DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 463 UD 013 972

AUTHOR	Bardez, Joan
TITLE	Data Processing Requirements for School Desegregation: A Case Study of the San Francisco Unified School District.
INSTITUTION	Council of the Great City Schools, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	43p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Council of the Great City Schools, 1707 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 (Price not quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Data Processing; Elementary School Students; *Information Needs; Integration Methods; *Reports; School Conditions; *School Integration; School Organization; School Redistricting; Secondary School Students; Student Characteristics; Student Placement; Technical Writing; Transfer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The goal of this report is to introduce the kinds of data and the kinds of reports which are useful in the process of desegregating schools. In September of 1971, the San Francisco Unified School District desegregated its elementary schools. That it was able to open these schools in semi-normal fashion was due in large part to the services provided by the District's Data Processing Department. This report is intended to serve as a guidebook for Data Processing personnel in other school districts who may be faced with a similar situation. One fundamental change which is made necessary by school desegregation is the evaluation and development of new student assignments to schools based on the racial/ethnic distribution of students. The desegregation plan which had been developed during the spring of 1971 and accepted by the Court in July organized the City into seven geographic areas or "zones." School assignments are made by Census block. The close to 100 elementary schools which had been previously organized as kindergarten through grade six now were converted to "primary" (i.e., kindergarten to grade three) or "intermediate" (grades four to six.). This required the re-evaluation of school sites and their suitability for primary and intermediate grade levels. The advantage to changing grade level designation is that most children can be assigned to their local school for at least part of their elementary school years. (Author/JM)

DATA PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

written by:

Joan Bardez, Manager
Systems and Procedures
Data Processing Department
San Francisco Unified
School District

for:

The Equal Educational
Opportunities Project
Council of Great City Schools
June, 1973

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

PREFACE

The Council of Great City Schools, a consortium of twenty-three of the nation's largest urban public school systems, since January 1969 has made available to its member cities technical assistance in the area of school desegregation. Under a series of grants awarded by the Office of Education under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Council's Equal Educational Opportunities Project through its EEO Committee has enabled school district staff responsible for school desegregation-EEO related matters in each member city to work with and to benefit from the programs and experiences of staff with similar responsibilities and problems in other large urban school systems.

The EEO Project, its committee and project staff have been involved with the process of school desegregation in San Francisco since 1969. As part of its technical assistance to other desegregating school systems, the Council is publishing this account of the use and application of data processing in the San Francisco public schools as it related to that city's court-ordered desegregation of its elementary schools. We believe that this account touches upon one of the "facts of life" of school desegregation—that is, that desegregation is not just a matter of concern to a district's office of desegregation or human relations or intergroup education, but rather that it involves all of a district's programs, departments and areas of concern. Though the technical task recounted here was that of pupil assignment and though the program responsibility for completing that task lay with the Data Processing staff, information from and the cooperation of those responsible for enrollment projections, for admitting and withdrawing students from special educational programs, for knowing about the physical characteristics of school buildings were required. Further, as the author herself points out, those responsible for the "technical" tasks associated with school desegregation must be cognizant of the "political" process going on at the same time. It is hoped that this report will enable school systems throughout the country to learn from and to benefit from the experience of the San Francisco school district staff.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In September of 1971, the San Francisco Unified School District desegregated its elementary schools. That it was able to open these schools in semi-normal fashion was due in large part to the services provided by the District's Data Processing Department. While this report is not intended as a testimonial to the S.F.U.S.D. Data Processing staff, it is intended to serve as a guidebook for Data Processing personnel in other school districts who may be faced with a similar situation.

One fundamental change which is made necessary by school desegregation is the evaluation and development of new student assignments to schools based on the racial/ethnic distribution of students. In both anticipating and completing this process of reassignment, computers can be exceedingly useful. Their usefulness, of course, is determined by a variety of factors, some of which limit and some of which support data processing functions. Political considerations come first to mind since they can hamper as well as require computer services. For example, the use of computers can be excluded as "too cold" and "unresponsive," or their use may be encouraged as a way of labeling the process "scientific" and "objective." Again, however, this report is not intended as a political handbook for technical personnel (although such an idea is certainly not without merit) but rather as an introductory reference for Data Processing staffs who will need to provide technical support, typically in a politically and emotionally volatile situation.

Other factors which influence the extent of data processing involvement include hardware capabilities; flexibility of production schedules and technical staff assignments; availability of student, teacher, and facilities data; and, not to be slighted, recognition of the computer's potential and willingness to allocate resources to it by the school district's administration.

In San Francisco, planning for total elementary school desegregation began in January of 1971. At this time, the district was faced with a lawsuit brought by the N.A.A.C.P. in 1970 claiming discrimination against blacks in the public elementary schools in San Francisco. The U. S. Federal District Court order requiring desegregation for the school year 1971-72 was issued on July 9, 1971. This meant that the 1970-71 school year was already over, that elementary school principals and their support staffs were not available and that the District would be unable to notify children of their new school assignments through their current year teachers.

The desegregation plan which had been developed during the spring of 1971 and accepted by the Court in July organized the City into seven geographic areas or "zones," meaning that the School District could be viewed as seven attendance districts with students living within a zone assigned only to schools located in that zone. School assignments are made by Census block* so that all children in the same grade living on a block are assigned to the same school. In addition, the close to one hundred elementary schools which had previously been organized as kindergarten through grade six now were converted to "primary" (i.e., kindergarten to grade three) or "intermediate" (grades four to six). This, of course, required the re-evaluation of school sites and their suitability for primary and intermediate grade levels. The advantage to changing grade level designation is that most children can be assigned to their local school for at least part of their elementary school years.

The above briefly indicates the time frame and desegregation concepts within which the District's Desegregation Office, the Data Processing staff, administrative personnel, and interested community groups were to function. Within such a calendar, what kinds of services can be handled by computer? Hopefully, the descriptions that follow will give some indication of what was useful and what was possible. The narrative has been organized into three sections:

1. BASIC DATA REQUIREMENTS
2. BASIC REPORTING NEEDS
3. ANCILLARY REPORTS.

No attempt has been made here to suggest the "best" or "most sophisticated" data processing techniques for accomplishing the services required (a loaded topic, to be sure). Rather, the goal of this report is to provide an outline of the kinds of data and the kinds of reports and services which are necessitated by the student reassignment process.

*The terms "city block" and "Census block" are used interchangeably in this paper in their usual sense, i.e., the area bounded typically by four city streets.

BASIC DATA REQUIREMENTS

Student Data

Data about students, their racial/ethnic identity, and where they live comprise the first basic set of information required for the desegregation effort. In some school districts, this information will be readily available in machine-readable form as part of a computerized student accounting system, attendance system, classroom scheduling system, or other school function which has been automated over the last five to ten years. In other districts, student information will be neither complete enough nor current enough for use in the desegregation effort. San Francisco in 1971 fit into this latter category.

The following list of student information identifies the data items which were initially collected from the elementary schools during the spring of 1971 (Appendix A provides formats and examples of these fields):

1. student name
2. student address, divided into
   - street number
   - street direction (north, south, east, west)
   - street name
   - street suffix (e.g., avenue, boulevard, street)
   - apartment number (if applicable)
3. current school
4. grade
5. ethnic code
6. sex
7. birthdate
8. room number
9. teacher
10. participation in special programs.

In San Francisco, the racial/ethnic background of each student is identified by the classroom teacher in accordance with guidelines established by the City's Board of Education. Nine ethnic categories are distinguished: Spanish Speaking/Spanish Surname (e.g., Mexican American or Latino), Other White (i.e., Caucasian), Negro/Black, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, American Indian, Filipino and Other Non-White (e.g., Samoan, Hawaiian, Indian). For most reporting purposes, however, these nine categories are combined to produce five: Spanish Speaking/Spanish Surname, Other White, Negro/Black, Asian (which includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean), and Other Non-White (which includes

American Indian, Filipino, Other Non-White). Because the Board's guidelines specify that neither children nor parents be asked their racial/ethnic identity and also because students are assigned to schools on the basis of the block they live on, no verification of ethnic identity has been done, other than the normal corrections due to keypunch or legibility problems. If students were assigned specifically because of their individual racial/ethnic background, some verification or perhaps a different metnod of identification would seem necessary.

Students participating in special educational programs such as physically handicapped, educationally handicapped, bilingual classes, and others are identified as such since their school assignments are handled separately from the normal pattern depending on the placement of classrooms for each program. This identification of students in special programs should be done by the appropriate program director or office which has the responsibility for admitting students into the program and withdrawing students from the program. This should provide accurate information plus a source for continued updating.

As the collection of the above data proceeded during the spring of 1971, a Student Accounting System was also developed to place student data on machine readable files and to provide maintenance facilities for adding, deleting, and changing records. Using this system, additional data items are included with each student record at the time student information is placed on file:

11. student number
12. phonetic code
13. date of entry into system
14. block number (using 1970 Census tract/block numbers)
15. postal zip code.

