



Safety regulations mandate seatbelts in cars, they pull harmful bugsprays off the market, they make sure stepladders are stable and kids' pajamas don't burst into flames. So why don't guns get the same scrutiny? 10

The Joyce Foundation supports efforts to protect the natural environment of the Great Lakes, to reduce poverty and violence in the region, and to ensure that its people have access to good schools, decent jobs, and a diverse and thriving culture. We are especially interested in improving public policies, because public systems such as education and welfare directly affect the lives of so many people, and because public policies help shape private sector decisions about jobs, the environment, and the health of our communities. To ensure that public policies truly reflect public rather than private interests, we support efforts to reform the system of financing election campaigns.

InThisIssue

Money and Politics

Air Time 4

Election news coverage is shrinking, while negative political ads turn off many voters. Is there a better way?

Employment

Job Training on Track 6

Taking advantage of new federal legislation, Indiana is pulling together job-training and other services to meet local needs.

Education

Help Wanted: Grownups 8

Chicago school reform depends on strong local leadership. Elections this spring are critical for keeping it going.

Gun Violence

Safety First 10

Time to give firearms the same scrutiny we give aspirin bottles, teddy bears and toasters.

Progress Notes 14

Food and pesticides • School priorities: Governance, Minority student achievement

Grants Approved 18

Grants approved at the December 8, 1999 meeting of the Board of Directors

For More Info 21

Reports, web sites, information of interest

Work In Progress is published three times a year following each Board meeting.

For information on programs of the Joyce Foundation, please consult our web site, www.joycefdn.org, or call our offices to request a copy of our annual report or guidelines pamphlet. 312.782.2464

One million political ads will hit TV screens this election year, sending voters screaming for cover. Is this any way to run a democracy?

Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford don't think so. The two ex-presidents are pushing for an alternative. They're urging TV stations to spotlight the candidates in short, high-quality — and free — issue forums, every night for a month before the November election.

“Citizens are turned off by [political] ads and by the money chase that pays for them,” argue Carter and Ford in a letter to television executives also signed by Walter Cronkite and others. “We call on you to open the nation’s airwaves in 2000 to a different kind of campaign communication — one whose currency is ideas, not money.” The letter appeared in ads in *The New York Times* and the trade publication *Broadcasting & Cable*.

The driving force behind the idea is Paul Taylor, a former *Washington Post* reporter who runs the public interest group Alliance for Better Campaigns. Taylor pushed for free air time during the 1996 election, with limited success. Since then, a White House advisory panel, co-chaired by CBS President Leslie Moonves, recommended that commercial TV stations voluntarily provide five minutes each night of “candidate-centered discourse” in the 30 days prior to elections. Now, supported in part by a one-year, \$100,000 Joyce grant, Taylor’s Alliance plans a public campaign to push the “5/30” proposal on the heretofore largely unenthusiastic management of the nation’s TV outlets.

At the root of the issue is money. Political ads are expected to generate \$600 million in TV revenues this election year, according to Taylor. Paying for them becomes a huge burden, he adds: “The public is aware

that money is out of control in politics. One engine driving this money chase is the high costs of ads.”

But it’s the slash-and-burn tone of political ads that makes ordinary citizens cringe — and turns many away from politics. Protected by the First Amendment, political ads are not held to the standards of accuracy that commercial spots must meet. Former U.S. Senator Paul Simon has remarked that if airlines adopted the same advertising strategy as politicians — if one airline’s ads pictured devastating crashes of competitors’ planes — pretty soon no one would fly.

In state and local elections especially, proliferation of ads is counterbalanced by declining news coverage of campaigns. The Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California found that TV stations in California’s top five media markets devoted an average of one-half of one percent of total news coverage to that state’s 1998 gubernatorial race — while candidates spent more than \$100 million on TV ads.

With a little imagination, Taylor argues, broadcasters can do a much better job. He plans to organize public campaigns in at least twenty states to challenge broadcasters to provide the free forums and offer assistance on formats for those who are ready to try. A scorecard, using Annenberg research, will track how much money stations get from ads and how much time they devote to candidates discussing issues. If that doesn’t work, Taylor is contemplating a “clicker campaign” to get disgruntled citizens to tune out stations that don’t go along.

By early December, a handful of local stations had expressed willingness to produce the free forums, but no networks or station groups had taken up the challenge.

Paul Taylor, 202.879.6757



Job Training On Track

States have new power to coordinate job-training services and tailor them to local needs. And Indiana is leading the way.

