Even the most fleeting review of the millennium’s first year (or last, depending on one’s view of the calendar) confirms that it was remarkable for both the country and the Urban Institute. Yet even as the country divided itself over issues of personality and specific policies, there was conspicuous agreement among the smart people—legal, and analytical—devoted to the virtual draw that resulted from the presidential election of 2000. Clearly, the Institute’s research agenda mirrors thenation’s priorities more than ever.

This convergence positions the Institute to make practical and perceptive contributions to the debate over what policies should make the next phase of the American experiment work better. The Institute ... be particularly valued in the aftermath of the historic presidential election of 2000. This is a satisfying prospect.

For trustees, it is also satisfying that the transition to the Institute’s second president has gone smoothly, and that the enduring strength of the Institute remains while new windows of opportunity are being opened. In short, there is every reason to have high hopes for the Institute’s future and pride in its many years of public service.
Away for 14 years, I returned early in 2000 to an organization that had maintained all of its strengths while it built new competencies and expanded its vision and reach. Intellectual rigor, objective analysis, policy relevance, collegiality, and an informal but hard working environment characterize the Institute today just as they did in the mid-1980s. But now the Institute is more than twice as large, more vibrant, and more outwardly oriented than it was in 1986.

The scope of our work is broader too. Our research on such issues as taxes and criminal justice has expanded, and we have entered into such new policy realms as philanthropy and the not-for-profit sector, education, and community development. The International Activities Center has extended our geographic reach by working with partners abroad on some of the social and governance challenges facing emerging democracies. A single large project—Assessing the New Federalism—draws together multi-disciplinary teams from throughout the Institute to analyze the impacts of the profound changes in the way the nation provides income support and social services to its vulnerable populations. And over the past 14 years the Institute has innovated ways to make its research findings useful and accessible to federal, state, and local policy-makers, the media, policy stakeholders, and the public.

The year 2000 finds Washington with a new political configuration—a single party controls both the White House and Congress. Growing budget surpluses—a state of fiscal grace unimaginable just a few years ago—are projected for the foreseeable future. And a new Decennial Census has begun to illuminate the complexities of the population public policies must serve. Together, these developments promise to break the gridlock that hobbled policy development and stymied rational debate during much of the last two decades.

continued >>>>>>>>
The promise of surpluses means that for the first time in decades policymakers can consider such fundamental policy changes as Social Security reform, Medicare restructuring, a prescription drug benefit for seniors and the disabled, major education initiatives, and large tax cuts. Less monumental but still important decisions will have to be made on such issues as the reauthorization of the 1996 welfare reform legislation, the challenge to communities of re-integrating hundreds of thousands of released prisoners each year, and healthcare for the 43 million who lack health insurance. Also before policymakers are the numerous policy fronts where incremental change can improve public programs’ performance.

With an extensive knowledge base built up over 32 years, the Urban Institute is uniquely positioned to help lawmakers evaluate policy options and craft solutions to emerging and persistent problems, explain the strengths and weaknesses of policies and proposals to the media, and inform the public about the consequences of the choices facing the nation. With sophisticated models that Institute researchers have developed over decades, we can estimate the quantitative impacts of past and prospective policy changes. With the experience and sensitivity that come from years of studying the implementation and operation of government programs where they affect real people in states, cities, and communities, Institute researchers can also bring a qualitative perspective to public policy’s effects on our society and economy. As policymakers at all levels of government begin to grapple with the challenges of the new century, they increasingly value nonpartisan analysis grounded on objective quantitative and qualitative research—the Urban Institute’s hallmark.

For all these reasons, these are exciting times to be entrusted with the helm of a ship whose talented and dedicated crew can help make public policy more responsive to changing national needs and help deepen public understanding. The challenge facing me has been made easier by my predecessor and friend, Bill Galbraith, who gave the Institute forward-looking, enlightened leadership for its first 32 years and turned over to me a sound institution headed in the right direction.

The Policy Environment Has Changed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1968</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. population</td>
<td>200,706,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum wage in 2000 dollars</td>
<td>$7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Jones Industrial Average (December 31)</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of families headed by a female with no husband present</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adult women in paid jobs</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of federal spending accounted for by discretionary vs. mandatory</td>
<td>66 vs. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of U.S. employed labor force with a college degree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT scores of entering college classes</td>
<td>math 533, verbal 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (2000 dollars)</td>
<td>$21,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National health expenditures as share of GDP</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban % of total population</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of voting age population who voted in the presidential election</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes per 100,000 people</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total household income received by poorest fifth vs. richest fifth</td>
<td>4.2% vs. 42.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Research

Policy research matters. It can measure effects, compare options, show which stakeholders get the most and least, test conventional wisdom against the facts, reveal trends, and make costs, benefits, and risks explicit. Solid research keeps at least some policy mistakes hypothetical. At the Urban Institute policy research means:

Picking the right issues. Determined to make a contribution, we concentrate on issues important to the country and carry out research suited to our particular strengths. We make sure that we aren’t duplicating credible work by others. We also seek a balance between short-term and long-term studies, national and local issues, and applied and theoretical work.

Among the broad topics that have passed these tests in recent years are welfare reform, the outlook for the uninsured in the changing healthcare system, and Social Security’s future. Among the many issues our agenda expanded to include in 2000 were affirmative action programs’ economic impacts, the legal and regulatory framework governing nonprofit advocacy organizations’ roles in public policymaking, international comparisons of home care for the elderly, and the multiple challenges posed by prisoners reentering society.

