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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States Supreme Court, in 1954, submitted to the American people a decision that was one of the most important ever presented to any nation. The decision, known as Brown versus Board of Education, established that racially segregated education violates the Constitution and is harmful to children.

The courts have been consistent in ruling that separate schools are not equal; therefore such schools are in violation of the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution. Since the original decision of 1954, the courts have continued to reflect a concern for elimination of dual school systems and for the creation of unitary school districts that achieve a much greater measure of heterogenity. The decision in Alexander versus Holmes County Board of Education (1969)\(^1\) mandated that the "deliberate speed" doctrine be set aside and that immediate desegregation take place. The South has taken its time, but "according to government statistics, schools [in the South] are now less segregated there than outside the Old Confederacy. As of the last year, 1970, 39 per cent of black children in the South went

to schools where whites were in the majority, compared with only 28 per cent in the North and West."²

Now nearly two decades later, after Brown versus Board of Education, federal courts are finally forcing school systems in the North to face the hard facts of de facto segregation. The federal district court, in Keyes versus School District Number One, Denver, Colorado (1970), ³ ruled that since the effects of de facto or de jure segregation are the same, the school board had violated the Fourteenth Amendment. ⁴ Favorable decisions for immediate desegregation of de facto or de jure segregated school systems have been rendered recently in Pontiac and Detroit, Michigan. United States District Judge Damon Keith has ruled that Pontiac, Michigan, in Davis versus The School District of Pontiac, ⁵ must desegregate its schools. He maintained that districts were gerrymandered to remain basically black or white. United States District Judge Stephen J. Roth, in Bradley versus Milliken, ⁶ found Detroit Public Schools to be


segregated and ordered the suburban areas and the State of Michigan to aid in correcting the situation. He ruled in his order that the State Department of Education must present alternative desegregation plans to him and that the suburbs would have to be involved for Detroit to overcome its school segregation. Judge Roth's decision was appealed to the Sixth United States Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati, Ohio. Recently, the Cincinnati based court rendered a decision upholding Judge Roth's ruling but indicated that further hearings must be held. Judge Roth must allow for surrounding suburbs to "have their day in court" before implementation of his order is begun.

In 1972, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People took the school board of Dayton, Ohio, to court in Columbus, Ohio, and United States District Judge Carl Rubin heard the case without a jury. The suit also included the State of Ohio and asked that suburban school districts be included in efforts to desegregate the city schools, but the judge would only hear the portion dealing with the Dayton school district. "Rubin has made it clear that the considerations in the law suit so far have been limited to determining whether the Dayton schools were segregated through actions of the school board and proposing corrections within the Dayton School District."  

Judge Carl Rubin, on February 7, 1973, ordered the Dayton Public School Board to prepare a desegregation plan within sixty days of the aforementioned date. He ruled, in part, that racially imbalanced schools, optional attendance zones, and action taken by a conservative majority controlled school board to rescind the outgoing board's resolution to desegregate without a court order cumulatively were in violation of the Equal Protection clause of the United States Constitution. The totality of the findings required intervention by the court under the mandate of Brown versus the Board of Education, Judge Rubin opinioned.

The original suit filed in April, 1972, asked the judge to order adoption of a desegregation plan drawn by Dr. Gordon Foster of the University of Miami in Florida. The plan was not ordered implemented.

United States District Judge Robert R. Merhige, Jr., on January 11, 1972, ordered Virginia State officials to consolidate the 64 per cent black school system of Richmond with the two surrounding suburban districts, Henrico and Chesterfield, which are 91 per cent white. The Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals has reversed Judge Merhige's order. The United States Supreme Court supported the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals by a

---

division of 4 for and 4 against with Justice Powell abstaining because of having been involved with the Richmond's schools earlier in his career.

Miller, in discussing the content of the Supreme Court rulings, notes:

The courts have shown that even if a community is willing and unprepared to desegregate it must do so in any case. Because the courts have ruled according to principle—the spirit of the Constitution, their decisions reflect careful, rational consideration. In a sense, judges have the luxury of deciding difficult social and political questions in a vacuum; they are able to see the issues in perspective. 9

Efforts to desegregate schools in some instances have brought about polarization which stems from such factors as ignorance, fear, anxiety, and distrust. Racial attitudes and class prejudices cannot be ignored. They have become the foci of black and white reluctance to desegregate. A desegregation plan always gives rise to the following kinds of questions:

What will be the response of the community?

Will there be violent reactions?

What is fair treatment of all students? 10

The potential answer to such questions can be explored by looking at the experiences and findings of people who have experienced desegregation. Ultimately, the weight of political conflict must be handled by local communities. How well a community will

---


10 Ibid.
respond to a plan for desegregation is determined by several factors. The local political style, the community's history in relationship to poor and racial minorities, how power is allocated among community groups, and the composition of the population all influence the responses.

The preceding pages have outlined how important the courts' role has been in bringing about change in the education of students. Another important aspect to consider is the role that the local school board plays. Southworth described the original concept of school boards and their members. School board members were elected by fellow citizens of the school districts and they were to represent the best interests of the districts. There was understanding that the locally elected members would be absolved of political parties and would serve in the best interest of students. In 1973, we can seriously doubt whether school board members can, or should, view their role in this manner.

The researcher, recognizing that the courts may continue to require desegregation and knowing that local boards and superintendents need some plans for responding effectively, will attempt to validate a planning guide of educational change through desegregation

---

by calling upon the experiences and findings of people who have recently been involved in the process of change through desegregation.

PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE CHANGE THROUGH DESEGREGATION

Equalizing educational opportunities necessitates unprecedented, comprehensive planning and development. The process requires an intellectual journey that has been taken by few educators. What the realization suggests and demands is that every aspect of the educational enterprise, both national and local, is affected by this process. This holistic view of educational change can omit no component or element of school planning.

The comprehensive approach suggested here includes attention to at least the following major interrelated aspects of long-range development:

Community
- School-community relationships
- Cooperation with other social institutions
- Inter-district planning and cooperation
- Utilization of outside resources

Students
- Policy-making procedures and review procedures
- Desegregation of students
- Methods for coping with student activism
- Demographic planning
Staff

Administrative assignment and promotion policies
Faculty assignment
Nonprofessional staff assignment
Recruitment
In-service education
Relationships with professional unions
Overcoming internal and external resistance to change

Facilities and Transportation

Transportation services
Planning for building sites
New building and renovations
Assessment of physical facilities

Programs

Curriculum
Finance
In-service development programs
Learning materials: prescribed and supplementary
Coordination of special projects and special programs

External Concerns

Cooperative planning: federal, state, local, and related agencies
Clarification of legal issues

Evaluation and Assessment

These are not necessarily the only key forces in comprehensive school change. But they are important, nevertheless, and they represent a spectrum sufficiently broad and powerful to merit serious attention. Some proposals for desegregation seem to carry a promise of change toward greater educational quality and more equality. Others appear to reinforce low quality education and patterns of racism.
The thrust for desegregation has not had the same urgency in different communities and regions of the nation. To assume broad community support for racial and educational change is fallacious. Desegregation has received top priority, generally, only in those school districts where court orders have mandated immediate reply. The efforts at change attempted in these systems primarily have focused on planning and reorganizing technical and material resources. The early efforts of desegregation involved development of technically attractive plans for transporting youngsters, for rearranging schools and classrooms, and for redrawing attendance zones. The specialists of today, directors of Title IV Centers and Institutes, have recognized that an additional factor, human resources (e.g., political leaders, educators, students, parents), are necessary to support change agents involved in racial and educational change. The approach to change then becomes more comprehensive. The most recent court decisions and judicial mandates suggest rapid technical plans for rearrangement of the schools. At the same time, plans must be submitted to boards of education to reorder the human resources of community leaders, teachers, administrators, parents, and students.

Desegregation of schools is a major social change in most communities and one which heralds many other changes in minority group status. For this reason many school boards maintain that the issue is a social, not an educational, concern.
Nevertheless, the school, as expressed by Chesler, Guskin, and others, has the responsibility for reallocating its resources to facilitate desegregation based on its initial organization of those resources. They maintain that a school system is geared to norms and standards established by the community and that segregation and racism help determine local school policy. Some school segregation is de facto, with neighborhood patterns determined by socio-economic factors. Local school boards, as legal authorities, often add to the situation with de jure segregation in their failure to correct attendance zones which reinforce racially identifiable schools.

Segregation is publicly supported by public schools in several ways:

- Establishing boundary zones for attendance.
- Locating new schools and renovating old schools in ghettos.
- Providing whites with easy transfers.
- Employing few minority teachers and administrators.
- Establishing teacher and administrator standards that favor whites.
- Assigning educators in a manner that supports white control of curriculum and services.  

The focus of much racial change in public schools has been on the physical arrangement of different races and ethnic groups,

---

dictated by federal mandate. The missing ingredient is decisive and comprehensive educational reform. No one person is expected to have, nor indeed can have, expertise in all of the suggested areas for comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation. In contemporary America, however, the educational developer must have ability and experience to maintain the comprehensive overview that can provide coordinated programs in all areas. The process of equalizing educational opportunities provides an unprecedented challenge for the "doctor of social ills" to apply his skills and knowledge.

THE PROBLEM

Equalizing educational opportunities is at the heart of the matter of desegregation. Desegregation needs to go beyond the idea that physical arrangements in which blacks and whites are in the same schools and classrooms is, in fact, equalization of educational opportunities.

Equalizing educational opportunities for all American children involves a set of conditions and processes that include many more components than normally have been associated with the process of desegregation.

Early desegregation efforts failed to provide for comprehensive change. As a result, we find second generation problems emerging for which districts are not prepared to provide solutions.
Research and/or theory, to date, has not provided help to school districts to arrive at workable solutions. This study is prompted by the need for better understanding of the total process for providing equal educational opportunities.

The problem pursued by the researcher is to develop and to validate a planning guide for comprehensive change that will provide guidance for school districts moving from segregation to desegregation. The guide will be conceptual in nature and will be validated by the practical and theoretical experiences of those who have worked in desegregation and educational change.

Any conceptualized planning guide for comprehensive change through desegregation is only an approximation of reality. Mercer indicates that a model [or in this case a planning guide] is only a conceptual tool that may be useful in ordering complicated events, guiding decision-making by clarifying critical segments of specific situations, and suggesting probable outcomes from various courses of action. 13

JUSTIFICATION FOR STUDY

Schools, as primary institutions of our society, are being severely tested by the lack of adequate funds, educational reform,

and desegregation. The crisis in the schools relates to the purpose and objectives as well as to the principles and strategies utilized in the day-to-day operations. Newmann and Oliver point up the need for new dimensions in the objectives of educational institutions and call for reform in the organizational structure because of obsolescence. 14

Martin ably states the case for comprehensive change through the process of desegregation. He suggests that educators, by the nature of their profession, are duly mandated to influence the directions of society. The process is begun with those people in whom change of some kind is desired. Once they are identified, the process of designing a new educational change for them can be begun. Immediately school board members, administrators, supervisors, teachers, clerical staff, maintenance staff, other support staff, parents, and pupils are brought to the forefront.

"People in whom change is desired," Martin stated, "must learn new patterns for living, shed old designs, and relearn those that may have been forgotten through lack of use." In this way, some of the knowledge collected during our lifetime can become applicable to the removal of barriers that impede progress to equal opportunity for all students.

He further observes that the lack of efforts on the matters of human rights make it clear that one of the major prerequisites to learning and consequently to change is not being met. Because we do not have an integrated society there are no role models to emulate. Prototypes or models of integration must be created in every facet of school-related society.  

The conceptual planning guide of comprehensive change through the process of desegregation is only one of many ways to help bring about change. The guide is an abstraction from experience; an approximation to reality. No conceptual guide will fit any given social situation without being adjusted for uniqueness. If it does have usefulness, some insights can be derived. The researcher will provide a tool which may be helpful in guiding educators on the forefront of change through the process of desegregation. This tool will help in the clarification of critical events and the delineations of specific areas of change. It will also propose planned means for clarifying events and spelling out specific areas of change. It is believed that the elaborated guide will be a contribution to the field.

The researcher is aware that the study cannot be the panacea for all of the ills found in the process of desegregation. Nevertheless, the study may provide additional insights for quality multi-cultural

education. Such studies are necessary because, through the present
time, the high court has not revoked the following principles con-
cerning desegregation:

1. Public school segregation violates the Equal Protection
clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the due process clause
of the Fifth Amendment.

2. Local school boards are responsible for instituting
desegregation plans; federal district courts may act on
charges of non-compliance.

3. A school managed by agents of the state is subject
to desegregation even though it may otherwise be private.

4. Violence or threat of violence is not good enough reason
for delay in integrating a school.

5. Challenge to a desegregation plan may be made directly
through the federal courts.

6. A transfer plan based on race is unconstitutional;
similarly, a freedom of choice plan may be upheld only if
it produces integration.

