The high costs of **SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC** disparity

The changing language of **NEWS IN AMERICA**

Helping **SCHOOL PRINCIPALS** succeed
A Decision Support Tool for the San Francisco Bay–Delta Levees Investment Strategy

The risks facing the 100+ islands and tracts northeast of the San Francisco Bay are complex and varied: Some are at high risk from flood damage; water supplies, important habitats, and the Delta’s historical towns, agricultural land, and public roadways are also at risk. RAND developed a risk modeling framework and decision support tool to help in the formation of an investment strategy.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/TL266

Measuring Social and Emotional Learning

Educators have questions about how to measure social and emotional learning (SEL) topics such as relationship skills and self-awareness. The desire to improve SEL for all students is growing, and two newly developed tools—the SEL Assessment Guide and the RAND Education Assessment Finder—can help.

MORE AT www.rand.org/b190328

Potential Impacts of Single-Payer Health Care

What do policymakers need to know when thinking about single-payer proposals and their likely effects on cost and access? In this video, policy researcher Jodi Liu discusses key characteristics of single-payer proposals and their potential impact; common misconceptions and areas of uncertainty; and plan details and implementation decisions that would affect impacts.

MORE AT www.rand.org/v190123

Countering Violent Extremism in Australia

As nations develop programs to prevent homegrown terrorism, there is a dearth of understanding about what types of programs to counter violent extremism exist and which approaches are most effective. This project documents an effort to help program directors and policymakers in Australia place their efforts in context and identify promising approaches internationally.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/RR2168

Ensuring Access to Timely, High-Quality Health Care for Veterans

In April 2019, senior policy researcher Carrie Farmer and senior behavioral scientist Terri Tanielian submitted testimony to the U.S. Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs. Their comments derive from a series of studies about the VA health care system and community care for veterans conducted by RAND over the past several years.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/CT508
Jessica Coley, a principal-in-training in Prince George’s County, Md., examines student projects on a recent school day. Coley is part of a “principal pipeline” to prepare her to succeed as a school leader. Students in districts with pipelines outperformed their peers in reading and math, a recent RAND study found.
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Research Briefly

The Value of a Good Teacher

Good teachers might be even more valuable than we thought. A recent study found they can lift the achievement of students they never even met.

The study looked at data from more than 500,000 New York City students as they moved from fifth grade into middle school. That transition brought them into contact with students from other grade schools, as they all fed into the same middle school.

Students who came from an effective fifth-grade teacher did better on their math and reading tests when they got to middle school. That makes sense. But the study found students also did better when their classmates came from an effective teacher, even when they did not.

In fact, the study estimated that the value of a good teacher could be at least 30 percent higher than previously thought when you take into account that spillover effect. (The study identified good teachers by estimating the value they added to their students’ test scores, over and above what those students would have achieved otherwise.)

It could be that better-taught students spread their knowledge as they make new friends in middle school. The data showed that the effects tend to cluster by race and gender, which might support that peer-to-peer theory. But it also could be that the better-taught students freed up their teachers in middle school to help students who were further behind.

The findings have some important policy implications—from how districts evaluate teachers to how they weigh the benefits of teacher-improvement programs. If nothing else, the study underscores the impact good teachers can have, far beyond their own classrooms.

MORE AT
www.rand.org/t/EP67831
An Effective Way to Reduce Opioid-Related Fatalities

States that allow pharmacists to dispense the opioid antidote naloxone without a prescription saw opioid overdose deaths fall by more than a third, a recent study found.

The drug is already standard-issue for police, paramedics, and other first responders. In recent years, as the opioid crisis hardened into the deadliest drug epidemic on record, a growing number of states passed laws to get it into the hands of more people who could help.

Most states still require a doctor’s prescription or other authorization. But nine states now allow pharmacists to dispense naloxone on their own. In those states, researchers found, opioid overdose deaths fell by an average of 27 percent within two years, and 34 percent within three years.

At the same time, the number of emergency-room visits for opioid overdoses jumped 15 percent in those states. It’s not clear why, although the researchers noted it could be a sign that more people in those states survived overdoses and were able to get to a hospital.

States with weaker access laws, where pharmacists still need prior authorization to disperse naloxone, saw their opioid mortality trend lines continue to rise. Only laws that allow direct dispensing by pharmacists appeared to make a difference.

That underscores the importance of expanding access to naloxone, the researchers concluded—and of getting people with opioid-use disorders the help they need when they get to the emergency room.

At stake are tens of thousands of lives. From 2005 to 2016, the time period the study looked at, the number of people who died of opioid overdoses climbed from nearly 15,000 a year to more than 42,000.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/EP67858

Education and Artificial Intelligence

Robot teachers won’t be taking over the classroom anytime soon. But computers that can think, learn, and even score an essay could help real teachers do their jobs more effectively, a recent paper concluded.

