Our celebration of the Sanford School of Public Policy’s first graduating class is imminent. Ninety-three master’s students are wrapping up their projects and a record 21 of 137 graduating public policy seniors are completing honors theses. (You can read about two of them on pages 12-13.)

The School’s inaugural year has featured a host of lectures, special events, and new ventures. Duke’s commitment to interdisciplinary education is a particular boon to the Sanford School, where much of our research and coursework are interdisciplinary by definition.

Partnerships with the Nicholas School of the Environment, the Fuqua School of Business and the Duke Global Health Institute are facilitating strategic faculty searches and hires despite the economic downturn. We’ve added faculty in the areas of energy and the environment, health, international development, global governance and grand strategy, and are well on our way toward our 10-year goal of doubling our faculty. We’ve added 11 tenure-track and five regular-rank faculty in the last three years.

New collaborations with international partners also are under way or under examination. In April the School’s Duke Center for International Development (DCID) launched a weeklong residential leadership training program for United Nations Development Programme senior managers. The program was modeled on DCID’s successful “Managers in Transition” program for World Bank senior managers. Based on the evaluation of the pilot program, the UNDP may enter into a contract with Duke to provide training to groups of 20 to 30 participants.

The Global Semester Abroad will take 30 Duke undergrads to India and China for coursework and in-depth field experiences. (See story on page 4). For this project, we’re working with Duke Global Health, the department of cultural anthropology, and NGOs in the host nations.

We’re also exploring an opportunity to partner with the Fuqua School of Business to launch a one-year master’s program in Private and Public Management with Shanghai Jiao Tong University on the Duke campus in Kunshan, China. Also, with Nicholas School counterparts, we met with officials at Vietnam National University in Ho Chi Minh City to launch a longer-term discussion of a Vietnamese master’s in environmental protection policy to address Vietnam’s critical need for expertise in that field.

We closed our yearlong series of inaugural events on April 23 with a return to the state and local concerns that motivated Terry Sanford. N.C. Sen. Dan Blue (who is also chair of Duke’s Board of Trustees) delivered a key note address of substantive weight, passion and eloquence—“The Audacious Adventure of Making North Carolina All It Can and Ought to Be”—about the related topics of poverty, racism, and education. Video of his address and the panel discussions can be seen on the School’s website.

The success and forward momentum of the Sanford School’s inaugural year was also touched with sadness. On April 1, the Sanford community lost Susan Tifft, an admired colleague, beloved friend and mentor to many students. Susan fought an epic 2 ½-year battle with uterine cancer, which she chronicled with candor and wit on her CaringBridge blog. The Chronicle ran an article about Tifft’s career, as well as several pieces in which Duke students wrote about her lasting effect on their lives. You can find the articles online here: dukechronicle.com/article/tifft-remembered-passion-grit

Upon Susan’s retirement last year as the Eugene C. Patterson Professor of the Practice of Journalism and Public Policy, we established an annual undergraduate teaching award in her name. The first award will be presented by Susan’s husband, Alex Jones, at our graduation ceremony on May 15. We also established the Susan E. Tifft Fund for Teaching and Mentorship, to support research by students in classes offered by the school’s DeWitt Wallace Center for Media and Democracy or students working with the center’s faculty. The fund has already raised $20,000. Teaching and mentoring were her passions, and we know she’d be thrilled at this means of celebrating her very full life.

Best regards,

Bruce Kuniholm
Popular Professor to Return to Sanford

By Naureen Khan

After a three-year stint as president of the Robertson Scholars Program, Tony Brown is returning to his true passion: teaching. In the fall of 2010, he’ll be back in the classroom at the Sanford School of Public Policy, where he was a professor of the practice from 1994 to 2006.

This time around, he’ll also serve as co-director of the Hart Leadership Program with current director Alma Blount.

“I am returning to the best job at Duke,” Brown said. “I’m 67 and I want to finish my career in the classroom. My time away from teaching has rekindled my passion.”

Blount said Brown is the perfect person to help lead the Hart Leadership Program as it improves the quality of existing programs and charts new territory. “We’re both passionately interested in leadership and we’re both incredibly passionate about teaching Duke students,” she said.

“Over the years, Tony has been an inspirational teacher, an exceptional mentor and a cherished colleague,” said Bruce Kuniholm, dean of the Sanford School of Public Policy.

“We are excited about the innovative ideas for undergraduate teaching that he has begun to think about while overseeing the Robertson Scholars.”

One of the new courses will explore what moral courage means in the 21st century; another will help students process and integrate summer service experiences into their lives; yet another will focus on how young adults exercise leadership choices as they navigate their lives after college.

Brown is known at Duke as a consummate teacher and mentor, but it wasn’t until mid-life that the former insurance executive found his calling. After graduating from the University of Connecticut in 1965 and earning his MBA at Harvard University, Brown spent the next 25 years in the business world.

By age 37, he was the CEO of the Covenant Group, an insurance company in Hartford, and already concerned with issues of social responsibility. As he approached his 50s, Brown decided he needed a change.

“When I was 50, I made a decision to create another career where the core mission was about people,” he said. “When I thought about the accomplishments that were fulfilling to me in my career, they always centered on organizational leadership—not on insurance or the financial markets.”

“I came to Duke in the spring of 1993 to teach one course, and it was the most thrilling thing I’d ever done. So, I never left,” Brown said. Over the next decade, Brown became a respected teacher, winning the Howard Johnson Distinguished Teaching Award for undergraduate teaching excellence in 1997.

He pioneered the Enterprising Leadership Initiative (ELI), a program that allows students to get hands-on experience in social innovation. Brown’s impact can be traced all over campus and the City of Durham. The Center for Race Relations, Common Ground, The Durham Giving Project, Rival Magazine, Crayons2Calculators, The Girls Club, and Student U, an academic enrichment program for Durham students, all emerged from Brown’s courses.

“He was able to help me take my wild dreams and turn them into something practical, giving me and my team some real support, some real knowledge,” said Dan Kimberg, Trinity’07, co-founder and executive director of Student U. “He enabled us to get to where we are.”

The secret to Brown’s success as a professor? “I teach as I would lead an organization,” he said. “I communicate the depth of my commitment to my students’ education, and I challenge them to make this the best course in their college experience.”

Graduate Students Start Policy Journal

They have a name, a submission policy, a stack of manuscripts and a website in beta. In April, a group of MPP students published the first online edition of The Sanford Journal of Public Policy.

Co-Editors-in-Chief Jason Lemons and Marjie Patterson and Managing Editor Garth Weintraub led the publishing team, which includes 15 members of the 2010 and 2011 classes.

The publication’s format is that of a traditional academic journal, with a mix of research, position papers, book reviews and opinion pieces. The articles were edited by the journal staff and reviewed by Sanford faculty.

“We’ve been surprised and pleased by the diversity of submissions,” said Patterson. “It’s been global, with submissions from Romania and Columbia.” They have articles written by students, faculty and policymakers for the first issue.

The first issue has four articles, including one on “Teacher Retention in North Carolina” and “The Potential and Future of Geomatics.” The full issue is online at sjpp.sanford.duke.edu

Elizabeth Frankenberg, director of graduate studies, Sanford’s Senior Associate Dean Phil Cook and Sarah Cohen, professor of the practice of journalism and public policy, have been faculty advisors to the journal.

The editorial team has been careful to include many first-year students in the process.

“So Bob Bliwise (lecturer with the DeWitt Wallace Center) has talked to us about success planning,” said Lemons. “We’re recruiting first-year students and will also talk about the journal to admitted students.”