7. A state or its subdivision may not close schools to
avoid desegregation.

8. Waiting ten years or more to desegregate schools is
too long even at the rate of one grade a year.\(^{16}\)

Since this study relies on previous work concerned with the process
and problems of comprehensive change and earlier attempts to
simulate certain stages of the comprehensive change process, a
search of the literature as related to both areas, desegregation and
educational change, was necessary.

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 7.
Chesler, Jorgensen, and Erenberg wrote that "movement from racial separation or mere desegregation is most likely to be successful when it is carefully and systematically planned and when it utilizes the skills of each teacher, student, and administrator." 17

It is also noted that educational practitioners and behavioral scientists suggest a six-stage scheme for planning school change, beginning with goal identification and extending through the recycling process. 18

Desegregation is an issue that is greatly resisted because certain aspects of the social situation tend to perpetuate existing patterns and to maintain the status quo. The combined forces of history, tradition, and habit serve to reinforce resistance to change. One outstanding factor contributing to negative racial attitudes and resistance is the belief in myths about a particular race. These myths tend to influence behavior both in the schools and the community.

Clift, Anderson, and Hullfish stated that many people hold to the idea that African Negroes (American Indians or other people whose culture is relatively simple) are a "child race"; that is, they are backward or retarded and must go through a long developmental process before they can "catch up" with the more advanced people. 19


18 ibid, p. 3.

Although Blacks have had substantial legal support in their effort to secure "Equal Opportunities," there has been an enormous amount of backlash which has strengthened resistance to desegregation. Laws change the way people act and can make possible experiences that result in changed feelings and attitudes.\textsuperscript{20}

**ASSUMPTIONS**

1. Desegregation efforts which are conducted within a comprehensive educational change effort will have a greater likelihood of providing equal educational opportunity for all children.

2. Equal educational opportunity is reflected in educational outcomes which extend beyond those indicated by criteria, such as dropout rates, achievement scores, school attendance, and student participation in school affairs.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

**De Facto Segregation**

Conditions and process, existing in opposition to an assumed or fictitious state of affairs by which different component groups in the population--ethnic, religious, and economic--do not come to share a commonality of values and experience.

**De Jure Segregation**

Conditions and process, through legal sanctioning of

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}
of segregation, by which different component groups in the population—ethnic, religious, and economic—do not come to share a commonality of values and experience.

**Expert**

Those superintendents and Title IV University-based directors who have been involved in desegregation.

**Rationale**

Set of justifications for choosing particular principles and concepts as the foundation of the desegregation plan.  

**METHOD**

The study will involve the developing and validating of instruments for use in collecting data and treating the results descriptively. The methods to be employed in the study will be explained in the following order: (1) instrument development, (2) procedure for gathering data, and (3) descriptive treatment of data.

**Instrument Development**

The basic framework for a comprehensive change planning guide and an opinionnaire were developed by the researcher and the Midwest Institute for Equal Educational Opportunity. The guide and

---

the opinionnaire were critiqued by three faculty members of The Ohio State University and Mr. Wendel Roye, Associate Director, Columbia University's Equal Educational Opportunity Center. The guide and opinionnaire identify steps and some activities under each step that should assist school districts in moving from segregation to desegregation. Purposive sampling was employed in selecting twelve university-based Equal Educational Opportunities Centers and six school districts to be involved in this study. The Equal Educational Opportunities Directors and the Superintendents were asked to add, modify, or delete any steps and activities on the basis of their appropriateness as elements of the guide.

**Procedure for Gathering Data**

In order to determine whether the steps and the activities outlined in the guide and opinionnaire are applicable for school districts, twelve directors of Equal Educational Opportunities Centers and six public school superintendents, or their designees, were asked to respond. The Center directors and superintendents were given the comprehensive change guide and opinionnaire to determine whether the steps and activities outlined are of practical value to public schools. They also were asked to supplement the list of steps and activities. The Equal Educational Opportunities Directors and Superintendents were asked to make suggestions and comments about the validity and practical usefulness of the guide and opinionnaire.
Treatment of Data

The data arising from this study was treated descriptively. The study was concerned with determining whether or not the comprehensive change guide and the opinionnaire were of practical value to school districts. The reactions of experts provided the basic evidence in that determination.

The researcher organized the comments and suggestions dealing with the comprehensive change guide into categories so that duplications and ambiguities were eliminated. Also, the researcher illustrated, through a table of frequencies, the elements of consensus, deletions, and additions or suggested activities.

The data requested to complete the change guide dealing with transitional steps was described. The data collected from the opinionnaire has been treated in the same manner.

ORGANIZATION OF CHAPTERS

The following chapters report the base of literature for the study, the design and procedures utilized, the data, and the conclusions of the study. Specifically, Chapter II reviews the literature as it relates to comprehensive change and equal educational opportunity. Chapter III deals with instrumentation, data collection, and the treatment of data. Chapter IV includes the treatment of data generated in the study. These data were descriptive and revealed the degree to which the comprehensive change guide approximated reality. Chapter V summarizes the study, presents the conclusions, discusses their importance, and makes final recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the literature related to educational change is reviewed in terms of three perspectives in order to develop further the setting of the problem under investigation. The first perspective focuses on the process of educational change; the second on change models and their application for educational change; the third on the relationship between desegregation and educational change.

The scope, complexity, and pressures associated with desegregation have increased tremendously in recent years. Because of these and other pressures, school systems must seek alternatives that help enhance the process of educational change through the process of desegregation.

A search of the literature did not reveal a practical comprehensive conceptual tool designed to serve as a guide for school districts moving from segregation to desegregation. This study is concerned with the extent to which a planning guide for desegregation can be helpful in understanding and dealing with comprehensive change in a school system.
THE PROCESS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Authors in the fields of anthropology and sociology have contributed to the body of knowledge and understanding about educational change. They have provided the framework necessary to provide a step-by-step process for change. Educators have support in moving from awareness of problems to the adoption of reasonable solutions.

One of these writers is Gallaher who cited the nature of planned change in education from the anthropological viewpoint. He states that all social systems, regardless of size, have a culture that is developed. The culture provides selective guidelines for conducting its affairs. The changes that occur within the culture stem either from internal or from external contact with other systems. Changes resulting from external contact with other systems occur by diffusion or adoption. The adoption process is frequently motivated by patterned situations, whereby an innovator intrudes actively and purposefully with the culture of a potential receiver, called a target system. Educational change is no more than directed cultural change within the educational institution. ¹

Another contributor who has added to the body of knowledge is Wayland who stated that the structural features of American education are a basic controlling factor in the process of educational change. He maintains that innovation in education, as well as in any system, involves changes in the social organization of that system. He theorizes that innovations are likely to encounter greater resistance and have a briefer period of life if they are difficult to institutionalize than those which are not difficult. ²

Several citations indicate the need for change even if desegregation is not an issue. Thompson contends that more time and energy must be invested in the analysis of cultural changes if substantial and valid changes in schooling are to be instituted. The institution called school often prepares students to live in the past rather than the tomorrows. Students are building tomorrow today, and tomorrow will not wait until the institution decides to change. ³

Postman and Weingartner's description of the school supports Thompson's view. The school is viewed as an archaic system which thwarts all students:


The institution we call "school" is what it is because we made it that way. If it is irrelevant, as Marshall McLuhan says; if it shields children from reality, as Norbert Wiener says; if it educates for obsolescence, as John Gardner says; if it does not develop intelligence, as Jerome Bruner says; if it is based on fear, as John Holt says; if it avoids the promotion of significant learnings, as Carl Rogers says; if it punishes creativity and independence, as Edgar Friedenberg says; if in short, it is not doing what needs to be done, it can be changed, it must be changed.4

Bennis and Miles developed the notion of organizational health as a factor in affecting educational change. The basic tenet of this notion is that any planned change has to consider the organizational climate of the institution. The planned change effort is modified by the condition of the system as the change occurs. If there are to be successful efforts at planned change, the organizational health of the institution, i.e., the school system's ability to develop into a more fully functioning system, must be taken into account at the initial planning.5

Another variable to be considered is noted by Lippitt. He made the point that before change can be given a fair chance, the attitudes, skills, and values of the practitioner must undergo some


5Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966); see also Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," Change Process in the Public Schools (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965), pp. 11-34.
degree of change. The social upheavels found in the larger society do not allow the public school to be unaffected. The practitioner who wishes to remain contemporary and to provide opportunities for students to be aware and to become change-oriented must be cognizant of the observable social flux around the school.

The thought prevailed at one time that the schools would be constantly in a state of change because of the following:

1) increased specialization and bureaucratization
2) demographic changes
3) urban-suburban dichotomization
4) revolution in race relations
5) increased government involvement and creation of interdependent functions, and
6) cultural change springing from mass media.

The above factors failed to expedite the changes that appeared to be coming from the forces impinging on the society. Educational change still needs to be fostered and ushered over the threshold. Desegregation can be one of the facilitating forces to enhance the process.

---


The students, whom the schools are designed to serve, are demanding and calling for change. Student unrest supports the thesis that change is necessary and that schools, as presently constituted, are not meeting the needs of today's student.⁸

Summary

Social research has provided avenues for institutional planning and change. Following this theme, educational change becomes no more than a cultural change. This type of change stems from two sources, internal or external. Positive educational planning must have a base of public interest and participation allowing the schools to do more than reinforce the dis-integrating social influence in any community.

Innovation, regardless of where it is found, involves change in the social organization of the system in which change is desired. At the same time, the factor of the system's health must be taken into account at the initial planning stage.

It is not enough that the organizational, cultural, and structural features are known about the institutions to be changed. The individuals who wish to institute change must have undergone change in their attitude, skills, and values.

Contrary to early beliefs, it requires more than uncontrolled internal and external forces to bring about change in the educational

⁸Ibid., pp. 42-63.
environ. These forces, left to their own devices, do not alter the status quo.

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE MODELS

Any change that calls for an altering of behavior or attitude is emotionally resisted because it implies that former behavior and attitudes were poorly derived and not based on sound judgement. In order for change to occur, an alteration of the status quo which supports the present behavior and attitudes must take place.

The above point is substantiated and supported by Lewin's model for educational change which takes into account the "mechanisms" for change. The model, one of the early attempts aimed at educational change, is composed of three stages. Stage one is called "unfreezing" which is essentially creating conditions whereby change becomes motivated. The second stage is called "changing." This stage is the sorting out, processing, and utilizing information for the express purpose of achieving new attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions. The third stage is called "refreezing" which simply means the process of integrating and establishing a new set of behaviors which lead to change. The refreezing is necessary for change to become stabilized. 9

---

The concept of change models can be carried to another degree. Havelock concluded that the educational change process is geared to a relationship between resource system and user system. The model stresses the need for a reciprocal relationship between the two. Havelock also points out that many models are inadequate because they do not take into consideration the reciprocal nature of the relationship between the resource and the user systems. A main point associated with the establishment of a reciprocal relationship is that something happening in the resource system must relate to what is occurring in the user system. Simulation of the user situation within the resource system is one way to assure such a correspondence.

The data flowing from the user system to the resource system are primarily problem messages. In return, the data flowing from the resource system to the user system are primarily solution data. Within each of the two systems the process of accomplishing the respective tasks is primarily that of problem solving. The focal point of the problem solving cycle within the user system is to identify problems, to send the problems identified to the resource system, and to utilize the solutions returned from the resource system.

---

The concept of educational change models as developed by Miles is based on the work of Bennis. This model focuses on the health of organizations in effecting change. It is based on the proposition that any planned change is shaped by the state of the organization in which it occurs. "Nevertheless," Miles says, "most studies focus on individual innovations, their roles and their actions, and on the properties of a particular innovation to the neglect of an emphasis on the dynamics of receiving organizations."^12

Wayland provides support to the position taken by Miles in discussing the structural features of American education as a basic factor in controlling the process of educational change. Wayland also states the acceptance of educational change generally has implications for the structural features of the institution. ^13

Finally, Lin discusses a model developed to analyze diffusion and dissemination processes in specific institutions. There are five phases for study. The first deals with diffusion and dissemination. This phase focuses on those who make the decision to diffuse an innovation in the school.

The next phase is the diffusion or dissemination process in the institution. The sequences of offices through which information

^11Bennis, *loc. cit.*

^12Miles, *loc. cit.*

^13Wayland, *loc. cit.*
flows, the behavior of the role incumbents in relation to the flow of information, and the interrelationships among the role incumbents are included.

The third phase is focused on the receivers of the dissemination and diffusion efforts. The receiver members of the institution are the ones affected by the phenomena. There are three important elements in this phase. They are how and when the receivers become aware of the innovation, how and when they adopt the innovation, and their position relative to the innovation.

The fourth phase of the study is the effect of diffusion and dissemination process on the school. What are the consequences of the adoption on the members of the institution, on the surrounding society, and on the products?

The fifth phase added to the diffusion model (source, process, receiver, and effect), is the control system. A reinforcement system, a memory (storage) subsystem, and a feedback system are all major elements of the control system. 14

The uniqueness of this model in relationship to other models is that it is concentrated on disseminating an innovation at the basic level of school organization.

