[MS-0234. 0234.006-001-008]

# PLAINTIFFS PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR INTEGRATION TASK FORCE

## I. ORIENTATION OF TASK FORCE AND MONITORS

Members of the Task Force and all monitors should be provided with extensive orientation by professional persons from an organization whose responsibilities include such activities. Preferably, to help insure objectivity, the agency chosen should be from outside San Diego. There are a number of such organizations, at least two of which are available without cost to the Task Force:

1. Community Relations Service, U. S. Department of Justice, San Francisco.

2. Far Western Laboratories for Educational Research and Development.

We believe it would be appropriate for the chosen organization to begin by discussing the orientation project with members of the Task Force, Defendants, Plaintiffs and the Court. Plaintiffs believe that the orientation should include the following:

1.) History and background of the Carlin Case with supporting documents which should include at least the following:

a. The San Diego Integration Plan - March, 1978.

b. Plaintiff's Objections to the Plan.

c. The CACRI Report - May, 1977.

d. The Courts Integration Orders to the School District - March, 1977, August, 1977, November, 1977, and July, 1978.

e. The Court's charge to the Task Force.

An opportunity should be provided for plaintiffs and defendants to explain, interpret and discuss these documents from their perspectives with the Task Force at the beginning of the orientation.

2.) The Crawford decision and other pertinent data concerning the current status of the law in California.

3.) Background information about successful integration procedures implemented in other school districts.

4.) Monitoring and training procedures.

## II. TASK FORCE FUNCTIONING

Budgets of monitoring committees vary widely throughout the country. Funding in San Diego should be adequate to provide support for the Task Force in carrying out its multi-directional charge.

People in the community must have an easy and widely-publicized means of communicating their suggestions and comments. A "hot line" to the Task Force might be one way of accomplishing this.

## III. THE MONITORING PROCESS

A. Schools to be monitored.

All schools should be monitored since they all have human relations programs which are part of the integration plan. All of the schools which have been designated as segregated by the court and all schools which enroll students who do not live in the attendance areas of that school and who come for integration purposes (Magnet Schools, VEEP Schools, Learning Center Schools, and schools with exchange programs) should have more thorough and intensive monitoring. Schools whose participation in the integration plan is limited to the human relations program should have one monitor each. Other schools participating in the Magnet, VEEP and Learning Center programs should have two monitors each and two alternates who would also act as assistants if necessary. This will insure continuity in case of dropouts.

B. Selection of Monitors

1. With the exception of Plaintiffs, Board members, and employees of San Diego Unified School District, all adults who support integration and who live in the City of San Diego, should be invited and encouraged to apply to be monitors.

2. A list of weighted criteria should be drawn up by the Task Force and used during selection interviews. Some cities have used professionals for interviewing; others have used committee members.

Some criteria:

a. Demonstrated commitment to integration

b. If not (a), then stated support of integration

c. Sensitivity to feelings and needs of minorities and of majority

d. Ability to be objective

e. Ability to avoid adversary stance while still maintaining independence

f. Time and effort commitment

3. One good source of monitors who have demonstrated commitment to integration would be the parents of students involved in such fulltime integration programs as Magnet Schools and VEEP. Preferably monitors should not monitor schools where their own children are enrolled.

4. Monitors should be selected by a majority of the Task Force, with no Task Force member having veto power over these selections.

C. Reimbursement of Monitors

In some cities (e.g., Detroit, Cleveland) monitors have received $5 for each visit they make to a school or for each day they visit a school, in order to reimburse expenses of child care, travel, etc.

D. Monitor evaluation

Criteria for satisfactory/unsatisfactory monitor performance should be established. They would include the areas of compliance with guidelines for monitors and number and frequency of monitoring visits required. A procedure for reviewing performance and replacing monitors who are not doing the job should be established.

E. Orientation of Monitors

Recommendations regarding orientation of the Task Force also apply to monitor orientation.

F. Guidelines for Monitors.

We believe that the guidelines used by the Community Education Council of Denver provide some excellent suggestions and we have attached copies of a portion of these guidelines. We would suggest the following additions to those guidelines:

1. Add to #5. The right to privacy should be respected. Some students, parents, and school personnel may be reluctant to report to the monitors if their names are to be made public. Provision should be made for authenticating such complaints and reports privately. Easy access to the monitors is of primary importance. This could be accomplished by establishing

a well publicized "hot line" number through which parents, students or others could contact monitors, and/or by posting names and phone numbers of monitors at schools and possibly at other locations. Some persons may be more willing to speak to the monitors if the meetings could take place on neutral ground away from the school.