It identified three areas where artificial intelligence could help schools in the near term:

1. **Intelligent tutoring systems** can walk students through a subject like algebra at their own pace with tests and immediate feedback. They’ve been around since the 1980s, and many schools already use a version of them, especially to support math instruction. More advanced versions can provide extra support to students who are struggling, and let those who have already mastered a subject skip ahead.

2. **Automated essay scoring** allows teachers to assign more writing without having to grade papers all weekend. Some current systems use the same language-processing technology as home assistants Alexa and Siri. They can spot grammatical errors and overuse of the passive voice; some can also assess an essay’s style and organization.

3. **Early warning systems** could scan thousands of lines of student data to identify students at risk of dropping out or not graduating. That could help educators get help to students who need it, long before they would recognize the problem themselves. But more still needs to be done to understand the accuracy of these systems, and any potential bias that could influence which students get flagged.

System developers should focus on applying cutting-edge AI approaches like machine learning to well-known challenges in education like these, the paper concluded. As they do, they will need to address concerns of bias and accuracy, and provide enough transparency into the hows and whys of their systems that schools, teachers, students, and parents can trust them.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/PE315

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/EP67858
Senior political scientist Jennifer Kavanagh helps lead RAND's work on "truth decay," the diminishing role of facts and analysis in American public life. Her research has helped set a national agenda to better understand and combat the problem, to explore its historical precedents, and to mitigate its consequences. Kavanagh also serves as director of the Strategy, Doctrine, and Resources Program within RAND Arroyo Center, the U.S. Army's sole federally funded research and development center for studies and analysis.

Searching for Truth

Q You recently looked at how journalism has changed over time. What did you find?

A We looked at how print and broadcast journalism has changed since the 1980s, and then compared broadcast and cable since 2000, and print and online journalism since 2012. What we found overall was a shift away from the traditional 'who, what, when, where, and why' to something that is much more subjective. It depends on which platform you’re talking about, but there’s more argumentation, more personal perspective, more advocacy, more conversation. It has the same basic information, just presented in a very different way.

Those changes are biggest when we compare across platforms—broadcast to cable, print to online. The changes for newspapers have been pretty small; for broadcast, a little bigger but still small compared with these cross-platform changes.

Is journalism today less factual than it was in the past?

If you’re considering the full range of journalism options that we have, we have more choices and different types of information. And some of those forms do tend to have less fact-based information and more opinions and arguments. If you’re choosing to read only online journalism, then you’re getting something that looks different than newspapers, for example. So is journalism less fact-based? Maybe overall, but only because we’re looking at these many different types of platforms, which vary in how they present information. But sources
like newspapers and broadcast television haven’t changed much and have essentially the same amount of facts as ever.

**A frequent criticism of the media is that it has lost its objectivity. Does your study support that?**

No. Criticism of media tends to focus on major newspapers, broadcast television, and cable. For broadcast and newspapers, we have actually seen only minor changes. Yes, there was a shift in print journalism from a more straightforward, event-based presentation of news to something that is more narrative, and in broadcast toward something more subjective. But those changes have been pretty small.

Cable is probably the most subjective and filled with the most personal perspective, opinion, and argumentation, but their model is to appeal to niche audiences who have specific preferences.

Cable is probably the most subjective and filled with the most personal perspective, opinion, and argumentation, but their model is to appeal to niche audiences who have specific preferences.

**How were you able to measure what’s changed?**

We collected text data—whether that’s text from newspapers or transcripts from television—and we ran it through a text-analysis tool called RAND-Lex. It allows us to look at 121 linguistic characteristics of a given text—emotion, personal perspective, subjectivity, uncertainty, things like that. We can compare two sets of data and see whether there are meaningful differences across the two samples in linguistic characteristics. So, for example, we compared newspapers pre- and post-2000 and could assess whether there were significant changes across that divide in terms of how news is presented.

**What’s next in this line of research?**

We have an upcoming study on the role that media literacy might play as a response to truth decay. We have another study looking at what media sources people use and how they view those sources. We’re also looking at media governance—whether there are policy or regulatory mechanisms that could help us reduce disinformation. Regulation is often cast as “nothing” versus “Ministry of Truth,” but there’s a whole range of gray, a range of options that could be acceptable, within the bounds of the First Amendment, that could help.

**How does this fit into your research on truth decay?**

Our earlier research laid out a framework for understanding truth decay, and as part of that we tried to identify what’s driving it. One of the drivers is changes in the information environment. We all have a sense that the presentation of news has changed, but we really wanted to measure what has changed. That’s really key to understanding the evolution of truth decay, and then figuring out what to do about it.

