[ms-0234.003.001.002]

VERONICA A. ROESER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
455 SPRECKELS BUILDING
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
AREA CODE 714
TELEPHONE 234-3673

December 4th, 1978

Chief William B. Kolender,
Chairman, Integration Task Force,
801 West Market Street,
San Diego, California 92101

Dear Chief Kolender:

The following is information which I had planned to include in the presentation to the Task Force on September 26, 1978. Where appropriate the material has been brought up to date to reflect new information or data which has become available since September, such as the Pupil Ethnic Census, 1978-79.

The material includes:

I. General issues which we believe the Task Force should consider.

II. Documents which we believe the Task Force should have for reference.

III. Background information and the questions suggested by the information.

IV. Some data tabulated to show the wide variations in potential for student interracial contact and interaction in integration programs which range from none in some schools to full time in others.

In order to maintain the independence of the Task Force the court is establishing procedures by which the Task Force may receive information from the plaintiffs and the defendants. Within these procedures we welcome the opportunity to respond to any requests which you may make, and we also will continue to volunteer information when appropriate, following these procedures. We are in the process of preparing an analysis of the Pupil Ethnic Census 1978-79.

Sincerely yours,

Veronica A Roeser

VERONICA A. ROESER

VAR:jmr

Encl.

78-535B

I. GENERAL ISSUES

A. Priorities

With the limited number of monitors available we recommend the following priorities in the allocation of monitors.

1. The 23 segregated schools.
2. The VEEP receiving schools. (1)
3. The "tipping" schools. (2)
4. The remaining magnet schools.

B. The Basic Data For Evaluation Of The Plan

Activities in the classrooms may differ from directives issued or reports received by the central administration, or information provided by the plaintiffs or by others. Therefore, independent, on-site observations by the task force and its monitors should be the basis for the evaluation of the desegregation plan.

---

(1) Minority students entering white schools through the VEEP may, because of achievement tracking, find themselves in minority segregated classrooms. It has come to our attention, for example, that at Muirlands Junior High School, VEEP students are heavily concentrated in some classes, one social studies class having more than 70% minority students. For this reason monitoring of VEEP schools should have a high priority. In view of the limited number of monitors available, an ethnic census of each classroom in the district, taken by the district, would provide essential information to the task force.

(2) The court said "Schools in the San Diego Unified School District that contain 80 percent or more minority students are definitely segregated. Schools that contain more than 50 percent minority students are in danger of becoming segregated". ((First) Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, July 27, 1978, p.4.). Schools in danger of becoming segregated are called "tipping schools".

The school district indicated in its presentation to the task force that it intends to rely heavily on opinion surveys to determine the success of the integration program. While such surveys are valuable in determining what people think about programs, they are not reliable measures of the effectiveness of programs.

C. Sharing Benefits And Burdens

The first recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Commission on Racial Integration was, "To be fair a plan or program for desegregation/integration must involve the entire community. All persons must share any benefits or burdens in reaching the goal." (3) Plaintiffs recommend that the task force also use this concept in the evaluation of the plan and its programs.

D. Test Scores

It is recommended that the annual basic skills achievement test scores for schools be available to the task force and its monitors. Monitors should be encouraged to review the test scores for the schools which they are monitoring and also scores for a sampling of other schools. This will provide a reference for their observations concerning academic programs. It will also provide perspective to the task force in making its evaluation.

II. IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS FOR REFERENCE

A. Crawford v. Board of Education, 17 Cal. 3d 280 (1976). (The

---

(3) REPORT TO BOARD OF EDUCATION FROM CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION ON RACIAL INTEGRATION, May 31, 1977, p.1.

State Supreme Court decision on the Los Angeles desegregation suit. It enunciates the basic law under which the Carlin case is being decided.)

B. The court's major decisions in the Carlin case.

1. Memorandum Decision and Order, March 9, 1977. (The court's first decision: found 23 schools segregated; ordered the board to present a desegregation plan, and provided some guidance concerning the nature of the plan.)

2. Final Order for 1977-78 School Year, August 8, 1977. (Ordered certain desegregation programs to be implemented in 1977-78.)

