[ms-0234.005.003-013]

SAN DIEGO INTEGRATION TASK FORCE MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1980
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Judy McDonald, Acting Chair
Fred Castro, 2nd Vice Chair
Tom Carter
Irma Castro
Morris Casuto
Ann Hunsaker
Judge Judy McConnell
Mike Madigan
Ralph Ocampo, M.D.
Hartwell Ragsdale

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Hal Brown, Chair
Jim Anderson
Jerry Baker
Richard Calvin
Judge Joe Davis
Larry Gonzales
Alan McCutcheon
Clarence Pendleton
Bill Rohan
Delia Talamantez
Eunice Winston
Beverly Yip

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

Acting Chair, Judy McDonald, introduced Mr. Robert Amparan, Principal at Memorial Jr. High. He explained briefly that Memorial is involved in the Instructional Exchange Program with Pacific Beach Junior High (Spanish class) and Lewis Jr. High (social studies and English).

MONITOR REPORTS

Secondary Exchange Program - Elaine Smith, Chair
The secondary exchange program affects 13 secondary schools and approximately 260-400 students in San Diego schools. The program consists of a pairing of 2 or 3 schools for from 2 to 4 study periods per day for 1 year (except the S.D.H.S.-Pt. Loma High exchange which is one semester). The students from one school are transported to the other school and have classroom instructional time together in an integrated setting. The schools participating are: San Diego-Pt. Loma; Morse-Madison; O'Farrell-Hale/Pershing; Lincoln-Henry/Clairemont; Memorial-Lewis/Pacific Beach. Each pair is a separate exchange, i.e., Lincoln has two separate programs, one with Henry and one with Clairemont.

San Diego-Pt. Loma: Two instructional periods of 12th grade "local government and field studies". Forty two students are participating, 21 from each school. From Pt. Loma: 1 Black, 1 Asian, 1 Hispanic, 18 Caucasian. From San Diego: 5 Black, 6 Hispanic, 10 Caucasian. Total: 28 majority students, 14 minority students. Class consists of class discussion on American Government and lots of field trips. Seating in classroom according to choice and is along racial/ethnic lines.

Lincoln-Henry/Clairemont: Lincoln-Henry (27 minority students, 27 majority students), Lincoln-Clairemont (28 minority students, 30 majority students). Social studies and English.

Madison-Morse: 11th Grade American Lit. and U.S. History. Madison (50% majority, 50% minority), Morse (100% minority students participating). Three periods per day plus one for transportation, two periods in classroom and one period for lunch at host school.

Strengths:
The students are being taught in an integrated classroom setting. Many teachers and their enthusiasm, creativity and planning are also a strength of this program.

Weakness of the Program:

1. The unreliability of the buses
2. The shortness of the exchange, which in most cases is two periods of instructional time and one period of bus ride.
3. The disorganization of the program at the administrative level, i.e., schools on different time schedules; schools with different requirements for graduation in required courses and these courses being in on the exchange; classrooms not being available; budget problems; recruiting of students for program, no definition of who can participate in program (minority students from a majority school and vice versa); different textbooks for the same course at different schools.

Magnets - Carlton Schroeder, Chair

There are in excess of 32 magnets and over 11,000 students participating in the program. The monitors looked at the following three areas:

1. What was the impact of the magnets program on the school at which it was located and what was the impact of the magnet on the community it was located in? In general, the answer was good to excellent. There seems to be much better impact in the elementary schools than in the secondary schools. The goal of the magnet program seems to be readily attained at the elementary level than the secondary level. The staff people at magnet schools are superior. This seems true regardless of whether monitors thought the program was successful or not. The feeling is that there has definitely been an improvement over the past year. The impact on the community has been little or none. It is hard to determine what the impact is, but where there was feedback from the community it was positive.

2. There is little or no problem at the elementary level where the magnet program and non-magnet program exist side by side. There is much more of a problem at the secondary level. Total magnets such as Johnson seemed to work out much better than any split magnet. The monitors asked what could be done to help overcome the "we-they" situation.

3. The monitors feel that as a general program, the magnet is very good as an aid to integrate. Certain programs at specific schools seem to be of questionable value.

Questions asked by TF members:

A. How is the quality of education and curriculum evaluated in a magnet and specifically how do monitors evaluate a magnet school where you have one of a kind: e.g., communications, medical aide? There is nothing one can mirror these programs with to see if they are working well.

