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Abstract

The movement of school desegregation plans from mandatory means to voluntary means has led to a fierce debate. The school desegregation problem is encapsulated by two competing strategies: making a plan that enforces racial balance, and making a plan that stops white flight. The purpose of this study was to describe how high schools in East Baton Rouge Parish implemented court approved magnet programs, and to examine the results brought about at each of the high schools in terms of desegregation and school improvement. The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. How have high schools in EBR implemented new magnet programs?
2. What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of desegregation?
3. What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of school improvement?

The case study research design used to address these questions was a holistic (single unit of analysis) multiple-case design in which the school was the unit of analysis. Three schools participated in the study: two with new magnet programs, and one without a magnet program. Three forms of data were collected for each case study: observations, interviews, and documents.

The study found that the manner in which a magnet program is implemented makes a difference in the success of the program. Recruiting, faculty involvement, and district support are three major factors. In terms of school desegregation, the magnet programs in this study were not very effective in recruiting non-black students in East
Baton Rouge Parish at least in the short term. However, moving to a voluntary desegregation policy stemmed the tide of white flight at the high school level in East Baton Rouge parish.

In terms of school improvement findings, three points stand out. First, magnet students had positive attitudinal and behavioral changes due to the magnet programs, but community based students were not affected. Second, dropout rates at all three schools are high, consistent with rates in urban schools. Third, the high percentage of non-certified teachers impedes success of any educational initiative.
Chapter 1 - Introduction

In 1954, the U. S. Supreme Court issued its historic decision in Brown v. Board of Education (Brown I), mandating an end to racial segregation in the public schools. Over the years, federal courts ordered hundreds of school districts to take specific steps to end the racial segregation of school children. In spite of these efforts, many school children continue to attend schools in racial isolation; and this is particularly true in many urban school systems.

The concept of school desegregation is still a hotly debated topic. Virtually no one argues that the Brown I decision was wrong or needs to be overturned. However, there are major disagreements about how desegregation should be accomplished. The next chapter will provide a literature review that breaks these disagreements into three main areas: the history of school desegregation litigation, the benefits of school desegregation, and the implementation strategies of desegregation plans.

As seen in the literature review, the shift in desegregation plans has been away from mandatory plans and toward voluntary plans. Magnet programs have been a vital component of plans attempting to persuade members of racial groups to attend schools where they are a minority. Urban schools are confronting a myriad of problems that racial isolation deepens. Fossey (1996) documents several of those problems: corruption, mismanagement, adversarial labor relations, poorly-trained and uninspired educators, and the breakdown of the two-parent family. Although magnet schools will not solve all of the problems of urban schools, it attempts to combine school improvement plans with desegregation plans in attacking those problems.
Statement of the Problem

The movement of desegregation plans from mandatory means to voluntary means has led to a fierce debate over the years within the educational research community, policy making institutions, and the public. *Busing U.S.A.* (1979) explains some of the initial differences within the educational research community. Coleman, Armor, and Ravitch argued that desegregation exacerbated white flight; while Pettigrew, Green, Rossell, Hawley, Willie, and Orfield did not believe that desegregation caused white flight. The discussion on white flight reached a feverish pitch because major desegregation strategies such as busing loomed in the balance.

As Rossell defected to the camp believing that mandatory desegregation plans contribute to white flight, she used a new concept to evaluate desegregation plans. She used interracial exposure, not merely racial balance, as the concept in evaluating desegregation plans (Rossell 1990). She recognized that school systems could achieve perfect racial balance within their schools and still not have meaningful levels of interracial exposure. In other words, a mandatory desegregation plan that bused children in a manner that achieved perfect racial balance may contribute to such white flight that there would be less interracial exposure than prior to the desegregation plan.

The desegregation problem is encapsulated by two competing strategies: making a plan that enforces racial balance, and making a plan that stops white flight. In explaining the difficulty of putting both strategies in a plan, Rossell states, “If one were to consider only white flight costs, the desegregation decision would always be to do nothing, since that produces the least white flight (1990 p. 71).” Voluntary desegregation plans try to
include the components of racial balance within a choice framework that reduces white flight.

Source of the Problem

The segregation problem is not a static problem that was solved once and for all with mandatory desegregation plans. Nor will it be solved once and for all with voluntary plans. The source of our continued segregation problems is our changing demographics. Table 1-1, copied from Orfield et. al. (1997), shows the changing racial makeup of our public schools.

Table 1-1
Public School Enrollment Changes, 1968-94
(In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>+3.57 (178%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglos</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>-6.24 (-18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>+0.85 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although Table 1 does show the quickly changing demographics of our public schools from a national perspective, it does not show the intensity of demographic changes in certain areas. Five states already have a majority of non-white students, including the two most populous states, California and Texas (Orfield, et.al. 1997). Within these states and the rest of the nation, minorities are continuing to concentrate in urban areas.
With the changing demographic patterns and desegregation policies, the nation is beginning to slip back toward an increase in school segregation. Orfield et. al. stated, "Overall, the level of black segregation in U.S. schools is increasing slowly, continuing an historic reversal first apparent in the 1991 enrollment statistics (1997).” Many urban districts struggle to maintain desegregation goals with the challenges brought by tremendous demographic changes.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to describe how high schools in an urban district implemented new magnet programs, and to examine the results brought about at each of the high schools in terms of desegregation and school improvement. Through case study research methods, the study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. How have high schools in EBR implemented new magnet programs?
2. What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of desegregation?
3. What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of school improvement?

   A. What are the attitudinal changes of the teachers and students?
   B. What are the behavioral changes of the teachers and students?
   C. What are the cognitive changes of the students?

**Importance of the problem**

As urban districts continue to segregate into islands of poor minorities, the problem of desegregation and school improvement is becoming one of the most crucial
problems of our society. The literature review suggests that desegregation brings positive social outcomes to black students. Schofield (1995) and Wells (1995) both stress the importance of this finding in their literature reviews of the benefits of desegregation. Understanding how desegregation can bring positive social outcomes to minority students should bring about better desegregation implementation strategies. Also, the magnitude of changing demographics may force us to consider additional forms of school improvement that can be implemented in geographical areas where desegregation is not found to be politically or economically viable.

Mandatory desegregation plans have been found to exacerbate white flight (Rossell 1990). Magnet school plans have become a widely used strategy in trying to voluntarily desegregate schools without increasing white flight from the areas being desegregated. By learning more about how magnet school programs are implemented and the results they obtain, educational policy makers and leaders can make educated decisions in developing desegregation plans that include voluntary components. This knowledge may help schools, principals and teachers develop methods that will enhance racial balance while at the same time improving student achievement.

**Summary of Chapters**

Chapter 2 provides a review of selected literature dealing with desegregation. This literature review has four parts: (1) the history of school desegregation litigation, (2) an overview of the literature on the benefits of school desegregation, and (3) a review of the literature on desegregation strategies.
Chapter 3 discusses East Baton Rouge Parish School System as it has attempted to desegregate its schools over the past 45 years. The main emphasis of this chapter is to provide the context of high schools in East Baton Rouge Parish from which case studies of three of the high schools can be written.

Chapter 4 discusses the methodology used to study how East Baton Rouge Parish high schools implement magnet programs and results that magnet programs have produced at the high school level in East Baton Rouge Parish. This chapter includes a justification for the research design, a description of the participating schools and the instruments, and procedures for data collection and analysis.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 contain the case studies of the three participating high schools. Chapter 5 is a case study on Glen Oaks High School. Chapter 6 is a case study on Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet. Chapter 7 is a case study on Capitol High School. Finally, Chapter 8 summarizes, concludes, and makes recommendations based on the literature and results of this study.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

A vast literature exists about school desegregation in both the fields of law and education. The Index of Legal Periodicals contains over 100 law-related articles on the topic of desegregation, and the ERIC data base lists more than 300 articles with desegregation as a key word. This vast literature can be organized in numerous ways. Charles Teddlie (1995), for example, has divided the literature into four categories: legal, polemical, geopolitical, and social psychological.

This literature review was developed in the context of a study of a magnet school program in East Baton Rouge Parish School District, a program approved by a federal judge more than 40 years after the school district was first sued for racial discrimination. The literature review has four parts: (1) the history of school desegregation litigation, (2) an overview of the literature on the benefits of school desegregation, (3) a review of the literature on desegregation strategies, and (4) an assessment of the nationwide status of school desegregation 45 years after Brown v. Board of Education first decreed that segregated education must cease.

History of School Desegregation Litigation

Prior to the Supreme Court's historic decision in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), school districts were permitted to operate separate schools for black and white children under the "separate but equal" doctrine articulated by the Supreme Court in Plessy v. Ferguson (1896). In the Plessy case, Homer Plessy, a black man, challenged a Louisiana law requiring blacks and whites to have separate seating on trains. The Supreme Court upheld the segregation law so long as the facilities offered to both races
were relatively equal. The Court rejected Plessy's constitutional claim, ruling that "separate but equal" public facilities did not violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In later years, courts relied on the Plessy decision to uphold segregation laws in a variety of settings, including the public schools. Thus, by the early 1950s, segregation both in fact and law was a firmly entrenched principle in public education, particularly in the South.

In Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954) (Brown I), the Supreme Court did an about face and unanimously overturned the "separate but equal" doctrine.

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Court recognized that the implementation of this historic decision would bring about more complexity and issued further guidance in the Brown II decision.

A year after Brown I, the Brown II decision explained how and when the Court expected desegregation of the public schools to take place. The Supreme Court directed lower courts to develop desegregation plans that would require desegregation "with all deliberate speed." Several states tried different tactics to subvert the implementation of this ruling. Many questions were raised that would have to be settled in future cases.

Over the years, numerous cases have clarified the Brown decision's desegregation mandate. In Green v. County School Board of New Kent County (1968), the Supreme
Court pushed districts to dismantle segregated school systems "root and branch" with respect to facilities, staff, extracurricular activities, and transportation. Green involved a challenge to a school district's "freedom of choice" plan, which allowed pupils of all races to attend the school of their choice. These "freedom of choice" plans were common across the South in the early 1960s, and were offered by school districts as the means by which they met the desegregation mandate of the Brown decision.

In practice, however, "freedom of choice" did little to end racial isolation in most Southern districts. For example, in the Green case, the Supreme Court observed that 85 percent of black children in the New Kent district still attended all-black schools, even though a "freedom of choice" plan had been in place for three years.

In Green, the Court clearly said that a school district could not meet its obligation to desegregate its schools simply by enacting a "freedom of choice" plan. Rather than dismantling its dual system of schooling, the Court concluded, such a plan "operated simply to burden children and their parents with a responsibility which Brown II placed squarely on the School Board." The Court ordered the New Kent school system to formulate a new desegregation plan that would promptly convert the system from one of black schools and white schools to a system of "just schools."

Green was followed by Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg Board of Education (1971), in which the Court approved busing as a desegregation strategy. As a means of complying with its desegregation obligation, the Charlotte-Mecklenberg school district had assigned children to schools on the basis of geographically drawn zones, but that action had failed to bring about a significant mixing of the races. In fact, about two-thirds
of the district's 21,000 black students continued to attend schools that were at least 99 percent black.

The Court ruled that this state of affairs was unacceptable. In a system where de jure segregation had existed, the Court declared, a court was empowered to use busing as a means of achieving more meaningful desegregation. In addition, the Court approved the judicial alteration of attendance zones, even though it would mean that some children did not attend the school closest to their home.

Such extraordinary remedial measures might not be justified, the Court acknowledged, absent a history of intentional segregation of children by race.

Absent a constitutional violation there would be no basis for judicially ordering assignment of students on a racial basis. All things being equal, with no history of discrimination, it might well be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes. But all things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation. The remedy for such segregation may be administratively awkward, inconvenient, and even bizarre in some situations and may impose burdens on some; but all awkwardness and inconvenience cannot be avoided in the interim period when remedial adjustments are being made to eliminate the dual school systems (Alexander and Alexander p.434).

Thus, in Swann, the Court gave its approval to busing, to the alteration of attendance zones, and to school assignments by race in those cases in which school districts had deliberately engaged in segregation practices.

At the same time, the Swann decision signaled that there are limits to what a court can do to change the racial composition of schools. In particular, the Court pointed out that many communities are not demographically stable, and that racial composition of many school districts is likely to change. Unless a population shift is the result of
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deliberate governmental action, courts should not intervene to counter such a demographic trend.

Neither school authorities nor courts are required to make year-by-year adjustments of the racial composition of student bodies once the affirmative duty to desegregate has been accomplished and racial discrimination through official action is eliminated from the system ... [I]n the absence of a showing that either the school authorities or some other agency of the State has deliberately attempted to fix or alter demographic patterns to affect the racial composition of the schools, further intervention by a district court should not be necessary (Alexander and Alexander, 1998 p.434).

In fact, by the early 1970s, it was clear that the racial composition of many communities was changing dramatically and changing in such a way that the effectiveness of court-ordered desegregation plans was being undermined. Urban school districts, in particular, were becoming increasingly black in terms of student enrollments, as white families moved to the suburbs. In order to attack the growing racial isolation in urban schools, some desegregation proponents argued in favor of metropolitan desegregation plans, whereby largely black inner-city districts were merged with primarily white suburban school systems in order to achieve racially balanced school populations (Orfield and Eaton, 1996).

However, in Milliken v. Bradley (1974), the Supreme Court effectively vetoed metropolitan desegregation plans as a court-ordered desegregation remedy, unless there was evidence of deliberate segregation by governmental actors. In Milliken, the plaintiffs had argued for a metropolitan desegregation plan that would include the Detroit school system and over 50 suburban districts in the communities surrounding Detroit. At that time, the Detroit school system had a student body that was 80 percent African American,
undercutting the effectiveness of any desegregation plan that was confined to the Detroit school district itself. At the district court level, the plaintiffs were successful, and a metropolitan desegregation plan was approved by a federal trial judge.

On appeal, however, the Supreme Court reversed the trial court's action. The Court made plain that an interdistrict desegregation plan was not called for unless a constitutional wrong could be established. More specifically, an interdistrict remedy was called for only if it could be shown that the state, a school district, or a group of school districts had engaged in some deliberate act of racial discrimination that had a segregative effect on Detroit. Since the trial court had not been presented with evidence of a constitutional violation, the Court ruled that it had overstepped its authority by ordering a metropolitan-wide desegregation plan.

Apart from ruling on constitutional issues, the Milliken opinion expressed grave concern about the way a cross-district desegregation plan might undermine traditional notions of democratic government and local control. The Michigan educational structure involved in this case, in common with most States, provides for a large measure of local control, and a review of the scope and character of these local powers indicates the extent to which the interdistrict remedy approved by the district court could disrupt and alter the structure of public education in Michigan. The metropolitan remedy would require, in effect, consolidation of fifty-four independent school districts historically administered as separate units into a vast new super school district.

Entirely apart from the logistical and other serious problems attending large-scale transportation of students, the consolidation would give rise to an array of other problems
in financing and operating this new school system. Some of the more obvious questions would be: What would be the status and authority of the present popularly elected school boards? Would the children of Detroit be within the jurisdiction and operating control of school boards elected by the parents and residents of other districts? What board or boards would levy taxes for school operations in these fifty-four districts constituting the consolidated metropolitan area? What provisions could be made for assuring substantial equality in tax levies among the fifty-four districts, if this were deemed requisite? What provisions would be made for financing? Would the validity of long-term bonds be jeopardized unless approved by all of the component districts as well as the State? What body would determine that portion of the curricula now left to the discretion of local school boards? Who would establish attendance zones, purchase school equipment, locate and construct new schools, and indeed attend to all the myriad day-to-day decisions that are necessary to school operations affecting potentially more than three-quarters of a million pupils?

As many commentators have noted, the Supreme Court's Milliken decision substantially restricted the federal courts from developing desegregation plans that would address the racial isolation of many inner-city school districts, particularly in the North. In the years to come, student populations in many of these urban systems became overwhelmingly black, while the suburban districts that ringed the urban cores maintained largely white student bodies.

In Milliken II (1977), the Supreme Court elaborated on the kinds of remedies that were available to federal judges in desegregation cases. In addition to busing, courts
could order that special programs be established, programs designed to remediate the harmful effects of past segregation. As Alexander and Alexander (1998, p. 481) pointed out, such remedies could be extensive and costly. In Kansas City, for example, the state of Missouri and the Kansas City school district spent over a half billion dollars in programs and facilities construction in an effort to overcome the effects of past racial discrimination in the Kansas City schools (Mawdsley, 1995).

In the 1970s, the Supreme Court issued more opinions on the scope of school desegregation. By this time, school districts that had been under federal desegregation orders were beginning to petition courts to dissolve these orders. In determining whether such relief was appropriate, courts were required to determine if a particular school system had achieved "unitary" status. Unitary status was defined as the condition a school district achieves "when it no longer discriminates between school children on the basis of race" or a system's status when it has affirmatively removed all vestiges of race discrimination from a formerly segregated school system (Alexander and Alexander, 1998, p. 470, citing Columbus Board of Education v. Penick (1979)). In determining whether a school district had obtained unitary status, courts were required to look at several factors: (1) student assignment, (2) faculty, (3) staff, (4) transportation, (5) facilities, and (6) student activities.

One question that arose in these questions was whether a school district was required to achieve unitary status for all six factors, or whether unitary status could be achieved gradually, as a school district satisfied the criteria for unitary status for some of the six factors. In 1979, the Court ruled that an incremental approach was acceptable.
(Freeman v. Pitts). In a 1976 case, the Court ruled that a court was not empowered to annually adjust a school district's attendance zones, once it was established that the district's desegregation plan had achieved racial neutrality in students' school assignments (Pasadena City Board of Education v. Spangler, 1976).

In the Oklahoma City case, the Court emphasized that judicial oversight of school districts should not go on indefinitely. Once a district could show that it had complied in good faith with a court desegregation order and that the vestiges of past discrimination had been remedied, a court should allow the school district to resume control of its affairs without judicial supervision (Board of Oklahoma City Public Schools v. Dowell, 1991).

Recently, state courts have been asked to deal with metropolitan desegregation on the basis of state constitutions. Fossey and Kemper (1998) give a detailed analysis of the Hartford desegregation case - Sheff v. O'Neil. In the Sheff case, the Connecticut Supreme Court ignored federal precedents, and made cross-district desegregation possible. By explaining that racial isolation, regardless of how it occurs (de facto or de jure), violates the Connecticut constitution, the Connecticut Supreme Court cleared legal obstacles to a metropolitan desegregation plan for Hartford and surrounding suburban school districts.

However, Fossey and Kemper noted, "...that although Sheff makes cross-district desegregation possible, it does not make it inevitable" (1998 p.30). After the Sheff decision, the Connecticut legislature took control of Hartford schools. To date, no metropolitan desegregation plan has been implemented in Hartford.
As urban areas become larger, poorer and more segregated, the task of ridding urban areas of racially isolated schools becomes more daunting. Desegregation lawsuits may shift from federal courts to state courts, as have school finance lawsuits. Watching some state courts try to solve problems that federal courts have been unable to solve in the last 44 years will be interesting, but it remains to be seen whether state courts will be more effective than federal courts at fashioning remedies for desegregated and racially isolated schools.