**Has any of this changed how you consume the news?**

Definitely. I’ve become really aware of how easy it is to get sucked into reading things that are aligned with what I already believe. I’m trying to be more conscious of the need to reach outside and get other perspectives, even when I know I’m not going to agree.
At the Crossroads

A Bold, and Feasible, Approach to Eliminating Roadway Deaths in the United States

By Doug Irving, Staff Writer
It had been a good day, a happy day, Latanya Byrd remembers. A family day: Kids running around with water balloons, parents trying to keep cool in the sweltering heat of Philadelphia in July. And then a phone call, words between sobs: “Aunt Tanya, they’re dead.”

Her niece, Samara Banks, had been walking her four children home when a car slammed into them at high speed. She and three of her children died. It was a senseless loss, a tragedy that never should have happened. But it was no accident.

Tens of thousands of people die on American roads every year. A recent RAND study looked at what it would take to bring that number down to zero. We could do it by 2050, the study concluded, if we change how we think about road safety, make smart investments in vehicle technology, and stop accepting car crashes as car accidents.

“If it doesn’t happen to you, you just say, ‘Oh yeah, that boulevard is crazy,’” Byrd said. “You think differently when they take your family.”

Just one swipe. Two generations of our family. Just took them all.
—LATANYA BYRD
A different approach to car and road design

Banks and her children had almost reached the median of a 12-lane thoroughfare that cuts through their neighborhood when a drag-racing Audi S4 crested a hill. She was the heart of her family, the one who always organized dance contests for the kids and played princess with her nieces. She died with her sons, 7-month-old Saa’mir, 23-month-old Saa’sean, and 4-year-old Saa’deem.

“Just one swipe,” her aunt says now. “Two generations of our family. Just took them all.”

On an average day in America, more than 100 people will lose their lives in car crashes. In recent years, a growing number of cities have committed to building a traffic system that prevents death and serious injuries—one that never puts a young mother on a 12-lane road in the dark with her children. Their goal is not to reduce traffic fatalities, but to end them altogether. If that sounds too ambitious, talk to Sweden.

In the late 1990s, concerned about its own safety record on the roads, Sweden enacted a policy that it called Vision Zero. It was easy to scoff at—a national promise to eliminate road deaths?—except that Sweden now has one of the lowest traffic mortality rates in the world.

Working with the National Safety Council, RAND brought together transportation officials, safety advocates, traffic engineers, and other experts to develop a plan for how that could work here. They imagined the year 2050 as the first year with not a single death on American roads. Then they asked how we get there.

People die on the roads every day because someone got behind the wheel drunk, or nodded off, or checked a phone message, or drifted across a yellow line, or decided to race a car through a city neighborhood. We know that people make the same mistakes and bad decisions, over and over again. And yet we’ve built a traffic system with so little margin for error that one moment of inattention can kill someone.

What if we designed our cars and roads for bad drivers, rather than good drivers?

Think about a four-way stop, for example. It takes one mistake, one missed sign, for a car to slam into the side of another. That kind of T-bone crash causes nearly half of all moving, car-to-car road fatalities. Put a traffic circle there instead, and you might see more side-swipe crashes as drivers try to merge, but you prevent those more serious T-bones.

Life-saving innovations

That kind of thinking would go a long way toward preventing traffic deaths. If every country road had raised bumps down the center, drivers would jolt awake the moment they drifted into an oncoming traffic lane. If every traffic light gave pedestrians a few seconds’ head start, they’d be more visible by the time cars got the green light, and less likely to get hit.

“A lot of people think this is too big of a problem to eliminate,” said Liisa Ecola, a senior policy analyst and transportation planner at RAND, who led the study. “These ideas are ambitious, but not eye-rollingly so. They’re not really outside of the box. These are actions we could be taking now.”

By 2050, the study concluded, cars themselves might be so advanced that they prevent most crashes from ever happening. Some might well be fully autonomous, no drivers required. But the real life-savers—the
ones that should be a focus of investment now—will be much less flashy.

Automatic emergency brakes, lane-departure warnings, and other driver backup systems could save 10,000 lives a year. Cars that could sample the air for even a whiff of alcohol on a driver’s breath could save at least 7,000 more.

Even when a crash does happen, the cars of 2050 might be able to call 911 themselves and alert paramedics to the type of damage and number of people involved. By some estimates, half of the people who die on the roads today survive the initial crash. Getting them faster and more effective trauma care could save thousands of lives.

A cultural shift

Getting all the way down to zero deaths is going to require a society-wide change of attitude, too. Ecola sees a useful lesson in what happened to smoking. It wasn’t one big policy change that removed cigarettes from airplanes and restaurants. It was an evolution in both law and public opinion that gathered momentum as each reinforced the other. We need to make dangerous and distracted driving as socially unacceptable as smoking in public.

