

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**A STUDY OF THE DESEGREGATION PLAN OF
URBANA SCHOOL DISTRICT 116 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:
FROM THE BEGINNING OF IMPLEMENTATION TO THE PRESENT**

BY

PRESTON LEE WILLIAMS, JR.

**B.S., Indiana State University, 1979
Ed.M., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1987**

THESIS

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000**

Urbana, Illinois

UMI Number: 9971219

**Copyright 2000 by
Williams, Preston Lee, Jr.**

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 9971219

Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

© Copyright by Preston Lee Williams, Jr., 2000

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

APRIL 2000

(date)

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

PRESTON LEE WILLIAMS, JR.

ENTITLED A STUDY OF THE DESEGREGATION PLAN OF URBANA
SCHOOL DISTRICT 116 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: FROM THE
BEGINNING OF IMPLEMENTATION TO THE PRESENT

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

James H. Ward

Director of Thesis Research

Paul W. Thurston

Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

James H. Ward

Chairperson

Robert P. Parker

Nona A. Peltine

Susan E. Woffke

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

ABSTRACT

This work covers the beginning of an idea in the African-American community of Urbana, Illinois about equity and equality in the area of public education. It traces the concept from a federal policy to its eventual culmination in a Midwestern school district. This is the story of a desegregation initiative in Urbana, Illinois to desegregate its elementary schools during a very turbulent time in America's history. The story describes in detail the many twists and turns that eventually led to a desegregation policy that was one of the first of its kind in the State of Illinois. The individuals who are most responsible for the implementation of the policy are discussed and give amazing insight into what made this policy happen. There are five major themes that are discussed related to how they all came together to influence this medium sized Midwestern school district to desegregate its elementary schools. Those themes are the federal shift in policy, interplay of local preferences in federal policy, the Board of Education members' moralistic decision or fear of the federal government, politics of power within the Urbana community, and the myth of the African-American monolithic thought concept. The incredible interplay among the various themes and the individuals that put federal policy into action within the community of Urbana created a very intriguing story of federal policy and local reaction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I began this process a number of years ago, one person has been solidly in my corner no matter what. That individual is my lovely wife, Ivy. She has stuck by me through all of the late nights and long weekends, has continued to make our house flow, and still has a wonderful vibrancy--this is truly a gift from her. A special debt of gratitude to my children, Jacquelyn and Preston (Trè), who allowed me to work late into the night and miss a few activities to complete this process.

To Dr. Jim Ward, my advisor, whose thoughtful insight and belief in my abilities have been a driving force in my life for the past decade and hopefully into the future. He has helped to guide my career from one challenge to the next, and I am truly grateful.

To Dr. Nona Prestine who showed me that through hard work and conviction anything is possible. She also provided me with the insight to be willing to look through different lenses on any subject and to view all the varied sides of an issue.

To Drs. Laurence Parker and Susan Noffke who have shown patience and provided me with valuable resources to complete this project.

To Joyce Hipskind, who has helped me to understand the importance of detail, I will be forever grateful.

To the Cohort group: Randall, Becky, Mike, Cal, Susan, Mike, Dennis, and the rest of the gang for the great times and their ongoing encouragement to complete this process. Also to my colleagues within the district: Bob, Gene, Carol, Susan, Sherry, Carmelita, Kathy, Janet, and to all the others for their support in this process. I hope that all of you understand

**the thankfulness that I have in being able to know each and every one of you and
acknowledge how grateful I truly am.**

-

-

v

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Process of Desegregation in Urbana	2
	Description and History of Urbana	4
	African-Americans in Champaign County	6
	Problem Statement	8
	Research Question	9
	Summary	10
2	THE LEGAL CONTEXT AND IMPLEMENTATION	11
	OF DESEGREGATION	11
	Independent School District v. Salvatierra (1930, 1931)	11
	Alvarez v. Lemon Grove (1931)	12
	Méndez v. Westminster (1946, 1947)	12
	Brown v. Board of Education	13
	Plessy v. Ferguson	14
	Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas	16
	Brown II	17
	Desegregation Reports	23
	The Coleman Report	24
	Southern Cities Desegregation Efforts	25
	Northern Cities	27
	Small Northern Cities	30
	Civil Rights Act of 1964	33
	Summary	34
	Contemporary Perceptions	35
3	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	38
	Restatement of the Problem and Research Question	38
	Research Design	39
	Site-Selection	44
	Data Collection	45
	Interviews	47
	Documentary and Archival Evidence	48

CHAPTER

3	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (<u>continued</u>)	
	Data Analysis	50
	Reliability and Validity	52
	Limitations of the Study Design	56
4	THE URBANA PLAN: FROM IDEA TO PRACTICE, THE STORY	59
	Norris Brookens	60
	Carlos Donaldson	61
	Paul Hursey	62
	The Ellis Group	62
	Harold Miller	63
	Don Holste	64
	Background	66
	The Story	71
	Creating a Plan	71
	Orchard Downs Community Responds	74
	Desegregation Resolution Approved by Urbana Board	77
	What About Hays School?	79
	Perceptions From an Urbana Elementary School Building Principal	81
	Community Activist Speaks: Mr. Paul Hursey	92
	Community Activist Speaks: Mr. Carlos Donaldson	98
	Religious Leaders' Reactions	102
	Summary	103
5	AN ANALYSIS OF FIVE PREVALENT THEMES WITHIN THE URBANA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DESEGREGATION EFFORT	105
	A Shift in Federal Policy	105
	Interplay of Local Preferences in Federal Policy	111
	The Role of the Board of Education	114
	The Power Play	118
	Views of African-Americans About Desegregation	121
	Summary	125
6	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	128
	What Influenced and Disrupted Desegregation in Urbana?	130

CHAPTER

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (continued)

Strategy in Developing the Desegregation Plan 131
Recommendations 135
Implications for Future Study 137
Summary 144

REFERENCES 151

APPENDIX

A PRE-INTERVIEW PHONE CONTACT 158

B PRE-INTERVIEW CALL SHEET 161

C FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR STUDY PARTICIPANTS 163

D INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 165

VITA 169

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1999, Urbana School District 116 began to back away from busing for racial balance, partially because of local political pressures and partly because the Office of Civil Rights banned race-based policies. This ends an era that began in Urbana in the mid-1960s and begins with the story you are about to read. Understanding the complexities of the effort and the reason they are now abandoning busing is important. The issues that were seemingly addressed in the 1960s are still present today.

Urbana School District 116 desegregation efforts: Legislative amendments effective on July 1, 1963, put Urbana School District 116, as it did many other school districts across the state, face to face with the issue of school segregation. These amendments to the Illinois School Code prohibited school boards from erecting, purchasing, or acquiring buildings for school purposes which would promote segregation because of color, race, or nationality. In September of 1963, Dr. Ray Braun, Acting Superintendent of Urbana 116, created a committee to study school boundaries in light of this legislation. The committee's charge was to study the current boundaries as to whether they promoted segregation and to make recommendations to the school board regarding future planning, even today.

This committee represented both community and school factions. Active community members of the committee included Robert Judd, chairman, Mrs. Francis Kruidenier, Kenneth Livingston, Ovid George and Mrs. Lorenzo Wylie. School members included Miss Esther Ewald, Mrs. Norma Zimmer, and Mrs. Esther Blackburn as ex officio members of the

committee. The legislation and the committee's recommendations have continued to have an impact on the Urbana school districts system.

Three years after the initial legislation and response, in the summer of 1966, the Urbana School Board passed a motion to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools. (Urbana secondary schools had always been desegregated.) When the motion was passed, Superintendent Braun was out of the country. What did occur during the three years that the Citizens Advisory Board was investigating the situation and making recommendations to the School Board. According to Mrs. Esther Blackburn, Business Manager of Urbana School District 116, 517 pupils were bused for desegregation purposes that first year (1966), and equaled 24.5% of the total number of students bused to school.

Demographically, Urbana School District 116 in 1966 had an enrollment of 6,519 students. At the elementary level, there were 3,901 students attending 10 enrollment centers: Hays (294), Leal (414), Lincoln (168), Thornburn (117), Thomas Paine (477), Washington (378), Webber (576), Wiley (588), Yankee Ridge (494), and Prairie (567). The racial composition of the schools, either individually or collectively, is not available at this time. It seems records on racial composition were not kept. However, according to an administrator for the district, 90% of the African-American elementary students were housed at Hays. In light of this information, the school boards goals were to have a minimum of 13% of all elementary schools composed of African-American students.

Process of Desegregation in Urbana

By the early Spring of 1966, informal discussions were being held by patrons of

Urbana School District 116 concerning possible methods whereby a better racial balance could be obtained in the elementary schools. Hays Elementary School, renamed Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School in 1970, was by far the predominant African-American school of the nine elementary schools in the district. The one junior and one senior high schools were integrated.

During the regular Board of Education meeting held on May 17, 1966, a representative of the Council on Community Integration encouraged the Board to establish a policy on integration. Members of the Council offered to meet with other interested groups, and particularly with the Citizens' Advisory Council which was also studying ways to bring about integration.

Then, in the summer of 1966, the Urbana School Board passed a motion to desegregate Urbana elementary school buildings. The process instituted by Urbana is the focus of this research. How this small college town put into effect one of the most innovative desegregation programs in the United States is still a mystery to be unraveled. What occurred in meetings held between the Advisory Council and the Community Integration Council that formed the eventual plan for desegregation is central to the successful outcome of the resulting process.

A major factor that was considered in the Urbana School Board's decision was the geographical location of the African-American community. A majority of the African-American community in Urbana in 1963 lay north of University Avenue, east of Wright Street, and west of Cunningham Avenue. Generally, this is still the case in 1999; during the

1960s the concentration within this area was even greater. Thus a de facto segregation pattern based on housing patterns truly existed within the Urbana community.

Description and History of Urbana

Situated in east-central Illinois, Urbana is a city with a current population of 36,500. In examining the process of desegregation in Urbana Schools, a look at the community in terms of its history seems important. These historical notes were prepared by the staff of The Urbana Free Library. Urbana has a long tradition of being a dynamic community, as well as being a diverse community. Its heritage is rich in every aspect of living—business, the arts, education, and technology. Early history reveals the influence of the American Indian. In the 1700s, Chief Shemauger of the Pottawatomie Nation was born under a hickory tree near Boneyard Creek, about where the Jolly Roger restaurant now stands (Cunningham, 1905, p. 642). In 1822, the first pioneer cabin was built in what will eventually become Urbana. William Tompkins built a home near Boneyard Creek, behind where the Courier Café now stands (Cunningham, 1905, p. 642).

Then in 1833, Urbana was declared the county seat of the newly formed County of Champaign. In the state of Ohio, another city of Urbana is the county seat of another Champaign County. Champaign County in Illinois was settled relatively late because the land was extremely swampy and inaccessible by boat. Because of its county seat status, many well known and influential people were drawn to the area. Abraham Lincoln delivered a speech against slavery at the courthouse in Urbana where he visited frequently as a lawyer on the 8th Judicial circuit. The Illinois Central Railroad reached Urbana in 1854. For the

first time, Urbana was easy to reach from the outside world. Because the land west of Urbana was easier to build on, the railroad was built two miles west of the courthouse. The new community of West Urbana grew up around the station. In April 1860, West Urbana became an independent city, Champaign. Continuing a tradition of progressive growth, the University of Illinois opened its doors in 1868. The first year, the University had only 13 professors and 77 students. In 1996, over 2,000 professors and 36,500 students populate the university, an institution with world-wide recognition. Also in 1868, Busey Bank opened in downtown Urbana. Busey is now one of the largest financial institution in east-central Illinois. On October 9, 1871, much of downtown Urbana burned to the ground. On the same day, 150 miles to the north, the Great Chicago Fire began. Both fires start in stables, Urbana's in a stable just south of where the Methodist church now stands. One of the landmarks of the community, the Urbana Free Library, was founded in 1874. It is one of the first tax-supported public libraries in Illinois. Located at the corner of Race and Elm Streets since 1918, the library has grown to have one of the highest per capita use levels of all 610 public libraries in the state. In 1931, Carle Foundation Hospital and Clinic was founded. Urbana has become a major medical center in Illinois with Covenant and Carle Medical Centers.

The year 1964 proved to be a very productive year for the city of Urbana. Lincoln Square opened as America's second indoor shopping mall. On campus, Mr. and Mrs. Herman Krannert provided funds for the construction of Krannert Center for the Performing Arts at the University of Illinois. Thirty years later, Time magazine called it "arguably the best performing arts center in the nation." In 1970 Sunnycrest shopping center opened in

southeast Urbana, and in 1973 Solo Cup began production in its plant in east Urbana.

Finally, in 1993 Urbana celebrated the 160th anniversary of its founding with the erection of a new city clock at the corner of Race and Elm streets (courtesy of the Urbana Free Library staff).

African-Americans in Champaign County

History is not solely under the proprietorship of the American Indian and the White pioneer. Since emancipation, Blacks in Champaign County have also experienced a rich and interesting history.¹ The first wave arrived after Blacks were granted their freedom in 1865. The immediate post-Bellum period saw many Blacks migrating to different sections of the country, hoping to provide better lives for their families. Later, in the early 20th century, Blacks migrated from border and Southern states (primarily Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Indiana, Mississippi, and Georgia) seeking jobs in the industrialized Northern society.

Since the primary mode of travel was by train, and Champaign County was located along major migration routes, Blacks often decided to reside in Champaign County. To illustrate the change in the number of Blacks in Champaign County, the census shows that the "first wave" of Black migration (late 1860s through 1880) resulted in an increase from 48 Blacks in 1860 to 233 in 1870, and 462 by 1880. It must also be noted that Blacks were listed on the 1840 census, as well in Champaign County, with less than 20 individuals.

¹Information pertaining to African-American history was obtained in the Spring of 1997 from the Champaign County African-American History Committee, chaired by Ms. Estelle Merrifield.

Further, from 1900 to 1920, the number of Blacks in Champaign County tripled from 551 to 1,620.

As significant numbers of Blacks arrived in Champaign County, they began to build and develop their own institutions (i.e., churches, businesses, social groups, etc.). This separating of institutions from existing ones happened primarily for two reasons. First, many of the established institutions in Champaign County excluded Blacks from joining them. Second, Blacks migrated to establish economic and social freedom; thus, separate institutions were not necessarily problematic for Blacks in Champaign County.

Not unexpectedly, given the cultural significance of the institution, the church was a primary institution for Blacks to achieve social independence and stability. The two earliest churches in Champaign County were Bethel A.M.E. Church and Salem Baptist Church, both highly active yet today.

Another institution established for the social welfare of Champaign County Blacks was Douglass Community Center. Dedicated on September 23, 1945, the center was founded in response to social segregation and the generally inadequate recreational facilities in the Black community.

Economically, Blacks in Champaign County were even more restricted. Throughout the late 19th and 20th centuries, Blacks were limited mostly to railroad, domestic, and day labor. However, some Blacks became successful in establishing their own businesses and owning their own farms. For example, George W. Smith of Raymond Township purchased 80 acres of land around 1876, and eventually owned 437 acres. Blacks also established smaller scale businesses such as barbershops, stores, and cleaners. In spite of social and

economic restrictions, the significant contributions the Black community has made to the development of Champaign County are evident in all aspects of life. The diversity that Champaign-Urbana is famous for can be attributed in great part to its Black history. From business, to the arts, to religion, the African-American heritage is alive and thriving (Champaign County African-American History Committee, 1995).

Problem Statement

There has been much progressive and aggressive growth throughout Urbana's history, especially in the diverse make-up of the Urbana community. In order to determine how Urbana linked itself to national and state desegregation initiatives, it seems important to look at the process of desegregation in this community in order to achieve a deeper and better understanding of why desegregation happened, how it happened, and to its future. In 1968, Roy Wilkins, Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, stated:

Now, 24 years after Brown, we find that the 1954 Supreme Court decision has not yet become reality for black American school children. We cannot stand by and risk the loss of another generation. We are faced with the shame of such places as Detroit, Louisville and, above all, Boston. (As cited in Jones, 1979, p. xi).

The South, which initially displayed bitter and massive resistance to school desegregation, as Jones (1979) says, "is more thoroughly integrated than the North" (p. xi).

At the NAACP, our task has become one of challenging, through the courts, those Northern bastions of school segregation which rail against "court-ordered forced busing" and attempt to frighten us with alarming cries of "White Flight" from urban centers (Jones, 1979).

In Urbana, Hays Elementary School, as has been acknowledged previously, was being attended predominantly by Negro pupils when the Board of Education, Urbana School

District 116, on July 26, 1966, announced, "convinced that racial balance in all schools of the district is educationally sound as well as morally right, the board has decided to place the majority of Hays School area pupils in other schools" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, July 27, 1966, p. 1). This interchange of students was to be accomplished by daily busing.

The Board was rewarded for such forward-thinking action, on June 17, 1968, as follows:

The Board of Education, Urbana Schools, has been cited by the Association of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association in cooperation with Thom McCann Corporation for the action taken to initiate a program during the summer of 1966 to end de facto segregation in the Urbana Schools. The nomination for the award was made by the Urbana Education Association. In making the nomination, it was pointed out by representatives of the U.E.A. that the Urbana School District was the first school district in Illinois with segregated schools to initiate and to implement a program that would eliminate segregation in the schools. (Urbana School Board Minutes, June 17, 1968, p. 1)

Research Question

The major research question of this study is: How and why did the Urbana Public Schools desegregate their elementary schools in the period 1966 and after. A series of subsidiary questions support the main research question:

1. What factors and influences worked for and against desegregation?
2. Who were the individuals involved in desegregating Urbana elementary schools?
3. How did both building and district administrators react to the desegregation efforts?
4. Did the municipal and state government or university participate in this desegregation effort?
5. What strategies were used in developing the desegregation plan?

6. Who made the decision to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools and what were the priorities for implementation?

7. Were any of the African-American churches involved in formulating the plan?

Summary

This chapter has briefly introduced a general background on the need to understand the process of desegregation within a mid-size northern school district, namely Urbana, Illinois. Urbana may differ from other school districts with similar populations and geographical locations. This study is not generalizable to any other school district or location. This study only applies to the Urbana, Illinois, school district and it is the focus of this study. Because of the relationship of the researcher as a former teacher and current administrator within the district, researcher bias might be a possible residue of the researcher's relationship with the district. The topic of desegregation is a very sensitive and, in some cases, a very volatile topic. So it is very important to remember the sensitive nature of this topic and the responses that might be forthcoming from respondents. This is also only one researcher's view of the process of desegregation within the Urbana elementary schools.

CHAPTER 2
THE LEGAL CONTEXT AND IMPLEMENTATION
OF DESEGREGATION

Independent School District v. Salvatierra (1930, 1931)

The legal struggle for school desegregation was initiated in Texas and California in the early 1930s. The case that stands out among a number of cases fought during this time period is the Salvatierra case, Independent School District v. Salvatierra (1930, 1931) in Del Rio, Texas. This case was quite different; it challenged the constitution of the State of Texas which was adopted in 1875 and ratified in 1876 that allowed for the segregation of White and "colored" children, colored meaning African-American. Consequently, Salvatierra questioned the constitutionality of separating Mexican-American children on racial grounds. The other reasons that made this case such a landmark is that it was the first battle by the LULAC, an advocacy organization for Mexican-Americans; and the last reason was the fact that this case would serve as the basis for future legal challenges of segregation of Mexican-American students. The Court ruled in Salvatierra that the school district illegally segregated Mexican-American students on the basis of race (Rangel & Alcala, 1972), although they were considered to be members of the White race--a strong point argued by plaintiffs' lawyers (Rangel & Alcala, 1972). The judgment was subsequently overturned by the Appellate Court on the grounds that the school system did not intentionally segregate the Mexican-American students by race; and given that the students had special language needs, the Supreme Court refused to hear the case based on a lack of jurisdiction.

Alvarez v. Lemon Grove (1931)

This case is recognized as the first successful legal challenge to school segregation in the nation. This case involved the school board of Lemon, California, that built a separate grammar school for its Mexican-American students. The parents of the students refused to send their children to the segregated school and challenged the school board in the courts. The courts ruled that the separation of Mexican-American students were not conducive towards their Americanization and retarded the English-language development of the Spanish-speaking children. The judge in this case also found that the school board had no legal right to segregate Mexican American children, because California law had no such provisions. This case was very localized and had no precedent setting legal significance outside of Lemon Grove.

Méndez v. Westminster (1946, 1947)

This case in California, which preceded the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka by nearly a decade, was the first federal court decision in the area of school segregation and marked the end of de jure segregation in California (Gonzalez, 1990). The plaintiffs claimed their children were denied access to a White school simply because they were Mexican. The significance of this case is that the judge ruling regarding a new interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment, as well as his decision on the legality of segregating Mexican-Americans on linguistic grounds. The Court concluded that the school board had segregated Mexican-American children on the basis of their "Latinized" appearance and had gerrymandered the school district in order to ensure that Mexican

American students attend segregated schools. The Court concluded that this was an illegal action, as there was no constitutional or congressional mandate that authorized school boards in California to segregate Mexican American students. Judge Paul McCormick stated that the Fourteenth Amendment had guaranteed Mexican Americans equal rights in the United States (Donato, Menchaca, & Valencia, 1991). This case is also significant because it was the first case where the Fourteenth Amendment served to repeal rather than protect the practice of segregation.

These cases along with others that helped to set the foundation for Brown are very significant in the fight to eliminate segregation in the school systems of the nation. In some quarters this vital and important information has been ignored by many individuals. These cases should be applauded for their significant contribution to the cases against segregation. Brown was not an isolated event in the cases against segregation. It was definitely not in a vacuum and many of the arguments that were the foundation of the case in Brown were fought and won through the efforts of other minorities in this nation. It was a long and twisting battle between the power elites and the minority communities.

Brown v. Board of Education

The information provided about Urbana is a preview of some of the phenomena associated with Urbana School District 116. Actions taken here reflect a movement that was spreading across this nation with the ferocity of a forest fire and which had influenced every state in these United States in some manner. This force was the desegregation verdict handed down by the Supreme Court in 1954. This case, which so impacted the U.S. educational

system, is known universally and informally as the Brown decision. Because of this verdict, segregation in the public schools continues to be an issue of concern and a source of conflict for schools (Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 1954).

Until 1954, segregation of American public schools had been the law of the land in almost every school district in the United States with a substantial African-American or other minority population. Segregation, in some way shape or form, had been become a mainstay of this country prior to its existence as a nation. Justification of this segregation is primarily based on the belief that the races, "primarily African-American and Caucasian, were unequal, with Whites being superior" (Franklin & Starr, 1967, p. 4). Beginning in the 1880s, many states, especially, but not exclusively in the South, began to enact laws designed to separate the races. These so-named Jim Crow laws existed in the areas of education, housing, employment, transportation, marriage, and dining. The power of these laws becomes clear in the 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson case (Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537, 1896).

Plessy v. Ferguson

Perhaps, one of the most famous court cases in the history of the United States challenging segregation was Plessy v. Ferguson (163 U.S. 537, 1896). this particular case established the doctrine of "separate but equal." Specifically, this decision upheld the constitutionality of a Louisiana law segregating rail passengers by race. Ultimately, the ruling clearly allowed states, schools, and municipalities to establish separate accommodations in all of the areas listed above and more. This decision provided a new

stimulus for the creation of laws to separate the races and, of course, to "discriminate against Negroes" (Franklin & Starr, 1967, p. 5).

Beginning in 1873, the Supreme Court had invalidated the Civil Rights legislation of the Reconstruction-era Congresses and reinterpreted the post-Civil War amendments to the Constitution in ways that denied that their purpose was to guarantee the full citizenship of Blacks.

So powerful was the prejudice of the times, that only one of the nine justices, Justice John Marshall Harlan, dissented from the Plessy decision. Perhaps, the most famous passage within his dissent is as follows:

In view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law. The humblest is the peer of the most powerful. The law regards man as man, and takes no account of his surroundings or his color when his civil rights as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are involved. (Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537, 1896, p. 1)

This powerful verdict set state legislatures throughout the country to the task of separating the races in the areas that were mentioned earlier: education, housing and transportation. The focus of this research is in only one area--education.

