## U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

COMMISSION MEETING

# **Unedited**

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 17, 2006

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The commission convened at 9:00 a.m. in room 550 of 624 9th St NW, Gerald Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

## Present:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Member

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Member

ARLAN D. MELENDEZ (via telephone), Member

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Member

MICHAEL YAKI, Member

#### Staff Present:

KENNETH MARCUS, Staff Director EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor DAVID BLACKWOOD, General Counsel

# A-G-E-N-D-A

I.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA
II.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 13 MEETING 4
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS
IV.	PROGRAM PLANNING 6
	Briefing Report Benefits of Diversity in Elementary and Secondary Education
V.	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
	Orange County Voter Harassment Letter
	2007 Business Meeting and Briefing Calendar
VI.	STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES 101
	Recharter Package for California State Advisory Committee
VII.	FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
VIII.	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
IX.	ADJOURN

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

the late start. Is Commissioner Melendez on the line?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I apologize for

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Very good.

Washington, D.C.

This meeting will come to order. This is a meeting of

the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at 624 9th Street,

commissioners are present, except for the Vice Chair,

Commissioner Melendez is participating by telephone.

Rights

Unfortunately, due to scheduling conflicts, we have

had a low rate of acceptance from potential speakers.

We will try again to conduct this briefing next year;

however, today we will conduct only our regular

monthly meeting. First item on the agenda is the

approval of the agenda. Once we have a motion to

approve the agenda, I suggest that we amend the agenda

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

We were previously scheduled to conduct a briefing.

in

the

2

1

(9:20 a.m.)

Okay.

the

All

Territories.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

N.W.,

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just to rearrange the order.

Is anyone on the line?

Room

on

540,

Voting

In any event, may I have a motion to approve the agenda?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. // I move to
5	change the order of the items to be considered so that
6	the Staff Director's Report will be the last item on
7	the agenda. Is there a second?
8	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
10	favor?
11	(Chorus of ayes.)
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
13	Okay. The motion passes unanimously.
14	The second item is the Approval of the
15	Minutes of the October 13th, 2006 meeting.
16	II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 13 MEETING
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a motion?
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
22	favor?
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
25	Any abstentions? The motion passes unanimously.

Next up, we have the Announcements for the month of November.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: November is National American Indian and Alaska Native Heritage Month. This month is dedicated to recognizing the intertribal cultures, events, lifestyles, designs, and achievements of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has marked this observation since 1976, and on behalf of the Commission, I urge all Americans to celebrate National American Indian and Alaska Native Heritage Month by participating in appropriate programs and activities:

Also, November marks the 22<sup>nd</sup> anniversary of Fred Korematsu and Min Yasui, and Gordon Hirabashi, their petition to overturn their World War II convictions for violating curfew and the evacuation orders directed at Americans of Japanese descent. It is also the --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: The coram novis cases.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: They were called the coram novis cases.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I guess we could have a briefing on that alone, and have you as one of the

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

panelists. It is also the 16<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the signing by then President George H.W. Bush of a law requiring the payment of \$20,000 to each surviving Japanese American internee.

And, finally, November 29<sup>th</sup> marks the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities and Education Act. IDEA mandates the provision to allow students with disabilities to obtain a free appropriately structured public education. This anniversary reminds us of the importance of working together to ensure that all children are provided with educational opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential.

Next up, we have the Briefing Report on the Benefits of Diversity in Elementary and Secondary Education.

## IV. PROGRAM PLANNING

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: On July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the Commission conducted a briefing on the impact of racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools. The Commission directed staff to prepare a briefing report after the briefing. The Office of the Staff Director distributed the first draft of this briefing report to the Commissioners on September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2006, at which time we were asked for

1	our input with the hopes that OSD would incorporate
2	those comments and redistribute a proposed final draft
3	in time for a vote at the October 13th meeting.
4	Based on the request of some
5	commissioners, additional time was needed.
6	Consequently, at the October 13th meeting,
7	Commissioners agreed to have OSD distribute another
8	draft on October 20th; whereas, Commissioners'
9	comments were due to OSD on November 2 <sup>nd</sup> . The Staff
LO	Director's Office then turned around a proposed final
L1	draft briefing report incorporating those comments on
L2	November 9th for a vote at this business meeting.
L3	It's now been three and a half months.
L4	since the briefing, and a month and a half since the
L5	Commissioners were first provided with a draft of this
L6	report. May I have a motion to approve the briefing
L7	report sent to the Commissioners on November 9th,
L8	2006?
L9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
21	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? Oh, yes.
23	Why am I not surprised? Commissioner Yaki.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, you should not be
25	surprised. Are the staff who wrote this report

present?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Unfortunately, one of the individuals who put in a lot of time called in sick this morning.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that's unfortunate, because I would like to ask questions about --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Who is that, by the way?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Chris Byrnes.

commissioner YAKI: Some of the statements in here, I'd like to know the source of many of the changes that were made, and I would especially like to know his familiarity with the rather voluminous bibliography that was attached, because I believe that there are statements made about certain of the studies that do not comport with what their conclusions were, other ones are all lumped together, and I'm not too sure whether they should be lumped together in terms of citations. And, again, I have no idea where some of the changes came, especially in the findings which are radically restructured in a way that would enable me to get some idea about who participated, and why certain changes were made.

In the absence of that, I cannot -- in the

absence of the author being here, I really believe I cannot, in good conscience, vote on this in any way, shape, or form, given the fact that this is our first opportunity publicly to discuss this document, and to ask questions that go toward the heart of the justification for many of the findings, and to ask whether or not aspects of the bibliography were, indeed, read cobbled together, or just relied upon from other citations in other works; which, for me, goes to the whole issue of why I have objections to the very nature of doing findings and recommendations in briefing reports.

ago, we had many discussions about the fact that we wish to do items that had a much more raw nature about the data and the research, that we would put it out there. I remember the quote, "Put it out there on the website and let people draw their own conclusions, or use it as they would in proceedings before the legislature, in Social Science, what have you." We have diverged radically from those original declarations, in that the briefings which I always thought would be a good way to get issues out on the table, to hear divergent points of view, to hear discussion and dissension on topics, and let the

public, let the policy makers, let the researchers use that material, much as you would a hearing report in the House of Representatives or the Senate, where conclusions are not drawn, but the raw material is out there for people to access and use. And when I looked at - I don't want to jump too far ahead of myself - when I looked at Commissioner Braceras' attempts to put some structure to briefing reports, which I greatly admire and commend her for doing that, it still seems to me that it's like our dear late friend, Ann Richards, used to say - you can put lipstick on a sow and call it Susie, but it's still a pig.

This is an issue where the idea that we can somehow from three hours of testimony, go to a body of literature afterwards and create findings and recommendations, I think is inconsistent with this. It's a drain on staff resources. I would love to know how much of our staff time is spent combing through the one, two, three, four - seventy-odd, hundred-odd citations in the bibliography, given that we already are screaming about lack of staff resources for our national reports, as it is. As you know, two meetings ago we cut back on our national report, because we don't have the kind of resources with which to do that.

So in the absence of Chris being here, I understand he's a hardworking guy, respect him greatly. I would have appreciated him being here to answer these questions, which I believe go toward the credibility and the changes in the report over time, and in the absence of that, I can't vote on it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner Braceras.

BRACERAS: This isn't COMMISSIONER specifically about this report, but I just wanted to raise, at this time, the issue of reforming the process going forward. And just to note for the record that as Commissioner Yaki said, I did submit to all of you for discussion purposes, a draft of proposed rules for briefing reports that I hope will eliminate many of the concerns that Commissioner Yaki has, and I share many of those concerns. while I realize that we cannot grind our work to a halt while commissioners deliberate on new rules, and come up with a new plan for briefing reports, I would like just to be very clear that this will be the last briefing report that I will vote for until we implement, not necessarily my rules, but a system that hopefully we can get buy-in on from the Democratic members of the Commission, as well. Because I think

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	that's really important to our credibility going
2	forward, and I think that it's important to have
3	integrity in the process, and have all of the
4 .	commissioners feel comfortable with that process,
5	whatever it may turn out to be. So I hope that you'll
6	all carefully look at the draft I put together, and we
7	can maybe conference about it; and, ideally, bring it
8	up for debate and vote at the next meeting.
9	So with that in mind, I'm going to vote
10	for this report because a large amount of work went
11	into it, and I think it's a good report, but it will
12	be the last report I will support until we have some
13	better procedural rules in place.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'd like to
<b>-</b>	CONSTRUCTION NOT THE CONTROL OF THE
15	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is  Commissioner Melendez here.
	·
16	Commissioner Melendez here.
16 17	Commissioner Melendez here.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
16 17 18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Can you hear
16 17 18 19	Commissioner Melendez here.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.  COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Can you hear  me?
16 17 18 19 20	Commissioner Melendez here.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.  COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Can you hear  me?  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
16 17 18 19 20	Commissioner Melendez here.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.  COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Can you hear  me?  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.  COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I just wanted to

said in my comments was that I believe that we go

beyond the testimony, similar to the Native Hawaiians, where we interjected most of our own opinion about staff, and I think we kind of see that here in this report. So just based on the fact that we don't want to seem biased to either of the presenters at that time, I would hope that we could send in a report to Congress that was basically without findings, similar to what we did before. And, hopefully, they can make up their own minds as to that testimony of all of the presenters, so that's kind of my position until we can actually get a better process in place, so I would concur with Mr. Yaki that the findings are what I'm having trouble with. We don't have the expertise as ... far as Social Science review in our office, I don't believe, or it hasn't been done, except for Chris Byrnes maybe reviewing this. And I think we go beyond what the people actually testified to, so that's my opinion, and hopefully -- I would vote not to include the findings, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, I'd like to say that -- well, first of all, I'd like to commend the staff. I think that this report is quite good. I think that the staff put in a lot of time, and they came up with a -- the product is good, in my humble opinion. I find it interesting that we are spending

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this much time talking about our procedures.

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

So far, no one has identified any fatal flaws with the document.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No,/I --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let me finish. We're talking procedural issues, tactical issues. If we can point to something in the document that is fatally flawed, then I think that we should address it. Hold on, folks, let me finish. I'll get to everyone.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Don't raise a question that you know I'm going to have an answer to.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, well, no. I don't: I want to have this discussion. that we issue briefing reports without any findings, I don't think that's the way we should go. This is the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and it would be a deviation from the role that we have historically We are not neutral observers. Sometimes played. things are right, sometimes things are wrong. agency, this commission has always had a particular point of view. If you will, it's been biased against say the South's attempt to deny the vote to blacks. It's not unusual for the commission to take a leadership role when it comes to civil rights issues.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

That's why we're here. This is not a think-tank. Our job is not to just deliver facts to decision makers. Our job is to influence decision makers, in my view.

This particular document, I think that the findings reflect what was said. I think that the main thrust of the document is that when we look at the literature out there, at best, the benefits are modest in reading. In math, I think that there is a consensus that there is no benefits that have been quantified, so that was the main thrust of the findings. I think those findings are supported by the testimony.

This is not an instance where a particular panelist was singled out. I think that the findings are a -- this is the consensus of all the individuals that participated in the briefing. Modest findings for reading, no benefits in math, and some screwy findings with respect - one study showed that segregation, in some instances, helped Hispanics, so the data is all over the place. That's what I took away from the hearing.

Commissioner Braceras.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you on the merits, that I think that that's what the evidence demonstrates. However, I have to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

respectfully disagree with your comment that we're spending too much time discussing process. I think process is extremely --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, no, no. I don't think I said that. I said I find it interesting that we're focusing on process --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But I think process is critical, because --

THAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let me rephrase

my statement then. I am not -- I think it's a good

idea that we're going to have some clear guidelines

with respect to our briefing reports, but looking at

the merits, looking at this particular document, I

don't see --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Under a revised process, it may very well be that we'd come out with the exact same -- well, I think we would come out with the exact same findings and recommendations. However, I think what would be different about it is that the findings would be findings that -- rather than staff findings, I think they'd be commissioner findings. And I think there would be a chance to explore each of the findings at a commissioner level, instead of just voting for the report in and all or nothing format. And this -- it's the same objection I had under the

old regime with Mary Frances Berry, where at that time, when we were in the minority, we were presented with reports that had conclusions and recommendations with which not everyone agreed, and we were asked to vote up or down on the entire thing, even though there may be some very good, interesting material in the report. We, as minority commissioners at the time, didn't necessarily agree with all the findings and conclusions. And what we wanted from Mary Frances Berry, and what we never received, was an opportunity to deliberate over each of the findings, and have an opportunity to vote on them individually.

Now under that regime, we still would have lost those votes. And under this administration, the Democratic commissioners may still loose particular votes on particular findings, but I think that if they had an opportunity to discuss the findings one by one, and to dissent from each particular finding so that would give the process greater integrity. That's all. I'm not saying that the findings would be different, or that the report is in any way academically flawed, But I do think the process is extremely important.

Anyway, putting that aside, I'd just simply like to ask Commissioners Melendez and Yaki if there's any compromise possible on this document that

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

would satisfy them, and enable them to vote for it?