Guba, in discussing the diffusion of innovations, suggests that the techniques employed in diffusion are limited. From the point of the diffuser, every action possible to him in attempting to cause an entity to adopt an innovation falls under one of the following categories: telling, showing, helping, involving, training, and intervening.  

Summary

The purpose of reviewing educational change models is to show that the literature contains a number of classifications of strategies for change that tend to be quite similar while at the same time to reflect differences. Research focuses on identifying educational change models and on validating the value of specific strategies for given change situations.

The same set of strategies that were considered in the above statements must become the criteria for the guide of educational change through the process of desegregation. Some of the strategies or considerations would be: (1) creating conditions which motivate change; (2) sorting out, processing, and utilization of information; and (3) integrating and establishing a new set of behaviors. An

---

additional factor to be considered is the relationship between the resource system and user system. There must be a reciprocal relationship between the two systems. Thus, it is important in developing a model or guide that such areas as professional staff, community, students, facilities and transportation programs, external concerns, and evaluation assessment are taken into account.

DESEGREGATION AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

If the mandate for educational desegregation is clear and unequivocal, then an assessment of educational practices that give priority to the needs of children can be the source of justification for imaginative and far-reaching educational reforms. Desegregation to most educators and board of education members appears to be a moral or political situation regardless of the fact that it has, on a number of occasions, been successfully discussed in educational terms. 16 Morality, politics, and education all involve conflicting values and emotions. Because of these factors, a school desegregation decision is generally made under conditions of uncertainty. 17


Bailey said that leadership is needed when conditions of uncertainty prevail and innovative decisions must be made. The point is made that uncertainty means conditions arise that do not have prior solutions to guide people's reactions. There is no basis or similar condition in the past to establish a plan of action. This uncertainty arises not because a precedent does not exist, but because many precedents have been set, each point to a different set of circumstances.

Though each desegregation effort is unique, Grandstaff wrote that sensitive educators and lay people seeking reasonable ways of attacking problems will see desegregation as a chance to promote the privileges of educational participants. These privileges are part of the legitimate educational claims of all children regardless of race.

Many educators and laymen may not view desegregation positively as stated above. If, however, as Chesler, Guskin, and Erenberg noted, they have an effective program of educational change prior to desegregation, the planning and implementation will be more effective. A model of seven categories was developed by Chesler


and others. The first category is the identification of goals centered around the change effort. This enables better design strategies to reach goals established. The second category is gathering of information and diagnosing technical matters related to number of ethnic students, physical distribution of students, faculty placement, transportation and the like. This category also includes assessment of human resources. The third category is the development of a plan or several plans for achieving stated goals. The chief officer of the school district develops a comprehensive program that sets clear guidelines for implementing items established at stage one. The fourth category of the change process is a feasibility study (time permitting). Such a study may help provide clarity for revision of a plan. This effort should not delay the implementation of a plan which requires the superintendent and his staff to plan strategies for beginning the change process and emphasizing commitment to it.

The fifth category is implementation of the plan. Successful efforts of implementation require the anticipation of potential problems with specific guidelines to handle them. The superintendent and his staff must plan the necessary procedures for announcing the district's policy for beginning the change process and for restating their commitment to that policy. Successful implementation at the building and classroom level requires that teachers, principals and counselors know enough about the components of the plan so that
they can be committed to work on their own with vigorous support from central office staff and the superintendent.

The implementation of the plan only signals the beginning of constant support, reinforced with energy and skill. Category six is the establishment of an evaluation design in order to get feedback on the desegregation progress. Category seven is a recycle of the change process. 21

Desegregation is only the first step in a continuing program of change. Educators must continually plan because of potential problems with personnel and instructional programs. As indicated above, evaluation becomes a key factor for diagnosing and understanding the barriers of change.

Solomon summarizes one of the key aspects of change by desegregation. The desegregation movement must alter existing patterns; the values, attitudes, habits, and relationships that make up a pattern of noncommitment to the education of the poor and minorities, and must emphasize the molding of a new pattern that involves action and commitment to education. This action is more than mechanical compliance of material means. The very spirit of the educational process must be influenced. 22 Solomon is supported

\[\text{\textsuperscript{21Ibid.}}\]

by Chesler and others in that with such iteration, plans can be made to alter school and classroom conditions to create a positive environment for education.\textsuperscript{23}

The findings by Pettigrew also offer some significant insights into the topography or physical features of educational reform in the United States. In order to bring about any substantive change, the economic and social structure that creates segregation, North and South, must be altered. In lieu of some structural change, Pettigrew points to some specific factors affecting educational reform that are amenable to change. First, he shows that dramatic national events have immediate and also long-range effects. What happens in national politics is extremely important in breaking down racial barriers. In the South especially, areas that are most resistant to racial change are influenced by external pressures from the federal or state governments. With a strong, consistent federal policy, white segregationists offer the least resistance to the initiation of school desegregation. In the North, the white working class finds itself in fairly secure economic positions with little status; their anger toward the blacks stems from the economic competition between these two groups. This anger is misdirected toward blacks when in fact the system that places them in such low esteem ought to be changed.

\textsuperscript{23}Chesler, Gusking, and Erenberg, \textit{loc. cit.}
If the white working class were to come to grips with their predicament, they would fight for better education for their own children rather than resenting the efforts of others.

Pettigrew then suggests that national events and politics can promote or prevent school desegregation, but the role of local decision-makers is also of great importance. If leaders in federal government can work effectively in convincing and helping local leaders bring about desegregation, those most resistant to change can be brought around. Many whites now resistant to desegregation might change their minds if they saw the federal and local governments working to better their children's education as well as to effect racial integration. Once old patterns of racial discrimination are changed and behavior is forced along new lines, attitudes take a position for desegregation, and it is easier for people to accept new and difficult situations. 24

The crux of the matter, states Bowles, is that the educational system supports and enhances the power structure within a given society. The power wielders determine who counts and really governs in the community. The power structure has a tendency to maintain existing patterns and support the status quo while

desegregationists are calling for reallocation of power. 25

Clift, Anderson, and Hullfish put one desegregation issue into its perspective. Minorities are viewed as being incapable, backward, and not fit to be considered until they have gone through a long developmental and evolutionary process. 26

Martin presented the case for educational change through the process of desegregation. He views educators as having a mandate to interact with and to influence society. People will change as they learn new modes of living, forsake old learnings, and utilize the knowledge that is known to be ideal and affords every person an equal chance or opportunity. 27

Elias Blake outlined a series of stages involved in desegregation and related them to a time line going from complete segregation to complete integration. He classified the possible problems related to the segregation-integration continuum into five broad areas: community relations, school administration-organization policies, school personnel interpersonal-relationships, student interpersonal relationships, and desegregation and learning programs. The time continuum consists of six main stages: beginning desegregation,

25Bowles, loc. cit.

26Clift, Anderson, and Hullfish, loc. cit.

27Martin, loc. cit.
increasing desegregation, completing desegregation, beginning integration, increasing integration, and completing integration.  

The American Federation of Teachers Executive Council suggested six ideal steps that may guide its member-planner in his quest for school desegregation:

1. Obtain community recognition that a problem exists.
2. Win school board acknowledgement of the problem.
3. Secure board appointment of a committee (with a deadline).
4. Appear before this committee and present your own report.
5. Seek immediate board adoption "in principle" of the entire report of the board committee.
6. Establish a definite timetable for the faculty education.

Michael J. Bakalis, Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of Illinois, stated that:

... the basic components of our effective desegregation plan are conditions that improve the educational climate of any school. The components required in the "Rules and

---


29Civil Rights Committee of the American Federation of Teachers Executive Council, Toward Equal Opportunity (Chicago: The American Federation of Teachers), pp. 4-8.
Procedures" in the State of Illinois are those necessary not only to meet compliance but to achieve effective desegregation.

Bakalis also identified five stages that will suggest various means of meeting the requirements of specific sections of the "Rules and Procedures for the Elimination and Prevention of Racial Segregation in Schools."

1. The descriptive and statistical information required.
2. Subsequent action: school board policy statement and community committee report.
3. Plan development.
4. Plan implementation.
5. Plan evaluation. 30

Robert Crain and others gave six stages relating to the process of desegregation:

1. Appearance of the issue. (A civil rights group presented the request.)
2. The Rejection of the Demand (by the local school board).
3. The First Civil Right Action (boycotts, demonstrations, etc.).
4. The Key Response (by the local school board which sets the tone for all later responses).
5. Escalation and Resolution (the board has taken a position).

6. Introduction of New Actors (state commissions, courts, etc.).

Summary

Desegregation is viewed by some educators and board of education members as being a moral or political issue and should not be discussed in educational terms. Other educators and many laymen see the process of desegregation as being a golden opportunity to promote the privileges of educational participants which bring benefits to all children. The basic components that are found in desegregation plans are conditions that improve the educational climate of any school. The desegregation movement alters existing patterns: values, attitudes, habits, and relationships that previously made up patterns of noncommitment to the education of the poor and minorities.

Desegregation intensifies the need for educational change and presents prime opportunity to bring about needed educational reform. Effective desegregation requires comprehensive analysis which should lead to attention to educational change. This involves aspects of personnel policy and deployment, program planning, curricular content and organization, in-service teacher training, student grouping, school-community relations, materials and resources,

parent-teacher relations, evaluation and extra-curricular activities.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the literature is reviewed from three perspectives. The first pertains to the component facets of the educational change process; the second to educational change models; and the third to desegregation and educational change.

The central theme of research in educational change is focused on identifying variables which have an effect on change. While research pertaining to desegregation as a means to bring about comprehensive change is limited, research pertaining to procedures used in effecting change does exist and has some relevancy to the research problem under consideration.

The purpose of this review of literature is to develop further the context of the research problem and to assist the researcher in developing a general plan from which to proceed with the investigation. It has also substantiated the need for a comprehensive planning guide through the process of desegregation.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this study was to develop a planning guide for comprehensive change to accompany a desegregation order. The guide was submitted to two groups of respondents to secure their evaluation to validate, revise, and complete the guide. The guide divided the comprehensive change process into ten steps. In addition to collecting descriptive data about the ten steps of comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation, an opinionnaire was designed to collect data about the comprehensiveness of the guide. The instruments were designed to gather the perceptions of public school administrators who were desegregating or had desegregated their public school system and the perceptions of university-based Title IV Center Directors who had worked in school districts that had problems incident to or occasioned by desegregation. These Centers are funded by grants from the Office of Education under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The procedure used to develop the comprehensive change planning guide involved a systematic examination of the literature concerning the change process and experience with desegregation.
Though literature search did not reveal any attempts to conceptualize comprehensive change through the process of desegregation, the investigator extrapolated that which was germane to the problem under investigation. Additional information was sought through the director of The Ohio State University Title IV Center and through fellow colleagues working at the Title IV Center. The researcher and other members of the Midwest Institute were able to formulate from the various assortments of data a new comprehensive planning guide and an opinionnaire intended for assessing the guide.

This chapter contains descriptions of the development and construction of the instruments, the selection and identification of the population of potential respondents, procedures, and treatment of data. The activities reported in Chapter III appear in the order they occurred.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

The investigator was able to find models of change that dealt with narrow, discreet aspects of education. No existing model was found that dealt with the degree of comprehensiveness that would serve the purpose of this research. An instrument was developed to gather the perceptions of public school administrators and Title IV Center Directors regarding steps of progression in the process of desegregation. The comprehensive planning guide, developed over
a three-month period, was based on relevant data taken from the literature along with the conceptualizations of the director and other members of the Midwest Institute staff.

The developmental process involved designing and analyzing different models to determine the value of using each model as it related to comprehensive educational change through desegregation. This is a process guide which proposes that ten major steps are involved when a school district is moving from segregation through desegregation. Three dimensions are provided in each step of the guide: the actors and actions, suggested activities, and the transitions necessary to move from one step to another.

The researcher developed concurrently an opinionnaire which reflected the minimum number of elements which he presupposed to be necessary for comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation. The opinionnaire was developed in order to determine whether the guide dealt with the items necessary to be considered comprehensive.

The preceding steps were followed in generating the change guide and opinionnaire. Books in the area of change and desegregation were read. This enabled the researcher to develop the content items for the opinionnaire. Some of the most important of these books are:
A review of the studies in the area of desegregation enabled the researcher to develop the content items for the opinionnaire; they are:


Because the director of the Midwest Institute was involved in the early efforts to desegregate the South and the more recent
efforts in the Charlotte-Mecklenberg system, the investigator consulted with him for additional data. Other staff members of the Institute were consulted and further analysis of related literature was made before working drafts of the planning guide and the opinionnaire were finalized.

