

EVOLUTION OF A RACE/HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM

George T. Frey
Assistant to the Superintendent
Community Relations and Integration Services Division

Presented to:

The American Educational Research Association
1984 Annual Meeting
April 23-27, 1984
New Orleans, Louisiana

EVOLUTION OF A RACE/HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM

By George T. Frey

INTRODUCTION

San Diego Unified School District was not immune to the tremors which shook the very foundations of American institutional structures during the racial and civil movements of the 1960's. Predictably, as with institutional counterparts throughout the nation, human relations programs flourished, ethnic studies classes entered the curriculum, and dialogue groups sprang into existence. In spite of these highly charged, participatory involvement opportunities, the institution itself was able to avoid significant change, avoid accountability, and leave unrecognized the lack of social and educational equity.

Schools remained segregated, skin shades continued to define relationships and expectations, educational opportunities differed, prejudices and racism, whether covert or observable, remained alive and well--and children suffered.

It became increasingly apparent that the isolated, scattered responses to human rights and recognition of unqualified human dignity were not beginning to approach the root of the problem. Students were being educated differently--some groups better than others. We were a segregated school system! The magnitude of the changes needed would challenge conceptual powers--would be acted upon through band-aid approaches--band-aid approaches that would substitute for substantive goals and objectives.

As it became apparent that the institution would not change itself, the certainty that the courts would be called upon became imminent and in 1967, a class

action suit, Kari Carlin vs. the Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District, was filed by majority and minority parents on behalf of their children. The suit alleged infringement of constitutional rights due to lack of integrated learning opportunities. Ten years later, in 1977, the first court order put decision-making power related to integration under court jurisdiction. Thus, the school system relinquished some of its decision-making powers.

Although court intervention had not been an unrecognized threat to the school system, the court's entrance was not perceived as fair or warranted. The system viewed itself as having been responsive to the need to desegregate, for in the early 1970's the district had implemented the Voluntary Ethnic Enrollment Program (commonly known as VEEP). This program allowed students to cross school boundary lines, if by doing so would improve the ethnic balance at sending and receiving schools. The program was one-way busing since more than 99% of the students actively involved were ethnic minorities.

In addition to VEEP, some magnet schools were established and offered special interest curriculums. Mixed racial outings and voluntary pairing for summer studies promoted limited cross-racial exposure for a few students. To the district these programs provided proof of its recognition and responsiveness to the "race" problem.

The court did not agree. Among the findings, the presiding judge, Louis Welsh, indicated that part of the district's recalcitrance could be found in its "desegregation" focus as opposed to an "integration" commitment. In his 1977 Decision and Order, Judge Welsh effectively called this to the district's attention with the following suggestion: "The school board may consider the appoint-

ment of an 'Integration Task Force.' The word 'integration' would serve as a constant reminder that more is expected than the simple mixing of people." In other words the judge was advocating the premise that there is a fundamental, significant difference in perspective between desegregation and integration. Desegregation implies the need for an intellectual reaction to a problem of logistics. Numbers and location are the focus of change when following a desegregation mode. In contrast to this is integration which refers to an ethical and moral commitment to basic human equality. When in this frame of reference, the focus for change becomes attitudes, interaction patterns, and understandings which lead to a recognition of the other person's value. Integration will not be realized until the two-way nature of giving and taking is recognized. As long as one race views itself as the givers but sees nothing of value to take, then human worth remains stratified.

Thus, from its inception, the court order, which was ultimately to impact every school site and central office department, was directed not toward desegregation but toward the larger, more complex goal of true integration. The GOAL mandated significant institutional change. In a concerted drive the district needed to address and change attitudes--long ingrained and buried in subconscious behavior, curriculum deficiencies, procedural inequalities, and performance discrepancies. All systems needed to have an interlocking cohesive purpose capable of meeting both the collective and individual needs of its youthful population. In order to do this there needed to be a gelling force which could bind the parts into a whole. Such a force had to be able to affect change at the behavioral and attitudinal levels relevant to job performance and interpersonal relationships. Race and human relations was to be that force--the most nebulous,

ambiguous institutional thorn was to lay at the heart of a successful court order compliance. In the 1982 Memorandum of Intended Decision resulting from the annual review and evaluation, the court said, "This program (race/human relations) should be one of the most important, if not the most important program in the school district's desegregation efforts."

Thus, a race/human relations program became the gelling or support structure needed for integration implementation. San Diego City Schools recognized this relationship and began to plan accordingly.

In the decade (1967 to 1977) separating the filing of the Carlin Case and the issuance of the first court directive, the known importance of individual or collective attitudes and behavior on successful delivery systems served as a catalyst for district efforts. Therefore, a race/human relations program was established. Today's comprehensive program and efforts are descendants of the visions and concepts behind the original planning. Unfortunately, at the outset, the scope and potential of these first efforts were restricted by the structure within which they were to operate and by some who were charged with pushing the buttons. So, while most intentions were laudable and commendable, they were often a shot in the dark. An institution thrives on status quo or entropy, resisting the effort and energy costs inherent in change.