Is there anything, short of tanking the whole thing,
that you would remove from the report? I mean, is
there some way we can come up --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Or object to?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Are there sections of the report that could be removed, and would then satisfy your concerns?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, point of clarification. With respect to -- well, I would -- am

I correct that with our national reports, our statutory report, for example, we have the flexibility to support particular findings, but not others. Is that already in place?

Right. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. So when the working group on the reform came up with its original rules, they were focused on national reports because we hadn't, as a commission, yet moved to this model. But then when we moved to this model, we found ourselves in the position of having to vote on findings and recommendations that hadn't been vetted in the same way by the commissioners themselves. And it's not that I think that the commission should not making findings business σf and the in I think it's fine for us to make recommendations.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

findings and recommendations, but I think that as with other study groups, and even governmental commissions, I think that each finding needs to be considered separately, and there needs to be an opportunity to explain the positions of the majority and minority on each finding.

I think, for example, to the report on Title 9 that was done by you guys at the Department of Education. Right? That was under your leadership. Where the findings were stated, and then underneath it would say something like dissenting commissioners were concerned that blah, blah, blah, blah, so their concern about each finding was listed. There weren't voluminous dissenting statements, but it was broken down in what seemed to be a more procedurally democratic way. That might be a model that we would look to, and that's something that we need to discuss as commissioners, whether that's a model we want to adopt.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think we should redouble our efforts to get the procedures in place, and with any luck, vote on it at our next meeting.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's what I'm trying to do, but in the meantime, I would like to

1.5

1	hear from Commissioners Yaki and Melendez as to
2	whether there are specific paragraphs or things that
3	if removed they could support the report, or would you
4	vote against it anyway?
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, I think
6	this is Commissioner Melendez. Again, I have problem
7	with a lot of the findings and a lasso citation to
8	some of the Social Science portions of this. And
9	really what that would require would be to delay this
10	until another meeting, and go back over it, and
11	basically see if it's acceptable to delete certain
12	things, even more so; otherwise, I'd have to still
13	vote against the way it is now.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let me just put it
15	to you this way. If there were no findings and
16	recommendations in this report, would you vote for it?
17	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: If there were no
18	findings, yes.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Commissioner
20	Yaki?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let me just talk
22	just a little bit about procedure. I am somewhat
23	disturbed. And, again, this has nothing to do with
24	the qualifications of Mr. Byrnes, who I think does a
25	fine job, but this was, in many ways, an exercise in

understanding the Social Science research of this. It is my understanding that we have Social Science people in OCRE, and my first question is, did they review the bibliography and literature to determine whether or not some of the conclusions made about the literature, or characterization of the literature were accurate or not?

assignments, I think that we had the luxury of having on staff someone who is particularly expert in educational civil rights policy, and who had an unusual amount of expertise dealing with policies regarding diversity in education, and that's Mr. Byrnes. You may be aware that he joined us from the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education, where a large percentage of his work dealt with looking at issues of diversity in education. So he is, I think, a person who has an unusually strong background in the subject.

He was joined in this work for parts of it by an analyst that we had on detail from HUD. We did not have anyone --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is she an analyst or an attorney?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Pardon?

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

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Was she an analyst or
2	an attorney from HUD?
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: She was not an
4	attorney. I don't recall her exact personnel
5	designation, but she was some form of analyst.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And what kind of
7	training did she have?
8	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Her background is
9	in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity
10	dealing with fair housing issues at HUD. We did not
11	have precisely the sort of exercise that you
12	described, but we did have a review of at least some
13	of the findings by OCRE, just where it appeared that
14	some technical guidance would be necessary. It's a
15	kind of a reality check.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the basic answer
17	is no.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I don't think
19	that's the basic answer. The basic answer is what I
20	just gave.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I think the basic
22	answer is that OCRE's Social Scientist did not play a
23	significant role in reviewing whether or not the
24	characterizations of the Social Science research and
25	the bibliography, as characterized in the findings,

were accurate or not.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: They played only a supporting role in the findings. That's right.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. The reason

I'm bringing that up is that, like I said, I have
great fondness and appreciation for the comments of

Commissioner Braceras, and if you were to ask me, I
would say that, to me, the significant flaw, fatal
flaw of this document is in tone, and in
characterization. When you start with Finding One,
first sentence, "There's little academic consensus",
that sentence in -- that phrase, in and of itself, I
believe, is misleading. You had in the testimony from

Professor Kurlaender and Attorney Coleman that they
believed there was broad consensus on the idea that
there were educational benefits.

Now part of this definitional issue that we have, as the Chair said, the Chair keeps on talking about math, but the educational benefit, the educational experience in the American primary school system, and its impact on secondary and post-secondary goes far beyond simply whether or not it's a math score, or the English score.

I like, for example, the points brought up about should there be differential research on

1	economics, and some of the other areas? I think those
2	are good questions to pose. I think those are the
3	kinds of things that briefing reports should look at
4 .	to say, everyone seems to be focusing on these two
5	factors, but there are other differentials that we
6	should look at to see what kind of impact there is on
7	that. I like that.
8	What I don't like, though, is the idea
9	that you say there's little academic consensus, where
10	there is clearly two people saying there is, two
11	people there are not
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why don't we just
13	say the evidence is mixed?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The evidence is I
15	would say we would simply characterize the panel as
16	they said it, which is that two of them believe there
17	was broad academic consensus, and cite who it was they
18	believe constitutes that broad consensus, and the two
19	said there wasn't, cite the one or two studies, which
20	I know that they were doing, to say that there wasn't.
21	That, to me, is how these findings should be done.
22	So, number one, as it starts off, is just completely
23	off the chart.
24	I could go

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, before you go on

1 || -

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, you asked me for my response.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, no. Oh, no, no, no. And I want you to continue, but before you do, since my memory isn't what it should be, I would like to respond to the first bullet point. I mean, we have to sit in judgment of the evidence that's put before us, and to judge the credibility of the panelists, and the evidence. And we, at times, will come to different conclusions, and I think that that's all right. But in terms of the academic piece of this, I don't think - at least I don't recall any panelist stating that there were significant academic benefits to diversity.

Now to put it in context, I mean, the issue before the court - okay --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Did you say academic? What did you -- rephrase that.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Academic benefits? I said that, no, I don't recall any of the panelists stating that there was significant academic educational benefits to diverse settings in schools. Now the background, though, is a court case. The court is going to need a compelling state interest.

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

Now if we're saying that on the one hand we have to meet the strict scrutiny standard, and on the other, at best, what we have in one subject area is modest educational improvement, and even that is mixed. The high-performing black students, they seem to benefit; whereas, the low-performing black students do not. That's what the court is going to look at, and so when I discuss this issue --

result, or is that a differential result? In other words, you have a clear measure of higher performance in one category, and not in another. Now is that mixed, or is that a differential?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: In that particular case, it's mixed. Overall, I believe all of the Social Scientists on the panel said that with respect to math, nothing; with respect to reading, it's modest. I believe the best we can do is two points.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, just with respect to this first sentence, the word "consensus" means agreement. The fact that we're even having this discussion proves the validity of the sentence, that there is little academic agreement. I mean, if some people think that are benefits to racial and ethnic diversity, and some people think that there are not

1	benefits, then there's no consensus.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would disagree
3	with that, Commissioner Braceras, because if you and
4 .	I were to say based on, let's say Panelist A and
5	Panelist B. Panelist A said there was consensus,
6	Panelist B said there's no consensus, and you
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And if they don't
8	agree, there's no consensus.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that may be,
10	except that Panelist B is talking about two reports,
11	and Panelist A is talking about 125. I mean, to me,
12	that is part of the methodological and open
13	scholarship
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that's still
15	not a consensus. It could be 99 to 1, and that's not
16	a consensus, that's a majority viewpoint.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, in that case
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You wouldn't call
19	it a consensus.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: In that case, then we
21	should rephrase it to instead of using the weak
22	phrase, "There's little academic consensus", we could,
23	instead, say that the majority of academic reports
24	support blankity-blank, versus us taking it back
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or we could just

say the evidence is mixed.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- and saying mixed.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The evidence is mixed.

mixed.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But see, that's what

I don't believe that the evidence is as mixed as you

I don't believe that the evidence is as mixed as you say it is. When I look at the bibliographies, and I see who it is that's saying no, and who it is that's saying yes, it's one thing to say there's 25 reports here, and 25 reports here. There's nothing to say there's 25 different reports by different authors in different studies over here, versus 25 of the same people jinnying up the same thing over and over again.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you backing out the flawed studies? I mean, the two panelists who were most expert in this area both agreed, there was consensus, that most of the studies had fatal methodological flaws. There are not many studies out there, there are not many sound studies out there on this particular issue, so when you talk about 25 studies here, are you including the flawed ones?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I'm talking about the fact that when I received one of the big globs of backup material that we got from -- very late in the game that would support the -- that would go toward

supporting the findings in this document, and then I started looking at it more closely, it looked to me like complete rehashes by the same people over and over again, versus a much more distinct, varied, and broad-based set of studies on the other side. And that, to me, is --

Yes, but can I COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: just say one thing? I'm genuinely trying to sort of strike out a compromise, and if that means going over these findings one by one, and rewording them in a way that you think has a more neutral tone, then I'm willing to do that. But it seems from Commissioner Yaki's most recent statement that that may not solve : the problem, because it seems like what you're really concerned about is not necessarily whether language of these findings is neutral, but rather, the underlying studies. I mean, it seems, in other words, that you're not willing to acknowledge, for example, that the evidence is mixed. You don't like a certain set of studies, so you don't want to acknowledge them at all.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I would say -- I would characterize it -- let me just put it to you another way. I am not a Social Scientist, I'm a lawyer, I'm a politician. I acknowledge that, that's

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have staff here who are Social who I am. Scientists, who can look at the data, arrange it in such a way and say these studies tend to favor these, these are the kinds of things these studies looked at. There really was very little variation in what these studies were saying over and over again, versus the kinds of data that these people were going. I would say in that case, there seems to be a greater range of research supporting this on this side, a narrower range of research on the other side, and just leave it at that. I wouldn't say it's mixed. If you want to say it's mixed at that point, yes, but as long as you accurately characterize what it is within Column A or : Column B. And, quite frankly, I don't think that I am functionally confident to do that in the document as it's here right now.

Part of the reason why I wanted Chris here was to sort of ask some of the questions about where some of these things came from, to help me understand better what he relied on, and what he didn't rely upon. But if you want to go one thing, which I think is completely off the chart, is Recommendation 17, which just pops out of nowhere from anything that I can think of.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which page is that on?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER YAKI: 20. And just to finish, because I think that this is -- I just have one final statement to make.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I see.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And that is, I just find -- the difficulty I have with briefing reports, and I was a big fan of the briefing report. It was a means of dealing with issues with a lack of resources. We do findings and recommendations on the national report. We do findings and recommendations on the big hearings that we do. Briefings in the original context, and I was a big supporter, was to get issues on the table, hear about them, get it out so that we .. could react quickly to what was going on. understand what the Chairman says about having a point of view. Of course, we have a point of view, and the commission is charged with having a point of view. But to take a three-hour hearing with limited panelists on short timetables with limited staff, and then task that staff with going through 85, different studies, and not even ask our OCRE folks, who have Social Science degrees and are called Social Scientists, to take a look at it, as well, and provide feedback back, I think is a methodological and fundamental flaw, weakness of the entire document. I

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	cannot support this document. I'm not going to
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: In any form.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not going to sit
4	here and try to improve it any way, other than to say
5	I think that for the benefit of the credibility of
6	those of you who are going to be voting on it, Number
7	17 just really sticks out there as well, let me
8	just throw
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: a bias out there
11	real far.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you,
13	I think it should be removed.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So, in other words, I
15	don't want to take up more of the commission's time.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, I understand that.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think there is a
18	fundamental methodological and analytical weakness of
19	this document. I think that the findings
20	mischaracterize and do not do justice to the kinds of
21	opinions and studies that are out there. If we're
22	going to do this kind of work, it should be done in a
23	much deeper, broader, and more coherent point of view
24	that uses our Social Scientists at OCRE, and I cannot
25	support this report.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But the whole 1 point of the testimony, as I understand it, was that 2 these people were brought in, these experts we brought 3 in were Social Scientists who said that the Social 4 Science data out there is both unreliable, and a mixed 5 result, so how would we expect our staff of Social 6 Scientists, who, while they might well-trained, are 7 not the experts that we brought in before us, to make 8 9 sense of data that even they are saying they cannot . 10 make sense of? Well, iust 11 COMMISSIONER YAKI: in 12 response, Mr. Chair, and thank you for indulging this In that case, we shouldn't have a report 13 colloguy. 14 chock-full of references to studies that were not 15 discussed in full by any of the panelists, because --16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, then we can't 17 have any briefing reports -- I mean, the standard that 18 you just set forth --19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: The standard I set 20 forth is more like what I'm used to, which is a 21 hearing report, which is people come, they give 22 testimony, they have other stuff that's in there. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You want to dissect 24 the report and any statement in there has to be traced 25

back to not only a particular document, but we have to

1	explore the whole body of literature to see where that
2	particular statement, how it sits
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, the opposite.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no, no. If we
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think he's
6	saying the opposite.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: If we are using
8	statements that were not spoken of on the record, if
9	we are using source data that was only alluded to by
10	panelists - and if you look at the findings, they're
11	like multiple, multiple, multiple citations
12	for this and that; although, of course, there's no
13	citation for the widely cited 1984 review of research.
14	in the second sentence.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The Cook Report?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we're not citing
17	it. Anyway, the
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You know, just I
22	find this beneficial because it's causing me to think
23	about the role of the findings and who owns the
24	findings. Is it the panelists who come before us? Is

if they haven't said it, offer no opinion on a particular topic. I have a different point of view.

