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ABSTRACT

This research provides a descriptive account of the desegregation case Adams-Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) in a large urban public school district in the southwestern United States. Arias (1990) conceptual framework was utilized along with a chronological account of the events that occurred in the case. Research questions included: (1) Was bilingual education implemented along with desegregation after the Adams-Celaya v. Southwest school District lawsuit?; and (2) Did the district deal primarily with linguistic or descriptive needs of Mexican-American students?

This work constituted a detailed case study of the school district. Method included analysis of data gathered through board minutes, newspaper and district publications, historical data, and semi-structured interviews with individuals who played key roles in the district desegregation process.

Findings indicate that the court-ordered desegregation remedy occurred in three stages known as Phases I, II, and III. In Phase I mandatory busing occurred (minority students bore the burden). In Phase II, some inner-city elementary schools were designated as magnets with majority (white) students bused in after being offered and taking...
advantage of incentives such as extended day, small classes, and teacher aides. In Phase III, the focus of this study, four inner-city schools (three elementary and one middle school) were designated as magnets with bilingual curricula offered at each school along with incentives to attract east-side majority students to the inner-city minority populated schools.

With regard to impact, findings of this study generally support Arias (1990) that: (1) desegregation remedies must go beyond student reassignment strategies to include appropriate instructional components such as bilingual education, (2) demographic considerations, and (3) "controlled choice system" which is a form of the magnet school approach such as those offered by Southwest School district after the lawsuit. Further findings suggest some of the Phase III schools may be resegregating as racial isolation may be recurring and student enrollment at these schools is declining.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Segregation of racial minorities in Arizona public schools has existed for the past hundred years (Arias, 1990; Sheridan, 1986). One of the earliest cases arising over segregation of Mexican-Americans occurred in the Tolleson School in Phoenix, Arizona. In Gonzales v. Sheely (1951), a federal district court held that the practice of segregating Mexican-American students in separate buildings was discriminatory and illegal as a deprivation of their constitutional rights of due process and equal protection of law. Segregation has been a widespread problem, not confined to blacks in the South but also affecting Mexican-American students (Arias, 1990).

With regard to the segregation of black students in the South, their situation has not worsened (Orfield, 1987). Court decisions such as Brown v. Board (1954), Green v. Board (1968), Swann v. Charlotte (1971), and Milliken v. Bradley (1974) are a few of the more significant decisions made to improve educational opportunities for blacks (Orfield, 1978; Carter and Segura, 1979). Many researchers such as Bradley, Bryant, Calhoun, and Clark have written articles and conducted research about black students and the effects of desegregation (Coleman, 1985). As a result, much
of the literature and theory on educational equity has examined the effects of desegregation on black students in schools.

Conversely, others note that Mexican-American students are more segregated in the West than ever before, and their isolation in school has gone relatively unnoticed (Arias, 1990; Medina, 1986; Orfield, 1987; Orum and Shroyer-Portillo, 1982; Carter and Segura, 1979). While significant court decisions have been achieved for the benefit of Mexican-American students, including *Keyes v. Denver School District* (1973) and *Diaz v. San Jose School District* (1984), only recently have researchers taken interest in the effects of desegregation on Mexican-American students (Carter and Segura, 1979; Orfield, 1987; Arias, 1990). Researchers such as Arias, Carter and Segura, Orfield, and Orum and Shroyer-Portillo have emerged as experts in this field thus far. Of these, only Arias (1990) has developed a theoretical and applied base from which empirical research can be conducted. For this reason, her contribution is well worth noting.

Arias' (1990) research is important for a number of reasons. First, she considers linguistic as well as desegregation needs when looking at effects of desegregation on Mexican-American students. Second, she focuses on a rapidly growing student population in the Southwest. Third, she looks at curricular issues in addition to student
reassignment strategies, something that has not been the focus of many traditional studies on desegregation. Most important though is the fact that Arias' research is applicable to school districts in Arizona. The dilemma posed by segregated schools is one that warrants the attention of administrators and researchers alike. One reason is that Mexican-American students are a rapidly growing student population in many school districts (Arias, 1990; Medina, 1988; Orfield, 1987; Carter and Segura, 1979). Another reason is that traditional methods of teaching have been ineffective for this linguistically diverse student population in public schools (Cummins, 1989; Krashen, 1988; Crawford, 1989). Still another reason is that many segregated schools exist today that do not afford equal educational opportunity for Mexican-American students (Carter and Segura, 1979; Medina, 1988). One school district in Arizona challenged school segregation and did so successfully.

The subject of this study is one of the most significant cases involving segregation of Mexican-Americans in a large urban triethnic school district in Arizona. For purposes of this study, the district will be described as Southwest School District (SSD), and the names of the parties involved will be Adams and Celaya. *Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District* was filed in 1974 by two
parties, one black and one Mexican-American, who claimed Southwest School District was discriminating by maintaining racially segregated schools. In 1978 a federal district court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs and ordered desegregation of nine schools to achieve racial balance within these schools (Synopsis: Desegregation in SSD, n.d.).

The demographics of this District reveal a diverse student population with a substantial Mexican-American student enrollment. According to SSD Ethnic Comparison Figures for the 1989-90 school year, student enrollment totaled 56,493. Of this number 20,246 students or 35.8% are Hispanic. Furthermore, the SSD Department of Operations reports that 24,000 students are bused daily to various schools throughout the District.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive, analytical historical/policy investigation of Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) and its subsequent effect on the education of Mexican-Americans in a large urban triethnic district by responding to the following questions:

1. Was bilingual education implemented along with desegregation?
2. Did the District deal primarily with linguistic or desegregative needs of Mexican-American students?

The theoretical orientation from Arias' (1990) study of desegregation in the San Jose Unified School District will be used to determine whether or not Southwest School District is implementing a triethnic desegregation plan. Her undergirding premise is that mere student reassignment strategies are not enough to meet the needs of some Mexican-American students and, therefore, restrict their options in a "controlled-choice" system. A case study approach will be employed. Method of treatment will include analysis of data gathered from government documents, census data, newspapers, District publications, other publications, and semi-structured interviews with individuals who have played critical roles in desegregation during and after Adams and Celaya.

Background of the Problem

In order to set the context of this study, a historical background of Southwest School District is necessary to understand fully the scope of this problem. The Facts, Findings and Conclusions (1978) of Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) contain a brief historical sketch of the geographical area of Tucson, Arizona.

Tucson lies in southern Arizona sixty-five miles from Mexico. The city is surrounded by mountains—the Catalinas
to the north, the Tucson Mountains to the west, the Rincons and Santa Ritas to the east and south, respectively. Generally speaking, Tucson is approximately fifteen miles from the base of the Tucsons to the base of the Rincons and from the base of the Catalinas to the base of the Santa Ritas is quite a distance further (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).

The valley is drained by three streams, all of which are now intermittent. The Santa Cruz River is the largest. It flows from Mexico through the extreme western portion of the valley and then runs out of the valley to the northwest. The Rillito ("little river" in Spanish) flows west along the foot of the Catalinas to meet the Santa Cruz at the northern end of the valley. The Pantano Wash flows from the southeastern corner of the valley to join the Rillito. These streams have not presented major obstacles to school attendance, nor did they in any way affect the result of the suit (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).

The first Europeans came to this area in the sixteenth century. Coronado passed on the far side of the Rincons, Jesuit missionaries came later, and then the military and the settlers. Tucson has for many centuries been the site of Indian villages, but it is generally accepted that the original Spanish settlement was established in 1775. Tucson celebrated its bicentennial in 1975. This area became a
part of Mexico when the Mexicans won their independence from Spain, and it remained a part of Mexico after the war between the United States and Mexico. This area did not come under the American flag until the Gadsden Purchase in 1853. The area has a definite Mexican heritage (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).

The Gadsden Purchase brought the United States a satisfactory southern route for the railroad; however, not until 1880 did the railroad reach Tucson. The Southern Pacific main line now slants across the valley from southeast to northwest through the geographic center of the School District which is now twenty-four miles from east to west and averages nine miles from north to south. The railroad tracks passing through the District have always presented a major transportation barrier and problems for the School District (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).

The city of Tucson, Arizona, has been noted for its multi-ethnic and multi-cultural influences and primarily for its Spanish, Mexican, and Indian contributions (Puckett, 1985; Sheridan, 1986). Furthermore, Sheridan (1986) notes that Mexicans helped pioneer public and private education in southern Arizona.

Southwest School District was formed in 1867 with boundaries "one mile each way from the Plaza de la Mezilla." The area where the Plaza formerly was is now known as "La
Placita" and is located on Broadway Boulevard in the downtown area. The first school of the District operated in 1868 for only six months and then closed. Augustus Brichta, a saloon keeper, opened the school with a dirt floor and fifty-five Mexican boys. There was no public school in Tucson until 1872 (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).

The second school was located at the corner of Meyer and McCormick Streets and was taught by John Spring. Maximum enrollment was 138 and few students spoke English natively. The following school year (1873) the school had only 75 students and two teachers: Maria Wakefield and Harriet Bolton (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978). Sheridan (1986) points out that no one did more for the establishment of the public school system in Tucson than Estevan Ochoa who donated the land upon which the Congress Street School was built in 1875. Enrollment grew to 350 by 1882 (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).

During the 1870s Francisco Leon and Estevan Ochoa served on the Board of Education (Sheridan, 1986). From 1891-1895, Carlos Tully was appointed superintendent and is to this day the only Mexican-American to have held this office (Sheridan, 1986). Ochoa was the last Spanish-surnamed person named to the board at least through the 1935-36 term when Carter was elected in 1937 (Sheridan, 1986). Despite a sincere effort to educate Mexican-
Americans, blacks, and Native Americans, authorities were never able to develop a system that offered equal educational opportunities, since public schools were firmly in the hands of Anglo administrators and Anglo school boards by the end of the nineteenth century (Sheridan, 1986).

While it was true that many of the problems Mexican-Americans faced were due to the harsh realities of poverty and discrimination outside the classroom, the problems were aggravated by the cultural stereotypes of school personnel, stereotypes that made it even more difficult for Mexican-Americans to succeed in public schools (Sheridan, 1986). Thus, by the end of the nineteenth century, official policies of the school system were conceived and implemented by individuals who rarely possessed a thorough understanding of either Mexican-American culture or Mexican-American children (Sheridan, 1986).

Within the classrooms themselves, Mexican-American educators were almost nonexistent (Sheridan, 1986). In 1875, young Ignacio Bonillas was assistant teacher for boys at the Congress School; he later departed for MIT and was not replaced with a Mexican instructor (Sheridan, 1986). By 1910, the District had grown rapidly, employing fifty-three teachers and five principals, yet only one of these individuals might have been Spanish-surnamed (Sheridan, 1986).
The District expanded from four square miles to thirty square miles. In 1910 there were six schools: Roskruge Elementary (then the high school), Mansfield (now Saddle Elementary), Saddle, David, Dragman and the original Holladay (torn down to build Southwest High School. Dunbar, a segregated school for blacks, was opened in 1913 pursuant to state law and after a petition presented by black parents (Facts, Findings, and Conclusions, 1978).

Twenty years later at the beginning of the Depression, the situation had barely improved (Sheridan, 1986). In 1931-32 public school personnel numbered 328 people, of whom only nine (2.7%) bore Mexican-American names; out of a total of 50 individuals, Southwest High School employed three Mexican-Americans (Ida Celaya and Thelma Ochoa, who taught Spanish and supervised the study hall, and T. D. Romero, a bookkeeper), but no Mexican-Americans taught in the three junior high schools (Mansfeld, Roskruge, and Saddle) (Sheridan, 1986). One Spanish-surnamed instructor taught at each barrio (neighborhood) school: David (Maria Urquides, Play), Dragman (Amelia Maldonado, 1C), Ochoa (Sabina Sandoval, 1B), Elizabeth Borton (Nora Windes, 1C), and Carmona (Lugarda Ortiz, 1C) (Sheridan, 1986). No Mexican-Americans served as school principals (Sheridan, 1986).

By 1940, the only noticeable gain was the employment of Ricardo Manzo as Principal of the new El Rio School
(Sheridan, 1986). The year before the outbreak of World War II, the District had 402 administrators, teachers, and special personnel; of these only 16 were Mexican-American (3.9%) (Sheridan, 1986). Sheridan also notes that Mexican-American personnel rarely constituted more than 5% of the total number of District personnel. Throughout the first three decades of the twentieth century, Mexican-American children rarely encountered Mexican-American teachers in the public school system (Sheridan, 1986).

During the same time period, Mexican-Americans usually formed the largest ethnic group in the public school system (Sheridan, 1986). Sheridan explains that in May, 1929, students were divided into four categories: American (those speaking English as a first language), Mexican (those who spoke Spanish as a first language), Negro, and Other (including Indian, Chinese, etc.). Table 1 illustrates demographic distribution at that time (Sheridan, 1986).

Table 1. Demographic distribution, May 1929.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,119</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The discrepancy between the proportion of Mexican students and Mexican educators was glaring (Sheridan, 1986).

Unequal educational opportunity manifested itself in various forms during this time, helping to create a climate nonconducive to learning for thousands of Mexican-American children. Sheridan (1986) cites as an example that speaking Spanish was prohibited in and out of the classroom. As late as the 1950s one young Mexican-American girl remembers having her mouth washed out with soap for speaking Spanish (Sheridan, 1986). The lack of Mexican-American educators in schools was a problem that precluded Mexican-American students obtaining an equal education, a serious flaw of the school system dating back to the 1920s (Sheridan, 1986).

Although Anglo educators appeared to be well-intentioned, most believed linguistic and cultural assimilation was the only way Mexican-American students would succeed in the United States. These educators devised programs to teach American values or Americanization of Mexican students (Sheridan, 1986). One way to achieve linguistic assimilation was through "IC" classes which amounted to nothing more than English immersion programs where Mexican-American students were often retained for a second or third year until linguistic competence was attained (Reynolds, 1933; Sheridan, 1986).
These beginning English classes were state mandated in Arizona, as the law stated, "all schools shall be conducted in English" except for special bilingual education programs in districts with large numbers of non-English-speaking children (Sheridan, 1986, p. 223). Reynolds (1933) and Sheridan (1986) both note that these classes consisted of nothing more than English vocabulary lessons, a rudimentary form of teaching limited-English-proficient students.

By establishing these classes in 1919, Southwest School District attempted to meet the needs of Mexican-American students (Sheridan, 1986). Southwest School District's non-English speaking children continued in these classes until 1965, when more sophisticated programs of bilingual education supplanted the 1C program (Sheridan, 1986). For four and a half decades the 1C program was the District's attempt to Americanize Mexican-American students through their version of cultural and linguistic assimilation (Sheridan, 1986).

One of the unhappy effects of the 1C program was the "retardation" that occurred among Mexican-American students. In the 1920s, Southwest School District's Superintendent, C. E. Rose, described Mexican-American students' inability to learn: "they [Mexican-American and Indian children] enter school late or make slow progress after entering" (Sheridan, 1986, p. 222). This retardation, as it was referred to in
those days, would result in overage Mexican-American students being enrolled in classes and an increasing drop-out rate by high school. At minimum, these students received a grade-level education. Students fell behind from one to five years below grade level (Sheridan, 1986).

Superintendent Rose further substantiated his argument by claiming Mexican-American families followed migratory patterns as they worked on cotton farms in central Arizona (Sheridan, 1986). In his opinion, the IeC program was a means of closing the gap existing between Mexican-American and Anglo students (Sheridan, 1986). Rose and other educators perpetuated a belief system leading to increased subordination of Mexican-Americans:

The good intentions of Anglo school personnel could not surmount a number of major obstacles—obstacles which included their own cultural stereotypes about Mexican children as well as the broader pattern of Mexican subordination outside the school (Sheridan, 1986, p. 222).

Indeed, practices such as these led Mexican-American students to have negative experiences in school, resulting in frustration and high attrition by high school.

Rose and his colleagues were followers of a philosophical movement at that time advocating assimilation through Americanization as espoused by social philosophers like John Dewey (Sheridan, 1986). They argued that schools had to take the place of the family in preparing children for the future (Sheridan, 1986). Sheridan (1986) cites
Ellwood Cubberly (then Dean of the School of Education at Stanford) as one of the more well-known spokespersons for this perspective:

Our task is to assimilate and amalgamate these people as part of our American race, and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order . . . and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions (p. 226).

As educators continued to instruct Mexican-American students in "American" values and the English language, few of them stopped to consider the damage their own misconceptions and biases must have inflicted on many of their Mexican-American students (Sheridan, 1986).

Sheridan cites four master's theses done at The University of Arizona revealing prevalent modes of thinking with respect to Mexican-American students during the 1920s through the 1940s. The first thesis, written by Allstrom in 1929, discussed the need for Americanization of Mexican-American students by indoctrinating them to the democratic ideals of the United States. Furthermore, he cautioned this process would take at least two to three generations (Sheridan, 1986). The second thesis (Calloway, 1931) followed Allstrom's line of thinking. Although her language was more tactful when discussing Mexican-American students, she too felt the need for "moral instruction" in schools and the need for these students to learn English in order to overcome their "handicap" (Sheridan, 1986, p. 230). The
third thesis by Peak in 1931 presented a series of test results, unlike the first two theses that consisted of pejorative stereotypes of these students. Peak's results showed that intelligence tests administered in English were of little or no value when applied to non-English-speaking students (Sheridan, 1986). The fourth thesis by Riggins in 1946 blamed poverty and the culture of Mexican-Americans as reasons for their lack of success in school (Sheridan, 1986).

Papers such as those described above served as documentation to perpetuate stereotypes that existed about Mexican-Americans. Sheridan (1986) very astutely gives his perception of the inherent problems of the school system:

What Riggins and others fail to realize, or realize vaguely, was that significant improvement could only occur if the structure of society was transformed as well (p. 232).

Anglo teachers and administrators who had stereotypes and misconceptions of Mexican-American students continued to initiate and implement policy and programmatic changes justified by the needs of the democratic American system.

Rather than appreciating and welcoming diversity of culture and language in students, these people sought to make Mexican-American students fit a mold based on insensitivity and ignorance. Subsequent ill effects still linger today: high attrition rates, disproportionate numbers of Mexican-American teachers and administrators, an
inadequate number of bilingual programs (most transitional in nature), and curricular tracking just to name a few (Arias, 1986; Medina, 1988; Orfield, 1986; Sheridan, 1986).

Significance of the Problem

Traditional desegregation plans advocate student reassignment to achieve racial balance in schools. Diverse, triethnic school districts such as SSD require a different approach, as these plans may not suffice in meeting students' needs. Moreover, Arias' study (1990) of San Jose, California, shows that changing demographics in a school district can require a desegregation plan focusing on more than pupil assignment to integrate schools effectively.

Arias' (1990) theory holds that the goals of integration and attention to language needs can be compatible. She argues that

the remedy for relieving racial isolation must go beyond school assignment strategies to include the instructional components required by programs for language minority students (Arias, 1990, p. 2).

Furthermore, Arias (1990) advocates "careful student identification and program planning" for those districts involved in desegregation litigation suits (p. 17). She emphasizes the fact that researchers of "desegregation outcomes" also believe desegregation plans must have an instructional aspect since pupil reassignment strategies do not have a favorable effect on students (Arias, 1990, pp. 24-25). In particular, a desegregation plan for Mexican-
American students must have two components if the plan is to be successful: (1) ESL or bilingual curriculum and (2) increased parental participation (Arias, 1990, p. 25).

The concepts and method employed in her study may be used to examine the desegregation plan of a school district with an increasing Mexican-American student population. Arias (1990) presents an historical and legal account of the desegregation lawsuit in San Jose. This context becomes part of the framework she uses to discuss other data such as census reports and school enrollment figures. In addition, she presents a policy analysis of bilingual education and its implications that may serve as a model for other districts to follow, especially districts with a heavy concentration of Mexican-American students. In this way, future policy planning for school integration will be more effective.

A replication of Arias' study (1990) is necessary to describe and analyze the circumstances surrounding the Adams and Celaya case and the impact this case has had on the needs of Mexican-American students in Southwest School District.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be used in this study:

Desegregated School: Previously considered to be a racially segregated school and, now, court mandated to be racially integrated.

ESL: English as a Second Language

Language Minority Student: Mexican-American student whose first language may or may not be English.

LEP: Limited English proficient

Magnet School: School with open enrollment outside designated district boundaries for a particular site, designed as one remedy for integrating schools.

OLP: Other than limited proficient

Summary and Organization of the Study

The development of this study has been presented in this proposal including introductory comments, statement of the problem, significance of the problem, and definition of terms.

Chapter 2 will have a review of related literature, detailed discussion of Adams and Celaya, historical perspective, and theoretical considerations. Chapter 3 will describe the research design and methodology. Chapter 4 will present Southwest School District case study data analysis. Chapter 5 will present concluding comments and implications.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the following: (1) historical perspective of Mexican-Americans in public schools in the Southwest, (2) case law analysis, pre- and post-Brown v. Board of Education (1954), (3) theoretical orientation of desegregation research and strategies, (4) desegregation theory and strategies for Mexican-American students, and (5) desegregation in Arizona. By describing the context in which school segregation occurs, appropriate strategies to alleviate this problem will surface through the discussion of pertinent literature, in particular Arias' (1990) study.

Historical Background:

School Segregation in the Southwest

Reynolds' (1933) report to the Department of Interior entitled The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in Five Southwestern States and Weinberg's A Chance to Learn: The History of Race and Education in the United States (1977) both give an historical account of the state of education for Mexican-American students in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, California, and Texas. Reynolds (1933) states:
The establishment of the present boundaries of the five states concerned in our study was a result of the terms of the treaty closing the Mexican War in 1848, of the Gadsden Purchase, of the settlement西部 claim to territory made by Texas, and of the cession of certain portions of New Mexico to Colorado and Arizona in the years following (p. 3). Furthermore, in 1863 two state governments, California and Texas, as well as three territorial governments in Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico were established (Reynolds, 1933).

During the mid to late nineteenth century, schools in the Southwest were best described as assimilative and elitist. Until this time, Mexican-Americans outnumbered the Anglo population, but a large influx of new settlers in states such as California resulted in sharp increases in the Anglo population and, thus, the need for schools (Weinberg, 1977). In 1855 a California state law mandating instruction in English only was passed; however, a small group of wealthy cattle ranchers known as "Californios" who were descendants of land-grant recipients from Spain maintained control of numerous bilingual and bicultural schools in Los Angeles from the 1860s through the 1870s (Weinberg, 1977). The majority of Mexican-Americans who were not affluent or lived in poverty had limited access to schools, in part because the school system was designed for English-speaking students. Weinberg (1977) also points out that the three territories, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado, were comparable to California in that education for Mexican-Americans was a low priority for the Anglos who had attained
control of respective state or territorial governments. Like other territories during that time, New Mexico's effort to create schools for Mexican-Americans "mirrored" the social conditions of that time.

