DIRECTOR’S NOTE

Greetings and happy spring from the University of Pittsburgh Institute of Politics! After a year full of changes at the Institute, we have embarked on several new projects and ventures that have grown from the Institute’s community listening tour in early 2015 and from recommendations made by our Board of Fellows and key community partners. This issue of Report will cover these new initiatives in greater detail.

In a departure from tradition, the Institute’s Board of Fellows approved not one but two critical topics for discussion at the annual Elected Officials Retreat in September 2015: the social and political economy of poverty and a review of the criminal justice system. As reflected in the Elected Officials Retreat summary included in this issue of Report, the conversation on poverty was compelling, in no small part due to the bipartisan conversation that took place between the legislative panel and attendees on the afternoon of Thursday, September 10. No less compelling was the Friday, September 11, discussion of the criminal justice system. The data, experiences, and perspectives shared stimulated both thoughtful discussion and a request from Allegheny County Executive RICH FITZGERALD for the Institute to continue this work by exploring the ways that we might improve both the cost-effectiveness and fairness of our jailing policies and procedures while also maintaining high levels of public safety. The Institute has continued these conversations by convening regional experts and conducting in-depth research on both of these topics.

(continued on page 2)
The Municipal Poverty Advisory Committee, a subcommittee of the Health and Human Services Policy Committee, began meeting in August. The committee is examining wealth and income inequality, education, and housing and transportation issues and is developing a plan of action and recommendations for public, private, and nonprofit organizations to impact poverty issues in all municipalities, with a specific focus on the challenges of combating poverty in suburban communities.

To advance the criminal justice conversation, the Institute has convened a special task force of experts, including criminal justice professionals, academic researchers, elected officials, and key community leaders, to examine all points of the criminal justice system, from entry through incarceration, with the goal of developing policy options and recommendations for consideration by elected officials, civic leaders, and criminal justice professionals. This task force is co-chaired by PIT’s Chancellor Emeritus and Institute Chair MARK A. NORDENBERG and Buhl Foundation President FRED THIEMAN. The task force convened for the first time in November 2015, and subsequent meetings will be held through the summer of 2016, with a report resulting from its work scheduled for the fall retreat.

In addition to these and other projects of our policy committees, the Institute is excited about the launch of the Elsie Hillman Civic Forum. Created through a generous endowment from HENRY HILLMAN through the Henry L. Hillman Foundation, the Elsie Forum, as we have come to call it, is designed to engage students by aligning their academic interests with civic engagement activities that will tap into and develop their leadership abilities while providing them with unique opportunities to tackle real community problems with strategic community partners.

Two student programs are already under way—Legislator for a Day and the Internship and Seminar Program—and three new programs are under development, including the March 24, 2016, University-wide Never a Spectator student launch of the Elsie Forum! This event will include a keynote address on the importance of civic engagement by a young community activist and an opportunity for students to network with emerging and seasoned cross-sector leaders from the greater Pittsburgh region. The general aim of the event is to inform students about all of the programs of the Elsie Forum and to communicate to them that they, in ELSIE HILLMAN’s words, “are needed in every corner of our community.” We at the Institute believe that it is both an honor and our responsibility to serve as good stewards of Hillman’s sustained and rich legacy of activism in a meaningful way, and we could not accomplish our mission without the active involvement of the Elsie Hillman Civic Forum National Advisory Council. This group of esteemed leaders is assisting the staff in charting a bold course for leadership development and engaged citizenship of young scholars who possess the character traits evocative of Hillman. This issue features an overview of the first meeting of the advisory council, which occurred earlier this spring.

I hope you enjoy this edition of Report.

TERRY MILLER
Director, Institute of Politics
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POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

The presentation of the Coleman Awards, with its focus on service to others, served as a fitting transition to the introduction of Thursday’s topic: poverty. In her remarks, Miller offered some sobering statistics and a personal story that helped to set the stage for the following presentations and discussions.

REMARKS OF INSTITUTE OF POLITICS DIRECTOR TERRY MILLER

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Institute’s 19th Annual Elected Officials Retreat that we are honored to cohost with the University of Pittsburgh Office of the Chancellor. Chancellor PATRICK GALLOWAY will be here later this afternoon to provide an official University welcome. I missed the last two retreats due to non-elective surgery, so I’m particularly delighted to be here, especially as we look to take on two critically important regional issues.

As much of you know, we have a very special way that we kickoff the retreat each year, and that is by recognizing exceptional individuals who have had a lasting impact on our community by presenting them with the Coleman Award, or “The Moe,” as some of the past awardees have come to call it. It is named for our founding director, Moe Coleman, who has left his indelible good mark on countless individuals, organizations, institutions, and our community at large, evidenced by his personal example of community engagement and sustained generosity. I will get Mark Nordenberg up here in a minute to do the honors, but I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to mention another important person to the Institute and one who also has left her good mark on her beloved Pittsburgh. And I am, of course, referring to our dear Elsie Hillman.