I think that the commissioners are here to

exercise their judgment, to gather information, to cogitate, to think about it, to draw their own conclusions.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But Commissioner Yaki is right that there was, at some point in time, conceptually, at least, a difference between hearings and briefings, and hearing reports and briefing reports, and the whole notion was that hearings, we would hear from all of the witnesses, and there would be probably more than one panel of witnesses, but then. our own staff would get involved in doing their own research, be it legal analysis, or Social Science research. Whereas, a briefing was meant to be just that, bringing together people of different perspectives to give us their views, and for us to synthesize those views for the public, but not necessarily go back and do our own exhaustive research.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Changed.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Huh?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That changed.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I don't know

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

if I agree with that part, but the point is that there were supposed to be two different vehicles for us to be relevant in the civil rights debates that are happening, and the line between hearings and briefings seems to have become blurred. And I think that's where a lot of the objections we're hearing from Commissioners Melendez and Yaki are resonating with me, because it is procedurally confusing.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I agree that we need to get our arms around the procedural issues, and I think that the document that you put together is a good starting point. And I don't see any reason why - well, we have some holidays coming up, but I'm hopeful that we will be able to have a serious discussion, and hopefully vote on these new procedures at the next meeting. So I don't think there's any push-back in terms of the need to formalize our rules in terms of briefings.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, no. I understand that. I mean, with respect to this report, I think it would be a useful exercise; and, frankly, I think it's something we should do all the time, to go over -- to take each finding and recommendation and discuss them. And I know we're not going to get agreement from Commissioners Melendez and Yaki on a

majority of them, but if there are some that are 1 2 particularly either inaccurate or biased, then I would like to strike them for the integrity of the report. 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There's nothing to stop us from discussing any aspect of this briefing 5 report, whether it's the findings, or --6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. So let's do that right now. 8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you for 9 10 your patience, Commissioner Kirsanow. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just a couple of 11 I concur with 12 quick statements on the record. Commissioner Braceras, and I'm also sensitive to the 13 been 14 procedure questions that have 15 Commissioner Yaki. Just a couple of observations with 16 respect to some specific aspects of it. 17 With respect to the point of the Social 18 Scientists and who's considering the data, analyzing 19 the data, it's my understanding from what the Staff 20 Director said, that perhaps the person most suitable 21 on staff to do that was, in fact, Chris Byrnes. Maybe 22 it would have been helpful to run it by Social 23 Scientists, also, but my understanding was that in the allocation of resources, Chris Byrnes was probably the 24 individual who could do it the most efficiently, and 25

with the greatest amount of background.

Second, I would prefer a process similar to what was described by Commissioner Braceras, and that is that the statutory reports, of course, would have much more guts to them, been vetted a number of times, and could yield findings and recommendations; whereas, briefing reports, as Commissioner Yaki indicated, would probably consist of the facts gathered, maybe with some summarization or synthesis of those facts gathered, and put it out into the public domain.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow, let me ask you; would the commission be within its authority, would it be proper if there were some civil rights event for us to issue a statement condemning --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No, I agree with you on that. I think we don't sit simply as kind of solons that kind of throw things up and let them fall where they may. I think we do come to conclusions, and we have -- that's part of our charter. But my point goes to process, and I think having reviewed Commissioner Braceras' emails that she had sent around, I think that we're going to be going a long way toward establishing a process that I think everybody can sign on to.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A couple of other quick observations, and these are just very minor. With respect to findings and Recommendation 1, maybe I would have phrased it a little bit differently, but that was probably, in my estimation, the most accurate finding. I recall that we spent a good portion of time cross examining, for no other better term, the witnesses as to specific aspects of the purported educational benefits yielded by diversity. Not only did we go through the Grutter standards of whether or not it promoted cross-cultural understanding, eliminated stereotypes, students for a global marketplace, those that were cited by Grutter, but we went through specific academic disciplines to determine whether or not the extant data yielded any benefits. We asked them, given that they are the experts in the area, please cite for us the data that supports, or literature that supports a finding of benefit, if there is any.

I recall specifically what those findings were, and we can go through the transcript. There was a marginal increase in spelling scores, there was a disputed report with respect to an improvement in geography, there was a disputed report as to improvements in attendance and tardiness, or overall discipline, virtually every - and this includes

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Kurlaender, Coleman, Thernstrom, and Armor. Armor
was, perhaps, the most knowledgeable. If there was a
consensus, the consensus was there was hardly anything
out there to support benefits Later we received
literature from, I believe it was Professor
Kurlaender, which I went through in great detail,
which purported to be literature in support of
possible benefits in K-12, solely by virtue of
diversity. That literature was, at best, at very,
very best, yielding the most liberal interpretation
mixed, and more likely than not saying nothing, simply
coming up with conclusions that well, diversity is
intuitively considered a good thing, but can't point
to any particular standards whereby there have been
objective measurements that show that there are either
hard facts supporting improvements in academic scores,
or the Grutter standards, the kind of soft standards
of - and I don't even know how you measure these -
promoting cross-cultural understanding were improved,
so with respect to number 1.

Now going to another one, Commissioner Yaki's point with respect to 17, I agree with that entirely. If it were up to me, I would vote to excise that. And the reason I would is, I think we can come to conclusions like that. I think we have the

1	authority to do it. I think it's wise to avoid doing
2	that, because I think it tends I think we go beyond
3	merely standing in judgment, to the point where we go
4 .	make another leap beyond judgment, and even maybe
5	beyond advocacy, to coming to conclusions. It's a
6.	very conclusory statement, but more important is, it
7	is consistent with what - and maybe Jennifer Braceras
8	and I, the old timers here - had been faced with
9	during the previous regime, these kind of conclusions.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Battered
11	Commissioners' Syndrome.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I can't help it:. :
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think we have to
15	eliminate that one, even if we could somehow argue
16	that the data there supports it, I don't know that it
17	does, I think that's really a matter of opinion.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Now on 17
19	actually, I like 17, but I have no objections to
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Can I just say, I
21	agree with 17, but for the purpose of this commission
22	and its integrity, the fact of the matter is, I think
23	it is wise for us to avoid certain types of
24	statements, even if we could make reasonable arguments
25	in support thereof.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Isn't there a moral,
- 2	an ethical cost associated with distributing benefits,
3	at least here in America
4 .	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: benefits and
6	burdens on the base of risk. Isn't there an ethical
7	and a moral
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We can have that
9	discussion, but I think let's just not I mean,
10	it seems like the majority of the commissioners don't
11	want number 17 in there. It's not that I disagree
12	with you on the merits.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no, I think
14	. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just get rid
15	of it and move on.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think that
17	we're in agreement that 17 goes, but I think it's
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You want to have
19	the philosophical discussion, and we could do that at
20	· lunch.
. 21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no. I think
22	that it's an important issue.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there are
24	lots of important issues, but we have an agenda, so if
25	the majority of the commissioners don't support number
	1

1	17, let's strike it and discuss the philosophy later.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, there's the
3	discussion piece of the meeting here. This is the
4	first time since we started the discussion of this
5	briefing where we wanted to cut off discussion.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I'm not saying
7	that. I'm just saying that the moral and
8	philosophical question is one that could be debated
9	from here to eternity, and we
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, I disagree. I
11	think that the issue is settled in America, at least,
12	amongst most Americans, that it is, at a minimum,
13	unethical.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would say this.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just deal
16	with the report.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My recollection is
18	that Item 17 actually encapsulates something that
19	Professor Thernstrom said in his testimony.
20	
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't know that
22	I would prefer not to have it in there, but I think
23	that it is, at least, supportable on the basis of
24	something that someone had made a statement, somebody
2:5	made a conclusion that an expert had come to based on

1	a considered analysis and a longstanding, I mean, 30
2	years analysis of the purported benefits of diversity,
3	and also assigning students or others on the basis of
4	race.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's fine, but -
7	-
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So I would like to -
9	somebody tell me the procedure - move to amend the
10	document so that this particular finding is deleted.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: May I make a
12	recommendation?
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I agree with
15	Commissioner Braceras. I don't think Commissioner
16	Yaki - he's already indicated he's not going to sign
17	onto the document, but for - I think there is an
18	institutional imperative for us to go through each one
19	of those and say yea or nay.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I do. And I
21	think we should do that every time.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And I would let
23	me add to that, because I think it will improve our
24	work product. Despite the fact that Commissioner Yaki
25	and Melendez may not be inclined to support the

1	document, I think it's helpful for purposes of
2	improving the document to hear their criticism on each
3	particular point, because I think it will help us in
4	terms of our deliberative process. And we may want to
5	tweak some language in response to the criticism, so
6	I just encourage those two to participate.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And Commissioner
8	Yaki's strong arguments from time to time persuade me
9	that I am wrong.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: They should.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So I think we
12	should go over it, and then vote on the revised thing
13	at the end.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So number one, can
16	I make a proposal?
16 17	I make a proposal?  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
17 18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would propose
17 18 19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would propose that we delete the first sentence, and instead say,
17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would propose that we delete the first sentence, and instead say,  "The academic literature on the effect of racial and
17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would propose that we delete the first sentence, and instead say,  "The academic literature on the effect of racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary education
17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would propose that we delete the first sentence, and instead say,  "The academic literature on the effect of racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary education is mixed." Leave the rest of it as it is.

1	diversity improves academic performance. When
2	Commissioner Kirsanow went down the line, it was a
3	long laundry list of subjects, and the response for
4	most of them, the overwhelming majority was no, there
5	is no evidence to support it. So to say that the
6	evidence is mixed, I think is not
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there are
8	studies. It's just that we believe, and the panelists
9	believe that many of them are flawed. There are
10	studies.
11	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I just
12	have a question. Are you distinguishing in your own
13	mind between academic evidence and educational
. 14	benefits?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm thinking test
16	scores improved, academics.
17	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's what I'm
18	so are you using the two terms interchangeably?
19	- CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: My sense was that
21	the the way I heard the evidence come out, there
22	seemed to be more evidence on the soft side, which I
23	put in the category of educational benefits, which I
24	have a difficult time getting my arms around, versus
25	the harder academic aspects, the test scores, things -

- I mean, just those tangible things. And I didn't 1 know if you were using the two interchangeably. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, when I say 3 academic or educational, I'm referring, basically, to 4 subject matters like spelling, Social Studies, math. 5 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Things you can test, 6 7 versus cultural efficiency. 8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So how .--10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: As we all know, as think everybody here is a lawyer, there's a 11 difference between evidence and opinion. And the 12 evidence that was adduced during the hearing didn't. 13 even yield any standards with respect to the soft 14 characteristics. 15 They were simply conclusory 16 statements made, and then when you go through the 17 empirical - if you go through the literature, there's 18 nothing there. In fact, if I have any flaw with 19 number one, I wouldn't even say there was a consensus 20 - there's little academic consensus on whether it results in significant education benefits. There's 21 22 almost a consensus that it doesn't. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you don't want 25 to use the word "mixed". You want something stronger.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that
2	actually, when I look at this, I think that this was
3	well, this could have been even harder. I think
4	that there is very little evidence to support the
5	notion that diversity raises test scores. And if we
6	take a step back and just look at where is all this
7	achievement taking place, when we look at school
8	districts well, you pick the city where they have
9	mixed classes, so you have the academic literature,
10	you have the NAEP data, whatever benefits that are
11	being generated by diverse classrooms, those benefits
12	are modest.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So what's
14	your proposed edit?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Come up with
17	something concrete.
. 18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There is little
19	evidence to support that racial and ethnic diversity
20	results in improved academic performance.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There is little -
22	say it again - little academic
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There's little
24	evidence.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There's little

1	evidence.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That racial and ethnic
3	diversity results in improved academic performance.
4	Yes, increased reading level by two to six weeks, I
5	mean
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. Let's
7	just
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. I'm
9	trying.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So there is little
11	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
12	elementary and secondary schools
13	CHAIRMAN REYNÖLDS: Results in improved
14	•
15	cOMMISSIONER BRACERAS: results in
16	improved academic performance.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would strike the
19	word "any", and keep the word "significant", so that
20	it reads results in significant
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that's better.
22	That's more accurate.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. There is
24	little evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
25	elementary and secondary schools results