At some point, RAND’s study imagines, cities might even put up billboards like the ones posted at construction sites. “Welcome to our city, where we haven’t had a fatal crash in 27 days.”

“We shouldn’t accept deaths or serious injuries on the road, but we kind of do because it happens all the time and you never hear about it,” Ecola said. “I wouldn’t say this policy is a failure if we only eliminate 90 percent of car crash deaths. That would be an enormous achievement in traffic safety. That would save more than 30,000 lives a year.”

Philadelphia, for one, has a 42-page action plan to get to zero deaths on its roads—not by 2050, but by 2030. It calls for new street lights, safer sidewalks, lower speeds, and tougher enforcement. It singles out one roadway in particular as desperately in need of change: the 12-lane boulevard where Samara Banks and her children died. Her aunt has become a leading voice in the community, calling for safer streets.

“I feel like I need to jump out of my bed every time I hear that somebody died in a crash,” she said. “Is that what we’re supposed to do? Jump and run? Eventually, we’re going to have to pull together and do something to stop these crashes from happening.”

There’s a wide crosswalk now at the intersection where she lost her niece. There’s a traffic light there, a protected median, and yellow signs warning drivers to watch for pedestrians. There’s also a small green street sign, placed there as a memorial: Banks Way.
Smart Investments in School Leadership

The Wallace Foundation’s Principal Pipeline Initiative Yields Widespread Positive Effects

By Doug Irving, Staff Writer

It takes more than good teachers and textbooks to give students the education they deserve. A new RAND study shows just how important principals are, too.

Students in districts with carefully selected, prepared, and supported principals outperformed their peers by six percentage points on reading tests and nearly three points in math. Those are hard needles to move at the level of an entire district.

“We’re not aware of any other districtwide initiatives with positive effects on student achievement of this magnitude,” said Susan Gates, a senior economist at RAND who led the study.
Jessica Coley, a resident principal—part of the “principal pipeline”—stands by some student project work in the hallway of her school, Samuel P. Massie Academy in Forestville, Maryland.
Building the principal pipeline

Jessica Coley arrives early, long before the doors of Samuel P. Massie Academy in suburban Maryland fly open and her 600 students pour through the halls. She likes to walk the building, looking at student projects pinned to the walls, paying special attention to the teacher comments. In a school where more than 80 percent of students don’t meet state standards in reading or math, that has been a big push for her: making sure they get the feedback they need to improve.

“They know that I care,” said Coley, in her first year of a “resident principal” program that has her serve alongside a more experienced school leader. “And because they know that I care, they’re willing to work extra hard to make me proud and to make their parents proud. Once you have that relationship, you can really start to see children making the right decisions and becoming invested in their academic progress.”

Studies have shown that hiring good principals is one of the most important things a district can do for its students, second only to hiring good teachers. Yet the process has too often been haphazard, a scramble to fill vacancies with whatever teachers have the right certificates and the most time in the classroom.

In 2011, the nonprofit Wallace Foundation decided to change that. It partnered with six large school districts to develop “principal pipelines” to cultivate and support up-and-coming principals. It backed their start-up efforts with up to $12.5 million each.

The idea was to make the districts more deliberate in how they selected, trained, placed, and supported new principals. They set new standards, provided more opportunities for mentorship and on-the-job training, and tracked candidates as they moved through the pipeline. One of the districts, for example—Prince George’s County, Md., where Jessica Coley works—created what it calls baseball cards on its principal prospects, listing their key accomplishments and skills.

“Districts often haven’t been this thoughtful about it,” Gates said. “In other sectors, I think people realize that just because you’re a good doer, that doesn’t mean you’ll be a good manager of the doers. It’s a different skill set. But in the education field, they hadn’t really gotten to that.”

Better outcomes for students and schools

The Wallace Foundation brought in a team of researchers from RAND and Policy Studies Associates to evaluate the pipeline initiative. The researchers looked at data from more than 1,000 pipeline schools. Then they compared those schools with more than 6,000 others in the same states that also had new principals but were not part of the initiative.

They found that within three years, students in the pipeline schools were doing better than students in the comparison schools by an average of 6.22 percentile points in reading and 2.87 points in math.

Put another way: Imagine two schools, both right at the 50th percentile of student achievement, but only one with a principal that came through a pipeline. After three years, that pipeline school would be at the 56th percentile in reading and approaching the 53rd in math. The non-pipeline school would still be at the 50th percentile in both.

That kind of progress is sometimes found in focused, classroom initiatives, like an intensive reading program, Gates said—but not in big, districtwide initiatives.

