[MB-0234.010.013.001]

A

ATTACHMENT A

San Diego City Schools

EVALUATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT REPORT

EFFECTIVE FACTORS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

SDCS

JANUARY 1983

INTEGRATION & DISTRICT PROGRAMS UNIT

No. 345

Prepared for:
Superintendent
February 22, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	
Background of Study	6
Purpose of Study	6
CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SCHOOLS	7
PROCESS FOLLOWED IN STUDY	8
CAUTIONS IN THE INTERPRETATION OF DATA	9
FACTORS CONSIDERED	11
CLUSTER ANALYSIS	18
COMMENTS FROM THE PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW	21
FACTORS WHICH SHOW NOTICEABLE DIFFERENCES AND MIGHT REQUIRE FURTHER STUDY	23
POSSIBLE INTERACTING OR COMBINING FACTORS	27
OTHER STUDIES OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS	29
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	35
RECOMMENDATIONS	37
APPENDICES	
A. Memo Notice to Principals	39
B. Principal Interview Form	41
C. Data by School	45
D. Cluster Analysis	65
E. Selected Bibliography	71
TABLES	
I List of Factors Considered	13
II Summary of Identified Areas of Weakness in Cluster Analysis	20
III Factors Which May Require Further Study	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Effective Factors Study is to identify those factors in the 16 K-6 minority-isolated schools which may make a difference in terms of student performance on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS). The basic design of the study identified a group of high-performing schools and a group of low-performing schools based on several criteria related to performance over the past two years on the CTBS. This yielded five schools in the high group and six schools in the low group.

Evaluation Services staff, interacting with selected central office staff having experience with these schools, then generated a list of 58 factors which conceivably could be related to high or low performance. Evaluation Services staff then collected data available centrally and interviewed all of the principals of the 11 high and low schools, using an inquiry procedure built around 58 factors. Results of the interviews were then quantified and the subsequent array of information was averaged for each of the two groups.

The next step was to identify those factors among the 58 that <u>appeared</u> to indicate a difference between the high and low groups. Since much of the data was based on estimates and the unit of study was the school, the use of sophisticated statistical procedures was not appropriate. On the basis that the study was exploratory in nature with the aim of recognizing promising leads for further investigation, the final list of factors were simply those that, on their face value, appeared to suggest a difference between the two groups of schools. Altogether, 28 of the 58 factors were selected in this manner, falling roughly into two categories: 13 that were associated with time-on-task, focus and structure; and 15 that were miscellaneous background variables.

It is important to underscore a caution before summarizing the conclusions and

recommendations. The obtained differences do not justify cause-and-effect conclusions at this preliminary stage. They simply indicate a range of factors associated with performance. The association could be accidental, insignificant, the result of a condition over which the school has no control, or simply an association that has no causal implications. On the other hand, since the association also could be causally related, principals will have some preliminary information to help them further examine and possibly modify their programs and approaches, where appropriate. One further caution: when the analysis is redone later this year using spring, 1983, CTBS achievement results, it is possible that one or more of the schools among the high or low group will change its status, either dropping out of the selection range altogether, or moving from one group to the other. Such is the nature of schools and the factors associated with them.

Summary of the Findings and Conclusions

1. Thirteen factors with *noticeable* differences between the high and low schools are variables which are within the control of the school, variables associated with the structure, focus and time-on-task.
2. Using the technique of cluster analysis of spring 1982 test results to determine specific weaknesses within the areas of reading, language, and mathematics as measured by the CTBS, 88% of all identified weakness among the low group of schools occurred in grades 4, 5, and 6.
3. According to cluster analysis, the language area accounted for about 60% of all identified weaknesses across both groups of schools; reading accounted for around 30%; and math, approximately 10%.
4. Fewer parents are regularly involved with the schools in parent organizations at the lower-achieving schools.
5. Variables related to principal supervision/monitoring activities seem to be stronger at higher-achieving schools. This includes such factors as the

number of classroom visitations, the use of modified days for inservice and meetings, and the number of staff meetings.

6. Examination of charted individual school data shows some schools in the high group are similar to schools in the low group and vice versa. For some variables, one or more schools appear to be outliers, that is, they differ substantially from both groups.

7. There is some indication in the data that the goal of achievement may be in conflict with the goal of integration. For example, the percent of students leaving the low group of schools for VEEP is higher on the average than from the high group of schools. The reasons for this are not clear-cut and vary from the possibility that the higher-achieving students are leaving the low group to simply effective VEEP recruiting efforts, unrelated to student achievement level.

8. Many of the variables originally considered have been eliminated as either showing no differences between groups or as background factors over which the school has little or no control. While it is necessary to acknowledge that background factors outside the control of the school or district affect student achievement levels, it is necessary to concentrate on those variables which can affect achievement and are within the control of the school or district.

9. Factors present in combination with other and their interaction offer more promise than any single factor. Looking at an isolated factor increases the risk of false conclusions.

10. Most of the areas of noticeable differences between the higher-achieving group and the lower-achieving group are consistent with other large scale research studies on effective schools.

Summary of the Recommendations

1. Individual school data already provided to the eleven schools in the study should be used as *needs assessment* information and incorporated into school improvement planning.
2. The information in this study may be generally useful to other schools throughout the district.
3. It is important to look upon the information contained in this report as preliminary, with careful consideration of the cautions cited.
4. Results of cluster analysis should be examined by Curriculum and Programs Division to derive information to strengthen specific programs at particular grades.
5. During 1983-84, a design should be developed to refine and sharpen the focus of the study based on the information found and factors eliminated this year, and a more in-depth study should be conducted of the high and low schools, utilizing information from teachers, other appropriate staff, and observations in classrooms.
6. Investigate possible interaction patterns among the factors to gain better insight into which factors combine and what can be done to improve student achievement.

In conclusion, it is noteworthy that the findings on effective factors in San Diego's minority-isolated schools are generally in line with the findings reported in other studies across the nation. Thus far, there have been no surprises. Furthermore, it is proposed that the present investigation be continued for another two years to sort out any unstable variables to refine and sharpen the study's focus.

A NOTE OF SPECIAL THANKS

Special thanks are due to the eleven principals for their cordial cooperation and willingness to share data about their schools and for their interest in our study and in the preliminary results they've seen.

While we were searching for differences between high and low schools which would enable changes to be made to improve school effectiveness, it is important to keep a perspective on the quality of school personnel with whom we had contact. In all cases, we saw evidence of caring, concerned administrators expressing both their interest and their efforts to improve student achievement and improve their schools. They were organized, knowledgeable, and able to produce information requested of them.

Our purpose in this study was not to evaluate people nor do we have a need to protect and defend people. These comments are offered in the spirit of maintaining a perspective.

EFFECTIVE FACTORS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

Significant progress on CTBS scores has been reported to the Court for the first two years of effort in raising achievement in minority-isolated schools. By July, 1982, interim achievement goals had been met in 23 out of 30 areas.

Nevertheless, differences exist among schools. Some schools seem to have less difficulty meeting the interim goals; others, more difficulty. The Achievement Goals Program is based on the theory of mastery learning which assumes, among other things, that all students can learn. What, then, makes the difference? In Evaluation Services Department Report No. 315, "Testing Results for Minority Isolated Schools," dated July 20, 1982, it was recommended that:

> . . . an evaluation of the instructional practices at schools meeting higher degrees of achievement test success be contrasted with similar schools which are not obtaining improved test scores. This is frequently called a high-low study. The intent is to find "promising practices" which can be disseminated across schools.

The Integration and District Programs Unit in Evaluation Services proposed in Fall, 1982, to study the factors of achievement in several schools during 1982-83.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this evaluation study is to identify factors which contribute to the successful achievement of students in the minority-isolated schools, particularly those factors which can be controlled, transferred to, and implemented in other schools to improve achievement. A second purpose is to identify factors which hinder achievement, and which are controllable, alterable,

or able to be eliminated so as not to further hinder achievement.

It is important to recognize that there will be other variables associated with student achievement over which the school has no control, or little or no influence, otherwise known as unalterable variables.

Criteria for Selection of Schools

The selection of schools was limited to elementary schools due to the small number of minority-isolated secondary schools.

The criteria to identify the schools were as follows:

1. The school did/did not meet its interim goals 1980-81.
2. The school did/did not meet its interim goals 1981-82.
3. Percent of students achieving at or above median percentile 1980-81 in reading, math and language.
4. Percent of students achieving at or above median percentile 1981-82 in reading, math and language.
5. Decline in percent of students at or above median from 1980-81 to 1981-82.
6. Achievement in percentiles.

Schools were rank-ordered according to these criteria. Grades 2-6 were ranked separately for each of three curricular areas: reading, language and math. Then the schools which appeared most frequently in the top four or bottom four on the lists were included in the respective group of higher-performing *(high)* or lower-performing *(low)* schools. There were five schools in the high group and a tie put six schools in the low group.

Process Followed in Study

The process followed by Evaluation Services in conducting this study is outlined briefly below:

1. Analysis of two years of CTBS test data (1980-81 and 1981-82) and of progress toward Court achievement goals as discussed in Report No. 315 and as provided by Evaluation Services.
2. Determination of selection criteria for the high group of schools and for the low group of schools among the 23 minority-isolated schools.
3. Use of criteria to select five schools in each group. A tie put six schools in the low group. All schools were AGP schools with the exception of one in each group.
4. Discussion of the potential study and its purpose with appropriate groups: Executive Council (now the Interim Cabinet), Integration Planning Committee, and Evaluation Committee (the President and Vice-President of the Board of Education and the Acting Superintendent).
5. Development of list of factors to be considered. Discussion with a director from Elementary Division expanded the list.
6. Collection of all data from the list which was available centrally.
7. Development of an interview form for the school principal.
8. Scheduling and conducting interviews with all eleven principals at their schools. In some instances, the principal chose to include others in the interview. Usually, these people were vice-principals and/or resource teachers.
9. Determination of means (averages) across schools in the high group and across schools in the low group where appropriate. Listing of those factors and the means for which there appeared to be a difference

between the high group and the low group.

10. Sophisticated statistical techniques were not used to examine the data due to the following: the unit of study was the school, resulting in a small sample size; the data involved many estimates; and this is an exploratory study to identify promising leads rather than to put specific research hypotheses to the test.

    The analysis therefore is based on a logical assessment which is tentative and will require further study.

11. Separation of the list of factors which might show a difference between high and low achieving schools. Charting of the preliminary data by individual and by interacting factors and determination of recommendations for further steps. Interacting factors are those which, by themselves, might not make a difference, but which in combination with other factors, could show a difference in effectiveness.

12. Discussion of the factors which show some differences and possible differential interacting factors with principals in study and appropriate high-level district administrators.

13. Presentation of these preliminary findings to the Superintendent and Board of Education.

Cautions in the Interpretation of Data

While throughout the report there is discussion about the meaning of the data and its application to improve student achievement, care must be taken not to jump to premature conclusions. A number of cautions must be underscored in examining the data to follow:

1. Do not assume a cause and effect relationship between the factors and the achievement of their associated schools. This relationship may be the result of the other variables acting singly or in combination.

2. Care should be taken in the interpretation of means and percentages since they are based on a small sample of schools. For example, 40% of five schools is two schools while 67% of six schools is four schools, a difference of only two schools.

3. Many of the numbers were estimates. For example, the principal interviewed may not have known exactly what percent of aide time is used for paperwork and preparation of materials or precisely how much homework is assigned.

4. The data are limited to two years. It remains to be seen what the test results will be for the spring of 1983 and whether or not the same schools will reappear in their respective high or low grouping.

FACTORS CONSIDERED

From discussion with many interested persons including district administrators and board members, a list of factors was generated. The initial list expanded as the study progressed. Initially, it was felt that some of the factors would not yield data that differentiated between high and low schools, but it was considered worth the effort to investigate as many as possible so as to have available a large pool of factors to consider. A total of 58 factors were identified in addition to open-ended questions and comments from the principal interviews. A list of the factors follows in Table I. This table shows an abbreviated description of the factor studied in the left column, the source of information, the range of responses across all eleven schools, and a mean of the responses from the group of high and the group of low schools.

Some of the factors which did not lend themselves to charting by range or mean are simply listed with the source of data given, but with no range or mean. The interested reader is referred to a more extensive listing in Appendix C, which shows the distribution of schools in a continuum and charts all factors.

In the interest of brevity, each factor is not discussed separately. It is hoped that most are apparent from the description given and that the reader can refer to the principal's interview (Appendix B) to find the exact question asked. Factors 50-54 are from California Assessment Program data on Grade 3 and are used as confirming data. In other words, the information was gathered in a different way and at a different time for CAP but confirms or is consistent with other data for these schools.