During this time, 1967-1977, efforts were being made to expand the sensitivities and awareness levels of those people having direct student contact. Trained district personnel served as inservice trainers and interaction facilitators to school sites. School administrators contracted with consultants specializing in

human relations. Student and community input was sought and, more importantly, assigned credence. In a review of events leading to the current status of our race/human relations program, we are remiss if recognition is not given to the successes and ground work established in these early years. Many individual programs and efforts of that time serve as prototypes for the most exciting components of today's efforts.

However, in 1977 the court correctly identified the major weakness of these early answers. The successes were spotty. Efforts were the responsibility of the sites and the degree to which the sites functioned was usually determined by the catalytic actions of a handful of people. The systems of the institution itself were not being used to chart new organizational directions or sculpture new visions. Persuasive approaches to change needed to be augmented by the force of authority and site autonomy needed to be laced with accountability to an overall system. This was the situation Judge Welsh faced as he wrote his decision, thus his response spoke to a system, not to a person.

"The 'human relations program,' partially designed to bring about understanding among races, has been inadequate. Students have not been prepared for each other. Teachers attend human relations workshops but there is little emphasis on problems of ethnic cultural shock or the needs of minority youngsters. Moreover, there is no follow-up to see that the participants at these workshops are assigned to set up similar programs in their schools. The whole subject of human relations is left to the discretion of each principal. Involvement of the court is required."

Recognizing the accuracy of these comments and because the people in the insti-

tution did believe in integration and equal human value, the district implemented an ambitious plan requiring that all schools and all district personnel experience ten hours of human relations inservicing a year. This meant that every student in San Diego City Schools--approximately 111,000--would receive guidance in developing attitudes and behaviors regarding interpersonal skills. Additionally, all employees in and out of the classroom would have the opportunity for enriched and extended new understandings and techniques. Both collegial and teacher-student relationships would be positively influenced.

The beauty of these goals was that the program was to be a partnership with and within the schools. Each school would retain its autonomy and uniqueness by assessing its own needs from which site personnel would design appropriate staff and student race/human relations training components. The bridge between site and central administration lay in the requirement that each site was to have its plan filed with the corresponding central division and was required to submit reports indicating compliance.

The district in turn trained and maintained qualified facilitators and support services which were available on an as-requested basis. At their discretion, schools could use these services or develop their own objectives and implementation resources.

Quality of programs at some schools was outstanding--students began to interact and relate in new ways. Teachers were learning new techniques and finding new approaches and rewards. Exciting things were happening throughout the district. People were seeking and assuming ownership in change and growth.

Although the intent of this program should not be questioned, the results fell short of both the court's and the district's expectations. Pockets of resistance remained; some sites did not respond with enthusiasm; some personnel did not accept the view that change was required or desirable.

Unfortunately, the district program did not have qualitative safeguards to control such situations. The monitoring in the program revolved around quantity rather than quality. So, as in the pre-court situation, what went on at a campus was determined by the commitment of its personnel. There is no question that the number of exemplary programs increased or that many people were highly committed to positive change, but, in too many places, the "build your own program" was not working. Lack of equity in and out of the classroom remained. Staff and students more often than not continued to view each other via stereotypical perceptions. Performance expectations were not yet free of ethnic bias. Suspicion and distrust had not been eliminated from employee interactions. By 1982, Judge Franklin Orfield, the jurist who replaced Judge Welsh, concluded that changes in the area of attitude and behavior had not occurred to the degree needed, in spite of overwhelming signs of progress in some areas and locations. Consequently, he issued a new order charging the district to create a districtwide non-site negotiable plan for race/human relations. By court order this was to be a mandated, long-term program encompassing the training needs of all students and all employees. In his earliest memorandum of intended decision he wrote:

"It has become abundantly clear that the race/human relations program is spotty and uneven at best and virtually nonexistent at worst. This program should be one of the most important, if not the most important program in

the school district's desegregation efforts. It is ordered that the school district centrally produce a complete race/human relations course of classroom instruction for each of the 13 grades and require classroom presentation of this course."

"It is further ordered that the school district centrally produce a complete race/human relations program insofar as it relates to the indoctrination of teachers and other school employees."

Without question, the initial reaction to this edict generated the "can it be done" fears that all great challenges tend to produce. Dr. Yvonne Johnson, director, Community Relations and Integration Services Division, and her staff accepted the challenge, determined to create a comprehensive program which would not only speak to the needs of San Diego schools, but which would also serve as a prototype for other districts.

The result of these efforts was a six-year program which is developmental and sequential and which contains outcomes for both students and staff. These programs focus on providing cognitive information and interactional skills in the area of race/human relations.