The development of the opinionnaire depended heavily on the procedures for questionnaire construction as outlined by Sheatley and Kornhauser. ¹ Particular attention was given to clarity of items, clarity of instructions, length and type size of the instrument, and the amount of time required to answer the opinionnaire. The researcher included twenty-five items. The following criteria were used in judging items and constructing the opinionnaire: (1) Are the items related to the essential aspects of the study? (2) Are the items expressed in attitudinal form? (3) Are the items too complex to incorporate into the final instrument? (4) Are all the respondents in the study knowledgeable in the area covered by the items? (5) Can the respondent or topic be sampled through the use of an opinionnaire? Edwards and Goodenough² reinforce the suggestions made by Sheatley and Kornhauser with the following:


1. Avoid statements that may be interpreted in more than one way.

2. Avoid the language in statements that is not simple, clear, and direct.

3. Avoid statements that contain more than one complete thought.

4. Avoid statements that are in the form of compound or complex sentences.

5. Avoid the use of double negatives.

The comprehensive planning guide and opinionnaire were then analyzed by the researcher's advisory committee and a public school administrator to determine whether the elements contained in the guide and opinionnaire were measures of comprehensive change. Items were added, deleted, or clarified as a result of these consultations.

The investigator, director, and other members of the Midwest Institute presented the comprehensive planning guide and opinionnaire at a conference at the National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational Opportunity, an Equal Educational Opportunity Center sponsored at Teachers College, Columbia University. The presentation was made to an audience that included university and state department personnel. No revisions were made as a result of the presentation made on July 19, 1972.

Validation of the Instrument

The researcher presented the guide and opinionnaire to three
faculty members of The Ohio State University. The individuals were
selected because they had worked with school districts involved in
the desegregation process. Along with critiquing the guide and the
opinionnaire, they were asked to list the activities in which a school
district should engage in making the transition from one step of the
guide to another. The following suggestions were made for improving
the guide:

1. The packet contained too much material to be digested.

2. The material required too much time from the respondents.

3. Directions for the respondent needed to be clarified to
focus on what is being requested.

4. Items needed to be restated in a manner that lessens
ambiguity.

As a result of the above suggestions, the following changes
were made:

1. The number of pages to be handled were reduced
by condensing the skeletal guide.

2. Condensing the skeletal guide also reduced the
amount of time necessary to respond.

3. The items on the instrument were rephrased to
increase their clarity.

4. Directions were restated in terms that lessened
confusion about what was desired.

The revised guide and opinionnaire were given to four public
school administrators who had been involved in school districts
that had to desegregate. This validity check took place at a
conference at St. Johns College, Collegeville, Minnesota, on August 20, 1972, sponsored by the University of Minnesota's Title IV Center and Midwest Institute for Equal Educational Opportunity.

The administrators were given a cover letter that explained the purpose of the study and pointed out that the skeletal guide and opinionnaire were being administered for purposes of validation. Each respondent was asked to assess whether or not the guide and opinionnaire had practical value for public schools contemplating desegregation or comprehensive change. The median time taken in responding to the opinionnaire and guide was reasonable, and all persons complied with the request to express their opinions.

Two of the respondents were interviewed for approximately forty-five minutes each, and they were asked questions such as the following:

1. What value did the guide have for them?
2. Were additional steps needed?
3. Should some steps be deleted?
4. Were enough situations, actors and actions, and suggested activities enumerated to help in clarity?
5. What additional aspects needed to be added?

As a result of the various suggestions, the investigator made the following modifications in the instrumentation and the research:
1. Complete revision of the cover letter was done to focus more on what was needed.

2. Misunderstandings were minimized by restating ideas that were not clear.

3. The aspect of organization and power structure of the black community had to be considered at each step of the guide.

4. The research was descriptive in nature so that it could be used as a guide in planning desegregation or educational change.

IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS

Two sets of data were gathered during this study. The first set of data collected during the study consisted of the responses to the various phases of the planning guide. Respondents were asked to modify, delete, or add other items to the list of activities. Also, respondents were asked to supply the necessary strategies that would provide transitional means from one step in the planning guide to another. The second set of data was gathered from the opinionnaire which outlined school programs and processes identified as being related to comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation. The twenty-five item opinionnaire was not exhaustive nor indeed did it necessarily contain the most important elements of change. However, the items' equivalence or correlation suggest them as being valuable considerations. The opinionnaire suggests the minimum elements to be considered in the development of
plans for desegregation resulting in comprehensive educational change.

Purposive sampling was used in selecting twelve university-based Equal Educational Opportunity Centers and six public school districts to be involved in this study. The Equal Educational Opportunity Centers selected were those which had, on request, provided technical assistance to local school districts in planning for and meeting problems incident to desegregation. This assistance is generally made available only after the school system seeking help has accepted responsibility to proceed with desegregation. The type of technical assistance provided by the centers ranges from help in identifying desegregation facts and problems to in-service training programs for school personnel.

The centers also encourage university involvement in desegregation efforts. (See listing under Title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964, for local school districts, state educational agencies, and universities in the states which have received Title IV grants.)

The school districts involved in the study were selected because they had to desegregate by a Federal Court order, had voluntarily desegregated, or had voluntarily desegregated teaching staffs in preparation for desegregation of the student population.

The Equal Educational Opportunity Centers and school districts that were selected to be involved in the study were:
Centers

Auburn University
Mississippi State University
Quachita Baptist University
St. Augustine College
Tulane University
University of California
University of Georgia
University of Miami
University of Oklahoma
University of South Alabama
University of Texas
University of Virginia

Districts

Charlotte Mecklenberg Public Schools
Charlotte, North Carolina
Dayton Public Schools
Dayton, Ohio
Evanston School District
Evanston, Illinois
Minneapolis Public Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Princeton School District
Princeton, Ohio
Wake County Public Schools
Wake County, North Carolina

Collecting the Data

On September 8, 1972, the following items were mailed:

the opinionnaire, the guide, and a cover letter explaining the purpose

of the research and a statement about its value. A self-addressed

envelope was enclosed in each packet.

In an effort to solicit a thoughtful reaction to the guide and

opinionnaire by those individuals included in the study, the cover

page provided the respondents with the purpose of the study, the
identity of the funding agency, and a description of the group from which responses were being sought. The letter was not brief, but it was designed to encourage its reading. The cover letter included the following information: (1) the purpose of study, (2) importance of study, and (3) importance of response. Return envelopes were preprinted to facilitate ease in returning the guides and opinionnaires. Each accompanying letter was individually signed by the researcher and the Director of the Midwest Institute. Subjects were urged to return the questionnaire by September 22, 1972.

As responses were received, letters of appreciation were sent to respondents. After a two week period, follow-up letters requesting attention to the guide and opinionnaire were mailed to members of the sample from whom a response had not been received. Follow-up telephone calls were made to the respondents who did not reply to the second mailing. Copies of all form letters used are contained in Appendix A.

In the first week, three respondents had returned the comprehensive planning guide and opinionnaire. The first follow-up letter brought an increase in the responses, and at the end of three weeks, eleven of the comprehensive change guides and opinionnaires had been returned. The final follow-up was done by telephone. This increased the total number of responses by one. Four weeks after
the initial mailing, twelve of the sample had responded to the comprehensive change guide and opinionnaire.

Table 1
Summary of Questionnaires Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title IV Centers</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in original sample</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returning both instruments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return one instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total returns</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TREATMENT OF DATA

The data were collected for the purpose of determining whether the proposed guide for comprehensive change approximated reality and was of practical value for school districts that are involved in or contemplating being involved in the desegregation process. The opinionnaire was developed for the purpose of providing a way in which the researcher could collect additional data about the validity of the comprehensive change planning guide.

The method of data analysis utilized for this study was to organize the responses of the respondents to the comprehensive change guide and to tabulate the responses to the opinionnaire. The data collected from the responses to the comprehensive change
guide were collated and written intact in tables under each proposed step. Each step had three distinct sections which were identified as follows: (1) actors and their actions, (2) supporting action proposed by researcher and respondents, and (3) transitional activities that were proposed only by respondents. The data collated from the transitional activities were used to complete each step of the guide.

Chapter IV contains the data analysis of the responses to the ten-step comprehensive change guide and the opinionnaire. The data were reported in the form of tables and are recorded as presented by respondents, without editing. This was strongly suggested by a member of the investigator's committee. The rationale behind the suggestion was that the intent of the respondent was not misinterpreted by the investigator adding or deleting original words. Two of the distinct sections, Actors and Actions and Supporting Action, are presented in one table followed by a synopsis of the information therein. The second table contains transitional statements, followed by a short summary prepared by the researcher.

The respondents indicated on the opinionnaire the importance of the twenty-five points involved in comprehensive planning. The respondents were asked to check the items that should be included in any desegregation plan. An assessment was made based on the number of responses to a given element. A table of respondents'
replies to the twenty-five elements was compiled showing the areas of most agreement.
CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The ten-step comprehensive change guide and an opinionnaire were submitted to representatives of four school districts and twelve university-based Title IV Centers. The respondents were asked to read the guide, making suggestions for its improvement. They were also asked to respond to the opinionnaire by indicating those elements they thought were crucial to consideration of any desegregation plan. This chapter reports the nature of their reactions to the guide and the opinionnaire. The reactions are reported in a series of tables. The reply of one respondent will be discussed separately because he did not respond directly to the guide or the opinionnaire but rather proposed his own.

A review of the basic guide will help the reader understand the step-by-step analysis of the respondents' reactions. The guide proposes that it is helpful to conceive comprehensive change in educational desegregation as a process involving ten stages, each of which is referred to as a "step" in the process. These ten steps, in the order of their occurrence, are topically described by the following headings, which indicate the nature of the action being taken:
1. Initiation of action
2. Evidence brought into the situation
3. Development of rationale (is ordered by)
4. Rationale is presented by
5. Development of detailed plan
6. Detailed plan is presented by
7. Implementation is ordered by
8. Final implementation ordered or approved by
9. Evaluation is ordered by
10. Reexamine and recycle

For each step, the investigator proposed those actors who would be involved, the actions that would be taken, and the supporting actions believed to be necessary. The respondents reacted step-by-step to these proposals. They were asked also to suggest the nature of the transition activities which they thought appropriate as one moved from one step to another.

The data derived from this effort to validate the guide will be presented in tabular form with the researcher's preselections in one column and the respondents suggestions in a second column. The data contained under the respondents' column will be presented exactly as reported to the researcher. A brief paragraph will follow each table explaining and summarizing the suggestions of the respondents.

Table 2 presents the information developed by the researcher and the respondents with respect to the first step in the comprehensive plan.
Table 2
Initiation of Action in Desegregation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of education voluntarily moves. Suit initiated by individual or group. Local superintendent presents data to board. State department of education moves. Pressure from community activists.</td>
<td>*Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Action</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify needed evidence.</td>
<td>Attention given to the needs of people and concerns of faculty and parents. The suggested activities of the researcher should be ranked in order of ascending power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect evidence.</td>
<td>Present evidence.</td>
<td>Some type of school-community program should be developed while elicitation of support from the news media is begun. Assistance should be sought from Title IV Center. Teacher reeducation and in-service education around race and human relations should begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Court order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Solicit cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board of education should plan to show strong initiative and positive attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Appeal to authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents did not find it necessary to make comments about the researcher's actors and actions under Initiation of Action. The suggestions under Supporting Action indicate that the board of education should take the lead in providing strong initiative and a positive attitude toward desegregation and should begin some type of school-community program while simultaneously seeking support from the news media and those who have experience in helping school districts desegregate.

After the action has been initiated, the guide calls for the gathering of evidence. Table 3 presents the respondents' suggestions for the transition from Step 1, Initiation of Action, to Step 2, Evidence Brought Into the Situation.

The critical considerations deemed necessary to make the transition from Step 1 to Step 2, as seen by the respondents, are summarized in Table 4, page 64. They suggest that the key issues in making the transition are that the board begins planning a public relations program to generate support for change. In the respondents' view, the board should show an attitude and public image that is positive, optimistic, and professional, thus helping to minimize the chance for conflict. Outside consultant help should be hired and a demographic study conducted. Step 2 of the guide involves bringing evidence into the school-community situation. Table 4 presents the actors and actions proposed and the supporting actions recommended
### Table 3

**Transition to Step 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Researcher made no proposal for the transitional steps.</em></td>
<td>An assessment of needs must be done and then priorities established in light of given human and financial resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The power structure and opinion leaders must be involved and informed. Interpretation of data is presented through use of the mass media. The school district’s staff must be sensitized to the situation.

The school board needs to decide who will make up the composition of the study committee.

The board needs to decide what types of information would be needed upon which to base decisions.

The board begins planning public relations programs to generate support for change.

The board of education begins a positive approach and program at this time. Avoid negativism if at all possible.

The re-education of teachers and students in matters of race and human relations should begin at this time and continue--ad infinitum.

Anticipate resistance - identify resistance - plan positive program
Table 3 (continued)

Transition to Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Researcher made no proposals for the transitional steps.</em></td>
<td>and efforts to co-opt or at least minimize [resistance].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attitude and public image of the administration and board are of the utmost importance— if public image is positive, optimistic, professional, etc., the chances of public acceptance and minimizing conflict are good; otherwise, the problems are magnified and multiplied.

The board of education develops plans for change with help of outside consultants.