In 1891 the first comprehensive school law in the New Mexico territory was passed; while it provided for a seven-month school year, no school tax supported it (Weinberg, 1977). School funds were obtained from meager state tax funds such as from "licenses and fines, chiefly those from the gambling and liquor industries" (Weinberg, 1977, p. 142). After numerous attempts to pass laws and obtain funds for schools since the 1850s, the first full-scale effort was destined for failure because the majority of Mexican-Americans who resided in poor, small towns were unable to procure adequate funding to support schools (Weinberg, 1977). Additionally, an administrative ruling mandating English as the only language of instruction caused an uproar in communities (Weinberg, 1977). Thus, the largest territory's efforts to initiate a statewide school system was encumbered by major obstacles and did not afford Mexican-Americans equal educational opportunity.

By 1900 between 100,000 and 200,000 Mexican-Americans resided in the Southwest according to the U.S. Census Report for that year (Reynolds, 1933, p. 6). In the schools in the early twentieth century, curricula focused on English as the
language of instruction (Weinberg, 1977). Moreover, by 1920 the State of Texas had created separate schools, inferior facilities, no bilingual/bicultural focus, and a shorter school year for Mexican-American students (Weinberg, 1977, p. 145). California had a similar pattern of schooling (Weinberg, 1977).

The first study of Mexican-American children was conducted in Texas in 1928 by Manuel, whose findings confirmed the prevailing pattern of schooling. Mexican-American students comprised 13% of the state's school population (Weinberg, 1977, p. 145). Among his findings were these:

1. Half the population entered first grade yet only one twenty-fifth entered high school.
2. Teacher-pupil ratios were exceedingly high, causing overcrowded classrooms.
3. Their school year was shorter, sometimes half as long as for Anglo students.
4. They were frequently segregated.
5. Segregated schools were seriously inferior to Anglo schools (facilities and materials).
6. Teacher salaries in these schools were the same, even though class sizes were much larger.
7. Pupil teaching costs were lower in these schools (Weinberg, 1977, pp. 145-146).
Manuel also reports that the common attitude shared by many state officials and school administrators at that time was most apathetic regarding the education of the Mexican-American student population, especially considering the fact that in at least seventeen school districts, no school at all was provided for them (Weinberg, 1977, p. 146).

Weinberg (1977) describes the state of schools in the Southwest during that decade, a situation that would perpetuate itself for decades to come:

The schools of the Southwest were decreasingly effective in educating Mexican-American children in the liberal arts and skills of modern life. They succeeded beyond measure in instructing the same children to play a subordinate role in the dominant role in Anglo society (Weinberg, 1977, p. 149).

Thus by the late 1920s, Mexican-American students were systematically denied equal educational opportunity as evidenced by the indifference of high level officials as well as the blatant disregard for students' educational needs. In addition, segregation became a standard practice throughout the Southwest during this decade.

Camarillo (1984) and Weinberg (1977) confirm that segregation practices began both in neighborhoods and schools in the 1920s. Weinberg (1977) goes on to list three
major factors contributing to the inefficacy in educating Mexican-American students: (1) discrimination, (2) segregation, and (3) financial deprivation (p. 146). Inherent in the Texas public school system was the practice of retaining Mexican-American students in the first grade for as long as two to three years (Weinberg, 1977). Also, students were assigned to classes based on ethnicity rather than ability (Weinberg, 1977). The apparent lack of well-trained teachers and instructional techniques designed to meet students' needs are examples of discrimination and inadequate financial resources in the school system that contributed to the "academic retardation" of Mexican-American students (Weinberg, 1977, pp. 146-147).

Allocation of inadequate financial resources was a serious problem that permeated not only schools in Texas but schools throughout the Southwest. Overworked teachers and the lack of resources to purchase adequate materials were only two of the problems that occurred. Instructional time in the classroom was also shortened in order to release Mexican-American children early to report to migrant farms where they worked in the fields (Weinberg, 1977). Anglo farmers who sat on school boards or had attained a certain level of influence in communities throughout Texas sought to use their power to their advantage by following an agrarian philosophy of education, one that became a form of
exploitation of Mexican-American children and perhaps even child labor laws (Weinberg, 1977).

Weinberg cited other examples of discrimination in Texas schools that hindered Mexican-American students' progress. In some school districts only 2% of the Mexican-American student population was enrolled in high school as many were not permitted to register in high schools (Weinberg, 1977, p. 147). High schools that denied access to Mexican-American students sent them to other high schools out of designated attendance areas (Weinberg, 1977). Also, compulsory attendance laws were intentionally ignored (Weinberg, 1977).

In summary, three factors contributing to inferior school conditions during the early 1890s through 1930 were (1) discrimination, (2) segregation, and (3) lack of adequate financial resources (Carter and Segura, 1979; Weinberg, 1977). Methodological practices consisted of immersion, a practice that is obsolete by today's standards. Apathetic attitudes on the part of high-level state and school officials led to an unfavorable atmosphere in schools of the Southwest, thereby creating problems that still linger in today's schools such as high attrition, inadequate resources, lack of trained bilingual staff, and overcrowded schools (Carter and Segura, 1979; Weinberg, 1977). Clearly then, the bleak atmosphere in schools during this period
still prevails in today's schools as precedent was established in the Southwest since that time.

**School Segregation Cases: Pre-Brown v. Board (1954)**

The late 1920s and early 1930s was, as Weinberg (1977) describes, a period characterized by "ambivalence of the courts on discrimination and segregation" (p.164). Although local school boards in Texas had absolute authority to segregate black students, no such authority existed for Mexican-American students (Weinberg, 1977). The first school desegregation case filed on behalf of Mexican-Americans was Del Rio Independent School District v. Salvatierra (1930) (Arias and Bray, 1983; Carter and Segura, 1979). The Texas Supreme Court held that school officials had no power to separate Mexican-Americans because they were Mexican-American (Arias and Bray, 1983). However, the court found that the language "deficiency" of these students justified separate classrooms, even separate buildings until the third grade (Arias and Bray, 1983). In the opinion of the survey staff, it was wise to segregate if it was done on educational grounds and resulted in distinct efforts to provide the non-English-speaking pupils with specially trained teachers and the necessary special training resources. Although the court recognized that segregation had been used for the purpose of giving the Mexican children a shorter school year, inferior buildings, inferior
equipment, and poorly paid teachers, the effect of Del Rio was to legitimize separation of Mexican-Americans from Anglos based on language (Arias and Bray, 1983). In reality, few Mexican-American students at this time went beyond the third grade. Retention in the first grade for two to three years was not uncommon (Arias and Bray, 1983; Carter and Segura, 1979). Consequently, most of these students, whether they experienced a "language deficiency" or not, attended segregated schools in Texas (Arias and Bray, 1983; Carter and Segura, 1979).

Mexican-American students also had similar experiences with discrimination in California. This state had 64 schools in eight counties with 90-100 percent of the Mexican-American students enrolled in 1928 (Arias, 1990). The second case involving language isolation and segregation in the early 1930s, Alvarez v. Lemon Grove School District (1931), was a significant case where Mexican-Americans contested school segregation. A group of parents boycotted a new school and then filed a writ of mandate suit (Arias, 1990; Reynolds, 1933). San Diego Superior Court Judge Claude Chambers on March 13, 1931, ruled in favor of the plaintiffs (Arias, 1990; Reynolds, 1933).

Reynolds (1933) cites the following account from an article about the "Segregation of Mexican Children" in El Nacional, a daily paper in Mexico City, September 6, 1931:
In Lemon Grove, California parents of 75 Mexican children were notified by school authorities that their children, who had up to that time attended the same school as that attended by other whites, should in the future attend a school destined exclusively for Mexicans. School trustees responsible for this action justified it by stating that they had established such separation in order to facilitate the acquisition of the English language on the part of Mexican children. In spite of the protest of Mexican parents, the school authorities stood their ground. Meanwhile the Mexican children did not attend any school. The case finally went to the courts. The judge decided in favor of the complainants, and the Mexican children were readmitted to the school from which they had been excluded. Prior to rendering his decision the judge said: "I understand that some children might be separated if they need special instruction in order to improve their situation but to separate in a group, all the Mexicans would be to infringe the laws of California. I believe that this separation deprives the Mexican children of the presence of American children which is so necessary for them in order to learn English" (p. 13).

The court ordered that Mexican-American children be reinstated to the original schoolhouse, and the reconverted barn was abandoned as the new school site (Arias, 1990). Judge Chambers' analysis of this case of segregation in the 1930s reflects what many modern second-language-acquisition experts believe: in order to learn a second language, language minority students should be racially integrated so that they will acquire linguistic competence in the target language (Arias, 1990; Cummins, 1989; Biber and Krashen, 1988).
However, the Lemon Grove ruling did not end school segregative practices (Arias, 1990). Although segregation was not legally justified, it was practiced throughout the Southwest as well as in California (Arias, 1990; Weinberg, 1977). Separate schools were built and maintained for Mexican-American students, the premise being that this segregation was in the best interests of these students and that residential segregation predisposed school boundaries in this manner (Arias, 1990; Camarillo, 1984).

By 1930, California and Texas had no statute requiring segregation of Mexican-American students (Weinberg, 1977). After Salvatierra, Texas considered Mexican-Americans to be Caucasian. Conversely, a ruling by the attorney general in California gave a legal basis to segregate Mexican-American children since they were considered "Indians" and, therefore, were to be educated separately from Anglos (Weinberg, 1977, p. 167). While one state (Texas) considered Mexican-Americans to be Anglos, the other (California) considered them to be "Indian" (Weinberg, 1977, p. 168).

The third case involving segregation occurred fifteen years later in California (Arias, 1990; Arias and Bray, 1983; Weinberg, 1977). Mendez v. Westminster (1947) was the first federal case filed by Mexican-Americans contesting school segregation as described by Arias (1990): In a class
action suit, five Mexican-American fathers in the Westminster, Garden Grove, Santa Ana and El Modeno Districts of Orange County, alleged a concerted policy and design of class discrimination against "persons of Mexican or Latin descent or extraction" of elementary school age by school agencies in the conduct or operation of public schools, resulting in the denial of their equal protection (p. 9). While the segregation of Mexican-American students had also been explained on the basis of their "language handicap," their actual language proficiency had never been measured (Arias and Bray, 1983). In 1945, the Mendez decision formally outlawed segregation of students on this basis (Arias and Bray, 1983; Carter and Segura, 1979). In 1947, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed this decision, marking the first time that public school segregation had been denounced by the federal courts: "A paramount requisite in the American system of public education is social equality. It must be open to all children by unified association regardless of lineage" (Arias and Bray, 1983, p. 10). Although significant, the decision had a practical impact only in the Ninth Circuit (Arias and Bray, 1983).

The year after Mendez, Mexican-American parents in three counties in Texas brought a class action suit in
federal district court, **Delgado v. Bastrop County** (1948), to eliminate separate schools for Mexican-American students:

In Delgado, the court declared the practice to be in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Separation was approved for a single year in first grade; thereafter only following the administration of scientific and standardized tests equally given and applied to all pupils (Weinberg, 1977, p. 168).

The key difference between the **Salvatierra** and **Delgado** cases was that the former was initiated due to language and racial isolation, while the latter was initiated due to racial isolation only (Arias and Bray, 1983; Weinberg, 1977).

Cases litigated in the pre-Brown era involving Mexican-Americans in the Southwest had a dual purpose. Arias (1990) lists these purposes as (1) prior to the 1954 **Brown v. Board** case Mexican-American parents challenged segregative practices and (2) because language proficiency was often used as the "pedagogical rationale" for continued isolation of Mexican-American students (pp. 10-11).

These conditions can be applied to the four cases discussed above: **Salvatierra** (1930), **Lemon Grove** (1931), **Mendez** (1947), and **Delgado** (1948). Of these cases, **Mendez** is one of the more compelling cases in that it was the first action filed in a federal court against school segregation, and the plaintiff's verdict was upheld in 1947 by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the first time public school
segregation was struck down in a federal court (Arias, 1990, p. 11).

The state legislature then eliminated the remaining segregation statutes in the California Education Code in 1947 (Arias, 1990, p. 11). Segregative practices in schools were no longer sanctioned in that state. However, future cases of segregation throughout the Southwest would later undergo intense, intricate litigation.


Cases involving segregation of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest after Brown (1954) became more complex as inner-city school districts throughout the Southwest became embroiled in lengthy court battles that some experts speculate had little effect on achieving educational equity for Mexican-American students (Arias, 1990; Orfield, 1984; Carter and Segura, 1979). A significant factor is the socio-political context that impinges on desegregation cases during this time, factors that can have a negative impact on some court decisions (Arias, 1990; Medina, 1988; Orfield, 1984).

Although the Brown (1954) decision benefitted blacks by not sanctioning segregated schools, cases litigated on behalf of Mexican-American students whose parents allege segregation involve a dual issue: racial and linguistic isolation (Arias, 1990; Sacken, 1984). The subsequent
period from 1955 through the 1960s was a relatively inactive period of time for desegregation as the Civil Rights Movement was at its height and dealt with many other issues involving racial discrimination. However, by the early 1970s, litigants involved in desegregation cases encountered major obstacles in the long struggle for equity and integration (Arias, 1986, 1990; Medina, 1988; Carter and Segura, 1979).

One of the most important decisions affecting school desegregation of Mexican-American students is the U.S. Supreme Court decision Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado (1974). For the first time since Brown (1954), a Supreme Court decision extended to include Mexican-American students as a separate minority group from blacks (Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978). Arias and Bray (1983) state:

The U.S. Supreme Court in reviewing Keyes set precedent regarding second minority groups . . . in a desegregation case. The Court found that proof of segregative intent on the part of the Denver school district with respect to blacks raised a presumption it had discriminated against Hispanic students as well (p. 10).

Because the Supreme Court reasoned that Mexican-American students were also victims of discrimination and segregation, they were entitled to the same remedy as blacks, what is referred to as a "tri-ethnic" remedy (Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978). Here the court found that
Mexican-American students had experienced the injury of racial isolation. However, the court rejected bilingual education as a remedy for racial discrimination: "Bilingual education is not a substitute for desegregation. Although bilingual instruction may be required to prevent isolation of minority students in a predominately Anglo school system . . . such a plan must be subordinate to a plan of school desegregation" (Arias and Bray, 1983; Orfield, 1978). For the first time, a federal court gave precedence to the harm of racial isolation rather than to the language difference, which had ostensibly been the basis for segregation (Orfield, 1978; Arias and Bray, 1983; Roos, 1978).

The U.S. Supreme Court in reviewing Keyes set another precedent regarding second minority groups intervening in a desegregation case. The Court found that proof of segregative intent on the part of the Denver school district with respect to blacks raised a presumption that it had discriminated against Mexican-Americans students as well (Arias and Bray, 1983; Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978). The effect of this decision was that the school board was required to prove that it had not discriminated against the Mexican-American intervenors, whereas the original plaintiffs in the Denver case were required to prove that the school board had discriminated against them (Arias and Bray, 1983; Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978).
As the designing of the Keyes remedy proved to be a sensitive and difficult process, this decision would have implications for other large urban school districts which also went through a similar process of designing remedies suited to the needs of Mexican-American students (Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978). In other school districts such as the Southwest School District in Arizona, Mexican-Americans constitute a substantial portion of the total population with 11,787 or 27.9% between 1970-74 (Orfield, 1978, p. 29). A case in point is the Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) lawsuit that involved a tri-ethnic integration plan. In this particular case, the desegregation remedy included curricular issues such as bilingual education programs as part of the remedy, in addition to the traditional student reassignment strategies in previous cases.

The designing of desegregation remedies became more complicated when they involved language issues; the scope of decisions would extend to include a Supreme Court case that set precedent for language issues: the Lau v. Nichols (1974) decision. In this decision, the Court rejected the traditional American presumption that immigrants or LEP students must learn English on their own (Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978; Sacken, 1984; Carter and Segura, 1979). Reutter and Hamilton (1976) state the following: The court observed
that a student who does not understand the English language and is not provided with special instruction is effectively precluded with any meaningful education (p. 132).

The lawsuit initiated by Chinese plaintiffs in San Francisco would have profound implications for Mexican-American students (Hawley, 1981; Orfield, 1978; Sacken, 1984).

Although the Supreme Court did not base this decision on the equal protection clause of the Constitution, the Court did find the San Francisco Unified School District in violation of Title VI of the HEW guidelines from 1970 (Arias and Bray, 1983; Sacken, 1984). Herein lies the weakness of the Lau decision:

It was based on a federal statute, rather than the Constitution. Consequently, compliance and enforcement procedures can be revised or rescinded by administrative or Congressional action (Arias and Bray, 1983, pp. 11-12).

The Lau decision provided guidance in the most general sense as lower courts and local school districts were instructed to derive remedies according to their respective situations (Arias and Bray, 1983; Orfield, 1978; Sacken, 1984).

Arias and Bray (1983) cite an example of a federal court in New York in Cintron v. Brentwood Union Free School District (1978) that used this reasoning to reject a desegregation plan. The court found the "Avelino Plan" unacceptable because no exit criteria existed for students to be tested to see whether or not they could receive
regular instruction in English (Arias and Bray, 1983, p. 12). A subsequent decision by the same court extended the \textit{Lau} decision and found that

\begin{quote}
While the District's goal of teaching Hispanic children the English language is certainly proper, it cannot be allowed to compromise a student's right to meaningful education before proficiency in English is obtained (Arias and Bray, 1983, p. 12).
\end{quote}

As a result, to delay a child's education while he or she learned English would be a discriminatory act (Arias and Bray, 1983; Roos, 1978).

Orfield (1978) in \textit{Must We Bus?} asks, "Is there a conflict between \textit{Keyes} and \textit{Lau}?" (p. 210). In \textit{Lau} (1973) the Supreme Court explicitly required some form of special instruction for LEP students so that their education would not be "wholly incomprehensible," while in \textit{Keyes} (1975) the Supreme Court ruled that bilingual education would not suffice as a remedy for segregated Mexican-Americans (Orfield, 1978; Roos, 1978; Sacken, 1984). In various articles scholars such as Arias (1990), Orfield (1978, 1984), Roos (1978), and Fernandez and Guskin (1981) have argued that integration and bilingual education are compatible, providing that certain conditions are met. Fernandez and Guskin (1981) cite Arias' testimony in 1978 during the \textit{Los Angeles v. Crawford} (1982) court proceedings:

1. adequate number of trained bilingual staff to receive LEP or NES (non-English speaking) students
2. include most isolated Mexican-American schools in any desegregation remedy

3. effective remedy for racial isolation such as magnet schools that actively involve parents and provide multicultural education for students and staff (p. 116).

Programmatic and instructional planning can be incorporated into the effort to devise any desegregation plan for a tri-ethnic school system.

One of the more significant cases of segregation involving Mexican-Americans was Crawford v. Los Angeles School District (1982). This school desegregation case continued over a twenty-year period, beginning in the Superior Court of Los Angeles and eventually being argued before the U.S. Supreme Court. The result was a dismantling of a desegregation plan that required busing throughout one of the largest urban school districts (Orfield, 1982).

Orfield (1982) describes the demographics as significant:

The city's population is already dominated by Hispanics. . . . The entire society of southern California has a very large and rapidly growing Hispanic population. It will be the first great region in the continental U.S. where the capacity of our institutions to deal with diversity on this scale will be tested (p. 338).

Local anti-busing groups became involved in the case and were instrumental in the effort to dismantle the desegregation plan (Orfield, 1982).
The case was initiated by black plaintiffs who alleged unequal treatment by virtue of the District's segregated schools for minorities. As the case progressed, Mexican-American groups became involved, contending inequality on the basis of the following:

1. highly segregated schools
2. more advanced curriculum at schools with Anglos whose interests and backgrounds were academic
3. District's year-round schooling plan was unequal in that additional funding was not allocated to segregated schools to cope with added financial needs
4. lack of resources to deal with growing Mexican-American LEP population (Orfield, 1982, pp. 340-345).

As language isolation became one of the key features, Orfield (1982) pointed out the lack of attention to this issue: "Unquestionably Hispanics in Los Angeles have faced a history of discrimination and they face considerable continuing segregation" (p.345).

The failure of this desegregation plan can be attributed to many sources: (1) local anti-busing groups, (2) existing socio-political conditions that affected court decisions and District allocation of financial resources, and (3) District's failure to evaluate the success of various forms of desegregation in the city (Orfield, 1982). The only desegregation plan that now exists is voluntary,
since the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the dismantling of the mandatory plan in the state court order (Orfield, 1982). Minority students decide individually to be bused to magnet schools or schools with available space so their needs are met. Because of the factors given above, the Los Angeles desegregation plan did not succeed in an effort to effectively integrate schools.

Another recent case that focused on segregative practices of Mexican-American students is the Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District (1985) case in California. In 1971, a group of Mexican-American parents filed a class action lawsuit on behalf of their children, "claiming a constitutional violation of access to equal education opportunities" (Arias, 1990, p. 18). Parents claimed the school board was responsible for inequitable distribution of resources (Arias, 1990). Later, evidence was introduced that showed high schools in the suburban areas of San Jose had a more academically oriented curriculum while San Jose High School had inadequate libraries and laboratory facilities (Arias, 1990).

This case went through the court system from 1971 until 1985 when a federal judge found the District guilty of segregation of Mexican-Americans, ordering the implementation of a desegregation plan (Arias, 1990). In the narrative of her study, Arias (1990) poses the question,
"How has the desegregation plan in San Jose increased access?" The Court Monitor's report examined availability of the "controlled choice system" and Mexican-American students participation in ESL or bilingual programs:

1. significant numbers of LEP students in little or no ESL or no bilingual resources
2. bilingual-certified staff in schools with no programs
3. teachers who had little contact time with LEP students were resentful of additional time needed to report for LEP students
4. Minority parents did not take full advantage of the controlled-choice system as majority parents did (pp. 23-27)

Finally, Arias (1990) stresses that while the choice system succeeded as a desegregation remedy, she feels that it is unclear whether Mexican-American parents and students had access to the same range of choices available to majority parents.

As can be seen, more recent desegregation cases became more complex as inner-city school districts in the Southwest examined two significant issues, linguistic and racial isolation, when involved in litigation and designing remedies in tri-ethnic school districts. Additionally, the political climate changed significantly from the 1970s to the 1980s as the former period reflected a liberal climate.
that recognized gains in court decisions to integrate schools while the latter period reflected the conservative political climate in that court decisions favoring integration were few in number.

Desegregation Theory and Research

Theory and research in this area have primarily addressed the needs of blacks who, traditionally, have been the focus of research in desegregation studies. Additionally, numerous well-documented historical perspectives about black children help to shed light into the problem of integrating schools to provide an equal education for them. Coleman's (1985) review of literature on desegregation best summarizes this:

Post-1954 research on school desegregation concentrated on the achievement of black students as an outcome of their assignment to segregated or desegregated schools (pp. 4-5).

Even the well-known Coleman Report (1966), which gained national attention and had a profound influence on education in America, focused on student outcomes of black and white students (Coleman, 1985; Orfield, 1978).

The infamous Coleman Report (1966) would later become the center of future published studies on desegregation, especially during the 1970s when a plethora of research surfaced (Coleman, 1985; Orfield, 1978). Furthermore, the report was a catalyst for change in schools as cities began
full-scale busing to integrate schools (Coleman, 1985). Thus, the student reassignment strategy emerged as the form of desegregation.

