INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again–beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Fuller, Howard Lamar

THE IMPACT OF THE MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM'S DESEGREGATION PLAN ON BLACK STUDENTS AND THE BLACK COMMUNITY (1976 - 1982)

Marquette University PH.D. 1985

THE IMPACT OF THE MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM'S DESEGREGATION PLAN ON BLACK STUDENTS AND THE BLACK COMMUNITY (1976 - 1982)

by

Howard L. Fuller, B.S., M.S.A.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School, Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
May, 1985

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee:

Chairperson

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to:

My children, Kelli, Malcolm, and Kumba;

My late grandmother, Pearl Wagner, whom I know is somewhere watching over me;

A true "Blue Devil", the late Mary Ann Love (Yes, Mary Ann, we're still pushing);

A courageous person, Ms. Myrtle Lacy, with the hopes that one day justice will be done;

and All of the Black children who have endured the practices of MPS over the years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of a dissertation normally represents the culmination of years of hard work and perseverance, and in my case, that is exactly what has happened! But, this accomplishment is not mine alone. There are literally hundreds of people who have had a role in the development and completion of this study. Although it is not possible for me to acknowledge all of them, I am going to mention as many of them as possible given the limitations of my memory and the amount of space available.

I want to begin with the students and the faculty at North Division High School who had the courage to stand and fight when the Milwaukee Public School System attempted to convert North to a city wide specialty school. It was their "Blue Devil" spirit and determination that led to the formation of the Coalition to Save North Division High School (CSND).

It was the Coalition with its slogan, "Enough is Enough", that started me on the road to understanding how desegregation can become just as discriminatory as segregation. I want to thank all of the staunch fighters from the Coalition for their spiritual guidance in beginning this project. So, thanks to:

Ann Avington, LaRonda Bearden, Gisela Benning, Sandra Brown, Hubert Canfield, Sheila Cargile, Delta Ceasar, Elsie Ceasar, Michael Cummings, Cassie Downer, Christine Faltz, Betty Glosson, Fred Gordon, Sarah Grant (Aunt Em), Doris Green, Saron Henry, John Irish, Doris Jackson, Veronica Jackson, Fran Johnson, Kathryn Jones, John LaFave, David Levine, Greg Lewis, Marion McDowell, Pauline McKay, the late Savannah McKenzie, Rev. Joseph McNeil, Al Nichols, Ellen O'Brien, Sharon Payne, Grace Pearson, Charles Reese, Helen Robertson, Mary Rogers, Tazzalean Rogers, Joan Smith, Lisa Smith, Anita Spencer, Mamie Troutman, Therese VanThull, Brian Verdin, Dwaine Washington, Evelyn Williams, LaWanda Williams, Ralph Williams, Regina Williams, and Alban Williamson.

There is now another group of people, the Concerned Citizens for Quality Education for Black Children, carrying on the battle started by the CSND. Some of the fighters from the Coalition are in this one too, but there are some different people--individuals who deserve to be mentioned here. My thanks go out to: Cloyce Burns, Gladys Burns, Pat Flood, Beverly, Griffin, Reuben Harpole, Janice Jackson, Naomi Jackson, Rev. James Lathan, Rahman Malik, Gloria Mason, Clarence Nichols, Bob Peterson, Mohammad Sabir, Mike Smith. Paul Spraggins, and Rev. Willie Walker.

To Larry Harwell and all of the people involved in "Two Way

or No Way", thanks for raising the questions. We are where we are in this battle today because you dared to go against the tide and demand equity for our people.

Thanks go out to the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO), and the Center for Constitutional Rights. Your support at key points in the CSND struggle was critical to our ability to continue moving forward. I can never repay the friendship and support that has been given me all of these years by Rev. Lu Walker, Marilyn Clement, and Victor McTeer.

This work is being completed at Marquette University so it is only appropriate that I express my deep gratitude to some very special people at Marquette: Dr. Arnold Mitchem (Mitch) for hiring me to work for the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), thereby giving me a chance to regain my sense of commitment to the human struggle for a better quality of life; Dr. Albert Jache for supporting me and believing in me while I was at Marquette; George Lowery for remaining a true friend through the years; Dr. James Green for giving me the chance, in spite of what the test scores seemed to indicate; all of my sisters in EOP--Sande Robinson, Kathy Cade, Debbie Hendricks, LaVerne Jackson-Harvey, and Ethel Woods; my good brother Art Mayberry and finally my comrade in struggle, Bob Lowe (thanks for the constructive criticism at a critical point in this effort).

Thanks also to Lois Quinn, who without her knowing it, spurred me on to do research on MPS, Mr. Wesley Scott and the late Dr. Robert Starms, who served as my mentors during an important period of my life.

I wish to thank Governor Tony Earl for giving me the opportunity to serve in his cabinet, thereby giving me access to information that otherwise would not have been possible for me to obtain. To my staff at the Wisconsin Department of Employment Relations, thanks for carrying me during the last few weeks of this project. In particular, my gratitude goes out to Eric Stanchfield, Peggy Howard, Dave Hendricks, Laura Vinje and Barbara Horton (I needed those prayers!).

Thanks to my new colleagues in Madison, especially Nate Harris, Kirbie Mack, Dennis Dresang, Debby Laurel , Euriel Jordan, Fred Reed, and Pickens Winters, for their help and support at crucial moments.

Thanks also to my sisters and brothers in the Black Political Network, especially Martha Love, Veronica Dorsey, Anthony Bradford, James Mosley, Pat McManus, Kevin Ingram, Phil Anderson, Wyman Winston, Paula Dorsey, Spencer Coggs, RoseMarie McDowell and Danae Davis-Gordon for carrying on with the work of the BPN during my absence to finish this project.

To Derrick Bell, thanks for your drive, determination, and

the courage you have shown to pursue a new path in the light of new information and a better understanding of what we face as black people.

To my dear friend Maureen McCormack-Larkin, thanks for forcing me to think, and for turning me on to the effective school literature. Thanks too for pushing me to finish this study.

Thanks to Melodie and Dick Yates, Howard Stanback, Gene Locke, Walter and Barbara Aaron, Viola Plummer, and Abdul Akalimat for their encouragement and moral support over the years.

Thanks to Lawrence and Mackie Knox and Delores and Bill Bell for helping me grow and develop. Not everyone is lucky enough to have surrogate parents like you.

Finally, let me express my deepest appreciation to my committee members: Dr. David Buckholdt, Dr. Adrian DuPuis, Dr. Daniel Maguire, Dr. Albert Thompson, and Dr. Thomas Martin. In particular, I want to thank Dr. DuPuis for his efforts as my initial chairperson, and Dr. Buckholdt for his help as my chairperson during the writing of this dissertation. These two men gave me all the support I needed.

SPECIAL MENTION

In addition to the people I mentioned in the acknowledgment, there are four people who deserve special mention, because without them this dissertation would never have been completed.

First, my mother, Juanita Smith, who has always been there during the various passages of my life. She has always been there to lend a helping hand and to encourage me to push on. I am in many ways a difficult son, but she has always been a beautiful Mother.

Second, my dear friend Dotty Holman. It was Dotty who helped me think through a way to do this research. It was her work in the CSND struggle that served as the backdrop for this dissertation. Her boundless energy, her enthusiasm, and her unwaivering demand for equity for black children has been a continuing source of inspiration to me.

Third, Tony Milanowski who had the vision and the knowledge to create the format for the tables that are a major part of this study. His willingness first to help me understand the type of data that was needed, and then to help me conceptualize the manner in which to present the data was invaluable. I can never thank him enough for the hours and hours he spent after work and

on weekends developing the program for the computers, inputting the data, and printing the tables over and over again until we got it right! A huge piece of this dissertation has Tony's signature written all over it.

Finally, Claudetta Wright-Fuller, my wife, who served as my typist, editor and proofreader. Claudetta's willingness to sit at times for as long as 18 hours at the computer typing and editing this dissertation was the major reason this work is complete. In spite of the normal tensions of marriage, the additional tensions that exist because I'm her husband, and the ones that are inherent to any effort to complete a dissertation, she stuck with me. No matter how angry we got at each other, the dissertation work went forward. Claudetta sacrificed some of her own work towards her Master's Degree in Public Administration (which she will receive in May of 1985) to help me. Thank you for your support. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLES OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

May 16, 1984 was the 30th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, et al[1] (hereafter to be referred to as the Brown decision). To many people, this decision marked a critical turning point for racial relations in this country. Lightfoot (1980) spoke of the decision in the following manner:

> When the Brown decision was handed down in 1954 . . . I was ten years old. The memory of that moment the news reached our house is still vivid. The evening news reported the uncompromising, strong words of the Supreme Court justices that segregation in schools was illegal, unjust and wrong. Through a child's eyes, I could see the veil of oppression lift from my parents' shoulders. It seemed they were standing taller. And for the first time in my life, I saw tears in my father's eyes. 'This is a great and important day,' he said reverently to his children. And although we had not lived the pain and struggle of his life, nor did we understand the meaning of his words, the emotion and the drama of that moment still

survives in my soul today. (p.3)

It seemed to her father, and indeed to many people, that finally the United States was on the way to developing a society where discrimination based on race was unacceptable. Many Americans saw in this crucial first step in the educational field, the beginning of the end of the whole evil system of segregation and racial oppression.

The Brown decision has indeed accomplished a great deal. There is little question but that it was a spark that helped light the flame of the Civil Rights Movement in the late 50's and the 60's. It gave hope to millions of black and white people who moved forward with courage and determination to transform American society. Yet today some of the same people who were filled with such hope now find themselves filled with sorrow. Lightfoot (1980) talked about an atmosphere of hate and bewilderment. She felt this reversal of attitude from 1954 was inevitable "because the solutions proposed for desegregation of schools were simplistic and unrealistic arrangements designed for failure . . ." (p. 4).

The cynicism and pessimism that Lightfoot discussed is very much in evidence in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Over the past several years, dissatisfaction and disillusionment with Milwaukee's school desegregation plan have increased. In particular, many more black people have expressed their displeasure with what they perceive to be a disproportionate burden on their children to make desegregation work.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not Milwaukee's desegregation efforts between 1976 and 1982 were carried out in a manner that was in fact discriminatory against black students.

Specifically, this study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Did the desegregation program of MPS result in (a) a disproportionate number of black students being denied educational access to their neighborhood schools; and (b) a disproportionate number of black students being bused out of their neighborhoods to attend school?

2. Did the Milwaukee Public School System (MPS) use (a) a pattern of school closings, and (b) make decisions about the locations of specialty schools, in a manner that resulted in a disproportionate burden of dislocations being placed on black students?

Answers to the above questions will be helpful in making a definitive judgment on the possible discriminatory nature of Milwaukee's school desegregation efforts.

Definitions

There are a number of key definitions that must be understood in order to follow the general and specific observations made in this study. Several of these definitions are taken from The School Desegregation/Integration Notebook (1978):

1. De facto Segregation - "Segregation which exists in fact but which cannot be traced to or said to result from legal action" (p. 6).

2. De jure Segregation - "Segregation which exists as a result of legal action--for example by statute, ordinance, or school board practices" (p. 6).

3. Freedom of Choice - "Desegregation plans which allowed students to attend the school of their choice" (p. 7).

4. Magnet Schools (Specialty Schools)- "Schools designed to attract students from a wide geographic area by offering innovative programming or by supplementing activities which exist in traditional schools" (p.7).

5. Racial Balance - "When the black/white ratio in the school is identical to the black/white ratio in the population" (p. 9). For purposes of this study the population being referred to is the total school population in the Milwaukee Public School System.

Another key definition for this study is found in the Georgetown Law Journal (1972):

1. Tipping Point - "A widely accepted rule of thumb which says that when the percentage of black pupils in a given school reaches 40, white exodus from that school is accelerated and becomes irreversible, thereby tipping the racial balance" (p. 1302).

The two concepts that are at the core of the study are defined by Pettigrew (1972):

1. Desegregated School - "refers only to its racial composition. Desegregation, then, is the mere mix of bodies without reference to the quality of the interracial interaction. While it is a prerequisite for integration, it does not in itself guarantee equal educational opportunity" (p. 24).

2. Integrated School - "refers to an interracial facility which boasts a climate of interracial acceptance. Interracial acceptance is most easily generated in any institution, educational or otherwise, when the two groups share equal status in the situation and work for common goals" (p. 24).

Overview of the Issue in Milwaukee

The genesis of this problem in Milwaukee can be found in the actions taken on June 18, 1965 by a black attorney, Lloyd Barbee. He filed a suit in Federal court against the Board of School

Directors of the City of Milwaukee (hereafter referred to as the "Board"). His complaint, filed on behalf of Craig Amos and Jeffrey Amos, et al, charged that the Milwaukee Public School System was systematically discriminating against blacks. He charged that the system was consciously maintaining all white schools, and all black schools, and in the process providing unequal educational opportunities for black students. Through the suit Attorney Barbee sought declaratory and injunctive relief against the actions of the Board. These actions were said by Barbee to be in violation of the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

This case, Craig Amos and Jeffrey Amos et al, v. Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee (1963) signaled the beginning of a very long court fight over desegregation in Milwaukee. The plaintiffs were allowed to amend the complaint on March 28, 1969. The amended complaint cited two classes of students that were allegedly harmed by actions of the Board. These students, 30 of whom were black and 11 of whom were white, were said to be being deprived of equal educational opportunity because of the Board's failure to develop and maintain an integrated school system.

The actual trial on the suit began on September 10, 1973. It took U. S. District Judge John Reynolds until 1976 to reach a decision on the case. He ruled on January 19, 1976 that the Milwaukee Public School System did in fact discriminate against

blacks. In his decision he stated the following:

> The defendants (Milwaukee Board of School Directors) argued that they are under no duty to desegregate when segregation results from factors over which they have no control. I have accepted that as law for the purposes of this discussion. I have concluded, however, that the segregation which exists in the Milwaukee System is directly attributable to acts of the defendants . . . .Segregation was the result of the cumulative effects of the various decisions made by school officials, and segregation that results from the actions of school authorities is illegal and unconstitutional when the actions are intended and made for that purpose . . . . The Court concludes that the defendants have knowingly carried out a systematic program of segregation affecting all of the city's students, teachers, and school facilities, and have intentionally brought about and maintained a dual school system. The Court therefore holds that the entire Milwaukee Public School System is unconstitutionally segregated. (p. 820-821)

Judge Reynolds appointed a special master, Dr. John Gronowski, to "assist in the development and implementation of a school desegregation plan" (p. 823). Judge Reynolds made it clear that he intended to be flexible and would allow the special master and the Board to work out an acceptable plan. The

school system appealed and the Milwaukee Teacher Education Association acted as an Undesignated Intervenor on the issues related to faculty desegregation. Judge Reynolds, on June 11, 1976 in the Armstrong v. O'Connell case, issued the following ruling:

> (2,3) The number of schools having a student population between 25% and 45% black shall be deemed indicative of the extent of school desegregation of the school system. The plan which the defendants submit should cause at least one-third of the schools in the system to have student populations falling within the foregoing range by September 30, 1976, at least an additional one-third of the schools to have student populations within that range by September 30, 1977. And the remaining schools to have student populations within that racial range by September 30, 1978.
>
> (p. 1345-1346)

The Milwaukee Board of School Directors continued to appeal the decision and orders of Judge Reynolds. Finally, in 1979, after 14 years of motions, counter motions, appeals, etc., an agreement was reached by the plaintiffs and the defendants in the case. Through a consent decree a plan was approved by Judge Reynolds in May of 1979. This plan was set up to determine student movement for the 1979-80 school year through the 1983-84 school year.

The plan dictated that the following guidelines were to be met:

1. At least 75% of students in Milwaukee Public Schools must attend desegregated schools. A desegregated school is defined as 25-60% black at the elementary and middle school levels and 20-60% black at the high school level. (The order exempted about 12,000 students from the desegregation order: kindergarten pupils, exceptional education students in special schools for the handicapped, and students in 4 schools with very high concentrations of Hispanic students).

2. As soon as the black student population exceeds 50% of the total student population, the percentage of students required to be in desegregated facilities will be reduced according to a mathematical formula.

3. Every elementary and middle school must have a minimum of 20% black student population, and each high school must have at least 20% (or 250 black students) in attendance. (Schools with bilinqual education programs may have a 25% minority student population including at least 12.5% black and at least 12.5% Hispanic student bodies).

4. Each student in the system must be notified annually of his/her right to attend a desegregated school and any student requesting that right was to be accommodated.

The decision was accepted by most sectors of the community, but there was a note of discord about the plan sounded by both blacks and whites. Anderson and Olson (1981) stated that

"blacks alleged that the School Board's efforts disproportionately burdened black pupils and destroyed the neighborhood school concept. White opponents forecast accelerated white flight from the city and declining educational quality" (p. 152). These concerns by blacks about a disproportionate burden, e.g., discrimination against blacks, loss of the neighborhood school concept, etc., were ignored by those blacks and whites who had fought so long for school integration. The supporters of the plan accepted any possible burden as an unfortunate but necessary "by-product" of desegregation. They also thought that over time the procedures would be changed so that there would be no disproportionate burden on either race. The concern over the loss of neighborhood schools was characterized as aiding and abetting racists who also used support for the neighborhood school concept as a rationale to oppose any form of school desegregation.

These concerns that were expressed by members of Milwaukee's black community were not new. In fact, these very concerns were being raised in various other communities in the U. S. where desegregation efforts were underway. In the view of some, the problems being experienced by blacks in Milwaukee and other places could be directly attributed to the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, et al decision.

The Brown decision was the foundation for the many desegregation suits that were filed in the 60's and 70's. Some

social scientists, educators, and activists (black and white) had reached the conclusion that the Brown decision itself was based in part on racist assumptions. For this reason, it was believed that the Brown decision actually promoted the proliferation of desegregation plans that were, with or without judicial intervention, discriminatory.

Although this study will be dealing with the desegregation efforts in Milwaukee, there must be some discussion of the Brown decision in order to get a more complete view of the issues involved in the situation. This is necessary because of the relationship between Brown and all other desegregation litigation.

Summary of the Brown Decision

On May 17, 1954 the United States Supreme Court decided Brown v Board of Education (Brown I). This decision held that segregation of white and black children in state public schools, solely on the basis of race, denied to black children the equal protection rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court said, "We conclude that in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (p. 495). The Court went on to say that the separation of (black) children "of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race, generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the

community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way very unlikely to be undone" (p. 483).

On May 31, 1955 (over a full year after Brown I), Brown II, the implementation decision, was handed down. The Supreme Court, in calling for this implementation, in essence ordered the Federal District Courts to handle desegregation cases in a manner consistent with Brown I. They gave the lower courts some guidelines to follow in making their decisions. These guidelines included the following parameters:

1. Local school authorities were given primary responsibility for implementation.

2. The Federal Court was given the right to decide whether the local school board's response constituted good faith implementation.

3. The district court was to be guided by equitable principles "characterized by practical flexibility" (p. 294) in shaping remedies. In this respect the Court cautioned that the principle of equal educational opportunity espoused in Brown I was not to be yielded simply because of disagreement with that principle.

4. Although the district court was to take into account the practical problems of implementation, they were to make sure that the local school authorities were making a "prompt and reasonable start" (p. 295).

The Court went further to say that, "The judgments below,

except that in the Delaware Case, are accordingly reversed and the cases are remanded to the District Courts to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis with all deliberate speed to parties to these cases" (p. 301).

In summary, the Brown decision and the court cases that followed served as the historical backdrop for the various developments that occurred in the Milwaukee situation. The legacy of Brown will be a constant reference point throughout the remainder of the study.

Limitations of the Study

This study encompasses the years 1976 through 1982 but because of the lack of data, and some of the changes that were made in the way that data was collected, much of the analysis will involve only the years 1979 through 1982. It is reasonable to assume that if data were available for the years 1976 through 1979 in the same format, the findings of the study might have been altered. However, there was sufficient data available for a four-year period, which the writer feels is an adequate length of time for (a) trends to develop and be identified and (b) to make the findings of this study valid.

The investigator purposefully limited the data base for the study to written records and documents dealing with the period

covered by the study. This method was chosen to assure the most objective analysis of the problem, especially given the investigator's bias concerning this issue.

Finally, this study and any implications arising there from may be pertinent only to the Milwaukee situation. It may not be advisable or appropriate for these findings to be applied in analyzing any other school desegregation efforts in this country.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Related Literature

The effort to critically analyze the issues emanating from the questions being researched in this study led the writer to focus on four areas in the review of the literature concerning school desegregation. Those areas are the following: (1) school closings, (2) the use of specialty schools [magnet schools], (3) busing and (4) neighborhood schools.

School Closings

Articles about school closings began to appear in various journals and other publications in the late 60's and continued throughout the 70's. Most of the articles centered on the decline in population that was expected to take place between 1975 and 1982. These studies appeared during a time when school boards and school administrators had just witnessed an expansive period for both the economy and the school population. Diane Divoky explained the problem this way:

> For a long time, everything in American education went up: enrollment, buildings, budgets, expectations,

> public support. In the fifties, when we couldn't put up classrooms or train teachers fast enough for the babyboom kids who were our entries in the brain race against the Russians, we groused about it but loved it. All that growth, all that enterprise, all that bigness. It seemed that it would go on forever. It didn't, of course. Public school enrollment declined by half a million between 1971 and 1972, the beginning of a loss of five million students--11%--over the following decade. It was the end of the era of expansion and the beginning of the era of retrenchment . . . .(p. 87)

Educators reacted in different ways to the problem. Initially, some tried to pretend it was not happening, but others recognized it and began to deal with it. The American Association of School Administrators was one group that offered solutions to this growing problem. They published a guide in their Executive Handbook Series that was designed for school superintendents, school board members, and other school administrators. This guide book discussed techniques to forecast enrollment trends, suggested ways and means of dealing with all sectors of the community that were to be affected by school closings, and outlined public relations practices needed to bring the community through this difficult process (Eisenberger and Keough, 1974). Some studies concentrated on the leadership qualities needed by school administrators to deal with the "politics and related human problems" brought on by school

closings (Thomas, 1980).

There were very vehement reactions against school closings in various communities throughout the United States. A number of studies were undertaken in an effort to find out why communities were protesting school closings. Berger (1983) undertook one such study. In his study he stated that there were four major theories being put forth to explain the variation of community opposition to school closings. They were: (a) the lack of comprehensive planning, (b) the lack of participation of the people who are affected by the decisions, (c) the sense of loss that a community feels because the school represents an entity that binds the community together (community maintenance), and (d) the impact of the social environment (contextual factors).

Some of Berger's observations based on his study were quite surprising. He concluded, for example, that comprehensive planning tended to actually increase the amount of community opposition rather than reduce it. He also stated that the community opposition was lessened in those situations where the superintendent had the same view on closings as the board, irrespective of the relationship between the superintendent and the community. Finally, he found that the greater the involvement on the part of the teachers the less the community opposition.

Not all of the literature accepted the idea that school closings was the best method to deal with declining enrollment

and increased costs. Shakeshaft and Gardner (1983) suggested that school closings were, in fact, the worse thing to do in a community. They stated, ". . . closing schools disrupts the stability of the educational system. It threatens administrators' job security, jeopardizes school board continuity, mobilizes community interest groups in opposition to school officials, weakens confidence in the educational system, reduces per-pupil costs only by a small amount . . . and satisfies no one" (p. 493-494).

They suggested that school systems must first understand their educational mission, and understand that decline creates the opportunity to reassess existing programs with an eye towards eliminating those which are not consistent with that mission. They discussed the possibility of private sector funding, shared space arrangements with private industry, and increased state funding.

As the various discussions concerning the problems brought on by closings continued, the changing character of school districts' racial composition became more and more of an issue. Colton and Frelich (1979) in their study of school closings in St. Louis made the point that:

> Race based politics enter the school-closing issue in a variety of ways. Some voices argue that desegregation could be furthered by transporting blacks from overcrowded schools to underutilized (usually old) white schools. Others argue that new schools in

> abandoned neighborhoods could become sites for integrated programs. Still others assert that whites will not go into such neighborhoods and that blacks who have fled from them will not go either. Permeating the entire dialog are implicit agendas reflecting varying shades and intensities of racial feeling, views of the quality of urban education, housing aspirations and political advantages. (p. 401)

There were some educators who believed that declines in enrollment and school closings were potentially a positive factor for school desegregation. Cronin (1977) was one of the supporters of the notion that creative use of school closings could be very valuable to the school desegregation effort. He described how various cities in Illinois used the closure of old school buildings to help foster desegregation. He did, however, add the following caution:

> The canons of fair play and the principles of racial justice demand that:
>
> 1. The community early and often be informed fully of enrollment trends and the need to close down certain facilities in the future on a racially just basis.
>
> 2. The schools closed be those with inferior educational facilities or expensive maintenance or rehabilitation costs.

> 3. The burden of closing be shared equally by families of both races, avoiding the injustice of black students bearing a disproportionate share of any dislocation or new transportation required. (p. 10)

Iannaccone (1979) in his analysis of the Colton and Frelich study made the point that declining enrollment problems really seemed to exacerbate already existing political problems in the community. Iannaconne found that "the political nerve hit by declining enrollment problems everywhere --one of its universal political aspects -- is the somewhat hidden political tension already present in the local political system" (p. 426).

While it is certainly true that school closings have raised controversies in communities throughout this country irrespective of whether or not school desegregation was involved, Iannocone's point is still well taken when school desegregation is a factor. That is to say, the unresolved problem of the relationship between the races in this country is the underlying tension that has existed throughout the school desegregation effort. To the extent that school closings become a factor in the desegregation process, the general tensions brought on by school closings are exacerbated by the racial conflicts already existing in the society. This is an issue that will bear watching throughout the course of this study.

In summary, then, the school closings issue was initially discussed in the literature simply from the point of view of

declining enrollments. Articles were written to advise administrators and school board members on how to handle the public relations problems inherent in actions to close schools. Some authors concentrated on analyzing the reasons why school closings led to negative reactions by people affected by the closings. The literature later began to touch on the race issue and school closings, specifically, how school closings and desegregation could be linked. So, the school closing question has many ramifications in society, including it's link to school desegregation and the broader race relations problems in the United States.

Specialty Schools [Magnet Schools]

Specialty schools (referred to in this section as magnet schools) have been a widely touted device for helping to bring about school desegregation. There is quite a vast and varied array of literature on this subject. Through all of this literature there is a relatively clear consensus of what magnet schools are designed to do. Broh and Trent (1981) asserted that magnet schools have a great deal of appeal to both whites and non-whites because not only do they help desegregation but they mean a quality education for their children. They stated, "Often superior educational curricula in magnet schools serve to attract minorities and whites from several zones in the district" (p. 20).

While magnet schools have seemed to some to emerge as a very innovative institutional arrangement, they are not new to the American educational system. Robert Barr (1982), in an article entitled, "Magnet Schools An Attractive Alternative," made the point that magnet schools existed in places like New York and Boston in the 1920's and 30's. Among other things, these schools provided parents with an opportunity to choose where their children would attend school. He discussed the uniqueness of these schools and the requirements for entry into them. He said, "Although they drew students from throughout their district, these schools focused solely on elite or talented students and

used auditions or stiff entrance requirements to screen out all but the very best" (p. 38).

Broh and Trent (1981), in their study assessing school desegregation strategies, found that most of the qualitative literature about school desegregation generally supported magnet schools. Rossell (1978) concluded that magnet schools were positive because they: (1) helped to end racial isolation, (2) improved race relations, (3) improved academic achievement and (4) had generally positive but yet unspecified outcomes.

The educational literature was not the only place where support for magnet schools was found. There was also support from Federal judges in and out of the courtroom. One of those judges was William Taylor, a U. S. District Court Judge from Dallas. He made a speech called "The Dallas Story" at the first annual conference on magnet schools. In that speech, according to Estes and Waldrip (1979), he praised specialty schools as imaginative substitutions for massive busing. He stated, "they are not only legitimate and proven desegregation tools, but they also appear to be the wave of the future in terms of public education" (p. 129).

There are a number of special projects set up to deal with the problems associated with desegregation. Charles McMillan was the project director for the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, Massachusetts Department of Education, and as a part of his work he was very involved with the magnet school effort in Boston. McMillan (1977) noted the fact that these schools were

very attractive to parents and students. He said his discussions with various people throughout the Boston community led him to the conclusion that they were attractive because they were "good" schools. He listed (in order of their importance) nine factors that appeared to have contributed to the attractiveness of magnet schools.

1. Most magnet schools are safe and secure in safe neighborhoods.

2. Most magnet schools provide a quality education.

3. Many magnet schools have aggressive and talented faculty and administration.

4. Many magnet schools are paired with universities, cultural agencies and/or businesses.

5. Many magnet schools are in new or renovated buildings with excellent facilities.

6. In some magnet schools parent involvement is encouraged.

7. Magnet schools are integrated and some Boston parents value an integrated education for their children.

8. Most magnet schools have attractive learning themes (i.e., science, language arts, vocational work/study).

9. A few magnet schools have teaching style themes (i.e., open space). (p. 159)

Magnet schools became a popular concept to study, review, or to write about in various journals, books, and newspapers around the country. In most of these writings there was support for

magnet schools, but there was also some criticisms of their impact on school desegregation.

Rice (1977), an education reporter from Syracuse, New York who had traveled all over the country looking at magnet programs, made the following analysis of the programs that he saw:

> First of all, magnets as I see them have not voluntarily desegregated any urban school system. With few exceptions, individual magnets have not attracted pupils voluntarily in numbers representative of any city's particular racial balance. Furthermore there is little evidence to indicate that they ever will.
>
> Secondly, although magnets have not succeeded in desegregating city schools systems, I think they have had a significant impact on urban education. The magnet schools that I visited were filled with a real excitement, vitality, pride. I witnessed a turning back to the city. (p. 145)

Rice went on to say that magnet schools could only be a component of a desegregation program, but could not be seen as a substitute for a desegregation plan. In short, he saw no possibility of magnets being used for desegregation unless they were coupled with mandatory busing.

There were also researchers and educators who began to question the impact of magnet schools, particularly on desegregation. It was the view of Gary Orfield (1978) that decision makers preferred the magnet school approach because it

required no mandatory busing. He said, "The magnet school plan is often presented to the community, the press, and the courts as an effective method of ending segregation. The fact that no large urban district has ever been fully desegregated through the use of magnet schools is ignored" (p. 158).

Trombley (1977) quoted a three-judge panel from the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals when it reversed a lower court's refusal to permit the NAACP to intervene in the St. Louis case:

> The record reveals that since the consent decree (under which the magnet schools were established), the school district has broadened its magnet school program and achieved some degree of success in doing so . . . . However in view of the small percentage of students participating, the magnet school program must be recognized as only an adjunct to a plan of desegregation and it can not constitute the plan itself. (p. 99)

In addition to the fact that magnet schools, according to various experts, had a very limited impact on desegregating school systems, there were continuing questions about the lack of equity and equal opportunity for all students under the magnet school approach. Broh and Trent (1981) in their study assessing school desegregation strategies, talked about the difficulty of truly evaluating the effectiveness of magnet schools as a desegregation tool. They stated:

> A difficulty with magnet schools is that they do not produce much change in the racial balance of students throughout an entire school system. Furthermore, magnet schools often substitute class discrimination for racial discrimination since middle class minorities generally volunteer for magnet schools leaving a disproportionate share of poor minorities in neighborhood schools. [In addition, the propensity of magnet schools to improve race relations, achievement, and so forth, is difficult to evaluate since these schools tend to attract highly motivated students.] (p. 20-22)

Power (1979) and Bottomly (1977) both raised questions about the equity of magnet schools. Power said, "unless all schools become magnets -- seemingly a contradiction in terms -- some children will be unable to attend magnets. The system will be open to charges of inequity toward those children" (p. 70). Bottomly was very concerned about magnet schools being seen as "better" than other schools rather than just "different". He was also very critical of efforts to develop magnet schools that resulted in the closing of attendance area schools in black communities, transferring black students out, and then reopening the schools as specialty schools. He said these types of actions were "all right so long as black and white people -- minority and majority people -- are equally involved in the decision making so that it is not the white establishment imposing something on the

minority community" (p. 17).

Orfield (1978) made the point that "most magnet plans, particularly those in big cities, rely primarily on transfers of minority children to schools in white or transition areas" (p. 163). This was done, in his opinion, to minimize the fears of whites who did not want to go to schools in black communities.

St. Louis was one of the cities that relied very heavily on magnet schools to achieve desegregation. But Trombley (1977), however, found a number of criticisms about these schools, not the least of which was a concern about "brain drain" of the teaching staff. He stated, "Another complaint about magnet schools in St. Louis and elsewhere, is that they attract the best teachers in the system, thereby lowering the quality of instruction in traditional schools" (p. 98).

In summary, it is clear that magnet schools have generated a lot of support as well as a lot of criticism. They are supported by those who see them as "good" schools, tools of desegregation, the wave of the future in public education, and the answer to mandatory busing. They are criticized for being elitist, ineffective tools for desegregation, mechanisms for placing the burden of desegregation on minorities, and not equitable for all children.

Busing

At one time in American society, the school bus supposedly represented one of the good things about America. Pictures of buses filled with school children was a normal part of the image of the tranquil American scene. But something happened to all of that when the school bus became the tool for school desegregation. Those images became the reflection of a dream torn asunder. Busing became an issue of great emotion and tremendous controversy.

The U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1972) published a pamphlet called Your Child and Busing, and in this pamphlet they cited the change in the attitudes of Americans about busing. The Commission noted that busing had historically been well received by parents and in fact any protest about busing was for more, not less. They also pointed out that the busing of gifted children, handicapped children, and children in rural areas, was continuing without any negative reactions. They asserted that "only in the context of school desegregation has busing been an issue of emotion and controversy. For this purpose alone, the familiar school bus has aroused passionate objections . . .and has generated acts of violence" (p. 3).

The literature is extensive and varied on the issue of busing. The arguments for and against busing cover a tremendous number of viewpoints and concerns.