B. Who can go to these programs and how do we attract students to these programs?

C. How do you intend to improve your magnet program? How do you intend to increase the numbers of minority or majority students to make it a success.

Susan Jay, a monitor, said that at Gompers there is more coexistence. There is far less of the "we-they" situation. Parents no longer have the feeling that "they get everything they need." There is concern about having student teachers teaching instead of teachers, as well as teacher absences. Bettie McIntosh, also a monitor, pointed out that junior and senior high students have very little from which to select as far as electives are concerned. Also, if students don't get along with a teacher, he/she has to stay with that teacher because no other teachers are teaching that class.

Learning Centers - Authored by Monitors

The following seven Elementary School Learning Centers are being monitored: Carver, Chollas, Freese, Grant, Grantville, Kennedy, and Stockton. These schools are divided up among a monitoring committee including: Miriam Gerstler, Chair, Susan Neptune-Richardson, Laura Hoke and Julia Jennings.

The monitors learned from Dr. Cisnero's office that the Board of Education is in the process of formulating a plan to phase out (or change the nature of) the Learning Centers. We felt that our greatest contribution to the Task Force at this time was to gather information from the Administrators of and the Teachers in Learning Centers and include the following questions:

1. Are you aware of the plan to phase out the Learning Centers and phase in paired and clustered schools?

2. Did you have any input into the plan?

3. What was your input?

4. If you did not provide input to the Board of Education, what would you like to contribute?

We also plan to become familiar with each of the Learning Centers, their staff and program operations, as well as their paired and feeder schools.

The one-day-a-week integrated Learning Center experience was designed as an "ice-breaker" to build mutual trust, break down racial barriers and dispel myths and false stereotypes produced by isolation. The special equipment, lower class size and highly specialized staff make it possible to give each child an exceptional educational experience in Science and Physical Education or Art and Music. This year each Learning Center has its own full-time counselor available to provide well-planned race/human relations activities for the children. Every child in the Learning Center will participate in the sessions at the Counseling Center. Administrators and Learning Center Team leaders have stated that they feel the full-time District Counselor is a great asset to their programs.

The basic skills areas of Reading/Language Arts and Math offer the students an opportunity to work in classes with a ratio of ten students to one certificated teacher. This is accomplished by using the regular classroom teacher from the visiting school to work with the especially-trained Learning Center staff.

Each Learning Center is organized in a similar pattern of 2/3 majority to 1/3 minority mixing of 4th - 6th grade students. In most of the schools the children are kept in their racially balanced group from the time they step off their bus, through their classroom activities, on the playground and at lunch until they reboard the bus for their home school. This is accomplished better in some schools than others based on the adequacy of adult supervision. At first some of the teachers felt this strict conformity would be too restricting. However, by the end of the last school year, those most vociferously against the plan at the start of the school year were the most supportive upon reviewing the positive results. Structure as well as curriculum are seen now as very important to the functioning of the Learning Centers.

The principals of the schools we have visited as monitors are very proud of their Learning Centers and feel that their programs are providing an excellent integration experience combined with quality education. As monitors, we must agree. Some school principals are more knowledgeable about and involved with the plan to phase out the

Learning Centers and reorganize the voluntary integration program at the elementary school level than others. Donna Keenan, Principal at Grant Elementary, felt that the Board of Education has been open and responsive to the input of school personnel in this process.

Administrators have expressed their dedication to assist in making the Learning Center transition an orderly process for the schools, for parents and children while maintaining credibility with parents and teachers.

We were told that the phase-out of the Learning Centers would be implemented by June 1981 for the 1981-82 school year. Examples of the current planning include the following:

Grant Elementary (a majority school) would become a kindergarten through sixth grade magnet with a math/science emphasis. All teachers would be screened and thus there may be some changes in staff. Learning Center personnel, however, have already been screened and could continue teaching in the proposed magnet program. The Learning Center buildings would be used for growth areas.

Chollas Elementary (a minority isolated school) would become a mirror magnet to Grant. The principal at Grant stated that her school is located in an "educationally oriented" community that has been apprised of this proposed plan and is supportive of it. She said that parents from her school have demonstrated a willingness to take advantage of the choices for educational enrichment and integration-oriented experiences for their children. Grant is located in Mission Hills and has good freeway accessibility as does Chollas in Southeast for busing children.

The Spanish immersion program at Horton and Oak Park would both be located at Horton. The French program at Knox would also be placed at Horton making it a specialized Spanish/French language immersion school.