To briefly summarize the history of school desegregation from Brown to the present is probably impossible. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that in the years after Brown, the Supreme Court initially gave federal courts broad authority to fashion remedies that would effectively wipe out school desegregation and its effects. In addition to busing, the Court permitted federal judges to redraw school district boundaries and to order the implementation of expensive educational programs designed to eliminate the vestiges of past segregation. By the 1970s, however, the Supreme Court began defining limits to judicial supervision. Milliken I, in particular, sharply limited the power of federal judges to attack the problem of racially isolated urban school districts. In that decision, the Supreme Court prohibited the imposition of cross-district desegregation plans in the absence of evidence that state actors had engaged in intentional discrimination that contributed to the segregation of school children.

Benefits of School Desegregation

An introduction describing the purpose of desegregation is necessary in understanding the research dealing with the benefits of school desegregation. The
assumed purpose drives the research methodology, and the research methodology may drive the conclusions. For example, Wells (1995) believes that the large volume of short-term effects literature has had much more political sway in terms of policy making than what she considers the more informative small collection of long-term effects literature.

Looking back over the forty years since the Supreme Court's Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, decision and the twenty-six years since the Green decision, when more forceful implementation of desegregation policy began, many Americans refer to school desegregation as a "failed social experiment"—one that resulted in massive white flight, resegregation within desegregated schools, loss of jobs for African-American educators, and a greater sense of alienation among African-American youth. While many of these conditions exist in cities and towns across the country, their causal relationship to desegregation court orders is not always clear. In fact there is growing evidence of the more positive outcomes of school desegregation and a clearer understanding of the ways in which desegregation policy can be designed and implemented to assure that it fulfills the promise of Brown. (Wells, 1995, p.691)

Purpose of Desegregation

In discussing the purpose of desegregation, this paper will not debate whether legally mandated segregation should exist. That question was decided in 1954 with the Brown I decision. However, there are totally different perspectives on the purposes, effects, and implementation strategies of desegregation. Let us begin by outlining the various purposes of desegregation found in the literature.

Armor (1975) believes there are three main assumptions of integrated schools: moral and constitutional, educational benefit, and contact theory. How social scientists view these three assumptions contributes to the type of research done and the conclusions drawn from the data. Moral and constitutional ideals are the main force of all the other assumptions. There are social scientists who believe that moral and constitutional ideals
demand that ethnic groups be represented proportionally in all aspects of life, such as, schooling, housing, and jobs. There are other social scientists that believe that individual choice is the more compelling moral obligation, and that equal opportunity is the only moral obligation driving desegregation.

For instance, Metcalf believes that the purpose of desegregation “is integration, not improving schools.” Schools in essence become the chief part of the social engineering mechanism in integrating American society. Willie states, “In a pluralistic society, there is not quality education where there is not desegregation.” Again, the moral rationale, understood here as quality, is the purpose. Orfield and Eaton (1996) sum up the moral rationale for desegregation as follows:

Unfortunately, the framing of the issue in racial terms often leads both blacks and whites to conclude that desegregation plans assume that black institutions are inferior and that black gains are supposed to come from sitting next to whites in school. But the actual benefits come primarily from access to the resources and connections of institutions that have always received preferential treatment, and from the expectations, competition, and values of successful middle-class educational institutions that routinely prepare students for college. Segregated schools are unequal not because of anything inherent in race but because they reflect the long-term corrosive impact on neighborhoods and families from a long history of racial discrimination in many aspects of life. If those inequalities and the stereotypes associated with them did not exist, desegregation would have little consequence. The fact that they do exist means that desegregation has far more significance than those who think of it merely as “race-mixing” could understand (1996 p.57).

Others disagree on the extent of moral obligation. In the book The Integration of American Schools, Armor (1975) states “if two or more ethnic groups tend to congregate together in separate communities out of choice, I don’t think there’s any moral or constitutional mandate that those two communities must integrate; that they must be forced to racially balance their neighborhoods or their schools” (Harris and Jackson, 18
1975, p.143). He goes on to say that most ethnic groups in America, and other countries, tend to congregate in separate areas if their cultures are different.

Ravitch (1983) believes the moral argument started with the ideal of a color blind society and quickly moved toward the ideal of mixing the races. She sees this moral and constitutional ideal of desegregation questioned by opposing groups such as the community control movement. Although the community control movement failed to deter the momentum of integration, the revival of ethnocentrism continues to complicate the “melting pot” ideal of American culture. A contemporary example of this is the Atlanta public school system. Atlanta decided in 1973 to move away from concentrating on the ideal of mixing the races, and chose to have a black run school system (Orfield and Eaton 1996).

As the debate over the purposes of desegregation has continued, so has the discussion on the benefits derived from desegregation. The research on the benefits of desegregation has evolved with the discussion on the purposes. Originally the research focused on student achievement, but it has moved to social outcomes. The benefits of desegregation discussion in this paper will be organized into two parts: academic achievement and social achievement.

**Academic Achievement**

The big debate about the effects of desegregation on academic achievement began with the Coleman Report in 1966 (Coleman, et. al.). This report concluded that black achievement scores were higher in predominately whites schools. The reason was surmised that these were the only chances blacks had to attend middle class schools. In
1972, Armor challenged the Coleman Report's findings and claimed that the achievement test gap between blacks and whites did not close as a result of desegregation. Pettigrew, Armor's mentor at Harvard, attacked Armor's paper (Pettigrew et. al. 1973). Social scientists ever since have argued over desegregation's effects on student achievement (Crain, Mahard and Narot 1982).

Numerous papers and doctoral dissertations emerged with differing conclusions (Mahard and Crain 1983). Several of the studies showed increased academic achievement, others showed none, and some showed a decline. A review of the literature (St. John 1975) showed no definitive conclusion. Bradley and Bradley (1977) and Krol (1978) found that methodological problems of the studies made reaching a conclusion difficult. However, Krol (1978) did believe there was a general positive effect of desegregation.

Mahard and Crain (1983) did a comprehensive study by taking 93 studies on the effects of desegregation on academic achievement and doing a meta-analysis suggested by Glass and Smith (1981). Mahard and Crain concluded that desegregation is indeed beneficial, although it must begin in the earliest grades. They also found that the effects were strongest in majority white schools with a critical mass of black students. They suggested the following policy implications: early desegregation (starting at kindergarten), metropolitan desegregation, and desegregation in white schools with a critical mass of black students.

In 1984, the National Institute of Education commissioned seven researchers to examine the impact of school desegregation on African American academic achievement.
(Schofield 1995). Four of the researchers (Cook 1984, Armor 1984, Miller and Carlson 1984, and Stephan 1984) found no increase or decrease in the mathematics achievement of African American students. One researcher found a positive effect on math achievement (Walberg 1984). Two of the researchers (Crain 1984, Walberg 1984) did not distinguish between math and reading achievement.

All of the researchers that looked at reading achievement found that reading gains occurred. However, interpreting those gains are quite complex (Schofield 1995). The gain in achievement may not be followed by successive years of gain, and achievement scores may gradually shift back to the mean (Mahard and Crain 1983). Cook (1984) also cautions that mean gains are high, but other analyses do not provide such promising results. Cook noted that modal gain scores were near zero. Therefore, a few studies with abnormally high gains color the results. This may suggest that factors other than desegregation brought the academic gains. As Crain, Mahard, and Narot stated, “When a high school succeeds, it is not because it was lucky enough to get the perfect mix of students. ...in a successful high school, the principal and the faculty deserve the credit for its success” (1982, p.75)

Social Achievement

Schofield (1995) provides an extensive literature review on the outcomes of school desegregation. She outlined the research in three areas: post-secondary educational and occupational outcomes, the effects on African American self-esteem, and intergroup relations. In terms of occupational outcomes, she finds that attending desegregated schools appears to have some positive impact on the kind of post-secondary
education attempted by African Americans, and the kind of jobs that they attain. While she recognizes that these differences are small and sparsely supported, she believes that “...these outcomes are so crucial for individual’s social position and economic well-being that any reliable indication they are influenced by desegregation is of real importance.”

The literature dealing with the effect of school desegregation on African American self-esteem was extensive during the seventies, but declined by the 1980's (Schofield 1995). There were two main reasons this research stopped. One, the belief that African American children in segregated environments have low self-esteem, proved to be wrong (Cross 1980, Epps 1978, Gordon 1980, St. John 1975, Taylor 1976). Second, the major reviews of effects of school desegregation on African American self-esteem found no definite consistent impact (Epps 1975, 1978; Stephan 1978; St. John 1975, Weinberg 1977). Also, Schofield (1995) finds that the literature on the effect of school desegregation on intergroup relations yields “no clearly predictable impact on student intergroup attitudes” (p. 96).

Wells (1995) frames her review of this same literature in perpetuation theory developed by Braddock (1980). The theory holds that “minority students who have not regularly experienced the realities of desegregation may overestimate the degree of overt hostility they will encounter or underestimate their skill at coping with strains in interracial situations” (p. 699). She draws conclusions from the literature to support Braddock’s theory. She concludes that desegregated African-American students are better off than segregated African-American students in that they: set their occupational aspirations higher than segregated blacks; have occupational aspirations that are more
realistically related to their educational background; are more likely to attend
desegregated colleges; are more likely to have desegregated social and professional
networks in later life; are more likely to find themselves in desegregated employment;
and are more likely to be working in white-collar and professional jobs in the private
sector as opposed to government and blue-collar jobs.

Both Schofield (1995) and Wells (1995) suggest that more studies need to be done
on the effects of desegregation dealing with the social outcomes of minority students.
Although the research is sparse and considered inconclusive by others, the policy
implications are huge. The focus of research on the benefits of desegregation for the
future seems to be on social achievement rather than academic achievement.

**Implementation Strategies**

*Desegregating Public Schools: A Handbook For Local Officials* (Morgan, et.al. 1982) provides a useful table summarizing the desegregation techniques identified in
selected studies. Appendix A is a copy of this table. Interestingly, the desegregation
techniques discussed in the infancy of desegregation plans are still the methods being
discussed today. Although there are a myriad of different techniques as Appendix A
illustrates, the paper will discuss them as two kinds of approaches to desegregation -
mandatory plans and voluntary plans.

**Mandatory Plans**

Obviously, mandatory plans require students attending public schools to attend
certain schools in order to improve the racial balance of schools within a district. Of the
mandatory reassignment techniques found in Appendix A, four are most commonly
employed: construction of new schools, pairing and /or clustering, rezoning, and magnet-
mandatory schools (Morgan, et.al. 1982). These four techniques will be briefly
discussed.

New school construction will be looked at first. "The rationale for building new
schools is relatively straightforward: If the educational facilities are new or modern,
white parents may be more easily persuaded to send their children to integrated facilities;
also, by building new schools in neutral neighborhoods, commuting time may be
reduced; and finally, some older schools are simply not large enough to accommodate the
increased number of students due to integration" (Morgan et. al., 1982, p.42).

Pairing/Clustering is a technique used where two or more schools are grouped
together to form a single school catchment area. For example, a black school containing
grades 1-6 may be paired with a white school containing grades 1-6. In this example, all
of the students may attend one of the schools for grades 1-3 and the other school for
grades 4-6.

Rezoning school boundaries is another commonly used technique. In fact,
Hughes, et al. state: "This is the first technique that should be considered when preparing
a desegregation plan" (1980, p.54). Rezoning can be compared to gerrymandering.
Instead of carving out a section of voters for a voting district, rezoning requires districts
to be drawn in a manner that schools within a district have similar racial makeups.
However, the look of some school zones may look stranger than the political district that
earned the name gerrymandering.
Finally, magnet-mandatory plans may also be used as a technique for desegregation. Students have limited choices. According to Rossell (1979), they can: “(1) leave the school system, (2) accept the forced reassignment to a desegregated school, or (3) choose a desegregated magnet school” (1979, p.308).

**Voluntary Plans**

Voluntary plans were developed initially because they seemed more politically viable than mandatory plans, although some have argued that they are an attempt to avoid desegregation. Nonetheless, many new desegregation plans have been moving away from mandatory plans and toward voluntary plans. Voluntary plans use different enticements, as means in getting students to attend schools where they are the minority race. These enticements are normally found in magnet schools: more funding, better curriculum, and specialized tracks.

Rossell described the move toward voluntary plans in her book, *The Carrot or the Stick for School Desegregation Policy: Magnet Schools or Forced Busing* (1990). She makes the argument that voluntary plans cause less white flight than do mandatory plans; and therefore, provide for more racial interaction. Because the concept of white flight seems to be the biggest driving force in desegregation decisions, a discussion on this topic will comprise most of the explanation of desegregation strategies.

**The Debate About White Flight**

When the Supreme Court issued its historic decision in *Brown* (1954), ordering the desegregation of public schools, it did not explain how its order should be carried out. The Court's decision did not mention any specific form of relief. Instead, the Court asked
the United States Attorney General and attorney generals from the states to make recommendations about how segregated school practices would be dismantled.

In Brown II (1955), the Court stated that desegregation should begin "with all deliberate speed," but left it to the federal trial courts to fashion desegregation plans on a case-by-case basis. Some states attempted to close the public schools, while offering financial support to private schools (Alexander and Alexander, 1998); but the Supreme Court prohibited this strategy (Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 1964). Some school districts simply implemented "freedom of choice" plans, allowing children in their districts to go to whichever school they desired. In Green v. County School Board of New Kent County (1968), the Court made clear that such a tactic was only acceptable if it in fact erased the vestiges of desegregation.

Many federal courts relied on busing to achieve meaningful interaction among the races, and many redrew attendance zone boundaries as part of their desegregation order. In the Swann decision (1971), the Supreme Court approved these tactics, although there was public opposition to them in many American cities.

As the court-supervised desegregation process went forward some commentators became concerned about the movement of white families out of districts where school desegregation was taking place. In many school districts, this phenomenon, called "white flight," threatened to undermine the basic goal of school desegregation.

In a widely read and widely criticized essay that first appeared in the Phi Delta Kappan social science researcher James Coleman discussed research showing that white flight seemed to accelerate when there was a reduction in school segregation, particularly
in large cities. Based on this research Coleman questioned the wisdom of court-order desegregation plans. "[D]esegregation in some large cities is certainly not solving segregation," Coleman argued.

Ironically, 'desegregation' may be increasing segregation. That is, eliminating central-city segregation does not help if it increases greatly the segregation between districts through accelerated white loss. (Coleman, 1979, p. 126, reprinting Coleman's 1975 essay).

To deal with white flight, Coleman put forth two possible strategies. To deal with increasing racial isolation of urban districts, Coleman suggested that metropolitan desegregation plans might be in order. Alternatively, Coleman queried whether it might be better to slow down the process of reducing segregation in schools and accept the possibility that some urban schools will never be racially balanced. If the nation were to follow this strategy, Coleman maintained, "the focus in school desegregation [w]ould be on doing whatever is possible to slow the exodus of whites from central cities and to facilitate the movement of blacks to the suburbs" (1979, p.128).

Coleman's arguments were vigorously challenged on several points. Christine Rossell (1979), for example, attacked Coleman's core research findings, arguing that his research was fundamentally flawed. According to Rossell, "Desegregation under court order does not increase white flight, nor does massive desegregation in large school districts" (p. 215). Harvard's Charles Willie discounted the whole notion of white flight, claiming that there would always be enough white families in central cities to enable meaningful school desegregation to take place. Willie stated, "It is my contention that
there are enough whites in central cities now, and there will be in the future, to achieve meaningful desegregation of their public-school systems” (1981, p.126).

Perhaps Coleman's harshest critics were Thomas F. Pettigrew and Robert L. Green. In a piece that first appeared in the Harvard Educational Review (1976), Pettigrew and Green not only questioned the validity of Coleman's research but suggested that Coleman had allowed his personal views to color the objectivity of his research endeavors. In Busing U.S.A. (1979), the disagreements over white flight reached a feverish pitch. Lines were definitely drawn as Coleman, Armor, and Ravitch believed that desegregation exacerbated white flight in certain cases; while Pettigrew, Green, Rossell, Hawley, Willie, and Orfield argued that desegregation did not cause white flight.

Perhaps the arguments were presented with so much fervor because they seemed to be based as much on the moral beliefs of the researchers as on the actual data analysis. Rossell stated that during the late 70's and early 80's she believed, “...desegregation technique that was preferred by blacks but not by whites must be the morally superior technique...” (1990, p.xii). Coleman, speaking about the criticism on his white flight conclusions, stated, “I believe the force of this reaction stems from their recognition that when opposition to desegregation actions gains legitimacy, there is no longer a simple division between ‘good guys’ favoring any and all desegregating actions and ‘the bad guys’ opposing all desegregation, and then the policies must be judged instead on their merits”(1979, p.200)

Twenty years later, it is not necessary for us to resolve the conflict between Coleman and his critics. Rossell herself retreated from her earlier position that
court-ordered desegregation had no effect on white flight. She later concluded that desegregation plans did indeed have an impact on white flight, but that voluntary desegregation plans produced less of it than mandatory busing (Rossell, 1990). Willie's observation, that there would always be a sufficient number of white families in urban districts to allow significant mixing of races is no longer true in the 1990s, if it ever was true. In cities such as Detroit, Washington, DC, Cleveland, and New Orleans, student bodies are almost entirely African American. In those communities, most white families have moved to the suburbs or put their children in private schools.

However, from the perspective of hind sight, Coleman's concern, that white flight could fundamentally undermine school desegregation, was surely valid. As Orfield and Eaton wrote in 1996, many of the nation's urban districts are becoming more and more racially isolated, so isolated in fact that the Brown decision seems almost irrelevant in many inner-city schools. Although there are many reasons for this growing racial isolation, white flight and the exodus of middle class families from urban centers is surely at the core of the disturbing reality of all-black or nearly all-black schools.
Chapter 3 - Desegregation in East Baton Rouge Parish

Introduction

In order to place this study in context, this chapter will focus on the historical context of East Baton Rouge Parish as it has attempted to desegregate its schools. Douglas Davis (1999) provides a comprehensive history of the East Baton Rouge Parish desegregation case from its beginning in 1956 to the teacher crossover in 1970. Mathews and Jarvis (1998) provide a summarized history of the East Baton Rouge desegregation case up to 1997.

This paper will provide a summary of the historical process, followed by a discussion of the contemporary state of East Baton Rouge Parish as it relates to the 1996 desegregation plan. The literature suggests that districts have virtual plans within plans for their elementary, middle, and high schools (A New Desegregation and Education Plan (1996), The Board of Public Education for the City of Savannah and the County of Chatham Long Range Plan (1986)). The focus of this historical context will be on desegregation in the East Baton Rouge Parish high schools.

History of East Baton Rouge Parish Desegregation

Like virtually all-southern school districts, East Baton Rouge Parish schools were segregated by race when the Supreme Court issued its historic Brown decision in 1954. Shortly after the decision, some African American parents and 39 school children staged a demonstration against the East Baton Rouge Parish system, protesting the district's continued segregation (Jarvis & Mathews, 1998, p. 72). In 1956, black parents filed a lawsuit; and it is this lawsuit that is still pending more than 40 years later.
In a 1999 dissertation, Douglas Davis recounted the history of the desegregation litigation in East Baton Parish during the early years: 1956 to 1970. Davis organized this era into three periods: a period of resistance, a period of delay, and a period of attempted dilution (Davis, 1999).