Elsie’s passing in August triggered both widespread mourning and a deep sense of gratitude and awe from those who had the special opportunity to witness the enormous good that she did over the course of so many years. Those feelings are particularly intense within the Institute of Politics, not only because of her active engagement with us but also because so many of us were fortunate to have known her well.

I believe we all will agree that Elsie was a true tour de force, working tirelessly to improve the condition of those who lived here in her beloved Pittsburgh as well as in far more distant places. Elsie’s accomplishments were borne of a strong mind, a caring heart, and a generous spirit, and she often stood up for those things in which she believed even when those causes were not embraced by others.

And Elsie was an altruist—transforming the world through her humanitarian and philanthropic deeds. Her inspired entrepreneurship, her special gift to relate empathetically to others, her dedication to social justice, and her unique ability to will into being the unimaginable have left us with a legacy to remember, honor, and advance.

Of course, the Institute of Politics has a distinctive opportunity and responsibility to serve as an institutional steward of Elsie’s remarkable legacy. Less than two years ago, HENRY HILLMAN, Elsie’s loving husband and partner for 70 years, generously awarded IOP a $60 million endowment to establish the Elsie Hillman Civic Forum. The “Elsie Forum,” as we have come to call it, will engage students in activities that will prepare them to lead lives as engaged and contributing citizens. Among other things, and reflecting the pattern of her own life, the Elsie Forum will bring community leaders and young people together for educational programs, research projects, and mentoring opportunities designed to foster student interest and involvement in fueling civic progress in the Pittsburgh region. I am deeply honored to serve as the director of the Elsie Forum and look forward to designing meaningful civic engagement opportunities for students and regional leaders. What a very special privilege it will be to make hers a true living legacy. And I hope many of you will join me in doing this good work.

INTRODUCTIONS AND RETREAT OVERVIEW

As I thought about how to provide the introduction to today’s topics, I was asked by today’s moderator, MAX KING, if I would be willing to share some of my personal story, because he knows the story of growing up living in poverty. And because we want to put a community face and voice on this issue (a community voice video will follow shortly), I agreed to do this. Now I am very blessed to have had the good fortune to have been able to work my way up and out of poverty, although not without serious bumps and bruises along the way—let’s just say I got a very late run at a good life, not starting my college career until age 29. I will spare you the gritty details of that experience, but I will focus on one aspect of my early life that I care deeply about today, and that is hunger, or food insecurity, as we like to call it today.

We know—and have known for a long time—that children growing up in poverty and food- insecure families are vulnerable to poor health and are at higher risk for chronic health issues; have hindered ability to function normally and participate fully in school; and are at a higher risk of behavioral issues and social difficulties; and are ill prepared mentally, emotionally, and physically for the work environment. Yet, in Pennsylvania today, 20.5 percent of our children live with hunger, and 16.5 percent of all Pennsylvanians are food insecure, while 13.3 percent live in poverty. And the closer we get to home, the grimmer the poverty picture is, with 23 percent of Pittsburghers living in poverty and another 43 percent living within 200 percent of the poverty level. And, in addition to the social and economic implications of poverty, neurological and psychological research bears out that adults and children alike experience worry, anxiety, depression, helplessness, embarrassment, and shame as a result of being poor and hungry. I was one of those kids.

My father walked out on my mother, brother, and me when I was born. It was the 1950s, and the three of us shared one-bedroom quarters in Apartment #2 of Building #3 in Courtyard #7 in Arlington Heights. My mother suffered from diabetes and mental health issues. Financial support from my father was spotty at best, and because my parents were not divorced, we were not then eligible for government assistance. But we qualified for a food program where we went once a month to stand in the food line at the old Croatian Center on the South Side. There we would get powdered eggs and milk, blocks of cheese, vats of peanut butter, and cans of Spam if the giving was good. And I remember two things with exquisite clarity about that experience: I recall the shame I felt as people walked or rode by looking at us “poor” folks living on the dole. I remember wishing myself invisible. And the other thing I remember is that as much as I hated that, I feared even more that without this food, my mother, sick with diabetes, might die if she didn’t have it. There were many nights in my childhood when we had to figure out who was going to get a meal, who would go without, or if we would purchase food with the limited resources we had or if a utility bill or doctor bill would get paid. When my mother was sick, which was often, these decisions fell to me to make.

Around the time I was 10, I was selected for government assistance and food stamps. This meant that we could go to the market on a pretty regular basis. I loved everything about it—the sights, sounds, and smells. But then at the end, when we had to pay for the food with those dreadful food stamps, it seemed as though time stood still.
Even today, I can see my mother’s hands shaking as she tries to tear the right stamps out of the right books. I can see the look of disgust on the face of the checkout clerk and hear the people huffing in the checkout line.