Most of the literature agrees that the landmark Supreme Court decision that set the stage for the busing controversy was Swann et al v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education et al (1971). Chief Justice Berger in delivering the opinion of the court stated:

> The importance of bus transportation as a normal and accepted tool of educational policy is readily discernible in this and the companion case, Davis supra . . .The District Court's conclusion that assignment of children to the school nearest their home serving their grade would not produce an effective dismantling of the dual system is supported by the record . . . .
>
> . . . We find no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation. Desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school. (p. 29-30)

In making this critical decision the Court was very careful to cite the fact that the decision did not apply to de facto segregation; it applied only to de jure segregation. The court stated:

> . . . in the absence of showing that either the school authorities or some other agency of the state has deliberately attempted to fix or alter demographic

> patterns to affect the racial composition of the schools, further intervention by a district court should not be necessary. (p. 30)

Those persons who supported busing as a tool to bring about school desegregation had a two-pronged argument that guided their views. First, they believed that school desegregation was necessary because it was one (or some combination of) the following: (a) the law; (b) important for overall race relations in the U. S.; and/or (c) necessary to improve the achievement level of black children. Second, they asserted that given the level of housing segregation in America there was no way for school desegregation to take place without busing.

In support of the view that school desegregation was the law, the busing supporters simply cited the Brown decision and all of the court cases that supported the basic proposition that "separate but equal in public education" had no place in American society. The Court stated, "we have now announced that such segregation [in public education] is a denial of the equal protections of the laws" (p. 692).

Pettigrew (1972), Green, Smith, and Schweitzer (1972) all wrote articles suggesting that school desegregation was important for overall race relations in America. Pettigrew said, "I believe it is not an exaggeration to maintain that integrated education is essential for the future viability and harmony of our country" (p. 250). Green, et al stated, "No child, black or white, can be prepared for a multiracial world if brought up in

segregated schools. . . . The racial isolation of different segments of our society has serious detrimental effects on our understanding and acceptance of each other" (p. 543).

The belief that school desegregation was important to the achievement level of black students probably received its greatest impetus from the infamous Coleman Report. This report which was officially entitled Equality of Educational Opportunity (1966) was called for by the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

> Sec. 402. The Commissioner (U. S. Commissioner of Education) shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this letter, concerning the lack or availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia. (p. iii)

One of the issues discussed in the report was the relationship between student achievement and the types of schools they attend. The study came to the following conclusions:

> . . . it appears that a pupil's achievement is strongly related to the educational backgrounds and aspirations of the other students in the school . . . if a white pupil from a home that is strongly and effectively supportive of education is put in a school where most

> pupils do not come from such homes, his achievement will be little different than if he were in a school composed of others like himself. But if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase. (p. 22)
>
> [This analysis] suggests that in the long run, integration should be expected to have a positive effect on Negro achievement. (p. 28)

A White House Panel on Education (1965) discussing the problem of segregation and academic achievement noted that "there is clear documentary evidence of a direct relationship between segregated schools and inferior education, and of cumulative academic retardation among children in negro ghettos. There is evidence also that this waste is remediable, hence the greater tragedy" (p. 17)

Weinberg (1975) believed there was a positive relationship between the achievement of black children and school desegregation. Based on an analysis of a variety of studies relating to desegregation and achievement, he concluded that, "Under desegregation . . . academic achievement rises as the minority child learns more while the advantaged majority child continues to learn at his accustomed rate. Thus the achievement gap narrows" (p. 327)

There were a number of people who believed busing was the

only way to bring about school desegregation. Kriss (1972) was one such proponent. He recognized that busing caused problems, particularly when it involved transporting students long distances. But given the type of segregated housing existing in America, he saw busing as the only effective tool to be used to foster desegregation.

The Supreme Court, in its decision in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (1971), made it clear that busing had to be used to bring about desegregation. The Court pointed out:

> . . . Many attempts have been made to find a way to desegregate effectively without busing, but with the tightly segregated neighborhoods that exist in American communities, desegregation is simply not possible in many localities without busing. The Courts and many superintendents and school boards have had to conclude, therefore, that busing is, if not the only answer, an answer that cannot be ignored. (p. 52)

Another aspect of the busing controversy was the interrelated issues of racial balance and the tipping point. Ellis (1971) made reference to these issues when he discussed the 50% rule. This rule became the point of reference for deciding if a city could or could not be desegregated. This rule put forth the idea that a city of more than 50% black could not be desegregated because whites would be in the minority. He cited

the work of Berelson and Steiner (1964) as proof that such a rule made sense. They made the point that whites would be more accepting of integration if, "the minority [group of pupils] is relatively small, constituting at the very most not more than 25 per cent of the school population . . ." (p. 513). They went on to say that the majority population would reject policies that placed them in the minority.

The literature also contains a wide spectrum of articles by people who were opposed to busing as a means of bringing about desegregation. The educators, researchers, politicians, etc., who were against busing comprised at least three groups of people: (a) those who were against busing because they were opposed to any form of school desegregation; (b) those who were for desegregation but felt busing was an inappropriate method to achieve it; and (c) those who were for desegregation and busing but felt the manner in which busing was being carried out placed a disproportionate burden on blacks.

The opposition to busing that was essentially opposition to school desegregation, came from both the white community and the black community but for very different reasons.

Some of the opposition in the white community stemmed from racism in its rawest form. A white parent, Patricia Derian (1972), cited her views on why whites opposed desegregation in Jackson, Mississippi. She said, "most white parents believed that great harm would befall their children at the hands of black teachers and pupils. Poor and working class whites thought, and

said, that their children would catch syphilis from sharing toilets with black children" (p. 22). James (1972), discussing a confrontation between blacks and whites in the Canarise borough of Brooklyn, quoted a white man[2] giving his reasons to a black man for being against desegregation:

> Look, let's let's not doubt this this fact. You you people are criminal by nature. I mean I mean there's evidence all all over to support this. Look at Harlem and Bedford Stuy Stuy Stuyvesant. All that that crime in the streets. All those those robberies and murders and dope. All those jails crammed with with black people, you you see what I mean? I mean we don't don't want to see the area turned into a dope scene. And blacks beating up whites. You see? I'm not saying all all you people are criminals, but but the percentage is is so high you can't really blame us, you see what I mean? (p. 241)

Whites were not the only ones opposed to desegregation; there were blacks who were opposed as well. These blacks, however, saw forced desegregation simply as another form of racism. A resolution promoted by the South Carolina/Florida delegation at the National Black Political Convention in Gary, Indiana (1972) reflected this view. The resolution stated the following:

> We condemn forced racial integration of schools as a

> bankrupt, suicidal method of desegregating schools, based on the false notion that Black children are unable to learn unless they are in the same setting with white children . . . we demand quality education in the Black community through community controlled state school districts and a guaranteed equal share of all educational money. (p. 41)

This resolution reflected a view in the black community that school desegregation was going to destroy black schools. There were sectors of the black community which believed that all-black schools were necessary in order to maintain some sense of black pride and culture. It was felt these two elements were critical in providing blacks with the psychological strength to survive in America, given that America's very foundation was racist. W.E.B. Du Bois (1935), writing on this problem over thirty years before the Gary Convention discussed this same issue. He stated:

> The question which I am discussing is: Are these separate schools and institutions needed? And the answer, to my mind, is perfectly clear. They are needed just so far as they are necessary for the proper education of the Negro race. The proper education of any people includes sympathetic touch between teacher and pupil; knowledge on the part of the teacher, not simply of the individual taught, but of his surroundings and background, and the history of his

> class and group; such contact between pupils, and between teacher and pupil, on the basis of perfect social equality, as will increase this sympathy and knowledge, facilities for education in equipment and housing, and the promotion of such extracurricular activities as will tend to induct the child into life.
>
> If this is true, and if we recognize the present attitude of white America toward black America, then the Negro not only needs the vast majority of these schools, but it is a grave question if, in the near future, he will not need more such schools, both to take care of his natural increase, and to defend him against the growing animosity of the whites . . . (p. 278)

Those people, white and black, who supported integration but were against busing were a difficult group to actually pin down in the literature. It was difficult because there were certainly some people (particularly whites) who used the busing issue itself to rally around, but in reality the busing issue was for them just a pretext for opposition to school desegregation in particular and/or opposition to the development of a multiracial society in general. Wasserman (1972), Pettigrew (1972), and Green, et al (1972) were some of the supporters of this position. Wasserman said busing was not the real issue; rather it was "school racism, oppression and a crisis which is beginning to affect all members, even the most privileged, of our school

population and which arises out of the social functions which schools in America perform. Pettigrew said, "the real issue is the quality of our public schools. . . . It is no secret that many hard-core segregationists have seized on busing and neighborhood schools as a more respectable means than naked racism to fight racial integration" (p. 25). Green, et al believed the issue was "being used as an excuse to avoid facing the real issue, that is, the development of a multiracial society" (p. 543).

Newsweek (1972), in an article about the busing controversy, discussed the views of people who saw themselves as being anti-busing. The article talked of the difficulty of clearly being able to say that people opposed to busing were racist. A section of the article contained the following analysis:

> The anti-busers' arguments cover a broad spectrum. Some parents talk of the difficulty of making their way cross-town if Johnny should fall ill at school. Many pitch their protest on educational grounds; they have worked hard to move to an area with a good school, they say, and they don't want that achievement suddenly erased by a busing plan. Some object that children, unfairly they think, have been ordered to bear the brunt of the task of integrating American society . . . and others resent the social engineering implied in formulas for racial mixing and court orders dictating where they must send their children to school . . . .

> Many of these complaints are doubtless masks for racism, but it would be both groundless and presumptuous to pretend that all of them are. Busing touches upon a number of deep-seated nerves that have nothing to do with racism -- a parent's concern for his child's safety, his hopes for his child's future; these alone would account for the vast emotional pressure that has built up behind the anti-busing drive. (p. 22)

Another group that provided a very interesting perspective on the busing issue were those people who voiced support for school desegregation but for a variety of reasons opposed forced busing.

Armor (1972), a sociologist from Boston, was one such person. He issued the findings of studies he and others conducted on various desegregation efforts around the country. He reached two conclusions about busing:

> One is that massive mandatory busing for the purposes of improving student achievement and interracial harmony is not effective and should not be adopted at this time. The other is that voluntary integration programs such as METCO, ABC, or Project Concern should be continued and positively encouraged by substantial federal and state grants. Such voluntary programs should be encouraged so that those parents and

> communities who believe in the symbolic and potential (but so far unconfirmed) long-run benefits of induced integration will have ample opportunity to send their children to integrated schools. (p. 115-116)

This article led to a series of charges and counter charges about the evidence used by Armor to reach his conclusions. In spite of the criticism, Armor held to his views, and he was often quoted by anti-busing proponents in and out of Congress. Orfield (1979) was particularly critical of the impact of Armor's assertions. He felt that Armor's prior work with the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights and his status as a professor at Harvard gave him tremendous access to the media, and as a result, his findings had a great impact on policymakers. To support his point, Orfield cited the fact that Rep. Veysey of Ohio used Armor's finding to support his own efforts to pass legislation that would bring an end to forced busing.

Glazer (1972), a professor of education and social structure, spoke out against busing. Among other things, Glazer saw busing as a denial of freedom of choice and actually a denial of "equal protection of laws" for white children. In discussing the impact of remedies mandated by Brown and other court cases such as Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, he stated:

> Inevitably, however, the resulting increase in the freedom of black children--the freedom to attend the schools they wished--entailed a restriction on the

> freedom of others. In 'freedom of choice', the freedom of white children was in no way limited. In geographical zoning to achieve integration, it was limited, but no more than that of black children. But in busing to distant schools, white children were in effect being conscripted to create an environment which, it had been decided, was required to provide equality of educational opportunity for black children. It was perhaps one thing to do this when the whites in question were the children or grandchildren of those who deprived black children of their freedom in the past. But when a district judge in San Francisco ruled that not only white children but Chinese children and Spanish-speaking children must be constricted to create an environment which, he believed, would provide equality of educational opportunity for black children, there was good reason for wondering whether 'equal protection of the laws' was once again being violated, this time from the other side. (p. 45)

James Coleman, who was famous for giving leadership to the study on educational opportunity that was cited earlier, also became a critic of busing. His anti-busing position was made all the more critical because in some quarters he was given credit for being the "Scholar Who Inspired Busing" (June 7, 1975 headline of the National Observer) and the "Sociologist Who

Started it All" (June 1, 1975 headline of the Lansing, Michigan State Journal). Pettigrew and Green (1976) pointed out the fallacious nature of such views. They pointed out that people such as Charles Houston who was the chief counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in the 1930's, was really the person who began the school desegregation effort. They also cited the fact that, "the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its historic public school-desegregation ruling in 1954, a dozen years before the appearance of the Coleman Report" (p. 2).

Coleman, Kelly and Moore (1975) developed a paper that was read by Coleman at the American Educational Research Association's 1975 convention. The paper represented Coleman's entry into the school busing/school desegregation controversy. The writers made several conclusions. Those that are key for this particular part of the study are the following:

> . . . In the large cities (among the largest 22 central city school districts) there is a sizeable loss of whites (students)[3] when desegregation takes place. The effect of desegregation on white loss has been widely different among different cities where desegregation has taken place . . . Because, insofar as we can estimate, the loss of whites upon desegregation is a one-time loss, the long term impact of desegregation is considerably less than that of other continuing factors. The continuing white losses produce an

> extensive erosion of the interracial contact that desegregation of city schools brings about. (p. 78-79)

This report did not cause too much of a stir. But, several weeks later Coleman granted an interview to the Boston Globe in which he directly attacked court-ordered busing to enforce school desegregation. He argued that, "a whole generation of young talent thinks it can transform the society by winning court cases. That's enormously subversive of the whole political process in the United States" (p. 8). Coleman later told the Los Angeles Times, "When the imposition of school integration occurs, and doesn't flow out of the will of the community, then the response on the part of whites, if they have the income to leave, is to leave" (p. 10).

Coleman began to be attacked by educators, and activists. According to Pettigrew and Green (1976):

> These first a of Coleman's positions centered on three points. First they stressed the complexity of the so-called 'white flight' phenomenon and suggested the importance of variables that Coleman's work had not considered. Second, they questioned the scientific ethics of communicating opinions in the form of research results before any analysis was available for review by the social-science community. Third, they emphasized that even if Coleman's dire predictions of massive losses of white students were accurate, the

> appropriate policy response would be extensive metropolitan desegregation rather than the abandonment of constitutional protections. (p. 11)

Coleman[4], in responding to his critics, continued to give interviews. Walter Goodman writing for the New York Times in an article entitled, "Integration, Yes: Busing, NO", reported on an interview with Coleman in which he stated, "What's wrong with compulsory busing is that it's a restriction of rights. We should be expanding people's rights, not restricting them" (p. 48).

After almost a year of interviews, numerous revisions of his initial paper and thousands of headlines and articles in newspapers around the country, Coleman backed off from his initial assertion about white flight. He stated, "What is not clear is whether desegregation itself induces an increased movement of whites from the desegregated district" (p. 45).

In spite of this denial of his initial thesis, for a period Coleman was a champion of anti-busing although he said he supported school desegregation. His opposition to busing was an important element in the white anti-busing fabric during the 1970's.

The final group to be discussed in this literature review are those persons who did not oppose desegregation or busing, but wanted both done in an equitable fashion. They were the persons who were concerned about a disproportionate burden being placed on blacks to bring about desegregation. Bell (1975) and Banks

(1972) felt the actions taken to implement desegregation were being done in a way that whites found acceptable irrespective of the consequences for blacks. Bell talked of vigorous protests by blacks when their schools were closed and their children bused out in disproportionate numbers. Yet nothing was done because the courts and the school boards were making "an effort to make school desegregation as palatable for whites as possible" (p. 37). Banks discussed the lack of evidence that one way desegregation was helping black students. He made the point that these discriminatory plans were "formulated [not] in response to evidence about the way to desegregate most effectively but in response to what the white community will accept" (p. 164).

According to Broh and Trent (1981) in their study administered by the National Institute of Education:

> Local and national experts were keenly aware of the disproportionate burden of transportation that minority students and their families usually experienced during desegregation . . . No particular strategy was offered as a remedy for this condition except that attorneys interviewed suggested that such burdens may not be legal. Generally, however, the burden was seen as both a practical and political problem . . . . Respondents (in the city of Delaware) said that blacks are dissatisfied with the disproportionate burden but understand the practical necessity of it. In other

> instances respondents reported that the disproportionality was the political solution to creating and maintaining some stability in desegregated schools. (p. 129-130)

Hugh Scott (1983) stated that plaintiffs in the Kelly v. Board of Education case in Nashville, Tennessee challenged that city's school desegregation program in 1979 because it, "imposed inequities and inequalities on black students, teachers, and administrators" (p. 237). Among the allegations cited by the plaintiffs were the following:

> (1) School attendance zones as established by the school board imposed a disproportionately greater burden of the dislocations and disruptions on black students . . . .
>
> (11) The systemwide racial ratio mixture of 15%:35% black students as conceived treats black students inequitably and as implemented imposes a disproportionately higher burden of required dislocations and disruptions on black students. (p.237)

In Summary, the busing issue has many sides. By its supporters, it is seen as the only viable vehicle to bring about school desegregation. It is seen on the one hand as a "monster" infringing on the rights of the majority population and on the other hand as a tool for destroying black institutions. The busing issue has generated debate and discussion over a variety

of issues and concepts such as freedom of choice, tipping, racial balance, de facto vs de jure segregation, etc. In the words of Dr. Joseph Durham, (1973) "The question of busing to achieve integration is an involved and complicated educational, legal and constitutional matter with ardent supporters as well as ardent attackers" (p. 335).

Neighborhood Schools

Prior to the push for an end to de facto segregation, the idea of children going to schools close to their homes was one of the more sacrosanct notions of American society. With the exception of those children who lived in rural areas, and those that were sent to "special" schools, American children (particularly those in elementary school) went to schools in their neighborhoods. Summerfield (1971) stated it quite succinctly when he said, "In most American cities, children residing in a fairly small geographical district--a neighborhood--attend the same elementary school." (p. v)

According to Blackman (1964), the neighborhood school centers around the effort to achieve four important objectives:

> First, the neighborhood school provides the cheapest, safest, and fastest means of transporting the child from home to school . . . .
>
> Second, many educators believe schools should be small. The neighborhood form of organization helps keep them small . . . .
>
> Third, educators believe that young children benefit from the security that comes from learning and living in the same familiar environment. They feel that children should be able to have their classmates as after school playmates and that they should be able

> to return to school for after school classes and programs.
>
> Fourth, . . . educators want a close relationship between school and family. The neighborhood school should, and often does, serve as an invitation to parents to know, confide, and work with its staff. This offers a good chance for constructive community pressures on the central school administration and the political authorities for local school improvement. . . Stated from a different perspective, the neighborhood school is a reflection of the belief that education should be locally controlled. (p. 50)

These views about the role that neighborhood schools were playing became major points of contention when the neighborhood school concept came under attack during the move to desegregate schools. In America, because of residential segregation (particularly in the north), neighborhood schools for the most part meant one-race schools.

As with the busing issue, there were different groupings of people, black and white, who clustered around various beliefs about the validity of the neighborhood school concept as it pertained to desegregation. For purposes of this study, the review of the literature focused on four somewhat loosely defined categories of people: (1) those people, primarily whites, who were supporters of the neighborhood school concept because they opposed desegregation and reasoned that it was better to be <u>for</u>

neighborhood schools than against school desegregation; (2) those people (primarily blacks) who were most concerned about the disproportionate number of black neighborhood schools being closed; (3) those blacks who argued for the development of community controlled schools or more concentration on providing quality education within their own neighborhood schools, either of which was considered to be more important than integration; and (4) those persons who saw the neighborhood school concept as basically an outdated notion that essentially was being used in an effort to block school desegregation.

The tactic of supporting neighborhood schools rather than being against school desegregation was a mirror image of the position of being against busing rather than being against desegregation. Some writers discussed the neighborhood schools argument and the anti-busing sentiment in the same breath (Pettigrew, 1972).

Some of the anti-busing groups themselves made a connection between the busing issue and neighborhood schools. Daniel Zwerdling (1976) discussed this tactic while describing the activities of the National Action Group (NAG), an anti-busing organization from Pontiac, Michigan. He stated, "NAG insists that its opposition to busing has nothing to do with race . . . NAG opposes the busing because it destroys the 'neighborhood school system which is the American way'. . ." (p. 15). According to Zwerdling, this opposition against busing and

support for the neighborhood school concept existed although, "Pontiac schools have been busing some kids for years and many parents send their children to parochial schools." (p. 15)

The link between the anti busing argument and the desire for neighborhood schools was also made by Marty (1973). He discussed the tactic used by busing critics of lauding the virtues of neighborhood schools while they attacked judges who, according to them, "have exceeded their authority and have imposed on local school districts the necessity of carrying out actions that are unconstitutional, too costly, and detrimental to the health, welfare, and educational development of children they affect" (p. 753).

Featherstone (1976), discussing the Boston situation, made the point that the support for neighborhood schools was really a clash between both races and classes, not really about schools, but about overall relations between the different groups of people in the city. He stated, "Busing is scarcely new in Boston . . .' neighborhood schools' drawing on cohesive neighborhoods have for some time been the exception rather than the rule . . . . The fight in Boston involves a clash between various groups. . . .Besides being racial, it is also a cultural and class battle" (p. 14).

Jencks (1972) writing for the New York Times Magazine pointed out the fact that white officials often voiced their support for the neighborhood school concept supposedly because of its educational merits and its importance to the maintenance of

strong ties between the family and the school. But in reality, their support for the concept rested in its capacity to maintain segregation. Jencks claimed that Denver had long been changing school boundaries to keep whites in their neighborhood schools. He said, "If neighborhood schools did not have that effect, it seems safe to predict the current Denver Board would find new virtues in busing" (p. 121). There were a number of reasons given to explain why most desegregation plans led to a disproportionate number of black neighborhood schools being closed. But, two interrelated reasons were most often given to explain the problem. First, black children's motivation and achievement levels would be improved in an "integrated" environment. Second, in order for this integration to be done in an effective manner, it had to be done outside of the black community.

On the issue of whether an integrated environment improved the motivation and achievement of black children, the literature has shown mixed results. Weinberg (1977) cited the findings of the Coleman Report (1966) which showed a positive relationship between achievement and integration. This report stated:

1. . . . as the proportion white in a school increases, the achievement of students in each racial group increases.

2. . . . This relationship increases as the grade in school increases.

3. The higher achievement of all racial and ethnic groups in schools with greater proportions of white students is largely, perhaps wholly, related to effects associated with the student body's educational background and aspirations rather than with better facilities and curriculum.

4. . . . average test performance (for Negroes) increases as the proportion of white classmates increases . . . .

5. Those students who first entered desegregated schools in the early grades do generally show slightly higher average scores than the students who first come to desegregated schools in later grades" (p.107).

In Buffalo, New York, two researchers, Banks and Di Pasquale (1969) found that black students did much better academically when they were bused to a formerly all white school than did those black students who remained at the all black school.

There were also studies that showed no significant increase in achievement level for black students. Meyer Weinberg (1977) discussed a study by Charles Lee Evans (1969) that showed, "Black students in nonsegregated schools who scored lowest on a test of mental ability also gained more on achievement than peers in segregated schools. Otherwise, Black students in nonsegregated schools did not even match the achievement levels of peers in segregated schools" (p. 116).

The conclusion, though, that seemed to best capture the

reality of the whole issue was best stated by Dr. Nancy St. John. She surveyed various studies conducted during the decades of the 60's and 70's as they related to desegregation and achievement. In her findings she stated:

> On the basis of this evidence, biracial schooling must be judged neither a demonstrated success nor a demonstrated failure . . . . As implemented to date, desegregation has not rapidly closed the black-white gap in academic achievement, though it has rarely lowered and sometimes raised the scores of black children. Improvement has been more often reported in the early grades, in arithmetic and in schools over 50 per cent white, but even here the gains have been mixed, intermittent, or nonsignificant. . . .Biracial schooling is apparently not detrimental to the academic performance of black children; but it may have negative effects on their self-esteem. (p. 119)

In most cities it became the accepted practice to insist that blacks leave their neighborhood schools to implement school desegregations. Much of the rationale for this practice was at least indirectly supported by a theory that became known as "cultural deprivation", or the "culture of poverty".

This theory contended that the child's home or his or her neighborhood could not provide the stimulus that was needed for them to be successful in school. The neighborhood was said to be

a retardant on the development of their academic potential (Deutsch, 1967; Hunt, 1969).

Kenneth Clark (1963) was a critic of this theory, seeing it as a more refined version of the old biological or racial inferiority arguments. He felt this concept allowed proponents to side step attributing poor performance of black children to "inherent" deficiencies. Instead, this theory allowed for blame to be placed on "a complex of social and cultural deficits, burdens and problems in the general environment outside of the control of the school" (p. 4). These deficiencies, according to Clark (1972), that impaired learning were problems such as "neighborhood crime and delinquency . . . broken homes . . . no books in the home and other general conditions of poverty which send children to school without breakfast, without adequate clothing, and which prevent parents from providing quiet places for study" (p. 8). This environment that was being discussed was the black community. Most white parents simply refused to send their children into black communities which they considered drug ridden, crime ridden, and incapable of providing an atmosphere conducive to learning.

The other explanation offered for why blacks had to endure a disproportionate loss of access to their neighborhood schools was the unwillingness on the part of the whites to be in schools where there were too many black people. Nancy St. John (1975) said that whites would accept blacks in schools under certain conditions; namely, the percentage of blacks to whites had to

remain small. She stated that as long as it remains small, "there is no reason for white pupils to experience stigma, relative deprivation, social threat, marginality, or a change in norms, standards, or the expectations of their significant others" (p. 92-93). Hamilton (1968) discussed this problem from another angle. He discussed the condescending attitude toward the black community's concern about the loss of neighborhood schools. The Board noted that black parents might react negatively to busing the children to white schools. The suggestion was made to do everything possible to get a favorable reaction from these parents, but if that proved to be impossible "the transfer program would have to proceed without a popular base. In the light of the dismal alternatives such a program perhaps proceed without consensus" (p. 673).

Hamilton saw this kind of statement as a continuation of the practice of telling the black community what is best for it, irrespective of its views and concerns. It is important to note that Hamilton's comments occurred during the upsurge of the Black Power Movement, a movement that emphasized the need for more black community control over education and sought to minimize the push for school integration. His criticism, however, represents a trend in black reaction to integration that started at the time of the Brown decision and continued through the period being covered by this study.

Some blacks began to discuss the importance of demanding

community controlled schools rather than continuing the effort to bring about desegregation. Wilcox (1970) believed that there was a growing recognition by blacks of the need to control the substance of their children's education. He said, "This recognition is based on the effective lack of good intention and the questionable availability of skills within the white community to educate Blacks humanely and meaningfully." (p. 24)

Wilcox went on to define the "Black Controlled Schools" as:

> Schools located within the Black Community in which the Black Community seeks to remove white racists from control over the school in order to:
>
> (a) modify and control the content, form, and style of the school
>
> (b) mute the oppressive policies of the central board such as school suspension procedures, 'gentlemen's agreements' as they apply to the use of corporal punishment and staff promotion, the de-Africanization of the curriculum, the coercive use of the police system against kids to protect teachers who fail teach, the infantilization of parents, the regimentation of teachers, and feeble submission to union control.
>
> (c) involve the community in acquiring the skills to hold the school accountable
>
> (d) diminish the flow of public funds for school construction, the purchase of books and supplies,

employment purposes out of the community

(e) centralize community planning, and development around the community's most important asset -- the <u>future</u> of its children, not just its children. (p. 25-26)

Banks (1972) said that the practice of closing schools in the black community:

> . . . represents one of the most tragic recent developments in American society. . . . These actions reinforce the false and tenuous sense of racial superiority held by whites, and develop within them an insidious ethnocentrism which is inimical to the creation and perpetuation of a humane society. . . . We violate both the culture and integrity of a group when we close its schools and take the power and unity which these schools symbolize. . . . School districts should send whites to predominantly black schools, as well as blacks to white schools. But black schools should not be closed. (p. 270-271)

Altevogt and Nusbaumer (1978) discussed the importance of neighborhood schools to the black community. They said, "A community needs the presence of basic institutions in order to be a stable and healthy community. Schools are one of those institutions." (p. 34)

Arnez (1978), in describing the various harmful effects of the process on black children, touched on some of the problems caused by their loss of access to neighborhood schools:

> (1) . . . the loss of teaching and administrative jobs by Blacks through dismissals, demotions or displacement; (2) the loss of millions of dollars in projected earned income; (3) the loss of racial models, heroes, authority figures for Black children; (4) the loss of cherished school symbols, colors, emblems and names of schools by Black children when their schools were closed and they were shifted to white schools; (5) subjection to segregated classes and buses, and exclusion from extracurricular activities; (6) disproportionate numbers of Black students suspended, expelled, and pushed out of schools; (7) exposure of Black children to hostile attitudes and behavior of white teachers and parents; (8) victimization by forced one-way busing policies and the uprooting of Black children for placement in hostile school environments without any support systems; (9) victimization by misclassification in special education classes and track systems; (10) victimization by unfair discipline practices and arbitrary school rules and regulations; and (11) victimization by ignorance of their learning styles, culture and social, educational and psychological

needs. (p. 29)

One of the more interesting comments about the struggle by blacks to control the schools in their communities came from from Gunning (1972), a conservative Republican Assemblywoman from New York. She believed that there was growing support for the most militant blacks in the community because of their support for community control of schools. She felt that prior to this new source of leadership black people had no one to speak out against busing. She stated, "their [the militants] support in black communities has increased because they became the spokesmen against the children being sent out of their neighborhood and because they resent the condescension inherent in the theory that black children needed to be with whites to acquire 'quality education' . . . . " (p. 4). Ornstein (1971) described the struggle for community control by blacks in this way:

> The fight for black-controlled schools is based on the premise that the community is a social entity and entitled to its own maintenance structures and norms. It is based on the belief that all ethnic and racial groups have a right to control their own institutions so that they can function on a more equal basis within the larger system. The fact that the white power structure now controls black schools means that they lack legitimacy; the schools must be turned over to the people--and the people in the ghetto are black.(p. 437)

There were individuals in the black community who developed

serious reservations about the importance of desegregation when compared to the need to struggle for quality education. They did not push for community control, but they did see the need to concentrate on improving the quality of the education in black neighborhood schools.

Robert Carter (1980), one of the leading attorneys in the Brown litigation, was one such person. Carter said that given a change to litigate Brown again, he would have changed his strategy. He would not have used social scientists to substantiate his case. He would have instead asked educators to define equal educational opportunity. This view reflected Carter's current belief, that the quality of the education being received by blacks is more critical than integration. Although he continues to support school integration, he now feels that for blacks, particularly poor blacks, their only chance for decent jobs "is to concentrate on having quality education delivered to schools where blacks are attending, and in all likelihood will be attending for at least another generation" (p. 28).

This issue of quality education was at the forefront of the thinking of other blacks. Edmonds (1980) believed that the issue of racial balance needed to be pushed to the background so that attention could be focused on efforts to develop effective education. He expressed his opposition to the notion that simply putting black children into an integrated school would assure them of getting a quality education. He said, "demographic

desegregation must take backstage to instructional reform. . . . Surely, it must now be clear that black parents want effective schooling for their children and desegregation is useful to black parents if, and only if, it moves to that end" (p. 121)

Despite the big push for community controlled schools, there were blacks as well as whites who saw any form of struggle for neighborhood schools as, in essence, a move against desegregation. These individuals believed that school desegregation was the only way for blacks to get a quality education and at the same time prepare themselves to live in a multiracial society. Alvin Poussaint and Toye Brown Lewis (1976) represented this viewpoint. They were very strongly opposed to any effort that relaxed the push for school desegregation. They said:

> Achievement of school desegregation and racial equality remains a critical problem. The emotional and psychological toll that resistance to it will have on black children and their families will be as great as the toll the struggle for integration and liberation has had on black families since slavery. Yet, blacks must pursue their constitutional rights. The strategies to achieve desegregation must be deliberately speedy. Any relaxation of these strategies will give aid to forces seeking a reversal of desegregation policies and the continued subjugation of blacks as institutionalized practices. (p. 335)

Clark (1972) spoke very strongly of the need for school desegregation in American society. He saw the effort as crucial to the development of a democratic society. He argued against allowing any emotional attachments to the neighborhood school philosophy to stand in the way of desegregation. He said, "Desegregation of public schools and its implications for social stability and democratic education are matters of profound importance . . . ." (p. 11)

The U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1972) was extremely critical of the neighborhood school concept. They stated:

> . . . no parent has the absolute right to send his child to a school simply because it happens to be geographically nearest.
>
> The educational trend in recent years has been away from the neighborhood school, whose facilities are necessarily limited by size, toward larger schools which can provide better facilities and a broader curriculum. The neighborhood school was not sacred in the days of segregation, and there is no reason why it should be today. To make the neighborhood school the cornerstone of American education would be to turn the clock back educationally as well as socially. (p. 12)

To summarize, the neighborhood school concept was seen as an integral part of the American dream by its supporters, and an

outdated, irrelevant relic by its detractors. Some blacks supported the neighborhood school concept as a method for achieving community control of schools. Others were concerned about the disproportionate number of black neighborhood schools that were being closed as the result of the implementation of various desegregation plans. Some whites and blacks opposed any attempt to keep the neighborhood school idea alive because they viewed such action as an effort to deter school desegregation.

Throughout the entire period of this study, the debate between supporters and detractors of the neighborhood school philosophy continued unabated.

CHAPTER 3

Design of the Study

This dissertation was designed primarily to study and analyze the actual movement, for purposes of desegregation, of black and white elementary, middle, and high school students attending school in the Milwaukee Public School System during the school years 1979 through 1982. Essentially the study focuses on the movement of these students from their attendance area to attend either other attendance area schools, specialty schools or special program schools.

In addition to studying the movement of the students, both the legal framework established by the consent decree and the written policies developed by MPS that served as the guidelines for the movement of students throughout the system were analyzed.

Definitions

Before proceeding to describe the two key sources of information for this study, it is necessary to define some of the critical terms that are used in the analysis of the data. Two of these terms are defined in an MPS document entitled, First Draft: Comprehensive Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and

Improving Racial Balance in the Milwaukee Public Schools (December 8, 1976):

1. Attendance Area School -"schools (that) are determined by the residence of the student and his/her parent/guardian. Each student has an attendance area which becomes the attendance area feeder pattern for the student's residence; elementary school attendance area, middle school attendance area, and senior high school attendance area" (p. 88).