The steel mill city of Gary, the upscale communities around Bloomington, the factory-dominated suburbs north of the Ohio River above Louisville: Indiana's 36,000 square miles of gently rolling land include some very different regional economies. Now, working under a new federal law, the state is organizing its job-training services to help workers and employers in each of those areas get the help they need to become more productive.



In the past job-training services have been a collection of different programs funded and administered by different agencies, often with little relation to each other, and totally separate from welfare assistance for needy families. Lack of coordination meant poor service for families most in need of sustained help. But just as the 1996 federal welfare reform law pushed states to connect welfare and job placement services, the 1998 federal Workforce Investment Act gave states broad powers to coordinate job training and other services.

Indiana has been one of the first states to seize the opportunity. It divided the state's 92 counties into 12 economic regions, essentially areas where people "live, work and shop" together with a reasonable commuting range for most residents. Local, state and federal job-training and related services are to be coordinated within each of those regions to serve local needs. For example, the Bloomington area is creating high-tech jobs and attracting affluent retirees who

prize the cultural and musical life surrounding Indiana University. But the area is losing factory jobs, once a local staple. That means displaced workers — and training needs for high-tech and service industries. Contrast that with Indiana’s Louisville suburbs, which have plenty of high-paying factory jobs but are having difficulty recruiting qualified workers.

Recognizing such differences, Indiana will give financial incentives to local workforce investment boards to study employers’ and workers’ needs and develop ways of meeting them. Priority will be given to people on welfare, but local boards can also use the funds to meet needs of young people just entering the workforce as well as people currently working at low-paid, low-skilled jobs who need additional help to move up the job ladder.

Meanwhile, the state is creating a database of job-training and placement services, and is giving local agencies financial help to train employees about what’s available. Services will be offered at one-stop “information and service malls” in local communities.

“So when a person comes into an office looking for help getting into the workforce, they can identify what job-training services are available,” says Kenneth Bickers, associate professor of political science at Indiana University. “But they can also find out what healthcare programs they qualify for, such as children’s health insurance, and they can get housing assistance. The idea is to break down the divisions between different federal, state and local programs so you can go into one office and find out about services from all the others.” Information about the services will be available online as well.

So far, most of this is in the planning stages. Indiana is one of ten states that have been approved for early implementation under the Workforce Investment Act. With a three-year, \$227,047 Joyce grant, Bickers will lead an evaluation to inform policymakers how well the new system is coming together in different regions and what factors are essential to making it work in ways that meet the needs of local workers and employers.

Kenneth Bickers, 812.855.4198

Help Wanted: Grownups



Besides the primaries, another important election takes place this spring. Chicagoans choose some 5,000 people to help run local schools — and help keep the city’s decade-long school reform effort on track.

Chicago’s schools have been improving since the Secretary of Education, back in 1987, labeled them the “worst in the nation.” Key to the transformation have been two laws: a 1988 law putting control of individual schools in the hands of elected local school councils, and a 1995 measure assigning overall responsibility for the system to Mayor Richard M. Daley, whose handpicked administration put the system’s financial and administrative house in order and stiffened accountability for performance.

The decade has seen student achievement at many elementary schools improve. New resources from universities, corporations, and foundations have poured into schools. Educational experiments range from military academies to charter schools and smaller schools within schools. Although serious problems remain, the overall

progress led President Clinton to hail Chicago as a model of urban school reform.

Local school councils, made up of the principal, parents, teachers, and community representatives, have played an important role in the transformation. They choose the principal, create the school improvement plan, and oversee the spending of \$261 million each year. Research by the Consortium on Chicago School Research found that most councils have been working effectively. But keeping them going depends on keeping a steady supply of committed local leadership, which must be elected every two years.

That's where Leadership for Quality Education comes in. A business-led reform group affiliated with the Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago, LQE has helped organize every election going back to 1989, when 17,000 people ran for seats on the new councils and 300,000 people turned up at schools to vote. Since then, however, says LQE's John Ayers, the numbers have gone down, and so have the resources from corporations and foundations that helped generate participation in the early years.

This year's election is seen as a critical moment, in part because of recent attempts to recentralize authority and reduce the councils' control over principal selection. Says Ayers: "Those of us who have been following reform understand that it's important for local engagement and local accountability to keep principals focused not on the political power brokers but on the community they serve, the people whose children attend the school."