Choosing or creating the right methodologies. Half the challenge of research is finding, adapting, or creating the best tools for the job—those that best account for the evidence and explain it clearly and compellingly. We’re known in the research community for taking these challenges very seriously and for innovating, even under tight deadlines.

Quantitative modeling is a core competency of the Urban Institute. Another is revamping research methodologies to broaden their application. Survey design, case studies, and statistical analysis are other basic strengths. Often, we combine methods, bringing multiple perspectives to such complex issues as poverty, educational achievement, or community building.

Assembling the right team. Economists, public policy analysts, lawyers, statisticians, urban planners, demographers, sociologists, political scientists, communications experts, and other specialists make up Urban Institute’s staff. With such diverse expertise, we can breach academic boundaries as needed and blend qualitative and quantitative analyses. Equally important, at the Institute teams often stay together to complete many projects, building institutional depth that other organizations can seldom match.

Frequently, we collaborate with outside researchers and other institutions to augment our expertise and capacity. Partnerships with federal, state, and local agencies afford the Institute steady access to timely data and close interaction with those responsible for running government programs throughout the country. A steady stream of guest scholars visits the Institute to speak, share research results, and comment on our work.

Following the facts wherever they lead. The Institute is committed to analyzing and interpreting facts and numbers without an ideological agenda. We look beyond obvious explanations, but don’t ignore them. We make informed judgments about our research findings but take pains to quarantine our personal beliefs when we design and carry our studies. In short, we think what we do is called social science for a reason.

Finding the right words. We publicize results that validate widespread expectations as well as those that prove surprising. We speak the language of experts with experts but put research findings into the context of everyday life for the public. Our senior researchers can match expertise, sophisticated analyses, and facts with others who are immersed daily in the fine points of the policy debate. Since much of our research is by nature highly technical and quantitative, presenting our findings and the discussion in forms accessible to policymakers and the broader public can be a challenge. But practice pays off, and rewarding experiences with on-line and broadcast media create incentives to keep it simple whenever possible.

Subjecting our findings to outside review. Our methods, factual accuracy, and interpretations are all subject to outside review. The Institute’s largest projects have technical advisory boards. Smaller ones follow standard academic peer review procedures. Books published by the Urban Institute Press are reviewed anonymously outside the Institute and revised under the scrutiny of an in-house editorial advisory board.

Reaching the right audiences. We direct our research findings to multiple audiences: policymakers, program administrators, other researchers and university students, the media, nonprofit advocacy organizations, stakeholders in the private sector, and that important segment of the public that follows policy debates through the daily news. Settings range from the working group to the airwaves. Our annual roundtable on the federal budget brings together a few dozen experts on fiscal policy. First Tuesdays, our lunchtime policy seminars, typically draw a crowd of 100, including reporters from major newspapers and wire services. Our monthly radio series with WAMU-FM in Washington airs in 40 cities and reaches millions.

Identifying issues, choosing methodologies, conducting analyses, monitoring quality, and disseminating results are not easy. Few research institutes do all these steps well. But since taking shortcuts at any point can undermine the value of the enterprise, we follow this tough but time-tested regimen.
management techniques as results-based budgeting and “outcomes tracking,” in 2000 we completed a two-year study with the National Conference of State Governments. Building on years of work on such techniques, the Urban Institute has many voluminous data-bases under its wing. These include crime statistics that we manage for the National Institute of Justice; data generated for and by our simulation models; state-by-state details on Medicaid spending; and more.

We conducted the first nationally representative study of urban homelessness that included interviews of homeless people themselves. We also developed the first probability-based national estimate of users of homeless services. Including soup kitchens in our sampling frame, a never-before-tried method of statistically sampling “street people” proved more productive and less expensive than searching streets. Further innovations in our 1996 study, the National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients—which showed that the intervening economic boom had not reduced the number of homeless people—allowed us to cover suburban and rural areas, as well as central cities, and many more types of assistance programs.

In 2000, we estimated such vital statistics as the number of children of immigrants in U.S. elementary and secondary schools. Developing performance management techniques. As one example, thirteen years ago, we have led development of methodologies for measuring discrimination. With “paired testing,” first widely used by HUD to survey housing market practices in 1979, researchers can compare the treatment of Anglo-American applicants with that of racial and ethnic minorities as they compete for housing opportunities. In new applications developed at the Institute, paired testing measures discrimination in entry-level hiring, urban housing access, home insurance availability, and home mortgage applications.

In 2000, we estimated such vital statistics as the number of children of immigrants in U.S. elementary and secondary schools. Developing performance management techniques. As one example, thirteen years ago, we have led development of methodologies for measuring discrimination. With “paired testing,” first widely used by HUD to survey housing market practices in 1979, researchers can compare the treatment of Anglo-American applicants with that of racial and ethnic minorities as they compete for housing opportunities. In new applications developed at the Institute, paired testing measures discrimination in entry-level hiring, urban housing access, home insurance availability, and home mortgage applications.

In 2000, we estimated such vital statistics as the number of children of immigrants in U.S. elementary and secondary schools. Developing performance management techniques. As one example, thirteen years ago, we have led development of methodologies for measuring discrimination. With “paired testing,” first widely used by HUD to survey housing market practices in 1979, researchers can compare the treatment of Anglo-American applicants with that of racial and ethnic minorities as they compete for housing opportunities. In new applications developed at the Institute, paired testing measures discrimination in entry-level hiring, urban housing access, home insurance availability, and home mortgage applications.
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Evaluating Programs

An encyclopedic knowledge of how social services and programs are structured and what results they get. Our range of analysis extends from nationwide federal initiatives, such as Food Stamps and the school lunch program, to demonstration projects operated in several areas, to faith-based community action programs. The information we develop and organize is banked in reports, databases, and staff expertise. We share it both within the Institute and with government agencies, legislators, nonprofit organizations, business, and the public.

