[MS-0234.002.001.001]

Title: SCHOOL OF CREATIVE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Location: O'Farrell Site

Grade Levels: 4-11 (1981-82), 4-12 (1982-83)

Participants: The program will include minority students from schools having predominantly minority-student populations and majority students from schools having predominantly majority-student populations. The ethnic balance goal for this program should be consistent with the total district student ethnic population. In the final selection of applicants, consideration will be given to the following:

1. Majority students from schools with predominantly majority population.

2. Resident students within the O'Farrell attendance area.
   a. Grades 7-8 and 9 for 1981-82.
   b. Incoming 7th-grade students from 1982-83 on.

3. Minority students from schools with predominantly minority population.

Projected enrollment in the magnet school program is detailed below.

		Resident Students in Program	Non-resident Students in Program	Total Students in Program	Total Students in School	% Minority Students in School
1980-81	Minority	--	--	137	490	35%
	Majority	--	--	253		
1981-82	Minority	140	334	474	1,000	47%
	Majority	25	501	526		

Description: Elementary

This program for creative and performing arts is designed to meet the special needs of students with high interest and potential talent in the arts. The program provides the opportunity and encouragement to develop artistic skills, abilities, and appreciation while continuing a strong instructional program in the basic skills.

Fundamental to this concept is the belief that sound training and discipline in the arts also build the qualities of character, judgment, and insight important to good citizenship and a rewarding life in any vocation. The creative and performing arts program offers comprehensive study, beginning in the upper elementary grades in the visual arts, dance, theatre arts, and vocal and instrumental music.

The curriculum for the creative and performing arts program meets the basic requirements of the State of California and the Elementary Course of Study of the San Diego City Schools as adopted each year by

Description: (Continued)

the Board of Education. Included in instruction are the language arts, math, and the social sciences. Students are also programmed into one or more of the special activities each semester with the exception that students have some experience in each of the creative and performing arts areas upon completion of four years in this program. Elementary students enrolled in the magnet program follow an extended or re-structured day schedule. This program draws upon the artistic resources of the community.

Secondary

This is a program for students with demonstrated abilities and/or strong interests in one or more of the arts. A well-planned curriculum combines basic academic studies with special emphasis on art, music, theatre arts, dance, and television/media. The program capitalizes on the student's special abilities in the arts and prepares each student to pursue further arts study in higher education, to enter an arts field directly, or to acquire a lasting appreciation for the arts, with the assurance of having received a sound basic high school education with the opportunity to fulfill requirements for entrance to a college/university. Students will enroll in a sequence of courses in their area of specialization and in courses which will meet the basic requirements of the State of California and the Secondary Course of Study of the San Diego City Schools as adopted by the Board of Education.

Performances and exhibits of student work are scheduled on a regular basis in the community and in the schools.

Unique aspects of the program include:

1. Comprehensive academic and arts curriculum
2. Extended-time period for studio courses
3. Attendance at concerts, theatres, galleries, and shows
4. Visiting artists, musicians, performers
5. Increased exposure to community resources
6. Occupational courses to prepare students for employment or advanced technical training
7. Advanced placement in the arts as well as academic classes
8. Internship with area professionals
9. Total staff involvement in the arts
10. Gifted program and seminar MGM program.

Program Organization:

Participants are in the program for a full instructional day.

12/9/80
12/11/80 *(Revised)*

ATTACHMENT C

Title: CENTER FOR SCIENCE, MATH, AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

Location: Gompers Secondary School

Grade Levels: 7-12

Participants: The ethnic balance goal for this program is 60% majority and 40% minority. In the final selection of applicants, consideration will be given to the following:

1. Majority students from schools with 60% or more majority-student population

2. Resident students currently enrolled at Gompers

3. Minority students from minority-isolated and imbalanced schools.

4. Enrollment priority will be given to students enrolled in elementary math/science magnets if applications are received prior to the end of the first semester. Consideration will be given to the ethnic balance and maximum numbers within each grade level.

Projected student enrollment and ethnic balance within the program, as well as the total number of students and percentage of minority students in the total school, are detailed below.

		Resident Students in Program	Non-Resident Students in Program	Total Students in Program	Total Students in School	% Minority Students in School
1980-81	Minority	60	40	100	559	57.4%
	Majority	—	200	200		
1981-82	Minority	200	50	250	875	55.0%
	Majority	---	375	375		

Description: Students with a strong interest in the physical, biological, earth, and space sciences; mathematics; and computer sciences will participate in a program that includes working with professionals in the fields of science, mathematics, and computers. The district offerings in advanced science and mathematics will be available, along with additional elective courses not offered at other school sites, including geology, space science, and astronomy. Students will be given the opportunity for math/science/computer work experience with professionals in local agencies, industries, research laboratories, and other related facilities. Current concerns relating to energy and environment will be addressed, and the role of the computer in all phases of research will be emphasized. Courses in language arts,

Description: (Continued)

social science, and practical arts will be designed for science-oriented students. Additional courses in computer science and technology will be offered. Graduates of the program will have gained attitudes, knowledge, and skills for success in their chosen careers. They will have the backgrounds for continuing success in further study in the fields of science, mathematics, and computers.

Students enrolled in the above program will meet the basic requirements of the State of California and the Secondary Course of Study of the San Diego City Schools as adopted each year by the Board of Education. Students have the opportunity to receive a diploma from Gompers that reflects graduation requirements over and above those used throughout the district.

Program Organization:

This is a magnet program within the school. Most students participating in this program will be enrolled on a full-time basis. A regular instructional program will be offered at Gompers for other resident students.

12/9/80
12/11/80 *(No Revisions)*

ATTACHMENT C

Title: MUIR ALTERNATIVE MAGNET

Location: Muir Alternative School

Grade Level: K-12

Participants: Approximately 300 students have been selected from all schools within the district. The enrollment reflects the racial/ethnic balance of the total district and includes minority students from minority-isolated schools.

Projected student enrollment, number of resident and non-resident students, and the percentage of minority students are detailed below.