The study found that the pipelines had a positive and statistically meaningful impact on schools that needed it the most, those in the lowest quartile of student achievement. A more limited, exploratory analysis suggested the effects, while still positive, were somewhat smaller in schools with higher rates of poverty or students of color. And the overall averages masked some wide variations in district-by-district results.

One of the districts underperformed its comparison schools in math, for example. On the other hand, one district outperformed its comparison schools by nearly 20 percentile points in reading.

The researchers also found that principals who went through the pipelines were nearly

Principal Pipelines: A Feasible, Affordable, and Effective Way for Districts to Improve Schools is available for free download at www.rand.org/t/RR2666
8 percentage points more likely to stay at their schools for at least three years. That could be a significant money-saver; by some estimates, it can cost a district $75,000 every time it has to replace a principal.

A promising return on investment

The findings add to a growing body of research that helping principals succeed can improve schools and raise student achievement. Another recent RAND study, for example, also found improvements in reading and math scores under a different principal initiative, the New Leaders Aspiring Principals program. Other studies have shown that schools led by high-quality principals tend to retain and recruit high-quality teachers, too.

“If you have a good leader, people will follow that leader,” said Richard Carranza, the chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, one of the districts in the pipeline initiative. “I mean, they’ll travel across boroughs and pay tolls on bridges to go work in a school with a great leader.”

The costs of running a principal pipeline amounted to around one half of 1 percent of a district’s budget, RAND’s study found. Every one of the districts that participated in the initiative has continued to bring its principals up through the pipeline, long after the Wallace funding ran out.

Some now have a new problem: a surplus of highly qualified candidates coming through the pipeline, and not enough vacancies to place them. Some also worry that their rookie principals might be getting too much support, a “firehose” of instruction and advice.

Jessica Coley will take it. As a resident principal, she might be monitoring the lunch room one minute, drawing up a budget the next, and sitting in a classroom as an instructional coach after that. Last year, when the district suddenly needed someone to register students and make classroom assignments just days before school started, she jumped in and did that, too.

“The principal position, it’s one that sometimes people can think is about power. It can be glamorized,” she said. “I know that the responsibility is heavy. It’s about moving a school, being able to move students and move teachers, in a way that we can see the progress that’s being made.”

She’s ready to do just that. She hopes to drop the “resident” from her title as early as this fall, and become a stand-alone school principal.

Principal pipelines have four overarching components:

1. Leader standards that guided all pipeline activities
2. Preservice preparation opportunities for assistant principals and principals
3. Selective hiring and placement
4. On-the-job induction, evaluation, and support.

In addition, districts participating in the Principal Pipeline Initiative were expected to develop systems to support and sustain their efforts, such as leader-tracking databases, beyond the time frame of the initiative.

All schools were in minority-majority districts

These six participating districts were all among the 50 largest school districts in the United States and had predominately minority student bodies. Each had demonstrated a commitment to school leadership improvement and had undertaken some pipeline efforts before.
Pittsburgh Equity Indicators: A Baseline Measurement for Enhancing Equity in Pittsburgh is available for free download at www.rand.org/t/EP67846

The Chronic Stress of Inequity

How Pittsburgh Is Using Data and Performance Measures to Prioritize Investments, Reduce Disparities, and Improve Outcomes

By Doug Irving, Staff Writer

Being black in Pittsburgh, RAND research has found, means being six times more likely than a white person to go to bed hungry. It means bringing home less than half as much pay, and seeing your children hospitalized with asthma four times more often.

The city has been taking a hard look at race, wealth, and opportunity, in partnership with researchers at RAND’s office there. It hasn’t just run the numbers on subjects ranging from police contacts to business ownership to graduation rates; it has published them for all to see as part of a commitment to do better.

The results show what disparity looks like in one big American city. But they also provide a case study for other cities, of what they might find if they held up a mirror to their own promises of equity and inclusion.

“There are conversations about inequity happening all over the country,” said Linnea Warren May, a policy analyst at RAND who has led the work in Pittsburgh. “But how do you measure inequity? What are the critical systemic issues that contribute to it? Pittsburgh has this narrative of being a city on the rise, but there are still people being left behind.”

Pittsburgh has asked those questions before.

In the late 1900s, researchers fanned out across the city to document the deep disparities that separated rich and poor, new immigrant and native-born. They found steel workers putting in 12-hour days; children crowded into unlit, unheated classrooms; and poor sanitation marked by “indescribably foul” privies. Their study provided
Today, Pittsburgh ranks as one of the most livable cities in America, the Paris of Appalachia. Yet more than one-third of its black residents live in poverty. “Pittsburgh is a very hard city,” playwright August Wilson once said of his hometown, “especially if you’re black.”

RAND researchers, working with the city to anticipate the challenges of the 21st century, put social inequality near the top of the list. What the city needed was a way to not just identify disparities, but to show where it was making progress in fighting them, and where it was not.