A one-year, \$125,000 grant from Joyce and anticipated funding from other local foundations will create a pool of funds for community organizations to drum up interest and candidates for the April 2000 elections. LQE and its partner, the Chicago School Leadership Development Cooperative, are providing training and technical assistance, including working with religious communities to get out the word.

John Ayers, 312.853.1206

Andy Wade, 312.583.1714



Safety regulations exempt one of the most dangerous products in America: firearms.

One of the great struggles of the past century has been the need to protect ordinary Americans against common illness and injury. When crusading journalist Upton Sinclair documented revolting conditions inside Chicago meatpacking plants nearly 100 years ago, public outrage led to creation of the Food and Drug Administration to protect the food supply and guarantee that medicines are safe and effective. Over the century, other laws have established protections to make cars safer, keep poisons out of the air and water, and protect workers from dangerous conditions on the job.

Consumer products, too — from toys to toasters to children’s pajamas — are regulated for safety. But not guns. At the behest of the gun lobby, Congress specifically exempted firearms and ammunition from the jurisdiction of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in the Treasury Department has only very limited power over the design of firearms. Thus guns to this day remain virtually unregulated for safety.

One of America’s oldest and most venerable consumer watchdogs, the Consumer Federation of America Foundation, has vowed to change that. Seven years ago, the Federation passed a resolution calling for regulation of firearms. Now, with support from a three-year, \$871,053 Joyce grant, the CFA Foundation will launch a full-court press to get the guns regulated.

“We want to reduce consumer injuries and deaths,” says the Federation’s General Counsel, Mary Ellen Fise. “We look at the product, and ask, what can we do about this? Prospectively, that means setting standards, about how they’re made, about what information is packaged with them, about who can use them. Retrospectively, it means looking at safety issues involving this product in the past” — so that, for example, guns prone to discharge accidentally could be recalled.

“There’s a huge lack of understanding about this,” adds Fise, noting that most people are surprised to learn that guns are not regulated. Survey research backs her up. In a recent article in *Science* magazine, researcher Susan Sorenson of the University of California at Los Angeles reported that over half of Americans surveyed believe that guns are already regulated for safety. There’s also widespread support for such measures: three-quarters of those surveyed favored government safety regulations for the design of guns, according to the 1998 survey by the National Opinion Research Center and the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research. Other safety regulations, such as making guns childproof or designing them so that only authorized users can fire them, also draw strong support.

The Federation aims to translate that support into action. A three-year consumer outreach campaign will use everything from web pages to billboards to educate the public about why firearms need to be regulated — and what consumers can do about it. A series of “mini grants” will fund local groups building grassroots support. Meanwhile, the Federation will brief policy-makers and the media on legislative options.

Some steps are already underway. Maryland has a Governor’s Task Force preparing recommendations for mandatory safety features, including childproofing, for all guns sold in the state. If that doesn’t work, Attorney General Joseph Curran will look at using his consumer protection powers to regulate firearms, as his counterpart in Massachusetts, former Attorney General Scott Harshbarger, did in 1997. Curran’s aide, Carolyn Quattrocki, says the Attorney General is taking a comprehensive approach. “We’re looking at different categories of injuries and trying to see what we can do. When you look at unintentional injuries, shootings by children, teen suicide, the number of injuries by stolen firearms — that’s what’s led to the focus on consumer protection.”

Taking a consumer product approach isn’t just about unintentional injury, which accounts for less than 5 percent of gun deaths each year. It asks a broader question: whether a product poses an unreasonable risk to users and if so what steps can be taken to reduce the risk.

That question represents a major shift in thinking, one that parallels thinking about other common dangers. Automobile crashes, for example, are the most common cause of injury-related death in America. Once, efforts to reduce highway deaths mostly meant urging motorists to “Drive Safely.” But beginning in the 1960s the focus shifted to the cars themselves. Manufacturers were forced, by regulators and by lawsuits, to make vehicles involved in crashes less prone to collapse onto passengers or burst into flames, and to install safety features like seatbelts, airbags, and collapsible steering columns. The result: car deaths plummeted from 4.43 deaths per 100 million miles driven in 1972 to 1.76 in 1999.

Gun policy, like the automobile policies of the past, has traditionally concentrated on the person pulling the trigger. “As the National Rifle Association likes to say, we’ve got 20,000 gun laws, but they’re all focused on the user, or occasionally on the seller,” says Kristen Rand of the Violence Policy Center, which will work with the Consumer Federation on the push for regulation. “Virtually none of the laws apply to manufacturers. We’ve allowed that industry to innovate, not for safety, but for lethality.” Rand’s colleague Tom Diaz, in his 1999 book *Making A Killing*, documented manufacturers’ efforts in recent years to boost sales by selling more firepower and greater concealability. “We’ve allowed them to turn out millions of whatever kind of weapon they choose,” says Rand. “As a result we have this huge pool of highly lethal weapons out there in the hands of consumers.”