The harsh grip of segregation spread like a cancer throughout the nation and no part of the country was left untouched--even a mid-sized town, far removed from the Deep South and steeped in the words and deeds of the great emancipator Abraham Lincoln. Even, too, in the home of one of the most prestigious universities in the world, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Even here, segregation had a rich tradition based on deep-rooted beliefs

and customs. Even here, among the liberals who called Urbana, Illinois, home, segregation still reigned supreme at the elementary level of their public education system.

Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas

The Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision that mandated a change in how public schools would assign children according to race. The team of lawyers that made up the NAACP legal advisors, had won a great victory for desegregating public school systems throughout this nation.

In 1952 and 1953, the Supreme Court heard challenges to segregation laws in Kansas, South Carolina, Delaware, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, a group of cases known collectively as Brown v. Board of Education 347 U.S. 483, 1954). The NAACP's attack on school segregation, then compulsory in 17 states and permitted in 4 others, was based on one overriding principle: that the use of racial classifications was forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment.

One of the chief lawyers representing the NAACP in this case, the famous Thurgood Marshall (as cited in Friedman, 1969) argued, "that there were no recognizable differences from a racial standpoint between children"(p. 37), and that it was unreasonable for states to classify people on the basis of their race or ancestry.

The Supreme Court ruled unanimously for the African-American plaintiffs on May 17, 1954, declaring state-imposed racial segregation in the public schools unconstitutional. Education had become so important in modern society, wrote Chief Justice Earl Warren, that it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he/she is denied

the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954, p. 3). Even when physical facilities and other tangible factors are equal, said the court, segregation in public schools solely on the basis of race deprives the minority group children of equal educational opportunity. The court concluded that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 1954).

Brown II

The Supreme Court of the United States had spoken. Every school district within the United States of America clearly understood that segregation was intolerable, and that schools must be desegregated. That was not, of course, the case. In an effort to defy this mandated change, many states tried to force the issue of desegregation back to local jurisdiction and confuse the issue of desegregation.

For clarity, it is important to take a closer look at just what the Supreme Court had requested and the implications for the United States. The question is why and how did school district's desegregate? And what did the Supreme Court do and how did it react to these changes? In 1954 in Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483, Brown I), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the segregation of children in public schools, solely on the basis of race, deprived children of the minority group, equal educational opportunities. Because this decision left many important policy questions unanswered, the Southern states began a campaign of foot-dragging on the issue of desegregating its public schools. The U.S.

Supreme Court initiated the federal and lower court actions regarding implementation of the Brown decision with its follow-up decision of May 31, 1955--known publicly as the "deliberate speed" decision. At the time of the Brown decision, Southern opponents asked for a delay in its implementation. Civil Rights lawyers asked for a swift transition to uniform education for all. Regarding the basic question of desegregation, the Court held to its 1954 position in the "deliberate speed" decision. But on the question of how fast it should be achieved, the Supreme Court compromised, instructing Federal courts to issue such directives as were needed to desegregate public schools "with all deliberate speed." This was clearly a victory for the Southern states in that it granted them the delay they requested.

The Supreme Court's ruling in 1955, in Brown v. Board of Education (349 U.S. 294) (Brown II), required the following of local school districts:

Full implementation of these constitutional principles may require solution of varied local school problems. School authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing, and solving these problems; courts will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles. Because of their proximity to local conditions and the possible need for further hearings, the courts which originally heard these cases can best perform this judicial appraisal.

The court went on to say that: The cases are remanded to the district courts to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases. (Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S., 1955, p. 3)

Further elaboration on this very important decision brings out several issues. First, there was a concern about the failure of the court to issue a firm decree implementing desegregation. By allowing school boards to move with "all deliberate speed," instead of ordering or directing them to eliminate the practice of segregation within the school systems

at once, the court allowed these boards to move at a pace that they themselves had or would establish.

Kunen (1955) wrote, "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (p. 28) and violate the Constitution's equal-protection guarantee, a unanimous Supreme Court ruled on May 17, 1954. A year later, the court ruled that school districts must admit Black students on a nondiscriminatory basis "with all deliberate speed" and instructed the federal district courts to retain jurisdiction "during this period of transition" (p. 28.) Evidence abounds that the seemingly reasonable words, "with all deliberate speed" allowed states to effectively block desegregation efforts.

"The nation is still in that period of transition," observed Clark (1969), the Black sociologist upon whose work the Brown decision in part relied. He says, "I didn't realize how deep racism was in America, and I suppose the court didn't realize it either" (Clark, 1969, p. 111).

In addition, Wilkinson (1979) comments:

Fourteen years passed after the Brown decision before the Supreme Court set forth minimal requirements for compliance. And the court did little to clear up uncertainty over the following years about whether what was forbidden was state-imposed racial segregation or racial isolation, regardless of its cause. (pp. 29-39)

Second, the decision was criticized for its reliance on sociological and psychological evidence. Many people felt the court should have based its ruling on the Fourteenth Amendment, forbidding government to classify its citizens by race. Failing to base the decision on a constitutional principle effectively weakened efforts toward rapid desegregation.

Third, the decree was too vague and created uncertainty about what the Brown decision required. This vagueness and the weakness of having a constitution based ruling encouraged resistance and noncompliance. The failure of the court to specify what was permitted and what was forbidden generated confusion among federal district judges, led to conflicting opinions in the lower courts, and contributed to delay in implementation of desegregation.

Muse (1964) delivers on the intent of the court. He states, "The court decided in favor of gradualism and maximum consideration for the diversity of local situations, but only after 'a prompt and reasonable start' had been made" (p. 129). It left the formulation of specific decrees to district courts and in remanding the cases to them on May 31, 1955, in a 900-word opinion--again unanimous--it laid down these guidelines:

While giving weight to these public and private considerations, the courts will require that the defendants make a prompt and reasonable start toward compliance with our May 17, 1954, ruling. Once such a start has been made, the courts may find that additional time is necessary to carry out the ruling in an effective manner. The burden rests upon the defendants to establish that such time is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date. To that end, the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a non-racial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems. They will also consider the adequacy of any plans the defendants may propose to meet these problems and to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases. (Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294, 1955, p. 1)

In accordance with the foregoing, district courts were required to enter the "necessary and proper" orders to end public-school segregation "with all deliberate speed." The phrase "with all deliberate speed," strange at first to the general public, became a famous and much

debated designation for the tempo prescribed for school desegregation. Greenberg (1959) shed additional light on the court's decree and the term "all deliberate speed":

On May 31, 1955, the Supreme Court delivered its opinion on how and when desegregation would be required. The key features were:

All provisions of federal, state, or local law must yield to this [the holding of the School Cases] principle. Full implementation of these constitutional principles may require solution of varied local school problems: . . . the courts will require that the defendants to show a prompt and reasonable start has been made, the courts may find that additional time is necessary to carry out the ruling in an effective manner. The burden rests upon the defendants to establish that such time is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date.

Factors which might be considered in a plea for more time could include: problems of administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, and revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a nonracial public school admission system; revision of local laws and regulations and the adequacy of defendants' proposed plans to effect the transition. (Greenberg, 1959, p. 127)

"But," the court added, "it should go without saying that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield to simply because of disagreement with them" (Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294, 1955, p. 3). The district courts were directed to "take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with [the above] as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases" (Greenberg, 1959, p. 127).

Yet, "deliberate speed" is a term which, as used in judicial decisions prior to the May 31 opinion, conveyed little specific meaning for school desegregation. In Virginia v. West Virginia (as cited in Lewis, 1957), Justice Holmes used the expression in treating the controversy between those two states over the amount which West Virginia had to pay as its share of the public debt of the original state of Virginia:

A question like the present should be disposed of without undue delay. But a state cannot be expected to move with the celerity of a private businessman; it is enough if

it proceeds, in the language of the English Chancery, with all deliberate speed.
(Lewis, 1957, p. 25)

Greenberg (1959), however, and others whom he knows, have extensively researched the English precedents and have found nothing to elucidate the term's meaning. In essence, this term was one that most individuals would have a difficult time in trying to make some type of meaning out of. In the context of time, all deliberate speed leaves a tremendous amount of interpretation.

Suggestively, the Court itself cited no precedents for the meaning of "deliberate speed." It desired, apparently, that court control of desegregation be guided by the light of unfolding experience, by the nature of the right and the difficulties tagged as pertinent in the opinion, not by abstract doctrine.

Lewis (1953) also points out the courts requirement to local schools. He states:

On May 31, 1955, after what was surely one of the most exhaustive considerations it had ever given to any issue, the Supreme Court finally disposed of Brown v. Board of Education. Chief Justice Warren's opinion on implementation generally followed the line suggested by the Justice department but was even more gradualist in one respect: The court did not, as proposed by the department, direct the lower courts to make local school authorities present desegregation plans within a specified time. It said only that the lower courts must require "a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance." The process of desegregation, the opinion concluded, must proceed "with all deliberate speed"--a phrase first used in the Supreme Court in 1911, by Justice Holmes, and often invoked in recent years by Holmes' great admirer, Justice Frankfurter. (Lewis, 1953, p. 137)

Blaustein and Ferguson (1957) make a strong point as to the question of what the Court required of local school districts:

Again dwelling on "varied local school problems" and "variety of obstacles," the court assigned to school authorities "the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing and solving the extended problems of desegregation."

Chief Justice Warren stated it best, "Courts," wrote Chief Justice Warren, "will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith

implementation of the governing constitutional principles." Continuing the outline of "general outlines," Warren added: "Courts of equity may properly take into account the public interest in the elimination of . . . obstacles in a systematic and effective manner. But it should go without saying that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them." (Blaustein & Ferguson, 1957, p. 58)

In fashioning the specific terms of its remedy, the Supreme Court employed a variety of phrases which are not readily subject to judicial definition. This was perhaps a prerequisite for some measure of Southern cooperation in enforcement. But it is the generality of these phrases which makes Justice Jackson's prophecy seem likely--that the outlawing of school segregation would be followed by a "generation of litigation" (Metcalf, 1983, p. 148).

As we look back on the scope of the desegregation effort here in the United States, we are still fighting the same fight with new terminology to define the unwillingness of educational institutions to grapple with the effects of judicially mandated desegregation efforts. There have been no cookbook recipes to distribute around the nation. The frustration continues on both sides of the struggle to find a common ground for mutual benefit, some 50 years after the Brown decision.

Desegregation Reports

The following sample reports and data are taken from articles and reports published in 1966. The reason for highlighting these particular reports is to attain a flavor of what was happening in the nation during 1966. Examining these samples covering various regions of the U.S. and various sized cities helps determine if there was a trend nationally, or at least a

push from some outside forces, to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools at this particular time in history.

The Coleman Report

The product of an extensive survey requested by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241), the Coleman et al. (1966) report documents the availability of equal educational opportunities in the public schools for minority-group African-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans, as compared with opportunities for majority-group Blacks. Comparative estimates are made on a regional, as well as on a national basis. Specifically, the report details the degree of segregation of minority-group pupils and teachers in the schools and the relationship between students' achievement, as measured by achievement tests, and the kinds of schools they attend.

Educational quality is assessed in terms of curriculum offered, school facilities such as textbooks, laboratories, and libraries, such academic practices as testing for aptitude and achievement, and the personal, social, and academic characteristics of the teachers and the student bodies in the schools. Also, in the report is a discussion of future teachers of minority group children, case studies of school integration, and sections on higher education of minorities and school nonenrollment rates. Information relevant to the survey's research procedures are appended. Notable among the findings on the survey are that African-American students and teachers are largely and unequally segregated from their White counterparts, and that the average minority pupil achieves less and is more affected by the quality of his school than the average White pupil (Coleman et al., 1966).

Southern Cities Desegregation Efforts

Beyond these reports, several particular studies emerged which focused specifically on geographical regions. Crain, Inger, McWorter, and Vanecko's (1966b) study of the issue of desegregation evolved as desegregation occurred in seven Southern cities of the United States, resulting from the 1954 Brown (347 U.S. 483, 1954) decision of the Supreme Court. These cities were Columbus, GA; Jacksonville, FL; New Orleans, LA; Montgomery, AL; Atlanta, GA; Miami, FL; and Baton Rouge, LA. Case study data were gathered through interview responses and personal files of many individuals, including school board members, school administrators, public officials, and civil rights leaders. Primary emphasis was placed on a single case study, that of New Orleans (Crain et al., 1966b).

At the time this study took place, a breakdown in social control over the problem of school integration occurred, bringing on intense conflicts which triggered street demonstrations, school boycotts, and disputes between the Louisiana state legislature and the federal courts. In this study, three variables were considered. The main variable considered in the case studies about effective integration while maintaining social control was the degree of civic elite acquiescence, the willingness to desegregate and the ability to maintain law and order during the period of integration. The second factor considered was the local school board and its decision-making processes; the third, the Civil Rights movement with its demands and influences. All of this information was analyzed and some sociological conclusions were drawn, explaining ways in which different economic bases, populations, and governmental structures make cities different in their styles of decision-making. The authors concluded that at the heart of conflicts over school desegregation are

those who can control the degree of order or disorder in the social structure of a particular city (Crain et al., 1966b).

In the article "Federal Steps vs. School Desegregation" (Brickman, 1966), discussions are raised concerning the Health, Education and Welfare's (HEW) proceedings initiated against five school districts in five Southern states to determine whether their federal financial assistance should be terminated under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI bans the use of federal funds for discriminatory activities. This action to terminate federal assistance moved the segregation issues even closer to Urbana, when the State of Illinois also issued a ban on using state funds for discriminatory practices in 1966. This ban was challenged by some school districts within the state.

Leeson (1966) discusses the pace of desegregation in the Southern states. Although most districts in the South were complying with Civil Rights guidelines, the percentage of Blacks in desegregated schools remained comparatively low. One Southern complaint was that districts that desegregated voluntarily had to do more than those obeying court orders. South Carolina, Texas, and Georgia were all anticipating a doubling of their present Black enrollments to desegregated facilities the following school term (1966). A tremendous amount of planning for the change involved making many decisions with input from a variety of factions. The process proved complicated and time-consuming if desegregation occurred voluntarily.

However, in places where segregation was ordered, the process required much less planning and execution time. Instead of planning and moving faculty and staff while implementing a plan, schools could act hastily. In Fairfax County, Virginia., for example,

previously all-Black schools were closed while the faculty and administrators were shifted to the White facility. Haywood County, North Carolina, accomplished desegregation by consolidation of two districts, Canton and Waynesville. While HEW's guidelines were getting stiffer and harder to comply with, another phenomena erupted. Many Southern districts viewed the emergence of private facilities for White pupils. Fifty all-White private schools sprung up in Mississippi. The State of Virginia witnessed an expansion of enrollments, physical plants, and educational programs in existing private school facilities. In some cases, the state supported the creation of new private schools, even to the point of closing down public schools and opening up private schools in the same buildings, the buildings having been sold by the school board to these private concerns.

Some states began fighting the Brown decision in federal courts. The strategy was to delay the implementation of desegregation orders for as long as possible. In cases where private schools could not be used to avoid the changes, many succeeded in delaying change for quite some time. In some cases this delay exists even until today.

Northern Cities

Although different from Southern desegregation barriers, Northern efforts also encountered barriers. Garber (1966) sums up much of what occurred in the Northern cities regarding these efforts. The article examines the Supreme Court's reaction to de facto segregation. De facto segregation, apparent in the North because of area boundaries, gerrymandering, or segregated housing facilities is purely geographical in nature.

Several cases document the existence of de facto desegregation. In the Kansas case

labeled "Downs case" (Downs vs. Board of Education, 336 F. (2d) KS 988, 1964), the court refused to disapprove of de facto segregation. Expressing a similar view, the case of Gilliam stated that transportation and the elimination of neighborhood schools to acquire racial mixing in schools is not required by the Constitution. De facto segregation was, however, ruled illegal in New York's Blocker case (229 F.Supp. 709, U.S. Dist. Eastern Dist. NY, 1964). Thus, variation in rulings inhibited desegregation efforts in the North because precedents could be found for whatever the desired outcome.

The North's troubles with desegregation appeared to be developing national support for de facto segregation. The Supreme Court as of February 1966 had refused to review five de facto cases. These denials imply that the Court's position was that reasonable actions to end racial balance may be done by school boards but are not required (Garber, 1966).

Crain, Inger, McWorter, and Gerald (1966a) completed a study of school desegregation in the North. A preliminary, systematic picture (census) was developed on the status of school integration in eight Northern cities in the United State in compliance with the 1954 Brown decision of the Supreme Court. The purpose of the project was to correct the distorted views of school integration status, resulting primarily from news media reports over a period of years. By presenting accurate information, desegregation efforts might be more fairly appraised as to the successes and failures. Principal study data were gathered through interview responses and the personal files of approximately 200 persons. including school board members, school administrators, public officials, newspapermen. and heads of civil rights groups. These data were used to develop a case study for each city considered,

describing how the desegregation issue was raised, how it was debated, and how it was (or would be) resolved.

Investigated cities were St. Louis, Lawndale, Bay City, Newark, Buffalo, Baltimore, San Francisco, and Pittsburgh. An overall review of the eight case studies was also made in order to develop a general picture of typical integration decisions which considered three forces: the demands of the Civil Rights Movement, the responses of school boards and superintendents, and the reactions of the mass of White citizens. In three of the cities studied, problems of school integration had been resolved, and demonstrations, if they ever occurred, were a thing of the past. Plans were implemented in two others which showed promise in resolving the issues. In those cities remaining, work still needed to be done (Crain et al., 1966a).

Obviously, de facto segregation was the primary variable in most Northern desegregation efforts. The housing patterns of a particular community made busing of some type crucial to achieving racial balance in most cities. In spite of the somewhat varied successes in these eight cities, many wider studies have pointed out that successful efforts follow certain general guidelines. Typical of these guidelines are those set by the Riverside Board of Education: (a) A school board should commit itself publicly to integration. (b) Specific dates for integration to become effective should be set; delay causes suspicion. (c) School officials should ensure that integration will result in better education for all children (Kreidt, 1966).

As is the case with Southern efforts, the Northern efforts also leave a legacy of problems with which schools still live. Dentler (1966) report on barriers to northern school

desegregation is a chilling prediction of the future. What was the future is, of course, the now of 1999. His report purported that unless the rate of integration in Northern schools in large cities is accelerated, there would be extensive urban segregation until at least the mid-21st century.

In the big cities, technical solutions to reduce barriers can be based on rational pupil assignment, revised building plans which may involve pupil transportation, and a superintendent's emphatic commitment to desegregation. Little forward movement occurred in single big-city districts where this commitment was not apparent. Preservation of the status quo power structure is the major motivation for opposition to change and is related to political and educational bureaucratic interests. Change implies great political and educational bureaucratic interests. Change implies great political risks but will probably occur in most of the large Northern cities as a result of the fiscal pressures of maintaining ghetto schools and when superintendents begin to espouse racial balance. Significant success is possible under these circumstances. Likewise, failure is likely when these circumstances do not exist.

Small Northern Cities

In contrast to Dentler's (1966) report, however, data from smaller cities show that there seem to be "uniform" conditions which favor desegregation—Negro protest action, stimulus from extra local authority, and less highly stratified religious or racial class structure. But the case history of "little city" illustrates how the attitude structure of both races impedes integration. These smaller city studies point out similarities in patterns and

events. A particular case which shares some of the same qualities as the Urbana case is the Waukegan City School District case. Three Whites and four Black children attending a predominantly Black school in Waukegan, Illinois, brought suit against the city school board for an injunction requiring the elimination of de facto segregation in the schools. The court ruled that a state law, requiring school boards to revise school district boundaries in a manner to "take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race or nationality" (Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966b) had been enacted to correct de facto segregation, and that the law was not unconstitutional.

The court found that existing racial imbalance in the schools not to be the result of intentional discrimination. The board's earlier refusals to change school zone boundaries, it held, were based on considerations of traffic, walking distance, finance and classroom capacities. However, the court also held that the board had shown no reasonable ground, under the circumstances presented, for not correcting or improving "admittedly flagrant racial imbalance in the attendance units," as required by the statute. The board was enjoined from committing further violations of the law and was ordered to file a plan with the court by August 1, 1966, for revision of the attendance units in question so as to ameliorate the racial imbalance (Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966b).

In response to such pro-segregation judgments, many school districts experienced a backlash in the court system by disgruntled White citizens. One such case that was fairly typical was that of the Fuller (Fuller; as cited in Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966a) case in New Jersey. Charging that the Englewood, New Jersey, Board of Education was

maintaining a racially segregated public school system in which Negro pupils were denied equal educational opportunity in violation of state law, Negro parents petitioned the State Commissioner of Education to order the board to take immediate steps to eliminate racial segregation in the city schools. Another group of parents filed a cross-petition to restrain on the grounds that any change in that policy on the basis of racial considerations would be illegal.

The Commissioner directed the Englewood board to formulate plans to reduce the extreme concentration of Negro pupils in the most predominantly Negro school, to be put into effect for the 1963-64 school year. The local board then submitted a proposal for establishment of a city-wide sixth-grade school, reassignment of all pupils in grades 1 through 5 at the predominantly Negro school to other schools, and equalization of class loads. The Commissioner accepted the plan as compliance. Soon after the plan had been approved by the Commissioner, a group of citizens of Englewood brought suit, as taxpayers, to enjoin the school board and the city from expending public funds to implement the plan. The county court dismissed the action, and plaintiffs appealed, but the superior court also denied relief.

Subsequently, several of the same persons who had heretofore raised objections to the school board plan presented to state administrative officials and courts brought suit in federal district court to enjoin the city and the school officials from expending public funds for implementation of the plan. Further, this group pushed to have it declared unconstitutional. The court, in spite of the objections of this group, held that a local school board is not constitutionally prohibited from taking race into account in drawing or redrawing school

attendance lines for the purpose of reducing or eliminating de facto segregation in its public schools. It further asserted that plaintiffs had failed to prove an infringement on their constitutional rights, because there was no showing that racial integration as provided for in the school board's plan would discriminate against White pupils. The relief sought by plaintiffs was therefore denied, and summary judgment was entered in favor of defendants (Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966a).

Within the State of Illinois, desegregation efforts were receiving mixed reviews. Hanson (1966) of Rock Island, Illinois, then superintendent of Rock Island schools, wrote an article entitled "School Integration in Rock Island," in The National Elementary Principal. The article deals with desegregation efforts and his thoughts on the subject, along with discussing the integration efforts of Rock Island, Illinois. Stressing the breakdown of the ghetto as the answer to desegregating school facilities in this country, Hanson recognized that it would be practically infeasible in large cities like New York, St. Louis, Philadelphia, or Los Angeles. Smaller communities, he suggested, could possibly initiate such a plan. Busing was rejected by Hanson as a cure to segregation because the children would be used as tools to achieve a social good. Again, although different from those faced in larger cities, problems surfaced in the desegregation efforts of small Northern cities.

Civil Rights Act of 1964

These various court rulings were supported by Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which answered a variety of questions related to federal regulations for school desegregation policy ("Federal Rights Under School Desegregation Law," 1966). It presents the "revised

statement of policies for school desegregation plans," which was issued in March 1966 by the U.S. Office of Education. The statement specifically describes the requirements for voluntary desegregation plans based on geographic attendance zones and freedom of choice. Given that early in 1963, the Urbana committee had been formed, the School Board was, perhaps, influenced by the creating of these new guidelines provided by the federal government as well as by the new state guidelines within Illinois.

Summary

The Plessey case set the tone for separate but equal policies in this country beginning in 1896. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of a Louisiana law segregating rail passengers by race. Ultimately, the ruling allowed states, schools, and municipalities to establish separate accommodations in a large number of areas. Brown v. Board of Education ended constitutionally enforced segregation within the realm of education. It also spurred many individuals to challenge the separate doctrine in many other areas. Brown II is known as the "deliberate speed" decision. In essence, it slowed down the process of desegregating schools because it gave school districts reasons for not implementing desegregation procedures based on the Supreme Court's decree.

