DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 328 UD 021 561

AUTHOR Raivetz, Mark J.; Kean, Michael H.
TITLE Approaches to Evaluating a Systemwide Desegregation Effort.
PUB DATE 16 Apr 81
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at Symposium on "Measuring the Impact of Desegregation" at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 16, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Desegregation Plans: Elementary Secondary Education: *Evaluation Methods: *Evaluation Needs: *Program Effectiveness: *Program Evaluation: School Desegregation: Urban Schools: *Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

This paper briefly reviews the current racial balance in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania public schools and discusses the development of an evaluation system to assess progress toward desegregation. Priority products and services of the Desegregation Evaluation Unit, formed in 1979, are listed. A number of problems that must be addressed in order for the school district to participate successfully in a voluntary desegregation plan are discussed. Individual objectives, relating to racial balance, community involvement, staff development, and academic achievement, are outlined and ways of evaluating each objective are reviewed. Finally, serious barriers to voluntary desegregation are discussed, particularly the tendency toward "one way" desegregation: that is, minority students attend predominantly white schools, but few white students voluntarily attend schools in minority neighborhoods. (GC)

APPROACHES TO EVALUATING A SYSTEMWIDE DESEGREGATION EFFORT

Mark J. Raivetz
Office of Research and Evaluation
The School District of Philadelphia

Michael H. Kean
Educational Testing Service

Paper presented as part of a symposium on
Measuring the Impact of Desegregation
at the Annual Conference of
The American Educational Research Association
Los Angeles, California, Thursday, April 16, 1981

APPROACHES TO EVALUATING A SYSTEMWIDE DESEGREGATION EFFORT

1. A HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN PHILADELPHIA

The School District of Philadelphia officially initiated a Voluntary Desegregation Plan in February, 1979. The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) provided federal funds to assist the School District in implementing a desegregation process which had its beginnings in Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court some eleven years earlier.

In February, 1968, the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission (PHRC) ordered the School District to develop a plan to desegregate its schools. The PHRC is empowered by the state legislature to order school districts to desegregate. Pennsylvania law goes beyond federal statutes with respect to desegregation.

The PHRC need not prove willful intent against a district in order to take action. The presence of segregated schools is enough. If a school district's desegregation plan is not acceptable to the PHPC, the next step is Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court. Such was the case in Philadelphia.

On July 1, 1977, a Commonwealth Court judge ordered the Board of Education to "... proceed with the detailed development and implementation" of a voluntary desegregation plan. In so doing, the judge denied a plea from the Human Relations Commission that the School District provide a mandatory back-up plan should the voluntary effort not be successful.

Without any mandatory back-up, the judge agreed to give the School District a limited amount of time before reviewing its desegregation progress - until February, 1980. The 1977-1978 year was set aside for planning, with full implementation beginning September, 1978. Any time after the February, 1980 date, the PHRC could petition the court to take some mandatory action if it felt the School District was not making adequate voluntary progress.

Several PHRC recommendations for adding involuntary components to the plan were presented to the Board of Education during the Spring, 1980. They involved the mandatory pairings of some schools and the changing of some school feeder patterns. The Board elected not to change its Voluntary Plan. As a result, the PHRC voted in June, 1980, to petition Commonwealth Court to force the School District to modify its strictly Voluntary Plan to include some mandatory components. Hearings were held in January, 1981. At this writing, no decision has been announced.

The Voluntary Plan did not begin in September, 1978 as originally planned. The Office of Civil Rights found the School District to be out of compliance with respect to the racial balance of its faculties. As a result, the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) grants, which were to supply the majority of funding for the voluntary plan, were withheld. Without ESAA funding, it would be difficult to begin new desegregation projects. It took until February, 1979 to complete the transfer of nearly 3,000 teachers so that the programs could begin.