2. City Wide School (i.e., Specialty School) - "schools (that have) a unique program and do not have a designated attendance area for any section of the city" (p. 88).

The other definitions that are important to this study are the following:

1. Special Program Schools - These schools were set up for students who can not function in the regular educational program. For purposes of this study, there are two categories of schools covered under this definition: (a) those schools serving children with exceptional education needs (EEN). At the time MPS began its desegregation efforts, the Wisconsin Statutes, Section 115.76 (3) defined children and youth with EEN as: "any child who has a mental, physical, emotional or learning disability which, if the full potential of the child is to be attained, requires educational services to the child to supplement or replace regular education."; (b) those schools that were set up as alternative schools or continuation schools as MPS defined

them in a policy paper entitled, "An Array of Alternatives," (1975): "These (schools) tend to focus on students whose education has been or might be interrupted. They could serve actual or potential drop-outs." (p. 5). For purposes of this study, these schools were included in the data contained within the tables only where specifically noted. There are also population figures relating to these schools in the appendix.

2. K-8 Schools - There are several schools in Milwaukee that allow students to attend from kindergarten through eighth grade. The data used in this study does not include information on 7th and 8th grade students in these schools. The decision not to include these students was made on the basis of the limited number of students involved, and the fact that these schools do not fit the most common structural pattern of either an elementary or middle school in the Milwaukee Public School System.

3. Black School - Any school in which the number of black students enrolled is equal to 60 percent or more of the total student enrollment.

4. White School - Any school in which the number of white students enrolled is equal to 60 percent or more of the total student enrollment.

5. Hispanic School - Any school in which the number of Hispanic students enrolled is equal to 60 percent or more of the total student enrollment.

6. Black Attendance Area - Any attendance area in which

the black student population constitutes 60 percent or more of all students residing in the attendance area.

7. White Attendance Area - Any attendance area in which the white student population constitutes 60 percent or more of all students residing in the attendance area.

8. Hispanic Attendance Area - Any attendance area in which the Hispanic student population constitutes 60 percent or more of all all students residing in the attendance area.

9. Integrated Attendance Area - Any attendance area in which one race of students comprises more than 59.9 percent of all students residing in the attendance area.

10. Sideways Movement - (a) The movement of black students residing in a black attendance area to a school in another black attendance area; (b) The movement of white students residing in a white attendance area to a school in another white attendance area. In either of these two situations, school desegregation is not enhanced in any way.

The decision to use the 60 percent threshold to designate an attendance area school as being white, black, Hispanic or integrated was based on a recognition of the "tipping point" theory defined in Chapter 1. However, the writer decided to apply this conceptual framework to blacks as well as whites. In other words, if a 40 percent black population is considered the point at which white exodus becomes "irreversible", then it could certainly be "used" also as a "ceiling" for defining a white

attendance area. Since the writer believes that applying this principle to one group but not the other is racist, the decision was made to apply the concept to define a black attendance area as well. In taking this tact, the writer tried to remain cognizant of the advice given by Killian and Grigg (1965) concerning the "tipping point" concept. They said:

> Negroes will need to remember that as illogical, vague and essentially racist as it may be, the phenomenon of the "tipping point" is real for both whites and negroes.
>
> But the "tipping point" is no more precise or magical than is the quota. To attempt to specify either and make a precise figure the basis of a policy is to invite discrimination. What is required is the application of human intelligence to the use of these concepts not as solutions to the problems of desegregation but as danger signals. (p. 273)

The way in which the 60 percent threshold is used in this study represents an effort to recognize that the "tipping point" concept is indeed "real". However, the writer's decision to apply this concept to whites as well as blacks reflects an effort to remove any disparity of treatment given the two groups.

It is also important to note that the definition of the "tipping point" concept given in Chapter 1 applied to the population of a city. For purposes of this study, however, the threshold is being used to designate the race dominance of an

attendance area school--not the population of the city of Milwaukee.

Because of the myriad of specialty schools, special program schools, and specialties within the traditional schools, the writer felt it would be helpful to provide more detailed information about these programs in the various schools.

All of the attendance area high schools have a "school within a school" specialty concept in addition to the regular educational program. This is to distinguish them from the city wide specialty programs. In citing individual high school population figures, it was not possible to distinguish between students in specialty programs and those in the regular educational program as this breakdown was not so designated in the School Enrollment by Receiving School. The schools and their "specialties" that were established during or prior to this study are as follows:

1. Bay View - visual and performing arts
2. Custer - applied technology
3. Hamilton - marketing and business communication
4. Madison - a and natural resources
5. Marshall - communications and media
6. North - medical, dental, and health
7. Pulaski - transportation
8. Riverside - government and community services
9. South - tourism, food service, and recreation

10. Washington - computer data processing

11. West - law, law enforcement, and protective services

The city wide specialty schools and their programs that were established prior to or during the time period covered by this study are the following:

Elementary

1. 82nd St. - multi-language
2. Elm - creative arts
3. 55th St. - multi-language
4. Garfield - open education
5. Hawley - environmental education
6. Lloyd - multi-unit/individually guided education
7. MacDowell - Montessori
8. Meir - gifted and talented
9. Townsend - continuous progress
10. 21st St. - teacher pupil learning center
11. 38th St. - open education

Middle

1. Robinson - open education
2. 8th St. - individually guided education

High

1. King - college preparatory
2. Juneau - finance and small business
3. Milwaukee Tech - vocational/technical

Special program schools that were established prior to or during the period covered by this study are as follows:

Elementary

1. Gaenslen - physically/multiply handicapped
2. Manitoba Orthopedic - physically/multiply handicapped
3. Neeskra-Hearing - deaf and hard of hearing
4. Oklahoma Binner - learning disabled/emotionally disturbed/ mental retardation

High

1. Craig - alternative exceptional education
2. Demmer - GED/alternate high school
3. Lincoln - business development and skills/vocational education and programming center
4. Liberty - emotionally disturbed
5. Lapham Park - GED/alternate high school
6. Kilmer - GED/alternate middle/high school
7. Lady Pitts - school age parents program
8. 68th St. - GED/alternate middle/high school
9. Pleasant View - mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed

Sources of Information

This study was based on a systematic analysis of information contained within two Milwaukee Public School System data sources: School Enrollment by Receiving School (1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982) and School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area (1979, 1980,

1981 and 1982). These documents are the System's record of the movement of students from an attendance area school to a receiving school that is either a specialty school, a school in another attendance area or what is being referred to in this study as a special program school.

The School Enrollment by Receiving School booklet contains data on the racial makeup of the student population actually in attendance at a given school. The document is divided into three sections: high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools. In each section, schools are categorized as receiving schools and attendance area schools. The receiving schools are the focus of the document, therefore the information is structured in such a way as to allow for the identification of the total number of students and the total number of students of each race enrolled at the receiving school. It is also possible to determine the total number of students and attendance areas from which the students originated.

The School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area booklet contains data on the racial makeup of the student population in the student's attendance area. The booklet is divided into the same three sections as the receiving school booklet and uses the same categories: receiving schools and attendance area schools. However, since the focus is on the attendance area, the information is presented in a form that makes it possible to ascertain the total number of students and the total number of students of each race living in the attendance area prior to the

movement of any of these students to other schools. Additionally, it is possible to locate the receiving schools to which attendance area students are sent and to determine the number of black and white students sent to each of these schools. To draw conclusions on the four research questions posed in Chapter 1, the following information was needed:

1. The total number of students in a given attendance area.
2. The total number of black students in a given attendance area.
3. The total number of white students in a given attendance area.
4. The percentage of the attendance area population that is black.
5. The number of attendance area blacks remaining in the attendance area.
6. The number of attendance area whites remaining in the attendance area.
7. The number of blacks sent out from the attendance area.
8. The number of whites sent out from the attendance area.
9. The number of different schools receiving blacks from a given attendance area.
10. The number of different schools receiving whites from a given attendance area.
11. The number of blacks received by a school other than their own attendance area school.

12. The number of whites received by a school other than their own attendance area school.

13. The total number of black students in attendance at each of the receiving schools.

14. The total number of white students in attendance at each of the receiving schools.

15. The total number of students enrolled at each of the receiving schools.

16. The percentage of blacks in attendance at each of the receiving schools.

17. The total number of blacks sent from their attendance area to a black attendance area school.

18. The total number of whites sent from their attendance area to a white attendance area school.

The only information cited above that can be obtained from the School Enrollment by Receiving School booklet and/or the School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area booklet without any special calculations is the following:

1. The total number of students in each attendance area.

2. The total number of students of each race in each attendance area.

3. The total number of students attending school in a given receiving school.

4. The total number of students of each race attending each receiving school.

All other data was generated either through manual counting

(line by line e. g., to determine the total number of schools receiving students from a given attendance area), calculations to determine percentages or total numbers, or cross referencing between the sending and receiving school data sources.

An example of this process can be seen by tracing the steps followed to gather information on Auer Avenue school for 1982:

Step 1: Identify Auer Avenue as a black attendance area school.

a. Refer to sending attendance area booklet to find that there are 1705 students enrolled, 1652 of whom are black, 25 of whom are white.

b. Calculate percentage of blacks in total enrollment to be 96.89%

Step 2: Determine number of attendance area blacks and whites who remained in attendance area.

a. Cross reference to receiving school booklet where Auer Avenue is listed as a receiving school to learn that there are 531 blacks in attendance and 3 whites.

b. Subtract 531 remaining black students from the 1652 in the attendance area to determine that 1121 black Auer Avenue students were sent out. Similar calculation for Auer's white students shows 22 were sent out.

Steps 1 and 2 listed above in this example were completed for every elementary attendance school listed in the sending

attendance area booklet in 1982.

Step 3: Determine the number of blacks sent from Auer that were sent to black attendance area schools and the number of whites sent from Auer that were sent to white attendance area schools.

a. Cross reference data on receiving schools contained in the sending area booklet under Auer Avenue in order to tabulate which schools received white and black students from Auer.

Prior calculations in Steps 1 and 2 showed that LaFollette was a black attendance area school and Grantosa Drive was a white attendance area school. LaFollette received 4 black students from Auer; Grantosa received 1 white student from Auer.

b. A cross reference of the receiving school designation in the sending attendance area booklet reveals the following:

Black students from Auer sent to black attendance area schools: 52 of the 531 sent out

White students from Auer sent to white attendance area schools: 4 of the 22 sent out

Step 4: A count of the number of schools receiving the 1121 black students sent from Auer shows that they were dispersed to 94 different schools. The 22 white

students sent from Auer were dispersed to 12 different schools.

Step 5: Using the receiving school booklet determine the black and white student enrollment at Auer. The booklet shows:

Total Enrollment - 588

Black Enrollment - 569

White Enrollment - 6

Step 6: Calculate percentage of black students attending Auer: 569/588=96.77%.

Step 7: Cross reference to the number of black (531) and white (3) attendance area student remaining at Auer, subtract that figure from total black and white enrollment to arrive at the number of black and white students sent in to Auer:

	Blacks Enrolled	569		Whites Enrolled	6
-	Blacks Remaining	531	-	Whites Remaining	3
	Blacks Sent in	38		Whites Sent in	3

The example above shows how information contained in the appendix tables was used to analyze movement of students to and from a particular school, where that school was both an attendance area school and a receiving school. These appendix tables were used as the data base for the development of Tables 1 through 23 contained in Chapter 4. To facilitate the development of the information needed to generate both the appendix tables and the

tables in Chapter 4 (which had to be completed for each elementary, middle, and high school for each of the four years covered by this study) a spread sheet format computer program was developed to do most of the calculations of totals, averages, and percentages. As the writer progressed through the study, it became apparent that additional information was needed relating to the movement of black and white students to specialty schools. This led to the development of Table A-14 through A-16 in the appendix. The two additional categories contained in these tables show the number of black and white students sent to specialty schools from each attendance area. To get this information, the writer used a process similar to that utilized to determine the number of blacks and whites sent to black attendance area schools and white attendance area schools, respectively.

In addition to the two primary sources of information, other materials were utilized. Among them: official minutes of the Milwaukee Board of School Directors meetings; briefs and information memoranda pertaining to the original lawsuit; newspaper clippings during the years 1975 through 1982; reports and other documents developed by the MPS administration; reports and other documents developed by various citizens groups involved with the desegregation process; and official minutes of Milwaukee Board of School Directors sub-committee meetings. Most of the information sources cited in this paragraph were useful as background to give the writer a better sense of the myriad of

activities that were taking place as the desegregation plan was being developed and implemented.

CHAPTER 4

Presentation and Interpretation of Data

This chapter will present and interpret the data that have been gathered for this study in the following manner: first, background information will be cited in preparation for a review of the data that is specific to each of several research questions; second, each research question will be specified and the data relevant to that particular question will be set forth and analyzed. First, the author will define the term disproportionate burden, which has been used earlier in this study and is key to the research questions that will be addressed in this chapter. For purposes of this study, disproportionality is measured by determining what percentage of all black and white students being bused is represented by each race, and comparing that percentage to the percentage of all black and white students in the MPS population represented by each race. For either race, if the percentage being bused exceeds the percentage in the population by 10% or more, that race is shouldering a disproportionate burden of the movement for desegregation purposes. This definition (with appropriate changes) also applies when determining whether there is a disproportionate burden of dislocations resulting from school closings or the conversion of attendance area schools to specialty schools.

For example, 1979 data shows that at the elementary school level a total of 13,452 black and white students were moved for desegregation purposes. Of that total, 10,548 or 78.4% were black and 2,904 or 21.6% were white. Because the percentage of blacks being bused exceeds their percentage in the population by 30 percent, this means that black students bore a disproportionate burden of the student movement for desegregation purposes.

Background Information

The following information provides a description of the student population of MPS between 1979 and 1982. This data, while not specifically addressing any of the research questions, is essential for any analysis of MPS policies on school closings and student movement for desegregation purposes. It is being presented to give the reader some basic demographic data about the system, and also to present a different statistical possibility for defining a desegregated school. In both instances, the information being presented in this background section will be helpful to the reader's effort to understand and draw conclusions from the data presented in analyzing the research questions.

Table 1 presents the year-by-year totals and the four year averages of black, white and other student populations at the elementary, middle, and high school levels between 1979 and 1982.

Total enrollment declined from a high of 90,549 in 1979 to 85,881 in 1982. Between 1979 and 1982, the MPS population declined by 5.15 percent, with the largest drop occurring between 1979 and 1980 (3.2 percent or 2901 students). At all three levels, the student population declined each year with the exception of a slight increase at the elementary and middle school levels between 1981 and 1982 (.65% and .61%, respectively).

There were several notable changes in the racial composition of the student population during this four-year period. The most significant changes were as follows:

1. The percentage of white students dropped from 47 percent in 1979 to 41 percent in 1982, reflecting a loss of almost 7,000 students.

2. The percentage of black students rose from 44 percent in 1979 to 48 percent in 1982, an increase of 971 students.

3. There was an increase in both the number and the percentage of students in the "other" category. For purposes of this section, unless otherwise designated, the "other" designation includes Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian students. It also includes students designated by MPS as "other". There was an almost 2 percent increase in their numbers which represented an increase of 1257 students.

Over the four-year period the proportion of the total student population represented by the middle school level remained relatively constant. However, at the elementary level

the proportion increased by 1.11 percent while the proportion at the high school level decreased by 1.01 percent.

Table 1

Student Population in the Attendance Areas of the Milwaukee Public School System (1979 - 1982)

Year	Total Number	Number Black	% Black	Number White	% White	Number Other	% Other
Elementary							
1979	49127	23721	48.3	20625	42.0	4781	9.7
1980	48079	23865	49.6	19117	39.8	5097	10.6
1981	47243	23550	49.8	18413	39.0	5280	11.2
1982	47548	23768	50.0	18262	38.4	5518	11.6
4 Yr. Avg:	47999	23726	49.4	19104	39.8	5169	10.8
Middle							
1979	12182	5877	48.2	5491	45.1	814	6.7
1980	11915	5660	47.5	4841	40.6	1414	11.9
1981	11397	5980	52.5	4526	39.7	891	7.8
1982	11466	6139	53.5	4319	37.7	1008	8.8
4 Yr. Avg:	11740	5914	50.4	4794	40.8	1032	8.8
High							
1979	29240	10978	37.5	16543	56.6	1719	5.9
1980	27654	10837	39.2	15024	54.3	1793	6.5
1981	27406	11244	41.0	14217	51.9	1945	7.1
1982	26867	11640	43.3	13182	49.1	2045	7.6
4 Yr. Avg:	27792	11175	40.2	14742	53.0	1876	6.7

There are two other important statistical indicators that are useful as background information on MPS: (1) the number of attendance areas, and (2) the size of attendance areas. In reviewing this information it is important to note that at the elementary school level, the racial categories for attendance areas include black, white, integrated, and Hispanic. At the middle and high school levels, there are no Hispanic attendance areas. The analysis of the data contained within Tables 2 through 4 revealed the following:

1. At the elementary school level between 1979 and 1982 (a) the ratio, e.g. size relationship, of the number of white elementary attendance areas to all other attendance areas declined. For example, in 1979 the white to black ratio was 2.6:1, while in 1982 it was 2.5:1. The decline of white attendance area numbers in comparison to both integrated and Hispanic attendance areas was more substantial: from 9.9:1 and 23.0:1 in 1979 to 7.6:1 and 20.3:1 in 1982, respectively; (b) during the same time period, the ratio of black, integrated, and Hispanic attendance area size increased in comparison to white attendance area size. Throughout the entire period covered by this study black attendance areas remained over twice as large as white attendance areas. In 1979, the size ratio was 2.7:1; by 1982 it was 2.9:1. For integrated and Hispanic attendance areas, for the same years, the increases in size relative to white attendance areas was 1.9:1 and 2.2:1 to 2.0:1 and 2.3:1, respectively.

2. At the middle school level (a) there were no changes in the number of any category of attendance areas during the four-year period; the ratio of the number of white attendance areas to black attendance areas remained 2:1 and the ratio of the number of white to integrated attendance areas was 10:1; (b) over the four-year period, the ratio of the size of integrated attendance areas increased when compared to white attendance areas from 1.3:1 to 1.4:1; the ratio of the size of black attendance areas to white remained stable at 2.5:1.

3. At the high school level (a) the ratio of the number of white attendance areas to both black and integrated remained unchanged at 2.3:1 and 3.5:1, respectively; (b) the ratio of the size of black and integrated attendance areas increased substantially when compared to white attendance areas. the ratios moved from 1.64:1 and 1:10:1 in 1979 to 1.95:1 and 1.25:1, respectively, in 1982.

Table 2

Number and Average Size of Elementary School Attendance Areas (1979 - 1982)

Year		Attendance Area Type				
		Overall	Black	Integrated	White	Hispanic
1979	Number	106	27	7	69	3
	Avg. Size	468	822	585	306	675
1980	Number	98	24	9	62	3
	Avg. Size	496	919	613	312	695
1981	Number	97	23	10	61	3
	Avg. Size	487	897	642	299	658
1982	Number	97	24	8	61	3
	Avg. Size	490	882	637	302	692
Avg. Size All 4 Yrs.		485	880	619	305	680

Table 3

Number and Average Size of Middle Schcol Attendance Areas (1979 - 1982)

Year		Attendance Area Type				
		Overall	Black	Integrated	White	Hispanic
1979	Number	16	5	1	10	0
	Avg. Size	761	1282	650	512	-
1980	Number	16	5	1	10	0
	Avg. Size	745	1281	626	470	-
1981	Number	16	5	1	10	0
	Avg. Size	712	1243	618	436	-
1982	Number	16	5	1	10	0
	Avg. Size	717	1077	615	439	-
Avg. Size All 4 Yrs.		734	1221	627	464	

Table 4

Number and Average Size of High School Attendance Areas (1979 - 1982)

Year		Attendance Area Type				
		Overall	Black	Integrated[a]	White	Hispanic
1979	Number	12	3	2	7	0
	Avg. Size	2437	3396	2290	2067	-
1980	Number	12	3	2	7	0
	Avg. Size	2305	3280	2225	1090	-
1981	Number	12	3	2	7	0
	Avg. Size	2284	3327	2282	1837	-
1982	Number	12	3	2	7	0
	Avg. Size	2239	3409	2188	1752	-
Avg. Size All 4 Yrs.		2316	3353	2246	1687	

[a] Integrated between white and Hispanic.

The final component of the background data is found in Tables 5 through 7. These tables show the number and percentage of schools and attendance areas that would be designated as black, desegregated or white at the elementary, middle, and high school levels each year between 1979 and 1982 using two different definitions of desegregation.

This information is being presented in this manner for two reasons: (a) the writer believes that a valid measurement to be used for a school system's definition of desegregation is the population in the system rather than the population of the city. Consequently, it was felt that it might be useful to provide the reader with information to show the impact of this method of determining whether or not a school was desegregated; (b) this 40 percent minimum figure is consistent with the author's definition of a race-dominated attendance area, although in this instance the 40 percent minimum is used only as it applies to blacks.

An analysis of the tables using 1982 figures reveals the following facts:

1. For black schools, at each of the three levels, the number and percentage of schools and attendance areas remain unchanged using either definition. This results from the fact that the definition of desegregation is based on the percentage of black students enrolled in a given school. Therefore, irrespective of the change in definition, in order for a school

or attendance area to be considered black, at least 60 percent of its population must be black.

2. At the elementary level: (a) for desegregated schools, the use of the 40-60 percent definition results in a substantially lower percentage and number of both schools and attendance areas; the percentage of desegregated schools decreases from 76.4% under the 25-60% definition to only 50% under the 40-60% definition and the number of attendance areas drops from 13 to 7; (b) in contrast, the numbers and percentages of schools and attendance areas that would be defined as white, increases under the 40-60% definition; again, referring to 1982 figures, the percentage of white schools increases from 4.7 percent to 31.1 and the number of white attendance areas increases from 55 to 61.

3. At the middle school level: (a) for desegregated schools, the use of the 40-60% definition leads to a lower percentage and number of black schools and attendance areas; the school percentage is reduced from 82.4% to 76.5% when the 40-60% definition is used, while the number of attendance areas drops from 3 to 0; (b) the picture for white schools and attendance areas differs markedly from the other two categories; the percentages of schools rises from 0 to 5.9% under the 40-60% definition and the numbers of attendance areas increases from 7 to 10.

4. The most dramatic changes were seen at the high school level: (a) for desegregated schools, the use of the 40-60%

definition substantially lowers the percentage and number of schools; the percentage drops from 88.2% to 81.8% and the number drops from 18 to 11; the percentage and numbers of attendance areas decreases from 3 to 2; (b) for white schools, the use of the 40-60% definition brings about significant increases in the percentage and numbers of schools; the percentage increases from 4.5% to 36.4% in schools which is an increase from 1 to 8 schools; the percentage increases from 50 percent to 58.3% and the number of attendance areas increases from 6 to 7.

Table 5

Comparison of the Number and Percentage of Black, Desegregated, and White Elementary School Attendance Areas (1979 - 1982)

		Definition of Desegregation (% Black)	1979		1980		1981		1982	
			%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Black	School	25-60%	17.9	20	18.7	20	18.9	20	18.9	20
		40-60%	17.9	20	18.7	20	18.9	20	18.9	20
	Attendance Area	25-60%	26.7	27	25.5	24	24.7	23	26.9	25
		40-60%	26.7	27	25.5	24	24.7	23	26.9	25
Desegregated	School	25-60%	73.2	82	72.9	78	76.4	81	76.4	81
		40-60%	41.1	46	35.5	38	42.5	45	50.0	53
	Attendance Area	25-60%	13.9	14	16.0	15	16.1	15	14.0	13
		40-60%	5.9	6	8.5	8	9.7	9	7.5	7
White	School	25-60%	8.0	9	5.6	6	4.7	5	4.7	5
		40-60%	43.8	49	43.0	46	38.7	41	31.1	33
	Attendance Area	25-60%	59.4	60	58.5	55	59.1	55	59.1	55
		40-60%	67.3	68	66.0	62	65.6	61	65.6	61

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools included.

Table 6

Comparison of the Number and Percentage of Black, Desegregated, and White Middle School Attendance Areas (1979 - 1982)

		Definition of Desegregation (% Black)	1979		1980		1981		1982	
			%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Black	School	25-60%	17.6	3	17.6	3	17.6	3	17.6	3
		40-60%	17.6	3	17.6	3	17.6	3	17.6	3
	Attendance Area	25-60%	33.3	5	33.3	5	33.3	5	33.3	5
		40-60%	33.3	5	33.3	5	33.3	5	33.3	5
Desegregated	School	25-60%	82.4	14	82.4	14	82.4	14	82.4	14
		40-60%	52.9	9	64.7	11	70.6	12	76.5	13
	Attendance Area	25-60%	6.7	1	6.7	1	20.0	3	20.0	3
		40-60%	-0-	0	-0-	0	-0-	0	-0-	0
White	School	25-60%	-0-	0	-0-	0	-0-	0	-0-	0
		40-60%	29.4	5	17.6	3	11.8	2	5.9	1
	Attendance Area	25-60%	60.0	9	60.0	9	46.7	7	46.7	7
		40-60%	66.7	10	66.7	10	66.7	10	66.7	10

Note. Specialty Schools included, but K-8 schools excluded.

Table 7

Comparison of the Number and Percentage of Black, Desegregated, and White High School Attendance Areas (1979 - 1982)

		Definition of Desegregation (% Black)	1979 %	1979 No.	1980 %	1980 No.	1981 %	1981 No.	1982 %	1982 No.
Black	School	20-60%	13.3	2	11.8	2	17.4	4	22.7	5
		40-60%	13.3	2	11.8	2	17.4	4	22.7	5
	Attendance Area	20-60%	25.0	3	25.0	3	25.0	3	25.0	3
		40-60%	25.0	3	25.0	3	25.0	3	25.0	3
Desegregated	School	20-60%	70.6	12	88.2	15	78.3	18	81.8	18
		40-60%	29.4	5	41.2	7	43.5	10	50.0	11
	Attendance Area	20-60%	16.7	2	16.7	2	16.7	2	25.0	3
		40-60%	16.7	2	16.7	2	16.7	2	16.7	2
White	School	20-60%	5.9	1	-0-	0	4.3	1	4.5	1
		40-60%	47.1	8	47.1	8	39.1	9	36.4	22
	Attendance Area	20-60%	58.3	7	58.3	7	58.3	7	50.0	6
		40-60%	58.3	7	58.3	7	58.3	7	58.3	7

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools included.

Having presented this background data, the discussion will now move to the specific research questions posed in this study.

The Research Questions

Question 1: Did the desegregation program of MPS result in a disproportionate number of black students being denied educational access to their neighborhood schools?

The picture emerging from the data in Table 8 shows a vast difference in the percentage of black and white students attending schools in their own attendance areas between 1979 and 1982. Specifically, there is a 15 percent difference between the highest percentage of blacks attending in their own attendance areas in any of the four years covered in this study (49.71% at the elementary level in in 1980) and the lowest percentage of whites attending in white attendance areas (64.8% at the high school level in 1982).

Table 8

Comparison of the Percentage of Black v. White Students Attending School in Their Own Attendance Area (1979 - 1982)

	Black	White	Black	White
	1979		1980	
Elementary Schools	49.58	76.59	49.71	75.49
Middle Schools	37.06	83.88	40.62	85.83
High School	33.56	71.78	34.76	70.57
	1981		1982	
Elementary Schools	48.78	75.08	49.66	75.27
Middle Schools	37.94	82.37	37.68	81.78
High Schools	30.99	67.27	29.48	64.80

Between 1979 and 1982, at the elementary level the ratio of whites to blacks attending in their own attendance areas fluctuated around 1.5:1. At the middle and high school levels for this same period the ratio is consistently above 2:1, with the highest ratio (2.26:1) occurring at the middle school level in 1979.

Question 2: Did the desegregation program of HPS result in a disproportionate number of black students being bused out of their neighborhood schools?

There is obviously a close relationship between this question and the question that immediately preceded it. The data in Table 8 shows a wide disparity in the percentage of blacks and whites attending schools in their attendance areas. Given that data and the information that was presented earlier on the number and percentages of whites and blacks in the system, it is reasonable to assume that the answer to this research question is "yes". Although this might be an obvious response, the data presented in this section will demonstrate that there is additional factual information that supports this conclusion.

The data relating to this question is found in Tables 9 through 20. These tables show the comparisons of student movement out of attendance areas by race for each year between 1979 and 1982. Student movement which did not enhance desegregation (movement of students to attendance areas of the same race category as their home attendance area) is not included in these tables.

Tables 9 through 12 detail the movement of white and black elementary students. The information points to a similar disparity each year in the ratio blacks moved in comparison to whites, with the highest ratio being 3.86:1 in 1982 and the

lowest 3.61:1 in 1979. In addition, the data show that over the four-year period, the percentage of black students sent out of black attendance areas averaged 48.3 percent, which translated into an annual average of 9,423 students. By comparison, the figures show that over the same four-year period, the percentage of white students sent out of white attendance areas averaged a mere 11.8 percent, or 1,803 students. Stated another way, for every one white student sent out of white attendance areas, 5.23 black students were sent out of black attendance areas.

Table 9

Ratios of Black to White Elementary School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1979)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	20033	9369	46.77	1289	479	37.16
White Attendance Areas	1976	493	24.95	17045	1988	11.66
Integrated Attendance Areas	1701	682	40.09	1661	322	19.39
Hispanic Attendance Areas	11	4	36.36	630	115	18.25
All Attendance Areas	23721	10548	44.47	20625	2904	14.08

1979 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 3.61:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Table 10

Ratios of Black to White Elementary School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1980)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	19394	9400	48.47	915	376	41.09
White Attendance Areas	2065	597	28.91	15357	1906	12.41
Integrated Attendance Areas	2394	1110	46.37	2249	587	26.10
Hispanic Attendance Areas	12	2	16.67	596	115	19.30
All Attendance Areas	23865	11109	46.55	19117	2984	15.61

1980 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 3.72:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Table 11

Ratios of Black to White Elementary School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1981)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	18902	9316	49.29	791	351	44.37
White Attendance Areas	1729	494	28.57	14514	1724	11.88
Integrated Attendance Areas	2892	1385	47.89	2559	792	30.95
Hispanic Attendance Areas	27	4	14.81	594	168	28.28
All Attendance Areas	23550	11199	47.55	18458	3035	16.44

1981 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 3.69:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Table 12

Ratios of Black to White Elementary School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1982)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	19749	9605	48.64	1138	498	43.76
White Attendance Areas	1842	534	28.99	14431	1592	11.03
Integrated Attendance Areas	2133	938	43.98	2174	657	30.22
Hispanic Attendance Areas	44	4	9.09	519	123	23.70
All Attendance Areas	23768	11081	46.62	18262	2870	15.72

1982 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 3.86:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Tables 13 through 16 show the movement of white and black middle school students. The data reveal an even larger disparity between black and white movement at the middle school level. The highest ratio in the middle schools for black students moved in comparison to whites was 9.03:1 in 1982 and the lowest was 7.24:1 in 1979. Over the four-year period the data reveal that the percentage of black students sent out of black attendance areas averaged 62.9 percent, or 3,359 students annually compared to a 6.08 percent average or 228 white students sent of white attendance areas annually. This means that for every one white student sent of white attendance areas, 14.7 black students were sent out of black attendance areas.

Table 13

Ratios of Black to White Middle School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1979)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	5381	3304	61.40	813	178	21.89
White Attendance Areas	496	126	25.40	4304	279	6.48
Integrated Attendance Areas[a]	0	0	-0-	344	17	4.94
All Attendance Areas	5877	3430	58.36	5461	474	8.68

1979 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 7.24:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

[a] Integrated between white and Hispanic students.

Table 14

Ratios of Black to White Middle School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1980)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	5047	3341	66.20	706	178	25.21
White Attendance Areas	555	143	25.77	3692	234	6.34
Integrated Attendance Areas[b]	1	0	-0-	349	10	2.87
All Attendance Areas	5603	3484	62.18	4747	422	8.89

1980 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 8.26:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

[a] Integrated between white and Hispanic students.

Table 15

Ratios of Black to White Middle School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1981)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	5371	3309	61.61	627	175	27.91
White Attendance Areas	546	152	27.84	3509	203	5.79
Integrated Attendance Areas[a]	3	1	33.33	293	13	4.44
All Attendance Areas	5920	3462	58.48	4429	391	8.83

1981 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 8.85:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

[a] Integrated between white and Hispanic students.

Table 16

Ratios of Black to White Middle School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1982)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	5579	3482	62.41	614	189	30.78
White Attendance Areas	607	155	25.54	3412	194	5.69
Integrated Attendance Areas[a]	7	1	14.29	293	20	6.83
All Attendance Areas	6193	3638	58.74	4319	403	9.33

1982 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 9.03:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

[a] Integrated between white and Hispanic students.

Tables 17 through 20 show the movement of black and white high school students. At this level, the highest black/white disparity shows a ratio of 2.09:1 in 1982 and the lowest, 1.73:1 in 1980. The information contained in the tables also indicate that the percentage of black students sent out of black attendance areas averaged 68.3 percent or 5,502 students per year compared to a 18.4% average or 2,029 white students sent out of white attendance areas. These percentages and numbers indicate that for every one white student sent out of white attendance areas, 2.7 black students were sent out of black attendance areas.

Table 17

Ratios of Black to White High School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1979)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	8044	5462	67.90	1815	969	53.39
White Attendance Areas	760	321	42.24	12533	2002	15.97
Integrated Attendance Areas	2171	1027	47.31	2195	457	20.82
All Attendance Areas	10975	6810	62.05	16543	3428	20.72

1979 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 1.99:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Table 18

Ratios of Black to White High School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1980)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	7856	5037	64.12	1637	939	57.36
White Attendance Areas	815	226	27.73	11335	1784	15.74
Integrated Attendance Areas	2166	1067	49.26	2052	935	45.57
All Attendance Areas	10837	6330	58.41	15024	3658	24.35

1980 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 1.73:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Table 19

Ratios of Black to White High School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1981)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	8015	5585	69.68	1519	985	64.85
White Attendance Areas	878	354	40.32	10731	2160	20.13
Integrated Attendance Areas	2351	1220	51.89	1967	503	25.57
All Attendance Areas	11244	7159	45.88	14217	3648	25.66

1981 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 1.96:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

Table 20

Ratios of Black to White High School Students

Moved From Their Own Attendance Areas to Achieve School Desegregation (1982)

	Black Students			White Students		
	No.	No. Moved	% Moved	No.	No. Moved	% Moved
Black Attendance Areas	8295	5924	71.42	1420	976	68.73
White Attendance Areas	982	420	42.77	9998	2171	21.71
Integrated Attendance Areas	2363	1306	55.27	1764	517	29.31
All Attendance Areas	11640	7650	65.72	13182	3664	27.80

1982 Ratio (No. Blacks Moved/No. Whites Moved) = 2.09:1

Note. The number moved does not include those moved to schools in Attendance Areas of the same racial category (sideways movement).