The summarized desegregation reports show that where there were few minority students living, the schools were desegregated without much fanfare. However, whether in the North or South, rural or urban, where there were large numbers of minority students trying to exercise their constitutional right to desegregate schools, conflict and resentment was present. The results were "White Flight," increased minority populations in relationship

to Whites and in some instances a decline in standardized test scores. Race and racism are so prevalent and deep-seated in this nation that it destroyed a great deal of rationale thought as it related to educating our children.

Contemporary Perceptions

During my research of the topic of desegregation in American schools, I have attempted to draw a picture of how things were perceived during the time period of my study. Since everything does change, so has the perception of what was actually occurring during the desegregation period that I was researching. Contemporary researchers have begun reviewing in multiply ways how the desegregation effort was and is perceived today. This section is devoted to exploring many of these contemporary researchers and my perceptions of their findings.

Orfield (1995) wrote about the dismantling of the desegregation effort and the importance of the Supreme Court's 1990 decision in the Board of Education in Oklahoma City v. Dowell case and how this court ruling began opening the door to the possibility of dismantling desegregation by allowing the termination of plans under certain circumstances. In my research, most of the African-American leaders that I interviewed felt that the desegregation efforts did work to a point. Many felt that the promise of desegregation was however not met. In the Summer edition of Teachers College Record, Orfield (1995) reviews the findings of surveys conducted by USA Today and Cable News Network (CNN) on the subject of race. One of the more interesting findings in this national Gallup poll on race was the percentages that supported the 1954 Brown decision. The surveys found that 87% of

Americans believe the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on Brown--to strike down Southern segregation--was right, a sharp increase from the 63% support in the early 1960s. It seems that many respondents to these surveys felt that segregation was not right; however, they also felt that bussing was also not the proper solution to this problem.

In these surveys, the value of school desegregation was also reviewed in regard to race relations. The survey by Gallup (1994, as cited in Orfield, 1995) showed that 62% of Whites and 75% of Blacks said that "integrated schools had improved race relations" (p. 656). There was also an increase in the number of Whites who felt that "more should be done to integrate schools" (p. 656). This number increased from 37% in 1988 to 56% in 1994. Among Blacks, 84% support more efforts to achieve integrated schools. Therefore, it is the belief that desegregation has improved the quality of education for both Black and White students, and the belief that both races have gained because it prepares students to live in an increasingly interracial society.

Even though there was strong support for integration and the belief in its educational value, bussing was not viewed as a strong preference for bringing about integration. In fact, when asked whether integration or a decision to increase funding to minority students would be the best alternative to help minority students, Blacks favored increased funding by a 60 to 25% margin. By a smaller 47 to 33% margin, Whites also agreed that funding would be best. Therefore, even though respondents felt that integration is seen as a positive the issue of bussing has not proven to be the method of choice. The choice that most Americans feel is the best alternative is housing integration that would bring about natural integration of the school systems. Orfield (1995) made the following observations, "The policies most

congruent with the values expressed by the public are school desegregation with more choice and less mandatory student transportation" (p. 668). It seems that individuals are more interested in the quality of education and the need to find a different method of solving the issue of segregation. Orfield went on to say that, "The other policy that is very compatible with the structure of public preferences is an increased emphasis on housing desegregation to produce communities that are integrated and have neighborhood schools" (p. 668). Again the notion is that housing desegregation is the preferred method to desegregating school systems. A concern about this method is the case of suburban sprawl. Because of the over-concentration of minorities in urban areas. I find it hard to conceive that housing desegregation is a true method for ending segregation within our school systems. In fact, our urban districts are more segregated today than they were during the fifties and sixties.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Problem and Research Question

The primary research question to be answered by this study is the following:

How and why did the Urbana Public Schools desegregate their elementary schools when they did? This question will be addressed from the perspective of members of the school board, community leaders, members of the committee formed by the superintendent and newspaper accounts and school board minutes. Subsidiary questions to be addressed in pursuit of information to help elucidate the how and why of this study from the sources named above are:

1. What factors and influences worked for and against desegregation?
2. Who were the individuals involved in desegregating Urbana elementary schools?
3. How did both building and district administrators react to the desegregation efforts?
4. Did the municipal/state government or university participate in this desegregation effort?
5. What strategies were used in developing the desegregation plan?
6. Who made the decision to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools and what were the priorities for implementation?
7. Were any of the African-American churches involved in formulating the plan?

Research Design

Should I do a study that is clean, relatively quick, limited, do-able, so as to finish and get on with my professional life, or should I do something I really want to do that may be messy, unclear, ambiguous, yet also challenging and new enough to maintain my interest in the project?

In my quest to find the approach that best fit the needs of this study, I was confronted with the choices that confront most novice researchers. The choice between two methods: the rationalistic or quantitative method and the naturalistic or qualitative method. The rationalistic method or positivist approach views the world as a set of variables, either to be manipulated or controlled, and has as its goal context-free generalization. The naturalistic method, of which the case study is a part, focuses on a different way of knowing--one based on experience, empathy, and environment. Qualitative research is based on two very different sets of concepts.

One set of concepts is the naturalistic-ecological hypotheses (Owens, 1982) which claims that human behavior is so significantly influenced by the context in which it occurs, that regularities in those contexts are often more powerful in shaping behavior, and that differs from the individuals present. The other set of concepts basic to naturalistic inquiry is the qualitative-phenomenological hypotheses (Owens, 1982). This essentially holds that one cannot understand human behavior without understanding the framework within which the individuals under study interpret their environment, and that this, in turn, can best be understood through understanding their thoughts, feelings, values, perceptions, and their actions (Owens, 1982).

The basic methodology selected for this research was a qualitative or naturalistic form of inquiry, the case study approach. The case study involves an intensive investigation conducted in a field setting. As such, its distinguishing characteristic is that "it attempts to examine (a) a contemporary phenomenon in its real-life context, especially when (b) the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 1981a, p. 59). A case study is a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository of a documents, or one particular event (Merriam, 1988). This particular method was chosen for a number of reasons. First, it was important to have a holistic approach to this study.

The holistic approach assumes that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts; it also assumes that a description and understanding of a program's context is essential for understanding the program (Patton, 1980). Second, it is important to use an approach that allows the discovery of the processes of events and the context characteristics that will shed light on the issue.

Asking the question, "What's going on here?" is at once disarmingly simple and incredibly complex. It is to the answer of this question that qualitative research addresses itself (Rist, 1982).

Qualitative methods permit the evaluator to study selected issues in depth and detail. Approaching fieldwork without being constrained by predetermined categories of analysis contributes to the depth, openness, and detail of qualitative inquiry. The best use of qualitative methods of research can be found in (Marshall, 1985a, 1987):

1. Research that cannot be done experimentally for practical or ethical reasons.
2. Research that delves in depth into complexities and processes.

3. **Research for which relevant variables have yet to be identified.**
4. **Research that seeks to explore where and why policy, folk wisdom, and practice do not work.**
5. **Research on unknown societies or innovative systems.**
6. **Research on informal and unstructured linkages and processes in organizations.**
7. **Research on real, as opposed to stated, organizational goals.**

To summarize, the strengths of qualitative studies should be demonstrated for research that is exploratory or descriptive and that stresses the importance of context, setting, and subjects' frame of reference. The qualitative design follows Thomas's (1949) proposition that it is essential in the study of people to know just how people define the situation in which they find themselves: "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (p. 301). In this particular study, it was paramount that this study be done using the qualitative method. This study could not be done in an experimental format; these are real issues. Because of the sheer complexity of the issue, it was studied in depth. This study sought to answer the why and how questions that were addressed to understand the phenomena that occurred.

The general design of a case study is best represented by a funnel. Good questions that organize qualitative studies are not too specific. The start of the study is at the wide end of the funnel: the researchers scout for possible places and people that might be the subject or the source of data, find the location they think they want to study, and then cast a wide net trying to judge feasibility of the site or data source for their purposes. They look for clues on how they might proceed and what might be feasible to do. They begin to collect data,

reviewing and exploring them, and making decisions about where to go with the study. They decide how to distribute their time, who to interview, and what to explore in depth. They may throw aside old ideas and plans and develop new ones. They continually modify the design and choose procedures as they learn more about the topic of study.

In time, they make specific decisions on what aspect of the setting, subject, or data source they will study. Their work develops a focus. The data collection and research activities narrow to sites, subjects, materials, topics, and themes. From broad, exploratory beginnings they move to more directed data collection and analysis.

There are many forms of case study methodology available to researchers. The historical case study was the method that truly can tell the "thick" description necessary for this incredible story. What is a historical study? There are probably as many definitions as there are historians. Fischer (1970) provides a very useful definition for our purpose: "A historian is someone (anyone) who asks an open-ended question about past events and answers it with selected facts" (p. xv). He notes that questions and answers are fitted to each other by a complex pattern of mutual adjustments. Facts teach us how to formulate the questions; that leads to a different selection of facts, which in turn requires reformulation of the questions. Thus Fischer sees the logic of history as neither inductive nor deductive. Instead, it is adductive reasoning, where adducing means leading out the "answer . . . to a specific questions so that a satisfactory explanatory fit is attained. The result may take many forms: a statistical generalization, or a narrative, or a causal model or a motivational model, or . . . maybe even an analogy" (p. xv).

There are several characteristics that bolster the case study approach and provide some useful parameters: "the data are qualitative and not manipulated; the study focuses on a single case; ambiguity in observation and report is tolerated; multiple perspectives are solicited; a holistic approach is taken; and rich description is employed" (Prestine, 1988, p. 44). The case study primarily employs direct contact between the researcher and the respondent, uses emergent rather than a priori case designs (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961), develops data categories from the data themselves, and does not attempt to generalize to a universe beyond the study.

The content of this case study was determined chiefly by its purpose. Guba and Lincoln (1981) suggest four classes of purposes of case studies: (a) to chronicle or develop a chronological register of the facts or events; (b) to render or characterize a situation, organization, or problem; (c) to teach, that is, to provide knowledge of the unit under study; and (d) to test or to prove a theory. This study attempted to characterize a situation, desegregation efforts in Urbana Schools, and also provide knowledge about the desegregation effort. In many ways this was a combination of purposes as outlined by Guba and Lincoln (1981). There have been many efforts to differentiate the case study from other qualitative research strategies, and most have been hazy and ambiguous at best:

A case study can test theory as well as build theory, and use data gathering and data analysis techniques common to traditional forms of research. Neither is a case study defined by its focus upon a single social unit. A community is a social unit, for example, and one can survey that unit, conduct an experiment with it, or study the unit's history.

What distinguishes a case study is the product of that study. The result of a case study is an intensive, holistic portrait and analysis of the phenomena or social unit being studied. Rather than examining a single or even multiple variables across many cases as in comparative studies, the case study examines the interplay of all the

variables to provide the most complete and accurate explanation and understanding possible. (Prestine, 1988, p. 47)

Case studies give the audience or reader an opportunity to delve deeply into the facts and circumstances that have influenced a particular set of facts or variables that in combination are unique unto itself. The researcher examines and attempts to explain this interplay in such a manner as to obtain a deeper and thicker description of the event for his/her audience. The audience must understand that this particular circumstance is totally unique to these particular variables and their interaction in this time and place only.

By taking simple comparative correlation out of the research of the investigator, it focuses his attention upon the underlying processes which operate within the system. In this way the internal analysis may lead to a deeper explanation of the phenomenon and to generalization of a more fundamental kind (Lipset, 1956).

Selecting a particular methodology entails not only being cognizant of the distinctive qualities that characterize it and differentiate it from other research strategies but an awareness of the particular concerns and problems that may arise in using such a research strategy (Lutz& Iannaccone, 1969; Yin, 1981b). Case study by its very nature is dependent on the one-to-one personal contact and that access must be gained to those individuals that are crucial to the study. It is something totally different to gain the trust and acceptance of the individuals being researched. This type of research can be very intrusive and also seem threatening.

Site-Selection

Urbana is located in east-central Illinois. In 1950 the population of the City of

Urbana was 22,834 of that population 890 were considered non-White; or 3.9%. In 1960 the population of Urbana was 27,294 of that population 1,720 were considered non-White; or 6.3%. In 1970 the population of Urbana rose to 32,800 of which 3,575 were non-White or 10.9%.

African-American student population within the elementary schools during the period from 1964-65 was 345 out of a total enrollment of 3,491 or 10%. In 1965-66 the population was 426 out of 3,738 or 11%. In 1966-67 the population was 456 out of 3,781 or 12%.

The Urbana elementary school system was segregated prior to 1966. The great majority of Black students attended Hays School in the Northwest corner of Urbana. In the fall of 1966 a program of busing to achieve racial balance was instituted. Each school in Urbana received enough African-American students to constitute 13% of its student body. The assignment was, for the most part, random; although families were not split in the new placements. The Hays School retained 13% African-American students and, in addition, became the permanent school for the Orchard Downs Married Student Housing complex at the University of Illinois. (These students had previously been assigned to other schools in Urbana.) Generally, this pattern of desegregation has been maintained since 1966 (Report; The Office of Research and Program Coordination of the Urbana Schools).

Data Collection

The design and methodology of this study concentrated on delineation and exploration of the Urbana School board's decision to desegregate the elementary schools in the summer of 1966. In case study research of a contemporary education topic or recent

history, some if not all of the data are collected through interviews. One of the most common forms is that of the person-to-person encounter in which one person elicits information from another (Miriam, 1988). An interview is a "conversation with a purpose" (Webb & Webb; as cited in Burgess, 1982, p. 107). The primary purpose of an interview is to find important or special information. Patton (1980) explains further:

We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe. . . . We cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions. We cannot observe behaviors that took place at some previous point in time. We cannot observe situations that preclude the presence of an observer. We cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meaning they attach to what goes on in the world—we have to ask people questions about those things. The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person's perspective. (p. 196)

To further emphasize the need to utilize interviewing, Dexter (1970) summarizes when to use interviewing: "Interviewing is the preferred tactic of data collection when . . . it will get better data or more data at less cost than other tactics!" (p. 11).

Specifically, data collection consist of the following:

1. Application of two sets of interview questions, open-ended and focused, with the principal participants involved in the issue.
2. Examination of multiple forms of documentary and archival evidence.

These data collection procedures and the use of multiple sources of evidence contributed to an overall understanding of the issues, familiarity with the participants, and a knowledge of the why and how Urbana School Districts' decision to desegregate the schools was forged.

By gathering hard data from various sources—newspaper accounts, board minutes, school district reports, and individual records—it will help to verify and reinforce the interview information with written testimony, archival records, as well as another interview.

Through the use of multiple sources of evidence, which provided multiple measures of the same phenomenon, problems associated with construct validity were addressed. As Rist (1982) explains:

It is in the interaction of these methods that the strongest evidence can be compiled and the most firm analysis can be presented. Juxtaposing what was said with what was done or what was written provides a validity check on the data as well as alternative sources to confirm the analysis. Stated differently, the greater the alternative sources of data employed in the analysis of a setting, the greater the possibilities for accuracy and a holistic presentation. (p. 444)

Interviews

Initial interviews were in-depth interviews of an open-ended nature. In these interviews key respondents were asked their role in the issue. They were asked their perception about the events that occurred. Open-ended questions are typically used to: stimulate free thought, solicit suggestions, probe people's memories, and clarify positions. Further, they give respondents a chance to vent frustrations and state strong opinions. They are indispensable for exploratory studies in which the researcher's main purpose is to find the most salient aspects of things. They also promoted better participation in the interview survey; most respondents liked having the chance to answer questions in their own words. In addition, open-ended questions may give the best indication of an individual's real views (Fowler, 1988). Through this process of open-ended questioning many questions were answered along with a significant number that were posed by the questioning.

Interviewees were former Urbana School Board members during 1966, members of the Citizen's Advisory Committee, and also members of the Council on Community Integration and members of the Integration and Human Relations Committee Citizens'

Advisory Council. The members of the Urbana School Board at that time were Lowell Fisher, Elizabeth Lyman, Ruth Burnham, Norris Brookens, Harold Miller, Lyle Grace, and Peter Yankwich. By working with Mrs. Jean Burkholder, a long-time board member and community activist, I was able to learn that Lowell Fisher, Elizabeth Lyman, Ruth Burnham, and Norris Brookens were all deceased. I was unable to contact Lyle Grace or Peter Yankwich. Mr. Harold Miller was very willing to be interviewed and was very insightful about the board.

Because of the lack of records within the Urbana School District's archives related to phone numbers and addresses for the members of the Citizens Advisory Council, I was unable to establish contacts with any of its members. They were Robert Judd, Mrs. Francis Kruidenier, Kenneth Livingston, Ovid George, Mrs. Lorenzo Wylie, Miss Esther Ewald, Mrs. Norma Zimmer, and Mrs. Esther Blackburn.

There were two additional committees that had some relevance to the decisions that were made by the board of education in Urbana related to the desegregation plan. However, their relevance revolved around the role of one of the members of both committees, his name is Carlos Donaldson. The other members of the Integration and Human Relations Committee Citizens' Advisory Council in 1966 were Ruth Fisher, Alex Sawyer, John Scouffas, Myrna Wente, and Estelle Willis.

Documentary and Archival Evidence

I found a rich and abundant supply of documentary and archival evidence available. When this issue was occurring, the local newspapers were following the topic with a large

number of resources. Therefore, an abundant resource was available to reinforce or verify one-on-one interviews. Also the school board minutes supplied information and names of respondents. The reports that were issued by committees that made up the initial recommendation were available, along with follow-up reports from committees whose responsibility it was to monitor the ongoing efforts of the desegregation plan.

For the initial interviews, telephone contact was established with each respondent. A pre-interview phone contact protocol (Appendix A) was used to: (a) introduce the researcher and the study, (b) explain the purpose of the study, (c) describe the kind of information that was sought, and (d) outlined the conditions under which the interview was conducted and data collected, including assurances of confidentiality. Also a pre-interview call sheet was utilized (Appendix B). For individuals who agree to participate, an interview date and time was scheduled. A follow-up letter was sent to each participant (Appendix C) to confirm the interview schedule, reiterate the nature of the study, and to thank the respondent for agreeing to participate in the study.

Upon completion of the initial contact and selection process, one-on-one interviews were conducted with each of the participants. A standard interview protocol was used for each interview (Appendix D). Each interview was recorded and transcribed as it was completed. Open-ended questions were utilized to obtain information concerning why and how Urbana elementary schools desegregate and their role in this action. This question format was intended to allow for the greatest range and depth of individual responses which are particularly important in the investigation of this topic.

In summary, one-on-one interviews utilizing open-ended questions were administered to the key respondents who were part of the committees and community groups that brought the desegregation issue to the Urbana Schools. This research helped gain information on their role in the how and why Urbana elementary schools desegregated in the summer of 1966. The use of school board minutes, committee reports, and newspaper accounts did help to verify and reinforce the interviewees accounts of what took place.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was ongoing as information was collected to determine response patterns and categories of information that emerged from the study (Miles & Huberman, 1984). While the degree of prestructure applied to qualitative data analysis is largely dependent on the nature of a study, Miles and Huberman (1984) note that most qualitative research calls for something in between the extremes of tightly controlled designs and loose, emergent ones. Generally, the researcher approaches an investigation with "a fairly good idea of the parts of the phenomenon, but not enough to house a theory" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 27). Such is the case with this study. There is no defining work that exist that tells the "holistic" story of how and why the Urbana elementary schools desegregated when they did, the information obtained from the respondents who were involved in the phenomenon was examined in an effort to discover patterns or themes that occurred across individuals participating in the study. It is true that the subsidiary research questions provide a framework for the investigation of this phenomenon. It was anticipated that responses to the questions elicited answers that are not reflected in these probes. A certain amount of

prestructure for data analysis is implied by the nature of the interview questions, beyond which the researcher is free to develop categories for analysis that present themselves in the respondent's comments.

Each subject interviewed for the study was initially treated as a single case. One-on-one interviews were recorded (with the full knowledge and consent of the respondent) and transcribed as they were completed, and analyzed. The researcher looked for key ideas and opinions expressed by individual respondents. These points were noted along with reflections of the researcher and cataloged for future reference. In addition, then, to the audio tape transcription, a contact summary sheet (Miles & Huberman, 1984) was formulated for each interview summarizing the salient points expressed by each respondent and the researcher's impressions of how these ideas contribute to the meaning of the study data.

As data collection and analysis proceeded, it was anticipated that this information assisted in the formulation of pattern codes that helped identify emergent themes across respondents. Pattern coding has four major functions in qualitative data analysis which are enumerated below:

1. It reduces large amounts of data into smaller number of analytic units.
2. It gets the researcher into analysis during data collection, so that later data collection can be more focused.
3. It helps the researcher build a cognitive map, an evolving schema for understanding what is happening locally.

4. When several researchers are engaged in individual case study work, it lays the groundwork for cross-site analysis by surfacing common themes and causal processes (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 68).

As with the analysis of individual interview data, cross-case data analysis was ongoing, to a certain extent, as the data collection process proceeded. The initial pattern codes changed as more data were accumulated. Once all interviews were completed, a final cross-case analysis was done, at which time, patterns of responses underwent additional reformulations to reflect new meanings that emerged when they were considered as a group. Differences and similarities in respondents perception of the phenomenon were noted. The resulting data concerning how and why the Urbana elementary schools desegregated were summarized as findings of the study.

Reliability and Validity

Merriam (1988), for example, proposed that internal validity deals with the question of how one's findings match reality. Do the findings capture what is really there? Are investigators observing or measuring what they think they are measuring? Ratcliffe (1983) offers an interesting perspective on assessing validity in every kind of research. He suggests, that (a) "data do not speak for themselves; there is always an interpreter, or a translator" (p. 149); (b) that "one cannot observe or measure a phenomenon/event without changing it, even in physics where reality is no longer considered to be single-faceted" (p. 149); and (c) that numbers, equations, and words "are all abstract, symbolic representations of reality, but not reality itself" (p. 150). The assessment of validity must then be interpreting the investigator's

experience rather than reality. Is there a universally accepted method for guaranteeing validity? Ratcliffe concludes that there is no universal way of guaranteeing validity; there are only "notions of validity" (p. 158). Committing oneself to a particular notion of validity, Ratcliffe warns, can "limit the range of methods that can be applied to pressing problems" (p. 161).

A great number of writers that research this topic of validity and reliability argue that qualitative research because it is based on different assumptions about reality, a different worldview, a different paradigm, should have different conceptualizations of validity and reliability (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Lincoln and Guba (1985), for example, propose using the terms truth value for internal validity, transferability for external validity, and consistency for reliability.

Patton (1990) highlights the three inquiry elements that he feels are important in the area of credibility. The credibility issue for qualitative inquiry depends on three distinct but related inquiry elements:

(1) rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high-quality data that is carefully analyzed, with attention to issues of validity, reliability, and triangulation; (2) the credibility of the researcher, which is dependent on training, experience, track record, status, and presentation of self; and (3) philosophical belief in the phenomenological paradigm, that is, a fundamental appreciation of naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis, and holistic thinking. (p. 461)

Lincoln and Guba (1985) concentrate on the centrality of understanding and accepting the naturalistic inquiry paradigm as the key to the issue of credibility. Miles and Huberman (1984) concentrate on improved and more rigorous techniques for data gathering and analysis as the best way to enhance credibility and acceptance; indeed, they are quite comfortable applying traditional research criteria and logical positivist assumptions to qualitative analysis.

Alkin, Daillak, and White (1979) have shown that the utility of any evaluation is closely associated with and heavily dependent on the personal and professional credibility of the evaluation researcher. "The credibility of qualitative inquiry is especially dependent on the credibility of the researcher because the researcher is the instrument of data collection and the center of the analytic process" (Patton, 1990, p. 462).

A credible qualitative study will, therefore, need to address all three of these issues:

- (1) What techniques and methods were used to ensure the integrity, validity, and accuracy of the findings?
- (2) What does the researcher bring to the study in terms of qualifications, experience, and perspective?
- (3) What paradigm orientation and assumptions undergird the study? (Patton, 1990, p. 462)

The use of standard interview protocol for each respondent, administered by the same investigator, insured that the key method of data collection for the study was consistently applied. Documentation of each interview through audio tape recordings and transcription provides a complete chronicle of study information that can be reviewed by other researchers interested in this topic. To strengthen validity of the information obtained, member checks were conducted to clarify any questions that arose when data were transcribed. Through complete documentation of the procedures and instrumentation of this study, credibility and confirmability was insured.