Johnson elementary is an academic magnet and Oak Park a magnet for the gifted and talented children. Currently Grant has a gifted cluster center which could easily be moved to Oak Park. At this time, parents electing to have their children attend gifted cluster center at Grant have to provide their own transportation. If Oak Park were to become a magnet as is being proposed, buses would be provided by the school district for the children attending this program.

Fulton is an academic and athletic magnet including an extended day with a specialized swimming program. Knox may also evolve into a similar academic/athletic magnet.

A music conservatory is in the planning stages for one school. Sherman may remain strictly as an exchange program. The exchange programs would consist of a full half year at each of the paired school sites and include special programs in art and music. Summer school may be offered only at minority schools for children attending an exchange program.

Students enrolled in Children's Centers for extended day care would be transported by bus to a magnet school and back to the children's center in their own community.

A plan suggested by the principal at Grant would be to seek funding to provide an evening meal to low-income single working parents and their children enrolled at the Children's Centers. Low cost nutritionally balanced dinners could be prepared in the school cafeterias. She stated that from her experience in working with low-income families she believes there would be a significant reduction in the incidence of child abuse by reducing the tension involved with food purchasing and meal preparation and providing a relaxed environment for families to relax, share and eat together at school.

Last year one of the most consistent problems plaguing the Learning Centers was the late arrival of the buses. This seems to be due to the delayed departure from the home schools. There was a fear that some of the children would be left behind. One Center's team leader said that since the beginning of the program, buses have arrived on an average of 15 minutes late. This happens when they drop the children off at the Centers and when they take them back to their home school. The staff feels that this delay in returning students to their home school may be one of the reasons why students drop out of the program. Some of the bus drivers do not know how to get to the Learning Center schools and will not take direction from the teachers riding aboard the buses. The staff of the Learning Centers timed the bus rides from each school. The longest bus ride is one half hour.

Students who have been designated as LES/NES (Limited and Non-English Speaking Students) will have the opportunity to participate in a preview/review session the morning of the day they attend a Learning Center. Participating teachers have the option of recommending this session for their students. During the preview LES/NES students receive an oral presentation of the day's activities in their native language. A bilingual aide is provided for students requiring assistance in communicating and understanding classroom activities.

One monitor attended a meeting conducted by two Bilingual Specialists who outlined a program that they said they had worked on all summer. They demonstrated a lesson plan to teach the LES/NES students vocabulary and prepare them for concepts that would be taught in the Science class at Carver Learning Center. They conducted what appeared to be a tutorial on the lesson plan that they had devised. They expected the bilingual teachers to grasp in this one session what they had evolved during several months. They stressed the point that their program could be taught to the children in ten minute sessions a day. When the teachers told them that they didn't have ten minutes in their program to work in the material, the experts recommended that they do it on the bus coming to the Learning Center. There seems to be a great gap between the bilingual experts and the teachers who are teaching the LES/NES children. Perhaps it would be more fruitful for the school district to pay the bilingual teachers during their summer vacations to develop the material to be used by their children at the Learning Centers rather than hire "experts" who appear to be so far removed.

A few examples of feedback from parents and teachers are as follows:

One home teacher said she spoke to thirty-six parents of children in her class who are participating in this semester's Learning Center at Carver. The majority of these parents told her that they were willing to allow their children to be in this program as long as it was one day a week. They would not allow them to continue if the program were increased to five days a week.

Another home school teacher said that she believed that the children felt about their one day a week at the Learning Center as they do about field trips. She fears this special anticipation would disappear if the children went to the Learning Center more often.

A teacher from one of the minority feeder schools said she had the complaint from a large group of her parents that their children did not have the choice of whether or not they wanted to attend a Learning Center. These parents felt that the program was not voluntary for the minority students. There has been no alternative program provided at the home school for the student who did not want to go to the Learning Center. They felt this was very unfair to them.

A teacher from a majority home school had three suggestions: 1) Make sure that all the children have at least one friend from his/her home school in the Learning Center group so that the student does not feel isolated when attending the center. 2) When the emergency forms are made out by the children's parents, those students who are going to attend Learning Centers should have two forms sent home. In this way the duplicate forms to be kept on file at the Learning Center Office will be filled out by the student's parent. Now the home school teacher has to copy each form for the Learning Center. This is a waste of the teacher's time. 3) This teacher also feels that if the home school were programmed to attend the Learning Center five days a week in blocks of several weeks throughout the school year it would be very difficult to cover the curriculum required at the home school. With the program set up the way it is now, the teacher can plan to cover all of the material required in the four days allotted to them at the home school.