In addition to the points raised above, an analysis of Tables 9 through 20 yield the following facts:

1. For all four years at the elementary level, there were more blacks sent out of non-black attendance areas than there were whites sent out of non-white attendance areas (see Tables 9 through 12).

2. At the middle school level during all four years there were more whites bused out of non-white attendance areas than there were blacks bused out of non-black attendance areas (see Tables 13 through 16).

3. At the high school level, in 1979 and 1980 there were more whites bused out of non-white attendance areas than there were blacks bused out of non-black attendance areas. But in 1981 and 1982 the pattern shifted so that more blacks were being bused out of non-black attendance areas than whites out of non-white attendance areas (see Tables 17 through 20).

Dispersal of Students From Their Attendance Areas

For many blacks, another important issue is the number of schools to which black students are dispersed. Although not a major part of this study, this issue relates to the overall issue of whether or not there is a disproportionate burden on blacks in all phases or aspects of the student movement desegregation purposes. For this reason, some information on this topic will be presented in this section of the chapter.

The data contained within the appendix shows that, on the

average, black students from black attendance areas were dispersed to a larger number of schools than were white students from white attendance areas. One reason that has been given as an explanation for the higher dispersal rates for blacks is that black attendance areas are larger than white attendance areas. The author contends that it is at the elementary school level that this issue of dispersal is most salient, in large part because of the number of schools involved. Consequently the analysis of this problem is limited to the elementary level.

In analyzing the dispersal issue, Tables 21 and 22 are structured so that the affect of size on dispersal rate can be scrutinized. Table 21 contains data based on the average number of schools per 100 students to which black and white students from each type of attendance area were sent.

Table 21

Average Number of Elementary Schools That Students in Black, Integrated, White and Hispanic Attendance Areas Were Sent To, Per 100 Students (1979 - 1982)[a]

Race of Student	Year	Attendance Area				
		Black	Integrated	White	Hispanic	All
Black Students	1979	9.2	11.0	22.2	16.7	10.9
	1980	8.7	12.2	15.4	32.5	13.9
	1981	9.3	13.2	20.9	25.4	17.0
	1982	9.3	13.4	20.3	13.5	16.2
4 Yr. Average		9.1	12.5	19.7	22.0	14.5
White Students	1979	27.6	10.4	7.8	----	13.2
	1980	32.9	10.0	7.4	12.7	13.9
	1981	37.8	11.0	7.9	16.2	15.6
	1982	38.0	11.8	7.5	17.5	16.0
4 Yr. Average		34.1	10.8	7.7	11.6	14.7

[a] Attendance Areas with no Blacks not included. Note that many Hispanic and some white Attendance Areas have very small numbers of Black students, so year to year fluctuations may be great.

The data in Table 21 reveals the following information:

1. The four-year average of the number of schools to which blacks from all attendance areas were sent (14.5) roughly equals

that of whites (14.7).

2. When analyzed by type of attendance area from which the student was sent, blacks from black attendance areas were dispersed to an average of 9.1 schools while whites from white attendance areas were dispersed to an average of 7.7 schools.

3. White students from black attendance areas were dispersed to more than four times as many different schools as whites from white attendance areas (34.1:7.7).

4. Black students from white attendance areas were dispersed to more than twice as many schools as blacks from black attendance areas (19.7:9.1).

5. Whites from black attendance areas were dispersed to an average of 34.1 different schools compared to only 19.7 for blacks from white attendance areas.

In addition to comparing the average number of schools that white and black students were sent to per 100 students, another way to consider the impact of attendance area size on the number of schools to which were dispersed is seen in Table 22. In this table the author matched five black attendance area schools with five white attendance area schools. These schools were selected because for the year in question, the number of black students in the black attendance area school was nearly equal to the number of white students in the white attendance area school to which it is matched. Difference were no greater than six students. In each case, more black students were sent and they were dispersed

to more schools. For example, the 35th St. /Hayes comparison shows that 206 (62 percent) of the 35th street black student population was sent out as compared to only 96 (29 percent) of Hayes' white student population and that black students were sent to almost three times as many different schools.

Table 22

Comparison of the Dispersal of Black and White Students from Black and White Attendance Areas with Comparable Black and White Student Enrollments (1982)

BLACK					WHITE				
AA	No. of Students in AA	No. of Black Students in AA	No. of Black Students Sent Out	No. of Schools Black Students Sent to	AA	No. of Students in AA	No. of White Students in AA	No. of White Students Sent Out	No. of Schools White Students Sent to
Palmer	649	528	179	52	Mitchell	739	534	124	39
24th St.	434	354	81	39	Oklahoma	367	348	70	33
Phillp[a]	344	338	94	39	Irving	457	342	96	17
35th St.	538	329	206	52	Hayes	444	332	96	39
S.Spring[b]	322	270	74	30	Barton	377	276	25	17

[a] E. L. Phillip

[b] Silver Spring

While size of attendance areas is obviously important to an analysis of the dispersal issue, it is also useful to examine this question without regard to size. Table 23 details the dispersal of students from 20 of the 25 elementary schools in black attendance areas in 1982. Fifteen of the schools had students dispersed to 70 or more schools and three had students populations dispersed to 91 or more different schools.

A review of the data contained within the appendix will reveal that of the five remaining schools, none had students dispersed to fewer than 30 schools. A review of that same data will show that of the 61 white attendance area elementary schools, only seven had students dispersed to 30 or more schools, with only one out of the seven having students dispersed to 40 different schools.

Table 23

Dispersal of Students from Black Attendance Areas to Other MPS Schools (1982)

Black AA School	Number of Different Schools to Which Black AA Students Were Sent	Black AA School	Number of Different Schools to Which Black AA Students Were Sent
Auer	94	LaFollette	91
Berger	83	Lee	82
Brown	60	9th St.	70
Clark	99	Palmer	52
Franklin	72	Siefert	75
Garden Homes	62	31st St.	82
Green Bay	75	37th St.	75
Holmes	65	20th St.	79
Hopkins	88	27th St.	86
Keefe Ave.	77	35th St.	52

The Role of Specialty Schools

One of the more interesting patterns that was observed while reviewing the dispersal data was the movement of white students out of black attendance areas and conversely the movement of black students out of white attendance areas.

The author elected to examine the impact of specialty

schools on the dispersal configurations-- not just at the elementary level but at all levels. The question was as follows: were specialty schools serving a key role in drawing white students out of black attendance areas? Stated another way, were specialty schools a key to providing white students a way out of black attendance areas?

Tables 24 through 31 present data on the percentage of students at all three levels who were sent out of their attendance areas to specialty schools. An analysis of this data reveals the following information:

1. In 1979 (a) among black students, the highest percentage going to specialty schools were those enrolled at the high school level and who resided in integrated attendance areas (27.60%); the lowest percentage of students being sent to specialty schools were also from integrated attendance areas but were enrolled at the elementary level (3.6%); there were no elementary level students sent from Hispanic attendance areas sent to specialty schools; (b) for white students the highest percentage going to specialty schools came from black attendance areas and the lowest from Hispanic attendance areas, 81.47% and 8.47, respectively.

2. In 1980 (a) for black students, the highest percentage of students attending specialty schools were high school students from white attendance areas (37.89%), and the lowest were middle school students living in white attendance areas (6.16%); (b)

for white students, the highest percentage of students attending specialty schools were high school students from black attendance areas (77.56%) and the lowest were elementary school students sent from Hispanic attendance areas (14.29%).

3. In 1981 (a) for black students, the highest percentage of students attending specialty schools were those enrolled at the high school level from white attendance areas (29.9%) and the lowest was middle school students from white attendance areas (6.10%); (b) among white students, the highest percentage of students attending specialty schools were enrolled at the high school level and were from integrated attendance areas (65.02%) and the lowest was 15.92%, elementary students from Hispanic attendance areas.

4. In 1982 (a) for black students the highest percentage of students attending specialty schools were elementary students from integrated attendance areas (30.77%) and the lowest was middle school from white attendance areas (7.27%); (b) for white students, the highest percentage of students attending specialty schools was high school students from black attendance areas (71.51%) and the lowest was students enrolled at the elementary level who resided in Hispanic attendance areas (13.83%).

Table 24

Movement of White Students to Specialty Schools (1979)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	595	148	24.87
White	3578	748	21.91
Integrated	495	98	19.80
Hispanic	177	15	8.47
Total Percent=21.57	4845	1045	
		Middle	
Black	253	111	43.87
White	481	159	33.06
Integrated	61	13	21.31
Total Percent=35.60	795	283	
		High	
Black	1090	888	81.47
White	3024	1519	50.23
Integrated	561	400	71.30
Total Percent=60.04	4675	2807	
Grand Total Overall Percent=40.09	10315	4135	

Table 25

Movement of White Students to Specialty Schools (1980)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	504	225	44.64
White	3221	1213	47.60
Integrated	789	415	52.60
Hispanic	168	24	14.29
Total Percent=40.09	4682	1877	
		Middle	
Black	249	104	41.77
White	449	127	28.29
Integrated	47	17	36.17
Total Percent=33.29	745	248	
		High	
Black	1056	819	77.56
White	2806	1479	52.71
Integrated	559	381	68.16
Total Percent=60.60	4421	2679	
Grand Total Overall Percent=48.78	9848	4804	

Table 26

Movement of White Students to Specialty Schools (1981)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	427	176	41.22
White	2985	1155	38.69
Integrated	987	550	55.72
Hispanic	177	28	15.82
Total Percent=41.72	4576	1909	
		Middle	
Black	248	112	45.16
White	411	113	27.49
Integrated	41	10	24.39
Total Percent=33.57	700	235	
		High	
Black	1109	712	64.20
White	2858	1317	53.04
Integrated	626	407	65.02
Total Percent=53.04	4593	2436	
Grand Total Overall Percent=46.40	9869	4580	

Table 27

Movement of White Students to Specialty Schools (1982)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	590	244	41.36
White	2908	1129	38.82
Integrated	847	483	57.02
Hispanic	188	26	13.83
Total Percent=41.52	4533	1882	
		Middle	
Black	294	112	38.10
White	435	98	22.53
Integrated	58	17	29.31
Total Percent=28.84	787	227	
		High	
Black	1102	788	71.51
White	2932	1414	48.23
Integrated	634	416	65.62
Total Percent=56.08	4668	2618	
Grand Total Overall Percent=47.33	9988	4727	

Table 28

Movement of Black Students to Specialty Schools (1979)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	10716	775	7.23
White	520	47	9.04
Integrated	729	23	3.16
Hispanic	4	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=7.06	11969	845	
		Middle	
Black	3562	284	7.97
White	137	22	16.06
Integrated	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=8.27	3699	306	
		High	
Black	5830	1071	18.37
White	339	74	21.83
Integrated	1123	310	27.60
Total Percent=19.95	7292	1455	
Grand Total Overall Percent=11.35	22960	2606	

Table 29

Movement of Black Students to Specialty Schools (1980)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	10199	1447	14.19
White	623	113	18.14
Integrated	1176	282	23.98
Hispanic	3	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=15.34	12001	1842	
		Middle	
Black	3605	349	9.68
White	146	9	6.16
Integrated	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=9.54	3751	358	
		High	
Black	5470	1140	20.84
White	256	97	37.89
Integrated	1194	319	26.72
Total Percent=22.49	6920	1556	
Grand Total Overall Percent=22.16	16946		

Table 30

Movement of Black Students to Specialty Schools (1981)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	10105	1565	15.49
White	519	104	20.04
Integrated	1485	370	24.92
Hispanic	4	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=16.83	12113	2039	
		Middle	
Black	3486	343	9.84
White	164	10	6.10
Integrated	1	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=9.67	3651	353	
		High	
Black	6024	1315	21.83
White	377	109	28.91
Integrated	1359	351	25.83
Total Percent=22.87	7760	1775	
Grand Total Overall Percent=16.33	23524	4167	

Table 31

Movement of Black Students to Specialty Schools (1982)

Attendance Area	No. Sent Out	No. Sent to Specialty Schools	% Sent to Specialty Schools
		Elementary	
Black	10439	1601	15.34
White	520	110	21.15
Integrated	1001	308	30.77
Hispanic	5	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=16.87	11965	2019	
		Middle	
Black	3714	324	8.72
White	165	12	7.27
Integrated	1	-0-	-0-
Total Percent=8.66	3880	336	
		High	
Black	6340	1195	18.85
White	448	132	29.46
Integrated	1430	370	25.87
Total Percent=20.65	8218	1697	
Grand Total Overall Percent=16.84	24063	4052	

If the examination of the tables is limited to comparing the differences between what happened to white students leaving black attendance areas and black students leaving white attendance areas to attend specialty schools, the following points can be made:

1. Tables 24 through 27 show an extremely high percentage of white students sent to specialty schools from black attendance areas at the high school level. The highest percentage (81.47%) occurred in 1979, and the lowest percentage (64.20%) was recorded in 1981. With the exception of 1980, the situation at the elementary and middle school levels was similar to that of the high schools.

2. The data in Tables 28 through 31 detail the movement of black students. Only in 1979 at the middle school level was there a higher percentage of black students being sent to specialty schools from black attendance areas than from white attendance areas. The highest percentage for these students occurred in 1980 at the high school level where 37.89% of the students sent out went to specialty schools. The lowest percentage was at the middle school level in 1981 (6.10%).

In summary, the tables show that black students were sent out to specialty schools most often when they were residents of white attendance areas and white students were sent to specialty schools most often when they were being sent from black attendance areas. Comparing overall percentages for blacks and

whites sent to specialty schools from all categories of attendance areas, however, the following relationships emerge:

1. In 1979 the percentage of whites sent to specialty schools was 3.5 times as high as the percentage of blacks sent to specialty schools.

2. In 1980 the percentage of whites sent to specialty schools was 2.2 times as high as the percentage of blacks sent to specialty schools.

3. In 1981 and 1982 the percentage of whites sent to specialty schools was 2.8 times as high as the percentage of blacks sent to specialty schools.

The specialty school information presented above was extremely helpful to the author in tracing the movement of white students out of their attendance areas particularly those who lived in black attendance areas. It is clear from this information that far greater numbers of white students attended specialty schools than did black students.

This information on specialty schools leads directly to the next research question to be examined in this chapter:

Question 3: Did the Milwaukee Public School System make decisions about the locations of specialty schools in a manner that resulted in a disproportionate burden being placed on black students?

Tables 32 through 34 show the impact of attendance area schools being converted to specialty schools. Tables 32 and 33 show that there were eight more black attendance area elementary schools closed than white elementary attendance area schools. A total of 3,358 black students were dislocated by these closings compared to only 1,114 white students --a ratio of 3.01:1. Table 34 shows that the total number of black middle and high school students displaced when their attendance area schools were converted to specialty schools was 2,434. When compared to the 1,162 whites displaced, the result is a ratio of 2.09:1.

This information is important because is shows very clearly that the conversion of attendance area schools to specialty schools displaced significantly more black students, and as the information presented on student movement to specialty schools showed, a much lower percentage of blacks went to these schools. Blacks were disproportionately dislocated from their attendance area schools and yet benefited very little from these "new schools" located in their communities.

Table 32

Black Attendance Area Elementary Schools

Converted to Specialty Schools

Year	School	Black Enrollment	Other Persons Enrolled[a]
1976	4th St.[b]	181[c]	-0-
1976	Lloyd	454[c]	1
1977	Elm	434[d]	45
1978	MacDowell[e]	537[d]	59
1978	21st St.	435[f]	13
1980	Garfield	205[d]	81
1980	Townsend	376[d]	122
1980	38th St.	510[d]	282
Total		3132	603

Note. The years used to determine the impact of Attendance Area schools being changed to Specialty Schools on enrollment of black and white students varies from year to year. This variance is a reflection of the inconsistent methodology used by MPS to record enrollment changes due to these conversions.

[a] Other persons is used as a category in this table because the document from which the information was taken did not use a category labeled "white". However, these "other persons" referred to all students who were not American Indian, Black, Asian American or Spanish-Surname Americans. Given these exceptions, for this study, "other persons" are considered white.

[b] Name changed to Golda Meir in 1979.

[c] Based on 1974 enrollment figures.

[d] Based on 1975 enrollment figures.

[e] Spelling is inconsistent in MPS documents; varies from McDowell to MacDowell.

[f] Based on 1976 enrollment figures.

Table 33

White Attendance Area Elementary Schools

Converted to Specialty Schools

Year	School	Black Enrollment	Other Persons Enrolled[a]
1978	Hawley	87[b]	184
1980	55th St.	77[c]	127[d]
1980	82nd St.	62[e]	200
Total		226	511

Note. The years used to determine the impact of Attendance Area schools being changed to Specialty Schools on enrollment of black and white students varies from year to year. This variance is a reflection of the inconsistent methodology used by MPS to record enrollment changes due to these conversions.

[a] Other persons is used as a category in this table because the document from which the information was taken did not use a category labeled "white". However, these "other persons" referred to all students who were not American Indian, Black, Asian American or Spanish-Surname Americans. Given these exceptions, for this study, "other persons" are considered white.

[b] Based on 1976 enrollment figures.

[c] Based on 1978 enrollment figures.

[d] The document from which this information was taken used the heading "non-minority" rather than "other persons". Non-minority was defined as "white persons: (white) A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East. For the purpose of this study "non-minority" students are being characterized as "white".

[e] Based on 1975 enrollment figures.

Table 34

Middle and High Schools Converted to Specialty Schools

Year	School	Black Enrollment	Other Persons Enrolled[a]
		Middle	
1976	Peckham[b]	716[c]	22
		High	
1977	King	1586[d]	1
1978	Juneau	132[e]	1139
Totals:		2434	1162

Note. The years used to determine the impact of Attendance Area schools being changed to Specialty Schools on enrollment of black and white students varies from year to year. This variance is a reflection of the inconsistent methodology used by MPS to record enrollment changes due to these conversions.

[a] Other persons is used as a category in this table because the document from which the information was taken did not use a category labeled "white". However, these "other persons" referred to all students who were not American Indian, Black, Asian American or Spanish-Surname Americans. Given these exceptions, for this study, "other persons" are considered white.

[b] Name later changed to Jackie Robinson.

[c] Based on 1974 enrollment figures.

[d] Based on 1975 enrollment figures.

[e] Based on 1976 enrollment figures.

The conversion of attendance area schools to specialty schools was one reason for the dislocation of students from their attendance area. Another was the actual closing of attendance area schools. Therefore, the fourth and final research question pertains to the impact of school closings on student movement for desegregation purposes.

Question 4: Did the Milwaukee Public School System use a pattern of school closings in a manner that resulted in a disproportionate burden of dislocations being placed on black students?

An examination of school closings between 1977 and 1979 disclosed the differential impact of those closings on black and white students. Tables 35 and 36 show that at the elementary school level 1,754 black students were affected while 1,209 whites were affected.

Table 35

Black and White Elementary School Closings (1977 - 1979)

Year	School	No. Black Enrolled	% Black Enrolled	No. White Enrolled	% White Enrolled
		Black Elementary Schools			
1977	Walnut St.	261	93.5	8	2.8
1977	12th St.	408	99.0	-0-	-0-
1978	5th St.	285	98.2	4	1.3
Total		954		12	
		White Elementary Schools			
1977	Wilson Park	1	.6	129	86.5
1978	Warnimount	24	29.6	54	66.6
1979	Mound St.	45	18.5	155	63.7
Total		70		338	
Grand Total		1024		350	

Note. All of the enrollment figures are based on prior year attendance records.

Table 36

Integrated Elementary Schools Closed (1977 - 1979)

Year	School	No. Black Enrolled	% Black Enrolled	No. White Enrolled	% White Enrolled
1978	Carleton	205	39.1	298	56.9
1978	Jefferson	141	47.4	122	41.0
1979	Bartlett Av.	136	49.4	120	43.6
1979	Douglas Rd.	55	36.6	85	56.6
1979	Ludington	59	40.6	83	57.6
1979	36th St.	134	44.6	151	50.3
Total		730		859	

Note. All of the enrollment figures are based on prior year attendance records.

MPS closed only one middle school (see Table 37) and no high schools during this period. Taking the one middle school closing with those at the elementary level, 1909 black students and 1302 white students were affected by closings--a ratio of 1.46:1.

Table 37

Integrated Middle Schools Closed (1977 - 1979)

Year	School	No. Black Enrolled	% Black Enrolled	No. White Enrolled	% White Enrolled
1978	Wells St.	155	54.3	93	32.6

Note. All of the population figures are based on prior year attendance records.

By reviewing Tables 32 through 37, it is possible to determine the combined impact of school closings and the conversion of attendance area schools to specialty schools on black and white students. The cumulative result of these two actions between 1977 and 1979 was the displacement/dislocation of 5,241 black students and 2,439 white students--a ratio of 2.15:1.

Summary

Although there is certainly more information available on this topic and there are other methods of presenting the data, the author believes that any objective analysis will reveal essentially the same results as this study.

The information presented in this chapter examined a variety of statistical indicators of the movement, for purposes of desegregation, of black and white students attending school in the Milwaukee Public School System. Included in this

presentation was information on the differences in the numbers and percentages of blacks and whites attending schools outside of their attendance area, including specific reference to those attending speciaty schools. Also presented were facts and figures on the differences in the number of schools to which students were dispersed once they left their attendance area. Finally, data was set forth concerning the number of black and white attendance area schools that were either closed or converted to specialty schools.

The presentation and analysis of this data will serve as the foundation for the conclusions to be drawn in the final chapter of this study.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

Judge John Reynolds' January 1976 decision declaring that Milwaukee's public school system was unconstitutionally segregated started the system down the road toward desegregation of its schools. By May of 1979, when the Judge approved an out-of-court settlement that ended a fourteen-year court battle, MPS was already two years into its desegregation effort. This settlement set new parameters for the percentages of black students needed in each school in order for the school to be considered desegregated. It also dictated that by 1984, 75 percent of all MPS students be enrolled in schools that were desegregated. It is important to note here that the court's approval of the general settlement left to MPS a tremendous amount of discretion as to the process to be used in the implementation of the agreement.

As early as 1977, questions were raised about the disproportionate burden of dislocations on blacks to bring about desegregation. MPS itself initially acknowledged that there was indeed a disproportionate burden on black students but assured the community that as the program moved forward and was refined, the burden would become more equally shared between black and white communities.

The results of this study led the writer to conclude that rather than the "refinement" leading to a more equal sharing of the burden, it has, if anything, increased the burden shouldered by blacks. MPS has sytematically bused black students out of their attendance areas, closed schools in the black community, and converted other black attendance area schools to specialty schools to which neighborhood students had no attendance rights. These actions occurring prior to and during the period covered by this study, have made the maintenance of this disproportionate burden on blacks the system's modus operandi.

To understand what happened, when, and how, the reader should first recall that during the period covered by this study, the MPS black student population increased from 44 to 48 percent of the total population. During this same period the white student representation dropped from 47 to 41 percent of the total MPS population. According to Lois Quinn (1983), who has been involved in researching various practices of MPS for a number of years, this followed a trend which was evident even during the 1970s. Quinn developed the table below which summarizes the change in the ethnic makeup of MPS's student population between 1970 and 1979.

Summary of Ethnic Change: 1970-1979

	Total Enrollment	White Students	Black Students	Hispanic Students
1970-71	133,349	93,023	34,355	3, 898
1979-80	91,940	43,009	41,530	5,175
Change	-40,409	-50,014	+7,175	+1,277
%Change	-30%	-54%	+21%	+33%

In that same paper, Quinn also states that of the 48 schools built in Milwaukee between 1950 and 1979, 38 were located in segregated white neighborhoods. This resulted in more and smaller white attendance areas and fewer and larger black attendance areas. To exacerbate this situation, MPS closed some schools in the black community and converted others to specialty schools. This further reduced the number of attendance area schools available to black students.

When the busing program was implemented, the MPS assignment guidelines contained within the Comprehensive Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance in the Milwaukee Public Schools (1976) stated that each student would be assigned an attendance area and that ". . .preference will be given (to) the current residential population in attending an attendance area school when that population can be accommodated under racial balance requirements" (p. 25) These guidelines posed a double disadvantage for black students: (1) the fact

that black attendance areas were large in comparison with white attendance areas meant that it was not possible for all of the students to attend their attendance area school and, (2) since MPS would not bus adequate numbers of white students to black attendance area schools to achieve integration, most black students were left with no real choice. Their numbers mitigated against their meeting the accommodation criteria and since MPS would not bus many white students in, minimized their opportunities to attend racially balanced schools in their own attendance areas. For the vast majority of black students, there was only one choice--to be bused to a school outside of their attendance area. MPS consistently took the position that black students were volunteering to leave. Harris (1983) referred to this type of voluntarism as characteristic of what came to be called "forced voluntary" desegregation plans. He wrote:

> In Milwaukee, blacks have had to bear the burden for desegregating the schools. School desegregation has relied upon a 'forced voluntary' plan that has closed down some older, black, inner-city schools. . .Because children in closed schools were forced to moved out of their neighborhood schools, but had some choice as to which new school they wanted to attend, this approach to desegregation became known as 'forced voluntary'. This . . . approach to desegregation can be contrasted to a 'voluntary' desegregation plan where pupils are

not forced to move out of their neighborhood schools and can freely choose which school they wish to attend. (p. 427-428)

For large numbers of white students the situation was entirely different. They were allowed to remain in their attendance area schools because their attendance areas were smaller and black students were being bused in to promote desegregation.

In 1977 Dave Bednarek, an education reporter for the Milwaukee Journal, raised the question of the burden on black students with Superintendent Lee McMurrin. McMurrin replied, "That whole concept of burden in Milwaukee is ridiculous. It is ridiculous to talk of burden when the parents and students are moving voluntarily. It would be very difficult for the court to object to black parents opting out of containment into a desegregated opportunity" (p. 36). At the heart of McMurrin's comment is an attempt to deny the manner in which black students have been parcelled out all over the city of Milwaukee in such a way that the guidelines of the court were being met and the wishes of whites not to be enrolled in black attendance area schools were being accommodated.

In the same planning document mentioned above, MPS stated its belief that providing for whites "the psychological guarantee of not having to attend a school that is predominantly minority will tend to stabilize the population in the city" (p. 97). This statement is a clear indication of the

Administration's intent from the very outset to emphasize first and foremost the concerns of whites. It is important to ask why MPS held such a belief. The writer believes that almost unknowingly, this statement reveals the kind of intolerant attitude about black people that existed throughout the MPS structure. That attitude was one that accepted the notion of the inherent cultural deficiency of the black community. Consequently, it was the "responsibility" of MPS to shield white students from exposure to this milieu. Unfortunately, far too many black people had also accepted this image as an accurate description of black community life.

It is with this understanding that we must return to the point that Harris made about choice. Given this overall perception of the black community, it was only natural that many blacks would "choose" to opt out of their "contained" environment for one that was desegregated. Because many black parents were aware that, in many instances, their children were not receiving a quality education, and given the belief that the lack of achievement on the part of their students was directly attributable to the social/cultural deficits of their community, black people were seduced by the plans developed by MPS that ultimately led to blacks bearing a disproportionate burden for desegregation. It was only later that the community realized that acceptance of this burden would not automatically result in a quality education for their children.

Earlier in this chapter specialty schools were mentioned in terms of their role in diminishing black students' options to attend schools in their own attendance area. In keeping with the MPS attitude about black people, specialty schools became another mechanism to accomplish two objectives: (1) the reinforcement of black inferiority and (2) the compounding of a disproportionate burden for desegregation on the black community.

To accomplish the first objective, it was standard MPS practice to take black attendance area schools that, while populated by poor black students, had been allowed to run down physically and deteriorate academically and to renovate them, change them from attendance area schools to specialty schools with innovative educational programs, and to bus whites and blacks from other attendance areas in to populate the school. At the same time various forms of administrative trickery were employed to discourage and, in some cases, even restrict the number of attendance area black students that could enroll in these schools.

To accomplish the second objective, specialty schools became another viable option for white students to avoid attending black attendance area schools while for blacks, specialty schools were an illusionary "choice". Table 38 documents the success of MPS in meeting these two objectives. Although the table provides data on the elementary level, a review of Appendix B shows that a similar situation exists at the other levels, particularly high school.

Table 38

Four-Year Comparison of Black and White Movement at the Elementary Level Out of Their Respective Attendance Areas

Year	Race	% Moved to Desegregate	% Move to Attend Specialty Schools	% Moved Sideways
1979	**Black**	80.2	7.2	12.6
	White	34.7	20.9	44.4
1980	**Black**	78.0	14.2	7.8
	White	21.5	37.7	40.8
1981	**Black**	76.7	15.5	7.8
	White	19.1	38.7	42.2
1982	**Black**	76.7	15.3	8.0
	White	15.9	38.8	45.2

Note. Movement for desegregation is that which enhances racial balance.

Table 38 shows clearly that blacks, for the most part, were not enrolling in specialty schools in percentages comparable to whites nor were there substantial numbers or percentages of black students participating in sideways movement. On the other hand, more than 40% of all white students bused were bused sideways, and for the last three years covered in this study, another 40% were bused to specialty schools.

Clearly, the preponderance of the evidence presented in this study supports the writer's conclusion that, from 1979 until 1982, black students bore a disproportionate burden of dislocations to support school desegregation. Assurances were given by MPS in 1977 that the burden "would be made more equitable" in subsequent years of desegregation. The results of this study show that this simply has not occurred because, in essence, MPS has simply substituted a new form of discrimination, characterized by the disproportionate burden of dislocation of black students for the old form of discrimination, characterized by the containment or segregation of black students in black schools.

Review and Reassessment of the Literature

The Overview of the Issue in Milwaukee section of Chapter 1 and the Review of the Literature in Chapter 2 cite a number of authors for their contributions to various theoretical positions relating to issues dealt with in this study. In this section, the author will comment on some of these works. In some instances, assertions are upheld by the data collected during the course of the study. In other cases, the view of the various writers will be challenged in light of the data.

In the Overview of the Issue in Milwaukee section of the first chapter, an opinion was expressed that some blacks believed the Brown decision itself was based on racist assumptions and, as a result, it seemed to create a framework for a new form of discrimination. This view was one accepted and indeed espoused by this writer. It is now appropriate to examine this view in light of the material gathered and analyzed for this study.

One of the proponents of the idea that the Brown decision itself was racist is Nancy Arnez. Ms. Arnez (1978) argues that a problem developed because the Justices of the Supreme Court were misled by their reliance on certain social science literature that was cited in one of the footnotes[5] to this decision. She claims that this literature was the key to the Justices' conclusion that segregation was only harmful to black children. She believes such an assumption was racist because "it purports

that there is no benefit that white children can gain from association with black children. Thus, basing their opinion on a racist assumption provided the impetus for the racist implementation of a national policy" (p. 29).

A critical examination of the literature cited in the footnote does not, in fact, support Ms. Arnez's contention. Even the Myrdal (1944) book which does contain some negative assertions about black culture and black community life, makes a point to support equality of educational opportunity. He stated, "the American nation will not have peace with its conscience until inequality is stamped out, and the principle of public education is realized universally" (p. 907). In all likelihood, the Justices used passages such as this from the book to support their decision.

The Deutschen and Chein (1948) study surveyed more than 800 social scientists (anthropologists, psychologists and sociologists). The result was an overwhelming condemnation of segregation even where supposedly "separate but equal facilities" existed. For example, one of the anthropologists stated that, "even if the facilities are equal, this can have no effect if the general atmosphere is one of discrimination" (p. 280).

The thrust of that part of Frazier's (1949) work cited in the decision was a condemnation of the forced separation of the races. He said, "the theory of separate but equal facilities has never worked out in practice. Separate education for Negroes has

always meant inferior schools and inferior teaching personnel for Negro children" (p. 674).

As noted earlier, the writer has been sympathetic with the opinion of authors such as Nancy Arnez. But after close examination of the Brown decision, and further research on the issue, the writer's opinion has changed. The facts clearly indicate that the two Brown decisions (Brown I and Brown II) taken as a whole, struck a blow against segregation. As Kluger (1976) suggested, "perhaps all the Supreme Court could do, short of risking massive insurrection, was to proclaim to the nation that the enforced separation of human beings by race was neither God's will nor the purpose of the constitution as amended after the Civil War" (p. 746).

It is the writer's view, therefore, that the Brown decisions were not, in themselves, based on racist tenets. On the contrary, these opinions were a direct attack against the racist practice of forced segregation of schools. As Kluger (1970) stated, "now the law says that, like them or not, white America may not humiliate colored Americans by setting them apart. Now the law says that black Americans must not be degraded by the state and their degradation used as an excuse to drive them further down" (p. 747).

It is crucial to recognize, however, that Arnez's point (1976) that desegregation has been implemented in a discriminatory fashion is valid. The writer now disagrees with the view that the Brown opinions, themselves, were racist, but

still concurs with the opinion of Arnez and others that the manner in which desegregation has been carried out in many cities throughout America is racist. In essence, a separation must be made here between Brown I and Brown II. Brown II left the implementation of desegregation to the various school boards throughout the country. And although parameters were established to help support the decline of desegregation, concepts like "good faith implementation" and "practical flexibility in shaping remedies", helped create an atmosphere that allowed for not only stalling, but situations in which racist views that already existed became part of the fabric of the school desegregation effort.

The point being made here speaks to the fact that racism was not ended by the Brown decision. The racist views that were a part of this society were retained and therefore reflected in the implementation of desegregation plans. They were used not only to circumvent or slow the dictums of Brown, but also to actually "stand the decision on its head".

