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Portland Public School District and in particular Jefferson High School are examined in a functionalist framework to determine the extent to which they meet community needs. B. Malinowski's functionalist theory is employed to analyze desegregation and integration policies and actions of the Portland Public School District and Jefferson High School, a chief focus of integration and desegregation plans.

Malinowski's theory of culture places education as a key element in cultural maintenance. His theory provides an analytical structure to examine the form and function of an institution such as a school district. By examining the policies of the district and the actualities that occurred in the implementation of those policies it will be possible to reveal the underlying assumptions that the district made regarding integration and desegregation. It is then possible to evaluate the extent to which the policies,
the practices and the assumptions meet the needs of the community they are intended to serve.

The Portland Community has been only slightly affected by an increase in minority population which reached 14% in 1980. The Jefferson High School community has received the greatest impact, being transformed from a white homogeneous population to a diverse multicultural community in the span of 25 years. In the school's enrollment the minority population reached 55% in 1970; they were primarily black students with increasing numbers of Southeast Asian students. The district's response to these changes is examined by the use of two case studies to determine the extent to which the district has recognized the changing needs of the community it serves.

The first case study focuses on Project Turnabout. This 1974 project was specifically targeted for Jefferson High School to increase the total student population and reduce the percentage of minority students attending the school. The district's policies toward integration and desegregation are examined in their historical context.

The second case study focuses on the District's 1980 Comprehensive Desegregation Plan. This plan was designed to meet the needs of what had become the more vocal black community. This plan changed some of the basic policies toward desegregation and integration, the most significant being the recognition of Portland as a pluralist community.

The Portland School District's basic charter has affected the way the district has dealt with desegregation and integration
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DESEGREGATION, INTEGRATION AND THE
CHARTER OF PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to provide insights into educational institutions' relationships to a community's derived cultural needs by using Bronislaw Malinowski's theory of culture as an analytical tool. Malinowski was the founder of the functionalist school of anthropology. He believed that the task of anthropology was to discover how each social institution fulfilled a specific function in maintaining human needs. Malinowski's functionalist theory is built on the assumption that culture is a device to better cope with the satisfaction of people's basic needs. He identified three primary needs: reproductive, nutritive and hygienic which are determined by environmental and biological conditions. These needs are met by the creation of a secondary environment which Malinowski called culture. The creation of this secondary environment imposes new needs which he termed derived or instrumental needs.

He classifies these derived or instrumental needs into four categories. The first derived cultural need is the ability of the group to transmit the knowledge necessary to meet both primary and derived needs to the next generation through education. The second derived cultural need is the need to be able to function as a social group. This includes emphasis on group cooperation and the development of political organizations. The third derived cultural need is the sanction of customs and ethics by the group including the establishment of laws. The fourth derived cultural need is the
maintenance and renewal of the material substratum of the group through economic organization. Meeting these derived needs establishes necessary conditions for human survival. A deterioration in any one of these would lead in Malinowski's view to the disorganization of culture which would result in humans no longer being able to meet their basic needs.

Malinowski therefore defines culture as an integral whole which includes "a vast apparatus, partly material, partly human, partly spiritual, by which man is able to cope with the concrete, specific problems that face him" (Malinowski, 1944). His material apparatus are all those things that he creates to meet his needs. The human apparatus includes all the ways humans organize to meet their needs, and the spiritual apparatus includes symbolic communication ranging from language to religion to artistic expression. Malinowski summarizes his view of the cultural process as follows:

The cultural process, looked at in any of its concrete manifestations, always involves human beings who stand in definite relations to each other, that is, they are organized, and handle artifacts, and communicate with each other by speech or some other type of symbolism (Malinowski, 1944).

Malinowski's concept of culture revolves around human interaction as a primary method for meeting needs. The human species does not meet their basic needs in isolation from others. Therefore, a new set of needs is created which must also be met by the culture. A culture can be examined through the analysis of its various aspects such as education, social control, economics, systems of knowledge, belief and morality, and modes of creative and artistic expression.
Malinowski developed the notions of function and form to help analyze a culture. Function is the "satisfaction of a need (either basic or derived) by an activity in which human beings cooperate, use artifacts and consume goods" (Malinowski, 1944). The function of an institution can be determined by examining the activities of the institution and determining which needs and to what degree the culture's needs are met. The form of an institution is the organizational structure used to engage in activities which meet basic or derived needs. Malinowski includes in his definition of institutions all types of human organizations ranging from the family to more formal structures such as education. Malinowski considers institutions to be the only cultural isolates that can be scientifically studied. They can be observed as definite social groupings, they have a structure that is universally valid and they are integral to the society. Malinowski asserts that any trait of material culture, any standardized way of behaving or any idea within a culture can be placed into one or more institutions.

Education plays a key role in the transmission of culture. In the United States public education has developed into a complex institution originally designed to assimilate immigrants into the American way of life. Malinowski would argue that education plays such a key role in transmitting and maintaining culture, that if it is lost the culture will be unable to meet its basic and derived needs. Subcultures within the United States have become increasingly aware of the impact of the educational system on their children. Since the late 1960's public education has been increasingly criticized by minority groups, who feel that it does not attempt
to meet their needs. American public education has been slow to respond and more open conflicts have occurred between school districts and their communities which have significant minority population. By using Malinowski's institutional model to analyze an individual school district and its community it should be possible to determine whether that institution can meet the derived cultural needs of its community.

Malinowski identifies four general principles in his institutional model. The first principle he identifies for an institution is that of charter. A charter defines the institution, it establishes a common purpose or set of motives which sets the parameters for individual rights and the group's legitimacy. Principle two is that an institution has clearly identified membership, a seat of authority, defined functions and rules which regulate its members. Third, the institution establishes a set of norms of cooperation and conduct. Fourth, the institution is shaped by its association with its material environmental setting. Using the above principles the group engages in activities to meet its needs. These activities then result in a definite function of the institution. This function thereby satisfies the derived needs of the group.

Applying Malinowski's institutional principles to an individual school district, the charter would be a combination of the underlying philosophies about education and the school board's stated policies. These policies generally reflect both input from the community and from the school district's administration. These policies are then translated by administration into personnel and norms of the district. The norms of the district are established
through administrative rules and regulations which comply with board policy, curriculum, administrative and building plans. These norms are controlled by the district's administration. The personnel needs are controlled by the district's administration with final approval coming from the school board. The material environmental setting of the district is shaped by the population composition of the district and its physical boundaries. It includes all material resources, budget, equipment and buildings. Using these organizers, the school district engages in activities which include the basic instructional program, extracurricular activities, support programs to fulfill the basic function of the district. This function should, according to Malinowski's theory, satisfy the derived cultural needs of the community it serves. These principles are diagrammed for further clarification, see Figure 1. Using this structure it should be possible to determine whether the school district's function does indeed meet the derived cultural needs of the community it serves.

Portland Public School District No. 1 will be the focus of this study. It is the largest school district in the State of Oregon and has the largest percentage of minority students, representing many different cultural groups with the largest minority group being black. The district has faced a minimum of violent unrest that confronted larger urban school districts during the 1960's and it is only since the late 1970's that blacks and other minority groups have become a political force within the district. Its solutions to meeting minority needs have reflected national solutions and are therefore fairly representative of urban
derived cultural needs of the community
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Figure 1. Structure of School District
school districts.

According to current district administrators for the Portland Public Schools the function of the district is to provide "quality education." This is defined as student achievement in reading, writing and calculating. In addition the school district should provide work skills, human interaction skills and citizenship skills for every individual child (Thomas, 1981). The school district's policies are developed by the board of education which is made up of elected representatives. The board's role includes "complete charge and control of all activities and programs of the district, including its property, personnel and finances" (PPS Policy 100.1). There should therefore be a high correlation between the community's needs being met and school district policy.

The school district's policies which are made or endorsed by the school board provide the framework for the district's organization. These policies are also responses to situational problems. Board policy is then further specified by administrative rules and regulations. It is the policy of the Board of Education to delegate to the Superintendent of Schools the full authority and responsibilities of Executive Officer for the Board, of Chief School Administrator, of Education Leader for Portland Public Schools, and of School Clerk (Board Policy 140.1).

As Chief Executive Officer, the superintendent's duties include preparing agenda for board meetings, attending all board meetings and committee meetings, initiating and directing the development of policies for board approval, reporting to board, preparing budget, school calendar, administering budget, directing capital expenditures and purchases, maintaining and operating properties and
determining transportation needs. As Chief School Administrator, the superintendent's duties include the development and recommendation of curricula, determining admissions requirements for enrollment and attendance, recommending attendance boundaries to provide balanced educational opportunities. He has supervision over management of schools and administrative units, directs the work of professional staff, directs the selection and recommends adoption of textbooks and instructional materials. He can close schools due to health or weather conditions. He establishes qualifications for personnel, has power to assign any district personnel, formulates and administers evaluation programs for staff effectiveness, develops, maintains and operates staff development programs. He determines the length of school day and working hours, studies population trends, the educational and cultural needs of the community for construction or renovation of facilities, and establishes summer schools. As educational leader, the superintendent is responsible to specify action and design detailed administrative rules and regulations and arrangements by which board policy and school law will be followed. He is to be the public representor of Portland Public Schools to the community and to other districts, states, etc. (Policy 210.1). As school clerk he is secretary to the board and custodian of the board's reference file (Policy 150.2). The district's norms and personnel are therefore largely determined by the superintendent and his professional staff. In Portland Public Schools the administrative organization is diagrammed in Board Policy 210.211, see Figure 2).

The material environmental setting for the Portland Public
Figure 2. Portland Public Schools Administrative Organization
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School District includes a 1980 student population of 53,512 students. The minority enrollment has increased from 17.2% in 1975-76 to 27.6% in 1981-82. The school district has expanded and contracted during its 130 years of operation reaching its maximum enrollment in 1970 with 79,561 students. As of 1970 the district operated 111 neighborhood schools covering an area of 152 square miles within three counties.

From early in its history the district has operated from a neighborhood school concept in planning building sites. This meant that elementary children would not have to cross a major arterial or walk more than a mile to school. See map of Portland Public Schools Boundary (Policy 200.11) (Figure 3). The city's high schools were built to meet growing population demands and to meet the needs of local communities. The first Portland high school, which moved in 1952 and was renamed Lincoln High School, began operation in 1900 with an enrollment of 633 students. In less than 20 years eight additional high schools comprised the system. In its early history Portland operated night school and manual training centers. The second high school, Eastside (later called Washington), began operation in 1906 with 369 students. In 1908 Benson Polytechnic School was opened as the city's school of trades with a three year program of instruction, half practical and half academic. One year later Monroe, an industrial school for girls, was begun. In 1908 Jefferson High School was built to serve the growing Albina community which had been a separate city prior to 1890. In 1914 Franklin High School was opened with 136 students, and in 1915 the High School of Commerce (later known as Cleveland) was begun.
By 1918 the population which the district served was estimated at 322,900. School enrollment was 44,091 with the district employing 1200 teachers, and maintaining 70 buildings, including 62 elementary schools. In 1922 Roosevelt High School was built to serve North Portland. In 1923 Washington High School was rebuilt due to fire and in 1924 Grant High School was built. By 1937 four of the high schools had reached enrollments of over 2,000 students (Powers, 1937). Enrollment continued to increase as did the number of high schools. Madison High School opened in 1955 on the eastside and Wilson High School opened on the westside in 1956. Marshall High School began operating in Southeast Portland in 1960 and Jackson and Adams High Schools began in 1966 and 1968 respectively.

A portion of the material environmental setting for the district includes its annual budget. In the board's policies regarding budget the superintendent is responsible for establishing and directing budget planning, within board policy and state law. The board has final approval and final authorization for the expenditure of funds (Policy 800.1). In its budget policy the board states "that all expenditures be based upon responsible educational planning" (Policy 800.1). This implies that the budget should reflect the educational goals of the district. The Portland Public School District for the 1981-82 school year had an annual budget of approximately $164,274,150. Funding in the Portland district is derived from a property tax base, special levies, state and federal funds, grants and donations. (See Figure 4 which shows the sources of funding and the expenditures for the 1981-82 school years as provided by the district.) With increasing costs, lower student
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enrollment and tightening federal spending the district has been faced with budget problems which have resulted in the closing of three high schools and a number of elementary schools.

Using these organizational models and resources the district provides instructional programs to meet the needs of its students.

The District's programs shall be in accordance with State law, and their ultimate purpose shall be to help each child achieve full self-realization as an individual, as a student and as a member of society (Policy 600.1).

In the board's policies regarding instructional programs, Career Education is given high priority.

The public schools are responsible for providing every young person with learning opportunities that will enable him/her to discover his/her individual interest and abilities. Those learning opportunities should help him/her explore the many avenues of productive activity that might challenge and extend his/her talents of choice, self direction, self-discipline and responsibility. Every person who hopes to play a productive role in society must have some sort of occupational preparation since his/her place in society is, to a considerable degree, determined by his/her work role. Therefore, an orientation to the world of work and preparation for a career are necessary to his/her development (Policy 600.11).

The main function of public education in America has been to provide young people with intellectual growth, personal development and economic opportunity. According to the goals of Education for the Portland Public School District:

The public schools have two major responsibilities in our society. The first is to impart to students a knowledge of subject matter. . . . Secondly, the schools must attempt to create a logical and evaluative attitude of mind based on sound personal values in order that each student may become increasingly able to respond intelligently to the many economic, political and social issues commonly confronted.