1	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: In significant
2	academic.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: in significant
4	academic performance.
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait, significant
7	
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Improvements in
9	academic performance.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Significant
11	improvements in academic performance. Does everybody
12	agree with that?
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or is there
15	majority support for that sentence? There is little
16	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
17.	elementary and secondary schools results in
18	significant improvement in academic performance.
19	That's the new first sentence of number 1.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does that get your
21	support? '
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.
24	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No, it seems
25	pretty much the same as what we had before.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. Number
3	2, does anybody have any concerns, or proposed
4	language changes?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have none.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's go to number 3.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have no comments
9	on number 3.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Neither do I.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Neither do I. But
12	I just want to interject, so far in the first three in
13	going through this, I just want to relay to Chris
14	Byrnes that I think he has digested accurately and .
15	truthfully what was represented at the hearing.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I disagree.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: One small point on
18	3.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Steven?
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. That's
21	supposed to be Thernstrom. Right? Not Steven.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: He was probably
23	calling him up at the time.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay. I
25	didn't know who he was referring to.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I was going to make
2	the same comment.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So maybe a last
4	name should a first or last name should be
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I assume this is a
6	last name.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I believe it's
8	reference to Professor Walter G. Stephan.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can we say Walter
10	G. Stephan?
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Or Professor Stephan.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's just a little
13	confusing, since the panelist was Steven Thernstrom,
14	Steven spelled that way. I don't know. Maybe it's
15	not a big deal.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I agree with
17	Commissioner Braceras because in findings and
18	recommendations, there's no previous reference to
19	Professor Stephan, so it would be confusing as to
20	COMMISSIONER BP-CERAS: I know. I know
21	that's the way Social Scientists do it, though.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We tried to follow
23	the usual form, and in future findings we also refer
24	to a number of Social Scientists by last name.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Let's remain
2	uniform, at least.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just keep it
4	as it is.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Number 4.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait. I just want to
7	make an objection on number three.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And cite studies by
10	Braddock, Crane, McPartland, Dawkins, Eric Fulcher,
11	Hallanan, Hawley, Schofield, Ward, Slavin,
12	Sandleitner, Woods, and Amy Wells as being to the
13	contrary.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Contrary to what?
16`	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The idea that their
17	
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It says mixed
19	results.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So those studies -
22	- how do those studies
23	cOMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't think they're
24	mixed. I don't think that what we heard had anything
25	to do with being mixed. I thought that what I heard

1	from Thernstrom and Armor was much more on the
2	academic achievement side, and much less contradiction
3	of Professor Kurlaender's points of view. And I think
4 .	that the bibliographies that are out there tend to
5	support that, so I object. But, whatever. Let's keep
6	it going.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What if we deleted
8	the second paragraph of number 3, instead of bringing
9	in the examples, just sort of plucking out the studies
10	that we want to highlight, and just leave the first
11	paragraph as it is, which just says there are varied
12	results, and mixed results.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would you support that
14	finding?
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And not pluck out
16	the examples that we like.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And, by the way, the
18	things I'm looking at, which come from the David Armor
19	bibliography, were all post 1978.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I think if you took
21	out the second paragraph it would be
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. I move
23	that we strike the second paragraph in number 3.
24	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is

1	Commissioner Melendez. Hello?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I have in my
4	recommendation that I sent in, that was it possible to
5	consolidate finding 3-5. We got 20, I was wondering
6	is there any consolidate any of these?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would you support the
8	document with that change?
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, that's just
10	one component. I don't know if this is I'm trying
11	to take my comments line by line right now.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I guess I'm
13	trying to see I mean, we're changing the document.
14	and we're trying to accommodate some of the concerns
15	of Commissioners Melendez and Yaki, and I'm just
16	trying to see if that's going to be enough to get
17	support. And if not, then
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I think you can
19	pretty much count on the fact I'm not going to support
20	this document. The fact you're going through this
21	exercise is, I think, nice.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think we still
23	need to do it.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You're working on your
25	own dime now, Mr. Chairman.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It needs to be
2	done. I just
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We could not have
5	a regime where we have to vote up and down
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: on serious
8	findings and recommendations without going through
9	them as a commission.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Otherwise, we're
12	just a rubber stamp for the staff.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I mean, there's no.
1:4	disagreement. We are already doing what you have
15	suggested.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. So
17	we're striking the second paragraph of number 3.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That's fine.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I want to kind of
20	piggyback on what Commissioner Melendez just said
21	about some of the subsequent findings, seeming a
22	little drawn out, and maybe recommending a
23	consolidation.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So we strike the
25	second paragraph of 3.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I mean, it
2	seems that 4, 5, and 6 are not really findings, but
3	just summaries. They're summaries of studies, they're
4	not findings.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think a piece of 4
6	is a finding, and the discussion about the
7	mythological weaknesses.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, that is a
9	finding. No, 4 is a finding, but 5 and 6 are not
10	findings, they're summaries of research.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This is probably
12	something more appropriate in the body of the
13	document.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: 5 and 6 is really what
15	I wanted to talk to Chris about.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would strike 5
17	and 6, to be honest with you.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Is the first
19	sentence in 5, is that accurate, or is that
20 ,	misleading?
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Why would you suspect
22	that that's
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Well, if we're
24	striking it, to me, the first sentence seems to be an
25	important finding.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Some ongoing
2	research, including several longitudinal studies
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, those are if
4 .	we think that is where the research is really going,
5	I think that's an important point. I don't need the
6	examples afterward.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I mean,
8	the examples are something that should be either in a
9	footnote, or
10	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, they should be
1	in a footnote.
L2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: They're not
.3	findings.
.4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So what I am
.5	hearing is keep the first sentence of finding 5, and
.6	either delete or drop the remaining information in a
.7	footnote.
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Drop it in a
19	footnote. I think the information is useful, and then
20	anyone who is interested in the finding can refer to
21	the footnote, and then go to the original source
22	material.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So 5 and 6 would
24	go into a footnote?
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think that's

right. Keep the first sentence of 5, and the balance of 5, and all of 6 would be a footnote, probably to the finding, although, I prefer it to be in the text somewhere, the appropriate place in the text.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there is no appropriate -- see, here's the other thing, there is

appropriate -- see, here's the other thing, there is no appropriate place because there's no commission opinion, as it were. Right? There's a summary of what the panelists said and what the discussion was like, and then there's the panelists' papers, but there's no place in these documents, other than the findings and recommendations, where we offer our own views.

. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Then let's put it in a footnote.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So I think it should in a footnote, but I also think the first sentence needs to be tweaked a little bit. "Raise questions about" is a little vague. I would just say some ongoing research, including blah, blah, blah, suggests that - whatever it suggests. And then there's a footnote. Right?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would just like to point out from a scholarship point of view that neither of these papers has actually been published

1	yet under the first two by Fulker, and Ladd, and
2	Cooley, at least according to the bibliography, one
3	was a paper presented at a research conference, the
4 .	other one is an unpublished manuscript, so we do not
5	know whether or not, what kind of peer review its gone
6	through before it has entered the academic mainstream.
7	I just thought I'd point that out.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would be fine
9	striking it all together, to be honest with you.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm comfortable.
11	. COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I have no strong
12	feelings about it. It's more of a question than
13	anything else.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, it's
15	interesting, but it's not critical to the rest of
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's drop it.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Strike 5
18	and 6.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So we're at 7.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm sorry. How did we
	•
21	handle 4?
21	handle 4?  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We're leaving it,
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We're leaving it,

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 6 you mean, 7.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 5 and 6 have been
3	stricken, struck, eliminated.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Struck.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 7 makes a different
6	point. The piece that discusses controlling for socio
7	economic status.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think it's fine.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 8. I like 8.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's consistent
11	with the questions that we posed to them.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm interested in
13	the relationship that racial and ethnic diversity has
14	on people's performance in shop class.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Penmanship. Mine
16	was penmanship. I acknowledge that these questions,
17	that they are kind of silly, but I thought, you know,
18	no more silly than trying to come up with measurable
19	differences in performance between students who are in
20	a diverse setting, and those who are not, with respect
21	to whether or not it promotes cross-cultural
22	understanding, or there is an improvement in the
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, yes.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: global
25	marketplace. How do you measure those things?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Do people still
2	take home ec?
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, they do.
4	What I did is, when I posed those questions, I went
5	through the
6	cOMMISSIONER YAKI: That's one of his
7	teaching assignments. Right?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I went through
9	report cards that you might find through K-12, and I
10	just
11	cOMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: pulled out
13	every single one and said give it to me.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. Well,
15	I think 8 is fine.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 9.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's consistent
18	with what Professor Armor said.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not consistent
20	with some of the other studies, but that's okay. I'm
21	not voting for it, anyway.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is can we just
23	say on number 9 - I think this might change the tone
24	of it a little bit - there is some evidence
25	indicating that students in racially diverse

1	elementary and secondary schools were somewhat more
2	likely to engage in spirited classroom discussion than
3	their racially isolated peers.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm comfortable with
5	that, but, I mean, the horse trader in me, I don't
6	feel comfortable handing over compromises
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: To quid no pro.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
9	(Laughter.)
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's not a
11	compromise to try to get the result.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I feel like I'm
13	negotiating against myself.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. It's not
15	negotiating against yourself. We're not changing the
16	language to buy their votes. I mean, if they want to
17	vote for it, that's great. And if they don't feel
18	they can vote for it, that's their prerogative. I
19	want to change it to make it a better document, and to
20	make it as neutral and fair, as possible. And some of
21	the points that they raise I think are valid, and we
22	should incorporate them, not because we're trying to
23	get their votes, but because they're good comments.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
25	Braceras' comment, the impact of it actually dilutes

1	whether or not spirited classroom discussions are
2	supportable, findings are supportable. She said
3	"somewhat more likely".
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, because it
5	says they found only a small difference.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, there was a
7	very small difference. When you take a look at what
8	Professor Armor said, and there was really no
9	contradiction I'm sorry, not Professor Armor.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm sorry, that's not
11	true.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It is true.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It is not true.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It is true.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We can pull the
16	transcript.
L7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, then let's
18	pull it.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Since we've obviously
20	gone beyond the transcript in all these things, let's
21	get Chris out here, pull out the Amy Wells report that
22	went after the long-term impacts of classroom
23	interaction. Let's pull it out.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My recollection is
25	that in response, Professor - I think it's Professor

1	Armor referred to the flawed nature of that study, and
2	there were at least two other studies `
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we're taking his
4 .	word that it was flawed, and she says his stuff is
5	flawed bạck. And we can sit here and argue all day
6	about it.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And what we're
8	saying is there's research to support, despite the
9	fact that he says they're flawed, we're actually going
10	with
11	. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There's some
12	evidence indicated.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If we're simply.
14	relying on Professor Armor, we wouldn't even say
15	there's any evidence.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, if we were
18	relying on Professor Armor, we'd be in a much
19	different country than we are right now.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Professor Armor
21	says that he disputes that.
22	(Simultaneous speech.)
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that's the
24	question that I asked him during the thing, and I
25	stand by that.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think all the
2	evidence we heard during our briefing on historically
3	black colleges and universities - now, granted it's
4	higher ed and not primary and secondary ed, but,
5	basically, came to the opposite conclusion; that
6	students that attend historically black colleges and
7	universities, which are majority black, tend to be
8	more confident, and more engaged in spirited classroom
9	discussion, so I think evidence is all over the place
10	of it. I don't know which way that cuts
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I believe that
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: but I think we
13	should say that there is some evidence that comes to.
14	this other conclusion. That's fine.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think this is an
16	accurate summary
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Before we go on, we
18	have an issue. Ken.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'm just going to
20	remind commissioners that under our Defame and Degrade
21	Rules, any individual who might be defamed or degraded
22	by remarks here will have a right to respond, and the
23	transcript we'll review for purposes of compliance
24	after the meeting.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Fine. Okay. So

1	number 9, here's my suggestion.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I thought it was a
3	good shot.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There is some
5	evidence indicating that students in racially diverse
6	elementary and secondary schools
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Were somewhat more
.8	likely.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: were somewhat
10	more likely to engage in spirited classroom
11	discussions than their racially isolated peers.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's good.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Number 10.
14	I'm okay with number 10.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Number 11.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm still reading.
17	Please bear with me. I don't read as quickly as some
18	of you. I'm fine with it. Number 11.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't
20 .	understand.
21	. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This seems
22	redundant here.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't know that
25	we need 11, since we've made the point pretty much in

1	1	10	١
ı		10	ļ

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's strike it. 2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Strike 11. You 3 know, I think that similar to number 5, I think that 4 some of the citations to these other studies that 5 weren't in the transcript should just go into a 6 I mean, I know we ended up striking five 7 footnote. all together, but in this case, I would stop after the 8 word "definitive", period, footnote. And then the 9 whole "For example" part, I would put in a footnote. 10 And then I would come back to the text with, "It is 11 12 difficult". I'm okay with COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 13 14 that. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But take out -well, I'd put the whole thing in a footnote. 17 stop at "definitive", and put everything else in a 18 19 footnote. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: By the way, Mr. Staff 21 characterization of Ms. 22 Director, given the 23 Kurlaender's testimony in the beginning of the 24 document, I suggest that if you're going to do a

defame and degrade process, you should send that to

1	her, because when I last communicated with her, she
2	thought that was an overly narrow characterization of
3	her testimony, and she didn't have a chance to correct
. 4	it.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would be pleased
6	to submit the entire matter for a defame and degrade
7	review.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Fine.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Number 13.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm just a little
11	puzzled as to why we are making reference to early
12	studies. What do we'yield from that? What gain do we
13	get from that? I mean, I think there's good academic
14	reason for that, but I'm not sure that needs to be a
15	finding of our's.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would strike
17	number 13 for that reason.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's strike
19	it.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And let me just
21	say that I would not be opposed to putting this into
22	a footnote or somewhere. I mean, I think it's useful
23	information, but I don't know why it would be a
. 24	finding.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just strike