TABLE I

ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS

LIST OF FACTORS CONSIDERED

	Description of Factors	Source of Information	Range		High	Low
1.	Percent minority	CD	52.6 - 96.3	*	76.6	93.5
2.	Percent minority composition (Hispanic, White, Black, Asian, Alaskan/Indian)	CD				
3.	Mobility index	CD	38.9 - 73.4	*	47.1	60.1
4.	Enrollment (1981-1982)	CD	362 -1075		565.2	669.3
5.	Programs at school (AGP, DISTAR, VEEP, Magnet, Title I, Learning Center, SIP, Exchange Program, Bilingual, Pre-Kindergarten, ESAA, Special Education, Follow Through, Gifted, Miller-Unruh)	CD/PI				
6.	Percent resident	CD	56.5 - 100.0	*	80.7	95.3
7.	Percent non-resident	CD	0 - 43.4	*	19.3	4.7
8.	Percent of schools with year-round (vs. traditional) schedule	CD			0	66.7
9.	Total hours of instruction per school	PI	5.0 - 6.1		5.3	5.4
10.	Percent of schools with extended instructional day	PI			80.0	83.3
11.	Percent of teachers who spend instructional time over AGP requirements for Reading, Language, and Math	PI	Reading 0 - 60 Language 0 - 100 Math 0 - 100	*	5.6 6.3 0	20.2 30.1 30.1
12.	Minutes per day for sustained silent reading	PI	10 - 30		20.0	20.0

CD Data available centrally (Ed Center)

PI Interview with Principal of School (In several cases, Resource Teachers also present in interview)

W Written material provided by school

* Denotes a weighted mean

TABLE I
ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS
LIST OF FACTORS CONSIDERED

	Description of Factors	Source of Information	Range	High	Low
13.	Percent of schools with pullout programs	PI		100.0	100.0
14.	Maximum amount of time per day/per week for pullout program		per day 0 - 180 min. per week 0 - 900 min.	68 min. 352 min.	43 min 210 min
15.	Percent of schools with policy of non-interruptions to class	PI		100.0	83.3
16.	Percent of schools with tutorial programs (after school, peer tutoring, cross-age tutoring)	PI		0	0
17.	Breakfast program (percent of students)	PI	15.4 - 62.5 *	42.0	49.9
18.	Frequency of assemblies (number per quarter)	PI	1 - 14	4.2	4.0
19.	Traffic patrol (time out of class per week per student)	PI	15 - 35 min.	30 min.	22 min
20.	Other programs that involve students outside of regular instruction (office monitors, lunch workers, etc.)	PI			
21.	Maximum amount of time out of class for Items # 19 and # 20	PI	0 - 100 min.	50 min.	25 min
22.	Percent of schools which participate in Balboa Park Program	PI		100.0	100.0
23.	Percent of schools that indicated adherence to "time on task" instructional principles	PI		100.0	100.0

CD Data available centrally (Ed Center)
PI Interview with Principal of School (In several cases, Resource Teachers also present in interview)
W Written material provided by school
* Denotes a weighted mean

TITLE I
ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS
LIST OF FACTORS CONSIDERED

	Description of Factors	Source of Information	Range		High	Low
24.	Percent of students riding the bus	PI		0 - 41 *	18.0	5.5
25.	Time lost per week due to transportation problems	PI		0 - 60 min.	15.5 min.	9.4 min.
26.	Percent of schools with homework policy	PI/W			100.0	100.0
27.	Days per week for homework	PI		2 - 4	3.4	3.0
28.	Number of visitations (formal and informal) by principal to each class per year	PI	Formal Informal	3 - 25 0 - 150	6.7 51.7	9.5 40.8
29.	Percent of teachers who have aides at least two hours per day	PI			100.0	100.0
30.	Use of classroom aides (percent of time for teaching, percent of time for review/ reinforcement, percent of time for paper work/preparation of materials)	PI	Teaching Review Preparation	0 - 60 30 - 90 10 - 50	7.0 73.4 19.6	18.3 49.6 32.1
31.	Percent of schools indicating that classroom aides are given on-site training (also length and content of inservice)	PI			100.0	100.0
32.	Number of teacher inservice hours per year	PI		20 - 70	34.0	33.1
33.	Use of modified days (percent for inservice, percent for administrative matters, percent for teacher preparation)	PI	Inservice Administrative Preparation	10 - 75 0 - 25 10 - 90	48.0 12.2 39.8	44.2 7.0 48.8
34.	Frequency of staff meetings (number per month)	PI		1 - 4	2.5	1.6

CD Data available centrally (Ed Center)
PI Interview with Principal of School (In several cases, Resource Teachers also present in interview)
W Written material provided by school
* Denotes a weighted mean

TABLE I

ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS

LIST OF FACTORS CONSIDERED

Description of Factors	Source of Information	Range	High	Low
35. Percent of schools which had an agenda for staff meetings	PI/W		100.0	100.0
36. Given demands for teaching basic skills, how do teachers manage to teach other subjects	PI	Percent using afternoons Percent using learning centers	100.0 40.0	50.0 50.0
37. Time given to science, art, music, physical education, etc. (minutes per week)	PI	120 - 450 min.	227.0	257.5
38. External resources used at school sites (university, parent tutors, business, and community)	PI			
39. Parent organizations at school and number of parents regularly involved (SSC, SAC, PTA)	PI	8 - 45	29.6	17.7
40. Percent of schools with counseling center	PI		100.0	83.3
41. Percent of principals who described school's educational goals; percent of schools which provided a copy of school plan	PI/W	Goals related to district goals Goals related to basic skills Copy of school plan provided	20.0 40.0 80.0	16.7 66.7 83.3
42. Percent of LEP students		1.6 - 44.1 *	15.5	30.9
43. Percent of LEP students on waiver	PI	1 - 68.8 *	24.9	36.2
44. Number of teacher assignments changed and number of classrooms affected	PI	0 - 6 0 - 16	2.2 5.2	3.0 5.5
45. Average class size	PI	29 - 32	30.6	30.2
46. Percent of traditional classrooms; open classrooms; multi-graded classrooms; team taught classrooms	PI	Traditional 0 - 88 Multi-graded 12 - 100 Team taught 12 - 22	61.6 31.6 6.8	63.0 37.0 0

CD Data available centrally (Ed Center)
PI Interview with Principal of School (In several cases, Resource Teachers also present in interview)
W Written material provided by school
* Denotes a weighted mean

TITLE I
ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS
LIST OF FACTORS CONSIDERED

	Description of Factors	Source of Information	Range		High	Low
47.	Percent of minority teachers	PI	14.3 - 45.8	*	21.4	29.5
48.	Mean number of years of seniority for teachers at school	CD	5.1 - 12.2	*	8.2	7.3
49.	Mean salary classification of teachers	CD	C.3 - E.4	*	D.3	D.0
50.	Percent of AFDC (CAP data, grade 3)	CD	22.0 - 37.0	*	28.5	30.8
51.	Percent of LEP/NEP (CAP data, grade 3)	CD	0 - 63.9	*	13.7	31.4
52.	Scale Score - Reading (CAP data, grade 3)	CD	183 - 302	*	233.8	206.8
53.	Scale Score - Writing (CAP data, grade 3)	CD	186 - 318	*	240.9	206.4
54.	Scale Score - Mathematics (CAP data, grade 3)	CD	187 - 283	*	247.9	218.7
55.	Percent of students electing to leave local school for VEEP program	CD	0.3 - 26.76	*	2.8	15.3
56.	Number of years principal has been assigned to school site	CD	1 - 9		3.6	3.0
57.	Percent of students scoring at or below Quartile 1 and at or below Quartile 2 on CTBS	CD				
58.	Percent of students in magnet program	CD	0 - 100	*	60.3	27.6

CD Data available centrally (Ed Center)
PI Interview with Principal of School (In several cases, Resource Teachers also present in interview)
W Written material provided by school
* Denotes a weighted mean

CLUSTER ANALYSIS

In addition to the selection criteria for the high and low schools based on the CTBS total scores for reading, language, and mathematics, Evaluation Services provided cluster analysis results for the schools in this study. This is a technique which combines all of the CTBS test items measuring a common objective, computes their average p-value (percent of students passing these items), converts this to a quotient by dividing it by the publisher's p-value, and identifies as weaknesses those which fall below a predetermined level. This allows a more focused comparison between high and low schools in terms of specific weaknesses as registered on the CTBS. While individual schools have their own cluster analysis results and have been working with these since last fall, the group data may be of help in recognizing broad patterns that could benefit curriculum writers revising instructional materials.

For purposes of the group analysis, a weakness in the high group had to appear in at least three of the five schools to count, and for the low schools a weakness had to appear in at least five of the six schools, except at Grade 1 where a standard of four out of six was used. These arbitrary standards were used as a practical matter to generate a manageable number of weaknesses for both groups--neither too few to be helpful nor too many to provide focus. Again, the individual schools have their own complete sets of cluster analyses to allow them as much specificity as they wish in planning program improvement.

Looking at patterns of weakness for the high and low groups (See Table II), the following generalizations can be made:

1. For both the high and low groups the largest number of weaknesses appeared at Grade 5.

2. For the high group, Grades 3, 5, and 6 accounted for nearly all the identified weaknesses, though these were few in number.

3. For the low group, Grades 4, 5, and 6 accounted for the vast majority of weaknesses.

4. For both high and low groups the language area accounted for about 60% of the total number of identified weaknesses; the reading area, approximately 30%; and mathematics, around 10%.

5. In general, the students did as well as or better than the national comparison group on easier items. On the more difficult items the students tended to fall below the national standard.

6. Among the low group, especially at Grade 5, there were three predominant areas of weakness: the writing techniques cluster of the reading comprehension subtest and both the punctuation and capitalization clusters in the language mechanics subtest.

7. At Grade 5, in those relatively few areas where the high group had weaknesses, the low group did also.

8. Occasionally, there were paradoxical findings. For example, at Grade 3 in four of the six areas where the high group did poorly, the low group did well.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED AREAS OF WEAKNESS
ACROSS HIGH AND LOW GROUPS
BASED ON CLUSTER ANALYSIS*

GRADE	HIGH GROUP				LOW GROUP			
	Reading	Language	Math	Totals	Reading	Language	Math	Totals
1	-	-	-	0	1	2	-	3
2	-	-	-	0	2	5	-	7
3	1	3	2	6	-	3	3	6
4	-	-	1	1	8	25	3	36
5	5	5	-	10	19	34	6	59
6	-	4	-	4	8	14	2	24
TOTALS	6	12	3	21	38	83	14	135

*See Appendix D

COMMENTS FROM THE PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW

As stated earlier, the principal's interview form was developed to collect information not available through central documentation. Centrally available data reflect the 1981-82 school year, and Table I shows source of data. The principal interviews were conducted in October and November of 1982, and the data reported reflect conditions at that time. For example, questions about changes in classroom assignment are included to see the extent of changes necessitated by changes in enrollment which affect staffing formulas. This question is generally resolved by January. As it turns out, the reorganization of classes within schools did not appear to be a factor differentiating between the high and low groups. Another example is the Chapter 2 Supplementary Program, which was not in effect in the fall, therefore not reflected in data collections. It may, however, be in the reader's mind now. These temporal examples are used to set the stage for the reader as to time frame of data collection. It also points out the necessity, in a study such as this, to be aware of changes that occur during a year and from year to year.

In reviewing the preliminary data with principals, several changes were pointed out. Where changes represent phenomena occurring since November, the change will not be shown in the charted data. All efforts were made, however, to check carefully the accuracy of the data as collected in the fall interviews. It is necessary to note that the interviewers pressed the principals on some questions to estimate responses for which an exact percentage would be difficult to determine without keeping detailed logs, and this would interfere with the job an employee is to perform. For example, on questions as to percent of time spent in certain activities, the reader should recognize these responses as estimates, as indicators of whether further study is needed, not as absolute percentages.

The last question on the principal's interview was an open-ended one: "What else is unique to your school site that we have not mentioned or that you feel is

important for us to understand about your school?"

Several principals mentioned a strong and conscientious staff, a strong discipline program, community support by the parents for both the school program and the discipline program.

On the negative side, some principals mentioned the high mobility which they experienced with students and the difficulties of contacting and keeping close communication with parents, particularly those parents who are not English-speaking and/or those who feel uncomfortable coming to the school. Also, staff turnover and Learning Centers were cited as taking time away from AGP instruction.

While open-ended questions are a good way to obtain information during an interview, unfortunately the responses to this question may have been biased. Generally speaking, principals were aware that they were either a high or a low school. The principals at schools in the high group often responded with reasons to support their school being in that group and noted very positive things. The principals at schools in the low group tended to respond with reasons why the test scores might be low.

FACTORS WHICH SHOW NOTICEABLE DIFFERENCES AND MIGHT REQUIRE FURTHER STUDY

From the 58 variables originally considered, Table III shows 28 factors on which there was a noticeable difference between the means for the high schools and means for the low schools. Thirteen of these 28 variables were considered to be associated with the structure or focus of the instructional program of the school or as having an effect on time-on-task instructional principles in classrooms. The remaining 15 variables were considered to be background variables, most of which are not within the control of the school.

In examining Table III, it is of the utmost importance to underscore the caution not to jump to conclusions about the lineup of factors with the high or low groups. For example, item 12, the percent of schools with DISTAR programs, indicates that they most often appear among the low schools. It would be incorrect to conclude, based on this fact alone, that DISTAR is ineffective. On the contrary, based on other evidence, it is about as effective as AGP in improving achievement. What causes it to occur in the low column is the fact that Follow-Through DISTAR programs are required to serve the students in greatest need, therefore those with the lowest test scores.