Coleman's literature review (1985) also cites St. John's (1975) compilation of results from 120 published and unpublished studies of school desegregation. These studies focused on student assignment to schools on the basis of race and their achievement outcomes (Coleman, 1985). The majority of studies after Brown (1954) examined student reassignment to schools for integration and subsequent achievement outcomes.

School Segregation: Mexican-Americans in the Southwest

In the absence of pertinent theory with regard to this problem then, the question that comes to mind is, "What forces drive the desegregation movement for Mexican-Americans in the Southwest?" Arias (1986) and Orfield (1986) discuss societal issues impacting the desegregation movement for Mexican-Americans. Arias (1986, 1990) identifies three factors contributing to segregation of Mexican-American students: (1) racial isolation, (2) linguistic isolation, and (3) curricular tracking. Arias (1986) draws from a wide base of research to show the demographics of an increasing Mexican-American student
population and educational status leading to their segregation in schools.

Orfield (1986) presents an introduction to a collection of articles revealing critical issues facing Hispanics in schools. He shows the needs of this culturally diverse population, examining three types of needs: (1) socio-political context Hispanics face in their struggle for equality, (2) expanding research base beyond the traditional focus on language and bilingual education, and (3) important questions deserving scholarly attention (p. 3).

The legal cases presented in earlier sections of this chapter represent cases involving segregative practices of Mexican-American students in the Southwest. Tregar (1983) presents a brief chronological account of the Boston desegregation case from 1974 through 1977, noting the language-related elements in that case (Tregar, 1983). In her account, Tregar focuses on the forces that drove this case, the remedy, and how bilingual education was infused in school curricula as an integral part of the remedy. Although the initial impetus for bilingual education was driven by legislative mandate, the court remedy for desegregation also mandated that the district include bilingual education as part of the remedy. Her lucid account shows how bilingual education can be implemented in a court-ordered desegregation plan, although she identifies several
factors that impede the success of this type of plan in a large urban school district (Tregar, 1983).

She includes various factors that negatively influenced the Boston Desegregation Plan:

1. Philosophical differences emerging between ESL immersion versus bilingual education.
2. Powerful teachers' union that controls placement of teachers such as regular education teachers.
3. Bilingual community (Hispanics) who disagree with decisions of Bilingual Education Department.
4. Continued battle over whether or not to implement a maintenance or transitional approach to bilingual education.
5. Changing demographics in local neighborhoods as middle class couples with no children exhibit indifference to school-related issues.

As indicated above, the forces driving school desegregation are not theoretical in nature in as much as they are emotional, stirring controversy and notoriety (Tregar, 1983).

The court remedy for a desegregation case should be approached differently than past remedies designed for
blacks (Arias, 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1978, 1986, 1987; Arias and Bray, 1982). At least two kinds of intentional inequity toward Hispanics violated federal law. Segregation based on national origin is a violation of the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection of law. Failure to educate children by refusing to take into account their lack of English-speaking ability violates the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Arias, 1990; Orfield, 1978; Arias and Bray, 1982). Moreover, Arias and Bray (1982) note that in a desegregation case, a court will look closely at the history of the minority's isolation in education to determine the extent of the violation and the specific needs of the minority in question in order to remedy that violation (pp. 8-9).

Some researchers examine educational equity issues with regard to Hispanic students (Baez et al., 1985; Fradd, 1986; Fradd and Vega, 1986; Cummins, 1989; Arias, 1986; Orfield, 1986; Medina, 1988). Baez et al. (1985) discuss litigation strategies used for the benefit of bilingual education as well as racial integration of Hispanic students. Significant cases such as *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) and *Denver v. Keyes* (1973) are emphasized as being instrumental in designing court-ordered desegregation remedies incorporating bilingual education as an integral component (Baez et al., 1985; Fradd and Vega, 1986; Orfield 1978). Furthermore, research in bilingual education shows that language by
itself is not the only variable to be considered with regard to improving schools for language-minority students. The political climate in which bilingual-education legislation is considered can significantly impact the effectiveness of a law. For example, if the current political climate is a conservative one, then bilingual-education legislation will receive little financial support as opposed to a more liberal political climate where legislators approve a more substantial amount of money for the purpose of improving bilingual education programs (Baez et al., 1985; Cummins, 1989; Fradd, 1986).

Baez et al. (1985), Cummins (1989), and Fradd (1986) discuss the need for future research that addresses a wider scope of Mexican-American students' needs. Baez et al. (1985) state:

'It is hoped that . . . break[ing] away from the limitations imposed by the language-based-only solutions prevalent in most bilingual litigation will seek to ensure that remedies include other ways of treating or eradicating socio-cultural, socio-economic, and socio-political obstacles to equality of educational opportunity (p. 210).

Current research studies should investigate issues that operate in conjunction with language isolation (Arias, 1990; Orfield, 1986; Baez et al., 1985).

Other researchers who have examined this problem conclude that Mexican-Americans are becoming increasingly segregated (Arias, 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1986, 1987; Orum and
More specifically, segregation exists in three forms: racial isolation, linguistic isolation, and curricular tracking (Arias, 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1986, 1987). Orfield (1986, 1987), Arias (1986, 1990), and Carter and Segura (1979) note that Mexican-Americans are more likely to be segregated than blacks. Furthermore, as demographic trends in the southwest indicate ever-increasing numbers of Mexican-American students, researchers note the urgency in addressing the problem of segregation in order to provide equal educational opportunity (Arias 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1986, 1987; Carter and Segura, 1979). Orum and Shroyer-Portillo (1982) examine federal funding for school districts implementing desegregation plans as they explain the drastic reduction in federal funding, formerly known as the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), the most often used source of funds to assist school districts implementing desegregation plans. ESSA's consolidation with many other educational programs in the form of block grants to the states, substantially reduced federal funding for desegregation (Orum and Shroyer-Portillo, 1982).

Federal funding for desegregation programs decreased during the early years of the Reagan Administration as the political climate became less favorable for educational programs targeting minorities (Orum and Shroyer-Portillo,
Medina (1988) discusses what he calls a "Hispanic Apartheid" in the nation's educational system. He describes the political climate during the Reagan era as unfavorable from such major policy efforts as official-language amendments, immigration reform and immersion approaches to education, all contributing to the current state of education (Medina, 1988). The school reform movement of the 1980s ignored pressing issues affecting Hispanic students (Medina, 1988).

The four issues Medina (1988) gives as reasons for the current situation of Hispanics are
1. growing demographic prominence of Hispanics in the U.S.
2. Hispanic school segregation
3. school tracking practices
4. high drop out rate among Hispanics (p. 339).

Like other researchers, he cites articles indicating that segregation among Hispanics may be worse now than at the time of Brown (1954) (Medina, 1988; Arias, 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1986, 1987; Carter and Segura, 1979).

Various factors contribute to segregation of Hispanic
students. First, with an increasing Hispanic population comes increasing Hispanic isolation. Second, discrimination operates in conjunction with Hispanic student isolation. Third, legal and policy decisions of the 1960s and 1970s led to increased Hispanic isolation (Medina, 1988). Medina (1988) cites Orfield (1984) who believes cities with the highest levels of Hispanic segregation are linked to the nation's economic future: Los Angeles, San Francisco-Oakland, San Diego, Houston, San Antonio, Chicago, Miami, and New York (p. 341). Cities where Hispanic segregation decreased through desegregation court orders include Denver, Las Vegas, Austin, Sacramento, and San Jose (Medina, 1988, p. 341).

Medina's (1988) assessment of the political climate is similar to Orfield's (1986) assessment in his introductory essay to a special issue of *The Education of Hispanic Americans: A Challenge for the Future*. He describes the political climate during the 1980s:

> The expanding policy agenda and research . . . occurred against a background of a shrinking federal government and a conservative political era with little priority for issues of minority education (Orfield, 1986, p. 12).

He notes that a great deal of political energy was invested in purely defensive policy battles between conservative and liberal factions (Orfield, 1986).
Given this political climate, advocates of bilingual education during the 1980s faced staunchly conservative groups. Orfield (1986) states that the Reagan administration sharply reversed policies of the previous four administrations, moving rapidly in 1981 to reduce funds for programs (p. 14). The most severe cuts occurred in bilingual education funding as government officials supported funding for immersion programs (Orfield, 1986). The Reagan administration sought to weaken federal bilingual education requirements and encourage local autonomy (Orfield, 1986).

Researchers should extend the scope of studies beyond bilingualism to evaluate additional problems such as segregation, overcrowding and other forms of inequality (Orfield, 1986). Orfield cites demographic trends indicating that between 1980 and 1985 the nation's Hispanic population grew almost five times as fast as the overall population (p. 9). The situation for Hispanics has worsened in that problems now include high drop-out rates, increased isolation, and a rigidly stratified system of higher education (Orfield, 1986, 1987; Carter and Segura, 1979).

Desegregation in Arizona

Arizona has yet to have a desegregation case reach the U.S. Supreme Court. However, cases dating as far back as 1951 exist where litigants contested segregative practices.
In *Gonzalez v. Sheely* (1951), the United States District Court held that practice of public elementary school district authorities of segregating children of Mexican descent in separate school buildings with inferior accommodations and facilities was discriminatory and illegal in that it deprived children of constitutional rights of due process of law and equal protection of the laws (p. 1004).

Arias and Bray (1983) note that cases litigated prior to *Brown* (1954) attempted to dismantle a segregated school system which was established on the pedagogical rationale of linguistic differences. They also note that these types of cases did not, on the surface, consider that segregation was due to racial or ethnic characteristics (Arias and Bray, 1983).

Another significant case was filed on behalf of the children of the community of Guadalupe, *Guadalupe Organization Inc. v. Tempe Elementary School District No. 3* (1978), although it was not a case contesting segregative practices in as much as the plaintiffs sought a maintenance bilingual program (Sacken, 1984). Guadalupe is a small community consisting of 5,000 people, mostly Mexican-American or Indian (Sacken, 1984). Plaintiffs claimed the district failed to provide educational programs that met the linguistic and cultural needs of a minority-student population in Arizona (Sacken, 1984). Sacken (1984) states that plaintiffs faced two obstacles in a case such as this
one: (1) proving a statutory violation and (2) persuading the court that a program reflecting the Lau Guidelines was necessary to satisfy Title VI or to eradicate the effects of the district's inadequate program (p. 85).

The district court entered judgment for the school district, and the case was subsequently appealed to the Ninth Circuit, "which put the dispute to rest by affirming the lower court's order" (Sacken, 1984, p. 86). Baez et al. (1985) give the reasons for the plaintiff's failure in this case:

Flawed legal and pedagogical strategizing and an extremely limited use of the research evidence on the part of the plaintiffs led to two court decisions that established legal precedents which were negative to bilingual education (p. 201).

Sacken's (1984) case analysis in the Arizona Law Review is one of the few documents that gives a detailed analysis of the events in this case. A more detailed analysis is currently underway at Arizona State University by Dr. Beatriz Arias who has published numerous articles about issues facing Hispanic students.

Along the lines of Gonzalez v. Sheely (1951), another case occurred in the city of Southwest, Adams Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978), where plaintiffs contested segregative practices. Coleman's (1985) doctoral dissertation examined this case in a more traditional manner, in that she focused on educational achievement
outcomes of students in desegregated schools. Moreover, the study focused specifically on blacks and their history of segregation.

Although Coleman's (1985) study examines desegregation outcomes, she emphasizes the traditional student reassignment approach rather than broadening the focus to include linguistic isolation as well, especially considering the fact that Mexican-American students comprise 35.8% and blacks 5.8% of the total student population in Southwest School District (SSD Ethnic Comparison Figures, 1989-90). In light of this information, a study focusing on racial and linguistic isolation in this culturally diverse school district is warranted.

In order to examine racial and linguistic isolation of Mexican-American students in Southwest School District, Arias' (1990) concepts will guide this study as her study examines isolation of Mexican-American students. A detailed account of her study is included in the next chapter as well as an outline of the methodological framework for this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will outline the methods used to investigate the research problems identified in Chapter 1. Descriptions of the research strategies used, documents analyzed, and rationales for the selection of persons who were interviewed will be addressed.

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive, historical investigation of Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) and its subsequent effect on the education of Mexican-Americans in a large urban triethnic district.

Southwest School District is located in a large city in Arizona and has a large population of Mexican-American students, approximately 20,246 students or 35.8% of the District's enrollment (SSD Comparison Figures, 1989-90). SSD is experiencing significant growth of its Mexican-American population including both LEP and OLP (SSD Comparison Figures, 1989-90). At the conclusion of Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978), the District was ordered to reduce segregation of racial minorities (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978).
Implementation of the court order (1978) occurred in three phases: Phase I during 1978-79, Phase II during 1979-80, and Phase III during 1980-81 (Facts, Findings and Conclusions, 1978). A total of nine schools were targeted for racial integration in the order. The scope of the study follows a chronological sequence during the period 1980-1981 (Phase III). This study will focus on west-side schools targeted for integration in the settlement of Phase III.

A total of 14 persons were interviewed in order to recreate the events that occurred from the perspective of Mexican-Americans during the Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District desegregation case from 1974-78. Six individuals were internal participants (those employed by the District), while eight individuals were external participants (plaintiffs, attorney for the plaintiffs, etc.) (refer to Appendix A for names of people interviewed). The data obtained from interviewing these individuals as well as pertinent documents constituted the base from which the historical perspective is written.

This study will use Arias' (1990) conceptual orientation as a means of examining charts, newspaper articles, legal, and District documents. Arias (1990) believes curricular and student reassignment considerations are both necessary for reducing racial and linguistic isolation of Mexican-American students. The data will be
examined from the perspective of Arias (1990) in order to ascertain: (1) whether or not the desegregation process influenced the development of bilingual education in Southwest School District and (2) whether or not the District addressed linguistic or desegregative needs of Mexican-American students.

Research Questions

This study focused on the following research questions:

1. Was bilingual education implemented along with desegregation after the Adams and Celaya suit?
2. Did the district deal primarily with linguistic or desegregative needs of Mexican-American students?

Research Methods

This study primarily employs the use of qualitative data rather than statistical analysis. Merriam (1988) describes the process of qualitative research, paraphrasing key elements of this type of research from numerous sources:

Qualitative research assumes there are multiple realities—the world is not an objective thing but a function of personal interaction and perception. It is a highly subjective phenomenon in need of interpreting rather than measuring. Research is exploratory, inductive and emphasizes processes rather than ends. In this paradigm, there are no predetermined hypotheses, no treatments, and no restrictions on the end product. What one does do is . . . intuit, sense what is occurring in a natural setting—hence the term naturalistic inquiry (p. 17).

The emphasis is on interpretation in context, as the study focuses on one specific situation or phenomenon (Merriam,
Merriam (1988) adds that "qualitative inquiry is inductive--focusing on process, understanding and interpretation--rather than deductive and experimental" (p. 21).

Merriam (1988) explains that different types of qualitative research are used in education. For purposes of this study, a case study approach will be employed, a "historical case study" as Merriam (1988) refers to it:

This type of research employs techniques common to historiography. . . . the use of primary source material [and] the handling of historical material is systematic and involves learning to distinguish between primary and secondary sources. In applied fields such as education, historical case studies have tended to be descriptions of institutions, programs and practices as they have evolved in time. Historical case studies may involve more than a chronological history of an event. To understand an event and apply one's knowledge to present practice means knowing the context of the event, the assumptions behind it and perhaps the event's impact on the institution or participants (p. 24).

In order to develop accurate information for a case study, Merriam (1988) and Yin (1984) recommend collection of data relevant to the study such as documents, charts, records, reports, interviews, or other archetypal information, anything necessary to create a picture or story of an event.

Yin (1984) discusses four kinds of case study designs deriving from a 2 x 2 matrix depicted in Figure 1:
Figure 1. Matrix of four case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Case</th>
<th>Multiple-Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic (single units of analysis)</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded (multiple units of analysis)</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The matrix is based on the assumption that single- and multiple-case studies reflect different design considerations and that within these two types, there can also be a unitary or multiple units of analysis (Yin, 1984). Thus, for the case study strategy, the four types of designs are (1) single-case (holistic) design, (2) single-case (embedded) design, (3) multiple-case (holistic) design, and (4) multiple-case (embedded) design (Yin, 1984).

For purposes of this study, a single-case (embedded) design will be employed. Yin (1984) explains that this type of design is recommended for a study involving a "single case . . . worth documenting and analyzing" (p. 43). Moreover, this same case study may involve more than one unit of analysis characterized as "subunits" (Yin, 1984, p. 44). If the case study deals with a single phenomenon and the analysis includes outcomes from the program or case, then a single-case embedded design is used shown as type 2 of the matrix (Yin, 1984).

The author also provides steps for data collection and analysis:

1. develop theory
   a. aim to explain
2. select case
3. design data collection protocol
   a. define process operationally
b. define process outcomes
c. use formal data collection techniques

4. conduct case study
   a. interviews
   b. documents

5. Write individual case report
   a. chronological structure

6. Draw conclusions
   a. some events must always occur before other events, with the reverse sequence being impossible
   b. some events must always be followed by other events, on a contingency basis
   c. some events can only follow other events after a prespecified passage of time
   d. certain time periods in a case study may be marked by classes of events that differ substantially from those of other time periods (Yin, 1984, pp. 51-53, 113).

Data collection for a historical case study involves identification of specific indicators (data) to be traced over time, as well as the specific time intervals (chronological structure) to be covered (Yin, 1984).
Data Collection

Data used to complete the case study were compiled through document analysis and personal interviews.

Document Analysis

Demographic data, court records, newspaper articles, and District publications from the filing of the suit, Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District, in 1974 and the subsequent twelve-year period from 1978 through 1990 were analyzed and organized in chronological sequence.

Documents analyzed included:

Committee on Facilities Utilization Report
County Demographic Data
Dagin, Drake and Chavez: Estas son tus Escuelas
Facts, Findings and Conclusions, (1978)
SSD Office for Civil Rights Compliance Monitoring Committee Report, 1990

Miscellaneous documents used in Phase III process

Newspaper Articles

Reports to Southwest School Board
McCracken (1988) in The Long Interview describes interviewing as a systematic, analytic method of obtaining data for a study. He recommends this tool as a feasible option for researchers because "few have time . . . for the vast blocks of time that participant observation demands" (McCracken, 1988, pp. 10-11). He points out the potential effectiveness of interviewing:

For this research strategy . . . allows us to capture the data needed for penetrating qualitative analysis without participant observation, or prolonged contact. It allows us, in other words, to achieve crucial qualitative objectives within a manageable methodological context (McCracken, 1988, p. 11).

McCracken's approach will be utilized in this study since the historical nature of the study does not allow for participant observation, and interviewing is an effective means of collecting data to recreate the events that occurred during Phase III of the desegregation case Adams and Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978).

Two groups of individuals were interviewed during the course of this study: internal participants (those from the District such as administrators, legal personnel, etc.) and external participants (those not employed by the District, such as the attorney for the Mexican-American plaintiffs;
Mexican-American plaintiffs, Celaya and Garcia; and other community members). Appendix B contains a description of the roles of those interviewed. Appendix C lists the initial questions which provided the tentative protocol for the interviews. Because the roles of participants differed to a large extent, the researcher used varied formats of a semi-structured interview (different clarifying questions and probes as the interview progressed which led to new questions for subsequent interviews) when interviewing participants.

The interviews were tape recorded, and notes for analysis were derived from the tapes. The information produced was written in narrative form and merged with other data sources. All information contained on the tapes and notes was protected with respect to the confidentiality of the source. Interviews were followed up with a note of appreciation to the informants, which acknowledged the importance of his/her willingness to participate in the study.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed according to the methods proposed by Yin (1988) and Spradley (1979). Spradley's method is a consistent way to analyze information from documents and interviews referred to as subunits by Yin (1988). Analysis of the information will also follow the
conceptual orientation of Arias (1990) as a means of interpreting the data. The names of the district, community, and individuals interviewed or quoted have been changed; a name appearing in the study should be assumed to be fictitious. Consistency in the use of names is maintained throughout the case study.

Summary

This chapter has focused upon the research problem to be studied and the methods used to analyze data and arrive at conclusions. An overview of qualitative data analysis was provided to lend credence to this approach to the study.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS
Introduction

With the exception of the teacher strike in 1978, the 
desegregation case has had perhaps the longest lasting 
impact on SSD insofar as programmatic, staffing, and policy 
changes are concerned. A former Superintendent offered in 
the forward to the final report for the School Board from 
the Committee on District Facilities Utilization, in May 
1980, the following description of the desegregation case:

When Judge Grey rendered his decision in the case 
on June 5, 1978, the greatest threat to the 
community lay in the potential for exploitation of 
divisions among the various ethnic groups. The 
greatest need was for healing and the quieting of 
discord and rancor (minority plaintiffs, groups of 
parents and board member, committees).

The relationships among the Mexican-American plaintiffs, a 
former board member and the individuals appointed to 
committees were focal concerns during a long process 
throughout most of the desegregation remedy in Phase III. 
This phase was particularly interesting in that parents, SSD 
personnel and other significant parties created an 
alternative to the idea of school closure offered by the 
trial Judge and attorneys for both the District and 
plaintiffs. This chapter will describe the SSD School
District, its early history as well as the Adams-Celaya desegregation case, and eventually focus on the events in Phase III.

Description of the District

Southwest School District (SSD) is located in a large, metropolitan, southwestern city of about 405,644 people (See Figure 2). The demographics of the city's population are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographics of the city's population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the overall percentage of Hispanics or Mexican-Americans does not reflect a significant portion of the total population, the percentage of Mexican-American
Figure 2. Metropolitan Southwest.
students in SSD does reflect a substantial portion of the total student population.

Table 3 depicts the current demographic state of the District for the 1989-90 school year:

Table 3. Demographic state of the District for the 1989-90 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>20,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>30,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,493</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, Mexican-American students in SSD constitute a significant portion of the student population. SSD is rapidly becoming an inner-city minority populated school district as 26,407 of the students or 46.7% currently enrolled in District schools are minorities. In order to better understand how SSD has become a District with a significant number of minority students, demographic comparisons from previous years are necessary to fully understand the growth that has taken place.
The city has undergone rapid growth since 1870 as shown in Table 4.

Not only has the city experienced rapid growth, but most of the city's population resides within SSD School District. In fact, SSD was the first school district in the Southwest since its inception in 1867.

Table 4. City growth since 1870.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>45,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>299,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>405,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Court documents indicate that the increase in citywide student population began as early as 1919, as indicated in Table 5.

Table 5. Increase in citywide student population beginning as early as 1919.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grades K-8</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>4,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>8,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>9,526</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>11,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>13,997</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>16,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>28,102</td>
<td>8,495</td>
<td>36,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>37,114</td>
<td>16,497</td>
<td>53,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>42,583</td>
<td>19,842</td>
<td>62,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this data, a substantial growth pattern began in 1950 and has continued through 1976. Moreover, ethnic comparisons from the ten years indicate a growth pattern in the total student population.