A demographic study is conducted. The following aspects are attended to:

- Staff assignments by school, position, and race
- Distance between schools
- Transportation available
- School policies
- Curricular and extra-curricular offerings in each school
- Capacity and usability of each building

Most of the above information is located in the central office; otherwise, on-site visits must be made.

Start initial plans for organizing the community to support actions of the board of education.
Table 4
Evidence Brought Into the Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written deposition from individuals and groups in the community.</td>
<td>*Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee appointed to study data on racial imbalance and report to board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside consultant hired.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff's report to board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local board presents data to state board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community activists involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Action</td>
<td>Study session by one of the following:</td>
<td>Board of education is apprised of needs with recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of education</td>
<td>A study session is help for citizen committees and P. T. A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Staff is surveyed for their recollections. Involve each individual school faculty and its community in the process at this time. Total administrative staff is involved when presented to the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State department of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal session by board of education for acceptance or rejection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by both the researcher and the respondents at this stage of the desegregation effort.

In summary, the respondents did not find it necessary to make comments on the researcher's proposals about how evidence is brought into the situation. The suggestions under the heading Supporting Action indicate that they believe the board of education should be kept informed of needs and recommendations. District wide involvement should be maintained as well as involvement of the total administrative staff. Citizens' committees and parent-teacher organizations should be kept informed.

Table 5, page 66, presents the respondents' strategies for making the transition from Step 2 to Step 3.

The respondents' transitional strategies for getting from Step 2 to Step 3 are summarized in the following. The board of education should form a committee representative of all groups in the community to help develop an orderly plan for desegregation. The members of the committee and their actions should be publicized through the various news media in the community. The respondents suggest that the committee members be requested to report back to the membership of their respective organizations. The suggestions from the committee should be considered when the consultant develops the rationale for the desegregation plan. The board of education and superintendent should provide dynamic leadership so that dissident and radical groups do not fill the resultant power vacuum.
### Table 5

**Transition to Step 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Researcher made no proposals for the transitional steps.</em></td>
<td>The board of education, in light of recommendations from school-community appointed committees, advises superintendent to develop a desegregation proposal for board consideration. Proposal should include alternatives ranging from most to least amount of change required. Use meetings and media to make public aware of implications of evidence. Develop alternatives for dealing with the situation. If possible, initiate computer base of data so the outcomes of various proposals can be predicted. Committee reports on their findings. Board initial guidelines are established. Without dynamic and positive leadership on the part of the superintendent and board of education, dissident and radical groups and individuals will fill the resultant power vacuum and the problems increase. Involve outside expert. Experience of Title IV Center has shown that an outside consultant (out of state) has a much better chance of operating free of political and community pressures in designing desegregation plans. If possible, he should probably be appointed by the court.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

Transition to Step 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for the transitional steps.</td>
<td>Develop materials and facts to gain public support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive flow of information through news media and community meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-service training started for faculty in areas of desegregation and cultural differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulate a committee representative of all groups in the community to develop orderly steps and make plans for desegregation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make such committees known and their actions known through publications in the daily or weekly newspaper. Also, committee member report back to the organization they represent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the proposed guide, ordering the development of a rationale for desegregation is presented after the evidence is brought into the school-community situation. The proposals of the investigator and respondents for Ordering the Development of Rationale are presented in Table 6.
### Table 6

**Development of Rationale is Ordered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of education orders</td>
<td>Local board seeks support of community groups, state board of education, and courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State department of education orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community activists' involvement (activists cannot order development of rationale but they can be influential in having it done if it is outside of the court's domain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Action</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify components of rationale</td>
<td>Rationale is based on the educational policies of the local school district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop rationale</td>
<td>Determine guidelines and priorities governing planning (school capacity, distance traveled, techniques which are permitted and those which are not).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare information</td>
<td>Continue all aspects of positive staff, community, and student retraining and involvement. Continue and improve positive public relations program utilizing news media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present rationale to the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A review of the data in Table 6 reveals that one school district respondent saw the need to include an additional action to the researcher's preselection of actors and actions. He suggested that the local educational agency should seek wide support throughout the community, from the state board of education, and the court that invokes the decision. Under Supporting Action, the respondents indicated that the development of the rationale should be based on the educational policies of the district. As they saw it, the rationale establishes the guidelines and priorities under which a desegregation plan will be developed and also becomes the basis on which evaluation is conducted.

Table 7 presents the respondents' suggestions for the transition from Step 3, Order Development of Rationale, to Step 4, Rationale is Presented By.

A review of the respondents' suggestions for transition from Step 3 to Step 4 can be summarized as follows. The salient point developed under the notion of rationale is to seek support from community groups and involve bi-racial or multi-racial components selected by all groups in the community. The point must be kept in mind that lay groups or persons do not have expertise in designing a rationale for desegregation plans and sometimes the total process is stalled by community members. A deadline is established and all possible information and staff support are available for the development of the
## Table 7

### Transition to Step 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Researcher made no proposal for transitional steps.</em></td>
<td>Seek support from community groups on goals--quality integrated education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent and staff schedule several informal work sessions of board and staff when progress reports are given. Stress that these would not be decision-making sessions but &quot;work sessions&quot;-board members could interject their thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make all possible information and staff support available to committee for development of rationale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While the community-school should be involved in the desegregation process, it is questionable as to whether community groups or persons should be involved in the actual designing of desegregation plans. Experience has shown that the actual process may be complicated and even stalled by the involvement of local lay persons in the plan drawing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hopefully, the plans would be designed by those most knowledgeable and capable of the local school and the community is involved in a positive educational program amid acceptance of the plan--or at least minimizing resistance to the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale developers are given time deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine who will make the presentation to whom and in what manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solicit the help of news media in an attempt to get favorable coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationale is developed by and with community leaders. Bi-racial or multi-racial components of the community--selected by all groups in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rationale. Several informal work sessions and progress report sessions are held wherein board members and staff are able to interject their thoughts. The news media should be solicited for favorable coverage.

After the rationale is developed, it is presented. Table 8 shows the investigator's and the respondents' proposals in regard to the Presentation of the Rationale.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale is Presented By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors Involved</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study session by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State department of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal session for an acceptance or rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of the public school administrators and Title IV Directors responses with respect to the presentation of the rationale is presented below. A number of reviews and briefings should be held with the administrative staff and the board of education. Commitment should be sought for the total goal of the rationale. A thrust for acceptance or rejection should not be pressed at this point. Hearings should be open so that the community may participate. Upon resolution of areas of difficulty, the development of a desegregation plan is ordered.

The proposals of the respondents for making the transition from Step 4 to Step 5 are found in Table 9.

The investigator has summarized the transitional strategies of the respondents found in Table 9 as follows. The administrative staff and local school board should engage in prior planning as to what is to be involved in the rationale before community participation. Along with community participation, outside consultant firms or university personnel who may have had prior training in the desegregation process should be contacted. After the determination is made as to whom is to be involved, a budget is established and staff, community group, and consultant begin to plan the "how." Briefings and "sounding out" sessions are held with community groups. Favorable and unfavorable comments are objectively analyzed and some means provided whereby responsible criticism of rationale is fed into planning procedure as detailed plan is drawn. The board reviews the committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</em></td>
<td>Hold briefings and &quot;sounding out&quot; sessions with community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With goals established, involve staff and community groups in planning the &quot;how.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report the board meeting in detail in the press and take steps to see that as much community debate as possible occurs at this point. Provide some means whereby responsible criticism of rationale is fed into planning procedure as detailed plan is drawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board reviews committee action and accepts or rejects rationale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshal public support and keep evidence of external pressure before board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine who is to be involved in the planning of the plans. Develop a budget if necessary. Objectively analyze favorable and unfavorable comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior planning should be done before community participation by the administrative staff and local school board as to what is to be involved in the move. Also, outside consultant firms, college, or university personnel who may have prior training in the desegregation process should be contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate plans may be developed for consideration of the board by community groups, with the final merging of all plans left to the local board of education and consultant firm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
action and accepts or rejects rationale. The board meeting is reported in detail to the press, and steps taken to see that as much community debate as possible occurs at this point.

Table 10 presents the researcher's and respondents' actors and actions for Order Development of Detailed Plan, Step 5. This, of course, is a crucial step in the overall effort to move toward comprehensive change.

The respondents' contributions to this step will be summarized under seven topic headings, namely: community, students, staff, facilities and transportation programs, external concerns, and evaluation and assessment.

Community

The community is defined to include the state board of education as well as neighboring physical school districts and this suggests metropolitan planning. The mass media should be involved and a positive public relations program developed to educate the community to the fact that "it can work." Commitment to support should be sought from the power structure and opinion leaders in the community.

Students

A demographic study needs to be undertaken so that assignment of students outside of noncontiguous zones is not haphazard. Massive efforts should be undertaken to re-educate the students in
### Table 10

**Development of Detailed Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is Ordered By</th>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Activists' Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supporting Action

- Identify components of plan using the 25 Components of Comprehensive Planning. The components were presented to respondents under seven broad areas.  
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>State board of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-community relationships</td>
<td>Total community planning and input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with other social institutions</td>
<td>News media and public relations program. Positive program aimed at educating the community as to the desirability of racial integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-district planning and cooperation</td>
<td>Commitment of power structure and opinion leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Minority participation in student activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy making procedure and review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^] Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Action</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student desegregation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic consideration in the assignment of students to schools (noncontiguous zones).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for coping with student activism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student re-education effort in race and human relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student planning and advisory committees meet with administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assignment and promotion policy</td>
<td>Three-day program for all consultants and administrators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty assignment</td>
<td>A multiplier program to develop trainers in human relations competencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional staff assignment</td>
<td>Twenty-one clock hours of training for all certified staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>A professional grant program to help all faculty meet state recertification requirements. An extensive in-service program of four components.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service development program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with professional unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming internal and external resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement and commitment of employee organizations. Black and White encounter-awareness--administrative movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
<td>Proposed by Respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff (continued)</strong></td>
<td>Direct attention in some specific manner to the identification and consequences of institutional racism which are often overlooked in all areas by administrators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-service for school board. In-service for nonprofessional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratio of white and nonwhite teachers at time of desegregation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation services</td>
<td>Change in organization to accomplish task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building and renovations</td>
<td>Make use of private schools in the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of physical facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Have a &quot;task force&quot; on Ethnic Studies, a team of specialists in multi-racial/ethnic materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service developmental program</td>
<td>Integration of &quot;special education&quot; into main stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning materials: prescribed and supplementary</td>
<td>Revise special federal projects where guidelines are not compatible with a desegregated system—example, ESEA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (continued)
Development of Detailed Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of special projects and special programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative planning: federal, state, local, and related agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of legal issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare plans for presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the area of human relations. A student planning and advisory committee composed of all minority and majority cultures involved in the process of desegregation should be formed. Special efforts should be made to insure minority participation in all student and extra-curricular activities.

**Staff**

A program for all consultants and administrators should be instituted to develop a "multiplier program" of trainees in human relations competencies. Attention should be directed in some specific manner to the identification and consequences of institutional racism. Racism is an area that is often overlooked by administrators. One respondent suggests that twenty-one clock hours of training should be required of all certificated and noncertificated staff. Black and white encounter sessions should be held and an involvement and commitment sought from all employee organizations. Consideration should be given to the ratio of white to nonwhite employees at the time of desegregation and where it is not adequate, a new recruitment policy established. A professional grant program should be established to help all faculty meet state recertification requirements.

**Facilities and Transportation**

A change in the organization of transportation services must be implemented in order to accomplish the task of desegregation. Assessing the need for new buildings, renovations, and other
physical facilities should be undertaken and include considering the availability of private and parochial schools in the district.

**Programs**

A task force on ethnic studies, a team of specialists in multi-racial/ethnic material, should be empowered to recommend changes to humanize the curriculum. All "special education" and federal projects where guidelines are not compatible with a desegregated school system should be integrated into the educational main stream. Extra-class activities deserve special attention though technically considered to be part of "the curriculum." These activities provide a ready means for the integration of students. Decisions about programs should be flexible enough so that unique needs of individual schools can be addressed.

**External Concerns**

The researcher considered cooperative planning, federal, state, local, and related agencies as well as clarifying legal issues under this broad topic. No respondent reacted here.

**Evaluation and Assessment**

This could be considered the most important phase of the guide. Goals should be put in behavioral terms so that an objective evaluation is carried out and such evaluations become part of a continuous process. Local evaluation and assessment of
desegregation efforts should be conducted with the help of the state department of education. An accountability program that has a commonality among all buildings can be established.

After the development of the detailed plan, Step 5, the guide calls for the presentation of the plan, Step 6. Table 11 presents the respondents' strategies for making the transition from Step 5 to Step 6.