The School District is operating a Commonwealth Court approved Voluntary Desegregation Plan. Only school districts with court approved plans are eligible to apply for federal ESAA funds to assist in the desegregation process. In effect, there are two masters to please. The state approves the plan, the federal government assists in its financing.

For the Voluntary Desegregation Plan to be successful, parents and students must volunteer to attend schools so that racial isolation can be reduced.

Participating students receive free transportation to their new schools. The official Board policy permits voluntary transfers only if desegregation is promoted. Schools that are predominantly minority can only accept non-minority students. The reverse is true for predominantly non-minority schools. The School District's definition of a desegregated school is one in which the non-minority (white) population is between 25% and 75%. Hispanic students are considered minority. ESAA staff in Washington are willing to accept this definition. The PHRC is not.

The Human Relations Commission's definition of a desegregated school is stated in terms of black and non-black. Hispanic students are considered non-black (unless they comprise over 20% of the school's population). For the PHRC, a school is desegregated if it is not less than 25% non-black and not less than 40% black. In addition, if a school has over 20% Hispanic enrollment, it will be considered desegregated if it has no less than 25% white enrollment and no less than 25%

black enrollment. The School District and the PHRC have been unable to agree on the definition of a desegregated school. Each definition yields a different number of desegregated schools by which the School District's progress must be measured.

During the January, 1981 court hearings, the School District presented Coleman's Desegregation Index as another way to measure desegregation progress.

II DEVELOPING PROGRAMS FOR VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION

The School District developed a series of "educational opportunities for children" to encourage voluntary transfers for desegregation.

Schools and programs which were successfully desegregated prior to the Voluntary plan became part of the overall desegregation effort. These included several former alternative programs, Academics Plus back to basics schools, and the nationally respected Parkway Program.

New programs for desegregation were, in many cases, attempts to replicate already successful desegregated situations. Schools were selected if, in the opinion of School District experts, they could be desegregated on a voluntary basis with the addition of a specialized program. ESAA funds were sought to assist in financing these programs.

Since the start of the Voluntary Desegregation Plan, the School District has applied for and received ESAA grants for Basic, Pilot, Magnet, Neutral Site Planning, and Other Special Projects.

Basic Grant projects address problems incident to the elimination or reduction of minority group isolation in a school district. They are placed in neighborhood schools. The School District has received

Basic Grant funding continuously since February, 1979.

Pilot Grant projects address problems incident to the educational deficiencies of minority students in predominantly minority schools not affected by the desegregation plan. The 1979-1980 school year was the last year ESAA authorized Pilot Grant projects.

Magnet Grant projects address problems incident to the elimination or reduction of minority group isolation in a school district through the development of magnet schools. These schools offer special curricula designed to attract a desegregated student population, and are usually placed in a neutral site easily accessible by public transportation. The School District has received Magnet Grant funding continuously since February, 1978.

Neutral Site Planning Grant projects are given to a school district in order to enable it to plan adequately for new Magnet schools. The School District received Planning Grant funding for the development of three new Magnet high schools in July, 1980. They are scheduled to open in September, 1981.

Other Special Projects grants may be given to a school district at the discretion of the Secretary of the Department of Education. They may be used for any activity authorized by an ESAA grant. The School District received Special Project Grant funding from September, 1979 to December, 1980. Several Special Projects were terminated by ESAA prior to December, 1980.

Through the use of these funds, the School District developed programs around eight basic models: pairing, enrichment, middle school alternatives, music and art, multi-lingual/multi-cultural, student concerns, child development centers and special curriculum magnets.

Some programs were whole school, some served selected grades within a school, and some were in many schools. All programs and projects were designed in the hope that they would attract the desegregated student populations that the PHRC insisted on, at a price the ESAA budget officers were willing to fund.

Since April, 1979, many of the projects that ESAA has refused to fund have been assumed by the School District's limited operating budget desegregation funds.