Student number and phonetic code are generated by the Student Accounting System. The student number is unique for each student and is the key index into the student file; it is assigned in sequence as each new record is added during the school year. Phonetic code provides the means for locating student records by student name; it is created from the student's name and sex.

Block number is assigned to a student record by matching the student's address to a two dimensional table of city addresses and associated 1970 Census tract/block numbers. This table, called the "Address Coding Guide," was provided to the District by the Bureau of the Census. Since identification of block residence is basic to the San Francisco desegregation plan, some block numbering scheme is required. The Census system was used because it was available, it offered the future potential for analyzing student data in association with Census data, and it had been updated, although not completely, for the 1970 Census. Some modifications were made to the Census block numbers in cases where very large geographical areas were given one number or where blocks with very large numbers of children needed to be subdivided into smaller assignment units. Certainly other numbering methods can be just as useful, if block identification is necessary at all; city assessors, police

departments, registrars of voters all use some method of identifying blocks or areas of a city. A postal zip code is likewise assigned to a student record via the Address Coding Guide. It is necessary address information if any mailings are to be made.

Subsequent to making student assignments to schools, whether this is done manually by viewing maps or automatically by computer program, new school assignments need to be reflected on student records. This introduces the following data items:

16. new school
17. bus/walk indicator
18. zone or area code
19. previous years' schools.

New school and the bus or walk indicator should be available as results of the assignment process. Zone or area code is used in San Francisco to distinguish the seven attendance zones into which the City was divided by the desegregation plan; this may or may not be applicable in other cities. The data initially placed in "previous years' schools" should be the student's school of attendance at the end of the preceeding school year. For history purposes, this information should be saved year by year, unless some other technique for identifying past schools of individual students is used.

Additional student data which is useful and can be collected from the schools include:

20. activity code (e.g., active at current school, transferred within district, transferred out of district)
21. phone number
22. bus route numbers
23. temporary out of district attendance permit number
24. acceleration/retention code.

School Data

A second basic set of data required for the desegregation effort involves school facilities information. The primary need for this kind of information is to provide the capability for determining school capacities. Also, in San Francisco as in many other districts desegregating their schools, changing schools' grade level organization was a prominent factor in the student reassignment process. Decisions affecting such changes require information about school buildings.

The need for data about school facilities should not be taken necessarily to mean a need for automating its collection, maintenance, and retrieval. A district's physical plant remains relatively stable during the course of each school year and plans for additions and modifications are known to a certain degree in advance. The significance of these comments is that facilities data is the type of information

that usually does not require daily, weekly, or perhaps even monthly updating. Interestingly enough, San Francisco and other districts in California are currently faced with bringing school buildings up to earthquake safety standards as established by California's Field Act. This will require more frequent changes to the status of school building information. In most circumstances, however, data available at the start of a school year can usually be considered usable throughout the year.

In San Francisco, school data was available during 1971 but was not computerized; and within the existing time frame, it was not felt that such an effort was worthwhile. Certainly, a machine readable file containing school data, whether it is created for desegregation purposes or is already available as part of, say, a facilities inventory system, can offer desirable reporting and analysis capabilities.

Perhaps more significant, however, is the source of this data. The distinction between current utilization of space on the one hand and physical plant characteristics on the other should be stressed. It is the latter, namely the potential utilization of school facilities, which is pertinent to planning for desegregation. Thus, the source should be that school department or office responsible for knowing the physical characteristics of school buildings throughout the district.

The following data items proved useful in calculating school capacities and in evaluating and determining grade level designations:

1. number of classrooms per school site, including bungalows, portables, temporary housing, etc.
2. classroom size
3. teacher/pupil ratios
4. non-classroom space, including yards and playgrounds, auditorium space, libraries, cafeterias, lab rooms, and others
5. reserved room assignments for special programs
6. legal considerations regulating the use of school buildings.

Items 1, 2, and 3 provide the data necessary to calculate potential school enrollment capacity. Classroom size, i.e. number of seats, may vary if non-standard classrooms are used for teaching stations. For example, a small room may be classified as one-half or one-third size, meaning that only one-half or one-third the normal number of seats are available in that room. Teacher/pupils ratios likewise may vary, depending on district policies, city/state guidelines or statutes, teacher/union contracts, grade level, and other factors.

Non-classroom space is one determining factor, if not the determining factor, in considering the grade level designation of a school. Often the mere existence of a yard or a cafeteria can decide how a school building will be used. If more descriptive information such as square footage or physical condition is not available, as was the case in San Francisco, then subjective evaluations may of necessity be used. The concern here is that the availability of some information regarding non-classroom space is of value.

Reserved room assignments for special programs can play havoc with school capacity calculations. The point at which such information is known is critical. In other words, the calculations of potential school capacities for all school buildings in a district must take into account the fact that some rooms will be used for smaller classes or used only part-time. Specific school capacities, however, cannot be finalized until specific space is allocated for special programs. The earlier this is done, the less chance exists for over or under assigning students to a school.

One final item related to school data involves legal regulations which control health and safety standards. Fire laws in San Francisco, for example, restrict the use of upper floors of wooden school buildings to children in grades 2 and above. Laws concerned with earthquake or other natural hazards may likewise have an impact on utilization of school buildings. This type of information is normally already part of a school district's student assignment procedure, but it may now need to be gathered centrally and made available in written form.

Street and Distance Information

Two additional sets of data useful for desegregation purposes include information which enables one, first, to categorize the total student population by location and, second, to determine distances between students and schools. These sets are related in that they both contain descriptive information about locations within a school district.

Racial/ethnic distribution of students is one consideration in making student assignments to schools in a desegregated environment. Density of student population is another. In San Francisco, these kinds of figures were calculated by identifying the Census block associated with each student's address and then summarizing by racial/ethnic category the number of children on each block. As described earlier, the set of data used for this address-to-block conversion was, basically, a two dimensional table containing all known addresses in the City and their associated 1970 Census block numbers. This conversion technique further enables one to isolate students whose addresses do not place them within the district's attendance boundary or whose addresses are invalid or inaccurate.

The following data items are part of this table (see Appendix B for complete field descriptions):

1. street address, including low and high addresses, street direction, street name, and street suffix
2. 1970 Census tract/block number
3. postal zip code
4. street code
5. record number.

Low and high addresses simply identify the range of inclusive numbers located on the city block for each record of the table. Street code provides a unique identification for each street within the city and record number provides the means for updating the table as new streets and new housing are opened or address ranges are changed.

Information describing distances between students and schools is the basis for determining who can walk to school and who must be provided transportation. Such information is also necessary if any attempt will be made to optimize bus routing and scheduling in order to minimize travel distances and/or travel times.

Block to school distances in an absolute sense, i.e. "as the crow flies," can be calculated by computer program by using an X-Y coordinate system which identifies the location of every block and every school in X-Y terms. In San Francisco, as perhaps in other urban areas, such information is of limited value due to steep grades, one-way streets, city traffic, and many other factors which have a direct and restrictive bearing on travel routes and times. A more useful approach might be the calculation of a time factor between blocks and schools. Unfortunately, there has been no identification of data requirements or development of technique in this regard in San Francisco. During the summer of 1971 when student assignments were being made, block to school distances were calculated manually off a map, with subjective evaluations used to avoid obvious walk route problems such as crossing freeways, hills, lakes, and parks.

In this discussion of the basic kinds of data used for the student reassignment process many topics have not been covered, most notably, the verification and continued updating of the files established. Maintenance of the data may be required if yearly evaluations of the desegregation plan are ordered by the court, as has occurred in San Francisco. Maintenance may further be seen as desirable for other school functions, as has also happened in San Francisco. In either case, the need for accuracy and for up-to-dateness remain, implying a continued effort and cost in terms of personnel, forms, computer usage, and program maintenance. Hopefully, the data requirements specified above identify the items needed and their source. The descriptions that follow should help explain their usefulness.

BASIC REPORTING NEEDS

During the course of the reassignment process, many reporting needs will exist. Distinguishing between those that are "basic" and those that are "ancillary" is perhaps an arbitrary choice. Yet, the existence of a restrictive time frame such as occurred in San Francisco may require this. In other words, choices as to what reports can be programmed and produced may have to be made. Therefore, the attempt here has been to describe, first, reports which were found to be basic to the opening of school in San Francisco and, second, reports which were helpful but can be viewed as ancillary. Report formats are offered only as examples of the kinds of data to be presented. Certainly other school districts may recognize additional reporting needs based on their procedures and forms of communication.

The usefulness of the basic reports can best be described in terms of when they should be available during the course of the reassignment process. The collection of data, its verification and the establishment of data files are naturally the first steps. From this information, some method of evaluating the racial/ethnic status of the schools for the current year and for the next year is needed. In San Francisco, this evaluation is accomplished by using the current year student file and a promoted student file. The promoted file is distinct from the current year file and is created by duplicating records of current students in grades K and 1, promoting the grade level of students in grades 1 through 5, and dropping records of students in grade 6.* This file effectively becomes the district's projection of students for the next school year and offers the potential for calculating individual school projections for any assignment pattern.