Demographic growth patterns for the District for the last ten years indicate a steady decrease in the overall student population (see Table 6).
Table 6. Demographic District growth patterns for the last ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grades K-8</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>41,779</td>
<td>20,546</td>
<td>62,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>36,819</td>
<td>18,835</td>
<td>55,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>36,751</td>
<td>17,339</td>
<td>54,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>40,581</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>56,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the overall student population reflects a decrease in numbers, the Mexican-American student population reflects an increase in numbers. Table 7 provides a clear picture of this steadily growing population.

Table 7. Increase in Mexican-American student population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MexAm</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>NatAm</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>16,854</td>
<td>41,684</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>62,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>16,071</td>
<td>34,490</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>55,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>17,281</td>
<td>31,232</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>54,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>20,246</td>
<td>30,086</td>
<td>3,261</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>56,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 1974-75 through 1980-81, a downward trend occurred in the Mexican-American student population; however, in 1985-86 a gradual increase began that has continued through 1990. Clearly then, while the District's Anglo student population has experienced a substantial decline in enrollment during the school desegregation period, the Mexican-American population continues to grow.

Early History of the District

As stated previously, Southwest School District is the oldest school district in the city, dating back to 1867. The first school was named Brichta, opened in 1868 by Augustus Brichta a saloon keeper. The school had a dirt floor and operated for six months, then closed. Fifty-five Mexican boys attended the school. There was no public school in Southwest again until 1872 when the second school opened at the corner of Meyer and McCormick. Maximum enrollment was 138 and few students were native English speakers. John Spring was the only teacher. The following year two teachers named Maria Wakefield and Harriet Bolton were employed to teach 75 students. Then in 1975, the District built its own school building on Congress Street. Enrollment grew to 350 by 1882.

As the town grew, Southwest School District expanded both in area and enrollment. In 1887-88, 528 pupils were enrolled. By 1910 enrollment had grown to more than 2,300.
students. Furthermore, the District expanded from four square miles to thirty square miles. In 1910, SSD consisted of six schools: The high school (now Roskruge Middle School), Manner (now Saddle Elementary), Saddle Middle School, David, Dragman, and the original Hollinger (torn down to build a high school).

Pursuant to state law and after a petition presented by Negro parents, a segregated school named Sunbar opened in the fall of 1913. Sunbar School (later renamed Spring) was completed in 1917 and housed Black students in grades K-8 until steps were taken by Dr. Morrow, then Superintendent, to desegregate the school in 1951. Black students had attended the district's high school with all other students.

By May 1920, two more schools had been built: Renlo Park and Coronado Heights. District enrollment was 538 in the high school and 3,582 in the elementary schools. The new SSD Superintendent was C. E. Rose and during his tenure, the plaintiffs' witnesses would allege, the District created and maintained a separate system for Mexican-American students.

Physical Description of the District

Southwest School District is one of the largest school districts in the state, still the largest in the city of Southwest. The perimeter of the District spans from the downtown or inner-city area to the peripheral areas of the
city, including the foothills area in the northeast part. Southwest School District has a rectangular shape, encompassing approximately 228 square miles and spanning four townships (24 lineal miles) at its widest point (N to S). The width of the District varies along its length from 24 miles maximum at 22nd Street to two miles minimum at Snyder Road (see Figure 3).

The extreme north and south schools, Collier and Lyons Elementary Schools, are approximately 10.2 miles driving distance apart. The extreme east and west schools, Vesey and Dunham Elementary are 20 miles driving distance apart. From Collier Elementary in the northeast portion of the District to Lawrence elementary in the southwest is a driving distance of approximately 26 miles. From Sabino High School to Chula High School is a driving distance of approximately 19.3 miles (see Figure 3).

Early History of Adams-Celaya v. SSD

The story began in late 1973. Carmen Celaya and Florencia Tellez were both active parents in neighborhood schools. Celaya was a teacher's aide in the District. Her three children attended B. E. Hose Elementary School at different points throughout the lawsuit. Her second son was in the second grade. One day her son, who was crying, came home from school and stood in the doorway. She asked him in Spanish (the family spoke predominately Spanish at home),
Figure 3. Southwest Unified School District.
"What's wrong mi hijito (my son)? Why are you crying?" Her son answered (in Spanish):

Mom, I can't read. Here I am going to be nine years old and I will never learn to read the newspaper. My teacher just told me, told all of us in our classroom, she's going to continue to be our teacher all the way through high school which means she will never teach us how to read.

In an interview, Celaya explained that her oldest son did not encounter difficulties learning to read in elementary school and was now in middle school. However, she believes that programmatic change prevented her second son from learning to read:

I found out they had an experimental program called Follow Through. I thought this was an isolated case (her son's having difficulty learning to read). The Federal Program . . . they took away pencils . . . everything from the desks. They (teachers) got trained in this and left all the traditional things. It showed up in the way my son could not function, not being able to read, write and he was in the second grade. My other son did not have this Title I.

At this point, she expressed her complaint to teachers, the principal and other administrators, but after meeting with various District employees, she did not feel that she had been given a satisfactory response. One day, in a conversation with other parents, she heard about another parent named Florencia Tellez who was dissatisfied with her son's education at Renlo Park Elementary school and was organizing a group of parents from the school who also felt their children's education was not adequate. Carmen Celaya
went to Tellez's home and the two women agreed to work together.

Tellez was a housewife who had two sons enrolled at Chula High School in 1973. Her dissatisfaction stemmed from the fact that her sons' achievement scores were below their grade level. She had been working with parents at Renlo Park Elementary for some time and had a group of parents supporting her. She believed the elementary school had not adequately prepared her sons for high school, and described what she considered to be a weakness in Southwest School District:

The teachers at our school . . . they came to check your house, see how well you had your house furnished. The teacher was checking for that program. They would bring them (students) down the street. I was walking with them and the teacher would say: this is a rock, this is a flower, this is a fence. They were learning stuff they didn't need for the rest of their life. They needed to be in the classroom learning.

After meeting with Celaya, Tellez felt the two would be stronger if they worked together.

A third person, Armando Santiago heard about the two women from neighborhood acquaintances. Santiago telephoned Celaya and began meeting with the two women on a regular basis in late 1973. He had five children in various grades (elementary through high school) in SSD. Like Tellez and Carmen Celaya, he was dissatisfied with the elementary schooling his children received: "... children in
minority schools do not receive a good education. Our children should be able to function like Anglo kids in other schools." He felt that his children's futures were at stake and it was his responsibility to see that they "... received an equal education, one that prepares them for the future."

In early 1974, Celaya, while on an errand, began conversing with a young Mexican-American attorney who resided in her neighborhood. She explained her dissatisfaction with the District's educating of Mexican-American children and SSD's indifferent response to numerous complaints. He then suggested the three people contact MALDEF (Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund) for assistance. The lawyer actually contacted MALDEF for her and they, in turn, contacted Carmen Celaya. She received a phone call from MALDEF recommending a young local Mexican-American attorney named Michael Zamora who had just graduated from Stanford Law School. The three met with Zamora in Spring 1974 and were immediately impressed with his energetic attitude and intelligence. One of the plaintiffs said, "... we knew the minute we saw him... he would be our attorney. Somehow we just knew." They decided to retain him as their attorney. Carmen Celaya, Tellez, and Santiago expressed their frustration about the District's inability to address their sense of the children's needs. As one
plaintiff stated emphatically to Zamora, "We are going to sue (the District). We want you to be our lawyer." In October 1974, Mexican-Americans for Equal Education (MAFEE) brought a lawsuit in the local federal district court against Southwest School District alleging racial segregation of Mexican-American students in the District, in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Pleadings

Originally, when MALDEF contacted Zamora in Spring 1974, they had offered to provide assistance to him insofar as the research and preparation was concerned and his primary task would be to file papers for the plaintiffs. In October 1974, he filed papers for the case on behalf of the Mexican-American parents and MALDEF, charging illegal discrimination and unequal educational opportunity against Mexican-American children on the basis of race, color, and national origin. Earlier that year, in May, Black parents and the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) had filed a similar lawsuit that would later be consolidated with the Mexican-American parents' lawsuit. The lawsuit for the Mexican-American plaintiffs originally consisted of eight counts:

1. creation and maintenance of a triethnic desegregated system
2. discriminatory tracking of students
3. inferior curricula and facilities for minorities
4. discrimination in the hot lunch program
5. discrimination in the special education program
6. failure to take into account linguistic differences
7. lack of bilingual notices for parents
8. failure to employ and promote Mexican-American staff.

Prior to the trial, plaintiffs and defendants stipulated to dismiss counts three, four, and seven and to "sever and stay" any further proceedings to counts two, five, and six. The segregation and employment counts remained, and as no plaintiff alleged employment discrimination against himself, the issue was properly in the case only insofar as it was relevant to segregative intent and racial identification of schools.

The Mexican-American plaintiffs were concerned with two issues: segregation and unequal educational opportunity. The lawsuit for the Black plaintiffs alleged illegal segregation only. Zamora said he decided to meet with the attorney for the Black plaintiffs because he felt if the two cases were consolidated they could combine resources and, thus, have a stronger case against the District. In November 1974, the cases were consolidated, one month after Zamora originally filed papers shortly after attorneys for both sides met. Zamora stated, "... the strategy was to combine our resources and knowledge in order to win the case."
When the cases were consolidated, the attorney for the Mexican-Americans deleted the unequal educational opportunity charge, much to the chagrin of the two women Mexican-American plaintiffs. In their opinion, unequal educational opportunity was the crux of the problem in the District. To delete this from the case was to avoid dealing with a severe problem integral in the educating of minority children, especially in educating Mexican-American children. One of the plaintiffs recalled, "I never believed the case would take a turn like it did. I had hoped the court would make the District teach kids and raise test scores, not bus them." By this time, however, both Celaya and Tellez had become extremely fond of Zamora and were reluctant to seek another attorney, because both felt he was, "... a very sharp lawyer especially if you want to beat a deseg rap."

Zamora believed the case would be strengthened by unifying with their Black counterparts. However, by dropping the equal opportunity charge, in the event the plaintiffs won, the remedy would more than likely follow the pattern of previous desegregation cases, racial balancing of schools.

When the equal educational opportunity aspect of the case was dropped in November 1974, Santiago did not approve of the decision. He sought the advice of a community leader, who recommended he seek another attorney. Santiago's agreement stemmed from the fact that he advocated
a bilingual philosophical approach in westside schools with Mexican-American children, rather than the school integration that was strongly advocated by the Black plaintiffs. When he discussed this with Celeya and Tellez, however, he found that they advocated a traditional educational approach. Both women vehemently opposed any form of bilingual education in minority schools. Although he opposed Zavala's deletion of the equal opportunity aspect in the case and the conservative phonics approach of Celaya and Tellez, Sanchez remained optimistic:

I kept hoping things would change, but they didn't. So I went and found another lawyer as I had been advised to do the right thing before the trial was scheduled to begin.

Both Celaya and Tellez were surprised when Sanchez arrived the first day of the trial with his own counsel, Tomas Santos. Tellez admitted, "We did not think Armando could have done this (sought new counsel)."

Zamora and the attorney for the Black plaintiffs, Ruben Salter, began the extended preparation for trial in December 1974. Their work continued through December 1977 in what Zamora describes as:

... one of the longest and most difficult trial preparations I have been involved in. The work load for both of us (Salter and Zamora) was phenomenal even after we agreed to work together.

Celaya and Tellez recall their daily visits to Zamora's office: "We took Mike his dinner every night and stayed
with him in his office helping him work until 11:00 or 12:00." Santiago was unable to dedicate his time comparably as he was employed full time, frequently working overtime to support his five children.

By disassociating himself from the two female Mexican-American plaintiffs at the start of the 30 day trial in January 1978, Santiago had become a splinter plaintiff in the case. At this point in time, four different groups were involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plaintiffs</th>
<th>Defendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American plaintiffs</td>
<td>Southwest School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American splinter plaintiffs</td>
<td>Southwest School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo plaintiffs</td>
<td>Southwest School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black plaintiffs</td>
<td>Southwest School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zamora represented Celaya and Tellez (Mexican-American plaintiffs) who both still believed that a back-to-basics or phonics approach should have been the focus of the trial, but supported Zamora due to their emotional attachment. As Tellez said, ". . . we believed in Mike and decided to see it (the case through." Santiago became the splinter plaintiff, and his attorney, Santos, argued for equal opportunity in the form of bilingual education for Mexican-Americans. A group of eastside Anglo parents, joined the case as separate plaintiffs. They were represented by Ed Kelly, and took an anti-busing stand. The Black plaintiffs were represented by Richard Summers, who argued for school
integration and was aided at trial by Zamora. Clearly, then the Adams-Celaya lawsuit had become a complex case involving many groups, each with its own perspective.

Once Judge Frey rendered his decision in the Adams-Celaya v. Southwest School District desegregation case, the three Mexican-American plaintiffs (Carmen Celaya, Florencia Tellez, and Armando Santiago) did not maintain any further involvement in the post-trial remediation phases of the case. As Mrs. Tellez recalled in an interview in September 1990, "Maria and I ran out of gas. Armando went his own way, too. We were all very tired." Ultimately, new actors emerged who shaped the remedial phases in both expected and surprising manners.

Phase I - 1978-79

In June 1978, Judge Frey found SSD guilty of illegally segregating minority students. Furthermore, he ordered the desegregation remedy to be implemented in three stages, which became known as Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III. At the request of SSD, several committees were formed, such as the District Committee for Facilities Utilization (approved in plans in Phases II and III and oversaw Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools), Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools (created plan for Phase III), and the Educational Advisory Council (educator group that created educational plan for David, Dragman, and Carmona schools). The committees did
not emerge until Phase II, because Judge Frey felt the District should bear the responsibility of developing appropriate remedies and bringing them to the Court for approval. The purpose of Phase I was to reassign students, essentially through the familiar desegregation tool of forced bussing. No instructional components were envisioned for this phase. Furthermore, in an interview with a district administrator who met with Judge Frey, he remembered Frey stating, "... it was left to the Board to find appropriate methods, plans, or means to eliminate all vestiges of segregation." Phase I involved the closure of three predominately minority schools: Parker and Coronado Heights elementary schools and Spring Junior High School (formerly Sunbar School, a strictly segregated school) much earlier (Coleman, 1985).

Although search for data as to numbers and ethnicity of students bused uncovered only one newspaper article that revealed pertinent information. Oddly, district employees were unable to locate such information. On June 3, 1983, the Southwest Daily Citizen reported that approximately 150 pupils were bused from segregated schools. Of these students, 75 students Mexican-American and 25 Black students, were bused to majority dominant schools. Gonzalez noted in an interview for this study that, "... the burden of this phase (busing Mexican-American and Black students to
eastside schools) fell on minority students." Forced busing was imposed primarily on minority students, who were redirected and bussed involuntarily to other schools with the intent of reintegrating those predominately Anglo, non-minority schools.

Phase I took place in 1978-79 and included the following schools:

1. Hully Elementary (minority school)  
2. Kennedy Park Elementary (minority school)  
3. Glenman Elementary (majority school)  
4. Bragin Elementary (majority school)  
5. Toolen Middle School (majority school)  
6. Maxis Middle School (minority school)  
7. Lanzo Elementary (minority school)  
8. Brennon Elementary (majority school)  

Many non-minority parents on the Anglo eastside of SSD did not look upon Phase I favorably and vehemently opposed busing their children to westside schools. Zamora recalled an incident one evening at a meeting he attended with Ruben Salter:

I can remember one night during a meeting with these parents. Ruben Salter (attorney for the Black plaintiffs) and I were backed into a corner by them. They were angry because their children were to be bused to inner-city schools. I told Ben, 'We're never going to get out of here.' These parents were extremely angry and beginning to get hostile. We feared for our safety.

The unpopularity with Phase I persuaded SSD administrators to modify their desegregation remedy in Phase II.
Phase II - 1979-80

Rather than imposed forced busing as in Phase I, Phase II was, as Ricardo Molina states, "... a bridge toward voluntary integration through the creation of magnet programs in a variety of schools, elementary and middle schools." Thus, Utterback, Doolen, Townsend, Cavett, and other schools in the central part of the city were designated magnet schools, with the goal of attracting Anglo students to them for integration purposes. SSD created the District Committee of Facilities Utilization during Phase I to work on weaknesses in the remedy, primarily in the involuntary approach. The first function of this newly formed committee was to design Phase II. Community dissatisfaction and opposition to Phase I compelled a different solution for Phase II. Thus, the voluntary magnet school approach was formulated. Gonzales explained that:

Although magnet schools in Phase II are not true magnets, these schools were the District's rudimentary attempt to initiate a form of voluntary desegregation unlike what was done in Phase I. . . , not until Phase III did the more sophisticated magnet school appear, one with a curricular focus.

Unlike Phase I, Phase II included an instructional component through the creation of magnet schools. Richard Martinez, who was on the Committee for Facilities Utilization that designed Phase II, defined the magnets created during this phase as, "... (schools) with lots of
resources such as books, teacher aides, smaller classes and other incentives to attract students voluntarily." Although magnet schools were a significant component of this phase, these schools did not have a distinctive programmatic emphasis (e.g., a school for the performing arts) characteristic of the magnet schools that would emerge in Phase III. In essence, they were merely "enriched educational environments," with additional resources constituting the means of enrichment.

The voluntarism and magnet schools, joined with limited involuntary transfers and redrawing of school boundaries, characterized this phase. In time, these shifts actually impacted Mexican-American students negatively, according to sources who were involved in the planning of Phase II. According to the June 3, 1989, *Southwest Daily Citizen*, in May 1979, SSD bused approximately 1,000 pupils, most of whom were voluntarily bused for desegregative purposes. Newspaper articles and District data do not reveal the ethnicity of students bused during this period. However, non-minority children were bused into several minority dominant schools. In an interview in February 1991, Richard Martinez recounts the effects of busing on Mexican-American students:

Magnet schools were created at inner city schools, not eastside schools. Anglo kids went there by choice and Mexican-American kids had no magnet to attend (eastside); forced busing was imposed.
Receiving schools for our kids did not get resources; it was on paper only. The inner city schools got many resources Mexican-American kids never got because they were bused out and Anglo kids came in and got services and resources.

Eastside Anglo parents, who had strongly opposed busing, eventually acquiesced to the magnet school proposal for the inner city schools, and sufficient numbers of non-minority students were attracted that involuntary busing was not required. For Mexican-American students, however, the incentive to be bused voluntarily was not particularly strong, because eastside magnet schools did not exist at the time. Thus, Mexican-American students were received at majority dominant schools where no new resources or programs (including bilingual programs) preceded them, and the contrast with Anglo students at minority dominant schools was evident. Phase II did not, for Mexican-American students, diverge from the traditional model of straight integrationism as a remedy to prior segregation.

As Molina recounted his perception of the negative impacts of busing on Mexican-American students, he recalled a conversation with Rodolfo Gonzales in which they both identified what they felt was a fundamental weakness in the desegregation process thus far:

We (Mexican-Americans) did not control Phase II; we controlled Phase III. We should have had the mindset to control Phase II. In hindsight, we bought into their agenda, putting our kids on the bus and didn't put theirs (involuntarily). We should have made sure the resources were there
on the receiving end and made sure they had a concomitant amount of resources at the receiving end for the Mexican-American kids. I'm sure there are some real horror stories... it may as well have been a foreign country (eastside schools) for some of our kids.

According to the minutes from school board meetings, the Governing Board approved Phase II on February 12, 1979 for the 1979-80 school year and included the following schools:

1. Horton Primary Magnet (K-3) - minority school
2. Hollinger Intermediate Magnet (K, 4-6) - minority school
3. Ft. Lowe Elementary - majority school
4. Howell Elementary - majority school
5. Kellogg Elementary - majority school
6. Manner Middle School - minority school
7. Township Middle School - majority school
8. Sutterback Middle School - minority school
9. Gail Middle School - majority school

In both phases, the focus was primarily on integration, on balancing racial composition in the affected schools. The nature of the educational services provided to students, particularly Mexican-American students, had not fundamentally shifted, although Phase II introduced the practice of enriching receiving schools. However, it only directed new resources at minority-dominant schools, to ease the arrival for Anglo children and to mollify their parents.

Phase III - 1980-81

During an interview in September 1990, Rodolfo Gonzalez (a former board member from 1975-86), recalled Phase III as "... probably the most difficult and in hindsight, the one
that has had the most lasting impact." He had suggested the idea of a Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools, formed to deal exclusively with Phase III and to provide an alternative to the idea of school closures advocated by a majority of the SSD School Board, the plaintiffs' attorneys (on behalf of at least some of the plaintiffs) and Judge Frey. This Subcommittee ultimately had an enormous impact on Phase III.

Phase III originally anticipated the closure of three elementary schools; David, Dragman, and Carmona Elementary Schools, all schools located in the inner city or downtown area of Tucson (see Figure 4). Two quite oppositional positions emerged during public discussions on whether or not to close these schools. The plaintiffs' attorneys, School Board and district central administrators favored closure, but the Mexican-American parents in the respective neighborhoods were strongly opposed to closure. In October 1990, Zamora observed that, "... the idea of closure was viewed as beneficial because building new schools and reassigning minority students to predominately Anglo schools would provide a more integrated and positive environment for learning."

In an interview in September 1990, Gonzales recalled that parents did not support closure of the schools for Phase III for two reasons:
Figure 4. Elementary school attendance areas, 1990-91.
. . . too much historical significance to David, Dragman, and Carmona Elementary Schools to allow closure and the burden of proof (desegregation) had already fallen on minorities with the closure of Parker, Coronado Heights, and Spring Schools.

Moreover, Ricardo Molina said during his interview for this study that "... parents were against closure and fearful of it. They advocated retaining the schools and, after trying to convince them, I realized these were their schools." The schools were under-enrolled and vastly in need of more students in order to keep them open. Furthermore, Molina recalled that, "These were neighborhood schools for neighborhood kids. We would be remiss to ignore their linguistic and cultural needs." In deference to the neighborhood parents in the David, Dragman, and Carmona areas, Gonzalez and Molina proceeded with designing a plan that would retain the schools and provide an enhanced educational program, with an appropriate curricular focus to address the needs of Mexican-American students. For Mexican-American students, the new program involved a switch from a transitional (remedial) model to a maintenance bilingual model with a bicultural component designed to enhance learning.

The curricular and instructional approach they sought was a maintenance model in bilingual education, one that had not been implemented in SSD. Cummins (1990), describes a
maintenance bilingual education as one that contains a cultural and linguistic component:

Educators who see their role as adding a second language and cultural affiliation (maintenance model) to students' repertoire are likely to empower students more than those who see their role and replacing or subtracting students' primary language and culture (transitional model) in the process of assimilating them to the dominant culture (p. 60).

Martinez explained that this was viewed as an unpopular methodological strategy by district administrators, in part because it created funding problems:

Although the Mexican-American community had no organized groups against bilingual education (a controversial issue and relatively new strategy in SSD in 1979), district administrators were not in favor of this approach. The fact that large amounts of federal funds were phasing out was also important since bilingual programs were contingent on this funding.

From the inception of Phase III, federal funding was no longer an issue as SSD officials recognized the importance of complying with a court order to desegregate as explained in Apache Daily Star on April 29, 1981:

Because they are now under the court's wing, the three schools have nothing to fear from the ax now poised over regular program budgets as the district tries to trim $10 million from the programs for next year.