But a shift is already underway, says Stephen Teret, director of the Johns Hopkins Center and a long-time crusader for gun regulation. “Shifting the focus to the guns themselves makes it possible to think about whether certain guns — Saturday night specials or assault weapons, for example — are more problematic than others. It’s allowed us to think about how guns are advertised and marketed.” Johns Hopkins has complained to the Federal Trade Commission over advertising claims that guns in the home make people safer. “And, especially, we can look at how they’re designed: whether they should have an indicator showing if there’s a bullet in the chamber, or a device that makes it impossible to fire when the magazine is removed, or features to make

them childproof or personalized,” so that only authorized users can fire them. The Johns Hopkins Center has been a leading advocate of measures to force manufacturers to develop personalized gun technology.

Teret cites the Maryland task force, the vote by California legislators to ban Saturday night specials, the lawsuits brought by Chicago, New Orleans and other cities against gun manufacturers, all as concrete evidence of the shift. He is less optimistic about federal action. “Even after horrendous events like Littleton and public pleas for action, Congress did not do anything — they were unable even to address something like gun shows. Let’s not invest all of our effort there. It’s a stalemate.”

But the Consumer Federation and the Violence Policy Center believe comprehensive federal regulation offers the best long-term hope, and that’s where they’re putting their energies. Legislation introduced last spring by Rep. Patrick Kennedy (D, RI) and Sen. Robert Torricelli (D, NJ) would give comprehensive regulatory authority over the firearms industry to the Treasury Department, which has the most expertise on firearms.

With policymakers weary of disputes over gun sales and background checks, the time could be right for a fresh, consumer-oriented approach, argues Rand. Adds Fise: “In the past, messages have always been pro-gun vs. anti-gun. What we’re saying is, this is a consumer issue, just like banking or drinking water — one more issue that policymakers should be concerned about to protect their constituents.”

Mary Ellen Fise, 202.387.6121

Stephen Teret, 410.955.3995

Kristen Rand, 202.822.8200

Environment

Food, Chemicals and Kids

Few would argue with the need to protect children from harmful chemicals on food. Congress certainly didn't: its members overwhelmingly passed the 1996 Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), requiring regulators to set standards for pesticides to protect children, pregnant women, and other vulnerable people. The devil, as usual, is in the details. Joyce is funding environmental and public health groups to monitor the implementation of the Act — and stay on top of those details.

Take, for example, chlorpyrifos, over 20 million pounds of which is used by farmers and homeowners annually to control termites and other insects. Chlorpyrifos is one of a set of chemicals, called organophosphates, that at certain levels can disrupt the nervous systems of animals and humans along with the bugs. Last October, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency announced a tentative finding that chlorpyrifos may be dangerous for residential use and pose risks for those applying the chemical.

The Environmental

Working Group, a Joyce grantee, immediately called on the EPA to ban chlorpyrifos as an “excessive safety risk to millions of Americans each year.” Days later Dow Agro-Sciences, which manufactures chlorpyrifos, issued over 1,300 pages of comment on the risk assessment. Properly used, Dow says, chlorpyrifos controls insects, poses no long-term environmental concern, does not cause cancer or birth defects or harm reproduction, and in tests on humans showed “no signs or symptoms of toxicity.”

The EPA will decide what to do about chlorpyrifos this summer. But while the issue is especially hot right now, the battle over this and related chemicals has been going on for years. In the mid-1980s, Charles Benbrook led the initial research by the National Academy of Sciences analyzing dietary risks of pesticides. “We’re still trying to get at the underlying problems highlighted in our reports,” says Benbrook, now a consultant to the Consumers Union, another Joyce grantee. “Those chemicals that posed the biggest dietary

risk in 1987 still pose the biggest risk today. Like cats, these chemicals seem to have nine lives.”

Since 1996, the Environmental Protection Agency has been working its way through analyses of old and new pesticides to see which ones show up in food and drinking water and what health risks they pose. It's a complicated process, one that requires developing new tools to measure the cumulative effects of exposure to multiple chemicals over time, including risks to children and agricultural workers. Each step raises complex risk assessment and regulatory issues about which manufacturers, farmers, and public interest groups rarely agree. At each stage, those objecting to new regulations call for more research. “They always want to do another study,” says Carolyn Brickey, executive director of the National Campaign for Pesticide Policy Reform, also funded by Joyce. “And the study takes three years, and they keep the chemical on the market in the meantime.”