The focus for the district as shown in the Portland district policies is on preparing students to play a productive role in society
Both of these goals serve the needs of the American economy. Elizabeth Eddy would assert further that the very organization of the school has been adapted and modeled after industrial forms. Historically, schools were organized first on the factory model and later on the business model. The factory model treats pupils as though they were raw materials and the schools were to turn out finished products of good citizens and a specialized labor force. In this model the burden of responsibility for processing is on the teacher, under the direction of a management elite which specifies the production methods, goals, plans and activities. Under the business model, continuous progress of each child is measured, which should theoretically eliminate failure. The mastery of skills becomes important, measured against the child's past performance rather than against others. The child becomes a useful product by expert diagnosis and treatment. In this system teachers are professional specialists whose work can be separated from human and social realities. Business efficiency and the reduction of cost become the major forces in the educational process.

Success and failure in American culture are attributed to individual responsibility. As Obu puts it: "every American has equal opportunity and that any individual with ability can succeed not only in school but also in society." Education then becomes the principal means by which social mobility can be achieved. National education as well as the Portland Public School District have gone through a number of explanations as to why the needs of subordinate minorities are not met. For Portland, the first explanation came in the 1960's by the Committee on Race and Equal
Opportunity in Education, which attributed the failure of minorities to their disadvantaged environment, background and culture. Remedial programs were developed to remedy these needs. During the seventies, the school district blamed the individual schools with high minority enrollments for failing to meet their needs. Minorities were not learning because they were receiving inferior education. Programs were developed both to improve education at the predominately black schools and to attract white students to attend. However, to provide truly equal education, minorities were bussed to predominately white middle class schools where they would receive better education. The eighties see little change in these policies even though the district has embarked on a new Comprehensive Desegregation Plan designed to provide equal educational opportunities for all its students.

It is clear that the Portland School District can be examined using Malinowski's model. It is then possible to examine specific district policies to determine if they meet the derived cultural needs of the Portland community and its local school communities. The policies chosen for examination are desegregation and integration. Malinowski's theory will be applied to two specific programs implemented by the Portland School District to address the issues of desegregation and integration.
II. JEFFERSON COMMUNITY

In order to determine whether the Portland Public Schools can and do meet the derived cultural needs of a pluralist community it will first be necessary to understand how the district defines community, how the makeup of the community has changed historically and what impacts this change has had on the basic function of the school district.

During the 1980 school closure issues the district's public relations printed material defined community to include the entire Portland district, despite historically recognized communities. The argument was that separate neighborhoods and communities could not be accurately defined, and differed depending on what criteria were used, i.e. school boundaries, neighborhood associations, or post office boundaries, none of which matched. In spite of this, clear community lines were drawn during these debates between community and school board members.

Historically Portland has been a collection of distinctive communities. Prior to 1891 Portland (Westside), Eastside and Albina were independent towns. In the initial growth of the school district, high schools were constructed to accommodate community pride as well as increasing population growth. Eastside began with only 369 students (see Figure 5). This attitude was fostered by the neighborhood school concept. High schools were seen as the center of "community" activity.
Figure 5. Map - 1913 Portland High Schools
Albina was one such neighborhood community located in the north, north-east section of the city. During the early 1900's Albina was a separate self-sufficient community which had its own retail district, churches, elementary schools and residences. It provided numerous jobs for working class people. By 1910 Albina also had its own high school, Jefferson. The high school was viewed as a means to achieve success. The population of the Albina community was comprised in 1900 of 75% native-born, white residents, 25% foreign-born, mostly northern European, and .5% Orientals and blacks (LaPlante, 1970). Albina was considered a relatively homogeneous workingman's community.

Secondary education fulfilled several needs of the community and reaffirmed its basic values. These included: that the common man was important, that the individual was responsible for his success or failure, that the school's job was to provide equal opportunity. Success depended on self-improvement and this could be accomplished through politics, perseverance, thrift, hard work and education (LaPlante, 1970). During Portland's early history, curriculum and instruction were uniform throughout the district, further emphasizing the role of education in assimilating individuals into the dominate culture.

By 1920 Jefferson High School enrolled 2,300 students and had developed a reputation for academic quality and athletic achievement. The school was a focal point for youth activities and social events for the Albina community. The Albina community and school staff demonstrated extreme loyalty to the school especially in the support of athletic events. The latter fact is reflected in
the long tenure of teachers during this time period.

As a result of World War II, the community's composition began to change. As early as 1843 Oregon had tried to exclude blacks (McLagan, 1980). Until 1890 in Portland, blacks were restricted to a 35 square block area on the westside of the Willamette River known as the red light district. In 1890 both commercial and industrial businesses wanted this area so blacks moved to the eastside, slightly protruding into the Jefferson attendance area. By the 1930's blacks mainly held jobs as porters, waiters or domestics except for those who were self-employed. There were about 84 black business enterprises at this time. Blacks were still confined to a small area on the eastside because of housing discrimination which later would play an increasingly significant role in the changes that would occur at Jefferson High School (Hill, 1936).

World War II resulted in a significant increase in the number of blacks residing in Portland and discrimination in housing practices created a "de facto" segregation in Portland's schools. Prior to World War II, black housing was confined east of the river to Union Avenue and from the Steel Bridge to Russel Avenue. By 1942 whites were protesting the housing of newly arrived blacks in the Albina community (LaPlante, 1970). Federal funds provided housing for blacks who were attracted to job openings for both skilled and unskilled workers, especially in shipping and in Portland shipyards. One such development was called Vanport City which was located on the edge of the Columbia River in North Portland. By November of 1944, Vanport had 32,600 residents and was the second largest city in Oregon with a black population of over 5,800
During the war Portland's black population was estimated at 20,000 to 25,000 but after the war dropped to 9,500 (LaPlante, 1970). In 1948 the Vanport flood totally destroyed the entire development and forced approximately 5,000 blacks to move back into the city.

Three factors influenced where blacks could live. One was the neighborhood school policy, second was the racial discrimination practiced by real estate dealers and third was the general racial prejudice on the part of whites. The school board had attempted to determine the rate of growth and direction of growth of the city and had purchased and developed sites so that elementary children did not have to cross a major arterial or walk more than a mile to school. By 1947 Eliot Elementary school was already overcrowded with 73% of the school population black (LaPlante, 1970). The school board adjusted the school boundaries so some students would attend Holladay elementary school which was predominately white. Blacks were agreeable to this plan since they did not want a segregated school and Eliot was in poor physical condition. Whites, however, were afraid that having black children at Holladay might encourage more blacks to move into the area, so whites began soliciting property owners to sell to whites only. Real estate brokers played a significant role in keeping blacks segregated in specific residential areas. As more black families moved into southern Albina, more adjacent white families fled to the suburbs and were again replaced by black families. This trend of expansion continued northward along Williams Avenue. (See maps of distribution of black population for 1940, 1950, 1960, Figure 7).
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Figure 7.
By 1954 Jefferson was predominately a white lower-middle class comprehensive high school. Only one hundred blacks were enrolled at Jefferson but the neighborhood was undergoing rapid change as reflected in feeder school enrollments. Albina had become a racial mixed community. Jefferson became Portland's "Black High School" even before there was a 25% black enrollment, largely because population on the east side of the school became visibly black due to housing patterns.

In 1964 the school board appointed a committee to study the question of race and equal educational opportunity within the district. The committee spent a considerable amount of time studying the Albina community which they defined as a residential area in which the majority of blacks reside. They used the following elementary schools' attendance areas to set the boundaries for the Albina community (Schwab, 1964).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1963--64% of Black Students</th>
<th>1964--65% of Black Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holladay</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbolt K-4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from this report that Albina was seen as a separate community from Portland as a whole. Could the district meet the needs of both the Albina community and Portland as a whole?
Race did not become an issue in the Portland Public School District until 1962 when the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People cited Portland for having racially segregated schools. The Portland School Board ignored these comments. A year later a group of white citizens began to question the school district's segregated status. In July of 1963 the school board appointed the Committee on Race and Education, which was comprised of 45 members, five of whom were black. The black community did not feel that even these five members represented the spectrum of the black community.

The school board held two conflicting views regarding segregation. One was that the basic school problem was racial, and therefore racial concentration equaled inferior education and that black children should be redistributed throughout the district. The second view was that racial concentration was irrelevant to equal education and what was needed was increased instructional efforts, methods, materials and the development of special programs for blacks in black schools. The Committee on Race and Education was charged with answering the following questions:

1) Does the Portland School District, to any extent deprive the children of one race of education opportunities equal to those of another race? If so, what corrective steps should be taken?

2) What might be done to improve the achievement of students in culturally deprived areas of the city in meeting the educational objectives of this school system?

3) What might the school system do through its educational processes to eliminate unreasoned prejudice in the minds of children of one race against persons of another race? (Schwab, 1964).

The committee on Race and Education found that Portland Public Schools did not provide equal educational opportunities for all
its students. One reason for this was that the district did provide equal programs for its students without taking into account differences in backgrounds or abilities. The committee also decided that the main reason for low achievement of black children was the background that these children brought with them to school as early as five to six years old. The committee also felt that low teacher expectations and the lack of services for these children contributed to their disadvantage (Schwab, 1964).

The committee's report came under attack by the black community, partially because of its definition of integration. In the view of the committee integration was the same as assimilation. They defined integration as "citizens of all races shall have been assimilated into the educational, cultural, social, political and economic spheres of American life" (Schwab). The committee proposed to achieve integration through the process of desegregation:

the removal of all contrived barriers to social movement which are based upon race and the development of conditions, particularly of the intellect, which will allow individuals to make reasonable choices from an entire spectrum of choices (Schwab, 1964).

This makes the schools' role one of forcing students to have more individual choice and to accept more social responsibility. The burden was once again placed on minority students to accept these two conditions in order to be assimilated into American society. The committee further angered the black community by recommending compulsory education for elementary schools with low achievement rates and high incidences of social and learning problems while leaving an escape clause so higher achieving students could transfer out (Grose, 1970).
By the nature of the questions the Portland School Board asked the Committee on Race and Education, several underlying assumptions emerge regarding the school district's basic charter. First, that equal opportunity is important and should be a function of the district. Equal opportunity also implies that if students are given the same, equal, education they should be able to achieve. Second, student achievement is the main function of the school district. To be successful in life and work students should be able to excel in school under their own initiative. Third, students need to change in order to meet the educational objectives of the school system. These objectives historically were uniform for the district, regardless of the makeup of local school communities. Fourth, the district should help to eliminate unreasoned prejudice.

The findings of the committee also reaffirmed these assumptions. The Committee on Race and Education concluded that:

We believe that for the problems as they exist in Portland, the best approach is that of intensifying education efforts—concentrating attacks on those educational deficiencies which occur in students due to many factors, racial isolation, depressed economic prospects based on past history, deplorable physical environments, etc. Such a program would get at the roots of the problem so far as the school is concerned, for educational deficiencies severely limit the qualifications and future prospects of so many of the students as does racial bias (Schwab, 1964).

In addition, the committee made a series of recommendations to the school board which would have long term effects on the Portland School District and on Jefferson High School and the Albina community in particular. Recommendation number one was the establishment of a Model School Program. This program would be an attempt to bring "intensive educational efforts to bear on
a number of elementary schools" (Schwab). The committee recommended ten elementary schools for this project. Two were to be predominantly black and two were to be predominantly white. These schools included Eliot, Boise, Highland, Buckman, Holladay, Humboldt, Whitman, George, Woodlawn and Irvington. Five of these schools were located in the Albina community as defined by the Committee on Race and Education.

Blacks were not enthusiastic about this proposed direction:

In an official statement, the NAACP raised a question about bussing in the Model Schools Programs: One of the peculiar and bizarre elements of planning for Negro students who are to be assigned to the Model School is that they can transfer to another integrated school. . . . If the intentional design of the Model School in theory and practice is not inferior, why would advance provisions be made for students to transfer? This more than any other factor seems to reveal clearly the restrictive philosophy that has shaped the committee's view about how to arrange a 'little something' for the Negroes (McClenden, November 15, 1964, p. 1).

The committee made a number of additional recommendations which were implemented by the school board. The committee felt that the district should continue to use the neighborhood school concept for basic attendance but with greater flexibility. They also advised the district to avoid and to reduce the concentration of children with depressed environmental background or racial isolation. They therefore suggested that students who want to transfer out of the Model School Program should be given first priority. These policies became known as the district's Administrative Transfer Policy. These policies were to result in large numbers of black students being bussed to predominately white schools, allowing the district to select students to be transferred with parent approval, paid for by district funds (Schwab, 1964).
The committee recommended that the district examine its curriculum, especially at the high school level. This included the establishment of occupationally oriented programs. The career recommendations included better vocational counseling and more courses like distributive education and work with employment agencies. Some blacks felt this was another put down by the white community; since black children could not achieve academically they should be given manual and job skills (Grose, 1970).

Recommendations were also made regarding the removal of prejudice from the school system by greater teacher communication with community leaders; by the use of textbooks that represent all major ethnic groupings; and by the inclusion of study of the role of majorities and minorities in American life in social studies classes which would include ethnic group contributions, areas of racial conflict, and common stereotypes. The Committee on Race and Education believed that the district should meet both the material and cultural needs of the disadvantaged child, and that this should include: exposure to life's options, increased recreational opportunities, more field trips, recognition of the student as an individual, assistance with material problems like clothing and food, having a well-defined discipline code, and stressing the benefits of education. In the late 1960's, then, the Model School Program was designed to correspond to the board's second view of equal education: that is, to improve instructional efforts specifically in schools with a heavy concentration of minority students. This would be the focus of the program until 1970.

The Coleman Report (1969) provided the district with empirical
data on how best to deal with "disadvantaged" children. It showed that student achievement was tied primarily to out of school experiences, especially peer group pressure.

The general result was that the factors that, under all conditions, accounted for more variance (in achievement) than any others were the characteristics of the student's peers; those that accounted for the next highest amount of variance were teachers' characteristics; and finally, other school characteristics, including per pupil expenditure on instruction in the system accounted for very little variance at all (Coleman, 1969).