I remember one time in the A&P in Mount Oliver, a woman saying, “If she can’t afford to feed those kids, she shouldn’t have them,” and how fear shot through me that someone would take me away from my mother.

I watched, over time, as welfare and government assistance wore down and eroded my mother’s dignity and self-esteem, evident to me by the endless hours she spent on the couch. Diabetic and depressed, it was all she could do to keep up with doctor and caseworker appointments. She was overwhelmed and confused by information she received and fully ashamed and humiliated for having gotten her family in this situation.

There is nothing like seeing the one person you love and depend on the most in the world sick, hungry, and despairing and fearing that someone is going to take her away from you to get you thinking that something is terribly wrong with the world.

I end my personal story here because I want to mindfully begin our poverty story and mass incarceration policy dialogue with a reflection on the word “shame” and even after the notion of a personal and political shame nexus that might help explain, in some measure, the persistence of poverty.

On the personal level, people like my mother 50 years ago and, today, the 42 million women and 28 million children who depend on them live one incident—one doctor’s bill, one late paycheck, one unexpected illness, one broken-down car—away from economic ruin. These are our fellow citizens who are living on the brink of poverty, living with shame and a sense of powerlessness because the cause of their situation may not be of their own making. So, those are the living-on-the-brink people.

Then there are those who go one step forward and two steps back. These are people living in poverty at the edge of the “benefits cliff,” or the working poor, 10.5 million Americans or 7.2 percent of the labor force. And research shows that the effect of this benefits cliff is the single greatest barrier to our poverty and mass incarceration policy dialogue with a reflection on the word “shame” and even offer the notion of shame in relation to poverty over others. So shame in relation to poverty is constructed, a dynamic interaction of internally felt inadequacies and externally inflicted judgments.

Let’s face it: Being poor in America is viewed as not being proper; it is humiliating and disgraceful. But here’s the catch, not only for the poor but also for all Americans who tolerate it. Think about it: If the wealthiest nation in the world tolerates more than 15 percent of its residents living in poverty, including more than 20 percent of its children, what does that say about us as a nation?

We protect ourselves from the shame of poverty by touting cherished American values of individualism, self-sufficiency, and personal responsibility. True, many of the poor make bad choices. Some don’t want to work; some are so traumatized by the chronic stress of poverty that they suffer from shame, poor self-esteem, and even depression. Now whether these personal characteristics are the causes of poverty or the consequences of it is debatable, but there can be no debate that those who are poor and those who are not poor share these personal characteristics. Many Americans, poor and nonpoor alike, have fallen short of their obligations as citizens, but America also has failed to live up to its commitments to its citizens as well.

Individuals are held accountable for their personal economic well-being, but the nation also holds responsibility for the social and economic conditions that propel some into economic success and others into poverty.

And we know that America has a history of holding polarizing explanations of poverty over others. So shame in relation to poverty is constructed, a dynamic interaction of internally felt inadequacies and externally inflicted judgments. And society plays a role in persistently evaluating others against dominant norms and prioritizing certain explanations of poverty over others. So shame in relation to poverty is constructed, a dynamic interaction of internally felt inadequacies and externally inflicted judgments.

Let’s face it: Being poor in America is viewed as not being proper; it is humiliating and disgraceful. But here’s the catch, not only for the poor but also for all Americans who tolerate it. Think about it: If the wealthiest nation in the world tolerates more than 15 percent of its residents living in poverty, including more than 20 percent of its children, what does that say about us as a nation?

We protect ourselves from the shame of poverty by touting cherished American values of individualism, self-sufficiency, and personal responsibility. True, many of the poor make bad choices. Some don’t want to work; some are so traumatized by the chronic stress of poverty that they suffer from shame, poor self-esteem, and even depression. Now whether these personal characteristics are the causes of poverty or the consequences of it is debatable, but there can be no debate that those who are poor and those who are not poor share these personal characteristics. Many Americans, poor and nonpoor alike, have fallen short of their obligations as citizens, but America also has failed to live up to its commitments to its citizens as well.

Individuals are held accountable for their personal economic well-being, but the nation also holds responsibility for the social and economic conditions that propel some into economic success and others into poverty.

And we know that America has a history of holding polarizing views about its responsibility toward the poor.

The urban poverty that grew out of the Industrial Revolution led to the charity organization movement that sought to rehabilitate the person without public support.

The Great Depression, when one-third of the American labor force was unemployed, forced Congress to reexamine America’s reluctance to use public resources to support the poor, and it responded with the Social Security Act of 1935.

Michael Harrington’s galvanizing work, *The Other America,* stimulated public awareness of poverty and led to President Lyndon Johnson declaring the War on Poverty and Congress giving America the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964.

Medicare and Medicaid followed in 1965.

And now, most recently, the Great Recession reminded us that poverty exists and that economic disasters concentrate at the bottom of the economic ladder, increasing the amount of poverty. This recession exposed the gaping holes in social programs that failed to protect against economic calamity for millions of Americans caught in an economic vortex.