III THE DESEGREGATION EVALUATION UNIT

As required by federal regulations, each ESAA proposal includes an evaluation component. The Desegregation Evaluation Unit was formed in February, 1979 to provide evaluation services to the School District in its desegregation efforts. The six person unit was placed within the Office of Research and Evaluation's Federal Evaluation Resource Services division.

In addition, the Division of Administrative and Survey Research Services provided enrollment data to the unit in the form of special reports detailing the changes in racial balance within schools.

From its creation, there was no lack of work to complete. Desegregation programs, committee chairpersons, staff development sessions,

and proposals for new funding all competed for the unit's time.

To manage more effectively, a prioritized list of products and services was developed. Priority products included: (1) Needs Assessment and enrollment data necessary for ESAA grant submissions; (2) completing requests for data for legal counsel to use with the PHRC; (3) interim and final reports required by ESAA regulations; (4) special reports for School District community and staff; and (5) instrument development in the area of racial tolerance and understanding.

Priority services included: (1) evaluation services to project personnel, including monitoring, testing, consultation, data collection, and staff development; (2) requests from desegregation program staff; (3) requests from various citizens advisory councils; and (4) requests from the Office of Federal Programs.

Aside from providing evaluation services, proposal development is the key function of the evaluation unit. This includes responsibility for the needs assessment, enrollment figures, objectives and their evaluation design, and timeline for implementation.

Proposals are graded competitively. Voluntary desegregation plans are not considered as cost effective as mandatory desegregation plans. This accentuated the need for high "quality" points in each proposal area.

IV EVALUATING THE DESEGREGATION PLAN

Problems Associated with the Implementation of the Desegregation Plan

The evaluation unit participated in an intensive review of the existing conditions in all Philadelphia schools. The implementation of

the voluntary plan required resources and assistance for problems incidental to the desegregation efforts.

Five basic problems were identified. These problems needed to be addressed in order for the School District to successfully participate in the Voluntary Desegregation Plan.

Problem 1. If the plan is to be successful, students must be attracted to and retained in the schools to which they voluntarily transfer to achieve desegregation.

There are a large number of racially identifiable, racially isolated schools in Philadelphia. In addition, there are a number of schools with student populations that differ from the neighborhoods in which they are located. Here, non-minority students attend parochial or private schools, rather than attending their neighborhood schools. Effective projects would have to be designed to reverse this trend. Difficulties were caused by geographic separation as well.

Problem 2. When students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds are brought together after years of racial isolation, there is a potential for friction and misunderstandings.

The more new students that elect to volunteer each year, the greater this problem may become.

Approaches aimed at minimizing and eliminating these and other problems (e.g., resegregation within the school, maintaining high educational standards, offering innovative programs, providing materials and equipment, and preparing staff) must not be ignored.

Problem 3. Parents and children who are voluntarily enrolled in schools outside of their neighborhoods may feel isolated from the new school community. On the other hand, parents and children who live in and attend schools in their own neighborhoods may view the influx of children and parents of other races with some concern.

Parents and communities must receive the preparation necessary for accepting voluntary desegregation on a large scale. As more parents elect to transfer their children for desegregation, this problem must continually be addressed. Opposition to mandatory assignment was previously demonstrated in the rejection of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission's recommendation for such a component.

Problem 4. Teachers who have been transferred in order to achieve racial balance of school faculties may not be familiar with their new school community environment. In addition, where involuntary transfers have been instituted, teachers' attitudes may be less than positive.

The problems associated with teacher movement were critical. In response to a 1978 requirement by the Office for Civil Rights, the School District transferred more than 3,000 teachers to achieve racially balanced faculties. Teacher lay-offs and subsequent rehirings, as mandated by a recently negotiated teachers contract (September, 1980) were responsible for the movement of over 1,000 teachers. In December, 1980, an additional 850 teachers were reassigned with the system.

Problem 5. Continuity of instruction may be negatively affected when students elect to transfer. If a transfer to achieve desegregation has a negative impact on the quality of education that students are entitled to receive, parents may be reluctant to permit their children to volunteer.