Triangulation of data also contributed to verification and validation of this research. There are basically four types of triangulation for qualitative analysis: (a) checking out the consistency of findings generated by different data-collection methods, that is, methods triangulation; (b) checking out the consistency of different data sources within the same

method, that is, triangulation of sources; (c) using multiple analysts to review findings, that is, analyst triangulation; and (d) using multiple perspectives or theories to interpret the data, that is, theory/perspective triangulation. This study utilized the methods of triangulation to strengthen validity. Through complete documentation of the procedures and instrumentation of this study, credibility and confirmability was insured.

In summary, Merriam (1988) states that:

Because what is being studied in education is assumed to be in flux, multifaceted, and highly contextual, because information gathered is a function of who gives it and how skilled the researcher is at getting it, and because the emergent design of a qualitative case study precludes a priori controls, achieving reliability in the traditional sense is not only fanciful but impossible. Furthermore, for the reasons discussed, replication of a qualitative study will not yield the same results. (p. 171)

This, however, should not discredit the original study; it only shows that another study will yield a different interpretation from the researchers' or respondents'. Having dealt with internal validity through the use of the same-data collection source and interviewer, as well as method triangulation, we turn to external validity; the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations. This study is a single case selected in a purposeful rather than random manner, so it would make no sense at all to apply external validity to this study.

Merriam (1988) states, "One selects a case study approach because one wishes to understand the particular in depth, not because one wants to know what is generally true of the many" (p. 173).

However, this study improved the generalizability of its findings by:

1. Providing a rich, thick description "so that anyone else interested in transferability has a base of information appropriate to the judgment" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 124-125).

2. Establishing the typicality or modal category of the case-that is, describing how typical the program, event, or individual is compared with others in the same class, so that users can make comparisons with their own situations (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

3. Conducting a cross-site or cross-case analysis (Merriam, 1988).

Limitations of the Study Design

Limitations associated with the use of certain methodology were inherent in this type of study. Initially the issue of generalizability, which must be viewed in naturalistic inquiry as something all together different then in rationalistic inquiry. A qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit. This is a "bounded study" of the situation that occurred in Urbana, Illinois, that led to and was a part of the process that desegregated the elementary schools. It is not generalizable to another community. It only reflects the opinions and perceptions, including their bias of the key respondents of the study. Even though the researcher is knowledgeable of interviewing techniques and has a sound reputation among the key respondents, he is still one individual that also brings bias to this study. The case study as demonstrated by Guba and Lincoln (1981) state that:

Case studies are at best only partial accounts but give the impression of being the whole; that is, they tend to masquerade as a whole when in fact they are but a part—a slice of life. Of course, no study carried out by whatever paradigm can ever represent the whole. (p. 377)

Another limitation of the study was the limitation of the memories of the respondents and the availability of the key respondents to interview. This took place in 1966, fully 33

years ago. Although I made extensive contacts with the key respondents, time was of the essence. Some had died and others are well into their sixties and seventies.

A final limitation was the researcher's inexperience with conducting a case study. Because of my position with the local school district, there might be some thought as to the truthfulness of the respondents. I have held a number of positions within Urbana School District 116. These positions have ranged from classroom teacher to Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction. I have also had the pleasure of coaching at the high school and working as an assistant principal at the middle school. At one point, I headed up the Summer program in the district for both elementary and the high school. In other words, I have established a long history in the district at many levels.

Within the community I have established many lasting friendships, both within the African-American and White communities in Champaign and Urbana. My relationships also extend into the University of Illinois where I have had the pleasure of working with and studying under some of the great minds in the field of education. Because I am so well known in the community, as a researcher, many might feel that this notoriety might hinder any type of research into issues within the community; especially in the area of desegregation of the elementary schools in Urbana. Perhaps individuals would be hesitant to speak with me because of my position within the structure of the Urbana school system. They could feel that I might be searching for some type of information for the school district instead of my own personal research. Quite honestly, it would seem to make respondents some what apprehensive to speak with the Assistant Superintendent about his own school district. However, I found just the opposite. Many of my respondents had heard about me or felt that

they knew me well enough through mutual acquaintances to speak very freely to me. They had also known of some of the work that i had done with young people in the district and felt very comfortable in my ability to tell the story the way that they presented it to me. The other major positive about me having worked in the district is that it gave me a excess to many records and information that most of the public had long since forgotten about. It also allowed me the easy access to these files anytime that I wanted to view them without having to go through the typical red tape to review them. My position also allowed me the opportunity to speak with individuals who were a part of the struggle because they see me as something that they were fighting for. An African-American administrator at the district office in the capacity of Assistant Superintendent. They felt that me being at the center of the power structure could afford them an opportunity to hear the foundation that was built through struggle for the right to attend a desegregated elementary building. Maybe by hearing their story of struggle an pain that I could carry forth the message to the present generation and those to come. By no means did I feel my present position hindered me in this research effort. I really feel that it helped me to open many doors that a fellow researcher without the same background would be hindered.

CHAPTER 4

THE URBANA PLAN: FROM IDEA TO PRACTICE, THE STORY

Legislative amendments effective on July 1, 1963, made Urbana School District 116, as it did many other school districts across the state, come face to face with the issue of school segregation. These amendments to the Illinois School Code prohibited school boards from erecting, purchasing, or acquiring buildings for school purposes that would promote segregation because of color, race, or nationality. In September of 1963, Braun, Acting Superintendent of Urbana School District 116, created a committee to study school boundaries in the light of this legislation. The committee's charge was to study the current boundaries, about whether they promoted segregation, and to make recommendations to the school board regarding future planning.

This committee represented both community and school factions. Active community members of the committee included Robert Judd, chair; Mrs. Francis Kruidenier; Kenneth Livingston; Ovid George; and Mrs. Lorenzo Wylie. School members included Miss Esther Ewald, Mrs. Norma Zimmer, and Mrs. Esther Blackburn as ex officio members of the committee. The legislation and the committee's recommendations have continued to have an impact on the Urbana School District. Three years after the initial legislation and response, in the summer of 1966, the Urbana School Board passed a motion to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools (Urbana secondary schools have always been desegregated).

In every story of change, individuals stand out as the impetus for change. This story is no different. The following individuals were dramatically linked in the transformation of

Urbana Elementary Schools, from a very segregated institution to one that implemented a plan to push forward a major desegregation effort without the judicial system having to intervene. These individuals drastically changed the way that Urbana School District 116 carried on the business of educating its youth forever.

Norris Brookens

Norris Brookens, can be characterized as the "father of the desegregation effort in Urbana Schools." Brookens was a longtime school board member and noted physician at Carle Clinic in Urbana. He had been a strong supporter of African-American issues within the community for years. His support for fair housing, employment, and health service for the African-American community were noted by several individuals within this study. He played a tremendous role in influencing the board of education to take a good hard look at how we segregated children in Urbana's elementary schools. His expertise was within the role of bringing about systemic change among the status quo on the school board of Urbana.

Brookens arrived in Urbana in 1946 from Topeka, Kansas. He was the father of six children and was also the twelfth physician to join Carle Clinic. He was a physician during World War II in the Pacific and was stationed at Pearl Harbor. One interesting note about Brookens was that he studied in Germany prior to World War II and was a member of the Yacht Club, a cover for naval operations for Germany. It seems that after World War I, Germany was forbidden from training naval officers in a formalized way. In response to this, the Germans created Yacht Clubs to maintain and teach naval skills to young men. Brookens joined one of these clubs and when he returned to the United States, the government

suspected him of being a spy for Germany. So instead of going to Europe to fight in War War II, they sent him to the Pacific. According to his daughter, Brookens was deeply moved by what was taking place in his home of Topeka during the Brown vs. Board of Topeka case. He read everything that he could get his hands on related to that case and about African-American history. He felt a sense of purpose in making racial changes possible in Urbana and felt that it was his duty to begin the process.

Carlos Donaldson

Carlos Donaldson, an African-American community leader, moved to the community from Chattanooga, Tennessee. He was born in Spring City, Tennessee, which is near Chattanooga. He first arrived in the area in 1958. At that time he was stationed at Chanute Air Force Base in Rantoul, Illinois. He recalled that he originally joined the military in 1949 at the age of 15 years old. However, once the military found that he was under age, he had to wait until 1952 to reenter the service. He was discharged from the service in 1961 and joined the mail carriers at the University of Illinois in January of 1962. He moved up the ranks of mail carriers at the University and, in 1981, he was appointed the Supervisor of campus mail. Donaldson's three children attended Urbana Schools, with two of them graduating from Urbana High School and one from University High School at the University of Illinois. He went on to earn a Bachelor's degree in Urban Planning from the University of Illinois in 1979. He became President of the local Services Employees of Local 119 at the University of Illinois. He was also a member of the Urbana School Board from 1981-1985 and the second African-American school board member in Urbana's history.

Donaldson is also a member of Bethel AME Church in Champaign and remains a member today. He viewed the system from a perspective of what was possible. He also felt that the African-American community needed to be heard. After living and working at the University of Illinois and hearing about changes in segregation, he knew when his own children were attending school that something was not right. He also had the conviction, after years of protest and activism, to take a stand.

Paul Hursey

Paul Hursey was born and raised in Urbana, Illinois, and still resides in the Champaign-Urbana area today. He was one of the first African-American athletic stars at Urbana High School. He had the distinction of being the first African-American alderman in Urbana. After experiencing what he considered a quality education that allowed him to prosper in his own life, he realized the system was failing his own children and he was not willing to stand around and do nothing. He had been and would continue to be active in city politics but this was too "close to home" not to take a stand for what was right. In his own words, he felt that his children were not getting the quality education that he himself had experienced in the Urbana school system, nearly 20 years prior, and felt that he and others needed to speak up and change the system.

The Ellis Group

The Ellis Group so named because of the Ellis addition located in Northwest Urbana, was developed by John Goodell of Goodell Engineering. The subdivision was named after

one of the first African-American physicians in the Champaign-Urbana area. His name is Dr. Harry D. Ellis and he was born in Springfield, Illinois, in 1894. He graduated from the University of Illinois School of Medicine and practiced medicine for 22 years in Urbana at 112 N. Walnut Street. The Ellis addition was developed in three phases beginning with Phase One in May 1961, Phase Two in January 1962, and Phase Three in February 1966. This subdivision became somewhat of a haven for African-American families who were restricted from buying homes in other parts of the surrounding areas of both Champaign and Urbana. The subdivision is bounded by Bradley Avenue on the North and includes the following streets: Tremont, Beardsley, and Eureka.

The group of citizens who formed the core for change within Urbana were hardworking African-American families who wanted the best for their children. They also believed very strongly that a quality education could open doors and provide their children with opportunities to be successful. They were not going to allow tradition or desegregation to stand in their way. They began by fighting the University of Illinois and the City of Urbana about moving dilapidated two-story homes into their neighborhood and turning them into slum dwellings. When that battle was just about over, they turned their sights toward the desegregation efforts within Urbana's schools.

Harold Miller

Harold Miller is a local attorney who served on the board for many years. He felt a duty to be on the board and he later went on to serve as the board attorney for many years. Many individuals that serve on boards of education throughout the country feel a sense of

responsibility to give time, energy, and expertise to the communities in which they reside. This desire to "give back" is a very strong sentiment that can be found among many board members that serve. They feel an obligation to return something to a system that has given them so much. They also feel that with their expertise in various areas, they can help to make things better. He really did not consider himself a strong ally of the desegregation effort. However, he was an advocate of Brookens and felt that he (Brookens) was doing the right thing although, perhaps, a little too quickly. Miller still has a great admiration for Brookens even today. He watched as he moved the board toward a feeling of duty to a cause that was greater than their own agendas. He considered Brookens a friend way beyond their board of education ties, someone he could confide in, and someone who understood where he was coming from in his views on various topics. He was fortunate enough to be a member of the board during one of the most dramatic times in the history of the board.

Don Holste

Don Holste was a local administrator within the Urbana School system. He was new to Urbana and had just recently been employed at Valparaiso University. He walked in at a time in the history of the district when tremendous change was taking place. As a young administrator, he became part of a learning experience that would carry him for the rest of his professional career. He became the principal at Prairie Elementary School (a new elementary building) at the time of a population explosion and within one year of a desegregation movement that would affect the entire state. Holste later became the Director of the Gifted Program in Urbana, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Associate

Superintendent, and finally retired to the University of Illinois where he is currently employed in the Pre-Service training for teachers.

These individuals, along with Peter Yankwich (a board member for Urbana from 1958-1972), were the primary change agents within Urbana's movement toward desegregating the elementary schools. If time and distance had allowed, I would have enjoyed speaking to each living board member. However, the interviews were conducted with Donaldson, Holste, Hursey, and Miller. The rationale for selecting these particular individuals is as follows: Miller was a board member at this time, Donaldson and Hursey were the spokesmen of the "Ellis Group," and Holste was principal at Prairie Elementary School during this time. Other board members are either deceased or have limited capacity to recall the events surrounding the desegregation effort. The Superintendent at that time was Ray Braun who was either acting Superintendent or Superintendent from 1963-1972. During that fateful summer of 1966 which was so pivotal, Braun was vacationing out of the United States. I was unable to contact Braun to record his perception of the events that lead up to or followed that fateful summer. Through these reflections, perceptions, and graphic details, along with reviewing the data that I collected of what took place 33 years ago, it is my hope that this story will come alive as if it were the summer of 1966.

As in every great story, there is a beginning. Even though desegregation efforts were begun in 1963 (as was noted in Chapter 1), a committee was established to study school boundaries and to answer questions as to whether they (attendance boundaries) promoted segregation. They were also asked to make recommendations to the school board regarding future planning. This study was to be based on legislation (Illinois School Code) passed in

1963 regarding the district's fostering segregation. My focus is on the events that occurred in 1966.

Background

First, some background on what actually took place. The great majority of African-American elementary students attended Hays School in the Northwest corner of Urbana. In the fall of 1966 a program of busing to achieve racial balance was instituted. Each school in Urbana received enough African-American students to constitute 13% of its student body. The assignment was for the most part random; although families were not split up in the new placements. The Hays School retained 13% of its African-American students and in addition became the permanent school for the Orchard Downs Married Student Housing Complex located at the University of Illinois. J. W. Hays school was established in 1908 after a citizen led petition requested the establishment of a school in Northwest Urbana. As the racial demographics of the area changed to predominantly African-American families, J. W. Hays Elementary School reflected this change. Therefore, by the Fall of 1965, over 95% of the student population that attended Hays School was African-American. In contrast, the Orchard Downs area was made up of White graduate students primarily from middle-class economic backgrounds who were completing their academic studies at the University of Illinois. Most of these families were only temporary residents of Urbana and would only remain in the community for the duration of their academic studies. These students had previously been assigned to other elementary schools in Urbana, most notably Yankee Ridge. Early in the Spring of 1966, informal discussions were being held between citizens of Urbana

School District 116 and the board concerning possible methods whereby a better racial balance could be obtained within the elementary schools.

During the regular Board of Education meeting held on May 17, 1966, representatives (Donaldson and Hursey) of the Council on Community Integration encouraged the Board to establish some policy on integration. The Council on Community Integration later became the Council on Human Relations. It is now called the Urbana Human Relations Committee. It is currently a committee that is a formal part of the City of Urbana's community groups hierarchy. It was established to better racial relations in the City of Urbana through community action and relationship-building among the Black and White communities. Members of the Council offered to meet with other interested groups particularly the Citizens' Advisory Council which was also studying ways to bring about integration. It is also noted that the African-American community was the most active community group seeking to desegregate the schools.

Study meetings of the Board of Education were held on July 21, 1966, and July 25, 1966, to study student assignments for the 1966-67 school year. A special meeting of the Board was held on July 26, 1966, and the following policy statement was adopted:

The constant goal of the Urbana School District has been to provide an educational program to best serve the individual student within available financial resources of the District. To implement this goal, the Board of Education established the policy several years ago providing the J. W. Hays School with a superior staff and facilities and with a reduced class size.

Although this policy has proved effective, the Board of Education, after careful review, has determined that racial balance in our school system is not only desirable, but the racial balance can be achieved now, preserving our academic standards, without waste of existing facilities and without crippling financial expenditure.

Convinced that racial balance in all schools of the District is educationally sound as well as morally right, the Board has decided to place the majority of Hays School area pupils in other schools. Although it has heretofore been a policy of District

Number 116 to plan for neighborhood schools and to transport pupils only for special classes and because of lack of space, the Board recognizes that there is no feasible way to achieve racial balance in all Urbana Schools under present conditions. The Hays School area pupils will be enrolled in all grades of all elementary schools. To make use of the space thus vacated at Hays School, all pupils living in University-owned housing South of Florida Avenue and West of Race Street will be transported to Hays to join a core of Hays area pupils in an enriched program. In addition, several special education classes, including Head Start, will meet at Hays School.

The group of approximately 180 pupils living in that University-owned housing South of Florida Avenue and West of Race Street resides in a compact housing area and can board school busses without loss of time in making numerous stops. Some pupils from this area were transported to other schools in the 1965-66, because of overcrowded conditions at Yankee Ridge School. Most of these pupils are children of graduate students attending the University of Illinois for one to three years. As a group they are able children and would benefit from a special enriched curriculum such as will be provided for them at Hays.

The hot lunch program for pupils attending Hays, Washington, and Thomas Paine Schools will be continued. All other pupils in the elementary schools who are transported by bus will be asked to bring sack lunches. Milk will be available at all schools.

It is expected that there will be about 1,225 students at Urbana High School and about 1,350 at Urbana Junior High School. There will be no change in the use of bus transportation to these schools. The cafeterias will operate as before. (Board Minutes, July 26, 1966)

It is also important to note that this policy was only a guide for the administrators that would have to implement it during the fall of 1966. There were still many details to be clarified for this policy to become fully in effect. This particular policy or statement was a bombshell for the community. Because of its simplicity, it was both forward looking and complete in its thoughts. Maybe a little too simple for the likes of most lawyers, though, because it clearly was stating that the purpose of the board was to utilize racial balancing in an effort to desegregate the elementary schools. Given the times and what was happening throughout the nation regarding de facto segregation, the Board quickly sought the advice of legal council to draft a more formalized document to explain what their intentions were. The administration and Board continued to refine the policy and then on August 19, 1966, at a

Special Meeting of the Board of Education, the following resolution was presented and adopted:

Whereas, it is provided in and by 10-21.3 of the School code, that this Board of Education has the duty,

To establish one or more attendance units within the district. As soon as practicable, and from time to time thereafter, the Board shall change or revise existing units or create new units in a manner which will take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race, or nationality. All records pertaining to the creation, alteration or revision of attendance units shall be open to the public. As amended by act approved June 13, 1963; and

Whereas, it is provided in and by 10-22.5 that this school board shall have the power to assign pupils to the several schools in the district; to admit non-resident pupils when it can be done without prejudice to the rights of resident pupils and provide them with any services of the school including transportation; to fix the rates of tuition in accordance with 10-20.12a, and to collect and pay the same no pupil shall be excluded from or segregated in any such school on account of his color, race or nationality. As amended by act approved August 16, 1963; and

Whereas, pursuant to the duty and power aforesaid; this board has heretofore established certain attendance units within said school district, and prescribed attendance of pupils to schools in such attendance units, with exceptions made necessary to further the education of certain children, such as attendance in special classes, changing of residence during the school year and overcrowding of various schools; and

Whereas, due to the inadequacy of space in the Yankee Ridge attendance unit, it has been necessary to transport pupils residing in that part of the Yankee Ridge area, known as Orchard Downs, to various other schools where classroom space is available, and it appears desirable that the entire area attend the same school; and

Whereas, it appears to this board that many of the pupils residing within Hays School unit might be improved educationally and culturally by attendance in other schools of the district all as provided in the statutes hereinabove referred to.

Now, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, as follows:

1. That all that part of the Yankee Ridge School attendance unit lying West of the center line of Race Street in Urbana, Illinois, be detached from the Yankee

Ridge School attendance unit, and shall be designated as a new unit under the name " Orchard Downs' unit.

Pupils enrolled in kindergarten and grades one through six residing in such new attendance unit will be transported to the Hays School.

2. That the administrative staff assign those pupils residing in the Hays School attendance unit as in the judgment of such staff may likely benefit educationally and culturally by attending elsewhere, to each of the schools in the district other than Hays School.
3. That no pupil shall be excluded from any school or segregated in any such school on account of his color, race or nationality.
4. That existing attendance units and rules and regulations governing attendance of pupils residing within such units shall continue in full force and effect, except as modified herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution take effect upon its passage.
(Special Board Meeting, August 19, 1966)

The Board had formalized its original document with some very key changes. There was no mention of the racial balance issue, nor were the African-American students being moved based on race but rather because of the benefits educationally and culturally. These changes were, of course, a result of legal advice of the day in determining a rationale for the plan. The Board had in effect only utilized its power under the school code to assign or create attendance units. In this case making Orchard Downs an attendance unit to itself and detaching it from Yankee Ridge and reassigning students from the Hays attendance area to other elementary schools.

This was the resolution that changed Urbana forever. With this resolution, the Urbana School District 116 Board of Education began busing African-American students to the other eight attendance units in Urbana and out of Hays School. It also established the University of Illinois housing area as Orchard Downs and began transporting these students

to Hays School. The formula for busing students from the Hays School area to the other elementary areas was a simple one. The schools would all have 13% African-American students attending each elementary building. The administrators were directed not to break up families, and any new students moving into this area would be placed in one of the other elementary buildings based on race and availability within the grade level for that student. The first year of the desegregation effort, 80 students (301) remained at Hays School, 221 from Orchard Downs joined them at Hays. Leal School received 40 (440) students from the Hays area. Lincoln-Thornburn, 40 (305); Thomas Paine, 40 (444); Washington, 36 (399); Prairie, 40 (591); Webber, 43 (369); Wiley, 33 (587); and Yankee Ridge, 44 (504).

This was the official version of what took place. However, prior to the development of the statement or the more formalized policy, many meetings and discussions took place between board members and themselves, as well as between board members and certain members of the community. This is the story that is explored in this chapter.

The Story

Creating a Plan

One very influential board member began his own campaign to explore the possibilities of desegregating the elementary schools in Urbana. He was not the Board President nor the Secretary but his influence was felt throughout the process; his name was Dr. Norris L. Brookens. His presence was noted throughout all of the conversations that I had with all parties involved in this process. "He maintained an open dialogue with the

community and was instrumental in getting the board to move on this issue," according to Miller (personal communication, May 1998), a board member at the time.

"Behind the scenes there was a consciousness of thought between Dr. Norris Brookens and myself," stated Donaldson. According to Donaldson, "we had been meeting to discuss the desegregation of Hays Elementary School and how it could be accomplished."

Miller, who was a board member at the time, felt that Brookens was the driving force on the board to accomplish desegregation of the elementary schools. Miller stated that he and Brookens had many conversations concerning the desegregation issue and that "Dr. Brookens was looking for the right circumstances to get this accomplished." According to Miller, "financial problems had been preventing the district from accomplishing desegregation of elementary schools basically because of the transportation costs inherent in such a move away from neighborhood schools." Miller also spoke of the problems associated with the move away from neighborhood schools and the need to accomplish this with the least amount of turmoil within the community. He felt that there were a couple of major challenges that the board would face. He stated that "the first and most formidable was that of securing finances to pay for transporting the large number of children to accomplish desegregation." He went on to say that "another [challenge] being the fact of space," in that he stated, "all of the schools had a population already in place and in order to transport African-American students to other elementary schools in the district, they needed space." His final thoughts on this matter were related to the space factor of Hays School. He stated, "There was a need to bring students into Hays School in order to make room for the African-American students in other buildings."