Individual bad choices alone did not drive people into poverty.

America’s economic structure collapsed and dragged many into its quickmire. And while the recession has abated, its ruins are scattered about the country in lost homes, lost jobs, long-term unemployment, and families scrambling to regain their former economic standing.

And to be clear, the issues of poverty and the topic of our second day of the retreat, mass incarceration, are intrinsically linked.

Recent research indicates that, if not for the rise in incarceration, the number of people in poverty would fall by as much as 20 percent. Prior to the Great Recession, the U.S. economy had more than doubled in the last three decades, while the poverty rate remained largely unchanged. And, at the same time, incarceration rates increased rapidly by 342 percent. That is not a typo.

While we can debate if this rise in incarceration is due to more crime or “touch on crime” policies, two stark facts remain: that these policies have a disproportionate impact on people of color and people who enter the criminal justice system are overwhelmingly poor. And we know that incarceration also contributes to poverty in other ways—by creating employment barriers; reducing earnings; decreasing economic security through criminal debt, fees, and fines; making access to public benefits difficult or impossible; and disrupting communities where formerly incarcerated people reside.

Poverty and mass incarceration are interrelated, complex, multifaceted problems that can be overcome through good research to inform civil dialogue and a social and political willingness to explore comprehensive and innovative programs and policy options to advance a collective humanitarian response to these issues.

These topics, over the next day and a half, will be examined by first-rate experts whose insights should inform all of us and produce a fruitful, constructive dialogue.

We start with a true expert on the issue of poverty, ALEXANDRA MURPHY, who is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Michigan. Murphy’s research uses ethnographic methods to examine how poverty and inequality are experienced, structured, and reproduced across and within multiple domains of social life, including neighborhoods, social networks, and the like. Today, she will provide us with a national overview of poverty trends and also will introduce the topic of the changing geography of poverty that will be the focus of our discussions later today.

One of our local shining stars in social welfare, WALTER SMITH, will moderate what should be a lively discussion with Murphy. Smith currently serves as the deputy director for the Office of Children, Youth and Families at the Allegheny County Department of Human Services and was a longtime director of Family Resources, a nonprofit focused on the prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect. Full bios on all of our speakers are in your packets.

As we move into this retreat, I would like to leave you with some words from Elise. This was the last interview she did for Pittsburgh Quarterly magazine. She said, “Pittsburghers of considerable means must learn to be concerned about what’s going on around them in their community. We don’t live alone. None of us are islands. We must pay attention to the needs of others. After all, that’s what community is about.”

I hope that this retreat will provide you with good information and greater confidence as you go forward in your deliberations on these matters. Thank you for being here.
POVERTY IN PENNSYLVANIA

Next, Pennsylvania House of Representatives Majority Leader DAVE REED spoke about the listening tour that he organized while serving as chair of the House Majority Policy Committee. The committee’s findings, published in the report Beyond Poverty, were outlined in Reed’s remarks, and include:

• 13 barriers to escaping poverty identified by the committee, connected by the common thread of preventing people from obtaining or maintaining family-sustaining jobs;
• best practices among human service agencies across the Commonwealth; and
• five key policy strategies to address poverty at the state level.

More information and a copy of the report can be viewed at www.pahousegop.info/docs/Reed beyonddpovertyreport2014/index.html.

Subsequently, Reed emphasized the importance of developing meaningful metrics to measure the success of the commonwealth’s antipoverty programs. He noted that House Bill (HB) 1205 would authorize the Commonwealth to partner with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative to conduct cost-benefit analyses on assistance and other programs currently in place in Pennsylvania and potentially recommend changes. HB 1205 passed the house in early 2015 and remains in the Senate State Government Committee.

Reed also referenced HB 1164, which would, if passed, help to alleviate the “benefits cliff” for child care subsidy recipients. The committee found during its listening tour that the benefits cliff often experienced by recipients of assistance was preventing people from taking higher-wage jobs and promotions. HB 1164 would attempt to remedy this by restructuring the income ratio used to provide the subsidies in order to allow for a more graduated step-down. This legislation also passed the house and is currently in the senate awaiting review.

Reed concluded by acknowledging that there is no “silver bullet” to end poverty but that through incremental changes, legislators and others can take steps to improve lives in a meaningful way.

POVERTY IN SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Reed then joined a panel of his colleagues and other community leaders on the topic of Moving Forward. The panel began with an introduction by moderator MAX KING, who, noting that the Pittsburgh region is home to 500,000 poor or near poor individuals, announced The Pittsburgh Foundation’s 100 Percent Pittsburgh initiative. The initiative’s goal is to ensure that all residents benefit from the region’s recent renaissance and current growth, and that no one gets left behind. He then introduced a video featuring three personal perspectives on what’s it’s like to try to escape poverty today.

In the subsequent discussion moderated by King, panelists and attendees alike praised the Beyond Poverty report, Reed’s work in leading the committee, and his courage in taking on this difficult topic.