		Resident Students in Program	Non-Resident Students in Program	Total Students in Program	Total Students in School	% Minority Students in School
1980-81	Minority	-	108	108	300	35%
	Majority	-	192	192		
1981-82	Minority	-	120	120	300	40%
	Majority	-	180	180		

Description: Muir Alternative school has an open education philosophy. The program emphasizes individualized learning, student responsibility for learning, and flexible scheduling. Self-reliance, creativity, and leadership are promoted among its pupils. The curriculum is innovative and flexible, with students taking as much responsibility for choosing and planning their own learning programs as is possible for their maturity levels.

Secondary pupils participate in regular district course offerings which lead to high school graduation. They also may choose from a variety of courses which interest them, as well as provide them with a foundation for future careers and personal success.

Elementary pupils are taught basic skills in self-contained classrooms for a portion of each day. They have a choice of activities for the remainder of the day.

The curriculum meets the requirements of the State of California and the Elementary and Secondary Courses of Study of the San Diego City Schools as adopted each year by the Board of Education.

Students of all ages gain socially and academically through their interaction with each other. Students receive tutoring help from other students.

12/9/80
12/11/80 *(No Revisions)*

ATTACHMENT C

MUIR ALTERNATIVE MAGNET
(Continued)

Description: (Continued)	Students, staff, and parents share in making decisions related to school programs and activities. Consistent use is made of community resources.
Program Organization:	The entire school participates in the programs described above. Each grade level has a heterogeneous and balanced racial/ethnic and male/female population. All students are eligible to participate in all aspects of the school program.

12/9/80
12/11/80 *(No Revisions)*

ATTACHMENT C

programs who do not enhance desegregation. There are minority students from majority schools going to magnet programs also in majority schools. There are majority students leaving tipping or isolated schools to attend magnets in majority schools. Thus, the number of minority or majority students participating in a program is not an accurate indicator of how much desegregation is really taking place. There may be very good reasons for making exceptions to the rules, but those students should not be counted as desegregating. (See map accompanying Longfellow for demonstration of this problem. (See Figure II-15, See Page 77)

4. UNFAIR

Voluntary magnets have built-in unfairness. Of necessity more money will be spent on magnet participants than on other students; in some cases a great deal of money. (See cost analysis with each school). At the same time, some students are not eligible, because of their race and the racial mix of their school of residence, to attend any magnet. Other students may be eligible for some programs, but not others.

5. PLANNING PROBLEMS WITH VOLUNTARY MAGNETS

A completely voluntary magnet plan creates terrible planning problems. It is difficult to provide for a smooth transition through school when a certain type of magnet is located in a primary school in one area, an elementary school in another, a junior high school someplace else, and the associated high school program is still another location.

F. LARGE PROPORTION OF MINORITY STUDENTS INELIGIBLE FOR MAGNET PROGRAMS; ALMOST ALL MAJORITY STUDENTS ELIGIBLE

Not every student may apply for admission to a magnet program, even on his own site. The June 1979 Plan revision has several different ways of describing criteria for magnet eligibility. Minority students who attend "minority-isolated and minority-imbalanced schools" or schools with "predominantly minority student population" are designated as desired magnet participants. Eligible majority students are described as coming from "schools having predominantly majority student populations," or in the case of five secondary magnet programs, "schools with 65% or more majority student population."

Thus minority students who live in a majority school area, and majority students who live in a minority school area, are not eligible to apply for magnet programs. Some of the magnets have some slots set aside to accommodate some of the resident members of the opposite ethnic group in their school-within-a-school program, and some do not.

Table 5 compares the impact of this eligibility policy on minority and on majority students. The number of students in schools of over 50% opposite-ethnic enrollment, less the number of magnet slots in those schools allotted to these students, divided by the total enrollment of same-ethnic students in the District, yields the percentage of minority and majority students who may not attend any magnet.

//////////

The table shows clearly that nearly half the minority secondary students are excluded from magnet programs, while the majority exclusion is negligible at the secondary level and little more than 10% at the elementary level. That the excluded students are not racially isolated strikes a positive note. However, to set up a system using integration monies, special equipment, special personnel, and special attention to devise programs which are intended by definition to be superior to the schools the excluded minorities attend, and then to deny admission to substantial numbers of students in whose name the whole magnet system is being established and justified, seems a gigantic hoax whose victims are one third to almost one half of the minority students in San Diego City Schools.

In addition, this exclusive policy discourages residential integration on the part of either minorities or majorities. Why move to an integrated or other-ethnic neighborhood if by so doing you limit drastically your educational opportunities?

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

//////////

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS NOT ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR MAGNET PROGRAMS

MINORITY STUDENTS	Students in Schools Under 50% Minority		Magnet Slots for Minority Residents		Total Minority Students in District		% Not Eligible
Junior High	4,618	-	0	÷	9,577	=	48.2
Senior High	3,882	-	80	÷	9,010	=	42.2
Overall Secondary	8,500	-	80	÷	18,587	=	45.3
Elementary	8,671	-	408	÷	25,114	=	32.9

MAJORITY STUDENTS	Students in Schools Under 50% Majority *		Magnet Slots for Majority Residents		Total Majority Students in District		% Not Eligible
Junior High	592	-	30	÷	16,070	=	3.5
Senior High	781	-	40	÷	17,312	=	4.3
Overall Secondary	1,373	-	70	÷	33,382	=	3.9
Elementary	4,523	-	329	÷	36,848	=	11.4

TABLE 5

Source: San Diego City Schools 1978-79 Pupil Ethnic Census, modified by removing all VEEP and Magnet students from their receiving schools and adding them back into their sending schools, using data from San Diego City Schools "Students Participating in Voluntary Ethnic Enrollment Program (April 1979)" and "Students Participating in Magnet Programs (April 1979)". Individual school enrollment figures obtained by this procedure we consider the "natural" ethnic enrollment for that school.