In 2000, we evaluated community policing initiatives, the STOP Block Grant Program (aimed at reducing violence against women), juvenile drug courts, the assault weapons ban, and reforms of federal firearms licensing. This work informed debates over reauthorizing the Crime Control Act.

We completed an evaluation of Medicaid managed care—access, use, and user satisfaction—and began assessments of Head Start, Florida’s statewide school voucher program, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ teacher certification program, among others.

A sense of which indicators best reveal a program’s or project’s chances of success. Neighborhood indicators are to community health as vital signs are to personal well-being. Without such fine-tuned measures—whether block-by-block crime statistics, local kindergarten enrollments, or voter registrations—citizens and leaders can’t evaluate general vitality or progress toward goals. Our National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership brings organizations from 13 cities together to develop new ways to assemble and present data, as well as to get community residents to collect and use such data themselves.

We also design and track indicators as part of our research on governing for results, arts and culture as socio-economic forces, and the well-being of children.

A deep understanding of the difficulties of implementing policy. Few collective endeavors are harder than translating political slogans—whether President Johnson’s “War on Poverty” in the 1960s or President Bush’s “Compassionate Conservatism” today—into practical public programs. If the program is well-designed, it still might be underfinanced. If it’s properly financed, it may be poorly run. If it’s well-run, it can outlive its utility. And so on.

Long experience with different types of programs, different types of successes and failures, and different program settings gives the Urban Institute an edge here. We know where to start looking for hidden troubles and assets. We also know how much and what kind of information researchers and policymakers require. After that, our quantitative and analytical skills kick in to get the job done.

In 2000, we evaluated programs in all 50 states. We also worked abroad in 22 countries, helping our counterparts adapt and apply the knowledge and insights we gained at home.

Unusual independence. Only hard-nosed evaluations are worth doing and worth paying for. The objectivity required of researchers conducting such evaluations carries over to the rest of our research projects.
any Urban Institute researchers are public intellectuals. Congress invites them to testify, the media asks them for interviews or comments, and their articles and op eds link research at the Institute to the policy debates of the day. Institute staff also work behind the scenes to educate policymakers, the public, and the press. We help reporters sort through conflicting numbers or confusing program details. We share and explore our findings with other researchers. We brief government agencies and the media on key social policy issues. We publish texts used in university classrooms and by program administrators. We also make our findings available to advocacy groups. The events and releases highlighted here typify dozens of others that took place in 2000:

Conference on Medicare Reform. After the report of the National Bipartisan Commission on Medicare’s Future was released, we convened policy experts in Washington to look at the findings and at other proposals for restructuring Medicare.

Social Security and Families Conference. Experts met at the Institute to examine proposed Social Security reforms with changing family structures in mind. The goal was to make sure that poverty-prone groups—widows and widowers, divorcees, and single elderly people—aren’t forgotten. Our primer on the current system’s shortcomings summarizes the issue for the public, and a forthcoming UI Press book and conference will help frame the debate for policy analysts and legislators.

Symposium in Los Angeles on Immigrant Integration. With many immigration bills pending before Congress, we joined forces with the Carnegie Endowment, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Immigration Forum to stage a symposium on integrating newcomers into the American mainstream. Two issues held up to the light for policymakers and analysts were the increasing movement of immigrant populations to second stops that aren’t prepared for the influx, and the challenges and opportunities implied by the increasing “Mexicanization” of immigrant flows into the United States.

Release of the National Survey of America’s Families. We added new information from the second round of this unique survey—one of few sources of national and state-level information on family well-being—into the public debate over the supports needed by those leaving welfare for work. A key finding of our Snapshots II series was that many families playing by the rules still can’t make ends meet—important for policymakers to understand as the reassessment of the key welfare reform bill approaches.

Regional seminars for healthcare policymakers and administrators. With foundation support, we briefed state legislators and senior state health officials at three regional conferences on healthcare reform. By sharing with them what their counterparts in neighboring states were doing to expand health insurance coverage, we helped to jumpstart dialogue and proposals once participants were back on the job.

Media spotlights on election issues. Institute researchers were called on throughout 2000 to put campaign issues into historical and statistical perspective. We commented on sustaining economic growth, managing the surplus, revamping Medicare and Social Security, and other topics for PBS, CBC, MSBNC, CNN, C-SPAN, Fox News, MSNBC, and local radio and TV stations across the country. We were also quoted in Time, Newsweek, The Washington Post, The New York Times, the Washington Post, National Journal, the International Herald Tribune, the Wall Street Journal, and dozens of other dailies and weeklies.

Forum on what the District of Columbia needs from the new administration. On election day, we convened a forum on D.C.’s priorities for the new administration. Invited community and business leaders, activists, policy analysts, and the head of the federally mandated D.C. Financial Control Board butted heads but also came up with an impressive “to do” list for the next president. The event was moderated by radio station WAMU’s “D.C. Politics Hour” co-host Mark Plotkin.

Seminar on the Clinton Legacy. On the eve of President Clinton’s departure, we invited other researchers and the media to the Institute to discuss the accomplishments and missed opportunities of the past eight years. Our presentations on the economy and the budget, welfare reform, education, and healthcare covered both milestone events and trends, outlining a strong—if mixed—legacy for the 42nd President.