Panelists also offered additional statistics about poverty in the region. ESTHER BUSH, president and CEO of the Urban League of Pittsburgh, noted that Pittsburgh has the highest number of unemployed working-age Blacks of any metropolitan area in the country as well as one of the highest poverty rates for children under 5.

Suggestions for moving forward included addressing people’s basic needs first so that other programs designed to help people escape poverty are more effective. Addressing the benefits cliff and providing higher-quality educational opportunities, especially prekindergarten programs, for all children also were mentioned. Both topics are discussed in the Beyond Poverty report.

All panelists concluded that, in order to take on the issue of poverty, greater collaboration is needed between all stakeholders, including legislators and service providers.

WELCOME FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Chancellor Emeritus Nordenberg thanked the Moving Forward panelists for the thought-provoking discussion and then introduced University of Pittsburgh Chancellor Patrick Gallagher. Chancellor Gallagher thanked participants for attending and spoke about the University’s role in the larger community, noting that he hoped to encourage students to engage in experience-based learning throughout the region. He also expressed the University’s commitment to working with other partners to create technology-driven economic growth that offers a place for all residents, including those currently experiencing poverty.

POVERTY ACROSS GEOGRAPHY

After a reception and dinner, DAN FRANKEL, cochair of the Institute’s Health and Human Services Policy Committee and cochair of the subcommittee on municipal poverty, gathered participants for a discussion on poverty in rural, suburban, and urban areas. He noted that while rural and urban poverty have persisted over decades, there has been a more recent growth in suburban poverty. Frankel remarked that from 1970 to 2012, the suburban share of poverty increased by more than 8 percent, and 55 percent of low-income Americans live in the suburbs.

Frankel suggested that poverty is a problem that is not limited by geography but is instead impacted by it. Neighborhoods of concentrated poverty often isolate residents from the resources and networks they need to reach their potential. In addition, individuals living in impoverished neighborhoods often experience lower-quality health as a result of environmental issues, lower-quality schools and fewer educational opportunities, and disproportionate rates of crime.

In conclusion, Frankel applauded the Institute for taking on the issue of poverty and asked that attendees commit to working together to help the region to develop a better understanding of the causes of poverty and to formulate public policy to address it.

GEOGRAPHY AND INEQUALITY

Following Frankel’s introduction of the topic, keynote speaker Alex Murphy joined attendees again for a discussion moderated by Walter Smith. Currently serving as deputy director of the Office of Children, Youth and Families in the Allegheny County Department of Human Services, Smith has a long history of helping to provide human services to underprivileged children and families in the region.
Transportation and mobility issues are critical to low-income suburban families, many of whom, in the absence of reliable public transit, rely primarily on informal networks to get to work, stores, medical appointments, and service agencies. A lack of transportation, especially to certain pockets of neighborhoods, often leaves even human service providers unaware of residents’ needs.

Murphy suggested that engaging low-income residents in policy discussions about transit and transportation would be key to addressing this problem in a meaningful way.

**Rountable Discussions**

Attendees divided into small groups to focus on the barriers to escaping poverty that are featured in the Beyond Poverty report. The following paragraphs provide a summary of their discussions. Following the small group discussions, Moe Coleman, the Institute’s director emeritus, provided closing remarks.

**Social Supports**

Social supports have long served as anchors in communities, often providing short-term assistance for individuals and families overcoming obstacles. However, while urban areas may develop strong social supports among neighbors due to their proximity, the distance between homes in suburban and rural communities can pose a challenge to forming social ties. In some cases, the absence of reliable public transit or limited use of informal networks can work to strengthen them.

**Criminal Record**

Criminal records can prevent individuals from being hired, obtaining loans, or getting into college. A “ban the box” policy could assist applicants in allowing them to avoid being defined by their criminal history by preventing employers from asking about it until later in the hiring process. The government also could provide liability protections for organizations that hire ex-offenders from any future criminal actions the ex-offenders might take. On the other side, low-income individuals often are incarcerated as a result of being unable to pay bail, or they hastily accept pleas in order to return to precarious employment situations. In some cases, diverisornary courts may be able to provide a faster-moving docket or social services to relieve the issues faced by low-income defendants.

**Education**

Budget cuts at the state or national level disproportionately affect schools in poorer communities. While richer communities often can make up for this monetary loss by fundraising or increasing taxes, in poorer communities, those are not options. With less money to go around, schools in poor communities must make cuts to make up the difference, and as the opportunities in the schools begin to diminish, all too often the students’ test scores follow. A bipartisan solution to address the issue of education funding also would make a world of difference in access to quality education for all individuals. Until that can occur, partnership of different school districts and superintendents to ensure quality education for all students could be an effective route.