Although the voluntary plan does not address itself to providing remedial services, many children in racially isolated schools participate in Title I, ESEA. If they transfer to schools which are not Title I eligible, they will no longer be able to receive these compensatory services. The School District must continue to provide these services for pupils who transfer to other ESAA projects. Additionally, academically talented students must not be negatively

affected by electing to transfer to new schools. This problem must be continually addressed as new students elect to transfer into these programs, replacing students who move on to other desegregated settings.

Each of the five problems basic to the implementation of the Voluntary Desegregation Plan may be reflected ~~in~~ a corresponding need.

Needs in Relation to Identified Problems

Need 1: There is a need for minority and non-minority students to voluntarily enroll in schools to advance the desegregation efforts.

Need 2: Pupils who have been racially isolated have the need to develop tolerance and understanding of the behaviors and personal beliefs of people of different backgrounds. Innovative activities and supportive services that will promote understanding among students of different races are therefore, required.

Need 3: There is a need to reduce parent/community fears and apprehensions about voluntary desegregation.

Need 4: Teachers need to implement new curricula as specified by the activities within the Basic Grant and they need to instruct children who have previously been racially isolated.

Need 5: There is a need to ameliorate the discrepancy between students enrolled in minority isolated schools and those that are in predominantly non-minority schools in terms of achievement, attainment rates, attendance, and other student concerns (i.e., suspension, expulsion).

Objectives in Relation to Identified Needs

Each need is reflected in a corresponding objective. Each objective is evaluated. No two objectives can be evaluated exactly the same way.

The objectives and their evaluation are logical extensions of the needs and problems.

PROBLEM ⟶ NEED ⟶ OBJECTIVE ⟶ EVALUATION

If this problem-need-objective-evaluation relationship seems elementary, it is. And that's good. Central office desegregation staff and teachers in the schools became familiar with evaluation as an

integral part of the entire desegregation process. Little time was spent in explaining or justifying program evaluation and its related activities. Evaluation belonged.

Objectives to be evaluated and the evaluation techniques follow:

Objective 1

To continue to maintain or improve the racial balance of the desegregated schools in which the proposed activities are implemented, so that by June, 1981, the proportion of minority to non-minority students is not less than 25% nor greater than 75% as stated in the Voluntary Desegregation Plan.

Evaluation

The Pupil Directory Information File (PDIF) is a regularly maintained system that is used to keep track of individual pupil information such as school, grade, and room. The PDIF also contains an indicator for each pupil's race. The November 1980 update of this file will be used to produce a report on the racial distributions of each program.

The results of later updates of the PDIF will be reported so that project administrators may be kept informed of changes in the percentages of minority and non-minority students at each site.

The techniques specified will enable the evalation team to determine the degree to which the need for minority and non-minority students to voluntarily enroll in the project has been addressed. Descriptions of progress toward attainment will be produced after each pupil irectory update. The final June, 1981, update will be used to measure the objective.

Objective 2

During the 1980-1981 school year, students who participate in programs designed to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group isolation and discrimination will demonstrate a positive increase in tolerance, awareness, and understanding of peers from different racial or cultural backgrounds as measured by an increase in the number of cross-racial friendships from November, 1980 to May, 1981 on the revised Classroom Perception Inventory.

Evaluation

The Classroom Perception Inventory was developed by Robert E. Slavin at the Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University. It is a sociometric measure that has been successful in measuring cross-racial friendships.

The Classroom Perception Inventory will be administered in November, 1980 and again in May, 1981, to a stratified random sample of desegregated classrooms. An increase in tolerance, awareness, and understanding should be reflected by an increase in the number of cross-racial friendships.

In addition, the evaluation team is in the process of developing an Affective Observation Scale. This scale is designed to measure tolerant behaviors of students in free choice situations. Peer-peer interactions are videotaped so that observers may be trained and behaviors classified.