A review of the respondents' suggestions for transition from Step 5 to Step 6 is as follows. District goals should be established using accepted rationale, and a set of objectives established for each goal. Priorities should be established in terms of time table for accomplishing tasks and allocations of financial resources made. Allocations are made on the basis of improving staff, facilities, and programs with a comprehensive approach to determine "what is at the end of the ride." Computer facilities should be secured to predict possible outcomes. Briefing sessions should be conducted with board members so that both positive and negative features of the plan are fully understood. The presentation should be supported with audiovisual displays and prepared with anticipation of likely questions. Specifics such as costs, enrollments, number of pupils, and teachers affected should be clearly delineated. News media may be briefed with the understanding that news will not be reported until after Step 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>Set goals of school district. Develop a set of objectives for each goal delineating priorities, time table for accomplishing, and allocations of financial resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the greatest extent possible, include improvements in staff, facilities, and programs to accompany desegregation--&quot;what is at the end of the ride.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It will be helpful if a computer run or similarly detailed projection can confirm expected outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan briefing sessions with board of education wherein details are explained. State both positive and negative features of the plan. Anticipate likely questions and prepare answers ahead of time. Support the presentation with audio-visual displays. Know specifics such as costs, enrollments, number of pupils, and teachers affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold a briefing session for news media on the condition that news will not be reported until after Step 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using accepted rationale, committee develops plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources of school district are made available to committee to facilitate plan development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give preparers a deadline to present plan to the board of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication of all plans with the developed model for analysis and clarification by the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 presents the actors and actions proposed and the supporting actions recommended by both the investigator and the respondents for the presentation of the detailed plan.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activists' Involvement (pressure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State department of education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal session for acceptance or rejection</th>
<th>Continue positive public relations program involving community relations, staff, and news media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community informed through open hearing with parents and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief summary of the public school administrators' and Center directors' responses follows here. The board of education studies the detailed plan and calls a formal session for acceptance. Prior to this, the staff is briefed and a press conference is called to
inform that consensus has been reached. Public relations activities are continued and open hearings are held to inform various communities, parents, and students.

Table 13 presents the respondents' suggestions for the transition from the stage of Presenting Detailed Plans to the stage of Ordering Implementation.

The transitional data supplied by respondents are summarized in the following paragraph. A legal review is conducted to gain community support. News releases have insisted all along that any acceptable plan will be implemented. Once acceptance is gained, special meetings are held with departments facing critical change, such as transportation, administrators, certificated, clerical, and other nonprofessional staff. Leaders are prepared to work with these groups and with the community to involve them in implementation. Decisions that remain to be made are: "When will the plan take effect?" "What will it take to make the change as easily and quietly as possible?"

The proposals of the researcher and respondents for Implementation is Ordered By are presented in Table 14, page 87.

The data contributed by the respondents under Step 7 are summarized as: the board of education orders the implementation of the desegregation plan, and immediately the general community and all members of the school community are orientated to the plan. The next step is to follow the detailed plan.
### Table 13
Transition to Step 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>Briefing on general proposal to staff and board. Hold special meetings with departments facing critical assignments: transportation, principal, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board study of proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare leaders--staff and community--to work with groups in forming and involving them in implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal review--gain community acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This step may actually be Step 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is doubtful whether any plan involving a major reassignment of students and considerable transportation of students will be implemented by a local administration and board of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In most instances, the complete action will come through the courts in face of opposition from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
<td>Proposed by Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>the board of education and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The basic problem is one of the administration being courageous enough to have some positive input into the designing of the plan and then taking a positive and professional role in the implementation of the plan and in selling it to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public information has all along stated that whatever plan is accepted—will be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When will the plan take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What will it take to make the change as easily and quietly as possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plans, as developed by and with parent groups/student groups, should be presented to all concerned with the desegregation process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Implementation is Ordered By

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State board of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Action

| Orientate community and school       | Student orientation.  |
| community to plan.                   |                        |
| Follow detailed plan.                |                        |

Table 15 presents the respondents' strategies for making the transition from Step 7 to Step 8.

Table 15

Transition to Step 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>Community orientation is done through scheduled informational sharing sessions in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set-up check lists for principals and other administrators in each school--Charlotte procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize and coordinate relationship with police, media, fire department, and transportation agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue staff preparation and report on this preparation to board and general public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 (continued)

Transition to Step 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>Study in final hearing, with no legal complications--board orders implementation. Prepare for: sit-ins, boycotts, majority flight, racial conflict, teacher resignation. Plan for the inclusion of all students, faculty, and administrative staff. Workshops or training sessions with students who have been in almost all instances left out of workshop sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitional strategies, as viewed necessary by Public School Administrators and Center Directors, are summarized as follows.

The desegregation plan should be studied in a final hearing and, provided there are no legal complications, the board orders implementation. Simultaneously, informational sharing sessions should be held in the community. The administration should develop checklists for principals and other administrators in each school. Plans are made to include all students, faculty, and administrations. Workshops or training sessions are developed around needs of students. Preparation should be made to cope with sit-ins, boycotts, majority flight, racial conflicts, and teacher resignation. Final coordination of the
relationships with police, media, fire department, and transportation agencies should be completed.

Table 16 presents the actors and actions proposed and the supporting actions recommended by both the investigator and the respondents to Step 8, Final Implementation Ordered or Approved By.

Table 16

Final Implementation Ordered or Approved By

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State board of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activists' involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Action</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central office coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare curriculum specialist to take advantage of &quot;imbalancing&quot; effect of implementation plan by introducing more relevant curriculum and improve teaching techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts functions at optimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication room operational.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control center for community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty in-service training on adjustment with relation to fellow teacher-students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerns operational.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalize student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral codes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of data supplied by the respondents is presented below. Preparation should be made for a curriculum specialist to
take advantage of "imbalancing" effect of implementation plan through the introduction of multi-ethnic and relevant curriculum. Teaching techniques should be improved through in-service training and thorough attention paid to human relations between teacher and teacher, teacher and student, and student and teacher.

The proposals of the respondents for making the transition from Step 8 to Step 9 are presented in Table 17.

A review of the respondents' suggestions for transition to Step 9 is provided below. Schools cannot function well without the total involvement of teaching personnel, relating to the objectives and goals of a desegregated school. Everyone must be committed to "making it work." Participation of all students should be sought. Implementation of activities should become functional with the superintendent showing the way.

Table 18, page 92, presents the information developed by the researcher and the respondents with respect to the ninth step in the comprehensive change model. The respondents made no additional suggestions here.

The strategies for making the transition from Step 9 to Step 10, as proposed by the respondents, are presented in Table 19, page 93.

The responses in Table 19 are summarized by the investigator in the following manner. The stated objectives or goals should be
### Table 17

Transition to Step 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>Board, after tabulating community concerns, takes action on proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proxy parent plan in each school--reinforce children who have to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation should be done by someone who has no vested interest. Find this person or persons and begin the evaluation action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation activities carried out with superintendent providing leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical count of students by race in schools and class make-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record of conflicts and parental aggressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum conflicts and other human problems made known to public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certainly schools cannot function smoothly without the total involvement of teaching personnel, relating to the objectives and goals of a desegregated school. Everyone must work toward stated goals clearly understood with total participation of all students, minority as well as majority group students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Evaluation is Ordered By

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local board of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State department of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Supporting Action                    |                        |                               |
| Present evaluation data to proper authorities. |                        | *Respondents made no revisions in the researcher's list. |
| Review of evaluation data.           |                        |                               |
| Recommendations.                     |                        |                               |
Table 19
Transition to Step 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by Researcher</th>
<th>Proposed by Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals for transitional steps.</td>
<td>Local board initiates evaluation in concert with state board of education policy and any court-ordered decisions relative to the plan adopted by the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment objectives and procedures should have been under development all the way along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is essential that evaluation and corrections continue at least five years or until the previous pattern of segregation is thoroughly eliminated and it is evident that no resegregation trends are developing. Develop integration criteria for assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board of education should require periodic progress reports to the superintendent. The board should direct the superintendent to study the plan in operation and make recommendation for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide continuous interim evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make corrections for oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The stated objectives or goals should be in the form of behavioral terms. If the needs of all students are not being met, then a reexamination should be in order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presented in behavioral terms. The local board should initiate evaluation in concert with state board of education policy and any court-ordered decisions relative to the plan adopted by the board. Objectives and assessment procedures should have been under development all along. A minimum of five years of evaluation is in order. There must be continuous checking so that resegregation does not occur. The board should require periodic progress reports to the superintendent, and the administrator makes corrections for oversight.

Table 20 presents the strategy of suggestions by one respondent under Step 10, Reexamine and Recycle.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reexamine and Recycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Researcher made no proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process of planned change becomes a continuous effort to improve the quality of school life. Efforts in the area of social change need constant monitoring. In many situations, successful completion only signals the beginning of further educational change. Upon re-examining the evidence of changing conditions, the restating of goals, supported by another diagnosis, creates the setting for new plans for
change. The recycling of the entire planned change process reflects and creates a never ending concern for educational improvement.

One response to the comprehensive planning guide came in the form of a different approach that apparently grew out of the experiences of the respondent. The respondent and his staff discussed the documents presented by the researcher and found them to include the necessary elements for change through the process of desegregation. Though the documents included the necessary elements, it was difficult for the respondent to apply the guide in terms of his experience with any one school district. The staff could only react affirmatively by saying the elements may be included in any plan development. The use of the term "phase" was misleading to the respondent. The respondent stated, "Planning in the components proceeds simultaneously sometimes and not in phase order."

The respondent's observation of what the reality of desegregation is will be given verbatim below:

We could not help but come to the conclusion that the model is unrealistic since we could not follow it as it is described. However, you do have the necessary elements included. In an effort to be helpful, I will describe a somewhat different approach that follows what we have found through several years experience to be effective. I hope my explanation will be of benefit because you are to be commended for attempting construction of a planning model. I will include also some of the rationale behind our logic.

There are four major components as we see them. They may also be termed "phases" and the procedure is cyclic.
Phase I - The decision by the Local Board to desegregate.

Phase II - Development of a desegregation plan.

Phase III - Implementation of the plan.

Phase IV - Evaluation and feedback to be used in revision of Phase I, followed by Phase II, etc.

We can agree with most of the elements of your model but not necessarily in terms of the sequential steps you have outlined. Let me explain further. I have used the term "phase" also, but the phases overlap. You do not complete one and then move on to the other.

Phase I - Deciding to desegregate

Regardless of who initiates the action (or the reasons), the responsibility for desegregation lies with the local board of education. It is helpful to the planners to know who initiated the action and the purposes to be achieved through desegregation as determined by the board of education. (This information provides a basis for strategy used in Phase II.) In making the decision to desegregate, certain evidence may be presented to the board to establish the need for a positive decision. This evidence takes many forms: state department mandates, court order, demands of pressure groups, instructional or curricula problems, etc. Desegregation is done to achieve certain purposes. These purposes should be identified along with identification of the people responsible for helping the board formulate them. This is absolutely essential. What is to be achieved through desegregation? This question must be answered.

Phase II - Developing the plan

Somebody (or a group) is delegated the responsibility by the board of education for formulating a plan. In terms of the purposes to be achieved through desegregation and with consideration of those involved advocating and opposing these purposes, some basic steps must be taken. (1) The identification of who is to be involved in the plan development; (2) data needed for developing a plan to achieve the purposes identified and collected; and (3) the plan written.
Under each of these steps, many things happen. (1) Roles of people have to be identified, a schedule has to be established, places to work, decisions to be reached, and (most important) the criteria to be used in formulating and evaluating the plan must be identified. (2) As a result of criteria developed for the plan, certain data must be identified, collected, and made available in useful form to the planners. This consists always of pupil locator maps by race, enrollment data, current organizational structure, instructional program, staffing patterns, finance, and many other series of information. (3) Somebody writes out plan (or plans) in detail. (Depending on the purposes, again, the format may need to be in legal form for submission to the court, etc.)

I would include in Phase II also the adoption of a plan by the board of education. However, if I were detailing a model "adoption" might be a separate phase. Sometimes the plan must be approved by a court, state department, community groups, etc. Again, this depends on who made the initial decision and why. Hopefully, those responsible for plan development (at least criteria) would be directly involved in the development process. When court orders are involved, this would mean attorneys for the plaintiffs and the defendants for example.

Phase III - Implementation

Again, this is the responsibility of the local school board and its administration. Steps taken in implementation may occur simultaneously with some developmental steps by plan formulation. In any event, those responsible for implementation must be involved in the developmental process and the formulation of criteria.

Phase IV - Evaluation

Criteria determine what is to be evaluated and perhaps the means for evaluation. Again, the process and content of evaluation must be related to the purposes to be achieved.

It should be apparent why we had trouble with the model. I am sorry we could not respond as you directed. However, I hope this very general and superficial explanation will be of assistance.
As previously mentioned, the above statement reflects the experience of one respondent's work in school districts in the deep South. The respondent reduced the researcher's guide to four phases, but many points presented by the researcher in a ten-step guide are contained within the four phases given above.