**Homelessness**

For homeless individuals, there is not always a clear path of transition through the system. In this region, we have both an inefficient system and a shortage of proper shelter. An increase in both affordable housing and the provision of social services would help those experiencing homelessness. Some work has been done to provide successful solutions to this issue. Replicating programs like the Urban League of Greater Pittsburgh’s programs for renters and the CORL program in Illinois and Massachusetts, which prevents landlords from searching previously expunged records, as well as increasing funding for the State Housing Trust Fund and creating special programs geared toward people who were formerly incarcerated could be successful.

**Hunger**

Suburban and rural sprawl did not take into account how people access food or other services, leaving many people isolated and without their basic needs being met. A lack of transportation options available in many counties can make purchasing food difficult. Food banks have played an important role in reducing hunger in rural areas, but not all communities have sponsored programs. In addition, individuals may not know how to prepare or cook the food given to them, resulting in a lack of healthy meals. There also is a stigma around participating in assistance programs. Overall, individuals must take responsibility for the community and understand that even if hunger isn’t directly impacting them, it is impacting their community, and they have a role in addressing the issue.

**Mental Health and Substance Abuse**

In rural and suburban areas, accessing mental health and substance abuse services can be difficult. This hardship can be made worse for low-income residents due to several other negative impacts of receiving treatment. For example, treatment for these issues can be disruptive to the daily life of low-income patients, many of whom do not have jobs that allow them time off to seek help. In order to better address the needs of residents with mental health or substance abuse issues, increased funding and improved service delivery is needed. Better training and awareness of mental health and substance abuse among hospital staff members and police officers also could lead to quicker diagnosis and proper assistance.

**Friday, September 11, 2015**

**Mass Incarceration in America**

Chancellor Emeritus Nordenberg opened Friday’s program with an overview of the criminal justice system today. His remarks are reprinted here in full.

**Mass Incarceration in America: National Momentum for Change**

In 1936, Clarence Darrow—a lawyer nearly as famous as FRED THIEMAN, from whom you will hear momentarily—wrote an article for Esquire magazine. It was entitled “How to Pick a Jury.” In whatever period he might have lived, Clarence Darrow almost certainly never would have been known as a champion of political correctness. And, of course, he lived in a time not only long before that term had been coined but before the sensitivities that the concept is intended to protect had become such a part of the general social consciousness. Put more directly, his views were not based on anything like the “jury science” applied in at least some large cases today. Instead, they were grounded in his own experiences and expressed in sweeping stereotypes. Let me share just a few passages from that article with you:

In the last analysis, most jury trials are contests between the rich and poor. If the case concerns money, it is apt to be a case of damages for injuries of some sort claimed to have been inflicted by someone. These cases usually are defended by insurance companies, railroads, or factories. If a criminal case, it is practically always the poor who are on trial. …

Let us assume that we represent one of “the underdogs” because of injuries received or because of an indictment brought by what the prosecutors name themselves, “the state.” Then, what sort of [jurors] will we seek? An Irishman is called into the box for examination. … You should be aware that he is emotional, kindly, and sympathetic. If he is chosen as a juror, his imagination will place him in the dock; really, he is trying himself. You would be guilty of malpractice if you got rid of him. …
An Englishman is not so good as an Irishman, but still, he has come through a long tradition of individual rights, and is not afraid to stand alone; in fact, he is never sure that he is right unless the great majority are against him. …

If a Presbyterian enters the jury box and carefully rolls up his umbrella and calmly and critically sits down, let him go. He is cold as the grave; he knows right from wrong, although he seldom finds anything right. … Get rid of him with the fewest possible words before he contaminates the others. …

Beware of Lutherans, especially Scandinavians; they are almost always sure to convict. Either a Lutheran or a Scandinavian is unsafe, but if both in one, plead your client guilty and go down the ducket. …

Never take a wealthy man on a jury. He will convict, unless the defendant is accused of violating the anti-trust law, selling worthless stocks or bonds, or something of that kind. Next to the Board of Trade, for him, the penitentiary is the most important of public buildings. These imposing structures stand for capitalism. Civilization could not possibly exist without them.

Darrow’s own view of prisons stood in sharp contrast to the one he assigned to his stereotypical wealthy candidate for jury service. In fact, in that same article, he wrote, “I can think of nothing, not even war, that has brought so much misery to the others. …

But even for those of us whose basic attitudes about life include such law-and-order inclinations, it seems appropriate to ask whether we, as an American society, have moved along the spectrum too far in the direction of Darrow’s wealthy man. That is, have we elevated the place of jails and prisons in the criminal justice system to a point where both the economic costs and the human harms outweigh whatever good is produced? Put another way, as it was by National Public Radio in mid-July (2015), “Is it possible to let more people out of prison and keep crime down?”

Respected professionals from within the criminal justice system have been raising this question for years, having seen the impact of developments like the mandatory minimum sentences and three-strikes-and-you’re-out provisions, which had swept the country. Recently, the issue has become a very visible topic of more general discussion. Consider this “Jailhouse Nation” cover story from the June 20–26 [2015,] issue of The Economist. Its subtitle is “2.3 million reasons to fix America’s prison problem”—referring to the total number of people currently residing in our country’s prisons and jails.