They have also been working with the support of Deirdre Gordon, associate director of development, to engage Sanford alumni. As part of this effort, they presented the final journal and website to the Sanford School Board of Visitors at the end of the semester.

From left to right, back row: Anton Favorini-Csorba, Garrett Stiles, Matthew Jentgen, Lee Reiners, Jason Lemons, Marjie Patterson, Jill Fasching and Garth Weintraub. Front row: Jeanie Shattuck, Susan Wunderink, Lauren Akers, Gwen Tobert, Sarah Cordes, Sofia Baliño, and Aroha Bahuguna.
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Beginning next spring, students will have the opportunity for in-depth study of health and development issues in two of the world’s fastest growing economies—India and China. The Sanford School is developing a new Global Semester Abroad program in partnership with the Duke Global Health Institute and the department of cultural anthropology.

About 30 Duke undergraduates will spend a 6.5-week period in Udaipur, India, and another 6.5 weeks in Beijing, China. Half the students will start in India, the other half in China, then they will switch at the end of the first 6.5-week period. In each location, students will take two courses. They’ll also participate in internships, perform community service and live with host families.

Professors Anirudh Krishna of the Sanford School and Ralph Litzinger of the department of cultural anthropology will serve as faculty directors in India and China, respectively. They will each teach one course and supervise a second course taught by local instructors.

Cross-cultural learning and community engagement will be facilitated through community-based research and service internships with NGOs. In China, students will study at the School of Public Health at the Beijing University Health Sciences Center and live in the international student residence halls.

In India, students will work with nonprofit organizations working on important aspects of development and public health, including several that have won national and international acclaim,” Krishna said. “It’s abutted by a rural countryside that, while charming and pretty, is home to some of the poorest people in India.

“Working alongside the organizations that have agreed to partner with us in this enterprise, our students will have diverse opportunities for meaningful community engagement, service learning, cross-cultural inquiry, and independent field study projects.”

A limited number of students will also take up DukeEngage projects in India over the summer following the semester abroad.

Global Semester Abroad Includes Courses, Health Research, Internships in India, China

Three Graduates to Pursue 2010-11 Hart Fellowships

Three Duke seniors have been selected for the 10-month Hart Fellowship based on their strong leadership skills, creative minds and proven commitment to service. Fellows will be placed with organizations facing complex humanitarian, political, social, or environmental issues in the developing world. They will complete community-based research projects relevant to their partner organizations, while simultaneously developing leadership capacity. They are, from left in photo:

- **Nana Duffuor**, of Doylestown, Pa., an international comparative studies major. She interned at the North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence, where she has co-authored position papers on immigration reform and worked with African immigrant and refugee organizations in the Triangle. In 2007, she participated in DukeEngage in Durham, where she developed a summer program for children at the West End Community Center, and later became the service-learning assistant for the program. She has written articles for the Chronicle, ABCNews.com, and CBSNews.com. Duffuor participated in the Duke in New York and Duke in Paris study abroad programs, during the latter of which she conducted research about the gender and class in the European Union. Nana speaks French.

- **Nanjie Caihua** of Tibet, a cultural anthropology major. In 2007, with help from the Canada Fund, Caihua developed a project to introduce solar stoves to monks in rural Tibet. In 2008, he was a co-recipient of both the Davis Project for Peace award and the DukeEngage Individual Project grant. The grants allowed him to return to Tibet and provide 400 households with solar stoves. In 2009 Caihua was awarded the Dean’s Summer Research Fellowship and the Asian-Pacific Summer Research Grant to research Tibetan nomad resettlement projects in China. While at Duke, he worked in the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and participated in both the Duke in Rome and Duke in New York programs. Caihua’s native language is Tibetan and he is fluent in Mandarin.

- **Karmel Wong** of Toronto, Canada, a psychology major who also earned the Children in Contemporary Society certificate. In 2007, Wong participated in the Service Opportunities in Leadership (SOL) program, through which she conducted a community-based research project on cross-cultural friendships with the International Child Art Foundation in Washington, D.C. She also participated in the DukeEngage program at the Dandelion School in China. Wong is writing a senior thesis that examines maternal trauma and infant attachment, and is participating on a research working group on the resettlement of Bhutanese refugees in Durham. She is the president of her a cappella group, a member of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, works as the Hart Leadership Program’s staff assistant, and is fluent in French and Cantonese.
With Professor Bruce Jentleson, Consultant, Senior Advisor to the U.S. State Department

Bruce Jentleson was sworn in as a senior advisor to the U.S. State Department in July 2009. An expert on American foreign policy, Jentleson previously served as an advisor to the Clinton-Gore administration. In this Q&A, Jentleson discusses his role as a policy advisor and his perception of the Obama administration’s first year on the job.

Q: What policy areas are the focus of your consulting?
A: In general, I work with broad, comprehensive issues of strategy. Two particular areas that I’ve been involved in are the Middle East and genocide and mass atrocities prevention.

Q: How do you balance your role in Washington with your teaching and advising responsibilities at Duke?
A: My work at the State Department is on a consulting basis. It’s been very important to me that I fulfill my responsibilities at Duke to my students and continue my research and writing. Last fall I taught two courses, and this semester I am teaching a graduate-undergraduate seminar. I just had one book published, and another is due out later this year. I spend time traveling to Washington weekly, as well as trips abroad for meetings and projects.

Through my own experiences, I can communicate more effectively to students the complexity and unpredictability of the policy arena. At the same time, I can underscore the importance of a solid, fundamental framework for political analysis. I’m able to leverage my experiences in the policy world to improve, not take away from, my work with students at Sanford.

Q: What have been some of the most important developments on the foreign policy landscape?
A: In recent years, the world has become even more connected on new and different levels as a result of changes driven by the combination of the end of the Cold War, globalization and 9/11. Ours is an age of historic transition. There is much change, but also much continuity, as issues in the Middle East exemplify.

Q: Some commentators have given Obama’s first year an “incomplete” score on foreign policy. How would you “grade” foreign policy developments during President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s first year in office? Where have you seen the most progress, and what challenges persist?
A: We’ve reinforced the international system with institutional reforms such as the G-20. We’ve strengthened alliances such as NATO and improved some relationships, such as with Russia and much of the Arab world. No question, some issues have been tough to make progress on, such as Arab-Israeli peace and Iranian nuclear proliferation, but I’m confident we will make gains as the Obama administration moves forward.

Q: The Obama administration received some criticism for boosting troops in Afghanistan after expressing opposition to the war in Iraq. What deeper issues are at play in these situations of military leverage?
A: Even as a candidate Barack Obama differentiated between the war in Iraq, which he had opposed but was committed to end responsibly, and Afghanistan, where the threats required first a full-scale review and then the decision to send more troops as well as step up the political, economic and diplomatic aspects of our strategy.

Q: Obama’s commitment to foreign policy centered on the idea of “change” that shaped his campaign. What is the biggest difference between this administration’s approach to foreign policy, relative to the Bush administration?
A: In my opinion, the Obama administration is more realistic in its view of the world, seeing the need for American leadership but pursuing that leadership in ways that are more likely to engage rather than antagonize other key countries. It seeks to exert power more than to flaunt it.

Q: What pending policy decisions have potentially important implications for foreign relations?
A: It’s a pretty full plate: climate change, international economic issues, Arab-Israeli peace, Iran, terrorism, relations with China, and much more. In addition, the strength of our domestic policy establishes a foundation for what foreign policy can accomplish, so it is important that decisions about economics, employment, markets and social issues include a strategic global perspective.