One of the keys to implementing Brown in a discriminatory fashion was the allegation or assumption of the existence of cultural deprivation and pathological conditions in the black community. These "conditions" made it unwise, indeed unsafe, for white children to attend schools in the black community. Just as there was literature to support the decision to end forced segregation of schools, there was literature lending credence to

the idea of black inferiority. Interestingly enough, there is a passage in Myrdal's book that relates directly to this point. Myrdal stated:

> In practically all its divergences, American Negro culture is not something independent of general American culture. It is a distorted development, or a pathological condition, of the general American culture. The instability of the Negro family, the inadequacy of educational facilities for Negroes, the emotionalism of the Negro church, the insufficiency and unwholesomeness of Negro recreational activity, the plethora of Negro sociable organizations, the narrowness of interests of the average Negro, the provincialism of his political speculation, the high Negro crime rate, the cultivation of the arts to the neglect of other fields, superstition, personality difficulties, and other characteristics are mainly forms of social pathology which, for the most part, are created by cast pressures" (p. 928-29).

David Ausubel (1963) talked of black people being damaged. He said, "the stigma of the (Negro child's) caste membership is inescapable and insurmountable. It is inherent in his skin color; permanently ingrained in his body images." (p. 37) There were other studies charging that poor kids, a disproportionate number of whom are black, lived in neighborhoods that retarded the development of their academic potential

(Deutsch, 1967; Hunt, 1969). This led to efforts to get these children out of their neighborhoods--out of the "pathological conditions" that surrounded them.

The kind of thinking represented by these authors helped foster the idea that the only way a black person could escape this "pathology" was to be removed from his or her own environment. Thus, only if blacks were put into a "really integrated school" could there be any hope of getting a quality education. A "really integrated school" was defined as one which was predominantly white (over 60 percent) or as close to 50-50 as possible. This idea that it was necessary to have a school at least 50 percent white to be considered integrated, was first written into educational policy in 1963 by the State Commission of Education for New York State. This policy made it clear that any school that was more than 50 percent black was racially imbalanced and therefore incapable of providing equal educational opportunity.

The stage was then set for "racial balance" methods of integration. These methods set clear quotas on the number of blacks that could be allowed in a given school at any one time. Normally, the "acceptable" range was 80 percent to 60 percent white and conversely 20 percent to 40 percent black. This also opened the way for one-way busing (blacks to white schools--but not vice versa) and the closing of schools in the black community, while moving to accommodate the wishes of whites to

remain in their neighborhood schools. Obviously, if black schools and communities were "culturally inferior", one could not ask a white student to go into such an environment and "suffer the problems that afflict the black student".

It is the writer's conclusion, then, that implicitly and sometimes explicitly, the idea of an inferior and "sick" black community did indeed play a significant role in determining the means used to desegregate schools in Milwaukee and probably in most other American cities.

This then represents the theoretical views that needed to be reassesed from the Overview of the Issue in Milwaukee portion of Chapter 1. The next part of the review and reassessment of the literature will concentrate on theoretical points relating to the research questions posed in this dissertation.

There were four areas in the literature that served as central points of emphasis for this study: (a) school closings, (b) specialty schools [or magnet schools], (c) busing, and (d) neighborhood schools.

School Closings

The question of equity in the school closings process is an important consideration. One of the contentions of the black community is that more schools have been closed in the black community than in the white community. Cronin (1977) emphasized the importance of equity in the closing of schools. He cautioned against implementing a school closings program that was not shared equally by both races. In Milwaukee, during the period

covered by this study, there was an "intellectual commitment" to equity, but as the integration process developed, the very dangers Cronin warned against became standard practice. Rather than equity, inequity resulted as the black community found itself bearing a disproportionate burden in the school closings process. This lack of equity along with other disproportionate burdens associated with desegregation, caused a change in attitude in the black community; where there was once strong support for desegregation, there is now increasing hostility. Unfortunately, the perspective raised in Cronin's article was not the operational framework for Milwaukee's desegregation program.

Specialty Schools (Magnet Schools)

One of the crucial components of Milwaukee's desegregation program was the establishment of specialty schools. Rice (1977) made the point that in the cities that he visited, individual specialty schools did not voluntarily attract students in numbers representative of any city's particular racial balance. Milwaukee definitely deviated from this pattern, as some individual specialty schools did "attract" students from each race in numbers that closely approximated their percentage of the total student population in the system. (It is unclear whether Rice was using school system population or city population in his article). It is important to note here, however, that the Milwaukee experience with specialty schools clearly favored the white community. It is unclear, however, what proportions of the

population in the various specialty schools were there on a "voluntary" basis. However, the results of this study would seem to call into question Rice's conclusion that individual specialty schools did not attract students in numbers roughly comparable to their percentage of the student population, as this did happen for some specialty schools in Milwaukee.

Bottomly (1977) cautioned against closing attendance area schools in black communities and then re-opening them as specialty schools, forcing black students from those attendance areas to attend schools elsewhere. He found this to be a particular problem when there was not equal involvement of blacks in decision making. In Milwaukee, the process in most cases proceeded in exactly the manner Bottomly cautioned against. A prime example of this problem was the case involving North Division High School (see Appendix B).

One of the problems associated with reassessing the point made by Bottomly, is determining when the decision-making can be characterized as "equal". In the North Division situation, for example, the three black board members voted for the plan, although the vast majority of the black community opposed it. MPS used the support of these three board members to justify its decision. Further, even if the black members had opposed the decision, it would still have been possible for white board members to out-vote them. The question must be asked, When can the decision making process be considered equal?

It is the writer's contention that each decision has to be

It is the writer's contention that each decision has to be viewed within the context of all of the decisions made during a desegregation effort. The issue is not so much "equal" decision making around where a specialty school will be placed as it is a question of making certain that a disproportionate burden for desegregation is not placed on any one racial group in the community (in almost all cases this group has been black). Furthermore, a process has to be established that involves the affected communities in a meaningful way in the decisions made about the establishment and placement of specialty schools.

Another important issue involving specialty schools was raised by Orfield (1978). He postulated that specialty schools in large cities were placed in white communities or transition communities because whites would not come into black communities to attend these schools. This was not the case in Milwaukee. In fact, the Milwaukee experience was the exact opposite, as most specialty schools were placed in black communities. In Milwaukee, Orfield's views were right on target for attendance area schools, but not specialty schools. There was, however, an interesting twist in Milwaukee's plan. In most instances, when a specialty school was placed in the black community, the school became off limits to the neighborhood students.

The desegregation program in Milwaukee consisted largely of creating special education environments and then bringing whites and, in most cases, a new population of blacks (from outside of the original attendance area) in. Although the writer did not

research this issue, there is a suspicion that socio-economic or class status played a significant role in determining the make-up of the school's new student population. Thus, although Orfield's contention was not substantiated in the strictest sense, there seems to have been some effort to satisfy his basic premise--that most specialty school plans are designed to satisfy the concerns of whites.

Busing

One of the most significant works discussed in the Busing section of the literature review in Chapter 2 was The Coleman Report. Some of the conclusions set forth in this study served as strong ammunition for proponents of desegregation programs which placed an emphasis on busing black students out of their communities. The rationale for supporting such a program was based on the alleged inability of the black community to maintain schools in which the atmosphere expected or encouraged high academic achievement on the part of students.

The report concluded that student achievement was enhanced when students were exposed to other students with strong educational backgrounds and high aspirations. In this writer's view, in Milwaukee it became accepted as "fact" that such backgrounds and aspirations did not exist in any significant degree among students from the black community. The supporters of this position believed that the only way to achieve desegregation and to achieve effective education was to bus black

children.

The writer vehemently disagrees with this philosophical view. Fortunately, there is a entirely new body of literature, the school effectiveness literature, that makes it very clear that irrespective of race or class, **all children can learn.** The proponents of the effective school movement believe that high academic achievement can take place in poor, minority communities provided that students attend schools that (a) exhibit strong educational leadership, particularly on the part of the school principal, (b) have a curriculum that emphasizes the acquisition of basic skills, (c) have caring and effective teachers, (d) an orderly school environment, and (e) have high expectations for its students. (There is a growing body of empirical evidence to support these contentions).

Throughout this country, poor black children attending schools in their local communities are learning. It is the position of this writer that proponents of "busing out" who continue to use the Coleman Report as a foundation for one-way busing programs are dead wrong!

Neighborhood Schools

In reviewing the literature on neighborhood schools, most of the evidence supports at least one of four perspectives (see pp. 50-51) on the topic. The writer will touch on some of the literature that relates to each of these perspectives taken separately or in some combination.

Many people in Milwaukee, black and white, probably share

Blackman's (1964) views about the objectives and benefits of neighborhood schools. Along with the fact that neighborhood schools mean safe, quick, and inexpensive accessibility for children (because the schools typically were within walking distance), they allow children to have classmates as after school playmates and they make it convenient for parents to return to school for after school activities. When the school is located close to home, it is easier and more likely that parents will be more involved in the schools thus helping to increase the bond between the community's values and the school's academic and social mission. From a cost-benefit perspective, these views make sense.

The question that arose in Milwaukee, however, was how to capitalize on these benefits and at the same time break up a system of school segregation brought about in part because of segregated housing patterns. The views espoused by Blackman became a rallying cry for those who wanted to keep neighborhood schools, even if it meant maintaining segregated schools.

Many of the participants in this debate took the same position as described by Zwerdling (1976) in his article on the National Action Group (NAG)--that their opposition to busing was in no way related to race; rather it was related to the importance of neighborhood schools for all of the reasons outlined by Blackman.

The writer found Blackman's article to be particularly

helpful in conceptualizing those ideas about the value of neighborhood schools that allow parents and community leaders to stand "for" neighborhood schools without having to stand "against" integration. This certainly was the case in Milwaukee. While it is unlikely that every white person who cited these facts did so to camouflage anti-integration sentiments, or every black to conceal separatists ideas, both black a white parents used the very same arguments in voicing their support for neighborhood schools.

As stated earlier, the clash came when the neighborhood school concept came up against the effort to end segregation in schools. This was not just a philosophical battle but one that spilled over into the judicial system of this country with the advent of the Brown decision and, in Milwaukee, with the Craig Amos et al decision discussed earlier in this study.

Many Milwaukee supporters of school desegregation, shared the same view on neighborhood schools as did the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1972). The Commission saw the neighborhood school concept as a relic standing in the way of the educational progress they believed possible through desegregation. The writer believes that the Commission's view was incorrect, although their reasons for making the assertion were rooted in progressive intentions. That is to say, the Commission was fighting against the popular idea that the neighborhood school concept could be used to block desegregation. Yet, to take the position that supporting neighborhood schools was the same as

"turning back the clock" on the desegregation movement was, for this writer, an extreme view.

There are good reasons for the existence of neighborhood schools. The problem is how to ensure that black and white students have equal access to neighborhood schools, and when it becomes necessary to dislocate students for desegregation purposes, to make sure that the burden of that dislocation is shared equally.

Suggestions for Additional Research

During the course of this study several issues surfaced that seem to warrant additional study. Listed below are recommendations for additional research in areas directly or indirectly related to the subject matter of the present study.

1. A study is needed of the role that Chapter 220[6] has played in the movement of students within the city of Milwaukee during the four-year period covered by this study. Such an investigation would be an important addition to our understanding of the overall impact of Chapter 220 on the busing of black students as a part of Milwaukee's school desegregation process. A study of Chapter 220 should be a school-by-school analysis of which students, as a result of their being bused under Chapter 220, generated additional revenue for MPS from the state.

2. The writer is aware of at least one dissertation which has been done on equal opportunity and the politics of the Milwaukee School System. However, this study (Vorlop, 1970) was completed prior to 1976. It would be extremely valuable to have the same type of "political study" made of MPS covering the period 1974 through 1983. Such a study would shed additional light on the inner workings of the Board and the Administration during this period when the desegregation plan was initiated and subsequently implemented.

3. There is a study currently underway that is evaluating

the quality of the educational programs offered in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. If this study does not delve into the grades, suspensions, dropout rates, and achievement levels of each student, at each grade level, in each school broken down by race for the period covered by this study, then a study of this nature should be conducted. This type of information would give the Milwaukee community a better understanding of the impact desegregation has had on students' grades, achievement levels, and overall attitude about education.

4. A study of the impact of school closings in the black community and the conversion of black attendance area schools to specialty schools on black children's access to Head Start programs is needed. This is an important issue because lack of access to Head Start prevents black children from getting an early start in their formal education. Also it is through Head Start that many parents get their "feet wet" in dealing with the MPS bureaucracy.

Footnotes

[1]The Brown decision was actually a ruling in four separate cases that had been brought to the Supreme Court. They were the Kansas case, Brown vs. Board of Education, the plaintiffs being black children of elementary school age residing in Topeka; the South Carolina case, Briggs vs. Elliott, the plaintiffs being black children of elementary school age living in Clarendon County; the Virginia case, Davis vs. County School Board, in which the plaintiffs were children of high school age residing in Prince Edward County; and the Delaware case, Gebhart Vs. Belton, the plaintiffs being black children of both elementary and high school age living in New Castle County.

[2]The wording here is correct. Evidently the man stuttered.

[3]Coleman and his colleagues made the point that one of the ways that white parents responded to desegregation was simply withdrawing their children from public schools. They called this process white flight. Pettigrew and Green (1976) referred to this use of white flight in their response to Coleman. They said, "There are two main forms of what is commonly called 'white flight' from the schools: (1) white students being withdrawn from public schools undergoing desegregation and being enrolled in private or religious schools; and (2) white students being withdrawn from public schools as they and their families move from cities undergoing school desegregation to cities or suburbs not undergoing school desegregation. In both cases 'white flight' implies that withdrawal is caused by school

desegregation.

[4]Although Coleman was not the sole author of the original paper, he became the spokesperson for the paper, and he also began to speak out against school desegregation using the paper as a basis for his views.

[5]The footnote being referred to was footnote No. 11 and the social science literature she cited was K. B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Mid Century White House Conference on Children and Youth), 1950; Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making (1952), C. VI; Deuscher and Chein, The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 26 J Psychol., 259 (1948); Chein, What are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities? 3 Int. J. opinion and attitude Res. 229 (1949); Brameld, Educational Costs in Discrimination and National Welfare (MacIver, ed., 1949), 44-48; Frazier, The Negro in the United States (1949), 674-681, and see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1949). [Copied exactly as it appears in the Decision].

[6]Wisconsin Statute 121.85, passed into law in March of 1976 by the State Legislature, provided funds for fiscal incentives for pupil transfers which promote racial balance within the city of Milwaukee (intradistrict), and between Milwaukee and the surrounding districts (interdistrict).

Appendix A

Tables of MPS Raw Data

Table A-1

Elementary Schools-1979

ATTENDANCE AREA	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	#AA BLACKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHITES SENT TO WHITE AA	# WHITES SENT OUT
WHITE AA'S										
OKLAHOMA AVE.	338	0	322	0.00%	0	264	0	0	33	58
ALCOTT	213	0	204	0.00%	0	186	0	0	11	18
WHITMAN	267	0	259	0.00%	0	230	0	0	18	29
BURDICK	272	0	261	0.00%	0	232	0	0	15	29
88TH STREET	239	0	234	0.00%	0	192	0	0	33	42
VICTORY	266	0	255	0.00%	0	217	0	0	24	38
67TH STREET	226	0	215	0.00%	0	179	0	0	27	36
MORGANDALE	205	0	190	0.00%	0	159	0	0	22	31
78TH STREET	304	0	289	0.00%	0	268	0	0	11	21
FAIRVIEW	164	0	162	0.00%	0	128	0	0	14	34
GRANT	349	0	321	0.00%	0	262	0	0	29	59
MANITOBA	174	0	170	0.00%	0	136	0	0	21	34
FERNWOOD	345	0	333	0.00%	0	294	0	0	27	39
CLEMENT AVE.	218	0	211	0.00%	0	191	0	0	13	20
DOERFLER	365	1	262	0.27%	0	207	1	0	23	55
MITCHELL	719	2	556	0.28%	1	404	1	0	44	152
GREENFIELD	310	1	277	0.32%	0	190	1	0	46	87
DOVER STREET	579	2	493	0.35%	2	344	0	0	53	149
BURBANK	259	1	242	0.39%	0	213	1	1	18	29
TROWBRIDGE	235	1	222	0.43%	1	173	0	0	34	49
COOPER	427	2	414	0.47%	1	310	1	0	70	104
HAYES	425	2	327	0.47%	1	252	1	0	44	75
WHITTIER	203	1	196	0.49%	1	128	0	0	63	68
KILMER	150	1	141	0.67%	1	126	0	0	11	15
TIPPECANOE	142	1	134	0.70%	0	115	1	0	12	19
RILEY	270	2	198	0.74%	2	164	0	0	15	34
GARLAND	348	3	325	0.86%	0	233	3	0	68	92
LINCOLN AVE.	425	5	334	1.18%	3	250	2	0	33	84
BLAINE	254	3	241	1.18%	2	154	1	0	41	87
CURTIN	233	3	218	1.29%	3	174	0	0	32	44
82ND STREET	134	2	122	1.49%	2	112	0	0	8	10
LOWELL	188	3	165	1.60%	3	142	0	0	19	23
LONGFELLOW	610	10	384	1.64%	7	252	3	0	48	132
55TH STREET	116	2	111	1.72%	1	87	1	0	13	24
81ST STREET	208	4	200	1.92%	4	144	0	0	13	56
95TH STREET	96	2	94	2.08%	2	76	0	0	8	18
HUMBOLDT PARK	224	5	203	2.23%	2	163	3	0	32	40
NEESKRA	336	9	303	2.68%	6	140	3	0	18	190
HARTFORD AVE.	418	21	381	5.02%	15	217	6	0	7	164
GRANTOSA DR.	267	17	245	6.37%	15	216	2	0	23	29
GOODRICH	352	23	313	6.53%	18	269	5	0	38	44
PARKVIEW	225	15	202	6.67%	12	172	3	0	19	30
CRAIG	154	11	139	7.14%	10	111	1	0	18	28
MARYLAND AVE.	259	19	211	7.34%	9	124	10	0	13	87
BRYANT	330	28	294	8.48%	23	236	5	2	38	58
GRAND VIEW	198	20	172	10.10%	18	149	2	0	16	23
BRUCE	188	22	160	11.70%	21	139	1	0	15	22
ENGLEBURG	297	35	245	11.78%	22	206	13	0	23	39

Table A-1

Elementary Schools-1977

ATTENDANCE AREA	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	26	114	34	425	114	298	26.82%
ALCOTT	0	12	112	31	337	112	217	33.23%
WHITMAN	0	11	165	42	446	165	302	37.00%
BURDICK	0	14	109	99	457	109	331	23.85%
88TH STREET	0	11	104	9	310	104	159	33.55%
VICTORY	0	17	192	66	488	192	251	39.34%
67TH STREET	0	14	92	19	300	92	151	30.67%
MORGANDALE	0	18	130	62	370	130	275	35.14%
78TH STREET	0	13	158	29	473	158	264	33.40%
FAIRVIEW	0	15	114	151	300	114	331	38.00%
GRANT	0	19	151	29	465	151	291	32.47%
MANITOBA	0	19	80	45	269	80	181	29.74%
FERNWOOD	0	14	113	44	463	113	338	24.41%
CLEMENT AVE.	0	13	102	48	353	102	239	28.90%
DOERFLER	1	25	129	44	451	129	237	28.60%
MITCHELL	1	38	87	53	642	88	457	13.71%
GREENFIELD	1	26	117	23	362	117	213	32.32%
DOVER STREET	0	39	168	34	613	170	368	27.73%
BURBANK	1	14	147	51	425	147	378	34.59%
TROWBRIDGE	0	19	89	39	314	90	201	28.66%
COOPER	1	28	112	31	461	113	183	24.51%
HAYES	1	30	24	35	385	25	122	6.49%
WHITTIER	0	13	40	3	180	41	223	22.78%
KILMER	0	12	66	15	215	67	231	31.16%
TIPPECANOE	1	11	58	18	198	58	179	29.29%
RILEY	0	19	121	50	404	123	338	30.45%
GARLAND	2	25	70	13	336	70	122	20.83%
LINCOLN AVE.	1	29	141	39	501	144	151	28.74%
BLAINE	1	22	74	5	244	76	312	31.15%
CURTIN	0	18	102	29	321	105	134	32.71%
82ND STREET	0	10	146	10	277	148	1	53.43%
LOWELL	0	13	66	7	232	69	150	29.74%
LONGFELLOW	3	37	78	27	552	85		15.40%
55TH STREET	1	9	88	35	215	89	5	41.40%
81ST STREET	0	22	177	39	366	181	114	49.45%
95TH STREET	0	11	106	18	203	108	246	53.20%
HUMBOLDT PARK	1	19	100	33	316	102	282	32.28%
NEESKRA	2	25	122	12	285	128	291	44.91%
HARTFORD AVE.	5	15	268	51	570	283	190	49.65%
GRANTOSA DR.	2	12	282	45	565	297	261	52.57%
GOODRICH	3	16	108	13	424	126	297	29.72%
PARKVIEW	3	17	187	27	408	199	3	48.77%
CRAIG	1	19	138	25	289	148	213	51.21%
MARYLAND AVE.	4	15	114	30	330	153	305	46.36%
BRYANT	3	23	298	39	604	321	215	53.15%
GRAND VIEW	1	12	173	41	388	191	268	49.23%
BRUCE	1	17	145	12	323	166	163	51.39%
ENGLEBURG	9	21	168	25	434	190	241	43.78%

Table A-1

Elementary Schools-1979

ATTENDANCE AREA	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	#AA BLACKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHITES SENT TO WHITE AA	# WHITES SENT OUT
GRANVILLE CT.	389	46	322	11.83%	35	286	11	0	22	36
IRVING	574	77	482	13.41%	71	437	6	0	28	45
CASS	230	38	151	16.52%	35	104	3	0	16	47
65TH STREET	189	32	149	16.93%	26	117	6	1	14	32
HAPPY HILL	258	46	204	17.83%	32	171	14	0	16	33
STUART	210	38	161	18.10%	33	149	5	0	9	12
BARTON	390	73	308	18.72%	65	277	8	0	11	21
MAPLE TREE	289	56	216	19.38%	43	173	13	0	24	43
LANCASTER	318	63	238	19.81%	51	202	12	0	12	36
SHERMAN	426	86	314	20.19%	69	242	17	1	18	72
THOREAU	417	85	305	20.38%	77	283	8	0	10	22
EMERSON	173	40	128	23.12%	25	103	15	0	11	25
HI MOUNT BLVD.	598	156	383	26.09%	75	240	81	4	15	143
53RD STREET	235	62	164	26.38%	47	128	15	1	5	34
STORY	326	91	166	27.91%	61	132	30	0	10	34
HAWTHORNE	402	113	278	28.11%	78	228	35	1	31	50
HAMPTON	508	156	341	30.71%	117	280	39	0	27	61
FRATNEY	393	124	172	31.55%	96	131	28	9	9	41
CARLETON	670	212	425	31.64%	127	315	85	6	13	110
BROWNING	305	103	188	33.77%	85	155	18	1	15	33
INTEGRATED AA'S										
KLUGE	631	253	359	40.10%	177	299	76	0	27	60
WIS AVE.	417	174	114	41.73%	115	72	59	5	6	42
CONGRESS	454	214	230	47.14%	154	183	60	1	14	47
PIERCE	730	361	176	49.45%	155	100	206	23	39	76
37TH STREET	808	400	268	49.50%	209	159	191	11	22	109
35TH STREET	525	296	202	56.38%	159	129	137	7	26	73
FOREST HOME AV(a)	529	3	312	0.57%	3	224	0	0	39	88
BLACK AA'S										
KILBOURN	496	298	168	60.08%	179	130	119	0	18	38
27TH STREET	1362	1017	196	74.67%	215	124	802	72	8	72
TOWNSEND	763	571	139	74.84%	194	93	377	19	8	46
31ST STREET	859	650	141	75.67%	205	82	445	26	8	59
CLEMENS	262	204	50	77.86%	124	22	80	14	2	28
38TH STREET	1361	1074	214	78.91%	208	105	866	29	16	109
24TH STREET	408	325	73	79.66%	235	44	100	12	2	29
HOLMES	730	582	42	79.73%	385	9	197	16	16	33
PALMER	727	584	24	80.33%	354	10	230	103	6	14
SILVER SPRING	348	299	38	85.92%	205	24	94	20	5	14
SIEFERT	1127	1001	54	88.82%	459	3	542	68	5	51
BROWN	441	408	13	92.52%	310	1	98	11	1	12
BERGER	1096	1050	14	95.80%	531	0	519	70	4	14
CLARK	939	901	21	95.95%	400	11	501	47	0	10
GARDEN HOMES	919	890	21	96.84%	382	5	508	57	3	16
LLOYD	459	447	5	97.39%	143	2	304	55	1	3
20TH STREET	847	828	11	97.76%	404	9	424	61	2	2
GREEN BAY AVE.	902	882	9	97.78%	500	3	382	91	4	6

Table A-1

Elementary Schools-1979

ATTENDANCE AREA	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
GRANVILLE CT.	7	18	87	11	437	122	287	27.92%
IRVING	4	19	182	24	733	253	264	34.52%
CASS	3	15	129	44	405	164	14	40.49%
65TH STREET	5	16	122	20	293	148	5	50.51%
HAPPY HILL	6	13	157	44	412	189	196	45.87%
STUART	3	9	80	22	296	113	461	38.18%
BARTON	4	19	175	25	557	240	132	43.09%
MAPLE TREE	6	22	153	14	399	196	0	49.12%
LANCASTER	9	16	210	21	496	261	141	52.62%
SHERMAN	13	19	190	42	575	259	167	45.04%
THOREAU	8	16	164	19	569	241	4	42.36%
EMERSON	10	13	105	11	248	130	223	52.42%
HI MOUNT BLVD.	34	31	122	24	509	197	1	38.70%
53RD STREET	12	17	119	23	322	166	289	51.55%
STORY	15	16	88	58	413	149	234	36.08%
HAWTHORNE	14	17	119	13	452	197	279	43.58%
HAMPTON	15	21	69	25	497	186	149	37.42%
FRATNEY	16	16	45	19	370	141	237	38.11%
CARLETON	27	26	90	15	565	217	181	38.41%
BROWNING	10	21	170	96	523	255	58	48.76%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
KLUGE	24	31	158	66	717	335	187	46.72%
WIS AVE.	27	17	111	61	505	226	154	44.75%
CONGRESS	23	21	50	54	451	204	457	45.23%
PIERCE	42	16	39	22	491	194	221	39.51%
37TH STREET	64	32	18	14	480	227	152	47.29%
35TH STREET	40	22	7	8	323	166	25	51.39%
FOREST HOME AV(a)	0	26	60	88	536	63	114	11.75%
BLACK AA'S								
KILBOURN	24	17	34	37	420	213	94	50.71%
27TH STREET	83	22	57	38	631	272	1	43.11%
TOWNSEND	65	21	23	126	495	217	298	43.84%
31ST STREET	75	30	47	61	468	252	19	53.85%
CLEMENS	27	13	39	8	195	163	13	83.59%
38TH STREET	91	30	25	62	466	233	199	50.00%
24TH STREET	33	13	54	10	352	289	66	82.10%
HOLMES	56	10	51	5	621	436	122	70.21%
PALMER	49	8	117	3	524	471	125	89.89%
SILVER SPRING	34	10	49	17	303	254	214	83.83%
SIEFERT	76	15	24	0	487	483	297	99.18%
BROWN	43	5	97	5	425	407	284	95.76%
BERGER	74	8	49	0	585	580	3	99.15%
CLARK	86	7	24	0	440	424	41	96.36%
GARDEN HOMES	70	8	39	0	428	421	130	98.36%
LLOYD	59	3	58	232	469	201	137	42.86%
20TH STREET	79	2	69	57	577	473	198	81.98%
GREEN BAY AVE.	74	6	38	0	548	538	365	98.18%

Table A-1

Elementary Schools-1979

ATTENDANCE AREA	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	#AA BLACKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHITES SENT TO WHITE AA	# WHITES SENT OUT
LAFOLLETTE	1159	1137	9	98.10%	497	4	640	91	0	5
LEE	726	713	5	98.21%	432	1	281	52	0	4
HOPKINS	1598	1572	5	98.37%	632	5	940	135	0	0
AUER AVE.	1534	1512	18	98.57%	459	2	1053	98	3	16
FRANKLIN	1060	1045	10	98.58%	650	1	395	56	1	9
KEEFE AVE.	868	859	3	98.96%	537	1	322	68	2	2
GARFIELD AVE.	194	192	2	98.97%	72	2	120	26	0	0
9TH STREET	633	628	2	99.21%	410	0	218	22	0	2
E .L. PHILLIP	366	364	2	99.45%	205	2	159	28	0	0
HISPANIC AA'S										
KAGEL	576	2	190	0.35%	2	117	0	0	23	73
ALLEN FIELD	1014	9	379	0.89%	5	283	4	0	34	96
VIEAU	435	0	61	0.00%	0	53	0	0	5	8

(a) INTEGRATED WHITE/HISPANIC

Table A-1

Elementary Schools-1979

ATTENDANCE AREA	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
LAFOLLETTE	90	4	120	0	626	617	190	98.56%
LEE	73	0	119	0	557	551	171	98.92%
HOPKINS	99	0	66	0	706	698	167	98.87%
AUER AVE.	99	10	41	1	504	500	143	99.21%
FRANKLIN	74	4	78	0	733	728	137	99.32%
KEEFE AVE.	76	2	120	0	661	657	173	99.39%
GARFIELD AVE.	24	0	64	112	281	136	302	48.40%
9TH STREET	25	0	111	1	523	521	133	99.62%
E .L. PHILLIP	41	0	51	62	338	256	219	75.74%
HISPANIC AA'S								
KAGEL	0	29	2	15	470	4	251	0.85%
ALLEN FIELD	3	26	32	45	1010	37	328	3.66%
VIEAU	0	7	12	61	651	12	6	1.84%

(a) INTEGRATED WHITE/HIS

Table A-2

Elementary Schools-1980

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHITE AA
WHITE AA'S										
DOERFLER	390	0	282	0.00%	0	212	0	70	0	19
BURBANK	231	0	214	0.00%	0	194	0	20	0	10
COOPER	294	0	285	0.00%	0	249	0	36	0	22
FAIRVIEW	206	0	205	0.00%	0	131	0	74	0	16
VICTORY	335	0	319	0.00%	0	284	0	35	0	19
TIPPECANOE	138	0	131	0.00%	0	117	0	14	0	13
MANITOBA	172	0	168	0.00%	0	126	0	42	0	8
88TH STREET	195	0	193	0.00%	0	151	0	42	0	32
CLEMENT AVE.	196	0	187	0.00%	0	169	0	18	0	12
WHITMAN	251	0	240	0.00%	0	217	0	23	0	10
OKLAHOMA AVE.	340	0	324	0.00%	0	271	0	53	0	14
WHITTIER	207	0	198	0.00%	0	133	0	65	0	56
MITCHELL	700	1	526	0.14%	1	379	0	147	0	50
GRANT	341	1	294	0.29%	1	243	0	51	0	24
GREENFIELD	339	1	289	0.29%	0	195	1	94	0	55
FERNWOOD	328	1	316	0.30%	1	281	0	35	0	24
DOVER STREET	505	2	422	0.40%	2	308	0	114	0	40
BURDICK	250	1	239	0.40%	0	222	1	17	0	11
ALCOTT	201	1	189	0.50%	1	174	0	15	0	8
LINCOLN AVE.	462	4	369	0.87%	3	298	1	71	0	19
67TH STREET	218	2	202	0.92%	2	173	0	29	0	24
BLAINE	217	2	207	0.92%	2	139	0	68	0	30
RILEY	287	3	212	1.05%	3	177	0	35	0	14
78TH STREET	275	3	254	1.09%	3	235	0	19	0	13
GARLAND	322	4	303	1.24%	1	230	1	73	0	54
95TH STREET	132	2	125	1.52%	2	98	0	27	0	14
81ST STREET	242	4	229	1.65%	4	169	0	60	0	9
TROWBRIDGE	229	4	212	1.75%	4	171	0	41	0	30
HAYES	400	7	292	1.75%	5	207	2	85	0	38
HUMBOLDT PARK	223	4	196	1.79%	1	157	3	39	0	30
CURTIN	200	4	180	2.00%	4	156	0	24	0	14
LOWELL	166	4	141	2.41%	4	124	0	17	0	12
LONGFELLOW	617	17	386	2.76%	12	251	5	135	0	38
MORGANDALE	203	7	181	3.45%	5	159	2	22	0	16
HARTFORD AVE.	414	21	374	5.07%	17	216	4	158	0	6
NEESER A	311	18	264	5.79%	13	116	5	148	0	16
GOODRICH	320	20	291	6.25%	14	258	6	33	0	28
PARKVIEW	205	13	183	6.34%	13	156	0	27	0	18
BRUCE	172	11	155	6.40%	11	136	0	19	0	16
BYRANT	317	23	279	7.26%	16	228	7	51	1	29
MARYLAND AVE.	242	22	192	9.09%	9	102	13	90	2	28
GRANTOSA	294	27	257	9.18%	21	224	6	33	0	23
GRAND VIEW	198	23	171	11.62%	20	149	3	22	0	16
ENGLEBURG	267	35	217	13.11%	21	186	14	31	0	16
GRANVILLE CT.	365	48	294	13.15%	38	261	10	33	0	19
EMERSON	171	27	139	15.79%	20	109	7	30	0	14
65TH STREET	261	43	202	16.48%	29	140	14	62	0	22
CASS	277	50	178	18.05%	45	139	5	39	2	11
IRVING	530	97	413	18.30%	78	373	19	40	0	30
THOREAU	376	77	272	20.48%	64	249	13	23	0	15
MAPLE TREE	280	58	205	20.71%	44	168	14	37	0	21
LANCASTER	351	74	256	21.08%	55	197	19	59	1	28