Even before the lawsuit was filed, Louisiana legislators attempted to counteract the Brown decision by passing legislation that placed school segregation under the "inherent police powers of the state" to preserve law and order. This action led to a lawsuit in 1955, filed by the National Council for the Advancement of Colored People (NAAC) (Davis, pp. 51-52).

The parents' suit against East Baton Rouge Parish school system was filed in February 1956 and was supported by the NAACP. The State of Louisiana responded to this lawsuit by challenging the right of the NAACP to operate in the state, citing a 1924 law originally intended to stop Ku Klux Klan activity. The suit continued, however, and in 1960, Judge Skelly Wright issued an order directing the school district to desegregate and to submit a desegregation plan (Jarvis & Mathews, 1998, p. 72). The school district responded by submitting a "freedom of choice" plan, which did not include any affirmative action by the district to break up the racial isolation of African American children.

One day after Judge Wright's decision, the Louisiana Legislature passed so-called "emergency legislation" that created the Louisiana State Sovereignty Commission, which had the express purpose of preventing all forms of racial integration, including integration
of schools. The Commission was empowered to initiate investigations and to compel witnesses to testify in any proceedings that it conducted (Davis, pp. 55-56).

None of the actions taken by the state legislature, however, deterred the federal courts from fulfilling their responsibilities in the East Baton Rouge Parish desegregation case. In 1961, the Fifth Circuit upheld Judge Wright's 1960-desegregation order, although it did not set a date by which desegregation efforts were to begin.

As Davis explained in his dissertation, efforts to stop the school desegregation process in Baton Rouge continued at the local and state level throughout the early 1960s. In 1961, the state legislature passed a law increasing the number of East Baton Rouge Parish school board members in an attempt to pack the board with fervent segregationists (Davis, p. 63). In 1962, a Baton Rouge grand jury indicted some of the African American leaders who had been active in desegregation activities, charging them with defamation. This act was seen by desegregation proponents as a blatant attempt to intimidate and undermine African American desegregation leaders.

In 1963, Judge West issued an order directing the school board to prepare a desegregation plan that complied with federal court desegregation rulings that had been issued by the Fifth Circuit and the Supreme Court. Shortly thereafter, the school board began working on a plan, although some school board members publicly stated their opposition to desegregation. In June 1963, the board proposed to begin desegregating the schools by one grade a year commencing in 1964, beginning with the 12th grade (Davis, pp. 74-75). The NAACP opposed this plan, but Judge West approved its substance and ordered parts of the plan to be implemented in 1963.
Thus, school desegregation in East Baton Rouge Parish began after a fashion in 1963, almost seven years after the desegregation lawsuit was filed. According to Davis, the 1963 desegregation efforts resulted in only about one-tenth of one percent of African American students attending predominantly white schools.

In 1965, the NAACP asked the federal court to accelerate the desegregation process. In June, Judge West ordered the desegregation process to include all grades by fall 1968. However, this order did not require much affirmative action by the school board. Essentially, the judge expanded the number of African American children who could transfer to white schools as a matter of choice. No busing was involved and no redrawing of attendance zones took place. As Davis observed, "The East Baton Rouge School System . . . remained a dual system with Black and White supervisors, extracurricular activities, bussing, and administrations. In addition, all schools retained their designation as wither White or Black Schools" (1999, p. 84).

The next major legal development in the desegregation case occurred in 1970, when Judge West ordered the school district to move more aggressively to break up the continued segregation of school children by race. By this time, the lawsuit was 14 years old. In response to this order, the school board presented the court with a "neighborhood zoning plan," which included a process whereby white and black teachers would be reassigned to create more racial diversity in the teaching staff (Davis, p. 85, Jarvis & Mathews, p. 72-73). The federal court approved this plan.

The 1970 plan did not satisfy the plaintiffs in the litigation, and in 1974, they asked the court to provide further relief. The court denied this request and ruled that the
district was now operating a "unitary" school system that did not contribute to segregation of children by race. This ruling was appealed by the plaintiffs and reversed by the Fifth Circuit (Jarvis & Mathews, pp. 73).

All this litigation, stretching over many years did not truly desegregate the East Baton Rouge Parish school system. In 1979, the U. S. Justice Department intervened in the lawsuit on the side of the plaintiffs and asked the court to rule that the district was not in fact operating a unitary school system.

In a 1980 decision, the court agreed with the Justice Department, pointing out that 67 of the school district's 113 schools had more than 90% one-race student population. The court ordered the school district to submit a new desegregation plan (Jarvis and Mathews, p. 73, citing Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board, 1980). As a result of this order, the school board went back to the drawing board to create a new desegregation plan. The plaintiffs and the Justice Department also prepared a plan. The court ordered the parties to negotiate in an attempt to develop a plan they could both endorse. However, in April 1981, the parties reported to the court that agreement was impossible (Jarvis and Mathews, p. 74).

Shortly thereafter, the court issued its own desegregation plan. This plan was intended to achieve the desegregation of the elementary schools during the 1981-1982 school year. The judge ordered some schools closed, and ordered the remaining elementary schools to be paired in such a way that black and white elementary school children would begin going to school together. The court also transformed several
middle schools into single grade or double grade centers in an effort to desegregate them (Jarvis and Mathews, pp. 74-75).

The final result, approved by the Fifth Circuit in 1983, became the basis for the school district's desegregation obligations for the next 15 years. Although the 1981 order was modified from time to time in the succeeding years, the order remained essentially intact until the court approved a new, comprehensive desegregation plan for the district in 1996.

As the years went by, however, dissatisfaction with the 1981 order began to grow. There was abundant evidence, for example, that African American students were not thriving in the district. Dropout rates and suspension rates for these students were quite high (Fossey, 1995). In addition, there continued to be a high number of predominantly one-race schools and school environments where white and black students were separated. The district's program for gifted and talented students, which permitted gifted students to be schooled separately from the main school population, attracted one white middle school student out of 5, but only one black student out of 50.

Current Situation of High Schools in East Baton Rouge Parish

There are currently fifteen high schools in the district and one alternative school with high school students. Before the 1996 consent decree, two schools were set aside as dedicated academic magnets - Baton Rouge High School and Scotlandville High School. McKinley High School contained gifted students along with its community-based students. The 1996 desegregation order added community-based students to
Scotlandville, added magnet programs to Istrouma and Glen Oaks, and required Baton Rouge High to zealously recruit black students.

As Appendix B shows, there has been a dramatic shift in the high school student population from SY1979-80 (the year before the first court order) to SY1997-98 (the year the 1996 court order was implemented at the high school level). Over the time period from 1979 to 1998, the percentage of the public white high school students in East Baton Rouge Parish dropped from 61% to 44%. That number has fallen to 42.9% in SY1998-99.

From 1996 to 1997, the year that the mandatory plan was replaced by a voluntary plan, the public white high school students dropped from 45.8% to 44.4% of the public high school students in East Baton Rouge Parish (see Appendix C). However, the high school percentages of white students are still higher than the elementary and middle school numbers. Table 3-1 shows the white enrollment rates at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels for SY1995-96 and SY1998-99.

Table 3-1
White Enrollment Percentages (SY1995-96 and SY1998-99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>SY1995-96</th>
<th>SY1998-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In SY1995-96, the white percentage at the high school level was 46% compared to 37% at the middle school level and 36% at the elementary level. In SY1998-99, the white
percentage at the high school level was 42.9% compared to 33.6% at the middle school level and 30.6% at the elementary level.

Rossell's (1998) latest work gives some limited hope for the stabilization of white flight from East Baton Rouge public schools. She showed that white flight was actually reversed in Savannah-Chatham and dramatically slowed in Stockton as a result of discarding a mandatory desegregation plan for a voluntary desegregation plan. She further explained that the results were better in Savannah-Chatham because the racial makeup of the district was just over 50% white, but the racial makeup of the Stockton district was less than 30%. East Baton Rouge's student body racial makeup falls in between that of Savannah-Chatham and Stockton.

East Baton Rouge Parish's experience under the 1996 court order seems to be similar to that of Rossell's two case studies. This similarity is expected because Rossell patterned the East Baton Rouge Plan (1996) after the Savannah-Chatham Plan (1986). Although Appendix C shows the percentage white dropping from 45.8% to 44.4% from 1996 to 1997, the number of white high school students actually increased from 6,836 to 7,011. The change in percentage was largely due to the increase of black high school students in the parish from 8,103 in 1996 to 8,783 in 1997. The reversal of white flight at the high school level during the first year of implementation of the new desegregation plan offers some hope of stopping the seemingly irreversible tide of racially isolated schools in EBR.

Not all of the results at the high school level look so positive. Appendix D shows the racial makeup of the EBR high schools from 1981 to 1995 and the projected 1997
numbers (from the 1996 desegregation plan) compared to actual 1997 numbers. Notice the dramatic differences from the projected and actual numbers. Using a standard 15% allowable deviation from the racial proportion of the student body, the number of racially identifiable high schools rose from 9 to 10 during the first year of implementation of the new desegregation plan. Mathews and Jarvis (1997) noted that during the 1996-97 school year, four elementary schools and two middle schools lost their racially identifiable status. However, the high school results were not so positive.

Interestingly, the high schools with magnet programs are not the schools that are keeping the white students in the parish. Table 3-2 shows the number of blacks and non-blacks enrolled in the magnet schools from SY1996-97 to SY1998-99.

Table 3-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>96-97 B</th>
<th>97-98 B</th>
<th>98-99 B</th>
<th>Goal B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotlandville</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from EBR Magnet Office

Notice that the number of white students in magnet schools has declined each year since the 1996 consent decree. The number of white high school magnet students went down from 1153 in SY1996-97 to 954 in SY1998-99. The new magnets were supposed to have attracted more white students to public schools within the district. Instead, the new
magnets attracted very few white students as Scotlandville declined by 159 white students, and Baton Rouge High declined by 96 white students. Baton Rouge High was expected to lose white students, but Scotlandville's decline was not expected by the policy makers.

The community-based schools more than made up for the drop of 199 white magnet students from SY1995-96 to SY1998-99. During the same time frame, the number of white high school students in the district climbed from 6,836 to 6,890. Therefore, the community-based high schools added 253 white high school students from SY1995-96 to SY1998-99 as the high school magnet programs lost 199 white students.
Chapter 4 - Methodology

Desegregation and school improvement are two issues that many urban school districts seem to be confronting. From the literature review, it appears that mandatory busing desegregation plans are gradually being replaced with voluntary desegregation plans using magnet schools as the tool for desegregation and school improvement (Orfield and Eaton, 1996; Rossell, 1997). Much has been written on the topic using districts as the unit of analysis in case studies as well as literature on the theoretical justifications for magnet schools.

The purpose of this study is to examine how magnet programs effect individual schools. The research questions are:

1. How have high schools in EBR implemented new magnet programs?
2. What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of desegregation?
3. What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of school improvement?
   A. What are the attitudinal changes of the teachers and students?
   B. What are the behavioral changes of the teachers and students?
   C. What are the cognitive changes of the students?

Unit of Analysis

This study differs from many of the studies discussed in the literature because it looks at the school as the unit of analysis. Most of the research done on magnet schools as desegregation/school improvement tools has focused on the school district as the unit
of analysis (Rossell, 1997). Some would claim that looking at individual schools is not proper because desegregation plans are written at the district level and not at the school level. I argue that although there needs to be continuing work done at the district level, individual schools are the places being impacted by desegregation plans and are the ones that actually implement plans developed by districts. Metz's book, Different by Design (1986), is a good example of gathering rich data on individual schools as they implement magnet programs.

Teddlie and Springfield (1993) found that district offices have little meaningful influence on school effectiveness (p.220). In other words, the people in a school (administrators, teachers, and students) determine the effectiveness of their school. In much the same manner, magnet schools, in a purely voluntary magnet plan, attempt to attract students of different races more on their own merits than that of the district.

The literature reflects opposing viewpoints regarding voluntary and mandatory plans and whether magnet schools should be used in mandatory plans. However, the literature points to the fact that our inner city school districts' student populations are becoming poorer and more segregated. School improvement becomes a larger issue while desegregation becomes less of an issue, because there are fewer white children left in inner city districts to integrate with minority students. Therefore, I believe the school is the proper unit of analysis for this project.

**Participating Schools**

Three East Baton Rouge Parish high schools were chosen for this study: two high schools with magnet programs, and one high school without a magnet program. Table 4-
lists the magnet high schools in EBR and provides information as to the choices of Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet and Glen Oaks High School as the two magnet case study sites used for this project. The data in Table 4-1 was taken from data provided by the Information Systems department in East Baton Rouge Parish Schools.

Table 4-1
Participating Magnet Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Designated or Program</th>
<th>Type of Magnet</th>
<th>Percentage of Black</th>
<th>Year of Implementation</th>
<th>Chosen for Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotlandville</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Academic Engineering</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main reason that the two schools were selected is that they are in their second year of implementing their magnet programs. Baton Rouge and Scotlandville have traditionally been designated academic magnets and McKinley has housed the gifted program. Of the three new magnet programs, Glen Oaks and Istrouma are very similar in their student populations in terms of racial makeup and SES. Baker differs somewhat in that its student population is only 72% black, and has more middle class students. Additionally, Baker is in the process of seceding from the East Baton Rouge Parish School System.
Capitol High School was chosen as the non magnet site because its student body is very similar to Glen Oaks and Istrouma. Capitol is 99% black and is made up of inner city students. Table 4-2 shows the two high schools with magnet programs in comparison to the non-magnet high schools.

Table 4-2
EBR High School Racial Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Percentage of Black</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Chosen for Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks *</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma *</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belaire</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmoor</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2 shows that Capitol is the only non-magnet school that has close to the same racial demographics as the two participating magnet high schools. Istrouma, Glen Oaks, and Capitol all have predominately black, inner-city students from the Northern part of the Parish. Several of the students have attended one of these sister schools as the students are somewhat transient.
Research Design

Yin (1993) stated, “case studies are the preferred strategy when ‘how’ or ‘why’ questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context” (p.1). The first research question - How have high schools in EBR implemented new magnet programs? - fits all of Yin’s criteria. A holistic (single unit of analysis) multiple-case design will be used. The unit of analysis will be the school. Although there was a short section on the history of desegregation in the district, it was only to set the context for the three case studies on schools.

A multiple case design was chosen over the single case design because of three main reasons. First, individual differences may occur at each site which would not be captured by doing a single case study. Second, multiple cases provide more compelling evidence and make the study more robust. Third, multiple cases allow for interesting comparisons.

The first research question was answered by doing case studies on three similar high schools in EBR; two that implemented magnet programs during SY97-98, Glen Oaks High School and Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet, and one that did not, Capitol High School. The case studies on the two schools with magnet programs will show how they have implemented their different magnet programs. The third case study on Capitol gives insight as to whether the schools with magnet programs did more in implementing their programs than a school without a magnet program.
Since East Baton Rouge Parish implemented their desegregation and education plan in SY97-98, it was interesting not only to see how the magnet schools have implemented their programs, but to see how different that is from a non-magnet school. The new desegregation and education plan required every school to develop a school improvement plan with input from the community, faculty, students, and administration. Doing a case study on a non-magnet school gave a broader understanding of how magnet schools are implemented. For example, comparing how Capitol implemented its program without the magnet school support structure to how Glen Oaks and Istrouma implement their magnet programs should yielded interesting differences and similarities.

The second research question - What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of desegregation? - was answered within the framework of the case studies. A section of each case study detail the longitudinal racial makeup of the parish high schools and magnet programs within the high schools. Magnet school results in desegregating EBR high schools are evaluated by looking at the raw numbers in each of the case studies and making inferences about those numbers.

The third research question - What results do magnet programs at high schools in EBR have in terms of school improvement? - was answered within the framework of the case studies. Attitudinal changes of the teachers and students were studied from data gained from principal/teacher interviews and student focus groups. Behavioral changes of the teachers and students are analyzed from data such as teacher/student absenteeism, student dropout, and teacher turnover. The cognitive changes of the students are studied by looking at the longitudinal trends of the LEAP scores.
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Data Collection

Three forms of data were collected: observations, interviews, and documents. Triangulation of data sources is a powerful solution to the problem of relying too much on any single data source or method (Patton, 1990). Each data source has limitations that are compensated for by using multiple data sources.

Observations

Each school had a total of 5 observations. One observation per school was general in which a physical setting was written to provide a context of that school (the additional observations and interviews will build upon this description.) Each school also received two class observations in magnet classes, and two observations in non-magnet classes. The observations were for the purpose of setting the context of the school and gaining an understanding of the difference (or lack of difference) between magnet classes and non-magnet classes.

Classroom observation data was collected on three forms: field notes, a time-on-task assessment form, and a school effectiveness and assistance program classroom observation summary form. Blank forms used for these observations can be found in Appendix E and F. Charles Teddlie instituted the use of these three forms as part of the Title 1 program evaluation for Louisiana. These forms proved to be very useful for two reasons. The forms were developed to measure school effectiveness which use the same indicators as school improvement. Also, two of the three schools in this study, Istrouma High School and Glen Oaks High School, were evaluated in the Title 1 program.
evaluation the year before this study was done (Taylor, 1998). Therefore, there was data from a previous study in which to compare.

Free flowing field notes provided the ability to capture meaningful data that is not specified on one of the other forms. The time-on-task form provided a good snapshot of how diligent the teachers were in keeping students focused on instruction. The school effectiveness and assistance program classroom observation summary form gives specific information about the quality of instruction the teacher provided.

Patton (1990) provides five dimensions of variations in approaches to observations: role of the evaluator-observer, portrayal of the evaluator role to others, portrayal of the purpose of the evaluation to others, duration of the evaluation observations, and the focus of the observations. Each of these variations will be addressed as they apply to this study.

The dimensions of the role of the evaluator-observer range from full participant observer to onlooker observer as an outsider. On that scale, my role was basically that of being an onlooker observer as an outsider. I stepped in the school and classrooms to observe, but did not participate in the activities. However, prior to this study I worked at Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet for six years as a teacher, technology magnet coordinator, and finally the Assistant Principal of Instruction. I resigned my position July, 1998, six months before the data collection period began for this study.

The dimensions of the portrayal of the evaluator role to others range from program staff and participants knowing that observations are being made, and who the observer is, to program staff and participants not knowing that observations are being
made or that there is an observer. On that scale, the observer was known by some, not by others. Teachers of classes that are being observed knew the role of the observer; however, teachers and students did not know they were being observed during the general observations.

The dimensions of the duration of the observations range from a single observation with a limited duration to long term, multiple observations. The observations for this study fall in the middle of this scale. There were multiple observations within a six month time period. The observations lasted approximately the time period of a class, which ranged from 50 to 90 minutes.

Interviews

Each school had a total of 7 standard open-ended interviews: the principal, the assistant principal of instruction (API), the assistant principal of administration (APA), and four teachers. Appendix K consists of the standard open-ended interview questions for the Istrouma and Glen Oaks case studies. Appendix L consists of the standard open-ended interview questions for the Capital case study. These interviews led to two more interviews with the magnet coordinator and vocational director both of whom had roles in the implementation of the magnet programs at Istrouma and Glen Oaks.