Interview by Lauren Cooper.
Report Recommends Ways to Discourage Muslim-American Radicalization

The shootings at Fort Hood, the arrests of five young men in Pakistan and last summer’s arrests of terrorism suspects in North Carolina mark a troubling increase in terrorism-related activity by Muslim-Americans. But a report by scholars at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which analyzes the extent of terrorist violence by Muslim-Americans since 9/11 and identifies strategies to head off “homegrown” terrorism, says the number of radicalized Muslim-Americans is still small.

Since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, 139 Muslim-Americans have committed violent terrorist acts, been convicted on terrorism charges involving violence or been arrested with charges pending. Of that number, fewer than a third successfully executed their violent plots, and most were overseas.

The report recommends that policymakers reinforce successful anti-radicalization activities now under way in Muslim-American communities to address this low—but not insignificant—level of terrorist activity.

“Muslim-Americans organizations and the vast majority of individuals that we interviewed firmly reject the radical extremist ideology that justifies the use of violence to achieve political ends,” said co-author David H. Schanzer, director of the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security.

The report, “Anti-Terror Lessons of Muslim Americans,” was co-authored by Schanzer, associate professor at the Sanford School; Charles Kurzman, professor of sociology at UNC’s College of Arts and Sciences; and Ebrahim Moosa, associate professor of religion at Duke. It summarizes two years of research in Muslim-American communities in Seattle, Houston, Buffalo and Raleigh-Durham, funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice.

“Muslim-American communities have been active in preventing radicalization,” said Kurzman. “This is one reason that Muslim-American terrorism has resulted in fewer than three dozen of the 136,000 murders committed in the United States since 9/11.”

The research shows that denunciations of terrorism, internal self-policing, community building, government-funded support services and political engagement can all reduce risks of radicalization. The researchers analyzed interviews with more than 120 Muslim-Americans as well as websites and publications from Muslim-American organizations, data on prosecution of Muslim-Americans for terrorism-related offenses, and existing studies of Muslim-American communities.

The authors noted that Muslim-Americans “are feeling the strain of living in America during the post-9/11 era” and policies that alienate Muslim-American communities in an effort to crack down on terrorism are likely to exacerbate, not reduce, the threat of homegrown terrorism.

“Our research suggests that initiatives that treat Muslim-Americans as part of the solution to this problem are far more likely to be successful,” said Schanzer.

“Anti-Terror Lessons of Muslim-American Communities” is available on the websites of the Sanford School of Public Policy (www.sanford.duke.edu) and the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security (www.tcths.org).

Bergen: Influence of al Qaeda is Waning

By Alyssa Dack

Al Qaeda has nearly no chance of launching another credible threat on the United States, according to CNN analyst Peter Bergen.

The loss of public support comes as a result of another major problem for al Qaeda: the number of Muslim civilians killed in their attacks. A study by the Combating Terrorism Center in West Point, N.Y., found that a Muslim civilian is 54 times more likely to be killed in an al Qaeda attack than a Western citizen.

The shootings at Fort Hood, the arrests of five young men in Pakistan and last summer’s arrests of terrorism suspects in North Carolina mark a troubling increase in terrorism-related activity by Muslim-Americans.

But a report by scholars at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which analyzes the extent of terrorist violence by Muslim-Americans since 9/11 and identifies strategies to head off “homegrown” terrorism, says the number of radicalized Muslim-Americans is still small.

Since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, 139 Muslim-Americans have committed violent terrorist acts, been convicted on terrorism charges involving violence or been arrested with charges pending. Of that number, fewer than a third successfully executed their violent plots, and most were overseas.

The report recommends that policymakers reinforce successful anti-radicalization activities now under way in Muslim-American communities to address this low—but not insignificant—level of terrorist activity.

“When former allies begin to criticize you, you’re losing your base,” Bergen said. “Losing public support is not a game-changer for al Qaeda, though. They value one recruit more than 1,000 supporters.”

“Muslim-Americans organizations and the vast majority of individuals that we interviewed firmly reject the radical extremist ideology that justifies the use of violence to achieve political ends,” said co-author David H. Schanzer, director of the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security.

The report, “Anti-Terror Lessons of Muslim Americans,” was co-authored by Schanzer, associate professor at the Sanford School; Charles Kurzman, professor of sociology at UNC’s College of Arts and Sciences; and Ebrahim Moosa, associate professor of religion at Duke. It summarizes two years of research in Muslim-American communities in Seattle, Houston, Buffalo and Raleigh-Durham, funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice.

“Muslim-American communities have been active in preventing radicalization,” said Kurzman. “This is one reason that Muslim-American terrorism has resulted in fewer than three dozen of the 136,000 murders committed in the United States since 9/11.”

The research shows that denunciations of terrorism, internal self-policing, community building, government-funded support services and political engagement can all reduce risks of radicalization. The researchers analyzed interviews with more than 120 Muslim-Americans as well as websites and publications from Muslim-American organizations, data on prosecution of Muslim-Americans for terrorism-related offenses, and existing studies of Muslim-American communities.

The authors noted that Muslim-Americans “are feeling the strain of living in America during the post-9/11 era” and policies that alienate Muslim-American communities in an effort to crack down on terrorism are likely to exacerbate, not reduce, the threat of homegrown terrorism.

“Our research suggests that initiatives that treat Muslim-Americans as part of the solution to this problem are far more likely to be successful,” said Schanzer.

“Anti-Terror Lessons of Muslim-American Communities” is available on the websites of the Sanford School of Public Policy (www.sanford.duke.edu) and the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security (www.tcths.org).
Use of alcohol and recreational drugs among college students has long been a salient issue for campus administrators and policy-makers. In recent years, however, the problem has been compounded by the rising abuse of prescription drugs. A recent survey found that 20 percent of Duke University seniors reported nonprescription use of ADHD medications during their college years, a figure consistent with that found in other surveys at schools with highly competitive admission standards.

At a May 18-19 conference hosted by the Duke Center for Child and Family Policy, experts will discuss issues related to drug and alcohol use on America’s college campuses, and explore potential intervention and prevention strategies.

Scheduled talks will cover risk factors for substance abuse, the effect of substance use on the young adult brain, and a discussion of novel prevention and intervention methods. The full conference agenda can be found online at www.childandfamilypolicy.duke.edu

The conference is being coordinated by David Rabiner, associate director at the Center for Child and Family Policy, and Helene White, from the Center for Alcohol Studies at Rutgers University. Attendance is free, but registration is required.

Legislators Assess Suspension Rules

The Duke Center for Child and Family Policy hosted its sixth annual Family Impact Seminar for North Carolina lawmakers on April 27 in Raleigh, to discuss “School Suspension in North Carolina: Research and Policy Options.”

With the fourth highest suspension rate in the country and as many as half of high school students failing to graduate, the seminar focused on research into the effects of suspension on school success. Presenters reviewed the school suspension law in North Carolina, statistics on offenses and offenders and policies of other states.

The annual seminar topics are selected by a committee led by state representatives and senators. Previous years’ topics were: evidence-based policy, dropout prevention, juvenile justice, children’s mental health, and Medicaid cost containment. Policy briefings from the seminar series are available online at childandfamilypolicy.duke.edu

By Lauren Cooper

“Spunk, daring, courage, nerve, guts, backbone.” These words capture the values of Duke’s new “Moxie Project.” The initiative, cosponsored by the Duke Women’s Center and Sanford’s Program on History, Public Policy, and Social Change, will allow undergraduate women to complete a yearlong academic and internship experience focused on the rich history of women’s activism.