Many different projection techniques are used by school districts to anticipate student enrollment for various future time periods. However, typical grade-by-grade projections based on district-wide counts are not sufficient for desegregation purposes since racial/ethnic identity and location of student population are also needed. Likewise, school-by-school projections based on previously walking populations are insufficient since students may now be assigned to a school from many parts of a district.

Using the technique of building a promoted student file unfortunately also has its disadvantages. Since it is based upon specific students, the tendency is to view projected counts as actual. Furthermore, it is difficult to incorporate even standard methods of projecting such as the use of grade survival ratios, since it would involve either eliminating or creating specific student records. The point to note here is that enrollment projections must now provide more information than they have previously. Just as the assignment of students to schools can no longer be based primarily upon walking distance, the projection of student population can no longer exclude racial/ethnic distribution of students.

*Grades K and 1 student records are duplicated rather than promoted because of the very large parochial school attendance in San Francisco. These schools start at the grade 1 level, meaning that many families will send their kindergarten children to the public schools and then enroll them in parochial schools the following year. Students in special programs are also excluded from the promoted file since their assignments are handled individually.

Zone Summary Reports

As mentioned earlier, some method of evaluating racial/ethnic status of the schools is needed. This need exists both at the start of the reassignment process and during the development of potential assignment plans. In San Francisco, because the desegregation plan organizes the City into seven zone or attendance areas, the report which provides this method of evaluating is called the "Zone Summary Report" (see Sample Report A-1).* This report presents the following data:

1. an ethnic count by grade level for each contiguous group of blocks assigned to a school
2. a total projected school enrollment figure
3. a school capacity figure
4. the count of each ethnic group within each grade level at a school, with their associated percentage of the total grade projection
5. total ethnic counts and percentages for the school comparing these to district averages and zone averages for the zone in which the school is located
6. counts of students in special programs may be listed if such information is known
7. the number and percentage of each school's walking population and bused population
8. a total student count for each zone is shown after all schools for a zone have been listed, as well as total students bused and total students walking in the zone (see Sample Report A-2).

The first item identifies the number of children being assigned to a school from each contiguous group of blocks referred to as feeder areas. This particular portion of the report may be printed in one of two forms: (1) the "detail" form lists the grade level counts for every block in each feeder area, thereby providing the means for verifying individual block assignments of a given assignment plan (see Sample Report A-3); (2) the "summary" form prints only the grade by ethnic totals for each feeder area (see Sample Report A-4).

In the San Francisco desegregation plan, the primary means for determining whether or not a school is desegregated is a plus or minus fifteen percentage point difference from district-wide racial/ethnic percentages. This criterion is based upon a California State Department of Education guideline which says that a school is segregated if any one of its racial/ethnic populations differs by more than fifteen percentage points (plus or minus) from that population's district percentage. This is why "District Averages" and "Difference" are stated on the Zone Summary Report. "Zone Averages" and "Difference" are also shown since these can and do differ significantly from district percentages.

*See Appendix C for all sample reports.

The Zone Summary Report is based upon a block assignment file that can specify either current or proposed school assignment for every block in the City. Using this assignment file in conjunction with counts derived from the promoted student file, the Zone Summary Report calculates and presents the kinds of data necessary to evaluate the level of desegregation achieved at each school by a particular assignment plan. The report can also be useful once a specific plan has been adopted, for such purposes as teacher allocations, textbook and supplies distribution, building facilities modifications, and the many other facets of planning that go into the opening of schools each fall.

Parent Notification Letters

Upon acceptance of a specific desegregation plan, the need for reports changes from one of evaluating plans to one of notifying the many parties affected: parents and their children, school principals and their staffs, and the administrative offices of the district. "Parent Notification Letters" (see Sample Reports B-1 and B-2) were initially necessary in San Francisco because the 1970-71 school year had already ended when the desegregation plan was approved. This continued to be the case for the following school year when modifications to the plan were not adopted by the City's Board of Education until the middle of August. In addition, however, individual letters to parents do personalize the notification process as well as offer the means for including language translations of the letter, transportation information, safety brochures, school calendars, plus other items pertinent to the implementation of new school assignments.

The Parent Notification Letter developed for the San Francisco schools includes information specifying school assignment, school hours, and an indication of bus or walk distance. A cut-out name tag is also diagrammed in the letter, hopefully to be worn or carried by students on the first day of school to assist school officials in directing children to their proper buses, schools and classrooms. It is useful to print some blank versions of the letter form in order to anticipate the loss of some individual letters through the mechanical process of bursting and folding.

School Lists

School administrators and their staffs must also receive notification of who their students will be for the coming school year. The earlier in the year that principals receive this information, the better prepared each school can be for opening day. Classroom assignments, for example, can be included in the Parent Notification Letter if school assignments are known by late spring when principals and teachers are still available to make room assignments. Likewise, the exchange of cum folders and other student records can be arranged in advance for those children moving from one school to another.

In San Francisco, a "from/to" type of student listing was developed to aid school administrators in identifying their students for the new year; this report is called the "New/Old School Lists." The listing can be printed in one of two orders. The New School List option identifies by school the students expected for the next school year, showing their current year's school assignment (see Sample Report

C-1). The Old School List option identifies the students currently attending each school, showing the new school to which each student is assigned for the fall term (see Sample Report C-2). The listing format is identical for both options; it includes basic student information such as student number, name, grade, sex, ethnic, address, and phone number. This last item, i.e., phone number, can be exceedingly useful at the start of school when parents need to be contacted quickly regarding bus schedule problems and changes, student absenteeism, and parent meetings.

Master School Assignment Directory

The administrative offices of a school district are often more concerned with numbers of students attending each school rather than lists of specific children and where they are assigned to school for a new term. Certainly anticipated enrollments are a critical part of a district's planning function since they provide the basis for decisions in the areas of teacher allocations, books and supplies distribution, non-teaching personnel assignments, and special program schedules. As discussed earlier, the Zone Summary Report satisfies the need for this kind of information.

In a situation where massive changes of assignments are required and where these changes may need to be implemented within a very short time period, the central administrative offices of a school district will of necessity be called upon to assist the schools in answering questions from parents regarding their children's new school assignments. The report titled "Master School Assignment Directory" (see Sample Report D) offers the means for quick response to these kinds of inquiries. It is, in effect, the district's official document of student assignments for that particular school year. Because school assignments in San Francisco are based upon Census block and therefore upon street address, the Master Directory is a listing of every known street address in the City with its associated school assignment for the primary (K-3) grades and for the intermediate (4-6) grades. Additional information shown includes school start time, bus or walk indication, zone number, and postal zip code.

The Master Directory is a lengthy and thus costly report to produce, as can easily be imagined. In San Francisco, Directories were provided for each of the almost one hundred elementary schools in addition to the many central district offices which were involved in helping answer parent questions. An alphabetic listing of students and maps showing attendance boundaries are also useful in this regard, although they do not offer as complete or quick a method of determining student assignment as the Directory.

ANCILLARY REPORTS

In addition to the kinds of reports outlined in the previous section, there are many others which can facilitate the evaluation of desegregation plans and the opening of school. The following descriptions offer examples of some of the reports developed in San Francisco for these purposes.

Racial/Ethnic Distribution Reports

Reports providing racial/ethnic counts of students are the basis for documenting the segregation or desegregation of students within a school district. A variety of racial/ethnic distributions can be useful:

1. Grade by ethnic counts and percentages (see Sample Report E-1) show the yearly changes in racial distribution. In San Francisco, this report pointed out the significant percentage changes in several ethnic categories from kindergarten to grade one. Gradual percentage changes can also be seen, providing a clear indication of the direction of the district's racial/ethnic distribution.
2. Grade and ethnic counts by school (see Sample Report E-2) show the current number of students in each ethnic category in each grade at a school. Produced at regular intervals, for example, by month or by semester, this type of report can be used to monitor the current racial status of a district's schools. It can also serve as the basis from which attendance boundary changes are evaluated.
3. Ethnic distributions by special program (see Sample Report E-3) show the number of children in each ethnic category in each special program. Current state and federal laws which regulate the funding of special educational programs often require that these programs maintain integrated classes. Reports documenting these situations are often needed. Furthermore, court orders, such as the decision in San Francisco, may specifically say that special programs must be open to all children. For example, "bi-lingual classes are not proscribed. They may be provided in any manner which does not create, maintain or foster segregation."* A report showing ethnic counts by special program is one way of verifying that these programs are not segregated.

Memorandum of Decision, Judgment and Decree, D. Johnson vs. SFUSD, July 9, 1971, p. 11.

4. Racial/ethnic distributions by Census tracts (see Sample Report E-4) and Census blocks (see Sample Report E-5) are the basis for identifying and studying the demographic characteristics of a school district. As mentioned earlier, the use of Census divisions is only one of several possible geographic coding schemes. It is through reports showing racial/ethnic counts by location that housing patterns of racial segregation and integration can be seen. Density of student population is also provided. This type of report is useful in developing maps and visual displays which can serve as educational tools in disseminating information about a district's student population.