Table III shows an abbreviated description of the factors studied in the left column and means of the responses from the groups of high and low schools, respectively, in the right columns. The apparent differences which exist between the groups of high and low schools on each of these factors suggest the possibility of further in-depth study and analysis focusing on them.

TABLE III

ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS

EFFECTIVE FACTORS STUDY

Factors Which May Require Further Study

VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH STRUCTURE, FOCUS, TIME-ON-TASK

			High	Low
1.	Percent of schools which participate in a learning center program		40.0	66.7
2.	Mean number of days of homework assigned per week		3.4	3.0
3.	Mean number of informal class visitations reported by principal per class per year		51.7	40.8
4.	Percent of aide time used in review/reinforcement and paperwork/preparation of materials for teacher (as opposed to time in teaching activities)	Review Paperwork	73.4 19.6	49.6 32.1
5.	Percent of schools where principal identified the use of resource teachers in on-site training of classroom aides		80.0	16.7
6.	Percent of schools where principal indicated that aides are monitored by classroom teachers		40.0	0
7.	Percent of schools where principal identified familiarization with district and school procedures as a part of aide training		20.0	66.7
8.	Percent of modified days used for teacher preparation time (as opposed to inservice and administrative matters)		39.8	48.8
9.	Mean time spent on subjects other than Reading, Language and Math; Art, Science, Social Studies, PE, etc. (minutes/week)		227.0	257.5
10.	Mean number of staff meetings per month		2.5	1.6
11.	Maximum amount of time per day/per week for pullout program(s)		68 min/ 352 min.	43 min/ 210 min.
12.	Percent of schools with Distar program		20.0	66.7
13.	Percent of teachers who spend instructional time over AGP requirements for Reading, Language, and Math	Reading Language Math	5.6 6.3 0	20.2 30.1 30.1
14.	Percent minority (weighted mean)		76.6	93.5
15.	Mobility index (weighted mean)		47.1	60.1
16.	Enrollment		565.2	669.3
17.	Percent of schools on year-round schedule		0	66.7
18.	Percent of schools with magnet program		80.0	33.3
19.	Percent of students in magnet programs (weighted mean,		60.3	27.5

TABLE III

ELEMENTARY MINORITY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS

EFFECTIVE FACTORS STUDY

Factors Which May Require Further Study

(Continued)

MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND VARIABLES

		High	Low
20.	Percent resident population (weighted mean)	80.7	95.3
21.	Percent of students riding bus (weighted mean)	18.0	5.5
22.	Mean salary classification, indicating level of education (weighted mean)	D.3*	D.0
23.	Mean number of years of seniority (weighted mean)	8.2	7.3
24.	Percent of LEP students (weighted mean)	15.5	30.9
25.	Percent of LEP students on waiver (weighted mean)	24.9	36.2
26.	Percent of minority teachers (weighted mean)	21.4	29.5
27.	Percent of students leaving for VEEP** at another school (weighted mean)	2.8	15.3
28.	Mean number of parents actively involved in parent organizations	29.6	17.7

* D refers to a level of B.A. degree +60 or B.A. +54 with M.A. degree.

** Taken from preliminary report of 11/20/82. Official report is expected 2/83.

POSSIBLE INTERACTING OR COMBINING FACTORS

"Major elements for success are interrelated variables that have debilitatory effects if not on balance and synergistic consequences if operating in harmony."

Phi Delta Kappan Study of Exceptional Urban Schools

Interacting factors are those which by themselves, may not make a difference, but which in combination with other factors could impact school performance. Examination of the factors which may require further study in Table II did not appear at this point to single out any one factor as having an overriding effect on the performance of either the high or low schools. However, the following discussion of several groups of interacting factors may provide some useful insights.

FACTORS	DISCUSSION
Magnet Program Community Support Strong parent supported discipline code Mobility within community	1. In schools with a magnet program the parents, students and teachers select or are selected to be there. Principals identify community support as a positive factor and identify a strong discipline code supported by parents as a positive contributor to student achievement. This applies to the schools in the high group. In contrast, schools in the low group had fewer magnet programs, higher mobility, less parent participation. Principals less frequently mentioned community support and strong discipline codes (supported by parents) as factors in their school.
Staff Meetings Use of Modified Days Informal Visitations	2. These three factors relate to the degree of structure and control imposed by principal. Factors under this label include more staff meetings per month, percent of modified days used for structured teacher inservice and/or school meetings, and more informal class visitations reported by principals of schools in the high group.
Year-Round Schedule Mobility	3. More schools in the low group are on a year-round schedule. This by itself may not be important, but taken in combination with the following may have some merit for consideration. The low group of schools also have a higher index of mobility. If students are spending the summer in another area or with relatives or friends, they may miss up to a quarter of the school year. Some students enroll in

FACTORS	DISCUSSION
	the year-round school when it opens in the summer because parents are working and the child is cared for by the school. Then, when the neighborhood traditional school opens in September, the child is transferred back to that school. There are two effects: one, the child has five quarters of school during the year; and two, the child is enrolled in the traditional school when the CTBS is given and test scores reported.
Homework Time spent on subjects other than on Reading, Language and Math Use of Aide Time	4. These are factors which relate to classroom or instructional day schedule and "time-on-task." This category includes such factors as: slightly more homework is assigned at the schools in the high group, somewhat more time is reportedly spent on subjects other than Reading, Language and Math, and more aide time is spent in teaching and review/reinforcement activities at the schools in the high group.
Mobility LEP Students	5. A high mobility index may interact with a high number of limited English proficient students to the extent that there may be a consistent flow of students with limited English skills into the school over the year. Before any conclusions are drawn, it would need to be known how LEP students who have been at the school for a relatively long period of time achieve compared to other LEP students at the school.

OTHER STUDIES OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

There have been many studies of school effectiveness with some fairly consistent results in recent years which allow schools and districts to apply research in efforts to improve schools. A selected bibliography is included in this report as Appendix E. A few summary highlights are discussed here to give the reader a brief overview and to introduce some comparisons of consistent and inconsistent results of this study in its preliminary stage with similar studies conducted in the state of California and elsewhere.

The National School Public Relations Association study (NSPRA), (1981) found that four factors contributed to successful schools:

Strong administrative leadership
High expectations for students and teachers
Positive climate
Community support

Very similar results were quoted in Edmonds (1979) about a study by Weber in 1971, which found that the four criteria of successful reading achievement in four inner city schools were:

Strong leadership by the principal
High expectations for all students
Orderly, quiet and pleasant atmosphere
Strong emphasis on reading skills and
frequent evaluation of student progress

Brookover and Erickson (1969) also emphasized that parent and teacher expectations were very important. It is noteworthy that high expectations is one of the cornerstones of San Diego's Achievement Goals Program, found in 9 of the 11 schools included in the present report.

The New York study, "School Factors Related to Learning," (1976) found that the percent of teachers having thirty or more hours beyond a B.A. degree has a significant relationship to student achievement. For San Diego City Schools, the mean sal-

ary classification, reflecting level of education, for the low group was Class D (B.A. + 60 units or B.A. + 54 units with M.A.), and for the high group, slightly above Class D.) The New York study results also indicated less concern for the medium of instruction, but said that the sequencing and organization are very important.

Conclusions of the Phi Delta Kappa study of Exceptional Urban Schools (1981) included the following:

1. School improvement efforts are more likely to be successful if they concentrate on relatively narrow targets and clearly-defined goals.

2. School improvement efforts are more likely to succeed if they involve multiple tactics to attain the goals.

3. School improvement efforts in urban elementary schools should place the thrust of the intervention closest to the point of effective action. Principals affect teachers; teachers affect students.

4. Successful urban schools and programs are characterized by high levels of parental contact with the schools and parental involvement with school activities.

In the San Diego study, there was a difference between the amount of parent involvement via regular participation in parent organizations--PTA, SSC, SAC, etc.--and principals at schools in the high group commented appreciably on the parent and community support for their academic and discipline programs. Some principals at low schools commented on the difficulty of getting parents involved with the school.

5. Successful schools and programs frequently utilize staff development or inservice training programs to realize their objectives.

In the San Diego study, there was a somewhat greater use of modified day schedules for inservice activities in the high group. The inservice and training of aides in the high group was more often conducted by resource teachers. There was more emphasis on district and school procedures in the training at low schools.

6. Successful schools and programs are often supported with special project funds from federal, state, and local sources.

Although funding was not a part of the San Diego study, a look at the programs at the schools would indicate funding of special projects, including Chapter I, SI, ESAA, magnet, and other programs which would have special funding sources. Many of these programs exist at several schools and this factor does not differentiate between the high and the low groups.

From Michael Rutter et al, (1979), comes the following: "Students experience better academic success where homework is regularly set and marked and where teachers expect students to do well on examinations."

In the San Diego Study, slightly more homework is assigned at schools in the high group.

Ronald Edmonds, (1981) indicates that the adults in effective schools are consistent in the statement and implementation of instructional goals.

John Goodlad, (1979) says that "the principal is the key. . . in creating a sense of mission for an effective school."

In the San Diego Study, principals primarily articulated goals of basic skills. Four out of six (low) and two out of five (high) referred to Basic Skills or Reading, Language and Math. Two in the high group and one in the low referred the interviewer to district goals or a written school plan.

Edward Wynne, (1981) says that "in good schools, supervisors believe classroom discipline is essential to learning. Rules are clear and penalties consistent and judiciously applied. Rules are uniformly enforced by all staff and periodically reviewed."

In the San Diego Study, three of five principals at the schools in the high group mentioned a good or strong discipline code or a "community supported" discipline code. Since the information came voluntarily in response to an open-ended question, it is unfair to conclude that only these three schools have a strong discipline system.

A report by the Colorado Department of Education (1982), indicates the importance of a strong program of parent support and participation in the school. In the San Diego Study, more parental support and participation was reported in the higher achieving schools.

A high-low study which will be discussed in more detail is the California School Effectiveness Study (1974-75). It is of more interest because it was conducted in California and some schools in close proximity to San Diego were included. It is also of interest because, even at this preliminary stage in the San Diego study, some results have been found that are consistent with the California School Effectiveness Study (CSES), along with one that is contrary. It must be kept in mind that San Diego's sample is smaller and its methodology is different. Nevertheless, certain comparisons will be of interest.

In CSES, regression equations were run each of two years to insure consistency of performance of the schools identified for the study. Predictor variables included an index of socioeconomic status, the percentage enrollment of each of the five racial-ethnic categories, level of urbanism, and percentage of minority enrollment. In the State's use of the regression equations, it was found that, in general, student achievement was positively related to socioeconomic status and negatively related to both bilingualism and total percentage minority enrollment. The results in San Diego's study show a corresponding negative relationship between student achievement and language proficiency in languages other than English.

In examining the findings in the CSES, the following observations were consistent with the San Diego study:

Teachers at higher performing schools in the CSES were somewhat older, having a slight edge in years of teaching experience. The San Diego study collected no information about teacher age, but teachers in the high group had, on the average, one more year of district seniority than teachers in the low group. Moreover, according to salary classification which indicates level of education beyond a B.A., the teachers in the high group had slightly more education than those in the low group.

The CSES found more district influence in curriculum and teacher hiring among the higher schools in the statewide study. By comparison, in the San Diego study

wide changes may not occur or may take a long time to accomplish. Thus no local school design should depend on changes over which the local school does not have control."

An example in the San Diego Study which affects the control of the school is the conflict expressed by principals between the goals for integration and goals for achievement. At times, they wonder which has priority to the Court and to the Board.

He continues: "The research on the characteristics of effective schools has not yet shown some characteristics to be more important than others. Thus designs for school improvement must attend to all of the characteristics. It must be made clear that the need for change is school wide and includes both principals and teachers. All programs of school improvement should be evaluated on at least two distinctive measures. Changes in student achievement are an obvious important measure. Of equal importance are observable changes in the institutional, organizational nature of a school as a function of changes in principal and teacher behavior. Formative evaluation is to be distinctly preferred over summative evaluation."

there was more district influence over curriculum in the higher group since it included more magnet programs. On the other hand, there would be about equal amounts of district influence in those schools having the Achievement Goals Program, and these occurred in both high and low schools. It also should be noted that the magnet schools in San Diego had more influence over the teacher selection process. Since four of the five schools in the high group had magnet programs, and only two of the six schools in the low group were so constituted, this may be worth closer examination.

In the CSES, teachers in the more effective schools reported spending slightly more time in classroom instruction on social studies and less on mathematics. In the San Diego study, using schedules given them by teachers, the principals reported approximately thirty minutes more time spent teaching social studies, science, health, physical education, art and music (combined) in the low group than reported by the principals in the high group. This time difference included the time spent in Learning Center programs.

One additional finding in the CSES investigation was inconsistent with San Diego's study. In CSES, teachers in the higher performing schools used aides for more non-instructional activities and the handling of paperwork. In the San Diego study, teachers in the high group used aides more often to assist with instructional activities, including review and reinforcement functions. Certainly in the case of the Achievement Goals Program, materials are provided to the schools, making it practical to use the aides in this manner.

One last word on research on effective schools comes from Edmonds (1982). "Finally, it is important to note that most changes will occur within a school but some important and desirable changes can only be made by the school board or the superintendent. Local school designs for school improvement will from time to time reveal aspects of board policy or administrative rules that impede the plan. It is important at such times to continue the local school plan while acknowledging that district-

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Thirteen factors with *noticeable* differences between the high and low schools are variables which are within the control of the school, variables associated with the structure, focus and time-on-task.

