R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 988 UD 004 752

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN BERKELEY--THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS.

BY- SULLIVAN, NEIL V.

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.92 21P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, *BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, *BOARD OF EDUCATION ROLE, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY COOPERATION, BUS TRANSPORTATION, STAFF ROLE, ELECTIONS, INTEGRATION PLANS, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

DESCRIBED IS THE HISTORY OF THE EFFORTS TO DESEGREGATE THE BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, SCHOOL DISTRICT, WHICH IS SCHEDULED TO BE FULLY DESEGREGATED BY SEPTEMBER 1968. CHANGE BEGAN IN THE 1950'S WITH THE ELECTION OF A "LIBERAL" TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION. FIRST STEPS INVOLVED IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN AND MAKING EFFORTS FOR BETTER RACE RELATIONS. DESEGREGATION BEGAN IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS BUT NOT WITHOUT COMMUNITY FRICTION TO THE POINT OF A DEMAND FOR A RECALL ELECTION OF THE BOARD. HOWEVER THE BOARD WAS VINDICATED ON ITS STAND FOR VOLUNTARY INITIATION OF DESEGREGATION. A NEW SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT WAS FACED WITH THE JOB OF IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN AND BEGAN HIS EFFORTS BY DEVELOPING COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND PRODUCTIVE LIAISON WITH HIS STAFF. THE NEXT STEP INVOLVED DESEGREGATING THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. THE WIDE GEOGRAPHIC SEPARATION OF IMBALANCED SCHOOLS IN THE CITY REQUIRED THE DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN WHITE SCHOOLS AS RECEIVING SCHOOLS AND THE USE OF FEDERALLY FUNDED BUSES AND ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR THE 230 INCOMING PUPILS. HOWEVER THIS WAS ONLY A "TOKEN" EFFORT. VOLUNTARY REVERSE BUSING AND A TIMETABLE FOR COMPLETE DESEGREGATION HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED. IT IS FELT THAT THE REQUISITES FOR SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ARE FULL COMMITMENT BY THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND THE BOARD, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WITH AND FAITH IN THE BOARD AND ADMINISTRATION, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF "WORKABLE" PLANS. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA'S CITIES, SPONSORED BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 16-18, 1967. (NH)

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN BERKELEY: THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS

Prepared by
Neil V. Sullivan, Ed. D., Superintendent of Schools
Berkeley Unified School District-Berkeley, California
for the
National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity
in America's Cities
sponsored by the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
November 16-18, 1967

In recent years Berkeley, California, has been fortunate to have a school district which recognizes its problems and works effectively toward their solution. The city schools already have completely desegregated the junior high schools, and have made a token start at the elementary level. The School Board has committed itself to completing the process in all schools by September 1968. When that goal is reached, Berkeley will be a rare example of a major city working out a solution to this problem without court orders, violence, boycotts, or compulsion, but only with the conviction of the Board of Education, the Administration, and the citizens that it was right.

This has not been achieved overnight. To place the present achievements in their proper context it is necessary to trace the development of events in the recent past.

PRE-1964

The Liberal Renaissance - Prior to the mid-1950's Berkeley's local government -- including the Board of Education -- was typical of those found in most middle-size, middle-class communities. The orientation was pro-business, with a heavy emphasis on keeping the tax rate down. This condition was so pronounced that teachers, in order to obtain a much needed and earned salary increase, were forced to use an initiative petition to get school revenues raised; the Board had refused to do so.

There are many different versions concerning the beginning of the liberal renaissance. There is general agreement that the first concrete step was the election of one liberal to the Board in 1957, followed by another in 1959, and two more in 1961. With the 1961 election the liberals assumed control of both the Board of Education and the City Council. However, even with only one "liberal" Board member in the late 1950's, the Board began to give attention to the problems of race relations in a multi-racial city.

Preliminary Steps - A citizens committee (named the Staats Committee after its chairman) was organized to study race relations within schools. This committee did not come to grips with the question of de facto segregation but sought to deal otherwise with improving educational opportunities for minority youngsters and improving race relations in the schools. For the late 1950's this report was a forward-looking document. It led to two particularly noteworthy developments.