1	it for now, because well, let's just strike it,
2	because then we're going to vote, and we can't ask
3	for, at this point, the staff to go back and reword,
4	so I think it's either in or out.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any strong feelings on
6	that matter, on whether it goes into the footnote or
7	not?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't have a
9	strong feeling.
LO	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's strike
11	it.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So in number 14,
L3	I haven't read it carefully just now, but I would
L4	delete the word "more", because it makes sense if
L5	we're taking out 13, and start with "recent".
L6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right. Exactly.
L7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I had a question.
L8	Commissioner Melendez. I had suggested that merging
L9	it into finding two and my comments, if that's
20	possible.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Merging 14 into 2?
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, is that
23	possible? We've got too many findings, in my opinion.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I think it's
25	different, because one has to do with academic

1	well, number 2 has to do with academic achievement,
2	and number 14 has to do with cross-racial friendships.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, there are two
4	different components. One is the hard component, the
5	other one is the soft component.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But I would in
7	addition to striking the word "more" at the beginning,
8	after the sentence that ends "racially isolated
9	schools.", I would take that data, 2005 study, and put
10	it in a footnote at the bottom.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections?
12	Anything else for 14? Okay, 15.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 14, I would take
14	- I'm sorry, 15.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 15.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would start with
17	"A study by Crane and Mihard", and then down to the
18	bottom and put that in a footnote.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: You know, I
20	'wouldn't, Jennifer, and I'll tell you why.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You wouldn't?
22	Okay.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. Because the
24	first sentence deals with military academies, the
25	second one has to do with occupational aspirations.

1	It's a different subject. I was initially inclined to
2	do that, but I think it should remain as-is: We're
3	talking about two different concepts.
4 .	· COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait a minute.
5	Where is it military academies?
6 .	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The first one says
7	that racial composition has no effect on whether or
8	not someone is more likely to attend military
9	academies, or become officers. 15, right there, for
ίο	example.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. And then it
13	goes to occupational aspirations, in general.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, gotcha. All
15	right. Keep it, keep 15 as-is.
16	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I don't
17	persuasive, it says a little persuasive evidence?
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Delete
19	persuasive.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's a good point.
22	Anything else on 15?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait a minute.
24	Hold on a second.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Number 16, I would

delete. I agree with the statement. In fact, this is a statement that I think I made, but I don't think it's a finding.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This goes to the whole rationale by O'Connor under <u>Sweezey v. New Hampshire</u>, the Frankfurter rationale related to the benefits or the deference accorded to institutions of higher education, so let's delete that.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't agree, but I'll go along. I think that that's inordinate.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think that this makes it a tighter document. I think it has -- I thought the document originally had good integrity in terms of reflecting what was adduced at the hearing, and I think this is a very useful exercise. However we adopt or don't adopt changes to the procedure for briefings, and I think Commissioner Braceras' work on this is going to be very helpful, I think that this improves this particular document. And I hope we can do something - if we ever have findings and recommendations for briefings, and I have issues with respect to whether or not we should do that - but if we do that, and for statutory reports, I think this kind of exercise, first of all, is useful in terms of

sheer transparency, the procedural aspect of this.

Second, I think it vets the document one last time. Third, I think it reflects more accurately the consensus of the commission, and so that we can support this document more readily in a public domain. If we're ever asked in hearings, or by the press, or anyone else, I think that we have a more effective means by which we can respond, because this is -- I . think this does reflect the consensus commission. And, going to what Commissioner Braceras had indicated before, the Battered Commissioner Syndrome, is the antithesis of what had occurred I asked the question, are we potted plants? Because something would be presented to us, and the commission - by the way, let me just say, the staff had always done fine work, and it was within the parameters of what their charge was, but we would be presented with it, and we said we either sign off on it, or don't sign off on it.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That is the first time we've done this, and I think it was extremely helpful. So, anyway, I guess I'd move that we approve the document, as edited by the commission.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Discussion?

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Commissioner Yaki.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just wanted to thank
3	the rest of the commission for going through this
4	process. I think that for this document, it was a
5	good exercise. I still believe that for future
6	briefings, we need to look at a different process all
7	together.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that there is
9	
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I am not a member
11	of I do not have Battered Commissioner Syndrome,
12	but I'm wondering if I stay here too long, if I'll get
13	Stockholm Syndrome.
14	(Laughter.)
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You might.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor?
17	(Chorus of ayes.)
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All the folks who
19	object?
20	(Vote taken.)
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let the record
22	reflect that Commissioners Yaki and Melendez voted
23	against the amended motion, and the remaining
24	commissioners voted in favor, the motion passes.
25	V. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

Okay. Next up, last month all of the members of the commission signed letters urging the Attorney General to investigate very disturbing allegations of Anti-Hispanic Voter Discrimination in Orange County, California. I am pleased that the commissioners were unanimous in calling upon the Attorney General in this matter. This unanimity is reflective, I believe, of the level of cooperation that we should strive for. I thank Commissioner Michael Yaki for bringing this matter to the attention of the commission, and I thank all of commissioners for accepting Commissioner Yaki's recommendation to send the letters.

These letters, I think, should accessible to the public. May I have a motion for posting to the website the letters from Commissioners Braceras, Taylor, Yaki, Karsanow, and Reynolds, the letter that was sent to Attorney General Gonzalez on 18<sup>th</sup> October regarding an Anti-Hispanic Harassment Letter, and the letter that was sent by Vice Chair Abigail Thernstrom and Commissioner Melendez to Attorney Gonzalez dated October 19th regarding the same topic.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections, abstentions? The motion carries unanimously.

Okay. Now it's time to set a schedule for the meetings during the 2007 calendar year. May I have a motion to approve the proposed 2007 business meeting and briefing calendar that was distributed to the commissioners via email and hard copy sent on November 9th, 2006? May I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: So move.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner Braceras.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I'd like to discuss. A couple of things; first, I think as our previous discussion indicates, we need more time in the calendar for business meetings, and for thoughtful consideration of our reports, so I would like to propose -- I mean, the way it's set up right now is we have four briefings scheduled back-to-back, and then everything right now is open, but I assume that the theory was that we would plug briefings into this other slots. I think it's very difficult to have a

productive business meeting and a briefing on the same day. I know the commissioners that come from farther away have to get home, the commissioners who have children need to get home at the end of the day, and it's just hard to go late in the day on Friday, for a variety of reasons. So what I would like to propose is that we do fewer briefings, and perhaps get on an every other month rotation, where we'd do six briefings, and every other month have simply a business meeting where we can really hash out the reports, because I think while we put out fewer reports and fewer briefings, they would be of a higher quality, and we wouldn't rush through our agenda.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I like the idea, but I would ask that, would anyone object to tabling this issue so that we can think about it some more? I like the idea of reducing the number of briefings for the very reasons you've just articulated.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think the staff needs to know what they're going to be preparing for for January, February, and March, so I think -- I mean, my proposal would be to have a briefing in January, to not have a briefing in February, and then we could go from there. And I think -- I'd like to sort of discuss the order of the briefings, too. But

if you want to just first vote on the calendar and the 1 dates, we could do that, and then --2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, how about this; 3 how about we keep the briefing schedule for January, 4 and table everything else until we give this some more 5 thought in terms of restructuring our approach, and 6 7 also the order of the briefings. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I guess I'm not 8 sure why it's not something we can just discuss right 9 now. It doesn't seem that complicated. If there are 10 concerns, let's discuss them. I mean, it's simply a 11 question of whether the quantity of work product is 12 more important than breathing room, because I, myself, : 13 feel that I need breathing room, and I think some 14 other commissioners do, as well. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So basically, 16 we would move everything -- well, we would space -- we 17 would add a business meeting between each briefing. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Starting after 21 January. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Hopefully, that would avoid a situation where we have to 23 24 continuously table our votes on reports because people 25 feel that they haven't had the time to discuss or

consider it, because we've been discussing considering them at the meeting, so it might end up helping us to produce our reports more quickly in the end. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I understand the sentiment, but I object. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. 

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Two reasons; one, I like the briefings, I think that they provide intellectual and civic discussion of important issues, number one. Number two, a lot of this could be solved if we didn't have this insanely cumbersome mininational report process for briefing reports, where that has a habit of consuming staff time while they're busy also trying to prepare for briefings in the future. And, number three, I have my own parochial objection, because so far, those items which I had proposed keep on getting bumped further and further back, and an alternate schedule will put anything that I had an interest in probably into 2008, and I'm just

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Which are your priorities on the list?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: None of the ones right

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	there.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But tell me which
3	ones on the broader list are your priorities?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let's see, the
5	Patriot Act is now back to 2008, but the Domestic
6	wiretapping issue is something that I'm very
7	interested in, and it got a high number of votes, and
8	it could be it's last on that list, hopefully not
9	in terms of priority, but it always appears there
10	last, and I'm just worried that's going to get kicked
11	off yet again.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I mean, that
13	is very understandable, and I, personally, am more
14	than happy to see some of your priorities
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Moved up.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: moved up to
17	early this year, early 2007.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Folks, let's take a
19	10-minute break.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why now, we're in
21	mid-conversation?
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Because I have to
23	(Laughter.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I would rather not
25	respond.

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: All right. All you
2	have to do is hand the gavel over, walk out the door.
3	No one is going
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, hand the
5	gavel over.
6	(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
7	record at 10:55:59 a.m., and went back on the record
8	at 11:06:47 a.m.)
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Everyone is here.
10	Let's go back on the record.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I wanted to, if
12	it's okay, just discuss strictly the dates in the
13	calendar, first, before we discuss anything else, if
14	that's okay. And I raise the point that I know right
15	now that Friday, June 8th, doesn't work for me. I do
16	appreciate the September meeting not conflicting with
17	the first day of school this year, that's very
18	helpful, but December 14th, I'd like to point out is,
19	I believe, several days after Commissioner Kirsanow's
20	term and my term expire. Maybe you care about that,
21	maybe you don't, but if you wanted us to participate
22	in the December meeting
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: When does it expire,
24	when does your
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think both of

1	our's is the same date, December 9th.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: December 7th, or
3	the 9 <sup>th</sup> .
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The 7th.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 6th.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yaki can't get
8	them down fast enough.
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Does anyone
11	let's see, let me get out my gizmo. Okay. Let's
12	start with June. Well, the 7th, you said that that
13	may possibly work, the 7 <sup>th</sup> .
14	. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't know how
15	Thursdays work for other people. I could do a
16	different week, or I could do
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How does the 7th, June
18	7 <sup>th</sup> work for everyone?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It's fine with me.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: For the west coasters,
21	that kind of bites.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thursday bites?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is

1	Commissioner Melendez. Thursdays would be hard for
2	me, but Friday would work.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: How about the 15th?
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, what about
6	earlier, what's the Friday before?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The first. Are kids
8	out of school on the 15 <sup>th</sup> ?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, we go almost
10	until July in New England.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What has happened to
12	education since we went to school?
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Really.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The first and
15	the 15 <sup>th</sup> - the first works for me, and so does the
16	15 <sup>th</sup> .
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, it is
18	true, depending on snow days, that could potentially
19	be the last day of school, but we tend to go much
20	later. So the first would be preferable, just from my
21	
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: They tack on school
24	days for snow days now?
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Outrageous. I think
2	we ought to have a hearing on that.
3	(Laughter.)
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I know, their
5	civil rights are being violated.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Absolutely.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So unless I
8	hear an objection, I'll put it down for June 1st.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez,
11	is that okay with you?
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: That's fine. I
13	had another question about next month's meeting, was
14	that a Thursday instead of a Friday?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a Friday.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, it's a
17	Thursday, because Friday is the
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, next month.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Friday, that
20	· Friday in December is the first day of Chanukah.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Also, one of the worst
22	travel days of the year.
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: We can't move it
24	a week earlier?
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's take a

1	look.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's too late, isn't
3	it? We have to give 30 days notice or something like
4	that.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'm not aware of
6	a legal requirement.
7	PARTICIPANT: No, we don't need a 30-day
8	notice for agendas or attending a meeting.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No, it makes it a
10	little bit more difficult in terms of notice to the
11	panelists for the briefing, but I'm not aware of any
12	legal requirement.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What is our
14	December briefing?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Elementary and
16	secondary desegregation.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Haven't we already
18	sent out the have we received the responses?
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We've not yet.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. If that's the
21	case, then, we wouldn't be asking the panelists to
22	change their schedule. December.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Don't change - if you
24	change the 14 <sup>th</sup> , I'm toast.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a Thursday.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's currently
3	scheduled for Thursday.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's the only
5	Thursday that actually works for me. The only
6	Thursday, what about a Friday? Say the
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The 8th does not work.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, not for me.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Any later in the
10	month is probably untenable
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that's okay,
13	I can participate by phone.
. 14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You're going to get
15	snowed in at the airport, anyway, or the train
16	station.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Here are the
18	ugly options, the $29^{th}$ , the $1^{st}$ .
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Of what?
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: December.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The 29th?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chairman
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I said
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: is your middle name
<b>2</b> 5	Grinch?