Student Listings

Listings of students in alphabetic sequence for each school and for the district as a whole (see Sample Report F) can serve as directories of basic student information (e.g., name, address, phone number, etc.) as well as guides to where students will be located at the start of the new school year. Alphabetic sequence provides a convenient order for answering inquiries, since student number or school assignment are not always known. Also, if specific classroom assignments are made prior to the opening of school, then alphabetic lists by class can be printed for each teacher.

Bus Cards

Blank Name/Bus Cards (see Sample Report G) were used in San Francisco at each school site for children who were not pre-registered and, therefore, did not receive individual letters notifying them of school assignment or bus information. Students who appeared at a school on the opening day could thus be given this card with the school and bus data filled in by the school clerk. Also, these cards can be used during the remainder of the school year to send new school and bus information home to parents for children who are transferring within the district.

Name/Address Mailing Labels

The capability to print name/address mailing labels (see Sample Report H) offers several advantages. For example, in cases where a district does not want or is unable to produce individual parent letters, mailing labels offer an alternative method of preparing and sending notices of new school assignments. The labels are also useful where additional information is needed to send to students of a particular school, perhaps after the parent letters have been distributed, for updating bus information or notifying parents of a meeting.

SUMMARY

The goal of this report has been to introduce the kinds of data and the kinds of reports which are useful in the process of desegregating schools. It must be stressed that the lists of data and the sample reports are not meant to be definitive. Rather, the hope is that the descriptions of data items and potential reports will provide a starting point for identifying the needs of any other school district faced with reassigning a significant portion of its student population. An obvious assumption has been that the data will be processed by computer since this is how the reports were produced in San Francisco.

Certainly it must again be noted that many pertinent topics have not been discussed. Of these, the verification and continued updating of the data files established have already been mentioned. A further consideration is charting the time frame and sequence of tasks necessary to achieve the creation of data files and the production of the various reports. This is not an easy assignment in light of the constantly changing environment created by any political situation. In this regard, a final comment seems most appropriate: namely, that data processing personnel can be most productive in this situation if they recognize and accept the political nature of the task they are performing. Concurrently, non-technical staff members can be most helpful to data processing personnel if they learn to understand the capabilities and limitations introduced by the use of computers.

APPENDIX A

Description of Data Items Contained on Elementary Student File

STUDENT NAME:

20 CHARACTER FIELD. LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MIDDLE INITIAL.

Example: Brown, Charles S.

STREET NUMBER:

4 CHARACTER FIELD INDICATING THE HOUSE NUMBER OF THE STUDENT'S ADDRESS.

Example: 0146

STREET NUMBER SUFFIX:

ONE CHARACTER FIELD USED TO INDICATE THE DIRECTION OF A STREET WHERE REQUIRED.

Example: N = North
S = South
E = East
W = West

STREET NAME:

20 CHARACTER FIELD CONTAINING STREET NAME.

Example: Leavenworth

STREET NAME SUFFIX:

2 CHARACTER ABBREVIATION IDENTIFYING TYPE OF STREET. VALID SUFFIXES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

BL = Boulevard	WY = Way
ST = Street	RD = Road
DR = Drive	LN = Lane
CR = Circle	PZ = Plaza
TR = Terrace	AL = Alley
AV = Avenue	PK = Park
CT = Court	RO = Row
PL = Place	LP = Loop
SQ = Square	WK = Walk

APARTMENT NUMBER:

4 CHARACTER FIELD FOR APARTMENT NUMBER IF NEEDED.

Example: 206
A1
#18

SCHOOL:

3 DIGIT NUMBER IDENTIFYING STUDENT'S CURRENT SCHOOL OF ATTENDANCE. AT THE START OF A NEW SCHOOL YEAR, THIS FIELD CONTAINS THE NUMBER OF THE STUDENT'S NEW SCHOOL.

Example: 546

GRADE:

2 CHARACTER FIELD INDICATING THE CURRENT GRADE LEVEL OF THE STUDENT.

Example: Kb, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06

ETHNIC CODE:

2 CHARACTER FIELD IDENTIFYING ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENT.
VALID CODES:

OW = Other White	J = Japanese
SS = Spanish Surname	K = Korean
N = Negro/Black	F = Filipino
C = Chinese	AI = American Indian
ON = Other Non-White	

SEX:

M = Male F = Female

BIRTHDATE:

MM/DD/YY—6 CHARACTER FIELD

Example: 06/19/62

ROOM NUMBER:

4 CHARACTER FIELD PROVIDED FOR THE STUDENT'S ROOM ASSIGNMENT AT HIS SCHOOL OF ATTENDANCE.

Example: 0203

TEACHER:

15 CHARACTER FIELD PROVIDED TO INDICATE STUDENT'S TEACHER. ONLY LAST NAME IS USED.

Example: Washington

SPECIAL PROGRAM:

THIS AREA ALLOWS FOR A STUDENT TO HAVE A MAXIMUM OF 10 SPECIAL PROGRAM CODES. EACH CODE ENTRY IS 2 CHARACTERS.

Example: 1 = EMH
2 = TMH
3 = Hard of Hearing
4 = Gifted
5 = Chinese Title VII Class
6 = Spanish Title VII Class
plus many others.

STUDENT NUMBER:

10 DIGIT FIELD. THIS NUMBER IS ASSIGNED TO A STUDENT BY THE STUDENT ACCOUNTING SYSTEM WHEN HE IS ADDED TO THE DATA FILE.

Example: H072001053

PHONETIC CODE:

6 CHARACTER FIELD USED TO LOCATE A STUDENT RECORD BY NAME. THE PHONETIC CODE IS GENERATED FROM THE STUDENT'S NAME AND SEX.

Example: HNZLCF (generated from Heinz, Claudia—female)

ENTRY DATE:

DATE OF ENTRY INTO CURRENT SCHOOL.

Example: 09/13/71

CENSUS TRACT/BLOCK:

6 DIGIT NUMBER INDICATING THE CENSUS TRACT AND BLOCK NUMBER OF THE STUDENT'S ADDRESS ACCORDING TO THE ADDRESS CODING GUIDE (ACG).

Example: 216 101 tract-block

ZIP CODE:

5 CHARACTER FIELD PROVIDED FOR ZIP CODE.

Example: 94114

BUS CODE:

1 CHARACTER CODE INDICATING WHETHER STUDENT WALKS OR IS BUSED TO SCHOOL.

Example: A = walks
* = Special Program student
B, C, D, etc. = bused

ZONE:

2 DIGIT FIELD INDICATING THE ZONE IN WHICH THE STUDENT IS ATTENDING SCHOOL.

Example: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07

PREVIOUS SCHOOL OF ATTENDANCE:

3 CHARACTER FIELD CONTAINING SCHOOL NUMBER OF THE SCHOOL THE STUDENT PREVIOUSLY ATTENDED (IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO HIS CURRENT SCHOOL).

Example: 546

SCHOOL OF ATTENDANCE 70-71:

3 CHARACTER FIELD CONTAINING SCHOOL NUMBER OF THE SCHOOL THE STUDENT ATTENDED AT THE END OF THE SCHOOL YEAR 1970-71 (BEFORE DESEGREGATION).

Example: 392

SCHOOL OF ATTENDANCE 71-72:

3 CHARACTER FIELD CONTAINING SCHOOL NUMBER OF THE SCHOOL THE STUDENT ATTENDED AT THE END OF THE SCHOOL YEAR 1971-72.

Example: 401

ACTIVITY CODE:

1 CHARACTER FIELD INDICATING THE CURRENT ENROLLMENT STATUS OF A STUDENT.

Example: b = Active
W = Withdrawn
D = Drop from file

PHONE NUMBER:

7 DIGIT FIELD PROVIDED FOR THE STUDENT'S HOME PHONE NUMBER.

Example: 863-4680

A.M. BUS:

4 CHARACTER FIELD PROVIDED FOR BUS ROUTE NUMBERS. THIS FIELD INDICATES THE NUMBER OF THE BUS THE STUDENT ARRIVES ON.

Example: 109R

P.M. BUS:

4 CHARACTER FIELD PROVIDED FOR BUS ROUTE NUMBERS. THIS FIELD INDICATES THE NUMBER OF THE BUS THE STUDENT LEAVES ON.

Example: 343A

INTRA-DISTRICT PERMIT NUMBER:

4 CHARACTER FIELD CONTAINING THE NUMBER OF THE PERMIT ISSUED TO A STUDENT TO ATTEND A SCHOOL NOT ASSIGNED BY ADDRESS.

Example: 1078

ACCELERATION/RETENTION CODE:

1 CHARACTER FIELD USED TO INDICATE IF A STUDENT IS TO BE RETAINED OR ACCELERATED AT PROMOTION TIME (USUALLY JUNE).

Example: A = Accelerate
R = Retain

APPENDIX B

Description of Data Items Contained on Address Coding Guide

ADDRESS RANGE:

12 DIGIT FIELD, THE FIRST 6 OF WHICH IDENTIFY THE LOWEST NUMBER AND THE LAST 6 THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF A RANGE OF ADDRESSES ON A CENSUS BLOCK FACE OF A GIVEN STREET. BOTH NUMBERS ARE ODD OR EVEN. AN ADDRESS OF ZERO MAY APPEAR FOR BLOCK SIDES THAT CONTAIN NO ADDRESSES. ALSO, THE HIGH AND LOW NUMBERS MAY BE EQUAL IF THERE IS ONLY ONE ADDRESS ON THE BLOCK FACE. IN SAN FRANCISCO, ALL ADDRESS NUMBERS ARE 4 DIGITS OR LESS; THUS, THE FIRST 2 POSITIONS OF BOTH THE HIGH AND THE LOW NUMBER ARE NOT USED.