This report supported the Board's view that racial concentration leads to unequal education. Students could be helped by providing them with an integrated atmosphere where middle class values were dominant. This would set the tone for the district for the next ten years. Beginning in 1970, "the schools for the seventies" was an attempt to increase local involvement by decentralizing the district. The district would be better able to meet local needs and maintain social, racial and economic balance in smaller units. The district was divided into three subdistricts called areas. Each area was to have an assistant superintendent, who with advice from a local advisory citizens board, would direct his area. In order to accomplish this, boundaries were redrawn to try to reduce the minority enrollment at Jefferson High School. Each area's black population ranged between 7% and 11%. No school was to have more than a 25% minority population. The plan also included restructuring the grade level combinations from K-8 elementary schools to K-4 elementary schools and 5-8 middle schools.

There was considerable criticism regarding this plan from a variety of sources. Many blacks saw this as another attempt to destroy black power by fragmenting the community. Whites criticized
the plan because it threatened the traditional neighborhood school concept, in that students would be bussed to schools outside their immediate neighborhoods. Even the Portland School Board was reluctant to relinquish its power and authority to more local groups. The plan however was adopted.

The first elementary schools to change to K-4 were in the Albina community, forcing students to attend upper grades outside their community. Blanchard's plan would mix black students with middle and upper class white students in order to equalize achievement. Funds that had supported "disadvantaged" programs under Model Schools would be used to transport students. Bussing, however, was one-way. Despite this plan minority enrollment continued to increase at Jefferson High School creating racial imbalance.

During the 1970's, as overall Portland Public School enrollment declined from 76,174 in 1970-71 to 53,670 in 1979-80, minority enrollment increased from 9.2% to 14.7%. By 1981 the minority enrollment had increased to 27.6%. This increase includes an Asian enrollment increase from 2.1% to 9.4%, which makes the district even more culturally diverse. The trend is shown in the superintendent's annual report on racial balance, Dec. 14, 1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>MINORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>62,028</td>
<td>684**</td>
<td>7,799</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>10,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1***</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>52,869</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>12,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>52,340</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>14,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>53,020</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>7,476</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>15,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Projected)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number   ***Percent
With a 27.6% minority enrollment, it is clear that the Portland district serves a pluralist community rather than a homogeneous one. The superintendent's racial balance report states that "even though the student population is still 72.6% non-minority, the total minority and the Asian populations continue to increase, thereby making the District more culturally diverse" (Enrollment, PPS. 1971).

The superintendent further identifies three factors which have led to racial imbalance in the district's schools. (Twelve schools have exceeded 50% minority enrollment.) These factors include:

- the increase in the number and percentage of minority students;
- 2) the tendency of minority students to live in the areas served by Early Childhood Centers and Jefferson High School; and
- 3) the community emphasis on neighborhood schools creates new and greater challenges in the District's efforts to meet state guidelines and District policies on racial balance (Superintendent's Report on Racial Balance, 1981).

These factors all demonstrate an increased concern on the part of the district's administration that the community has changed from a homogeneous one to a pluralist one.
III. PROJECT TURNAOUT

What specific problems did Jefferson High School encounter as its neighborhood was transformed into a pluralistic community? What district policies were adopted to meet these community changing needs? Did these policies reflect the charter of the district and did they reinforce the function of the schools? Did these policies meet the derived cultural needs of the schools? Did these policies meet the derived cultural needs of the larger Portland community and the Jefferson community? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to examine events at Jefferson from 1964 to 1974. During that ten year period enrollment steadily declined from 2,315 in 1963-64 to 918 in 1974-75 (see Figure 8 for this trend). At the same time the percentage of black student enrollment increased from 20% to 42%, even though the actual number of black students enrolled declined (see Figure 8). During the same time period achievement rates also declined so that the incoming freshmen in 1972 were on an average 1.5 grade levels behind the rest of Area I students. (Area I was comprised of Lincoln High School, Wilson High School, Roosevelt High School, Jackson High School, Jefferson High School and their feeder--elementary--schools.) This meant that during the decade the school had not fulfilled its function of improving student achievement. The Portland School District became increasingly concerned over this deficiency and in 1974 directed James Weed, an Evaluation Specialist for the district, to assess
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total enrollment</th>
<th>Black enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage of Blacks enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>2315</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>43%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The year Adams High School began operation.

Compiled from The Jefferson Study, 1975.

Figure 8. Jefferson High School Enrollment 1963-1974
the Jefferson situation. At the same time the Oregon State Department of Education agreed to conduct a school evaluation review.

The purpose of the Weed study was to collect data on school climate, student population, instructional program, financial structure, physical plant and grounds and to make recommendations for change. Weed was to answer four basic questions about Jefferson:

1) Why do so many Jefferson Area students choose to attend high schools other than Jefferson? 2) How can Jefferson enroll an increased percentage of graduates from local feeder (elementary) schools? 3) What special programs could be developed or emphasized which would fit into a specialized high school concept and attract students from other areas of the city to Jefferson? 4) What can be done to improve the parent and community perceptions of Jefferson? (Weed, 1974).

Initially Weed identified both non-school and school district influences that had a bearing on Jefferson High School's declining enrollment. For non-school influences he noted two primary factors. One was the city's construction of the I-5 freeway and the Fremont bridge ramps which further eliminated housing and physically split the community along east-west lines. The east side of the freeway was identified as being black and the west side as being white. The second factor which influenced the school was the national unrest and policies of confrontations and violence being used by minority groups, especially blacks. This had led to a more militant attitude on the part of blacks who were insisting that their children be given quality education in Portland.

The internal district's influences, however, were to have the most direct impact on the school. In 1969 Adams High School was opened, which resulted in boundary changes, and shifted the school population to the east. Many black students had to attend Adams
and many white students from Roosevelt High School had to attend Jefferson. While this was supposed to better balance the racial composition of Jefferson, many black families resented having children attend Adams since Jefferson was seen as their school. Many white families were fearful and resentful of sending their children to Jefferson. The open enrollment policy allowed black students to attend any high school in the city but white students of the Jefferson area were restricted to Jefferson. The policy resulted in a large number of white male students enrolling at Benson High School which was the only school open to them under the open enrollment policy. It also led to a number of illegal ways to avoid attending Jefferson such as falsifying addresses. The Administrative Transfer Policy encouraged blacks to attend elsewhere so they could receive a better education. Finally the school had been faced with a rapid turnover of administrators which eliminated effective long range planning. Each of these factors helped to contribute to Jefferson's declining enrollment.

In the Jefferson Study, as Weed's assessment was called, parents, students, graduates, eighth graders and their parents, and teachers' attitudes toward the school were surveyed in an attempt to answer the district's four basic questions. Regarding school climate, Weed found that both students and staff in 1974 had a positive attitude toward the school. They felt that Jefferson had been through a "traumatic period" between 1968 and 1973, but had "weathered the storm." The education offered at Jefferson High School was seen as equal to other city schools. Students and staff also demonstrated a positive feeling about the community and the
establishment of an environment which was conducive to learning. Parents were only mildly positive and did not support the school or its activities in any visible way. The parents rated the quality of education all the way from very poor to very good (Weed, 1974), which indicates that they probably knew very little about what was happening at Jefferson.

The parents in the community who were sending their children elsewhere had extremely negative attitudes which were expressed by dissatisfaction and lack of confidence in Jefferson. Eighth-graders were primarily fearful and negative. They felt the instructional program was easy and not challenging compared to other high schools. Graduates from 1971 were negative about their experience at Jefferson and graduates from 1973 were slightly more positive. During the early seventies Jefferson High School was perceived by the community as unsafe with little learning occurring. Perceptions included fear of their children being beaten up or knifed in the restrooms to full scale riots occurring in the halls. Discipline was seen as a significant problem by all groups but of most concern to parents. Eighth graders perceived the school as unsafe, especially for boys. This was the most common reason given by parents for not sending their children to Jefferson. The result was that 40% of the feeder school eighth-grade population attended Jefferson. Of the remaining 60%, approximately 25% of the eighth grade boys attended Benson High School, 10% of the eighth-grade girls attended Monroe High School and the remaining 25% were divided between those who legally and illegally attended other high schools (Weed, 1974).
The initial questions of the study were only partially answered. Negative perceptions of Jefferson by the larger Portland community were seen as the biggest obstacle to overcome and the hardest to change, since these perceptions were based on both facts and rumors. Weed recommended widespread communication and district commitment to a designated plan of action for at least a four year period. He also thought that the staff would have to have a positive and aggressive commitment to make substantial changes. He also recommended some specific changes within the school. These recommended changes included: 1) clear statement of philosophy and goals, 2) clear behavior expectations and enforced discipline, 3) show pride in diversity of student population and use this to reduce negative racial attitudes in the Portland community, 4) design a program of communication with feeder schools, 5) develop a more effective attendance accounting procedure, 6) modify the outside of the building to reduce outside students and help public image, 7) focus on curriculum development and instruction, academic program and greater career opportunities, 8) establish Jefferson as a unique and specialized (magnet) school. [The magnet concept meant that Jefferson would offer a course of study which would not be available in other Portland high schools. This would then draw students who would normally attend their neighborhood high school, hopefully reducing racial imbalance. The magnet choice for Jefferson was Performing Arts. This was to include a full range of courses in dance, television, theater.], 9) reorganize the school's management model and 10) increase the use of the community as a resource (Weed, 1974). These recommendations would
be expanded and modified under Project Turnabout.

In February of 1974 the Jefferson High School staff became concerned about the recommendations which were presented to the school board. At this point neither the staff, students or community had been given an opportunity for input or involvement into Jefferson's future. All through the Weed report racial attitudes had been alluded to but were not clearly addressed. The present board policies were seen by the staff as maintaining city-wide racist attitudes, Jefferson was an interracial school but the board's policies had attempted to eliminate racial concentration by bussing black students. White students and families, however, continued to flee the community and thus further increased minority percentages in the school.

The magnet, or specialty high school concept, was also questioned by the staff. Was this to be another Jefferson experiment or was it to be a part of a comprehensive city-wide plan? Did the proposed magnet reflect the needs of the Jefferson community? What was the purpose of the magnet? What would be its drawing power if one of its goals was to help increase enrollment? Was the district willing to provide the resources—time, money, personnel and commitments to see if such a program would work? Was the district willing to provide dynamic and creative leadership in its hiring of school administrators and to leave them in the school more than two years? Was the district willing to stop the drain on Jefferson's enrollment through its own policies? What effect would the magnet have on other schools' enrollments? (Jefferson Staff Position Paper, 1974). These and other concerns were in part answered by the
development of Project Turnabout. Project Turnabout was initiated by the district in response to the Weed report. A new principal and administrative staff were appointed to direct the project with input from the then current staff.

Project Turnabout was initiated to solve two basic problems. One was Jefferson High School's declining enrollment, and the second was to reduce the increasing percentage of minority students at Jefferson. It was designed to turn the school about so that students would want to attend, especially white students. This was to be accomplished through Title III ESEA Grant and Title IV-C ESEA Grant matched by district funds. The original grant proposal was to create a specialty school. The school would become four subschools within the school. One subschool would be the School of Science and Humanities. This school would provide general education for all the students. It would maintain all the state graduation requirements and provide college bound specialized courses. It would also maintain supportive courses for Career Education and Interpretative Arts. The second subschool would be the Competency School. This school would be a satellite of the School of Science and Humanities. It would ensure that students achieve minimum competencies, accomplish personal development, and accept social responsibilities. It also would provide career development for low achieving students and provide more individualized instruction. The third subschool would be the School of Interpretative Arts. This school was to be the drawing card to attract middle and upper middle class white students. Its aim was to "produce intelligent and appreciative consumers of the arts" (Turnabout, 1976). Its programs
included television, communications, applied arts and performing arts (dance, music and theater). The fourth subschool was the School of Careers. This school was to provide students with training for job entry skills, exploratory experiences, job training in data processing and legal secretarial, and to counsel and place students in jobs.

In the 1974 original grant, six goals for Project Turnabout were identified. They were:

1) improved academic achievement rate in basic skills of reading and math, 2) improved attendance rate, 3) reduction of the dropout rate, 4) improved personal and social attitudes reflecting behavior patterns, 5) enriched school offerings especially as they deal with career choices, and 6) improved public confidence in Jefferson High School (Project Turnabout Model for a Specialty High School, 1974).

These goals were then further specified in terms of measurable objectives for the project. Objective number 1 was threefold: to increase enrollment by 50 students, to improve attendance by 5% and to reduce the dropout rate by 5%. Activities to achieve this objective included improving contact with elementary schools, establishing a residency arts program, preparing a multi-media presentation to advertise the program and to program students by their needs and interests to enhance magnet attraction. Evaluation of this objective was to be regular attendance records.

Objective number two was to improve the achievement rate as shown by a two percent increase on standardized tests. Activities to achieve this objective included improving achievement through both the Competency School and the School of Science and Humanities. Students were to achieve basic skills before they became involved in other programs. This was to be accomplished by individual
prescription and counseling. This portion also raised concerns by the staff. These included: Would this lead to segregation in the skill program? Would it become a dumping ground for behavior problems?

Objective number three was to improve social behavior in the school by reducing student referrals by 10%. Activities emphasized shifting from a pupil management focus to a curriculum focus, improve the socio-economic mix and establish a climate of positive expectation.

Objective number four was to have students demonstrate a career choice by exploration through an increase of 10% enrollment in Career Education programs and related offerings including cooperative enrollment with another high school offering a specialized career program, cooperation with advanced higher institutions like Portland Community College and community based work experience. Jefferson would focus on business, data processing and governmental services.

Objective number five to increase interest in interpretative and performing arts by increasing enrollment by 15% and participation of students in at least three community arts activities. Activities would include the development and piloting of magnet classes beginning with dance, television, theater and instrumental music. High school students would also act as resident artists to feeder school students. Evaluation was through records of student enrollment and participation.