Martinez then explained that the "pro-bilingual education agenda" consisted of: (1) institutionalizing bilingual education so it was no longer dependent on federal funding, and (2) shifting the district's focus in bilingual education
from a transitional to maintenance model. The Phase III plan addressed both these items in the desegregation plan approved by Judge Frey.

Phase III was the "Mexican-American solution" to the desegregation problem in SSD. The focus of this phase was curricular issues (the equal educational opportunity aspect) which had not been the foci of Phases I or II. In February 1991, Richard Martinez described Phase III as:

... the Mexican-American solution to desegregation. Phase III was the equivalent to the Black level of equal educational opportunity at David, Dragman, and Carmona. Bilingual Education was the instructional medium used for this purpose. The goal was to implement a bilingual maintenance model and obtain adequate district funding both of which we accomplished.

In prior years, the District had interpreted bilingual education as a form of remediation and adopted a transitional model (two languages used for instruction but eventually one language, English, becomes the language of instruction). David, Dragman, and Carmona Elementary Schools had all implemented some form of bilingual education at each grade level. However, the approach to bilingual education shifted during Phase III, as a maintenance model was introduced. David Elementary became the "flagship for the maintenance model in SSD" as Richardo Molina labeled it. Phase III was dominated by efforts at addressing the linguistic needs of Mexican-American students in SSD through the proposed bilingual maintenance approach. However, David
Elementary was the only school in SSD that used this approach.

Furthermore, as Martinez described the events in Phase III, Saddle Middle School was added to the original list of Phase III schools:

Linda Reyes was a concerned parent who wanted Saddle included in the Phase III schools. Saddle was addressed separately after we finished the DDC (David, Dragman, and Carmona) plan. We never really had much opposition to Safford since the DDC plan was the controversial issue. Saddle was tacked on the end.

Rodolfo Gonzales (board member during the desegregation process from 1974-1986) explained other issues surrounding Saddle Middle School, "For the most part, the integration factor (75% minority and 25% non-minority), bilingual model and magnet school concept applied to Saddle after being devised for David, Dragman, and Carmona." Molina then described how the details regarding Saddle were finalized, "... political deals had been cut with the DDC and it was a matter of adding Saddle to the package." Thus, in addition to shifting Phase III's focus to bilingual educational programs, advocates also expanded the number of affected schools.

Programmatic Transfer Policy

In an interview, Rodolfo Gonzales recalled events surrounding the busing of students for Phase III in 1979-80:

One thing Mexican-Americans were united on was they were anti-busing. This was a point of
tension between the Blacks and Mexican-Americans, but we controlled Phase III. We needed to have attractive programs at inner-city schools to bus in the needed 25% non-minority population.

The concern to attract Anglo students did not surface as a critical issue until the educational planning stages when Dragman Elementary School was designated as a K-3 school, a program the Subcommittee on Inner-City Schools, believed would be popular among eastside Anglo parents. A large scale public relations campaign began in Spring 1981 to attract the 25% non-minority student population at the three schools. Attracting Anglo students to the Phase III schools was particularly critical, given the schools' low enrollment when Phase III began. Transportation was provided for non-minority students who opted to attend David, Dragman, or Carmona. Ricardo Molina described the integration issue as:

Mexican-Americans were not pushing transportation as the remedy; their focus was curriculum/instruction. Clearly, the need was to desegregate, to attract Anglos. They got transportation (buses) and the Mexican-Americans who came in from other areas didn't. That was part of the incentive to draw the non-minority population in. The compromise we eventually reached was 75% minority and 25% non-minority.

Although attracting Anglos to integrate inner-city schools was part of the Phase III remedy, curriculum and instruction became the central focus of this phase as discussion of the planning stages will reveal. The SSD public relations campaign to attract eastside Anglos in Spring 1981, followed the development of the Phase III educational plan described
in the next section; a separate section describes the campaign at the end of this chapter.

After establishing the necessary guidelines for integration, Judge Frey issued a court order in July 1980, mandating the programmatic transfer of students to David, Dragman, and Carmona schools based on recommendations approved by the Southwest School District Governing Board and originating from the Committee on District Facilities Utilization. In the minutes of a School Board meeting on March 18, 1980, Dr. Gage, then SSD superintendent, defined programmatic transfer as, "... a statement designed by staff and legal counsel to allow students to enter a specified school on a programmatic transfer basis so long as the racial/ethnic balance was not impaired." The court order stated, "In order to provide maximum possible access to the educational programs at David, Dragman, and Carmona, SSD students shall be allowed entry to those schools on the following basis:"

1. No more than 50% of the incoming children may be members of minority groups.
2. Transferring children shall improve the racial and ethnic balance at David, Dragman, and Carmona and shall not further imbalance the school from which they transfer.
3. Children resident in either the David area or in the Dragman and Carmona combined area shall enjoy priority consideration should they desire to transfer either from David to Dragman or Carmona, or from Dragman to Carmona to David.
4. The design rated capacity of David, Dragman, and Carmona shall be determined within two years of the completion of all physical improvements and the full implementation of the programs set forth in this Plan.

5. The capacity of David and the combined capacity of Dragman and Carmona, as determined by '3' above, shall be sufficient to permit their respective enrollments to reach no more than 75% minority group student enrollment.

6. The enrollments of David, Dragman, and Carmona shall be between 70% and 100% of their design rate capacities, as determined by '3' above, within three years of full implementation of this Plan.

As the development of Phase III unfolded, the curricular issues, as opposed to the traditional focus on involuntary transfer of students through busing, evident in previous phases, became a critical part of implementation in the Phase III schools.

In the minutes from the same board meeting on March 18, 1980, Mr. William Bittner, legal counsel for SSD, reiterated that:

... the issue with respect to David, Dragman, and Carmona was not one of balancing racial or ethnic groups, but one of examining educational programs, designing educational programs and further making a determination as to whether or not all or any of the three schools in question should continue as elementary schools or whether there should be some modification of that.

In spite of Mr. Bittner's statement regarding David, Dragman, and Carmona, board members Tom Chavez and Dr. Mike Babich, were opposed to keeping the schools open and to the proposed curricular changes. They represented the Board's
"old vanguard," according to Molina. A "new vanguard" had appeared with the election of Rodolfo Gonzales (in 1975) and Eve Bacon (in 1979) to the Board. Chairman Leslie Albright provided unconditional support to Gonzales as he struggled to gain approval for the Phase III plan. Thus, she became part of the "new vanguard," along with Gonzales. Ultimately, Bacon had the tie-breaking vote that would approve or reject the Phase III plan. As Molina described it:

... we had real problems with Eve. We extracted a real price for her support. She demanded there be unquestioned support for her agenda (gifted students). What white people got out of it, we got David, Dragman, and Carmona. They got University High School and the GATE program. She played it beautifully.

A roll call vote was called on a motion that the Board adopt the recommendations for David, Dragman, and Carmona incorporating the new curricular model and a programmatic transfer statement for the three schools. The motion carried by a three-to-two vote, with Mrs. Bacon, Mr. Gonzales, and Mrs. Albright voting for approval and Mr. Chavez and Dr. Babich against the motion.

Minutes from board meetings indicate that Phase III was approved and accepted by the Governing Board on March 31, 1980, to be implemented in the 1980-81 school year. The following schools were declared magnet schools:

1. David Elementary School (Grades K-6) - Maintenance Bilingual Program
2. Dragman Elementary school (Grades K-3) - Includes a bilingual component at each grade level
3. Carmona Elementary (Grades 4-6) - Includes a bilingual component at each grade level
4. Saddle Middle School (Grades 6-8) - Includes a bilingual component at each level.

All schools had a new bilingual component designed to achieve a maintenance approach.

It is important to note at this point that the political process for the adoption of the Phase III plan was to a large extent directed by Ricardo Molina and Rodolfo Gonzales. They had active roles in generating the plan and pursuing its adoption. Ricardo Molina served both as Chairman of the Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools and as a member of the Committee for Facilities Utilization. He described his and Gonzales's strategy for Phase III:

The Board had no option. We sent one plan only. Their role was to accept or reject--that's all. My job was the internal politics (approval of the Subcommittee and DFC - Facilities Utilization Committee) and Rodolfo's was the external politics (Board votes necessary for approval). We had clear cut roles from the beginning.

In the sections that follow, the events culminating in the adoption of this plan and an assessment of its consequences will be scrutinized in detail.

Significance of the Subcommittee on Inner-City Schools and Educational Advisory Council

Various court and SSD documents use the terms Subcommittee or Mid-City Schools and Subcommittee for Inner-
City Schools synonymously. For purposes of this study and to maintain consistency, the latter term will be used.

During an interview Richardo Molina described how Mexican-Americans gained control of Phase III:

In the first two phases, Anglos controlled the decisions. What happened was many Mexican-Americans threatened to walk out and protest the control they had when talks started for Phase III. Rodolfo used his influence to have me named the Chairman of the Subcommittee. I approached the role aggressively. We controlled Phase III.

Regarding the importance of having Molina as Chairman of the Subcommittee beginning in the summer of 1979, Gonzales stated that:

Richardo (Molina) and I had lots of communication about the subcommittee). This was a difficult process . . . took almost one and a half years of planning, . . . maneuvering, convincing the community, advocacy.

Moreover, Molina described the Subcommittee process as, ". . . an extension of me, which was really an extension of Rodolfo (Gonzales)." In the minutes to a subcommittee meeting on July 25, 1979, "Richardo Molina reported that the Inner-City Schools Subcommittee was planning for a public process to begin in September to include alternative ways of dealing with the individual school communities." The SSD Time Line of Preparation and Implementation Activities listed as the official dates for the public process from November 1979 through September 1980.
The Subcommittee for Inner-City schools was formed to provide an alternate solution to the original idea of closing of David, Dragman, and Carmona schools, which had been proposed soon after the Stipulation of Settlement Order was given by Judge Frey. The Subcommittee consisted of eleven individuals; eight of the individuals were Mexican-American. Its role was to ensure that an appropriate plan for Phase III was devised and presented to the governing Board. Richardo Molina who was both chairman and a university student in 1979, and the other members (only one member was an educator in higher education) soon realized their need for educational expertise if they were going to develop the curricular aspects of Phase III. This expertise was especially critical because the primary focus of this phase was programmatic. Molina created an Educational Advisory Council in the fall of 1979 to "... invite educators, most of whom were in the classroom at the time, to give input and develop curriculum plans for DDC" (David, Dragman, and Carmona). Molina then described his criteria for the selection process of the Advisory Council:

This committee had the most influence. We (Gonzales and Molina) had the committee stacked with our own people. It needed to be our plan (Gonzales and Molina). These were our schools, our kids. Our agenda was to serve the barrio area. As long as we had the percentage of Anglos to integrate (25% non-minority) who cared what the rest were. We wanted to figure out how to get our own kids (Mexican-American) in these schools since they would be bilingual.
Clearly then, their concerns were hardly oriented to securing the benefits of integration. Attracting Anglos was the cost of preserving the schools where the newly wrought bilingual education could be established.

The Educational Advisory Council consisted of 12 educators, 10 of whom were classroom or resource teachers. The remaining two were Mexican-American administrators in the District. Among the group, nine were Mexican-American, two were Black and one Anglo. The 13th person was Richard Molina, who again served as the Chairman, the only noneducator in the group. These educators were invited to give their input and then to devise a curricular plan for the three schools. The Advisory Council promulgated the entire curricular plan for David, Dragman, and Carmona.

Although the Advisory Council was ostensibly an appendage of the Subcommittee, it appropriated the central function of articulating the educational process for the three schools.

The model (Figure 5) is a diagram of the planning process that the Subcommittee used in developing a plan for Phase III in 1979. Though not delineated on the chart, other parties were also part of the decision-making process. The aggregation of actors through which Phase III was approved included: Educational Advisory Council, Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools, District Facilities Utilization Committee, SSD Governing Board, and Judge Frey.
Planning Process: Dates TIMES Locations

Proceso de Planeamiento: Fechas Horas Lugares

El Distrito Escolar Unificado de Tucson ha entrado en un acuerdo legal con la comunidad para dirigirse a las necesidades educacionales y físicas de las escuelas elementales Davis, Drachman y Carrillo. Este acuerdo incluye una serie de juntes con el propósito de salir con un plan que contiene recomendaciones de programas educacionales y el futuro de los edificios escolares.

El proceso de planeamiento, como se puede mirar arriba, da cabida a las sugerencias de todos los que desean formar parte de la decisión.

El resultado de todo este proceso va a representar las necesidades de los estudiantes, los deseos de los padres y el futuro de la comunidad.

Tucson Unified School District has entered into a legal agreement with our community which involves a joint public process to address the educational and facility needs of Davis, Drachman, and Carrillo Elementary Schools. The goals at these meetings are to develop a plan containing recommendations on educational programs and the future of the school buildings.

The planning process, as illustrated above, is one which will allow input from all who wish to be involved in the decision-making process.

The outcome of this planning process is one which will represent the students' needs, the parents' aspirations, and the community's future.

Figure 5. Planning process.
Worth noting is that much of the planning of Phase III was left in the hands of the Educational Advisory Council and the Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools. Once the Advisory Council developed its Phase III plan, the Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools approved the plan and submitted it, along with a formal letter, to the District Facilities Utilization Committee (DFC) on February 4, 1980. Richardo Molina described the politics involved at that point:

It was my job to get the DFC to approve the plan. Then it was Rodolfo's (Gonzales's) to get the Board to pass it. My job turned out to be much easier than I thought it would be. Rodolfo's was the usual, dealing with Eve (Bacon), but he already had dealt with that.

Gonzales "dealt with" securing Bacon's vote by exchanging votes for gifted programs for bilingual education. Ironically, the Phase III agenda turned on Gonzales's willingness to support the symbol of elitist education, separate programs for the gifted. In an interview with Ben Gaxiola in 1991 (member of the Subcommittee), he recalled Gonzales and Molina's involvement in Phase III, "given the circumstances, they did the best they could. Most of the (Subcommittee) members felt they did a good job." The DFC approved the plan and conveyed it to the Governing Board; the Board quickly approved it and then sent it to Judge Frey for final approval.

During the course of this planning process, the Educational Advisory Council had complete discretion to
decide the philosophy, methodology and other curricular details in the Phase III plan. In 1979, Superintendent Gage's cabinet consisted of eight assistant superintendents, two of whom were particularly offended by the absence of any role in the deliberations of the Educational Advisory Council. Dr. Florence Reinard, Acting Deputy Superintendent and Dr. Beth McCracken, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Schools, had hoped to have considerable influence over the context of the Phase III plan. Dr. Reinard was offended because although she was second in command in SSD, she was left out of the desegregation process (during the Phase III remedy). Dr. McCracken represented the "old school" who had opposed bilingual education and attempted to exert her authority to become involved. Richardo Molina described how Dr. McCracken failed in her attempt to use her authority:

Beth especially was offended and powerless. Even though she tried to use her position to gain power politically, she failed because ultimate authority had been given to the Advisory Council by the Board.

Dr. McCracken had gathered a group of educators who were opposed to bilingual education whom she wanted to serve as part of the committee. However, her attempt at influence was quickly thwarted by the School Board which believed that in order to comply with the court order, the District needed to address the needs of Mexican-American students (not done
in Phases I and II), "The Board believed Beth's intentions were to exert control and authority rather than complying with Judge Frey's order."

In addition to the Advisory Council's complete control over the curricular aspects of Phase III and the introduction of the bilingual maintenance model to SSD, they also propounded the "new school" concept that was later implemented at various other sites throughout the District. Tomas Gamez, a liaison for the District during Phase III, explained a "new school" as, "A school that is opened (similar to a newly built school) where everything is redone from the philosophy to hiring to redrawing boundaries."

Gene Benton, who had been appointed in 1979 Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Schools in the southwest region of SSD, confirmed that the "new school" concept had "... begun at this time. We declared David, Dragman, and Carmona new schools so that everyone from top to bottom had to reapply."

When the public and the District's Teacher Education Association (TEA) became aware of this aspect of the newly formed plan for Phase III schools, there was an immediate antagonistic reaction. Richardo Molina explains,

TEA was real threatened by this. The new school concept breaks one of the basic tenets they had (teachers with most seniority obtain vacant teaching positions) which was to say that seniority did not matter when applying for positions at DDC. Seniority is not a factor when
Although TEA vehemently opposed the new school proposal, as well as the newly created requirements for bilingual classroom teachers, the Phase III plan proceeded because the Board's need to satisfy Judge Frey's court order by creation of a satisfactory plan was important enough to surmount TEA's opposition to the new school concept and teacher qualifications. Rodolfo Gonzales observed that:

Complying with the court order was the most critical issue the District faced. TEA was not a factor in its request to alter the Phase III plan. Fortunately, the new school concept and the bilingual endorsement still is in effect (as of 1980).

TEA's attempt to resist the new school concept and teacher qualifications in Phase III was soon further obscured by the district's need to increase minority staffing, particularly among its ranks.

Many of the educators on the Educational Advisory Council were classroom teachers. However, they became administrators during the planning process or shortly afterwards, as Gonzales recounted:

... many of the (minority) educators involved in the planning and advocacy for Phase III (Educational Advisory Council) are now in leadership roles throughout the district. They were the nucleus who stepped forward at the time and let us plan for our kids.
Gonzales reiterates that those who were involved in this critical process in support of bilingual education programs have continued in leadership roles in SSD,

These people have done well for themselves in that they are in administrative positions now. It was critical we increase the number of Mexican-American administrators in SSD. That was an issue to contend with.

Thus, the teachers who stepped forward to produce a curricular plan that met the wishes of Gonzales and Molina were rewarded with career advancements within the District.

Wednesday, November 7, 1979

The first meeting in the Planning Process took place on Wednesday, November 7, 1979. The steering committee for the Subcommittee on Inner-City Schools consisted of Ricardo Molina, Letty Rosas, Ben Gaxiola, and Pete Carrasco, all of whom were noneducators, with the exception of Gaxiola who is a university professor. Ricardo Molina, Chairman of the Subcommittee, recalled:

The overall purpose of this first meeting (Wednesday, November 7, 1979) was to set the time frame for future meetings in which the Advisory Council would present their plans for the three schools and other details. We also came up with a list of goals Raul and I thought would be relevant to the developing of the plans for DDC.

The steering committee for the Subcommittee met, generated a list of goals, and sent the list to the other members of the committee.
The list of goals for David, Dragman, and Carmona schools, developed during the initial meeting, was composed of the following 13 goals, which were used as a guide throughout the process:

1. To serve the indigenous population of the area.
2. Build a relationship with new (existing and potential) residential population to area.
3. Develop new educational opportunities for students in the area.
4. Increase levels of achievement.
5. Raise quality of physical environment of the schools.
6. Maintain a relationship between each school and its supporting population.
7. Respect historic importance of schools.
8. Maintain ambience of older schools.
9. Recommendations should reflect prudent economic analysis and decisions.
10. Enhance educational opportunities for District as a whole.
11. Promote a compatible relationship with adjacent land uses and transportation routes in the downtown area.
12. Maintain safe pedestrian and bus access to schools.
13. Promote joint use of facilities.

To a larger extent these goals reflect the interests of neighborhood Mexican-American parents, Rodolfo Gonzalez (former board member) and Richardo Molina (former Chairman of the subcommittee). Molina gave his perception of how the goals were generated.

... our goal was to serve the indigenous population in the area by retaining the schools and retaining the culture as much as possible. Most of these (goals) were really an extension of myself and more so an extension of Rircardo. What we hoped to achieve was to dispel the notion of
minority kids and low SES (socio-economic status). Our kids are a reflection of the quality of the programs in our schools.

Mexican-American parents in these neighborhoods were, as Martinez said during his interview, "... fearful of school closure and favored retaining the schools." This fear led to the first goal, because parents were adamant in their stand to retain the three schools. However, the remaining goals were a mirror of what Molina and Gonzales viewed as the substance of quality programs in their endeavor to achieve this, the two men persuaded the Subcommittee that their ideas were essential to the successful planning of programs at David, Dragman, and Carmona. Both Molina and Gonzales wanted to address the equal opportunity aspect of the Adams-Celaya desegregation case that had faded when the Mexican-American and Black cases were consolidated. The list generated by the Subcommittee became the framework the Educational Advisory Council used to develop the curricular plan for David, Dragman, and Carmona. In the introductory statement of the final report to the District Facilities Utilization Committee, Estas son tus Escuelas, submitted on February 4, 1980, Molina wrote that "The purpose of this format (Subcommittee goals) was to give the meetings some type of structure as well as provide a model for parents."

After Dr. McCracken and TEA's attempts to undercut the Advisory Council's authority to design the curriculum during
the fall of 1979 were fended off, the Council worked diligently at generating a list of concerns and needs to aid in the bilingual curriculum design. Ricardo Molina recalled that because he selected educators for the Educational Advisory Council with the same philosophical orientation as he and Gonzales, members agreed with their ideas of needs and goals, "For the most part, we all agreed on what we came up with in our meetings (of the Advisory Council), because we believed in bilingual maintenance programs." For the Council, a primary consideration was finding suitable times for members to meet and compile material to present in the general public meetings schedule for November 14 and 20, and December 5 and 12, 1979 (see Figure 5). The Council compiled four master lists and submitted them to the Subcommittee, which in turn, compiled a final report on the three schools. The first list compiled by the Advisory Council is best described as a set of needs and goals of students at David, Dragman, and Carmona (See Appendix A). A closer examination of this list shows a close parallel to the ideas of Martinez and Gonzales, reflected in the overall goals of the Subcommittee.

The Council identified two primary areas of "concern": learning and selection of staff. The "new school" concept began to emerge as qualifications and selection of staff was emphasized. Although stated obliquely, the description of
school staff was skewed to allow only professionals "compatible" to the programs and the community. Presumably, most would be trained in bilingual education or at least sympathetic to such methods. The "educational needs" section stressed the students' need to "maintain" two languages and cultures, thus anticipating the development of a maintenance bilingual model.

The need to increase school achievement was also stressed, an item about which the Mexican-American plaintiffs had long been concerned. The "program" section stressed the importance of a "developmental program that minimizes remediation," as opposed to a program that maintains two languages throughout a student's schooling and enhances his growth. Molina recalled in an interview in February 1991 that, "... bilingual education followed the transitional model and was a form of remediation. We wanted to dispel the notion that low SES minority kids could not learn." The nine items listed in the "Staff" section reveal the "new school" concept that emerged during this process (especially numbers 2, 3, 5, and 7). The last section, "Goals" stressed the importance of cultural and linguistic experiences as part of the curriculum (#1). Overall, the list posed a daunting task, but it clearly focused on the needs of indigenous students, rather than the in-coming Anglos.
Wednesday, November 14, 1979

The second major meeting in the planning process was held on Wednesday, November 14, 1979 at 7:00 pm at David Elementary School. This meeting was the initial general meeting for parents of the three schools. The purpose of this meeting was to present the goals of the Subcommittee and the needs and goals of the Educational Advisory Council to the parents as a model for a list of needs and goals that the parents were to devise. Tomas Gamez, who was released from a full-time elementary position to a 3/5 teaching and 2/5 "Process Facilitator" position, recalled that, "We wanted good bilingual schools and we accomplished that because two of the three are now A+ schools (David and Dragman)."