Two focus group sessions were conducted with students at each of the participating schools. One student group from each school was selected from the magnet program (except at Capitol where a magnet program does not exist) and one focus group from each school consisted of students from the regular school population. Convenience sampling was used to select the students for the focus groups.
The participants for the magnet focus group at Istrouma came from all four grade levels and had a mixture of black and white students. The magnet coordinator at Istrouma helped provide a diverse group of magnet students. Ten students (one-third of the magnet students at Istrouma) participated in this focus group session. The participants for the non-magnet focus group from Istrouma were again a diverse group of students in terms of grade level; however, they were all black. The non-magnet focus group at Istrouma consisted of twelve students from the student council and other student leader organizations on campus.

The participants for the magnet focus group at Glen Oaks came from one magnet class. The students ranged in grade level from 10 to 12. All seven of the students were black and were enrolled in the environmental and architectural design magnet. There were twelve participants in the non-magnet focus group at Glen Oaks. Eight of the students were seniors, two were juniors, and two were sophomores. The seniors were members of a guidance class and the other four students were picked by the guidance counselor to make the focus group more representative of the entire student body.

Since there was no magnet program at Capitol High School, the two focus groups were differentiated by academic skill level. One focus group consisted of the honors senior English class. This group consisted of seven students including one white student. The other focus group consisted of 8 students in a pull out program for students with reading deficiencies. These students ranged in grade level from 9 to 12.
Documents

Documents used in answering the first research question consisted of brochures, magnet curriculum guides, magnet interaction plans, recruitment plans, school improvement plans, and other documents that were found to yield helpful information. Documents useful in answering the second research question consisted primarily of the longitudinal racial makeup of the parish high schools and the magnet programs within the high schools. Reports from the EBR mainframe and charts from A New Desegregation and Education Plan (1996) were used as the primary documents in which to analyze the longitudinal racial makeup. The documents for the third research question consisted of data stored on the EBR mainframe consisting of teacher/student absenteeism, student dropout, teacher turnover, and longitudinal trends of LEAP scores.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed by writing case studies that use the program logic model described by Yin (1994). The four dominant analytic techniques described by Yin are: pattern-matching, explanation-building, time-series analysis, and program logic models. The program logic model strategy is a combination of the other three strategies. This strategy was first promoted by Joseph Wholey (1979). "He applied this concept to the tracing of events when a public policy intervention was intended to produce a certain outcome (Yin p.118)." The research questions for this project lend themselves to this program logic model strategy. In this study, magnet schools were created for a certain outcome - desegregation and school improvement.
Before writing the case studies, the large amount of data was organized by using Lincoln and Guba's constant comparative method. There are not specific indicators from the literature that were looked at concerning the implementation of magnet schools, because there is little written on how individual schools should implement magnet programs. However, the observations, interviews, and documents helped in the development of indicators that were compared across case studies using the constant comparative method.

**Constant Comparative Method**

Lincoln and Guba's constant comparative method was used to analyze the qualitative data from the field notes of the observations and the answers to the interview questions. The data from the field notes was unitized so that the information was divided into meaningful units. Then, categories were developed into which these units fit. The units were labeled with one of these internally consistent and mutually exclusive categories. There was a miscellaneous category for information that is an outlier or does not fit another category.

After the units of information were categorized, some of the categories needed to be collapsed into other categories. Categories were collapsed by logical connections and frequency of occurrence. If there are too many categories, the data will be too broad to analyze. However, caution was taken when collapsing categories so that rich information was not lost. Comparing the categories developed from the observations helped determine the similarities and differences of the classrooms in the participating schools.
The data from the interview questions were also unitized and categorized by question. The categories developed from observations and interviews at one school were compared to the categories developed from data from the other schools. The similarities and differences of the categories and the number of occurrences in each category gave rich data from which inferences were made.

Qualitative Component

In discussing the validity and reliability issues of this study, I will use the qualitative perspective in Mixed Designs (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998) which consists of trustworthiness, credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Trustworthiness is addressed by using a protocol for the case studies that can be replicated. Credibility is addressed by direct quotes from interviews and using key informants to provide feedback on the observations. Transferability is addressed by a detailed contextual analysis of the district and then the school, so that inferences can be made in a knowledgeable manner. Dependability is addressed by the researcher following the case study protocol so that consistent results occur. Confirmability is addressed in three main ways: by a thorough literature review providing a theoretical and contextual understanding of the problem, by addressing the other aforementioned issues of reliability and validity, and by grounding logical conclusions from this study in data.
Chapter 5 - Istrouma High School Case Study

Physical Setting

Istrouma is located in a residential area in north Baton Rouge. The present facility was built in 1951. The general area has experienced tremendous change since that time. When the school was built, it serviced mainly working class whites whose parents worked at the nearby petrochemical plants. Now, the school services mainly blacks whose parents have low paying jobs in the trades industry or have a single parent on welfare.

An example of the demographic change is reflected in local churches. Istrouma Baptist Church, one of the largest churches in Baton Rouge, moved its location well away from the neighborhood. The building was sold to a smaller black congregation that has had trouble maintaining the facility. Another Baptist church in the area consolidated with Winbourne Avenue Baptist Church, just down the road from Istrouma High School. Together the two churches are barely managing to keep the doors open at one facility. A dwindling Methodist church congregation is allowing Istrouma High School to use the bulk of its facilities for a teen parenting program. Numerous businesses in the area have closed or their buildings have deteriorated with little maintenance over the last several years.

Two blocks away from Istrouma is the Louisiana Technical College. This facility is a bright spot in the neighborhood. Several students at Istrouma take advantage of this facility for dual credit (high school and college) work in electives. There seems to be
great potential for revitalization in this area due to quick access to the interstate, the technical college, and the state Capitol.

The campus at Istrouma contains all of the infrastructure of a large high school: classrooms, office space, vocational shops, football stadium, baseball fields, auditorium, gym, and cafeteria. The bulk of the classrooms and offices are in a two story U-shaped building. Other than some vocational shop classes and the physical education classes, the concentration of the classrooms makes supervision of the large campus a quick walk. Many of the stairwells are made of marble, and the building appears to have been beautiful when first built.

When walking into Istrouma’s front door, one notices that the floors are clean and there is no graffiti. However, one also notices that age has begun to take its toll on the facility. Walking around the facility, one notices that the marble is discolored and paint in several places is peeling off because some of the roofs leak. When walking into the students’ restrooms, one notices that the boys do not have mirrors, stalls for privacy, toilet paper, or soap. When walking into the classrooms, one notices the abundance of computers. Every classroom has connections for computers and most have computers. All the computers have access to the Internet and software on a central file server.

Principal

The principal is a black man in his mid to late 50's. He is a former football coach and has over thirty years experience in education. He was brought to Istrouma about eight years ago as principal to restore order after a student was murdered in a knifing incident on campus. He definitely has restored order on campus and has a commanding
presence whenever on the hall. He eats lunch with the students and is very visible on
campus. He is very concerned with the education of all the students at the school. He
knows the students by name and knows most of the parents from his long tenure in the
educational system as a student and educator. In general, he delegates much of the
instructional process to his Assistant Principal of Instruction (API). However, he is very
supportive of the instructional program, and has pushed for new initiatives to deal with
the reading problems of the students.

In terms of the technology magnet program, the principal delegated the process to
one of his teachers, whom he pushed to become the technology coordinator and finally
the API. Once this person (the researcher) changed jobs, he again placed a person in the
technology magnet coordinator position that he trusts and who backs his decisions.

Magnet Program

The technology magnet program was designed by two people in vocational
education at the district level. They originally wrote a plan that would have cost about
twelve million dollars. However, the school board and litigants of the desegregation
court case asked these two people to reduce the amount of money to under a half a
million dollars and have the plan ready for court in two days. Thus, the magnet program
for Istrouma was quickly thrown together in the last minutes before the new
desegregation plan became law. The hastily-written plan became law and Istrouma was
given little outside help to make this plan work in the following school year.

The principal appointed a teacher to manage the magnet implementation process
and spread that teacher's classes to other teachers. A committee of teachers was quickly
formed to develop curriculum and set policies for the new magnet program. As the process unfolded, the vocational director supplied much more money than was originally budgeted, because more equipment and technical expertise were needed than had been estimated.

The committee of teachers dissected the desegregation plan and put all of the new courses required from the consent decree in four career paths: drafting design, computer technology, communications technology, and computer integrated manufacturing. They asked the district for permission to start the magnet program for only 9th graders because of prerequisites needed in the career paths. The district refused citing the consent decree. Therefore, the school was required to recruit students at 9-12 grade levels. This was one of several issues that the consent decree went contrary to what building-level officials recommended.

The committee knew that the magnet program had to have something to show prospective students and their parents, if it was going to recruit top students from diverse cultures. Therefore, a budget was hastily prepared and equipment was requisitioned. Much of the computer equipment was installed during the spring semester prior to the 97-98 school year. However, work was done all summer long in preparing the technology for the first year of implementation. Many teachers were involved in summer training sessions in technology, and others taught a technology camp for students. This technology camp became the best recruitment tool for the magnet program and also gave several teachers training on equipment in preparation for the start of school.
The committee felt that the only possible way of recruiting students for the 200 slots was to separate them from the rest of the student body. Therefore, policy was promulgated that required all magnet students to take honors classes in all core disciplines, and then, to remain grouped together for their magnet electives. In the process of making this policy, some objected to the segregation of magnet students from the regular population. They felt that the whole purpose of the consent decree was to desegregate, not find another way to segregate. However, after discussing the reality of recruiting the type of students to Istrouma that would be needed for the magnet program, the committee unanimously believed that this limited form of segregation was necessary to achieve the primary goal of more racial interaction.

**Teachers and Teaching**

Teachers and Teaching data will be organized in the following manner: a description of the faculty, data collected from the School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) Classroom Observation Summary Form, data collected from the Time on Task form, data collected from field notes, data collected from interviews, and data collected from focus groups.

**Description of Faculty**

There are over 70 teachers at Istrouma High. About 65% of those teachers are black and 35% are white. Fourteen members of the professional staff are currently uncertified (eleven are on 665 status, two are substitutes, and one is on a temporary certificate). Interviews with administrators reveal that the inability to recruit and retain the best teachers seems to be a serious problem in terms of the instruction in the
classrooms. Discussing this issue with other high school administrators and system personnel officers at a teacher recruitment fair revealed that this problem is not isolated to Istrouma. Other area high schools struggle to compete for a limited number of certified teachers, especially teachers certified in math, science, and special education.

As teachers moved during last year, Istrouma was left with half of its math and science teachers uncertified. Both of the foreign language teachers left, and were replaced with uncertified substitutes. Istrouma worked hard at recruiting teachers over the summer and currently have 18% of their teachers uncertified (14 teachers uncertified out of 79 professional staff). The fourteen uncertified teachers are in the following fields: 6 special education, 1 reading, 1 math, 3 science, 1 family and consumer sciences, 1 industrial arts, and 2 music teachers. All of the teachers teaching magnet electives are certified.

SEAP

The School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) Classroom Observation Summary Form gives specific information about the quality of instruction the teacher is providing. The specific components that are looked at are taken from the Louisiana Components for Effective Teaching (LCET) (Taylor 1998). The assessed teaching components are divided into two domains - management and instructional. Table 5-1 shows data from the SEAP for Istrouma High School. Scores consist of 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Needs Improvement, 3-Area of Strength, and 4-Demonstrates Excellence.
Table 5-1  
Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet SEAP Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Mag Average</th>
<th>Non-Mag Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizes space, materials, equipment to facilitate learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes a positive learning climate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages routines/transitions in timely manner</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages/adjusts time for planned activities</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes expectations for learning behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses monitoring techniques to facilitate learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Mag Average</th>
<th>Non-Mag Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses techniques which develop lesson effectively</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequences lesson to promote learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses available materials to achieve lesson objectives</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusts lesson when appropriate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents content at developmentally appropriate level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents accurate subject matter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates relevant examples ... or current events to content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates individual differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulates and encourages higher order thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages student participation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors on-going performance of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback to students regarding their progress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Instruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Domain

At Istrouma, the magnet teachers scored 2.92 on the Management components and the non-magnet teachers scored 2.58. This small difference with such a small sample does not provide much useful information. However, there was a large difference on one
component of the Management Domain. The magnet teachers scored a 3 on "establishes expectations for learners" whereas the non-magnet teachers scored a 2.

**Instructional Domain**

On the Instructional Domain, magnet teachers and non-magnet teachers were more similar with magnet teachers averaging 2.85 and non-magnet teachers averaging 2.73. However, there were three components of the Instructional Domain that showed big differences. Non-magnet teachers scored a 2 on "accommodates individual differences" compared to magnet teachers scoring a 3. Magnet teachers scored a 3 on "sequences lesson to promote learning" and "stimulates and encourages higher order thinking skills at the appropriate developmental level" compared to the non-magnet teachers scoring a 2.

In comparing the data collected in this study to the data collected last year in Istrouma's Title 1 Evaluation (1998), the total averages of the management domain were 2.75 in this study compared to 2.7 in the Title 1 evaluation, and the instructional domain scores were 2.79 in this study compared to 2.7 in the Title 1 evaluation. The Title 1 sample was much larger at 21 teachers than the sample for this project. The Title 1 data did not specify which observations were in magnet/non-magnet classes.

**Time on Task**

Table 5-2 shows data collected during the observations on the time-on-task instrument. Examples of off task, non-interactive time on task, and interactive time on task are given on the instrument seen on Appendix F. The magnet students were much more likely to be off task at 9.31% than the non-magnet students at 1.19%. Among the
students who were on task, magnet students were much more likely to be involved in interactive time at 22.45% versus the non-magnet students at 6.75%.

Table 5-2
Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet Time on Task Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Magnet Average</th>
<th>Non Magnet Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Time on Task</td>
<td>22.45%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interactive Time on Task</td>
<td>68.25%</td>
<td>92.06%</td>
<td>80.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Notes

The field notes from the observations revealed little more about the differences between the magnet and non-magnet teachers. However, they enrich the information provided by the SEAP. As the SEAP showed that the magnet teachers scored higher on “establishes expectations for learners”, the field notes revealed two examples. In one of the non-magnet classes, the teacher was using one student’s work as an example of how everyone should complete the project. He had the other students look at the work, so that they might emulate the work for their projects. In looking at the project, I noticed that there were several misspelled words and several capitalization errors on the project. Instead of having the student who finished his work edit his work, the teacher used the work as an example. The non-magnet teacher seemed to have low expectations on the quality of the projects.

On the other hand, a magnet math teacher expected her students to do homework, so that her class could use the results of their homework with an elementary class in
explaining how to solve problems. She expected the students to behave as they walked across the street to the elementary school and worked with the elementary students. The students met her expectations.

Magnet teachers scored higher on “stimulates and encourages higher order thinking skills at the appropriate developmental level”. In one non-magnet class, the students were working on word puzzles during most of the class that mainly use comprehension skills. In the other non-magnet class, the teacher had the students work on a project. However, the project required following a template instead of using creativity and thought.

The magnet classes were quite different. One teacher had the students use the Internet to research material for their term papers. The students used higher order thinking skills as they were going through the research and writing process. In the other magnet class, the teacher had the students apply what they learned by doing a project, graphing data from that project, and helping elementary students do a simpler version of their project.

Interviews

The interviews of the administrators and teachers revealed what attitudinal and behavioral changes the teachers underwent as Istrouma added a magnet program. Those interviewed included four teachers, the technology magnet Coordinator (TMC), the Assistant Principal of Administration (APA), the Assistant Principal of Instruction (API), and the Principal.
Attitudinal Changes

There were several attitudinal changes mentioned. Three of the teachers mentioned that their attitude has improved due to having students who are motivated and create few discipline problems. Two teachers mentioned that a community of teachers had developed that encouraged each other to work hard and innovate. One mentioned that teachers had improved their attitude toward technology and were always searching for more technology training. The APA mentioned that the magnet teachers have a better attitude toward change in areas such as block scheduling.

The API was the only one who stated that all the attitudes were not better. She called teacher attitudinal changes a “mixed bag”. She agreed that some teachers had better attitudes, but also explained another segment of magnet teachers. She explained that some magnet teachers had very high expectations of their students that were not being met, which in turn brought conflict. Some students who are “grade obsessed, but do not have skills” create problems for the teachers. Those students and their parents are used to inflated grades, and the teachers have a hard time communicating to the parents that their A student is making a C in a demanding magnet class.

Behavioral Changes

There were very few comments about teacher behavioral change due to the magnet program. However, three teachers mentioned that magnet teachers teach regular classes as well as magnet classes, and therefore, are incorporating new skills and teaching methods in all their classes. Also, one mentioned that the 9th grade magnet teachers have developed a community in which they share strategies and team teach unit lessons across the curriculum.
Student Body

Data on the student body includes the following: a brief description of the student body, impact of magnet program on desegregation, and the impact of the magnet program on school improvement.

Description

Istrouma has 1027 black students and 50 non-black students for a total of 1,077 students. Over 70% of the students are on free or reduced lunch which indicates the SES of the students. The vast majority of the students coming to Istrouma from feeder schools read well below grade level and have not mastered rudimentary mathematical skills. Several of the students are transient and move back and forth from other local high schools.

The freshmen class is always the largest class at the beginning of the school year. To illustrate, the freshman class this year has 353 students compared to the senior class with 179. After about six weeks, many freshman quit coming to school and the real educational process begins to take place in the freshman classes. The bulk of the problem children are weeded out before they reach their junior year, and teachers yearn to teach the upper level classes.

Of the 1077 students at Istrouma, 146 are magnet students. Table 5-3 shows the breakdown of the magnet students by grade and race that actually enrolled during the two years of the magnet program's existence. Out of 100 non black slots, 26 non black students enrolled during the first year of the program. Only 5 more non black students enrolled the following year.
Table 5-3
Istrouma Technology Magnet Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>9th Black</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>10th Black</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>11th Black</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>12th Black</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>Total Black</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desegregation

The impact of the magnet program at Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet on desegregation has been very small as shown by the numbers. The year before the magnet program started the student body was 96% black, the first year of the magnet program the student body was 96% black, and this year the student body is 95% black. The table above shows that Istrouma is having trouble filling the non-black slots. The numbers seen in the table show that only 31 of the 100 non-black magnet slots are filled. The numbers are very close to the numbers of the first year and show that the magnet program is not having a significant impact on desegregating the school.

Interviews

The interviews of the administrators and teachers revealed their ideas concerning how successful the magnet program at Istrouma is in terms of a desegregation tool. Those interviewed included four teachers, the technology magnet Coordinator (TMC), the Assistant Principal of Administration (APA), the Assistant Principal of Instruction (API), and the Principal. When asked, "Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a desegregation tool?" - all said, "No." However, the APA, TMC, and one teacher qualified their answers. The APA and teacher mentioned that there were students drawn to IHS that otherwise would not have come. The APA explained, "It is like saying
is a glass half empty or half full, because it did attract some whites that never would have come.”

Several tried to explain why the magnet program at Istrouma is not successful as a desegregation tool. One teacher said, “We are third in line behind Baton Rouge and Scotlandville.” This was echoed by the API who commented “there are a lot of private and public options; this is not a mandated option.” Another teacher said, “Overcoming a history. Public has been burned by trendy ways and have no confidence in the school system. I’m not sure this program has anything to offer besides equipment.” TMC believes the magnet program only needs time and that it will become effective because of the unique equipment of the school, and that as a magnet program it still offers comprehensive athletic programs.