Officially, the EPA has met interim timelines for reviewing products and applications under the law. But Brickey, Benbrook, and others say the EPA

needs to focus on the bigger picture: getting the most harmful chemicals out of circulation.

“A relatively small number of pesticide uses account for the lion's share of risk in the diet,” says Benbrook. Those include pesticides associated with cancer, nerve damage, and reproductive problems. “We are convinced that for 90 percent of those uses, the EPA could announce a phase-out tomorrow without adverse consequences. Maybe 10 percent of the uses they would need to phase out over a longer period, because there's uncertainty over whether farmers can find other ways to deal with target pests. We're worried that the EPA will delay taking any action because of concern over that last 10 percent.”

“The mandate in FQPA is very clear: EPA must deal with the worst first,” CU's Dr. Edward Groth said last summer on the third anniversary of the Act. Many of the chemical uses reviewed to date “are for obsolete or minimal uses with no impact on food safety,” CU said. Even steps announced at that time to restrict exposure to the pesticides methyl parathion and azinphos methyl will do



Reducing pesticide residues on produce and other food to protect the health of children was the goal of 1996 federal legislation. But implementation has been a struggle.

little to reduce risk, the group charged.

But the EPA did announce last summer an 18-month schedule for reviewing organophosphates, including chlorpyrifos. It is also expected to turn its attention soon to the triazine herbicides, including atrazine, widely used in the Midwest. Renewed Joyce funding will enable the Consumers Union and the Natural Resources Defense Council, along with EWG and the National Campaign, to stay involved in the process. The groups comment on the scientific papers and proposed regulations, help develop tools to evaluate risk (EWG is cited especially for its work in this area), and educate the public. Consumers Union's March 1999 report "Do You Know What You're Eating?" spotlighted the dangers posed by pesticides, especially to children, and drew wide public attention.

A 1998 NRDC report warned of the special risks farm children face.

A key issue remains helping farmers find other ways to control pests. The World Wildlife Fund has been working with growers and food processors on pest control methods that cause less harm to humans, wildlife, and the rest of the ecosystem.

"Many of the same organophosphates that present significant dietary risk to humans also pose significant risk to the rest of the natural environment," says project director Sarah Lynch, citing evidence that some organophosphates may be disrupting the endocrine systems of wildlife. Through a Joyce-funded collaboration with the Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association, World Wildlife Fund has researched alternative pest control methods and developed guidelines for farmers seeking to make the transition to safer systems.

Charles Benbrook
208.263.5236

Carolyn Brickey
520.647.7036

Sarah Lynch
202.778.9781

www.nrdc.org

www.ewg.org

Education

Spotlight on School Governance, Minority Achievement

Policymakers should look to governance as a key school reform strategy, says the Education Commission of the States. The group's National Commission on Governing America's Schools, in a report released last November, proposed two alternative models of governance:

- Publicly operated and funded schools, where states and districts establish goals, provide resources to achieve them, and hold schools accountable for results.
- Independently operated schools, run by nonprofit organizations, cooperatives, or for-profit entities, with public authorities providing funding, authorization and oversight.

The Commission pledged to lead a national discussion and work directly with states and school district leaders seeking to redesign governance systems.

Meanwhile, a report from the College Board focused attention on another problem facing America's schools. Sweeping changes in education are needed to enable minority students to become top academic achievers, according to a report from the National Task Force on Minority

High Achievement issued last October.

Reasons for underachievement range from different school resources and educational levels of parents to peer influences and racism. Efforts to tackle the problem generally focus on helping low-performing students reach minimum standards, the Task Force noted, ignoring strategies that would help talented minority students achieve at the highest levels. The report called for "Affirmative Development" of promising strategies for reaching potential high achievers, from early childhood education to scholarships that channel talented students into engineering and science.

Meanwhile, a consortium of top school districts is taking up the effort. The Minority Student Achievement Network pulls together districts from such communities as Evanston, Ill., and Cambridge, Mass., to explore minority underachievement and share solutions.

ECS, 303.299.3600

**College Board,
212.713.8000**

Network, 847.424.7515

Grants Approved

The following grants were approved at the December 8, 1999 meeting of the Board of Directors:

Education

Arizona State University, College of Education

Tempe, Arizona \$10,000

To offset planning costs for a conference to deepen understanding of cultural factors that may influence results of standardized achievement tests and performance-based assessments (3 mos.)