Example: bb2101 bb2199
bbbbb2 bbbb98

STREET DIRECTION:

2 CHARACTER FIELD IDENTIFYING NORTH, SOUTH, EAST, OR WEST DIRECTION OF STREET IF THAT IS PART OF STREET NAME

Example: N = North E = East
S = South W = West

STREET NAME:

15 POSITION FIELD IDENTIFYING STREET NAME, WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS REMOVED.

Example: Diamondheights, 3rd, K, Presidio

STREET SUFFIX:

2 CHARACTER ABBREVIATION INDICATING TYPE OF STREET. VALID STREET SUFFIXES INCLUDE:

Example: AL = Alley
AV = Avenue
BL = Boulevard
CR = Circle
CT = Court
DR = Drive
LN = Lane
LP = Loop
PK = Park
PL = Place
PZ = Plaza
RD = Road
RO = Row
SQ = Square
ST = Street
TR = Terrace
WK = Walk
WY = Way

1970 CENSUS TRACT NUMBER:

6 DIGIT FIELD IDENTIFYING A CENSUS TRACT NUMBER AS DEFINED FOR THE 1970 CENSUS. FIRST 4 DIGITS SPECIFY THE BASIC TRACT WHILE THE FINAL 2 IDENTIFY A SUBDIVISION INTO 2 OR MORE TRACTS OF WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY A SINGLE TRACT IN THE 1960 CENSUS. IN SAN FRANCISCO, ONLY THE 3 DIGIT NUMBER FROM POSITIONS 2 TO 4 WITHIN THIS 6 DIGIT FIELD ARE NECESSARY TO IDENTIFY UNIQUE CENSUS TRACTS.

Example: 6 Digit Field = 0179bb
3 Digit Field = 179

1970 CENSUS BLOCK NUMBER:

3 DIGIT NUMBER IDENTIFYING A CENSUS NUMBER FOR EACH CITY BLOCK AS DEFINED FOR THE 1970 CENSUS. THE FIRST DIGIT IS ALWAYS 1 OR GREATER. BLOCK NUMBERS ARE UNIQUE WITHIN EACH CENSUS TRACT.

Example: 103, 601, 204

ZIP CODE:	5 DIGIT FIELD INDICATING POST OFFICE ZIP CODE FOR THE STREET AND ADDRESS RANGE OF THE GIVEN RECORD. ALL SAN FRANCISCO ZIP CODES BEGIN WITH '941.' Example: 94115
STREET CODE:	5 DIGIT FIELD THAT UNIQUELY IDENTIFIES EACH STREET WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO. Example: 06504 (Hampshire St)
RECORD NUMBER:	6 POSITION FIELD THAT UNIQUELY IDENTIFIES EACH RECORD ON THE A.C.G. THIS FIELD IS USED TO CONTROL THE UPDATE FUNCTION. Example: 931105, A50640, Z08020

There are many additional fields on the Address Coding Guide as it is received from the Bureau of the Census. The above data are the fields used for the San Francisco desegregation plan.

APPENDIX C

Sample Reports

TOTALS FOR SCHOOL -- SAMPLE SCHOOL #1

PROJECTED SCHOOL ENROLLMENT -- 0467 SCHOOL CAPACITY -- 0837

GRADE	--TOTAL---		----SS----		----OW----		----B-----		----A-----		----ON----	
UN	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
K	64	13.70	12	18.75	31	48.43	12	18.75	5	7.81	4	6.25
1	153	32.76	35	22.87	43	28.10	41	26.79	14	9.15	20	13.07
2	120	25.69	12	10.00	32	26.66	47	39.16	16	13.33	13	10.83
3	130	27.83	18	13.84	41	31.53	37	28.46	17	13.07	17	13.07

	SCHOOL TOTALS	SCHOOL %	DISTRICT AVGS.	DIFFERENCE	ZONE AVGS.	DIFFERENCE
SPANISH SURNAME	77	16.4	14.6	+ 1.8	8.8	+ 7.6
OTHER WHITE	147	31.4	30.2	+ 1.2	34.1	- 2.7
BLACK	137	29.3	31.7	- 2.4	33.6	-4.3
ASIAN	52	11.1	13.4	- 2.3	10.7	+ .4
OTHER NON-WHITE	54	11.5	10.1	+ 1.4	12.8	- 1.3

SPECIAL PROGRAMS≥	EST TOTAL	EST SS	EST OW	EST BLACK	EST ASIAN	EST ONW
EH L D G	18					
E S L	25					
SPAN BILING	80					
LRN COUNSEL						

STUDENTS BUSED --- 270 57.81 %

STUDENTS NOT BUSED --- 197 42.18 %

Sample Report A-1

Zone Summary Report

*** TOTAL STUDENTS FOR ZONE -- 01 -- 4095

*** STUDENTS BUSED ---- 2376 58.02 %

*** STUDENTS NOT BUSED --- 1719 41.97%

Sample Report A-2

Zone Summary Report—Zone Totals

DATE -- 08/19/72 TIME -- 14.04.40

ZONE --- 07

S C H O O L --- SAMPLE SCHOOL #1 (378A)

P R I M A R Y

TRACK	BLOCK	UNGRADED	KINDERGARTEN	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	TOTAL
202	108	0	0	0	0	0	0
202	109	0	0	0	0	0	0
202	202	0	1	2	0	0	3
202	203	0	0	1	3	2	6
202	204	0	2	1	1	2	6
202	205	0	0	1	2	0	3
202	206	0	5	20	11	12	48
202	301	0	1	4	1	3	9
202	302	0	0	1	0	1	2
202	303	0	3	3	1	1	8
202	304	0	4	4	0	1	9
202	305	0	1	2	1	2	6
202	306	0	1	0	1	2	4
202	307	0	0	2	4	3	9
202	308	0	1	3	1	2	7
203	101	0	0	0	0	1	1
203	102	0	0	3	2	2	7
203	103	0	3	3	1	1	8
203	104	0	0	0	0	0	0
203	105	0	1	4	2	1	8
203	106	0	1	2	0	2	5
203	201	0	0	0	0	0	0
203	202	0	0	4	3	4	11
203	203	0	3	2	2	2	9
203	204	0	1	3	0	2	6
203	304	0	0	4	1	5	10
203	305	0	1	5	2	2	10
203	306	0	0	0	1	1	2

GR	SS	OW	B	A	ON	TOTAL	AREA TOTAL
UN	0	0	0	0	0	0	
K	12	7	4	4	2	29	
1	33	12	9	6	14	74	
2	9	8	10	6	7	40	
3	14	12	11	4	13	54	
							197 (A)

Sample Report A-3

Zone Summary Report—Detail Form

DATE -- 09/01/72 TIME -- 21.17.06

ZONE --- 02

S C H O O L --- SAMPLE SCHOOL #2

P R I M A R Y

GR	SS	OW	B	A	ON	TOTAL	AREA TOTAL
UN	0	0	0	0	0	0	
K	0	4	3	2	1	10	
1	1	4	14	1	1	21	
2	2	7	16	0	2	27	
3	0	9	15	0	0	24	
							82 (A)

GR	SS	OW	B	A	ON	TOTAL	AREA TOTAL
UN	0	0	0	0	0	0	
K	0	2	0	7	0	9	
1	0	5	0	9	0	14	
2	0	5	1	4	0	10	
3	0	3	0	12	0	15	
							48 (B)

GR	SS	OW	B	A	ON	TOTAL	AREA TOTAL
UN	0	0	0	0	0	0	
K	1	2	0	0	0	3	
1	0	4	0	0	0	4	
2	0	3	0	0	0	3	
3	0	7	0	0	0	7	
							17 (C)

Sample Report A-4

Zone Summary Report – Summary Form

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
135 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102
864-1080

AUGUST 23, 1972

TO THE PARENTS OR GUARDIANS OF

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DEAR PARENTS OR GUARDIANS:

THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT HAS JUST COMPLETED THE ASSIGNMENT OF ELEMENTARY STUDENTS FOR THE FALL TERM, 1972. WE WOULD LIKE TO INFORM YOU THAT YOUR CHILD WILL BE ATTENDING SCHOOL. SCHOOL BEGINS WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1972.