3. Order and Guidance Memorandum, November 28,1977. (Found the first plan too vague and indefinite, gave guidance on some programs, and ordered a revised plan to be submitted.)

4. Memorandum of Intended Decision, June 12, 1978. (Established the Integration Task Force to monitor the plan and stated court's intention to conditionally approve the plan.)

5. Charge to the Integration Task Force, July 21, 1978. (Assigned responsibilities to the task force, including programs to monitor, what to look for, and when to report.)

6. Order Re Integration Plan, July 27, 1978. (Conditionally approved the 1978-82 integration plan and ordered certain reports to be made by the Board of Education.

7. (First) Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, July 27, 1978. (Findings and conclusions are based upon evidence submitted at 1976-77 trial. Includes the definition of segregated and tipping schools.)

8. (Second) Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, July 27, 1978. (Based upon the first year of the desegregation plan and other evidence regarding the School District's 1978-82 Integration Plan. Contains details of the conditional approval of the 1978-82 plan.)

C. San Diego Plan For Racial Integration, 1978-82, March 22, 1978. (The revised plan which was conditionally approved by the court.) Available from school district.

D. Amendment to San Diego Plan for Racial Integration, 1978-82, August 8, 1978. (Contains amendments to 1978-82 plan, including Clustering and Pairing Component which court ordered reinstated.)

E. Final Report on an Evaluation of the Voluntary Ethnic Enrollment Program. December 1977. By L.E. Orcutt and Associates, Inc. (An evaluation of VEEP commissioned by the school board.) Available from school district.

school dist

F. Pupil Ethnic Census, 1977-78 and 1978-79. (These documents show the racial/ethnic enrollment for each school and the totals for the district. The census is generally taken in October and released by the School District in October or November.) Available from school district.

school dist

G. Racial/Ethnic Balance Transfer Statistics, School Year 1978-79. (Gives information regarding VEEP, including the number of students participating in VEEP, the number of dropouts, and the reasons for dropping out.) Available from school district.

H. Sending - Receiving Analysis Report Active VEEP Students (For 1978-79 School Year). (Computer printout for each VEEP sending and receiving school: gives the number of students in each racial/ethnic group and the school the students come from or go to.) Available from school district.

I. Resident and Nonresident Program Participants (For 1978-79 School Year). (Lists resident and nonresident students in each magnet program and gives the racial/ethnic group to which student belongs and school from which nonresident students come.) Available from school district.

J. Basic Skills Testing Results for 1978-79 and for past several years. (Basic skills are tested annually in grades 2, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12). Available from school district.

K. Guidelines, Plans to Alleviate Racial and Ethnic Segregation of Minority Students (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Sections 90-101.), (Contains regulations and guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education for desegregating schools. Also contains a list of resource organizations and agencies which assist in desegregation and a list of reference materials.) Available from the State Department of Education.

III. QUESTIONS

A. Clustering and Pairing

One of the conditions which the court placed on the 1978-82 integration plan was that the voluntary pairing and clustering proposal set forth in the board's original plan submitted on June 13, 1977 (pages 131-138) be reinstated. The following questions are suggested concerning clustering and pairing.

1. How is the court's order to reinstate the voluntary clustering and pairing component of the integration plan being implemented?
2. Which schools, if any, have clustered or paired?
3. If there has been clustering and pairing, what has been the nature of the program?
   a. Are they full-time or part-time programs?
   b. Do they involve the total school, individual classes, or partial classes?
   c. Do they involve academic programs?
   d. Are field trips involved?
   e. Are visits exchanged between sites? If so, how often and for how long?

B. Learning Centers

Though not the only objective,[4] improved academic

---

(4) The State Supreme Court noted in the Crawford case that "The harms traditionally inflicted on minority children by school segregation do not, of course, relate solely to objective measures of academic achievment. Although from the existing evidence it appears that, by and large, the maintenance of segregated education probably does disproportionately impede the achievement of minority students vis a vis majority students, the detriments traditionally identified with segregated education rest in significant part outside the academic sphere." (17C.3d 280 at 296)

achievement for previously segregated minority students is one of the goals of integration. One component of the San Diego plan which addresses this need is the basic skills instruction in reading and mathematics provided in the Learning Centers. Students participate in this program one day a week and come from segregated schools and predomin--antly majority schools. Educational programs, achievement levels, and cultural backgrounds differ widely among these schools. If some of these programs are successful in teaching basic skills to such a diverse student body, they can provide valuable information and guidance for other integration programs, including further demonstration of the educational value of mixing achievement levels, rather than tracking. The following questions are suggested concerning Learning Centers.