Chicago Annenberg Challenge

Chicago, Illinois \$300,000

Continued support for an independent evaluation conducted by the Consortium on Chicago School Research of the schools participating in the Chicago Annenberg Challenge (2 yrs.)

Community Media Workshop

Chicago, Illinois \$50,000

For continued support of the Chicago Successful Schools Project to raise public awareness about the valuable contributions of local school councils (1 yr.)

Leadership for Quality Education

Chicago, Illinois \$125,000

To organize, in cooperation with a network of grassroots and reform organizations, a city-wide campaign to generate greater participation in Chicago's local school council elections (1 yr.)

National Center for Fair and Open Testing

Cambridge, Massachusetts \$495,000

For continued work with national and regional school reform organizations on issues related to student assessment and to educate policymakers on the need to develop alternatives to standardized tests (3 yrs.)

University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Education

Chicago, Illinois \$165,000

To redesign and improve its teacher education programs in partnership with the Chicago Comer Schools Initiative and the Youth Guidance agency (1 yr.)

Total Education \$1,145,000

Employment

Center for Law and Human Services

Chicago, Illinois \$300,000

For advocacy work to promote an Illinois state earned income tax credit which would supplement the incomes of working families whose earnings fall below the poverty line (2 yrs.)

Federation for Community Planning

Cleveland, Ohio \$270,000

For policy analysis and advocacy for increased access to education, training, and other employment services by low-income working families and welfare recipients in Ohio, and to develop recommendations for reauthorization of the federal welfare law in 2002 (3 yrs.)

Indiana University, Department of Political Science

Bloomington, Indiana \$227,047

To evaluate Indiana's implementation of the Workforce Investment Act and its potential to serve the most disadvantaged job seekers (3 yrs.)

The Institute for Wisconsin's Future, Inc.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin \$220,000

To develop policy recommendations that help working poor families, including former welfare recipients, gain the skills necessary to advance beyond low-wage work (2 yrs.)

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

New York, New York \$150,000

To work with policymakers in St. Paul, Minnesota and Milwaukee, Wisconsin to design strategies that help low-wage workers sustain employment and advance to higher-paying jobs (1 yr.)

Total Employment \$1,167,047

Environment

Concord Coalition

Washington, D.C. \$107,778

For a series of public education activities to introduce the concept of resource-based tax shifting into the election-year debate (1 yr.)

Consumers Union of United States, Inc.

Yonkers, New York \$160,000

For its efforts to strengthen federal scientific and regulatory policies that protect people and the environment from agricultural chemicals (2 yrs.)

Earth Day Network, Inc.

Seattle, Washington \$75,000

To coordinate a series of environmental public education activities and events throughout the Midwest leading up to and including Earth Day 2000 (1 yr.)

Environmental Health Fund, Inc.

Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts \$100,000

For the Midwest component of Health Care Without Harm, a project that encourages the health care industry to reduce and eliminate its use of toxic substances (1 yr.)

Get America Working, Inc.

Arlington, Virginia \$25,000

Planning grant for new organization that will conduct research to determine whether replacing payroll taxes with pollution and natural resource taxes would have significant environmental and economic benefits (4 mos.)

Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Ann Arbor, Michigan \$10,000

For a scientific workshop on the incidence of tumors in zooplankton (microscopic animals) in surface water in the Great Lakes and elsewhere (3 mos.)

Kansas Rural Center, Inc.

Whiting, Kansas \$65,000

To support the Sustainable Agriculture Coalition network in promoting policies for environmentally friendly agriculture (1 yr.)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.

New York, New York \$200,000

To track and participate in the implementation of a federal law that addresses the toxicity of pesticides with a view to protecting children's health (1 yr.)

Tellus Institute

Boston, Massachusetts \$98,000

To investigate the opportunities for expanding remanufacturing industries in the Great Lakes region (1 yr.)

West Michigan Environmental Action Council Educational Foundation

Grand Rapids, Michigan \$120,150

To coordinate efforts of Grand Rapids area businesses to make the region more environmentally, economically, and socially healthy (18 mos.)

Wisconsin's Environmental Decade Institute, Inc.

Madison, Wisconsin \$75,000

To ensure that a pesticide-use tracking system being developed by the state of Wisconsin is designed to provide useful information to public health and environmental officials (1 yr.)