2. Cluster Analysis provides insight into areas of weakness at higher and lower achieving schools as a group by subject areas and by grade levels. The upper grades (4-6) account for 88% of all identified weaknesses at the lower-achieving schools.

3. According to Cluster Analysis, language area accounted for about 60% of identified weaknesses at the high and low groups; reading accounted for around 30%; math, approximately 10%.

4. Fewer parents are regularly involved with the schools in parent organizations at the lower-achieving schools.

5. Variables related to principal supervision/monitoring activities seem to be stronger at higher-achieving schools. This includes such factors as the number of classroom visitations, the use of modified days for inservice and meetings, and the number of staff meetings.

6. Examination of charted individual school data shows some schools in the high group are similar to schools in the low group and vice versa. For some variables, one or more schools appear to be outliers, that is, they differ substantially from both groups.

7. A possible conflict between student achievement goals and integration goals may appear in some of the data. For example, the percent of students leaving the lower-achieving schools for VEEP is higher on the average than from the higher-achieving schools.

There are at least 3 possible reasons for this phenomenon. For example:

1. Higher-achieving students leave the school; thereby resulting in lower schoolwide test scores;
2. Students leave the school due to parent and/or student perception that the school has an inferior program; or
3. VEEP recruiting efforts are accomplishing varying levels of success.

If it is assumed that students leave the school due to its program, and punitive action were then taken against the school, it would, in effect, punish the school for not performing as well on one goal (achievement) while being more successful than others on another high priority goal (integration).

8. Many of the variables originally considered, have been eliminated as either showing no differences between groups or as background factors over which the school has little or no control. While it is necessary to acknowledge that background factors outside the control of the school or district affect student achievement levels, it is necessary to concentrate on those variables which can affect achievement and are within the control of the school or district.

9. Factors present in combination with others and their interaction offer more promise than any single factor. Looking at an isolated factor increases the danger of false conclusions.

10. Most of the areas of noticeable differences between the higher-achieving group and the lower-achieving group are consistent with other larger scale research studies on effective schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Individual school data, which has been shared with the schools in the study, can be used as *needs assessment* information and incorporated into school improvement planning. Schools that find themselves "outliers" in an undesirable direction can make changes on specific practices.

   Other schools "in the middle" between the high and low, but in the minority-isolated group of schools may also find the data useful in program planning and improvement.

2. This study should be treated as preliminary data, with careful review of the cautions section. No major districtwide changes should be made on any single factor alone.

3. Results of cluster analysis should be further examined by Curriculum and Programs Division to derive information to strengthen specific programs at particular grades.

4. During the summer of 1983, the 1982-83 CTBS results should be examined, using the same criteria to determine high/low status of those schools and the implication of any changes.

5. During 1983-84, a design should be developed to refine and sharpen the focus of the study based on the information found and factors eliminated this year, and a more in-depth study should be conducted of the high and low schools, utilizing information from teachers, other appropriate staff, and observations in classrooms.

6. Investigate possible interaction patterns among the factors to gain better insight into which factors combine and what can be done to improve student achievement.

APPENDIX A

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: October 12, 1982

MEMO TO: Principals of Selected Sites

FROM: Tomblin BJ.

SUBJECT: EFFECTIVE FACTOR STUDY

At the beginning of the year in various principal's meetings, we stated that we are planning to study two groups of minority isolated schools to find effective and ineffective factors related to achievement. The two groups are comprised of schools within the minority-isolated (1) who are doing well with respect to increasing achievement and meeting interim goals and (2) who are having difficulty raising achievement and meeting their interim goals. According to six criteria, your school was one of eleven selected to participate in this study. Results of the study will be used to strengthen programs and student achievement at all sites. I will be calling to set up an appointment with you to discuss the study and talk with you about your school and its uniqueness.

Although I respect the fact that your duties are many and your time very precious, I request that you set aside an hour to an hour and a half for discussion. Bob Raines, an outstanding Program Evaluator in the Integration and Programs Unit, will accompany me. If we can isolate changeable factors, I believe the usable information will make the time spent worthwhile.

An additional note: We will make every effort to maintain anonymity of individual schools. We are interested in finding factors common across a group of schools, not in singling out individual schools. It is our hope that with our mutual cooperation this will be a productive study.

Thank you in advance for allowing us to come to your school to better report on the unique factors at your site.

APPROVED:

Eloiza Cisneros

Eloiza Cisneros
Assistant Superintendent

Betty Tomblin
Assistant Director
Evaluation Services

EC:BT:gem
cc: Isaac, Raines

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPALS

STUDY OF EFFECTIVE FACTORS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN MINORITY ISOLATED SCHOOLS

1. May I have a copy of your school's daily time schedule?

2. Do you have an extended instructional day?

3. Approximately what percentage of your teachers spend instructional time over and above AGP requirements in Reading? _____ Language? _____ Math _____ Do you have a sustained silent reading program? _____ How many minutes per day? _____

4. Do you have a pullout program? If so, describe briefly.

5. What is the maximum amount of time a child could be out of class in pullout programs per day? _____ Per week? _____

6. What is your system for non-interruptions to class? How does it seem to work?

7. Do you have an after-school tutorial program? _____ If so, how long does it last? _____ Do you have peer tutoring? _____ Do you use cross-age tutoring? _____ If so, are tutors in-school or from other schools?

8. Do you have a breakfast program? _____ If so, what effect, if any, do you feel it has on student achievement?

9. Does your school participate in a Learning Center Program?

10. How often do you have assemblies?

11. Do you have a traffic patrol? _____ If so, approximately how long are students out of class each week?

12. What other programs do you have that involve students outside of the regular classroom instructional program?

    _____ Office monitors _____ Lunch workers _____ Other

13. What is the maximum aount of time a child is allowed to be out of class in these types (See #11, 12) of activities?

14. Does your school participate in the Balboa Park Program?

15. In general, do you feel your teachers are adhering to "time-on-task" instructional principles?

16. Approximately what percent of your students ride the bus?

17. Approximately how many minutes per student per week of instructional time is lost due to transportation problems?

18. Do you have a school policy relating to homework?

19. How many days per week is homework given? _____ Does this vary from teacher to teacher? _____

20. Estimate how many visitations (formal and informal) you make per class per year?

    Formal _____ Informal _____

21. How many of your teachers have aides for at least 2 hours per day? _____

22. Generally speaking, how are your classroom aides used?

    % of time in teaching activity _____

    % of time in review/reinforcement _____

    % of time in paper work/preparation of materials for teacher _____

23. Are the classroom aides given any on-site training?

    If so, describe briefly the content and length of the inservice.

24. Approximately how many hours of teacher inservice are conducted at your site per year? _____

25. How do you use your modified days?

    a. What % for inservice of staff? _____

    b. What % for routine administrative matters? _____

    c. What % for teacher preparation time? _____

26. When and how often are your staff meetings held?

27. Could I see or could you describe a typical agenda for a staff meeting?

28. Given the demands for teaching basic skills, how do your teachers manage to teach other subjects?

    How much time, for example, is given to science, art, music, physical education, etc.?

29. What external resources (e.g., university, parent tutors, business and community) do you use at your site? What effect, if any, do you feel each has had on student achievement?

    University _____

    Parent _____

    Business _____

30. What parent organizations do you have at your school? How many parents actively participate in each group?

31. Do you have a counseling center? _____

32. Briefly describe your school's educational goals. May we have a copy of your school plan?

33. How many of your students are LEP? _____

34. How many of your LEP students are on waiver? _____

35. How many changes of teacher assignments have occurred since the beginning of the school year?

36. What is your approximate average class size? _____

37. What percent of your classrooms would you characterize as:

    Traditional _____ Open _____ Multi-grade _____ Team taught _____

    Other _____

38. What is the majority/minority ratio of teachers at your school?

39. What else is unique to your school that might affect student achievement?

B

ATTACHMENT B

ITF RACE/HUMAN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE AND MONITORS 1982-83

CHAIR: Beverley C. Yip
1031-25th St.
San Diego, CA 92102
(0) 232-6454 (H) 277-9879

EVALUATION SERVICES:

Betty Tomlin
293-8433

ITF LIAISON	MONITOR	SCHOOL
Morris Casuto S.D.-Arizona Regional Ofc. of Anti-Defamation League 7850 Mission Ctr. Ct. Suite 207 San Diego, CA 92108 293-3770	Susan (Burton) Jay	Adams Elementary 4672 35th St. San Diego, CA 92116 284-1158
	....	John N. Jones, Prin.
	Susan (Richard) Braun	Cleveland Elementary 6365 Lake Atlin Av. San Diego, CA 92119 463-4414
		Cecilia Estrada, Prin.
	Barbara Krepps	Vista Grande 5606 Antiqua Bl. San Diego, CA 92124 560-4424
		Beverly B. Foster, Prin.
	Katie Klump	Hickman Elementary 10850 Montongo San Diego, CA 92125 271-5216
		Tom A. Austin, Prin.
Howard Carey Neighborhood House Assn. 841 S. 41st St. San Diego, CA 92113	Olga Gunn	Morse High School 6905 Skyline Dr. San Diego, CA 92114 262-0763
		George T. Frey, Prin.
	Williard Gee	Wilson J.H.S. 3838 Orange Av. San Diego, CA 92105 280-1661
		Ferman McPhatter, Prin.

ITF LIAISON	MONITOR	SCHOOL
	Betty Zimmerman	Valencia Park 5880 Skyline Dr. San Diego, CA 92114 264-0125
		David A. Anfangar, Prin.
	Barbara Curtis	Fremont Elementary 2375 Congress St. San Diego, CA 92110 298-8275
		Electa J. Strub, Prin.
David W. Carroll Pacific Telephone Community Relations Mgr. 525 B St., Rm. 1912 San Diego, CA 92101 237-3340	Betty MacIntosh	Standley J.H.S. 6298 Radcliffe Dr. San Diego, CA 92122 455-0550
	....	Mary Lee Wilcoxon, Prin.
	Joe Nalven	Farb Middle School 4880 La Cuenta Dr. San Diego, CA 92124 292-0235
		Lloyd (Bill) McClain, Prin.
	Carlton Schroeder	La Jolla H.S. 750 Nautilus St. La Jolla, CA 92037 454-3081
		Charles J. Clapper, Prin.
	Alene Altman	Serra J/S High 5156 Santo Rd. San Diego, CA 92124 560-4341
		LaRene M. Sullivan, Prin.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
1897

ATTACHMENT C

RULES AND PROCEDURES

1. There will be mileage reimbursement for all monitors (30¢ per mile). Please keep a record of miles traveled on forms provided.

2. Monitors are to report monthly to their ITF Liaison person. The latter will endeavor to visit the site at least twice with the monitor.

3. Monitors should report to the school office on the first visit to campus. Subequent signing in etc., will depend on what site's requires.

4. Monitors should try to visit the site at least once a week for 2-3 hours.

ATTACHMENT C

REPORT FRAMEWORK FOR ITF MONITORS

1. Your initial report should be a general description of the school you are observing:

   a. The characteristics of the site, eg., number of
      Minority/majority students
      Racial makeup of staff
      Does it have an active race/human relations committee
      Are parents involved, do they reflect student population
      How old is the school, where is it located
      Is it a VEEP, magnet, learning center, etc.
      Eg., describe the integration program.

   b. The climate eg., the quality of teacher-pupil, teacher-parent, pupil-pupil, teacher to teacher interactions.

   c. Observe the latter area for differences from first visit and last visit.

2. Observe/attend in-service training for the teachers at your site.

   - What is the quality of the in-service program.
   - How is it received by staff.
   - Is attendance mandatory?
   - Do teachers reflect genuine acceptance of the in-service?
   - Do teachers find the in-service beneficial?

3. Classroom observation

   - Are teachers using the conflict materials to teach?
   - Do the teachers seem knowledgeable about teaching this topic?
   - Do the students understand what is taught?

4. Evaluation of R/HR program

   - Is the district evaluating the R/HR program?
   - If so, how.
   - Do you believe that the evaluation is an objective one?

5. Attitudes of teachers/students towrds Race/Human Relations program

   - Do teachers/students accept the R/HR program in a positive light?
   - Are you received in a friendly comfortable way?

*Cite examples to support your observations/conclusions.

D

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY RACE/HUMAN RELATIONS EVALUATION DESIGN 1982-83

I. BASELINE DATA FOR LONG-RANGE GOALS

Racial Mixing and Interaction Variables

1. What is the quality of interaction between people at the school (Student-student, student-teacher, teacher-student, teacher-teacher, teacher-administrator, administrator-student)?

2. Does racial mixing exist? What is evidence it does/does not exist? Areas for study:

   a. In classroom
   b. Out of classroom
   c. Student participation in school sponsored activities.

3. What are institutional practices that contribute to or hinder good race/human relations at schools?

   a. Selection procedures of students for awards and leadership positions.
   b. Criteria for student scheduling and placement in classes.
   c. Duties and procedures for counselors.
   d. Procedures for determining suspensions.