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I prefaced my
2	statements by saying that these are the ugly options.
3	You're not available on any Thursday, except the 14th.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I actually could
5	do the 29th, now that I think about it.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm in Hawaii.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Good man.
8	(Off the record comments.)
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, folks. Where
10	are we on December? Jennifer is fine with the 29th.
11	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'm fine with
12	that, too.
13	(Laughter.)
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What was that laugh?
15	What the hell laugh was that? If you want to fly on
16	the weekend before New Year's, that is just
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Folks, the 29 <sup>th</sup> , I
18	mean, Jennifer, Arlan, I just think that the 29th is
19	just bad.
20	. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff, is going to want
22	to prepare for the New Year's, and all that good
23	stuff, and people will take time, at least I hope.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. No, that's
25	fine.

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Scrooge.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let me just throw
3	something else out there. Do we need a December
4	meeting? We had an August meeting.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We have a briefing
6	scheduled.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We could postpone
8	the briefing to January.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We can't make it
10	earlier in December? And what's the problem with the
11	date we have on the calendar?
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Who is the trouble
13	maker?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I thought it was you.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I'm fine with
16	it. I think Commissioner Melendez raised it.
17	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I have a meeting
18	on Wednesday night. I will pull a red-eye, like
19	Michael Yaki did the last time.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, would you be
21	willing to participate by phone?
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, I guess I
23	could do that, if I have to.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Keep it where it

is then.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, it's good. I
like it. It's the only Thursday that works for me.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other dates that
are problematic?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, the only
other one I raised was the December 14 <sup>th</sup> .
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Of next year.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Of next year.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Of 2007.
. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER YAKI: Actually, I have a
problem with that date, too.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Can we do it the
week before?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We need to move it
up another week.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. So like the
first.
. COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'd be in the same
situation, a Wednesday meeting.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, the 7th.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It needs to be the
3	week before that if Commissioner Kirsanow and I are
4	going to participate. And we'll be expecting a big
5	farewell party with beverages and pastries.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, they said their
8	terms expire the 6 <sup>th</sup> , so we have to do it before the
9	6 <sup>th</sup> .
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, the 6th.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So Wednesday, the 5th?
13	Or Monday?
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The 3rd works for me.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I can actually do it
16	Monday.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is that the 3 <sup>rd</sup> ?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It doesn't matter
20	· to me.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: What date?
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The 3 <sup>rd</sup> , which is a
24	Monday. How much pain does that inflict on you?
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: That's fine.
	NEAL D. ODOGG

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: If you guys get
3	reappointed before then, I want to move
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Are we done
6	with the we are done with the dates. Okay.
7	Briefings. I suggest that we take two items that are
8	not currently slotted. One would be, assuming that
9	Commissioner Yaki approves, is to put the domestic
10	wiretapping briefing on the calendar, and also
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me. I'm
12	sorry. Can we deal with the structural question first?
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I think so,
14	as to whether or not we're going to have on-day/off-
15	day, or on-briefing
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Can I ask a
17	question? This is Commissioner Melendez. As far as
18	alternating may not be feasible, but I think maybe one
19	time we should have just strictly not a briefing
20	meeting, similar to today's meeting.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Even if it's just
22	once a quarter.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Like two on, one off,
24	two on, one off.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

	93
1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Like the Senate
2	schedule, two weeks in, one week off.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is everyone
4	comfortable with that approach?
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm comfortable
6	with that, as long as we have some that are designated
7	for purely business agendas.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's fine.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. If that is the
10	case, then the question of when this starts.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So, if we have a
12	briefing in December, then maybe we want to have a
13	business meeting in January, and a briefing in .
14	February, and in March, and a business meeting in
15	April. What does the Staff Director think of that?
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: He thinks it's crazy.
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think that
18	there's no problem with that. I think we're
19	indifferent as to where the breaks are.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I mean, the breaks
22	have some operational ramifications that I think
23	balance out. One is that we might have had difficulty
24	doing all of these briefings in light of the expected
25	appropriations, anyhow, so this is

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So there will be
2	several briefings for next year.
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: On the other hand,
4	. we've announced publicly and to Congress the briefings
5	we're going to have, so we'll have to revise that, and
6	let them know we're going to do less than we initially
7	committed to, that may be a wash.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think
9	that's okay.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So if I
11	understand this right, we will have a briefing in
12	December, a business meeting in January, then a
13	briefing in February.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think I
15	preferred having a briefing in January, given the fact
16	that we've had a briefing today. Let's do December,
17	January, then take
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Break in February.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Business meeting in
20	· December.
21.	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, no.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Briefing in
24	December, briefing in January, then we'll take
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And a business

1	meeting in February.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: February for a
3	business meeting. So it'll go March, April, business
4	meeting in May.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So that means the last
6	meeting can be done strictly to extolling your
7	virtues, and
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Exactly.
9	(Off the record comments.)
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So it would be seven
11	briefings, four meetings.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And then
13	as Kim points out, the end of the fiscal year in
14	September, that would be a strictly business meeting,
15	which might be good. So briefing January, business
16	February, briefings for March and April, business May,
17	briefings June and July, business September, briefings
18	October and November.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is anybody writing
20	this down?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And party in December.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And party for Pete
23	and me in December.
24	(Laughter.)
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So we are done,

1	I believe, with that.
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Can I ask a
3	question?
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Are we set for
6	four briefings next year already all the way up to
7	April?
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We are about to tackle
9	that issue, as soon as we're done with the briefing
10	versus business meeting.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So we've
12	got the calendar now. Now we're going to plug in the
13	topics.
14	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay, go ahead.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I would like to
16	move two issues that are not currently calendared, and
17	they are the No Child Left Behind briefing, and the
18	Domestic Wiretapping Briefing.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'd like to add,
20	Commissioner Melendez' important one was the
21	discrimination against the American Border towns.
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. I've been
23	waiting a long time for that one, also.
24	(Off the record comments.)
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, why don't

1	we let the Dems pick the March briefing. You work
2	that out amongst yourselves.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, we're both going
4	to get one. What are you talking about?
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, which do you
6	want in March? You can't have two in March.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, in March.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, you don't have
9	to decide now. You can consult with Commissioner
10	Melendez, and just let the Staff Director know.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I propose that
13	the one on No Child Left Behind, NCLB, that that go.
14	forward in January.
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: As a briefing.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's fine.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And March will be
19	the topic of the Democratically appointed
20	Commissioners' choice. The Democrats choice.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Arlan, do you mind if
22	I put mine there?
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Go ahead, that's
24	fine.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.

1	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Domestic
2	wiretapping?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: For March.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So you pulled rank on
6	him.
7	(Laughter.)
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I asked did he mind.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that's right.
10	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No, that's fine.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sort of like when my
12	boss asks me if I want to do something. Okay. So we
13	have December covered, January covered, March covered:
14	When is the next briefing?
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: April.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: April. Thoughts?
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, one thought
18	I have is that we haven't done anything on gender, and
19	so that might be an appropriate slot for the Title 9
20 .	topic.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm still recovering
22	from my involvement with Title 9 when I was at the
23	Department of Education, but that's fine.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So you have Battered
25	Title 9 Syndrome. Is that

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, indeed. Yes,
2	indeed, angry women, angry girls.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay, go ahead.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's fine with me.
5	Is there does anyone else have concerns? Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: How would you like to
7	reserve either October or November for Arlan's
8	briefing?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. What are
10	the months?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Either October or
12	November for Arlan's briefing.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure. Okay. How
14	about we put it down for October?
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that good?
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And you guys can work
18	out the rest offline.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I think that's
20	a good suggestion.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is everyone in
23	agreement that we would work out the rest of the slots
24	offline? '
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. So

1	it's NCLB in January, domestic wiretapping in March,
2	Title 9 in April, and the rest is to be determined?
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. And the border
4	towns.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, where
6	is that?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: October.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: October.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And why October,
10	as opposed to
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just chose October.
12	And then you can
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I defer to the
14	Democrats.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That'll give you a
16	nice stream of uninterrupted Republican briefings, so
17	
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You didn't want
19	the summer, you'll be vacationing?
20	. (Laughter.)
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. October is
22	border town.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have good attendance
24	here.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And the rest is to

be determined from this list. Sounds good.

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

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Where am I?

### VI. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The staff has done an exemplary job of preparing the recharter packages for the commission's consideration for the State of California. In this instance, the recharter package was initially presented to the commission for a vote in July of 2006. At the request of a commissioner, the vote was delayed until today's meeting. At this point, I would like to discuss the folks who are being voted on. Well, skip that piece.

I'm, going to move that the Okay. following individuals be appointed to the California SAC; Gail Heriot, Luis Alejo, James Bolton, Sharon Browne, Jack Citrin, John Dodd, Marc Dollinger, Percy Duran, Thomas Gray, Lance Izumi, Manual Klausner, Sanford Lakoff, Al Latham, Leonard Mitchell, Velma Montoya, and Matthew Rosenthal. And I also move that the commission appoint Gail Heriot as Chair of the newly rechartered California State Advisory Committee. These members will serve as uncompensated government employees. Under the motion, the Staff Director to authorizes the execute appropriate paperwork for the appointment of these

individuals. Is there a second? 1 2 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? 3 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes'. This is 4 Commissioner Melendez. Again, I have a real concern 5 in the makeup of some of our advisory committee 6 7 members. One of my concerns, as I mentioned, and even the Connecticut, and some of these other State 8 9 Advisory Committees, was that I think there's a lack 10 of women. As you know, there was only 19 percent in 11 this of California SAC nominees, 13 percent in 12 Connecticut, and only 27 percent in Georgia, as far as 13 number of women that are being appointed to the SAC. 14 And the other thing was that there's four returning 15 members to this California SAC, and I was wondering 16 why one of those returning members wasn't the Chair, 17 would be nominated then for the Chair. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I probably nominated 18 19 Gail. I know her personally. She's scary smart. She 20 knows a lot of the issues that come before the 21 commission, and I just thought that she'd do a fine 22 job. So that's the rationale.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: And then the other thing I had was, there is -- the other question was how qualified are our commissioners with respect to

23

24

civil rights work, and I think there was one question 1 as far as this John L. Dodd, who didn't really appear 2 to me that he has a lot of experience in civil rights 3 That was my other concern. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I went through 5 the rechartering packages last night, and I looked at 6 each individual in terms of their interest in civil 7 rights, and no one jumped out at me as not having an 8 interest, but give me a moment while I find his paper. 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Can I ask a question 10 of the solicitor? 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 12 Sure. Yes. COMMISSIONER YAKI: What are the conflict 13 14 of interest rules regarding, can a SAC committee 15 member participate on an item in which he or she is 16 involved in litigation on the subject? In other 17 words, if the SAC were to consider desegregation, and 18 one of the attorneys is involved in a desegregation 19 case. I know that we have some conflicts in our ability to deal with items for which we are receiving 20 21 remuneration or compensation for specific items, 22 specific topics. I just want to know whether or not 23 that applies to SAC members, as well. 24 MS. MONROIG: Well, the regional directors 25 have -- and in some cases, civil rights analysts have

1	been appointed Deputy Ethics Officers. The
2	appropriate thing is for members of SACs that might
3	have a conflict to disclose all the circumstances, and
4	for them, in the first instance, to analyze it to see
5	if there's a conflict, and maybe consult on the
6	matter.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would like to know
8	from the Staff Director whether or not the California
9	SAC is one of the SACs that would be dealing with the
10	desegregation issue.
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think that the
12	SAC would have to convene together, and talk about
13	what they want to deal with. At this point, I would
14	say that the
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But I
16	CÓMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You mean for our
17	national report.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. I had understood
19	that some of the SACs were being tasked with dealing
20	with some of the issues related to the national
21	report.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But don't they have to
23	decide to
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Let me just answer
25	these. That is, part of it is if they get to decide.