We have read about the "complaint that the Learning Centers produce a lot of movement but very little education." As Learning Center Monitors we would like to state firmly that we disagree with this complaint. Our observation is that the Learning Centers provide an exceptional learning experience for children; the specialized staff are highly qualified and enthusiastic, the material presented is new and exciting; and the children are having a rewarding integration experience.

THE NEXT INTEGRATION TASK FORCE MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1980, 4:00 P.M., LOGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, 2875 OCEANVIEW BLVD., SAN DIEGO.

November 3, 1980

SAN DIEGO INTEGRATION TASK FORCE MEMBERS

[illegible]OLD BROWN (Chairman)
Associate Dean for External
Relations, College of Business
San Diego State University
San Diego, Ca 92182
265-6437

JUDY McDONALD
(First-Vice-Chairman)
5289 Canterbury Dr.
San Diego, Ca 92116
284-4640

FRED CASTRO, ESQ.
(Second Vice-Chairman)
3104 Fourth Ave.
San Diego, Ca 92103
291-4500

JAMES ANDERSON
Vice-President
Wells Fargo Bank
500 Broadway
San Diego, Ca 92101
238-6312

[illegible]RRY BAKER
Kaufman, Lansky & Baker
656 Fifth Ave.
San Diego, Ca 92101
235-6361

DR. LILLIAN BEAM, President
Educational Cultural Complex
4343 Oceanview Blvd.
San Diego, Ca 92113
230-2825

RICHARD CALVIN, Manager
California Curl
4183 Market St.
San Diego, Ca 92102
263-8141

TOM CARTER
First Vice-President
San Diego Federal
Savings and Loan Assoc.
600 "B" St., Suite 350
San Diego, Ca 92101
231-6214

IRMA CASTRO, Director
Chicano Federation
1960 National Ave.
San Diego, Ca 92113
236-1228

MORRIS CASUTO, Director
San Diego-Arizona Regional
Office of the Anti-Defamation
League
7850 Mission Center Ct.
Suite 207
San Diego, Ca 92108
293-3770

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH K. DAVIS
Judge of the San Diego
Municipal Court
County Courthouse
220 W. Broadway
San Diego, Ca 92101
236-2620

HILARIO "LARRY" GONZALES
Director, Department of
General Services
County of San Diego
5555 Overland Ave.
San Diego, Ca 92123
565-5283

ANN HUNSAKER
1540 Savin Dr.
El Cajon, Ca 92021
444-4211

THE HONORABLE JUDITH McCONNELL
Judge of the San Diego
Superior Court
P. O. Box 2724
San Diego, Ca 92112
236-2641

ALAN McCUTCHEON, Director
Centre City District
San Diego Gas & Electric
P. O. Box 1831
San Diego, Ca 92112
232-4252, x1436

MIKE MADIGAN
Vice-President
Development Corporation
Pardee Construction
110 West "C" St., Suite 2200
San Diego, Ca 92101
231-9744

RALPH R. OCAMPO, M.D.
4060 Fourth Ave., Suite 440
San Diego, Ca 92103
298-8891

CLARENCE PENDLETON
President
San Diego Urban League
P. O. Box 8248
San Diego, Ca 92102
263-3115

HARTWELL RAGSDALE
Anderson-Ragsdale Mortuary
5050 Federal Blvd.
San Diego, Ca 92102
263-3141

WILLIAM B. ROHAN
Research Law Librarian
San Diego County Law Library
1105 Front St.
San Diego, Ca 92101
236-2231

DELIA TALAMANTEZ
Director, Special Programs
Staff Personnel Management
University of California,
San Diego
Q016
La Jolla, Ca 92092
452-3694

EUNICE WINSTON, Treasurer
City of San Diego
City Administration Bldg.
202 "C" St., 8th Floor
San Diego, Ca 92101
236-6112

BEVERLY YIP
Executive Director
Union of Pan-Asian Communiti
2459 Market St.
San Diego, Ca 92102
232-6454

ANNA CAZARES, Secretary
County Courthouse
220 W. Broadway, Rm 5005
San Diego, Ca 92101
235-8185

9/8/80 amc

Draft-!