Objective 3

To promote community involvement with parents and other community members through the use of phone calls, meetings, workshops, written communication, and conferences during the 1980-1981 school year to the extent that 30% of the parents of elementary and secondary school children in the project are contacted by the program staff, as measured by the Basic Grant Parent Survey.

Evaluation

In order to determine the level of parent/community involvement for the projects, the evaluation team will develop record keeping forms and procedures for the collection of data on contacts between programs and the community. The forms will be reviewed and summarized periodically to determine the extent of the projects' efforts in light of the established criteria. The school counselor will be responsible for keeping records of these contacts.

The target population includes parents of children enrolled in each of the grant projects. During the 1980-1981 school year, the evaluation team will observe workshops, meetings, and conferences in order to collect information regarding the extent to which activities have been implemented that deal with the reduction of fears and apprehensions about voluntary desegregation. It is believed that such parent/community contacts will reduce these fears and apprehensions.

In May, 1981, the evaluation team will administer the Parent Survey to a stratified random sample of parents of children enrolled in desegregation projects in order to determine the amount and quality of these contacts.

Objective 4

In order to meet the special needs of teachers and other staff arising from their assignment to new schools, or involvement with pupils who will be new to the schools, each teacher and paraprofessional associated

with desegregation programs will receive, by June, 1981, training in: inter-group relations; development of specialized curricula; teaching skills; and characteristics of effectively integrated schools; as indicated by the existence of specific plans for staff development within each program and the attendance records for each training session. The Staff Development Survey will be administered in June, 1981 in order to determine staff perceptions of the effectiveness of the training.

Evaluation

In order to document the implementation of the staff development component of each program in the areas of intergroup relations, specialized curricula, teaching skills, and the characteristics of effectively integrated schools, there will be ongoing observations of the training sessions by the program evaluators. Also, training session plans and attendance records will be reviewed so that information for both program management and outcome evaluation purposes may be developed. It is expected that all staff involved in each program will receive staff development in the areas specified. Their involvement in these activities should result in improved approaches and improved intergroup relations.

In June, 1981, the evaluation team will administer the Staff Development Survey to a stratified random sample of teachers and other staff in order to determine their perceptions of the effectiveness of the training sessions.

Objective 5

Students enrolled in Instructional Enrichment Centers, Music and Art Enrichment Centers, and Middle Years Alternative Programs will maintain or improve their national percentile ranking in reading and mathematics from February, 1980 to February, 1981 as measured by the California Achievement Tests (CAT).

Evaluation

The School District's citywide testing program data from the February, 1980 and February, 1981 administrations of the CAT will be used to compare the pretest and posttest differences for individual students enrolled in these programs.

Determination of improved achievement as specified in the objective in reading and mathematics for the 1981-1982 school year will be determined by using the nationally-normed California Achievement Tests. Since these data will be analyzed for each program, information dealing with the specific target populations will be presented. It is assumed that

participation in these enrichment programs will have a positive effect upon achievement levels to the extent that students are able to maintain or improve their percentile ranks from 1980 to 1981. Since the School District has a voluntary desegregation plan, the availability of a legitimate control group is precluded. Thus, each individual in the program acts as his/her own control.

V ATTEMPTING TO MAKE EVERYONE HAPPY

Five separate problem areas and their corresponding needs, objectives and evaluation designs have been identified. So too have the eight basic program models the School District has developed to encourage voluntary desegregation.

Even trying to keep the evaluation as manageable as is possible still results in five objectives for each of eight different educational programs in 76 schools. If the desegregation programs were only "basic skills," or only "music enrichment," or only "pairing," the task would be much easier. As it is, the objectives and their evaluation are less program specific than they are desegregation general.

The evaluation unit operates on as many levels as there are clients. The needs of each client differ. An early criticism of ESAA program officers in Washington was that there were too many overall objectives. An early criticism from school principals and program coordinators was that the objectives were not program specific. The challenge was to make everyone happy.