In 2015, New York City provided a template, an annual report on inequality. Data point by data point, it charted disparities across the city, comparing its least advantaged residents to its most advantaged. It looked at how many low-income residents lacked reliable heat, how many Muslim residents were hesitant to call the police, how often its Native American residents were denied home loans. Dallas looked at how much more its black residents paid in municipal court fees than white residents.

Pittsburgh partnered with RAND to develop its indicators and run the numbers. The results underscored the city’s black-white divide. Its top-level equality score was 55 in 2017, essentially an F-plus. The score didn’t budge when researchers collected and analyzed the data again in 2018. But that masked some significant progress made, and lost, in individual indicators.

The graduation rate for black high school students went up, for example, adding ten points to the “student success” score. At the same time, though, black incomes fell, especially compared with white incomes, deducting ten points from the “income and poverty” score.

Black residents were nine times more likely to be homeless, and five times less likely to own their own businesses. Homicide rates improved across the city, but black residents were still nine times more likely to die a violent death. Lead levels in children plummeted in black neighborhoods, erasing a disparity there, amid efforts to get lead out of homes and water supplies.

The indicators mostly focused on disparities by race—but not always. They showed, for example, that low-income neighborhoods had much higher rates of diabetes than high-income neighborhoods. Female high school students were somewhat less likely than their male peers to enroll in science, technology, engineering, and math programs.

Taken together, the Pittsburgh indicators provide a proof-of-concept for other cities, RAND’s Warren May said—that it’s possible to track disparities across many fields in a way that is transparent and can help guide good policy. “There hasn’t really been such a systematic look at equity” in Pittsburgh or other cities, she said. “Not something that takes it all together and tries to see the whole picture. Tracking these indicators is a good first step, but the results point to additional work we’d like to do to look at root drivers of inequity.”

The indicators have already had an impact in Pittsburgh. The city government plans to release millions of dollars for affordable housing and quality child care. It has launched a “Stop the Violence” initiative, taken steps to improve air quality, and required bias training for all police officers. Earlier this year, it announced the creation of an Office of Equity.

“We are using the Equity Indicators to begin to untangle the deep roots of inequality that exist in this city,” Mayor William Peduto said in a statement. “One report or one budget cycle will not undo decades of disinvestment and systemic structural barriers. This requires a sustained, community effort to improve.”

City officials have talked about taking a more neighborhood-by-neighborhood approach to measuring disparities, of zooming in on some of the most troubling indicators. They describe the two-year Equity Indicators project as one step in a much larger effort to assess the well-being of the city and its people, and from there to improve it.

Peduto, for one, has described that vision as a Pittsburgh Survey for the 21st century.
As a graduate of the last all-male Coast Guard Academy class and the son of a service mom who opposed women in the military, I might seem to be a ripe pick to be a social dinosaur, eager to resist efforts to bring on and keep more women in the service that safeguards U.S. interests on the seas.

Far from it. I’ve commanded or served as executive officer on vessels with all-male and mixed-gender crews. It isn’t easy and can be complex to have forces inclusive of women and members of underrepresented groups.
That said, I’d take mixed-gender crews in a second, because I’ve seen for decades from the front lines, as well as from leadership posts, what dedicated and capable Coast Guard women do.

I’ve seen them operating on the frigid Bering Sea in winter, with hurricane-force winds gusting and 40-foot waves crashing around them, laboring side-by-side with male colleagues in multiple ocean rescues. I’ve watched the female lead of a Coast Guard boarding party back down a 6-foot-7, 400-pound, surly, mouthy suspect and cuff him to a boat rail after he thought he could intimidate her from her maritime law enforcement role. I’ve been proud to help prepare and support the Coast Guard women who have excelled at shipboard operations and support in a combat zone in Southwest Asia, and in intelligence, cybersecurity, and other intense and complex assignments around the globe.

In my experience, with both sexes throughout the ranks, much-needed candor, directness, and order abound in ways they might not when units are packed only with good but rambunctious young men. The Coast Guard benefits from the heightened respect that I’ve seen colleagues show each other in mixed-gender units, giving personnel greater opportunity to focus and excel at their tasks at hand.

Obstacles persist to gender equity and equality in the Coast Guard. Traditions, born of centuries of warfare by men, die hard. Keeping in mind the basic military idea that newcomers start equal but at the bottom, working their way up over a career with excellence and accomplishment, perhaps now is the time to revisit the fundamentals of how we select, train, and retain our Coast Guard members, as highlighted by the challenges of women in the service.