Like the Advisory Council, the parents also generated a list of needs, goals, and other recommendations to be submitted to the Subcommittee. However, the parents' list was generated after they were offered the Council's list as a model (See Appendix B). It is unsurprising then, that many of the needs listed by parents closely paralleled the list of the Advisory Council and the Subcommittee. For example, the parents requested a bilingual program (including homework and oral competence in two languages, English and Spanish). Specific requests in the "Staff" section reinforced the "new school" concept that emerged
during Phase III (e.g., total staff commitment and philosophy to early childhood education and total staff commitment to bilingual education). However, the one item that parents strongly believed in, retaining David, Dragman, and Carmona, surfaced at the end of the list in the "Facilities" section. Lupe Diaz, one of the parents who attended the meetings in 1979, recalled during an interview that, "... much of what they talked about I did not understand, but we (parents) knew we did not want our schools closed. I let them (Advisory Council) do the rest."

Parents also devised a list of facility improvements for the three schools at this meeting. A checklist was distributed for this purpose (see Figure 6). The parents were to list specific items they felt were in need of improvement in order to make each school a better educational environment for students. Very little disagreement took place during this part of the process as Lupe Diaz explained, "... it seemed that we all did this (checklist for improvements) by ourselves and we knew what needed to be done." Parents wrote in their recommendations for improvements. After this process was completed at all three schools, the Subcommittee then compiled a master list (See Appendix C). The facilities list became part of the final report submitted to the district Committee on
INNER CITY SCHOOL CHECKLIST

Street Improvements
Dragman
David Carmona

Site Expansion
Dragman
David Carmona

Building Adequacy
Dragman
David Carmona

Other Considerations
Dragman
David Carmona

Figure 6. Inner City Checklist.
Facilities Utilization, the committee that oversaw the Subcommittee on Inner-City Schools.

Although the planning process flow chart revealed each meeting was held at a different site (David, Dragman, or Carmona), parents divided themselves into groups according to the school their children attended. In this manner, they proceeded to generate the list of school improvements. In order to comply with parental requests to retain the three schools, extensive renovating would have to take place (from this list), because the buildings were considered historic schools, located in the inner city area of the District. The parent meetings uncovered a diversity of opinions about how these schools should operate during Phase III. Not all parents quickly agreed to the renovation of the schools and the installation of first language programs for bilingual students. The final report for Phase III, *Estas son tus Escuelas*, included various neighborhood parents' comments with regard to the retaining of David, Dragman, and Carmona:

#1 - David parents don't want their children to go to Carmona and Carmona parents don't want their children to go to David.
#2 - Why have a new school when we have three schools?
#3 - Maintain the three schools as they are now and bus children in.
#4 - Why close the three schools when enrollment will increase.
#5 - Why not have bilingual education at Carmona?
#6 - I don't like it (the schools).

Because parents were unable to arrive at a decision with respect to the three schools due to their diverse opinions,
the carefully constructed consensus of the Advisory Council and Subcommittee was imperiled. The parents were not as focused on the bilingual programs that the process thus far had been directed at promoting. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, Richardo Molina, described the situation:

We had many parents with many opinions. The only thing they had in common was the decision to retain the schools. The Subcommittee believed a voting process was the fairest manner of solving this.

Two days after the November 14 meeting, the Subcommittee met and created a plan that parents could later vote.

Other building considerations had to be taken into account by the Subcommittee in planning the use and educational plan for the three buildings. There are significant differences in the buildings and grounds of the three schools which make different uses more plausible. Dragman is the only building with a single story. It has a smaller playground and smaller classrooms, all of which suit the school for use by children of a younger age. David has two levels and is the oldest of the three buildings. It is located in the middle of its grounds. Carmona has three levels and is located at one end of its playground which is substantially larger than the other two.

_Tuesday, November 20, 1979_

After parents explored different uses of the three schools and listed areas of improvement, the Subcommittee
for Inner-City Schools composed a total of six options for the three schools. Parents were to decide which plan they favored through a vote that would be held prior to the next general meeting on November 28, 1979. A detailed discussion was led by Richardo Molina (Subcommittee and Advisory Council chairman) at Carmona Elementary at 7:00 pm to insure parents understood each plan on the "Open School Plan" shown in the Figure 7. Ben Gaxiola recalled that, "... parents had many questions, but for the most part, the discussion went smoothly with very little disagreement."

The upper left corner of the page contains a directional guide, with each school in its respective position. The first open-school plan had David and Dragman designated as pre-kindergarten through grade three elementary schools with early childhood emphases, and Carmona Elementary designated for grades 4-6. The second plan had Dragman as a pre-kindergarten through grade two site with David housing grades three and four both sites would emphasize Communicative or Language Arts. Carmona Elementary would house grades five and six. The third plan had Davis as a kindergarten through grade six bilingual elementary facility, Dragman as a kindergarten through grade six Language and Social Science elementary, and Carmona as a kindergarten through grade six "back-to-basics" elementary.
Figure 7. Alternative open-school plans.
The fourth plan had David as a pre-kindergarten through grade six bilingual elementary, Carmona as a grade four through six intermediate learning center, and Dragman as a pre-kindergarten through grade three early-childhood learning center. The fifth open-school option had David as a pre-kindergarten through grade five bilingual elementary school, Dragman as a pre-kindergarten through grade two early childhood learning center, Carmona as a grade three through five intermediate learning center, and Saddle as a middle school for grades six through eight. The sixth open-school option had David as pre-kindergarten through grade five bilingual school, Dragman as pre-kindergarten through grade three school, Carmona as grades four through six school, and Saddle as a middle school for grades six through eight.

A School Option Rank Sheet (see Figure 8), was the voting ballot used by parents to select and rank their preferences from the six school options. The Subcommittee instructed parents to write their selections in order in the blanks with one being the favorite choice and six being the least favorite choice. After completing all six blanks, parents then wrote their signatures on the blank line provided on the lower right corner of the ballot.

On November 27, 1979, the Subcommittee held meetings at each school, with different members from the steering
SCHOOL OPTION RANK SHEET

1. __________________________________________

2. __________________________________________

3. __________________________________________

4. __________________________________________

5. __________________________________________

6. __________________________________________

Parent of David, Dragman, or Carmona

Figure 8. School Option Rank Sheet.
committee were sent to David, Dragman and Carmona. The "open school plan" was presented to them along with the voting ballots. Voting took place that evening results were compiled and presented at the general meeting on November 28, 1979.

**Wednesday, November 28, 1979**

Voting results of the David School parents were tabulated by the Subcommittee for each school and presented at the Wednesday, November 28, 1979 meeting (see Figure 9). The vertical columns for each plan were totaled at the bottom of the grid. These results (from highest to lowest number of points) were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A closer look at the grid will reveal that parents overwhelmingly chose plan #4 as their first choice, with 54 votes. (The tally marks in the upper left corner were used initially to count votes, but found to be ineffective as the number of votes increased.)

Voting results for Dragman Elementary were also tabulated and distributed at the general meeting on Wednesday, November 28, 1979 (see Figure 10). As their
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**DAVID**

**PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9.** David ranking plans.
For two people none of the choices was acceptable.

Figure 10. Dragman ranking plans.
first preference, Dragman parents overwhelmingly selected plan #4 (48 votes). Thus, both groups strongly favored one proposal.

The voting results at Carmona Elementary were tabulated on November 26, 1979, and presented on November 28, 1979. (see Figure 11). As their first preference, parents were evenly divided between plans #3 and #4 (30 votes each). Overall, plan #4 did receive a higher point total. Unlike the parents at David and Dragman, the votes for the six plans were more evenly distributed, although plan #4 was the favorite.

The Plans Rankings (voting results) are compiled in Figure 12. Each school is listed and has the six plan options ranked from the most popular (at top) to the least popular (bottom). Parents from all three schools selected plan #4 as the first preference. The second preference of parents was plan #3. Parents from Carmona and David both ranked plans 1, 2, 5, and 6 as their third through sixth preferences. Parents from Dragman selected plans 6, 2, 5, and 1 as their third through sixth preferences. While parents at all three schools selected identical plans as their first and second preferences (plans #4 and #3), parents at two schools (Carmona and David) were consistent in selecting identical plans for their third through sixth preferences (1, 2, 5, and 6).
Figure 11. Carmona ranking plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CARMONA</th>
<th>DRAGMAN</th>
<th>DAVID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Ranking plans for Carmona, Dragman, and David.
When the voting results were presented to parents of the three schools at Dragman Elementary that evening, a group of parents were dissatisfied with the voting results. They argued that all parents had not had an opportunity to vote. In *Estas son tus Esucuelas*, the final report submitted to the District Facilities Utilization Committee, an addendum to the plan component (with a summary of minutes for voting procedures that evening) reported this background information:

Several parents at Dragman School were concerned about the fact that only a few parents had voted for the plans presented on 11/27/79. They did not think those parents represented the feelings of the majority of parents at Dragman. They called an additional meeting of parents only at which they could be given the opportunity to vote. Parents felt excluded from the voting and wanted another vote for those who had not voted.

A subsequent meeting was held on December 3, 1979 at Dragman Elementary. Nine parents attended and submitted their votes while one parent brought seven "proxy" votes. The addendum reported that, "... one of the parents suggested that this vote be combined with the previous Dragman vote to come out with a plan that Drachman parents would support."

Final voting were compiled and presented at the Steering Committee meeting on December 5, 1979 (see following page for compilation of final results). Parents selected plan number four (113 votes). Under that plan, David Bilingual Elementary School would have bilingual
classes at all grade levels (grades K-6), Dragman Elementary would have a bilingual strand (class) at each grade level (K-3), and Carmona Elementary would have a bilingual strand (class) at each grade level (4-6). Plan #3 was their second preference with 97 votes. Voting results from November 27, 1979 reveal that plan #4 remained the most popular, with all other plans receiving fewer than 20 votes. Voting results from December 3, 1979 reveal that plans #3 and #4 were the most popular, but #3 received the most votes. As totals for both voting dates were used, plan #4 was considered the overall most popular choice among parents at all three schools. The plan ranking for both dates revealed identical results for parent choices of plans the first, second and third choices (4, 3, 6) remained the same in spite of a second vote on December 6, 1979 (see Figure 13).

Richardo Moldina and Rodolfo Gonzales both favored a plan that had David Elementary designated as a K-6 bilingual school. Both plans 3 and 4 had it as a bilingual site. However, Tomas Gamez recalled that the Subcommittee had to, "... make sure the programs went beyond bilingualism and make sure the programs succeeded." Ben Gaxiola also recalled that, "It was more of a selling job than anything" when Molina explained the plans to parents of the three
### VOTING RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes of 11-27-79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes of 12-6-79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLAN RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As of 11-27-79</th>
<th>As of 12-6-79*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Modified to combine the votes from both meetings.

---

**Figure 13.** Voting results, plan ranking.
schools. Molina recalled that, "East side Anglo parents liked the idea of early childhood education. We knew that would be a plus to attract Anglos." As he focused on the early childhood component for Dragman, neighborhood parents appeared to follow his lead and voted for plan 4.

Prior to the 11/28/79 general meeting, the Advisory Council met and derived a list of premises on which the philosophies and curricula of the schools would be based (see Appendix D). A closer examination of the list revealed that the goals were general enough to apply to any of the six plans that neighborhood parents chose after voting. Tomas Gamez recalled that the goals were designed by the Advisory Council to, "... create sound educational programs of such quality that east side Anglos and minority children would benefit from the programs." The list was presented to parents at this meeting. Like the previous list derived from the Advisory Council, many statements mirrored the ideas of Ricardo Molina and Rodolfo Gonzales. Very little disagreement took place as the Council had similar philosophical beliefs about bilingual education. Ricardo Molina described the Advisory Council meetings in an interview in February 1991, "We stacked the EAC (Educational Advisory Council) to obtain their goals (Gonzales and Molina). The members knew what we needed to
do." The statements are not in priority ratings (see Appendix D).

The first section, called "considerations," emphasized "quality education", as had the original list of needs and goals from the Advisory Council. The second section, "premises and considerations" stressed the importance of a maintenance bilingual model, "The curriculum should build upon and maintain the students' language and culture" (also emphasized in the first list generated by the Advisory Council). The need to increase student achievement (a goal of the Mexican-American plaintiffs) and an all school philosophical commitment to the maintenance bilingual model is also reflected in the second and third section of the list:

- Develop oral language in all curricular areas, Spanish/English. . . . Total staff . . . compatible to assessed needs and school's goals.
- Teachers should have special skills, i.e., bilingual. Increase school achievement significantly.

As stated earlier, each list mirrored the programmatic ideas of Molina and Gonzales. Martinez and Advisory Council members explained the list to parents at the meeting on November 28, 1979.

Wednesday, December 5, 1979

At the Subcommittee's Steering Committee meeting, members were apprised of the voting results and the list of
premises and considerations that had been presented to parents at the November 28 general meeting. Richardo Molina recalled the steps in the planning process, "The primary function of the steering committee was to make sure timelines and our list of goals was met." More importantly though was the fact that the Educational Advisory Council had devised educational plans and curricula for David, Dragman, and Carmona which were subject to the Steering Committee's approval. The plans were approved unanimously, as Molina described in his interview:

... our goals were attained. We integrated the maintenance bilingual model at David and we had some form of maintenance at Dragman and Carmona. The educational plans were approved unanimously.

At the next general meeting on Wednesday, December 12, the Educational Advisory Council would present the curriculum plans for the three schools to the parents.

**Wednesday, December 12, 1979**

The last general meeting held at David Elementary had one purpose: to present the educational plans to the neighborhood parents of the three schools. Richardo Molina recalled that, "... once we had the package compiled for DDC (David, Dragman, and Carmona), the Facilities Committee passed the plan (Wednesday, January 9, 1980) and Rodolfo (Gonzales) took care of the Board's role." The subsequent section explains in detail each program. The programs were approved by the Governing Board on February 4, 1980 (see
Phase III section for summary of Board action and approval) and by Judge Frey on February 24, 1980.

Educational Programs

The educational programs for David, Dragman, and Carmona were developed by the Educational Advisory Council. The educational programs were the fundamental framework from which the Council, along with parents, staff, and appropriate District support, continued working to further develop the programs. The curricula for the three schools stem from the 13 goals outlined by the Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools and the premises/considerations generated by the Educational Advisory Council. Saddle Middle School was addressed later by the Subcommittee, and the process followed similar guidelines in the development of their program.

David Elementary School

David was built as a five room school in 1901. Six classrooms were added in 1908 and other improvements brought the school to a total of 17 classrooms in 1950. Two classrooms were converted to cafeteria and auditorium use in 1954. No portables have ever been needed. The campus currently encompasses 2.9 acres.

Table 8 reveals the demographic changes David has gone through during the 15 year period since the filing of the lawsuit in 1974.
Table 8. Demographic changes David has gone through since 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minorities</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures above reveal a disproportionately high minority student population, especially high in Mexican-American students in spite of the court's order to integrate the school. In addition, Davis is currently below the target enrollment number of 300 students needed to maintain the school's operation pursuant to the District's policy plan. Although the number of Mexican-American students has decreased from 90.7% in 1974-75 to the current 65.1%, the current percentage nevertheless indicate a substantial majority of Mexican-American students in a school mandated to be desegregated under a 1978 court order.

The educational program at David consists of a total bilingual or maintenance program with development and
maintenance of two languages and two cultures as a goal in grades pre-kindergarten through sixth, as opposed to the focus on remediation and transition to English classes that had been done in the past. The languages used for instruction are Spanish and English. A bicultural approach is also employed (the Mexican-American culture and the dominant culture of our society).

The David program was designed primarily for the David area children, second for the Carmona area children, and third for students outside of the schools' attendance/residential areas. The operational definition still adhered to today is as follows:

Bilingual/bicultural education is an education process by which a selection of educational objectives are taught in two languages; educational content is learned through two languages; cognitive skills are learned two languages; self-concept is enhanced to learning needs; and with culture, as content and process, permeating and facilitating the above areas.

The bilingual maintenance program was categorized into different components as shown in Appendix E.

Dragman and Carmona Elementary Schools

Dragman Elementary was designed to be a primary school (grades K-3), and Carmona Elementary was designed as an intermediate grade school (grades 4-6). Document analysis revealed that both schools were planned together during Phase III to provide a continuum for grades K-6. Thus, the
two schools' pedagogical and curricular programs are interconnected.

Both Dragman and Carmona Schools were built in the early 1900's. Dragman was built as a four room school in 1901, and additions were built in 1908, 1927, and 1936, after a fire destroyed 80 percent of the building in 1948. In 1950, it was rebuilt with 17 classrooms. No portables have ever been used, which is not surprising as the school has remained below the 300 student minimal established for Phase III. The campus encompasses 1.8 acres. Carmona School was built with 12 classrooms in 1930, and four classrooms were added in 19339. No portables have been used, for much the same reason as at Dragman. This campus encompasses approximately 4.5 acres, the largest of the three schools.

Like David Elementary School, Dragman has experienced demographic shifts, with some growth in its enrollment since 1974 (See Table 9). The asterisked percentage reflects an enrollment below the minimum enrollment figure of 300 students for each of the three schools. The totals for both Black and Mexican-American students decreased, although only four percent for Mexican-Americans across the 16 years. As with Davis, Dragman experienced an increase in the Anglo student population, rising to 23.8% in 1985-86. However, a sharp decline occurred during the last five year period,
Table 9. Dragman demographic shifts since 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minorities</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-9.5%*</td>
<td>185*</td>
<td>294*</td>
<td>278*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resulting in a 14.7% non-minority population for the 1989-90 school year. More importantly, although the Mexican-American student population has experienced a decrease since 1974, they still represent the largest student population in the school with 69.4%. In addition, the total student population figure experienced a decrease in a five year period between 1985-86 through 1989-90. One might note that the ten percent increase in Anglos accomplished since 1974-75 is largely a result of reduced enrollment of Black students.

Among the three schools, Carmona Elementary has achieved the most integrated setting. The chart below depicts the growth that has occurred at the school (See Table 10).

The "Other", or White, student population experienced substantial growth by 1985-86 and maintained that to date, while the Native American and Black student populations experienced an initial decline, followed by an increase by 1989-90. The Mexican-American student population has decreased markedly, but continues to constitute a significant percentage of the total population at Carmona. Consequently, unlike David and Dragman Schools, Carmona Elementary School has maintained the most integrated setting thus far. With respect to the total enrollment figures for
Table 10. Carmona Elementary growth since 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minorities</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-13.5%*</td>
<td>217*</td>
<td>261*</td>
<td>249*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the three schools, David, Dragman, and Carmona Elementary Schools all remain below the total enrollment figure of 300 students set by the District, according to the Enrollment Policy as depicted in Figure 14. Indeed, with the exception of David in 1985-86, none of the schools ever achieved that goal during the sample school years.

The original plan for the educational programs at these schools reflect those areas believed to be critical for successful programs. The following categories of curriculum are applicable both to Dragman and Carmona unless otherwise noted (see Appendix F).
PROPOSED DISTRICT POLICY

Optimal Enrollment 70% - 100% rated Designed Capacity

Below 70% = Underenrolled

Two-year enrollment goal for remaining existing facility

*The school years as illustrated on this graph are not to be a binding recommendation but are intended to merely demonstrate the need for increased enrollment. Exact recommendation is in the recommendations section.

Figure 14. Proposed district policy.
Saddle Middle School

Saddle Middle School was founded in 1918 and is located in the center of the Armory Park Historic District of the city (see Figure 15). The details of the educational plan for the proposed magnet school were developed by a group of parents and the staff at Safford. A list of recommendations applicable to middle school grades was derived that reflected many of Molina and Gonzales' ideas:

1. Saddle should remain open as a middle school.
2. The development of the alternative program at Saddle must recognize and incorporate the educational needs of the school's attendance zone population.
3. Recognizing that curriculum enhancement and flexibility of programming is the key to increasing enrollment and striving to obtain a racially integrated setting, the following options should be explored: a) community survey to determine which programs will attract non-minority students from other school attendance areas, b) combination of a basic curriculum and an elective curriculum through the needs identified from the survey, c) possibility of including physical education, year-round school, classical, society sciences, bilingual education, and mastery learning, d) and explore different methods of scheduling, i.e., an extended day program.
4. Alternative Program should be developed to attract non-minority students to Safford to desegregate the school.
5. The Saddle complex should be renovated for health and safety purposes, for new and existing programs and for the total educational environment.
6. Boundary change to the west to accommodate the expected new enrollment of that area should be explored.
7. Feasibility of the alternative use of a summer school program as part of the year-round school should be explored.
Figure 15. Middle school attendance areas.
8. Feasibility of a parent education training center should be explored.
9. An eastside magnet at the middle school level should not be considered at this time as an alternative to decrease minority enrollment.
10. Saddle Middle School should be considered a "new" school for staffing purposes and all positions should be declared open.

Like the three elementary schools, Saddle also emerged as a "new school" during the planning stages. Among the more salient features in the list was the recommendation to integrate the school (as the student population was predominately Mexican-American), the need for more specialization areas and the recommendation to recognize the needs of neighborhood (minority) students.

In the 15 year period following the lawsuit, the demographic pattern for Saddle Middle School appears to have a more integrated setting than previous years (See Table 11)

In 1974 the total enrollment figure reflects a decrease in enrollment from the previous school year in the years following the lawsuit, a continual increase in enrollment occurred while, at the same time, the overall student population shows a more integrated setting than previous years would indicate. However, increased Anglo enrollments again were offset by Black losses.

The educational plan for Saddle Magnet Middle School was submitted to the Judge for approval on March 10, 1981. The report consisted of four parts: Purpose, Student
Table 11. Demographic pattern for Saddle Middle School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minorities</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-4 %*</td>
<td>323*</td>
<td>507*</td>
<td>596*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population, Curriculum/Instruction Program, and Support Programs. In an interview with Gonzales, he described Safford's later inclusion in Phase III, "Once David, Dragman, and Carmona were finished (school plans), the Saddle plan was included in Phase III due to parent request." Moreover, Molina recalled the event leading to addition of Saddle to the Phase III plan:

Linda Reyes was an active parent from the Saddle area and it was she who gave the push to include Saddle in Phase III. We used the same integration figures (75% minority and 25% non-minority) and the goals for the Subcommittee to develop their plan.

The educational plan gave a detailed account of the various aspects of the middle school program (see Appendix G). In the purpose statement, four programs are listed: Environmental Education, Computer Instruction, Fine Arts, and Bilingual Education (intended to maintain the dual language or maintenance model). Like the three elementary schools, Saddle provided, "bilingual/bicultural education . . . as an integral part of the total curriculum. . . .

Additionally, though, Safford provided a more comprehensive program by emphasizing Computer Instruction, Environmental Education and Fine Arts as opposed to the early childhood and intermediate grade emphasis of David and Dragman. Saldate recalled:

The Saddle plan was intended to serve as a continuum for students from bilingual programs at the three elementary schools. We also added
'extras' to attract east side children. We wanted the school to have a maintenance model for those who desired that and an ESL component for neighborhood kids who needed it.