4. What are suspension rates at schools? Are these reasonably proportionate to enrollment by race, ethnic group and sex?

5. What is the perception of justice by students and staff at the schools.

6. What is the correlation of discrepancy between students' and staff's perception of justice at the schools?

7. Are there discernible patterns of differing goals which students indicate on their plans for careers and further schooling (as evidenced in Career Planning Inventory results) which are related to race, six , or ethnic group?

8. Is there a relationship between school context variables and the results of the race/human relations program?

9. Are there correlations between students' perception of justice and suspension procedures?

II. SHORT-TERM GOALS: FIELD TEST OF PROGRAM - SPRING 1983

A. Student Race/Human Relations Program

1. What is the student program at the elementary, junior, and senior high school levels?

2. How is the program implemented at each level?

3. How effective was the in-service training?

4. To what degree was the program implemented?

5. What were the strengths/weaknesses of the program?

6. What were the reported achievement/mastery levels of students?

7. How satisfied were staff with using the program (teacher-administrator)?

8. What are recommendations for improvement?

B. Staff Development Program

1. What is the program for certificated, administrative, and classified staff?

2. How is the program implemented?

3. What are the expected outcomes of the staff develoment program.

4. How effective was the orientation/in-service of the materials.

5. To what degree was the program implemented.

6. How effective was the program in achieving the expected outcomes?

7. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the program?

8. What degree of administrative/staff support for the program was identified?

9. How satisfied were staff with the program?

10. What recommendations for improvement need to be implemented?

III. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

Multiple Sources of Data:

Documentation, Observation, Interviews, Surveys, Analyses.

Both single and correlation (or cross validation) analyses will be done on the data.

Teams which visit the schools will be mixed by racial/ethnic group and male/female.

BT:pms
5-16-83

E

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
RACE/HUMAN RELATIONS EVALUATION
STUDENT AND STAFF SURVEY

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING STUDENT AND STAFF SURVEY

1. Do not put your name on this survey nor on the answer sheet.

2. Each school in the District has a three digit location code.

   In that section of the answer sheet labeled "IDENTIFICATION" enter in the first 3 blocks the three numbers which make up your school location code. Using your number 2 pencil, darken the circle containing that number directly below the number you entered.

3. In the fourth block in the area labeled "IDENTIFICATION" enter the number from below which best identifies your racial/ethnic background.

1.	STUDENT: HISPANIC	6.	STAFF: HISPANIC
2.	STUDENT: WHITE	7.	STAFF: WHITE
3.	STUDENT: BLACK	8.	STAFF: BLACK
4.	STUDENT: ASIAN	9.	STAFF: ASIAN
5.	STUDENT: OTHER	0.	STAFF: OTHER

   Again, using your number 2 pencil, darken the circle containing that number directly below the number you entered. (The computer cannot read the numbers you entered in the blocks at the top; it can read the numbers which you darken in those little circles.)

4. For each item of the survey, indicate your response to the item by choosing a number from 1 to 5 which best expresses your evaluation. On the scale, 5 is high and 1 is low. Darken the circle on the answer sheet for that numbered item which corresponds to your evaluation of the item.

5. You may use the clear space on the front and back of the answer sheet to make comments. Do not write in the green areas and do not write in the areas provided for responses.

6. Return your number 2 pencil, this survey form, and your answer sheet to your teacher.

7. Teachers and other staff should return all answer sheets and surveys to the principal's secretary or any other person designated to collect them. Staff and student surveys do <u>not</u> need to be separated.

8. Teachers should feel free to read items to students and to make any clarifications necessary for student comprehension.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

STUDENT AND STAFF SURVEY

1. There is a written form which explains the rules and expected behavior of students at our school.

2. The rules of behavior are taught in such a manner that all students know and understand them.

3. Students have a part in writing the rules of the school.

4. There is a means for students to express what they dislike about discipline and how the rules of the school are enforced.

5. Students from all races and ethnic backgrounds are treated equally and fairly under our discipline code.

6. Before students are given punishment at our school, they are given a clear explanation of what they have done wrong.

7. Students at our school are given the right to present their side of the story when they are charged with breaking a rule.

8. Administrators listen to the student's side of the story when students are accused of breaking a rule.

9. Counselors listen to the student's side of the story when students are accused of breaking a rule.

10. Teachers listen to the student's side of the story when students are accused of breaking a rule.

11. Students of all races are treated fairly by those who give punishment at our school.

12. At our school, teachers only give referrals when it is clear that a student has broken a rule.

13. If I have a complaint about something that seems unfair to me, I know whom to see.

14. Student complaints are listened to by the administrators and teachers at our school.

15. Administrators and teachers really try to do something about complaints at our school.

16. There is a clearly explained way for students to present complaints and problems to our principal.

17. Students who treat another student unfairly are punished at our school.

18. Students feel safe and secure at our school.

19. All students feel they are respected at our school.

20. Both male and female students are treated equally and fairly.

21. The secretaries and clerks treat all students equally and fairly.

22. Cafeteria workers treat students equally and fairly.

23. Students of all races and backgrounds are encouraged to take part in clubs, activities, and leadership positions at our school.

24. Students, rich or poor, feel comfortable and welcome in the clubs and activities of our school.

25. Every year we review the rules and regulations to see if any need changing.

BD:nl
1/6/83

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
1897

ATTACHMENT F

ADMINISTRATIVE CIRCULAR NO. 110
Superintendent's Office No. 29

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

Date: January 20, 1983

To: Principals, Division and Department Heads

Subject: DISTRICT GOALS AND SUPERINTENDENT'S OBJECTIVES, 1982-83

Department and/or Persons Concerned: All district staff

Due Date: None

Reference: None

Action Requested: Review with staff and file for reference

Brief Explanation:

Attached is a copy of the goals for the district that were adopted by the Board of Education for this school year. Under each goal I have written a set of objectives for reaching it.

As you know, the purpose of the board's goals is to provide a general policy direction for us to follow in the administration of the district and the allocation of our time and resources. My objectives set forth time lines and specific things for us to do to meet the goals.

I believe that having clear goals and objectives allows us to be more accountable. We have talked a good deal recently about accepting responsibility and the consequences of our actions. I think my objectives demonstrate that I am willing to assume responsibility and to be held accountable. I hope that they will encourage others to do the same by demonstrating that I am not asking anyone to do more than I am willing to do.

Please familiarize yourself with the goals and objectives and review them with members of your staff. You will want to refer to them as you make plans for the remainder of the year. Additional copies are available from the Public Information Office, 293-8414.

Sometime in the spring, the board will adopt a set of goals for the 1983-84 school year. When it does, I will then modify my objectives to match the new goals. We will then distribute them in a document that you can refer to as you plan for the school year ahead.

Thomas W. Payzant

Thomas W. Payzant
Superintendent

TWP:sg

Attachment
Distribution: Lists A, C

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
Office of the Superintendent

DISTRICT GOALS AND SUPERINTENDENT'S OBJECTIVES 1982-83

On June 8, 1982 the Board of Education adopted goals for the district. The objectives of the superintendent are stated for each goal. These goals and objectives constitute the expectations the board and superintendent have for the district, the direction that employees must take in meeting the responsibilities of their positions, a plan which will guide decisions about the allocation of resources and a focus for evaluation of programs and personnel.

DISTRICT GOAL 1: BASIC SKILLS

To continue the development, refinement, implementation, and evaluation of the Achievement Goals Program as part of a balanced curriculum so that it systematically leads to a higher level of achievement in the basic skills required for graduation from high school by the end of the 1985-86 school year.

Superintendent's Basic Skills Objectives

1. The superintendent will present to the board a comprehensive master plan for basic skills, K through 12, for students enrolled in regular, special education, and advanced programs by April 1, 1983. The plan will include program recommendations and an implementation calendar for:

   a. Achievement Goals Program: reading, language, and mathematics (K-12).

   b. Higher competency standards in reading, writing, and mathematics.

   c. Proficiency standards defined for required courses for diploma.

   d. High level competencies for advanced course in literature, mathematics, science, social studies.

   e. High school graduation and grade level requirements for increasd instruction in science, mathematics, and computer education.

   f. Computer education instruction plan, K-12.

   g. English language development program for limited English proficient students.

   h. Development of K through 8 mathematics program.

   i. Consolidation of categorical funds to support district basic skills programs.

   j. Plan for reporting pupil progress.

2. By January 15, 1983, the Evaluation Services Department will supply the superintendent with a list of those schools whose CTBS subtest scores were below the national norm based on spring, 1982 districtwide testing (Grades 5 and 7). For those schools which are not already part of a comprehensive plan to raise achievement (e.g., AGP schools), the superintendent, in coordination with the respective site administrators, shall develop a three-year plan to raise test scores. As a result of the planned efforts implemented during the 1983-84 school year, spring, 1984 districtwide median percentile scores on the CTBS for Grades 5 and 7 will indicate improvement or maintenance on at least 10 of the 14 subtests when compared to spring, 1982 results.

3. The average attainment for the court identified minority isolated schools in 1982-83 will meet or exceed at least 80 percent of the 35 interim goals established by the Evaluation Services Department in the content areas of reading, language, and mathematics derived from the goal stated in the court order of December 2, 1980.

4. By April 1, 1983, the superintendent will develop a process for review of the district's current pupil promotion and retention practices and present to the board by September 1, 1983 a pupil promotion/retention plan which if approved by the board would be implemented by the beginning of the 1984-85 school year.

5. By March 1, 1983, the superintendent will develop a process for review of the district's current homework practices which will result in recommendations for a homework policy to be considered by the board no later than July 1, 1983 for implementation at the beginning of the 1983-84 school year.

DISTRICT GOAL 2: BASIC SKILLS

To expand the staff development effort aimed at enhancing the capabilities of principals, vice principals, and other administrators to function as instructional leaders.

Superintendent's Basic Skills Objectives

1. The superintendent will prepare by February 1, 1983 a new uniform plan for leadership development which will include new techniques for assessment of leadership potential, training programs and selection procedures designed to identify those employees with the greatest potential for instructional leadership.

2. The superintendent will present to the board by May 1, 1983 a revised administrator evaluation plan which will include job descriptions, job standards, and performance objectives as part of the plan.

3. The superintendent will present to the board by May 1, 1983 a staff development plan, cost estimates, and an implementation time line for upgrading the skills of managers and supervisors. Included will be training activities in areas such as using data for decision making, evaluation of personnel, community and race relations, and instructional leadership.

DISTRICT GOAL 3: MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

To maintain a high level of instructional quality in an environment of decreasing resources through a combination of the following types of actions: reallocation of existing resources, reorganization of units for more efficient performance, rigorous program evaluation including cost/effectiveness studies, rigorous evaluation of personnel performance and management procedures, leadership training in personnel evaluation, closer interdivisional cooperation, site recognition of student achievement/involvement, and other actions initiated by staff.

Superintendent's Management and Organization Objectives

1. Using the observations and recommendations regarding the administrative organization of the district, plus other relevant information (e.g., items listed in Goal 3), the superintendent will develop a plan for modifying the structure of the district so as to make operations more effective and efficient. This plan will address, but not be limited to, participatory decision making, enhanced communication, site implementation and monitoring of programs, and recognition of employees' accomplishments. The plan will be submitted to the board for approval by December 14, 1982, and implemented by July 1, 1983.

2. Using the approved Superintendent's Objectives, a management system will be in operation by July 1, 1983 school year which will (a) establish clear communication and priorities, (b) include specific enabling objectives at least through the assistant superintendent level, (c) be used in budget formulation and decision making, and (d) be used as a primary component of personnel evaluations.

DISTRICT GOAL 4: INTEGRATION

To reevaluate the degree of pupil participation and the quality of experiences in each of the integration programs in an effort to improve those existing efforts, discontinue ineffective programs or practices, and to find new, creative approaches to fully achieving true integration.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
1897

ATTACHMENT G

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street

I7

Board of Education agenda
April 4, 1983

DATE April 4, 1983

MEMO TO Members of the Board of Education

FROM Payzant

SUBJECT SUPERINTENDENT'S BASIC SKILL OBJECTIVE 1 - A MASTER PLAN FOR BASIC SKILLS, K-12

On June 8, 1982, the Board of Education adopted a set of goals for the district. On January 18, 1983, I provided the board with administrative objectives for each of the nine goals. This report is in response to Objective 1 under District Goal 1 which states:

> The superintendent will present to the board a comprehensive master plan for basic skills, K through 12, for students enrolled in regular, special education, and advanced programs by April 1, 1983. The plan will include program recommendations and an implementation calendar for:

a. Achievement Goals Program: reading, language, and mathematics (K-12).

b. Higher competency standards in reading, writing, and mathematics.

c. Proficiency standards defined for required courses for diploma.

d. High level competencies for advanced courses in literature, mathematics, science, social studies.

e. High school graduation and grade level requirements for increased instruction in science, mathematics, and computer education.

f. Computer education instruction plan (k-12).

g. English language development program for limited English proficient students.

h. Development of K through 8 mathematics program.

i. Consolidation of categorical funds to support district basic skills programs.

j. Plan for reporting pupil progress.