Aggregating data was necessary for ESAA initial and final reports to Washington. They were of little value to individual school programs.

The individual schools were less interested in how all of the projects fared in one area than they were in the progress of their particular project in that area. While fully acknowledging this need,

the evaluation unit was still taxed in its efforts to meet it on a school by school, project by project basis. Decisions of greatest good for the greatest number frequently had to be made.

Written reports were limited to those required for continued funding. The evaluation unit could write reports, or it could evaluate programs. There was not enough time to do both. The unit specialized in providing process evaluation services on a school or project basis. Anything that came out in a summarized written report was already old news to the teachers and coordinators responsible for the programs. All services to individual projects were documented by program monitoring reports.

Still, it is difficult to make everyone happy. For example, the evaluation unit is not always happy. They have collected all manner of interesting data. If they only had the time to disseminate them...

VI THE NEED FOR EFFECTIVE MULTIPLE MEASURES

On the individual school or project level, each objective is stated in terms of an evaluation question. The evaluation of the voluntary desegregation plan seeks answers to five questions:

1. *Are students volunteering so that schools become desegregated?*
2. *Do the students get along with each other in their new schools?*
3. *Are parents involved and informed?*
4. *Are teachers and other staff receiving the necessary training so that the programs are properly implemented?*
5. *How has the desegregation plan affected students' achievement in basic skills?*

1. *Are students volunteering so that schools become desegregated?*

This question is answered through the use of the Pupil Directory Information File (PDIF) updates in October, January, April, and June. On the school level, the actual number of voluntary transfers in or out is computed. This is the easiest question to answer. It is also considered the most important. Unless the school becomes desegregated, there is no program left to evaluate. ESAA withdraws its funding.

2. *Do the students get along with each other in their new school?*

This question is answered in several different ways. Primarily, students are observed throughout the school day by a member of the evaluation unit. Regular monitoring, as well as discussions with principals, teachers, aides, and students give the evaluator the best sense of how well the students are getting along.

Observations during free choice situations (unobtrusively of course) have also proved invaluable. The unit has experimented with video taping in the school yards and lunch rooms in order to categorize different types of behavior in desegregated situations.

Students in grades three to eight are administered the Classroom Perception Inventory on a stratified random basis. The sociometric measure has been successful in measuring cross-racial friendships.

On the secondary level, a locally developed instrument designed to measure racial tolerance and understanding has been successfully field tested.

3. *Are parents involved and informed?*

This question is answered on the school level through the project personnel themselves. The school secretary, principal, teachers, and counselors regularly communicate with parents. These contacts are recorded. Flyers and announcements are shared with the evaluation unit.

Meetings and staff development sessions directed at parents and community are attended by the evaluators.

To answer this question on a citywide basis, a parent/phone survey is administered to a stratified random sample of parents in the spring.

4. *Are teachers and other staff receiving the necessary training so that the programs are properly implemented?*

This question is answered several different ways as well. The evaluation unit regularly attends scheduled staff development sessions for project personnel in a school. Once a session has been completed, the evaluator monitors the project in the classroom to see if, in fact, the teacher or aide is using the skills that were presented in the earlier staff development session. Feedback is supplied, not only to the school staff, but to the person or persons who led the staff development session as well.

To answer this question on a citywide basis, a staff development survey is administered to a stratified random sample of school staffs in the spring.

5. *How has the desegregation plan affected students' achievement in basic skills?*

Although the School District tests all students in reading and mathematics on the California Achievement Tests as part of its citywide testing program, this question is best answered on an individual student basis.

For individual schools who have participated in the Voluntary Desegregation Plan for two test administrations, the answer to this question was not an easy one to explain. Teachers and principals felt their schools were "doing better." Individual students and grades within schools did, in fact, show an increase in achievement.