SAN DIEGO INTEGRATION TASK FORCE MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1980
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Judy McDonald, Acting-Chair
Fred Castro, 2nd Vice-Chair
Tom Carter
Irma Castro
Morris Casuto
Ann Hunsaker
Judge Judy McConnell
Mike Madigan
Ralph Ocampo, M.D.
Hartwell Ragsdale

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Hal Brown, Chair
Jim Anderson
Jerry Baker
Richard Calvin
Judge Joe Davis
Larry Gonzales
Alan McCutcheon
Clarence Pendleton
Bill Rohan
Delia Talamantez
Eunice Winston
Beverly Yip

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

Acting Chair, Judy McDonald, introduced Mr. Robert Amparan, Principal at Memorial Jr. High. He explained briefly that Memorial is involved in the Instructional Exchange Program with Pacific Beach Junior High (Spanish class) and Lewis Jr. High (social studies and English).

MONITOR REPORTS

Secondary Exchange Program - Elaine Smith, Chair
The Secondary Exchange Program affects 13 secondary schools, and 260-300 students. The program consists of pairing 2-3 schools for 2-4 study periods for one year: San Diego-Pt. Loma, Morse-Madison, O'Farrell-Hale/Pershing, Lincoln-Patrick Henry/Clairemont, Memorial-Lewis/Pacific Beach.

Strengths of the Program:
1. Students are being taught in an integrated classroom setting
2. Many teachers are a ~~strength~~ strong and committed

Weaknesses of the Program:
1. Unreliability of buses
2. Shortness of exchange time: two periods of instructional time
3. Teachers felt there was disorganization at the administrative level
4. Disorganization at classroom level
5. Paired schools are at different time schedules
6. Schools with different requirements for graduation and required courses are part of exchange program.
7. Classrooms havenot been made available when they were supposed to be
8. Teachers complained of budget problems.
9. Recruiting of students to program is a problem. There is no set way to recruit. No definition of who can participate in the program. VEEP students are participating in the exchange program.

Other points made:
1. In some schools students with behavior problems are screened out of exchange program, as well as Title I students (Title I students receive compensatory education).
2. The schools have different textbooks for the same class.
3. The teacher is very important to this program. It is important to have teachers participate who are enthused about the program.

4. Mr. Fletcher feels the "buddy system" should be encouraged
5. The Pt. Loma/San Diego program has learning on the buses. Several Task Force members would like to know what kind of learning is taking place.
6. Tom Carter would like to know what teachers are doing to stimulate interaction among the students.

Magnets - Carlton Schroeder, Chair

There are in excess of 32 magnets and over 11,000 students participating in the program. The monitors looked at the following three areas:

1. What was the impact of the magnets program on the school at which it was located and what was the impact of the magnet on the community it was located in? In general, the answer was good to excellent. There seems to be much better impact in the elementary schools than in the secondary schools. The goal of the magnet program seems to be readily attained at the elementary level than the secondary level. The staff people at magnet schools are superior. This seems true regardless of whether monitors thought the program was successful or not. The feeling is that there has definitely been an improvement over the past year. The impact on the community has been little or none. It is hard to determine what the impact is, but where there was feedback from the community it was positive.

2. There is little or no problem at the elementary level where the magnet program and non-magnet program exist side by side. There is much more of a problem at the secondary level. Total magnets such as Johnson seemed to work out much better than any split magnets. The monitors asked what could be done to help overcome the "we-they" situation.

3. The monitors feel that as a general program, the magnet is very good as an aid to integrate. Certain programs at specific schools seem to be of questionable value.

Questions asked by TF members:

A. How is the quality of education and curriculum evaluated in a magnet and specifically how do monitors evaluate a magnet school where you have one of a kind: e.g., communications, medical aide? There is nothing one can mirror these programs with to see if they are working well.

B. Who can go to these programs and how do we attract students to these programs?

C. How do you intend to improve your magnet program? How do you intend to increase the numbers of minority or majority students to make it a success.

Susan Jay, a monitor, said that at Gompers there is more coexistence. There is far less of the "we-they" situation. Parents no longer have the feeling that "they get everything they need." There is concern about having student teachers teaching instead of teachers, as well as teacher absences. Bettie McIntosh, also a monitor, pointed out that junior and senior high students have very little from which to select as far as electives are concerned. Also, if students don't get along with a teacher, he/she has to stay with that teacher because no other teachers are teaching that class.

Learning Centers - The Learning Centers report is attached.