The program begins with a gateway course on women in history and policy, followed by an eight-week summer internship with an organization serving women and/or girls in New York City. Upon returning to Duke, students will complete a capstone seminar course focused on a social action project in Durham.

The Moxie Project is co-directed by Women’s Center Director Ada Gregory and Kenan Institute for Ethics Policy and Research Associate Rachel F. Seidman, who is also a visiting assistant professor of public policy.

“We wanted to provide students with a chance to take what they had learned and activate it outside the classroom, and to learn from women who are working on these issues every day,” Seidman said.

However, the project is not only about student growth. It is important to the organizers that the students’ social action projects generate results for the Duke and Durham communities.

Six students were accepted to the program’s first year. Sanford’s Hart Leadership Program sponsors the current gateway course, Women as Leaders. The Women’s Center has generated support for the summer experience through a patchwork of donors. Additionally, the Women’s Center staff provides much of the logistical support.


The Moxie Project was awarded a $10,000 start-up grant from the Bridging Theory to Practice Project. Moxie directors hope funding will grow, enabling the project to expand. The program builds on the strengths of successful Duke experiences such as the Baldwin Scholars Program, Duke-Engage and the Hart Leadership Program and adds new dimensions to make it especially challenging and rewarding for women.

“Duke’s 2004 Women’s Initiative report called for more all-female environments that promote women’s development, agency and well-being and more mentoring opportunities for women,” Gregory said.

“The program design specifically caters to these needs.”

Sanford Briefs

Summer Research in Africa • Erin Boland

PPS’11 was one of 23 students awarded funding for field research by the Duke Global Health Institute. Boland’s project is “Assessing Disparities in HIV/AIDS Awareness Across Gender in Lomé, Togo.” Boland will explore gender inequalities in AIDS-related knowledge, perceptions, and behaviors of young Togolese adults over the summer.

Global Health Case Competition • PPS student Katherine Roemer was part of the winning team in Duke’s first global health case competition in March. Seven teams of Duke students from multiple disciplines prepared a 12-minute solution to the challenge of addressing chronic care in Haiti following the 2010 earthquake.

Thirty-three undergraduate and graduate students representing six schools the Global Health Institute participated. Other members of the team were: Farah Akbar (engineering), Brian Clement and Madeline McCrary (cultural anthropology), Amanda Leahy (divinity) and Alexa Monroy (neuroscience).
Sanford Senior Wins Teaching Fellowship

Angela Vo, a senior in the Sanford School of Public Policy, was one of only 25 students nationwide selected for a 2010 Woodrow Wilson-Rockefeller Brothers Fund (WW-RBF) Fellowship for Aspiring Teachers of Color. The program awards a $30,000 stipend to students to pursue a master’s degree in education.

Vo, of Cary, N.C., will graduate in May with a public policy major, an education minor and a global health certificate. The WW-RBF Fellowship requires a three-year commitment to teaching in a high-need public school and provides support and mentoring throughout. Shari Baker of Wheaton, Md., a Duke cultural anthropology major, also was chosen for the fellowship.

Vo discovered her passion for teaching through a series of internships and off-campus volunteer experiences during her four years at Duke. Her talent for it came to her as “a big surprise,” she said. “I really love being in the classroom and seeing the positive impact that a teacher can have on a student.”

Vo’s experiences include working at the WISER school for girls in Kenya, in Student U summer programs for at-risk Durham middle-schoolers, and with FEMMES, a program that encourages girls interested in math and science.

“My interest really started freshman year when I worked with WISER. I saw that for young Kenyan girls, the lack of access to education really impacted their lives outcomes and their health. They were more vulnerable to HIV/AIDS and poverty.”

Vo found close friends and mentors in Duke alumni Dan Kimberg and Amanda Dorsey, co-founders of the nonprofit Student U. Through her work with Student U, she’s gotten to know Durham better than many Duke students do.

“We (Duke students) do a lot for the Durham community, but there are still a lot of students who don’t know that much about Durham and what a liberal, eco-friendly, culture-rich area it is. The schools are more diverse than any I’ve been to.”

Vo plans to take time to complete her teaching certification before beginning graduate school next fall, and hopes to come back to work in Durham schools.

The WW-RBF Fellowship, established in 1992 by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, was created to help recruit, support, and retain individuals of color as public education teachers and administrators. Since the program’s inception, it has awarded nearly $8 million in grants and financial assistance to 350 Fellows. In January 2009, RBF transferred the program to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.
Inaugural Celebration

Completed “Terry Sanford” Exhibit Opens

From left, Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation Senior Fellow Tom Lambeth, Elizabeth Kuniholm and Sanford School Dean Bruce Kuniholm look at a photograph of Terry Sanford with President Lyndon Johnson while Alex Harris (not shown) describes the image.

Panelists, from left, R. Scott Ralls, president of the N.C. Community College system, Fredrick A. Davis, Durham Public Schools board member, and Helen Ladd, Sanford professor, discuss “Facing the Achievement Gap from Kindergarten to College.” Sanford Professor Jacob Vigdor (not shown) moderated.

Naomi Feaste, director of Cultural Enrichment Services Inc., makes a point while fellow panelist Noah Raper, program associate at MDC, listens. They spoke on the panel, “From Then to Now: Antipoverty Efforts in North Carolina.”

Sanford Professor Sherman James discusses health inequalities with panelists, from right, William A. Darity Jr., Sanford professor, and Dani Martinez-Moore of the NC Justice Center. Professor Anna Gassman-Pines, far left, moderated the panel, “The Pursuit of Equity in Health, Wealth and Citizenship.”

Sanford Professor Robert Korstad signs a copy of his book while former N.C. legislator Anne Barnes, center, and Billy Barnes, the North Carolina Fund’s photographer, look on.
Poverty is the product of decisions — made by the few rather than the many — about the distribution of power, wealth, and opportunity.

The North Carolina Fund was a pioneer effort to improve the lives of the “neglected and forgotten” poor in a nation that celebrated itself as an affluent society. Governor Terry Sanford created the Fund in 1963, at a time when the United States stood at a crossroads. A decade of civil rights activism had challenged the country to fulfill its promise of equality and opportunity.

But it was by no means clear how the American public would answer. Alabama governor George C. Wallace spoke for one possibility. In his inaugural address, delivered on the steps of the Alabama statehouse in January 1963, he pledged to defend “Segregation now! Segregation tomorrow! Segregation forever!” Those words made Wallace the point man for a politics of fear and resentment, which eventually spread to communities across the land.

In North Carolina, Governor Terry Sanford offered a dramatic alternative. On July 18, six months after Wallace’s swearing-in, Sanford announced the establishment of the North Carolina Fund, a unique five-year effort to stamp out the twin scourges of discrimination and economic deprivation.

“In North Carolina there remain tens of thousands whose family income is so low that daily subsistence is always in doubt,” he explained. “There are tens of thousands who go to bed hungry. … There are tens of thousands whose dreams will die.” That anguish cried out for “institutional, political, economic, and social change designed to bring about a functioning, democratic society.” This, the governor proclaimed, “is what the North Carolina Fund is all about.” With those words, Sanford positioned the private nonprofit corporation and the state as the “advance guard” in what would soon become a national, federally funded war on poverty.

The Fund was overseen by a board of directors that included civic leaders — men and women, black and white — from across the state. It began its work with $2.5 million in financial backing from two local philanthropies, the Z. Smith Reynolds and Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundations, both of which were tied to influential banking and tobacco interests. The Ford Foundation, which had been investing in projects of social reconstruction in urban America, gave an additional $7 million. The Fund also became the primary conduit for the flow of federal antipoverty dollars into North Carolina. Its total five-year budget of $16.5 million roughly equaled the state of North Carolina’s average annual expenditure for public welfare during the mid-1960s.