Miller went on to explain how these challenges were accomplished during what he termed an "illegal board meeting; as far as the Open Meetings Act was concerned." He did not recall who made the suggestion about utilizing the "impact aid" money from the state for the children of University of Illinois students to pay for transportation costs; in retrospect he felt it was a great idea (this actually occurred after the desegregation effort began). Miller explained, the "impact aid" was funding that was designated to University communities to offset some of the costs associated with the lack of tax dollars being assessed to university property within the communities and the effect of universities students children on the local school districts in which they attended school. He explained how crucial it was for "Urbana to have a good working relationship with its politicians at the state and federal levels." By this, he meant that they (politicians) could help with aid designed for communities like Urbana. He gave examples like the impact aid for military bases to help offset the cost of educating military personnel's children. This is the type of aid that the district was receiving to help it support itself. Miller explained, "The impact aid for University students' children was able to be utilized to support the transportation factor in the desegregation effort." The question of who gets transported was another sticky issue. Miller was very valuable in this effort by shedding light on the issue of which students would be transported to Hays in order to make room for the African-American students in the other elementary schools. I thought his statement related to the temporary status of the students from Orchard Downs was important to this equation. Miller stated that "the children of students from Orchard Downs were temporary, at least within our community." He went on to say:

Many board members felt, because of there transient nature, that it would be best to transport them to an 'international' school at Hays Elementary School. Thus creating

space at the other elementary buildings, and also replacing the students that were leaving Hays.

This was a great plan for the times. The board would be instituting de facto desegregation without really displacing the traditional White population in Urbana. Even though Miller never really came out and said this, it is quite obvious that the plan would have a very small impact on most White students in Urbana, as far as transporting them away from their home schools. By transporting the "international" students much of the political backlash that had accompanied many such moves in other communities was avoided. These parents had little or no clout on the board or for that matter within the community. Also a very important argument could also be made, that argument being that it (transporting Orchard Downs' students) allowed the district to concentrate its efforts for these students in one building instead of throughout the district. Miller went on to say, "There was very little resentment from the Orchard Downs community, in regards to this plan."

Orchard Downs Community Responds

In a letter to the editor of the Urbana-Champaign Courier, dated August 22, 1966, Harlen Lewis, President of the Housing Council for Orchard Downs, spoke of the integration policy and of being misquoted in an article on August 19, 1966. I feel this letter to the editor sheds some light on the feelings of a major portion of the Orchard Downs community. The letter is as follows:

To The Editor,

Sir: I would like to correct an error of a rather serious nature which occurred in the August 19 issue of the Courier, it was a story on the first page of the second section, concerning the Thursday evening meeting between the parents of children

attending Hays School this fall, and the Urbana School Board and School Administration staff.

According to the article, I was supposed to have said that I viewed the integration of the schools by busing Orchard Downs children to Hays School as an easy way out of a sticky problem, by taking advantage of two minority groups and as being a not particularly courageous act at all.

Actually, I made no such statement. This statement was made by a gentlemen seated directly behind me in the audience.

This would be a rather trivial matter, if I had not been identified in the same paragraph of the article as the president of the Council which represents all of the students in Orchard Downs, these residents are, in the majority, against the integration. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, the Council has worked closely with Dr. Fisher of the Board, Dr. Johnson of the Administrative Staff, Mr. Arthur Davis of the Hays School PTA, and Mr. Bemon [Vernon] Barkstall of the Urban League, to arrange meetings and the results of the meetings, ever since the initial announcement of the integration plans by the news media. The Council has taken no position with regard to the integration proposals, but it is firmly committed to seeing that the plans work well at Hays, and that the curriculum and staff of Hays School attain and maintain a level of instruction for all the children to the highest degree.

The attitude of the majority of the Orchard Downs parents also is that the important thing is to insure that the children receive the quality of education at Hays which they formerly received at Leal and Yankee Ridge. Integration issues are largely irrelevant; the important thing is the quality of education.

Finally my personal position, as I stated in an earlier article in the Courier, and in an interview over WKID, is that the integration of the Urbana schools is a commendable and worthwhile action. I understand the quandary of the Board in trying to find a reasonable plan for integration, and therefore I can also understand why the Board proceeded as it did. However, my first interest as an individual, as a parent of children who will be in Hays this fall, and as President of the Housing Council for OD, is to assure that the level of education at Hays is commensurate with the abilities of the children, with no reservations. (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 8)

In many ways, this letter to the editor reinforces Miller's contention that there was very little resistance from the Orchard Downs community concerning the desegregation plan by the Board. It also gives us a sense of the commitment that the community of Orchard Downs had in making sure that the transition was a smooth one for their children. Even if the resentment was light from the community, it was still present. As noted in the reference to

the article written on August 19, 1966, where a statement was attributed to Lewis about the "easy" way out of a very sticky situation by the Board, this also confirms the existence of some disgruntled residents of Orchard Downs from the perspective of why "us" and not others in Urbana.

The article written on August 19 was a result of some very tough questioning by members of the Orchard Downs community and African-American families visiting the Hays School site for the first of a number of meetings to discuss the new curriculum and other factors related to the move. As noted by Thomas Akerman, the reporter covering the story for the Courier:

Finally the questions that apparently bore heavily on their minds were asked, and Lowell B. Fischer, president of the Urbana School board, gave frank answers: "You are not achieving complete integration [by busing the children of temporary residents of the community into Hays School]" said Harlan Lewis, coordinator for the university housing residents." [In the letter to the editor, noted before, Mr. Lewis denied the fact that he ever asked this question or made the statement.]

It continued:

"We have been isolated [from the mainstream of community life] the same as these people. Contrary to what the newspapers say, I don't think this was a courageous decision at all. We have no choice either." Mr. Fischer was quick to respond to this comment with the following statement, "And we have had no choice where you lived, either," Fisher replied. "Graduate students before this group wanted transportation, a change in the sack lunch program and participation in the PTA. You have these things." He went on later to state that, "we weren't trying to pick on graduate students. This is the only way we could get integration in all the schools. It is a very challenging thing, but we will have true integration here at Hays. I think you people will make history."

This statement was really profound, considering that Fisher was readily admitting the fact that true integration would only take place at Hays School. Fisher had made statements on

August 19, 1966, at a board meeting alleviating many fears of residents by explaining what the board's purpose would be.

Desegregation Resolution Approved by Urbana Board

After the resolution had been read by board member Brookens and approved (which in many ways reinforces the belief that Brookens was a major supporter of the plan), Board President Lowell B. Fisher said he wanted to emphasize particularly "Item 4," assuring that the neighborhood schools except Hays will remain intact.

"Some mistaken notion is going around," said Fisher, "that this [busing from and to Hays School] 'is 'the beginning of upsetting the fruit basket' and that other pupils will be included. This is not true, absolutely not true and won't be true so long as these members are on the board," Fisher said about any possibility of further changes that would curtail the neighborhood schools (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 17).

According to the Courier, Miller then explained that there would be no cross-busing. He stated, "There will be no cross-busing. This we do not intend to do." He went on to define cross-busing as "taking youngsters by bus from their own school and replacing them with pupils from their 'new' school" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 17). This is a very interesting analogy that we will explore later in this chapter. As can be seen from the articles and the responses of the board, a tremendous amount of posturing was taking place to sell this plan to the Orchard Downs community and also to waylay the fears of the White community about losing their neighborhood schools.

At the meeting on August 18, 1966, at Hays School, a very interesting conversation was taking place involving members of the board, Orchard Downs parents, and members of the Hays School community. As was stated earlier in this chapter, Fisher was explaining why it (the move to Hays) was beneficial to the Orchard Downs community from the standpoint of a hot lunch program, all Orchard Downs Children going to one school, and the enriched curricular program to be offered at the school. A resident of Orchard Downs asked the question, "Has the board considered the alternative of combining groups of equal abilities from each school?" Fisher's response to the question was, "The problem of maintaining neighborhood schools makes this open enrollment impractical. When people are going to make life investments in a house, they pick the area of the community they want to live in, the kind of people they want to associate with," he explained. "This method seems the best way to achieve integration," he said (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 19, 1966, p. 3).

The question was then raised as to, "Why was the decision so sudden?" Fisher responded. "The board studied the problem for two years, and we toyed with the idea of changing school boundary lines," he stated. "Then the citizens from this area [referring to Hays School area] came to the board and presented their plan firmly. Even if segregation is de facto, this doesn't relieve the board of responsibility. We thought it was time to act." (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 19, 1966, p. 3).

I think it is important to sum up some of the points that were mentioned thus far in regards to the board and also the Orchard Downs community. It is very important to note that the Orchard Downs community as a whole did not come out against the board plan. However, it (the Orchard Downs community) never gave it a ringing endorsement. They

basically summed up the situation as "what choice do we have in this matter?" They were willing to go along with the plan as long as certain safeguards were being met by the board (e.g., a more enriched curriculum and a quality education for all the students at Hays School). The board had instituted a plan that achieved some integration without alienating the majority of the White citizens in Urbana and maintaining the neighborhood schools' concept with the exception of Hays School. It also stated that the plan would actually save money by decreasing the cost of educating students in the Hays area significantly more than the transportation costs.

What About Hays School?

As noted from an interchange with a Dennis Bing, who made the statement that he had been under the impression that Hays School had smaller classes and more professional staff members, his question was, "Will they continue to have this, when bused to other schools?" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 6). The board responded with a resounding No! They further explained that the education cost "will go down more than the cost of transportation goes up" because of the reduction of staffing at Hays. So with no additional cost, not breaking up neighborhood schools, and responding to the call to desegregate by the African-American community, the board's plan went into effect.

Fisher had basically outlined why the board had moved when it did. Even though they had looked at various plans and proposals and one board member behind the scenes had been urging the board in the direction of change, it took an act by a few citizens within the Hays School area to move the board in the direction of changing the course of history in

Urbana schools. This group led by Hursey and Donaldson were the impetus for moving the board toward desegregating its elementary schools.

During the meeting that was held at Hays School, two very important statements were made that night. One was by Vernon Barkstall, Director of the Champaign County Urban League. He stated: "It disturbs me to see an enlightened, and that's in quotes, group think Negro children have nothing to contribute to culture. I know it's hard to do, but leave your prejudices at home. If you can't be part of the solution, don't add to the problem" (Champaign News-Gazette, August 20, 1966, p. 8). It was noted in the story that there were over 100 people in the audience with only 15 being Negroes. Barkstall must have noted some hostility in the audience that night to make the statement that he made. Again, note the fact that much of the audience was indeed White and showing some concern in the transitioning of their children into Hays School.

Another statement that gave me reason to pause was the statement made by Lowell Johnson, Director of Instruction for Urbana schools. In reassuring the group, probably referring to the academic standing of the children remaining at Hays, he stated, "I don't think you are going to have to worry about the children that remain at Hays. They have above-average reading ability and will be able to compete with the children from Orchard Downs" (Champaign News-Gazette, August 20, 1966, p. 8). This raises the specter of who was actually asked to remain at Hays School and who was transported? Johnson had also made a statement at the meeting on Friday, August 19, about the ability to compete with students from Orchard Downs. In responding to a question from a citizen that night, he stated, "Some 'academic retardation' could occur at first when the Hays youngsters are thrown into other

schools, but this has been hitting these kids when they go into junior high school" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 6). "Academic retardation," a very interesting statement from the Director of Instruction of the district. The students remaining at Hays would be able to compete but the others transferring would be faced with "academic retardation." The president of the board went on to explain what some of his university colleagues had stated concerning this issue of academic retardation, "that the advantages of being in the schools with the other children will make up for any temporary 'academic retardation'" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 6).

Perceptions From an Urbana Elementary School Building Principal

In talking with Holste, an administrator in the district (Prairie Elementary School) at the time, he stated, "many of the students coming into the building from Hays School were, on average, not at the same ability level as other students within the building." He went on to explain that "we had to in-service our teachers to be prepared to teach those students." He continued by saying that it was his "experience, in the earlier stages of the plan, that there was an increase in fights and confrontations." A factor somewhat overlooked was brought to light by a report that Holste presented to the board some eight years later. In that report presented to the board in September of 1974, Holste pointed out that prior to 1966, a significant change occurred in the definition of a special education program entitled Type A (socially maladjusted children). At Hays School, which was 95% African-American prior to 1966, as many as "40% of some grade levels" were placed into the category of socially maladjusted. He went on to explain that in the fall of 1966 services for this group were

beginning to be provided on an itinerant basis in some of the schools with these children being regarded as part of the regular classroom. So, if only partial services were being provided and, in some cases, not at all of the elementary buildings, then it stands to reason that there would exist some difficulties in adjusting to a new building by these students. It would also be interesting to see how many of these Type A students stayed at Hays. Holste went on to explain that "many of the students were faced with how to interpret the actions of students who were culturally different themselves." Holste was referring to numerous altercations involving students at Prairie School during that first year. He went on to explain, "We have no way of knowing how many of these incidents were the result of racial conflict or just your typical grade school type altercations." Needless to say, Holste felt that it was important to note these incidents.

Holste was a new administrator to Urbana in 1966. He had just taken over the helm of Prairie Elementary School in East Urbana in 1965. In our conversation about the desegregation plan and some of its effects on administrators, he was quite helpful. He first mentioned how the plan was a complete surprise to many administrators upon their return from summer break. "Many administrators were not aware of any change of this nature; that was [not] even discussed prior to the end of the school year," Holste stated. He went on to say, "we were not given a lot of time to prepare for such a major change in the district." Many of them were not aware of what was actually going on with the board and the central administration during the crucial months of June and July. Holste continued, "The superintendent was out of the country visiting Europe, and the principal at Hays School was recovering from a heart attack." It was interesting to note that the district, particularly

Holste's school, Prairie, was undergoing tremendous growth at that time because of the housing development taking place directly east of the school. Holste stated, "We were adding between 20 and 30 new students per week, therefore many new teachers were hired during the school year to maintain class sizes at the contractual level." He went on to say, "This was significant because many of the new teachers were from rural settings and had not experienced teaching African-American students before." Holste continued by stating:

Many of the new teachers were ill-prepared for what was to confront them in the form of some of the students from Hays School . . . even though the district had in-serviced teachers in the elementary schools on sensitivity training and had also allowed the junior high and high school teachers to hold workshops on how to teach the students from Hays.

He went on to state that it was inadequate for some and, because of the late hiring of others, they did not even receive the training that was offered earlier.

He also mentioned the transportation plan that was implemented by the district.

Holste stated that "the students met at Hays School and were placed on the bus that would take them to their new buildings." On the first few days, according to Holste, "many of the students were not aware of which school they were to attend, so many of the principals along with parent volunteers from the Hays area had to match the students with their school." He also remembered that "for a few days and periodically throughout the first semester, volunteers rode the buses to each of the schools to monitor the progress and also to safeguard the students from any type of trouble." He also felt that the situation in the schools was somewhat tense that first year and that some problems took longer to resolve than anticipated.

There was some opposition to the plan in the community that his school served. Most of it was more individualized, in that the organized effort in his building was limited to a few angry parents hoping to stop the busing effort. Holste, however, remembered that there was a campaign to oust the board members from office during the next board elections in 1967. A very active anti-busing coalition was formed and ran candidates against the sitting board during the elections of 1967. The coalition was called THE and the candidates backed a neighborhood plan for the Urbana schools. The candidates were Mrs. G. M. England, Dr. William Toland, and Jack Hensler who all endorsed a nine plank platform to reform the schools of Urbana. For our purposes, though, I believe their stance on busing became a major issue. Toland, in an article dated Sunday, February 19, 1967, said as follows: "We are not against busing as it is at the present time. But we are against further cross-busing." The incumbents won and the effort did not materialize in any significant way. Also at the same time many African-American leaders were opposed to Ms. Anna Wall Scot running for the Board of Education, because they felt that she would take African-American votes away from the incumbents in the race against three of THE candidates running. Scott ran anyway and the incumbents, as noted, still won reelection. Holste also mentioned that there were some teachers who elected not to return to the district the next year because of the desegregation effort; he was not sure, however, of the exact number.

Holste recalled that the Board of Education began to discuss the desegregation effort and, in his view, the Hursey family was the main force behind the movement. He went on to state: "Dr. Brookens and Mr. Fisher were very forward looking individuals on the issue of racial integration." He stated that "some of the issues brought forward by the African-

American community were that the district was concentrating minority students in one school and they [African-American] viewed this as very unfair." He continued by saying that "it wasn't a matter of the amount of spending in each building, but that racism and segregation were being promoted by the existence of the one White elementary school." He also pointed out that "the African-American students were missing the opportunity to learn about the White culture and that other schools within the district that were primarily White were also missing out on the opportunity to learn about African-American culture." Holste also explained why he felt it was also affecting the staff: "Because of the segregation that existed in the schools, many administrators and teachers in the district were not fortunate enough to also learn about African-American culture."

This particular viewpoint was a theme used by Hursey, one of the community activist fighting for desegregation. During one of the board meetings, a question was asked at the board meeting by a visitor about the plan (desegregation plan). The question was, "'Who will benefit by this transfer?' Lowell Fisher said that it is his personal opinion that all will benefit, Negro and White children, as both bring their own cultural backgrounds to the schools" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 8).

Board member Jack May took exception to this view, saying that "you can't haul the youngsters to another school by day, then back to their old environment at night and get full results." He went on to say that he was looking to the day when one can see the youngsters going to and from school together as friends. May was a board member from 1959-1967. He was defeated in 1968 and ironically replaced by the first African-American board member, Evelyn Burnett. Mr May was a strong advocate for the board to hold meetings throughout

the city at each elementary building in the district. He also created a procedure in the board called "Show and Tell"; this was an opportunity for board members to bring up miscellaneous items at meetings of the board.

Mr. and Mrs. Paul Hursey took exception to the way May referred to Negro children's background, noting that some of them come from just as good or better home backgrounds than Whites. May later stated that he had not meant it that way (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 8).

This type of dialogue took place all over the district as African-American students entered previously all-White schools. Many myths and preconceived notions on both sides had to be faced and solutions created.

Holste noted that the Orchard Downs issue was originally an issue all to itself. He recalled that this was the case because "basically the population was growing within Orchard Downs and pushing the class size limits at Yankee Ridge, Wiley, and Leal." He also noted that "the University had plans to increase the size of married student housing at Orchard Downs in the coming years." As the issue of desegregation became the main topic of the board, he felt that the idea of busing the Orchard Downs children to the other schools became a part of the solution. The question had to be raised as to why not just bus them to Hays School. Holste went on to say that:

The board had to take into consideration the existing power structure within the White community, as it related to displacing "community" White students. The Orchard Downs situation was a very fortunate and unique situation for the district. Because these students were already being bussed, as well as their temporary status within the community; it made perfect sense. (Personal communication, May 1998)

The board was able to switch the African-American students with those of Orchard Downs with very little displacement of the student population from anywhere else. He also stated, "the district was way ahead of national trends in desegregating de facto segregation because of the uniqueness of the Orchard Downs community."

Holste was very helpful in describing the plan for introducing African-American students into the other elementary schools. According to Holste:

The district at that time had about 15% [actually about 13%] of its elementary school population that was African-American. The district administration set that as a cap on African-American population at all of the elementary schools. They began the task of dividing the children of Hays School into increments of 15% for each of the elementary schools; not based on boundaries but on families and space within the various elementary buildings. (Personal communication, May 1998)

He also said, "it was a fairly random selection process that was done by the principals in the elementary schools. Placement was also based on where space was available within the grade levels within the various elementary buildings" (personal communication, May 1998).

Holste also began reliving the first day of school, remembering teachers that had never taught Black students, an administrator that had never had Black students in his building, and students that had never associated with Black students. The school was also in its second year of existence. He stated that "it was a traumatic experience," considering that he was only in his second year in the district. The school was also in its second year with only one teacher from the Champaign-Urbana area. He also described how the neighborhood around Prairie had grown up overnight. The neighborhood directly east of Prairie had been developed primarily as starter homes for young families. The promotion was that for "\$100 dollars down and \$100 dollars a month, you can own your own home." The developer allowed homeowners to purchase these homes at this price as long as they finished the homes

themselves (painting, sidewalks, driveways, etc.). Many young families with several children took advantage of this plan and most were blue collar families.

The first day of school, according to Holste, found these families coming to the school to meet the two buses coming from Hays. "Many of the families were angry and threatening," said Holste. He also went on to explain how "many of the families were not enlightened to the desegregation movement or Civil Rights, and that they were very negative." He also said that "many Black parents accompanied their children the first day to see what was going to happen to them." He felt that many of the African-American children were frightened, and that the atmosphere was very tense and explosive.

He recalled how many of the White parents made threatening remarks concerning what would happen to the African-American children and also to him, personally, if he did not do something about desegregation. Many of these citizens felt that the administration and the board were responsible for this desegregation plan, and Holste said he felt the resentment of these parents on many occasions.

Holste felt that the children really had a better time of it than many of the parents and teachers. "Of course, there were incidents that occurred throughout the year involving students that had racial overtones," according to Holste. All in all, though, he felt that the year went relatively well, considering the atmosphere surrounding the desegregation plan.

There was one particular incident that significantly stood out in his mind though. It involved one particular African-American family who decided they would purchase a home in the neighborhood directly east of Prairie since their children were attending Prairie. He recalled, "a cross was burned in their yard and their tires were slashed" and related just how

dangerous it was for this family in the neighborhood. "Then some families within the neighborhood stepped up to help this African-American family adjust to the community and really helped establish a support network for the family. As a result of this, many more African-American families began moving into this neighborhood," Holste stated. He proudly added that "eventually, many years later, Prairie became the first elementary school in the district to become naturally integrated; it took about 10 years." He also felt that it was the school that helped integrate the neighborhood, and that Black parents who were sending their children to this school eventually decided to move into the neighborhood.

Holste also mentioned the fact that "many of the African-American families were not in favor of the desegregation effort." In fact, he said that they were very happy about staying at Hays School. Many of the families did not know where their children would be attending school until they arrived at Hays School near the Quonset hut for assignment. Many of these children had been at Hays School their entire educational years. Now they were being shipped all over the district; in many cases, to very hostile environments where they were "not welcomed at all."

One other important theme was that the Orchard Downs community was very upset with their children having to leave Yankee Ridge, which at that time was considered the higher-achieving school, and placed at the low performance school--Hays School. This was offset by several factors that the board continued to focus on. One, the Orchard Downs community would have only one school to attend. Prior to this time, they were spread throughout the district to about three schools. Second, the curriculum would be strengthened at Hays School. Lowell Johnson, the Director of Instruction, announced that Hays School

would be receiving foreign languages and mathematics laboratories. They were also receiving art and music classes. Johnson stated, "I think we can arrange two 30-minute art and music classes per week." He also promised to try and get a full-time librarian for the school" (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 20, 1966, p. 8).

The district was definitely going all out to make Hays an attractive school for the community of Orchard Downs. It was becoming somewhat of an enriched school within the district to appease the faction within Orchard Downs that perceived their children would be losing out at not being at one of the more "preferred" schools. Holste stated how this "effort was crucial because many of these families were from segregated countries from all over the world. Many of these countries were even more segregated than the United States at that time, especially some of the Latin American countries" (personal communication, May 1998).

The district administrators were very concerned about the cultural conflicts that were going to take place because of differences between populations within their buildings. Holste felt that the feelings among administrators was mixed about the plan:

Some felt that Urbana had a good thing going and why change it. Others looked upon it as Urbana was on the cutting edge of a solution to de facto desegregation and it was a great opportunity to learn and be out front on an issue that would eventually take place all over the country. (Personal communication, May 1998)

He felt that the in-servicing that the district offered to staff was very helpful and allowed for all, but especially administrators, to grow in areas that without this plan they may never have had the opportunity to do. The in-servicing was conducted at each of the elementary buildings outside of the Hays area. The presenters were teachers from Urbana High School and Junior High School who had experience with educating African-American students.

Vernon Barkstall, the executive director of the Urban League, also was enlisted to present staff development to these various elementary staffs throughout the district.

Many of the leaders within the African-American community had raised a number of questions related to the deficiencies at Hays School. Holste reasoned that "these issues related to the facility of Hays School and test scores, as well as the number of non-tenured staff members; all were mentioned as problems associated with Hays School at that time and many had validity" (personal communication, May 1998).

Holste really had a genuine like for Brookens, whom he felt was the driving force behind the desegregation movement. Even though he was not the President of the Board, he had a tremendous amount of influence within the district and community. He was definitely very much the driving force behind the plan. Brookens spent a great deal of time within Prairie School monitoring the progress of the plan, so much so that in the following year Holste was promoted to the district office on the recommendation of Brookens.