A follow up question to the initial desegregation question was “What could be done to enhance the magnet program at your school, so that it would be a better desegregation tool (recruitment, staffing, funding)?” The responses were very similar. All of the teachers thought recruiting, staffing, and technology courses were critical in helping the program work. One teacher said that more students were needed in order to have more staff which would allow more technology courses to be offered that are outlined in the career paths. Another teacher said the courses had to be offered, and then students would come. Whether the chicken or the egg comes first, all agreed that recruiting, staffing, and offering technology courses are critical.

The APA said, “We need to get rid of school within-a-school foolishness and either become a dedicated magnet or go back to being a community school. We could
draw white kids if we were treated just like Baton Rouge High. We could probably put
Baton Rouge High out of business. But as long as we have so many special education
kids and a partial magnet it will not work. Either have it or don’t have it.” The API’s
comments were similar in that she believed students should be mandated to come to
Istrouma. She felt the school is doing everything to recruit students and it is not helping.

Focus Group Data

The two groups of students disagreed on the question, “Is the magnet program at
your school successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?” The magnet focus group
said, “Yes.” They believed that the program will attract more non-black students in time.
Several of the non-black students in this group explained that they would not be at
Istrouma if there were not a technology magnet program. The non-magnet focus group
said, “No.” They did not believe that bringing 30 non-black students to a campus of over
1000 black students is desegregation. One non-magnet student explained, “the magnet
kids are not in our classes, so we don’t see the white students.”

School Improvement Results

School Improvement in terms of the student body will be organized in the
following three parts: attitudinal changes, behavioral changes, and cognitive changes.
Attitudinal changes will be addressed by using data collected from principal/teacher
interviews and student focus groups. Behavioral changes of the students will be analyzed
from data on student absenteeism, student dropout, in addition to the principal/teacher
interviews and student focus group data. The cognitive changes will be studied by
looking at the longitudinal trends of the Graduate Exit Examination (GEE) scores.
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**Attitudinal Changes**

One of the interesting comments from the interviews was that there was no polarization of magnet students and non-magnet students. The magnet students did not seem to look down on the community based students and the community based students were not jealous of the magnet students. Two teachers mentioned that positive peer pressure encouraged magnet students, but that the positive peer pressure had not “rubbed off on the non-magnet students.” Another teacher mentioned that a community of magnet teachers and students took pride and pushed one another academically; however, not all the magnet students are pushing themselves.

The student focus groups reinforced the ideas mentioned in the interviews. The students had not seen any friction develop between the magnet and non-magnet students. The magnet students in general were very happy with the magnet program and explained that their attitudes toward school were better because of the magnet program. The non-magnet students did not see how the magnet program changed their attitudes about school at all.

**Behavioral Changes**

There were not a lot of comments from the interviews concerning behavioral changes of the students. Two thought that overall discipline and attendance problems had gone down. The APA stated, “The attendance and discipline of the magnet kids is exemplary. As for the rest of the kids, they are not a hell of a lot better.” Three others stated similar comments.
These comments from the teachers and administrators were supported by the student focus groups. The magnet students commented that the discipline was much better in their magnet classes than in other classes. The non-magnet students did not see any behavioral changes in the students based on the magnet program.

Student dropout, student attendance, and students suspended and expelled are three quantifiable attributes that can be looked at longitudinally to determine student behavioral change. Table 5-4 shows the student dropouts for the past six years. SY1997-98 is the first year the technology magnet program was implemented at Istrouma High School. One can see that the dropout numbers are mixed from SY1996-97 to SY1997-98. The 10th and 11th grade dropout rates declined, but the 11th and 12th grade dropout rates increased.

Table 5-4
Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet Student Dropouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>1995-96</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>24.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>24.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective with 1995-96, both regular and special education students are included in the calculations; hence, prior years' data are not comparable.

Table 5-5 gives the percent of student attendance for Istrouma and compares it to the percentages for Capitol, Glen Oaks, the district, and the state. The first year the technology program was implemented, the student attendance rate dropped from 93.21 to 88.13. The five percent drop in the attendance rate seems to be inconsistent with the
information provided from the teachers about the excellent attendance record of the magnet students. Seemingly, the high attendance rates of the magnet students would have pulled up the school average. After investigating the attendance issue further, poor attendance records are found to make comparing attendance data questionable.

Table 5-5
East Baton Rouge Parish Percent of Student Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td>86.62</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>87.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>92.04</td>
<td>93.86</td>
<td>90.45</td>
<td>89.66</td>
<td>91.69</td>
<td>89.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>91.22</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td>91.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>90.62</td>
<td>91.06</td>
<td>90.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)A standard attendance definition was piloted statewide in 1993-94; hence prior years' data may not be comparable.

\(^2\)Effective with 1995-96, both regular and special education students are included in the calculations; hence, prior years' data are not comparable.

Table 5-6 shows the numbers of students suspended and expelled from Istrouma during the last two years. There are no data available for previous years. The number of out of school suspensions dropped by a little over 4%; however, the other categories of suspensions and expulsions grew by almost enough to offset the decline in out of school suspensions. The in school suspensions rose over two percent and the expelled in school rose by about one percent. Out of school suspensions are suspensions in which the students not allowed at school and receive failing grades for class work they miss. In school suspensions are suspensions in which the students are separated from their classmates. Also, the students are allowed to make up class work in which they miss due to an in school suspension.
The numbers in Table 5-6 show that there has been no dramatic change in student discipline since the implementation of the technology magnet program. The principal and assistant principal of administration have remained stable over the last eight years which add credibility to these findings. Unlike poor record keeping with attendance and drop outs, these numbers seem to be reported accurately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-6</th>
<th>Istrouma Students Suspended and Expelled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended (In School)</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended (Out of School)</td>
<td>23.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled (In School)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled (Out of School)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-7</th>
<th>Istrouma Attainment Rates for Initial GEE Testing of All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comp.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cognitive Changes

Longitudinal Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) scores for Istrouma are found on Table 5-7. Results of this year's GEE are not available at this time. 1998 attainment
rates are from SY97-88, the first year of the magnet program at Istrouma. One can see that Istrouma improved on four of the five subjects after the magnet program was implemented. However, one can also note that Istrouma improved on four of the five subjects the year before the magnet program was implemented.

There are some concerns about making too many inferences from these test scores. One is that many high schools had total shifts in school populations from 1997 to 1998. The attendance zone that Istrouma had in 1998 is much smaller than the one it had in 1997, making the comparison in test scores more like apples to oranges than apples to apples. Secondly, most of the magnet students from the first year were in the 9th grade and did not take the GEE.

Although there are concerns with the comparisons, it is clear that the scores are generally rising. One can not say that the magnet program created the rise in test scores, but the cognitive level of the student body is trending higher. Interestingly, four areas of the GEE improved from the previous year in both 1997 and 1998. The only other year in which four attainment rates improved was in 1990.

When teachers were asked about cognitive changes of the students, there was a consensus that the community based students did not have any cognitive changes that resulted from the magnet program. All said that the magnet students score much higher on the GEE, which pulls up the school average. The TMC noted, “All magnet students passed the GEE on the first try.”
Chapter 6 - Glen Oaks High School Case Study

Physical Setting

Glen Oaks High School is located in a residential subdivision in the North Baton Rouge area. The facility was built in 1960. The general area has experienced a general decline during the past several years. Numerous retail businesses, including large department stores, have closed, and some restaurants have either closed or relocated. The main employer in the area is Earl K. Long Hospital. The neighborhood has shifted from predominately white to racially-isolated black. A 1996-97 SACS study reported that 21 percent of the parents had not earned a high school diploma. On the other hand, an average 27.5 percent had graduated from college. Most parents were employed in blue collar or service jobs.

The Glen Oaks campus consists of 48 acres with 14 separate buildings. When arriving at the school, there are so many buildings it is hard to ascertain where the main office is located. Facilities are in different stages of disrepair. Some of the buildings were almost completely refurbished on the inside from efforts of a local church congregation. Fresh paint, new floors, and new desks made those buildings look good. The boys' restroom in these buildings were in good shape. There were mirrors, stalls, paper towels, toilet paper, and soap - quite different from the boys' bathroom at Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet.

Other buildings suffer from leaking roofs. An interview revealed that students and teachers get drenched under the covered walkways during rain, and I experienced this myself on one of the observation days. There are so many dilapidated walkways that
renovating them would be a major construction project. In F building, teachers have to cover their materials with plastic during heavy rains, and often are forced to relocate to drier buildings.

Principal

The principal is a white female in her mid 50's. She was a business teacher in the system for many years before becoming the Assistant Principal of Instruction (API) at Glen Oaks. After only two years as API at Glen Oaks she became principal last year. She is businesslike in her appearance and style of administration. She does not seem to delegate very much to her two assistants - the API who started this year, and the Assistant Principal of Administration (APA) who started last year. In fact, she is about the only one at her school who understands the workings of the two magnet programs at her school. She worked on it when she was the API, and has not delegated it to her new API.

The Glen Oaks principal has earned the respect of her fellow administrators and teachers as a hard working leader. One of the interview questions asked, “What will the future be like for your magnet program?” One of her administrators answered, “With a strong person leading the battle like Mrs. Henry, it will work!”

The students, on the other hand, have another opinion of the principal. Both groups of students that were interviewed felt that the principal was “too hard with no fun.” When questioned further, the students explained that the principal “is afraid to loosen up and has no faith in students.” They gave the following examples: the strict dress code, the lack of pep rallies, and the lack of dances.
From the observations and interviews it is clear that this principal has made school safety a top concern for Glen Oaks. Some of the students complain about the strict rules and the lack of extracurricular activities. However, as one group of students put it, “This school used to be violent, but it has been quiet for the last three years.”

**Magnet Programs**

There are two magnet programs at Glen Oaks: the medical magnet program and the environmental and architectural design program. Glen Oaks is the only high school in the parish that was given two distinct magnet programs.

**Medical Magnet**

The medical magnet program was set up to be phased in one year at a time from Belaire High School to Glen Oaks. Therefore, there was little work to be done in implementing the new program at Glen Oaks, because the program already existed. Last year, ninth grade medical magnet students at Glen Oaks took one science elective from a visiting teacher from Belaire and were mixed in with the general population of students for the remainder of the day. This year, 9th and 10th grade medical magnet students are taking one elective from visiting Belaire teachers. Next year, the 11th grade medical magnet students will take a two-hour specialized course in nursing, dentistry, or health occupations. The following year, seniors will take a three-hour specialized course that includes clinical experiences with community health agencies or individuals. In two years the entire medical staff from Belaire will be located at Glen Oaks.

After talking to staff, I understood that many of the teachers in Belaire’s medical program refused to teach at Glen Oaks during the 97-98 school year. One of the teachers
who came the following year admitted, “I did not know if I would make it at Glen Oaks when coming from Belaire.” From the start, the medical teachers wanted the program to remain at Belaire. They were not concerned with the 9th grade program moving to Glen Oaks, because they feel the medical magnet should not start until the 10th grade year, and the heart of the program does not start until 11th grade.

Due to public criticism during the 97-98 school year, the school board asked the judge presiding over the consent decree to allow the medical magnet to remain at Belaire, or alternatively, to allow dual programs at Belaire and Glen Oaks. There was fear that bringing the medical magnet from Belaire to Glen Oaks would not do anything to desegregate Glen Oaks, but could potentially push Belaire into racial isolation as well. A meeting at Glen Oaks with concerned parents and community people expressed disagreement with the Board. Interestingly absent from the meeting at Glen Oaks were any administrators from the school. Glen Oaks administrators were caught between Board wishes and community wishes, and they did not know whether the medical magnet would be at their school during the 98-99 school year.

The judge decided that the medical magnet program must move to Glen Oaks in its entirety as the consent decree originally stated. During the 97-98 school year, the 9th grade magnet moved; during SY1998-99 the 10th grade magnet moved; and over the next two years the remainder of the magnet program will be moved to Glen Oaks. By school year 2001-2002 the medical program will totally be removed from Belaire and totally in place at Glen Oaks. A new building will be erected at Glen Oaks that will house the
medical magnet program and will be equipped with newer and better equipment than Belaire was using in their medical program.

The controversy over whether the medical magnet would actually move from Belaire to Glen Oaks created confusion with the medical magnet staff and the community. As a result, the medical magnet staff had a more negative attitude during the transition to Glen Oaks. Also, recruiting non-black students was hindered or at least not emphasized while policy makers decided where the medical magnet program would be placed.

**Environmental and Architectural Design Magnet**

The Environmental and Architectural Design Magnet started school year 98-99, the year after the medical magnet began being phased in at Glen Oaks. The consent decree established the program description:

The proposed magnet will be patterned after the existing CEAD (Center for Environmental and Architectural Design) program at Nease High School in St. Augustine, Florida, and the Environmental Magnet at Taylor County High School on the panhandle of Florida. We have commitments from three businesses/agencies in our city who will partner with the program. The Center for Energy and Environmental Studies at Southern University, headed by Director Robert L. Ford; Friends of Environmental Education with Nancy Roberts serving as Executive Director; and BFI Recycling Systems, Vaughn Meiners - District Manager, all have attached letters of support for this program (East Baton Rouge parish School Board 1996).

Besides the collaboration from the groups specified in the consent decree, another group became heavily involved in the acquisition of equipment and knowledge for the program. This group is made up of three companies: Greenbrier Consortium, Intergraph, and Wellsco. Harry Ingalls, the director of technology for the parish, made a fruitful contact...
with this group at a conference. Through this contact, Intergraph supplied 80% of the equipment needed for the start up of this magnet program.

The lead teacher for this magnet program, Ms. Major, is highly spoken of by district and school personnel. She is excited about her program and is optimistic about its future. She was involved in the implementation of the program from the beginning. The APA mentioned that the teachers involved in this magnet have formed a positive team; whereas, he feels there is more work to be done with the medical magnet staff.

Teachers and Teaching

The following data about teachers and teaching will be discussed: a description of the faculty, data collected from the School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) Classroom Observation Summary Form, data collected from the Time on Task form, data collected from field notes, data collected from interviews, and data collected from focus groups.

Description of Faculty

There are 69 faculty members at Glen Oaks High School this school year. About 49% of those teachers are black and about 51% are white. During the 1997-98 school year, 57.14% of the teachers had master's degrees or higher (1997-98 Louisiana Progress Profiles). Seven members of the professional staff are currently uncertified in the subject they are teaching (three on 665 status, two are teaching out of their field, and two are TTAO).

Interviews with administrators reveal that the inability to recruit and retain the best teachers seems to be a serious problem in terms of the instruction in the classrooms.
Discussing this issue with other high school administrators and system personnel officers at a teacher recruitment fair revealed that this problem is not isolated to Glen Oaks. Other area high schools struggle to compete for a limited number of top-notch teachers, especially teachers certified in math, science, and special education. Glen Oaks seems to be doing a little better than Capitol and Istrouma in terms of recruiting certified teachers. Glen Oaks has only three 665 status teachers compared to eight at Capitol and eleven at Istrouma.

SEAP

The School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) Classroom Observation Summary Form gives specific information about the quality of instruction the teacher is providing. The assessed teaching components are divided into two domains - management and instructional. Table 6-1 shows data for Glen Oaks High School. Scores range from 1-Unsatisfactory to 4-Demonstrates Excellence.

Table 6-1
Glen Oaks High School SEAP Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Magnet Average</th>
<th>Non-Magnet Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes space, materials, equipment to facilitate learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes a positive learning climate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages routines transitions in timely manner</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages adjusts time for planned activities</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes expectations for learning behavior</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses monitoring techniques to facilitate learning</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Management</strong></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Magnet Average</td>
<td>Non-Magnet Average</td>
<td>Total Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses techniques which develop lesson effectively</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequences lesson to promote learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses available materials to achieve lesson objectives</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusts lesson when appropriate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents content at developmentally appropriate level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents accurate subject matter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates relevant examples ... or current events to content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates individual differences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with students</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulates and encourages higher order thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages student participation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors on-going performance of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback to students regarding their progress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Instruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)

**Management Domain**

At Glen Oaks, the non-magnet teachers scored 3.25 on the Management components and the magnet teachers scored 2.83. One non-magnet teacher that scored extremely high skewed the results somewhat due to the small sample size. The magnet teachers only scored higher in one component of the management domain - “promotes a positive learning climate.” The two magnet teachers were attempting to make learning fun. For example, one magnet teacher had her class working in group projects that were of interest to the students. The other magnet teacher fashioned her class after the Apollo theater as students presented their projects. Non-magnet teachers went through the material in a more traditional lecture type style.

The non-magnet teachers scored a full point higher than the magnet teachers in three components of the management domain: “manages allotted time for planned...
activities,” “establishes expectations for learning behavior,” and “uses monitoring techniques to facilitate learning.” The free-flowing facilitating style the magnet teachers used allowed students to waste time between planned activities. The non-magnet teachers had specific tasks for the students to do that were monitored in incremental stages; whereas, the magnet teachers had the students do large projects with more independence.

**Instructional Domain**

On the Instructional Domain, magnet teachers and non-magnet teachers were more similar. Non-magnet teachers averaged 3.04, and magnet teachers averaged 3.00. Three components of the Instructional Domain were a full point different. Non-magnet teachers scored higher on “sequences lesson to promote learning.” Although much more traditional in nature, the lesson activities in the non-magnet classes were sequenced in a clear, logical manner. The magnet classes were much more free flowing with little logical sequence.

The magnet teachers scored a point higher in: “uses available teaching material to achieve lesson objectives;” and “relates relevant examples, unexpected situations, or current events to the content.” In all fairness to the non-magnet teachers, the magnet teachers are supplied with more materials than the non-magnet teachers, and the subject matter of the magnet classes is naturally geared to more relevant examples. However, the non-magnet teachers seemed very comfortable using traditional methods with textbook examples.
Time on Task

Table 6-2 shows data collected during the observations on the time-on-task instrument. Examples of off task, non-interactive time on task, and interactive time on task are given on the instrument seen on Appendix. The magnet students were more likely to be off task at 17.58% compared to the non-magnet students at 12.32%. Among the students who were on task, magnet students were much more likely to be involved in interactive time at 37.80% versus the non-magnet students at 5.41%.

Table 6-2
Glen Oaks High School Time on Task Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Magnet Average</th>
<th>Non Magnet Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Time on Task</td>
<td>37.80%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>21.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interactive Time on Task</td>
<td>44.63%</td>
<td>82.27%</td>
<td>63.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>17.58%</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
<td>14.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Notes

The field notes from the observations revealed little more about the differences between the magnet and non-magnet teachers. However, they enrich the information provided by the SEAP.