Conferences in Eastern Europe on decentralization. In Macedonia and Hungary, our International Activities Center presented our USAID-sponsored survey of fiscal decentralization initiatives in Eastern Europe during the 1990s. The educators, policy analysts, and trainers invited from these countries are expected to apply and disseminate practical knowledge gained on municipal finance, power-sharing among various levels of government, and more. Much of the material reviewed at the conferences is now available in a handbook and CD-ROM package.

Choice award to The Encyclopedia of Taxation and Tax Policy. An Urban Institute Press book was named Choice magazine as an “Outstanding Academic Title” of 2000. Some 25,000 books are nominated and just over 600 are picked for “their excellence in scholarship... their significance... to the field, and their value as an important—often the first—treatment of a specific subject.”

Testimony on Capitol Hill. Our researchers testified often in 2000. We accepted invitations from the Senate Finance Committee to discuss Medicare reform. The House Subcommittees on Health and Environment and on Oversight and Investigations, as well as the Committee on Veteran’s Affairs, asked us to comment on liability for medical errors. The House Committee on Workplace and Education invited our comments on labor shortages. For other committees, we testified on using general funds to pay for entitlements, declining participation in the Food Stamp program, flexible funding for child welfare services, and more.

For Well Done

Several Institute researchers were honored for career achievements this year:

Mary Kopczynski won the Louis Brownlow Award for the best Public Administration Review article written by a practitioner.

Harry Hatry received the Association of Government Accountants’ 50th anniversary award for outstanding service promoting government accountability.

Joshua Weiner of the Health Policy Center was named R.M. Gibson Visiting Fellow of the Australian Association of Gerontology.

In the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy, Mark Hager won the Gabriel Rudney Award for best dissertation from the Association for Research on Nonprofits and Voluntary Action. Center director Elizabeth Boris was named one of the 50 most influential leaders in the nonprofit sector by the Nonprofit Times for the second year in a row.
The exceptionally low unemployment rate, welfare reform's emphasis on work, and changes in family structure invite Americans to rethink what roles work and supportive services should play for low-skilled and vulnerable populations. We have to pose hard questions: Are training and employment programs keeping former welfare recipients' heads above water? Will the hardest to employ ever find work? Which work supports help struggling families the most? If a vibrant economy alone isn't enough, what additional support services are the best shields against homelessness, substance abuse, and domestic violence? And what types of programs prepare young adults and welfare leavers for work? The Urban Institute's Center on Labor and Social Policy grapples with these and related policy issues.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000

We developed new first-in-a-decade estimates of the nation's homeless population. Point-in-time homelessness rates rose overall, we found. More important, we also identified a much larger pool of very poor people who experienced a spell of homelessness at some point during a year.

Our widely publicized review of affirmative action programs showed, contrary to accepted wisdom, that they have little or no negative economic effect.

Our analysis of low-wage labor markets revealed that large metropolitan areas have provided enough jobs for welfare recipients without taking jobs from other less-educated workers or lowering their wages. We also studied three intertwined influences that affect how low-wage workers fare in the labor force: prospects for advancement, job turnover, and the networking opportunities.

This year, we laid ambitious groundwork for synthesizing data on employers and employees. Preliminary findings: employers are quite willing to hire welfare-to-workers, high turnover in this group traces back to social and family factors rather than skills deficits, and firms within the same industry vary dramatically in terms of wages paid, kinds of workers hired, and productivity rates achieved.
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Selected Publications


"Father Involvement with Their Nonmarital Children: Patterns, Determinants, and Effects on Their Earnings," by R. Lerman with E. Sorensen, in Marriage and Family Review.


Selected Publications

- Structuring the Inquiry into Advocacy, edited by E. Reid.
- Poverty in the District of Columbia—Then and Now, by C. De Vita, E. Twombly, and C. Manjarrez.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000

- Work completed on the nonprofit database—housed in our National Center for Charitable Statistics—makes it the nation’s largest and most comprehensive resource on nonprofit organizations, with some 400 dimensions identified for each organization. Another ambitious project finished this year is our tax model on charitable giving. We use it to analyze and compare how various tax proposals might affect charitable donations and government revenue.

In 2000, we launched a new seminar series to explore the legal and regulatory framework governing nonprofit advocacy. We are trying to find out how this framework affects nonprofits’ involvement in public education, lobbying, and election-related activities. We also held a conference to discuss perspectives on the property tax exemption for nonprofits. The ideas generated at this conference will lead to a path-breaking book on the topic.

We are also taking advantage of new technology to display our research results in new ways. For the District of Columbia and four other cities, we produced maps showing the location of community organizations and such local social and demographic characteristics as the number of children living in poverty. Such maps help grant-makers and policymakers see both community capacity and potential needs.
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HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000

- We conducted the first systematic analysis of the national E-Rate program, created in 1996 to wire the nation’s schools and libraries for the 21st century. Looking closely at whether the program helped close the “digital divide,” we found that public schools got the lion’s share of the $4 billion available and that the poorest districts got the most funding per student. Larger districts also appear to have taken more advantage than smaller districts have of the E-Rate program.

With the Population Studies Center, EPC unveiled a statistical portrait of immigrant teenagers in the United States. An examination of the organization of secondary schools showed how these schools failed to meet the needs of immigrant students who, as a result, are overlooked and underserved.