*Most magnets require that majority students come from "predominantly majority" schools; hence the "over 50%" for this column. Five secondary magnets require instead 65% majority enrollment at the sending school for participating students. For those five programs, majority students at Kearny High School and Montgomery, Roosevelt, and Wilson Junior High Schools would become ineligible, though they are eligible for other magnets. For simplicity's sake Plaintiff used the single criterion.

site for its fundamental magnet program. With 26 resident majority students electing this magnet program, Webster drew 31 above their numerical goal of majority students.* Valencia Park's experience with its University Lab program also supports this tentative conclusion. They were projected to have 137 majority students, and wound up with 188, including 162 non-resident whites who opted to come to this minority isolated inner-city school. Encanto, which drew 176 non-resident whites to its General and Math/Science Program, and Oak Park, which drew 87 to its Intercultural Spanish Program, offer further evidence that magnet programs may still prove to be a viable tool for desegregating minority isolated schools or stabilizing so called "tipping" schools, as in the case of Encanto and Oak Park. That this will be a long hard road may be indicated by the fact that Horton's Intercultural Spanish Program captured well less than half of its projected 81 majority students and only 30 non-resident whites chose to come to the inner city for this attractive program. Lowell's Bilingual Program did even worse. It was projected to enroll 61 whites, and it received nine, with eight of them being non-residents. The physical condition and location of the school in the middle of an industrial area undoubtedly contributed to this dismal failure.

3. We cannot overlook the fact that the original reason for having magnet programs is to provide a number of quality educational options to district residents: creative, innovative, specialized, educationally sound programs which are impractical if not impossible to offer in every neighborhood. Tailoring magnet programs specifically for integration needs, physically locating them for integration reasons, and hedging them about with, what sometimes seem to be ridiculous restrictions as to who and how many can attend, sometimes leads to problems. These problems can have a counterproductive effect on the magnet both as a quality educational option and as an integration tool. Questions such as restricted participation in magnet programs because of race or racial balance at school of residence came up repeatedly at the six public meetings held by the Task Force. Deep frustration exists due to not being able to attend a program of one's choice because of race, name, neighborhood of residence, racial balance of school presently attended or any other reason that seems arbitrary or capricious. This can cause a backlash against the school system, the integration program, and the Court. This and other problems arising from the dual nature of magnet programs should be addressed in the future by the Court.

*It must be pointed out, however, that some peculiar circumstances may have influenced these figures. Sixty-nine of the 162 non-resident whites came from a single school, Miller.

1 be controversy.

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 THE COURT: That's one point we can agree on.

4

5 BY MR. STERN:

6 Q Dr. Patrick, are you familiar with the suggestion

7 of the Integration Task Force that the School District look

8 only to the racial balance at the receiving school rather than

9 at the balance of both the sending and receiving school in

10 determining whether a particular student is eligible to attend

11 a particular integration program?

12 THE COURT: Well, you don't need to ask that because

13 I don't agree with that either.

14 MR. STERN: That would save considerable time.

15 THE COURT: I think we're all -- Plaintiffs, Dr.

16 Patrick, who hasn't said it yet; and I all agree to that.

17 So, go on to another question.

18 MR. STERN: Very well.

19 THE COURT: I understand the reasons why the

20 Integration Task Force state it; but the problem is that every

21 time you press one lever, you cause something else to go up;

22 and this is what we're in is a balancing act here. Short of

23 leaving this earth and going to Nirvana, we're not going to

24 get a perfect system. Go ahead.

25 MR. STERN: Well, just, again, to save time and so

26 that I understand, you don't feel that the District needs to

1 present any evidence as to the admissions policies it now has?
2 THE COURT: Well, as to that point. In other words,
3 the question was a narrow question. It was whether he agreed
4 with the Integration Task Force recommendation that the racial
5 balance in the sending school not be considered.
6 MR. STERN: We don't need to explore the
7 consequences of adopting that suggestion?
8 THE COURT: No, no. I think they're pretty obvious.
9 This is one of the problems with your slogan "Better Education
10 by Choice"; because, you see, it irritates a lot of people
11 because they don't have the choice and they only have the
12 choice if they fit into the racial patterns that are the
13 criteria. Those have the choice, but other people are -- they
14 think, "What are you telling me? You've got a nice school
15 over here. My kid wants to do this, and I can't send him."
16 They get understandably angered by that. But I
17 can't help it. Maybe the Supreme Court can figure it out.
18 Go ahead.
19 MR. STERN: Thank you.
20 Q Also on the subject of admissions standards and
21 requirements to the various programs, the Task Force recommends
22 that applicants be screened or tested as a condition of
23 admission to the program.
24 Have you ever considered admitting students to the
25 magnet programs or other integration programs on the basis of
26 an examination?

1 Q. Do the secondary schools offer courses that, for one
2 reason or another, may be attractive or more attractive to a
3 particular racial ethnic group of students?
4 A. There are some limited examples of that.
5 Q. What would a limited example be?
6 A. Well, Black Studies could be one example, Chicano
7 Studies another, possibly ethnic studies; and we found in some
8 of these offerings that we -- as an elective, we did not get
9 balanced reception as an elective.
10 THE COURT: You have the current Ethnic -- that is,
11 the October '78, which is the latest, I guess, Ethnic --
12 THE WITNESS: Census.
13 THE COURT: -- Census attached to one of these.
14 MR. STERN: It's in the evaluation, your Honor.
15 THE WITNESS: It's part of the evaluation.
16 MR. STERN: Let me check.
17 THE COURT: Well, if I were to turn to a school,
18 such as a secondary school such as Crawford, which has 65
19 percent white, or Kearny, 63 percent white, or Point Loma, 83
20 percent white, is it my understanding that under your current
21 rules that minority children going to those schools could not
22 go to Wright Brothers?
23 THE WITNESS: There are two groups of schools that
24 you mentioned there. Crawford is, in our thinking, an
25 eligibility, a balanced school; so, we would want to maintain
26 that balance; and we would be more selective on a two-to-one