1. What techniques are being used in Learning Centers to teach basic skills to students of widely varying backgrounds and achievement levels?
2. Are some, or all, of these techniques effective in improving the basic skills of low achieving students?
3. If some of the techniques are effective, are the more effective techniques applicable to other integration programs which also involve classes of diverse students?
4. Could some of these techniques be used to make it possible to integrate classes in schools where students who now transfer in may be placed in segregated classes?

5. Does the experience one day a week in the Learning Center produce observable improvement in performance in basic skills the other four days in the home school?

6. Are the two teaching programs in basic skills, the one in the Learning Center and the one in the home school, coordinated? If so, in what way?

7. How does the learning of basic skills in Learning Centers, with the diverse group of students involved, compare with the learning of basic skills in such full-time integrated programs as those in Encanto, Fremont, and Silver Gate?

8. If there are differences, what are they, what are the reasons for the differences, and what changes might be made to obtain the benefit of the best experience?

C. Tipping Schools

One task assigned to monitors by the court is to visit all tipping schools and to observe and report on the progress of the integration plan.(5) Tipping schools are those which have over 50% minority students but are not yet segregated.(6) At the time of the court's first order of

---

(5) Memorandum of Intended Decision, June 12, 1978, p.7. "This task force will appoint monitors (balanced individuals in each community) who will visit all minority isolated, tipping magnet and "receiving" schools to observe and report the progress of the integration plan." Charge to the Integration Task Force, July 21, 1978, p.1. "The goal of the task force is outlined in the Memorandum of Intended Decision signed and filed on June 12, 1978."

(6) See Footnote 1.

March 9, 1977, in which the court noted that schools over 50% minority are in danger of becoming segregated,(7) there were thirteen schools in this category.(8) Since then five more schools have entered this category and one in the tipping category has become segregated.(9)

If enrollment trends of the last five years continue, Boone, Paradise Hills, and Lee will become segregated between 1981 and 1982. The school district reports that their demographic projections indicate that no tipping school will become over 80% minority during the period covered by the plan.(10)

The following questions are suggested concerning tipping schools.

1. What is the basis of the district's projections that no tipping school will become more than 80% minority by 1982?
2. What is the effect of the integration plan on enrollment at Oak Park and Encanto, (two of the tipping schools with integration plans)?
3. Are there other effects of the integration plan on these two schools?

---

(7) MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER, March 9, 1977. p. 6 "The court also finds that all district schools with an enrollment of 50% or more minority students are in danger of becoming minority isolated and that future planning must take into consideration every means available to stabilize these schools."

(8) Schools over 50% minority, but not designated segregated in March 1977: Audubon, Boone, Central, Encanto, Keiller, Lee, Linda Vista, Oak Park, Paradise Hills, Perry, Washington, Bell, San Diego.

(9) In 1977-78 Brooklyn, Carson, and Dewey became over 50% minority. In 1978-79 Euclid and Penn became over 50% minority. In 1977-78, San Diego High School, which had been 78.4% minority moved into the segregated category when it became 82.5% minority. This year San Diego High School is 80.5% minority.

(10) San Diego Plan for Racial Integration, 1978-82, March 22, 1978, p.4 "The district's demographic projections indicate that no school which presently has a minority student enrollment of between 50% and 80% will have a minority student enrollment of 80% or more in 1982."

4. What is the effect of the integration plan on enrollments (VEEP, magnet schools, etc.) in tipping schools with no program of their own?

5. Are there other effects of the integration plan in these schools?

D. Rules of Inclusion and Exclusion for the Integration Programs.

Some of the eligibility rules of the San Diego School District's voluntary integration plan are designed to increase integration and some are not.(11)

For those rules designed to enhance integration, the primary drawback is that they limit participation. Some students with interests, abilities or talents appropriate to a particular integration program are denied the opportunity to participate because of their race or school of residence. (E.g. At Encanto Elementary School all non-resident minority students and majority students from minority or integrated schools are excluded.)