It was not always this way. According to the Economist article itself, “In 1970, America’s state and federal prisons together held just under 200,000 inmates”—compared, again, to 2.3 million today. That dramatic rise is the product of incarceration rates that stand out internationally. Again, according to The Economist, “Per head, the incarceration rate in the land of the free has risen seven-fold since the 1970s, and is now five times Britain’s, nine times Germany’s and 14 times Japan’s.”

Other recent articles have focused on specific aspects of the processes leading to incarceration. For example, the August 16 [2015,] cover story from The New York Times Magazine was “The Bail Trap.” Its subtitle was: “Every year, thousands of innocent people are sent to jail only because they can’t afford to post bail, putting them at risk of losing their jobs, custody of their children—even their lives.” The story itself goes on to examine how people who can’t afford bail are put at risk before they even have been found guilty of anything.

Probably no single event of the recent past attracted more attention to the broad issue of incarceration than President Barack Obama’s visit to the federal prison in El Reno, Okla., in mid-July. According to coverage in The New York Times, once inside its walls, this was one of his first views of prison life:

They opened the door to Cell 123, and President Obama stared inside. In a space of 9 feet by 10 feet, he saw three bunks, a toilet with no seat, a night table with books, a small sink, prison clothes on a hook, some metal cabinets and the life he might have had.

Again, quoting from coverage in The New York Times, after his visit, the president said:

“[W]e have a tendency sometimes to almost take for granted or think it’s normal” that so many young people are locked up. “It’s not normal,” he said. “It’s not what happens in other countries. What is normal is teenagers doing stupid things. What is normal is young people making mistakes.” …

Still, he made a distinction between them and criminals guilty of crimes like murder, rape and assault. “There are people who need to be in prison, and I don’t have tolerance for violent criminals. … [W]e need to keep our communities safe.”

As we all would expect, the fact that Obama was the first sitting president to visit a federal prison did generate a great deal of attention. More surprising, in this age of unrelenting partisan warfare, was the fact that his visit triggered strong public expressions of support from a range of key Republicans also championing the cause of criminal justice reform. Here are three examples from the news of that very same day:

• Speaker of the House John Boehner confirmed his desire to bring a bipartisan bill proposing criminal justice reform to the House floor. In doing so, he expressed his belief that there are people in prison who don’t need to be there and said, “I’ve long believed that there needed to be reform of our criminal justice system. Some of the people are in there under what I’ll call flimsy reasons.”

• Similarly, it was reported that Chris Christie, who had served as a U.S. attorney before being elected New Jersey’s governor, described our criminal justice system as “broken” and said, “Justice isn’t something we can jail our way to. Justice is something we have to build in our communities.”

• Perhaps most surprising of all, The Wall Street Journal published an article bearing the headline “Obama, Koch Brothers in Unlikely Alliance to Overhaul Criminal Justice:…”

White House and High-dollar GOP Donors Team Up to Push for Rewrite of Federal Sentencing Laws.”

Because of the confluence of social and fiscal issues, this is a cause that already had produced unlikely allies in a range of sometimes surprising settings across the country. Consider the May 19 [2015,] issue of The Washington Post, which bore the headline “Skyrocketing Prison Costs Have States Targeting Recidivism, Sentencing Practices.” That article goes on to report:

It is not often that the American Civil Liberties Union and the Southern Poverty Law Center find common cause with conservative Republicans in Alabama. But on Tuesday, both sides will celebrate when [Republican] Gov. Robert Bentley signs legislation that will substantially cut the number of prisoners in state custody.

The legislation reflects a growing bipartisan consensus that a generation of tough-on-crime attitudes that dramatically increased the prison population has placed a burdensome strain on state budgets without actually achieving the goal of rehabilitating offenders. To reduce the number of offenders behind bars, both over the short and long terms, states like Alabama are reclassifying some minor crimes and spending more to make sure those who do wind up in prison don’t come back after their release.

The same article goes on to report that Texas, North Carolina, and Georgia already had passed similar reform measures and that Nebraska and Washington seemed poised to do so as well. Even more dramatically, in the sense that it involved direct action by the voting public, was the passage of Proposition 47 in California in November (2014). According to that state’s official voter information guide, the initiative requires that misdemeanor sentences rather than felony sentences be imposed for certain drug and property offenses, excluding any person with a prior conviction for a serious or violent crime as well as registered sex offenders; projects savings in “the high hundreds of millions dollars annually”; and directs that those savings be spent on school truancy and dropout prevention, mental health and substance abuse treatment, and victim services. Despite opposition by some prominent law enforcement organizations, this proposition passed with nearly 60 percent of the vote.