HE/SHE IS SCHEDULED TO WALK TO SCHOOL. REGULAR SCHOOL HOURS ARE TO . THE FIRST SCHOOL DAY WILL BE A SHORTENED DAY; HOWEVER, STARTING TIME REMAINS THE SAME.

THE CUT-OUT TAG IN THE LOWER LEFT-HAND CORNER OF THIS LETTER IS FOR SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES. PLEASE HAVE YOUR CHILD WEAR THIS TAG ON HIS/HER OUTER GARMENT ON THE FIRST DAY OF SCHOOL.

YOUR CONTINUED COOPERATION IS APPRECIATED.

SINCERELY,

OFFICE OF DESEGREGATION/
INTEGRATION

NAME-

SCHOOL-

GRADE- ROOM-

Sample Report B-1
Parent Notification Letter—Walk Form

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
135 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102
864-1080

AUGUST 23, 1972

TO THE PARENTS OR GUARDIANS OF

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DEAR PARENTS OR GUARDIANS:

THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT HAS JUST COMPLETED THE ASSIGNMENT OF ELEMENTARY STUDENTS FOR THE FALL TERM, 1972. WE WOULD LIKE TO INFORM YOU THAT YOUR CHILD WILL BE ATTENDING SCHOOL. SCHOOL BEGINS WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1972.

HE/SHE IS SCHEDULED TO RIDE A BUS, WHICH HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE. PLEASE CONSULT THE ENCLOSED BUS SCHEDULE FOR THE PICK-UP POINT CLOSEST TO YOUR HOME. REGULAR SCHOOL HOURS ARE TO . THE FIRST SCHOOL DAY WILL BE A SHORTENED DAY; HOWEVER, STARTING TIME REMAINS THE SAME.

THE CUT-OUT TAG IN THE LOWER LEFT-HAND CORNER OF THIS LETTER IS FOR SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES. PLEASE HAVE YOUR CHILD WEAR THIS TAG ON HIS/HER OUTER GARMENT ON THE FIRST DAY OF SCHOOL.

YOUR CONTINUED COOPERATION IS APPRECIATED.

SINCERELY,

OFFICE OF DESEGREGATION/
INTEGRATION

NAME-

SCHOOL-

GRADE- ROOM-

• NEW SCHOOL LIST: 1972-73 STUDENT LIST SHOWING LAST YEARS SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT

• ALAMO --301 DATE -- 08-26-72

• STUDENTS FOR NEXT SCHOOL YEAR

STUDENT NO	NAME	GR	ROOM	ETHNIC	FORMER SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT		ADDRESS		SEX	PHONE
	CHRISTIAN	03	0007		ALAMO	--301	29TH	AV	F	752-07XX
	DAVID	03			FRANK MCCOPPIN	--330	GEARY	BL	M	752-07XX
	SANFORD	03			ALAMO	--301	23RD	AV	M	752-37XX
	MICHAEL	03			ALAMO	--301	LAKE	ST	M	752-84XX
	LLOYD	03	000A		ALAMO	--301	27TH	AV	M	386-83XX
	FRANKIE	03			HAWTHORNE	--343	44TH	AV	M	648-03XX
	KELLI	03	000A		ALAMO	--301	22ND	AV	F	387-01XX
	NONA	03	000A		ALAMO	--301	CALIFORNIA	ST	F	-
	KATHERINE M	03	0007		ALAMO	--301	44TH	AV	F	386-58XX
	RENEE	03			JOHN SWETT	--341	SCOTT	ST	F	922-34XX
	DANIEL	03			ALAMO	--301	PALM	AV	M	386-46XX
	RAY GERRALD	03	0007		ALAMO	--301	MCALLISTER	ST	M	-
	VINCENT	03	000A		ALAMO	--301	43RD	AV	M	566-96XX
	NOELLE LYS	03	0007		ALAMO	--301	CLEMENT	ST	F	221-39XX
	SHERLETTE	03	0007		ALAMO	--301	MCALLISTER	ST	F	346-37XX
	TONIMARIE	03	0003		ALAMO	--301	MCALLISTER	ST	F	567-13XX
	PATRICIA	03	0007		ALAMO	--301	26TH	AV	F	752-83XX
	JUDY KIND	03	0014		ALAMO	--301	16TH	AV	F	221-73XX
	NORA L	03			GOLDEN GATE	--337	MCALLISTER	ST	F	567-58XX
	MARY	03			ALAMO	--301	FULTON	ST	F	551-51XX
	KAMI DOUGLAS KEN	03	000A		ALAMO	--301	44TH	AV	M	752-19XX
	RODOLFO	03	0003		ALAMO	--301	21ST	AV	M	387-62XX
	ROBERT	03			ALAMO	--301	32ND	AV	M	386-71XX
	PATRICK	03	000A		ALAMO	--301	20TH	AV	M	681-83XX
	NOY JOHN	03			ARGONNE	--304	CABRILLO	ST	M	221-56XX

Sample Report C-1

School Lists—New School Option

• OLD SCHOOL LIST: 1971-72 STUDENTS WITH NEW SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT FOR 1972-73

• ANDREW JACKSON --303 DATE -- 08-26-72

• STUDENTS FOR CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR

STUDENT NO	NAME	GR	ROOM	ETHNIC	NEW SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT		ADDRESS		SEX	PHONE
	DANIEL DEB	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	27TH	AV	M	752-54XX
	ULYSSES F	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	FELL	ST	M	922-70XX
	PAMELA	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	22ND	AV	F	221-67XX
	MICHAEL	03			ANZA	--305	ROSSI	AV	M	751-47XX
	MICHELLE M	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	FULTON	ST	F	221-39XX
	SHIRLEY ANN	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	GROVE	ST	F	752-36XX
	SHIRLEY	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	26TH	AV	F	751-48XX
	CYNTHIA JO	03			ANZA	--305	MCALLISTER	ST	F	567-84XX
	HERMAN	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	GOLDENGATE	AV	M	386-05XX
	SAMUEL	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	MASONIC	AV	M	387-74XX
	JULIAN	03			ANZA	--305	ROSELYN	TR	M	387-78XX
	VICKY	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	SHRADER	ST	F	221-25XX
	MARY J	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	25TH	AV	F	751-28XX
	TACEE	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	33RD	AV	F	387-33XX
	ALFREDO	03			ANZA	--305	27TH	AV	M	387-78XX
	KEVIN	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	34TH	AV	M	752-37XX
	SUSAN	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	22ND	AV	F	387-36XX
	ATHAN	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	BALBOA	ST	M	387-48XX
	KEVIN	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	GROVE	ST	M	922-14XX
	ANNA	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	25TH	AV	F	752-84XX
	LEON	03			ANZA	--305	29TH	AV	M	752-37XX
	RAY	03			ANZA	--305	29TH	AV	M	752-37XX
	TRACY BEA	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	HAYES	ST	F	387-77XX
	TROY LEE	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	HAYES	ST	M	387-77XX
	JANE	03			ANZA	--305	GEARY	BL	F	- XX
	VINAY KUMAR	03			LAFAYETTE	--354	FULTON	ST	M	752-46XX
	REGINA	03			CABRILLO ANNEX	--311	25TH	AV	F	386-89XX

Sample Repon C-2

School Lists—Old School Option

MASTER SCHOOL DIRECTORY -- BY STREET ADDRESS 08/21/72 PAGE 589

STREET NAME STREET FROM	NUMBERS TO	EVEN /ODD	ZIP CODE	IN ZONE	PRIMARY SCHOOL GRADES K-3 NAME	PRIMARY SCHOOL START TIME	PRIMARY SCHOOL FEEDER AREA	INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL GRADES 4-6 NAME	INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL START TIME	INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL FEEDER AREA
YORBA ST										
2801	2999	O	94116	06	ULLOA	8:25AM	WALK	ORTEGA	8:55AM	352C
2900	2998	E	94116	06	ULLOA	8:25AM	WALK	ORTEGA	8:55AM	352C
YORK ST										
100	199	E/O	94103	03	JEAN PARKER	8:25AM	WALK	ORTEGA	8:55AM	352C
100	199	E/O	94103	03	JEAN PARKER	8:25AM	WALK	REDING	8:55AM	352C
401	499	E	94110	03	JEAN PARKER	8:25AM	348C	PATRICK HENRY	9:25AM	370D
401	499	O	94110	03	JEAN PARKER	8:25AM	WALK	PATRICK HENRY	9:25AM	370D
500	599	E/O	94110	03	JEAN PARKER	8:25AM	348C	PATRICK HENRY	9:25AM	370D
800	899	E/O	94110	03	JEAN PARKER	8:25AM	348C	PATRICK HENRY	9:55AM	370D
900	999	E/O	94110	03	BRYANT	8:55AM	WALK	PATRICK HENRY	9:55AM	370D
1000	1099	E/O	94110	03	BRYANT	8:55AM	WALK	EDISON	8:55AM	322B
1100	1198	E	94110	03	ALVARDO	8:55AM	302C	EDISON	8:55AM	322B
1101	1199	O	94110	03	BUENA VISTA	8:55AM	WALK	EDISON	8:55AM	322B
1200	1298	E	94110	03	ALVARDO	8:55AM	302C	PATRICK HENRY	9:25AM	370C
1201	1299	O	94110	03	BUENA VISTA	8:55AM	WALK	PATRICK HENRY	9:25AM	370C
1300	1399	E/O	94110	03	BUENA VISTA	8:55AM	WALK	PATRICK HENRY	9:25AM	370C
1500	1599	E/O	94110	03	MIRALOMA	8:25AM	365C	LE CONTE	8:55AM	WALK
1600	1699	E/O	94110	03	MIRALOMA	8:25AM	365C	LE CONTE	8:55AM	WALK
YOSEMITE AV										
0	0	E	94124	05	HILLCREST	8:55AM	344B	MONROE	8:55AM	366D
1300	1399	E/O	94124	05	CLEVELAND	8:55AM	313B	JOHN MCLAREN	9:25AM	317C
1400	1499	E/O	94124	05	CLEVELAND	8:55AM	313B	JOHN MCLAREN	9:25AM	317C

CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR STUDENT POPULATION
ETHNIC BREAK DOWN FOR ELEMENTARY STUDENTS DATE: 02/08/73

GRADE	SPANISH SURNAME	OTHER WHITE	NEGRO	CHINESE	JAPANESE	KOREAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	FILIPINO	OTHER NON-WHITE	UNKOWN	TOTAL
K	945	1888	1623	676	96	30	19	437	283	1	5998
%	15.8	31.5	27.1	11.3	1.6	.5	.3	7.3	4.7	.0	
UN	52	73	62	25	3	0	0	15	4	0	234
%	22.2	31.2	26.5	10.7	1.3	.0	.0	6.4	1.7	.0	
01	931	1615	1827	645	72	24	19	464	199	0	5796
%	16.1	27.9	31.5	11.1	1.2	.4	.3	8.0	3.4	.0	
02	857	1591	1911	685	94	33	19	474	177	1	5842
%	14.7	27.2	32.7	11.7	1.6	.6	.3	8.1	3.0	.0	
03	847	1571	1812	825	118	21	22	451	173	1	5841
%	14.5	26.9	31.0	14.1	2.0	.4	.4	7.7	3.0	.0	
04	735	1515	1746	725	75	17	17	436	179	0	5445
%	13.5	27.8	32.1	13.3	1.4	.3	.3	8.0	3.3	.0	
05	775	1564	1729	795	96	33	30	476	157	0	5655
%	13.7	27.7	30.6	14.1	1.7	.6	.5	8.4	2.8	.0	
06	765	1618	1879	880	116	20	19	423	189	0	5909
%	12.9	27.4	31.8	14.9	2.0	.3	.3	7.2	3.2	.0	
SCHOOL TOTALS	5907	11435	12589	5256	670	178	145	3176	1361	3	40720
%	14.5	28.1	30.9	12.9	1.6	.4	.4	7.8	3.3	.0	

0 RECORDS WITH INVALID GRADES

Sample Report E-1
Grade by Ethnic Distribution

** ETHNIC BREAK DOWN FOR SAMPLE ELEMENTARY 593 *DATE: 04/20/73

GRADE	SPANISH SURNAME	OTHER WHITE	NEGRO	CHINESE	JAPANESE	KOREAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	FILIPINO	OTHER NON-WHITE	UNKOWN	TOTAL
04	15	35	39	3	1	0	2	19	3	0	117
%	12.8	29.9	33.3	2.6	.9	.0	1.7	16.2	2.6	.0	
05	30	34	44	5	1	0	1	28	0	0	143
%	21.0	23.8	30.8	3.5	.7	.0	.7	19.6	.0	.0	
06	24	39	49	4	1	0	2	14	4	0	137
%	17.5	28.5	35.8	2.9	.7	.0	1.5	10.2	2.9	.0	
SCHOOL TOTALS	69	108	132	12	3	0	5	61	7	0	397
%	17.4	27.2	33.2	3.0	.8	.0	1.3	15.4	1.8	.0	

Sample Report E-2

Ethnic Distribution by School

** ETHNIC BREAK DOWN BY ATTENDANCE CATEGORY ** DATE: 04/20/73

ATTEND CATEG.	SPANISH SURNAME	OTHER WHITE	NEGRO	CHINESE	JAPANESE	KOREAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	FILIPINO	OTHER NON-WHITE	UNKOWN	TOTAL
T M H	28	38	33	12	2	0	0	14	2	0	129
%	21.7	29.5	25.6	9.3	1.6	.0	.0	10.9	1.6	.0	
BLIND	1	3	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	12
%	8.3	25.0	41.7	8.3	8.3	.0	.0	8.3	.0	.0	
CHINESE ES	69	30	3	626	52	39	0	130	65	0	1014
%	6.8	3.0	.3	61.7	5.1	3.8	.0	12.8	6.4	.0	
SPAN BILIN	186	58	37	2	3	0	0	12	8	0	306
%	60.8	19.0	12.1	.7	1.0	.0	.0	3.9	2.6	.0	
SPAN ESL	183	20	1	36	1	1	1	60	30	0	333
%	55.0	6.0	.3	10.8	.3	.3	.3	18.0	9.0	.0	
FIL BILING	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	13
%	23.1	7.7	23.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	46.2	.0	.0	
FIL ESL	3	4	1	15	0	0	0	19	1	0	43
%	7.0	9.3	2.3	34.9	.0	.0	.0	44.2	2.3	.0	
M E C	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
%	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
F E C	8	1	0	0	1	0	2	115	3	0	130
%	6.2	.8	.0	.0	.8	.0	1.5	88.5	2.3	.0	
GIFT-T.I.	35	387	131	147	54	3	2	33	18	0	810
%	4.3	47.8	16.2	18.1	.7	.4	.2	4.1	2.2	.0	

Sample Report E-3

Ethnic Distribution by Special Program

CURRENT YEAR STUDENT POPULATION
1970 CENSUS TRACT SUMMARY OF SFUSD STUDENT POPULATION

TRACT	GRADE	SEX	SS	OW	N	C	J	K	AI	F	ON	GRADE TOTAL
170	TOT		14	41	8	1	1	1	0	2	0	68
	%		20.5	60.2	11.7	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.0	2.9	0.0	
171	TOT		18	159	210	12	9	1	0	28	8	445
	%		4.0	35.7	47.1	2.6	2.0	0.2	0.0	6.2	1.7	
176	TOT		15	12	1	3	0	2	1	100	42	176
	%		8.5	6.8	0.5	1.7	0.0	1.1	0.5	56.8	23.8	
177	TOT		108	21	34	5	1	0	1	26	25	221
	%		48.8	9.5	15.3	2.2	0.4	0.0	0.4	11.7	11.3	
178	TOT		37	16	50	2	0	0	3	116	9	233
	%		15.8	6.8	21.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.2	49.7	3.8	
179	TOT		37	483	95	4	14	2	2	132	39	808
	%		4.5	59.7	11.7	0.4	1.7	0.2	0.2	16.3	4.8	
180	TOT		9	8	19	2	0	0	0	19	0	57
	%		15.7	14.0	33.3	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	
201	TOT		149	51	20	15	0	0	3	74	33	345
	%		43.1	14.7	5.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.8	21.4	9.5	
202	TOT		103	64	64	43	4	3	9	31	12	333
	%		30.9	19.2	19.2	12.9	1.2	0.9	2.7	9.3	3.6	
203	TOT		79	45	22	11	0	1	5	21	6	190
	%		41.5	23.6	11.5	5.7	0.0	0.5	2.6	11.0	3.1	

Sample Report E-4
Ethnic Distribution by Census Tracts

SAMPLE ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION BY CENSUS BLOCK
ETHNIC PERCENTAGES OF SFUSD STUDENTS FOR 1970 CENSUS TRACT/BLOCKS

TRACT BLOCK	SS	OW	N	C	J	K	AI	F	ON	BLOCK TOTAL
IN	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
102 PR 205	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 IN 205	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 PR 206	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
102 IN 208	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 PR 303	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
102 IN 303	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 PR 304	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 IN 304	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 PR 306	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
102 IN 306	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 PR 307	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 IN 307	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 PR 401	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 IN 401	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 PR 402	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 IN 402	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
102 PR 403	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102 IN 403	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Sample Report E-5
Ethnic Distribution by Census Blocks