Objective number six was for the administration to describe the change process of taking a traditional school and turning it into a specialty school (Project Turnabout Model, 1974).
The initial plan can be diagrammed as follows for further illustration.

Project Turnabout was, under the Title IV-C grant, to be a change model in order to implement an instructional program and an overall school philosophy to "cope successfully with the needs of the changing community" (Adopter's Guide, 1976). The first step in this change model was the assessment of needs. This had been completed by the Jefferson Study by James Weed. However, as this study focused on specific district concerns, it is doubtful that the community's needs are adequately assessed. Step two as the establishment of goals and planning for implementation of the new management philosophy, curriculum design and magnet program. See Figure 9 which shows the need and the goal established to meet those specific needs. Although these goals are similar to the original goals for the project, there are interesting differences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Assessment Finding</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The achievement rate of Jefferson freshmen is 18% lower than for freshmen attending other Area I schools. The differential equals 1.5 years difference in grade equivalent scores based on national norms. A disproportionate number of students have low academic skills.</td>
<td>Improved academic achievement rate in basic skills of reading and math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson's attendance rate is below that of other area high schools. A sizeable number of students are tardy or skip class. Attendance is the school problem most often cited in interviews and group discussions.</td>
<td>Improved rate of attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disproportionate amount of staff time is being spent on student management.</td>
<td>New emphasis on curriculum rather than merely maintaining order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career courses lack specific vocational orientation. Too few work-related experiences are available. Pre-career counseling and career awareness is minimal.</td>
<td>Enriched school offerings, especially as they deal with career choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many negative attitudes (social and academic) about the school, from parents, students and teachers in feeder schools particularly.</td>
<td>Improved public confidence in the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Needs and Goals for Project Turnabout
All the needs are written as school/district rather than community needs. Except for the goal to improve public confidence in the school, they have little to do with the community served.

The norms for the institution include the philosophy of administration and the organizational structure of the institution. It includes the rules and regulations for conduct within the institution. The personnel includes the people and their specific roles.

Since one of Jefferson's problems had been a rapid turnover of administration, a new philosophy of management was proposed to correct this problem. The pre-Turnabout management model had been custodial management, but this was to be transformed into a change model. The emphasis would be placed on participatory decision-making, involving teachers in the design and implementation of curriculum reform. Two-way communication was viewed as the most important component of this model. New jobs and job descriptions were written for Principal, Curriculum Vice Principal, Project Coordinator, Unit Leaders and Program Leaders. The Project Coordinator and Unit Leaders were new positions designed to be change agents within the school.

The centralizing concept for the new management philosophy was Abraham Maslow's delineation of the hierarchy of human needs (Adopter's Guide, 1976). For change to occur within the school, teacher's basic needs would have to be met. The needs of the staff which were not being met were identified as security, self-esteem and self-actualization. This had been mostly a result of what the staff termed as revolving door administration. The staff felt that education occurred at Jefferson in spite of administration. Teachers were also professionally isolated with little or no input into
administrative policies. In order to meet the need of security, reasonable and understandable management structures were to be adopted. This included clear and precise guidelines and a five year commitment to the new curriculum design.

The need for self-esteem was to be met by providing teachers with both social and personal power:

- to have an institutionalized means by which information, ideas and reactions can be fed into those bodies responsible for decision making, and receive feedback concerning factors which influence the final decisions, is vital in contributing to the perception of power (Adopter's Guide, 39).

This also meant a change in structure, implementing a curriculum council forum where teacher's views could be heard on curriculum decisions. Unit leaders initially were viewed as teacher advocates for the teachers in their unit. Unit meetings were held bimonthly to discuss school-wide issues, and share information and strategies.

The third need, self-actualization, was to be fulfilled by unit leaders providing staff with positive and helpful support in curriculum development, classroom strategies, diagnosing problems and finding solutions. It was felt that if the teachers' needs could be met then the educational needs of the students would be better met by the teachers (Adopter's Guide, 40).

The following four figures from the Adopter's Guide show first the model for management (Figure 10), second, the structure for management (Figure 11), third, the structure for management of communications (Figure 12), and fourth, a share-decision making model (Figure 13). As Figure 10 illustrates the community was to have a significant role in management with input both through administrative cabinet and project planning. There was no direct link between the
Figure 10. Turnabout Management Model
Figure 11. Turnabout Management Structure
Figure 12. Turnabout Management of Communication
Figure 13. Turnabout-Shared-Decision Model
school's staff and the community. All contact was through the administrative cabinet (made up of the principal, vice principals and the project coordinator). The community was represented by the local school advisory council which advised the principal on issues affecting the school. This council did not represent any organized groups in the community but was comprised mainly of parents.

As for the management structure diagram (Figure 11), rather than simplifying management it added an additional layer of bureaucracy further separating staff from administration. In the beginning program leaders, who were a powerful group in the school, were in charge of day-to-day operations while unit leaders were charged with long-range planning and teacher advocacy. Conflict resulted between the two groups.

The communications model (Figure 12) was also complex. All information was channeled through the administrative cabinet which became a clearinghouse for information. This tended to decrease their effectiveness in making decisions. The administration also tended to lose creditability with the staff when decisions were made because staff did not see all the other factors influencing the decision, nor were they provided with explanations for decisions made. Another problem came in the formal and informal communication systems. Both systems were operating within the school and it often became difficult for teachers to determine which system to use. Often the informal system was faster and more receptive to teacher-initiated change.

Based on the design proposed by the Turnabout Project, the norm structure was not fully modified and within four years, by
1978, had begun to revert to the standard secondary administrative model. Even though the norm structure was significantly modified to meet teachers' needs, the old structure prevailed.

The material environmental resources of the school were also significantly altered by Project Turnabout. The east and west sides of the school's street accesses were modified to decrease student car traffic and outsiders. The building was modified to include dance studios and a full color television studio, specialized personnel were added in television, music and dance to include professional dancers and musicians. Money was spent on curriculum development, teacher planning time and other services. School funds were increased dramatically during this time period due primarily to federal funds.

The activities of the school became more curriculum oriented. The improvement of academic standards was the focus of the Project. Teachers were trained in concept-based curriculum, and were encouraged and paid to write curriculum, which was then implemented into the classroom. Teachers were encouraged to vary teaching strategies to meet the needs of a wider range of students. Placement of students by demonstrated skill levels began in Language Arts and Math so that all students would meet minimum competencies before moving through the standard high school program. The school reemphasized student achievement through both meeting teachers' needs so that they would be more effective classroom teachers and through diagnosing and prescribing students individually so that they could achieve whether they were at the basic skill level or the college prep level. The school recognized individual differences but not
cultural differences. The goals were designed to help Jefferson become like the other academically oriented high schools in Portland and to attract students from those high schools in order to end Jefferson's declining enrollment and increasing minority percentage.

No evaluation was accomplished by the district on Project Turnabout, even though the goals specifically detailed evaluation criteria. Since only scattered elements are left of Turnabout, it would be difficult now to determine how effective the program was. However, based on the goals of the program, and looking at the eight year period in which Turnabout has operated, it is possible to draw some general conclusions about the achievement of its stated goals. The concept of four subschools within the school was never implemented. In its place were created five units: Science, Humanities, Competency, Performing Arts and Careers. All were under the direction of the curriculum vice principal.

Improved academic achievement rate has occurred in both reading and math as compared with other Area I high schools. In April of 1981, based on the district's Portland Levels Tests,¹ 40% of Jefferson's entering freshmen read below the 212 RIT score which was the district's minimum competency level, which is equal to the average sixth grader. At the end of the freshman year 13% of the 40% had improved their reading skills above the minimum. In Area I, the average annual growth in Title I reading was 3.82, not including

¹The Portland Levels Test is a test developed by the district's evaluation department and administered to all eighth graders to determine whether they meet the district's minimum competencies in math and reading.
Jefferson; Jefferson's average growth rate was 6.28. Since the district has operated no standard measure of achievement throughout the district, overall student achievement data are not available. If achievement rates are measured by success in the classroom and a decrease in failure rates is an indicator, then a drop from an average failure rate of 49% in 1974 to an average of 18.8% in 1979 is significant (Curriculum Council). Therefore, Jefferson under Turnabout did become more successful in improving student achievement.

Attendance rates on the other hand have fluctuated over the eight year period and still remain a problem today. No effective reporting or communicating to parents was implemented for more than a one year period. Teachers attribute a large percentage of class failures to attendance. In 1979, in a curriculum council report, of the students who failed in 1979, twenty percent failed due to lack of attendance in elective courses and twenty-five percent failed due to lack of attendance in required courses.

In the principal's Jefferson High School: A Short Prospectus (Ayers, 1978), student supervision was described as an effective and efficient due process which had reduced discipline problems. During the four year period from 1974-1978, there were no major racial disturbances, little racial conflict within the school, student wandering and loitering in the halls had disappeared, vandalism had decreased, and there were no major crimes or violence. By 1982, however, management again became the focus of the school. In a memo to the staff on February 1, 1982 the principal initiated procedures to deal with an increase in student absences and
mischievous behavior (Ayers, 1982).

School offerings were enriched as illustrated by the 1978-1980 course offerings (see appendix). Offerings increased in the legal secretarial magnet, dance, television and theater. They had decreased, however, in other career areas. Jefferson lost its food services and medical careers programs. Industrial arts and home economics were cut back to offering only beginning levels. English and social studies electives were also reduced due to the curriculum reorientation. Except for the magnet portion of the school, the comprehensive program remains typical of the other city high schools. In 1978 there was also a reemphasis on basic skill improvement in which the superintendent set minimum standards for testing and stopped automatic promotion (Blanchard, 1978). At the same time Jefferson High School was also focusing its attention on both basic academic skills and social and societal protocol skills needed to survive both getting a high school graduation and getting and holding a job (Ayers, 1978).

The school's reputation has slowly improved in the larger Portland community. Enrollment in the magnet program at the high school level was 243 neighborhood students and 199 magnet students in 1980. The program also included 782 middle school students enrolled in the Jefferson Middle School Outreach Performing Arts Program at six middle schools (see appendix 1 for program scope and offerings 1980-1981). Another indicator of improved public confidence is the press coverage Jefferson High School receives in the local Oregonian and other local papers. One relatively recent example of this occurred in the Dec. 6, 1981, Oregonian which
contained a series of articles written by Huntly Collins. Titles for these articles included: "Jefferson High Works Hard to Provide Good Education," "Renowned Jefferson Magnet Program Lures Students," "Jefferson Battles Student Influx, Reputation as a Ghetto School." National public confidence has improved through the performing arts magnet which is seen as one of the finest in the nation.

In spite of these improved images Jefferson is still not able to draw students from its own feeder schools. At a school board meeting on school closure, Herb Cawthorne, black school board member, charged the district and the board with deliberately discouraging students from attending Jefferson. The potential number of students residing in the Jefferson/Adams attendance area is estimated at 3,000 (Citizens Report, 1980). Cawthorne stated that the district was "depending on students not wanting to go there and in fact promoted this image through its policies" (Cawthorne, May 11, 1981).

In spite of Jefferson's improved image in Portland, underlying attitudes and assumptions about the school have persisted. During the 1980 school year when parents called to find out the quality of Jefferson's program, they were informed by the Public Information Office of the school district that the performing arts program was excellent but the rest of the school was weak. This was later denied, with a promise to the principal from public relations that all requests for information regarding Jefferson's programs would be directed to Jefferson's Curriculum Vice Principal. Public confidence continues to be very dependent on school board attitudes and current press coverage of the school.

In meeting the district's goals, Jefferson has increased its
enrollment, according to the district's 81 Enrollment Report, from a low of 918 in 1974 to 1,360 in 1981-82. Several factors account for this increase in enrollment. From 1974 to 1980 there was a slow but steady increase: 1977-78 = 983, 1978-79 = 1,012, 1979-80 = 1,091. In 1980-81 enrollment again declined to 981 due to the school closure issue. Many students felt that if Jefferson High were to be moved or merged they did not want to attend and wanted to be able to choose which other high school they attended. In 1981-82 enrollment increased to 1,360 as a result of the closure of Adams and Washington/Monroe High Schools. Considering the total Portland enrollment declined from 79,000 in 1970 to 52,340 in 1981 (81 Enrollment Report) and all other high schools have experienced declining enrollment, Jefferson appeared to be stabilized, meeting the district's goal of stopping declining enrollment by turning the school around.

The minority percentages, however, have remained relatively the same with a sharp increase in 1980 due to the influx of Southeast Asian students. Jefferson's percentage of minority students increased from 43.2% in 1980-81 to 60.7% in 1981-82. The district's problems remain the same. Jefferson remains a racially imbalanced school. According to the project,

At that time the primary goal of the study was to concentrate on developing a pattern of organization, style of operation and program focus which would better respond to the needs of the community (Ayers, 1978).

Turnabout in part would be in response to the needs of the school district by drawing additional white students and improving student achievement. For portions of the larger Portland community, particularly those interested in the arts, the school has gone far
to meet their needs and is recognized nationally. In meeting the needs of the Jefferson community, however, it would appear from the evidence available that it has not met their needs or more local neighborhood students would be attending Jefferson.

Project Turnabout did not change district policies and in many cases those policies continued to work against the stated goals of the project. The changes that occurred within the school-norm structure, personnel, budget, curriculum revision, helped to improve the basic function of the school by improving student achievement. They did not and have not addressed or attempted to meet the needs of the changing Jefferson community. If anything, the changes which occurred under Turnabout no longer exist, and the school is now run like all the other high schools in Portland. The district, therefore, is once again moving to a more centralized curriculum and as it does, the diverse and unique Jefferson community will again be ignored.
IV. COMPREHENSIVE DESEGREGATION PLAN

On April 14, 1980 the Portland Public School Board adopted a Comprehensive Desegregation Plan:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts the attached Desegregation Plan, directs the Superintendent and staff to comply with and implement this plan and programs emanating from it, and calls upon the people of Portland, the leadership of church, business, labor, professional and civic organizations, and governmental officials to support your schools as we carry out this plan for the benefit of children of Portland (Board of Education, PPS, 1980).