We also launched an evaluation of Florida’s bellwether voucher program in collaboration with researchers from Princeton and the University of Florida. We spent the year collecting baseline data from teachers, schools, and school districts on school programs and practices, resource allocation, staffing patterns, and students’ background and performance. We will continue gathering data for at least another year and start examining how public schools respond to whatever competitive pressures emanate from the voucher program. Then we will assess vouchers’ effects on student performance.
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A at the top of the nation’s policy agenda, education reform wears many faces. The Urban Institute’s Education Policy Center studies school vouchers, teacher certification, recruitment, after-school programs, educational opportunities for immigrant students, and achievement standards. We also evaluate major national programs. Three under study now are Head Start, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and Comprehensive School Reform Models.

Selected Publications

- Overlooked and Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools, by J. Ruiz-de-Velasco and M. Fox, with B. Clewell.
- E-Rate and the Digital Divide: A Preliminary Analysis from the Integrated Studies of Educational Technology, by M. Puma, D. Chaplin, and A. Papa, for the U.S. Department of Education.
- Does Teacher Certification Matter? High School Teacher Certification Status and Student Achievement,
- Review of Teacher Recruitment Programs, by B. Clewell with K. Darke, L. Forcier, and S. Manes, for the U.S. Department of Education.
- Standards-Based Reform at the School District Level: Findings from a National Survey and Case Studies, by J. Hannaway with B. Turnbull, for the Department of Education.
HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000

This year our contribution to the knowledge base needed to make sound healthcare policy was matched by methodological advances that should help clarify the national debate. Published in Health Affairs, analysis of survey data from the Urban Institute’s 1999 National Survey of America’s Families showed the early impacts of state initiatives to insure more children and of higher rates of employer coverage owing to the exuberant economy. New modeling advances we made also allowed us to begin figuring out how tax credits for health insurance will influence the number of Americans with employer sponsored or individual coverage.

To understand how the State Children’s Health Insurance Program works in practice, we carried out on-site studies. In 18 states, we looked at program design, outreach, cost-sharing, benefits packages, the “crowd out” effect, and the use of managed care.

With more and more participants turning to managed care within Medicaid, we grappled with why states have problems attracting and keeping health plans. Looking closely at the managed care market in six cities, we found the key issues to be difficulty in negotiating with providers and low payment rates coupled with administrative burdens.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000

Examining how the current retirement system works for various family types, we updated two models. One simulates the household effects of current and proposed rules governing Social Security eligibility and pay-outs. The other, designed for the Social Security Administration, helps assess alternative social security benefit structures. Related studies addressed the retirement decisions of couples and individuals.

Our tax specialists analyzed how state tax systems treat low-income families. We also compared the impacts of various proposals to revamp the federal income system. Tracking a broad lens on tax...
The Urban Institute’s International Activities Center provides research services and technical assistance to new democracies in Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Latin America, and Asia. We help others adapt and apply what we have learned about social sector reform, decentralization, the development of civil society, housing policy, and public finance.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000**

- In Armenia, we have developed a much needed program for those still stuck in temporary shelter after losing their homes in the 1988 earthquake. As noted in a front-page story in the Washington Post, this pilot initiative allows participating households to move into permanent housing available on the market for a fraction of what it costs to build new homes.

- In Albania, we incubated and nurtured a first-of-its-kind dialogue between central and local governments on decentralization issues. One welcome result has been a new law that defines the function and structure of local government, the terms of intergovernmental relations, and financing mechanisms. Another has been amendments to laws covering local government property, taxes, and revenues, changes that make it easier for local governments to operate independent of central government control and to respond better to local concerns.

- In Russia, with our Moscow-based partner, the Institute for Urban Economics, we are working to upgrade social service delivery in several cities. The challenges are consolidating a mishmash of subsidies into more effective assistance, streamlining program administration, and channeling assistance through community organizations.
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**Selected Publications**

- Decentralization in Central and Eastern Europe, by T. Levitas, J. Pigey, J. Kalman, V. Kamenickova, and G. Peterson, for USAID.
- Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in Eastern Europe: A Sourcebook for Policy Analysts and Trainers, by F. Conway, B. Desilets, P. Epstein, and J. Pigey, for USAID.
- Social Safety Nets at the Local Level in Russia: Case Studies of Four Cities, by the International Activities Center staff.
- Poland: Housing Finance at the Millennium, by S. Merrill, M. Lea, D. Diamond, and K. Temkin, for Price Waterhouse Cooper LLP.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000**

- The new center sponsored two kick-off events. One brought leading academics and practitioners to Washington to discuss prisoner re-entry—new data, recent policy changes, state variations in policy and practice, the underlying challenges, and research findings and gaps. The second event was a national forum on crime’s decline. Two dozen national experts—many of them co-authors of The Crime Drop in America, a new Cambridge University Press volume—met to sift through the evidence on the relationship between the crime rate and various social, demographic, economic, and political forces.

- At sites in Minnesota, Michigan, and Massachusetts, we began testing the hypothesis that strong judicial oversight of perpetrators of domestic violence can reduce the incidence of repeat offenses, increase the offender’s accountability and the justice system’s, and better protect victims. Results, expected in 2003, should help policymakers and justice officials determine whether combining the court’s vigil with graduated sanctions for offenders and comprehensive services for victims works.

Another line of inquiry for the Justice Center involves the question, How can drug courts be adapted to work for juvenile offenders? To find out, we are first analyzing the structures and processes used in drug courts for juveniles today. Later, in scattered cities from Orlando to Missoula, we will evaluate the effects of judicially supervised treatment on the subsequent drug use and criminal activity of youth.