First, the hiring practices for minority teachers were greatly improved. The number of Negro teachers increased from 36 in 1958 to 75 in 1962. Negroes also were advanced to principalships and other high positions in the District's administrative hierarchy. And by 1962 there were about 30 Orientals on the certificated staff.*

Second was the Intergroup Education Project (IEP). This project was designed to help teachers appreciate cultural diversities and better understand youngsters from other than middle-class backgrounds. It conducted seminars for teachers, mass community meetings, and weekend conferences for this purpose. The IEP helped prepare the ground for the high staff support for later integration efforts.

Junior High School Desegregation - In 1962 a delegation from the Congress on Racial Equality visited the Superintendent of Schools -- and later the Board of Education. Complimenting the School District for progress already made, the CORE delegation suggested that it was time to get on with the task of desegregating the schools. CORE asked that a citizens committee be appointed to study this problem.

The report included a recommendation for desegregating the junior high schools by assigning some students from the predominantly Caucasian "hill" area to Burbank, the Negro junior high school; students from predominantly Negro west Berkeley would be assigned partly

---

* The distribution of minority teachers among the various schools did not keep pace with progress in hiring. Most of these recruits were assigned to predominantly Negro schools. In more recent years we have made a concerted effort to achieve a better racial balance on all faculties. It is important, especially to combat stereotypes, to the education of all children to see members of all races working together in such respected vocations as teaching.

to Garfield, the Caucasian junior high school. Since the third junior high school already was racially balanced, this recommendation would have eliminated de facto segregation at the junior high school level.

The report struck the community like a bombshell. Although the community was aware that the committee was functioning, most people had not taken seriously the possibility that such a concrete recommendation would be made. The reaction was intense. During the remainder of 1963 and through January of 1964 there was extensive community discussion of the proposal. Two hearings were held -- one attracting 1200 people and other drawing over 2000. PTA's and other groups set up study committees on this problem; never before had such crowds attended PTA meetings!

In the hill area affected by the recommendation many liberals faced a dilemma. Some asked: "How do we express our opposition to this particular proposal without sounding like bigots?" Our response was to ask them to develop a better plan. Many sincere critics of the citizens committee proposal set out to do just that.

One of these alternative proposals was named the "Ramsey Plan" after the junior high school English teacher who suggested it. This plan proposed desegregation of Berkeley's three junior high schools by making the predominantly Negro school into a 9th grade school and dividing the 7th and 8th graders between the two remaining junior high schools.

In February 1964 a five-member staff committee was asked to study the reactions of the Berkeley school staff to the citizens committee proposal and to other ideas that had been offered. Every school faculty was asked to consider the matter.

In March the 5-member staff committee reported to the Board that the staff as a whole was favorable toward integration, and preferred the Ramsey Plan to the original citizens committee proposal. The Board instructed the Superintendent to consider the educational pros and cons of the Ramsey Plan, and its feasibility for September 1964 implementation.

The results of this study were presented to the Board and the community on May 19, 1964, a landmark date in the history of Berkeley schools. Again there were over 2000 people in the audience. The opposition, which had formed the "Parents Association for Neighborhood Schools" (PANS) solemnly warned that if the Ramsey Plan or any such desegregation proposal were adopted, the Board would face a recall election. The Board members did vote for the Ramsey Plan -- and they did face recall.

The Recall - Through the summer months the opponents of the Board collected signatures on recall petitions. A rival group was formed to defend the Board (Berkeley Friends of Better Schools). By late July the PANS group had enough signatures to force a recall election.

There followed a series of procedural skirmishes before the City Council and the state courts. Finally, an election was called for October 6, and after an intensive and heated campaign it was held. It was a stunning triumph for the courageous incumbent Board members. This election was another landmark for Berkeley education and for the cause of desegregation across the nation. There was more at stake than indi-

vidual Board members continuing in office. The basic issue was the survival of a Board of Education which voluntarily took effective action to desegregate schools -- not because of court order or other compulsion, but simply because the Board believed desegregation was right. If such a board of Education could not be sustained the lesson would not be lost on boards of education in other cities facing the same problem. Thus, it was extremely significant that in this election the Board was vindicated by the Berkeley community.

SULLIVAN ADMINISTRATION

The New Administration - On September 1, 1964, five weeks prior to the recall election, I took office as Berkeley's Superintendent of Schools in the midst of a climate of change and uncertainty. Of the five-member Board of Education which had unanimously invited me to come to Berkeley, only two remained in office. One had resigned because his business interests led him to move from the city. Another was transferred to become minister of one of the largest churches of his denomination in New York City, and a third was appointed by the Governor to be a Superior Court judge. The two who remained were facing a recall election.