Coast Guard leadership had the courage to enlist RAND researchers to tackle the challenge of retaining women in the service. They found that women had issues with their fair treatment and prospects for advancement, worrying as well about sexual harassment and sexual assault while serving in the Coast Guard. (Full disclosure: I reviewed RAND’s recently published study *Improving Gender Diversity in the U.S. Coast Guard* but did not participate in the research.)

When the Coast Guard zeroes in on evidence-based and appropriate accommodations for women and their physical capacities, and on child-bearing, child-rearing, and family life, it will benefit everyone in uniform. We’re not giving special breaks to select groups in examining human capacities; we’re finding how individuals can excel and bring new and needed skills to our missions. Rising generations are emphatic about the importance of work–life balance, and it benefits the services when military personnel enjoy rewarding home lives with minimal domestic worries.

The Coast Guard may be in measurable terms slightly ahead of its military peers and advanced in its inclusionary efforts when compared with many corporations with similar workforce dynamics. Still, this service is determined to stay at the fore and be pushed forward even more by its capable leaders and broader societal changes to reconcile the tough demands of active duty with the real and specific needs of individuals in unique groups with demonstrated talents.

I’m a retired vice admiral now. It was my privilege for decades, at sea and on shore, to tell those I led that I insisted simply that they give themselves 100 percent to their duties with honor, ensure leaders were aware when they were not 100 percent so they could reconcile that or alter expectations, and then go home with pride and give 100 percent to their loved ones.

The Coast Guard can and should reasonably ask for unwavering commitment from its people, if it returns it—to them all. The U.S. military, history teaches, played a model role in advancing civil rights and striking down racial discrimination. We need to step up to that tradition anew, bringing in, keeping, and raising up all the able and dedicated women and men in the Coast Guard, because it’s the good and right thing to do.

From 2009 to 2019, Brooks served as president of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). In the fall of 2019, he will join the faculty of the Harvard Kennedy School and Harvard Business School.

Brooks is featured in AEI’s documentary film *The Pursuit*, the culmination of three years of research, conversations, and travel around the world, from the streets of New York City to the Dalai Lama’s monastery in Dharamsala, to seek an answer to the question “How can we lift up the world, starting with those at the margins of society?” The film is available on iTunes and in August 2019 is coming to Netflix.

Brooks earned his Ph.D. in policy analysis from the Pardee RAND Graduate School, which presented him with its Alumni Leadership Award in 2016.
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Answering hate with love is what strong people do. It requires doing something that is against your will, against your habit.

On bubbles
If you’re only around people who agree with you, you have got to get outside your bubble. People are curating their news feeds, and living in neighborhoods where everybody agrees, and going to churches and schools and sending their kids to colleges where everybody agrees with their politics—this is a really bad phenomenon that makes us weak, makes us unable to debate, makes it impossible for us to see beyond our ideological sphere. Proximity to people who think differently than you gives you much more appreciation—certainly tolerance and even love if you’re working on it—for people who disagree with you. You will recognize that we can have a lot of similarity in the moral formulae that are animating us and at the same time have different policy prescriptions. This is a long way of saying, Find more friends who are different than you, and embrace diversity, real diversity, which is diversity of thinking.

On disagreement
We don’t hate each other in America. We just act as if we did, take offense, and believe other people are hating us. One of the things I often ask politicians is, ‘How many of you wish we lived in a one-party state?’ Zero hands. If you’re grateful for not living in a one-party state, you just told me you’re grateful for the other party. Shocking but true.

Disagreement is good because competition is good. Competition lies behind excellence—in the economy, obviously, and in democracy. You don’t want uncontested elections; you want a competition of ideas. The idea is not that we have to disagree less—we have to disagree better.

On political persuasion
My dad used to say, “The mark of moral courage is not standing up to the people with whom you disagree; moral courage entails standing up to the people with whom you agree, on behalf of those with whom you disagree.” That’s exactly what we don’t do when we’re in a base-locking exercise that says that the other side is stupid and evil, thus persuading nobody. It’s incredibly impractical, by the way, because nobody in history has ever been persuaded with insults. Nobody in life has ever been convinced with hatred.

On higher standards
Civility is a garbage standard. If I told you my wife and I were civil to one another, you’d say we need counseling. You want to actually have a better country? We need to live up to a much higher standard. What is it? Love. What is love? It’s not a feeling. To love, according to Saint Thomas Aquinas, is to will the good of the other. When I feel hatred, when I feel contempt, what should I choose? Answering hate with hate is what weak people do. Answering hate with love is what strong people do. It requires doing something that is against your will, against your habit. That takes a lot of strength.

On goals
Love people who are proximate to you because those are real human beings, with whom you can make eye contact. If you’re going to be treated with contempt, you can answer with love. And what are you going to get? A chance at being persuasive. If you answer hatred with hatred, you will not persuade anybody, 100 percent guaranteed. I ask people all the time and they push back and say, “But some people deserve our contempt.” “They’re so bad, they’re hurting our country.” “They’re so evil.” I reject that, because I think that certain ideas deserve our contempt but not people, and we have to separate ideas from people.