1 movement out of the school to programs to control that.
2 A school such as Point Loma, as an example, we would
3 allow only in the eligibility standards. The white students
4 can move out into programs so that we -- until we reach that
5 particular point of balance.
6 THE COURT: So, the bottom line is that in order to
7 keep your balances in your magnet schools, including Wright
8 Brothers, there are some white students and some minority
9 students in the community who may not move into them --
10 THE WITNESS: That's --
11 THE COURT: -- because it may -- it would adversely
12 affect the school from which they leave?
13 THE WITNESS: That's correct.
14 THE COURT: Why don't you change that to "Better
15 Education by Choice if You Are in the Right School."
16 All right. Go ahead.
17 MR. STERN: That was the issue we began to explore
18 yesterday with Dr. Patrick, and you suggested we --
19 THE COURT: Oh, no. No. I agree that you have to
20 consider it.
21 MR. STERN: I am thinking particularly of the people
22 that have called to complain and that I have said, "Let us
23 wait until after these hearings, and then call me back, and
24 we'll let you know."
25 THE COURT: No. There's no question that you cannot
26 do it otherwise. If you did it otherwise, what you

1 gained in racial balance in one place, you'd lose in another;
2 and you'd come up with a zero.
3 All right. Are you through with the witness?
4 MR. STERN: Just one or two questions, your Honor.
5 Q Are all classes on the computer printout, which is
6 now Exhibit 1-A and B, reviewed by a director?
7 A Not on the printout in itself. The director goes
8 to the school site and sits down with the principal and other
9 personnel to look at the master schedule and numbers on the
10 master schedule of that school to look at a variety of things.
11 We have -- Beyond just the ethnic composition of the class,
12 we have other factors that we have to examine.
13 So, they are looking specifically at the school site.
14 And we follow it up within our division in looking at that in
15 regards to preparation for the OCR Reports.
16 Q Does Exhibit 1-A and 1-B show corrections or changes
17 that were made as a result of a review of a particular class?
18 A Those that were reviewed prior to the time of its
19 site would be reflected in that, and there may have been some
20 adjustments that we would need to make after that time in
21 correction that appeared there. There were corrections that
22 we need to make and at the sites regularly.
23 Q How many secondary classrooms or courses are there
24 in the District?
25 THE COURT: Hundreds and hundreds.
26 THE WITNESS: Thousands perhaps. Each -- If you

The Superior Court
OF THE
State of California
COURTHOUSE

CHAMBERS OF
LOUIS M. WELSH
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

MAILING ADDRESS
POST OFFICE BOX 2724
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92112

January 4, 1978

Mrs. Roberta Heyer
1255 Wren Street
San Diego, California 92114

Dear Mrs. Heyer:

I am sending a copy of your letter to counsel in the Carlin case so that they may advise me at future hearings.

Thank you for your continued interest.

Sincerely,

LOUIS M. WELSH

LMW:pap

cc: William Gavin, Esq.
Veronica Roesner, Esq.
Ralph D. Stern, Esq.
Nancy Reardan, Esq.
Don R. Lincoln, Esq.

ATTACHMENT I

Dec. 23, 1977
1255 Wren St.
San Diego, CA 92114

Judge Louis M. Welsh
Superior Court
San Diego, California

Dear Judge Welsh,

You may remember that I testified in the Carlin trial as a white parent from the Morse High School area. My three children attended schools in the area, during which time we witnessed the change in the schools from integrated to minority isolated.

I wish now to call your attention to a serious flaw in the Morse High School Magnet plan, as explained in the Union of Dec. 19, 1977. The article states that initially the plan will not be open to white students now attending Morse, but will be open to Morse minority students. Nothing could be worse for the stability of this transition area than denying the local white students access to the new program.

White parents who continue to send their children to Morse do so because they believe in integration, despite the hardships involved. To deny them the benefits of an integration effort will give them one more reason to flee the area. Under the Ethnic Transfer program minority families at Morse have had the option of enrolling their children in a "better" school up north. White families equally dissatisfied with the school never had that option. Their only recourse was to move (up north, or into the county) or to transfer their children to a county school with a falsified address. Remarkably, some white families have stayed on in this area, accepting integrated schools and minority neighbors as a way of life.

The percentage of white at Morse is now down to 25%. To exclude white students from applying for a new attractive program at their neighborhood school, meant to bring whites from the rest of the city, would be insulting and demoralizing to those white families who are living their convictions. The magnet concept carried on in

ATTACHMENT I

this manner can only contribute to increased segregation of this area, not to a lessening. The program should enroll all of the white and minority students at Morse who wish to be in it. Then students from the rest of the city could be invited to fill the remainging places, according to ethnic ratio. As the program expands, spaces will become available for more outside white students.

The District has never grasped the fact that special attention should be given to schools in transition, to maintain their stability if at all possible. A current example of this insensitivity is the lack of publicity that the Encanto Magnet school has received past and present. During the fall when mention of the four new magnet schools was made repeatedly in the paper, attention was never called to the already established successful Magnet School at Encanto, nor to the fact that most of the school was already integrated by the make-up of the surrounding community. Some District encouragement in the past for schools in transition could have lessened the number of minority isolated schools that need to be dealt with today.

I would greatly appreciate your giving attention to the need for encouragement of white families to remain in minority areas, by insisting that the schools so located maintain an education equal to that of the rest of the city. Further, any program designed to attract outsiders to a school should first be offered to all of the locally enrolled students as a matter of course.

Sincerely,

Roberta Heyer

Roberta Heyer

c.c. Dr. Leonard Sherr
Principal Morse High

ATTACHMENT I

RALPH D. STERN, Schools Attorney

BEN ECHEVERRIA, Assistant
GLORIA M. BEUTLER, Deputy

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, California 92103
Telephone (714) 293-8450

February 6, 1978

The Honorable Louis M. Welsh
Judge of the Superior Court
220 West Broadway
San Diego, California 92101

Re: Carlin v. Board of Education

Dear Judge Welsh:

You will recall that on January 4, 1978 you forwarded to us a copy of a letter that you received from Mrs. Roberta Heyer concerning enrollment at the Morse Center for Urban Studies. Enclosed, for your information, is a copy of a letter from Dr. Ralph Patrick, Deputy Superintendent for Operations, to Mrs. Heyer responding to the concerns raised by Mrs. Heyer.