There also was a sweeping change in the school administration. Virtually every top ranking member of the central administration was either new to the District or new in his position. Over one-third of our schools had new principals.

Making the New Plan Work - The decision to desegregate the junior high schools had been made before I arrived. The role of the

new administration was to make it wo k.

School opened as usual and the new system was put into effect with no marked difficulties. In fact, the orderliness of the transition was an important contribution to the defeat of the recall attempt. It demonstrated clearly that desegregation could be achieved without the dire consequences that had been forecast.

Developing Community Support - Defeat of the recall election meant that courageous Board members would remain in office, and the junior high school desegregation plan would continue. My next task as Superintendent was to attempt to reunite a badly split community, to develop a sense of community understanding, and to provide a basis for school support.

I approached this problem by creating a climate of openness with the public. We immediately established the practice of recognizing and admitting our problems and inviting the community's help in seeking solutions. As a new superintendent, I was beseiged by invitations to speak publicly. I accepted as many as I could and during the 1964-65 school year scheduled over 100 speaking engagements.

I issued an open invitation to citizens to visit my office and discuss their school concerns, to share their ideas and suggestions. In addition I telephoned or wrote to dozens of people who had been recommended to me as community leaders deeply interested in schools. For several months I met almost continually, often a few times a day, with citizens individually and in groups. These meetings made me familiar with the Berkeley community and established a climate that encouraged exchange of ideas.

I established a liaison channel between my office and the area-wide PTA Council. I made it a practice to convene three or four briefing sessions a year with the unit presidents and council officers of that organization, and included other groups such as the League of Women Voters. At these sessions problems and issues facing the schools, as well as hopes and plans for improvement were discussed.

The day after the recall election I recommended the formation of a broadly-based School Master Plan Committee, to examine all facets of the School District's operation and to develop guidelines for the future. I urged participation of all elements of the community, making it clear that we wanted cooperation, regardless of positions in the recall election. The response was heartwarming; over 200 highly qualified citizens were nominated or volunteered their services. The Board of Education selected 91 people from this list to serve on the committee. Also named were 47 staff members. The committee has been hard at work for two years, and presented its report in the fall of 1967.

During my first year in Berkeley, I was invited by the local newspaper to write a weekly column on local and national education matters. This column has been a valuable means of keeping the community informed and introducing some new ideas. During the past year I accepted the invitation from a local radio station to conduct a weekly program of fifteen minute sessions dealing with events in the school system and issues facing public education. Each month the final week's program is extended to one hour, and features a direct phone-in from the radio audience.

In addition to developing relationships with the general public, we have worked to maintain good liaison with the staff. We have frequent breakfast conferences with the leaders of both teacher organizations, and meet regularly with the Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council, made up of teacher representatives chosen by each faculty.

The purpose of these communication efforts has been threefold. First, extensive dialogue with staff and community helps to identify and define problems needing attention. Second, it serves as an excellent source of new ideas and suggestions. Third, it helps interpret our problems, goals, and programs to the community.

Our efforts have been, in short, to "mold consensus" in the community behind the school system. Although we have not achieved unanimity on any single subject (that would be impossible in Berkeley!) there have been good indications during the past three years. It seems that we have succeeded in molding community support for the schools, and in developing sufficient consensus to resolve some of the crucial problems facing urban schools today.

A START TOWARD ELEMENTARY INTEGRATION

Segregation in the Elementary Schools - The Board's adoption of the Ramsey Plan, followed by the defeat of recall election, insured desegregation at the junior high school level. Since there is only one regular senior high school, our entire secondary school program, beginning with grade 7, was desegregated. However, we still face de facto segregated elementary schools. The four elementary schools in south and west Berkeley are overwhelmingly Negro. The seven schools located in

the northern and eastern hill areas of the city are overwhelmingly Caucasian. In between, in a strip running through the middle of Berkeley, are three desegregated schools. Since the racially imbalanced Negro and Caucasian schools are on opposite sides of the city, separated by the integrated schools, boundary adjustments will not solve the problem.

When the Ramsey Plan was adopted the Board tabled a companion recommendation that would have desegregated the elementary schools by dividing the city into four east-to-west strips, each containing three or four schools. The schools within each of these strips would have been assigned students on a Princeton principle, i.e., 1-3 in some schools, grades 4-6 in others.

Educational Considerations - It is not the function of this paper to develop fully the case for school desegregation. However, the basic motivation underlying our progress in Berkeley can be stated concisely.