What’s your goal? Is it to exile somebody? Do you wish we would have a regime where people just kick out people who disagree with you? No. You want to take away their vote and put them in jail? No. You want to sneak into their house and hurt them while they sleep. “Of course not, what kind of person do you think I am?”

So what do you want? I ask. They say, “I want them to think and act differently.”

So how’s your hate working out for that? You want to have a chance at being persuasive? Only love will do.
Family legacy: A new generation of Wolfs is helping RAND thrive in the 21st century.

Tim Wolf remembers going into the office with his father, punching numbers into a calculator to keep himself busy. They weren’t just random digits, though; his father had him working on data on foreign aid to South America.

His father was the late Charles Wolf, Jr., a researcher and economist who spent more than 60 years at RAND. He is widely recognized as one of the intellectual founders of modern policy analysis. His work on the costs of the Soviet empire was so insightful that even the Soviets read it.

Charles Wolf was also the founding dean of the graduate school at RAND—now known as the Pardee RAND Graduate School—which he led for nearly 30 years and remained committed to as a philanthropist. He and his wife, Theresa, included a $1 million bequest in their estate plans to support the school and its students. It’s a commitment his son plans to carry forward.

“I want to stay connected because the research ventures and innovations that RAND pursues are significant,” said Tim Wolf, president of the investment firm Wolf Interests and former chief integration officer of MillerCoors Brewing Company. “RAND and Pardee RAND were important to my father, and I think we’ll all agree they continue to be important,” he said. “Especially in this world where facts seem to matter less and louder voices seem to carry the day.”

His father came to RAND in 1955. His early work focused on Soviet economics; he correctly predicted that economic exhaustion and ethnic dissension would eventually topple the Soviet Union. He also was one of the first economists to anticipate the economic rise of postwar South Korea.

In 1970, Charles Wolf successfully argued for RAND to establish a graduate school in policy analysis. Even after he stepped down as dean, he continued to support the school as a donor and advisor. When the school introduced the slogan “Be the Answer,” he expanded on it: “Before one can Be the Answer,” he wrote, “they must first ask the question.”

Wolf published nearly 300 academic papers and more than a dozen books. He worked almost until his death in October 2016. His last report, published just months before his death, described how the United States and China could hammer out a win–win future if both made some concessions.

He and Theresa supported RAND and Pardee RAND, in part, through the Legacy Society, a group of donors who have included the organization in their estate plans. Their $1 million bequest will help Pardee RAND attract top students and reimagine what it takes to develop good policy in the 21st century.

As much as anyone, Charles Wolf represents RAND’s past; his son said he wants to represent its future. Tim Wolf said he plans to carry on the family commitment, whether that means promoting RAND or ensuring its graduate school can continue to fulfill his father’s vision.

“RAND is a very, very unique organization with an amazing collection of very talented people who are all about improving policy and moving substantive analytics further,” he said. “Adding substance, fact, insight, acumen. That is especially important right now, when people who speak with the loudest voice—not necessarily the smartest voice—may be followed more than they should be.”

He points especially to the daily headlines about Russia and North Korea. “RAND provides that historical and substantive perspective; you sure don’t get that in the national discourse. But they’re the same kinds of issues that my father was thinking about.”

Pardee RAND, the largest public policy Ph.D. program in the United States, is building a new model for public policy graduate education. It is the only program based at an independent public policy research organization—the RAND Corporation. To learn more, visit www.prgs.edu.
When Mad Men Roamed RAND

By Melissa Bauman, Staff Writer

A Pregnant Pause: In the 1950s, only about 1 in 3 American women was in the workforce, which might explain RAND’s most retro(grade) policy. RAND required a woman to provide a doctor’s note to keep working after her fifth month of pregnancy. We’re all glad that times have changed. In 2018, 51 percent of our entire workforce and 47 percent of new hires were female.

You Sunk My ... Kriegspiel? To draw researchers out of their shells and into collaborations, RAND has always sponsored on-site games, clubs, and activities. While RANDites can still play table tennis at work, Kriegspiel tournaments have fallen out of favor.

Off the Hook: Sure, RAND had office phones in 1957. But the Telephone and Teletype Office handled long-distance calls and had a secure circuit for sending classified data to Washington.

Night and Day: RAND’s old building (and the “new” one) was accessible 24 hours a day so that night owl researchers, who are often college professors as well, could set their own hours.
The RAND Corporation is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.

If you enjoy the stories in RAND REVIEW, please remember RAND in your annual giving.

Your gift will support research and analysis that improve lives.