Respectfully,

Ralph D. Stern

RALPH D. STERN
Schools Attorney

RDS:jmo

Enclosure

cc: Donald R. Lincoln, Esq.
Veronica Roeser / William F. Gavin, Esq.
Nancy Reardan, Attorney at Law

ATTACHMENT J

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

RALPH PATRICK
Deputy Superintendent, Operations

EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal St., San Diego, CA 92103
(714) 293-8031

February 2, 1978

Mrs. Roberta Heyer
1255 Wren Street
San Diego, CA 92114

Dear Mrs. Heyer:

MORSE HIGH SCHOOL

A copy of your letter to Judge Louis Welsh, in which you express concerns regarding the Morse Center for Urban Studies, has been referred to my office.

As you know, this magnet program was designed as one of the major efforts of the district to reduce racial isolation in the secondary schools. The Morse High School Center for Urban Studies is a magnet program that started on Monday, January 30. Since the initial concept of the magnet was proposed several months ago, considerable planning and development have occurred. Under the administrative leadership of Dr. Leonard Sherr, principal of Morse High School, key teaching and clerical staff have been selected, counselors and resource teachers have been assigned to the magnet, and staff orientation and curriculum development have taken place. In addition, an advisory committee, composed of representatives of local government and social service agencies, law enforcement organizations, and community leaders, has met regularly to review and react to the various developmental stages of the program.

Participants will be selected from both resident and non-resident students. The magnet has been designed to provide a program for 300 students, 100 from Morse High School and 200 from other high schools. In order to fulfill the goals of the district's integration plan, ethnicity of students will continue to be one of the selection criteria. Of the 100 students selected from Morse, 25 will be majority and 75 will be minority. The 200 students selected from other high schools will be predominantly majority; however, minority students also will be considered for the program.

In developing this magnet, the Morse staff recognized the importance of allowing both majority and minority students to apply. The selection criteria allows for Morse students to participate, but within the overall limitations of achieving the stated ethnic distribution of the magnet.

ATTACHMENT J

Students and parents of Morse High School have been advised of the application and selection process. Interest and participation by Morse students have been most favorable.

Your continued personal interest in the educational programs of our schools is appreciated. Should you have further questions or suggestions, you may wish to contact Dr. Sherr or Dr. James Kaupp, secondary schools regional director for Morse.

Sincerely,

Ralph Patrick

Ralph Patrick
Deputy Superintendent
Operations

RP:mtm

cc: Sherr
Kaupp

ATTACHMENT J

FILED
Robert D. Zumwalt, Clerk
SEP 20 1979
BY S. TA BOTT
DEPUTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

KARI CARLIN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, Defendant.	Case No. 303800 CHARGE TO THE INTEGRATION TASK FORCE 1979-1980 SCHOOL YEAR

To the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Members of the INTEGRATION TASK FORCE.

GREETINGS:

The Task Force is specifically charged to:

1. Monitor, analyze and evaluate the quality and methods of education in all minority isolated schools and recommend steps that should be undertaken to make certain that in all such schools, the quality of education is at a superior level and that all children are

inspired to achieve. To this end, a subcommittee of the whole under chairmanship of the Vice Chairman of the Task Force is formed. It shall be known as the Minority Education Task Force.

2. Evaluate the human/race relations programs in various schools, identify the successful techniques and recommend which programs or portions thereof should be used throughout the district.

3. Monitor, analyze and evaluate the Secondary Instructional Exchange Program.

4. Monitor, analyze and evaluate the Elementary Exchange Program (pairing and clustering).

5. Accumulate data and investigate the causes for violence in the schools and recommend procedures for reducing violence and punishing offenders.

6. Evaluate the overall plan as to whether meaningful progress to alleviate segregation is being made.

7. Report to the Court its activities on or before March 14, 1980 and June 6, 1980.

To carry out this charge, the Task Force is authorized to engage the services of monitors and necessary experts and advisors.

///

Stipends paid to such persons must be approved by the Court.

Dated: September 20, 1979

LOUIS M. WELSH

Judge of the Superior Court

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY 1897

mailed 11/15/79

MEETING WITH DR. DIANE EVANS AND THE HUMAN/RACE RELATIONS COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 9, 1979.

Present: Beverley Yip, Napoleon Jones, Jr., Veronica Roeser, Melba Margolis, Shuf Swift, Dena Anderson, Edward Fletcher, Rene White.

Dr. Evans suggested several dimensions which we could use, eg.

1. Observation: verbal and behaviorial based on such things as rhythm, sounds, who talks to whom, eye contact, nonverbals such as facial expression, gestures, tics. Interactions such as who responds, patterns in classroom, who cuts off whom, seating patterns, body posture.

   Total climate of classroom such as restlessness, attention span, acting out, undercurrent of anger.

2. Validation of observation findings through students, parents, teachers feedback or correlation of indicators such as absenteeism, violence, misconduct, grades etc.

MEETING WITH DR. ROBERT GUTHRIE AND THE HUMAN/RACE RELATIONS COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 14, 1979.

Present: Beverley Yip, Rene White, Shuf Swift, Ed Fletcher, Yvonne Johnson.

Dr. Guthrie recommended using an instrument to be completed by a stratified random sample of classrooms in the target schools and any where else we might want for control purposes.

The "human/race relations assessment" would be designed to measure the objectives identified in the R/HR plans of each school.

Advantages of such an approach:

1. Can be administered to many people quickly and unobtrusively with limited person power.

2. Can be replicated later to give indication of progress.

3. More objective and subject to less "contamination" than observation method.

4. Can be designed to produce cross-tabulations to other variables such as sex, color, school etcetera.

Recommendation:

I recommend we adopt the"R/HR assessment" method.

The next step would be to engage a consultant to assist us in designing the instrument, the research methodology, and anlysis.

Dr. Gathie is reviewing the Lee/Hoven Relations materials. We'll set up a meeting during week of 17th to meet with committee & review recommendations.

RALPH D. STERN, Schools Attorney

BEN ECHEVERRIA, Assistant
ERNESTINE DOUGLAS LITTLEJOHN (TINA), Deputy

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, California 92103
Telephone (714) 293-8450

June 25, 1980

The Honorable Louis M. Welsh
Judge of the Superior Court
220 West Broadway
San Diego, California 92101

Re: Carlin v. Board of Education
(Superior Court No. 303800)

Dear Judge Welsh:

The San Diego Unified School District would like to take this opportunity to respond to the specific recommendations made by the Court's Integration Task Force in its report dated June 16, 1980.