The Fund’s reliance on a combination of private and federal dollars was a calculated political tactic designed to ensure its independence. It allowed Sanford and his allies to bypass conservative state lawmakers and challenge the entrenched local interests that nourished Jim Crow, perpetuated one-party politics, and protected an economy built on cheap labor and racial antagonism. The Fund’s purpose, explained executive director George Esser, was “to create the possible” by mobilizing like-minded reformers at the community level and promoting new approaches to anti-poverty work.

When Terry Sanford became governor in 1961, he inherited the bitter legacies of an economy built on cheap labor and white supremacy. The state’s factory workers earned some of the lowest industrial wages in the nation, more than a third of families lived below the federal poverty line, half of all students never finished high school, and a fourth of all adults were functionally illiterate. Those conditions had once given North Carolina’s industries — textiles, tobacco, and agriculture — a competitive edge at the bottom of America’s economy, but even that advantage was rapidly becoming a liability.

Automation in the textile and tobacco factories and the mechanization of farming cost thousands of men and women their jobs and drove them onto the welfare rolls or out of state. At the same time, a generation of black citizens who had defended democracy in battles abroad demanded freedom at home. They built a reinvigorated civil rights movement through the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Congress on Racial Equality; they rallied to fresh efforts at biracial unionism; and their children turned the world’s attention to places such as Greensboro, N.C., where the sit-in phase of the black freedom struggle began in 1960. In the face of those challenges, diehard segregationists fought to defend the crumbling kingdom of Jim Crow. Others, like Terry Sanford, saw in the upheaval the white South’s last best chance to reconstruct itself.

Governor Sanford saw in the sufferings of the poor a dark vision of the future. He reasoned that North Carolina would remain outside the economic mainstream so long as it
Fund and the Politics of Poverty

was burdened by men and women who lacked the motivation, work ethic, and skills to participate successfully in the labor force and in the lives of their communities. It was necessary and right, Sanford and Fund officials insisted, for the state to develop new strategies to “reverse trends, motivate people, reorient attitudes, supply the education and the public services and the jobs that will give all our people the chance to become productive, more self-reliant, and able to compete in the complex but dynamic, exciting but perilous world of today and tomorrow.”

The Fund organized a volunteer program for North Carolina college students during the summer of 1964, a moment when hundreds of young people were traveling to Mississippi to take part in the Freedom Summer campaign for civil rights and black voter registration. The North Carolina Volunteers came from every campus in the state and were assigned in racially integrated teams of men and women to work for each of the eleven community action programs. They served in a wide variety of roles, from camp counselors to tutors and assistants to public health nurses.

The student volunteers also acted as canaries in the coal mines: they were the first to confront the challenges that would soon beset the Fund and the larger national antipoverty movement. The fact that they worked and lived together—black next to white, women alongside men—horrified most whites in the communities they went to serve. Every team suffered racial taunts; many endured social ostracism; and in several cases, the volunteers were fired upon by Klansmen.

Those experiences left the students frightened and unsettled. They were disappointed by the resistance they encountered, frightened by the rage they provoked, and shocked by the conditions they discovered in poor people’s homes. White volunteers confronted their own prejudices in the angry faces of those who scorned them, while their black peers wrestled with the thought that whites might be trusted allies. Together, black and white students came to understand that charity and self-help would never be enough to alleviate poverty. That task, one Fund veteran explained, required something quite different: a “radical strategy” to “stop the exploitation of the poor by the more economically well off.”

The Fund was at the center of national debates over poverty and politics. Its efforts to mobilize the poor and to demand accountability from elected officials and government agencies generated “intense public hostility” that was “responsible in significant part” for the dismantling of the War on Poverty.

In the decades that followed, conservatives undertook a persistent campaign to dismantle the institutions and programs of the Great Society. The counterassault culminated in 1996 with sweeping welfare reform that returned money and control to the states. The federal government was made a less effective ally of the dispossessed, and antipoverty programs lost much of their force as a vehicle for social and economic change. As these shifts took place, fundamental questions all but faded from view: where does poverty come from, and why does it persist?

In North Carolina, the inheritance [from the War on Poverty] is the social learning amassed by the hundreds of volunteers, staff, community activists, and ordinary men and women the North Carolina Fund called to battle. As they took up arms against the scourge of poverty, they came to understand that their enemy was neither a paradox in a land of plenty nor a misfortune the poor had brought upon themselves.

They discovered that poverty is political; it is the product of decisions—made by the few rather than the many—about the distribution of power, wealth, and opportunity. To fight poverty is to struggle for democracy—to give voice to those who have been excluded from civic life, to transcend divisions that breed anger and distrust, and to balance individual responsibilities to society with our social responsibilities to one another.

The challenge, George Esser wrote in 1968, is to “reinstate human freedom and human dignity and genuine justice as major goals in American society.” That work remains largely undone and calls on new generations to right the wrongs of the past.

From To Right These Wrongs: The North Carolina Fund and the Battle to End Poverty and Inequality in 1960s America by Robert R. Korstad and James L. Leloudis (abridged Introduction). Copyright © 2010 by the University of North Carolina Press. Used by permission.
Monopolies on Biologics May Cost Taxpayers Billions

By Dr. Anthony D. So and Dr. Samuel L. Katz

Everyone knows that an easy way to save money on medicines is to buy generics rather than brand-name drugs. Makers of generics estimate that over the past decade they have saved the American health care system about $734 billion. Yet, we continue to spend more on drugs, in part because of the increasing use of so-called biologic medicines, which cost, on average, 22 times as much as ordinary drugs. In 2008, 28 percent of sales from the pharmaceutical industry’s top 100 products came from biologics; by 2014, that share is expected to rise to 50 percent.

Biologic drugs can be more expensive to manufacture; they are grown inside living cells rather than put together chemically, as conventional drugs are. But this does not fully account for their high prices. Another important factor is that they very rarely face competition from generic copies.

So and Katz

Congress had an opportunity to change this by including in health care reform measures incentives for generic drug makers to compete in the biologics marketplace. But unfortunately, the health care reform law contains provisions that discourage the development and significantly delay the approval of generic biologics.

The package approved by Congress protects biologic medicines for 12 years after their approval by the Food and Drug Administration—seven more years of market exclusivity than conventional drugs have. This extra protection for biologics can add billions of dollars to future health care costs. Biologics, which include not only medicines like the breast cancer drug Herceptin and the arthritis drug Humira but also vaccines like the one that prevents HPV and cervical cancer, account for one in four new products approved by the FDA. But for all their promise, biologics impose a heavy financial burden. A breast cancer patient’s annual cost for Herceptin is $37,000. People with rheumatoid arthritis or Crohn’s disease spend $50,000 a year on Humira.

The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission found that the top six biologics—including Avastin, a chemotherapy drug, and Remicade, a treatment for plaque psoriasis and rheumatoid arthritis—already consume 43 percent of the drug budget for Medicare Part B, which covers doctor visits and outpatient services. And the rate of increase in spending for biologics under Medicare Part D, the prescription drug benefit, significantly outstrips that of other drugs.

The health care reform legislation delays generic competition for biologics for at least 12 years. Even after 12 years, the legislation allows a drugmaker to extend market protection for its biologic by making minor modifications—a small tweak that would change its dosing, for example. In addition to blocking competition, this reduces the industry’s incentive to create drugs. After all, given the option to extend protection on old therapies, why would any firm invest in new ones?