Holste believed the only way that the district was able to pull off this plan was because of the uniqueness of the Orchard Downs community. He stated:

The displacement issue was a key factor that was avoided because of the Orchard Downs community and the fact that Yankee Ridge and other elementary schools did not have to displace their students. If this had occurred, then it would have been a great deal more difficult. (Personal communication, May 1998)

Holste also wanted to give credit to the community leaders within the African-American community for their stand. Many individuals within the community, both African-American and Whites, were very hostile to them. He also noted how forward looking the Board was in creating and pushing forward this plan. He spoke of the disadvantages that were present because of the lack of training that was available for staff beyond that of

sensitivity workshops. Holste did state that "the district did provide this in-servicing for teachers and many of these sessions were taught by community leaders, and also teachers within the junior high school and high school that had been desegregated for many years."

At this point, Holste felt that it was important that he point out a very interesting fact about the desegregation effort within the junior high school and high school. Holste began to explain what desegregation really meant at the secondary level:

They were not really desegregated because of special education classes and tracking that was taking place. Many of the African-American students were being placed in special education programs and being tracked into lower level courses that were segregated from the majority of the White population.

He also noted that "many of these students [African-American] did not go on to graduate from Urbana High School but, after the desegregation of the elementary schools, it was noted how the numbers of African-American students graduating from the high school began to increase."

Community Activist Speaks: Mr. Paul Hursey

One of the most important factors, as noted by many of the individuals that I interviewed, was the importance of the African-American community in the effort to desegregate a school system. The leadership of the desegregation effort within the African-American community did not consider themselves the leaders of the "Ellis Group." Nevertheless, the two main individuals within this movement were Donaldson and Hursey.

Hursey was the individual who brought the Hays School community group together to work on two very important issues: One involving the moving of homes off of the campus and into the Hays neighborhood. "These homes were large and in not very good shape,"

according to Hursey, who also felt that these homes were to be turned into run-down, multiple family dwellings. They called themselves the Hays Neighborhood School Association. Hursey was the first elected alderman in Urbana in 1962. Hursey was a graduate of Urbana Schools, and he and his former wife felt that their children were not getting a quality education at Hays School. Hursey stated, "I received a quality education from Urbana, and I did not feel that my children were receiving the same type of education." He also noted that he had served on a committee studying the graduation rates of Black students. He noted that "93% of the African-American students that started elementary school in Urbana were not graduating." He also stated that "it was a personal battle for me, based on the fact that I felt that I had received a quality education from Urbana during the 1930s and 1940s." According to Hursey, "the schools were integrated then, including Hays." He also pointed out that "the teachers were good teachers then and the neighborhood was mixed." He clarified this point later by explaining that the quality of the teachers that his own children were getting at Hays School at that time were the "bottom of the barrel" compared with Leal and Yankee Ridge. He also explained that the neighborhood had changed tremendously, in that it had become "predominantly African-American."

Hursey pointed out that "my son had been labeled as hyperactive and after some tests were administered to him by the district, he was labeled gifted and allowed to transfer to Wiley School where the accelerated students were housed." He felt that this only happened "because my wife and I were so active in the PTA." So he was able to monitor what was actually happening within the district.

Hursey explained:

The way that I was able to gain information about what was happening in the Urbana Schools system was very interesting. I was a mail messenger, and one of the rules was that we shouldn't have to carry books. One day I was making a delivery to Mumford Hall and felt the rim of a book my bag. When I opened it up, here was a study by a graduate student in the College of Education, and there was a tremendous number of statistics on the Champaign and Urbana school systems about African-American students. This was at the time that we were going to the school board to discuss the Hays School situation. (Personal communication, May 1998)

He still feels today that it was strange how it happened. How ironic that something so extremely valuable in the fight to desegregate the schools just happen to show up one day on his route.

He further stated:

I was truly astonished to learn that the Hays Neighborhood Association only numbered about six to eight people. They approached the board with the declaration that they would not send their kids to Hays School in the Fall of 1966. They sent out flyers to the neighborhood residents to attend the next board meeting. At that meeting the community showed up in force to support the association.

Hursey recalled "how many of the African-American residents lined the walls and how there was no place to sit." He exclaimed, "What a beautiful sight to see it was!" His presentation consisted of using state law as well as the thesis that he had found. He also mentioned the fact that "one of the other concerns was transporting the students from the Hays community to Urbana High School. Because these student had to provide their on transportation to and from school, even though they lived more than a mile and a half away."

Hursey was also involved in other efforts to desegregate the community. He spoke of establishing a Human Relations Committee that took a long time to create. He was also involved in a housing effort in the 1950s to desegregate neighborhoods.

One of the most startling discoveries by Hursey was the fact that "there were many African-American families that were against the plan to desegregate the schools." He explained: "We never told the board how to desegregate the schools, but only that they needed to be desegregated that fall." He also mentioned a plan to the board that included everyone being bused called the "Princeton Plan." He stated: "How very surprised I was by the move by the board to transport the Orchard Downs students to Hays School." Hursey stated that "this plan was announced two weeks prior to the start of the school year." He mentioned how very important Brookens and Yankwich were in getting this done.

He felt that many of the African-American parents that were "'ticked off" were upset because they would have to do a little more preparation in getting their children ready for school than they would have had to do if they were still at Hays School."

His depiction of how the district administration reacted to the plan was that they did pretty much what the board had asked them to do. He felt that all of the schools accepted the children "with the exception of two schools, Washington School and Webber School." He stated that one of the reasons that these two were a problem was because "both of these buildings were similar to Hays School socio-economically, with the exception being that they were all White." He went on to say:

If you were poor, then you didn't get the same education as at the Yankee Ridge's and Leal's. Then when you went to the junior high school you were behind academically, if you attended Webber, Washington, or Hays. Many of these students were in the same boat economically and socially.

He mentioned that "the Carroll addition was dirt poor and predominantly White. However, they were extremely angry and the reception at Washington and Webber was extremely different than at the other schools. The children were definitely not wanted." During the first

few weeks of school, Hursey rode the buses to the schools to see how the children were being treated. He also found out how many of his friends were upset with him. He believed that the area known as Ellis addition was the leading advocates of the plan. There were no members outside of the Ellis addition that were involved in the group that presented to the board. According to Hursey, "many of the parents outside of the Ellis addition were upset with them because they felt that they were somewhat 'uppity' in their ways. In other words, they [Ellis residents] thought of themselves as being better than other African-American residents." Of course, Hursey felt that this was untrue. He felt that "they were no better than anyone else or any worse, only that they were hardworking and caring parents."

He also insisted that "individuals must be outspoken about what was going on in their communities." He pointed out that there had to be "some cooperation between the school district and the university considering the Orchard Downs decision." He felt that "a discussion had to take place between the university administration and the board at higher levels considering the magnitude of what was going to occur." However, he stated that he "was not a part of this discussion."

When I asked the question, "What was the primary reason behind this movement?" he stated very clearly that he felt that his "children were being short-changed. Because I know what the Urbana School system had to offer," he responded, and "my brothers and sisters had had a great education." He reiterated that "the reason behind this is because the neighborhood had changed so dramatically within 12 years of graduating from Urbana High School." He explained that "the Hays community had become African-American, primarily from the

South, and the schools reflected this change by becoming inferior to other schools as the Whites moved out of the Hays neighborhood."

On a side note, Hursey mentioned just how important Taylor Thomas was and how he became a very motivating influence in Hursey's life. Thomas became a teacher and administrator in the Urbana School system. He was also the first African-American teacher and administrator in the school district of Urbana. Thomas grew up in Champaign and began his teaching career in Danville because he could not get hired in either Urbana or Champaign school districts. Taylor Thomas joined the Urbana staff in 1956 and was very active with a number of youth activities at the school where he was the faculty advisor for the Afro-American Club and co-chairmen of the senior class. He attended Tennessee State Normal University where he received his undergraduate degree, and was awarded his masters degree and an advanced certificate from the University of Illinois. He also took courses at Illinois State University, Indiana State University, and Indiana University. He began his teaching career in 1948 at Danville Junior High School where he taught until accepting the teaching position at UHS. He also became the first African-American administrator in the district when he became the Assistant Principal at Urbana High School, and the first district administrator when he moved into district office as the District Personnel Director.

Hursey felt that there was never anything in particular that influenced them (the Ellis Group) on a national level. They were aware but they did not really focus on a particular civil rights incident. He again stressed that the Ellis addition residents felt that "if they were going to build in Urbana and pay taxes in Urbana, then they were going to receive equal treatment."

He also mentioned: "There were some African-American teachers that were not interested in what was going on in the African-American neighborhood." According to Hursey, "Many were only interested in gaining a pay check." He also felt that "they were not as prepared as their White counterparts," and he also spoke of an incident where one African-American teacher was sleeping at the desk during class. He mentioned one prominent African-American person within the community who wanted to lead their group; he stressed how they told this person that they did not need her input on matters concerning their children and that they did not need a leader.

Hursey also felt that "money was the key to desegregating the schools." He went on to explain that:

By keeping the African-American students out of school, it would force the board to make a decision because of the loss of revenue. The fact that Urbana prided itself on having great schools was another factor. If African-American students were not attending school, Urbana would be given a black eye in the public arena for denying African-American students. The fact that the university was in the midst of recruiting African-American professors also could have been a contributing factor. Surely the university didn't want this to be used against them.

Hursey felt that the socializing factor (between Black and White students) was a very positive factor in allowing children to learn about each other at an early age. And also that "African-American children could show everyone that they could do just as well as any other students in Urbana."

Community Activist Speaks: Mr. Carlos Donaldson

Donaldson, also a leader of the African-American parents, spoke that night at the Urbana School Board meeting. Donaldson went on to become a member of the board of

education himself. At that time he was the second African-American Board of Education member in the history of Urbana. Donaldson characterized his involvement in the process from the perspective of a parent that was very concerned with what was not happening at Hays School. He stated that "my children were not getting a quality education from Hays." In a study that he had seen showed that students entering Urbana Junior High School from Hays School were at least two grade levels below academically when they entered. This concerned him greatly because he felt that "there was nothing wrong with African-American students attending Hays, so therefore there had to be something wrong in what they were receiving at Hays." He was also very concerned with the "lack of African-American students that were graduating from Urbana High School." Donaldson was instrumental in working with Brookens to bring about the desegregation effort in Urbana. He remembered fondly many of the conversations that he and Brookens had had concerning the effort. Donaldson felt that Brookens was "the leading member on the Board who was fighting behind the scenes to get the board to move on the desegregation effort."

He recalled one incident that reinforces some of the comments by Holste about the lack of knowledge that many of the staff members had about African-American children or families. He recalled his son "sitting in front of the television one evening singing a song about 10 little niggers!" Of course, he was appalled and asked his son where he had heard this song. His son replied that he learned it in school and that they sang it all the time. At that point, Donaldson called Brookens who contacted the building principal who then contacted the teacher. The next day the teacher showed up at his (Donaldson's) home to apologize for her oversight and her lack of sensitivity. She explained that she was totally unaware of the

seriousness of her actions and that she had had her students singing that song for years.

However, she could not see how offensive it was and would discontinue using it. As can be seen from this example, the sensitivity training had not quite taken effect on the entire staff.

Donaldson stated that there were numerous types of incidents of this nature that took place over that year. He felt that "many of the staff members and administrators just tolerated the presence of the African-American children and their parents." He went on to speak about the feeling that he had when he entered many of the buildings, including his own son's. The feeling of being "unwelcome and watched": he felt that much of this was uncalled for. The principal at Thomas Paine at the time had insisted that he sign in when he entered the building. At first he did, but he said, "I noticed that everyone was prepared for me when I came in." So, later, he stopped signing in at the beginning of his visits and waited until he had observed the classes before reporting to the main office. He mentioned how that small change "gave me a better insight into what was actually happening in the building on a day-to-day basis. By the way, the principal never asked me to change this pattern," stated Donaldson. His belief is that it was because of his close allegiance to Brookens, as well as his own activism in the community, that allowed him to continue this approach.

It was important that the first few weeks of school have minimal bus problems. He recalled the number of bus trips he and others took back and forth from school to ensure that there were relatively few problems. He thought that the administration's support in transporting students from the Hays site was good. "We tried to educate many of the

African-American parents about the need to have their children ready to go when the busses arrived at Hays," stated Donaldson.

He also pointed out that there were a significant number of African-American people that resented their efforts to desegregate the schools. "Many of them stopped associating with me and other members of the Ellis Group," explained Donaldson. His rationale was that "many African-American community members didn't realize the importance of an education and how their children weren't gaining a quality education at Hays," he explained.

In looking back, Donaldson felt that they (the Ellis Group) had "done the right thing." He also stated: "Dr. Norris Brookens had great vision in realizing the importance of the desegregation effort. Without his [Brookens] effort on the board, the process would have taken much longer."

The effort of this small group of concerned parents within the Ellis addition was also noted by him. What they accomplished in such a small time was tremendous. Another fact that he emphasized was that two of the members of the Ellis group addition went on to serve on the Board of Education in Urbana in less than two years after this desegregation effort.

Donaldson pointed out the fact that they (the Ellis Group) had supported the incumbent board in the next election. He felt that they had to support this slate in spite of the presence of an African-American candidate on the ballot. Because they (the board) had supported the effort to desegregate the elementary schools. The fact that they supported the incumbents became another very heated debate within the African-American community. Donaldson explained that "it was the right decision for the time and that the board continue to support their efforts in helping African-American students within the system."

Religious Leaders' Reactions

One group that was somewhat absent from the process that was happening in the community was the church. In speaking with all of the individuals in my study, they felt that the church itself, particularly within the African-American community, did not play a vital role in the effort to desegregate the schools. However I did find an article detailing how 20 clergymen in Champaign-Urbana came out in favor of the Urbana Plan. They approved a statement that said:

I personally endorse the actions of the Urbana school board to integrate the entire elementary school system of Unit 116. I commend an attitude of charity and understanding to the end that both as adults and children our community can respond to this opportunity in the most wholesome and positive way possible. It is hoped this commendation by religious leaders will add to the wholesome spirit and positive attitude in which our community confronts the opportunity for Urbana to be a model and example of how people of good will can work, learn and live together in harmony and mutual progress. (Urbana-Champaign Courier, August 25, 1966, p. 18)

By supporting the plan and promising to speak about the plan with their congregations during services, these clergymen went a long way towards defusing some of the hostility that could have been exploited without this statement. These clergy were from both Urbana and Champaign, possibly because of the overlapping of congregations within the two cities.

The following clergy came out in support of the plan: Mrs. Eleanor S. Hutchens, representing the Baha'i Assembly of Urbana; the Rev. Harris J. Mowry, Emmanuel Episcopal Church; the Rev. Herbert B. Tiedemann, First Baptist, Urbana; the Rev. Harry C. AppleWhite, First Congregation, Champaign; the Rev. John Andrew Smith, First Methodist, Urbana; the Rev. G. Loran Lewis, First United Church of Christ, Urbana; the Rev. George S.

Easley and Rev. Richard L. Harrison, First United Presbyterian of Urbana; the Rev. James R. Hine and the Rev. James Ray, McKinley Presbyterian; the Rev. James Jackson, St. Andrew's United Church of Christ. The Rev. Dale A. Kool, Grace Methodist; the Rev. Dennis Griffin, St. Matthew's Lutheran; the Rev. Fr. Charles H. Martell, St. Patrick's Catholic; Rabbi A. James Rudin, Sinai Temple; the Rev. Edwin W. Hahn, Trinity Lutheran; the Rev. John A. Taylor, Unitarian, Universalist. The Rev. R. T. Eissfeldt, University Lutheran; the Rev. Raphael H. Miller, Jr., University Place Christian; the Rev. Benjamin Garrison, Rev. J. R. Ford, and Rev. Joseph Peacock of Wesley Methodist; and the Rev. Fr. F. C. Engels of St. Mary's Catholic Church.

Summary

The elementary schools were now desegregated, or at least to some extent. Through the efforts of concerned board members, community members, and the location of a graduate student housing complex, the elementary schools in Urbana were desegregated. Through the efforts of individuals, such as Brookens who cajoled, persuaded, and worked the magic that is sometimes called "politicking" (but seems to mean so very much more), and particularly through his efforts of motivation, the board after over three years of study was able to finally adopt a plan for desegregation within four months.

Donaldson wanted a quality education for his children and would not just sit back and watch them receive what he felt was an inferior education. He then, with a conviction to stand up within his own community against all odds, said, "This is the right thing to do."

Hursey fought discrimination in all its forms, from housing to education. He had the foresight to study and learn information about the educational system and how to successfully desegregate public schools. But he was also a man who had pride in his city, in his community, and in his school system and would not let it remain a segregated institution, as long as he had something to say about it.

These gentlemen, along with Yankwich and the other members of the board, had the integrity to change a system that was perceived as being unfair within a segment of their community. The "Ellis Group" was willing to stand up and be counted in a time when many within their own community wanted them to sit down and be quiet. These men and women truly changed the course of history in Urbana for all times.

I could not help noticing the other night when scanning the orchestra at Urbana Middle School the colors of the rainbow throughout the orchestra itself, and in the audience and the staff. I realized then just how far we have come but also realize just how far we have to go.

To these men and women of the past, we owe a debt of gratitude and many thanks for their efforts. Perhaps future generations can gain strength and courage from these past efforts for tomorrow's challenges.

CHAPTER 5
AN ANALYSIS OF FIVE PREVALENT THEMES
WITHIN THE URBANA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
DESEGREGATION EFFORT

Five themes are highlighted in this chapter that summarize my discoveries on this topic. The first theme is the major shifts in federal policy on desegregation of public schools that took place from 1960 to the 1990s. The second theme is the interplay of local preferences in federal policy. The third theme concerns the question: Did the Urbana Board of Education implement the desegregation policy based on a moral conviction or fear of the federal government? The fourth theme discusses the political context of decisions from the most politically powerful to the least politically powerful, and the ramifications of these decisions for both. The fifth theme would be that of the clear differences that existed and still exist within the African-American community on the topic of desegregation of public schools.

A Shift in Federal Policy

Clearly, in the first theme, that of the shift in federal policy as it relates to desegregation of public schools, we must revisit some very important federal cases. It is very important to understand that the shift is not in the area of what is illegal (i.e. under Brown v. Board of Education, the Supreme Court ruled that state-imposed racial segregation in the public schools was unconstitutional). Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote:

Education had become so important in modern society, that it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he/she is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is

a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954, p. 3)

Even when physical facilities and other tangible factors are equal, said the court, segregation in public schools solely on the basis of race deprives the minority group children of equal educational opportunity. The court concluded that: "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S.483, 1954). The shift in policy was not in this particular area. The shift occurs in the area of de facto segregation.

For years, the uncertainty over whether the courts forbid racial isolation, regardless of its cause, became the most confusing and an ever-shifting area of desegregation within the public school sector. The confusion stemmed from a number of cases where the courts seemed to be giving mixed messages. These cases seemed to be in the North primarily where de facto segregation--because of area boundaries, gerrymandering, or segregated housing facilities--is purely geographical in nature. Several cases document the existence of de facto desegregation. In a Kansas case labeled the Downs case (Downs v. Board of Education, 336 F. (2d) KS 988, 1964), the court refused to disapprove of de facto segregation. Expressing a similar view, the case of Gilliam stated that transportation and the elimination of neighborhood schools to acquire racial mixing in schools is not required by the Constitution. However, in New York, de facto segregation was ruled illegal in the Blocker case (229 F. Supp. 709. U.S. Dist. Eastern Dist. NY, 1964). Thus, variation in rulings inhibited desegregation efforts in the North because precedents could be found for whatever the desired outcome. The Supreme Court, as of February 1966, had refused to review five de

facto cases. These denials imply that the Court's position was that reasonable actions to end racial balance may be done by school boards but are not required (Garber, 1966).

The major shift by the federal government was its interpretation of racial balancing to achieve desegregation. In a case in Illinois, where students brought suit against the Waukegan School district, the courts made a very interesting determination that I believe many districts followed until the federal government changed directions in its enforcement of desegregation efforts. The court ruled that a state law, requiring school boards to revise school district boundaries in a manner to "take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race or nationality" (Tometz, as cited in Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966b) had been enacted to correct de facto segregation, and that the law was not constitutional. The court found that existing racial imbalance in the schools was not the result of intentional discrimination. The board's earlier refusals to change school zone boundaries, it held, were based on considerations of traffic, walking distance, finance, and classroom capacities. However, the court also held that the board had shown no reasonable ground, under the circumstances presented, for not correcting or improving "admittedly flagrant racial imbalance in the attendance units," as required by the statute. The board was enjoined from committing further violations of the law and was ordered to file a plan with the court by August 1, 1966, for revision of the attendance units in question so as to ameliorate the racial imbalance (Tometz, as cited in Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966b).

The federal courts had actually taken the verdict of Brown and expanded on its meaning. Initially, as had been noted earlier in this chapter, the Supreme Court held that

state imposed segregation was illegal. The lower courts expanded on this notion by including de facto segregation which was in effect caused by factors other than state imposed decisions in most cases. This geographic separation became an issue in itself that the Supreme Court refused to hear during the 1960s and left the interpretation in the hands of lower courts and state law.

Many districts took a very strong stance in eliminating segregation by imposing bussing and setting quotas for minority populations in its schools. This aggressive stance became a lightning rod in many sectors of the nation. Many felt that the courts and the federal government were moving well beyond what the Supreme Court had originally intended and many districts were placed under desegregation orders by the federal courts. However, in the late 1980s and during the 1990s, the federal court began taking a different look at these desegregation orders and began reversing decisions. When these reverse decisions took place in Kansas City, Mobile, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Seattle, the tables turned in the interpretation of de facto segregation as it relates to public schools. Even in the case of Urbana, where the Office of Civil Rights, under the Department of Education, issued a determination that de facto segregation was not grounds to change attendance units as long as the (a) geographic segregation was not state or locally imposed and (b) the attendance areas were not based on race. This was a significant shift in policy; the federal government was now saying that as long as segregation was natural in the school system, they would not mandate racial balancing.

In a recent article in USA Today, July 22, 1999, the cover story was, "Is School Desegregation Fading?" This article was so compelling and so connected with the shift in

federal court policies that I feel it must be included in this analysis. Rather than a sign that people are "throwing up their hands" about integration, courts are moving in the direction that was anticipated many years ago. The court orders by the federal government to end segregation were not intended to be permanent injunctions requiring mandatory busing or assigning students based on race. "I think there's some misunderstanding about that," says David Armor, desegregation expert at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia. The article goes on to give some very interesting statistical data from the Department of Justice. Since early 1970s, a total of 42 school desegregation cases, affecting 45 school districts, have been dismissed. Thirty-four other school districts also are no longer under court order, although their cases have not necessarily been dismissed.

In Orfield and Eaton's (1996) book, Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education, the authors take a far-reaching ride through the desegregation movement in public schools and brings it up to the 1990s. The dismantling of the desegregation continues today from local and federal efforts. The growth of residential housing segregation that contributes to the segregation of public schools and the costs and gains of desegregation in the public's eye continues. Many individuals feel that the real cost of busing students will be cut and that White flight will cease and the middle class will come back to the public schools. Orfield and Eaton contend that this is a fallacy, "School board members claim that teachers and principals will now have the resources and motivation to help economically disadvantaged African American and Latino children perform at high levels"(p. 73). The reality is that they never mention the fact that resegregation is just segregation spelled a different way. Orfield and Eaton also wrote about the dismantling of the

desegregation effort and the importance of the Supreme Court's 1990 decision in the Board of Education in Oklahoma City v. Dowell, and how this Court ruling began opening the door to the possibility of dismantling desegregation by allowing the termination of plans under certain circumstances. In my research, most of the African-American leaders I interviewed felt that the desegregation efforts did work--to a point. Many felt that the promise of desegregation was not met.

In the summer edition of Teachers College Record, Orfield (1995) reviews the findings of surveys conducted by USA Today and Cable News Network (CNN) on the subject of race. One of the more interesting findings in this national Gallup poll on race was the percentages that supported the 1954 Brown decision. These surveys found that 87% of Americans believe the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on Brown to strike down Southern segregation was right, a sharp increase from the 63% support in the early 1960s. It seems that many respondents to these surveys felt that segregation was not right; however, they also felt that bussing was also not the proper solution to this problem.