The policy change that occurred was that integration became the district's highest priority. Under this policy the board defined integration to be the complete elimination of barriers to educational attainment: prejudice, racism, class differences and institutional discrimination. Each child, under this policy, would be provided with equal opportunity for educational achievement and the district would provide an integrated educational setting. The school board went beyond its normal policy resolutions and outlined strategies, program elements and administrative rules and regulations. Under this plan, change was to occur in the charter, norms, personnel, budget and activities of the district. This was to be an all out effort on the part of the district to provide integrated education.

The charter is reflected in the goals established and the policies adopted. The goals of the plan are:
1) To avoid and eliminate inequitable compulsory burdens imposed by desegregation; 2) To increase desegregation and integration through equitable means; 3) To provide education which more fully meets the needs of each child; 4) To create an excellent multicultural/multiethnic education for all children; 5) To promote interracial acceptance and understanding among students and staff; 6) To increase educational choice for all children in the district; and 7) To comply with federal and state laws, policies and regulations (Board of Education, PPS, 1980).

No specific evaluation criteria were outlined in the plan except that it would be monitored by an advisory committee made up of one representative from: Black United Front, Urban League of Portland, League of Women Voters, Schools for the City, the NAACP, Albina Ministerial Alliance, the Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon, American Friends Service Committee, Oregon Minority Educators, Committee of Spanish Speaking People of Oregon, the Oregon Association of Black School Educators, the Metropolitan Human Relations Committee, Committee for Neighborhood schools, Parents Advisory Committee on the Indian Education Project, Portland Council of PTA, ESAA Advisory Committee, and the American Jewish Committee.

The strategy to be used to implement the plan is voluntary desegregation, that parents will choose to send their children to an integrated school. Choice one is to attend the neighborhood school and choice two is to attend another school in the city which better fits the child's needs. Plan elements included program improvement and diversification. In order to accomplish this the district promised to establish a middle school at Eliot, in the Albina community; to improve Early Childhood Centers so that white students would remain longer in the black community; create a fundamental magnet at Boise, in the Albina Community; provide staff
training for all staff to enhance self-esteem and cultural identity and racial understanding; to improve multicultural/multiethnic curriculum and instruction; to reduce the number of suspensions and expulsions by improving discipline procedures; and to continue to support high school magnets. The district would also encourage voluntary transfers.

Other elements of the plan include citizen involvement in staff assignment, in which the principal is to consult with their local school advisory committee to determine characteristics, attitudes, talents and skills for staff. Staff hiring was also a separate element of the plan and this included increasing the number of black and ethnic group applicants. The district was to prepare an implementation plan by May 30, 1980.

During Phase I of the Comprehensive Desegregation Plan the district further detailed procedures of implementation directly affecting the norm structure of the district. There were four components of the plan that directly affected Jefferson High School. These included staff training, a twenty percent plan, curriculum improvements and discipline in the schools. The staff training was to provide teachers with an inservice class that taught black history and culture, history and culture of other ethnic groups and problems created by class in our society. During the winter of 1980, fifty Portland Public School staff attended such a class (district administrative staff). A survey was given to assess teachers' needs in multicultural education so that each school could more effectively plan its own inservice. In the spring of 1980 a revised class was given for teams from each of the high schools
and other schools most affected. This course consisted of a variety of possible approaches that individual schools could take in their staff training. The purpose of the course was to plan and implement an inservice class in their respective building. Each team, made up of principal, ESSA teacher and designated staff from the buildings, were paid to attend.

In addition, each school in the district with a twenty percent or more minority enrollment had to submit a twenty percent plan. This plan was to demonstrate how the staff training plan would include interaction with community groups and parents. This plan was to underscore the cultural uniqueness of the community, to gain positive community support and personal contributions by ethnic groups. It was to focus on teacher, student and parent perceptions and expectations.

The district established specific goals for multicultural/multiethnic curriculum and instruction. These goals were awareness and appreciation of cultural/ethnic diversity and individual uniqueness; development of and encouragement or respect for cultural/ethnic pride; and recognition and reduction of the harmful effects of cultural/ethnic stereotyping (Adair, Wolfe, 1980). Along with these goals the district published sample learner outcomes for each of the disciplines, which were for illustrative purposes. The district also revised the District's Scope and Sequence in Language Arts, Music, Visual Arts and Social Sciences to include the multicultural theme.

Discipline in the schools was the fourth area that directly impacted the schools. The philosophy of discipline that was to be
adopted was that student, teacher, and principal interaction should 1) be unconditional positive regard, 2) show mutual respect for human needs, personal safety and property, 3) demonstrate vigilant recognition of others' efforts and achievement and appreciation of their ethnic diversity. The result of implementing this philosophy was to be a reduction in the number of suspensions and expulsions particularly of black students. These four changes were to occur within the norm structure of the district.

Personnel changes occurred at the district level rather than the school level, for most schools. An office of Desegregation was added to the Community Relations department. Specialists in multicultural/multiethnic curriculum were hired. National consultants (Asa Hillard, Carlos Cortez) were flown in for meetings and conferences. National programs such as P.A.S.S. (positive alternative to students' suspension) were brought in as well. Each school was assigned a teacher from the Teacher Support Center who was to assist in staff training and be the liaison between the district and the school. At Jefferson, an ESAA (Title VII) teacher was also added to the staff to facilitate communication between the school and the magnet parents.

On the following Figure 14 is a breakdown of the Desegregation/Integration budget for 1979/80 (prior to implementation), the 1980/81 budget and the 1981/82 budget. A large portion of the budget is targeted for transportation which had been the primary method of desegregation. Increases have occurred in the office of Desegregation/Community Relations specialists and in Staff Training and targeted programs. In addition to this specific budget, other
DESEGREGATION/INTEGRATION

This discussion relates to the Office of Desegregation/Community Relations, parts of which appear in various budget items on the following pages. The Dimension/Program will be noted under description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FTE 1979/80</th>
<th>FTE 1980/81</th>
<th>FTE 1981/82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Title VII - ESAA Office of Deseg./Comm. Relations Specialists Dimension 1220A</td>
<td>19.0 $460,400</td>
<td>23.5 $613,769</td>
<td>22.5 $679,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative Transfer Support - &quot;Follow the Child&quot; Dimension 1420A</td>
<td>9.0 217,400</td>
<td>9.0 212,584</td>
<td>9.0 169,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transportation - Recruiting Dimension 27000</td>
<td>17.5 288,968</td>
<td>14.2 364,405</td>
<td>14.2 350,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transportation - Jefferson/Adams Dimension 27000</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>55,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1980 Desegregation Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Early Childhood Education Dimension 1150I</td>
<td>52.6 1,468,088</td>
<td>49.6 1,507,489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Elementary Deseg. Support Dimension 1250I</td>
<td>3.0 197,652</td>
<td>3.0 174,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Middle Sch. Deseg. Support Dimension 1350I</td>
<td>6.2 347,767</td>
<td>6.2 320,338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. P.A.S.S. - Positive Alt. to Suspension 1450I</td>
<td>2.0 55,159</td>
<td>2.0 61,756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff Training &amp; Targeted Programs -- Dimension 23206</td>
<td>1.0 236,865</td>
<td>8.0 449,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following describes the decreases in this schedule:

Item 5a - reduction in BOC support by $100,000 in response to the levy priorities established in January 1981.
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Figure 14.
items in the general fund are also labeled desegregation. Changes in the budget occurred in the district financial support of desegregation plans for early childhood education, elementary desegregation support and middle school desegregation support (see Figure 14).

In terms of the district's activities, Jefferson High School's attempts to implement the district's policy and plan for desegregation will be the focus. In the spring of 1980 a team from Jefferson, made up of three unit leaders, the ESSA Coordinator and the principal attended the district's inservice class, which was to provide each school with a range of possibilities in planning their school's staff training. The sessions included: Portland Public School commitments and overview of the Desegregation plan; teaching strategies for education that are multicultural (EOC, SOAI, PASS); curriculum development; definition of education that is multicultural; textbook, needs assessment and goal planning for education that is multicultural; cultural components process model; Afro-Americans; issues for classroom instruction; parent and student involvement strategies for integrated education and work sessions. As a result of the training the Jefferson planning team developed "School Community Relations Proposal" (see appendix 2).

Briefly, this proposal made some assumptions about education and its role in a pluralist community. First, it stressed that education is a process of cultural transmission. Second, it explicitly stated that the Jefferson community is pluralistic. Third, it emphasized that the school exists to help develop human resources in the community. Fourth, it stresses that schools should not be isolated from their community. Fifth, it
acknowledged that schools do not solely bear the cultures' responsibility to develop human resources. Sixth, that school should serve and advocate community needs. This proposal included goals for parents, neighbors, students and staff. The staff training was only one element of a more comprehensive plan. The team's process included phase I: the gathering of pertinent data which included the district's desegregation plan, 1970 and 1980 census data, the identifying of overall community problems, key pressures on the school (what kind and by who, how powerful), what had been done and how much in control the school was, plus listing of key institutions in the community. Phase II called for the establishment of a school community relation council which would work together to develop a community wide assessment. This involved a cooperative effort of the Local Parent Advisory Counsel, students and teachers, Phase III was to be a survey of community needs and analysis of data collected to plan Jefferson's program so that it would be responsive to community needs. Phase III was never implemented due to the district's debate over school closures.

The Jefferson staff training for the fall of 1980 had three goals. One was to distribute and discuss the district's desegregation implementation plan with the staff, to understand the legal basis of the plan and its goals and objectives. The second goal was to increase staff awareness of the benefits and potential scope of community school interaction. Goal three was to increase staff awareness of the benefits and potential scope of education that is multicultural. The staff training plan was developed by a committee comprised of two unit leaders, three vice principals, three teachers
and the principal. Before implementation the staff training plan was discussed with representative community members including Black United Front, Local School Advisory Council, Albina Ministerial Alliance, Title I advisory parent council and other interested parents and community members as well as the staff. One goal of the staff training sessions was to involve as many staff as possible. Attendance ranged from 80% to 90% of staff members per session.

The winter training sessions focused on the district's goals of black history and culture, the history and culture of other ethnic groups and class difference, with a special focus on the Hmong who were the newest addition to Jefferson's diverse student population. Based on the staff survey the majority of staff at Jefferson felt that they had already received substantial training in black history and culture. Based on a teacher expectation survey, this training had had little impact on their white middle class values and it was only when the staff had the opportunity to meet directly with community members to discuss both common expectations and diversity did awareness increase. The session with the community was also rated the highest by the staff.

The spring sessions which were to be joint working sessions between community members and staff to develop a community assessment tool and then assess the needs of the Jefferson Community were never realized. (For the specific goals and objectives of the Jefferson Staff Training plan see Appendix 3). On December 6, 1980 the school/community relations council met to implement the plan. On December 12, 1980, the staff were given the goals and criteria for school closure/consolidations, which included a statement by
Jefferson's Local School Advisory Committees giving their position on closure:

We the members of the Local School Advisory Committee for Jefferson High Oppose: 1) Any closing of Jefferson High School. Such closure would be detrimental to students in Northeast Portland, the community and the future of high school education in Portland. 2) Any plans for program and administrative merger of Jefferson High School with any other school. This would be unwelcomed and an unworkable solution to the high school closure problems. 3) Any action to move the Jefferson High School to any other facility. We consider the present location and facility to be ideal for meeting the educational needs of the students and community served (Closure/Consolidation Report).

On January 14, 1981 the School/community council meet to establish goals for the council as part of Jefferson's twenty percent plan. This plan was developed at Jefferson by a planning committee composed of the staff training committee, the original planning team and members of the parents advisory council. The long range goals for the 20% Plan were: 1) the community (school staff, students, parents, people living and/or working in the Jefferson attendance area) will accept the reality of our culturally pluralist society; 2) the community will work together to create quality education that is multicultural; 3) the community will work together to expand a school/community atmosphere that is multicultural.

On January 15, 1981 Friends of Jefferson met to discuss the closure issue. On March 11, 1981 the citizen committee recommended closure of two high schools, Adams and Washington/Monroe. Jefferson at this time was not considered by the Citizens committee for closure:

Jefferson High School also benefits from existing resource distribution policies. However, Jefferson's favorable staff allocation is not simply a result of small enrollment, but is tied to the District's policies regarding
desegregation and education of disadvantaged students. The committee concurred that the policy issues at Jefferson are complex and extend into areas beyond the committee's charge.

Therefore, the committee did not add Jefferson to its list of schools for further closure consideration (Citizens, 1980).

On April 4, 1981 the superintendent made his recommendations to the school board on school closure and consolidation. He recommended that Jefferson High School be moved to the Adams High School facility putting the black middle school at the Jefferson site. His rationale for moving was that Adams was a superior site, that the low enrollment at the two schools was hampering offering comprehensive programs and combining the two would make one full program, offering both a comprehensive high school and a magnet school. The Jefferson site could then house the neighborhood middle school and leave Eliot an Early Childhood Center. The remainder of April and May were spent by staff, community members and students protesting the move of Jefferson. Not only did this issue effectively serve to pull attention away from staff training, it made uncertain the very makeup of the community for the next fall. Planning for community assessment stopped.