Tomas Gamez recalled, "Safford was the first middle school with a bilingual program that was not transitional to serve our kids, but the school also had other programs such as Computer Instruction (see Appendix H). After examining all four school curricula plans and from interviews with committee members, it would appear that a dual language approach is provided in grades K-8 at all four schools in Phase III. Additionally, resource people were used in the planning and implementation of the educational plan as Reading, SESD (Standard English as a Second Dialect), Learning Disabled (LD), School Resource Officer, Librarian, Counselors, Curriculum Specialists, Indian Education Project Specialist, and a Nurse were integral to the successful implementation of the program. Other resource people were provided with the assistance of central administrators.

Public Relations Campaign: Magnet Schools

Due to the extensive amount of planning and timelines for approval of Phase III, SSD did not begin its recruitment campaign to attract non-minority students to the four schools (David, Dragman, Carmona, and Saddle) until spring 1981. In a memo that delineated timelines for implementation of Phase III, the public process (planning process of Subcommittee and Advisory Council) lasted from
November 1979 through September 5, 1980, which was the date of the final court hearing for approval of the Phase III plan. The memo also gave dates of the recruitment campaign, "Preparation of brochures and applications begins on March 1, 1981 and (letters of) acceptance begins on April 1, 1981" as SSD, "faced . . . a May 31 deadline for attracting 155 Anglo students . . . as ordered by the U. S. District Court" (Southwest Daily Citizen, 3/24/81).

Various newspaper articles document the progress of SSD in its endeavor to attract a 25% non-minority population for David, Dragman, Carmona Elementary schools. Very little information was reported as to the progress at Saddle Middle School, except in an article from the Southwest Daily Citizen on April 28, 1981. The article stated, "... these students from the three schools might eventually go to Saddle Junior High as a continuation of the programs at the three schools." On March 24, 1981, the Southwest Daily Citizen reported in "3 inner-city schools seeking transfers" that SSD officials were beginning its campaign for, "... 155 Anglo students . . . seeking applications for voluntary transfers to the inner-city David, Dragman, and Carmona Elementary schools." The article also reported that:

They hope to lure the Anglos through such "extras" as small class sizes, an innovative curriculum and extended-day program for children of working parents. . . . items many students don't have at their home schools. Such programs were successful in attracting transfers to Horton and Hollinger
"magnet" schools which required significantly more transfer students two years ago. Both now have waiting lists.

On March 24, 1981 in "SSD using mail, malls to attract Anglos to 3 schools," the Apache Daily Star reported that, "As part of the third and final phase of limited desegregation, Carmona, David, and Dragman Elementary schools are to open in the falls 'new' schools."

Furthermore, the article also stated:

The campaign that began with yesterday's 'traveling press conference' will include mailings to parents and presentations to chapter of the School-Community Partnership Council. On some weekends, the three (new) principals will hawk their schools in shopping malls.

As can be seen, a large scale campaign was designed to attract the 25% non-minority population at each of the three schools required by Judge Frey's order. Tomas Gamez recalled that the Subcommittee, "... made sure the schools succeeded by offering other incentives besides bilingual education. The programs needed to go beyond bilingual education." Gaxiola recalled that these incentives included, "... small classes, fulltime teacher aides, bilingual education, extended day, and specialists in music, P.E."

On March 25, 1981 from an editorial, "Three schools with a difference" (Apache Daily Star) revealed the quotas needed for each school as, "... 60 Anglo pupils each for Carmona and Dragman ... and 35 for David Elementary School..."
to provide better racial balance at the three downtown area schools to comply with a settlement of a desegregation lawsuit." The article then described the three "new" school programs:

... David ... will offer a K-6 program in both Spanish and English. It is a unique opportunity for parents who want their children to take full advantage of learning a second language in a community whose heritage is rich in Spanish-language culture.

Dragman will offer a special early-learning center for preschool through grade 3. And at Carrillo, an intermediate-learning center for grades 4-6 will complement the Dragman program.

The editorial ends with a final incentive for attracting the non-minority student population, "... the program will offer academic advantages to both Anglo and minority children."

In spite of the District's recruitment efforts, the Southwest Daily Citizen on April 28, 1981 reported that SSD's recruitment campaign was not as successful as hoped in, "New SSD magnet schools not drawing enough Anglos":

With only a month remaining before a deadline ordered by the U. S. District Court, two inner-city elementary schools ... attracted fewer than one-third of the Anglo volunteer transfer students they need to comply with a desegregation plan this fall.

Moreover, the article reported that the three schools were below the required numbers reported in earlier articles:

David ... has attracted only 10 of the 35 Anglo students needed to raise its enrollment to 25% non-minority. Carmona ... so far has signed up
20 of the 60 required Anglo students. Dragman . . . is doing better attracting 47 of the 60 Anglo students.

The article explained the advantage of voluntary transfers (Anglos) to the three schools:

Despite discontent in many SSD schools over the belt-tightening measure adopted by the Superintendent (Dr. Gage), few parents are voluntarily moving children to schools not affected by cutbacks . . . David, Dragman, and Carmona are virtually immune from the cutbacks (fewer teachers, teacher aides and larger classes). Principals in those schools have federal desegregation funding and know SSD officials can't skimp on programs once approved by the court.

The gloomy outcomes portrayed in this article was reiterated in a somewhat similar manner in a later article in the Apache Daily Star.

On April 29, 1981, the Apache Daily Star in "Inner-city schools drawing Anglos, principals say" reported that, "Special programs offered at David, Dragman, and Carmona Elementary Schools are finally starting to draw needed Anglo children." The article then described the District's situation in complying with a court order:

. . . only a little more than a month remains for voluntary desegregation at the three inner-city schools. Principals . . . say they are confident they will enroll enough Anglos to meet their quotas. If SSD officials are unable to show the U. S. District Court a list of at least 60 new registrants for Drachman, 60 for Carmona and 30 for David by May 31, the District may have to resort to less appealing methods to establish ethnic balance (busing).
Despite the newspaper's skepticism with respect to the recruitment campaign, SSD administrators continued to remain optimistic in the effort to recruit the 25% non-minority populations at the inner-city schools. Eugene Benton, newly appointed Regional Assistant Superintendent for David, Dragman, and Carmona was quoted in the article as saying:

The numbers are not, at this point, what we want them to be. I am optimistic that another month should be enough to bring in the required number of Anglos . . . a clause in the court's approval of the DDC plan allows the District to request a 45 day extension if it has made significant progress toward the quotas, but has come up short at the deadline.

At the same time, however, District memoranda reveal a more positive outlook toward the recruitment campaign.

In a memorandum dated April 30, 1881, to then Superintendent Merrill Gage from Roberto Baez (Community-School Representative for SSD), the following information was reported as to the status of the recruitment campaign:

The campaign is going strong and ahead of schedule despite the Southwest Daily Citizen's tone. The latest DDC count as of April 30, 1981 is: David 17, Dragman 70 (met quota), and Carmona 32.

A status report sheet issued on May 15, 1981 for David, Dragman, and Carmona, reporting the numbers of applications received and accepted for the three schools, revealed that the District had met the court stipulated quotas (Anglo student enrollment) for each school: David 53, Dragman 112,
and Carmona 79. the last planning stage in Phase III was now complete.

Summary

This chapter has provided a detailed account of the history of Southwest School District, the physical description of the District, recounting of the events in the Adams-Celaya desegregation case from the perspective of the Mexican-American plaintiffs and other key participants, description of the remedy used in the case (Phase I, II, and III), and a description of the four schools and the educational program changes as a result of the lawsuit. Though still in place today, the programs at each school have not succeeded in achieving fully integrated settings. In fact, enrollment continues to decline in spite of District efforts to improve the educational environment at each school.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, OBSERVATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research was to describe the implementation of Phase III of Adams-Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) as well as the events leading to this phase from the perspective of the Mexican Americans. The study was framed by the following questions:

1. Was bilingual education implemented along with desegregation after the Adams-Celaya lawsuit?
2. Did the district deal primarily with linguistic or desegregative needs of Mexican American students?

This chapter will address the two research questions, note key observations and implications, and suggest directions for future research.

Research Question #1: Was bilingual education implemented along with desegregation after the Adams-Celaya v. Southwest School District (1978) lawsuit? The San Jose Plan described by Arias (1990) and the Denver Plan in Denver v. Keyes (1973) both included bilingual education as part of the court-ordered remedy. Arias' (1990) study of San Jose Unified School District's desegregation plan analyzed a
desegregation plan that included bilingual education as part of the instructional component. Although she does not describe the types of bilingual programs used in the San Jose Plan, she contends that these programs are essential in addressing the needs of Mexican-American students. The Denver Plan involved the modification of an existing transitional model as the court found numerous weaknesses in the District's implementation of the bilingual program. The transitional model uses the student's first language to facilitate mastery of both content area skills and English fluency with the purpose of eventually mainstreaming the student to classes for native speakers (Fradd, 1987). Among the weaknesses found in the existing model were:

1. Lack of a standard method for assessing teachers' bilingual competencies (oral and written) as a requisite for a bilingual teaching assignment.

2. Teacher assignment to schools based on seniority of teachers per consensus agreement as opposed to programmatic need.

3. ESL teachers had little if any training in ESL theory and methodology and many did not speak a second language.

4. Lack of testing methods for placement of LEP students.
5. Lack of testing and testing results in remedial programs in reading and writing of English.


7. Lack of consideration of LAU classification in pupil assignment (placement in appropriate levels).

The Denver Plan required modification of the existing model in order to comply with the desegregation remedy. The San Jose Plan required student reassignment as well as implementation of bilingual education.

Southwest School District's desegregation plan is similar to the Denver Plan in that both school districts had bilingual programs in the districts prior to Denver v. Keyes (1983) and Adams-Celaya v. SSD (1978). In the case of SSD, the focus of bilingual education shifted after the court decision from a transitional model to a maintenance model. Cummins (1990) defines maintenance model as designed to develop students' fluency in the first language (L1) while they learn English (L2). The SSD desegregation remedy for Phase III infused bilingual education in the curricula of four schools in the inner city of Southwest:

1. David (Grades K-6) - Maintenance Bilingual Program

2. Dragman (Grades K-3) - Includes a bilingual component at each level
3. Carmona (Grades 4-6) - Includes a bilingual component at each level
4. Saddle Middle School (Grades 6-8) - Incorporates a bilingual strand at each level

The desegregation remedy for Phase III included a maintenance bilingual model for grades K-8. Rodolfo Gonzales, a former board member, expressed his disappointment that, "... a more comprehensive bilingual approach was not adopted, one that encompassed more schools, elementary through high school levels" as he felt this was an inherent weakness in Phase III.

Like the court ordered remedies in San Jose and Denver, Southwest School District's desegregation remedy included bilingual education; however, this methodology was not an integral part of the remedy in this case until Phase III. At this point, the Educational Advisory Council worked diligently with parent groups of the three schools (David, Dragman and Carmona) to insure that bilingual education was infused in the curricula. Saddle Middle School was addressed separately; the decision to incorporate a bilingual strand in the school was made earlier and had not encountered the decisiveness among parent groups that occurred in the three elementary schools during the planning process.
Indeed, SSD's desegregation plan followed Arias' (1990) notion that an appropriate instructional component must be included with a student reassignment plan in the designing of a desegregation plan for Mexican-American students. SSD's Phase III planning process consisted of a series of four meetings in which the Educational Advisory Council presented their educational plans to the parent groups at David, Dragman and Carmona Elementary Schools. Bilingual education was the philosophy adopted for the four schools by Rodolfo Gonzales, Ricardo Molena and the Educational Advisory Council. In the case of Southwest School District, the bilingual education focus shifted significantly from a remediation, transitional bilingual education model to a maintenance bilingual model designed to enrich and enhance the education of Mexican American students. SSD's implementation of bilingual education in Phase III schools was an attempt to address the linguistic needs of Mexican American students.

Research Question #2: Did the district deal primarily with linguistic or desegregative needs of Mexican American students?

A prevailing theme in Arias' (1990) study is that desegregation as it relates to Mexican American students must go beyond traditional student reassignment strategies to include appropriate language components. In Phases I and
II, SSD dealt primarily with desegregation of schools in the district as opposed to the educative needs of Mexican American students. In fact, in an interview in September 1990, former board member Rodolfo Gonzales, described the effects of Phase I on Mexican American students:

"Phase I involved closure of Spring, Parker, and Coronado Heights schools, all minority populated. Mexican American students were involuntarily bussed to eastside schools."

In another interview, Richardo Molina (former chairman of the Subcommittee for Inner-City Schools and the Educational Advisory Council) recalled the effects of Phase II on Mexican-American students, "In Phase II the burden (bussing) fell on our (Mexican-American) kids. East side schools may as well have been a foreign country to them." Not until Phase III were linguistic and desegregative needs of the Mexican-American student population addressed directly in the court-ordered process.

Arias (1990) gives three considerations for a desegregation plan for Mexican American students:

1. Demographics
2. Desegregation vs. Bilingual Education
3. Controlled Choice System

These three considerations are integral parts of a desegregation remedy for a triethnic district such as SSD that has a rapidly growing Mexican American student population.
Demographic growth is the first consideration, as the ethnic composition of a school district largely determines what the remedy must encompass in a desegregation case such as *Adams-Celaya v. SSD* (1978). In the four schools of Phase III a significantly high Mexican American student population remains despite SSD's efforts to integrate these schools. Moreover, with the exception of Saddle Middle School, overall enrollment at the three elementary schools continues to decline.

Demographic figures for the three elementary schools would seem to indicate they are resegregating again (see Table 12).

All three schools have experienced a drop in the overall enrollment over the fifteen year period following the lawsuit. In addition, minority student populations continue to grow at David and Dragman, and while Carmona maintains the most integrated school, it is still predominately minority-populated. Demographics of SSD seem to indicate that resegregation is occurring and will continue to do so unless the district explores options to reintegrate the student populations at these schools.

To a large extent, the demographics of linguistic minorities in the three elementary schools in this case shaped the court-ordered desegregation remedy. Where traditional pupil reassignment alone does not resolve
Table 12  Demographics for David, Dragman, and Carmona.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>David</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex. Amer.</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minor.</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dragman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex. Amer.</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>65 %</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minor.</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer.</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex. Amer.</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minor.</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
educational dilemmas, as discovered in the *Denver v. Keyes* (1973) case, SSD implemented an instructional component (the maintenance model used in bilingual education), in addition to student reassignment. Thus, the remedy was more complex than past desegregative remedies.

The controversy over Bilingual Education versus Desegregation is the second consideration that has been discussed in numerous articles and papers (Arias 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1984, 1986; Carter and Segura, 1979; Baez, et. al, 1985; Fradd, 1986; Fradd and Vega, 1986; Tregar, 1983). Scholars such as Arias (1986, 1990) and Orfield (1986) contend that the goals of bilingual education and desegregation are not mutually exclusive; rather, in a desegregation plan for language minority students, the remedy must go beyond integration strategies to include instructional components appropriate for the needs of the Mexican American student population such as bilingual education.

The SSD desegregation remedy did not fuse the goals of bilingual education and desegregation until Phase III. At present, the four schools have a bilingual component designed to maintain two languages through grade eight (at Saddle Middle School). Worth noting, however, is that while a maintenance bilingual program is available to majority and minority students, the presently declining enrollment and
resegregation occurring at these schools indicates racial isolation will be a factor to contend with in the near future. On the other hand, there has been relatively little community discomfort or anger over the latter phases of desegregation. The local communities of the Phase III schools seem contented that the programs there maintain a focus on Mexican American culture and the Spanish language.

The third consideration in Arias (1990) study is the "controlled choice" option used in the desegregation plan in San Jose School District. An "Assignment Center" is used for registration and school placement in the district where parents can select the school their children attend. San Jose Unified School District achieved 100% integration as ordered by a federal court in 1985 (Arias, 1990). Thus far, integration efforts in that district, which were overseen by a court-appointed Monitor, have been successful in reducing racial isolation as well as addressing the linguistic needs of Mexican American students.

Southwest School District originally used Phase I, II and III as their desegregation remedy. The first two phases involved familiar integration strategies (school closings, involuntary busing), but Phase III focused on both instructional strategies and integration considerations for the Mexican American student population. The four schools David, Dragman, Carmona, and Saddle were designated as
magnet schools with a bilingual program or component infused in the curricula. Students from other areas in SSD were able to attend after parents put their names placed on a "waiting list". Nonminority students from other areas in the district were given preference as one goal was to integrate the schools. As stated earlier, based on demographic comparisons of the twelve year period following the lawsuit, the three elementary schools appear to be resegregating even though the District offers incentives such as extended day, smaller class sizes, etc. designed to attract majority students from the east side of the district.

In later years, other desegregation schools were designated magnet schools, as well as some other non-desegregation schools. SSD also established a Magnet School Office with a full time coordinator whose job is to ensure that enrollment at the schools is integrated and that all students are treated equitably. These schools are scattered throughout the District:

Phase I

1. Hully Elementary
2. Kennedy Park Elementary
3. Glenman Elementary
4. Bragin Elementary
5. Toolen Middle School
6. Maxis Middle School
7. Lanzo Elementary
8. Bennon Elementary

Phase II
9. Horton Primary Magnet (Grades K-3)
10. Hollinger Intermediate Magnet (Grades K and 4-6)
11. Ft. Lowe Elementary
12. Howell Elementary
13. Kellogg Elementary
14. Mannner Middle School
15. Township Middle School
16. Sutterback Middle School
17. Gail Middle School

Phase III
18. David Bilingual Magnet (Grades K-6)
19. Dragman Primary Magnet (Grades K-3)
20. Carmona Intermediate Magnet (Grades 4-6)
21. Saddle Magnet Middle School (Grades 6-8)

Additional Magnets after Adams-Celaya:
22. Monillas Basic Curriculum
23. Boone-Lickett Math/Science Magnet (Grades K-8)
24. Southwest High Fine Arts Magnet High School

As can be seen, the desegregation remedy for integration has expanded beyond the original three phases. The magnet school approach adopted by SSD is similar to the controlled
choice option used in San Jose except that magnet school options in SSD focus on various curricular emphases such as Fine Arts, Math, Science, Computer Technology, and Bilingual Education just to name a few.

Policy Implications

Arias (1990) discussed three components that contributed to the effectiveness of the desegregation plan for Mexican American students in San Jose School District: 1) controlled choice system for integration 2) appropriate instructional strategies and 3) demographic considerations. SSD had a similar approach with its desegregation remedy in Phase III: 1) magnet schools to integrate (inner-city schools) and 2) instructional component of bilingual education, and 3) focus on linguistic and desegregative needs of Mexican-American students (in Phase III). One other criterion she discusses that is critical for a desegregation plan for Mexican American students is parent participation. In Phase III of SSD's desegregation plan, parents were involved in various aspects of the planning that occurred. For example, parents held meetings to determine which site would serve different grade levels, which alternative plan (of six options) would serve as the Phase III plan for the three schools, and what building improvements were needed at each site. Parents were
actively involved in many decisions that became policy in SSD.

However, some parents believed the decisions were carefully orchestrated, and that parents were influenced to choose alternatives desired by key actors in the process. Indeed, two of the original plaintiffs the case expressed discouragement with the ultimate outcomes. The process was clearly managed adeptly and politically within the district. The Court permitted SSD to formulate a plan that diverged from its own preference. That opportunity was seized by bilingual education advocates to redirect the desegregation process towards creation of programs consistent with their education policy preferences. Educators within the district were recruited to design curricula and support the emerging strategies. Those who responded were subsequently rewarded for their cooperation with administrative posts. An internal and external coalition, then, formed to reorient desegregation from arguably anglo-oriented (or at least traditional) strategies to those that would bring the linguistic needs of Mexican American students (and the instructional preferences of the key actors) to the foreground.

Southwest School District faced staffing problems similar to those in Denver. Bilingual and ESL teachers were assigned to schools with bilingual programs according to
seniority per the districts' consensus agreements without the necessary bilingual or ESL endorsements. In Denver, the court identified this as a weakness to be corrected. In SSD, provisions were taken to insure that only staff members (teachers and administrators) with appropriate endorsements be considered for positions in bilingual programs irrespective of the seniority stipulation in the consensus agreement. According to District policy, any teacher or administrator in a bilingual program must have a bilingual or ESL endorsement in order to be considered for a position with the exception of those holding a provisional certificate and pursuing the endorsement at a university.

Another policy modification that occurred as a result of the desegregation lawsuit is known as the "new school" concept. Prior to the lawsuit, school staffs remained intact and only transfers or vacancies were filled as needed. The three elementary schools in Phase III were designated as "new schools". All positions were considered open, from custodial to principal, and all staff members who wished to remain were required to reapply for their positions at each of the three schools. The new school concept was later used in other schools throughout the District that were designated as magnets. Despite the teacher union and its consensus agreement stipulating that seniority and various other factors must be considered when
hiring teachers and support staff, the new school concept continues to be used by Southwest School District as an means of staffing new schools. This concept was critical to the recruitment of specialized administrators and faculty to the new Phase III magnets.

Southwest School District also significantly altered the focus of its bilingual program from a remedial, transition model to a maintenance model designed to build and retain students' first language. In the Denver desegregation case, although the District attempted to implement a transitional model of bilingual education, their efforts were not successful in that the court found numerous flaws in the implementation of bilingual programs. Among the weaknesses were: non-endorsed teachers placed in bilingual classrooms based on seniority in the District, lack of standard measuring instruments to base student placement in language programs and inadequately prepared teacher aides. Though Arias (1990) did not describe the extent or type of bilingual programs in San Jose, these programs were implemented in the District. The Educational Advisory Council in SSD followed the maintenance model and designed the programmatic details that emanated from it. Richard Martinez described the success he and the Advisory Council had when he stated, "We (Mexican-Americans) controlled Phase III."
Future Directions in Research

This study has described the Adams-Celaya desegregation case from the perspective of the Mexican American plaintiffs and the planning of Phase III of the remedy by those who were actively involved in this process. Demographics for each school was given for the fifteen year period following the lawsuit. This descriptive study may represent points of departure for others who wish to conduct further studies regarding desegregation and language minority students such as Mexican Americans.

Authorities in this field who discuss desegregation outcomes in articles contend that if a desegregation strategy does not have an appropriate instructional component, then student performance will not necessarily improve (Arias, 1986, 1990; Orfield, 1986, 1987; Fradd, 1986; Fradd and Vega, 1986; Carter and Segura, 1979). Arias (1990) points out other informal indices of improvement should be considered:

1. reduction in drop out rate
2. increased school attendance
3. increased parental participation
4. increased curricular offerings for minority students
5. increased number of students taking advanced placement classes or gaining admission to college (p. 25).

This study did not address the items listed above. SSD and other school districts in the southwest could examine the indices listed above through which they may ascertain whether or not a desegregation plan is effective for language minority students.