In these surveys, the value of school desegregation was also reviewed in regard to race relations. The survey by Gallup in 1994 showed that 62% of Whites and 75% of Blacks said that "integrated schools had improved race relations" (Orfield, 1995, p. 656). There was also an increase in the number of Whites who felt that "more should be done to integrate schools." This number increased from 37% in 1988 to 56% in 1994. Among Blacks, 84% support more efforts to achieve integrated schools.

Interplay of Local Preferences in Federal Policy

The second theme of interplay of local preferences in federal policy is one that became very apparent in my interviews with members of the African-American community who were involved in the initial policy change. Many of them felt that the only way to help their children and all African-American children were through the desegregation of Urbana schools. In other words, they felt that by having their children in the same school and classroom with White students that they would get a better education than they were receiving at the time. Many felt that by being in the same classroom and hearing the same information that White students were receiving would result in higher achievement scores and better opportunities for their own children. The quality of teaching and the materials would all be enhanced by being at these schools, along with the fact that "we knew that they were receiving the best that the district had to offer," stated by Hursey. Most felt that the quality of education that their children were receiving at Hays School was inferior, and that the worst teachers in the district were being sent to teach at Hays by the district administration. The old adage that, if they (teachers) are White then they must be better, was very strong among many of the individuals interviewed.

Most parents did not look at the other factors involved in achievement, drop-out rates and other indicators of success. A great number just felt that if the children were at the same school as Whites, then good things would occur, no matter what else happened. In other words, even though many wanted a model of desegregation based on the Cambridge model, that of cross-bussing; they were willing to bear the burden of bussing for their children for the hope of a better quality of education for the African-American children of the community.

However, many of the African-American children began showing up in special education classrooms, and suspension and expulsion rates for African-American children began to soar. Along with achievement scores that were significantly lower than everyone else's in the building, these concerns were coupled with an uneasiness by administrators and staff members when African-American parents began visiting the schools. While there, these parents noticed a distinct difference in the treatment of African-American children as compared to the treatment of Whites. Many became frustrated with the system's reaction to the desegregation efforts and began advocating for "neighborhood schools" or others (Whites) being bused into African-American neighborhoods to achieve racially balanced schools. Many became disenchanted with the whole notion of desegregation and felt that it was not helping their own children because it gave them the sole honor of balancing the schools racially.

Sentiments changed, based mainly on the perceptions of what the promise of desegregation would provide, with the harsh realities of what actually occurred. Many of the advocates became frustrated and disappointed in the desegregation plan because of its lack of overall academic success, in their eyes, for the African-American children in the community. Many felt that the desegregation effort, in effect, robbed their children of a neighborhood school and also alienated them in the schools that they were being forced to attend. In essence, the plan in many ways did not provide many of the children with the same quality that they were hoping they would receive by attending the predominately White schools in the community.

Neighborhood schools have long been a source of community pride and stability for communities. The school serves as a gathering place for the community, as well as a social focal point for the children of the neighborhood. By removing the neighborhood school from the community, many members felt no bond to the schools that their children were bussed to. They never felt that they became a part of the new schools; in some ways they felt very alienated from everyone else at school and also within the social circles of the schools.

In the article "Is the Land of Oz an Alien Nation?" Larson (1997) wrote a fascinating story about the miscommunication and signals that take place between different racial groups within the context of an American high school. There are many similarities between the stories of Urbana and Jefferson Heights High School. In both communities the issue of race was very prevalent on everyone's mind. The importance of the desegregation of both districts was in the context of bussing African-American students to a White institution where the authority figures in the schools were White. The misinterpretation of situations by the White majority led to conflict in both instances. Protest and confrontation by the African-American community, the use of the media to put the district administration on the defensive, and the eventual change in personnel by the district. In both instances many of the parents felt that their children were not made to feel that they were a part of the school community.

The failure of traditional schooling to meet the academic and social needs of children from diverse backgrounds suggests a critical need for educational leaders who are capable of creating alternatives to closed bureaucratic systems of control. We cannot escape the fact that bureaucratic systems have been far more effective in getting minority youths and youths of poverty out of schools rather than they have been in educating them (Fine, 1992). Also by

utilizing Bacharach and Mundell's (1993) frame for examining logic of political action and Edelman's (1977) theory of political language, illustrates the political thinking and strategies that groups in both studies used to impose their logic of action in the school community. Researchers in educational administration are recognizing the importance of understanding schools as arenas of political activity (Bacharach & Mundell, 1993; Ball, 1987; Marshall & Scribner, 1991, Maxcy, 1994; Peterson, 1976; Wirt & Kirst, 1989). It is important to note that the study of macropolitical research is an area that illuminates the ways in which external interest groups, groups not subject to formal administrative control, attempt to influence the internal operations of a school or school system. Unfortunately, this research has primarily focused on the relationship of the superintendent and the community. In the present study, the Superintendent was not involved in the decision-making process at its inception. So in the next section, attention is turned toward the relationship between the board and its various communities.

The Role of the Board of Education

The third theme was focused on the role of the Board of Education. Were they basically trying to do the right thing morally by desegregating the elementary schools, or were they afraid of the consequences inherent in a federally mandated policy of desegregating the elementary schools? This question is a very tough one to diagnose; on the one hand, you had individuals like Brookens who advocated that this was the right thing to do. Even today, many of the advocates of the plan feel that Brookens was a visionary leader that truly felt that the desegregation effort was the right thing to do. In speaking with

Brookens' daughter (Melinda Ostergan), she talked about her conversations with her father and how he felt it was wrong for the school system to allow segregated schools, and that it was his responsibility to change this practice with his influence. Also, there were no law suits looming on the horizon for the district when they undertook this endeavor as well. There was, of course, community pressure from the African-American community to bring about a change but not really a prolonged struggle to desegregate the elementary schools.

However, we must also consider that Urbana was not in a vacuum during this time. Many changes, drastic changes, were taking place all around the nation at this time, in public education as well as Civil Rights. Brookens and the other board members were well aware of these changes and had to wonder about the effect of these changes in Urbana. I am sure that at meetings with other board members throughout the state and in consultation with their own school district's attorneys the discussions had to contain some of the legal battles surrounding desegregating the public schools.

The State of Illinois also passed a law preventing school districts from using funds to continue the practice of segregating schools, especially when they were building additional classroom space. This is the time when Urbana saw tremendous growth, and many elementary schools were being built between 1964 and 1969 (Prairie and Thomas Paine Schools). It must be noted that some of this funding was from state sources which required that the district not continue the process of segregating students. It is not clear what the motivation was for the Board of Education in this matter. One must also recall the pressure that was being brought to bear by the African-American community and its supporters throughout the community. The Urbana School Board could be characterized by McCarty

and Ramsey's (as cited in Spring, 1998, p. 138) analysis of dominated communities, there emerges a pattern of educational policies resulting from elite control. In this type of control, the elite leaders would like to reduce community conflict.

In their book Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation, Kirby, Harris, and Crain (1973) highlight the important role of elite groups in urban school politics. They studied 91 cities ranging in size from 50,000 to more than 250,000. Their major conclusion is that urban elites are the most important political actors in determining school desegregation plans. In their words, "School desegregation is a political decision made by elites rather than the masses" (p. 84). In Urbana, with Norris Brookens and some of the other elites on the Board, this description fits the situation in many instances--from the physician to the lawyer to the University professor.

Understanding that in the midst of trying to pass referendums, many strange partnerships have been forged. Also understanding that the African-American community held a number of potential votes for any referendum that needed a great deal of support. So, perhaps, the politics of economics played a part in the school board's motivation to change the policy. Perhaps looking at the lack of academic success and the overall high drop-out rate of African-American students in the district also played a role in their decision. Many board members only needed to take a look at the district reports on Special Education, honors courses, drop-out rates, discipline reports at the secondary level, or the concerns of staff members about African-American students to get a clear picture that there was something drastically wrong. Did they in effect take a good hard look at the numbers or hear the concerns and decided to try early intervention as the best possible solution? Did they listen to

the African-American community's cry for help or their threat to the district in the form of possible law suits or the lack of their (African-American's) vote for new referendums? Was it, in fact, Brookens' visionary leadership and his moralistic belief in doing the right thing for African-American children that was the driving force in this change? Or, perhaps, it was a mixture of all of these.

The board was well aware of the African-American communities' disgust with "the status quo" at Hays School. Brookens and the board had seen and heard the complaints about the school and the anger that the African-American community had displayed at the board meeting and at other community committee meetings. The board was also well aware of the resentment that the White community would display if their children were bussed out of their communities to attend Hays. Orchard Downs was a community without political power within Urbana. The Orchard Downs situation was truly contextually significant to the events that transpired in Urbana. The housing complex was a unit of the University of Illinois housing administration. It was conveniently located within Urbana on the far-eastern section of the campus. It was also large enough to make a significant impact on the elementary population of at least two Urbana elementary schools, Wiley and Yankee Ridge. The inhabitants were transient by community standards because of the very nature of the complex. It was created for graduate students to the University and their families to reside near the University for a limited number of years. This population tended to be more liberal concerning desegregation, especially those enlightened thinkers from other major universities in the North. Many had young children who were considered high achievers academically and, for the most part, used to changes; considering the very move to Urbana.

Many of the residents were not politically active in the community, at least from all accounts. These factors made the decision to desegregate the elementary schools a lot less controversial because of the very contextual nature of the Orchard Downs complex. Bell's (1995) work on interest convergence in the book, "The Critical Race Theory," will shed a great deal of theoretical light on the issue of how the various interests in the Orchard Downs and Urbana desegregation plans converged to create the situation that allowed the district to plan the least controversial solution for its desegregation efforts. As was noted earlier in this study; "elites" on the school board always tried to find the least controversial method for dealing with sensitive racial issues. Their major conclusion is that urban elites are the most important political actors in determining school desegregation plans. In their words, "School desegregation is a political decision made by elites rather than the masses" (Kirby et al., 1978, p. 84). The power elite had made a decision to desegregate the school in the least harmful way from their standpoint, with the minimum amount of conflict. It was a "no brainer" to desegregate the schools without moving the White neighborhood students outside of Orchard Downs. At one point in time, all of the before-mentioned situations came together at a unique time period and moved the board into an unprecedented action.

The Power Play

The fourth theme is probably one of the most intriguing. This particular theme discusses the unique power play that the board engaged in in creating a solution for the challenge of finding space for the African-American students and finding students to replace them at Hays Elementary School. The African-American leaders in the desegregation effort

believed in a cross-bussing plan that would have all children being bussed to achieve desegregation. The board did not see this as an alternative because of the strong opposition that they would receive from the "White community" if they began bussing their children from their neighborhood schools. This opposition was very real and the board was very much aware of its presence within the community. In addition, there was a number of board members who were not in favor of bussing White children into the African-American neighborhood to achieve desegregation. Many had gone on record to say that that would not happen on their watch.

Urbana had another community, Orchard Downs. This community was made up of White graduate students and their families, many of whom only lived in Urbana for a short time, three to four years at the most. There were many citizens in the community who looked upon these individuals and their families as receiving all of the benefits of the community without having to pay for it (taxes). These families were not looked upon as "real" Urbana residents. Many of their children attended Yankee Ridge Elementary School, as well as the other elementary schools where space was available.

Someone on the board suggested that these students be moved to Hays School for the purpose of desegregation. The rationale was simple but effective. These students all lived in a concentrated area (Orchard Downs) with easy pick-up routes for the transportation service. They were already being bussed to other elementary schools in the district, so the children were used to being bussed, so now just head the bus to one school.

The families living in Orchard Downs did not have strong ties to the community as a whole. They were somewhat isolated politically in the community from the established

White families in the community. They did not pay property taxes, and many taxpayers within the community viewed them as outsiders. So, in essence, the board was able to open space in other elementary schools, find students who were White to attend Hays School, limit the potential White backlash from middle-class, established White residents, and achieve desegregation in the elementary schools. They were also able to establish a "magnet type" elementary school at Hays School to attract the middle-class African-American students who were currently enrolled at Hays, and who remain based on their achievement scores. It seems that the district had initially disaggregated the population of Hays School based on academic standing.

Lowell Johnson, Director of Instruction for Urbana Schools, was quoted in the Champaign News-Gazette on August 20, 1966, as stating, "I don't think you are going to have to worry about the children that remain at Hays. They have above-average reading ability and will be able to compete with the children from Orchard Downs" (p. 8). In another statement, Johnson talked about "academic retardation" occurring in the students that would be attending the other elementary schools outside of Hays. These statements lead one to believe that perhaps ability grouping was taking place within this plan. The question begs to be asked: Why? Was this an effort to assure the Orchard Downs community that the curriculum was not "dumbing down" and that their children would be involved in an enriched program, complete with the best of the best of African-American students? Or, was it an attempt to send the academically challenged students to other schools where they would not be a threat to the academic supremacy of the White students and continue to feed the myth of many White staff members about the lack of ability among African-American students? My

research tells me that it was an attempt to fashion Hays into an enriched school with a challenging curriculum to make it more attractive. Some African-American families eventually elected to attend other elementary schools because of their reputations for excellence, even though Hays School's curriculum was "enriched."

Views of African-Americans About Desegregation

My final theme deals with the belief that all African-Americans think the same about issues. Granted, I know this belief seems pretty ridiculous, but many policies take this particular notion to the extreme. In the case of the desegregation effort in Urbana, for instance, many African-American families were against the desegregation effort for a variety of reasons.

In an interview, Donaldson, a main advocate for the desegregation effort in Urbana, gave many examples of African-American families who were upset with the desegregation effort. One of the reasons given by some African-American families was having to get up earlier in order to get the children to the bus stop. This seems petty; however, some of their reasons have been on target. One concern was that the children would not be treated fairly by the teachers and administrators in the new buildings. Another reason given was that they would not feel welcome in the new buildings by the White families and their children.

Some families also felt that the schools were too far from the African-American neighborhoods, making it difficult to become involved in the activities of the school. All seemed very legitimate, and many of these feelings still persist today. The irony of this is that if one were to ask a typical White family at that time if African-Americans were in favor

of desegregation, the characteristic answer would be yes. That is because most individuals buy into the myth of oneness on the part of African-American people. This myth has persisted for years and has become ingrained in our belief system as a nation. When one examines factors such as economic status, education, religion, and upbringing, African-Americans are as different as Whites are different on these issues.

There is one common factor that all African-Americans have in common and that is skin color. The color of one's skin has become a status symbol in this country since the days of slavery. This one factor so permeates the thoughts of most individuals that the other factors seem irrelevant in the face of it. So when Urbana started moving African-Americans to other elementary buildings in Urbana, the only factor that they eventual took into consideration was that of race. So the factor of race was the only factor involved in determining which students would be bussed to other elementary schools.

Although we have talked about the factor of academic excellence, in terms of reading ability for the 80 students that remained at Hays, we know without a doubt that race was the determining factor for the plan to even coming into existence. There were and are clear differences of opinion in the African-American community. Factors such as income, social status, job title, education, marital status, religion, politics, and experiences are only a few factors that determine African-American thoughts on a variety of subjects. The belief that they all think alike is basically a stereotypical response based on master-servant mentality from a not so distant past. Unfortunately, this belief remains strong, even today as we enter the year 2000.

The color of one's skin does not determine the thoughts of one's mind. Granted, African-Americans, as a people, share a past that is rich with struggle and accomplishments through struggle. Nevertheless, believing there is oneness in thoughts and beliefs on a variety of issues is groundless. This shameless belief proposes that one is incapable of individual, reflective thoughts. Many policy makers still fall into this trap by trying to appease a few spokespersons in the African-American community with decisions based on their interpretations of a situation and refuse to look deeper within the African-American community for other interpretations. In other words, policy-makers make decisions based on the dialogue from a few spokespersons, usually anointed by the media or the policy-makers to make decisions affecting a greater majority who are never even heard.

In this particular instance of the Urbana desegregation effort, there were never more than five individuals from the African-American community to persuade the Urbana Board of Education to act. The board took one look at a crowd, staged by these individuals, on a late summer night, and made a decision that affected a large population not even interested in desegregating the schools in Urbana for a variety of reasons. The African-American community is not a monolithic community; whether it would be better to speak with one voice or not, is not the issue. It has been proven time and time again that policy makers would prefer this to be the case, but it is not. The Urbana Board of Education thought that it was and their decision was based on the belief that this small group of community leaders (Ellis Group) spoke for the African-American community and its policies reflected this belief.

The African-American community as a whole did not have a voice in the Urbana School District. Edelman (1977) observes that people without support will violate the laws

and rules of organizations when they are worried or desperate. The leaders in the African-American community were tired of waiting for change. They felt the powers on the board had ignored the problem far too long. Wilson (1995) observes that African-Americans or other marginalized groups often seek conflict, whereas administrators avoid it. Because administrators are typically beneficiaries of established systems, they avoid conflict and struggle to maintain the status quo; minority groups, on the other hand, may invite and even resort to stimulating conflict in hopes of establishing more equitable systems. The leaders in the African-American community kept up the heat by keeping the desegregation issue in the news, by their very act of showing up at the school board meeting in mass to generate media coverage, and to put the board on the defensive. Many within the African-American community were somewhat perplexed by the lack of movement on the part of the board over time. They wanted action but they were conflicted as to how they should react to the board's lack of action. Edelman (1977) notes that people who get the least of what organizations have to offer often feel conflicted about whether they should play by the rules of the system or resist them on the grounds that they are inherently inequitable.

Historically, people of poverty or marginalized groups have been most successful in attaining political power by forming coalitions and engaging in collective actions of resistance. However, given society's overtly negative view of resistance, marginalized groups, who must live and work within the society they struggle against, avoid using tactics of resistance until they have no other choice. Because minority groups often fear retaliation from more powerful counter coalitions, they typically try to get their needs met within the system (Bacharach & Mundell, 1993; Fine, 1991). The Urbana experience mirrored this

example in many ways: the resistance to the status quo, the willingness to work within the system, but also the willingness to foster conflict and the fact that they the African-American community was a marginalized group. The board went into a crisis mode similar to what Edelman (1977) spoke of about organizations, "organizations tend to go into crisis mode when people who have passively suffered grievance for many years begin to resist collectively" (pp. 334-335). These individuals are looked upon as being evil and violent and that they are out to disrupt the institutional life.

Summary

In summary, the five themes that were analyzed and discussed in this chapter were: the federal shift in policy, interplay of local preferences in federal policy, Board of Education members' moralistic decision or fear of the federal government, politics of power within the Urbana community, and the myth of the African-American monolithic thought concept. These themes came together to produce the desegregation effort that occurred in Urbana. The shift in federal policy to challenge de facto segregation in the North produced uncertainty in many Northern communities, because now the federal government was taking many districts to court to challenge defacto segregation. Many African-American community members felt that the mere presence of Whites in the classroom would give African-American students a better chance to achieve. The Board of Education, led by Brookens, felt that the district had an obligation to desegregate the elementary schools. This obligation stemmed from factors that were brought to bear by the African-American community; the threat of the federal shift in policy played a role as well. Factors of poor teaching and low scores on standardized

assessments were powerful indicators to the board that a change was needed. The location of Orchard Downs and the fact that they were not permanent residents of Urban, and the fact that they were being bussed any way, made the desegregation effort even more appealing because the “White neighborhood” students could remain within their own neighborhood schools. The myth of an African-American monolithic thought concept also had a major hand in the desegregation effort. One of the neighborhood leaders spoke of how they went to all the African-American churches, taverns, parks, and any other place they could find African-American people to attend the board meeting on the night of May 17, 1966. It was explained to these individuals that they did not have to say anything, just show up and look angry. He felt that the board would interpret this as a sign of disgust by the entire African-American community.

There were other factors that helped speed up the decision to desegregate the elementary schools of Urbana:

1. A shift in federal policy that challenged “de facto” segregation.
2. The force of the African-American community arguing for change.
3. The Board of Education, led by Brookens, felt a moral obligation to give African-American students a better chance to achieve.
4. The children of predominantly “White” families living in the Orchard Downs community were considered temporary residents. Because these children were being bussed anyway, this provided a concentrated group of students to replace the African-American students at Hays. It also opened up space in other elementary buildings.
5. No White neighborhood students would have to be bussed to Hays.

6. **Fear of the African-American community and what they might do to the school system.**

7. **It was believed that the entire African-American community was backing this movement.**

There are other themes also present in this research; however, I preferred to concentrate on the five that were presented in this chapter as the major themes for analysis.

-

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This long and exhaustive study of the desegregation plan for Urbana School District 116 elementary schools has been an excellent opportunity to see things change before my very eyes as it relates to this topic. However, I believe that it is very important to revisit the initial research questions in order to conclude this research.

The major research question of this study was: How and why did the Urbana Public Schools desegregate their elementary schools in the period 1966 and after? A series of subsidiary questions supported the main research question:

1. What factors and influences worked for and against desegregation?
2. Who were the individuals involved in desegregating Urbana elementary schools?
3. How did both building and district administrators react to the desegregation efforts?
4. Did the municipal and state government or university participate in this desegregation effort?
5. What strategies were used in developing the desegregation plan?
6. Who made the decision to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools and what were the priorities for implementation?

The Urbana School District 116 desegregated its elementary schools in 1966 for several reasons. Public pressure from the African-American community would not allow the board to continue to delay desegregation. They were tired of waiting for the board to take action. They felt that too many committee's were studying the situation, but no one seemed willing to act. So they mobilized and presented a united front to the board of education and

demanded action to desegregate the elementary schools. It reached a point that if desegregation did not happen within a reasonable length of time, then they were prepared to carry out some type of legal action against the school district.

It was the quiet leadership of Brookens who was able to persuade enough of the board members to carry out this action. His foresight and knowledge and how he felt desegregation would impact the district, if a court had to impose desegregation, was very visionary. In speaking with his daughter, she recalled a conversation with her father involving desegregation and its impact on the community. She conveyed his belief that desegregation was better accepted when it is not mandated from outside the community. In other words, when an elected body of community members decided to enact desegregation measures, the community was more accepting than if the state or federal government mandated it and enforced the mandate.

The third factor that I believe influenced the Urbana School Board was a state law enacted in Illinois that was being challenged by the Waukegan City School District in 1966. In essence, the state law required school boards to revise school district boundaries in a manner to “take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race, or nationality” (Tometz, as cited in Vanderbilt University School of Law, 1966b). This law had been enacted to correct de facto segregation. I believe this legislation, along with some of the court battles that were happening national--Brown II and the de facto segregation battles throughout the North and Southern cities--created a climate for change within Urbana.

The “how” question has been answered several times throughout this study but we will revisit the topic. How did the school board desegregate the elementary schools? The initial step was to devise a plan to take the population of Hays Elementary School, which at that time was over 95% African-American, and transport them to the other elementary

schools on an equal basis. The board decided to encompass the Orchard Downs Married Student Housing Complex at the University of Illinois and transport those children to Hays School, thereby solving several major problems: (a) to fill up the emptied space at Hays School with children, (b) to open up space at other elementary schools for the African-American children leaving Hays, and (c) to desegregate Hays School with White children from Orchard Downs without having to transport any of the White “Urbana” children.

What Influenced and Disrupted Desegregation in Urbana?

There were a number of factors that worked to influence and disrupt the desegregation efforts in Urbana, a situation that was occurring throughout the nation as we grappled with the Brown case and how it would affect society:

1. There was a strong commitment from the Ellis Group, and its leadership was the driving force behind this effort. The forward-looking vision of Brookens, encouraged the board’s commitment to have a successful plan.

2. The help of many staff members in the process of desegregating the elementary schools, and their willingness to learn new ways of teaching and understanding children.

Some of the same factors that helped the process also hindered it. There were some staff members who were unwilling to change their thoughts and views on African-American children from Hays, and it showed in their reaction to these children. There were also a number of board members who did not want this plan in the first place and spoke out against it in private conversations as the “lesser of two evils.”

There was also at least one community group that opposed the desegregation efforts and organized a campaign against the board members who were running for reelection and

made their campaign based on “neighborhood” schools for all. There were also parents and community people on both sides of the desegregation issue that I interviewed concerning many situations in the context of this research study.