For those programs with looser eligibility requirements, no student may be barred from participating, but the program may do little to promote increased integration of the school district. (E.g. At Longfellow Elementary School minority students from the entire district are invited to attend, but last year 63.4% of those minority students who participated

(Continued on page 15)

Footnote 11 follows on pages 11 to 14.

FOOTNOTE (11) Program Eligibility Rules

School	Program	Eligibility Rules	Ineligible Students
Benchley	Individualized Instruction.	Open to all K-3 pupils in district, with priority to neighborhood pupils and those who will improve ethnic balance.	Students possibly ineligible because of racial/ethnic origin and area of residence.
Encanto	Individualized Instruction. Math/Science Magnet. Spanish Bilingual Program.	Resident pupils and majority pupils, K-6, from predominantly majority schools. Transfers must improve ethnic balance at sending school and Encanto.	Non-resident minority students. Majority students from minority schools and integrated schools.
Fremont	Individualized Instruction.	Parents throughout district are encouraged to consider Fremont.	None.
Silver Gate	Individualized Instruction.	Resident pupils and minority pupils from any area of district.	Non-resident majority students. *
Foster	Fundamental	Same as Silver Gate.	Same as Silver Gate.
Rolando Park	Fundamental	Same as Silver Gate.	Same as Silver Gate.
Webster	Fundamental	Resident pupils and majority pupils from any area of district.	Non-resident minority students. **

* Minority students from majority schools worsen racial balance of sending schools.

** Majority students from minority schools worsen racial balance of sending schools.

School	Program	Eligibility Rules	Ineligible Students
Horton Longfellow Oak Park	Spanish Intercultural Language Program.	K-6 grade pupils whose home language is English. Preference to K, 1 and 4 grade pupils. Assignment to Horton, Longfellow or Oak Park on basis of: ethnic balance at site, transportation routes, and area of residence.	None.
Lowell	Spanish Bilingual.	Resident pupils and majority pupils from predominantly majority schools. First and second grades in 78-79. Grades 1-6 in 79-80.	Non-resident minority students. Majority students from minority schools and integrated schools.
Spreckels	Spanish Bilingual.	Resident pupils and 80 non-resident Spanish speaking pupils.	Non-resident minority students, (except Spanish speaking). Non-resident majority students.
Lindbergh	Career Awareness.	Transfer to Lindbergh possible, if it maintains or improves ethnic/racial balance at Lindbergh. Minority enrollments encouraged.	Students possibly ineligible because of racial/ethnic origin.
Muir	Alternative School. Open Educational Philosophy.	K-12 pupils selected from all schools in district. Enrollment reflects racial/ethnic balance of district.	Students possibly ineligible because of racial/ethnic origin.
Valencia Park	University Laboratory School.	K-6 grades, resident minority pupils, and non-resident majority students from predominantly majority schools.	Non-resident minority students. Students from integrated schools.
hollas	Science, Physical Education, Health, Learning Center.	4-6 grades from predominantly minority and majority schools. Students will participate as class unit. Classes will reflect ethnic balance of district.	Students from integrated schools.
rantville	Music/Arts Learning Center.	4-6 grades, one-third from minority isolated schools, two-thirds from predominantly majority schools.	Students from integrated schools.

School	Program	Eligibility Rules	Ineligible Students
Collier-Point Loma	Spanish-English Bilingual Center.	Resident pupils and non-resident minority pupils. Must be fluent in English with 3 years of Spanish, or speak Spanish with limited English ability.	Non-resident majority students.
Hale-O'Farrell	Secondary Instructional Exchange Program.	Equal numbers of minority pupils from racially isolated schools and majority pupils from majority schools. Pupils may opt out of program.	Students from integrated schools.
Lincoln-Gompers	Science/Math & Computer Technology. Medical & Health Program.	Consideration given to majority pupils from schools 65% or more majority; to resident pupils; and to minority pupils from minority isolated and imbalanced schools.	Minority students from majority schools. Majority students from minority schools. *
Memorial	Spanish Intercultural Language.	Longfellow and Oak Park Intercultural Language graduates; Title VII bilingual program graduates; majority graduates of elementary schools with 65% or more majority pupils; minority pupils from minority isolated schools and racially imbalanced schools; and resident students. Ethnic balance must be maintained.	Minority students from majority schools. Majority students from minority schools. Students from integrated schools. **
Morse	Urban Studies	Pupils in grades 9-12 may attend full or part-time. Priority given to full-time pupils. Preference to those who improve the ethnic balance at Morse and sending school.	If preference is given those who improve racial balance, some may be ineligible because of racial/ethnic origin and area of residence. If no preference is given, student may worsen racial balance at Morse or sending school.