Table A-2

Elementary Schools-1980

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
DOERFLER	0	27	135	39	452	135	251	29.87%
BURBANK	0	11	129	41	383	129	235	33.68%
COOPER	0	20	135	31	423	135	280	31.91%
FAIRVIEW	0	16	136	48	321	136	179	42.37%
VICTORY	0	20	173	42	515	173	326	33.59%
TIPPECANOE	0	7	64	24	210	64	141	30.48%
MANITOBA	0	16	118	34	290	118	160	40.69%
88TH STREET	0	12	107	7	267	107	158	40.07%
CLEMENT AVE.	0	10	100	43	322	100	212	31.06%
WHITMAN	0	13	156	31	419	156	248	37.23%
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	26	148	48	479	148	319	30.90%
WHITTIER	0	14	42	9	190	42	142	22.11%
MITCHELL	0	39	111	15	617	112	394	18.15%
GRANT	0	23	149	35	464	150	278	32.33%
GREENFIELD	1	28	122	18	375	122	213	32.53%
FERNWOOD	0	16	118	32	443	119	313	26.86%
DOVER STREET	0	37	176	44	603	178	352	29.52%
BURDICK	1	11	121	81	439	122	303	27.79%
ALCOTT	0	12	101	26	311	102	200	32.80%
LINCOLN AVE.	1	30	129	32	533	132	330	24.77%
67TH STREET	0	10	106	20	314	108	193	34.39%
BLAINE	0	17	102	6	257	104	145	40.47%
RILEY	0	19	119	37	392	122	214	31.12%
78TH STREET	0	12	155	33	445	158	266	35.51%
GARLAND	2	21	80	15	337	81	245	24.04%
95TH STREET	0	15	108	17	232	110	115	47.41%
81ST STREET	0	19	231	51	463	235	220	50.76%
TROWBRIDGE	0	14	92	24	308	96	195	31.17%
HAYES	1	29	67	14	360	72	221	20.00%
HUMBOLDT PARK	1	18	110	22	312	111	179	35.58%
CURTIN	0	14	97	25	299	101	181	33.78%
LOWELL	0	8	66	6	219	72	130	32.88%
LONGFELLOW	5	36	105	24	571	117	375	20.49%
MORGANDALE	2	14	110	78	382	115	237	30.10%
HARTFORD AVE.	4	17	275	49	585	292	265	49.91%
NEESER	4	18	121	13	287	134	127	46.69%
GOODRICH	3	11	106	11	297	120	269	30.23%
PARKVIEW	0	18	181	27	387	194	183	50.13%
BRUCE	0	15	145	10	309	156	146	50.49%
BYRANT	6	21	236	25	518	252	253	48.65%
MARYLAND AVE.	6	14	150	19	304	167	121	54.93%
GRANTOSA	4	17	286	49	590	307	272	52.03%
GRAND VIEW	2	12	166	20	360	186	169	51.67%
ENGLEBURG	9	14	148	36	404	169	221	41.83%
GRANVILLE CT.	9	19	96	4	418	134	265	32.06%
EMERSON	3	18	115	11	258	135	120	52.33%
65TH STREET	9	20	175	21	381	204	161	53.54%
CASS	5	14	113	45	452	158	184	34.96%
IRVING	5	20	170	41	688	248	414	36.05%
THOREAU	9	12	259	19	619	323	268	52.18%
MAPLE TREE	8	22	146	12	385	190	180	49.35%
LANCASTER	8	20	232	19	526	287	216	54.56%

Table A-2

Elementary Schools-1980

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHITE AA
STUART	200	45	144	22.50%	41	131	4	13	0	8
BARTON	399	90	295	22.56%	84	270	6	25	0	11
HAPPY HILL	273	62	199	22.71%	40	164	22	35	1	23
BROWNING	271	77	184	28.41%	65	156	12	28	0	12
HAWTHORNE	385	117	251	30.39%	85	207	32	44	0	26
STORY	338	107	143	31.66%	75	112	32	31	1	5
HAMPTON	472	157	304	33.26%	120	256	37	48	0	14
CARLETON	695	232	425	33.38%	111	295	121	130	1	19
FRATNEY	400	138	166	34.50%	108	118	30	48	8	18
HI MOUNT BLVD.	742	274	394	36.93%	123	220	151	174	8	25
INTEGRATED AA'S										
SHERMAN	819	331	433	40.42%	104	227	227	206	6	33
KLUGE	605	247	322	40.83%	183	261	64	61	4	30
WIS AVE.	414	183	97	44.20%	131	62	52	35	10	7
PIERCE	778	370	182	47.56%	189	118	181	64	26	28
37TH STREET	808	400	268	49.50%	209	159	191	109	13	27
CONGRESS	461	239	212	51.84%	162	178	77	34	1	12
53RD STREET	602	328	251	54.49%	78	149	250	102	4	9
35TH STREET	502	292	188	58.17%	158	109	134	76	3	23
FOREST HOME AV(a)	524	4	296	0.76%	4	194	0	102	0	33
(a) INTEGRATED (WHITE/HISPANIC)										
BLACK AA'S										
KILBOURN	469	289	155	61.62%	183	120	106	35	0	18
27TH STREET	1352	1045	167	77.29%	245	88	800	79	23	5
HOLMES	790	620	43	78.48%	421	12	199	31	11	18
31ST STREET	879	698	111	79.41%	206	70	492	41	11	1
CLEMENS	272	216	46	79.41%	142	13	74	33	1	7
PALMER	763	608	29	79.69%	392	11	216	18	26	28
24TH STREET	476	393	60	82.56%	304	31	89	29	60	6
SILVER SPRING	351	306	32	87.18%	217	21	89	11	11	5
SIEFERT	1070	934	44	87.29%	433	9	501	35	32	5
CLARK	1934	1760	108	91.00%	411	9	1349	99	56	4
BROWN	609	581	11	95.40%	326	2	255	9	25	1
BERGER	1104	1069	8	96.83%	558	3	511	5	52	1
AUER AVE.	1706	1656	32	97.07%	497	2	1159	30	63	5
GREEN BAY AVE.	905	884	10	97.68%	545	2	339	8	62	5
20TH STREET	868	848	6	97.70%	447	3	401	3	28	1
LEE	988	968	9	97.98%	458	5	510	4	45	2
GARDEN HOMES	910	892	12	98.02%	390	4	502	8	31	1
LAFOLLETTE	1229	1205	14	98.05%	549	2	656	12	52	11
FRANKLIN	1084	1065	6	98.25%	664	0	401	6	37	2
9TH STREET	638	632	6	99.06%	357	0	275	6	18	0
E .L. PHILLIP	353	350	1	99.15%	223	1	127	0	8	0
LEEFE AVE.	871	864	2	99.20%	572	1	292	1	55	2
HOPKINS	1523	1511	3	99.21%	655	2	856	1	92	0
HISPANIC AA'S										
ALLEN FIELD	1080	7	359	0.65%	6	271	1	88	0	30
NAGEL	561	3	179	0.53%	2	110	1	69	0	19
VIEAU	443	2	58	0.45%	1	47	1	11	1	4

Table A-2

Elementary Schools-1980

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
STUART	4	9	108	27	317	149	158	47.00%
BARTON	4	16	201	30	601	285	300	47.42%
HAPPY HILL	10	14	164	41	419	204	205	48.69%
BROWNING	9	15	125	124	496	190	280	38.31%
HAWTHORNE	17	18	146	5	464	231	212	49.78%
STORY	18	15	67	93	433	142	205	32.79%
HAMPTON	16	20	55	28	464	175	284	37.72%
CARLETON	25	24	70	12	506	181	307	35.77%
FRATNEY	21	16	31	22	360	139	140	38.61%
HI MOUNT BLVD.	48	33	82	27	500	205	247	41.00%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
SHERMAN	53	29	181	22	564	285	249	50.53%
KLUGE	28	25	114	96	690	297	357	43.04%
WIS AVE.	23	13	49	66	510	180	120	35.29%
PIERCE	47	18	28	15	579	217	143	37.48%
37TH STREET	64	32	18	14	480	227	173	47.29%
CONGRESS	32	19	36	56	445	198	234	44.49%
53RD STREET	42	17	110	22	353	189	161	53.54%
35TH STREET	44	23	10	10	305	168	119	55.08%
FOREST HOME AV(a)	0	36	125	53	575	129	247	22.43%
(a) INTEGRATED (WHITE/HISPANIC)								
BLACK AA'S								
KILBOURN	23	17	48	32	407	331	152	56.76%
27TH STREET	82	27	40	38	618	285	126	46.12%
HOLMES	54	11	43	8	700	464	20	66.29%
31ST STREET	75	18	21	79	473	227	149	47.99%
CLEMENS	31	16	34	5	197	176	18	89.34%
PALMER	48	8	81	2	528	473	13	89.58%
24TH STREET	44	8	38	6	391	342	37	87.47%
SILVER SPRING	35	8	27	16	291	247	37	83.85%
SIEFERT	70	12	38	2	488	471	11	96.52%
CLARK	100	17	23	1	447	434	10	97.09%
BROWN	55	5	68	3	408	394	5	96.57%
BERGER	79	4	33	0	594	591	3	99.49%
AUER AVE.	95	16	48	1	550	545	3	99.09%
GREEN BAY AVE.	67	8	31	0	583	576	2	98.80%
20TH STREET	82	2	45	47	589	492	50	83.53%
LEE	84	3	65	2	536	523	7	97.57%
GARDEN HOMES	67	4	32	5	433	422	9	97.46%
LAFOLLETTE	91	5	130	0	685	679	2	99.12%
FRANKLIN	79	4	56	0	725	720	0	99.31%
9TH STREET	60	2	63	1	421	420	1	99.76%
E .L. PHILLIP	40	0	46	37	326	269	38	82.52%
KEEFE AVE.	79	1	48	1	624	620	2	99.36%
HOPKINS	93	1	38	0	701	693	2	98.86%
HISPANIC AA'S								
ALLEN FIELD	1	31	30	39	982	36	310	3.67%
KAGEL	1	28	0	19	426	2	129	0.47%
VIEAU	1	8	22	49	641	23	96	3.59%

Table A-3

Elementary Schools-1981

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHITE AA
WHITE AA'S										
MANITOBA	158	0	153	0.00%	0	109	0	44	0	14
BURBANK	222	0	199	0.00%	0	186	0	13	0	5
FAIRVIEW	200	0	198	0.00%	0	137	0	61	0	14
VICTORY	336	0	321	0.00%	0	291	0	30	0	21
WHITTIER	201	0	189	0.00%	0	133	0	56	0	51
WHITMAN	221	0	211	0.00%	0	187	0	24	0	12
OKLAHOMA AVE.	334	0	315	0.00%	0	256	0	59	0	36
CLEMENT AVE.	165	0	159	0.00%	0	135	0	24	0	21
TIPPECANOE	127	0	122	0.00%	0	112	0	10	0	9
COOPER	248	0	245	0.00%	0	216	0	29	0	29
88TH STREET	187	0	184	0.00%	0	148	0	36	0	27
GREENFIELD	361	0	310	0.00%	0	217	0	93	0	41
DOERFLER	398	1	289	0.25%	1	222	0	67	0	27
MITCHELL	736	3	532	0.41%	2	364	1	168	1	47
BLAINE	219	1	204	0.46%	1	136	0	68	0	34
GRANT	362	2	318	0.55%	2	262	0	56	0	23
ALCOTT	173	1	158	0.58%	1	141	0	17	0	11
FERNWOOD	343	2	326	0.58%	1	301	1	25	0	22
DOVER STREET	506	4	410	0.79%	3	317	1	93	0	46
BURDICK	247	2	237	0.81%	0	223	2	14	0	12
67TH STREET	207	2	190	0.97%	2	162	0	28	0	15
78TH STREET	272	3	254	1.10%	3	242	0	12	0	9
81ST STREET	248	3	235	1.21%	2	162	1	73	0	15
LINCOLN AVE.	491	7	390	1.43%	5	309	2	81	0	27
TROWBRIDGE	210	3	196	1.43%	1	154	2	42	0	28
HAYES	417	6	313	1.44%	6	206	0	107	0	51
RILEY	272	4	189	1.47%	4	171	0	18	0	6
CURTIN	200	3	183	1.50%	2	163	1	20	0	16
GARLAND	286	5	268	1.75%	2	208	3	60	0	46
95TH STREET	138	3	130	2.17%	2	98	1	32	0	17
HUMBOLDT PARK	206	5	180	2.43%	0	153	5	27	0	24
LONGFELLOW	644	17	389	2.64%	14	240	3	149	0	40
LOWELL	172	6	139	3.49%	4	120	2	19	0	13
HARTFORD AVE.	433	19	386	4.39%	16	212	3	174	0	7
GOODRICH	320	15	294	4.69%	12	266	3	28	0	23
MORGANDALE	188	9	159	4.79%	6	144	3	15	0	11
MARYLAND AVE.	223	14	180	6.28%	4	88	10	92	0	28
BRUCE	174	11	158	6.32%	10	147	1	12	0	10
NEESHA	305	22	254	7.21%	14	118	8	136	0	12
BRYANT	283	22	253	7.77%	15	206	7	47	0	30
GRANTOSA DR.	282	26	251	9.22%	21	218	5	33	0	18
PARKVIEW	189	19	160	10.05%	16	136	3	24	1	11
EMERSON	156	18	130	11.54%	16	101	2	29	0	9
GRAND VIEW	187	23	156	12.30%	16	139	7	17	0	14
GRANVILLE CT.	384	51	310	13.28%	34	276	17	34	0	22
ENGLEBURG	218	30	177	13.76%	19	150	11	27	0	11
CASS	247	41	156	16.60%	32	118	9	38	0	16
IRVING	476	80	370	16.81%	64	336	16	34	0	20
THOREAU	332	62	249	18.67%	52	231	10	18	0	17
BARTON	404	82	298	20.30%	77	273	5	25	0	9
STUART	201	41	143	20.40%	35	125	6	8	0	9
HAPPY HILL	303	62	232	20.46%	45	194	17	38	0	23

Table A-3

Elementary Schools-1981

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
MANITOBA	0	17	116	46	281	116	155	41.28%
BURBANK	0	11	230	36	475	230	222	48.42%
FAIRVIEW	0	13	130	35	308	130	172	42.21%
VICTORY	0	19	195	50	553	195	341	35.26%
WHITTIER	0	14	48	7	197	48	140	24.37%
WHITMAN	0	14	185	32	415	185	219	44.58%
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	27	145	36	460	145	292	31.52%
CLEMENT AVE.	0	10	91	21	254	91	156	35.83%
TIPPECANOE	0	8	51	42	210	51	154	24.29%
COOPER	0	19	143	28	390	143	244	36.67%
88TH STREET	0	13	90	10	251	90	158	35.86%
GREENFIELD	0	29	113	13	380	113	230	29.74%
DOERFLER	0	31	143	35	485	144	257	29.69%
MITCHELL	1	45	88	18	583	90	382	15.44%
BLAINE	0	22	99	1	247	100	137	40.49%
GRANT	0	23	147	37	480	149	299	31.04%
ALCOTT	0	9	122	18	291	123	159	42.27%
FERNWOOD	1	12	124	22	459	125	323	27.23%
DOVER STREET	1	33	196	31	622	199	348	31.99%
BURDICK	2	11	131	68	432	131	291	30.32%
67TH STREET	0	10	89	22	292	91	184	31.16%
78TH STREET	0	6	164	41	467	167	283	35.76%
81ST STREET	1	20	174	38	386	176	200	45.60%
LINCOLN AVE.	2	33	144	35	567	149	344	26.28%
TROWBRIDGE	2	22	119	21	310	120	175	38.71%
HAYES	0	39	107	5	379	113	211	29.82%
RILEY	0	14	123	34	360	127	205	33.42%
CURTIN	1	13	105	29	317	107	192	33.75%
GARLAND	3	20	78	17	316	80	225	25.32%
95TH STREET	1	17	99	17	221	101	115	45.70%
HUMBOLDT PARK	2	11	110	31	317	110	184	34.70%
LONGFELLOW	2	41	71	21	539	85	261	15.77%
LOWELL	1	11	69	4	215	73	124	33.95%
HARTFORD AVE.	3	17	266	45	580	282	257	48.62%
GOODRICH	2	12	134	16	438	146	282	33.33%
MORGANDALE	2	12	112	88	400	118	232	29.50%
MARYLAND AVE.	6	17	146	29	282	150	117	53.19%
BRUCE	1	12	143	14	318	153	161	48.11%
NEESER A	7	24	108	32	323	122	150	37.77%
BRYANT	7	24	221	18	469	236	224	50.32%
GRANTOSA DR.	5	16	266	44	555	287	262	51.71%
PARKVIEW	3	15	161	36	359	177	172	49.30%
EMERSON	1	14	110	14	236	116	115	49.15%
GRAND VIEW	5	12	156	12	328	172	151	52.44%
GRANVILLE CT.	10	18	200	9	536	234	285	43.66%
ENGLEBURG	7	14	189	27	392	208	177	53.06%
CASS	8	16	82	44	387	114	162	29.46%
IRVING	11	20	146	31	607	210	367	34.60%
THOREAU	5	12	241	24	572	293	255	51.22%
BARTON	4	16	169	31	575	246	304	42.78%
STUART	4	11	119	25	320	154	150	48.13%
HAPPY HILL	10	17	149	19	416	194	213	46.63%

Table A-3

Elementary Schools-1981

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLACK AA	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHITE AA
LANCASTER	329	74	232	22.49%	51	171	23	61	3	17
MAPLE TREE	298	69	207	23.15%	47	172	22	35	2	16
65TH STREET	259	60	182	23.17%	39	132	21	50	0	15
STORY	331	93	141	28.10%	52	105	41	36	0	6
BROWNING	279	81	187	29.03%	69	152	12	35	0	11
HAWTHORNE	387	113	252	29.20%	87	191	26	61	0	39
HAMPTON	471	150	307	31.85%	107	249	43	58	1	22
CARLETON	663	221	405	33.33%	105	290	116	115	7	21
FRATNEY	386	138	148	35.75%	91	98	47	50	10	13
INTEGRATED AA'S										
HI MOUNT BLVD.	792	322	397	40.66%	165	214	157	183	2	18
SHERMAN	807	336	426	41.64%	122	211	214	215	5	18
KLUGE	639	286	322	44.76%	209	250	77	72	4	33
WIS AVE.	380	179	76	47.11%	122	44	57	32	5	3
PIERCE	735	355	181	48.30%	152	89	203	92	29	33
CONGRESS	482	247	219	51.24%	163	185	84	34	8	12
53RD STREET	567	308	234	54.32%	83	141	225	93	9	8
37TH STREET	908	535	232	58.92%	241	132	294	100	19	15
35TH STREET	533	318	190	59.66%	144	108	174	81	19	25
FOREST HOME AV(a)	576	6	282	1.04%	6	197	0	85	0	31
(a) INTEGRATED WHITE/ HISPANIC										
BLACK AA'S										
KILBOURN	441	294	101	66.67%	166	100	128	31	3	10
HOLMES	800	612	46	76.50%	414	17	198	33	16	13
27TH STREET	1349	1064	136	78.87%	248	72	816	64	24	7
31ST STREET	937	762	95	81.32%	217	54	545	41	19	6
PALMER	706	578	25	81.87%	387	11	191	14	47	4
SIEFERT	1066	880	35	82.55%	442	3	438	32	20	7
CLEMENS	276	228	41	82.61%	132	13	96	28	4	4
24TH STREET	473	392	59	83.09%	318	38	75	21	4	2
SILVER SPRING	337	290	24	86.05%	206	15	84	9	10	4
CLARK	1962	1791	95	91.28%	388	14	1403	81	75	2
BERGER	1055	1004	10	95.17%	450	4	605	6	51	1
BROWN	592	572	12	96.62%	339	5	233	7	18	2
FRANKLIN	1031	1000	12	96.99%	633	2	367	10	34	1
GARDEN HOMES	869	843	12	97.01%	350	5	493	7	45	1
AUER AVE.	1636	1588	26	97.07%	522	5	1066	21	60	5
20TH STREET	868	849	3	97.81%	402	1	447	2	40	0
LEE	989	969	7	97.98%	459	3	510	4	44	0
GREEN BAY AVE.	828	812	8	98.07%	530	4	282	4	53	3
E .L. PHILLIP	335	329	1	98.21%	232	0	97	1	12	0
LAFOLLETTE	1161	1142	8	98.36%	570	1	572	7	65	0
9TH STREET	614	608	1	99.02%	334	0	274	1	21	0
KEEFE AVE.	816	810	1	99.26%	530	0	280	0	30	1
HOPKINS	1493	1484	3	99.40%	579	0	905	3	94	0
HISPANIC										
KAGEL	543	3	168	0.55%	2	97	1	71	0	26
ALLEN FIELD	1065	21	327	1.97%	19	232	2	95	0	38
VIEAU	368	3	54	0.82%	2	43	1	11	0	5

Table A-3

Elementary Schools-1981

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
LANCASTER	11	20	197	17	467	248	188	53.10%
MAPLE TREE	14	15	109	10	355	156	182	43.94%
65TH STREET	11	23	136	20	339	175	152	51.62%
STORY	21	15	51	60	342	103	165	30.12%
BROWNING	8	19	195	113	554	264	265	47.65%
HAWTHORNE	16	21	105	9	415	192	200	46.27%
HAMPTON	18	26	69	22	457	176	271	38.51%
CARLETON	38	27	55	16	485	160	306	32.99%
FRATNEY	27	16	33	30	342	124	128	36.26%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
HI MOUNT BLVD.	46	27	75	26	524	240	240	45.80%
SHERMAN	51	30	190	22	570	312	233	54.74%
KLUGE	29	28	78	78	643	287	328	44.63%
WIS AVE	37	16	49	53	549	171	97	31.15%
PIERCE	54	23	35	14	468	187	103	39.96%
CONGRESS	38	20	29	113	517	192	298	37.14%
53RD STREET	39	16	87	43	364	170	184	46.70%
37TH STREET	76	30	14	15	472	255	197	54.03%
35TH STREET	46	23	13	5	285	157	113	55.09%
FOREST HOME AV(a)	0	37	157	54	710	163	251	22.96%
(a) INTEGRATED WHITE/ HISPANIC								
BLACK AA'S								
KILBOURN	28	16	41	48	378	240	140	54.76%
HOLMES	57	12	37	20	700	457	33	65.29%
27TH STREET	83	23	23	31	601	271	103	45.09%
31ST STREET	78	18	24	74	493	241	128	48.88%
PALMER	55	9	81	3	540	468	14	86.67%
SIEFERT	68	12	32	0	487	474	3	97.33%
CLEMENS	39	15	17	7	173	149	20	86.13%
24TH STREET	36	7	42	5	417	360	43	86.33%
SILVER SPRING	38	9	32	21	294	228	36	80.95%
CLARK	99	13	31	3	444	419	17	94.37%
BERGER	87	4	14	0	472	464	0	98.31%
BROWN	66	6	70	2	421	409	7	97.15%
FRANKLIN	69	6	57	0	701	690	2	98.43%
GARDEN HOMES	66	3	28	8	406	378	19	94.50%
AUER AVE.	94	13	38	2	576	560	7	97.22%
20TH STREET	89	1	52	70	564	454	72	77.74%
LEE	86	4	85	2	559	544	5	97.32%
GREEN BAY AVE.	72	3	27	1	563	557	5	98.93%
E .L. PHILLIP	37	1	46	39	352	278	49	78.98%
LAFOLLETTE	91	4	105	0	679	675	1	99.41%
9TH STREET	62	1	45	0	380	379	1	99.74%
KEEFE AVE.	75	0	46	0	578	576	0	99.65%
HOPKINS	90	1	36	1	617	615	1	99.68%
HISPANIC								
VAGEL	1	35	1	14	400	3	111	0.75%
ALLEN FIELD	2	42	32	29	943	51	261	5.41%
VIEAU	1	8	35	4	435	37	47	8.51%

Table A-4

Elementary Schools-1982

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
MANITOBA	181	0	171	0.00%	0	136	0	0	35	13
CLEMENT AVE.	194	0	187	0.00%	0	158	0	0	29	25
WHITTIER	197	0	189	0.00%	0	134	0	0	55	49
BURBANK	216	0	195	0.00%	0	179	0	0	16	4
BLAINE	234	0	226	0.00%	0	163	0	0	63	31
BURDICK	231	0	221	0.00%	0	221	0	0	16	14
ALCOTT	158	0	147	0.00%	0	121	0	0	26	21
FAIRVIEW	220	0	211	0.00%	0	147	0	0	64	21
WHITMAN	200	0	194	0.00%	0	176	0	0	18	10
COOPER	230	0	223	0.00%	0	197	0	0	26	19
GREENFIELD	391	0	323	0.00%	0	243	0	0	80	51
66TH STREET	150	0	149	0.00%	0	123	0	0	26	17
OKLAHOMA AVE.	367	1	348	0.27%	1	278	0	0	70	47
VICTORY	309	1	291	0.32%	1	256	0	0	33	20
78TH STREET	261	1	240	0.38%	1	227	0	0	13	9
67TH STREET	218	1	204	0.46%	1	177	0	0	27	17
FERNWOOD	332	2	310	0.60%	2	289	0	0	21	16
TIPPECANOE	148	1	144	0.68%	0	129	1	0	15	14
MITCHELL	739	5	534	0.68%	2	410	3	0	124	53
GRANT	358	3	316	0.84%	3	276	0	0	40	17
DOVER	519	5	426	0.96%	4	301	1	0	125	65
CURTIN	224	3	207	1.34%	3	179	0	0	28	25
GARLAND	264	4	245	1.52%	1	186	59	0	59	45
LOWELL	192	3	159	1.56%	3	136	0	0	23	16
LINCOLN AVE.	524	9	422	1.72%	8	347	1	0	75	39
TROWBRIDGE	214	4	197	1.87%	1	151	3	0	46	28
81ST STREET	265	5	243	1.89%	5	172	0	0	71	18
HAYES	444	9	332	2.03%	9	236	0	0	96	48
DOERFLER	418	10	295	2.39%	8	245	2	0	50	17
RILEY	287	7	201	2.44%	6	179	1	0	22	10
HUMBOLDT PARK	211	6	193	2.84%	1	171	5	0	20	19
95TH STREET	128	4	121	3.13%	1	99	3	1	22	11
LONGFELLOW	649	22	382	3.39%	19	233	3	0	149	46
MORGANDALE	203	7	173	3.45%	4	158	3	0	15	11
HARTFORD AVE.	395	17	362	4.30%	14	187	3	0	175	16
MARYLAND AVE.	235	12	189	5.11%	5	85	7	0	104	32
GOODRICH	287	18	259	6.27%	14	233	4	0	26	20
BRUCE	164	15	141	9.15%	13	130	2	0	11	7
GRANTOSA DR.	263	25	229	9.51%	22	200	3	0	29	17
NEESHAKA	285	30	229	10.53%	14	104	16	2	125	11
BRYANT	278	30	233	10.79%	26	196	4	4	37	20
PARKVIEW	212	23	176	10.85%	20	151	3	0	25	11
GRANDVIEW	157	21	132	13.38%	15	118	6	0	14	12
ENGLEBURG	226	33	181	14.60%	19	156	14	0	25	16
GRANVILLE CT.	383	61	306	15.93%	50	269	11	1	37	25
EMERSON	146	25	113	17.12%	15	89	10	0	24	17
STUART	175	31	128	17.71%	29	104	2	0	24	18
CASS	251	48	162	19.12%	39	130	9	5	32	15

Table A-4

Elementary Schools-1982

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
MANITOBA	0	17	92	54	295	92	190	31.19%
CLEMENT AVE.	0	11	75	16	258	75	174	29.07%
WHITTIER	0	7	38	8	184	38	142	20.65%
BURBANK	0	11	180	35	416	180	214	43.27%
BLAINE	0	13	98	1	266	98	164	36.84%
BURDICK	0	11	104	73	395	104	278	26.33%
ALCOTT	0	12	110	13	251	110	134	43.82%
FAIRVIEW	0	18	98	26	278	98	173	35.25%
WHITMAN	0	8	172	44	404	172	220	42.57%
COOPER	0	16	109	26	336	109	223	32.44%
GREENFIELD	0	30	113	12	417	113	255	27.10%
88TH STREET	0	10	125	10	261	125	133	47.89%
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	33	120	27	448	121	305	27.01%
VICTORY	0	17	183	42	504	184	300	36.51%
78TH STREET	0	9	191	44	490	192	271	39.18%
67TH STREET	0	11	69	16	277	70	193	25.27%
FERNWOOD	0	12	122	40	469	124	329	26.44%
TIPPECANOE	1	12	42	37	212	42	166	19.81%
MITCHELL	3	39	104	16	649	106	426	16.33%
GRANT	0	24	167	47	526	170	323	32.32%
DOVER	1	37	124	26	516	128	327	24.81%
CURTIN	0	15	119	31	347	122	210	35.16%
GARLAND	3	19	93	16	309	94	202	30.42%
LOWELL	0	12	61	20	247	64	156	25.91%
LINCOLN AVE.	1	32	156	28	618	164	375	26.54%
TROWBRIDGE	3	21	108	15	284	109	166	38.38%
81ST STREET	0	22	183	30	401	188	202	46.88%
HAYES	0	39	99	12	410	108	248	26.34%
DOERFLER	2	26	165	31	552	173	284	31.34%
RILEY	1	16	95	34	373	101	213	27.08%
HUMBOLDT PARK	3	9	105	31	323	106	202	32.82%
95TH STREET	3	10	124	115	247	125	115	50.61%
LONGFELLOW	2	40	61	17	536	80	250	14.93%
MORGANDALE	3	11	98	81	406	102	239	25.12%
HARTFORD AVE.	1	16	303	67	596	317	254	53.19%
MARYLAND AVE.	6	14	128	26	265	133	111	50.19%
GOODRICH	3	15	111	27	394	125	260	31.73%
BRUCE	1	7	142	8	298	155	138	52.01%
GRANTOSA DR.	3	14	257	61	552	279	261	50.54%
NEESLARA	11	23	121	39	326	135	143	41.41%
BRYANT	4	19	213	14	462	239	210	51.73%
FAIRVIEW	2	14	166	29	380	186	180	48.95%
GRANDVIEW	4	10	127	7	269	142	125	52.79%
ENGLEBURG	10	13	209	26	420	228	182	54.29%
GRANVILLE CT.	7	17	127	3	460	177	272	38.48%
EMERSON	7	12	102	10	222	117	99	52.70%
STUART	2	14	103	32	283	132	136	46.64%
CASS	8	14	125	37	428	164	167	38.32%

Table A-4

Elementary Schools-1982

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO WHT AA'S
THOREAU	327	63	238	19.27%	53	215	10	0	23	14
IRVING	457	91	342	19.91%	79	311	12	0	31	20
HAPPY HILL	276	60	204	21.74%	38	161	22	1	43	28
BARTON	377	82	276	21.75%	73	251	9	0	25	12
LANCASTER	353	77	253	21.81%	52	185	25	0	68	24
65TH STREET	277	61	200	22.02%	50	147	11	0	53	15
MAPLE TREE	320	77	217	24.06%	54	178	23	1	39	19
STORY	362	91	126	25.14%	58	89	33	8	37	7
BROWNING	268	76	183	28.36%	61	153	15	0	30	6
HAWTHORNE	384	113	244	29.43%	95	196	18	2	48	30
HAMPTON	464	149	305	32.11%	118	258	31	2	47	17
CARLETON	729	255	434	34.98%	126	309	129	4	125	17
FRATNEY	399	145	150	36.34%	86	99	59	11	51	10
INTEGRATED AA'S										
HI-MOUNT BLVD.	758	323	366	42.61%	171	192	152	2	174	18
SHERMAN	886	380	444	42.89%	139	218	241	8	226	33
PIERCE	729	341	198	46.78%	199	94	142	12	104	37
KLUGE	624	295	298	47.28%	212	237	83	13	61	36
53RD STREET	611	316	269	51.72%	92	147	224	8	122	16
WISCONSIN AVE.	413	215	87	52.06%	133	41	82	13	46	12
CONGRESS	479	254	210	53.03%	178	176	76	7	34	12
FOREST HOME AV(a)	599	9	302	1.50%	8	222	1	0	80	32
(a) INTEGRATED WHITE/ HISPANIC										
BLACK AA'S										
35TH STREET	538	329	179	61.15%	123	89	206	10	90	6
37TH STREET	943	602	205	63.84%	205	114	397	14	91	11
KILBOURN	475	326	127	68.63%	167	97	159	3	30	8
HOLMES	841	662	48	78.72%	466	12	196	17	36	9
31ST STREET	965	764	89	79.17%	206	54	558	30	35	5
CLEMENS	256	203	45	79.30%	108	15	95	2	30	5
27TH STREET	1313	1042	126	79.36%	249	70	793	75	56	11
SIEFERT	1036	831	30	80.21%	384	3	447	38	27	2
PALMER	649	528	22	81.36%	349	10	179	40	12	5
24TH STREET	434	354	60	81.57%	273	33	81	14	27	6
SILVER SPRING	322	270	19	83.85%	196	15	74	5	4	2
CLARK	1985	1829	85	92.14%	419	12	1410	90	73	5
BERGER	1052	1006	11	95.63%	499	3	507	41	8	2
AUER AVE.	1705	1652	25	96.89%	531	3	1121	52	22	4
BROWN	584	566	9	96.92%	323	0	243	14	9	1
GARDEN HOMES	853	830	11	97.30%	377	4	453	33	7	1
FRANKLIN	1042	1017	8	97.60%	649	0	368	39	8	2
GREEN BAY AVE.	837	819	6	97.85%	553	2	266	41	4	2
LEE	951	931	7	97.90%	500	2	431	13	5	0
LAFOLLETTE	1167	1144	9	98.03%	594	2	550	67	7	2
E.L. PHILLIP	344	338	2	98.26%	244	2	94	21	0	0
20TH STREET	817	804	3	98.41%	370	3	434	28	0	0

Table A-4

Elementary Schools-1982

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
THOREAU	7	14	271	17	581	324	232	55.77%
IRVING	9	17	194	36	647	273	347	42.19%
HAPPY HILL	10	19	154	11	372	192	172	51.61%
BARTON	6	17	239	21	602	312	272	51.83%
LANCASTER	14	20	185	17	471	237	202	50.32%
65TH STREET	7	23	151	33	397	201	180	50.63%
MAPLE TREE	10	14	89	11	346	143	189	41.33%
STORY	22	16	138	46	444	196	135	44.14%
BROWNING	9	14	239	102	573	300	255	52.36%
HAWTHORNE	11	18	111	6	433	206	202	47.58%
HAMPTON	17	23	111	30	525	229	288	43.62%
CARLETON	36	24	61	24	542	187	333	34.50%
FRATNEY	32	15	86	32	392	172	131	43.88%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
HI-MOUNT BLVD.	45	25	122	20	555	293	212	52.79%
SHERMAN	54	28	149	36	581	288	254	49.57%
PIERCE	48	24	21	17	521	220	111	42.23%
KLUGE	31	31	51	79	608	263	316	43.26%
53RD STREET	41	19	69	41	359	161	188	44.85%
WISCONSIN AVE.	37	28	74	30	561	207	71	36.90%
CONGRESS	34	16	30	106	512	208	282	40.63%
FOREST HOME A/(a)	1	36	143	33	691	151	255	21.85%
(a) INTEGRATED WHITE/ HISPANIC								
BLACK AA'S								
35TH STREET	21	12	13	4	248	136	93	54.84%
37TH STREET	75	18	24	17	432	229	131	53.01%
KILBOURN	32	15	42	67	401	209	164	52.12%
HOLMES	65	9	54	14	741	520	26	70.18%
31ST STREET	82	16	21	70	471	227	124	48.20%
CLEMENS	33	14	9	6	143	117	21	81.82%
27TH STREET	86	23	34	33	632	283	103	44.78%
SIEFERT	75	10	28	9	422	412	3	97.63%
PALMER	52	6	57	4	447	406	14	90.83%
24TH STREET	39	12	32	1	352	306	34	86.93%
SILVER SPRING	30	4	42	18	295	238	33	80.68%
CLARK	99	15	29	1	464	438	13	94.40%
BERGER	83	6	8	0	512	507	3	99.02%
AUER AVE.	94	12	38	3	588	569	6	96.77%
BROWN	60	7	64	0	389	387	0	99.49%
GARDEN HOMES	62	5	24	6	421	401	10	95.02%
FRANKLIN	72	7	40	1	695	689	1	99.14%
GREEN BAY AVE.	75	3	24	0	561	577	2	102.85%
LEE	82	5	62	0	572	562	2	98.25%
LAFOLLETTE	91	4	69	1	669	663	3	99.10%
E.L. PHILLIP	39	0	76	55	358	280	57	78.21%
20TH STREET	79	0	48	80	555	418	83	75.32%

Table A-4

Elementary Schools-1982

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO WHT AA'S
HOPKINS ST.	1517	1495	8	98.55%	682	3	813	69	5	0
9TH STREET	642	633	2	98.60%	348	0	285	31	2	1
KEEFE AVE.	780	774	2	99.23%	495	0	279	47	2	2
HISPANIC AA'S										
ALLEN FIELD	1069	27	310	2.53%	24	205	3	1	105	42
KAGEL	610	12	163	1.97%	11	92	1	0	71	20
VIEAU	396	5	46	1.26%	4	34	1	0	12	3

Table A-4

Elementary Schools-1982

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
HOPKINS ST.	88	3	19	0	710	701	3	98.73%
9TH STREET	70	2	37	0	389	385	0	98.97%
KEEFE AVE.	77	2	51	0	546	546	0	100.00%
HISPANIC AA'S								
ALLEN FIELD	3	44	37	23	934	61	228	6.53%
NAGEL	1	34	0	54	419	11	105	2.63%
VIEAU	1	8	23	9	522	27	43	5.17%

Table A-5

Elementary Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TTL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1979			
Golda Meir	232	88	134	37.93
Lloyd	469	201	234	42.86
Elm	379	136	223	35.88
McDowell	516	228	237	44.19
21st St.	672	285	349	42.41
Garfield	281	136	114	48.40
Townsend	495	217	219	43.84
38th St.	466	233	167	50.00
Hawley	307	123	163	40.07
55th St.	215	89	122	41.40
82nd St.	277	148	122	53.42
	Special Program Schools-1979			
Gaenslen	149	68	72	45.64
Manitoba Orthopedic	83	15	58	25.86
Neeskra-Hearing	44	9	34	26.47
Oklahoma Binner	30	8	19	26.67

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-5

Elementary Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TLL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1980			
82nd St.	311	122	169	39.23
Golda Meir	253	94	151	37.15
21st St.	659	287	331	43.55
55th St.	176	67	97	38.07
McDowell	526	238	240	45.25
Garfield Ave.	235	128	84	54.47
Lloyd	418	227	212	54.31
Townsend	488	231	215	47.34
Elm	376	156	200	41.49
38th St.	495	217	170	43.84
Hawley	319	136	156	42.63
	Special Program Schools-1980			
Manitoba Orthopedic	76	14	47	18.42
Gaenslen	142	62	73	43.66
Neeskra-Hearing	32	6	25	18.75

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in i[illegible] equal to the total number attending.