World Resources Institute

Washington, D.C. \$250,000

To help midwestern state policymakers develop strong policies to protect watersheds at low cost through pollution trading (2 yrs.)

Total Environment \$1,285,928

Gun Violence

Consumer Federation of America Foundation

Washington, D.C. \$871,053

To support a project to advocate for the treatment and regulation of guns as consumer products (3 yrs.)

Duke University, Office of Research Support

Durham, North Carolina \$30,000

To develop a full study on the relationship between city- and state-level gun ownership density and various types of crimes (9 mos.)

Entertainment Industries Council, Inc.

Reston, Virginia \$664,627

For project to support efforts within the entertainment industry to promote firearm injury prevention (3 yrs.)

Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence

Chicago, Illinois \$545,000

To support the OnTarget Coalition, a network of organizations working to reduce gun violence in Illinois, and to hire a regional coordinator to work with gun violence prevention advocacy groups based in the Midwest (3 yrs.)

National Opinion Research Center

Chicago, Illinois \$194,449

For the fifth annual survey of public attitudes on gun policy issues (1 yr.)

Total Gun Violence \$2,305,129

Money and Politics

Alliance for Better Campaigns

Washington, D.C. \$100,000

For efforts to persuade commercial television stations in the Midwest to give candidates in local, state, and federal elections free broadcast time (1 yr.)

American Friends Service Committee

Chicago, Illinois \$25,000

Support for the Ohio-based Dollars & Democracy Project (6 mos.)

Archdiocese of Chicago, Office of the Ministry of Peace and Justice

Chicago, Illinois \$47,353

Support for the Catholic Political Responsibility Project (1 yr.)

Brennan Center for Justice

New York, New York \$300,000

For efforts to reform campaign finance laws through legal research and litigation (2 yrs.)

Public Citizen Foundation, Inc.

Washington, D.C. \$40,000

For series of reports highlighting the nexus between special interest contributions and the outcome of major domestic policy debates (1 yr.)

Total Money and Politics \$512,353

Culture

Chicago Theatre Company

Chicago, Illinois \$56,000

Support for administrative development of award-winning African-American theater group (2 yrs.)

Facing History and Ourselves National Foundation, Inc.

Chicago, Illinois \$50,000

To present its *Choosing to Participate* exhibit, which depicts historic instances of prejudice and violence and explores the choices children and adults have when confronted with such events, and to develop related programs at the Chicago Historical Society (1 yr.)

Total Culture \$106,000

Special Opportunities

Center for Neighborhood Technology

Chicago, Illinois \$51,000

To create better information tools to support local planning and democratic decision-making (1 yr.)

University of Illinois at Springfield, Institute for Public Affairs

Springfield, Illinois \$395,657

To support comprehensive planning for the establishment of a statewide public affairs television network (2 yrs.)

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Institute of Government and Public Affairs

Urbana, Illinois \$145,978

To examine the value and feasibility of reinstating cumulative voting or some other variant of proportional representation in Illinois legislative elections (1 yr.)

Total Special Opportunities \$592,635

**Total Grants Approved
\$7,114,092**

Education

Neighborhood Capital Budget Group found that overcrowding and the need for school facility improvements plague many of the nation's school systems, despite new school construction efforts. *Rebuilding Our Schools Brick By Brick* uses a detailed case study of the Chicago Public Schools' capital improvement program to show that local school districts alone can no longer shoulder the financial burden of school construction. www.ncbg.org; 312.939.7198

Education Commission of the States offers a guide for reporters that gives a broad view of how schools are organized and managed, what changes are taking place, and how governance relates to other education stories. *Governing America's Schools: A Primer for Reporters* includes ideas for stories and a list of resources. www.ecs.org; 303.299.3600

Money and Politics

Citizens' Research Foundation found that the financing of the 1996 federal election campaign differed dramatically from previous years. Tenth in a series of post-election reports, *Financing the 1996 Election* shows how candidates and their donors have circumvented Watergate-era campaign finance regulations, and it examines the consequences. 213.743.5211

The National Institute on Money in State Politics web site offers a searchable database of businesses, individuals and interest groups that contribute to candidates and parties in each state. Comparisons can be made by sector and across states. www.followthemoney.org/

California Voter Foundation found that 35 states currently offer some kind of campaign finance data on official state web sites, and 32 states are moving forward with electronic filing of campaign reports. Seven states won the "Digital Sunlight Award" honoring the best web sites combined with most advanced electronic filing: Illinois, California, Michigan, Virginia, Hawaii, Louisiana, and New York. www.digitalsunlight.org