* Minority students from minority schools worsen racial balance at Lincoln or Gompers.

** Minority students from minority schools worsen racial balance at Memorial.

School	Program	Eligibility Rules	Ineligible Students
O'Farrell	Fundamental	Consideration given to majority pupils from schools 65% or more majority; to resident pupils; and graduates of elementary fundamental schools.	Students from minority schools. Minority students from majority schools. Students from integrated schools.
Roosevelt	Creative and Performing Arts.	Grades 4-7. Minority pupils from predominantly minority schools and majority pupils from predominantly majority schools. School will reflect ethnic balance of district. Grades 4-12 by 1981-82. Pupils must demonstrate ability or interest in one or more of the arts.	Minority students from majority schools. Majority students from minority schools. Students from integrated schools.
Wright Brothers	Career High School.	Open to pupils, grades 10-12, with satisfactory grades and good citizenship.	*

* Students may worsen racial balance of sending schools.

in the program came from majority schools.) From the enrollment data at Longfellow it may appear that ample integration of minority students was taking place. Actually, many minority students simply moved from one majority school to another. At Wright Brothers, where broad eligibility rules permit the enrollment of white students from the entire district, 62 of the 146 white students who enrolled in the program last year came from minority schools. This increased the segregation at the sending schools.

The following questions are suggested.

1. Are there students who want to transfer to a magnet program, but are not able to do so because of eligibility rules?
   a. How many students?
   b. At what schools?
   c. To which program or school did they wish to transfer?
   d. Which eligibility rules are involved?
2. Are there students who have transferred under the present rules whose transfer did not improve the racial/ethnic balance at either the sending or the receiving schools or both?
   a. How many students?
   b. At what schools?
   c. Which eligibility rules were involved?
3. Are there hardships or inequities which result because of the present rules?
   a. How many students are affected in these ways?
   b. Which rules are involved?
4. Are there changes in the rules and procedures governing

the transfer of students and eligibility for programs which could be made to permit students to attend educational programs of their choice and also achieve integration?

a. What are these changes?

5. Are there other changes which might achieve the aim of integration and choice of educational program?

E. Attendance Patterns at O'Farrell

In the past, O'Farrell Junior High School, one of the court-designated segregated schools, did not reflect the racial/ethnic balance of the elementary schools which feed into it, as other junior high schools did. It appears that last year over two thirds of the white students who normally would have attended O'Farrell as their neighborhood school, did not do so. (12)

---

(12) Comparison of O'Farrell enrollment with elementary feeder schools enrollment:

Elementary Feeder Schools	Majority	Minority	Total	Percent Minority
Audubon	233	390	623	
Encanto	332	703	1,035	
Freese	176	695	871	
Fulton	2	285	287	
Keiller	107	183	290	
Valencia Park	13	407	420	
Plus Students Who Leave in VEEP	1	142	143	
Minus Students Who Come in VEEP	77	7	84	
Total Students from Neighborhood (Corrected for VEEP)	787	2,798	3,585	78.0
O'Farrell	114	756	870	
Plus Students Who Leave in VEEP	1	560	561	
Minus Students Who Cime in VEEP	0	1	1	
Total Students from Neighborhood (Corrected for VEEP)	115	1,315	1,430	91.9

If Majority and minority pupils were in the same proportion to each other at O'Farrell as in the elementary feeder schools there would be about 370 majority students at O'Farrell, instead of 115. O'Farrell would be 78% minority instead of 91.9 minority.

The following questions are suggested.