A MASTER PLAN FOR BASIC SKILLS, K-12

Achievement Goals Program: reading, language, and mathematics (K-12)

For the past three years the district has implemented an achievement goals program (AGP) designed to raise the academic achievement in reading, language, and mathematics of the students in the court-identified racially isolated schools in the district. As part of this court-approved plan, programs are now in place in reading, K-7 and 10; mathematics, K-8 and part of 9; language arts, using the district language arts program, K-8; and reading, language, and mathematics programs for Spanish speaking limited English proficient students, K-9.

The programs which have so far been implemented have helped to move the schools covered by the court order progressively closer to the court-ordered goals. In mathematics, they have already been reached at a number of grade levels, and the progress in reading and language, while less spectacular, also shows every sign of helping us to achieve the stated goals. As the program is still not implemented at all grade levels, and as the students in the program have not moved up into all grade levels, we still must expand the program to all of the grade levels and subjects indicated on schedules approved by the court and the school board.

In following the approved time line, the district has piloted during this school year programs in Science/Reading 8, Social Studies/Reading 9, and additional programs in mathematics at grade 9. I will propose the implementation of those programs as fully operational for 1983-84 along with the initial implementation of programs in mathematics at grade 10 in both English and Spanish.

The final parts of the approved schedule will be put into place during 1984-85, with piloting in 1983-84, to give us complete coverage in all three subject areas, K-12.

A recommendation for the continuing implementation of the Achievement Goals Program with refinements to eliminate weaknesses and build upon strengths, and the budget required to support such implementation will be presented to you as part of comprehensive reports on both the district integration program and the overall program for basic skills development.

Higher competency standards in reading, writing, and mathematics

In May, 1978, competency standards in reading, writing, and mathematics were adopted by the board. Since that time, experience

has demonstrated that specification of expected levels of competency has a positive effect upon the quality of instruction as well as upon student achievement.

During the current year, staff work has been directed toward raising competency standards in an ongoing effort to improve the achievement level of all students. As a result, new assessments will be implemented effective with the 1983-84 school year which will:

1. Increase the difficulty of the content assessed (e.g., include intuitive algebra on the mathematics competencies).

2. Increase the difficulty and number of items assessed (e.g., increase the number of words required for the essay on the writing competency).

3. Increase the percent of correct items required to meet each competency standard.

Specific recommendations for each competency were included in a committee report submitted to the board in relation to the report on graduation requirements.

At present, staff members are preparing revised assessment instruments under a Chapter 2 project. The new instruments will be printed this summer and will be ready for districtwide use beginning in the fall semester at grades 8, 9, 10 and 11. This objective, therefore, will be fully implemented in 1983-84.

Proficiency standards defined for required courses for diploma.
Parallel to raising basic competency standards in reading, writing, and mathematics, plans are now in place for achieving further levels of proficiency in basic skills as a prerequisite for issuance of a high school diploma. These added efforts to raise student achievement will include the following:

1. Each course specifically required for high school graduation will have proficiency levels established.

2. Each student, prior to receiving credit for one of these required courses, must demonstrate that he or she possesses the required proficiency level.

3. Satisfactory completion of demonstrated proficiencies will be in addition to any other requirements normally prescribed by the class instructor for earning a passing grade in the course.

Tentative proficiencies for English, social studies (U.S. History 1, 2 and American Government 1) and mathematics courses were proposed

in the committee report submitted in relation to graduation requirements. These are now being refined and reviewed by sites under Chapter 2 funding.

Implementation of the added proficiencies in courses required for the diploma will begin by requiring all twelfth grade students graduating in June, 1984, to meet proficiencies set for American Government 1 and twelfth grade English courses. During 1983-84, eleventh grade students will be required to meet proficiencies set for U.S. History 1, 2 and English courses, and tenth grade students will be required to meet proficiencies set for English 3, 4 and mathematics. As these proficiencies are implemented in the several grades next year, they will become fully applicable for all students in succeeding years.

High level competencies for advanced courses in literature, mathematics, science, and social studies.

The definition of competencies expected of all entering college freshmen as defined by the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) and by the California Consortium have been used as a basis for assessing and ultimately improving the district's college preparatory courses. For the purposes of reviewing these courses, those which now qualify for the "Diploma with Academic Distinction" were used. In addition to those subject areas specified in the original objective, art history and a second language requirement have been added.

Curriculum resource personnel in art, language arts, science, second language, and social studies have examined available advanced placement curriculum materials and have developed for specified courses preliminary lists of appropriate higher-order thinking skills and competencies. These include those student behaviors expected for satisfactory completion of courses approved for graduation with academic distinction and sample models for assessing such higher-order thinking skills and competencies in each subject area. The listings of higher-order thinking skills and competencies for art history, language arts, science, second language, and social studies are being refined further for each subject area.

Our efforts in this area are not viewed as a district-mandated and centrally administered assessment program, but rather as a definition of desirable and achievable proficiencies along with model assessment techniques to be used by teachers and site staffs. Using funding approved under Chapter 2 and in the 1982-83 budget, implementation of this significant effort to ensure high-level achievement of our most able students includes:

Spring, 1983 - development of curriculum materials for teaching the skills and competencies appropriate for each course listed for graduation with academic distinction and suggested methods for attainment.

Summer, 1983 - preparation of assessment models for higher-level, subject-related competencies.

Fall, 1983 - staff development programs during the fall of 1983 to assure that teachers are aware of the competencies and the level of proficiency the district expects for college preparatory students.

Ongoing assessment of the district curriculum will be necessary to ensure that instruction for each of the competencies is effective.

High school graduation and grade level requirements for increased instruction in science, mathematics, and computer education.

With the board's adoption of increased graduation requirements on March 8, several actions were approved to increase instruction in science, mathematics, and computer education. These include:

1. The increase of the science requirement from one year to two years is to be phased in by offering science as one of several options to increase academic course time beginning in 1983-84 and becoming required for all students in the graduating class of 1989.

2. The increase of the science requirement at grades 7-8, from one semester to two semesters, is to be phased in over a two-year period by offering in 1983-84 two semesters of science in grades 7 and 8 on a pilot basis in selected schools and requiring in 1984-85 all eighth grade students to complete two semesters of science in grades 7 or 8.

3. The increase of the mathematics requirement from two years to three years is to be phased in by offering mathematics as one of several options to increase academic course time beginning in 1983-84 and becoming required for all students in the graduating class of 1989.

4. The adoption of a computer literacy competency is to be phased in by offering courses in computer education or courses in mathematics, science, and business education in which computer education and applications are incorporated beginning in 1983-84 and becoming required for all students in the graduating class of 1989.

The adoption of the above increased course requirements, coupled with concurrent work to specify proficiencies, combine to place greater emphasis on academic achievement.

Computer Education Instruction Plan (K-12).
At present, a broad K-12 computer education program proposal has been approved. Staff work is now being directed toward developing goals and objectives for a K-8 long-range computer education curriculum and at grades 9-12 toward maintaining and expanding existing computer education courses and developing instructional elements to be incorporated in selected mathematics, science, and business education courses. These initial steps are to be completed by July, 1983 through Chapter 2 funding.

Beginning in September, 1983, pilot programming will be initiated to include computer literacy instruction in selected secondary mathematics, science, and business education courses, accompanied by appropriate inservice of teachers using the pilot materials. These pilot programs will provide the necessary base upon which to phase in the computer literacy requirement for high school graduation, beginning with next year's eleventh grade students.

Also during 1983-84, curriculum will be prepared for the K-8 computer education program based on the program goals and objectives currently being developed. With field testing of K-8 materials, evaluation of the grades 9-12 pilot components, necessary revisions, concurrent inservice programs, and the development of projections for equipment and software needs, we will have by June 30, 1984, a reasonable grasp on the key elements of a district-developed computer education curriculum leading to full implementation of the computer literacy requirement for 1989 graduates.

The potential impact of equipment and software identification and procurement, careful curriculum development, and teacher and staff preparation dictate that computer education be phased in to ensure thoughtful planning, adequate piloting and assessment, and staff development.

English language development program for limited English proficient students.

The Second Language Education unit was established by the board in September of 1982. The unit consolidated the functions previously assigned to several separate units. The following is a summary of the unit's progress to date and an outline of its plans.

General: At the elementary school level, teachers are currently provided with a district-developed English as a second language (ESL) continuum. This consists of content, suggested activities, and guidelines for instruction. At the secondary school level, teachers use texts of their choice and are provided a district guide which gives objectives and other guidelines for instruction.

Materials development: Reacting to teacher and administrator dissatisfaction with the present ESL program, the district embarked last year on a project to create a new curriculum for teaching English to limited English proficient (LEP) students (ELEPS).

A team of four resource teachers, one leader and three writers, is currently creating the first year's program at three grade level groupings: 1-3, 4-6, 7-12. Each grade level grouping consists of 12 units. The program will encompass a three-year sequence for a total of 36 units at each grade level grouping. Staff members are currently reviewing kindergarten materials to determine whether a program for that level should be purchased or created by the district.

Advisory committees have been established at each level to review materials as they are produced.

A program of inservice education which consists of workshops conducted by nationally known leaders in second language acquisition is in progress.

Although five units have been produced at each grade level grouping (units 10, 11, 12, 1, and 2 in that order), writers are having difficulty in meeting their production schedule. There is some question whether the commitment to have the first year's materials available for use next year (including at year-round schools) can be met.

Materials are currently being reviewed by teachers; planning did not include field testing (piloting) of materials. Therefore, the production plan will be changed to designate 1983-84 as the year for field testing of the first year's materials, thus delaying districtwide implementation to 1984-85. To assure effective field-testing with appropriate modification based on piloting, it will be necessary to employ at least two additional resource teachers.

Time allocation: District guidelines call for one hour or less of instructional time devoted to ELEPS.

If LEP students are to learn English effectively and rapidly, they must spend significant blocks of time focused on that task, especially at the beginning of their program. The older the student is, the more time needs to be devoted to this.

The amount of time in study of English must be increased, with a minimum of 60 to 180 minutes per day, depending upon grade level.

Responsibility for instruction: Current district policy at the elementary school level holds each classroom teacher responsible for teaching ESL.

Effectiveness of implementation varies widely among sites and among teachers at the same site. At some sites, instruction is relegated to aides. At other sites teachers receive no administrative support. I am expecting each site principal to be responsible for delivery of an appropriate ELEPS program. This responsibility includes organizing the site to facilitate effective instruction. I also will be assigning additional central office staff to assist teachers in providing appropriate instruction.

Articulation: Students may enroll at a junior high school (grade 7) or a senior high school (grade 10) without records indicating either that they are continuing as LEP students or that they have been exited. This leads to faulty placement. To rectify this, the second language unit has been meeting with principals, counselors, and other personnel at each level involved. In addition, forms to enable site personnel to relate the elementary school ESL continuum to the secondary school program are being developed.

Materials development--Spanish: For Spanish-speaking LEP students at the elementary school level, the district has expanded use of the AGP Spanish program to all sites (not merely those designated as AGP schools). Materials for use in this program are complete, with a few minor revisions being made this year. At the secondary level, use of the Spanish AGP materials is limited to schools designated as AGP. The first two levels of the program are produced. Writing of the third level--reading in social studies--is currently in progress. Completion of a proposed fourth level--U.S. government--next year will depend upon approval of funding requests.

In general, the program for Spanish speaking LEP students includes language arts, reading, mathematics, and social studies taught through the Spanish language.

Materials development--Indochinese languages: For students who speak Indochinese languages, the district's social studies program is being modified and translated

into Cambodian, Hmong, Lao, and Vietnamese. In addition, seven units devoted to math concepts (as contrasted to math computation) are being translated.

Because the Indochinese have been in this country for only a short time (many, fewer than five years), their proficiency in English is not at the same level as that in their home language. Translations require a long time to produce and are thus expensive. Their accuracy often leaves much to be desired. Despite this, level A (the first year's materials) of the program will be completed by the end of this school year. Requests for next year's production are being revised so that only the highest priority needs are met.

Materials development--other languages: The number of students in languages other than Spanish and Indochinese languages is not large enough to warrant the cost of extensive materials development. Nonetheless, some materials have been developed through special projects for such languages as Pilipino.

Program implementation: Implementation of the program for Spanish-speaking LEP students seems to be progressing satisfactorily, with the usual variations that occur from site to site. Implementation of the program for Indochinese students is considerably less effective. The major problem is in the "sheltered English" aspect of the program. This aspect is new, and implementation requires commitment on the part of regular teachers as well as site organization to facilitate instruction. Development of a policy which holds principals responsible for providing all elements of instruction for LEP students and more intensive inservice education may help to improve the situation.

Itinerant team: When an elementary school site has only a few LEP students in a given language group, or when site resources do not permit employment of home language instructional aides at the site, the district provides home language instruction for LEP students through the itinerant team. The team consists of 13 teachers and over 100 aides. Each teacher supervises from 7-10 aides, with responsibility for providing instruction at as many as 10-12 schools.

In addition to being costly, the program is so designed that itinerant teachers spend relatively little time in direct supervision of their aides. Although it was our

intent to reduce the number of schools served and number of aides supervised, requests for service have prevented any significant reduction.

Evaluation of student performance: The development of a plan for evaluating progress of LEP students is in its final stages. Steps are being taken to begin implementation of the plan this year so that 1982-83 becomes the base year for comparison with data to be collected in future years.

