	
16	
17	-
18	
19	•
20	
21	
22	•
23	
24	
25	

## CERTIFICATE 1 2 STATE OF MISSOURI 3 . ) 4 5 COUNTY OF CLINTON 6 7 I, the undersigned Certified Court Reporter and 8 Notary Public of the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings was taken before 9 10 me and thereafter transcribed into computer-aided 11 transcription under my direction and supervision; and I 12 hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a full, true and correct transcript of my 13 shorthand notes. 14 15 I further certify I am neither counsel nor related 16 to any party to said action, nor otherwise interested in 17 the outcome thereof. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand and 18 affixed my seal this 16 Day of firme, 2004. 19 20 21 COSTS: SANDRA S. SONDAG Paid by Midwest Civil Rights Clinton County 22 My Commission Expires 23 24

215 West 18 Street Kinsas City MO 64108

25

Allen Reporting Services

Jennifer S. Barker 816-221-3441