Interviews

The interviews of the administrators and teachers revealed what attitudinal and behavioral changes the teachers underwent as Glen Oaks added magnet programs. Those interviewed included four teachers, the Assistant Principal of Instruction (API), the Assistant Principal of Administration (APA), and the Principal.
The interviewees were asked, “Has the magnet program brought any attitudinal changes for teachers?” A few responded that they did not know. The API stated, “There is some jealousy between magnet and non-magnet teachers.” However, none of the teachers alluded to the idea of jealousy. One teacher said, “No, teachers don’t know anything about the magnet programs.” There was a general lack of knowledge from the non-magnet teachers about the magnet programs. Additionally, the magnet teachers knew little of the other magnet program. Although a few teachers were jealous of the new equipment the magnet teachers received, most teachers barely knew the magnet programs existed much less how they were equipped.

Another teacher coming from Belaire explained that she and the students have earned each others mutual respect. Before coming to Glen Oaks, she was concerned “I would not be able to make it at Glen Oaks.” In addition to hearing rumors about Glen Oaks High School, she and her fellow medical staff members were convinced that moving the medical program from Belaire to Glen Oaks was the wrong policy decision. Therefore, the medical magnet staff’s attitudes were not great for implementing a magnet program. As the APA explained, “We have some work in developing our medical team.”

**Student Body**

Data on the student body will be organized in the following manner: a brief description of the student body, impact of magnet program on desegregation, and the impact of the magnet program on school improvement.
**Description**

Glen Oaks has 1,025 black students and 10 non-black students for a total of 1,035 students. Less than 70% of the students are on free or reduced lunch, so the school does not receive Title 1 funds as does Capitol and Istrouma. This indicates that the SES of the students is a little higher than that of the other two student bodies in this study. However, several of the students are transient and move back and forth from other local high schools.

The Sophomore class is the largest class at 285 and the Senior class is the smallest at 183. The difference in class size shows that many students do not make it to the senior class. However, it is noteworthy that out of the three high schools in this study, Glen Oaks is the only school with a larger sophomore class than freshman class. Capitol and Istrouma lose a much larger number of freshmen every year than does Glen Oaks. Glen Oaks' students appear to stay in school a year longer before dropping in large numbers.

Of the 1035 students at Glen Oaks, 103 are magnet students. Tables 6-3 and 6-4 show the breakdown of the magnet students by grade and race. These figures cover the two years of the medical magnet program and the one year of the environmental and architectural magnet program.

**Table 6-3**
Glen Oaks Medical Magnet Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>9th B</th>
<th>9th NB</th>
<th>10th B</th>
<th>10th NB</th>
<th>11th B</th>
<th>11th NB</th>
<th>12th B</th>
<th>12th NB</th>
<th>Total B</th>
<th>Total NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B - denotes black students
NB - denotes non-black students
Table 6-4
Glen Oaks Environmental Magnet Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>9th B</th>
<th>9th NB</th>
<th>10th B</th>
<th>10th NB</th>
<th>11th B</th>
<th>11th NB</th>
<th>12th B</th>
<th>12th NB</th>
<th>Total B</th>
<th>Total NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desegregation

The impact of the magnet programs at Glen Oaks High School on desegregation has been negligible as shown by the numbers. The year before the magnet program started the student body was 96% black, the first year of the magnet program the student body was 99% black, and this year the student body remains at 99% black. This 1% non-black number is strikingly different from the 21% non-black number that Christine Rossell (East Baton Rouge Parish School Board 1996) predicted for the 97-98 school year. In fact, Glen Oaks has continued to march toward a total 100% black student body since the 1996 consent decree. Of the 10 non-blacks that are enrolled at Glen Oaks, I only saw one Asian student during my observations.

The consent decree (1996) estimated that there would be a total of 335 students in the medical magnet program. Of that number there would be 150 black slots and 185 white slots for a 55% white population for the medical magnet. As Table 6-3 shows there are a total of 65 black students and 2 non-black students currently in the program. Because the 11th and 12th grade medical magnet has not been phased in yet, there should currently be 92 white students in the medical magnet program. However, it can be seen that the consent decree estimation is not coming close to being met.
The consent decree (East Baton Rouge Parish School Board, 1996) estimated that there would be a total of 200 students in the environmental architectural magnet program. Of that number there would be 100 black slots and 100 white slots for a 50% white population for the environmental architectural magnet. As Table 6-4 shows, there are a total of 35 black students and 1 non-black student enrolled. Neither the medical magnet program or the environmental architectural magnet program has even started to accomplish the desegregation goals set forth in the consent decree (East Baton Rouge Parish School Board, 1996).

**Interviews**

The interviews of the administrators and teachers revealed their ideas concerning how successful the magnet program at Glen Oaks is in terms of a desegregation tool. Those interviewed included four teachers, the Assistant Principal of Administration (APA), the Assistant Principal of Instruction (API), and the Principal. When asked, "Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?" - all said, "No." Only two teachers attempted to answer why it is not successful. They both mentioned that the perception of the school being unsafe will stop the program from attracting non-black students. The APA and another teacher were puzzled why the medical program was brought to Glen Oaks when it attracted a diverse student body at Belaire and was a quality program.

A follow up question to the initial desegregation question was "What could be done to enhance the magnet program at your school, so that it would be a better desegregation tool? (recruitment, staffing, funding)" Three of the six explained that safety
is the number one concern of parents. The API mentioned that there needs to be a better feeder program into the magnet high school programs. The APA believed that more publicity, including highlighting the successful people that graduated from the medical program while it was at Belaire, would help. One mentioned that the “quality” of other classes needed to improve. Another mentioned that interest inventories done at middle schools should be tied to mandatory field trips to schools offering programs that interest students.

Since safety was the number one reason mentioned that is stopping non-black students from enrolling in Glen Oaks magnet programs, it is interesting that students and teachers all believe their school is safe. In fact, the students complained that the principal was being too tough on discipline, because the school is so safe. They believe that the perception of violence earned by Glen Oaks several years ago is no longer true. They realize that this false perception may not go away, making the reality of integrating Glen Oaks impossible.

Focus Group Data

When the two groups of students were asked, “Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?” - both groups said, “No.” The magnet group had three answers as to why: people are scared to send their kids here, people of one culture do not always treat others as well, and the magnet program is more work. The non-magnet group explained that students want to go where their friends are, and that Glen Oaks has a bad reputation of violence from years ago.
Besides the safety issue that was also mentioned by the adults, the students were quite frank in explaining that going to school with their friends was more important to them than potentially getting a more specialized high school education. They explained that there would be a very limited number of students who would be willing to go to a magnet program that consisted of: a school outside their neighborhood, a school that their friends did not go to, a school that overwhelmingly consisted of students from another culture, and a magnet program that required more work with higher standards.

School Improvement Results

School Improvement in terms of the student body will be organized in the following three parts: attitudinal changes, behavioral changes, and cognitive changes. Attitudinal changes will be addressed by using data collected from principal/teacher interviews and student focus groups. In addition to the principal/teacher interviews and student focus group data, behavioral changes of the students will be analyzed from data on student absenteeism and student dropout. The cognitive changes will be studied by looking at the longitudinal trends of the Graduate Exit Examination (GEE) scores.

Attitudinal Changes

One of the interview questions was, “Has the magnet program brought any attitudinal changes for teachers and students?” Several teachers made comments about the faculty attitudes which were mentioned previously. However, there were few comments about students’ attitudinal changes. One magnet teacher explained, “Some teachers are surprised about the difference in one of my magnet students.” Another magnet teacher said, “The students and I have earned each others mutual respect.”
general, the magnet teachers felt the attitudes of the magnet students had improved. However, the other teachers did not see a change in students’ attitudes.

The non-magnet focus group did not discuss any attitudinal changes of the students. The magnet group believed that the attitude toward learning improved in the magnet classes. They explained that the magnet program had higher standards for learning than the community based part of the school. One of the students stated, “In the community base, people don’t have to compete. In the magnet program there is positive peer pressure.” The magnet focus group believed that this positive attitude toward learning has rubbed off on some other students that want to get into the program.

**Behavioral Changes**

The interviewees were asked, “Has the magnet program brought any behavioral changes for teachers and students?” Four interviewees said, “I don’t know.” One said, “No, good kids do good things.” Another said, “Not significantly, but more positive...respect is high.” There was only one teacher that believed there was a positive behavioral change, and she did not specifically state what behavior changed. The non-magnet student focus group did not see any behavioral change. However, the magnet students believed that they were working harder because of the learning tempo of the magnet program.

Student dropout, student attendance, and students suspended and expelled are three quantifiable attributes that can be looked at longitudinally to determine student behavioral change. Table 6-5 shows the student dropouts for the past six years. SY1997-98 is the first year the medical magnet program was implemented at Glen Oaks High.
School. One can see that the dropout numbers are mixed from SY1996-97 to SY1997-98. The 9th and 10th grade dropout rates declined, but the 11th and 12th grade dropout rates increased.

Table 6-5
Glen Oaks High School Student Dropouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>16.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1In 1992-93, Louisiana was in transition to the federal reporting calendar; hence, prior years' data may not be comparable.

2Effective with 1995-96, both regular and special education students are included in the calculations; hence, prior years' data are not comparable.

The large changes in numbers from year to year make these dropout statistics in Table 6-5 look questionable. Richard Fossey found that many dropout statistics are inaccurate (1996).

Evidence abounds that school districts and even some states are reporting inaccurate dropout information... Inadequate dropout information makes it difficult to evaluated school reform efforts or to compare one school district's education program with another's. Understanding the dropout problem, which is common in big city districts, has concealed the crisis in urban schools, where as many as half of the students either drop out or graduate without basic skills. African American school children are probably most harmed by inaccurate dropout information. It is in urban school systems, where a majority of African American children attend school, that the contrast between published dropout reports and reality is most stark (1996, p.144).

Therefore, these dropout statistics give us little information in determining student behavioral change.
Table 6-6 gives the percent of student attendance for Glen Oaks and compares it to the percentages for Capitol, Istrouma, the district, and the state. The first year the medical magnet program was implemented, the student attendance rate went down from 91.69% to 89.92%. These numbers are very close and probably do not show any behavioral change that can be linked to the implementation of the magnet program.

Table 6-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td>86.62</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>87.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>85.57</td>
<td>80.72</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>90.49</td>
<td>93.21</td>
<td>88.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>91.22</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td>91.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>90.62</td>
<td>91.06</td>
<td>90.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)A standard attendance definition was piloted statewide in 1993-94; hence prior years’ data may not be comparable.

\(^2\)Effective with 1995-96, both regular and special education students are included in the calculations; hence, prior years’ data are not comparable.

Table 6-7 shows the numbers of students suspended and expelled from Glen Oaks during the last two years. There are no data available for previous years. Out of school suspensions are suspensions in which the students not allowed at school and receive failing grades for class work they miss. In school suspensions are suspensions in which the students are separated from their classmates, but they remain at school. Also, the students are allowed to make up class work in which they miss due to an in school suspension.
Table 6-7
Glen Oaks Students Suspended and Expelled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspended (In School)</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended (Out of School)</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>13.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled (In School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled (Out of School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of students increased substantially in every category of suspension and expulsion from SY 1996-97 to SY 1997-98. One would have anticipated that the discipline problems would have declined once the magnet program started; however, the numbers indicate the opposite result. One mitigating factor that may account for the change in numbers is that the Assistant Principal in charge of discipline came to Glen Oaks at the beginning of SY 1997-98. He may have had higher discipline standards than his predecessor, requiring more suspensions and expulsions.

Cognitive Changes

Longitudinal Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) scores for Glen Oaks are found on Table 6-8. Results of this year's GEE are not available at this time. 1998 attainment rates are from SY97-98, the first year of the medical magnet at Glen Oaks. One can see in Table 6-5 that Glen Oaks improved on four of the five subjects after one of the magnet programs was partially implemented. However, one can also observe that Glen Oaks improved on four of the five subjects the year before the magnet program was implemented.
Table 6-8
Glen Oaks Attainment Rates for Initial Testing of All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comp.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some concerns with making too many inferences from these test scores.

One is that many high schools had total shifts in school populations from 1997 to 1998.

The attendance zone that Glen Oaks has in 1998 is smaller than the one in 1997, making the comparison in test scores quite difficult. Secondly, the magnet population at Glen Oaks was very small last year and only included 9th grade students that do not take the GEE.
"Capitol High School is located on a 13-acre plus plot in a northern inner-city area. The attendance zone encompasses areas where crime rates are high" (School Improvement Plan 1998/99). As the title of the school illustrates, Capitol High School is near the state Capitol. Various governmental buildings are located near the high school. The housing near the school consists mainly of rundown wood frame shotgun-style houses.

Driving to Capitol High School, one notices that the school is enclosed by tall fences. From the outside, the school appears somewhat like a prison. The front of the high school has a white painted iron fence that connects all of the buildings so that no visitors can enter from the front unless they enter through the gate. The gate swings open about 15 feet wide and the fence is about 15 feet high.

Administrative offices are located to the left inside the entrance gate and the auditorium is to the right. Continuing straight ahead you enter a court yard filled with mature live oaks, crepe myrtles, magnolia trees, azaleas, and other trees and shrubs. Unlike the outside of the facility, the inside of the court yard is very attractive. There are several concrete benches positioned in inviting places to sit. In one area of the court yard a large concrete area has been sunk in the ground with three steps. This area provides a place for social interaction as students can use the steps for seats.

Looking straight ahead from the court yard is the gymnasium. Looking to the left in the court yard one sees the two story buildings where all the core classrooms are located.
located. There are no hallways on the inside of the classroom buildings. All classrooms open to the outside where there are covered walkways. For an inner city high school there is very little graffiti scribbled on the buildings, and none that is very noticeable. However, there are slogans painted on the brick walls of the outside stairwells leading to second story classrooms. Apparently, the slogans were painted by a parental support group, and all mention positive character traits such as respect, hard work, and honesty. There are also a few murals on some of the outside walls that are signed by art classes or art students from the past.

The third, and also the last, two story building from the court yard is being remodeled with state-of-the-art science laboratories. Money for these science classrooms comes from the consent decree (East Baton Rouge Parish School Board, 1996) which requires monies be spent on upgrading racially identifiable black schools.

During the remodeling process, science classes have been relocated in a building that once housed the Capitol Preparatory Institute (CPI), which held junior college classes. CPI no longer exists, and the building now houses the health clinic, the ROTC program, and the science classes.

Principal

The principal is a black woman who appears to be in her late 50's. She was principal of McKinley Middle Magnet School for about five years before assuming the principalship of Capitol High School. She has been at Capitol for the last five years as principal. She has over thirty years experience in education and plans on retiring at the end of this school year.
The principal is extremely warm and open. She invites as many people to her campus as possible. Many LSU and Southern students are on campus every day doing observations, community service, and student teaching. Two years ago when she was teaching some graduate courses for LSU in educational administration, she held the classes at Capitol High School. She speaks freely about the challenges of the school and also about the good points of the school. The principal speaks with deep emotion about the challenge of involving parents in the educational process of her students.

**Special Program**

Capitol High School is a traditional high school and does not have a specific program that is highlighted above all others. The methodology of this study includes the examination of a non-magnet school program that can be compared to the magnet programs at Istrouma and Glen Oaks. However, there currently is no special program. Teachers and administrators were asked, “What type of special programs do you have here, or is this a traditional well rounded school?” All seven said, “Traditional.” When asked further about special programs at the school, a few were mentioned.

The API mentioned the writing and math labs that were first in the Parish. The labs are used to bring up low student skill-levels in language arts and math. A computer teacher explained that his computer science classes always have a student who wins 1st or 2nd in programming competition. Another mentioned, “Coach Bates with football sets the pace here.” Three mentioned that there were good vocational programs such as bricklaying/masonry, agriculture, auto mechanics, COE, and DECA. Finally, several mentioned that the choir had been an exceptional program a few years ago. However, the
principal is planning on discontinuing the choir, because she is unable to find a good choir teacher.

None of the programs at Capitol are comparable to the magnet programs at Glen Oaks or Istrouma. Of the programs mentioned from the interviews, none of the programs seemed to be known or marketed school wide. Therefore, there will be no comparison of how a regular school implements a special program compared to a magnet school implements a magnet program.

**Teachers and Teaching**

The following data about teachers and teaching will be discussed: a description of the faculty, data collected from the School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) Classroom Observation Summary Form, data collected from the Time on Task form, data collected from field notes, data collected from interviews, and data collected from student focus groups.

**Description of Faculty**

There are 75 teachers at Capitol High School. 57% of the faculty is black, 38% of the faculty is white, and 4% is Asian or Hispanic. During the 1997-98 school year, 47.95% of the teachers had master's degrees or higher (1997-98 Louisiana progress Profiles). Fifteen members, or 20%, of the professional staff are currently uncertified (eight are on 665 status, one is on a TTA certificate, and six are on TTAO certificates.) This compares with about a 13% statewide total of uncertified teachers and about 20% in the East Baton Rouge Parish system.
Interviews with administrators reveal that the inability to recruit and retain the best teachers is a serious problem in terms of instruction in the classrooms. Discussing this issue with other high school administrators and system personnel officers at a teacher recruitment fair revealed that this problem is not isolated to Capitol. Other area high schools struggle to compete for a limited number of certified teachers, especially teachers in math, science, and special education.

Capitol’s fifteen uncertified teachers are in the following subjects: 5 in science, 3 in math, 3 in special education, 1 in social studies, 1 in English, 1 in music, and 1 in physical education. As can be seen, there is at least one uncertified teacher in all four core departments. With 5 out of 7 science teachers and 3 out of 7 math teachers uncertified, the educational quality of the instruction at Capitol High School is questionable.

SEAP

The School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) Classroom Observation Summary Form gives specific information about the quality of instruction that teachers are providing. The specific components that are looked at are taken from the Louisiana Components for Effective Teaching (LCET) (Taylor 1998). The assessed teaching components are divided into two domains - management and instructional. Table 7-1 shows data for Capitol High School. Scores consist of 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Needs Improvement, 3-Area of Strength, and 4-Demonstrates Excellence.
Management Domain

Capitol High teachers scored an average of 2.79 on the management components. They scored a high of 3 on two different components: "promotes a
positive learning climate,” and “manages adjusts time for planned activities.” They scored a low of 2.5 on “establishes expectations for learning behavior.” While the teachers seemed to have planned lessons in a positive climate, the expectations for learning were low. About half of the observed teachers seemed to accept student apathy and low academic skill level as a given.

**Instructional Domain**

Capitol High teachers scored an average of 2.71 on the instructional components. The teachers scored highest on components that dealt with teacher-student interaction. All of the teachers observed had good rapport or at least a common respect with the students. The class sizes were very small, which may have contributed to this student teacher interaction. The class sizes that were observed ranged from 5 to 16 with an average class size of 11. The teachers scored a low of 2.5 on several instructional components shown in Table 7-1.

**Time on Task**

Table 7-2 shows data collected on the time-on-task instrument during the observations. Examples of off task, non-interactive time on task, and interactive time on task are given on the instrument seen on Appendix. Capitol High School had the largest percentage of students off task at 16.49% compared to 14.95% at Glen Oaks High School and 5.25% at Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet.
Table 7-2
Capitol High School Time on Task Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time on Task</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>68.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interactive</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>16.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-2 gives more insight to the findings from the SEAP concerning low student expectations. Allowing 16.49% of the students to be off task is an example of not expecting students to learn. Half of the teachers had over 25% of their students off task during the course of the period. The other half of the teachers pulled up the average. These seem to be large percentages of off task behavior when class sizes are so small.