1	California is not one of the states that we are
2	relying on in the sense that we feel it is important
3	to our national report to get something from them. I
4	don't recall off-hand whether it was one of the ones
5	that we designated with a request, that designation
6	was based on whether they had certain filings there,
7	but it's not one of the ones that we feel that we
8	need.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Well, my
LO	response to that is I find that very odd, given that
11	it's one of the
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Oh, I'm sorry.
13	Commissioner Yaki, and I can say further that it is
14	not one of the ones that we even made a request of.
L5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. I was just
16	going to say that's odd, given that it's one of the
17	most diverse states in the country with some of the
18	biggest issues involving deseg, but hey, whatever.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The requests were
20	not based on subjective evaluations, but based on the
21	Department of Justice docket.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Getting back to
23	. Commissioner Melendez' issue. I have before me the
24	rechartering package, and, quite frankly, I am
25	comfortable with is background. Apparently, he has

	106
1	done work in the area of Criminal Justice,
2	representing the indigent, and I think that that is
3	well, I'm satisfied. Other questions?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm 'sorry, the
5	indigent?
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Are they within our
8	charter?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Under certain
10	circumstances, yes. To the extent that these issues
11	relate to race, ethnicity.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Well, may I
13	speak on this subject?
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have, as someone who
16	has been an elected official in the great State of
17	California, who has campaigned up and down the state,
18	been involved in campaigns there, and electoral and
19	public policy issues for 20 years of my life, I have
20	· to say that I am absolutely 100 percent - and you may
21	send this out for defame or degrade, whatever way you
22	want - I'm completely appalled by the nominees to the
23	California State Advisory Committee. There is a
24	difference between having diversity of viewpoint on a

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

committee, and creating uniformity of viewpoint in

that diversity.

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

amongst these individuals have You overlapping -- let me put it another way. Three to four members of the appointees were all part of the Prop. 209 campaign, which has done horrific things to affirmative action issues in the University of California system. You have people who have been involved, who are currently involved working together on the Seattle and Louisville cases. They are, by most parts, all lawyers or professors, hardly a crosssection of the type - even if we cut out the issues of ethnicity, hardly a cross-section, a representation of the people of California.

I think that this is an elite group of individuals, who share a distinct point of view. I do not believe there is diversity. I look at the fact that 75 percent of the new nominees are white, and male. I look at the fact that 63 percent of the committee is going to be white in a state that is majority minority, and even if you say well, we have no quotas, the mere fact you would ignore the fact that in a state where ethnicity and race plays such a major role in how things work, by having the committee of this makeup, I think is a slap in the face to Californians. It's a slap in the face to the

1	communities of color in California, and I cannot
2	support this in any way, shape, or form. And, to me,
3	the idea that Gail Heriot would be named Chair, when
4 .	I found her to be wholly unconvincing and evasive
5	during her testimony on the Native Hawaiian Act, send
6	that to her, let her respond, is a double insult to
7	the people of color in California. And that is my
8	statement, and I don't even want to participate in
9	this vote.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We will treat
11	Commissioner Yaki's actions as an abstention.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I won't even be here.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Not voting at all. I
15	refuse to have my name appear in any way, shape, or
16	form with any vote on the composition of this
17	committee. This committee is anathema to everything
18	that people of color, that women, and minorities in
19	California have worked for, for years. And this is
20	I mean, as I've said before, there is diversity, and
21	there is uniformity.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is this because those
23	three individuals
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's more than the
25	three. I could have gone into much more detail about

1	all the different back about all the similarity of
2	backgrounds, about all the organizations that they all
3	cross-belong to.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The fact that they
6	belong to the same network of people, and it just does
7	not say to me that this commission is seriously
8	interested, as I said it was, in promoting balance and
9	diversity of viewpoint.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And the State Advisory
12	Committees, especially in a state as big, and as
13	important, as California. Because of that, I cannot
14	participate in this farce of a proceeding on the
15	California State Advisory Committee.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is the driver that the
17	individuals that you mentioned were in the forefront
18	of Prop. 209, a proposition that was supported by a
19	majority of the folks living in California?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The driver is that the
21	overall composition of this committee, the selection
22	process that was used, the criteria that evidently was
23	pulled together, creates homogeneity of viewpoint and
2.4	background that is completely contrary
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Am I mistaken

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: There's more than
2	three people.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. You
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Am I mistaken, I
5	thought this was a pretty evenly balanced panel in
6	terms of 50 percent sort of liberals, and 50 percent
7	conservatives?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, because if you
9	look at some of the resumes for the independents and
10	the Ds, they're not.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: They're not what?
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: They're not liberals.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So would you like.
14	to remove some of the independents and Ds, and come up
15	with your own suggestion?.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I've already spoken
17	with the Chair. There is no desire to remove any of
18	the people involved, and
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you just want
20	more Ds.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I just think that
22	
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Not different Ds.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just think that the
25	idea that if the commission were willing to think

about looking at these names differently, adding a 1 different kind of viewpoint and ethnic balance to the 2 3 committee - for the life of me, I don't understand --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why don't you sit 4 down and we'll discuss it. 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- how the commission 6 could believe that it could, with a straight face, 7 8 nominate a SAC that is completely out of whack with the State of California. 9 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How so? COMMISSIONER YAKI: The idea that the 11 12 State Advisory Committee would be 64 percent Caucasian in a state that is majority minority is, in and of ... 13 itself, indicative of a lack of understanding. If you 14 15 cannot find conservatives, people of color to 16 articulate a viewpoint and put it out there, I have 17 little trouble with that. Let that debate go on. 18 That's number one. 19 Number two, is the fact that when you look 20 at from where the recruitment began, there is such 21 similarity and cross-overlap of bodies of work, of 22 organizations that they belong to, that it just does 23 not seem to me -- it would be one thing to say I'm 24 going to get someone from this community who is

conservative and believes in dahdala dahdala da, but

doesn't necessarily belong to the same three groups as 1 three other people do. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm not sure that 3 belonging to an organization, that that 's' a proxy for 4 5 each issue. For example, the Federalist Society, 6 there are libertarians. COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have heard --7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Conservatives --8 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chairman, with all 10 due respect, I have heard your argument on that time and time again. The fact of the matter is, is that 11 12 the fact that we cannot, especially in a state as big 13 and as diverse, and as populous as California, with as 14 many different interests, and people involved, that 15 outside the box of you cannot go certain 16 organizations, and instead, rely on the fact that 17 well, maybe they're not all the same. Well, Democrats 18 aren't all the same, Republicans aren't all the same. 19 I understand that. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree. 21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We have in various 22 SACs, I would wager that a number of SACs, if not 23 most, have more than one, two, three individuals who 24 belong to the same organization, such as the NAACP.

I don't know that belonging to the same organization

WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701

is necessarily a disqualifying factor. I understand your concerns. I also don't think that, and I would be personally opposed to some type of proportional ethnic representation. If the chips fall where they may and that happens, fine. But I think one of the things we wanted to avoid was ethnicity as a proxy for viewpoint. So, because you're from California, and you've got a particular knowledge of that, I mean, I'm sensitive to your view, but I'm not necessarily persuaded by it.

commissioner YAKI: Well, I would say that you can look at certain areas, certain regions, certain states, and make differential conclusions about where interests lie, what groups should be involved. But I'm just saying this as a practical fact, it is California, it is the largest state in the Union, it is the most diverse state in the Union, it is the seventh largest economy in the entire world, it is a place where people of all colors, all creeds, all political persuasions get together and have a friendly hash fight, and no so friendly hash fight every two, four, or six years, depending on what election is going on.

It just strikes me as bizarre, and certainly indicative of either lack of effort,

1	imagination, or creativity to find a little bit more
2	diversity. Just look at it from one point of view.
3	Why is the vast majority of the new appointees all
4	lawyers? Why is the vast majority or professors?
5	That's it, that's the group. Certainly, there are
6	other types of individuals involved in the civil
7	rights perspective from both left and right, who don't
8	necessarily belong in the lawyer drafting camp, and
9	the professor camp.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a question
11	for you. May I ask a question of Commissioner Yaki?
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If this group were.
14	to contain more community activists, more people of
15	color, as you suggest, but it still contained the
16	names of the three individuals with whom I understand
17	you have strong objection, would you vote for the
18	panel?
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Let me just say this;
20	. I named three individuals as being sort of from the
21	same cut of cloth. If you really want my
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If Gail Heriot
23	were still named as Chairman, and the other two
24	individuals - I forget who they are, even, that you
25	object to - are still on the panel, is it Manny

1	Klausner, is that one of them?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not going to get
3	into names.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay: Well, if
5	Gail were still named as Chair, and the other two
6	individuals to whom you object are still on the panel,
7	but there was reshuffling of other individuals to
8	include more community activists, and other types of
9	criteria that you desire, would you vote for the
10	panel?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I might.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because I don't
13	believe that you would vote for a panel with Gail
14	Heriot on it, no matter what it looked like. And so
15	that's why
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, Gail I have
17	trouble with. I think overall in terms of what I
18	mean, I've been a politician most of my life.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So what
20	· I'm saying is I think you're bluffing a little bit,
21	because I think you would reject any panel that
22	included Professor Heriot.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. I can tell you
24	right now, I would not reject any panel that included
25	Professor Heriot.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: As Chair?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It would depend on who
3	the Vice Chair was, and would depend on the
4	composition of the rest of the committee. Never say
5	no, never say never.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But you're not
7	saying yes.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I suggest that we vote
9	on the
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not saying yes,
11	because I've been informed that that's not going to
12	happen. And that's not going to happen, I can't vote
13	for it. I'm not going to vote on speculation that.
14	maÿbe
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not asking you
16	to vote. I'm just asking your intention.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I suggest that we vote
18	on this slate, and this is 16 individuals. I believe
19	California has what, 18 slots? Is that correct?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Our standard is to
21	go up to 19, no more than 19.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We could
23	continue these conversations with respect to the
24	remaining slots, and see if through discussions we can
25	come up with some candidates that have the support of

1	Commissioner Yaki. But in the meantime, I suggest
2	that we vote. All in favor?
3	(Chorus of ayes.)
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Aye.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That would be a
7	nay.
8	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No. I vote no.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Please let the record
10	reflect that Commissioners Braceras, Kirsanow, Taylor
11	and Reynolds voted in favor of the California SAC
12	members proposed, and that Commissioner Yaki did not
13	vote, and that Commissioner Melendez voted against the
14	motion. The motion passes.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: For the record,
16	Commissioner Yaki left the room so he did not vote.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let the record reflect
18	that Commissioner Yaki left the room so he did not
19	vote.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Would not vote.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would not vote,
22	refused to vote. Next up, Future Agenda Items.
23	VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do any of the
25	commissioners have any items that they'd like to

discuss?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. This is Commissioner Melendez. Are we going to have an update on the audit?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, but -- one, two.

Okay. We have to wait until Commissioner Braceras
returns so that we will have a quorum. Okay. We're
going to start the discussion of the Staff Director's
Report.

## VIII. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff Director Marcus.

Chairman. First, I just wanted to make a brief announcement about the Utah State Advisory Committee, which is one of our most newly rechartered committees.

On December 13, the Utah Advisory Committee will conduct a briefing in Salt Lake City, Utah regarding discrimination against Native Americans in border communities. Our Denver office is working hard to put on what I think will be a very fine panel on that topic. The governor of Utah is now scheduled to participate, as is the mayor of Salt Lake County, Utah.

The meeting is very shortly before our commission meeting, which, unfortunately, was an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

unavoidable conflict. Nevertheless, if there are any commissioners who are interested in attending that meeting, please let me know, and I'm sure that they will be welcome.

I'd like to say a few words about the commission's financial reporting and finances. On Thursday night, Wednesday night, early Thursday morning, we completed and issued our Annual Performance and Accountability Report, including our Audited Financial Statement.

As you know, these reports were seldom prepared and delivered to OMB on time in the past, and getting our paperwork together for the deadline was, I think, nothing short of a heroic effort. I particularly would commend Tina Martin and Debra Carr. Staff worked here until 2:30 in the morning to get the work done, and I think that their ability to compile this accountability report really was an indication of extraordinary dedication by commission staff.

The report, together with the audited financial statement, paints a picture that I think has two main features. One of them is that it shows that we still have some weaknesses that are significant, and that will require concerted effort in order to fix them and turn them around. We still have a great deal

of work to do on our finances, and I think we have a great deal of aggressive work still to do.

On the other hand, they do show rather dramatic improvement from two years ago; and rather dramatic improvement even from last year. commissioners will recall, we have never before been able to get even a qualified opinion on more than one of our financial statements. In 2004, when we arrived, the Parker firm was in the middle of an audit that took two years to complete, and when they completed it, they only looked at the balance statement, and were unable to provide even a qualified they provided a disclaimer; Instead, opinion. together with a discussion of weaknesses on that one statement.

Last year, we made substantial progress, even though we still had the same accounting firm that had been contracted by the prior administration, we actually were able to get a full-scope audit, which is to say an audit of all five financial statements, and we were able to get not a disclaimer, but a qualified opinion on our balance sheet, as well as disclaimers on the other four statements.

opinions on all five financial statements. Becoming

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

auditable, and being able to get qualified opinions on all five statements I think is an extraordinary amount of progress. But what's more is that we didn't get qualified opinion on all five of our statements, we actually got unqualified opinions on every single one of them for the first time, so this is a dramatic improvement.

say, there are still material I weaknesses and reportable conditions. They deal with the travel and approval process, they deal with human supporting needs, travel expenses, documentation, file maintenance, and travel and approval processing. These are all things that we are in the process of developing a corrective action plan to deal with. Nevertheless, the work to ensure that our financial reporting is sound, I think was a big So it is mixed news, still very step forward. significant issues, very significant issues, but dramatic improvements.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Could I ask a question? This is Commissioner Melendez. Here's where we really need what the findings was, maybe the other stuff, but we need the findings, here's where it's really needed. What were the actual findings as far as issues relating to the budget, and spending,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

those type things?