Here in Pennsylvania, and more particularly in Allegheny County, we see trends mirroring those that have surfaced nationally. That is, we have seen significant growth in the jail population, a companion increase in the public expenditures required to maintain that population, and serious questions about the returns being generated by those investments. Fred Thiemann is part of a group that has been analyzing these issues, and he is here to offer a report to you today.
CRIMINAL JUSTICE WORKING SESSIONS

Attendees selected an area of interest and participated in small group discussions led by practitioners. The following table offers summaries of their discussions.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
- Implementing means testing for fines and other costs would help to ease the burden on the poor; currently, these costs are often mandatory.
- More extensive pretrial diversion programs could be established for those with mental illnesses.
- Public education about the costs associated with the current criminal justice system is critical to reform; without it, there will be backlash.

JAIL
- Additional opportunities available through the Intermediate Punishment Program, which offers counties flexibility in their treatment of offenders arrested for certain crimes, could be explored.
- The financial burden on families of supporting someone in jail is astronomical.
- Recent programs have shown some success, but concerns include the length of stay (people are not in long enough to benefit from the program, so it's often easier to redirect people pretrial).

JUDICIARY
- Access to legal counsel at multiple points throughout a person's journey through the criminal justice system was cited as a problem. Public defenders are usually not present until a trial date is set, and, unless an offender can afford private counsel, preliminary assignment is done without counsel present. Participants also commented that defenders cannot be lifted without the knowledge of the defendant.
- Other challenges identified by the group included the presence of zero tolerance judges and mandatory sentencing laws that limit the district attorneys' discretionary ability.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
- A lack of sufficient staff prevents assessments of general needs when offenders enter the system. Volunteers with clearances might be able to fill this role.
- Poverty was identified as a root cause of individuals' entrance into the criminal justice system, and providing additional support services to the communities where these individuals reside might address some of the criminal behavior that results.
- Reducing recidivism and helping people leave the system permanently should be a top priority.
- Requiring ability to pay hearings, as other states do, could help reduce the burden on those in poverty.

CLOSING REMARKS

Chancellor Emeritus Nordenberg remarked that this year's retreat helped to lay the foundation for continued efforts on two of the region's most critical issues. Moving forward, our region needs to develop a more comprehensive understanding of these issues in order to create sound recommendations for needed reforms.
The Elsie Hillman Civic Forum (Elsie Forum) National Advisory Council, made up of 24 individuals, including cochairs Edie Shapira and John Denny, all of whom were handpicked by Hillman to oversee student programs and uphold her legacy and values, convened for the first time on October 16, 2015. The meeting began with members speaking of their experiences with and love for Hillman and sharing in a moment of silence to remember her life and legacy. The council went on to review the mission, vision, and guiding principles of the Elsie Forum and to discuss the current and developing student programs functioning under its umbrella.

One area of interest generated by the survey involved the influence of the Institute’s publications and the desire to see them reach more of the region’s population, as public interest in and engagement with the Institute’s work were seen as potential catalysts for action. Survey respondents also expressed an interest in determining how the Institute should address the increasing number of requests for the Institute to examine specific policy issues coming informally from elected officials and other community leaders rather than through the traditional policy committee structure.

In the next few weeks, the Institute will be developing action steps necessary to address the concerns and ideas brought forth in the survey and discussion. The action steps will be disseminated in the spring along with a short follow-up survey to evaluate the proposed actions.

The discussion of the meeting focused largely on the overarching goals of the Elsie Forum and the different student programs offered. Members emphasized the importance of upholding Hillman’s legacy, values, and special areas of interest as the Forum moves forward with its various initiatives. The members were given an opportunity to learn about and make suggestions regarding two current programs—Legislator for a Day and the internship placement in the office of an elected official—as well as potential future programs—the Elsie Hillman Honors Scholars program, Elsie Hillman Leader in Residence program, Ambassadors for Civic Engagement program, and the Never a Spectator event. These programs are meant to serve as a catalyst in continuing Hillman’s legacy for generations to come, emphasizing her involvement in politics, community engagement, and effecting social change.

The council also heard a presentation on the Elsie H. Hillman Papers, held within the University Library System. Now available for public review, these archives hold Hillman’s collection of papers from throughout the years, demonstrating her long career in civic engagement and her influence. A select number of papers are currently available online at elsiehillman.pitt.edu, along with information regarding Hillman’s life and legacy. For more information and updates on the activities of the Elsie Forum, please visit elsiehillmanforum.pitt.edu.
While there have been several key developments in infrastructure and transportation funding that have occurred over the past few years, there is still much that needs to be done to help regional transportation networks develop and finance projects that are critical to future economic development potential, health, and vitality of the communities that they serve.

This forum will feature national experts who will discuss methods that other regions across the country are using to tackle these issues.

Additionally, attendees will hear from representatives at the state, regional, and local levels regarding some innovative initiatives already underway.

We look forward to you joining us for this informative and timely discussion!