Before proceeding to discuss the recommendations, however, the School District feels it imperative to state its belief that the Task Force's comments concerning a lack of commitment on the part of the Board of Education and the administration are not supported by the facts. Approximately 40,000 of the District's 112,000 students are participating in full- and part-time integration programs. Without the strong support of the Board and the administration, San Diego would not have the country's most successful voluntary integration program. This is not to suggest that improvements in the program are not possible; rather, it is simply not fair to blame the Board and the administration for those programs which are not successful and fail to give them credit for those which have succeeded.

The District believes that the San Diego Plan for Racial Integration is precisely the sort of multi-year integration plan which the Task Force calls for on page 2 of its report. Given the appointment of the Task Force, the employment of experts by the Court, the filing of annual evaluations and the holding of periodic hearings, there is little doubt concerning the rigid enforcement of that plan by the Court. Obviously, since a major aspect in the development of a voluntary integration plan is the concept of building on successes, a multi-year plan will require

some periodic amendment or revision as well as some measure of flexibility in the use of facilities. Furthermore, both the District, the Task Force and other interested groups have learned from the actual experience of implementing a voluntary integration plan. For example, the views of some concerning programs-within-a-school as opposed to whole-school magnets appear to have changed considerably over a period of time.

On page 6 of its report, the Task Force makes six specific recommendations. Each of these recommendations is set forth below and is followed by the District's response.

Recommendation 1

"The concept of the METF should be continued. We have found widespread support for pursuing the subject of quality education in the racially isolated schools and this should be a part of the charge to the Integration Task Force for next year."

Answer

The District is fully committed to doing everything possible to improve the quality of education in the minority isolated schools. Some years ago the District began implementing instructional improvement programs such as DISTAR. Last year it proposed, and the Court approved, innovative amendments to the San Diego Plan for Racial Integration for Burbank Elementary School and Lincoln High School. On May 20, 1980 it proposed a program for improving the achievement of students in the minority isolated schools. The importance of this aspect of the District's effort to alleviate the effects of minority racial isolation is recognized and everything possible will be done to ensure the successful continuation of existing programs and implementation of new programs.

Recommendation 2

"A report is to be submitted to the Court by the district, due August 1, 1980, listing the number

of students ranked by school at the various levels of the achievement tests in reading and math in grades K through Six."

Answer

In the elementary grades, districtwide testing occurs only in the fifth grade. Information concerning the distribution of students' fifth grade Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) reading and mathematics scores, by school, is being prepared and will be available by September 15, 1980. This information includes all students taking the test rather than just those students enrolled for the entire school year. As soon as it is available, these data will be forwarded to the Court and the Task Force.

The District also will provide, by September 15, 1980, histograms illustrating spring, 1980 CTBS test results for students in grades 1 through 6 in the minority racially isolated schools. Displays will include total reading and total math data for all students tested in April, 1980.

Should the Task Force require additional data, a meeting could be arranged through Mr. Edward S. Fletcher, Assistant Superintendent, Community Relations Division, with Dr. Stephen W. Isaac, Evaluation Services Director, and appropriate representatives of the Task Force.

Recommendation 3

"The district will submit to the Court by September 1, 1980, a plan which contains the study and methods of approach to a solution that addresses the needs of those students ranked below the national reading and math averages. The plan is to focus at the K through Sixth grades."

Answer

The District believes that the Achievement Goals Program presented to the Court on May 20, 1980 is fully responsive to this recommendation.

Recommendation 4

"A report of each major incidence of violence that could be interpreted as harmful to the integration program is to be sent to the Integration Task Force for investigation. There is to be continuation and strong enforcement of the discipline code."

Answer

The District has some difficulty in understanding this recommendation since the Task Force itself on page 13 found that "School violence problems are generally minor and are being effectively addressed by appropriate parties. Almost all acts of violence are spontaneous and consist of one-on-one mutual combat situations." It is believed that involving the Task Force in the investigation of specific acts of violence may well interfere with the rights to privacy guaranteed students by state and federal law. Similarly, the involvement of the Task Force could well interfere with criminal prosecution in some serious incidents. The District fully supports the continued strong enforcement of its discipline code.

Recommendation 5

"A plan is to be developed and implemented in the Fall of 1980 that projects the positive aspects of racially isolated schools. This plan should be submitted to the Court by September 1, 1980."

Answer

As part of its response to Recommendation 15(b) of the Court-Appointed Experts, the District observed that it has already undertaken a number of actions to offset a negative perception with respect to the minority isolated schools. These actions include the development of film strips and slide presentations for community use which show that schools having integration programs are positive, productive and safe places. The District has also arranged tours of schools with integration programs for community leaders, parents and

students. For example, during the past year over 1,000 people visited secondary integration programs. In addition, the Court is respectfully referred to Appendix F of the Evaluation of the San Diego Plan for Racial Integration, 1979-80, which has been filed with the Court. This Appendix sets forth the public information/student recruitment activities for the past school year. A major portion of these activities are designed to project the positive aspects of the minority racially isolated schools.

Recommendation 6

"The Court should invite major companies and universities to adopt one or more of the 23 isolated schools. The business firms and the universities would work with the schools to assist in developing new programs or maintaining current ones in moving toward the goal of integration and a higher quality education. The business firms and universities would develop instruments or methods to evaluate the schools' progress with the various programs."

Answer

As indicated in the response to the Court-Appointed Experts, businesses, community organizations and universities already play an important role in a large number of District programs. Greater support is, however, possible and for that reason the District supports this recommendation. Richard R. Jackson, Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Schools Division, has been given the responsibility for working with such groups as the Chamber of Commerce in promoting the involvement of businesses, community organizations and universities in educational programs.

The enthusiasm expressed by Lee Grissom, Executive Vice President of the Chamber of Commerce, suggests the possibility of accomplishing a great deal. Mr. Jackson will work with Mr. Grissom in compiling lists of specific needs that could be met by businesses, community organizations and universities for the various elementary and

secondary integration programs. The areas of need include, but are not limited to, speakers, internships, field trips, advice on the content and structure of programs, job placement and counseling assistance, materials and equipment, tutoring and sponsorship of individual student projects. The list will be completed by early September at which time the District will forward copies to the Court and the Task Force.