November 3, 1980

INTEGRATION TASK FORCE REPORT ON LEARNING CENTERS

The following seven Elementary School Learning Centers are being monitored: Carver, Chollas, Freese, Grant, Grantville, Kennedy, and Stockton. These schools are divided up among a monitoring committee including: Miriam Gerstler, Chair, Susan Neptune-Richardson, Laura Hoke and Julia Jennings.

The monitors learned from Dr. Sissnaro's office that the Board of Education is in the process of formulating a plan to phase out (or change the nature of) the Learning Centers. We felt that our greatest contribution to the Task Force at this time was to gather information from the Administrators of and the Teachers in Learning Centers and include the following questions:

1. Are you aware of the plan to phase out the Learning Centers and phase in paired and clustered schools?

2. Did you have any input into the plan?

3. What was your input?

4. If you did not provide input to the Board of Education, what would you like to contribute?

We also plan to become familiar with each of the Learning Centers, their staff and program operations, as well as their paired and feeder schools.

The one-day-a-week integrated Learning Center experience was designed as an "ice-breaker" to build mutual trust, break down racial barriers and dispel myths and false stereotypes produced by isolation. The special equipment, lower class size and highly specialized staff make it possible to give each child an exceptional educational experience in Science and Physical Education or Art and Music. This year each Learning Center has its own full-time counselor available to provide well-planned race/human relations activities for the children. Every child in the Learning Center will participate in the sessions at the Counseling Center. Administrators and Learning Center Team leaders have stated that they feel the full-time District Counselor is a great asset to their programs.

The basic skills areas of Reading/Language Arts and Math offer the students an opportunity to work in classes with a ratio of ten students to one certificated teacher. This is accomplished by using the regular classroom teacher from the visiting school to work with the especially-trained Learning Center staff.

Each Learning Center is organized in a similar pattern of 2/3 majority to 1/3 minority mixing of 4th - 6th grade students. In most of the schools the children are kept in their racially balanced group from the time they step off their bus, through their classroom activities, on the playground and at lunch until they reboard the bus for their home school. This is accomplished better in some schools than others based on the adequacy of adult supervision. At first some of the teachers felt this strict conformity would be too restricting. However, by the end of the last school year, those most vociferously against the plan at the start of the school year were the most supportive upon reviewing the positive results. Structure as well as curriculum are seen now as very important to the functioning of the Learning Centers.

The principals of the schools we have visited as monitors are very proud of their Learning Centers and feel that their programs are providing an excellent integration experience combined with quality education. As monitors, we must agree. Some school principals are more knowledgeable about and involved with the plan to phase out the

Learning Centers and reorganize the voluntary integration program at the elementary school level than others. Donna Keenan, Principal at Grant Elementary, felt that the Board of Education has been open and responsive to the input of school personnel in this process.

Administrators have expressed their dedication to assist in making the Learning Center transition an orderly process for the schools, for parents and children while maintaining credibility with parents and teachers.

We were told that the phase-out of the Learning Centers would be implemented by June 1981 for the 1981-82 school year. Examples of the current planning include the following:

Grant Elementary (a majority school) would become a kindergarten through sixth grade magnet with a math/science emphasis. All teachers would be screened and thus there may be some changes in staff. Learning Center personnel, however, have already been screened and could continue teaching in the proposed magnet program. The Learning Center buildings would be used for growth areas.

Chollas Elementary (a minority isolated school) would become a mirror magnet to Grant. The principal at Grant stated that her school is located in an "educationally oriented" community that has been appraised of this proposed plan and is supportive of it. She said that parents from her school have demonstrated a willingness to take advantage of the choices for educational enrichment and integration-oriented experiences for their children. Grant is located in Mission Hills and has been freeway accessibility as does Chollas in Southeast for busing children.

The Spanish immersion program at Horton and Oak Park would both be located at Horton. The French program at Knox would also be placed at Horton making it a specialized Spanish/French language immersion school.

Johnson elementary is an academic magnet and Oak Park a magnet for the gifted and talented children. Currently Grant has a gifted cluster center which could easily be moved to Oak Park. At this time, parents electing to have their children attend gifted cluster center at Grant have to provide their own transportation. If Oak Park were to become a magnet as is being proposed, buses would be provided by the school district for the children attending this program.

Fulton is an academic and athletic magnet including an extended day with a specialized swimming program. Knox may also evolve into a similar academic/athletic magnet.