Table A-5

Elementary Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TLL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1981			
Garfield Ave.	292	161	99	55.14
McDowell	572	264	267	46.15
38th St.	515	218	166	42.33
Townsend	509	248	217	48.72
Lloyd	469	229	194	48.83
82nd St.	345	136	189	39.42
Golda Meir	251	95	143	37.85
Elm	412	170	227	41.26
55th St.	214	73	115	34.11
21st St.	660	333	283	50.45
Hawley	289	137	132	47.40
	Special Program Schools-1981			
Manitoba Orthopedic	85	20	50	23.53

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-5

Elementary Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TLL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1982			
21st St.	642	331	253	51.56
Golda Meir	246	104	131	42.28
82nd St.	370	142	205	38.38
Hawley	295	128	141	43.39
Townsend St.	514	259	219	50.39
55th St.	238	89	116	37.39
McDowell	597	268	273	44.89
Elm	420	178	229	42.38
38th St.	494	224	144	45.34
Garfield Ave.	260	143	76	55.00
	Special Program Schools-1982			
Gaenslen	161	75	74	46.58
Manitoba Orthopedic	92	24	54	26.09

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-6

Middle Schools, 1979

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
BELL	397	0	387	0.00%	0	375	0	12	0	8
SHOLES	546	1	513	0.18%	1	453	0	60	0	20
AUDUBON	439	1	408	0.23%	1	352	0	56	0	43
WALKER	801	3	651	0.37%	1	500	2	151	1	47
FRITSCHE	450	4	411	0.89%	4	382	0	29	0	7
MORSE	326	31	289	9.51%	27	273	4	16	0	13
BURROUGHS	655	70	562	10.69%	66	533	4	29	0	13
WEBSTER	507	103	383	20.32%	80	342	23	41	0	11
WRIGHT	345	75	264	21.74%	30	226	45	38	4	13
MUIR	657	208	436	31.66%	149	387	59	49	6	27
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)										
KOSCIUSZKO	650	0	374	0.00%	0	313	0	61	0	44
BLACK AA'S										
EDISON	943	620	296	65.75%	299	258	321	38	14	18
STEUBEN	1469	974	403	66.30%	377	293	597	110	56	37
ROOSEVELT	1474	1310	85	88.87%	355	8	955	77	0	18
FULTON	944	923	9	97.78%	289	0	634	9	77	1
PARKMAN	1579	1554	20	98.42%	499	1	1055	19	111	1

Table A-6

Middle Schools, 1979

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTNDING
BELL	0	6	292	54	740	292	429	39.46%
SHOLES	0	10	279	19	787	280	472	35.58%
AUDUBON	0	8	308	49	760	309	401	40.66%
WALKER	2	11	247	21	866	246	521	28.64%
FRITSCHE	0	8	325	84	838	329	466	39.26%
MORSE	3	6	370	36	702	381	309	54.27%
BURRROUGHS	3	7	293	35	956	359	568	37.55%
WEBSTER	6	9	370	20	827	450	362	54.41%
WRIGHT	9	9	289	41	594	319	267	53.70%
MUIR	12	7	256	21	828	405	408	48.91%
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)								
KOSCIUSZKO	0	11	14	50	712	14	363	1.97%
BLACK AA'S								
EDISON	16	9	69	73	726	368	331	50.69%
STEUBEN	16	12	105	65	905	482	358	53.26%
ROOSEVELT	17	11	46	11	451	401	11	88.91%
FULTON	17	7	162	1	457	451	1	98.69%
PARKMAN	17	5	54	0	555	553	1	99.64%

Table A-7

Middle Schools, 1980

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
FRITSCHE	418	0	378	0.00%	0	358	0	20	0	5
AUDUBON	391	1	375	0.26%	1	317	1	58	0	42
BELL	338	1	325	0.30%	1	315	0	10	0	7
WALKER	786	6	489	0.76%	3	489	3	162	0	62
SHOLES	446	4	420	0.90%	3	382	1	38	0	16
BURROUGHS	575	66	494	11.48%	62	471	4	23	0	16
MORSE	329	43	275	13.07%	35	242	8	33	0	25
WRIGHT	311	71	231	22.83%	32	200	39	31	2	13
WEBSTER	466	115	324	24.68%	91	291	24	33	1	12
MUIR	644	248	381	38.51%	182	340	66	41	0	17
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)										
KOSCIUSZKO	626	1	349	0.16%	1	292	0	47	0	37
BLACK AA'S										
EDISON	919	636	260	69.21%	315	215	321	45	11	19
PARKMAN	1551	1083	17	69.83%	446	1	1083	17	59	0
STEUBEN	1493	1070	343	71.67%	415	237	655	106	51	38
ROOSEVELT	1398	1240	75	88.70%	374	5	866	70	72	11
FULTON	1042	1018	11	97.70%	338	0	680	11	71	3
SPECIALTY SCHOOLS										
8TH STREET										
ROBINSON										

Table A-7

Middle Schools, 1980

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
FRITSCHE	0	6	314	79	799	314	437	39.30%
AUDUBON	1	8	344	54	737	344	371	46.68%
BELL	0	5	291	69	689	292	384	42.38%
WALKER	3	11	269	16	914	309	505	33.81%
SHOLES	1	6	250	103	682	253	408	37.10%
BURROUGHS	2	6	351	33	938	413	504	44.03%
MORSE	5	5	329	31	651	364	273	55.91%
WRIGHT	9	8	282	52	573	314	252	54.80%
WEBSTER	6	9	330	5	741	421	296	56.82%
MUIR	7	6	302	27	869	484	367	55.70%
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)								
KOSCIUSZKO	0	11	49	31	697	50	323	7.17%
BLACK AA'S								
EDISON	15	10	67	53	675	382	268	56.59%
PARKMAN	17	4	59	0	508	505	1	99.41%
STEUBEN	17	13	77	92	893	492	329	55.10%
ROOSEVELT	17	9	41	4	447	415	9	92.84%
FULTON	17	6	54	0	395	392	0	99.24%
SPECIALTY SCHOOLS								
8TH STREET			159	139	331	159	139	48.04%
ROBINSON			153	193	377	153	193	40.58%

Table A-8

Middle Schools, 1981

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
BELL	300	0	284	0.00%	0	274	0	10	0	7
FRITSCHE	396	1	359	0.25%	1	337	0	22	0	6
WALKER	715	6	575	0.84%	3	431	3	144	0	50
AUDUBON	351	3	332	0.85%	1	279	2	53	0	41
SHOLES	425	4	397	0.94%	1	365	3	32	0	15
BURRROUGHS	537	74	446	13.78%	61	420	13	26	0	12
MORSE	281	39	233	13.88%	32	196	7	37	0	30
WEBSTER	477	121	335	25.37%	87	311	34	24	2	14
WRIGHT	319	95	211	29.78%	46	185	49	26	7	13
MUIR	559	203	337	36.31%	150	300	53	37	3	20
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)										
KOSCIUSZKO	618	3	292	0.49%	2	251	1	41	0	28
BLACK AA'S										
STEUBEN	1517	1120	321	73.83%	459	214	661	107	43	36
EDISON	884	665	200	75.23%	297	158	368	42	11	22
ROOSEVELT	1352	1170	82	86.54%	352	4	818	78	50	12
FULTON	1023	990	12	96.77%	337	3	653	9	43	2
PARKMAN	1441	1426	12	98.96%	440	0	986	12	30	1
SPECIALTY SCHOOLS										
ROBINSON										
8TH STREET										

Table A-8

Middle Schools, 1981

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
BELL	0	5	277	61	633	277	335	43.76%
FRITSCHE	0	5	330	81	785	331	418	42.17%
WALKER	1	11	308	11	861	311	442	36.12%
AUDUBON	1	7	322	43	663	323	322	48.72%
SHOLES	1	6	233	25	648	234	390	36.11%
BURROUGHS	4	6	353	25	877	414	445	47.21%
MORSE	4	6	275	23	533	307	219	57.60%
WEBSTER	7	9	320	22	760	407	333	53.55%
WRIGHT	12	6	282	48	579	332	233	57.34%
MUIR	8	8	340	33	843	490	333	58.13%
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)								
KOSCIUSZKO	1	11	68	29	742	70	280	9.43%
BLACK AA'S								
STEUBEN	17	12	48	88	892	507	302	56.84%
EDISON	16	10	64	40	613	361	198	58.89%
ROOSEVELT	17	12	36	2	414	388	6	93.72%
FULTON	17	5	60	0	404	397	3	98.27%
PARKMAN	17	4	32	0	472	472	0	99.79%
SPECIALTY SCHOOLS			213	131	371	213	131	57.41%
ROBINSON			149	149	322	149	149	46.27%
8TH STREET								

Table A-9

Middle Schools, 1982

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
BELL	280	0	263	0.00%	0	256	0	7	0	6
FRITSCHE	355	2	317	0.56%	1	300	1	17	0	10
SHOLES	403	3	380	0.74%	1	355	2	25	0	21
WALKER	750	6	578	0.80%	3	424	3	154	0	71
AUDUBON	364	3	333	0.82%	1	271	2	62	0	50
BURROUGHS	592	89	473	15.03%	77	442	12	31	0	16
MORSE	272	48	212	17.65%	35	183	13	29	0	15
WEBSTER	478	122	332	25.52%	98	307	24	25	0	16
WRIGHT	334	111	209	33.23%	52	172	59	37	3	6
MUIR	563	223	315	39.61%	174	267	49	48	7	30
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)										
ROOSEVELT	615	7	293	1.14%	6	235	1	58	0	38
BLACK AA'S										
STEUBEN	1624	1220	316	75.12%	464	182	756	134	47	68
EDISON	948	743	184	78.38%	280	132	463	52	13	21
ROOSEVELT	1320	1109	89	84.02%	332	6	777	83	59	13
FULTON	1037	996	13	96.05%	328	0	668	13	50	0
PARKMAN	1531	1511	12	98.69%	461	0	1050	12	63	0
SPECIALTY SCHOOLS										
8TH STREET										
ROBINSON										

Table A-9

Middle Schools, 1982

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTNDING
WHITE AA'S								
BELL	0	5	282	60	623	282	316	45.26%
FRITSCHE	1	7	351	84	778	352	384	45.24%
SHOLES	1	7	319	20	716	320	375	44.69%
WALKER	1	12	327	11	880	330	435	37.50%
AUDUBON	1	7	322	45	668	323	316	48.35%
BURROUGHS	4	8	86	41	979	463	483	47.29%
MORSE	3	5	355	113	706	390	296	55.24%
WEBSTER	7	7	373	22	825	471	329	57.09%
WRIGHT	11	8	296	58	595	348	230	58.49%
MUIR	11	8	285	28	776	459	295	59.15%
INTEGRATED AA'S (WHITE/HISPANIC)								
KOSCIUSZKO	1	11	66	21	737	72	256	9.77%
BLACK AA'S								
STEUBEN	17	13	48	96	882	512	278	58.05%
EDISON	15	8	55	41	687	335	173	48.76%
ROOSEVELT	17	13	31	3	389	363	9	93.32%
FULTON	17	9	75	2	411	403	2	98.05%
PARKMAN	17	4	34	0	496	495	0	99.80%
SPECIALTY SCHOOLS								
8TH STREET			147	159	326	147	159	45.09%
ROBINSON			202	164	397	202	164	50.88%

Table A-10

High Schools, 1979

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
HAMILTON	1756	3	1720	0.17%	2	1552	1	168	0	25
BAY VIEW	2045	4	1899	0.20%	4	1556	0	343	0	38
PULASKI	2505	5	2402	0.20%	2	1784	3	618	0	169
SOUTH DIVISION	2643	7	1865	0.26%	2	1246	5	619	2	161
MARSHALL	1707	189	1478	11.07%	114	1307	75	171	7	29
MADISON	2403	346	1995	14.40%	209	1558	137	437	6	85
VINCENT	1412	206	1174	14.59%	88	506	118	668	3	515
INTEGRATED AA'S										
RIVERSIDE	1625	736	726	45.29%	392	429	344	297	44	15
CUSTER	2954	1435	1469	48.58%	656	1205	779	264	52	89
BLACK AA'S										
WASHINGTON	4656	2981	1516	64.02%	886	643	2095	873	148	97
WEST DIVISION	1758	1360	259	77.36%	585	78	775	181	77	23
NORTH DIVISION	3773	3703	40	98.14%	743	4	2960	36	143	5
KING (a)	3	3	0	100.00%	1	0	2	0	-	-

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
HAMILTON	1	10	795	89	2483	797	1641	32.10%
BAY VIEW	0	11	624	197	2502	628	1753	25.10%
PULASKI	2	11	731	112	2698	733	1896	27.17%
SOUTH DIVISION	3	15	379	103	2426	381	1349	15.69%
MARSHALL	11	9	1187	111	2761	1301	1418	47.12%
MADISON	14	13	664	573	3061	873	2131	28.52%
VINCENT	10	13	361	101	1162	444	691	38.21%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
RIVERSIDE	14	12	242	93	1310	634	522	48.40%
CUSTER	15	13	267	246	2416	923	1451	38.20%
BLACK AA'S								
WASHINGTON	15	15	6	126	1881	992	769	52.74%
WEST DIVISION	15	12	216	41	1032	801	119	77.62%
NORTH DIVISION	15	9	161	14	935	904	18	96.68%
KING (a)	2	0	425	519	964	425	519	43.19%

Table A-11

High Schools, 1980

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
HAMILTON	1497	1	1463	0.07%	1	1291	0	172	0	25
BAY VIEW	1905	3	1762	0.16%	3	1423	0	339	0	38
SOUTH DIVISION	2530	7	1723	0.28%	3	1052	4	671	12	169
PULASKI	2310	8	2201	0.35%	5	1577	3	624	0	161
MARSHALL	1515	200	1278	13.20%	105	1047	95	231	7	29
VINCENT	1290	209	1139	16.04%	123	806	86	333	0	85
MADISON	2216	387	1769	17.46%	219	1333	68	436	11	515
INTEGRATED AA'S										
RIVERSIDE	1536	664	685	43.23%	269	398	395	287	60	15
CUSTER	2914	1502	1367	51.54%	703	1095	799	272	67	89
BLACK AA'S										
WASHINGTON	4587	3060	1354	66.71%	806	517	2254	837	200	93
WEST DIVISION	1754	1356	247	77.31%	559	57	747	190	90	23
NORTH DIVISION	3500	3440	36	98.29%	971	7	2469	29	143	5

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
HAMILTON	0	12	617	124	2077	618	1415	29.75%
BAY VIEW	0	14	485	199	2239	488	1622	21.80%
SOUTH DIVISION	5	16	654	91	2478	657	1143	26.51%
PULASKI	1	16	571	127	2362	576	1704	24.39%
MARSHALL	13	15	1014	91	2291	1119	1138	48.84%
VINCENT	8	12	442	149	1558	565	955	36.26%
MADISON	15	14	642	294	2538	861	1627	37.92%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
RIVERSIDE	16	13	203	398	1124	472	493	41.99%
CUSTER	16	14	194	276	2311	897	1371	38.81%
BLACK AA'S								
WASHINGTON	16	16	100	138	1719	906	655	52.71%
WEST DIVISION	16	14	211	45	975	770	102	78.97%
NORTH DIVISION	16	10	268	24	1292	1239	31	95.90%

Table A-12

High Schools, 1981

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
HAMILTON	1383	2	1343	0.14%	1	1157	1	186	0	34
BAY VIEW	1860	3	1726	0.16%	2	1366	1	360	0	50
SOUTH DIVISION	2477	9	1642	0.36%	4	860	5	762	0	207
PULASKI	2189	8	2074	0.37%	3	1361	5	713	1	194
MARSHALL	1339	188	1111	14.04%	90	831	98	220	10	39
VINCENT	1459	243	1164	16.66%	169	1006	74	158	3	70
MADISON	2154	425	1671	19.73%	232	1232	193	439	9	104
INTEGRATED AA'S										
RIVERSIDE	1508	675	656	44.76%	256	316	419	340	58	23
CUSTER	3056	1676	1311	54.84%	736	1025	940	286	81	100
BLACK AA'S										
WASHINGTON	4688	3237	1252	69.05%	698	376	2539	876	221	92
WEST DIVISION	1786	1340	238	75.03%	442	28	898	210	85	29
NORTH DIVISION	3507	3438	29	98.03%	851	6	2587	23	133	3

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
HAMILTON	1	14	604	146	1956	605	1303	30.93%
BAY VIEW	1	17	334	188	2201	542	1554	24.63%
SOUTH DIVISION	5	21	290	96	2070	485	956	23.43%
PULASKI	2	21	394	145	2213	623	1506	28.15%
MARSHALL	15	21	940	95	1986	1030	926	51.86%
VINCENT	10	16	624	189	2038	793	1195	38.91%
MADISON	20	20	789	109	2409	1021	1341	42.38%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
RIVERSIDE	21	14	173	100	1023	429	416	41.94%
CUSTER	23	19	215	260	2304	951	1285	41.28%
BLACK AA'S								
WASHINGTON	23	22	118	132	1513	816	508	53.93%
WEST DIVISION	23	16	162	28	812	604	77	74.38%
NORTH DIVISION	23	12	321	13	1216	1172	19	96.38%

Table A-13

High Schools, 1982

SCHOOL	TOTAL # STUDENTS IN AA	# BLACKS IN AA	# WHITES IN AA	AA % BLACK	# AA BLACKS ATTDNG IN AA	# AA WHITES ATTDNG IN AA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT OUT	#AA BLKS SENT TO BLK AA'S	#AA WHTS SENT TO WHT AA'S
WHITE AA'S										
HAMILTON	1248	1	1208	0.08%	0	1008	1	200	0	45
BAY VIEW	1750	5	1623	0.29%	4	1268	1	355	0	48
PULASKI	2053	6	1947	0.29%	3	1244	3	703	0	201
SOUTH DIVISION	2427	13	1562	0.54%	8	748	5	814	1	241
MARSHALL	1278	217	1026	16.98%	103	723	114	303	9	50
VINCENT	1386	257	1065	18.54%	182	929	75	136	3	40
MADISON	2123	483	1567	22.75%	234	1146	249	421	15	114
INTEGRATED AA'S										
RIVERSIDE	1463	661	620	45.18%	238	252	423	368	45	23
CUSTER	2913	1702	1144	58.43%	695	878	1007	266	79	94
BLACK AA'S										
WASHINGTON	4732	3339	1157	70.56%	643	296	2696	861	192	95
WEST DIVISION	1848	1388	233	75.11%	379	26	1019	217	86	31
NORTH DIVISION	3646	3568	30	97.86%	943	6	2625	24	138	0

SCHOOL	# OTHER SCH REC AA BLKS	# OTHER SCH REC AA WHTS	BLACKS SENT IN	WHITES SENT IN	TTL STUDENTS	TTL BLACK ATTENDING	TTL WHITE ATTENDING	% BLACK ATTENDING
WHITE AA'S								
HAMILTON	1	15	611	159	1817	611	1157	33.63%
BAY VIEW	1	17	725	216	2318	729	1484	31.45%
PULASKI	2	20	695	202	2229	698	1446	31.31%
SOUTH DIVISION	5	20	322	85	1986	529	833	26.64%
MARSHALL	17	20	893	83	1830	996	806	54.43%
VINCENT	10	15	613	204	1994	795	1133	39.87%
MADISON	20	17	799	96	2338	1047	1242	44.78%
INTEGRATED AA'S								
RIVERSIDE	21	21	196	89	963	434	341	45.07%
CUSTER	22	18	265	267	2193	960	1145	43.78%
BLACK AA'S								
WASHINGTON	23	23	121	296	1450	764	443	52.69%
WEST DIVISION	22	19	175	49	743	554	75	74.56%
NORTH DIVISION	23	5	272	16	1262	1215	22	96.28%

Table A-14

High School Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TTL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1979			
Milwaukee Tech	2584	720	1721	27.86
King	984	425	519	43.19
Juneau	1050	412	601	39.24
	Special Program Schools-1979			
Liberty South	31	16	12	51.61

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-14

High School Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TTL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1980			
Milwaukee Tech	2404	707	1555	29.41
King	1142	503	590	44.05
Juneau	973	346	578	35.56
	Special Program Schools-1980			
Liberty South	44	24	19	54.55
Pleasant View	205	82	108	40.00

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-14

High School Specialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TTL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1981			
Milwaukee Tech	2324	732	1421	31.50
King	1230	515	663	41.87
Juneau	1056	377	610	35.70
	Special Program Schools-1981			
Lincoln Dec.	83	34	49	40.96
Liberty South	36	18	17	50.00
Craig	71	38	27	53.52
Kilmer	235	12	200	5.11
Lapham Park	92	83	6	90.22
Pleasant View	233	93	122	39.91
68th St.	149	76	66	51.01
Demmer JAC	123	81	32	65.85
Lady Pitts	134	188	11	88.06

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-14

High SchoolSpecialty Schools

and Special Program Schools (1979 -1982)

Name of School	TTL Students	TTL Black Attending	TTL White Attending	% Black Attending
	Specialty Schools-1982			
Milwaukee Tech	2289	734	1372	32.07
King	1288	544	687	42.24
Juneau	1108	421	616	38.00
	Special Program Schools-1982			
Lincoln Dec.	152	90	52	59.21
Liberty South	35	18	16	51.43
Craig	68	35	28	51.47
Kilmer	221	9	197	4.07
Lapham Park	98	87	9	88.78
Pleasant View	244	103	120	42.21
68th St.	159	92	62	57.86
Demmer JAC	44	34	4	77.27
Lady Pitts	157	143	8	91.08

Note. Specialty Schools and Special Program Schools have no attendance areas so the number of students sent in is equal to the total number attending.

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1979

SCHOOL	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	0	58	8
ALCOTT	0	0	18	4
WHITMAN	0	0	29	5
BURDICK	0	0	29	6
68TH STREET	0	0	42	7
VICTORY	0	0	38	5
67TH STREET	0	0	36	3
MORGANDALE	0	0	31	4
78TH STREET	0	0	21	2
FAIRVIEW	0	0	34	3
GRANT	0	0	59	18
MANITOBA	0	0	34	4
FERNWOOD	0	0	39	7
CLEMENT AVE.	0	0	20	3
DOERFLER	1	1	55	11
MITCHELL	1	0	152	19
GREENFIELD	1	0	87	18
DOVER STREET	0	0	149	47
BURBANK	1	0	29	7
TROWBRIDGE	0	0	49	7
COOPER	1	0	104	15
HAYES	1	0	75	12
WHITTIER	0	0	68	2
KILMER	0	0	15	2
TIPPECANOE	1	0	19	0
RILEY	0	0	34	4
GARLAND	3	0	92	14
LINCOLN AVE.	2	0	84	13
BLAINE	1	0	87	31
CURTIN	0	0	44	4
82ND STREET	0	0	10	1
LOWELL	0	0	23	2
LONGFELLOW	3	0	132	32
55TH STREET	1	0	24	7
81ST STREET	0	0	56	17
75TH STREET	0	0	18	3
HUMBOLDT PARK	1	0	40	1
NEESKRA	3	3	190	109
HARTFORD AVE.	6	4	164	67
GRANTOSA DR.	2	0	29	1
GOODRICH	5	0	44	3
PARKVIEW	3	1	30	2
CRAIG	1	0	28	2
MARYLAND AVE.	10	4	87	19
BRYANT	5	2	56	9

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1979

SCHOOL	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
GRAND VIEW	2	0	23	4
BRUCE	1	0	22	1
ENGLEBURG	13	2	39	3
GRANVILLE CT.	11	1	36	10
IRVING	6	0	45	1
CASS	3	1	47	17
65TH STREET	6	0	32	3
HAPPY HILL	14	3	33	6
STUART	5	0	12	1
BARTON	8	0	21	11
MAPLE TREE	13	2	43	7
LANCASTER	12	0	36	5
SHERMAN	17	2	72	19
THOREAU	8	1	22	2
EMERSON	15	1	25	2
HI MOUNT BLVD.	81	10	143	54
53RD STREET	15	0	34	16
STORY	30	0	34	8
HAWTHORNE	35	3	50	12
HAMPTON	39	5	61	3
FRATNEY	28	0	41	15
CARLETON	85	5	110	23
BROWNING	18	0	33	2
Total:	520	47	3578	784
Percent:		9.04%		21.91%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
KLUGE	76	0	60	8
WIS AVE.	59	7	42	6
CONGRESS	60	1	47	9
PIERCE	206	0	76	18
37TH STREET	191	12	109	29
35TH STREET	137	3	73	21
FOREST HOME AVE.	0	0	68	7
Total:	729	23	495	98
Percent:		3.16%		19.80%
BLACK AA'S				
KILBOURN	119	0	38	4
27TH STREET	802	71	72	14
TOWNSEND	377	22	46	14
31ST STREET	445	42	59	10
CLEMENS	80	6	28	10
38TH STREET	866	53	109	46
24TH STREET	100	5	29	12
HOLMES	197	9	35	0

Table A-13

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1983

1979

SCHOOL	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
PALMER	230	8	14	2
SILVER SPRING	94	10	14	3
SIEFERT	542	90	51	13
BROWN	98	5	12	3
BERGER	519	25	14	5
CLARK	501	25	10	1
GARDEN HOMES	508	24	16	4
LLOYD	304	7	3	0
20TH STREET	424	22	2	0
GREEN BAY AVE.	382	22	6	0
LAFOLLETTE	640	28	5	1
LEE	281	22	4	0
HOPKINS	940	182	1	1
AUER AVE.	1053	35	16	4
FRANKLIN	395	16	9	1
KEEFE AVE.	322	19	2	0
GARFIELD AVE.	120	5	0	0
9TH STREET	218	13	2	0
E .L. PHILLIP	159	9	0	0
Total:	10716	775	595	148
Percent:		7.23%		24.87%
HISPANIC AA'S				
ALLEN FIELD	4	0	96	8
VIEAU	0	0	8	0
KAGEL	0	0	73	7
Total:	4	0	177	15
Percent:		0.00%		8.47%
Grand Total:	11969	845	4845	1045
Overall Percent:		7.06%		21.57%

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

	1980			
ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
DOERFLER	0	0	70	17
BURBANK	0	0	20	6
COOPER	0	0	36	7
FAIRVIEW	0	0	74	10
VICTORY	0	0	35	8
TIPPECANOE	0	0	14	1
MANITOBA	0	0	42	12
88TH STREET	0	0	42	6
CLEMENT AVE.	0	0	18	3
WHITMAN	0	0	23	5
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	0	53	15
WHITTIER	0	0	65	6
MITCHELL	0	0	147	31
GRANT	0	0	51	15
GREENFIELD	1	0	94	30
FERNWOOD	0	0	35	10
DOVER STREET	0	0	114	46
BURDICK	1	0	17	3
ALCOTT	0	0	15	6
LINCOLN AVE.	1	0	71	27
67TH STREET	0	0	29	3
BLAINE	0	0	68	34
RILEY	0	0	35	9
78TH STREET	0	0	19	2
GARLAND	2	1	73	14
95TH STREET	0	0	27	9
81ST STREET	0	0	60	43
TROWBRIDGE	0	0	41	10
HAYES	2	0	85	18
HUMBOLDT PARK	3	0	39	4
CURTIN	0	0	24	3
LOWELL	0	0	17	0
LONGFELLOW	5	0	135	38
MORGANDALE	2	0	22	5
HARTFORD AVE.	4	4	158	150
NEESKRA	5	3	148	125
GOODRICH	6	0	33	4
PARKVIEW	0	0	27	5
BRUCE	0	0	19	2
BYRANT	7	0	51	15
MARYLAND AVE.	13	6	90	60
GRANTOSA	6	0	33	8
GRAND VIEW	3	1	22	4
ENGLEBURG	14	3	31	9
GRANVILLE CT.	10	1	33	0
EMERSON	7	0	30	11
65TH STREET	14	5	82	30
CASS	5	1	39	26
IRVING	19	3	40	6
THOREAU	13	3	23	6
MAPLE TREE	14	4	37	13

Table A-13

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1980

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
LANCASTER	19	4	59	21
STUART	4	1	13	3
BARTON	6	0	25	10
HAPPY HILL	22	3	35	12
BROWNING	12	3	28	10
HAWTHORNE	32	3	44	11
STORY	32	5	31	11
HAMPTON	37	5	48	10
CARLETON	121	10	130	39
FRATNEY	30	4	48	24
HI MOUNT BLVD.	151	37	174	124
Total:	625	113	3221	1213
Percent:		18.14%		37.66%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
SHERMAN	227	92	206	167
KLUGE	64	2	61	18
WIS AVE.	52	12	35	8
PIERCE	181	6	64	17
37TH STREET	191	19	109	45
CONGRESS	77	17	34	15
53RD STREET	250	123	102	81
35TH STREET	134	11	76	32
FOREST HOME AVE.	0	0	102	32
Total:	1176	282	789	415
Percent:		23.98%		52.60%
BLACK AA'S				
KILBOURN	106	7	35	6
27TH STREET	300	83	79	30
HOLMES	199	23	31	5
31ST STREET	492	53	41	14
CLEMENS	74	14	33	15
PALMER	216	25	18	8
24TH STREET	89	8	29	15
SILVER SPRING	89	11	11	3
SIEFERT	501	101	35	13
CLARK	1349	258	99	31
BROWN	255	30	9	2
BERGER	511	42	6	3
AUER AVE.	1159	140	30	17
GREEN BAY AVE.	339	43	8	2
20TH STREET	401	35	3	0
LEE	510	123	4	1
GARDEN HOMES	502	45	8	1
LAFOLLETTE	656	48	12	1
FRANKLIN	401	35	9	3
9TH STREET	275	67	6	4
E .L. PHILLIP	127	11	0	0
KEEFE AVE.	292	21	1	0
HOPKINS	356	176	1	1
Total:	10199	1447	504	225