Implementation of this program began in 1982-83 and the initial indications are that the total design and program will be productive in those very areas which prompted the need. Additionally, the need which sites have to address problems and situations unique to their own populations and circumstances has not been left unrecognized in this program. Each site still retains responsibility for developing an action plan to meet its own objectives; however, the ability to do so is much greater than in the past because of the understanding and skill

building developed through the training program.

A trained facilitator has been assigned to each site. This person works closely with the administration and staff in the areas of assessment, program delivery, action plan development, and implementation. The facilitators themselves receive continuing training and updating in their delivery skills and program knowledge, allowing them to be a true asset and support service to their assigned schools. This meshing of district sponsorship and program structure, including outcome measuring instruments, with site adaptation leeway, holds the promise of being the long-sought change agent in the realm of attitudes and behaviors. If this is so, the academic program and emphasis which have resulted from a renewed commitment to educational equity will have an environment in which to flourish.

In the 1982 court order, Judge Orfield wrote:

"The race/human relations program that has been centrally devised by the school district for students and staff is a program that has obviously been well planned and is in the process of being well implemented.

It is ordered that the race/human relations program be implemented as heretofore ordered and all school personnel be made aware of the importance of this program and its place in the integration effort. It is the finding of the court that the school district is complying with the order in a commendable manner."

A description of the race/human relations program for both staff and students is centrally directed and is as follows:

STAFF PROGRAM

The staff program (for both certificated and classified personnel) is based on 3 major strands incorporating 47 program objectives.

Strand I (Personal Strand) -- Focuses on awareness of one's self as an ethnic person and an awareness of the characteristics, contributions, and contemporary issues of different groups.

Strand II (Classroom Strand) -- Focuses on creating a positive learning environment.

Strand III (Institutional Strand) -- Focuses on institutional practices which support individual and classroom efforts to achieve harmonious racial integration.

In order to maintain an effective program and provide for effective evaluation, the 47 objectives spoken of earlier are sequential.

Pertinent information on the staff development program is as follows:

All full-time district staff (approximately 10,000 school site and non-school site people) are involved.

Staff receives inservice in certain prescribed objectives each year. Training for the objectives is based on staff receiving skills and knowledge to implement (in most cases) the objectives at their site. All objectives are geared toward creating a positive climate for integration and academic success. As stated above, objectives are organized into content areas or "strands." School site staffs deal with objectives in all three strands. Non-school site staff are

inserviced in the objectives as appropriate to their job function.

School site staff members are inserviced together during prep periods, minimum days, or after school. At times, several smaller staffs will hold a joint inservice. Non-school site staff are released from their job assignments to attend inservice sessions during the regular work day. Organization of the inservice can vary. Large departments or office can attend inservices as a whole or can attend in smaller work-station groups. Attending in smaller groups is particularly useful when issues specific to a particular work site are being discussed.

Inservice locations are determined by the race/human relations committee at the site. Most inservices are held on site; however, non-school site inservices may be held at locations away from the work place.

Inservice sessions for all staff members are given by the site-assigned race/human relations facilitator, assisted and supported by the site committee. After the initial training sessions for each objective, the site committee assumes responsibility for fully implementing the objective. The facilitator acts as advisor and consultant to this process. Presently, there are 18 facilitators assigned to cover more than 160 school sites and non-school site activities.

STUDENT PROGRAM

The student program is presently a 13-year K-12 course of study. The structure of the program is based on 5 areas of study found in the multicultural component of the California State Course of Study. They are:

1. Diversity -- which develops valuing similarities and differences among individuals, and racial/ethnic and cultural groups.
2. Identity -- which develops awareness of cultural heritage, self-worth, and self-definition.
3. Culture -- which develops awareness of what "culture" is and the ways cultures are different and alike.
4. Conflict -- develops skills for establishing positive relations and constructive responses to conflict between individuals and groups.
5. Prejudice and Discrimination -- develops sensitivity to stereotyping prejudice and discrimination in its many forms.

Implementation

The implementation of the student program is the responsibility of the site administrator. The individual classroom teacher, following the guidelines of scope and sequence included in this section, implements the student program during the first semester.

The race/human relations facilitators assigned to sites assist and support the site administrator and the classroom teacher by:

1. Conducting group training sessions with staff.

2. Giving demonstration lessons in the classroom.
3. Consulting with the classroom teacher concerning implementation strategies.

Scope and Sequence

In the student program, each Concept Goal is addressed sequentially and developmentally at the elementary, junior, and senior high levels. As students move sequentially through early levels of the program, they are provided with foundation knowledge in each Concept Goal. This knowledge is then used at later levels to help students understand the more sophisticated dynamics of race/human relations.