Additionally, for Mexican American students other informal indices that are important include: 1) access to bilingual education 2) access to ESL and 3) increased parental participation (Arias, 1990). While SSD included all three in the planning stages for Phase III, an interesting issue for this district and other districts in the southwest would be to explore the extent to which minority parents are currently participating in the four schools.

In the twelve year period following the Adams-Celaya lawsuit, few studies have been conducted to ascertain achievement levels of Mexican American students and their counterparts in Phase III. Coleman's (1985) dissertation examined reading achievement levels of Black students in desegregation schools within SSD. A detailed study of the schools in Phase III and Mexican American students is needed
to more accurately describe language minority student achievement levels in desegregated schools.

In light of the fact that the four schools in this study are experiencing a decline in enrollment, a future study might examine alternative reintegration strategies in a large triethnic school district under court mandated desegregation order. Moreover, instructional components appropriate for Mexican American students should be examined for effectiveness as Arias (1990) believes integration and bilingual education are compatible goals. Desegregation schools should be monitored yearly for effectiveness programatically and for compliance of integration.
APPENDIX A

ROLES OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED
## ROLES OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Fourteen individuals were interviewed for this project. Many were involved in the *Adams-Celaya v. SSD* desegregation case, some during and some after the court-mandated remedy. The following summary indicates the number of people interviewed who were able to address from personal experience the role categories noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Category</th>
<th>Number of Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board Members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents involved in Phase III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaintiffs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Administration (Principals)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PARENT'S LIST OF NEEDS
CONCERNS

A. Learning
   1. Child's experiential background.
   2. Total learning environment.
   3. Achievement

B. Staff
   1. Qualifications.
   2. Selection.
   3. Continued service training and support.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

A. Students - Assessed needs of students give direction to the entire educational effort.
   1. To utilize and maintain their language and culture.
   2. To develop self-direction.
   3. To develop self-discipline.
   4. To develop a positive attitude toward self and others.
   5. To develop a positive attitude toward learning.
   6. To utilize his particular learning style as well as acquire others.
   7. To increase his school achievement.
   8. To learn, extend and apply his basic skills.
   9. To develop their psychomotor, cognitive and affective potential.

B. Program - In order to fulfill assessed needs, program requirements must be addressed.
   1. A curriculum is needed that focuses on building upon the students' strengths and fulfilling the students' needs.
   2. A curriculum that utilizes, maintains and extends the child's language and culture.
   3. Adequate educational materials that are appropriate to all aspects of the instructional program, e.g., language, culture, levels, quality, quantity.
   4. Instructional approaches that are compatible to learning styles.
   5. A variety of planned educational experiences.
   6. A developmental program that minimizes remediation.
   7. A comprehensive language development program.
   8. Incorporation of Bilingual Instruction and Standard English as a Second Dialect.
   9. A comprehensive skill and concept development program.
10. An effective discipline policy.
11. A low pupil-teacher ratio.
12. An evaluation component that contributes to the students' learning.
13. Physical facilities to accommodate the program.

C. Staff - The qualifications of the staff are directly related to the needs of students, the program, the parents, and the community.
1. Assessed needs for students and program must be evidenced in the school's staff.
2. The total staff must be compatible to the assessed needs and schools' goals.
3. Certified personnel's qualifications should be commensurate with the educational program.
4. There should be effective communication among the total staff.
5. There must be a positive staff disposition toward the population being served and toward the educational program.
6. Selection and continuation of staff facilitate the on-going, multi-year nature of an effective educational program.
7. Personnel with curriculum specialties (e.g., music, art, P.E.) are needed.
8. Effective on-going inservice and support must be available for the staff.
9. Selection deadlines for staff must be as early as possible in order to plan, prepare and effectuate a successful education program.

D. Parents and Community - The role and participation of parents and other components of the community are essential to the total educational effort.
1. The home and parents need to be seen as positive sources of information and support to the educational program.
2. Involvement of parents in instructional, advisory and support capacities is necessary.
3. Education for parents to aid them in helping their children.
4. A planned program is needed with appropriated staff and support to assure effective parent participation.
5. The school is seen and functions as part of the immediate and extended community and should be available for community education and other service activities.
6. The immediate and extended community should be utilized as part of the curriculum.

GOALS

1. A learning environment will be developed in which the children's cultural, linguistic and historical experiences are integrated into the curriculum which will result in successful and active participants of the local and total community.
2. Children will develop a positive attitude toward self and others.
3. The children's strengths and needs will be incorporated into the curriculum to significantly increase academic achievement.
4. Students will learn concepts, content and basic skills.
5. Children will develop and learn to apply thinking skills such as problem-solving and decision-making.
6. Students will learn and apply social skills such as self-discipline, initiative and human relations skills.
7. Communication and cooperation between the home and the school will be promoted and maintained.
8. Students will develop a positive attitude toward learning.
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MASTER LIST OF FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS
I. **NEEDS**

A. **Students**
   1. **Discipline**
      a. teach sense of right and wrong to improve discipline
   2. **Academics**
      a. more homework in English and Spanish
      b. more reading and spelling improvement
      c. more reading assistance for all children
   3. **Language**
      a. to be able to express themselves in their native tongue
   4. **Social Skills**
      a. To provide opportunities for children of different races to learn about each other and other countries
   5. **Individual Needs**
      a. teachers should spend more time with students who don't know how to read or spell English
      b. teachers should approach each child differently and give more individual attention
      c. small classes help achievement in reading and other subjects
      d. small classes allow teachers to approach each child as an individual for they come to school with different backgrounds.

B. **Program**
   1. **Special Classes and Programs**
      a. special classes for all children that need specialized help held at their own school
      b. need for extended and comprehensive Physical Education program
      c. utilize University students in school
      d. need specialists to help the child that learns at a slow pace and the child that does not qualify as a target student.
   2. **Bilingual Education**
      a. a bilingual program that is effective
      b. fall children should be taught in Spanish and English
   3. **Materials**
      a. plenty of materials available to all teachers
4. Other Concerns
   a. students should not be passed to next grade if they are not ready

C. Staff
   1. Support Personnel
      a. full-time principal, librarian, qualified nurse, parent/school representative, and janitors to deal with daily concerns
      b. specialists in the areas of music, art, P.E., etc.
      c. counselors at the elementary schools
      d. more aides in the classrooms
   2. Qualifications and Selection
      a. positive disposition toward population being served and toward program
      b. total staff commitment to bilingual education
      c. better pay or benefits to personnel working at these schools--they work hard, extra time, etc.
      d. experienced, strict, more male teachers
      e. sincere desire to work with parents and students
      f. apply psychological principles of early childhood education
      g. children should not have to change teachers frequently

D. Parent/Community
   1. Involvement with School and Children
      a. discipline begins at home
      b. parents should show they're interested in child's learning by regular visits to classroom, helping in classroom and reading to children
      c. principal should be involved with parents and students
   2. Support and Services
      a. need for a person that will get parents involved--full-time Parent Involvement Aide
      b. counselors to help parents help children
      c. effective police service--S.R.O. Officer
      d. night and evening classes
II. GOALS

A. To prepare children for the next grade, the next school.
B. To prepare children to be better citizens.
C. To prepare them for a better job.
D. To prepare them for a better future.
E. To instruct them in both languages so they can become bilingual and thus won't lose their native tongue.
F. To make children feel good about themselves.
G. To instill in children a respect for others.
H. To have parents, students and teachers work together for better discipline.

III. FACILITIES

A. Buildings
   1. Improve auditoriums--new drapes, more space
   2. Improve cooling and heating--pipes too noisy
   3. Larger nurse's, principal's office, conference rooms, kitchen area, library
   4. General repairs--roofs, restrooms
   5. Furniture--for library, for rooms
   6. Keep schools open

B. Playground/Parking Space
   1. Bigger playgrounds--close adjacent streets
   2. New ramada
   3. More and better playground equipment
   4. Lighting in playgrounds
   5. Better, needed parking

C. Classrooms
   1. Carpeting
   2. Bigger classrooms
   3. Bathrooms in rooms
D. Services
1. Modernization to include the physically handicapped
2. Improve street drainage system
3. Musical instruments for children that cannot afford them
4. Clean up empty lots to bring in people
5. Make buildings available to community groups.

IV. TOPICS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

A. From David
1. Close up one school and use as a community center
2. Leave all schools open and use Spring as a resource school

B. From Dragman
1. Bigger schools
2. Auditorium separate from cafeteria
3. Color TV in rooms

C. From Carmona
1. Access to library—people to work and run the library
2. Extend Carmona's boundaries to include David and/or Dragman.
APPENDIX D
INNER-CITY SCHOOL CHECKLIST
Inner-City School Checklist

Street Improvements

Dragman: Lights
Close streets - allow for expansion

Carmona: Drainage - rain
Lights on streets
Crosswalk to Kennedy
Extra lighting on southside playground
Reduce street traffic noise

David: Clean up empty lots to bring people in
Needs more lighting

Site Expansion

Dragman: Shut down 8th Street and 18th Street and
expand the school
Larger playground and more playing equipment

Carmona: Parking - Simpson & Main (NW or NE corners)
Enlarge playground more equipment

David: More playground area and playground equipment
More parking space
Close street south of David and buy empty lot
Close south and westside streets for parking

Building Adequacy

Dragman: Have toys for younger kids
Carpets and curtains for rooms
Repair the bathrooms
Heating and cooling
Painting of school inside and out
Larger cafeteria
Outside lighting
Separate auditorium and cafeteria
Larger nurse's office
Better roofs
Bathrooms in each room
New drapes for auditorium
Outside entrance to restrooms
Better library
Carmona:  Fix pipes, radiators
          Remove closets for more shelving
          Bigger stage
          Bathrooms in each room
          Fix kitchen and room plumbing
          Bathrooms on second floor
          Fire escapes
          Conference rooms
          Fulltime groundsman
          Improve heating and cooling
          Modernize to include physically handicapped
          Enlarge kitchen area
          Better library

David:  New ramada
           Bigger library
           Better library
           Needs outside lighting
           More electrical outlets
           Improve heating and cooling
           More storage space
           Lounge and workroom need to be separate rooms
           Increase stage size
           Need larger cafeteria
           Build-in conference rooms
           Adequate facilities for language
           Resource room
           Restrooms upstairs
           Safety of stairs
           Fix outside fire escapes
           Adequate office area
           Larger kitchen
           Fence - take out barbed wire

Other Considerations

Dragman:  New books
          Library furniture

Carmona:  More books for library
          Crossing guard on Main and on 18th street - too much traffic
          Musical instruments for children whose parents cannot afford them
David:  Direct bus route away from David School
Crossing safety - adequate crossing guards
Adequate recreational facilities
Listening posts and materials
Place to put coats, sweaters, etc.
Fix up basement
Blinds do not work
Need input from teachers to remodel building
Carpeting through the school
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BUILDING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM
Extended Implicating Considerations

1. The school's primary function is to provide a quality education for the students that each school serves and who come from the Carmona, David and Dragman attendance area.

2. Federally funded assistance, Phase III schools, must be planned and implemented, and will be included only to supplement compatibility the individual school's goals and programs. Planning and implementation will be done only with the direction and assent of personnel at the affected schools.

3. District Student Services will be available to Phase III schools on the basis of need, compatibility and cooperative assent by the affected school personnel.

Premises and Considerations

Curriculum

1. The curriculum should build upon and maintain the students' language and culture.
   a. Use language and experiences toward school success.
   b. Develop oral language in all curricular areas, Spanish/English, Standard English as a Second Dialect, Social Studies, etc.
   c. Multicultural curriculum.
   d. Build upon strengths to fulfill student needs.

2. Develop positive:
   a. Self-direction
   b. Self-discipline
   c. Attitude toward self and others
   d. Attitude toward learning

3. Increase school achievement significantly.

Staff

1. The total staff must be compatible to the assessed needs and school's goals.

2. Effective on-going inservice and support must be available for the staff.

3. Staff should reflect the school population and be a positive and effective factor in the educational process.
4. Teachers should have special skills, i.e., reading, bilingual/multi-cultural, music, art, etc.

5. There should be a low teacher-pupil ratio, maximum 25 per teacher. This is a very important factor in successful learning.

6. The school principal should be:
   a. informed, aware and empathetic to the population, needs and program.
   b. have input into staff selection.
   c. work well with staff, parents and community.
   d. fulltime.

7. Selection of total staff should be completed as early as possible prior to program's start.

Parents/Community

1. Parents should be involve in all manners in the school's program.

2. The local and extended community should be incorporated into the school's needs and service.
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CATEGORIES OF CURRICULUM

AT DRAGMAN AND CARMONA
Curriculum

The curriculum included and is not limited to the following categories:

1. Curriculum content should be multicultural.
2. Basic skills receive strong emphasis.
3. Curriculum model developed by school personnel and parents.
4. Two educational directions are evident:
   a. minority language and culture moving toward dominant language and culture
   b. dominant language and culture learning minority language and culture.

Instruction

1. Instruction based on the self-contained classroom. Consideration reserved for other approaches as future planning takes place.
2. One direction of instruction is to increase school achievement.
3. Consideration of at least two instructional approaches: activity-oriented and traditional teacher method.
4. Resource and directed instruction available through a language instruction specialist with special room reserved for use.
5. Basic skills receive strong emphasis.
6. Instruction take place variously in large groups, small groups and individually.
7. Adaptive education at David will use bilingual education as needed.
8. Adequate instructional materials in quality and quantity.

Staffing Considerations

1. The large majority, if not all, of the staff will be bilingual/bicultural.
2. A language instruction specialist will be part of the staff.
3. Other specialists part of the staff, P.E., Music, Art, and Counselor.
4. Principal should be: bilingual/bicultural, an effective administrator with experience in bilingual education and selected by April 1, 1980.
5. Screening committee established in March 1980 made up of District personnel and parents.
6. Fulltime instructional aides for each teacher.
7. Fulltime health personnel
8. Office help due to program and increased enrollment.
10. All teachers have expertise in bilingual education.
11. Teacher/pupil ratio:
    Pre-K - 15-20
    K - 15-20
    1,2,3 - 20
    4,5,6 - 20-25
12. Bus monitors
13. Fulltime librarians
14. Pre-K and kindergarten programs be extended beyond the usual half-day.

Before and After School Activities
1. Some activities before and after school recommended.

Inservice
1. All inservice activities mandatory for those affected.
2. Two week preservice summer 1980.
3. Adequate planning and preparation time before and after throughout the school year.
4. Inservice includes but not limited to: linguistics, culture, instructional modes applicable to bilingual education, evaluation, materials use and construction.

Facilities Consideration
1. Remodeling appropriate to Pre-K, K, instruction, use of second floor.
2. Facilities should not be overtaxed due to an unduly high enrollment.
3. One room for specialized language instruction.
4. Re-evaluation of library and media center.
5. Teachers' lounge and conference room.
6. Workroom.
7. Expand office space.
9. Adequate storage for maintenance and instructional needs.
10. Facilities for parent involvement and education.
11. L.D. resource room.
Evaluation

1. Evaluation of the total program planned and conducted cooperatively between evaluation personnel and the building staff.
2. Evaluation to be ongoing.
3. Evaluation should indicate relative success of the educational effort and give direction to improvement of the total program.
4. Evaluation will incorporate evaluation instruments appropriate to the curriculum.
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VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAM
Curriculum - Multicultural

1. Language
   a. Total language development
   b. Standard English as a Second Dialect (SESD)
   c. Bilingual instruction

2. Cultures
   a. Content
   b. Awareness, sensitivity, respect, utilization
   c. Human relations

3. Content
   a. Development of concepts, skills, application
      math, reading, language arts, science, social
      studies, physical education, health and fine
      arts.

4. Comprehensive learning of the basic skills
   a. Reading, math
   b. Cognitive and conceptual development

Curriculum - Daily Emphases

1. The morning will concentrate on the basic skills
   (language arts and mathematics)

2. The afternoon provides reinforcement of the basic
   skills through content areas such as social
   studies, science and fine arts.

Instruction - Emphases

1. Selected instructional approaches are offered that
   provide effective learning and options in
   approach.
   a. activity-oriented, traditional teacher
      directed, and bilingual instruction.

2. Skill development in self-direction, leadership
   and problem-solving is included.

3. Instruction takes place variously in large group,
   small group and individually.

Staffing Considerations

1. The schools designated as "new schools" for total
   staffing needs.

2. Selection of staff
   a. screening committee established in March 1980
      and made up of district personnel and
      parents.
   b. selection of principals by April 1.
   c. selection of curriculum specialists by April
      15.
3. Selection of teaching staff by May 10.
4. Selection of classified staff by June 1.
5. Certified staff
   Qualifications:
   a. early childhood background - Dragman
   b. content area and intermediate grade strength - Carmona
   c. knowledgeable in variety of instructional approaches
   d. background in reading instruction
   Personnel:
   a. fulltime principals at each of the above schools
      -knowledgeable in the particular school's emphasis
      -effective communication with parents
      -effective in administration and curriculum
   b. curriculum specialist for each school
   c. fulltime instructional aides for each teacher
   d. fulltime librarians
   e. fulltime health personnel at each school
   f. fulltime parent/community representatives
   g. Physical Education Specialist
   h. Music Specialist
   i. Art Specialist
   j. Additional office help for increased enrollment and extended day.
6. Pupil/Teacher Ratio
   Pre-K - 15-20       1, 2, 3 - 20
   K - 15-20           4, 5, 6 - 20-25
7. Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Programs should be extended beyond the usual half-day.

Extended Day Program - An extended day program is available for service to the immediate community as well as an added attraction to increase enrollment. It will function as a support to the regular educational program.
1. Activities
   A.M. - Tutoring, counseling, breakfast, open library, specialty classes (languages, gardening, crafts, etc.)
   Noon - Guided recreation activities, open library and quiet games
   P.M. - Recreation, open library, projects (which extend and support regular program), tutoring, and specialty classes

2. Extended Day Staff
   a. Curriculum area specialists (Physical Education, Music, etc.)
   b. Certificated person for a.m. and p.m. programs (could be from curriculum area specialists)

3. Aides
4. Parents and other volunteers

Inservice

1. Pre-service and inservice activities will be mandatory for designated staff.
2. As much inservice as possible should be on-site.
3. Adequate time should be provided for teachers to plan and prepare effective instruction.
4. Areas of inservice to include but not be limited to: reading, math, instructional approaches, cultural sensitivity, linguistics, evaluation, instructional materials, knowledge of the community, staff coordination and cooperation.

Facilities Considerations

1. Dragman
   a. Remodeling appropriate to Early Childhood Instruction (PreK-3)
   b. Adjustment to library and media center.
   c. Remodeling of patio for activities of younger children
   d. Carpeting for rooms
   e. A room dedicated for parent involvement and parent education
   f. Conference space
   g. L.D. Resource Room
   h. Adequate storage for maintenance and instructional purposes
   i. Re-evaluation of office area
2. Carmona
   a. Facilities for science, math, reading, art, and P.E. activities
   b. Adequate adult restrooms, restrooms on 2nd floor
   c. Adequate athletic equipment and facilities geared to intermediate children needs
   d. Remodeling of library to meet intermediate children's needs
   e. Upgrading of 2nd floor westside porch classrooms
   f. Remodeling of multi-purpose room
   g. Remodeling of kitchen
   h. Possible remodeling of office area
   i. Facilities for parent involvement and education
   j. L.D. Resource Room

Evaluation

1. Evaluation of the total program planned and conducted cooperatively between evaluation personnel and the building staffs.
2. Evaluation is ongoing.
3. Evaluation indicates relative success of the educational effort and give direction to improvement of the total program.
4. Evaluation incorporates evaluation instruments appropriate to the curriculum.
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CATEGORIES OF CURRICULUM: SADDLE MIDDLE SCHOOL
Purpose

Saddle Middle School will promote excellence in education through a strong basic skills program utilizing Environmental education, Computer-Assisted Learning, Bilingual Education, and Fine Arts as an integral part of the total curriculum focus for instructional development.

Student Population

1. The student population of Saddle will consist of the following four groups of students:
   - Students currently assigned
   - Students assigned from the traditional feeder school patterns such as Saddle, David, Dragman, Carmona, Ochoa, Horton, and Glenman Elementary Schools
   - 100 non-minority students from schools that are identified according to the transfer policy
   - Students reassigned due to Boundary Committee Report

2. Saddle Middle School's current enrollment is 290 students (93% minority and 7% non-minority). This should change to 390 students (69% minority and 31% non-minority).

3. Subsequent enrollment should consist of one minority to one non-minority to improve racial ethnic mix.

Curriculum/Instruction Program

1. Promote basic skill/survival skill development.
2. Teach basic skills in all content areas.
3. Place emphasis on "teaching the student" where he or she is vs. content.
4. Promote self-dignity and worth of all students.
5. Emphasize a core curricular approach with basic components of Environmental Education, Computer assisted Instruction, Bilingual/Bicultural Education, and Fine Arts.
6. Assist students in clarifying their values and making post-eighth grade educational goals through a comprehensive counseling and guidance program.
7. Provide specific basic skill classes for remediation only (lab concept).
8. Emphasize community based/involved instruction as much as possible.
9. Assess students learning style/mode/preferred environment and incorporate into students individualized educational programs.

10. Utilize teacher-advisor role.

11. Be built around adolescent developmental needs.

12. Incorporate an extended day concept that can be either an early morning or late afternoon experience to accommodate student/family needs and learning/work style.

13. CURRICULUM STRUCTURE - The school curriculum will emphasize the basic skills of reading, writing, computation, and responsibility. An additional focus will be on building success in a supportive, structured, cooperative positive environment. Individualized educational plans will be developed by identifying learning styles, student interests, strengths, and deficiencies:

A. Environmental Education
   Environmental Education provides an effective means for children to acquire information and meaning through observing, listening and reading. This component is designed to develop student interest in acquiring and using information which is directly related to their personal lives. The historic, cultural, business, governmental, political, and environmental communities available in the area provide a wide range of opportunities for developing knowledge, skills and positive attitudes. An understanding of the basic inter-dependence of the biological, physical and human resources of the environment enables students to make reasonable decisions and be active participants.

B. Computer Assisted Instruction
   The basic skills curriculum is supported, developed and assessed through the use of the computer. The computer will be utilized in the instructional programs in the following ways:
   1. to teach computer programming.
   2. for one-to-one instructional and enrichment programs.
   3. as computer guided instruction where the computer is used to diagnose, assess and prescribe sequential and subsequent learning for the individual student.
C. Bilingual/Bicultural
Bilingual/bicultural education is provided as an integral part of the total curriculum emphasizing basic skills acquisition.

D. Fine Arts
1. Fine Arts is used to motive learning in all subject areas. It will also help to broaden the way students view and think about their interests, environment and opportunities.
2. With each art experience the students are involved with the production, appreciation, critical analysis, and awareness of fine arts as they exist in the cultural and historical context.

E. Support Programs
A support program is designed to strengthen and support the basic skills emphasis. The expertise needed to prevent, as well as resolve, those problems that block the achievement of academic excellence, is provided by a student services support system. These services assist students to overcome personal, social, learning, family, and peer problems that may distract from their individual learning program. SESE/BASE support is provided to address linguistic and cultural needs of black students. However, the language/cultural needs of black students is addressed throughout the curriculum.
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