Rather than uniting the Jefferson community the closure issue demonstrated just how diverse the community was and how little its members communicated with each other. The recommendation by the superintendent that Jefferson be moved came as a shock to many, but not all, staff members. The Black United Front was outraged by this plan which in place of creating a middle school at Eliot, threatened to take away the only identified black high school in the city. By April 13 the magnet parents had organized and were
strongly opposed to moving Jefferson further east. The move was viewed by both the Performing Arts staff and the magnet parents as a way to eliminate the Magnet Program at Jefferson. Considerable monies had been spent to remodel Jefferson creating four dance studios and a television studio, none of which Adams had. Conflict resulted between the black community and magnet parents both of which did not want the school moved, but for very different motives. Black community members viewed the magnet as taking away funds which could have been used to improve the regular and basic skills program rather than used to bring in white kids at a considerable expense. The white magnet parents and students felt hurt and rejected by this attitude on the part of members of the black community.

On April 13, 1981 the Jefferson Cluster Committee (feeder school parents) responded to the move by presenting two alternatives to the board. The cluster committee had two major concerns regarding the move. One was that transportation facilities were inadequate to handle the number of students who would be moved. The second and most important consideration was that Ockley Green (within 15 blocks of Jefferson) had just been converted into the middle school to feed Jefferson. Putting Tubman at the Jefferson site would put two middle schools within one half mile of each other. Tubman was started as part of the desegregation plan (housed temporarily in the old Monroe building) and already got more financial support from the district plus the performing arts magnet ties. This had already led to bitterness in the community and would result in further disruption. The Adams site was not seen as part of the Jefferson community (Beetle, 1981).
On April 13, 1981 faculty concerns were discussed. Out of 111 staff who voted in an opinion poll about the move, 85 opposed, 21 supported and 5 had no opinion. Some of the staff felt that they could not get involved, as employees of the district they would report to where the district sent them. Others felt they were a part of the Jefferson community and that the board should get a whole view of the situation. At the faculty meeting on April 13, 1981 the superintendent appeared to speak to the school staff. He was not able to identify any educational benefits that would result from the move. He tried to reassure the staff that it was an economic decision and that moving would result in an extended Jefferson community. The magnet would still remain an integral part of the school and the long term cost benefits would outweigh the immediate outlay for remodeling. He said he was sympathetic to the social dynamics of such a move but he was convinced that delaying would not result in a better solution for the long range. He asserted that the staff could make it work with a positive, creative, and futures attitude (Fenwick, 1981).

On April 22, 1981 the Jefferson staff presented school board members with an item by item analysis of the superintendent's advantages for moving. On April 23, 1981 the principal asked program leaders and unit leaders for input for a feasibility study of the Adams facility. On April 27, 1981 the principal reported to the district specifications for the move to the Adams site, plus a statement of concern. On April 28, 1981 the school board took testimony at Benson High school. The Black United Front accused the board of breaking its promises made to the black community under
the desegregation plan and that they were "double dealing and double crossing" (Herdon, 1981). At the same meeting the Jefferson Committee for Quality Education (made up of staff members) presented testimony to the board. They argued that the reasons for a successful program at Jefferson were a staff committed to mutual goals, low student/teacher ratio, reduced number of administrative transfers, attraction of magnet students and the beginnings of restored confidence among the neighborhood--enrollment had stabilized with a diverse student body.

The move to Adams would result in loss of a cohesive program, since there was no time for staff training or preparation of staff and student bodies or the community; increase student/teacher ratio; loss of neighborhood; 44% of the combined Jefferson/Adams neighborhood students would be forced to attend another high school in the district thus bearing a disproportionate burden of the budget cuts and closure.

On April 30, 1981 a letter from the principal to the Deputy Superintendent of Operations gave the options for the placement of Jefferson at the Adams facility, and specified space needs. On May 4, 1981 a letter from the Community and Intergovernmental Relations to the CIR staff with a copy to Principal regarding the public testimony that this office "tells callers that Jefferson's program is built around the performing arts and is weak in the academic areas" directs staff to refer questions about the curriculum to the school vice principal. On May 4, 1981 a letter was sent to board members that restated the position of the Jefferson Staff, School Board member McNamara visited Jefferson. May 5, School Board
member Bill Scott visited Jefferson and met with staff. That evening the district administration presented a position paper to the board concerning the state of Jefferson's academic program. A faculty member got a copy from a reporter. This position paper came from Jefferson's administration without input from staff, which had increasingly moved into a management mode. Before community input they established values and goals for Jefferson which included: 1) student achievement; 2) standards of promptness; 3) standards of attendance; 4) alternative programs within the school for inadequate attenders; 5) high teacher expectations for student performance, 6) high priority for learning academic skills and gaining academic success.

On May 7 Board Member elect Charlotte Beamon visited Jefferson and met with staff. Staff prepared a response to the position paper with input from administration and administration set up a meeting with the Central administration. The superintendent presented the staff response to the school board that evening. On May 11th the staff committee met with the entire staff; the administration met with program leaders and unit leaders whose task it was to prepare documents to determine program and school strengths, improvements and needs. These leaders were also given copies of all documents received by the school principal regarding the move beginning from March 10th to May 6th. The school board met this same evening and attempted to close a high school with no success. The superintendent came out with one definite recommendation, plan 4 from his report. School board members argued that the administration was depending on students not wanting to attend Jefferson and had created an image
to support this through open enrollment, Benson High School, Desegregation Plan, and Magnet concept. Cawthorne argued that if the district will "improve the academics, students will want to go to Jeff" (Cawthorne).

During the May 14 Board meeting the superintendent reviewed the status of the school closure/consolidations decision making process and suggested alternative courses of action for the board: delay the decision or make no decision. Both were unacceptable to the board. At the end of the school year the Jefferson's staff time was taken up with the school/program assessment. On May 29 the Jefferson administrative staff presented a reorganizational model which was to improve communication and shared decision making. Unit Leader positions were eliminated at Jefferson. On July 2 the board finally made the decision to close Washington/Monroe, and Adams for the 1981-1982 school year and Jackson High School for the 1982-83 school year. Jefferson was not moved.

Beginning on December 6, 1981 the Oregonian, in a series of articles by Huntly Collins, reported on the situation at Jefferson with an increased enrollment up to 1,360 students (53% minority) with closure of Adams. Collins asserted that Jefferson does provide good education: 1) that it has the most committed and competent faculty in the city; 2) that high expectations are set for students; 3) that explicit demands are made on students including homework; 4) that its curriculum is one of the most diverse available ranging "from modern dance under tutelage of world-renowned performers or learning computer programming on sophisticated machines" (Collin, 1981); 5) that the remedial programs are the most comprehensive
in the city and get twice the results as do other Portland High Schools; 6) that Jefferson's climate is one of warmth, friendliness and tolerance of differences. Collins also pointed out that problems remained. Of the neighborhood students who could enroll at Jefferson (only 48.6% did), 15.5% of those who did not attend go to Benson High School. Another problem was the low academic achievement among students who enter Jefferson from its feeder schools. Forty percent of the freshmen were below grade level in reading and forty-nine percent were below grade level in math. The largest problem remaining was chronic absenteeism.

Phase II of the Comprehensive Desegregation Plan for the 1981-1982 school year was carried out primarily by district administration. Dr. Asa Hillard provided consulting assistance to the district staff. Together they assessed the first year of the program and developed plans for the second year. Desegregation planning was largely unaffected by budget cuts during the 1981-82 school year. During Phase I, programs were improved and diversified. These included the opening of Harriet Tubman Middle School in September, 1980 with an enrollment of 478 students from 53 schools throughout the city. Early Childhood Education Centers were improved by adding additional staff, and a basic skills coordinator and a curriculum coordinator were added to each school. Continuous Progress program had also been implemented in these centers. Boise fundamental magnet was also improved. During Phase I, 31 schools offered a thirty-three hour staff training program in multiethnic, multicultural education. All schools with 20 percent or more minority enrollment implemented programs. In curriculum, the district's Scope and
Sequence for Language Arts, Music, Social Studies and Art were field tested. Pilot discipline projects were established at Lincoln and Grant High Schools. With the closure of Adams High School, its computer programs were moved to Jefferson.

The Phase II focus is to improve student achievement and increase administrative accountability. Also the impact of South-east Asian student population will be monitored by the district and programs developed to meet their needs. Asian enrollment has increased from 1,316 students in 1975-76 (2%) to 3,617 in 1980-81 (6.8%). The influx of Asian population is concentrated in the Jefferson High School attendance area, affecting both Early Childhood Centers and Jefferson High School.

Jefferson becomes a more significant element for the Comprehensive Desegregation Plan. Recognizing this, the superintendent, Central and Area staff and the school administration and staff are proceeding with plans to improve the Jefferson program (Phase II, 1981).

What historical background led to the development of the district's Comprehensive Desegregation Plan? In order to answer that question, it is necessary to briefly examine the district's policies during the 1970's and community response. The "Schools for the Seventies" program (Board Resolution #3553, March 23, 1970) attempted to eliminate racial concentration in a number of ways. This policy changed the attendance area around Jefferson High School, so that more whites were included in the area. It created K-3 Early Childhood Training Centers in the Albina community in an attempt to draw in white students. It eliminated 4-8 grades in the elementary schools in the Albina community forcing black students to attend those grades in other neighborhoods.
In 1974 at the same time the district was studying the declining enrollment and increasing minority population at Jefferson, it was also instrumental in the development of Oregon State Department of Education policy #4171. This policy stated that the Oregon State Board of Education would encourage and support racially integrated education; that each district with a large racial minority should formulate policies and implement programs to prevent or eliminate racial isolation. This policy encouraged, supported and requested districts to provide racially integrated education, which still meant "Children of all races learn together and acquire the skills and attributes of citizenship" (Policy #4171). In August of 1974 guidelines were developed to support this policy by the intergroup Human Relations Commission. This commission consisted of six members from Portland, six members from other areas in Oregon and two members from the State Department of Education in Salem. One of the six from Portland was a Portland Public School Board Member. After interviewing the Superintendent for Public Instruction and other members of the Department of Education in 1982, it was discovered that Policy #4171 was not a part of the state mandate or administrative rules for the Oregon State Department of Education but was a philosophical position and was therefore not binding on school districts.

The Portland School Board immediately adopted the State Department policy and its guidelines as part of its board policy (Administrative Series 2000). This reaffirmed the district's commitment to eliminate racial concentration which included the setting of a maximum of 50% minority enrollment in any school in Portland.
This increased the district's efforts to encourage white students to attend Jefferson High School while discouraging black students. The threat that was continually made by administration was that the district would lose its state and federal funds if enrollment of minorities was over the 50% mark. This threat stemmed both from the Oregon State Department of Education guidelines and Oregon State Revised Statutes 69.150 and 695.155 which defined discrimination and directed the State Board of Education to establish rules to insure compliance, with failure to comply resulting in the withholding of all or part of state funds. As of 1978 seven schools were not in compliance in the Portland district.

In the district's 1975 policy, students from the black community were scattered and isolated to achieve school desegregation. One example given by the Coalition Report stated that the forty-four students who left Eliot in 1977 were bussed to twenty different schools in the district (Coalition Report, 1978). In 1975, the Open Enrollment Policy for secondary schools was to provide a rich menu of school offerings so that students would have a wide choice to attend any high school in Portland. The only operational magnet programs however, were the Jefferson's Performing Arts Magnet and several years later Lincoln's International Studies Magnet. Budget constraints were the reason given for not beginning the magnets. However, it was not necessary to attract black students to other high schools in the city.

From 1973-1977, parents of Administrative Transfer students signed a form stating that, "my child will continue in the school to which he is transferred until all grades in that school are completed and that he will automatically be transferred to the upper grade school or high school serving that school (Coalition Report, 1978)."
It was therefore only necessary for the district to have a magnet in the black high school so that white students could be attracted, thereby reducing racial concentration.

In 1977 the Board tried to restrict black enrollment at Jefferson High School under the Boise-King Redistricting Plan. This plan again attempted to reduce the racial concentration at Jefferson by prohibiting black students from attending their neighborhood high school. The black community was vocally dissatisfied with this plan and the School Board on July 25, 1977 deferred action on the Boise-King Plan and asked recommendations be made by NAACP, Urban League of Portland, and Metropolitan Human Rights Commission. Based on the recommendations of these groups the board formed the Community Coalition for School Integration which spent fifteen months studying the issues and presented a full report with recommendations to the board on Nov. 27, 1978. The Coalition was comprised of members from 38 organizations in the city. Its commitment was to:

1) identify common concerns in the Portland community regarding school desegregation, and 2) develop the kind of policy recommendations that would enhance equal educational opportunity (Coalition Report, 1978).

The Coalition Report to the school board supported school integration as a means of equalizing educational opportunity. It further listed factors that would increase positive results for school desegregation. These factors included beginning integration at an early age, community support and involvement, showing benefits for blacks and whites, commitment and visible support from the school board and administration, improved discipline and high expectations for all students. The committee also recognized that an all voluntary desegregation program was not a viable alternative and they further
recommended alternatives such as school pairing. The district's immediate response to the report was to reduce the scattershot effect of busing.

On January 8, 1979 the Board of Education adopted resolutions X-6119 and X-6121. The first resolution dealt with school integration curriculum, to survey the extent of instruction in minority cultures, encourage teachers to use multi-ethnic themes, and appropriate materials. The second resolution dealt directly with standards of performance for teachers in multi-ethnic education and would become a part of the evaluation procedure for teachers. Since teachers would be evaluated on their incorporation of multicultural education in the classroom this could be a powerful tool on the part of the administration to insure multicultural/ethnic curriculum infusion.