The Center for Governmental Studies, in conjunction with the Council on Governmental Ethics Laws, has completed work on developing a uniform format for electronically filed campaign finance data. The American National Standards Institute, through its X-12 Committee, has approved the format. 310.470.6590, ext. 115

Money and Politics Iowa chair Joan Lucas has been appointed to a six-person Campaign Finance Task Force, created by the legislature to "study campaign finance disclosure and related laws to recommend reforms." MAP Iowa, in cooperation with the National Institute on Money in State Politics (see above), has created a searchable database of over 100,000 campaign contributors covering three Iowa election cycles. 515.628.8100; www.mapiowa.org; www.followthemoney.org

Employment

University of Michigan School of Social Work reports that declining welfare caseloads do not automatically translate into improved well-being for former recipients. *Work, Income and Material Hardship After Welfare Reform* reports that women who worked most experienced fewer financial hardships, but they were also least likely to have health insurance. The study includes recommendations to strengthen the post-welfare reform safety net. www.ssw.umich.edu/poverty/pubs.html; 734.998.8515

Environment

Earth Day Network, Inc.'s web site lists Earth Day 2000 events worldwide, part of its year-long public education and advocacy campaign. The site includes a form to endorse the use of renewable energy sources. <http://www.earthday.net>

Gun Violence

University of California-Davis Violence Prevention Research Program found that purchase of a handgun substantially increased the risk of suicide by firearm. The study, reported in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, found that women were at much greater risk for both suicide and homicide following handgun purchase than men. 916.734.3539; <http://web.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/vprp/>

JoinTogether, the online resource on gun violence prevention, won recognition as a finalist for a prestigious Global Information Infrastructure Award, which recognizes creative uses of Internet technology in several areas, including public service. JoinTogether features the latest information on gun-related research, public policies, funding and other resources for combatting gun violence. www.jointogether.org

Violence Policy Center published the 1999 edition of its key resource on the gun industry, *Firearms Production in America*. Using data from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the book lists every domestic manufacturer that produced over 1,000 firearms in any given year and compiles statistics on production between 1975 and 1997. 202.822.8200; www.vpc.org

Foundation Announces Staff Changes



Deborah Gillespie joins the Foundation in January 2000 as Chief Financial Officer. Gillespie comes to Joyce from the Gaylord and Dorothy Donnelley Foundation, where she was Director of Finance and Administration and Assistant Treasurer. Prior to that, she was Financial Director of the Great Lakes Protection Fund. She also held positions at OpenLands and the Metropolitan Planning Council, both Joyce grantees. She was part of an award-winning management team at Chicago's Friends of the Parks and wrote a chapter on financial management in the Land Trust Alliance's *The Standards and Practices Guidebook*. As Chief Financial Officer she will manage the Foundation's financial operations, including budgets, tax matters, grant payouts, and regulatory compliance.



Deborah Dell'Aringa also joins the Foundation in January as Executive Assistant to the President. Debby comes to the Foundation from the National Equity Fund, one of the nation's largest nonprofit syndicators of low-income housing tax credits, where she was Executive Assistant to the President. She has over 35 years experience in secretarial and office management in both the public and private sectors.

Leaving the Foundation at the end of 1999 were two key staff members, Reginald Lewis and Linda Schelinski. Reggie has served as Education Program Officer since 1997. He will become Director of Policy and Program Development at the Fund for New Jersey in his home state. Linda began work for the Joyce family lumber company, which preceded the Foundation, in 1969. She has served in a variety of positions, including Vice President for Administration. In that capacity she was responsible for the smooth functioning of the Foundation during a period of significant growth in assets, program, and staff.

2000 Guidelines are now available on the Foundation's web site, www.joycefdn.org, or by calling or writing the Foundation.

Culture

Ellen Alberding

Education

Warren Chapman

Peter Mich

Employment

Kara Kellahe Mikulich

Unmi Song

Environment

Margaret O'Dell

James Seidita

Gun Violence

Roseanna Ander

Money and Politics

Lawrence Hansen

Proposal deadlines are:

December 8, 1999 for the

April 2000 meeting

April 14, 2000 for the

July 2000 meeting

The Joyce Foundation

Three First National Plaza

70 West Madison Street

Suite 2750

Chicago, Illinois 60602

312.782.2464 Telephone

312.782.4160 Fax

www.joycefdn.org

Work In Progress

Editor: Mary O'Connell

Assistant: Carol Donahue