On page 8 the Task Force discusses the Secondary Instructional Exchange Program. In response to the recommendations made in connection with this program, the District will provide greater opportunities for nonclassroom interaction. Steps will also be taken to increase field trips and to resolve transportation problems. The District does not believe that the 2-hour class period can be extended because of the already tight scheduling of secondary school students.

The District agrees with the Task Force concerning the need to continue close coordination among the Police Department Secondary School Task Force and Street Band Detail and the Secondary Schools Division and School Security Department.

Attachment A to the Task Force Report is entitled "Report on Teacher Responses to the Minority Isolated School Survey by School Survey Subcommittee." Although the respondents to this survey were self-selected (i.e., only those individuals who wished to answer did so), the District believes that there may be some valid concerns expressed in the responses to the survey. In order to properly evaluate those responses, the District requests that the complete results of the survey, without the names of the respondents, be provided to the District. This information should include favorable as well as critical comments. In this way the District would be able to determine whether a particular concern is limited to one or two respondents or is more widespread, suggesting the need for careful review.

Although the District has not responded to every comment of the Task Force, it has sought to respond to the substantive

suggestions. The District wishes to assure the Court that even those comments not specifically responded to have been noted and are being carefully considered.

Respectfully,

Ralph D. Stern

RALPH D. STERN
Schools Attorney

RDS:jmo
0287A

cc: Veronica A. Roeser
William F. Gavin
Donald R. Lincoln
Integration Task Force

Summary of existing program —

Plan — timetable

Use of monitors

Resources of Community —

4th Wednesday

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY 1897

Courtney Cazden
Joseph Rosen

Report to Judge Louis M. Welsh
Superior Court, San Diego, California
April 15, 1981

At your request, we spent March 5 and 6 in San Diego visiting schools and meeting with school officials. You asked us to assess the progress that is being made toward the attainment of the objectives established for the 23 racially isolated minority schools in the court order of September 6, 1980. Our areas of concern were, in good part, related to those expressed by us on April 1, 1980. These concerns were:

1. The Leadership of the School System
2. The Instructional Program
3. Child Welfare Concerns
4. The Schools and Parental and Community Relations

Leadership, Attendance and Parental Relations

The general feeling of the principals, assistant principals, and the Central Office personnel with whom we spoke was one of optimism and satisfaction with the work that had been done to install the Achievement Goals Program, with the services that were generated because of the new and vigorous attendance improvement program, and with the involvement of parents in regard to student attendance and homework policies.

With respect to leadership, the court order to the school officials has been accepted as a most serious challenge. We were reminded of our use of the term "loose coupling" in reference to the free relationships that had existed hereto fore between the Central and Area Offices and the local schools. According to the statements of principals in schools that we visited, the presence - physical and spiritual - of Central Office personnel had never before been so frequently experienced nor so firmly felt as since the court order. Specific demands have

been made upon the principals in regard to improvement of academic achievement, the use of resource teachers in classrooms for in-service, attendance improvement goals, kindergarten extended day, homework and discipline policies, and parental involvement. While "demand" may seem to be a very strong term, this characterizes the need of the schools and supports Judge Welsh's edicts.

In regard to leadership, therefore, there appears to be movement in keeping with order #5 to "continuously evaluate the effectiveness of the Superintendent, school principals, supporting leadership staff and teachers during the school year."

As much as possible, evaluation of leadership should have objective and measureable bases, that is, achievement results, attendance percentages, parent attendance at school meetings, home visits by aides and counselors, and records of in-service classroom assistance by the resource teachers. There is evidence in some cases that resource teachers are diverted from their in-service functions in order to assist principals in other ways. This diversion can cause lesser academic achievement and non-fulfillment of the Achievement Goals Program; principals, area superintendents and their staffs must be held accountable.

Further, in regard to leadership, there appears to be discrepancy between the goal established by the Judge on order #1, p. 26, of the September 6, 1980 Memorandum of Intended Decision to "implement a course or courses of study in minority isolated schools which will result in 70% of the students in each of the schools having a median achievement rate on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills at the national norm in reading, mathematics and language by 1983-84." The Judge has modified this goal from 70% to 50% of the students, yet school principals in their AGP goals plans have stated their goals to be that of the original district pronouncement of an improvement of only nine percentile points by 1983-84. A top school official has assured us that the Judge's goal

is the aim and that the district is striving for 50% of the students achieving to national levels. This needs further follow up by the Central and Regional offices.

In regard to the effectiveness of the leadership, a key issue must deal with the quality of the commitment of school principals and those whom we visited appeared to be enthusiastic and knowledgeable as to the process for implementing the ACP. This commitment needs to be translated into systematic managerial practices with teacher-by-teacher analysis to determine where strengths and weaknesses exist. The observation form for classroom visitation is a step toward a more thorough evaluation process but the question must be asked as to the follow-up use of the form; a pattern needs to be established.

The leaders of the S.D.U.S.D. are being pushed to install programs and practices and there will be resistance on the part of some teachers to the change in teaching format. However, in view of the low achievement levels of students, it is critical that leaders insist upon teachers following the program as planned. The statement that creativity is being lessened must be held against the fact that creativity of teachers in the past has not produced achievements that are acceptable. Creative teachers cannot be stifled - they will embellish the established programs of instruction to mastery with tangential and supplementary methods and materials.

Dr. Thomas Nagel and Dr. John McLevie, integration analysts for the Board of Education, have made an in-depth series of statements in "Status Report I, on the Progress of Implementing the Achievement Goals Program in San Diego City Schools, January 28, 1981." They indicated that "the AGP is off to a good start" and "it seems clear that the continued use of the Ginn Reading Series is appropriate and advisable." However, "it is most difficult to make a

judgement on student achievement until the school year is completed." p. 38. Further, the pupils' progress charts that are to be completed by classroom teachers, the teachers program cards, the End-of-the-Unit Reports all give promise that the goals of the District can be achieved.