Multicultural curriculum had been a focus of Area I since 1975 when select individuals from Area I were trained in multicultural curriculum. They worked with James Banks, Cliff Campbell and Carlos Cortes all leading proponents of multicultural concepts. As a result of their training under Title VII funds, Concepts and Strategies for Multicultural Education was prepared and published. The following year each school who was a part of the Title VII Project sent teams of five teachers to be trained in multicultural curriculum and to develop a plan to infuse and inservice their schools staff. At Jefferson High School as a result of this training, curriculum changes occurred in the Humanities Unit and the Library-Media center, but funds were cut so no inservice class was created for the staff as a whole. In 1979 multicultural education became
a part of the evaluation process for teachers. In 1980, the staff training team were given copies of the district's document, *Multicultural/Ethnic Curriculum Guidelines* to distribute to the staff.

The Desegregation planning team viewed this document as a rush public relations job and were concerned over the learner outcomes and whether staff would be evaluated against them. The document was withheld from the staff until clarification could be made by district personnel. Teachers were to be evaluated against the three goals of the guide but the rest of the guide was for illustrative purposes only. (See Appendix 3 for specific goals.)

On July 29, 1979 the Black United Front threatened a boycott for the opening of the 1979-80 school year if the board did not address the issues raised in the Coalition's Report. The major goals of the boycott were: 1) to increase the percentage of black enrollment for individual schools from the district guideline of 30% to 40%; 2) to insure that white students who enrolled in the Early Childhood Centers stay in the black community for their entire elementary experience; 3) to create two middle schools in the black community; 4) to allow minority hiring to be the same as the percentage of minority students; 5) to improve achievement and test scores; 6) to correct the alleged unfair treatment of black students, reducing the number of black students expelled or suspended (*Oregonian, July 29, 1979*). In September of 1979 the school board began to adopt both short and long range policies which resulted in the Comprehensive Desegregation Plan.
V. CONCLUSION

Malinowski's basic principles of institutional form and function provide an analytical procedure for the analysis of institutional change and its impact on the derived cultural needs of the community it serves. The Portland Public School District No. 1 serves an increasingly pluralistic community. This community, particularly the black community, has been increasingly vocal in their dissatisfaction with the school district's policies and programs since the early 1970's, which are to serve the needs of black and other minority children. Why do these groups feel that their needs are not being met by the district?

The district's charter has remained consistent in regards to integration and desegregation policies. Both policies have been viewed by the district's administration and the school board as means to provide equal educational opportunity, which means to assimilate all students so that they can be successful in American society. This remains the primary goal of the district.

Several underlying assumptions continue to shape district policies. Portland school board policy has reflected the needs and values of the dominant culture. The major focus of the district's charter has been and continues to be preparing young people for the "world of work." These values include hard work, punctuality, delayed gratification, future-orientation, achievement through the efforts of the individual and self-reliance. Failure, therefore,
is a result of one's own personal inabilities or weaknesses. Success is rewarded by obtaining a good job and financial gains. All groups served by the district must fit within this framework. Groups or individuals who do not are regarded as failures and are consequently blamed for their own failures.

It appears in the Portland district at least that only when the minority group could bring enough economic and political pressure to bear on the district did changes in policies begin to occur. In most cases the district has operated from its own economic and political needs rather than from community needs. Pressures from the black community did not result in basic policy resolution changes, except to make integration the highest priority in the district. Rather, changes were implemented within and consistent with the existing charter. At no time did Project Turnabout attempt to deal with the larger policy issues of actual integration and desegregation. The district's Comprehensive Desegregation Plan was the major attempt on the part of the school board to not only establish policies regarding desegregation, but to dictate regulations for implementation. This was in large part a situational response to economic and political pressures rather than a basic change in the district's charter.

Because the district's charter has remained unchanged, programs and activities implemented to respond to economic and political pressure are short-term. Project Turnabout and the Comprehensive Desegregation Plan are both good examples of this. Turnabout was designed to reduce racial concentration and to further desegregation. When larger economic issues came to bear, Turnabout was
slowly phased out, keeping only the magnet, without an evaluation
to determine if it was effective. The Comprehensive Desegregation
Plan also was subverted when the larger economic and political issue
of school closures was debated. Phase II of the district's Compre-
hensive Desegregation Plan clearly shows a reaffirmation of the
district's charter which is to improve student achievement. Desegre-
gation as defined by the district has now become the vehicle to
achieve that goal.

The norm structure of the district moved from a highly central-
ized organization to a decentralized one during the 1970's. Under
the decentralized model, Schools for the Seventies, the community
was to have greater input into administrative decisions through
Area and local parent advisory councils. The makeup of each Area
was designed to maintain an even racial balance. This worked to
keep minority groups powerless since they were only a small frag-
ment of the larger Area. At Jefferson the local parent advisory
council did work with the principal, but issues were usually deter-
mined by central or area administration or based on situational
problems. The district has since moved toward a more centralized
model (especially in curriculum), thereby making decisions more
uniform and further removed from the community's actual derived
cultural needs.

During Project Turnabout, basic norm principles were modified,
which for a short time resulted in a shared decision-making model.
However, with continued external pressure, that model has been
replaced with a more traditional management model. Under the Compre-
hensive Desegregation Plan the norm structure has not been altered
except to add an additional level of administrative support. Since changes did not occur in the basic charter of the school district, it is not surprising that little change occurred within the norms of the institution.

In terms of personnel for the district, few changes have been made. This has resulted in the continued reinforcement of traditional school values. The Schools for the Seventies, of which Project Turnabout was a part, was implemented by one superintendent. The Comprehensive Desegregation Plan was largely implemented by the school board while they had an acting superintendent. A new superintendent has been hired for the 1982 school year. It is as yet too early to tell if any substantial changes will result. The record suggests that it will not.

Although the district has been somewhat more active in recruiting minority employees, the number remains small and they remain scattered across the district in accordance with the district's philosophy of eliminating racial concentration. Jefferson, therefore, has but a handful of minority staff members.

So far as provisions of material apparatus, the district has spent large sums of money on equipment, remodeling, materials and personnel to support their policies. No evaluation can be made about whether this would have been the most efficient use of the district's resources to accomplish its goals. The larger Portland community has continued to support the district financially but only by a narrow margin as the May 1982 election demonstrated. The district's tax base won by only 1,056 votes, less than a one percentage point.
The black community spokesmen have continued to object to the way in which the district has allocated its resources. They argue that monies identified for desegregation should be used to improve basic programs in which their students participate rather than expensive "magnet programs" to attract white students; that greater local community input needs to occur for both the allocation of resources and the hiring of personnel.

The activities of the district have been focused at two levels. One has been the classroom, where direct interaction takes place between teachers and students. In this context the district has instituted their multicultural/ethnic orientation. Administration is evaluating teachers on their use of the multicultural/ethnic goals. This is the only context of the educational institution in which parents have an effective input. The curriculum, instruction and teacher attitudes towards students should reflect a multicultural perspective. However, since this attitude is not formalized in any other component of the district's organizational structure or in the community as a whole, it becomes very easy for teachers to get caught between the local community and the district.

The other level of activities occurs at the district level. Here, there is little concern expressed for community needs, except by a few individuals. The organizational structures tend to force individuals to look at the larger Portland community and to deal with specific groups as the need arises by creating new administrative units or redefining existing ones to cope with specific problems.

The function of the school district remains--to improve student achievement. In order to accomplish this the district, from its
earliest history, has attempted to create a uniform community. This cannot and will not meet the needs of a pluralistic community. District policies have been implemented to respond to situational priorities, usually resulting from external economic or political factors, rather than from the identification of real community needs. Since these situational responses are not an integral part of the district's charter they are quickly phased out or simply disappear when the situation changes. The community's derived cultural needs therefore are not met and this results in increased conflict between the school district and the community it is to serve (see Figure 15).

In single culture communities the school district's economic and political needs would match closely with the derived needs of the community served or the institution would be modified so that these needs are met. However when the community becomes a pluralistic one, the district's economical and political needs, which conform to the dominate culture, will not necessarily serve the needs of other cultural groups. When community expectations and values are not expressed by the political and pragmatic concerns of the district, struggle between the community and the school district results. At first the community attempts to work within the existing structures, but when its efforts for change are frustrated it is forced to attempt to gain some control, at least at the local level. As long, however, as change does not occur within the basic charter of the school district, changes within the structure of the district will result in reaffirming traditional values rather than accommodating new ones. The function of the district continues to be to create uniformity within the community. Pluralist communities need to
Figure 15. Community/School Conflict Model
allow maximum diversity. Conflict will continue and there is little hope that the dominate culture will be ready or willing to accept the concept of a pluralist community, one in which each cultural group can maintain its own culture and at the same time interact with other groups. This change would require a substantial shift in attitude and perspective, allowing students to become representatives and bearers of cultural variations.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1
### COURSE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION NO.</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>SEM/yr.</th>
<th>PERIODS/SECTION</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T VISUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Basic Art</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Adv. Art Studio</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1053</td>
<td>Ceramics/Sculpture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>Drawing/Painting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054</td>
<td>Art Metal</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(If more than 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1st yr. Typing</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>2d yr. Typing</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>3rd yr. Typing</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>Office Machines</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td>Beg. Shorthand</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>Adv. Shorthand</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Pers. Finance</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td>Bus. Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Bus. Eng.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9150</td>
<td>Legal Secretary</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Basic Comm.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>Basic Comm. Image</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>Soph. Comm. Dev.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>Soph. Comm. Impr.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Soph. Comm. Image</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>Jr. Eng. Develop.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td>Yrbook Workshop</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>Internatl. Lit</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Science Fiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>Mass Media Lit.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Pulp Lit.</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Bus. English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Journal. Wrtng. I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Journal. Wrtng. II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>JHS News Bureau</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Newspaper Wksp</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Reading Dev.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Reading Imp.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Reading Power</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Jr. Eng. Imp.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>Jr. Eng. Image</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Writing Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Writing Imp.</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Comm. Dev.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION NO.</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>SEM/yr.</td>
<td>PERIODS/SECTION</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(If more than 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FOREIGN LANGUAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Spanish 1-2</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Spanish 3-4</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Spanish 5-6</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>German 1-2</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>German 3-4</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>French 1-2</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>French 3-4</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HOME EC.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>ABC's Child Care</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Coed Clothing</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Creative Clothing</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Coed Foods</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Creative Foods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Home Decoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Pers. Fin.</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9154</td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>3-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL ED.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2250</td>
<td>Auto Tune Up</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2251</td>
<td>Exploring Ind. Ed.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2252</td>
<td>Basic Electronics</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2253</td>
<td>Interm. Electr.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>Basic Metal</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256</td>
<td>Basic Wood</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2257</td>
<td>Interm. Wood-Roos.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>Exploring Drafting</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9151</td>
<td>Intro to Auto Mech.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9152</td>
<td>Adv. Auto/Ind.</td>
<td>1 &amp; Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2255</td>
<td>Interm. Metal</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OFF-CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3852</td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3853</td>
<td>Metal Technology</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3854</td>
<td>Bldg. Constr.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (+1)</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3855</td>
<td>Draft. &amp; Mech. Dwg.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3856</td>
<td>Adv. Elec.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (+1)</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3857</td>
<td>Student Tutoring</td>
<td>1-2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3858</td>
<td>Co-op Work Exp.</td>
<td>1-2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3859</td>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>1-2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>(9)-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3860</td>
<td>Gen. Work Exp.</td>
<td>1-2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>(9)-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td>1-2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450</td>
<td>1st yr. Algebra</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2451</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2452</td>
<td>Applied Math</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2453</td>
<td>1st yr. Algebra</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2454</td>
<td>2nd yr.: Algebra 3-4</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2455</td>
<td>2nd yr. Alg. 3-4</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2456</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2457</td>
<td>Math Seminar</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2458</td>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2459</td>
<td>Intro to Computers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2460</td>
<td>Advanced Topics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERFORMING ARTS**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>Wind &amp; String Wksp</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2751</td>
<td>Stage Band</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2752</td>
<td>Jazz Ensemble</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2753</td>
<td>Show Band</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2754</td>
<td>Audio Engineering</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2755</td>
<td>Orchestra &amp; Arrang.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2756</td>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2757</td>
<td>Beg. Piano</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2758</td>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2759</td>
<td>Frosh Glee</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2760</td>
<td>Strings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2761</td>
<td>Strings Ensemble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DANCE**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2951</td>
<td>Basic Dance</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2952</td>
<td>Int. Dance</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-7 MWF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2953</td>
<td>Adv. Dance (Repertory)</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2954</td>
<td>Beg. Ballet</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-7 MWF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2955</td>
<td>Int. Ballet</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2956</td>
<td>Adv. Ballet</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-7 MWF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2957</td>
<td>Beg. Tap</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5:30-8:30 Mon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2958</td>
<td>Int. Tap</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2 MWF, 3-4 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2959</td>
<td>Beg. Jazz Dance</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2960</td>
<td>Int. Jazz Dance</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-7 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2962</td>
<td>Dance Seminar</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4 TTh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION NO.</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>SEM/YR.</td>
<td>PERIODS/SECTION</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PERFORMING ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>THEATRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2970</td>
<td>Beg. Drama</td>
<td>Yr. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2971</td>
<td>Int. Drama</td>
<td>Yr. 1</td>
<td>3-4 MWF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2972</td>
<td>Adv. Drama</td>
<td>Yr. 6-7 MWF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2973</td>
<td>Beg. Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2975</td>
<td>Cost. &amp; Makeup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-4 TTh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2977</td>
<td>Theatre Light.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4 TTh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2980</td>
<td>Beg. Mime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-4 TTh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2981</td>
<td>Musical Thtr.</td>
<td>Yr. 6-7 TTh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2982</td>
<td>Children's Th.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4 TTh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2979</td>
<td>Beg. Fencing</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>3:30-5:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TELEVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9160</td>
<td>Intro. to TV I&amp;II</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9162</td>
<td>Int. TV Prod.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9163</td>
<td>Adv. TV Prod.</td>
<td>Yr. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9164</td>
<td>TV Journalism</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9165</td>
<td>TV News Prod.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9166</td>
<td>Writing for TV</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9167</td>
<td>TV Aide</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL ED.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050</td>
<td>Basic PE Men</td>
<td>1-2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3051</td>
<td>Recreational Act.</td>
<td>1-2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3052</td>
<td>Basic PE Women</td>
<td>1-2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3053</td>
<td>Lifetime Activ.</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3054</td>
<td>Team Sports Women</td>
<td>1-2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3055</td>
<td>Team Sports Men</td>
<td>1-2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3450</td>
<td>Gen. Science</td>
<td>Yr. 1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3451</td>
<td>Health Ed I</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3452</td>
<td>Health Ed II</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3453</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3454</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3455</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3456</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3457</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Yr. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3458</td>
<td>Medical Career</td>
<td>Yr. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3460</td>
<td>OMSI Seminar</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOCIAL STUDIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3551</td>
<td>Basic Soc. St.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3552</td>
<td>Image Soc. St.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3553</td>
<td>Basic Amer. St.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3554</td>
<td>Image Amer. St.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555</td>
<td>Basic Curr. Iss.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3556</td>
<td>Image Curr. Iss.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3557</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3558</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563</td>
<td>Dr. Ed/Health I</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health I/Dr.Ed.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
1. Introduction. If education is a process of cultural transmission which occurs in a variety of interdependent social systems, and if learning is a total social process of growth and development, then the Jefferson community should provide each student with a set of cultural experiences so that successful and meaningful cultural adaptations might be made. As a part of that community, Jefferson High school must participate in this culturally pluralistic society. Through consciously sought "cultural feedback" Jefferson may be required to restructure its organization and activities in order to better serve the needs of the community and society. Such educational strategies must become a major and clearly articulated set of goals.