Reclassification criteria and procedures: Because the state has recently changed its criteria for reclassifying LEP students, the district is currently in the process of modifying its criteria to comply with state requirements. In addition, the Second Language Education unit is in the process of trying to staff a classification team to assist sites with classification and other processes which have caused difficulties at the sites.

Development of K through 8 mathematics program.

Experience over the past several years in using the unique district developed AGP materials has clearly demonstrated the success of the program in raising the achievement levels of students and of providing materials designed to meet the needs of varying ability levels. The latter is a feature not found in commercial texts because the publishers now design materials for the broad, middle range of students and do not produce auxiliary materials to care for the needs of students at the upper and lower ability levels. It should be emphasized again that when commercial math texts have been adopted, and many are now in use throughout the district in non-AGP schools, it has been necessary to develop within the district supplemental materials to be used in conjunction with the texts. This need for supplemental district developed materials will continue to exist whenever commercial texts are used.

The board is considering a recommendation for proceeding with a carefully planned and evaluated mathematics program during 1983-84 and 1984-85. The recommendation calls for developing and field testing district materials in 60 elementary schools and 10 junior high schools and for continuing the use of currently adopted commercial texts in remaining elementary and junior high schools.

Consolidation of categorical funds to support district basic skills programs.

Categorical programs exist for the primary purpose of helping participating students to succeed with the regular program. The planned use of these resources is coordinated in a way that will provide maximum support to the district educational program.

All schools develop a comprehensive educational plan reflecting the assessed needs of their students, staff, and community. A major component required to be addressed in each plan is basic skills. Needs in this area receive top priority for allocation of district resources such as classroom teachers, counselors, administrators, staff development, books, and instructional supplies.

The special educational needs of many district students become the primary focus of categorical programs. Programs with required components in basic skills include compensatory education, school improvement, Project Follow Through, and bilingual education. Project schools must file a plan with federal and state agencies which specifies how categorical resources will supplement the regular district program resources in each component area. Parents and staff who develop the plan are able to consider the total needs of the school and consolidate resources in a manner that is most responsive to the school. Final plans are subject to review and approval at local and state levels.

For purposes of compensatory education, school improvement, Project Follow Through, and Indian Education programs, central services are consolidated in one department and location. Co-funded or multi-funded staff positions are assigned for efficiency and better program coordination. This enables a single manager, resource teacher, or budget analyst to be assigned to care for all of the categorical programs for a given school.

Schools which receive categorical support implement district programs in language, reading, and mathematics. In addition to basic instructional staff funded from district resources, principals have assigned supplemental staff to provide additional program services to project students, including tutoring and counseling. Paraprofessionals assist teachers with record keeping, preparation of materials, and attendance follow-up. Project resource teachers provide technical assistance to schools regarding program guidelines, planning, record keeping techniques, and parent involvement. They also conduct demonstration lessons in various instructional strategies and classroom management.

Central resource teachers provide assistance for several programs: e.g., School Improvement, Chapter 1, Chapter 2. Coordination of services and materials with curriculum and guidance staff ensure that district policies and objectives are followed. This is reinforced through participation in ongoing district staff development sessions. Work with parent groups and advisory/site councils are combined across programs where possible.

Joint program compliance reviews for all of the categorical programs provide assurance that they are coordinated at the site level. The review is also used to verify observance of project regulations and the supplementary nature of categorical programs as required by law. Purchase of textbooks, special instructional equipment and materials are reviewed and approved by curriculum specialists to ensure adherence to district standards and by a program administrator for compliance with project regulations.

Meetings for principals of schools having categorical programs are scheduled throughout the year to provide the necessary communication and coordination of program information. For schools with school improvement, compensatory education, and bilingual programs, these meetings include all three programs to limit the number of separate sessions that might be called to address each program. In 1983-84, these conferences will include representation from the Schools Operations and Planning and Research divisions.

Annual school evaluation reports are developed in a consolidated format with data about the assessment of each program in a single document. This enables parent councils and staff members to review student achievement and needs from the perspective of the total school as well as those of special need populations.
Finally, the external funding director will participate as part of Educational Services Management Staff meetings. This will provide for better communications and improved coordination of all supplementary services for the K-12 operation.

Plan for Reporting Pupil Progress.
The purposes of reporting pupil progress are to evaluate and to assist in guiding and facilitating the learner's academic, social, emotional, and physical development through communication among the child, the teacher, and the parents, and to strengthen relationships between school and home.

The elementary pupil growth report is one way of aiding parents and teachers to gain a better understanding of the progress a child is making in his or her academic achievement, development of good attitudes, and acceptance of responsibilities.

Evaluation is based on the child's current achievement. Achievement levels for each subject area are outlined in the "Course of Study for Elementary Schools." The following English and Spanish options are available for selection of pupil growth report forms:

- Use of Reporting Pupil Progress, forms 22-P-9006 and/or 22-P-9007.
- Use of site developed form based on criteria developed by the Reporting Pupil Progress Committee and magnet school needs.

Other ways of aiding parents and teachers to understand the progress a child is making include parent-teacher telephone conversations, written communications, and parent-teacher-pupil conferences. A maximum of four conference days may be scheduled during either the first or second report period, or the four days may be divided between the first and second periods.

A survey of sites conducted in the spring of 1981 indicated that only 76 elementary schools used the district form while 45 were using site developed reporting pupil progress forms. Although guidelines for developing site based forms were established, there was concern as to whether all of the site developed forms were adhering to those guidelines.

Last spring the Elementary Pupil Growth Report was revised as the result of a study by a committee of elementary administrators, teachers and parents. In January, 1982, the committee of 26 members representing all areas of the city was formed to review the elementary reporting pupil progress forms and policies.

The major tasks of the committee were to review and revise the district criteria for reporting pupil progress and determine whether we would have a district report card only, a district card and site developed card, or site developed cards only. In addition, the committee reviewed the current schedule for reporting pupil progress for traditional and year-round schools, use of parent-teacher conference days, kindergarten reporting forms, grade level equivalents, rating scales, and primary language reports.

The committee met seven times between January 21 and May 5, and the following recommendations were made:

1. Add to the existing criteria for progress report forms to include:

   a. Attendance.

   b. ESL grade (if applicable).

   c. Basic skills competency assessment.

   d. Promotion/retention recommendations.

   e. Provisions for grading students in their primary language (if applicable).

2. Continue to report pupil progress three times per year in traditional and year-round schools.

3. Allow schools to use either the new district progress report form developed by the committee or to use a site developed form if it met the revised criteria. (For 1982-83 only, schools with a supply of old district cards or old site developed cards on hand could use up that supply.)

4. Develop a rating scale for academic achievement on the new district card based on grades of 1-5. A, B, C grades would continue to be used only by fundamental magnet schools.

5. Continue to report pupil progress for kindergartners via 2-3 parent conferences rather than by a more formal district progress report.

By May, 1982, the committee had developed a new district progress report form which included all criteria previously established. Each member of the committee took draft #5 of the progress report to their schools and asked several teachers to review the new form. Suggestions and comments were received from 63 teachers. Revisions were made to the form and the final draft was completed by June, 1982.

Inservice for year-round principals was conducted on July 30, 1982. Inservice sessions for principals on traditional schedules were conducted October 5 and 6.

At the inservice, principals were given the criteria for progress reporting and a sample of the "Basis for Report Card Grades" which was prepared by a subcommittee. It was suggested that principals discuss with their staff the "Basis for Grades" and each site develop consistent standards for marking academic achievement.

During 1982-83, 104 schools are using the new district progress report, and 12 schools are using site developed progress reports.

Comments from site administrators indicate a need to change the Message to Parents section on the front of the new form to state that this is a district card rather than one developed especially for the site. It is also recommended that we print the superintendent's signature on the message rather than having each principal sign each card.

TWP:vjh

Memo No. 244 (1982-83)

03171B

H

ATTACHMENT H

Integration Task Force

Evaluation of Magnet Program
Tasks & Activities

Activity	*Completion Date*
1. *Complete time schedule for tasks*	*February 16, 1983*
2. *Call Professor Nagel and ask if he would provide feedback on instrument and objectives*	
3. *Background reading*	
4. *Meet with Ken, discuss activities, draft letter, questionnaire instrument, complete minutes of February 14 meeting*	*February 17, 1983*
5. *Complete draft letter and instrument*	*February 18, 1983*
6. *Complete background reading*	
7. *Summarize Magnet Programs*	
8. *Send letter and questionnaire, list of goals to Ed Fletcher's office for review*	*February 21, 1983*
9. *Select schools to visit with*	
10. *Get feedback on instrument from concerned parties, i.e.,* *A. Contacts at school* *B. Professors Harrison & Nagel* *C. Members of Integration Task Force* *D. School district employees* *Obtain feedback by February 25, 1983*	*February 23, 1983*
11. *Revise instrument and send to Ed Fletcher*	*February 25, 1983*
12. *Mail out letter and questionnaires from Fletcher's office. Request one week turnaround.*	*February 28, 1983*
13. *Analyze data and complete measurable objectives*	*March 9, 1983*
14. *Arrange follow-up visits*	
15. *Complete visits and phone calls*	*March 9 - March 14*
16. *Revise measurable objectives*	*March 16, 1983*
17. *Send program descriptions and objectives to Integration Task Force, schools participants, Nagel and school district*	*March 18, 1983*
18. *Complete revised descriptions and objectives*	*March 25, 1983*
19. *Define data requirements and collection procedures. Complete time schedule for data collection phase.*	
20. *Review by school personnel, school district*	*March 31, 1983*
21. *Complete draft evaluation report/plan*	*April 5, 1983*
22. *Review by Integration Task Force, school personnel, school district, Nagel*	*April 15, 1983*
23. *Submit evaluation report/plan for Magnet Schools to Integration Task Force for approval*	*April 20, 1983*

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
1897

San Diego City Schools
Community Relations and Integration Services Division

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Name of Magnet Program: ACADEMIC ACADEMY MAGNET

Name of school: JOHNSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To provide a quality educational program that will help pupils achieve academically.

2. To offer more class time on learning and mastering basic skills.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Academic Academy Magnet.....

- students will gain knowledge in the basic skills of reading, writing, spelling, grammar and mathematics.

- students will improve self-concept.

- students will enhance their appreciation and understanding of ethnic differences.

- students will learn problem solving techniques and develop self-discipline.

Name of Magnet Program: ACADEMICS AND ATHLETICS

Name of School: GREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
FULTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOAL:

To offer a strong program of basic skills instructions balanced with specialized instructions in gymnastics, physical fitness, swimming and nutrition.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Academics and Athletics Magnet .....

- students will gain basic experiences in each of the developmental physical educations areas

- students will increase knowledge of exercise, nutrition, and health

- students will demonstrate attitudes of good sportsmanship and cooperation

Name of Magnet Program: MUIR ALTERNATIVE MAGNET

Name of School: MUIR ALTERNATIVE MAGNET

GOALS:

1. To provide students with a nontraditional and flexible approach to learning.

2. To offer students the opportunity to participate in classroom and school policy decision making.

3. To promote an educational atomosphere of total involvement and self responsibility.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Muir Alternative Magnet .....

- students will develop self-reliance, creativity, and leadership

- students will show gains in all basic skills areas

- students will foster a greater understanding of self respect, responsibility and decision making.

Name of Magnet Program: BILINGUAL MAGNET

Name of School: SPRECKLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To provide students the opportunity to learn a second language.

2. To offer a quality education in an intergrated setting.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Bilingual Manget .....

- students will improve their fluency in two languages, English and Spanish.
- students will develop an awareness of customs and values of of various cultures including those of the language taught.
- students will enhance their ability to listen, speak and think in a second language.

Name of Magnet Program: CAREER AWARENESS MAGNET

Name of School: LINDBERGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To expose students to a variety of occupations and careers.

2. To assist students in finding their own personal interest and strength.

3. To offer a strong academic program.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Career Awareness Magnet .....

- students will demonstrate awareness of many career choices.
- students will become familiar with community business and services.
- students will gain self-confidence.
- students will develop decision making skills.
- students will show gains in basic skills.

Name of Magnet Program: CENTER FOR ENRICHED STUDIES

Name of School: LOWELL AND OAK PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

GOALS:

1. To provide for gifted and high achieving students by grouping for expanded and enriched academic experiences.

2. To offer a program designed for the development of independence and creativity in students.

3. To establish a comprehensive instructional program built around the interest and strengths of students.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Center For Enriched Studies .....

- students will demonstrate gains in all academic areas.
- students will develop an understanding in the use of computers.
- students will develop decision making skills.

Name of Magnet Program: COMMUNICATIONS MAGNET

Name of School: KNOX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To improve student achievement in basic skills.

2. To provide experiences with various communication media.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Communications Magnet .....

- students will acquire and improve communications skills.

- students will improve oral and written languages skills through creative dramatics, publishing and video technology.

Name of Magnet Program: ENCANTO MAGNET

Name of school: ENCANTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOAL:

1. To provide a total school involvement in an integrated setting with special programs to meet individual student needs.

OBJECTIVES:

-Students participating in the Math/Science program will foster an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method and develop the ability to use a computer for enrichment math.

-Students participating in the gifted program will demonstrate gains in all academic areas.

-Students participating in the Bilingual program will develop oral proficiency in a second language.