Some lawmakers in Congress say biologics need longer monopoly protection because they cost more to develop than conventional drugs do. But according to studies cited by the pharmaceutical industry’s own trade association, the average research-and-development costs of producing a biologic—$1.2 billion—are about as much as those of making a conventional drug—$1.318 billion.

The Federal Trade Commission recently sized up the entry costs for generic biologics, it declined to recommend that biologics be granted any years of exclusivity protection.

Of course, one reason why the pharmaceutical industry likes 12 years of protection for biologics is that it sets the stage for lengthening the period of monopoly protection for conventional drugs as well. GlaxoSmithKline has already called for 14 years of exclusivity for conventional drugs.

Congress should re-examine this provision and allow biologics no more than five years of protection. That would provide drug makers plenty of incentive for innovation, and still protect consumers from the high prices that extended monopolies allow. Striking the right balance will ensure that Americans can afford the most effective medicines available.

Dr. Anthony D. So is the director of the Program on Global Health and Technology Access at the Sanford School of Public Policy. Dr. Samuel L. Katz is a professor and chairman emeritus of pediatrics at Duke. A version of this commentary appeared first in The New York Times on March 7, 2010.
Institutions Can Be a Healthy Option For Rising Number of Orphans

By Alyssa Zamora

A Duke University study of more than 3,000 orphaned and abandoned children in five Asian and African countries has found that children in institutional orphanages fare as well or better than those who live in the community.

The findings contrast sharply with research that associates institutions with poorer health and well-being, and with policies adopted by many international agencies and governments.

“Our research is not saying that institutions are better. What we found is that institutions may be a viable option for some kids,” said study leader Kathryn Whetten, director of the Center for Health Policy at the Duke Global Health Institute and associate professor in the Sanford School. “As the number of orphans continues to rise worldwide, it is vital not to discount orphanages before assessing whether they are harmful to the millions of children for whom they care.”

Whetten’s research team compared the physical health, cognitive functioning, emotional health, behavior and growth of orphaned or abandoned children ages 6-12, half of them living in institutions and the other half dwelling in the community. The study found that children in institutions in five countries reported significantly better health scores, lower prevalence of recent sickness and fewer emotional difficulties than community-dwelling children. These findings suggest the overall health of children in orphanages is no worse than that of children in communities.

The research team has been following the 3,000 orphans for three years, and plans to continue tracking them into their late teens and early 20s to determine how their childhood affects their life course.

Published Dec. 18, 2009 in the interactive open-access journal PLoS ONE, this is one of the most comprehensive studies of orphans ever conducted. Data were collected between May 2006 and February 2008 from children and their caregivers in 83 institutional care settings and 311 community clusters. The study assessed five culturally, politically and religiously distinct countries that face rising orphan populations. Sites included Cambodia, Ethiopia, Hyderabad and Nagaland in India, Kenya and Tanzania.

“What people don’t understand is that, in many cases, the institutions are the community’s response to caring for orphaned and abandoned children,” said Whetten. “These communities love kids and as parents die, children are left behind. So, the individuals who love children most and want to care for them build a building and that becomes an institution. These institutions do not look or feel like the images that many in this country have of eastern bloc orphanages, they are mostly places where kids are being loved and cared for and have stable environments.”

The research findings run contrary to global policies held by children’s rights organizations such as UNICEF and UNAIDS, which recommend institutions for orphaned and abandoned children only as a last resort, and urge that such children be moved as quickly as possible to a residential family setting.

“This is not the time to be creating policies that shut down good options for kids. We need to have as many options as possible,” said Whetten. “Our research just says, ‘slow down and let’s look at the facts.’ It’s assumed that the quality of caregiving is a function of being institutionalized, but you can change the caregiving without changing the physical building.”

The study was supported by grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Development. Other Duke researchers involved in the study include Rachel Whetten, Jan Ostermann, Nathan Thielman, Karen O’Donnell, Brian Pence and Lynne Messer.

PLoS One: “A Comparison of the Wellbeing of Orphans and Abandoned Children Ages 6-12 in Institutional and Community-Based Care Settings in 5 Less Wealthy Nations” http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008169
After Informed Consent: Story of ‘HeLa’ Illustrates Chronic Issues in Medical Ethics

When Henrietta’s children learned of HeLa, they were consumed with questions: Had scientists killed their mother to harvest her cells? Were clones of their mother walking the streets of cities around the world? And if Henrietta was so vital to medicine, why couldn’t they afford health insurance? Today, in Baltimore, her family still wrestles with feelings of betrayal and fear, but also pride. As her daughter Deborah once whispered to a vial of her mother’s cells: “You’re famous, just nobody knows it.”

— From the book The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks, by Rebecca Skloot.

Henrietta Lacks grew up in Clover, Va., among tobacco fields where her enslaved ancestors had worked. By 1950, as a young mother, she entered the “colored” wing of the hospital of the Johns Hopkins Medical Center in Baltimore to be treated for cervical cancer. Some of her cancer cells were collect-

Students Explore Fiscal, Cultural, and Ethical

Local: Viewpoints of Durham Latinas

A vaccine that protects against a virulent cancer sounds like a great advance for public health, yet the use of the vaccine Gardasil, which protects against the cervical-cancer causing human papillomavirus (HPV), has met with resistance and controversy. Should the government mandate its use to insure the highest level of immunity within the population? Would a mandate to vaccine adolescent girls against a sexually transmitted disease violate parental rights?

Zahra Remtulla, PPS’10, became interested in the issues surrounding the use of the HPV vaccine in the United States while taking a class in Global Health Ethics taught by Associate Professor of Public Policy Kathryn Whetten. Remtulla is working on a Global Health Certificate.

Cervical cancer is the second most common cause of death for women worldwide, with those who do not have access to pap tests at higher risk. In the United States, minority populations have higher rates of the cancer, especially Latinas. Remtulla decided to look at local community attitudes toward the vaccine, focusing on Latina mothers in Durham.

She shaped her research to consider four ethical dilemmas raised by distribution of the HPV vaccine: whether vaccination should be mandated for school attendance; whether to vaccinate males as well as females; whether to vaccinate females under 18 without parental consent; and mandating the vaccine for immigrants.

Remtulla organized six focus groups, recruited through word of mouth, churches, local social service agencies, a health fair, and an ESL tutoring program. The sessions were conducted in Spanish and held at various community locations.

“I found things that were already happening and went there,” Remtulla said.

The women were asked to fill out a one-page survey, read a two-page information sheet about the HPV vaccine and then respond to a series of open-ended questions in a group discussion.

Remtulla found generally high acceptance of the vaccine among the groups, but with conservative approaches to the distribution questions. They favored vaccination for males, but thought parental consent should be respected. They disagreed with the mandate for immigrants, as a form of discrimination.

“All the women were willing to share and passionate in their views,” Remtulla said.

The groups also thought that if mothers knew more about Gardasil, they would want their daughters to be vaccinated. That would make some of the ethical dilemmas explored in her thesis non-issues, Remtulla said.

After graduation, Remtulla plans to return home to Canada, and work in public health policy for a year before pursuing a master’s degree in public health.
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Barriers to Access to HPV Vaccine

By Jackie Ogburn

Global: India and Developing Nations

After taking every challenging science course available during high school, Swathi Padmanabhan, PPS’10, said, “I was burnt out on science...” When she got to Duke, she was thinking about law school and a major in public policy.

Yet her honors thesis – “The Impact of Intellectual Property, University Licensing Practices, and Technology Transfer on Regional Manufacturing of and Access to the HPV Vaccine in Resource-Poor Regions” – combines all three interests in one long-range project that began her freshman year.