**STAFF**

- Adele V. Harrell (Center Director)
- Jeremy Travis (Senior Fellow)
- Peter Reuter (Visiting Scholar)
- Steven Anlian
- Louis Baghdasarian
- Brian Desilets
- Tamara Canty
- Francis Conway
- Sam Coxon
- John Doane
- Peter Epstein
- Jerome Gallagher
- Renee Hendry
- Olga Kaganova
- Harlott Kattura
- Bart Kennedy
- Rebecca Lawrence
- Katharine Mark
- Edward Mazuroski
- Marii Mikhaelen
- Gretchen Mikleska
- Ritu Nayyar-Stone
- Juliana Pigey
- Carol Rabenhorst
- Katie Reikofski
- Clare Romanik
- Eduardo Serrano
- Martha Sickles
- Malcolm Simpson
- Michael Stevens
- Steven Swanson
- Mary Tomlinson
- Charles Undeland
- Makiko Ueno
- Lee Walton

**Selected Publications**

- Brick by Brick: Dismantling the Border Between Juvenile and Adult Justice,” by J. Butts and O. Mitchell, in The Crime Drop in America, a new Cambridge University Press volume—met to sift through the evidence on the relationship between the crime rate and various social, demographic, economic, and political forces.

The national dialog on crime, justice, and community safety often gets stalled by emotional rhetoric. To help keep the debate on productive ground, the Urban Institute created the Justice Policy Center in 2000 to supply the public and policymakers with nonpartisan perspectives and fresh data. Building on the Institute’s Law and Behavior Program, we manage the federal justice system’s massive national databases for the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice. New initiatives on prisoner re-entry into mainstream society are under way, and we are also expanding our studies of juvenile courts.

**Selected Publications**

- Specialized Felony Domestic Violence Courts: Lessons on Implementation and Impacts from the King County Experience, by F. Conway, B. Desilets, P. Epstein, and J. Pigey, for USAID.
- Municipal Real Property Asset Management: An Application of Private Sector Practices, by D. Kaganova, R. Nayyar-Stone, and G. Peterson, for USAID.
- Social Safety Nets at the Local Level in Russia: Case Studies of Four Cities, by the International Activities Center staff.
- Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in Eastern Europe: A Sourcebook for Policy Analysts and Trainers, by F. Conway, B. Desilets, P. Epstein, and J. Pigey, for USAID.
- Poland: Housing Finance at the Millennium, by S. Merrill, M. Lea, D. Diamond, and K. Temkin, for Price Waterhouse Cooper LLP.
- Municipal Real Property Asset Management: An Application of Private Sector Practices, by D. Kaganova, R. Nayyar-Stone, and G. Peterson, for USAID.

The Crime Rate and Incarceration Rates in the United States, by O. Mitchell, in Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in Eastern Europe: A Sourcebook for Policy Analysts and Trainers, by F. Conway, B. Desilets, P. Epstein, and J. Pigey, for USAID.

The Crime Drop in America, by J. Roth, J. Ryan, S. Merrill, and K. Temkin, for Price Waterhouse Cooper LLP.

>> International Activities Center

>> Justice Policy Center
Location matters. Communities where Americans live—housing developments, neighborhoods, cities, and suburbs—profoundly affect their quality of life and access to opportunities. The Urban Institute’s Metro Center analyzes the varied forces shaping urban communities, especially the roles of federal, state, and local policies.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000**

At the federal level, we helped the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) strengthen the support services that residents of severely distressed public housing developments receive when the buildings they live in are demolished or renovated. And we continued to help HUD assess its efforts to encourage low-income families to use federal housing vouchers to move to better neighborhoods. These studies will track families making such moves and measure any changes in housing, neighborhood quality, employment, income, education, and overall well-being that may result.

In 33 states, Metro Center researchers studied emerging efforts to “manage for results” and developed recommendations for making strategic planning and performance-based management work better at the state level. We also conducted a first-of-its-kind survey of how urban Americans participate in artistic and cultural activities. This survey showed that traditional images of cultural participation—visiting an art museum or attending a symphony concert, for example—are far too narrow to capture the many roles that arts and culture play in the life of urban communities.

We also worked in our hometown. With other Urban Institute research centers, the Metro Center conducted a wide range of studies on the District of Columbia and its suburbs and launched a D.C. policy forum series to share findings with local policymakers and community activists.

**STAFF**

MARGERY AUSTIN TURNER (Center Director) | MARTIN ABRAVANEL | JULIE ADAMS | CLAUDIA ARANDA | BEATA BEDNARZ | JEANETTE BRADLEY | MARGARET BROWNE | PATRICK CORVINGTON | MARY CUNNINGHAM | MICHELLE DELAIR | DARYL DIER | KADJA FERRYMAN | JOHN FOSTER-BAY | STEFAN FREIBERG | ERIN GODFREY | AARON GRAHAM | LAURA HARRIS | HARRY HATRY | CHRIS HAYES | DIANE HENDRICKS | MARIA-ROSARIO JACKSON | JENNIFER JOHNSON | DAVI KIM | THOMAS KINGLEY | MARY KOPCZYNSKI | DIANE LEVY | ELLAINE MORGUE | KATHY PETTIT | SUSAN POPKIN | ELYNNE STANFORD | ROBIN REDFORD | ELLE RICH | MARK RUBIN | JEFFREY SHUMWAY | CHRISTOPHER SNOW | ROBIN SMITH | PETER TALIAN | KEN TEMKIN | SHEAVONIE THOMPSON | ALLEN TURNER | MARK TURNER | AVIS VITAL | ELISA VINSON | CHRISTOPHER WALKER | TIM WARE