Table A-13

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

		1980		
ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
Percent:		14.19%		44.64%
HISPANIC AA'S				
ALLEN FIELD	1	0	38	10
KAGEL	1	0	69	13
VIEAU	1	0	11	1
Total:	3	0	168	24
Percent:		0.00%		14.29%
Grand Total:	12001	1842	4682	1877
Overall Percent:		15.35%		40.09%

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1981

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
MANITOBA	0	0	44	26
BURBANK	0	0	13	6
FAIRVIEW	0	0	61	45
VICTORY	0	0	30	8
WHITTIER	0	0	56	2
WHITMAN	0	0	24	6
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	0	59	10
CLEMENT AVE.	0	0	24	1
TIPPECANOE	0	0	10	1
COOPER	0	0	29	2
88TH STREET	0	0	36	6
GREENFIELD	0	0	93	22
DOERFLER	0	0	67	18
MITCHELL	1	0	168	39
BLAINE	0	0	68	28
GRANT	0	0	56	26
ALCOTT	0	0	17	6
FERNWOOD	1	0	25	3
DOVER STREET	1	0	93	32
BURDICK	2	0	14	0
67TH STREET	0	0	28	5
78TH STREET	0	0	12	1
81ST STREET	1	0	73	57
LINCOLN AVE.	2	1	81	31
TROWBRIDGE	2	0	42	14
HAYES	0	0	107	20
RILEY	0	0	18	3
CURTIN	1	0	20	2
GARLAND	3	1	60	12
95TH STREET	1	0	32	11
HUMBOLDT PARK	5	0	27	1
LONGFELLOW	3	0	149	52
LOWELL	2	0	19	6
HARTFORD AVE.	3	1	174	160
GOODRICH	3	0	28	5
MORGANDALE	3	0	15	3
MARYLAND AVE.	10	5	92	58
BRUCE	1	1	12	1
NEESKRA	8	3	136	114
BRYANT	7	0	47	11
GRANTOSA DR.	5	0	33	11
PARKVIEW	3	1	24	9
EMERSON	2	1	29	13
GRAND VIEW	7	1	17	3
GRANVILLE CT.	17	2	34	10

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1981

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
ENGLEBURG	11	3	27	6
CASS	9	2	38	14
IRVING	16	3	34	5
THOREAU	10	6	18	5
BARTON	5	0	25	10
STUART	6	4	8	4
HAPPY HILL	17	3	38	14
LANCASTER	23	6	61	22
MAPLE TREE	22	11	35	16
65TH STREET	21	9	50	27
STORY	41	3	36	10
BROWNING	12	0	35	14
HAWTHORNE	26	5	61	18
HAMPTON	43	7	58	17
CARLETON	116	14	115	42
FRATNEY	47	6	50	31
Total:	519	104	2985	1155
Percent:		20.04%		38.69%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
HI MOUNT BLVD.	157	39	183	130
SHERMAN	214	99	215	181
KLUGE	77	4	72	23
WIS AVE.	57	11	32	11
PIERCE	203	9	92	30
CONGRESS	84	18	34	13
53RD STREET	225	129	93	74
37TH STREET	294	48	100	39
35TH STREET	174	13	81	27
FOREST HOME AVE.	0	0	85	22
Total:	1485	370	987	550
Percent:		24.92%		55.72%
BLACK AA'S				
KILBOURN	128	10	31	6
HOLMES	198	34	33	8
27TH STREET	816	87	64	26
31ST STREET	545	54	41	3
PALMER	191	26	14	5
SIEFERT	438	85	72	13
CLEMENS	96	28	29	15
24TH STREET	75	11	21	1
SILVER SPRING	84	16	9	0
CLARK	1403	290	81	62
BERGER	605	43	5	2
BROWN	253	70	1	3

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1981

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
FRANKLIN	367	62	10	4
GARDEN HOMES	493	44	7	0
AUER AVE.	1066	137	21	11
20TH STREET	447	55	2	0
LEE	510	110	4	1
GREEN BAY AVE.	282	33	4	10
F .L. PHILLIP	97	15	1	0
LAFOLLETTE	572	59	7	2
9TH STREET	274	55	1	1
KEEFE AVE.	280	34	0	0
HOPKINS	905	207	3	3
Total:	10105	1565	427	176
Percent:		15.49%		41.22%
HISPANIC AA'S				
KAGEL	1	0	71	15
ALLEN FIELD	2	0	95	12
VIEAU	1	0	11	1
Total:	4	0	177	28
Percent:		0.00%		15.82%
Grand Total:	12113	2039	4576	1909
Percent:		16.83%		41.72%

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

	1982			
SCHOOL	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
MANITOBA	0	0	35	20
CLEMENT AVE.	0	0	29	3
WHITTIER	0	0	55	4
BURBANK	0	0	16	9
BLAINE	0	0	63	30
BURDICK	0	0	16	1
ALCOTT	0	0	26	4
FAIRVIEW	0	0	64	40
WHITMAN	0	0	13	5
COOPER	0	0	26	5
GREENFIELD	0	0	80	15
88TH STREET	0	0	26	9
OKLAHOMA AVE.	0	0	70	12
VICTORY	0	0	33	13
78TH STREET	0	0	13	3
67TH STREET	0	0	27	3
FERNWOOD	0	0	21	4
TIPPECANOE	1	1	15	1
MITCHELL	3	0	124	34
GRANT	0	0	40	18
DOVER	1	0	125	34
CURTIN	0	0	28	2
GARLAND	3	1	59	13
LOWELL	0	0	23	7
LINCOLN AVE.	1	1	75	27
TROWBRIDGE	7	0	46	16
81ST STREET	0	0	71	47
HAYES	0	0	96	18
DOERFLER	2	2	50	12
RILEY	1	0	22	4
HUMBOLDT PARK	5	0	22	1
95TH STREET	7	0	22	9
LONGFELLOW	5	2	149	47
MORGANDALE	7	3	15	3
HARTFORD AVE.	3	2	175	165
MARYLAND AVE.	7	2	104	69
GOODRICH	4	2	26	6
BRUCE	2	0	11	2
GRANTOSA DR.	3	0	29	10
NEESKARA	16	6	125	101
BRYANT	4	0	37	11
PARKVIEW	3	0	25	13
GRANDVIEW	6	1	14	2
ENGLEBURG	14	3	25	6
GRANVILLE CT.	11	1	37	7
EMERSON	10	2	24	8
STUART	2	1	24	3
CASS	9	4	32	12

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1982

SCHOOL	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
THOREAU	10	2	23	5
IRVING	12	5	31	4
HAPPY HILL	22	5	43	12
BARTON	9	1	25	9
LANCASTER	25	7	68	24
65TH STREET	11	5	53	29
MAPLE TREE	23	6	39	19
STORY	33	9	37	18
BROWNING	15	6	30	11
HAWTHORNE	18	3	48	16
HAMPTON	31	8	47	10
CARLETON	129	14	125	49
FRATNEY	59	5	51	34
Total:	520	110	2908	1129
Percent:		21.15%		38.82%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
HI-MOUNT BLVD.	152	34	174	141
SHERMAN	241	105	226	178
PIERCE	142	6	104	26
KLUGE	83	10	61	14
53RD STREET	224	112	122	88
WISCONSIN AVE.	82	17	46	14
CONGRESS	76	24	34	8
FOREST HOME AVE.	1	0	80	14
Total:	1001	308	847	483
Percent:		30.77%		57.02%
BLACK AA'S				
35TH STREET	206	19	90	29
37TH STREET	397	55	91	41
KILBOURN	159	15	30	8
HOLMES	196	32	36	14
31ST STREET	558	57	35	12
CLEMENS	95	25	30	15
27TH STREET	793	68	56	30
SIEFERT	447	73	27	14
PALMER	179	25	12	3
24TH STREET	81	18	27	15
SILVER SPRING	74	11	4	0
CLARK	1410	292	73	41
BERGER	507	31	8	1
AUER AVE.	1121	140	22	12
BROWN	243	72	9	3
GARDEN HOMES	453	52	7	0
FRANKLIN	368	71	8	1
GREEN BAY AVE.	266	47	4	0
LEE	431	104	5	1
LAFOLLETTE	550	57	7	0

Table A-15

Number of Elementary School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1982

SCHOOL	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
E.L. PHILLIP	94	4	0	0
20TH STREET	434	36	0	0
HOPKINS ST.	813	198	5	4
9TH STREET	285	49	2	0
KEEFE AVE.	279	32	2	0
Total:	10439	1601	590	244
Percent:		15.34%		41.36%
HISPANIC AA'S				
ALLEN FIELD	3	0	105	13
KAGEL	1	0	71	13
VIEAU	1	0	12	0
Total:	5	0	188	26
Percent:		0.00%		13.83%
Grand Total:	11965	2019	4533	1882
Overall Percent:		16.87%		41.52%

Table A-16

Number of Middle School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1979

ATTENDANCE AREAS	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
BELL	0	0	12	4
SHOLES	0	0	60	36
AUDUBON	0	0	56	9
WALKER	2	0	151	42
FRITSCHE	0	0	29	15
MORSE	4	0	16	3
BURRROUGHS	4	0	29	12
WEBSTER	23	3	41	18
WRIGHT	45	5	38	14
MUIR	59	14	49	6
Total:	137	22	481	159
Percent:		16.06%		33.06%
INTEGRATED (WHITE/ HISPANIC)				
KOSCIUSZKO	0	0	61	13
Percent:		0.00%		21.31%
BLACK AA'S				
EDISON	321	11	38	16
STEUBEN	597	62	110	60
ROOSEVELT	955	86	77	22
FULTON	634	52	9	3
PARKMAN	1055	73	19	10
Total:	3562	284	253	111
Percent:		7.97%		43.87%
Grand Total:	3699	306	795	283
Overall Percent:		8.27%		35.60%

Table A-16

Number of Midle School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1980

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
FRITSCHE	0	0	20	1
AUDUBON	1	0	58	10
BELL	0	0	10	2
WALKER	3	0	162	41
SHOLES	1	0	38	22
BURRROUGHS	4	1	23	5
MORSE	8	0	33	8
WRIGHT	39	3	31	12
WEBSTER	24	2	33	17
MUIR	66	3	41	9
Total:	146	9	449	127
Percent:		6.16%		28.29%
INTEGRATED (WHITE/ HISPANIC)				
KOSCIUSZKO	0	0	47	17
Percent:		0.00%		36.17%
BLACK AA'S				
EDISON	321	15	45	17
PARKMAN	1083	95	17	4
STEUBEN	655	84	106	51
ROOSEVELT	866	95	70	30
FULTON	680	60	11	2
Total:	3605	349	249	104
Percent:		9.68%		41.77%
Grand Total:	3751	358	745	248
Overall Percent:		9.54%		33.29%

Table A-16

Number of Midle School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1981

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
BELL	0	0	10	2
FRITSCHE	0	0	22	13
WALKER	3	0	144	35
AUDUBON	2	2	53	7
SHOLES	3	0	32	14
BURRROUGHS	13	1	26	13
MORSE	7	0	37	7
WEBSTER	34	3	24	6
WRIGHT	49	2	26	11
MUIR	53	2	37	5
Total:	164	10	411	113
Percent:		6.10%		27.49%
INTEGRATED (WHITE/ HISPANIC)				
KOSCIUSZKO	1	0	41	10
Percent:		0.00%		24.39%
BLACK AA'S				
STEUBEN	661	78	107	61
EDISON	368	18	42	15
ROOSEVELT	818	88	78	31
FULTON	653	74	9	3
PARKMAN	986	85	12	2
Total:	3486	343	248	112
Percent:		9.84%		45.16%
Grand Total:	3651	353	700	235
Overall Percent:		9.67%		33.57%

Table A-16

Number of Middle School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

	1982			
ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
BELL	0	0	7	1
FRITSCHE	1	0	17	7
SHOLES	2	0	25	4
WALKER	3	0	154	36
AUDUBON	2	2	62	9
BURRROUGHS	12	0	31	11
MORSE	13	0	29	6
WEBSTER	24	3	25	5
WRIGHT	59	3	37	12
MUIR	49	4	48	7
Total:	165	12	435	98
Percent:		7.27%		22.53%
INTEGRATED (WHITE/ HISPANIC)				
KOSCIUSZKO	1	0	58	17
Percent:		0.00%		29.31%
BLACK AA'S				
STEUBEN	756	96	134	55
EDISON	463	25	52	15
ROOSEVELT	777	72	83	35
FULTON	668	60	13	3
PARKMAN	1050	71	12	4
Total:	3714	324	294	112
Percent:		8.72%		38.10%
Grand Total:	3880	336	787	227
Overall Percent:		8.66%		28.84%

Table A-17

Number of High School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

Table A-16

Number of High School Students Sent To Specialty Schools, 1979-82

1979

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
HAMILTON	1	0	168	135
BAY VIEW	0	0	343	281
PULASKI	3	1	618	425
SOUTH DIVISION	5	0	619	404
MARSHALL	75	25	171	107
MADISON	137	30	437	107
VINCENT	118	18	668	60
Total:	339	74	3024	1519
Percent:		21.83%		50.23%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
RIVERSIDE	344	86	297	271
CUSTER	779	224	264	129
Total:	1123	310	561	400
Percent:		27.60%		71.30%
BLACK AA'S				
WASHINGTON	2095	320	873	749
WEST DIVISION	775	162	181	130
NORTH DIVISION	2960	581	36	9
KING(a)	2	-	0	-
Total:	5830	1071	1090	888
Percent:		18.37%		81.47%
Grand Total:	7292	1455	4675	2807
Overall Percent:		19.95%		60.04%

(a) Being Phased Out as AA School: not included in this analysis.

Table A-17

Number of High School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

	1980			
ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
HAMILTON	0	0	172	127
BAY VIEW	0	0	339	264
SOUTH DIVISION	4	2	671	392
PULASKI	3	0	624	394
MARSHALL	95	29	231	138
VINCENT	86	32	333	57
MADISON	68	34	436	107
Total:	256	97	2806	1479
Percent:		37.89%		52.71%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
RIVERSIDE	395	78	287	250
CUSTER	799	241	272	131
Total:	1194	319	559	381
Percent:		26.72%		68.16%
BLACK AA'S				
WASHINGTON	2254	475	837	681
WEST DIVISION	747	153	190	128
NORTH DIVISION	2469	512	29	10
Total:	5470	1140	1056	819
Percent:		20.84%		77.56%
Grand Total:	6920	1556	4421	2679
Overall Percent		22.49%		60.60%

Table A-17

Number of High School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

Table A-17 Continued

Number of High School Students Sent To Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1981

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
HAMILTON	1	0	186	125
BAY VIEW	1	0	360	236
SOUTH DIVISION	5	1	782	263
PULASKI	5	0	713	390
MARSHALL	98	32	220	147
VINCENT	74	35	158	49
MADISON	193	41	439	107
Total:	377	109	2858	1317
Percent:		28.91%		46.08%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
RIVERSIDE	419	84	340	283
CUSTER	940	267	286	124
Total:	1359	351	626	407
Percent:		25.83%		65.02%
BLACK AA'S				
WASHINGTON	2539	512	876	574
WEST DIVISION	898	168	210	130
NORTH DIVISION	2587	635	23	8
Total:	6024	1315	1109	712
Percent:		21.83%		64.20%
Grand Total:	7760	1775	4593	2436
Percent:		22.87%		53.04%

Table A-17

Number of High School Students Sent to Specialty Schools, 1979-1982

1982

ATTENDANCE AREA	# BLACKS SENT OUT	# BLACKS SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS	# WHITES SENT OUT	# WHITES SENT TO SPECIALTY SCHOOLS
WHITE AA'S				
HAMILTON	1	0	200	113
BAY VIEW	1	0	355	240
PULASKI	3	0	703	384
SOUTH DIVISION	5	2	814	383
MARSHALL	114	34	303	166
VINCENT	75	43	136	36
MADISON	249	53	421	92
Total:	448	132	2932	1414
Percent:		29.46%		48.23%
INTEGRATED AA'S				
RIVERSIDE	423	83	368	299
CUSTER	1007	287	266	117
Total:	1430	370	634	416
Percent:		25.87%		65.62%
WHITE AA'S				
WASHINGTON	2696	530	861	646
WEST DIVISION	1019	190	217	131
NORTH DIVISION	2625	475	24	11
Total:	6340	1195	1102	788
Percent:		18.85%		71.51%
Grand Total:	8218	1697	4668	2618
Overall Percent:		20.65%		56.08%

Appendix B*

North Division and the Plan to Turn it into a Medical Specialty School

North Division High School was built in 1903. Between the years of 1955 and 1959, North changed from being a predominantly white school to one that was predominantly black.

The black community began to petition the Board in the 1960's to build a new school. Finally, after years of discussion and debate, the Milwaukee School Board decided to build a new North Division high school on the site of the old building. The school was finally finished in time for the 1978-79 school year. The school, in accordance with a decision made by the Board in April of 1976, was to open as a racially balanced school.

In September of 1978, the new building was opened as an attendance area school with a medical specialty as a part of the program. The school ended up being 98 percent black, as few whites volunteered to enroll at North Division. Although the Board claimed it wanted North to be "racially balanced", they did nothing to force whites to enroll there and they sent black students from King (another black school that had been closed and reopened as a college specialty school) to North.

In May of 1979, the School Board made a decision to close North Division as an attendance area school at the end of the 1979-80 school year and reopen the school as a city-wide health

---

*Reprinted from Coalition to Save North Division High School Newsletter, Enough is Enough (publication not dated).

and science technology school for the 1980-81 school year for grades 9 and 10, adding grade 11 in 1981-82, and grade 12 in 1982-83. To do this, several steps were to be taken:

1. No new full-time students were to be admitted to North for the 1979-80 school year.

2. At the end of the 1979-80 school year, all remaining students at North were to be transferred out of North to school where they would enhance "racial balance".

3. A committee was created by the School Board to develop the educational plan for the new school. Although the committee was supposed to have included representatives of North Division staff, students, parents, etc., the committee in fact included no representatives from either of these groups.

There were student protests (e.g., students walked out of North Division) and a protest from the community at a hearing called by the Board after they had reached their decision. This hearing was held on Tuesday night, May 8, 1979. Based on this strong reaction against the plan, the school administration asked a group of parents, students, staff, alumni, and interested community groups to come up with an alternative plan. A committee met and formulated a plan which incorporated the following basic elements:

1. North Division should remain a comprehensive high

school with an expanded medical specialty and technical specialty.

2. In accordance with the consent decree, the court-approved settlement of the Milwaukee Desegregation suit reached in 1979, North should be an integrated school, but a predominantly black one (60 percent black/40 percent white).

3. All students presently enrolled at North Division will remain and be allowed to graduate from North Division.

4. Supportive Services Programs should be developed to prepare students to become a part of the medical and technical specialties.

The School Board held an official meeting on May 29 which community members were allowed to attend but not participate. At that meeting the Board , without explanation, refused to consider the alternative plan offered by the community and gave final approval to their initial plan. As a result of this action, the Coalition to Save North Division (CSND) was organized.

The Coalition was opposed to the School Board's plan for several reasons:

1. This plan was conceived and adopted with absolutely no consultation with students, teachers, parents, or community groups who were involved with North Division. This was done in spite of the Board's knowledge of the intense concern of the black community about North Division.

2. The burden of the desegregation process was once again being borne by black people. Black children were being forced out. Whites were being force to do nothing. Blacks were being forced--whites were being "attracted".

3. The black community felt that there was an underlying assumption made by the Board that black institutions could not be expected to achieve academic excellence.

4. After years of struggle, the black community had a right to use that facility for its children.

The Coalition to Save North Division was made up of the same groups of people that developed the community's alternative plan. They began to meet weekly to plan strategies designed to get the School Board to change its decision. The Coalition carried out a number of activities:

1. They were able to get one of the Black School Board members (a prime supporter of the plan) to debate the issue on TV. This helped to publicize the issue and to clarify the basis for the community's opposition to the plan.

2. The Coalition led a petition drive asking people to indicate their support for the community's alternative plan. Over 10,000 signatures were gathered on this petition. Nearly 9,000 of these signatures were presented to a committee of the Milwaukee School Board.

3. The Coalition sponsored a community rally on the football field at North Division. More than 500 people attended

the rally.

4. The Coalition organized a march and rally on the evening of the August 1979 School Board meeting. Approximately 400 people participated in the march from the Martin Luther King Center to the School Administration building, where they were joined by another 100 people for a spirited rally against the Board's plan. The participants then attended the meeting where once again the Board refused to reconsider its plan.

5. Coalition members met with the editorial board of the Milwaukee Journal and the Milwaukee Sentinel. These meetings resulted in the two newspapers changing their editorial stance from supporting the Board's plan to calling for the Board to review its action. The Journal called for the Board to hold off implementing the plan for a year to allow for further study. The Sentinel called for the Board to allow the students who were currently at North Division to graduate from the school.

6. The Coalition filed a formal complaint with the Monitoring Board (a lay board created by the Federal judge to oversee the implementation of the out-of-court settlement that was directing the school desegregation process in Milwaukee). Ultimately, this Board agreed with the position of the CSND that the School Board's actions had placed an unfair burden upon the black community. As a result, a formal hearing was set up before the Federal magistrate to hear the case.

The Coalition to Save North Division, through its attorneys, filed a formal complaint with Federal Magistrate Ruth LaFave.

The complaint (1979) made a number of allegations about the School Board's actions with respect to North Division. The main point made was that,

> "The School Board/Administration (was) in violation of the court order (the 1978 Order) because its desegregation plan for North Division (was) discriminatory in that it (placed) a disproportionate burden on black students without a valid, non-racial reason when less burdensome alternatives existed."

The Magistrate scheduled an official hearing to determine the validity of the Coalition's complaint against the School Board. Throughout the period that the hearing was being conducted, Coalition members continued to meet with School Board members to pursue an out-of-court settlement. These discussions culminated in an agreement being reached on May 1, 1980 to abolish the Board's original plan. In its place there was an agreement between the School Board and the CSND provided for the following:

(a) North Division would be allowed to remain an attendance area school with a career specialty.

(b) The enrollment at North Division would be 60 percent black and 40 percent white.

(c) A School-Community committee made up of representatives from the Coalition to Save North Division, the North Division Community, teachers,

administrators, and students, would oversee the development, implementation, and evaluation of the educational program.

(d) All of the students enrolled at North Division would be allowed to remain and graduate from North Division.

References

Books

Anderson, H., & Olson, F. (1981). Milwaukee: At the gathering of the waters. Tulsa: Continental Heritage Press.

Ausubel, D. (1963). Ego development among segregated Negro children. In M. M. Grossack (Ed.), Mental health and segregation (pp. 33-40). New York: Spring[illegible] Publishing Company.

Banks, R., & Di Pasquale, M. E. (1969). A study of the educational effectiveness of integration. New York: Buffalo Public Schools.

Berelson, B., & Steiner, G. (1964). Human behavior: An inventory of scientific findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Carter, R. (1980). A reassessment of Brown v. Board. In D. Bell (Ed.), Shades of Brown (pp. 20-29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, K. (1972). A possible reality: A design for the attainment of high academic achievement for inner-city students. New York: Emerson Hall.

Clark, K. (1972). Cultural deprivation theories: Their social and psychological implications. In L. Plotkin (Ed.), The educationally deprived: The potential for change (pp. 1-12). New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center.

Deutsch, M. (1967). The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In M. Deutsch (Ed.), The disadvantaged child: Selected papers of Martin Deutsch and associates (pp. 40-57). New York: Basic Books.

Edmonds, R. (1980). Effective education for minority pupils: Brown confounded or confirmed. In D. Bell (Ed.), Shades of Brown (pp. 108-123). New York: Teachers College Press.

Eisenberger, K., & Keough, W. (1974). Declining enrollment: What to do. In AASA executive handbook series (Vol. 2). Virginia: American Association of School Administrators.

Frazier, E. F. (1949). The Negro in the United States. New York: The MacMillian Company.

James, D. (1973). Bunkerism in Carnarsie: Out of the family and into the street. In N. Mills (Ed.), The Great School Controversy (pp. 239-232). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Jones, L. (1979). From Brown to Boston: Desegregation in education 1954-1974. New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.

Kluger, R. (1976). Simple Justice. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Lightfoot, S. (1980). Families as educators: The forgotten principles of Brown. In D. Bell (Ed.), Shades of Brown (pp. 108-123). New York: Teachers College Press.

Myrdal, G. (1944). An American dilemma. New York: Harper and Brothers.

St. John, N. (1975). School desegregation outcomes for children. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Summerfield, H. (1971). The neighborhood-based politics of education. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Taylor, W. (1978). The Dallas story. In N. Estes, & D. Waldrip (Ed.), Magnet schools: Legal and practical implications (pp. 123-130). New Jersey: New Century Education Corporation.

Doctoral Dissertations

Vorlop, F. C. (1970). Equal opportunity and the politics of education in Milwaukee. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison).

Eric Documents

Annotated bibliography and summaries of reference materials. (1977). In School desegregation/integration notebook. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 905)

Bottomly, F. (1979). Magnets: Promises and cautions. In Magnet schools for desegregation. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 398)

Broh, C. A., & Trent, W. (1981). Assessment of current knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies Vol. VI: A review of qualitative literature and expert opinion. Washington, D.C. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 724)

Coleman, J. S., Kelly, S. D., & Moore, J. A. (1975, August). Trends in school segregation: 1968-1973. (Report No. 722-03-01) Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 117 252)

Coleman, J. S. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 275)

Rice, D. (1979). A reporter looks at magnet schools. In Magnet schools for desegregation. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 398)

Government Documents and Reports

Coleman, J. (1975). School desegregation and the loss of whites from large central-city school districts. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Report of the advisory committee on racial balance and education. (1966). Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1972). Your child and busing. (Clearinghouse Publication No. 12). Washington, D. C.

Weinberg, M. (1977). Minority students: A research appraisal (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education Publication). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Legal Documents

Armstrong v. O'Connell, 416 F. Supp. 1078 (E. D. Wisconsin 1972).

Brown et al v. Board of Education of Topeka, et al, 347 U. S. 483 (1954).

Craig Amos and Jeffrey Amos et al v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee, 408 F. Supp. 765 (E. D. Wisconsin 1976).

Swann et al v. Charlotte Mecklenburg Board of Education et al, 401 U. S. 1 (1971).

Milwaukee Public School System Documents, Reports, and Correspondence

A five-year school building and future sites program 1966-1970 (Jan. 12, 1965). Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of School Directors.

A six-year building and sites program 1970-1975 (September 2, 1969). Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of School Directors.

A six-year building and sites program 1973-1978 (May 19, 1972). Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of School Directors.

An Array of Alternatives (1975).

Comprehensive Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance in Milwaukee Public Schools (December 8, 1976).

Enrollment by Ethnic Categories and Schools (October 1, 1974).

Enrollment by Ethnic Categories and Schools (October 15, 1975).

Enrollment by Ethnic Categories and Schools (September 17, 1976).

Enrollment by Ethnic Categories and Schools (September 16, 1977).

Enrollment by Ethnic Categories and Schools (September 15, 1978).

Lawrence, Robert J. Administrative Assistant to the Deputy Superintendent, MPS. Letter to author of this study, March 9, 1985.

1981-1983 Roster (1982). Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Public Information/Community Relations MPS.

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 30, 1976).

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 16, 1977).

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 15, 1978).

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 21, 1979).

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 19, 1980).

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 18, 1981).

Official Fall Enrollment Report (September 17, 1982).

Reduction in Sites and School Capacity 1975-1982.

School Enrollment by Receiving School (September 21, 1979).

School Enrollment by Receiving School (September 19, 1980)

School Enrollment by Receiving School (September 19, 1981).

School Enrollment by Receiving School (September 17, 1982).

School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area (September 21, 1979).

School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area (September 19, 1980).

School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area (September 18, 1981).

School Enrollment by Sending Attendance Area (September 17, 1982).

Newspapers

Courts scored as going too far in school integration. (1975, May 29). Los Angeles Times, part 1, p. 10 cols. 1-4, p. 11 cols. 1-4.

Desegregation architect unhappy with overall results. (1975, May 18). Boston Globe, p. 8 cols. 1-8, p. 9 cols. 5-7.

Periodicals and Reports

Altevogt, B., & Nusbaumer, M. (1978, July-August). Black parents and desegregation in Fort Wayne. Integrated Education, 16 (4), 31-34.

Armor, D. (1972, Summer). The evidence on busing. The Public Interest, (28), 90-117.

Arnez, N. (1978, Winter). Implementation of desegregation as a discriminatory process. The Journal of Negro Education, 47 (1), 28-45.

Banks, J. (1972, December). The destruction of black schools: An American tragedy. Educational Leadership, 30 (3), 270-272.

Barr, R. (1982, January). Magnet schools, an attractive alternative. Principal, 61 (3), 37-40.

Bednarek, D. (1977, November-December). Milwaukee. Integrated Education, 15 (90), 36-37.

Bell, D. (1975, Spring). Waiting on the promise of Brown. Law and Contemporary Problems, 39 (2), 340-375.

Berger, M. (1983, February). Why communities protest school closings. Education and Urban Society, 15 (2), 149-163.

Blackman, A. (1954, August-September). Planning and the neighborhood school. Integrated Education, 2 (4), 49-56.

Boyd, W. (1979, May). Educational policy making in declining suburban school districts. Education and Urban Society, 11 (3), 333-366.

Busing: An American dilemma. (1972, March 13). Newsweek, pp. 20-24.

Colton, D., & Frelich, A. (1979, May). Enrollment decline and school closings in a large city. Education and Urban Society 11 (3), 396-417.

Cronin, J. (1977, January-February). City school desegregation and the creative use of enrollment decline. Integrated Education, 15 (1), 10-12.

Derian, P. (1971, August 3). White parents' fears. Inequality in Education, (11), 22-23.

Deutscher, M., & Chin, I. (1948, October). The psychological effects of enforced segregation: A survey of social science opinion. The Journal of Psychology, 26, 259-287.

Divoky, D. (1979,October). Burden of the seventies: The management of decline. Phi Delta Kappan. 6 (2),87-91.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1935, July). Does the Negro need separate schools? The Journal of Negro Education, 4 (3), 328-335.

Durham, J. (1973, Summer). Sense and nonsense about busing. The Journal of Negro Education, 42 (3), 323-335.

Ellis, R. (1971, November). The feasibility of public school desegregation. School and Society, 99 (2336), 433-436.

Featherstone, J. (1976, January 23). Busing the powerless. The New Republic, 174 (4), 11-17.

Glazer, N. (1972, March). Is busing necessary? Commentary, 53 (3), 39-52.

Goodman, W. (1975, August). Integration, yes: Busing, no. New York Times Magazine, 24, 10-11, 42, 46, 48.

Green, R., Smith E., & Schweitzer, J. (1972, May). Phi Delta Kappan, 53 (9), 543-546.

Gunning, R. (1972, September-October). Busing versus the neighborhood school. The Urban Review, 6 (1), 2-5.

Hamilton, C. (1968, Fall). Race and education: A search for legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review, 38 (4), 669-684.

Harris, I. (1983, Fall). Criteria for evaluating school desegregation in Milwaukee. The Journal of Negro Education, 52 (4), 423-435.

Iannaccone, L. (1979, May). The management of decline, implications for our knowledge in the politics of education. Education and Urban Society, 11 (3), 418-430.

Jencks, C. (1972, November 19). Busing--the Supreme Court goes North. New York Times Magazine, section 6, pp. 41, 119, 120-121, 125, 127.

Killian, L. M., & Grigg, C. M. (1965, Summer). Community resistance to and acceptance of desegregation. The Journal of Negro Education, 34 (3), 268-277.

Kriss, R. (1972, March 11). The split-level presidency. Saturday Review, 32.

McMillian, C. (1977, November). Magnet education in Milwaukee. Phi Delta Kappan, 59 (3), 158-163.

Marty, M. (1973, July 18-25). The real issue in the busing controversy. Christian Century, 90 (27), 751-755.

Note: Merging urban and suburban school systems. (1972, May). Georgetown Law Journal, 60 (5), 1279-1307.

Orfield, G. (1979, Autumn). Research, politics and the anti-busing debate. Law and Contemporary Problems, 42 (4), 148-173.

Ornstein, A. (1971, November). The myths of liberalism and school integration. School and Society, 99 (2336), 436-438.

Pettigrew, T. (1972, September-October). School research and the busing issue. The Urban Review, 6 (1), 24-25.

Pettigrew, T. & Green, R. (1976, February). School desegregation in large cities: A critique of the Coleman 'white flight' thesis. Harvard Educational Review, 46 (1), 1-53.

Poussaint, A., & Brown, T. L. (1976, May). School desegregation: A synonym for racial equality. School Review, 84 (3), 326-336.

Power, J. (1979, September-October). Magnet schools, are they the answer? Today's Education, 68 (3),68-70.

Quinn, L. (1983, March 28). Background on Plan to Close Ninth, Brown, and Roosevelt Schools. Paper developed for attachment to the Coalition to Save Our Schools complaint to the Monitoring Board of the United States District Court.

Quotation Marks: Busing and forced integration. (1972, September-October). The Urban Review, 6 (12), 41.

Scott, H. (1983, February). Desegregation in Nashville: Conflicts and contradictions in preserving schools in the black community. Education and Urban Society, 15 (2), 235-244.

Shakeshaft, C., & Gardner, D. (1983, March). Declining to close schools: Alternatives for coping with enrollment decline. Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (7),492-496.

Smith, P. (1977, November-December). Voluntary participation and public opinion in Milwaukee school desegregation. Integrated Education, 15 (6), 88-91.

Thomas, M. D. (1980, November). Administrative leadership in school closures. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (439), 21-26.

Trombley, W. (1977, November-December). Magnet schools costly in St. Louis. Integrated Education, 15 (6), 97-99.

Wasserman, M. (1972, September-October). Busing as a 'cover issue', a radical view. The Urban Review, 6 (1), 6-10.

White House panel on education. (1966, February-March). Integrated Education, 4 (1), 16-21.

Wilcox, P. (1970, January-February). Integration or separatism in education: K-12. Integrated Education, 7 (1), 23-32.

Zwerdling, D. (1971, October 23). White militance in Michigan: Block those buses. The New Republic, 165 (17), 14-17.

Biographical Notes

Name: Howard L. Fuller

Date of Birth: January 14, 1941

Place of Birth: Shreveport, Louisiana USA

Academic Degrees Received

Bachelor of Science, Carroll College, 1962

Master of Social Administration, Western Reserve University, 1964