Improvement of Attendance

In the area of attendance improvement the process is now in practice of teachers reporting 2 times a day the attendance in their classes, and the follow-up calls on the phone and the home visits by additional personnel that have been added are commendable. The principals must see that these good practices are maintained. The district has set a goal of reduction of non-excused absences by 30%, but the schools visited had improved by 40% to 50%. The effort to improve attendance has resulted in an additional $225,000 being paid to the district by the State. The parental reactions to the District's efforts are positive, especially for the homework programs; the pressure to improve attendance which has resulted in phone calls and home visits, and the extended kindergarten day have caused the positive reinforcement that schools need.

Instruction

With respect to the instructional program, impressive progress in the development and implementation of the AGP program, and lengthening of the kindergarten day have been noted above. In addition, we want to discuss two curriculum areas mentioned in our earlier report - the Oral Communication Program and bilingual education; and raise questions about one part of the San Diego program we had not considered before - the Learning Centers and Extended Instructional Exchanges.

On the Oral Communication Program (OCP), we have reviewed a package of

sample materials, visited classes where oral language activities were in progress, and talked with Robert Bennett, who has responsibility for all program development in this area but whom we had not met before as he was on leave in 79-80.

In general, program development in this area is very promising, and Bennett is well qualified to carry it out. We agree with Bennett's philosophy that improvement in oral language skills can only come from a program in which drill follows, and is closely related to, meaningful communicative activities (such as the interviewing, role playing, translation of stories into television scripts, etc., described in the sample materials). We realize also that a general curriculum problem is accentuated in the oral language area: curriculum objectives must not be reduced to what is tested on written achievement tests. They can test the fine points of English grammar (they are vs. they is), spelling, punctuation, etc.: but they can not test, for example, how to speak appropriately in a job interview or on the job itself. The challenge to curriculum design and implementation in all areas, but especially here, is how to use the pressure for increased achievement as demonstrated on tests as leverage for teaching more than the test scores can reflect.

According to the implementation plan, 1981-82 will be the first year of full implementation of the Oral Communication Program. Hopefully, the implementation procedures that have worked this year for AGP can be followed as successfully next year with the Oral Communications Program.

One set of oral language activities that is part of the AGP itself is the "word warm-ups" - five minutes of lively vocabulary building exercises that precede instruction each day. We did not happen to see any of these warm-ups, but we heard excellent reports from teachers about them. Vocabulary building is a critical aspect of both language and reading progress, and the warm-ups sound like an imaginatively designed way to do it.

We have not done an in depth analysis of bilingual education in San Diego.

We discussed it in our April 1980 report only in Recommendation #6 on focused supervision. There we mentioned, as an example of a program which did include such focused assistance to teachers, the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Demonstration Project in 3 classrooms in each of 5 schools. Our description of this "exceptionally well-designed model" referred only to the 15 classrooms in this demonstration program. We did not, and still do not, have sufficient knowledge to comment further. We note the recent appointment of a well-qualified person to take charge of programs for the growing number of Asian students in San Diego; and note as well the involvement of special consultant McLevie in the general bilingual education area. But while fully supporting the principles of bilingual education we do not feel able to comment further at this time.

Finally, the Learning Centers (LC) and Extended Instructional Exchanges (EIE): Both these programs were initiated to promote integration, but our charge was to evaluate the "quality of education" in the minority isolated schools and we did not consider these programs in our original report. However, now two specific links between the two goals of integration and quality education have become more obvious.

First there is the role of the LC in providing education outside the basic skills. According to both teachers and principals, the time commitments for AGP have tended to crowd out of teachers' plans and the students' time experiences in "basic" areas such as science, art and music. These are precisely the curriculum areas, in addition to physical education, where exciting experiences are available to children who attend LC oneday a week. As one intermediate grade teacher put it, even though attendance of her class at a LC further reduces the time available for AGP and everything else, the experiences her children have at the LC are far superior to anything she could provide (even with more time) because of the specialized qualifications of the teachers and the specialized equipment available to them. We visited some of the LC classes and found truly

exciting education in all curriculum areas - physical education, science, art, music and enrichment activities in reading, language and mathematics. We do not know if such high quality experiences can be provided as fully within the structure of the Extended Instructional Exchanges.

Second, in the EIE problems with the organization of instruction in the basic skills areas seem bound to arise. We have not seen any EIE programs in action, but we have discussed some of these problems with various members of the San Diego teaching staff. Because the EIE functions for a period of 40-45 continuous days, the organization of basic instruction in reading and math for nearly a quarter of the school year is at stake. Unless both groups in each exchange pair are following the same curriculum, one of two consequences seems unavoidable; either the progress of 1 of the groups will be disrupted; or the degree of real integration within the classroom walls will be minimal as separate groups of children follow their "home" curriculum in separate parts of the room. Moreover, even if the two groups do share a joint curriculum, the gap in achievement levels will tend to make reading and math groups de facto segregated anyway.

None of these problems affect the LC. Differences in basic skills levels are not as serious in the enrichment activities in reading, language and math and are largely irrelevant for working together in science, art, etc. We were extremely impressed with the quality of both the curriculum experiences and the degree of true integration in the LC classes we visited. True, the children are integrated for a maximum of 36 days per year (one day per week), while the EIE would place children together for 40-45 days per year. The quality of an experience - here, integrated education - is at least as significant as the quantity.

Moreover, we understand from Dr. Patrick that the LC are less expensive than the EIE (approximately $346.00 vs. $484.00 per child per year). For all these reasons combined - the benefits in quality of education and the quality

of integration and the smaller cost; we suggest reconsideration of the plan to phase out the Learning Centers. In saying this, we want to make it clear that these considerations were discussed orally with Drs. Goodman and Patrick, and with Judge Welsh during our visit to San Diego in early March, and are in no way affected by the subsequent California Supreme Court decision.

In conclusion, we want to affirm both the very commendable progress being realized in all critical areas of the San Diego program addressed in our earlier report, and the need for consistent and sustained focused supervision and managerial accountability if this momentum is to be sustained. Because of increased demands on the school staffs to achieve this progress, we urge implementation of a financial reward system discussed in Order #17 in the Court's September 80 Memorandum of Intended Decision.