Many studies, in Berkeley and elsewhere, have documented the fact that segregation hurts the achievement of disadvantaged youngsters. Schools with a preponderance of these boys and girls have low prestige and generally lack an atmosphere conducive to serious study.

The emotional and psychological harm done to children through this type of isolation also has been demonstrated. Regardless of cause, racial segregation carries with it the symbol of society's traditional rejection of Negroes.

The benefit of integration extends to children of all races. We are all sharing this society, and if it is to be successful we must learn to respect each other and get along with one another. This will not happen if segregation remains.

These considerations have been taken seriously in Berkeley as we move toward total school integration.

ESEA Busing Program - The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 allowed the schools to make a beginning on the problem of elementary school segregation. Berkeley's share under Title I of that Act was approximately a half-million dollars. A major share of these funds was used to reduce pupil-teacher ratios in our four target area (Negro) schools and to provide extra specialists and services for students attending them. The reduction of pupil-teacher ratios left a surplus of 235 children. The seven predominantly Caucasian hill-area schools had spaces for these youngsters. Our proposal for the first year's use of Title I funds, then, included improved services and reduced pupil-teacher ratio in the target area schools and the purchase of buses to transport the 235 "surplus" youngsters to the hill area schools.

In the preparation of this project we again employed our principle of mass community involvement. Each school faculty was invited to submit suggestions. Their response was gratifying. These suggestions, when piled together, produced a stack of paper several inches high. When they had been sifted and evaluated, and a project developed, we submitted it to the Board. Copies were made available to the school faculties and the public for their reactions. Two major public meetings were held in different sections of the city, and the Board of Education held a workshop session at which teachers could react. Many valuable suggestions and constructive criticisms resulted and were incorporated into the final proposal.

As might have been predicted, most of the public attention was centered on the busing proposal, although it involved a relatively minor share of the funds. This time the opposition, though by no means silent, was much less severe.

Since the children in the hill area schools were not being asked to go anywhere else -- the hill schools were simply going to receive youngsters from the other areas of the city -- this provided no focal point for the development of opposition. And the proposal included employing eleven extra teachers, paid with local money, and placing them in the receiving schools to maintain the pupil-teacher ratio there. A few scattered voices were raised against the proposal, but the preponderance of community opinion was favorable. Both teacher organizations endorsed the project, and on November 30, 1965, the Board adopted the program for implementation the spring semester.

The proposal went to the State Board of Education and became one of the first fourteen ESEA projects approved in the State of California. We had approximately two months to prepare for its implementation -- the selection of youngsters (this was voluntary on the part of the parents), the employment of teachers, arrangement of transportation, and other administrative details. Parent groups in the receiving schools helped by establishing contact with the parents of the transferring students. The students in the receiving schools likewise participated, and some wrote letters of welcome to the newcomers. Dry runs were conducted with the buses so that by the time the program was implemented in February 1966, the necessary advance preparation had been accomplished.

Results to Date - Although the program has not been in effect long enough for an extensive objective evaluation, early indications are that it has been extremely successful. The children have adjusted well in their new school environment and, by their performance, have made friends for integration. One evaluation, made by an outside consultant employed by the District, found that receiving school parents whose children were in class with Negroes were more favorable to integration than parents whose children were not in class with Negroes. And parents of the bused students were so pleased with the results that many requested that their other children be included.

This limited program provided an integrated experience for the 230 youngsters being transferred, less than 10 percent of the sending schools' enrollment. It also provided token integration for the receiving schools. However, it left the four southwest Berkeley schools just as segregated as they were before, although with a somewhat improved program due to the reduced pupil-teacher ratio and added services.

COMMITMENT TO TOTAL INTEGRATION

The Problem - Although the ESEA program has provided a start in the direction of elementary school desegregation, we never regarded the busing of only 235 youngsters as the solution to the segregation problem. The problem will not be solved as long as our four south and west Berkeley schools remain overwhelmingly Negro, and the schools in the north and east overwhelmingly Caucasian. The segregation problem must be solved if minority youngsters are ever to close the achievement gap and if all youngsters, regardless of race, are to be adequately prepared for life in a multi-racial world.

