[MS-0234.005.005.011]

11/22/82

TO: Integration Task Force

FROM: The Subcommittee on Magnet Schools

RE: Proposed Activities for 1982-83

- DRAFT FOR INTEGRATION TASK FORCE APPROVAL -

This draft proposal is being submitted to the Integration Task Force by the Subcommittee on Magnet Schools. It is based upon an initial review of the materials provided by the Integration Task Force on November 1, background information from Chairperson Judy MacDonald, a discussion with Judge Orfield, and a discussion among the subcommittee members, Kenneth Majer and Marie Widman.

This proposed plan is in compliance with the guidelines discussed at the November 1 meeting of the Integration Task Force:

(1) Review the court order;

(2) Review the school district response to the court order;

(3) Review recommendations of last year's Integration Task Force report; and,

(4) Review recommendations of last year's Integration Task Force and analyze what is going on this year.

Problem

We believe that the appropriate role for the Integration Task Force is to help Judge Orfield in his task of monitoring and evaluating the Integration plan for the San Diego Unified School District. If we are to be an effective Task Force, it seems reasonable that we should present information to the judge to help him make whatever decisions are necessary to execute his responsibility. As we understand it, Judge Orfield has the decision to either (1) continue in the role as enforcer of the Integration Plan; or (2) conclude that the Integration Plan (or a portion of it) is doing fine and that his attention should turn to other areas of the Plan or toward other issues of quality education in San Diego.

We further see that while there have been great efforts by the Integration Task Force in the past, the evaluation of the integration efforts in San Diego has been largely opinion. This is true in spite of massive data that has been collected (such as increased racial balance figures, the statistics on the voluntary busing program, etc.). As opinion, however, any evaluation conclusions have not yielded a clear judgment about the success or lack of success of the program.

This issue was succinctly summarized in an article that appeared in the November 21, 1982 San Diego County edition of the Los Angeles Times, "Waiting for Integration."

> "But while the voluntary plan was good enough to prevent the court order from ordering busing, critics contend that it never spelled out precisely what it would accomplish.
>
> "... there are no clear, specific objectives and a plan to fulfill those objectives. The school board bought the viewpoint of the attorney that if you spelled out the objectives too clearly--and didn't deliver--the plaintiffs would argue we didn't fulfill the plan.
>
> "But even without such goals, the plaintiffs and the Integration Task Force criticized the school district for moving too slowly to implement the voluntary plan..."

The Integration Task Force seems to be in the untenable position of having criticized the school district without having clear criteria against which success can be measured. Not only is this an uncomfortable position for the Task Force, it does not help the judge come to definitive conclusions.

Proposed Plan

We propose to spend our efforts this year devising specific, measurable outcomes that will yield precise criteria for gauging the success of the Magnet School portion of the Integration Plan. The result will be clear, objective indicators of success or nonsuccess to enable Judge Orfield to make conclusive decisions about this portion of the Integration Plan.

Becuase this is an ambitious task, the scope of this year's work would not include gathering data to evaluate the Magnet School Program. Rather, it would be limited to devising the method for making this judgment in the future.

1982-83 Activity

Should this proposal be acceptable to the Integration Task Force, we would suggest the following seven specific steps to take place in the time periods indicated:

Month	Activity
December/January	1. Establish goals of the Magnet School Program. From the data available, interviews with the school district personnel, interviews with the original developers of the Magnet School plan, and review by the Integration Task Force, a concrete list of goals for the Magnet School Program will be devised.
February	2. Write measurable objectives. Measurable objectives will be written for each of the goals listed. These objectives would be reviewed by all parties who would have input in Activity 1 above.
March	3. Define the data necessary for measuring the objectives. This activity would include the type and amount of data that would be necessary to obtain valid and reliable measurements of the specific program objectives.
April	4. Specify the data collection procedures.
	5. Specify the analysis procedures required.
	6. Prepare time schedules for the completion of a data collection phase.
	7. Submit the evaluation plan for the Magnet School portion of the Integration Task Force for approval to be included in the Task Force report to Judge Orfield.

Conclusion

We are submitting this plan for a direct evaluation of the Magnet School Program to the Integration Task Force for your discussion and approval. If the Task Force agrees that this is a sensible methodology for providing useful information to Judge Orfield, we urge the Task Force to appoint the appropriate staff to begin work in this activity immediately.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY 1897