Shifts in the economy and gender roles, improvements in healthcare delivery, new policies and programs, and a changing population growth and change. The Urban Institute’s Population Studies Center scrutinizes these forces to understand how and why the U.S. population is continually changing. Our current research looks at immigration, mortality trends, sexual and reproductive health, adolescent risk-taking, childcare, and child welfare.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000**

In New York and Los Angeles, we surveyed 3,400 immigrant households to gauge their economic mobility, health, and well-being in the wake of welfare reform’s restrictions on services and financial assistance for these newcomers. Our findings represent a major new source of information on today’s U.S. immigrant population amid rapid policy change.

In 2000, we issued three timely reports on risks taken by teens. The first—a statistical portrait of substance use, violence, suicide attempts, and potentially dangerous sexual behavior—shows how risk-taking behavior changes in this age group while the number of teens taking multiple risks holds steady. A surprise of note to parents and policymakers alike: the same teens who experiment with risky behavior often also get good grades, play school sports, or toe the line in other ways. The second report reviews what is known about successful interventions to reduce such risky behavior. The third addresses the need to put sexual and reproductive health front and center in a broad health initiative aimed at young men.

We also helped inform the national debate on childcare for America’s working families. Our analysis of data from the Urban Institute’s National Survey of America’s Families revealed which arrangements parents pick and what they pay for childcare. For many states, we collected the first-ever state-level data. One such finding: while about one-third of American kids aged six to twelve spent time alone in 1997 while their parents worked, only one-fifth in Minnesota did and over one-half in Michigan did.

**STAFF**

FREYA SONENSTEN (Center Director) | GINA ADAMS | SARAH ADELMAN | ROSEANA BESS | NATALYA BOLHUN | JEFFREY CAPIZANO | RANDY CAPPS | SONJA DRUMGOOLE | HARRIET DUKEPEP | JENNIFER ENRI | MARVIN EISEN | MICHAEL FIX | CHRIS FURGIOLE | ALYSA FREITZ | GARY GALIES | ROB GEEN | AMY JANZ | KATHY KORTEKAMP | LAURENCE LAGIARON | JACOB LESS-UTTLE | LAURA DUBBSTEIN LINDBORG | SHEILA LOPEZ | KARIN MALM | SCOTT MCKENNA | JEFFREY PASSEL | STACEY PHILLIPS | RAVEJ RAMCHAND | KATHLEEN SNYDER | MATTHEW STAGNER | WAYNE VROMAN | WENDY ZIMMERMANN

Selected Publications

- Earning a Living Wage: Metro Differences in Opportunity and Inequality for Adult Males with Low Education Levels, by J. Foster-Bey.
- Section 8 Mobility and Neighborhood Health, by M. Turner, S. Popkin, and M. Cunningham.
The Assessing the New Federalism Project

Welfare reform and the new State Children's Health Insurance Program represent a swing of the political pendulum toward relying on states to define and structure U.S. social policy. As these new laws were passed, the Institute’s Assessing the New Federalism Project (ANF) began monitoring state policy choices and tracking how children and families fare. Drawing on expertise from throughout the Institute, the ANF project represents a unique approach to understanding the transformation of the American social safety net into one organized around the notion that low-income parents must work.

Since 1996, eighteen foundations have funded Assessing the New Federalism's studies and surveys and have helped disseminate the results. This unusually broad-based venture speaks to public interest in the transformation of the American social safety net into one organized around the notion that low-income parents must work.

Selected Publications

- Snapshots of America's Families II, by the Assessing the New Federalism staff.
- Child Care Arrangements for Children under Five, by J. Capizzano, G. Adams, and F. Sonenstein.
- Three Years into SCHIP: What States Are and Are Not Spending, by G. Kenny, F. Ullman, and A. Weil.
- Racial and Ethnic Disparities: Key Findings from the National Survey of America's Families, by S. Staveteig and A. Wigton.
- Economic Conditions and State Tax Policy: Experience over the Last Decade and Implications for the Future, by D. Merriman.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2000

We released Snapshots of America’s Families II—findings from our 1999 National Survey of America’s Families. These briefs show how household income, employment, health, and well-being have changed in the first two years after welfare reform. Like all other ANF research, Snapshots are available on our Web site.

We also brought new information to the debate over who’s minding the nation’s children. And we delivered the first-ever state-by-state data on families’ experiences with childcare, estimating the number of young children who take care of themselves after school and the number of hours these kids are on their own.

Other issues covered in the dozens of ANF briefs and papers released in 2000 ranged from the reasons behind growth in state budgets in the 1990s, to health insurance coverage for the near-elderly, and to work among teenagers from poor families.

STAFF | Alan Weil (Center Director) | Fritz Scheuren (Senior Fellow) | Tamara Black | Ken Finagold | Alex Harrington | Phyllis Jackson | Harold Leibovitz | Olga Popovic | Robin McCullough-Harlin | Bonnie Nowak | Adam Safir | Sarah Staveteig | Kevin Wang | Alyssa Wigton
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THE URBAN INSTITUTE
The communications umbrella covers the UI Press/Office of Publications and the Office of Public Affairs, which work as partners. Key functions and activities include:

**BOOKS**
In-depth analyses of public policy and program issues. **Examples:** Improving the Odds: Increasing the Effectiveness of Publicly Funded Training; Vouchers and the Provision of Public Services

**CONFERENCES**

**DIRECTORIES AND GUIDES**
Information-rich compendiums for policymakers, program managers, and researchers. **Examples:** Young Men’s Sexual and Reproductive Health; Teen Risk-Taking: Promising Prevention Programs and Approaches

**EDUCATION**
Briefings and lectures on the Institute’s work, structure, and history for students, practitioners in training, researchers and dignitaries from abroad, and public officials.