*** ALPHA LIST -- *** DATE: 06/06/72 PAGE 3

STUDENT NO	NAME	GR	ROOM	SCHOOL #	SEX	ETH	BIRTHDATE	--------ADDRESS--		---------- PHONE	AT	
	NORMAN	03	0005	323	M		10-24-62	GIRARD	ST	468-17XX		
	PEDRO	01	0018	323	M		08-05-64	GIRARD	ST	468-17XX		
	MARIA LISA	04	0001	317	F		03-12-63	KEYSTONE	WY	585-07XX		
	STEPHANIE	K	0006	315	F		11-17-66	KEYSTONE	WY	585-37XX		
	CARLOS	04	0007	476	M		12-17-61	ELLIS	ST	673-32XX		
	KAMIA	03	0007	476	F		03-24-66	24TH	ST	824-81XX		
	MOHAMMAD	03	001M	316	M		04-21-63	24TH	ST	921-65XX		
	LOUIS	05	0208	307	M		08-30-61	WANDA	ST	586-85XX		
	DANIEL	06	0007	398	M		04-26-60	ORTEGA	ST	664-15XX		
	JESUS	01	0206	364	M		10-08-64	14TH	ST	0002 824-86XX	91-35-	
	YOLANDA	01	0210	364	F		11-09-65	14TH	ST	824-86XX	31-	R
	ARLENE	05	0202	307	F		06-03-61	ALEMANY	BL	586-04XX		
	ALEX ARDER	02	0201	471	M		07-10-64	BRADFORD	ST	647-71XX		
	HERIBERTO	03	0022	376	M		08-04-62	BRYANT	ST	-		
	IVMA	03	0023	350	F		08-24-63	SOUTH VAN NESS	AV	-		
	JAVIER	K	002B	363	M		02-12-66	SOUTH VAN NESS	AV	282-02XX		
	JOSE LUIS	05	0015	322	M		10-27-62	SOUTH VAN NESS	AV	-	92-	
	LETICIA	04	0105	370	F		02-04-62	KANSAS	ST	648-76XX		
	MARIAELENA	06	0013	371	F		07-11-60	BRADFORD	ST	637-71XX		
	MARK A	01	0102	471	M		09-17-65	BRADFORD	ST	647-71XX		
	MARTINA	05	0019	370	F		03-25-60	BRYANT	ST	824-95XX		R
	MIGUEL	01	0020	376	M		08-02-64	BRYANT	ST	824-95XX		
	RICARDO	K	0002	376	M		01-18-60	BRYANT	ST	824-95XX	17-	
	ALEX	04	0024	394	M		07-14-61	FRANCISCO	ST	931-75XX		
	CHRISTOPHER	K	0104	364	M		07-12-66	CHRISTOPHER	DR	566-83XX		
	CORDELIA	01	020B	364	F		01-09-65	CHRISTOPHER	DR	566-83XX		
	EDWARD	04	0204	321	M		02-16-63	CHRISTOPHER	DR	566-83XX		
	JENNIFER	06	0214	321	F		04-25-61	CHRISTOPHER	DR	566-83XX		
	CHRIS	03	0826	388	M		07-12-63	PORTOLA	DR	-		
	CELIA	02	0012	313	F		01-19-64	VIENNA	ST	333-33XX		
	MARK	02	0017	303	M		04-12-65	BALBOA	ST	668-65XX		
	AIDA	02	0010	336	F		03-11-64	ARMY	ST	0003 647-05XX		
	ANTONIO	05	0083	358	M		03-26-61	FOLSOM	ST	000A 282-64XX		
	BENJAMIN	04	001A	331	M		07-20-61	NAPLES	ST	333-36XX		
	DANIEL	01	000A	379	M		11-24-65	BAYWOOD	CT	585-65XX		

Sample Report F

Student Listings—Alpha Sequence

NAME -

SCHOOL -

GRADE -

TENTATIVE ROOM -

```
**********************************
*                                *
* AM PICKUP -                    *
*                                *
* PM RETURN -                    *
*                                *
* PICKUP LOCATION:               *
*                                *
*                                *
*                                *
*                                *
* BUS#                           *
*                                *
**********************************
```

Sample Report G

Name/Bus Cards

SONYA
30- 21ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94121

RODOLFO
33- 21ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94121

GARY TOSHIRO
37- 21ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94121

PATRICK
7-- 21ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94121

ARCHIVAL
43- 21ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94121

SUSAN
8- 21ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94121

Sample Report H

Name/Address Mailing Labels

Equal Education Opportunities Committee

DR. HILLIARD A. BOWEN
Assistant Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

MR. CLARENCE GITTINGS
Assistant Superintendent
Division of Educational Programs
Baltimore Public Schools

MR. ROLLINS GRIFFITH
Assistant Superintendent
Boston Public Schools

MR. JAMES R. HECK
Director of School Integration
Buffalo Public Schools

MR. EDUARDO CADAVID
Administrator
Special Language Development Program
Chicago Public Schools

DR. GEORGE R. RICKS
Director
Department of Human Relations
Chicago Public Schools

MRS. CONELLA BROWN
Assistant Superintendent
Cleveland Public Schools

MR. OTTO FRIDIA
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
for Inner City Schools
Dallas Independent School District

MR. MANUEL ANDRADE
Assistant Executive Director
Department of Elementary Education
Denver Public Schools

MR. GILBERT CRUTER
Executive Director
School-Community Relations
Denver Public Schools

DR. FREEMAN A. FLYNN
Divisional Director
Intergroup Relations
Detroit Public Schools

DR. JOHN CODWELL
Area Superintendent
Houston Independent School District

MR. RONALD PRESCOTT
Director
Multicultural Education
Los Angeles City Unified School District

MR. CHARLES J. PATTERSON, JR.
Director
Division of Race Relations
Memphis Public Schools

MR. ROBERT TESCH
Director
Publications and Mass Media
Division of Relationships
Milwaukee Public Schools

DR. ROBERT WILLIAMS
Assistant Superintendent
Intergroup Education
Minneapolis Public Schools

MR. HERNAN LA FONTAINE
Executive Administrator
Office of Bilingual Education
New York City Public Schools

MR. RUFUS SHORTER
Acting Executive Director
New York City Public Schools

MR. ROBERT BLACKBURN
Deputy Superintendent
Oakland Unified School District

MRS. GERTRUDE BARNES
Office of Community Affairs
Philadelphia Public Schools

MR. CHARLES HIGHSMITH
Associate Superintendent
Field Operations
Philadelphia Public Schools

MR. JOHN BREWER
Assistant Superintendent
Pittsburgh Public Schools

MR. DONALD McELROY
Associate Superintendent
Portland, Oregon Public Schools

MR. WILLIAM PEARSON
Assistant to the Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

MR. THOMAS McJUNKINS
Director
Office of Urban Affairs
San Diego Public Schools

DR. WILLIAM COBB
Assistant Superintendent
San Francisco Unified School District

MR. DWIGHT CROPP
Executive Assistant
District of Columbia Public Schools

Project Staff
Judith A. Winston, Director
Milton Bins
Barbara Edwards
Dolores Guerrero
Kathleen McMillan
Mary Ross

COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

OFFICERS

Dr. Richard Gousha, *President*
Mrs. James Tinsley, *Vice President*
Dr. Paul Briggs, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Dr. Jack Hornback, *Executive Vice President*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors of The Council of the Great City Schools includes one member of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools from each Member City.

CITY	SUPERINTENDENT	BOARD MEMBER
Atlanta	Dr. John Letson	Dr. Benjamin Mays
Baltimore	Dr. Roland Patterson	Mr. Larry Gibson
Boston	Mr. William J. Leary	Mr. Paul R. Tierney
Buffalo	Dr. Joseph Manch	Mr. Joseph E. Murphy
Chicago	Dr. James F. Redmond	Mrs. Louis A. Malis
Cleveland	Dr. Paul W. Briggs	Mrs. Ailene S. Taylor
Dallas	Dr. Nolan Estes	Mr. Eugene Smith
Denver	Dr. Howard Johnson	Mr. James C. Perrill
Detroit	Dr. Charles J. Wolfe	Dr. Cornelius Golightly
Houston	Dr. George Garver	Dr. George Oser
Los Angeles	Dr. William J. Johnston	Dr. Robert L. Docter
Memphis	Mr. John Freeman	Mrs. Lawrence Coe
Milwaukee	Dr. Richard P. Gousha	Dr. Harold Jackson, Jr.
Minneapolis	Dr. John B. Davis	Mr. John M. Mason
New York City	Dr. Irving Anker, Acting Chancellor	Mr. Murray Bergtraum
Oakland, California	Dr. Marcus Foster	Mr. Barney Hilburn
Philadelphia	Dr. Matthew Costanzo	Mr. Arthur Thomas
Pittsburgh	Dr. Louis J. Kishkunas	Mrs. James Novick
Portland	Dr. Robert W. Blanchard	Mr. Robert Ridgley
St. Louis	Dr. Clyde C. Miller	Mr. Malcolm W. Martin
San Diego	Dr. Thomas L. Goodman	Dr. Gene French
San Francisco	Dr. Steven P. Morena	Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.
Washington, D. C.	Dr. Hugh J. Scott	Mrs. Mattie Taylor

for further information, write:
The Council of the Great City Schools
1707 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006