Although we have integrated the schools down to the 7th grade, we strongly believe that integration must begin earlier. In too many cases attitudes already are hardened and stereotypes developed by the time the youngsters reach the 7th grade. It is, of course, politically and logistically easier to desegregate the secondary schools. In fact, a bi-racial city that has not desegregated its secondary schools is by definition not committed to integration. The problem is much more difficult at the elementary level. Buildings and attendance areas are smaller, children are younger, and community emotions are more intense. Yet, the problem must be solved at the elementary level. It is ironic that solutions come more easily at one level, but more good can be accomplished at the other.

The Commitment - The commitment of the Board of Education to desegregation of all elementary schools in Berkeley came in the spring of 1967. In early April a delegation from west Berkeley made a resentation to the Board, stating that it was time to get on with the job of total desegregation. The delegation had many other recommendations specifically relating to the south and west Berkeley schools and the programs available to minority youngsters. At this meeting I recommended that the Board authorize the Administration to develop a program of voluntary reverse busing from Caucasian areas to south and west Berkeley. I let it be known that this was to be regarded only as a stop-gap measure to demonstrate good faith and did not represent a solution to the desegregation problem.

At the next meeting, however, before we could develop a reverse busing plan, the issue moved ahead. Both of our certificated staff organizations made appeals to the Board for action either to erase de facto

segregation completely or at least to make a significant step in that direction. Officials of the local NAACP and other members of the audience supported these appeals. A motion was presented to the Board calling for desegregation of all Berkeley schools. The Board concurred and established September 1968 as the target date for desegregating the schools.

The next two or three Board meetings, including one workshop or "open hearing", drew crowds of several hundred spectators and many speakers. Most of the speakers and most of the crowds were supportive of the Board's action; there was a minority who disagreed with the Board's position -- some opposed desegregation altogether, and others felt that 1968 was too long to wait.

On May 16 the Board adopted a formal resolution reaffirming the September 1968 commitment and adding an interim calendar of deadlines for the various steps required to achieve desegregation. The Administration was instructed to develop plans for total integration. We were instructed to make our report by the first Board meeting in October, 1967. The timetable calls for the Board to adopt a particular program by January or February 1968. Seven or eight months would then remain for implementing the program in time for the opening of school in September 1968. This is the calendar on which we now are operating.

The Board included in its Resolution on Integration two other features: first, the assumption that desegregation is to be accomplished in the context of continued quality education, and second, that massive community involvement was to be sought in development and selection of the program. Both of these features I heartily support.

Developing the Plan - We went to work immediately. The Administration compiled information on enrollment and racial makeup of each school, school capacities and financial data. This information was distributed to each faculty. We then called a meeting of all elementary school teachers; I relayed our charge from the Board and asked each faculty to meet separately and develop suggestions. We also sent information packets to over sixty community groups and invited them to contribute their ideas. By the end of June we had received many suggestions, both from staff members and lay citizens.

Meanwhile both local and national endorsements were pouring in. The Berkeley City Council passed a resolution commending the Board on its commitment to integration. Other local organizations and individuals did the same.

During the summer months two task groups were assigned to work on the problem. One was concerned with the logistics of achieving desegregation and the other was concerned with the instructional program under the new arrangement. The Board appointed a seven-member lay citizens group to advise the Administration in development of its recommendations. Even after the Administration's recommendation has been given to the Board, this group will continue to function as an advisory body to the Board. Upon receiving the Administration's recommendation, the Board plans a series of workshop sessions to provide every opportunity for community reaction and suggestion.

As this paper is written (mid-September) we are making excellent progress toward meeting our deadline. Soon after the opening of school, a report from the Summer Task Group outlining four or five

of the most promising plans was sent to each school faculty and to each group or individual who submitted a plan during the summer. These proposals are being made available to the community as well, along with the many suggestions received earlier from staff and lay citizens. School faculties and the community-at-large are invited to react to these proposals and to make suggestions to the Administration. Procedures have been organized to facilitate a response from school and community groups. Each faculty has been asked to meet at least twice. On one afternoon, schools will be dismissed early and the district-wide staff divided into cross sectional "buzz" groups. Each of these groups will submit ideas. Following these steps we will use the task group proposals, along with the reactions and suggestions that come from the staff and community, in developing our recommendation to the Board. This recommendation will be presented to the Board on schedule, at the first meeting in October. From that point on the matter will be in the hands of the Board, which is to make its decision by January or February 1968.

As our plans develop, we have received invitations to appear before many groups, large and small. Some have been hostile at first. However, meeting with them has made possible an excellent exchange of views and an opportunity for explaining our program to people who had not been reached earlier. We anticipate that the fall months will be crowded with such speaking assignments. It is our firm commitment, and that of the Board of Education, to inform the citizens of Berkeley thoroughly about the issue and about prospective plans prior to the Board's adoption of a program in January or February.