The evaluation team was unable to attribute this finding solely to individual students' participation in the desegregation projects. The fact remains, however, that new students, mostly minority, voluntarily enrolled for the purposes of desegregation in schools that were predominantly non-minority. These schools showed no loss in achievement. In fact, the majority of grades actually gained over two test administrations.

The need for effective multiple measures cannot be discounted. Desegregation is not completed simply because students have transferred to their new buildings. On the individual school level, only adequate answers to each evaluation question can determine whether or not the desegregation process may be considered successful.

VII BEYOND THE OBJECTIVES

The evaluation unit is both capable and caring. This combination allows them to conduct professional evaluations of educational programs that are designed to encourage desegregation. Certainly, the problem-need-objective- evaluation relationship has proved effective on the district level. So, too have the evaluation questions been successful on the school level. Good evaluation notwithstanding, one should not get the impression that the Voluntary Desegregation Plan is "the answer."

The racial distribution of the general population and public schools is very different. While the city population is estimated to be 48% minority, the School District is over 70% minority. Philadelphia has one of the largest parochial school systems in the country. It is far more segregated (and far more white) than is the School District. Of the 28% of the School District that is white, the vast majority live in the northeast portion of the city.

The School District's Voluntary (or free choice) Plan was officially created by a Board Resolution which approved the policy that permitted voluntary transfers of students only if desegregation is promoted. That is, predominantly minority schools can accept only non-minority transfers; predominantly non-minority schools can accept only minority transfers. ESAA funds were spent to create programs that would attract students of the "needed" race into the school. Free choice for some is, in reality, no choice for others.

Black students in predominantly white schools are unable to take advantage of any of the desegregation programs. The same holds true, of course, for white students in predominantly black schools. Their leaving adversely affects the racial balance of a sending school.

Publicity efforts designed to make students and their parents sensitive to the many worthy "educational options" available as part of the Voluntary Desegregation Plan brought a tremendous number of transfer requests. Students in the "adversely affected" group have no "options." For them, this is a forced, involuntary, no-choice, stay where you are desegregation plan.

Transfers are limited by the School District's neighborhood school policy. A desegregation program placed in a neighborhood school is open, first, to all school age children living in the neighborhood. A program placed in a predominantly white school must first serve its neighborhood whites. Only if there is room can non-whites transfer in for the program. This leaves minority students on waiting lists for programs designed to attract them. Every effort is made to get these students off waiting lists and into other programs. There are still more minority students waiting to be served than there is room for them.

There is plenty of room for non-minority students in minority schools. Only neutral site magnet schools have successfully attracted white students. An attitude of "if they want to come here, fine, but don't make us go there" is present among most white parents.

Desegregation programs that have been placed in minority schools were not funded by ESAA after the first year. They were not cost effective.

Many principals in minority schools have expressed serious doubts about a desegregation plan that encourages their very best students to transfer, leaving them with fewer high achieving, well attending, youngsters (and parents) in their schools.

Even the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission has acknowledged that many minority students can not be desegregated given the demographics of the School District.

For all intents and purposes, the evaluation unit is evaluating a one-way desegregation plan.

VIII THINKING AHEAD

There are still questions to be answered:

- Is one-way desegregation better than no desegregation?
- How much more voluntary desegregation can be expected?
- What will happen to the Voluntary Desegregation Plan (and the evaluation unit) if ESAA grants are cut in favor of the proposed Reagan block grants?

Up to now, the Voluntary Plan has received favorable press for its programs, if not for its student movement. During 1976-1977, the year prior to court approval of the plan, there were 47 desegregated schools serving 40,171 students. By fall, 1980 there were 79 desegregated schools serving 62,063 students. Still, only 27.7% of Philadelphia's students are in desegregated schools.

The School District's attitude towards desegregation has always been one of "creative procrastination." It should prove interesting from a political (if not from an evaluation) standpoint to see what the next few months hold.