1. Are there transfers made under the present rules and procedures which increase segregation at O'Farrell?
2. How many white students who would normally attend O'Farrell as their neighborhood school did not attend O'Farrell in 1978-79 school year?
3. Did those not attending O'Farrell use Special Attendance Permits, or other procedures in order to transfer to other schools?
4. What were the reasons for requesting transfers?
5. If changes were made in the practice of issuing Special Attendance Permits, similar to the change reported at San Diego High School, (13) would there be an increase in the enrollment of white students from the O'Farrell neighborhood?
5. How do the numbers of white student transfers from O'Farrel compare with the numbers from other junior high schools?

---

(13) Between 1977-78 and 1978-79 the number of white students at San Diego High School increased by 16 while the number of minority students decreased by 145, with the percent minority enrollment decreasing by two percentage points. Mr. Fletcher explained to the Integration Task Force on November 21, 1978, that the increase in white students was the result of issuing fewer Special Attendance Permits to white students this year.

IV. DATA SHOWING VARIATIONS IN STUDENT INTERRACIAL CONTACT AND INTERACTION.

Explanation of Tables

The tables on the following pages show, in convenient form, the wide variations in integration programs offered in the San Diego Plan for Racial Integration. There are four main categories of tables, showing: (1) Full time, Full School Programs; (2) Full Time, Part School Programs; (3) Part Time, Part School Programs; and (4) No On-Site Programs. Each category is divided so as to separately show the elementary and secondary programs. The tables are arranged to facilitate further comparisons such as the following:

(a) Differences among Segregated, Tipping and Majority Schools. Eighteen elementary schools and five secondary schools were designated as segregated by the court. Tipping schools were defined by the court as those schools having 50% or more minority students but not yet segregated. Majority schools are those schools having fewer than 50% minority students.

(b) Differences between current programs (1978-79) and the programs for the last year of the proposed plan (1981-82). Those programs which will continue to have 80% or more minority students (designated by the court as definitely segregated) at the completion of the plan in 1981-82 are marked in yellow.

(c) Differences between integration and regular programs. In the tables, "regular programs"

include the total enrollment in schools which have not yet initiated an integration program. In schools which have part school integration programs (schools-within-schools), the designation "regular program" is applied to the enrollment in those portions of the school which do not offer special integration programs.

(d) Differences between projected and actual enrollments. The school district has made projections for most of the special integration programs, showing the expected enrollments for each year of the program's existence. The district Pupil Ethic Census, 1978-79 shows the actual enrollment for all schools. The projected and actual enrollment figures are placed side by side in the tables for easy comparison. Those enrollments which have achieved or exceeded district goals are outlined in green; those which have not are outlined in red.

In addition, the tables set out the percent of minority enrollment as well as the total enrollment in each program. This will make it possible to determine the success or failure of each program in terms of both variables. E.g. The Intercultural Spanish Program at Horton Elementary School has achieved the racial balance projected by the school district; its total enrollment, however, falls far short of the school district's goal. The Bilingual Spanish Program at Lowell

Elementary School, on the other hand, almost achieved the total enrollment projected by the school district but fell far short of the projected racial balance.

Mission Bay, Crawford and Kearny, though not qualifying as magnet programs, (14) have been included in the tables because they were included in the district's brochure, Voluntary Integration Better Education by Choice 1978-1982.

Data for the tables were obtained from:

San Diego Plan for Racial Integration, 1978-82. (3/22/78)

Amendment to San Diego Plan for Racial Integration, 1978-82. (8/8/78)

Elementary and Secondary Schools Composite Enrollment Report. (10/3/78)

Proposed New, Expanded or Revised Magnet Programs - 1979-80, (11/21/78)

Pupil Ethnic Census Report, 1978-79. (11/21/78)

---

(14) According to the Order and Guidance Memorandum, November 28, 1977 Pg. 5, line 23
"SECONDARY:
1. The role of the secondary magnet school is to attract white students to schools located in the minority community (e.g., Wright Brothers Career School). Therefore, those special programs that are planned for balanced or majority imbalanced schools (Mission Bay, Crawford, Madison and Kearney (?) - pages 70, 72-74, 85-86) do not qualify as magnet programs. The cost of these programs should not be attributed to the desegregation order."

The San Diego Plan for Racial Integration does not include these schools.