22 '

referring to the findings of our auditors, Walker and Company, they were distributed to commissioners yesterday. As I say, there were two material weaknesses, and three reportable conditions, which is an improvement from the prior year. Is it two and three or two and two? I'm sorry, it's two and two. Two material weaknesses, two reportable conditions, which is an improvement from the prior year, but that everything else is unqualified.

as to have we spent our money appropriately so that we don't really lose funding that reflects on the commission? Because, as you know, we were unable to hire special assistants for a number of months, and I'd hate to see us all of a sudden find out that we did not spend appropriately the money that we have. Could you answer that question?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez, we intend to go into closed session, and that issue will be discussed at that time. But we do have an answer for you.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Okay. The Staff Director has requested that the next portion of the meeting be closed pursuant to the commission's regulations implementing the Sunshine Act. Will the General Counsel and Solicitor please certify that the meeting can be closed pursuant to the commission's regulations?

MR. BLACKWOOD: Based on our knowledge of why the Staff Director is requesting the closed portion of the meeting, we certify in writing and have submitted in writing, that this meeting can be closed, and the information pertaining to same can be withheld. Pursuant to the following exemptions provided for in the commission regulations, see 45 CFR. Section 702.54. Exemption Two, when a meeting relates to the internal personnel rules and practices of the Exemption Five, when a meeting might commission. involve censoring a person. And Exemption Six, when a meeting might involve disclosing information of a personal nature, where disclosure might constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. And Exemption Ten, when the meeting might involve the commission's participation in a civil action or proceeding.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. May I have a motion to close this meeting pursuant to Exemptions

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	Two, Five, Six, and Ten of the Closed Meetings
2	Procedures for the commission meetings; furthermore,
3	this motion would authorize the Staff Director to
4	place in a location accessible to the public within
5	one working day, business day, the public vote to
6	close the meeting, reflecting an explanation of the
7	decision to close the meeting, and a list of all
8	persons attending the meeting.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I will call out
13	the name of each commissioner. The commissioner.
14	should then answer yes, no, or abstain. After the
15	voting is concluded, I will read out how each one of
16	you voted in order to ensure that the tally is
17	correct. Please vote when I call your name.
18	Commissioner Braceras.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor.
25	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I vote yes, also. 1 The tally is as follows, Commissioners Braceras, 2 Kirsanow, Melendez, Taylor, and Reynolds voted in the 3 affirmative. Commissioners Thernstrom and Yaki did 4 5 not participate in the vote. The motion passes. At this point, I guess we need to clear 6 7 the room pursuant to the affirmative vote. The 8 individuals who will participate in the closed session 9 Commissioners Braceras, Kirsanow, Taylor, are 10 Melendez, and Reynolds. Also present will be Staff Director Marcus, the General Counsel, David Blackwood, 11 12 the Assistant Deputy Staff Director, Debra Carr, the 13 Director of Administration, Tina Louise Martin, the 14 Director of Human Resources, Tyro Beatty, Derek Horne, 15 who is the Attorney Advisor to the Staff Director, and 16 the Solicitor, Emma Monroig. 17 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would add that 18 if Commissioner Melendez would want Mr. Schmechel to 19 remain, that there is no problem with his remaining. 20 I don't know whether Ms. Schuld is here, but if 21 Commissioner Braceras --22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: She is no longer 23 She needed to catch a flight. 24 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, Richard can 25 remain.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let the record
2	reflect that Richard Schmechel will also be in
3	attendance. Okay. So everyone is out, doors closed.
4 .	(CLOSED SESSION.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's go back
6	on the record.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: These are just
8	minor questions that I have.
9	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Are we required to
10	. certify on the back-end?
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Are we required to
13	certify on the back-end of a closed session?
14	. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. Yes.
15	(Off the record comments.)
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Ms. Monroig, why
17	don't you answer the question.
18	MS. MONROIG: The requirement, according
19	to the regs, is that you read the transcript of the
20	closed session afterwards to determine if there is any
21	items there that are disclosable to the public or not.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
24	Braceras.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I just had a

127 question about transcripts, and where we stand in 1 receiving them, and getting them up on the web for 2 previous briefings and meetings? 3 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, Commissioner 4 Braceras. We are now several months behind in making 5 the transcripts available in final form. The process 6 that we go through is a time-consuming one. Usually, 7 it is the Secretary to the Staff Director who does 8 this work, which involves not just reading the 9. transcript, but listening to the tapes carefully, 10 finding any errors, with due respect to court 11 reporters, which we do find. 12 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: With respect to .. the briefing, or also the meeting portion? 14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Both of them, we 15 find errors in both. Based on various efforts using 16 17 current staff, I've determined that we simply are not 18 able currently to make our way through the backlog 19 with the currently available people, particularly 20 given that the Secretary to the Staff Director remains 21 on long-term medical leave. 22 We are bringing on a temporary person for 23

24

1	matter, I hope, will be on board on Monday. And the
2	Director of Management is nodding her head yes, we do
3	expect her to be on board, so she can start.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I raise it,
5	simply because I've been asked by members of the
6	public who are interested in some of the briefings we
7	did, and I guess, wanted to do research based on them,
8	whether the transcripts were publicly available.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes. And that's
10	why we're spending the money to bring a temporary
11	person on board, is because we really need to get
12	those
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: My other question
14	is, is it our intention, with respect to all of the
15	briefings we've done, to try to issue briefing
16	reports, or are some of them just simply verbal
17	briefings? Specifically, I was wondering whether
18	we're putting together a report on the ABA Rules, and
19	on the Omaha briefing that we had.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes. We are
21	working on reports on all of the briefings that we've
22	held so far.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: When do you think
24	the ABA Rules one might come out?
25	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Fairly confident

by the January meeting, and there's a chance that it would be in the December meeting.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The reason I ask - I'm sorry. Go ahead.

asked, which may be the same reason that Commissioner Kirsanow was concerned, is that my understanding is that negotiations between the ABA and the Department of Education are moving along at a speedy clip, and I understand from folks at the Department of Education that it would be useful for them to have us weigh-in on the issue, or at least make the transcripts available as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That is my concern. My understanding is that the first week of December, the Department of Education is going to have its accreditation hearings. I know I'm going to be testifying at them, and then they're going to be making a determination shortly thereafter, so anything that we can do to weigh-in, I think might be helpful.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I would suggest that we make that particular transcript a priority. Is there any chance -- well, what's your estimate in terms of completing the briefing report for that topic?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think he just
2	said that
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, again, I'm
4	pretty confident for January, for December - and the
5	December, I believe, is after the hearing. I think we
6	have a pretty good chance, I don't know if it's 50/50
7	or not, but we can certainly try to focus on that
8	above all the others. I have to say, and I may need
9	to focus on it a little bit more, or maybe your input
10	would be useful - one of the difficult questions for
11	that briefing and the other briefings that are well
12	advanced in process, is to what extent we need to redo
13	them based on the new draft briefing procedures that
14	I think are still in process.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, let me just
16	ask a few questions. What are, other than Omaha and
17	ABA, the briefings that are out there that we're
18	trying to reduce to writing?
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Voting Fraud and
20	· Intimidation, Misidentification or Misrepresentation
21	of Minorities in the Census.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right.
23	Okay, so ABA, voting, census, and Omaha
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Those are the ones
25	I can think of off-hand.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And which is I
2	mean
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I have to say that
4	the some of the staff have been sent out and
5	haven't come back, so I can't guarantee for sure I
6	haven't forgotten something.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. No, no,
8	that's fine, but of these, am I correct - I mean, this
9	is just based on my shaky memory - but am I correct
10	that the oldest, the one that's been out there the
11	longest is ABA, or is it census?
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think it's
13	census. I did forget one. The one that I forgot is
14	the Effectiveness of Historically Black Colleges.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right. Age
16	perceives, okay. Right. And, hence, I think this
17	sort of reiterates our need for separate business
18	meetings, because this is a lot to talk about if we're
19	going to be putting these out. So is the priority to
20	do them in chronological order in terms of getting out
21	the briefing reports, or what is the priority?
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I suggest that, to the
23	extent an issue - a particular topic that's been
24	covered is being covered by a federal agency - for
25	example, the ABA briefing report, I would suggest that

1	we take that one out of order.
2	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The ABA report
3	happens to be one of the ones in the most advanced
4	stage.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I mean, I
6	think it should be, precisely for the reason that the
7	Chair just stated. I mean, other than that, I think
8	we should try to proceed chronologically, but when
9	something is more timely or current, I think we need
10	to move it to the head of the line.
11	. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There are, of
12	course, other considerations. For instance, there's
13	at least one that was - the timing of which is.
14	affected by a change in personnel.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Being done by
17	attorneys in OGC who are no longer employed here, so
18	it got delayed by that reason.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There are others
21	that are a little faster based on difference in
22	resources between OGC, versus OCRE, versus OSD.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I guess my
24	concern is that before we allocate staff time and
25	resources to planning further briefings, I think it's

1	important to try to kind of clear the docket, or make
2	headway on the docket before we move on to the next
3	thing. But my particular concern was with the ABA,
4	and I'd like to see that moved forward as quickly I
5	mean, if we could have with the ABA - if we could get
6	the transcript available ASAP so that it can be useful
7	to the Department as they move into their hearings,
8	that would be great. And then the report will just
9	come when it comes.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: With any luck, by
11	December. If not December, January.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We'll move it to
14	the top of the list.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I mean,
16	and why don't we, for purposes of procedure, you know,
17	our procedures are in flux, but why don't we try to
18	well, why don't we schedule I think that there
19	needs to be some sort of conference call where a
20	· member of the minority commissioners - the
21	commissioners in the political minority can kind of go
22	through it with some of the members in the majority,
23	and hash it out line-by-line. I don't know that we
24	need to call it a working group, per se, but I think

Commissioner Yaki and myself, and whoever else may be

1	interested with the Stair Director's Cooperation, we
2	should all talk soon about this. I don't know if you
3	want to if we can ask the Staff Director's shop to
4	coordinate that conference.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think it's a good
6	suggestion. I think the other commissioners, the ones
7	who are not going to participate in this
8	teleconference, should also read the document that you
9	prepared, and to provide you with their input. But I
10	think that the Staff Director should work with the
11	participants to select a date that this conversation
12	can take place.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can we try to do
14	that in the next couple of weeks?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would certainly
16	be happy to. Commissioner Melendez is on the line,
17	still?
18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Did you want to
20	participate on that?
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: If I'm available,
22	yes.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Then we should
24	assume that well, I'm going to assume that
25	Commissioner Yaki, he has a keen interest in these

1	procedural issues.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: How many can we
3	have without violating the Sunshine Act?
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It is four?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Four.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would be
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So that would be
9	Yaki, Melendez, Taylor, Braceras.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And the Staff
12	Director.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's right.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I think if we
15	can all set aside a chunk of time, an hour or so, or
16	more to hash through it on the phone, we can probably
17	take care of it in one phone call. But if everybody
18	else could get their written comments to me, and to
19	the Staff Director ahead of time, that would be great.
20	I mean, with respect to how to proceed on
21	the reports you're going to be putting together, I
22	guess I would I don't know. Do you have any
23	thoughts?
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This is the markers

	1
1	laid down. Well, assuming that we get the new
2	procedures in place quickly, then I don't think that
3	we're going to need that we're going to lose too
4	much ground, but there is the potential that we will
5	have to go back and redo some things.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think the
7	only risk is that if a report is coming up for the
8	December meeting for a vote, I think if we could
9	separate it physically into two parts, the summary of
10	the proceedings, and the finding and recommendations,
11	then, at the very least, I think we can vote on sort
12	of the clearinghouse version, and approve that without
13	hopefully, we could also approve findings and.
14	recommendations, but that could be a separate
15	discussion.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, I would be
17	interested to hear from Commissioner Yaki. I have no
18	idea whether that would be an acceptable approach for
19	Commissioner Yaki, but it's a reasonable one.
20	. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And my guess is
21	that it would be, but I don't want to speak for him.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a reasonable
23	approach.

I am uncomfortable voting to approve any further

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Like I said before,

24

reports, unless it is either just a clearinghouse
report, or unless the process has been put in place
beforehand. So if we're not voting on just a
clearinghouse report, I would abstain from that vote.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Until we have a
process.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I understand. Any
other questions or comments? Commissioner Melendez,
questions, comments?
COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I do have one
other question. Where do we stand with the strategic
plan right now?
pran right now.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close to having another draft. I think that we should have
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close to having another draft. I think that we should have one early next week before Tuesday.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close to having another draft. I think that we should have one early next week before Tuesday.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanksgiving reading.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close to having another draft. I think that we should have one early next week before Tuesday.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanksgiving reading.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close to having another draft. I think that we should have one early next week before Tuesday.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanksgiving reading.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.  IX. ADJOURN
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.  STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close to having another draft. I think that we should have one early next week before Tuesday.  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanksgiving reading.  COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.  IX. ADJOURN  CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, on that note,