2. Add to #10: The Task Force and the monitors must bear in mind that the monitors are not at the school on the school's sufferance. Rather the monitoring program exists to assist the court in evaluating the school district's attempts to come into compliance with the law. The monitors must, of course, keep any disruption of the functioning of the school to a minimum, always keeping in mind what is necessary to accomplish the task.

## IV. SPECIAL "FLYING SQUAD"

Some cities (e.g., Detroit, Cleveland) have established a special small group of highly trained professionals, primarily educators from other school districts and professionals in community and social agencies, to be available for call with no notice to monitor emergencies or acute crises involving integration.

We recommend that such a group be established in San Diego to be called when any school reports an ongoing racial incident of proportions which the community may consider sizable.

FROM MONITOR'S GUIDE
PREPARED BY THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION COUNCIL, DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS

RESPONSIBILITIES OF MONITORS

Monitors are exclusively responsible for fact-finding, information-gathering, observation, information-evaluation and reporting.

Monitors should perform these duties with an objective, open-minded, unbiased attitude. The principal guide in evaluating school performance should be the demonstrated commitment on the part of the school administration, teachers, staff, students, and parents to honest and effective implementation of the Court plan and the provision of equal educational opportunity for all children.

How to

1. Monitors are encouraged to develop positive, harmonious relationships with the school and its constituents, based upon mutual understanding and trust. Such relationships will open reliable, representative channels of communication and promote free flow of valid information which can be reported and acted upon.

2. It will be essential that close communication be maintained throughout the school year between monitors and Council members assigned to the same schools, in order to assure a constant and reliable flow of information from the various schools to the CEC. "

3. Monitors are expected to explain their role and function to persons and groups concerned with the affairs of the schools, but they should never presume to interpret or evaluate publicly school compliance or non-compliance with the Court order. Monitors should not publicly express personal positions on matters affecting the school, nor should they publicly evaluate or interpret actions or positions of the Community Education Council, the school administration, or the Court. "

4. Monitors must never assume ad advocacy role. Neither should they attempt to negotiate, resolve, or reconcile differences of position regarding matters affecting the assigned school. "

5. Monitors should receive and relay suggestions, petitions, or complaints from interested groups or individuals, and should facilitate communication and finding of fact.

6. Monitors should refer requests for speakers before school or community groups to the CEC.

How to

7. Undoubtedly many school matters will be brought to the attention of the monitor which are not germane to the Court Order. Monitors should not allow themselves to become sponges for individual petty gripes or problems.

"

8. Questions have arisen concerning the proper role of the monitors in relation to specific disciplinary decisions within individual schools. Some principals and some parents have requested that monitors be present during conferences where such decisions are made. To help clarify the monitor's role, the following guidelines have been developed:

"

a. At the request of the principal, a monitor may be present as an observer when disciplinary decisions are made. A monitor may OBSERVE ONLY, and not enter into the decision-making process in any way. If a parent requests that the monitor be present, the monitor may ask the principal's permission to attend. No monitor is required to attend any disciplinary hearing, nor should he or she ask to be allowed to attend.

b. Good judgment and sensitivity to the situation are probably the best possible guides, but if a situation arised, and the monitor has questions about how involved one should become, he or she should not hesitate to call a Monitoring Chairperson. If the monitor does sit in on such a meeting with the principal's permission or at the principal's request, a full report of the conference should be made by the monitor through the appropriate Council member.

MONITOR-SCHOOL RELATIONSHIPS

CEC believes the following principles should govern the monitor-school relationship:

1. At all times monitors will respect the authority of the principal as the chief administrator of the school. Under no circumstances should this authority be questioned, challenged, or undermined.

how to

2. Monitors will keep the principal informed at all times of his or her activities and maintain open, honest communication.

"

3. Monitors appointed to the same school may operate as a team. Effort should be made to conduct the initial interview with the principal as a team to avoid undue intrusion on the principal's time. Monitors are encouraged to conduct individual observation and review. However, reports and evaluations may be a team effort when monitor consensus prevails. Otherwise, monitors should feel free to submit reports and evaluations expressing an individual point of view. In any event, care should be exercised not to impose unduly on the time and attention of the principal.

How to

4. Monitors shall have access to school building and grounds.

5. Monitors will have authority to monitor classes in session after establishing a procedure with the principal regarding classroom visitation.

6. Monitors may interview teachers or staff during school hours, but should not interfere with assigned school activities.

7. Monitors should feel free to interview students within existing Denver Public Schools policies.

8. Monitors are encouraged to interview or discuss school matters with parents or other concerned persons.

9. Monitors should have the authority to monitor the assigned school's transportation program, including the right to board and ride school buses when appropriate.