The investigator proposed twenty-five elements that would be involved in comprehensive change through the process of desegregation. Each respondent was asked to indicate whether the elements should be included in planning for desegregation by a checkmark (✓). When the data were returned to the researcher, the responses of each respondent were coded and a tally made of his preference for the element suggested. The school districts were coded alphabetically—A, B, and C. The Title IV Center Directors were coded with numbers—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Table 21 indicates the responses of only three school districts because the fourth one was returned without comment. Number six of the Title IV Directors does not appear because it was handled separately in narrative form in the preceding pages. The appearance of a letter or number on the table indicates that the element was viewed by the respondent as being necessary for comprehensive change.

Table 21 indicates that the investigator has included, though not exhausted, the proper elements to be included for a school
district moving from segregation to desegregation to be reasonably sure comprehensive change could be the outcome of the process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Title IV Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four responding</td>
<td>Nine responding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase I - Community

- **School-Community relationships**: A B
- **Cooperation with other social institution**: A B C
- **Inter-district planning and cooperation**: A B
- **Utilization of outside resources**: A B C

### Other

### Phase II - Students

- **Policy-making procedures and review**: A B C
- **Student desegregation**: A B C
- **Method for coping with student activism**: A B C
- **Demographic planning**: A B C

### Other
## Table 21 (continued)

### Desegregation Plan Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III - Staff</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Title IV Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assignment and promotion policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional staff assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service developmental program</td>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with professional unions</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming internal and external resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

---

### Phase IV - Facilities and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Title IV Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation services</td>
<td></td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for building sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building and renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of physical facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

---
Table 21 (continued)

Desegregation Plan Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase V - Programs</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Title IV Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nine responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service developmental program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning materials: prescribed and supplementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of special projects and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase VI - External Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative planning: federal, state, local, and related agencies</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of legal issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 21 (continued)

**Desegregation Plan Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase VII - Evaluation and Assessment</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Title IV Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research described and analyzed a comprehensive educational change guide that could be used in the process of desegregating public schools. Equalizing educational opportunities for all students involves a set of conditions and processes that include many more components than normally have been associated with the process of desegregation.

What really happens when school districts desegregate tends to impinge on the people involved; the educators, parents, children, and the community at large. Early desegregation efforts failed to provide for comprehensive educational change and resulted in second generation problems emerging.

The problem pursued by the researcher was to develop and to validate a planning guide for comprehensive educational change that could provide guidance for school districts moving from segregation to desegregation. The guide was conceptual in nature and was to be validated through testing against the practical and theoretical experience of those who have worked in desegregation and educational change.
PROCEDURES

Professional books and research studies in the area of change and desegregation were perused for the purpose of obtaining a comprehensive list of items for the opinionnaire. The comprehensive change guide grew out of the experiences of the researcher and other staff members of the Midwest Institute for Equal Educational Opportunity, the Title IV University-based Center, located at The Ohio State University. The opinionnaire and change guide were then analyzed by the researcher's advisory committee and a public school administrator to determine whether the elements in the guide and opinionnaire reflected comprehensive change. The comments and suggestions were incorporated into the revised guide.

The revised guide and opinionnaire were given to four public school administrators and one university-based Title IV Center director. They received a cover letter that explained the purpose of the study and that the guide and opinionnaire were being administered for validation purposes. The respondents to the change guide and opinionnaire occupied positions similar to the respondents in the main study. The respondents were:

1. Public school superintendents or their designees.
2. Directors in charge of university-based Title IV Centers.

Six public school districts and twelve university-based Title IV Centers were selected to be in the main sample because they met
the necessary criteria. The criteria were that the public school
districts had desegregated or were in the process of desegregating
and the Title IV Centers worked with school districts that had prob-
lems occasioned by or incident to desegregation.

FINDINGS

Analysis of the conceptions reflected by the guide produced
the following findings:

1. The responses made to the guide and opinionnaire
verified that a theoretical guide for comprehensive change
through desegregation can be generalized or created.

2. A theoretical guide can be and has been produced
through the particular suggestions of respondents.

3. The respondents were able to add transitional
strategies for nearly each step of the guide.

4. The respondents' reactions to the opinionnaire elements
suggested that the elements proposed were reasonably compre-
hensive.

5. All respondents were able to react to the guide and
opinionnaire as presented except one. The one respondent
presented a guide that was consistent with his experiences.
Analysis of the respondent's guide found it to be compatible
with the original, the only difference being that it contained
fewer steps.

The extensive experience represented by the sample indicates
that an ideal plan should contain at least the following points:

1. The board of education does preliminary planning before
involving lay people from the community.

2. The board of education establishes a time line or
major "milestone" to be achieved by a given date.
3. The board of education and administration must develop supportive procedures for parents and students affected by the change.

4. Before the final draft is completed, a briefing session is conducted for the board of education where both positive and negative details are explained.

5. The administration must develop plans for involving and informing all school personnel.

6. The administration must be courageous enough to have some positive input into the design of the plan and then take a positive and professional role in the implementation of the plan and selling it to the community.

7. The administration must develop the criteria on which the desegregation process will hinge.

8. The superintendent should schedule several informal work sessions for the board and staff when progress reports are given.

9. The administration and board of education should identify and promote the programmatic benefits of desegregation.

10. Before any attempt is made to write a plan, a rationale for justification should be developed.

11. The desegregation plan should include planned means ranging from the most amount of change to the least amount of change required.

12. The desegregation plan should be accompanied by planned means for involving board members, administrators, teachers, students, clerical, and para-professionals in workshops.

13. Community leaders are identified and their support sought for comprehensive educational change, not just desegregation efforts.

14. Staff development programs are conducted for all certificated and noncertificated personnel.
15. A demographic study supported by computer assisted assignment of students is initiated and implemented.

16. Communication sessions or briefings should be held with the departments that will be experiencing the highest degree of change; transportation, principals, and other administrative staff, pupil personnel services.

17. The news media play an important role in communicating the positive aspects of desegregation as well as the technical process to the community.

18. Students should be involved in the planning and implementation of desegregation. It should not hit them cold the first day of school.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the study indicate that for the most part agreement existed between the concepts of school districts and the university-based Title IV Centers. This indicates that the guide has value as a planning tool for comprehensive change through the process of desegregation.

Analysis of the perceptions reflected by the responses provided some of the necessary actions and activities that could be used by one planning to desegregate a school system or to plan educational change. Several major points emerged from the data generated by the guide and opinionnaire. These pointed out the importance of (1) the image of the board of education and the administration, (2) the maintenance of communication with the community at large and within various groups in the community, (3) rapport with the news media, (4)
development of a rationale that allows for the minimum amount of change to the maximum amount of change feasible, (5) involvement of outside consultants, and (6) all vestiges of institutional racism must be ferreted out and rectified in the planning for change.

It is a very simple matter to place children from different racial and ethnic groups in the same physical plant and assume that desegregation is an accomplished fact. Such an act represents only the first step. Comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation provides a broader base and reflects an intent to "make it work." Every segment of the total school community--the school board, the citizens committee, the superintendent, the supportive staff, the principals, the teachers, the students--must continually be aware of inadequacies in the initial steps.

DISCUSSION

This study produced a planning guide containing ten steps with suggested activities and a clarification of transitional statements between each step. The details of the planning guide are contained in Chapter IV. The Midwest Institute for Equal Educational Opportunity planning guide for comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation follows here:

The MIEEO Planning Guide

I

Initiations of action in desegregation can be done on a
voluntary basis by the local board of education, a suit charging the
district with segregation, the superintendent presents a plan of action,
the state department of education requests the district to desegregate,
or pressure is applied by community activists. Regardless of whom
starts the action, the administration should start a positive school
and community program while seeking assistance from University
Center and Equal Educational Opportunities Institute. In-service
education focused on race and human relations should begin as soon
as possible.

Some strategies that facilitate transition from Step One to
Step Two are focused in two areas. The two areas are board of
education functions and administrative leadership. The board of
education needs to decide what information base is needed, upon which
to base decisions. This may lead to the establishment of a study
committee composed of power structure and opinion leaders as well
as some representative that may not agree with the action. The
administration needs to develop and implement a demographic study
with the help of an outside consultant. The board and administration
need to meet with the news media and try to solicit their cooperation
in not adversely alarming the community with ambiguous headlines,
lead stories, and focusing only on the negative aspects. The attitude
and public image of the administration and board of education can
influence public acceptance and minimize conflict.
II

The evidence can be brought forth through the taking of depositions from individuals and groups, the appointed committee, the outside consultant, or the administrative staff. The supportive actions necessary for the above are that the board is apprised of findings with recommendation made by the citizens groups. Study sessions are held where all concerned groups in the community may express their "gut level feelings." All of the administrative staff are present to deal with the areas of change.

The transitional steps necessary to get to Step Three are as follows: in light of the evidence presented, the board of education advises the superintendent to develop a desegregation proposal for consideration. The proposal should include several alternative approaches ranging from the most amount of change to the least amount of change required. The involvement of an outside consultant is important in considering alternatives because the consultant has a better chance of operating free of political and community pressures.

III

Development of a rationale is the third step. The board of education or the state department of education or the court orders the rationale to be developed. Once this order is given, the local board seeks support of community groups and the state board of education. Criteria or objectives on which the rationale is based
are the very same educational policies that prevailed before, except they apply to a unitary district now. The administration continues with public relation program utilizing all possible means to convey a positive message.

The major transitional strategy is to try and get a multi-racial component of the community to express itself to the rationale developer. The community should always be reminded that the district's goal is to develop quality education for all students in a desegregated school district. Several informal work sessions of the board members and staff are held where progress reports are given and released to the news media.

IV

Step Four of the guide is Presentation of the Rationale. It is possible for one of any of the following to make the presentation: the administrative staff, local school board, appointed committee, or the outside consultant. Several review and briefing sessions are held where "responsible" criticisms of rationale that is being developed can be expressed. This is done through "sounding out" sessions or open hearings.

Transition to Step Five is accomplished by having the rationale presented at the regular board meeting and the board of education reviews the document and accepts or rejects the rationale. If the rationale is accepted, the next step becomes possible.
V

Step Five is to Order Development of Detailed Plan. As previously stated, the order is issued by or in conjunction with one of the following: the board of education, state board of education, or the Federal Court. This is the place for the 25 components of Comprehensive Planning to be introduced. The 25 elements are as listed:

Community

School-community relationships
Cooperation with other social institution
Inter-district planning and cooperation
Utilization of outside resources

Students

Policy-making procedures and review
Student desegregation
Method for coping with student activism
Demographic planning

Staff

Administrative assignment and promotion policy
Faculty assignment
Nonprofessional staff assignment
Recruitment
In-service education
Relationship with professional unions
Overcoming internal and external resistance to change

Facilities and Transportation

Transportation services
Planning for building sites
New building and renovations
Assessment of physical facilities
Programs

Curriculum
Finance
In-service developmental program
Learning materials: prescribed and supplementary
Coordination of special projects and special programs

External Concerns

Cooperative planning: federal, state, local, and related agencies

Evaluation and Assessment

The only activity is to develop a detailed plan focused around the elements mentioned above.

The transitional strategy is to plan for sessions with the board of education wherein details are explained. Both negative and positive features of the plan are explored. Likely questions are anticipated and answers are prepared ahead of time. The briefing sessions are supported with audio visual displays with such specifics as cost, enrollment, number of pupils and teachers affected detailed. A briefing session could be held for the news media on the condition that news will not be reported until after Step Six.

VI

Presentation of Detailed Plan is done by one of the following: local board of education, outside consultant, or the appointed committee. The basic activity is to continue positive public relation program involving community, staff, and news media.
The strategies for transition to Step Seven are varied. Prior to meeting with the board of education, a meeting is held with all school personnel to explain details of the plan. The public has been told constantly that whatever plan is accepted will be implemented. The basic strategy is one of the administration being courageous enough to have some positive input in the design of the plan and taking a positive and professional role in the implementation and selling it to the community.

VII

Implementation Is Ordered is the seventh step of the guide. The board of education, state board, or the court orders implementation. It is at this point when orientations are held for students in the district.

The transitional strategies are to coordinate relationship with the police, media, fire department, and transportation agencies. Preparation and plans are made to deal with sit-ins, boycotts, majority flight, racial conflict, and teacher resignation. The plans should include preparation for students, faculty, and administrative staff for workshops or training sessions. The board studies the plan in a final hearing and if no legal complications are incurred, the board orders final implementation.

VIII

Step Eight of the planning guide is Final Implementation
Ordered. The possible actors are the board of education, state board of education, court, or the local superintendent. The basic activity is to prepare curriculum specialists to take advantage of "imbalancing" by introducing more relevant curriculum and means to improve teaching techniques.

The transitional strategies for Step Eight are as follows: the superintendent provides leadership in carrying out implementation activities. Plans are made to inform the public as to how desegregation is working. Everyone connected with the school should be advised of the stated goals of a desegregated school system.

IX

Evaluation is Step Nine of the planning guide. The local board of education, state department of education, the local superintendent, or the Federal Court orders evaluation procedures. The process is to evaluate what is occurring as the result of desegregation.