Padmanabhan said her parents encouraged her to “look outside her comfort zone, to try something different.” She decided to take a FOCUS program on The Genome Revolution, which offered a combination of classes on the topic in biology, ethics and policy. She studied with Robert Cook-Deegan, research professor of public policy and director of the Center for Genome Ethics, Law and Policy (GELP), who became her advisor for her honors thesis.

The HPV vaccine is effective in preventing cervical cancer, but it was developed by companies, Merck and Co. and Glaxo-SmithKline, that hold patents on the vaccine and some of the underlying development technologies. This makes the cost of manufacturing the vaccine prohibitive in developing countries.

Vaccine manufacturing companies are emerging in developing countries, especially in India, that are creating their own manufacturing methods and have the potential to produce lower-cost vaccines.

India has 25 percent of the world’s cervical cancer cases, so broad distribution of the HPV vaccine could have a tremendous public health impact there. Universities also play a large role in development of the intellectual property that underlies many new drugs and technologies. The availability of their research and intellectual property licenses influence which methods and drugs are developed.

To assess the impact of patents on research and production in developing countries, she traveled to Hyderabad, India, in December 2007 to visit three vaccine manufacturers: the Serum Institute of India, Bharat Biotech and Indian Immunologicals. “They were all very open to meeting with me, even though I was an undergraduate,” she said. She talked with scientists and the heads of research and development. The trip was funded through an undergraduate research grant with support from the Sanford School, the FOCUS program and the Baldwin Scholars program.

Padmanabhan decided to examine the manufacturing of rotavirus and Hepatitis B vaccines in India as possible models for HPV licensing and manufacturing. She revisited the three Hyderabad companies in the summer of 2009 as part of her research.

“I was surprised that one scientist asked me about what patents were filed in India,” she said. Apparently, some of this information was easier for her to find than it was for the local scientists. She shared her data with every company she dealt with in India.

Regional manufacturers can produce high-quality vaccines similar to the expensive products produced by Western companies, Padmanabhan concluded. However, these Western companies are increasing their patent filings on enabling technologies in India, so there is a need for policy changes to address barriers to access for these vaccines.

After graduation, Padmanabhan intends to go to law school to study intellectual property and to earn a master’s in public health. “I’ll be able to bring more of a science focus to my law practice,” she said.
Pfaff’s Research Shapes Call for Climate Policy Focusing on Protected Areas

Forest protection offers one of the most effective, practical, and immediate strategies to combat global warming, according to a report involving scientists from 13 different organizations, universities and research institutions. Research conducted in the Amazon by Alexander Pfaff, associate professor of public policy, economics and environment at the Sanford School, helped form the basis for the “Perspective” article published in March 2010 in PLoS Biology, a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

The article, “Indigenous Lands, Protected Areas, and Slowing Climate Change,” makes specific recommendations for incorporating protected areas into overall strategies to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from deforestation and degradation (nicknamed REDD).

“Deforestation leads to about 15 percent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions, more than all the cars, trucks, trains, ships, and planes on earth. If we fail to reduce it, we’ll fail to stabilize our climate,” said Taylor Ricketts, lead author and director of World Wildlife Fund’s science program. “Our paper emphasizes that creating and strengthening indigenous lands and other protected areas can offer an effective means to cut emissions while garnering numerous additional benefits for local people and wildlife.”

The authors highlight analyses showing that since 2002, deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon has been 7 to 11 times lower inside of indigenous lands and other protected areas than elsewhere. Simulation models suggest that protected areas established between 2003 and 2007 could prevent an estimated 100,000 square miles of deforestation through 2050. That is roughly the size of the state of Colorado, representing enough carbon to equal 1/3 of the world’s annual CO2 emissions. Within these efforts, location matters; protected areas in regions that face deforestation pressures would be most effective at truly reducing emissions.

“It is good that they have recognized—which many don’t—we need to identify where indigenous lands and protected areas would most effectively reduce deforestation rates and associated emissions;” said Claudio Maretti, conservation director, World Wildlife Fund Brazil. “Establishing protected areas usually clarifies land tenure and the associated carbon rights, which has been a sticking point in some negotiations.”

In addition, the study estimates that the cost of creating and better managing protected areas is lower than many other options to reduce emissions from deforestation. According to the study, forest nations can strengthen the role of protected areas in their REDD strategies by:

- Identifying where indigenous lands and protected areas would most effectively reduce deforestation rates and associated emissions;
- Establishing national monitoring to measure deforestation rates and quantify carbon emissions reductions;
- Establishing insurance mechanisms for illegal logging or forest fires;
- Providing indigenous groups and local communities the information and capacities they need to participate; and
- Distributing payments transparently to reward those responsible for reducing emissions.

The map depicts carbon stocks and potential emissions of selected forest protected areas in the Brazilian Amazon. Potential emissions are estimated by simulating future deforestation through 2050, with and without forest protected areas present. The difference (depicted by orange bars) represents the reductions of CO2 emissions contributed by each forest protected area. Figure and data modified from Soares-Filho, et al. Nature 440, 520-523 (23 March 2006). doi: 10.1038/nature04389

Adapted from a report issued March 16, 2010, by The World Wildlife Fund. The publication “Indigenous Lands, Protected Areas, and Slowing Climate Change” is available online at www.plosbiology.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000331

See also related papers co-authored by Alexander Pfaff:


Kudos

Elizabeth O. Ananat, assistant professor of public policy and economics, in April was named a William T. Grant Scholar, one of only four outstanding early-career researchers selected this year. The prestigious honor includes a $350,000 grant to support her research for the next five years. Her topic is “Economic and Social Determinants of the Educational, Occupational, and Residential Choices of Young Adults.”

Charles Clotfelter gave presentations on “Big Time: The Reign of Commercial Athletics in American Universities” at the Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, on Feb. 26 and at the Curry School of Education, University of Virginia, on Feb. 22. He and Helen “Sunny” Ladd gave a presentation Feb. 3 to the North Carolina Board of Education in Raleigh about their research related to racial and ethnic achievement gaps, teacher credentials, teacher mobility and exit from the profession, and racial segregation.

Stephanie Heims has joined the Executive Board for Women Administrators in North Carolina Higher Education.

Bruce Jentleson was a presenter on the panel “Regional Security Arrangements in the Middle East,” at the conference on Emerging Powers, Global Security and the Middle East in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, on Feb. 9. On Jan. 9, he was a discussant on the panel titled “Governance Challenges: Energy, Environment, and Public Health” at the Conference on New Foundations for Global Governance at Princeton University. He was a panelist for “Partnering for Supply: Troops, Assets, Training,” at the conference on “Cooperating for Peace: The Challenge and Promise of Partnerships in Peace Operations,” at the International Peace Institute and the Monitor.”


Seth Sanders gave a presentation on his paper entitled “Crime and the Family: Lessons (Cont. on page 18)” at the Friday Institute Seminar on Nov. 4, 2009 at the Friday Institute for Educational Innovation at North Carolina State University. Her talk was titled “The NCCRDC: Introduction to a Major K12 Statewide Data Set for Longitudinal Research.”

Christopher Schroeder, Charles S. Murphy Professor of Law and Professor of Public Policy, has been confirmed by the Senate as assistant attorney general for the Office of Legal Policy in the U.S. Department of Justice. Schroeder was nominated for the position by President Barack Obama on June 4, 2009.

Professor of Public Policy Jacob L. Vigdor won the 2009 IPUMS research award for his book, From Immigrants to Americans: The Rise and Fall of Fitting In. The award is given by the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series-USA, part of the Minnesota Population Center at the University of Minnesota. The award was presented at the Population Association of America annual meeting in Dallas, Texas, in April.