2. Overview. Identified Jefferson community members will jointly plan and participate in a forum to gain awareness and acceptance for the need to work together to prepare youth for life in a culturally pluralistic society. A survey will be prepared for interviewing the Jefferson community to determine its ethno-graphic make-up and its needs. As a result of this information, the school will plan with (and as part of) the community to provide service which will meet the needs as identified. This process will be reviewed and modified to become an ongoing regular activity between the school and community.

   a. Parents, neighbors, students and staff will develop an awareness and acceptance for the need to participate in an education that is multicultural.
   b. Parents, neighbors, students and staff will work together to provide an education that is multicultural.
   c. A representative steering committee will be formed and trained to develop plans to involve parents, neighbors, students and staff.
   d. Parents, neighbors, students and staff will participate in workshops.
   e. Parents, neighbors, students and staff will develop an interview form to assess the community's needs.
   f. Parents, neighbors, students and staff will interview community members to assess needs.

4. Objectives:
   a. Staff
      1. Multi-cultural Education team and consultants will develop a series of awareness sessions which will include but not be limited to information on Black history and culture, history and culture of other ethnic groups and problems created by class in our society.
      2. Staff will participate in awareness sessions.
3. Staff members will participate in winter workshops with parents, neighbors and students.
4. Staff members, working with parents, neighbors, and students, will develop an assessment tool and assess the community's needs.
5. Staff members will be kept informed of the progress of this plan, receive multi-cultural material as requested and have ample opportunity to analyze and discuss issues which arise.

B. Parents and Neighbors

1. Parents and neighbors will be contacted for input into the plan.
2. Working with the Local School Advisory Committee, parents and neighbors will be identified and recruited to participate with staff and students in winter workshops.
3. Parents and neighbors will participate in winter workshops.
4. Parents and neighbors, working with staff and students, will develop an assessment tool and assess the community's needs.
5. Parents and neighbors will be kept informed of the progress of this plan, receive multi-cultural material as requested and have ample opportunity to analyze and discuss issues which arise.

c. Students

1. Students will be contacted for input into the plan.
2. Student leaders will be identified and recruited to participate in joint parent, neighbor, staff and student workshops.
3. Students will participate in workshops.
4. Students, working with parents, neighbors, and staff, will develop an assessment tool and assess the community's needs.
5. Students will be kept informed of the progress of this plan, receive multi-cultural material as requested and have ample opportunity to analyze and discuss issues which arise.

5. Timeline

Autumn 1980 - Awareness sessions
Winter 1981 - Develop interview form
- Community involvement
- Ongoing awareness/acceptance discussions
Spring/Summer 1981 - Interview
Summer 1981 - Compile and analyze data
Summer/Autumn 1981 - Develop plan
Autumn 1981 - Submit to district
Winter 1982 - Plan for implementation
Fall 1982 - Implement plan
6. **Resource People**

- Dr. Tom Hogg, OSU
- Dr. Heflin, PSU
- Roger Gray
- Carlos Cortez
- James Banks
- David Milner
- Jesse Jackson
- Joseph Drake
- Assa Hilliard
- McKinley Bunt
- Ernest Bell

- Pearl Gray
- Ron Herndon
- Harriet Adair
- Carolyn Leonard
- Herb Cawthorne
- Chairman of School Board
- John Buckman
- Dick Whiticome

need Asian and native American resource persons

7. **Format**

- a. Tuesday morning awareness sessions 8:00-9:30
- b. Monday faculty meetings
- c. Winter workshops (to be determined)

8. **Evaluation:**

- a. establish Evaluation Team to assess building needs, evaluate staff development plan and awareness sessions.
- b. number of participants from parents, neighbors, staff and students.
- c. completion of interview form.
- d. completion of assessment of community's needs by staff, students, parents and neighbors.

Submitted by Steering Committee:

- Larry Ayers, Principal
- George Bleeke
- Judy Doyle
- Lucy Thomas
- Lloyd Neskimen
- Bob O'Neill

June 9, 1980
APPENDIX 3
Jefferson Desegregation Staff Training Plan

Jefferson's staff training plan is designed to provide the staff with a basic understanding of education that is multicultural and to provide an opportunity, jointly with the community, to make that concept a reality. The District has taken a radical step in their desegregation plan which changes the basic assumptions about education being a process of assimilation to education being a reflection of a culturally pluralistic society. We feel that Jefferson's staff training plan is the beginning of this change within a public school. This staff training plan is only one component of the larger school-community relations plan which is being implemented this year by Jefferson's school-community relations coordinating council. We feel that to assure success we must have full staff participation. We are not offering this as a staff training inservice course but are incorporating it within the school day without reducing instructional time. The overall objectives of our plan are to bring all staff to an awareness of the need for education that is multicultural and to assess our community and determine how best to meet their needs.

SEPTEMBER

Objectives:

1. To provide staff with input into the proposed staff training plan.
2. To integrate teachers perceived needs into the plan's components.
3. To write the formal staff training plan for the District.
4. To present the formal plan to the District for approval.

Format & Time:

1. Unit meetings Monday September 22.
2. Meetings

Human Resources:

1. BMC Staff Training Committee
2. Cl. Jackson
3. Administrative Cabinet

Material Resources:

1. Summary Report of Proposed Staff Training in BMC.

Evaluation:

1. Unit Leader assessment and recommendations based on unit discussions.
2. Administrative Cabinet approval.
OCTOBER

Objectives:

1. To provide Jefferson's staff with a basic understanding of Jefferson's historical background to understand the impact of minority and social class in the Jefferson community.

2. To provide the Jefferson staff with an understanding of school district's policies, effect of boundary changes, Project Turnabout and external factors.

3. To provide Jefferson staff with a basic understanding of the current desegregation plan and to enable them to assess its implications for Jefferson.

4. To help Jefferson's staff develop an awareness of national and Oregon laws and their impact on desegregation at Jefferson.

Format:

1. Jefferson roast
2. Background reading on desegregation plan
3. Group discussion

Time: Tuesday, 8:30-9:10, 2nd & 4th

Human Resources:

1. Past/present staff member and alumni
2. Dr. Ayers, B. Frazier, H. Grose
3. H. Adwin
4. Black United Front, Ron Herndon
5. Chairman of School Board or member
6. C. Jackson

Material Resources:

3. Desegregation plan

Evaluation:

1. Participation of staff, staff assessment of activities pre and post.
**NOVEMBER**

**Objectives:**

1. To enable Jeff's staff to examine their own backgrounds to determine what impact it has on their attitudes, beliefs and teaching style.

2. To provide Jeff's staff with an understanding of the dominant cultures' value and how they are reflected at Jefferson High School.

**Format:**

1. Survey
2. Group activity

**Time:**

1. 2nd and 4th Tuesdays 8:15-9:10
2. Faculty or Unit meeting

**Human Resources:**

1. Bleeke, Kornegay, Bowman
2. Teacher Support Center, Jackson, Stickle, McGrew

**Material Resources:**

1. Survey to assess teacher background and attitudes.

**Evaluation:**

1. Participation of staff
2. Staff assessment pre and post
December

Objectives:

1. To examine the current anthropological theories; assimilation, acculturation, cultural pluralism, separation, and to understand current district deseg plan in light of these theories. To examine difference between the way the district is operating now vs the past in regard to desegregation.

2. To provide staff with a basic understanding of ethnic groups within the Jefferson community and their treatment historically.

3. To provide staff with resources about each ethnic group.

Format:

1. Capsule presentation by ethnic group members
2. Large/small group discussions
3. Lecture
4. Films

Time:

1. 2nd and 4th Tues., 8:15-9:10
2. Faculty meeting
3. Individual teacher prep time

Human Resources:

1. Ethnic group members—specific persons yet to be identified. (Black, Hispanic, American Indian, European-American, Oriental)
2. Doyle, Stanler, Thomas
3. Dr. James Banks
4. Assa Hilliard
5. Barbara Sizemore
6. C. Posey
7. Whitcombe or Adrai

Material Resources:

2. Film: Killing Us Softly
3. Film: Images of Indians part 4 PBS
4. Biblio of films, books
5. Current articles
6. Established resource rooms

Evaluation:

1. Participation of staff
2. Staff assessment pre and post
JANUARY AND FEBRUARY

Objectives:

1. To provide staff with an understanding of different cultures' definition of education.
2. To provide staff with an understanding of different social classes' definition of education, values and attitudes about education.
3. To provide staff with an awareness of the impact of societal curriculum and hidden curriculum on the formal curriculum.
4. Staff will examine expectations about school, Jefferson, by parents, students, staff, and others.

Format:

1. Large/small group work
2. Community presentations either live or taped
3. Discussion
4. Lecture/tape
5. TV presentation
6. Role play

Time:

1. 2nd and 4th Tues 8:15-9:10
2. Faculty meeting (for Cortez)

Human Resources:

1. Carlos Cortez
2. Doyle, Bleeke, Grose, Thomas, Stemler
3. Ethnic group members-Black, Hispanic, Vietnamese, American Indian, Caucasian. Social Econ. representatives: Magnet, blue collar, welfare, boost rep., middle class, upper-middle class.
4. Drilling & TV Services
5. Drama Dept.

Material Resources:

1. Cortez article on Societal Curriculum
2. TV presentation pos/neg effects of media on ethnic groups
3. Articles on value of education, effect in the school
4. Survey of students
5. Focus of concern paper

Evaluation:

1. Participation of staff
2. Assessment by staff pre and post.
MARCH

Objectives:

1. To provide staff with an understanding of education that is multicultural vs multicultural education.

2. To provide staff with the opportunity to examine the differences in perception between these two concepts and their impact on Jefferson.

3. To provide staff with an understanding of our ethnographic community.

4. To provide staff with an opportunity to participate with community members.

Format:

1. Lecture
2. Discussion
3. Group activity with the community
4. Community staff workshops

Time:

1. 2nd and 4th Tues. 8:15-9:10
2. Evening meetings to be determined (community)

Human Resources:

1. Dr. Hogg and OSU intern
2. Thomas, O'Neill, Meskimen
3. Local Citizens Advisory Council
4. School-community relations coordinating council

Material Resources:

1. District's MCE document
2. Demographic info from 1980 census
3. Data collection instrument

Evaluation:

1. Staff participation
2. Assessment by staff pre and post
GOALS OF MULTI-CULTURAL/ETHNIC EDUCATION

* AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION OF CULTURAL/ETHNIC DIVERSITY AND INDIVIDUAL UNIQUENESS

* DEVELOPMENT OF AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF RESPECT FOR CULTURAL/ETHNIC PRIDE

* RECOGNITION AND REDUCTION OF THE HARMFUL EFFECTS OF CULTURAL/ETHNIC STEREOTYPING
APRIL

Objectives:

1. To train selected staff/community members in developing an assessment tool and procedures for assessing the Jefferson community by a professional consultant.
2. To develop an assessment instrument.
3. To encourage community/staff interaction.

Format:

1. Workshop

Time:

1. Evenings to be determined.

Human Resources:

1. Staff and community
2. Dr. Hogg, CSU Intern?
3. School community relations coordinating council

Material Resources:

Evaluation:

1. Completion of data collection instrument.
Objective:

1. Assess Jefferson's community (community includes: parents, students, staff, magnet parents and students, people living in the Jefferson neighborhood, people working in the Jefferson neighborhood).

Format:

1. Interview community members.

Time:

Human Resources:

1. Staff and community members
2. Dr. Hogg
3. Jefferson school community relations coordinating council

Material Resources:

1. Assessment instrument

Evaluation:

1. Assessment of community completed.
JUNE

Objectives:

1. Analyze Community assessment.

Format:

1. Unit meetings
2. Jefferson school-community relations coordinating council meetings

Time:

1. After school meeting
2. evening meetings
3. planning days

Human Resources:

1. staff and community members
2. Dr. Hogg and OSU intern

Material Resources:

1. To be determined

Evaluation:

Please add to budget for Community Relations Project:

1. Dr. Hogg consultant fee $125/day for 10 days $1,250
2. Mileage - 164 miles round trip for 6 trips at 17c a mile $170
3. Intern stipend $16/day for 30 days 500
4. Supplies $100 100