**FIRST TUESDAYS**
Monthly luncheon roundtables on issues of national interest. **Examples:** “Prisoner Recentry: Who’s Coming Home?”; “Beyond School-Based Sex Education: Promoting Responsible Behavior”; “Housing Vouchers: How Well Do They Work?”; “Child Care for Young Children: A First Look Across States”; “Are There Good Jobs for Low-Skilled Workers”; “After a Decade of Change Is the Tax System Any Better?”

**IN BRIEF**
A monthly notice of upcoming events, current research, new publications, and outreach.

**MEDIA Liaison**
Close work with the national press corps and state newspapers and broadcast media to provide facts and perspectives on emerging trends and breaking news.

**OP ED**
Policy perspectives for broad distribution to state, regional, and national newspapers. **Examples:** “Suicide: Won’t Improve Care” (Los Angeles Times); “Policing Police Misconduct” (New York Post); “Dr. Bradley or Dr. Gore?” (Washington Post); “One Tough Plant” (New York Times): “Will CHA’s New Plan Help Residents?” (Chicago Tribune); “Where is Welfare Reform Heading?” (San Francisco Chronicle)

**POLICY BRIEFS**
Concise and timely explorations of policy issues and choices. **Examples:** Extending the Charitable Deduction to Nonitemizers; Policy Issues and Options; Employee Stock Ownership Plans: A Status Report, Sharing the Pain of Social Security and Medicare Reform

**REPORTS**
Research findings, results from program evaluations, perspectives on emerging trends, problems with the social safety net, and policy opportunities. **Examples:** Structuring the Inquiry into Advocacy, vol. 1. The Low-Wage Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities for Economic Self-Sufficiency. Homeownership and Housing Finance Policy in the Former Soviet Bloc: Costly Populism; Section 8 Mobility and Neighborhood Health; Economic Consequences of an Aging Population

**SOURCEBOOK FOR REPORTERS**
A biennially updated guide to Institute expertise.

**SPECIAL PROJECTS**
One-off publications or events that highlight unexpected research findings or extraordinary scholarship, bring cross-cutting or synergistic work from two or more centers to the fore, or sharpen the public debate on pressing issues. **Examples:** Overlooked and Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools, Teen Risk-Taking: A Statistical Portrait

**TESTIMONY AND PRESENTATIONS**
Facts, background, commentary, and research findings delivered to members of Congress and other decision-makers, fellow researchers, and program managers.

**UPDATES**
Bulletins on recent Urban Institute conferences and legislative testimony to keep the public posted.

**WEB SITE**
An award-winning electronic tour of the Institute’s research, publications, staff roster, and activities (www.urban.org).

**STAFF**
Kathleen Courrier, Vice President for Communication

**WEB SITE**
UI Press/Office of Publications
Frederick Custer, Director

**WEB SITE**
IT also developed a computerized system that allows Metro Center researchers to enter, track, and cross-reference information of policy issues and choices.

**WEB SITE**
An even more ambitious IT project in 2000 was working with Institute researchers to convert our NSAF database to another format compatible with our micro-simulation models. Now the groundwork has been laid for using this wealth of data as input to simulations of how tax, welfare, or health insurance changes affect households.
Financial Statement

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL INFORMATION
For Fiscal Years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$76,900,000</td>
<td>$75,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>12,300,000</td>
<td>9,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets</td>
<td>64,600,000</td>
<td>66,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities and Net Assets</td>
<td>76,900,000</td>
<td>75,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Activities

- **Revenues**: 62,100,000
- **Expenses**: (61,100,000)
- **Subtotal**: 1,000,000

Non-Operating Activities

- **Revenues**: (200,000)
- **Expenses & Transfers**: (2,800,000)
- **Subtotal**: (3,000,000)

Total Change in Net Assets

- **Total Change in Net Assets**: (2,000,000)
- **Net Assets Beginning of Year**: 66,600,000
- **Net Assets End of Year**: $64,600,000

President’s Fund

The President’s Fund was established in December 1999 in recognition of William Gorham, the Institute’s founding President, and his service of more than 32 years. The endowed fund gives the Institute flexibility to pursue independent short-term research, bring together policymakers and analysts for debate, and finance capital projects. To date, contributions have been received from:

- Joan T. Bok
- Andrew Brimmer
- James E. and Diane W. Burke Foundation
- Carsey Family Foundation
- John Deutch
- ExxonMobil Foundation
- Ruth Z. Fleishman Fund
- Lucio Noto
- Hugh B. Price
- Price Family Fund
- Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Marcus
- Robert S. McNamara
- Charles L. Mee, Jr.
- J. Irwin Miller
- Arjay and Frances Miller Foundation
- Eleanor Holmes Norton
- J. Irwin Miller
- Arjay and Frances Miller Foundation
- Lucio Noto
- Hugh B. Price
- Price Family Fund
- Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Marcus
- Robert S. McNamara
- Charles L. Mee, Jr.

Contributions to the fund can be sent to Drew Wynn, the Institute’s development director.