Transitional strategies are as outlined. The local board of education begins evaluation procedures with the help of the state department on any decisions that are related to the adopted plan. The assessment objectives and procedures are an integral part of the adopted plan. It is necessary that evaluation and corrections continue at least five years beyond or until the previous pattern of segregation is thoroughly eliminated and it is evident that "business as usual" is no longer the popular theme of the day. Criteria for
integration are required and periodic progress reports are made to
the superintendent and board of education. Corrections for over-
sight and points that are not working well are made.

X

Revision and reexamination are the steps involved at Step
Ten. The process consists basically of adjusting according to evalua-
tion and insuring that no resegregation occurs. This cycle is continu-
ous and never ceases.

The planning guide for educational change through the process
of desegregation has enough comprehensiveness to eliminate prob-
lems that are occurring because only the aspect of moving bodies
was considered in early desegregation. The guide allows for com-
prehensiveness that goes beyond the physical aspect of moving bodies.

Educational change can be achieved by using the ten step
guide even if desegregation was not an issue. The same steps of
actions could be applied. The guide that has been validated by the
respondents is flexible enough to cover both the aspect of desegrega-
tion and educational change. The 25 elements proposed by this
document are the minimum essentials as seen by the developer and
other members of the Midwest Institute. The problems that are
occurring from early desegregation because of a lack of thoroughness
and the insights of present educational developers provide the impetus
for comprehensive educational change through the process of desegre-
gation.
Comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation does not eliminate the potential for "second generation" problems that occur after desegregation. It does offer a high degree of probability that most problems will be reduced to their lowest level because they were taken into account at the initial planning stage. Comprehensive planning increases the probability of education bringing the highest rewards possible to all students.

Comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation is an effort to revise educational practices, instructional programs, and teacher behaviors to assure that maximum achievement will occur in multi-cultural, multi-racial schools.

The success or failure of any plan developed, designed, and implemented to improve a school system depends on the willingness and commitment of each person and group to maximize personal effort toward achieving the stated objectives. The most persistent and bothersome problems usually are not those that involve policy making, administrative action, or curricular planning because they are easily changed. The difficult ones are focused on individuals' values, biases, attitudes, aspirations, and customary behaviors.

Improving the quality of a school district is not just a process to be accomplished by one individual or group. Rather, the quest for excellence is an interdependent one that depends on the contributions and cooperation of everybody involved.
Elimination of dual school systems provides educational leaders with unprecedented opportunities to develop innovative programs and practices that can be beneficial to all of the students served by the school district. Desegregation of facilities and the physical mixing of students and personnel are just the beginnings and not the ends of creating a unitary school district. Since the revocation of the dual school is occurring, an excellent opportunity is provided to review the total school program and comprehensively restructure as many programs and practices as resources will allow. Additional resources can be secured from the Federal government through the Emergency School Act, a program designed to help school districts desegregate. Opportunities for educational experiences should be equalized generally for all learners, yet specialized according to needs and interests of individuals in terms of available facilities and resources.

The following recommendations are made on the basis of the above.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study presents an opportunity for administrators and school board members to examine major characteristics, relationships of variables, and limitations of the process guide in order to prepare their districts for change. Considerations for planning
research and the development of future strategies might include:

1. "The practicality of the guide for comprehensive educational change through the process of desegregation needs to be further tested by a school district applying the guide to bring about educational change.

2. Because the present study utilized only six school systems and twelve Title IV Centers, there is need for additional study that would involve a larger sample.

3. What part should the state department of education play in evaluation and assessment of the desegregation process? The present design did not address this question.

4. Further study is necessary to determine whether the researcher's model does contain too many steps as indicated by one respondent.

5. Further research should be conducted to determine whether comprehensive educational change retards the act of desegregation.

6. How valuable is the process of developing a rationale for the desegregation plan before developing the actual details of the plan?

7. This study did not focus attention on the role of activists in the development of desegregation. Further study is recommended to determine how important it is to involve community activists in the development of plans for desegregation.

8. Further study is recommended to develop a manual of typical problems and planned means to resolve them for each step.

9. Further study should answer what the implications are for such a planning guide for efforts at curriculum development.
APPENDIX A

FORM LETTERS
Enclosed are two forms. One is a conceptualized model of the desegregation process and the other is a listing of the elements that Dr. Charles Glatt, Director of the Midwest Institute for Equal Educational Opportunity, The Ohio State University, and I believe should be included in any plan for desegregation. We ultimately hope to make both useful for school systems. We are asking your cooperation in helping us increase our understanding of the desegregation process because you have had experience with it. We need the insights that only people like yourself can provide.

The two forms require filling out a brief questionnaire and opinionnaire which takes no more than fifteen minutes of your time.

Each respondent will be sent a summary of the questionnaire and opinionnaire data when available if it is desired. Please indicate this when returning the packet. You will find enclosed a self-addressed return envelope for returning the packet.

Additional information about the study is found within the separate enclosures. Thank you very much for cooperating with this request.

Sincerely,

Dr. Charles A. Glatt, Director

Charles H. Rivers
Associate Director

Enclosures 2
Recently a packet was sent to you containing a questionnaire and opinionnaire concerning the process of desegregation. In checking the returns, we do not find a reply from your district. Perhaps the packet with your response has been delayed by the mails.

We have enclosed another packet and solicit your aid in defining the process of desegregation. The two items require about fifteen minutes of your time.

Thank you very much for responding.

Sincerely,

Dr. Charles A. Glatt, Director

Charles H. Rivers
Associate Director

CAG/CHR:erm

Enclosure 1
APPENDIX B

ATTACHMENT A
ATTACHMENT A

Planning Comprehensive Change Through Desegregation

The realization that equalizing educational opportunities necessitates unprecedented, comprehensive planning and development is an intellectual journey which has not been taken by few educators. What the realization suggests and demands is that every aspect of the educational enterprise, both national and local is affected by this process. This holistic view of educational change can omit no component or element of school planning.

The comprehensive approach suggested here includes attention to at least these major interrelated aspects of long range development:

Community

School-community relationships
Cooperation with other social institution
Inter-district planning and cooperation
Utilization of outside resources

Students

Policy-making procedures and review
Student desegregation
Method for coping with student activism
Demographic planning

Staff

Administrative assignment and promotion policy
Faculty assignment
Nonprofessional staff assignment
Recruitment
In-service
Relationship with professional unions
Overcoming internal and external resistance to change
Facilities and Transportation

Transportation services
Planning for building sites
New building and renovations
Assessment of physical facilities

Programs

Curriculum
Finance
In-service developmental program
Learning materials: prescribed and supplementary
Coordination of special projects and special programs

External Concerns

Cooperative planning: federal, state, and local
and related agencies
Clarification of legal issues

Evaluation and Assessment

No one person is expected to have, nor indeed can have, expertise in all of these programmatic areas. In contemporary America, however, the educational developer must have ability and experience to maintain the comprehensive overview that can provide coordinated programs in all areas. Again, the process of equalizing educational opportunities provides an unprecedented challenge for the doctor of social ills to apply his skills and knowledge.
APPENDIX C

DIRECTION AND SKELETAL GUIDE
DIRECTION AND OPINIONNAIRE
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DIRECTIONS

The conceptualized guide attempts to obtain information that addresses the following question:

Does the guide meet with reality and if it does,
what are the activities that allow one to make
the transition from step to step?

The guide provides for the expression of your insights in
determining suggested activities and how you did make or would make the transition from one step to another to achieve the goal of desegregation.
COMPREHENSIVE CHANGE
SKELETAL GUIDE

ACTION IS INITIATED BY

Step 1. A. Board of education voluntarily moves.
B. Suit initiated by individual or group.
C. Local superintendent presents data to board.
D. State department of education moves.
E. Pressure from community activists.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Identify needed evidence.
2. Collect evidence.
   a. Court order
   b. Solicit cooperation
   c. Appeal to authority
3. Present evidence.

OTHER

TRANSITION TO STEP 2
**EVIDENCE BROUGHT INTO THE SITUATION**

**Step 2.**

| A. Written deposition from individuals and groups in the community. |
| B. Appoint committee to study data on racial imbalance and report to board. |
| C. Hire outside consultant. |

**D. Administrative staff report to board.**

**E. Local board presents data to state board.**

**F. Attorney presents evidence to court.**

**G. Community activists involvement.**

---

**SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES**

1. **Study session**
   - a. Board of education
   - b. Court
   - c. State department of education

2. **Formal session for acceptance or rejection**

---

**TRANSITION TO STEP 3**

---
DEVELOPMENT OF RATIONALE IS ORDERED BY

Step 3.  

A. Board of education orders.  

B. State department of education orders  

C. Court orders.  

D. Community activists involvement.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Identify components of rationale.  

2. Develop rationale.  

3. Prepare information.  

TRANSITION TO STEP 4
RATIONAL IS PRESENTED BY
Step 4. A. Administrative staff.   C. Outside consultant.
B. Local school board.   D. Appointed committee.
E. Community activists involvement.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Study session
   a. Board of education.
   b. Court
   c. State department of education
2. Formal session for acceptance or rejection.

OTHER

TRANSITION TO STEP 5
DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILED PLAN IS ORDERED BY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 5.</th>
<th>A. Board of education</th>
<th>C. Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. State board of education</td>
<td>D. Community activists involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Identify components of plan using the 25 components of comprehensive planning. See Attachment A.

2. Develop plans.

3. Prepare plans for presentation.

TRANSITION TO STEP 6
DETAILED PLAN IS PRESENTED BY

Step 6.  A. Administrative staff       C. Outside consultant
        B. Local board of education    D. Appointed committee
        E. Community activists involvement

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Study session
   a. Board of education
   b. Court
   c. State department of education

2. Formal session for acceptance or rejection.

OTHER

TRANSITION TO STEP 7
IMPLEMENTATION IS ORDERED BY

Step 7. A. Board of education  C. State board of education
      B. Court  D. Community activist involvement

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Orientate community and school community to plan.
2. Follow detailed dated plan.

TRANSITION TO STEP 8
### FINAL IMPLEMENTATION ORDERED OR APPROVED BY

**Step 8.**

- **A.** Board of education
- **B.** State board of education
- **C.** Court
- **D.** Local superintendent
- **E.** Community activists involvement

### SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Central office coordination efforts functions at optimum ability.
   - **a.** Communication room operational.
   - **b.** Control center for community concerns operational.
   - **c.** Operationalize student behavioral codes and involvement procedures.

### TRANSITION TO STEP 9
EVALUATION IS ORDERED BY

Step 9. Checks against objectives in the rationale.

A. Local board of education       C. Court
B. State department of education  D. Local superintendent
E. Community activists involvement

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Present evaluation data to proper authorities
2. Review of evaluation data
3. Recommendations

TRANSITION TO STEP 10
Step 10.

School District or Title IV Center

Name and Title of Respondent
DIRECTIONS

The opinionnaire attempts to obtain information that addresses the following question:

Which items on the opinionnaire should be included
in any desegregation plan?

On the left-hand side of the opinionnaire you are asked to check (✓) the items your school district included in its desegregation plans. Add additional items if appropriate. On the right-hand side, you are asked to check (✓) the items that should be included in any desegregation plan. Again, add additional items you believe appropriate.

Although many items may appear similar, please judge each one on an individual basis.
### DESEGREGATION PLAN ELEMENTS

Check items included in your school district's desegregation plan and add others included but not shown

Check items and add others which should be included in any desegregation plan

---

#### Phase I - Community

- School-community relationships  
- Cooperation with other social institution  
- Inter-district planning and cooperation  
- Utilization of outside resources

Other

---

#### Phase II - Students

- Policy-making procedures and review  
- Student desegregation  
- Method for coping with student activism  
- Demographic planning

Other

---
DESEGREGATION PLAN ELEMENTS

Check items included in your school district's desegregation plan and add others included but not shown.

Check items and add others which should be included in any desegregation plan.

---

### Phase III - Staff

- Administrative assignment and promotion
- Faculty assignment
- Nonprofessional staff assignment
- Recruitment
- In-service developmental program
- Relationship with professional unions
- Overcoming internal and external resistance to change

---

**Other**

---

### Phase IV - Facilities and Transportation

- Transportation services
- Planning for building sites
- New building and renovations
- Assessment of physical facilities
## DESEGREGATION PLAN ELEMENTS

Check items included in your school district's desegregation plan and add others included but not shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase V - Programs

| Curriculum                                                                 |
|---|---|
| Finance                                                                  |
| In-service developmental program                                      |
| Learning materials: prescribed and supplementary                        |
| Coordination of special projects and special programs                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase VI - External Concerns

| Cooperative planning: federal, state, local, and related agencies |
|---|---|


## DESEGREGATION PLAN ELEMENTS

Check items included in your school district's desegregation plan and add others included but not shown.

Check items and add others which should be included in any desegregation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarification of legal issues</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase VII - Evaluation and assessment</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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