LESSONS LEARNED

While working toward integration in the Berkeley schools over the past several years, we have learned some lessons:

1. Support by the Administration and the Board of Education for the concept of school integration is absolutely essential. The Board must give its consent before any plan of desegregation can occur. The support of the Superintendent and his administrative team is vital in helping to obtain Board support and in making a success of any program adopted. While the Board nor the Administration need broad community support, their leadership role is vital.

2. Integration has the best chance of success when a climate of openness has been established in the community. Lines of communication with Board, Administration, teachers, and the community-at-large must be kept open through frequent use. Anyone who thinks a solution to the problem of integration can be developed in a "smoke-filled room" and then rammed through to adoption while the community is kept in ignorance is simply wrong.

Our citizens are vitally interested; they are going to form opinions and express them, whether we like it or not. It is in our interest to see that these opinions are formed on the basis of correct information. Furthermore, the success of integration, once adopted, depends upon broad community support and understanding between the lay community and the schools. This can be created only through a climate of openness.

3. <u>It can be done! A school district can move voluntarily to desegregate without a court order and without the compulsion of violence or boycotts.</u> Berkeley has demonstrated that a school community can marshal its resources, come to grips with the issue of segregation, and develop a workable solution.

Furthermore, if the new arrangement is well planned and executed, it will gain acceptance on the part of many who opposed it at first.

Many fears and threats which arose in Berkeley were not realized. The Board was not recalled. Our teachers did not quit in droves. In fact, the reverse happened; our teacher turnover rate has been drastically reduced during the last two or three years. Integration did not lead to the kind of mass white exodus being experienced in other cities (which, interestingly enough, have not moved toward integration). In fact, last year for the first time in many years the long-standing trend toward a declining white enrollment in the Berkeley schools was reversed.

The not-so-subtle hints that direct action for integration would lead to loss of tax measures at the ballot box proved to be unfounded. In June 1966 we asked the voters for a $1.50 increase in the ceiling of our basic school tax rate. Much smaller increase proposals were being shot down in neighboring districts and across the nation. In Berkeley we won the tax increase with over a 60 percent majority.

4. <u>A community can grow. Berkeley did!</u> When the citizens committee report came out in the fall of 1963 with an actual plan for desegregation of the junior high schools, the community suddenly awoke to the fact that desegregation was a real possibility. The furor that

resulted could be predicted in any city. However, as large public hearings and countless smaller meetings were held by dozens of groups, support for integration began to grow and opposition diminish. One area of the city that reacted emotionally at first later provided some of our strongest supporters.

An example in a different but related field can illustrate this point. Berkeley held a referendum election on a Fair Housing Proposal early in 1963, before the citizens committee report, and the measure was defeated by a narrow margin. A year and a half later the community, together with the rest of California, voted on the same issue -- Proposition 14. Although the statewide vote on that issue was a resounding defeat for Fair Housing, the City of Berkeley voted the direct opposite by almost a two-to-one margin. The Proposition 14 election was held only a month after the recall election, after almost a full year of intensive community involvement with the school desegregation issue. In other words, a city that voted down its own Fair Housing proposal, later voted two-to-one for Fair Housing in a statewide election. Many of us feel that this change of direction was substantially influenced by the extensive community involvement in the school integration question between the two elections. The community grew in understanding as it studied the issues.

5. <u>Community confidence in the good faith of its school administration and school board must be maintained.</u> Berkeley has been successful in doing this. The good faith of our Board and Administration has been demonstrated. There have been no court orders, no pickets, no boycotts, no violence. Each advance has been made, after extensive

study and community deliberation, because the staff, the Board and the community thought it was right. By moving in concert with the community we have avoided being placed in polarized positions of antagonism. The climate thus produced has enabled us, as we move step by step, to work with rather than against important segments of the community in seeking solutions. If this climate of good faith is missing, even the good deeds of school officials are suspect.

CONCLUSION

There is no greater problem facing the schools of America today than breaking down the walls of segregation. If our society is to function effectively its members must learn to live together. Schools have a vital role to play in preparing citizens for life in a multi-racial society. The Berkeley experience offers hope that integration can be successfully achieved in a good-sized city. This success can be achieved if the Board of Education, the school staff, and the citizens of the community are determined to solve the problem and work together toward this end.