A music conservatory is in the planning stages for one school. Sherman may remain strictly as an exchange program. The exchange programs would consist of a full half year at each of the paired school sites and include special programs in art and music. Summer school may be offered only at minority schools for children attending an exchange program.

Students enrolled in Children's Centers for extended day care would be transported by bus to a magnet school and back to the children's center in their own community.

A plan suggested by the principal at Grant would be to seek funding to provide an evening meal to low-income single working parents and their children enrolled at the Children's Centers. Low cost nutritionally balanced dinners could be prepared in the school cafeterias. She stated that from her experience in working with low-income families she believes there would be a significant reduction in the incidence of child abuse by reducing the tension involved with food purchasing and meal preparation and providing a relaxed environment for families to relax, share and eat together at school.

Last year one of the most consistent problems plaguing the Learning Centers was the late arrival of the buses. This seems to be due to the delayed departure from the home schools. There was a fear that some of the children would be left behind. One Center's team leader said that since the beginning of the program, buses have arrived on an average of 15 minutes late. This happens when they drop the children off at the Centers and when they take them back to their home school. The staff feels that this delay in returning students to their home school may be one of the reasons why students drop out of the program. Some of the bus drivers do not know how to get to the Learning Center schools and will not take direction from the teachers riding aboard the buses. The staff of the Learning Centers timed the bus rides from each school. The longest bus ride is one half hour.

Students who have been designated as LES/NES (Limited and Non-English Speaking Students) will have the opportunity to participate in a preview/review session the morning of the day they attend a Learning Center. Participating teachers have the option of recommending this session for their students. During the preview LES/NES students receive an oral presentation of the day's activities in their native language. A bilingual aide is provided for students requiring assistance in communicating and understanding classroom activities.

One monitor attended a meeting conducted by two Bilingual Specialists who outlined a program that they said they had worked on all summer. They demonstrated a lesson plan to teach the LES/NES students vocabulary and prepare them for concepts that would be taught in the Science class at Carver Learning Center. They conducted what appeared to be a tutorial on the lesson plan that they had devised. They expected the bilingual teachers to grasp in this one session what they had evolved during several months. They stressed the point that their program could be taught to the children in ten minute sessions a day. When the teachers told them that they didn't have ten minutes in their program to work in the material, the experts recommended that they do it on the bus coming to the Learning Center. There seems to be a great gap between the bilingual experts and the teachers who are teaching the LES/NES children. Perhaps it would be more fruitful for the school district to pay the bilingual teachers during their summer vacations to develop the material to be used by their children at the Learning Centers rather than hire "experts" who appear to be so far removed.

A few examples of feedback from parents and teachers are as follows:

One home teacher said she spoke to thirty-six parents of children in her class who are participating in this semester's Learning Center at Carver. The majority of these parents told her that they were willing to allow their children to be in this program as long as it was one day a week. They would not allow them to continue if the program were increased to five days a week.

Another home school teacher said that she believed that the children felt about their one day a week at the Learning Center as they do about field trips. She fears this special anticipation would disappear if the children went to the Learning Center more often.

A teacher from one of the minority feeder schools said she had the complaint from a large group of her parents that their children did not have the choice of whether or not they wanted to attend a Learning Center. These parents felt that the program was not voluntary for the minority students. There has been no alternative program provided at the home school for the student who did not want to go to the Learning Center. They felt this was very unfair to them.

A teacher from a majority home school had three suggestions: 1) Make sure that all the children have at least one friend from his/her home school in the Learning Center group so that the student does not feel isolated when attending the center. 2) When the emergency forms are made out by the children's parents, those students who are going to attend Learning Centers should have two forms sent home. In this way the duplicate forms to be kept on file at the Learning Center Office will be filled out by the student's parent. Now the home school teacher has to copy each form for the Learning Center. This is a waste of the teacher's time. 3) This teacher also feels that if the home school were programmed to attend the Learning Center five days a week in blocks of several weeks throughout the school year it would be very difficult to cover the curriculum required at the home school. With the program set up the way it is now, the teacher can plan to cover all of the material required in the four days allotted to them at the home school.

We have read about the "complaint that the Learning Centers produce a lot of movement but very little education." As Learning Center Monitors we would like to state firmly that we disagree with this complaint. Our observation is that the Learning Centers provide an exceptional learning experience for children; the specialized staff are highly qualified and enthusiastic, the material presented is new and exciting; and the children are having a rewarding integration experience.

Mimi Gestler
Susan Neptune
Richardson