Associate Professor of Public Policy Kathryn Whetten has been chosen to serve on the Institute of Medicine (IOM) Committee on Planning and Evaluation of Programs Under the U.S. Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. The IOM selection committee chose her from a list of more than 400 researchers and professionals recommended to the committee. Whetten will lead the committee’s child and adolescent section. She has also been reappointed as director of the Duke Center for Health Policy for a second five-year term.

Philip J. Cook was one of the organizers of the NBER Conference on “Making Crime Control Pay: Cost-Effective Alternatives to Incarceration” held Jan. 15–16 at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law. Along with John MacDonald of the University of Pennsylvania, he presented a paper titled, “Mobilizing Private Inputs for Crime Prevention.” Cook made a presentation to the American Society of Criminology annual meeting in Philadelphia on Nov. 5, 2009 titled “Leave the Minimum Drinking Age to the States.”

Elisabeth Frankenberg, director of graduate studies for the MPP program, earned promotion to professor of public policy this spring, while Donald H. Taylor Jr. earned tenure and promotion to associate professor of public policy. Taylor is also a professor in the departments of Community and Family Medicine and Nursing, an affiliate of the Center for Health Policy, and director of the Benjamin N. Duke Scholarship Program.

Professor of Public Policy Studies Sherman A. James gave the keynote speech at the sixth annual Jean Mills Health Symposium on Feb. 5 in Greenville, N.C. The symposium featured experts from across the state examining the role of individual and societal factors such as race and stress on health in North Carolina.

Associate Professor of Public Policy and Political Science Judith Kelley has been elected for a three-year term to the editorial board of International Organization, a leading peer-reviewed journal of international affairs.

John F. Burness, former senior vice president at Duke, was named interim president of Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster, Pa., effective July 1. Burness, a member of the college’s board of trustees for seven years, will serve while a search committee seeks a successor to President John Fry, who will
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regulatory policy.

including hidden information, in the design and implementation of
CRP as a launch point, Hamilton explores the role of information,
the role of various kinds of information in the CRP policy cycle.

quality and creation of wildlife habitat. In
reduced soil erosion, improved water

to stop farming, aiming to achieve a vari-

CRP, the federal government pays farmers

With more than 30 million acres
entailed between reasonable corporal
punishment and abuse. Law and
Contemporary Problems 73 (3).

Where and how to draw the line
between reasonable corporal
punishment and abuse. Law and
Contemporary Problems 73 (3).

Shedding “Light” On Marriage:
The Influence of Skin Shade on
Marriage for Black Females.
Journal of Economic Behavior
and Organization 72 (1): 30-50.

The Effects of Housing
Market Discrimination on
Earnings Inequality. In
The Integration Debate:
Competing Futures for
American Cities, ed. Gregory
Squires and Chester Hartman,

Never Surrender? How Women’s
Groups Abandoned Their Policy
Niche in U.S. Foreign Policy

Conserving Data in the Conser-
vation Reserve: How a Regula-
ry Program Runs on Imperfect

Bruce. 2010. American
Foreign Policy:
The Dynamics of Choice in the
21st Century. 4th ed. New
York: W.W. Norton.

Bruce. 2010. Coercive Diplomacy: Scope and
Limits, Theory and Policy. In The
Routledge Handbook of Security
Studies, ed. Myriam Dunn
Cavelti and Victor Mauer, 404-
414. London and New York:
Routledge.

Robert R., and James
Leloudis. 2010. To Right These
Wrongs: The North Carolina
Fund and the Battle to End
Poverty in 1960s America.

Donald H. Health
Care Reform, or Not? 2010.
North Carolina Medical Journal

Jacob L. 2009. From
Immigrants to Americans: The
Rise and Fall of Fitting In.
New York: Manhattan Institute
and Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
Alumna Works to Mobilize Young Voters

By Alyssa Dack

Walking into the Obama victory party just after the 2008 Iowa Caucuses, Heather Smith PPS’98, director of Rock the Vote, knew she had proved everyone wrong. Journalists, politicians and strategists had told her young voters would stay away from the polls. Just hours before, during an on-air interview, ABC newsman Sam Donaldson had mocked her mission and said things would never change. But when she entered the party that night, Barack Obama called her over to the stage. “I told you we could do this,” he said.

That moment reminded Smith that, “If you have a big idea, it’s based in research, and you talk to enough people about it, things could happen,” a lesson she had begun to learn during her time as a public policy major. Since graduating, Smith has amassed an impressive list of accomplishments, including coordination of the 2008 “Rock the Caucus” event in Iowa.

The event invited high school seniors to attend tailgate-like parties the night of caucuses—but to be eligible to enter they had to learn their caucus location. After the parties, volunteers drove tens of thousands of those students directly to their caucus locations. As a result, youth voter turnout increased by more than 700 percent compared to 2004. The majority of those votes went to Huckabee and Obama, the victorious candidates.

Before joining Rock the Vote, Smith worked with Green Corps, which trains organizers for critical environmental campaigns. While there, she ran a national campaign to have President Bill Clinton protect 16 million acres of roadless areas. She worked with a national network of Green Corps fellows and trainees, who contacted their senators in hopes of influencing the president’s decision. Just before Clinton left office, Smith received a phone call from the White House asking her to come to Washington, D.C.

“At first, I thought it was my brother prank calling me,” Smith said. Once she realized the invitation was actually coming from the White House, Smith quickly alerted her co-workers, setting up a phone tree for the easy communication of any announcements President Clinton might make. After stopping to purchase her first cellular phone, Smith boarded a plane bound for Washington.

She and 20 other attendees were bused to the nearby Shenandoah Valley, where President Clinton announced he would sign legislation to protect 16 million acres of roadless area. Smith considered it a victory. But when President George W. Bush reversed the decision as one of his first acts in office, Smith was forced to reevaluate her assumptions.

“I realized power came from money and votes, not people and votes like I was taught at Green Corps,” Smith said. “I wanted to find the progressive voters and then find ways to mobilize them.”

Smith then founded the nonprofit Young Voter Strategy and developed a model for increasing voter turnout among voters 18 to 29 years old. The organization’s efforts helped increase voter turnout by 14 percent in six pilot states in 2004. Still, the day after the election the headlines declared, “Youth turnout a bust.”

Realizing that she would need to redouble her efforts to overcome the entrenched negative image of young voters, Smith merged her organization with Rock the Vote.

Now Smith holds regular meetings with White House officials to discuss how to engage youth voters. Although the 2008 elections showed a remarkable increase in youth voter turnout, Smith says politicians’ work is not done.

“If politicians do not continue to show youth voters why politics is relevant to them—and court them—then we’ll lose all those voters,” she said.
The final event of the Sanford School’s inaugural series, “To Right These Wrongs: Continuing the Work of Terry Sanford,” on April 23 featured a keynote address by N.C. Sen. Dan Blue, above, who spoke about past and present challenges to the state in “Terry Sanford’s Outrageous Ambition: The Audacious Adventure of Making North Carolina All It Can and Ought to Be.”

The event included three panel discussions on key issues of Sanford’s career—poverty, education and inequality—as well as a networking reception, the opening of the expanded photography exhibit on Terry Sanford, and a book signing by co-authors Robert Korstad of Sanford and James Leloudis of UNC-Chapel Hill. See photos on page 9, and a book excerpt on pages 10-11.

Videos of Blue’s remarks and of the panel discussions are available online at www.sanford.duke.edu