Field Notes

The field notes from the observations revealed little more about the teaching at Capitol High School than the SEAP and Time on Task information provides. However, they do enrich the information. As the SEAP showed that teachers scored low on “establishes expectations for learners,” the field notes illustrate this finding. For example, as one math teacher had students work on problems individually, she explained her expectations for her students. She stated, “I always thought that I could teach 11 students anything. I was wrong.” She further explained that she felt she was wasting her time teaching these students because of their academic apathy and low skill level.

Focus Group

There were two focus groups of students at Capitol High School. One group of students were seniors in an English IV honors class, and the other group of students were of various grade levels with poor academic skills. Two of the questions the students were
asked dealt with their teachers. The first was: “Think about all the teachers you’ve had at this school so far. What is it about them or their classes that you’ve liked the best?” The lower group mentioned four teachers. The characteristics they discussed about the teachers they liked the best were: helping us learn and pass the exit exam, pushing us to learn, making learning fun, and discussing life issues. The honors group mentioned two teachers. The characteristics they mentioned were: making learning fun, and treating us like we are her kids at home.

The second question dealing with teachers was: “Is there anything about the teachers you’ve had at this school or their classes that you really didn’t like?” The lower group mentioned four teachers again. One teacher was too strict and had no communication skills. Another teacher “seemed like she has a split personality - nice then mean.” Another teacher “doesn’t teach, just puts it on the board and writes you up if you ask questions.” The fourth teacher “has a bad attitude and does not care about the students.” The honors group only mentioned two teachers. One teacher “writes too many people up for nothing and you get in trouble.” Another teacher “came to class everyday late and does not teach.”

Both groups of students liked their teachers who made learning fun, pushed them to learn, and communicated with them in a caring manner. The students in both groups disliked teachers who exhibited opposite traits. The students agreed that most of their teachers did teach fairly well, but few teachers talked to them about real-life issues that they want to discuss.
One other group of questions pertained to substitute teachers. "Do substitutes teach your classes very often? Why do you think you have substitutes? What happens in your classes when there is a substitute?" Both groups of students responded very similarly. They agreed that they seldom have any substitutes. When they do have substitutes, "students run over substitutes and they don't teach."

**Student Body**

**Description**

Capitol has 987 black students and only 7 non-black students. The School Improvement Plan 1998/99 describes the student body as follows:

Several factors impact student achievement and school attendance. Parent's lack of involvement and participation was reflected in a nine-percent response rate on a parental assessment survey. The majority of our students come from single-parent homes and latchkey environments. Many of these students live with grandparents or other relatives. A large number of our students were socially promoted as required by the Pupil Progression Plan. Many ninth graders score below the national average on the CAT test and records show that they failed the 5th and 7th grade levels. School performance on GEE and ACT is low, and the failure rate in courses is high. Eighty-two percent of our students qualify for free/reduced lunch. Eighty percent qualify for Medicaid, and more than 80% are without insurance. Approximately 5% of our female students are parents, and approximately 3% of the females are pregnant. Apathy is high among students and parents. As a result, there is very little parental involvement, and there is a high dropout rate. In 1997, approximately 41% of our students were suspended and approximately 12% were expelled.

As is typical in many urban schools, the freshman class is the largest class at Capitol High School. To illustrate, the freshman class this year is 333 compared to the senior class of 163. In fact, the freshman class is almost as large as the junior and senior class combined. The small number of upperclassman compared to the underclassman exacerbates the lack of student leadership mentioned in the teacher interviews. Several of
the teachers mentioned that many of the best students are siphoned away from Capitol to
attend one of the magnet schools.

Desegregation

Desegregation will be organized in three parts: a brief description of Capitol High
School’s demographics before and after the consent decree, comments from interviews
with teachers and administrators, and conversations from focus groups with students.
Although Capitol was not involved in the process of recruiting students from other
cultures, the faculty and students shared their perspective on using magnet schools to
desegregate high schools in East Baton Rouge Parish.

Description

Although Capitol High School was the only high school slated to remain a
racially identifiable black school after the consent decree, predictions were made that the
number of non-black students would nevertheless increase. Table 7-3 shows the actual
numbers of students enrolled and the predicted number of students enrolled at Capitol
high School following the 1996 consent decree.

Table 7-3
Capitol High Enrollments SY1996-97 through SY1998-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Non-Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY1996-97</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected SY97-98</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual SY1997-98</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY1998-99</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One can see that the numbers of non-black students did increase from 4 in SY96-97 to 9 in SY97-98. However, the numbers did not approach the 32 estimated non-black students. In addition, the number of non-black students decreased in SY98-99.

**Focus Groups**

The one question asked to the focus groups pertaining to desegregation was, “Are the magnet programs at Glen Oaks and Istrouma successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?” The first group of students did not like the question. One student said, “Too many things are based on race. I like the idea of choice - all students should be able to chose; not based on color.” The group formed a consensus around the idea that magnet programs and desegregation tools should not be used synonymously. In other words, the students liked the idea of choice that magnet schools gave students. However, they believed that the desegregation case should be dropped. The students do not want to be forced to go to another school even if the 1996 consent decree fails to achieve any desegregation success.

The second focus group analyzed the question more closely. Since all of these students are in English IV honors, they probably all have the credentials to be accepted to a magnet school. They believed that Glen Oaks and Istrouma are not attracting many non-black students mainly because of the “bad reputation of the schools.” They gave some other general reasons why students do not select magnet schools: poor or non-existent sports programs, too much work (or at least the fear of the unknown), and long bus rides. These students agreed with the first focus group that students should not be
forced to attend other schools if desegregation goals are not met by the current voluntary concept.

**Interviews**

The administrators and teachers at Capitol did not have any specific questions concerning desegregation, but one question led many to discuss desegregation. They were asked, “Do you have any comments about the magnet programs at the high school level in the Parish?” All but one spoke positively about the magnet program concept. The one that complained about the magnet programs said, “The magnet programs take the leaders out of Capitol.” She felt that the student leaders who were needed desperately by the student body were being siphoned off by private schools and even public magnet school programs.

Of the rest of the interviewees who spoke positively about the magnet program concept, two mentioned that part of the implementation of the new magnet programs was designed rather poorly. They specifically commented on two of the magnet programs: the medical magnet that was moved from Glen Oaks to Belaire, and the dedicated magnet at Scotlandville that was changed to a magnet program that added community based students to the school population. They explained that it was obvious that Belaire and Scotlandville would change from desegregated schools to overwhelmingly black schools, and that Glen Oaks would not become desegregated due to the implementation of the new magnet plan. For more information, Chapter 6 discusses the move of the medical magnet to Glen Oaks in detail.
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As the interviewees talked about the magnet programs, several pondered on the ramifications if desegregation is not improved by the magnet programs. One teacher mentioned that Capitol could be paired with Baton Rouge High to desegregate. However, the rest of the teachers and the administrators did not seem to favor forced attendance zones based on race. They agreed with the students that the students and parents should be able to chose schools. One administrator explained, “Many students want to go to schools in their neighborhoods and should be allowed to. However, schools should be equal and have equal access.”

After he explained his position, the administrator was asked, “Does that mean you believe the desegregation court case should be closed?” He paused for a moment and explained, “There also has to be trust which has not been earned in this community. There must be safeguards for all students.” A paradoxical situation arose in many of the interviewees’ minds. Although many thought voluntary programs were much preferred to mandatory programs, they did not trust the community to provide equitable schools for all children. In general, the students and younger interviewees trusted the community in this regard more than the older teachers and administrators. The lack of trust in the school system/community became larger as the age of the interviewee increased.

School Improvement Results

In Chapters 5 and 6, school improvement results were discussed in terms of how magnet programs impacted Istrouma and Glen Oaks. The 1996 consent decree mandated other school improvement items besides magnet programs. Even though Capitol does not have a magnet program, school improvement will be looked at during the same time
frame of the initial magnet implementation (SY 1997-98) until the present. This will allow for Capitol to be compared with Istrouma and Glen Oaks. The organization of school improvement results will be: attitudinal changes, behavioral changes, cognitive changes, and improvement suggestions.

Attitudinal Changes

In general, teachers and administrators did not see a significant change in students’ attitudes since the implementation of the 1996 consent decree. This is not surprising since no significant mechanisms were put in place to achieve student attitudinal change. Academic apathy continues to thrive at Capitol High School.

Behavioral Changes

Of the seven interviewees, four believed there were virtually no changes in student behavior. Three mentioned that there was a change in behavior because one of four rival neighborhoods was redistricted to Scotlandville High School. Before the 1996 consent decree, students from Easy Town, Park, Dixie, and Banks all went to Capitol High School. When attendance zones were redrawn, Banks was given to Scotlandville. The students from Banks, besides being a rival neighborhood, were known as discipline problems.

Besides the qualitative data discussed, there are quantitative data that are useful in studying student behavioral change: student dropout, student attendance, and students suspended and expelled. Table 7-4 shows the annual dropout statistics. The dropout numbers are fairly stable from SY 1996-97 to SY 1997-98 with the exception of the 12th grade dropout rate that fell from 45.86% to 17.03%. The number change at the 12th grade
level is so large that the data loses face reliability. This is another illustration of Richard Fossey’s findings, “Evidence abounds that school districts and even some states are reporting inaccurate dropout information.”

Table 7-4
Capitol High School Student Dropouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>20.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>24.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>17.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-5 gives the percent of student attendance for Capitol and compares it to the percentages for Glen Oaks, Istrouma, the district, and the state. The attendance rate dropped from 88.36% in SY1996-97 to 87.53 in SY1997-98. As Table 7-5 shows, all three high schools in this study had a decline in their attendance rate for SY1997-98, the year the consent decree was implemented.

Table 7-5
East Baton Rouge Parish Percent of Student Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>92.04</td>
<td>93.86</td>
<td>90.45</td>
<td>89.66</td>
<td>91.69</td>
<td>89.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>85.57</td>
<td>80.72</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>90.49</td>
<td>93.21</td>
<td>88.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>91.22</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td>91.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>90.62</td>
<td>91.06</td>
<td>90.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'1A standard attendance definition was piloted statewide in 1993-94; hence prior years' data may not be comparable.

2Effective with 1995-96, both regular and special education students are included in the calculations; hence, prior years' data are not comparable.
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Table 7-6 shows the numbers of students suspended and expelled from Capitol during the last two years. There are no data available for previous data. The number of students out of school decreased from 33.62% to 30.10%. However, the other categories of suspensions and expulsions grew a combined total of 5.48%. Therefore, suspensions and expulsions as a whole were up approximately 2%. Out of school suspensions are suspensions in which the students not allowed at school and receive failing grades for class work they miss. In school suspensions are suspensions in which the students are separated from their classmates. Also, the students are allowed to make up class work in which they miss due to an in school suspension.

Table 7-6
Capitol’s Students Suspended and Expelled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspended (In School)</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended (Out of School)</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled (In School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled (Out of School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-7
Capitol Attainment Rates for Initial GEE Testing of all Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comp.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social St.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cognitive Changes

Longitudinal Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) scores for Capitol are found on Table 7-7. Results of this year's GEE scores are not available at this time. 1998 attainment rates are from SY97-98, the first year of the implementation of the magnet programs at the high school level. One can see in Table 7-7 that Capitol improved on all five subjects from 1997 to 1998.

There are some concerns with making too many inferences from these test scores. One is that many high schools had total major population shifts from 1997 to 1998. The attendance zone that Capitol had in 1998 is smaller than the one in 1997, making the comparison in test scores quite difficult. However, Capitol's population profile did not change that much; its attendance zone simply shrank. The across the board rise in test scores provides a bright spot in Capitol's dismal academic achievements.

During the interviews with teachers and administrators, several mentioned that the establishment of the School Improvement Team (SIT) focused the school on improving GEE scores. The SIT seemed to help the faculty work together toward the goal of improving test scores. In addition, Title I monies, instructional equity funds from the consent decree, and other small sources contributed resources that seemed to energize the teachers to work toward the unified goal.
Chapter 8 - Conclusions and Recommendations

Overview

The purpose of this study was to describe how high schools in an urban district implemented court approved magnet programs, and to examine the results brought about at each of the high schools in terms of desegregation and school improvement. Three high schools were examined through case study research: the two high schools in East Baton Rouge Parish that implemented new magnet programs in accordance with the 1996 consent decree, and one high school with similar demographics that did not implement a magnet program.

Several data-collecting methods were used in gathering information for the case studies: observations, interviews, and documents. Triangulation of data collection methods provided a powerful solution to the problem of relying too much on any one data collection method (Patton 1990).

The literature suggests that desegregation brings positive social outcomes to black students (Schofield 1995) (Wells 1995). However, for a variety of reasons, including changing demographic patterns, the nation is beginning to slip back toward an increase in school segregation (Orfield et. al. 1997). Mandatory desegregation plans have been found to exacerbate white flight which further limits racial interaction (Rossell 1990). Magnet school plans have become a widely used strategy that attempt to voluntarily desegregate schools without increasing white flight from the areas being desegregated.

By learning more about how magnet school programs are implemented and the results they obtain, educational policy makers and leaders can make educated
decisions in developing desegregation plans that include voluntary components. This knowledge may help schools, principals and teachers develop methods that will enhance racial balance while at the same time improving student achievement.

**Summary of Findings**

**Magnet Implementation**

The answer to the first research question, “How have high schools in EBR implemented new magnet programs?” has been answered in case studies for the new magnet programs at Glen Oaks High School and Istrouma High School and Technology Magnet. Istrouma chose a different path in implementing its technology magnet than Glen Oaks chose with either its medical magnet or its environmental and architectural magnet. Findings are summarized in terms of: recruiting, faculty involvement, and local initiatives versus district mandates.

**Recruiting**

There was a major difference in recruiting efforts between the two magnet schools. Recruiting tools discussed in the case studies are found in Table 8-1. Several factors were crucial in explaining how Istrouma outpaced Glen Oaks in recruiting non-black students during SY1997-98. The summer camp that Istrouma held before the first year of magnet implementation was probably the most critical tool used in attracting non-black students.
Table 8-1
Recruiting Tools Used SY1997-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiting Tool</th>
<th>Istrouma</th>
<th>Glen Oaks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Coordinator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (API, then Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (1 person runs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Visits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Mania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Open House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Camp</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Involvement

The principals of the two high schools with magnet programs are quite different. Table 8-2 shows some of their main differences. Their style of leadership determined to a great extent the amount of faculty involvement in the magnet program implementation.

Table 8-2
Principal Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Delegating Disciplinarian</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Controlling Instruction In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>office</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal from Istrouma delegated the magnet program to a teacher who formed a committee of teachers that worked through every step of the implementation process. The principal from Glen Oaks handled the coordination of the medical magnet herself with the teachers from Belaire. She involved the lead teacher of the environmental and architectural design magnet in the start up of that magnet program. However, there were
no other faculty members involved in the decision making process, and the principal maintained control of the budget.

The amount of participation in the decision making and implementation of the magnet programs seemed to have an effect on the attitudes of teachers toward the magnet programs. Many Istrouma teachers actively worked to make the technology magnet program successful. Several teachers were on the magnet committee and several other teachers were teaching magnet classes or core honors classes that contained only magnet students. A cohort of magnet teachers and students formed that believed in the program. However, the meager non-black recruiting results, the magnet coordinator and API turnover, and the discontinuance of magnet committee meetings will be obstacles that Istrouma will have to overcome in order to maintain teacher morale.

The Glen Oaks medical magnet program was staffed by visiting teachers who had not accepted the idea of moving the medical program from Belaire to Glen Oaks. The district’s request to leave the program at Belaire complicated this frustrating policy decision for the medical staff. The teachers in this case did not help implement the Glen Oaks medical magnet. In fact, many probably wished the program would not work, so that the program would return to Belaire. The implementation of the medical magnet program is an example of how not to implement a magnet program.

The Glen Oaks environmental and architectural magnet had the energy of the lead teacher who was involved in the decision making process of implementing the program. She was motivated and formed a small team of educators and students who had high
expectations for the magnet program. However, the majority of the faculty knew nothing about this magnet. The school as a whole had not taken ownership of this magnet.

Local Initiatives versus District Mandates

Istrouma and Glen Oaks were given written guidelines from the consent decree to follow in setting up their magnet programs. The principals of the high schools in the parish were not consulted in the decision-making process concerning the establishment of magnet programs. As Istrouma’s case study noted, the Istrouma technology magnet design started as a $12 million proposal and turned into a hastily written $1/2 million plan. The consent decree was written foremost as a compromise between the district and litigants. Educational design and implementation were not the top priority.

Istrouma and Glen Oaks were expected to follow the consent decree and take the initiative in making their programs successful. Glen Oaks had an advantage in setting up the medical magnet program. The medical program had been in place at Belaire for years and could be simply moved to Glen Oaks. Istrouma’s technology magnet and Glen Oaks’ environmental and architectural magnet did not have that advantage. The high schools were supposed to train and recruit specialized faculty. The district did not pull specialized teachers from other schools to move to these magnets.

Desegregation

At the direction of the 1996 desegregation order, magnet programs were established in Istrouma High School and Glen Oaks High School. The purpose of these programs was to establish highly desirable specialty programs that would attract significant numbers of non-black students into these predominately black high schools.
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Christine Rossell had predicted that magnet programs would increase non-black enrollment to 13% at Istrouma and 21% at Glen Oaks (see Appendix 4). However, Table 8-3 shows that Istrouma went from 4.1% non-black in SY1996-97 to 4.6% in SY1998-99 and Glen Oaks declined from 3.1% non-black in SY1996-97 to 1.0% non-black in SY1998-99.

Table 8-3
Non-Black Enrollment Percentage at Three High Schools (SY1996-97 to SY1998-99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The magnet programs did not attract their quotas of non-black students. Table 8-4 shows the number of non-black students who enrolled in the three new magnet programs. These numbers support the views of the interviewees and student focus group members who did not believe that the magnet programs were a successful desegregation tool.

Table 8-4
Magnet Enrollment SY1998-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9th B</th>
<th>9th NB</th>
<th>10th B</th>
<th>10th NB</th>
<th>11th B</th>
<th>11th NB</th>
<th>12th B</th>
<th>12th NB</th>
<th>Total B</th>
<th>Total NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Magnet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Arch. Design</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programs may induce more non-black students in years to come, as the programs become better known and more established. Of the three magnet programs, the
technology magnet program at Istrouma currently has the best potential for recruiting its full number of non-black students. The Istrouma magnet student focus group was confident that the program would continue to increase the number of non-black students in the technology magnet. There were also two of Istrouma’s teachers who believed the program had a real chance of being successful and expressed their dedication to that goal. None of the interviewees and student focus groups at Glen Oaks saw any real chance of attracting non-black students to their school.

The disappointing outcome of the magnet programs in EBR is consistent with the results of the Kansas City desegregation experiment. In that case, the Kansas City school district spent more than $1 billion to develop new programs, upgrade facilities, and increase teachers’ pay based on the hope that these expenditures would induce white students back into the predominately black Kansas City school system. As Paul Ciotti found in his report on Kansas City: “The results were dismal. Test scores did not rise; the black-white gap did not diminish; and there was less, not greater integration” (1998, p.1).