The following information provides both the scope and the sequence of the student program:

1. Summary of Concept Goals, K-12 furnishes sites with an overall look at the scope of each Concept Goal and the skills (learner behaviors) that will be exhibited at each level.
2. Summary of Content Sequence gives sites the grade levels where the Concept Goal content material should be taught.
3. Detail of Content Sequence provides sites with a specific breakdown of the objectives and the corresponding learner behaviors which are to be taught at each grade level.

FACILITATOR SUPPORT

A major support to the district's race/human relations program is provided by a team of 18 facilitators who assist with the implementation of the Race/Human

Relations Program districtwide. Each individual facilitator is assigned to a specific group of schools within a geographical area of the district. This group usually consists of one to three secondary schools and their respective feeder elementary schools, and children's centers sites. The assigned facilitator has the primary responsibility for providing race/human relations services and support to this specific group of schools. The facilitator team also provides assistance to non-school sites in the implementation of their program. They support the district's race/human relations program by providing a variety of services, which include:

1. Consulting. The consulting role involves activities, such as contacting site administrators, and devising a plan of action for the year; serving on site committees; facilitating problem-solving and decision-making activities, and providing other resources, as needed.
2. Teaching Demonstration Lessons. Race/human relations lessons are conducted upon request. In addition, facilitators assist teachers as they become more comfortable in working with race/human relations activities.
3. Conducting Workshops. Facilitators prepare materials, arrange for resources, implement inservice sessions and workshops, in addition to assisting with individual workshop evaluations.
4. Developing Materials. Materials in race/human relations are constantly updated. Facilitators assist in conducting research and writing materials for classroom and workshops, as well as for use as curriculum items.
5. Teaching Continuing Education Classes. Facilitators teach staff

April 1984

Site representatives from K-6 schools will be inserviced in the new Social Studies/Race/Human Relations Program.

July 1984

The basic Social Studies/Race/Human Relations Student Program K-6 will be ready for the opening of the year-round schools.

July, August, October, November 1984

Inservice will continue in the Social Studies/Race/Human Relations Program for all K-6 sites in the district.

In summary, the Social Studies/Race/Human Relations Program for students is an instructional program that combines the affective experiences with the cognitive knowledge that students have gained through multicultural social science education. By participating in the program, students from diverse ethnic, cultural, and social economic backgrounds gain the opportunities and tools to openly interact with one another in a safe environment. This should provide the critical link between the process of learning about people to the process of learning to deal with people more effectively.

We have arrived at the threshold of a new challenge. After years of seeking meaningful resolution techniques to an elusive area of concern experienced by all urban school districts, San Diego now faces the challenge of an ambitious, exciting attempt to create change in the abstract world of relationships among people. The degree to which we are successful in this will determine the degree to which integration becomes a reality for San Diego children.

GTF:kkh
3/21/84

2. Inservice training was provided for administrators in the new social studies adoptions. Race/human relations staff co-presented.
3. The race/human relations program in this phase of the new adoption has addressed the following points:
 - a. The K-6 Race/Human Relations Student Program will remain indentifiable within the structure of the yearlong 30 minutes per lesson of the social studies program.
 - b. Race/Human relations has been adopted as a fifth strand of social studies. The foundation of the program rests on the development of five concept goals, Diversity, Identity, Culture, Conflict, Prejudice and Discrimination.
 - c. Twenty 30-minute teacher directed lessons are being developed by the race/human relations program staff writers. The lessons will address different concept goals at each grade level. The lessons will be taught in cluster groups with an evaluation after each cluster. Twenty 30-minute instructional days will be divided in the following way: four lessons followed by one evaluation lesson, this sequence will be repeated three times.
 - d. A lesson plan form will be used in the Race/Human Relations K-6 Program. Activities will be linked to the cognitive learning in social studies. New materials are being written per grade level which reflect the race/human relations concept goals.

development and training inservice classes in the area of race/human relations during fall, spring, and summer sessions.

STUDENT PROGRAM
WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS

September 1983

1. A decision was made by the superintendent's cabinet to infuse the existing social studies curriculum with the race/human relations student program.
2. In September, sequential management charts were designed for the K-6 program. Race/human relations activities were incorporated with existing social studies materials to insure a workable flow of each program learner outcomes. The management charts were designed to be used during the transition phase (1983-84 school year only).

October 1983 - January 1984

1. Representatives from both the race/human relations and social studies program staff field tested six of the prescribed social studies new adoptions and their related materials.
2. In January, 1984, a vote was taken by the Social Studies Continuum members to ascertain the best adoption for our district.

January 1984

1. The recommended adoption for the K-6 social studies curriculum was presented to the Board of Education for their study and approval.
2. Silver Burdette was adopted for the K-6 social studies program.

February - March 1984

1. Program writers from both social studies and race/human relations staff worked together to develop guideline packages for teacher use with the new adopted materials.