Name of Magnet Program: EXTENDED DAY MAGNET

Name of school: BURBANK AND MEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

GOALS:

1. To provide extended day care beyond the regular instructional day for magnet students.
2. To support the academic achievement of each student.
3. To provide a structured, well balanced physical developmental program that will help each student build interpersonal, and physical and academic skills.
4. To create a relaxed positive environment that will promote feelings of success.
5. To provide experiences which enhance race/human relations.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Extended Day Magnet .....,

- students will improve their academic skills.
- students will improve their physical fitness.
- students will enhance their feelings of self-worth, accomplishments, and a positive attitude toward school.

Goals and Objectives For Elementary
Magnet School Programs

Name of Magnet Program: FUNDAMENTAL MAGNET

Name of school: EMERSON, FOSTER, ROLANDO PARK AND WEBSTER

GOALS:

1. To provide an intense basic skill program that utilizes the traditional concepts of education.

2. To stress daily homework assignments, standards for personal and classroom discipline and good citizenship.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Fundamental Magnet .....

- students will demonstrate gians in reading, writing, spelling, speaking and mathematics.
- students will demonstrate an understanding in the structure of government.
- students will promote respect for authority, courtesy, and patriotism.
- students will develop pride and self-discipline.

Name of Magnet Program: INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION MAGNET

Name of school: BENCHLEY/WEINBERGER, FREMONT, SILVERGATE

GOALS:

1. To provide a program that promotes growth and achievement in accordance with the students own abilities and interest.

2. To offer a positive personalized learning experience.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Individualized Instruction Magnet .....

- students will demonstrate knowledge of the basic skills in reading, language, and math.

- students will develop positive human and race relations which result in a positive self-image.

- students will increase their ability to work independently.

Name of Magnet Program: SPANISH IMMERSION MAGNET

Name of School: HORTON AND LONGFELLOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To provide a program for students whose home language is English and want to become fluent and literate in the Spanish language.

2. To provide the opportunity to communicate in Spanish and interact with other students during co-curricular activities and reciprocal visits with schools in Tijuana.

3. To learn in an integrated environment.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Spanish Immersion Magnet. . . . .

- students will develop oral proficiency and literacy in Spanish as well as English.

- students will demonstrate mastery in the basic skills in both English and Spanish.

- students will develop an appreciation and sensitivity to people from other cultures who speak other languages.

Goals and Objectives For Elementary
Magnet School Programs

Name of Magnet Program: FRENCH IMMERSION MAGNET

Name of school: KNOX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To provide a program for students whose home language language is English and want to become fluent and literate in the French language.

2. To learn in an integrated environment with personal and academic experiences in both English and French.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the French Immersion Magnet .....

- students will develop oral proficiency and literacy in French as well as English.

- students will demonstrate mastery in the basic skills.

- students will develop an appreciation and sensitivity to people who speak other languages.

Name of Magnet Program: MATH/SCIENCE MAGNET

Name of school: CHOLLAS AND GRANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To offer students an intensive and enriched program in math and science as well as a strong program in reading, writing, spelling, speaking, social studies, and physical education.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Math/Science Magnet .....

- students will develop abilities in math and science.
- students will use laboratory equipment with skill.
- students will foster an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method.
- students will demonstrate knowledge in the use of computers.

Name of Magnet Program: MUSIC CONSERVATORY MAGNET

Name of school: BAKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOAL:

1. To provide a strong academic program that stresses the basic skills.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the Music Conservatory Magnet .....

- students will demonstrate knowledge in vocal music, piano, and orchestral instruments.
- students will build oral communication skills through creative dramatics, public speaking, and videotape technology.

Name of Magnet Program: UNIVERSITY LAB MAGNET

Name of school: SUNSET VIEW AND VALENCIA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOALS:

1. To offer a program that meets the unique instructional emotional and social needs of students.

2. To offer classes designed so that there is a lower student/adult ratio, through the combined resources of the school and the college community.

3. To benefit students with new approaches in teaching the basic skills and multicultural education.

OBJECTIVES:

By participating in the University Lab Magnet .....

- students will receive a more personalized instructional program, made possible by an on-site teacher training program.

- students will demonstrate knowledge in all academic areas.

- students will foster an appreciation and understanding of ethnic and cultural differences.

San Diego City Schools
Community Relations and Integration Services Division

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR SECONDARY MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Name of Magnet Program: ACADEMIC MAGNET FOR ENRICHED STUDIES AND ATHLETICS

Name of school: MEMORIAL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To provide opportunities for success in all academic areas.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the Academic Magnet, students will gain competence in academic subjects.

GOAL: To Emphasize athletic programs based on the individual needs of students.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the athletic component of this magnet program students will enhance their appreciation for the value of physical fitness programs.

Name of Magnet Program: CENTER FOR AVIATION/AEROSPACE/ENGINEERING STUDIES

Name of School: MORSE HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To provide career-oriented instruction in the aviation/aerospace/engineering fields.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the aerospace component of the magnet program, students will develop specialized skills for success in the field.

GOAL: To offer college preparation in the engineering course of study.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the engineering component of the magnet program, students will be provided a sequential math, science, and micro-computer curriculum.

Name of Magnet Program: BILINGUAL MAGNET CENTERS

Name of school: COLLIER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
POINT LOMA HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To provide opportunites for improvement of second language fluency.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the bilingual magnet, primary English-speaking students will improve their Spanish language skills and primary Spanish-speaking students will improve their English language skills.

GOAL: To gain appreciation for a multicultural society.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the bilingual magnets, students will foster a greater understanding of native English and Spanish cultures.

Name of Magnet Program: CENTER FOR BUSINESS AND OFFICE ADMINISTRATION

Name of school: CRAWFORD HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To provide an opportunity for students to explore the business field.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will increase skills applicable to business and office occupations.

GOAL: To offer a curriculum designed as advanced training in business and office administration.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program, students will develop necessary skills to be successful in business administration as a major field.

Name of Magnet Program: CAREER HIGH SCHOOL

Name of school: WRIGHT BROTHERS CAREER HIGH

GOAL: To relate academic classes to the student's specific career interest.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program, students will foster a greater understanding of academic skills necessary for a successful career.

GOAL: To provide career planning and occupational guidance experiences.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program, students will explore the world of work through unique career related elective courses.

Name of Magnet Program: CENTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Name of school: SAN DIEGO HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To provide opportunities for career preparation in the communications field.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the communications component of this magnet program students will acquire specialized skills applicable to careers in communications.

GOAL: To offer an international studies curriculum for exploratory or specific career choices.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the international studies component of this magnet program, students will increase their knowledge of the skills necessary for success in international business.

Name of Magnet Program: SCHOOL OF CREATIVE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Name of school: O'FARRELL SCHOOL OF CREATIVE AND PERFORMING ARTS

GOAL: To provide opportunities to explore one or more of the creative and performing arts areas.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program, students will enhance their appreciation for music, dance, visual and theater arts.

GOAL: To offer a quality instructional program in the academic subjects.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program, students will improve their basic academic skills as the foundation for any vocation.

Name of Magnet Program: FUNDAMENTAL MIDDLE SCHOOL

Name of school: KEILLER MIDDLE SCHOOL

GOAL: To emphasize high academic achievement through a strong basic skills instructional program.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program, students will increase their competence in academic subjects.

GOAL: To provide motivation for good citizenship standards for students.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will demonstrate understanding of the need for positive student behavior.

Name of Magnet Program: CENTER FOR INDUSTRY

Name of School: KEARNY HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To provide career preparation in specified areas of industry.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet porgram students will acquire skills necessary for entry-level jobs in the automotive services, machine working, welding, and electronics industry.

GOAL: To provide job training opportunities for students.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will be able to increase their paid and unpaid work experiences in industry.

Name of Magnet Program: CENTER FOR MARKETING, GRAPHICS AND MANAGEMENT

Name of School: MISSION BAY HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To offer career exploration and specialized training in the marketing, graphics and management fields.

OBJECTIVES: By participating in this magnet program, students will become familiar with skills unique to the advertising, graphics and marketing areas.

The three-year course of study will include skills as they apply to the job situation. Emphasis will be placed on reinforcing skills in reading, writing, computation, and speaking.

GOAL: To emphasize the attitudes, skills, and knowledge needed for successful business employment.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the magnet program, students will increase their understanding of the skills needed for success in the business world through field trips, guest speakers, role-playing situations and on-the-job training.

GOAL: To build a foundation for advanced training in these areas.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the magnet program, students will learn about career ladders in marketing, graphics, or management and the educational training and experience needed to attain their career goals.

Name of Magnet Program: MATH/SCIENCE/MICROCOMPUTERS

Name of school: BELL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To encourage students to realize their potential in the math and science areas.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will increase skills in specialized math/science/ microcomputer courses.

GOAL: To increase opportunities for integrated educational experience.

OBJECTIVES: By participating in this magnet program students will foster mutual understanding and appreciation of their ethnic and cultural differences.

Name of Magnet Program: MEDICINE AND HEALTH

Name of school: LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To offer career preparation for the health-care field.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the career preparation component of this magnet program, students will acquire skills necessary for entry-level health careers.

GOAL: To provide a preprofessional program for college-bound medical students.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in the professional component of this magnet program, students will increase knowledge in medical and related academic subjects.

Name of Magnet Program: SCIENCE/MATH/COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

Name of school: GOMPERS SECONDARY SCHOOL

GOAL: To offer specialized opportunities to students with strong interest in science, math and computers.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will demonstrate skills in areas of computer programming, math and science.

GOAL: To augment the specialized program with a strong curriculum in other academic areas.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will gain competency in other academic subject areas.

Name of Magnet Program: SPANISH IMMERSION

Name of school: MEMORIAL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
SAN DIEGO HIGH SCHOOL

GOAL: To offer a program of accelerated learning of Spanish.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will acquire proficiency in the Spanish language through the immersion method.

GOAL: To provide a comprehensive instructional program.

OBJECTIVE: By participating in this magnet program students will improve skills in academic subject matter.

J

ATTACHMENT J

To - Fletcher

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

RECEIVED
APR 15 1983
PT. LOMA
HIGH SCHOOL

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	X			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	X			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	X			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X — all students!			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X		J Gan ~~Chit~~	

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		X		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		X		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		X		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests				
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education		X		
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests	✓			
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		X		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests			X	
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		X		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		X		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		X		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	X			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		X		
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	X			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	X			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

APR 15 1983

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

RECEIVED
APR 15 1983

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	✓			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	✓			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests				
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	✓			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

K
4-15

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically			✓	
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in ~~racially isolated~~ schools * ALL	*✓	✓		
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities		✓		

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	X			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	X			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	X			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

APR 15 1983

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests			✓	
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools				✓
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests			✓	
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests			✓	
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

Return as directed

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests			✓	
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	✓			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	✓			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education		✓		
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

Dave Cufaro
Valencia Park

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		X		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		X		
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	X			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		X		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	✓			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	✓			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

APR 15 1983

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		✓		
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education		✓		
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program			✓	
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically		+		
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests	+			
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests	+			
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		+		
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		+		
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		+		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education			+	
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program			+	
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	+			

Collier

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

FREY
MORSE

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		X		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	X			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		X		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		X		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities			X	

Sunset View

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

APR 13 8 55 AM '83

SAN DIEGO

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		This can't always be done because of resident enrollment and facilities		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓	✓		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		X		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	X			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		X		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	X			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

APR 15 1983

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		X		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		X		
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	X			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		X		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests	✓			
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		? not sure what this means.		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓ ☆			
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

☆ It is difficult when Spanish is a primary language & instruction has to be separated by Ed.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EEF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		✓		
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program			✓	
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities		✓		

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests				
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		✓		
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	✓			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education				
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	✓			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	✓			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

APR 15 1982

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. To balance programs ethnically		✓		
2. To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3. To provide quality education based on parents' interests		✓		
4. To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools		✓		
5. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6. To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests		✓		
7. To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education		✓		
8. To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program		✓		
9. To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities		✓		

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	X			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests	X			
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	X			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	X			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests	X			
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	X			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	X			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	X			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	X			

CRAWFORD P-5.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

35

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests		✓		
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests	✓			
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests		✓		
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests	✓			
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			

APR 15 '83

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER | 4100 Normal Street

DATE: April 12, 1983

MEMO TO: Magnet School Principals

FROM: Fletcher EBF

SUBJECT: MAGNET PROGRAM GOALS

The Integration Task Force is interested in your views of the magnet program goals listed below. Accordingly, it is requested that you complete the survey and return it to me for transmittal to the Task Force.

Thanks, in advance, for your assistance.

	Magnet Program Goals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	To balance programs ethnically	✓			
2.	To provide quality education based on students' interests				
3.	To provide quality education based on parents' interests				
4.	To provide an integrated educational opportunity for as many students as possible, in racially isolated schools	✓			
5.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on students' interests				
6.	To provide unique (specialized) opportunities based on parents' interests				
7.	To provide an opportunity for youngsters to receive an integrated not just a desegregated education	✓			
8.	To have all magnet students participate in the Race/Human Relations Program	✓			
9.	To make sure magnet students have equal access to all school activities	✓			