As discussed in Chapter 3, the number of racially identifiable high schools in EBR increased from 9 out of 17 to 10 out of 17 during the year the consent decree was implemented. In 1996, there were 6 racially identifiable white schools and 3 racially identifiable black schools. In 1998, there were 4 racially identifiable white schools and 6 racially identifiable black schools.

**White Flight**

One of the main goals of the 1996 consent decree was to stop the white flight from the EBR school system. Christine Rossell’s theory that voluntary desegregation
plans are preferable to mandatory plans in order to minimize the amount of white flight from school districts was used as justification for selecting the type of desegregation plan used in the 1996 consent decree (Rossell 1991).

Table 8-5
EBR High School Enrollment SY1979-80 to SY1998-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY1979-80</td>
<td>6685</td>
<td>10440</td>
<td>17125</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY1996-97</td>
<td>8104</td>
<td>6836</td>
<td>14940</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY1997-98</td>
<td>8783</td>
<td>7011</td>
<td>15794</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY1998-99</td>
<td>9184</td>
<td>6890</td>
<td>16074</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8-5 shows, the white percentage of high school students continued to decrease after the implementation of the voluntary plan in SY1997-98. However, it is noteworthy that white flight paused in terms of absolute numbers of students once the voluntary plan was implemented. The number of white high school students actually increased from 6,836 in SY1996-97 to 7,011 in SY1997-98. The number of white students did fall in SY1998-99, but the number is still higher than in SY1996-97.

The increasing number of black students in the district is becoming the main reason for the diminishing percentage of white students in the high schools, not white flight. The number of white high school students grew by 54 (0.79%) from SY1996-97 to SY1998-99, whereas the number of black students grew by 1,080 (13.33%) from SY1996-97 to SY1998-99.
School Improvement

Although the results of the magnet programs were dismal in terms of desegregation, they seem to be a little better in school improvement. In general, results for the community-based students at the schools were unchanged, but results for the magnet students and teachers were positive.

Attitudinal Changes

There were no attitudinal changes mentioned at Capitol High School in terms of teachers or students. Academic apathy still reigns. There were no attitudinal changes in the community-based students at Glen Oaks and Istrouma. However, the students and teachers at both schools agreed that the magnet students' attitudes toward learning had improved as a result of being in a magnet program. Several teachers at Istrouma mentioned the positive peer pressure in the magnet classrooms. Magnet student focus groups at both schools were excited about their magnet programs.

Teachers at Glen Oaks did not mention any teachers’ attitudinal change. Several magnet teachers at Istrouma mentioned that their attitudes had improved due to having students who are motivated and self-disciplined. Other Istrouma teachers mentioned that a community of teachers had developed that encouraged each other to work hard and innovate.

Behavioral Changes

There were few teacher behavioral changes noted from the case studies. Differences in SEAP scores between magnet and non-magnet teachers were mixed. Magnet teachers at Istrouma scored higher than non-magnet teachers at Istrouma.
Magnet teachers at Glen Oaks scored lower than non-magnet teachers at Glen Oaks. The only noted teacher behavioral change was that some magnet teachers at Istrouma believed they were working harder because of the magnet program.

The consensus of the teachers and students at Istrouma and Glen Oaks was that magnet students may have improved their work ethic and discipline, but the community based students were not affected by the magnet program. Istrouma and Glen Oaks magnet students expressed that they worked a lot harder in their magnet classes due to positive peer pressure than they would have in a regular community based class. The dropout numbers, student attendance numbers, and suspended and expelled numbers support the consensus that the community based students were not affected by the magnet programs at their schools.

The dropout numbers at Istrouma and Glen Oaks were mixed across the grade levels, but the numbers balanced out at each school with about the same total percentage dropping out before and after the magnet programs were implemented. During the same time period, Capitol substantially dropped its 12th grade dropout rate from 45.86% to 17.03%. However, the large drop in numbers may be related as much to bad data as it is to real change.

The student attendance rate dropped a little at all three high schools the year the magnet program was implemented. The attendance rate continues to hover around the 90% rate. Again, as with the dropout statistics, the numbers maybe inaccurate. During classroom observations, many classrooms were about half full.
The numbers of students suspended and expelled seem to have better reporting methods than the dropout and attendance rate statistics. In SY 1997-98, the year the consent decree was implemented, Istrouma suspended or expelled about 32% of its students, Glen Oaks suspended or expelled about 27% of its students, and Capitol suspended or expelled about 44% of its students. Istrouma's suspension and expulsion rate remained stable after the implementation of the consent decree. Glen Oaks's suspension and expulsion rate climbed from 18% to about 27%, but still remains about 5% lower than Istrouma's rate. Capitol's suspension and expulsion rate climbed 2%.

Cognitive Changes

Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) scores are the only standardized test scores taken by the entire student body that can be compared longitudinally at the high schools. All three of the high schools improved the year that the consent decree was implemented. The percentage of Istrouma's students passing the GEE increased in 4 of 5 subjects, Glen Oaks's percentages increased in 4 of 5 subjects, and Capitol's percentages improved in all five subjects.

These test scores should be viewed with caution. First of all, many high schools had major population shifts from 1997 to 1998, which makes it difficult to compare scores from previous years. Another problem is determining what variable is related to the rising scores. Since Capitol improved in all five subject areas, one can not infer that the rise in scores at Istrouma and Glen Oaks were highly related to the implementation of the magnet programs.
The teachers and students at Istrouma and Glen Oaks did not believe that the community based students had any cognitive changes that resulted from the magnet program. Interviews at Capitol mentioned that the establishment of the School Improvement Team (SIT) focused the school on improving the GEE scores. In addition, Title 1 monies, instructional equity funds from the consent decree, and other small sources contributed resources that seemed to energize the teachers to work toward the unified goal of improving GEE scores at Capitol.

Conclusions

The shift in desegregation plans away from mandatory plans and toward voluntary plans has pushed the magnet program concept to the forefront of several urban school system’s desegregation plans. The magnet programs are designed for a two-fold purpose: to desegregate schools, and to improve racially isolated schools. This study included two high schools in East Baton Rouge Parish with new magnet programs and one other racially identifiable black school that did not receive a magnet program. Several conclusions are drawn from the findings.

Magnet Implementation

The way in which magnet programs are implemented makes a difference in the success of the program. Recruiting, faculty involvement, and district support are three of the largest factors discussed in the research findings. This conclusion is in harmony with other scholarship on school reform that has pointed out that the success of a school reform initiative depends in the final analysis on the way it is enacted by teachers and principals at the school site.
Bruce Fuller and Richard Elmore (1996), in their analysis of school choice, came to a conclusion about that school reform initiative that might well apply to desegregation strategies. Fuller and Elmore said, "Details matter in the design and implementation of choice policies" (p. 195). In other words, the value of most school reform initiatives, including desegregation policies, can not be evaluated as bad or good in themselves. The way a particular initiative is implemented, the quality of the educators who are in charge of its success, the amount of financial resources available, contribute to the initiative's success or failure.

**Litigation versus Education**

Inflexibility of the court mandated plan and the means of negotiating it among litigants sometimes leads to educational strategies that field personnel disagree with. Examples in the study were the Istrouma technology plan that was reduced from $12 million to $1/2 million in two days as a compromise. Another example was the moving of the medical magnet from Belaire to Glen Oaks. Several administrators and teachers disagreed with that move. None, including the faculty at Glen Oaks, spoke well of that decision. A third example was Istrouma's wish to change its policy with regard to recruitment of students. The school was told to follow the consent decree.

The rigidity of the consent decree and the continued oversight of the court relate to the issue of trust. The black and white students at the three schools expressed that they should have a choice in attending schools and did not favor returning to mandatory busing in the event that the magnet programs do not prove to be successful in terms of desegregation. However, the older teachers and administrators did not yet trust the
school system and community to provide equal access and funding for all students. This lack of trust may indicate that the school system’s early, long-running, stubborn resistance to desegregation continues to make some Baton Rouge teachers and administrators distrustful of the school district’s sincerity.

Desegregation and White Flight

In the short run, magnet programs put in black inner-city high schools have not proven to be very effective in recruiting non-black students in East Baton Rouge Parish. Moving to a voluntary desegregation policy stemmed the tide of white flight at the high school level in East Baton Rouge parish. Interestingly, the non-magnet schools have attracted more whites than magnet programs have attracted, an indication that community-based schools have done more for racial interaction than magnet schools.

The white flight results are consistent with Rossell’s findings in Savannah and Stockton (1998). When Savannah replaced its mandatory desegregation plan with a voluntary plan, the number of white students increased by 746 the first year. When Stockton instituted a voluntary desegregation plan, the decline in white enrollment was 1.4%, about half what it had been the previous four years. Rossell contributes the different results in Stockton and Savannah to the differing racial compositions in the two districts (1998). Stockton is about 20% white and Savannah is about 41% white.

East Baton Rouge Parish is between these two districts in racial composition, but closer to Savannah. The first year that the mandatory plan was discarded, the number of white high school students in the East Baton Rouge district increased by 175.
**School Improvement**

Three different points stand out from the school improvement findings. First, magnet students had positive attitudinal and behavioral changes due to the magnet programs, but community based students were not affected. Second, dropout rates at all three schools are high, consistent with rates in most urban schools. For any educational initiative to be considered successful, these rates must come down. Third, the high percentage of non-certified teachers impedes success of any educational initiative. Difficulty in attracting quality teachers will undermine efforts to create high-quality programs.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The first recommendation for further research is a continued study of EBR high schools to see if, and how, the magnets will be able to attract more non-black students. The study should be expanded to include elementary and middle magnets, and the two other high school magnets that had been in place before the 1996 consent decree. Understanding feeder patterns from elementary to high schools magnets will become more important as students complete elementary and middle magnet programs.

The second recommendation is to implement an embedded multiple case study that looks at several districts, and the schools within those districts, that have implemented magnet programs as part of a desegregation plan. Understanding how magnet programs are working in terms of school improvement and desegregation at other locations would be of great benefit to those developing and implementing desegregation policy. As was mentioned in chapter 4, most studies that have examined magnet
programs as a desegregation tool used the district as the unit of study. Looking at several schools as the unit of analysis within the context of their districts would provide valuable information.
References


128

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


130


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


134
Publications.
Table of Court Cases


Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537, (1896).


Appendix A:
A Summary of Desegregation Techniques
Identified In Selected Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-grade centers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified feeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip zoning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site selection/const./ reloc./ closing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment (voluntary)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory busing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areawide/metropolitan (multidistrict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorg. of grade structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This listing of four desegregation techniques from the Kirby, et al. study includes only those that could actually be used to desegregate the school system.*
Appendix B:
Racial Makeup of EBR
High Schools
SY79-80 and SY97-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>79 B</th>
<th>79 NB</th>
<th>79 total</th>
<th>79 B%</th>
<th>79 NB%</th>
<th>97 B</th>
<th>97 NB</th>
<th>97 Total</th>
<th>97 B%</th>
<th>97 NB%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge High</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belaire High</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmoor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northdale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotlandville</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6685</td>
<td>10440</td>
<td>17125</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8783</td>
<td>7011</td>
<td>15794</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C:
#### Racial Makeup of EBR High Schools
##### SY96-97 and SY97-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>96 B</th>
<th>96 W</th>
<th>96 Total</th>
<th>96 B%</th>
<th>96 NB%</th>
<th>97 B</th>
<th>97 NB</th>
<th>97 Total</th>
<th>97 B%</th>
<th>97 NB%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belaire</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmoor</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northdale</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotlandville</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8104</td>
<td>6836</td>
<td>14940</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>8783</td>
<td>7011</td>
<td>15794</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:  
Impact on % White  
1982 through 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge Magnet</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belaire</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmoor</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrouma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Lee</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotlandville Magnet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Author added data for 1997 (Actual) and 1998.
Appendix E:
School Effectiveness and Assistance Program
Classroom Observation Summary Form

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SUMMARY FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>DISTRICT SCHOOL CODE</th>
<th>DATE (DAY, YR)</th>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>OBSERVER CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>1 = Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>2 = Needs Improvement</th>
<th>3 = Area of Strength</th>
<th>4 = Demonstrates Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA1.</td>
<td>Organizes available space, materials, and/or equipment to facilitate learning.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA2.</td>
<td>Promotes a positive learning climate.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT B</td>
<td>The teacher maximizes the amount of time available for instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB1.</td>
<td>Manages routines and transitions in a timely manner.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB2.</td>
<td>Manages and/or adjusts allotted time for planned activities.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT C</td>
<td>The teacher manages learner behavior to provide productive learning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC1.</td>
<td>Establishes expectations for learning behavior.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC2.</td>
<td>Uses monitoring techniques to facilitate learning.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component A: The teacher delivers instruction effectively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA1. Uses technique(s) which develop(s) lesson effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA2. Sequences lesson to promote learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA3. Uses available teaching material(s) to achieve lesson objective(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA4. Adjusts lesson when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component B: The teacher presents appropriate content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB1. Presents content at a developmentally appropriate level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB2. Presents accurate subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB3. Relates relevant examples, unexpected situations, or current events to the content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component C: The teacher provides opportunities for student involvement in the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC1. Accommodates individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC2. Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC3. Stimulates and encourages higher order thinking at the appropriate developmental levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC4. Encourages student participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component D: The teacher assesses student progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIID1. Monitors ongoing performance of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIID2. Provides timely feedback to students regarding their progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F:
Time-on-task Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL:</th>
<th>CLASS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>START TIME</th>
<th>END TIME</th>
<th>OBSERVER CODE</th>
<th>DISTRICT CODE</th>
<th>SCHOOL CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR MIN</td>
<td>HR MIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:15 P.M.</td>
<td>1:15 P.M.</td>
<td>1:15 P.M.</td>
<td>1:15 P.M.</td>
<td>1:15 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:10 P.M.</td>
<td>3:10 P.M.</td>
<td>3:10 P.M.</td>
<td>3:10 P.M.</td>
<td>3:10 P.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT(S):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN THE CLASSROOM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF AIDES IN THE CLASSROOM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS PRESENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF OTHER ADULTS PRESENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Directions: For each classroom scan, count the number of children engaged in interactive, non-interactive, and off-task activities. Bubble in that number in the appropriate boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>TIME 1</th>
<th>TIME 2</th>
<th>TIME 3</th>
<th>TIME 4</th>
<th>TIME 5</th>
<th>TIME 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIVE TIME ON TASK:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Aloud, Making Assignments, Instruction/Explanations, Discussion/Reviewing Assignments, Practice Drill, Taking Test/Quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-INTERACTIVE TIME ON TASK:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Silently, Written Assignments, Students working together without direct adult supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF TASK:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction, Student Uninvolved, Being Disciplined, Classroom Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G:
Confidentiality Form

I promise not to discuss what was said in this focus group with anyone outside this group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H:
Parent/Guardian Permission Slip

April 6, 1999

Dear Parent/Guardian:
Our school is taking part in a study involving the implementation of magnet programs at high schools. A doctoral student from Louisiana State University will be visiting the school on ______________ to visit classes and to gather input from students, parents, teachers, and other school staff.

During the visit, the doctoral student will meet with two small groups of students. One group of students will consist of students in the magnet program, and the other group will consist of students not in the magnet program. The students will be asked to give their views on school life and to describe a typical school day. Participation is strictly voluntary, and no student will be asked to share any personal information.

The researcher will take notes and tape record the group discussion to make sure that he has an accurate record of the students’ views. The group’s comments, including all notes and recordings made of the discussions, will be completely confidential and will not be shared with any member of the school or district staff.

At the end of the study, the researcher will write a report based on the information he collects. The report will identify the implementation strategy used for the school’s magnet program, and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the school in terms of desegregation and school improvement.

Please indicate in the space below whether your child has your permission to take part in the student discussion group. This letter should be returned to your child’s teacher no later than _____________.

Sincerely,

Principal

Parent/Guardian’s Permission to Take Part in Research Study

My child, ___________________________________________

☐ has permission to take part in the student discussion group.
☐ does not have permission to take part in the student discussion group.
Signature___________________________ Date________
Appendix I:
Student Focus Group Questions

1. Tell me about the students who come to this school? How would you describe this school to a friend?

2. Could you describe student discipline at this school? Are there problems with students not behaving in this school or in class? What do the teachers and principal do if students misbehave? Do you think everyone is treated the same?

3. What do the people who live around here think about this school? What do you think about this school?

4. What do you and your friends like best about this school?

5. What do you and your friends like least about this school?

6. Think about all the teachers you've had at this school so far. What is it about them or their classes that you've liked the best?

7. Is there anything about the teachers you've had at this school or their classes that you really didn't like?

8. Do substitutes teach your classes very often? Why do you think you have substitutes? What happens in your classes when there is a substitute?

9. What would you do to make the school better?

10. Picture yourself when you're 20 years old. What do you think you and the other students around here will be doing then?

11. Will the students in the magnet program benefit more compared to the students in the regular community based program?

12. Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?

13. Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a school improvement tool? Why?
Appendix J:
Capitol Student Focus Group Questions

1. Tell me about the students who come to this school? How would you describe this school to a friend?

2. Could you describe student discipline at this school? Are there problems with students not behaving in this school or in class? What do the teachers and principal do if students misbehave? Do you think everyone is treated the same?

3. What do the people who live around her think about this school? What do you think about this school?

4. What do you and your friends like best about this school?

5. What do you and your friends like least about this school?

6. Think about all the teachers you've had at this school so far. What is it about them or their classes that you've liked the best?

7. Is there anything about the teachers you've had at this school or their classes that you really didn't like?

8. Do substitutes teach your classes very often? Why do you think you have substitutes? What happens in your classes when there is a substitute?

9. What would you do to make the school better?

10. Picture yourself when you're 20 years old. What do you think you and the other students around here will be doing then?

11. Will the students in magnet programs at other schools benefit more compared to the students in the regular community based programs?

12. Are the magnet programs at Glen Oaks and Istrouma successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?

13. Any more comments?
Appendix K:
Standardized Open-ended Interview Questions

1. Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a desegregation tool? Why?

2. Is the magnet program at your school successful in terms of a school improvement tool? Why?

3. What was and is the central office role in developing and implementing the magnet program at your school?

4. What was and is the school’s role in developing and implementing the magnet program at your school? Expand on the process your school went through.

5. What was and is your role in developing and implementing the magnet program at your school?

6. What could be done to enhance the magnet program at your school, so that it would be a better desegregation tool? (recruitment, staffing, funding)

7. What could be done to enhance the magnet program at your school, so that it would be a better school improvement tool? (recruitment, staffing, funding)

8. How will the students from your magnet program benefit compared to a regular community based program?

9. What will the future be like for your magnet program?

10. Has the magnet program brought any attitudinal changes for teachers and students?

11. Has the magnet program brought any behavioral changes for teachers and students?

12. Has the magnet program brought any cognitive changes for the students?

13. Do you have any other comments about the magnet program that I have not asked about?
Appendix L:
Capitol Interview Questions

1) What type of student body changes occurred here due to the consent decree?

2) What type of special programs do you have here, or is this a traditional well rounded school?

3) How does this school compare to other high schools now that some have magnet programs (staffing, funding)?

4) What would improve this school?

5) What did the new consent decree do for this school?

6) Do you have any additional comments about the magnet programs at the high school level in the parish?
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