Even though there were many individuals involved in the effort to desegregate the Urbana Elementary Schools, I believe that the main individuals in this effort were: Brookens, Donaldson, and Hursey. The Ellis Group, of which Hursey and Donaldson belonged, was also very influential. The most powerful organization, of course, in this change process was the Urbana School board who decided to implement a proposal that would change Urbana Public Schools forever.

The building and district administrators reacted like the general public. Of course, many were disappointed because they were not a part of the discussion to desegregate the elementary schools and had to implement a plan without notice in less than a month. However, they showed a commitment to make it work and set off full force to find staff development activities to prepare the teachers for desegregation.

I was unable to find where the university or city actually participated in this desegregation initiative. The state had enacted a law to eliminate de facto segregation in the schools, and it was in a number of legal battles questioning its constitutionality. However, specific to Urbana, I did not uncover any documentation to substantiate a role by the state government with involvement in Urbana.

Strategy in Developing the Desegregation Plan

It seems that the strategy used in developing the desegregation plan was simple in itself. The original plan called for transporting about 80% of the African-American

population from Hays to other elementary schools. The plan also called for transporting all of the children from Orchard Downs Married Student Housing Complex to the Hays Elementary School. Within the population of children remaining at Hays School, somehow choosing students who had performed well on standardized assessments and other testing applications, ensured that they remain at Hays with the children from Orchard Downs if at all possible.

Then the plan called for creating an enrichment program at Hays to appease the Orchard Downs parents, and to attract the top African-American students and their families to remain at Hays. Another strategy that did not gain a great deal of notoriety is the fact that only the children out of Orchard Downs and the African-American children were being bussed for desegregation purposes. To bus other White children outside of Orchard Downs was not required for desegregation purposes. This factor would later be very important to future desegregation efforts in Urbana.

The Urbana School board made the final decision to desegregate its elementary schools. The priorities for implementation were: all elementary schools would have an equal percentage of African-American students, Orchard Downs would become a part of the Hays attendance area, and no other "White" students would be bussed at the elementary level other than those from Orchard Downs to desegregate the elementary schools.

This study presented an opportunity to study a subject I have always had an interest in, that is, desegregation efforts. This process has given me a chance to look at Urbana and its school system in a different light. I learned about its history and studied some of the decisions that were made and why they were made. Reviewing these decisions and the ramifications of such decisions was especially enlightening with the passage of time. I can

only think of one quote from a history teacher I once had, and I am sure that it has been around for quite some time: “Those who fail to study history are doomed to repeat it!”

Before giving my recommendations for this study, I would like to add comments from an article that I found quite compelling. Tamara Henry (1999) wrote the article for the nationally syndicated newspaper USA Today, July 22, 1999, and it expressed so many of my thoughts about the issue of desegregation. I felt that her comments, and comments from other individuals who have a real connection with what is currently taking place across the nation (including Urbana), must be included in this chapter:

It's been 34 years since the nation began to integrate its classrooms through court-ordered busing. Now, the question the country faces--and may have answered to some extent already--is whether the USA has given up on the ideal of racial integration of its schools, a defining part of life in the late 20th-century America.

There is growing frustration among minority parents whose children have to endure the greatest burden of long bus rides for desegregation. But parents in general complain that millions are being poured into balancing schools when the money could be used for improving academics.

“I don't think the nation has given up on (integration),” says Gary Orfield, a desegregation specialist at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education. But, he insists, “we are being pushed into segregation by the Supreme Court. There are five members of that court that really don't see desegregation as a long-term goal in this country. They see it as a temporary punishment to Whites. which should be ended as soon as possible.”

But rather than a sign that people are “throwing up their hands” about integration, David Armor, a desegregation expert at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, says courts “are moving in the direction that was anticipated many years ago. The court orders were not intended to be permanent injunctions requiring mandatory busing or assigning students based on race. I think there's some misunderstanding about that.”

Misunderstanding or not, the list of major school districts in the process of ending or phasing out their desegregation plans is sizable, including Buffalo, N.Y.; the Florida counties of Broward and Duval, home to Fort Lauderdale and Jacksonville, respectively; Clark County, Nev., home to Las Vegas; Nashville-Davidson County,

Tenn.; Mobile, Ala.; Minneapolis; Cleveland; San Jose, Calif.; Seattle; and Wilmington, Del., Orfield says in a recent report, Resegregation in American Schools.

Christine DeBartolo of the Department of Justice says that since the early 1970s, a total of 42 school desegregation cases, affecting 45 school districts, have been dismissed. Thirty-four other school districts also are no longer under court order, although their cases have not necessarily been dismissed.

Ironically, the Supreme Court--accused of reversing many of the gains of the Civil Rights movement--actually launched the nation along the path of integration. In 1954, the Supreme Court outlawed intentional segregation in the South with its Brown v. Board of Education ruling.

"But times have changed," says Richard Jones, a Topeka, Kan., attorney working on the current class action version of Brown. "I think people are more accepting of the fact that we are not going to achieve racial balance," he says. The demographics of large cities today are so different from 45 years ago, he says, it would take "a super effort to even keep some White kids in some of the cities."

Right now, U.S. Department of Education statistics show that of the 36 million students enrolled in public schools, 63.4% are White, 17.1% are Black, 14.5% Hispanic and Blacks, 3.9% Asian, and 1.2% Indian/Alaskan. Orfield, who wrote the resegregation report with John Yun, says that from 1968 to 1996, the percentage of school age Hispanics and Blacks has increased 21% and 22%, respectively, while Whites dropped 16%. But the report shows a "clear and consistent eight-year decline" in integration--beginning in the late 1980s and continuing through the 1996-97 school year--as the percentage of Black students in majority White schools in the South fell from a peak of 43.5% to 34.7% in 1996. The integration level has fallen below the level achieved 24 years earlier in 1972.

Orfield is troubled by the erosion of progress in the areas of integration. "I think the saddest part is that we actually showed that we could do it (integrate) in the most difficult parts of the country," he says. "These reforms actually have produced some lasting successful models of integration education on a large scale for the first time in American history and we are now in the process of throwing those lessons away." But Armor says historians will view America's attempts at integration "as a tremendous success."

"We dismantled a system of mandatory Jim Crow laws," he says. "We completely abolished that. We looked at the schools, which are more complicated because you can't force where people live. The Brown decision integrated and removed barriers throughout civilization."

True enough, Price says. "But we've sort of discovered the outer limits of what you can do to engineer (integration) and also how resistant people are. "It's probably a noble chapter in integration that's over." (Henry, 1999, pp. 1-2A)

The saga of integrating schools based on race is a very complex and controversial event in American history. The cause was one that was steeped in American history and bias. Race has always and will always remain a dividing line among people of this nation. I truly believe that that is a given.

Even with the mass amounts of resources that were brought to bear to end segregation within the school systems of the United States, they still remain essentially segregated, either through academic stratification or through disciplinary procedures that show a distinct bias towards individuals of color. To also believe that all Blacks feel the same about this issue as well as others is a fallacy that White America seems to be in love with. We as Blacks have always felt that it was and is important to show solidarity in the face of the White majority on many issues just to be heard. Many times we are forced to react in kind because of the stereotyping that takes place on the issues that are affecting our society.

In 1999 the Office of Civil Rights (Education Division) asked that Urbana eliminate race as a basis for assigning students. The Urbana School Board in April of 1999 agreed to do just that. The desegregation efforts that had been in effect in one form or another for the past 40 years has ended: "It's probably a noble chapter in integration that's over."

Recommendations

The following are recommendations for any school district that is contemplating a desegregation effort within their school system:

1. What are the reasons for desegregating? This is a crucial step in an effort to desegregate a school system. Is it a court-ordered attempt? Has a local community organization brought forth a request? Is it an internal effort by staff members to desegregate? It is important to find out this information before making any steps in the process; it will save a great deal of time and resources if one knows this answer first.

2. Who are the main individuals in the movement to desegregate? This question goes hand in hand with the first question. In order to bring about change one must know who the main individuals are in the movement.

3. What changes are they seeking? Determine what the changes are and what the district can do to bring about these changes. Are there other factors involved in bringing about these changes that the district has no or little influence over?

4. What type of resources will be needed and where will the district find them? Most districts have a limited amount of funds, and it is in the interest of good fiscal management that the district address this question before promising any solutions.

5. Is there opposition to the desegregation effort; if so, identify them and determine their rationale for opposing the effort? It is important to know both sides of an issue and limit the number of surprises to a minimum, if at all possible.

6. Find a source of information that is familiar with these type of cases for consultation. This type of organization or an attorney with extensive knowledge of desegregation cases can help you disaggregate information and create solutions without reinventing the wheel.

7. Don't panic. There is always a way to a solution; however, one will never know it if one begins to panic at the first real sign of conflict or disagreement.

8. **Keep all communications open.** It does not matter who the individuals are; always establish a line of communication between the district and the individuals who are pushing for the change. This is the only effective way to resolve issues. If it becomes dialogue between attorneys, then things can sometime become even more complicated.

9. **Don't stereotype.** Do not assume to know what they want based on who they are. Take the time to understand deeper than surface conversations or understandings. Be willing to look through the "lenses" of their understanding of the situation; if that is not possible, then hire someone who can.

10. **Things change.** Remember that laws change, people change, and so do situations. Always keep this in mind and always prepare for this. Do not become personally interwoven into what is happening during this situation.

Implications for Future Study

The implications for future study from this research study are immense. The study of the effect of the desegregation plan on academic assessment scores, special education populations, "White Flight" from Urbana, racial changes in neighborhoods, and hiring of White staff in the school system are just a few. A study on what happened to the students who were bused and those who remained at Hays to achieve integration would be very intriguing. Also a look at how the new policy will effect the district (resegregation); is it a real possibility?

Carter (1995) stated that:

In the great metropolitan areas of the country, demographic factors, segregated housing, neighborhood assignment policies, and school district configurations clustering poor and minority children in school districts separate from the largely

White surrounding areas mean that a generation or more of Blacks will be educated in racially isolated schools in many of the urban centers of the country. (p. 619)

In Urbana the community still has segregated communities that are either all Black or all White, with a few from both races sprinkled among the majority populations within the School district of Urbana, therefore creating an imbalance in populations of at least two of our elementary buildings, Leal and Yankee Ridge. And another, because of redistricting that transport a very poor and racially isolated population from Lakeside Terrace; a federally funded low-income housing complex that is mainly African-American:

The challenge in Urbana is that of residential segregation. According to Massey and Denton (1988), residential segregation, which has played a catalytic role in the continuing challenge to desegregate the public school systems of America, "continues to exist because White America has not had the political will or desire to dismantle it" (p. 186). In the nation it continues to become a battle between those of wealth and power and those of poverty (Massey & Denton, 1993). The battle continues to be one of race with Latino and African-American students being re-segregated based on demographic factors. The Supreme Court outlawed segregation that was either sanctioned by state law or traceable to school board policies. The new segregation is usually blamed on demographic change: differential birth rates and patterns of migration and housing, including federal policies on the location of public housing projects. This year, nearly 40% of the nation's school children will be members of minority groups; within 30 years, half the nation's public schools will be mainly Black and Hispanic. Moreover, poverty and race in America are statistically inseparable: According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 43% of Black children and 36% of Hispanic children live below the poverty line, as compared with 14% of White children. In Urbana, with the

majority of African-American students living within certain pockets within the City of Urbana and Whites increasingly moving away from these pockets to areas either outside of the city limits or on the outskirts of the city, it will continue to become increasingly difficult to desegregate certain elementary buildings within the district. "The vision of school administrators must include education reform that directly addresses racial isolation and poverty without leaving it entirely to the courts" (Miller, 1995, p. 612).

In an article by Wilkins (1995) entitled, "Dream Deferred but Not Defeated," he states that, "the expectations of the lawyers and civil rights leaders that equality would follow such a decision were dashed because they had underestimated both the depth of American racism and the enormity of the remaining task of getting all of America's Black agricultural workers into the mainstream economy. As the twentieth century ends, that task, left over from slavery, still faces the American people" (p. 614). The task according to Wilkins is the assimilation of the large number of African-American agricultural workers moving to the north and unable to find away into the economy. Therefore, creating impoverished generation after generation who are unable to climb out of the pit of despair that we know as poverty. Because of this poverty they are unable to live and raise their families in areas that would be integrated because of "White Flight," therefore creating inferior neighborhoods and inferior schools within the neighborhoods. Given the recent trends of the nineties, since Milliken, resegregation will be even stronger than segregation was during the 1950's and 60's.

The recent trends of the 1990s of turning the clock back on desegregation of public schools trace its roots to a number of cases:

Milliken v. Bradley (418 U.S. 717, 1974). Milliken effectively shut off the option of drawing from heavily White suburbs in order to integrate city districts with very large minority populations.

Milliken v. Bradley II (433 U.S. 267, 1977). The Supreme Court ruled that a court could order a state to pay for educational programs to repair the harm caused by segregation.

Riddick v. School Board of the City of Norfolk, Virginia (784 F.2d 521 4th Cir., 1986). This was the first federal court case that permitted a school district, once declared unitary, to dismantle its desegregation plan and return to local government control.

Board of Education of Oklahoma v. Dowell (498 U.S. 237, 1991). The Oklahoma City school district had been ruled unitary by a federal court. The school board subsequently voted to return to segregated neighborhood schools. The Court held that "unitary status" released the districts from its obligation to maintain desegregation.

Freeman v. Pitts (503 U.S. 467, 1992). The Court ruled that school districts could be partially released from their desegregation responsibilities even if integration had not been achieved in all the specific areas outlined in the Green decision.

Missouri v. Jenkins (115 S. Ct. 2038, 1995). The Supreme Court ruled that Milliken II equalization remedies should be limited in time and extent and that school districts need not show any actual correction of the education harms of segregation. The Court defined rapid restoration of local control as the primary goal in desegregation cases.

The generalizability of the Urbana case to most of the cases that are looked upon as hallmark cases in the desegregation efforts are limited at best. The fact that the students and the desegregation effort involved African-American students and families; the small

leadership committee that was mentioned in the article, "Is the Land of Oz an Alien Nation?" by Larson (1997). By explaining cultural differences and the lack of power of the minority population and their use of the media in order to gain results. Also, the lack of communication between the power elites and the minority community. The fact that both the White and African-American communities saw the good things that occurred because of desegregation. As was noted in Orfield's (1995, p. 654) article that showed that there had been a sharp increase in the belief that integration has improved the quality of education for Whites. By 1994, 42% agreed with the statement up from only 23% in 1971. Also in 1994, 75% of Blacks believed that integrated schools had improved race relations and 62% of Whites also agreed. These numbers are up from the same study in 1988 where 37% Whites and 56% Blacks believed this statement. So there has been strong support among both races for desegregation or should I say the effects of desegregation. The other side of the coin is that most agree that bussing is not the answer. The challenge for America's public schools that are faced with desegregation is finding a vehicle that can deliver the positives of desegregation without utilizing a mandatory bussing system.

The Brown decision "had tremendous impact upon the consciousness of the country and was an important catalyst and support for the civil rights movement" (Orfield & Eaton, 1996, p. 7). Northern segregation, meanwhile, was virtually untouched until the mid-1970s. Most Northern districts even refused to submit racial data to the federal government to monitor segregation. Urbana Was this type of district; until the desegregation efforts, Urbana didn't keep track of racial data in its schools. The efforts of many districts continue to parallel the Plessy case of the 1800's. The increase in the segregation of students of color,

most noticeably African-American and Latino students. The concentration of these students in Racially isolated communities. The lack of basic funding to improve the quality of educational life for these students and the poverty that seems to be a criteria for these enclaves of students of color as noted by Orfield in Chapter Three of Dismantling Desegregation continues to be a theme of these resegregation efforts. The Urbana School system has taken on the task of dismantling the desegregation efforts of the sixties. We have noted a steady increase in the number of African-American students in the only elementary school located in the African-American community. The board has shown a reluctance to redistrict and given the nature of the residential segregation any effort would be futile. The only saving grace in the fact that an ESL program exists within the attendance center called King. This, of course, was a result of the redistricting of the Orchard Downs community of the sixties. Is it not ironic that the Orchard Downs community still remains a vital instrument into the year two thousand in the efforts of the district to live up to the desegregation legacy.

By maintaining the Orchard Downs English as a Second Language program at King, the district is able to maintain some socioeconomic variation, as well as maintain the academic rigor that is provided mostly by the students that are transported from the Orchard Downs area. To this point, the district has been able to maintain the diversity of King with these students and neighborhood students. The reality is, how long will this be allowed to continue as the number of students from the neighborhood continues to swell and the population of the building continues to swell? The space limitations become evident as they were before for Yankee Ridge during the sixties. It is somehow ironic how the circumstances seem to become like a never-ending cycle.

The factor of economics and race played a vital role in the decisions that the Urbana School Board made. The Orchard Downs area apparently became a very convenient method to alter the segregation pattern in Urbana with graduate students and their families who had very little power or economic clout within the community. The Urbana School board could be characterized by McCarty and Ramsey's (as cited in Spring, 1998) analysis of dominated communities, there emerges a pattern of educational policies resulting from elite control. In this type of control, "the elite leaders would like to reduce community conflict" (p. 138).

In their book, Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation, Kirby et al. (1973) highlight the important role of elite groups in urban school politics. They studied 91 cities ranging in size from 50,000 to more than 250,000. Their major conclusion is that urban elites are the most important political actors in determining school desegregation plans. In the author's words, "School desegregation is a political decision made by elites rather than the masses" (p. 84). The power elite had made a decision to desegregate the school in the least harmful way from their standpoint, with the minimum amount of conflict. The African-American community wanted to generate more heat on the "elite" board to pressure them into making a decision. This tactic had been tried in many parts of the nation by other civil rights movement advocates. The African-American community as a whole did not have a voice in the Urbana School District.

Edelman (1977) observes that people without support will violate the laws and rules of organizations when they are worried or desperate. The leaders in the African-American community were tired of waiting for change. They felt the powers on the board had ignored the problem for too long. Wilson (1995) observes that African-American or other

marginalized groups often seek conflict, whereas administrators avoid it. Because administrators are typically beneficiaries of established systems, they avoid conflict and struggle to maintain the status quo; minority groups, on the other hand, may invite and even resort to stimulating conflict in hopes of establishing more equitable systems. The leaders in the African-American community kept up the heat by keeping the desegregation issue in the news and by their very act of showing up at the school board meeting in mass to generate media coverage and to put the board on the defensive.

Summary

The decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, may have been the seminal Civil Rights event of the 20th century. It led to the dismantling of the systems of laws that kept Blacks shackled as closely to slavery as possible. But the expectations of the lawyers and the civil rights leaders that equality would follow such a decision were dashed because they had underestimated both the depth of American racism and the enormity of the remaining task of getting all of America's Black agricultural workers into the mainstream economy. As the 20th century ends, that task, left over from slavery, still faces the American people (Wilkins, 1995). When Paul Hursey talked about the Blacks from the South that moved to Urbana after he returned from the service, and their lack of drive for educational success, he was talking about the Black migration to the North of rural agricultural laborers looking for employment in the Northern states. This is a major area that is sometimes overlooked in the study of desegregation efforts.

However, Brown was more than education. When Robert Carter (Thurgood Marshall's chief deputy of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund) was asked why more thought had not been given to what would happen next, after the decision. Carter replied that all the forethought had gone into destroying the dual system of education because "we thought segregation was the box we were in" (p. 619). The same thought process was evident in the discussions that I had with Hursey and Donaldson. They felt that if we could eliminate the box then our children would prosper. Perhaps because of the large Black migrant population relocating within the community the leaders within the community did not realize the enormity of the challenge.

In An American Dilemma, Myrdal's (1944) study shows the power of speaking directly and forcefully about matters of race and equality. Brown v. Board of Education illustrates how vital the American faith in education has been to social progress. Although the Brown decision was important most immediately, because it established that segregated schools could not be equal schools and were therefore in violation of the laws of the United States, it was also important because it confirmed America's long-standing reliance on education as a means for addressing its most urgent social challenges. Just as education had been counted on in the 17th century to shield people from "that old Deluder, Satan," and then, in the eighteenth century, to teach the civic virtues that would enable the new Republic to survive, and thereafter also to teach the attitudes and skills necessary for productive work, now was it being called on to open equal opportunity to Black Americans? In today's environment schools are called upon to enhance the future vocational competence of their

students and also to meet or exceed the state or national assessment to determine their competency:

Rarely are we asked by the media to assert whether the environments that we are creating teach tolerance, cooperation, empathy, altruism, and all of the other virtues that it takes to live in a very complex world. When the NAACP attacked segregation by utilizing the tool of education, they viewed education in this light as an instrument of public policy. (Myrdal, 1944, p. xvii)

The fact that in Urbana many African-Americans are still isolated in certain areas of the city and Whites are concentrated in other areas will continue to lead to imbalances in the elementary population and its economic demographic split. This pattern has been well noted in a number of studies detailing the isolation of African-American and Latino populations, most notably in the urban areas of this country.

Carter (1995) stated that:

In the great metropolitan areas of the country, demographic factors, segregated housing, neighborhood assignment policies, and school district configurations clustering poor and minority children in school districts separate from the largely White surrounding areas mean that a generation or more of Blacks will be educated in racially isolated schools in many of the urban centers of the country. (p. 619)

The challenge in Urbana is that of residential segregation. According to Massey and Denton (1988), residential segregation, which has played a catalytic role in the continuing challenge to desegregate the public school systems of America, "continues to exist because White America has not had the political will or desire to dismantle it" (p. 186). In the nation it continues to become a battle between those of wealth and power and those of poverty (Massey & Denton, 1993). The battle continues to be one of race with Latino and African-American students being resegregated based on demographic factors. The Supreme Court outlawed segregation that was either sanctioned by state law or traceable to school board

policies. The new segregation is usually blamed on demographic change: differential birth rates and patterns of migration and housing, including federal policies on the location of public housing projects. More Black children are in all or virtually all Black schools today than in 1954. Are we really better off now than we were before Brown? The sobering reality is that many people of color are also asking troubling and difficult questions about whether Brown really has made a difference, a positive difference in their lives. Carter (1995), in his article, believes that Brown was a " triumph in the dismantling of legally reinforced apartheid" (p. 619).

Another view of Brown would be that the decision of 1954 called for the dismantling of segregated schools, the schools were placed in contraposition to the society. Brown called for a level of community in America that had been unknown and unaccepted in the larger society. The Court had spoken, but the "pace of change characterizing Black-White relations defied Court orders" (Miller, 1995, p. 610). However, Brown did break the back of apartheid in America, and set the stage for the Civil Rights Movement, Martin Luther King, and the Women's Movement. The Lau decision and Hispanics, Asian groups, the American Association of Retired Persons, and other groups concerned about equality in this country.

It has been a very long and sometimes tedious process to get to this point. I have discovered how complex this issue was and still is. It has always been a very controversial topic that becomes a very emotionally charged issue from all sides. African-American families feel the sense of frustration when it comes to desegregation issues. Although they are within the educational system, many feel that they are unwelcome and in some instances despised for pursuing equity within the public school system.

Many individuals within the African-American community saw what desegregation really meant for their children. They were being bussed into a hostile, unwelcoming environment and, once there, being resegregated into remedial classrooms. A review of the factors that related to discipline will show a disproportionate number of African-Americans being suspended. The special education data will also show a disproportionate number of African-Americans being labeled behavior disordered. There is an underrepresentation in the gifted programs and in the advanced placement classrooms, which clearly shows that something is wrong.

I believe that many African-Americans are tired of the fight--the fight for equality and equity--and are now ready to embrace a move to isolated educational systems, systems that are controlled by African-Americans and for African-Americans. Because many feel that the system (public education) and many Whites will continue to be unwilling to accept African-American people as equals, many African-Americans are now acknowledging the fact that they must protect their most precious resource, their children. Public school systems throughout the nation have shown, through their own data, where African-Americans are a minority within the system, African-Americans are not accepted. This is a very harsh reality for some, but by all the data that have been brought forth, desegregation has a very dismal run in this nation.

There are noted individuals who have a dissimilar view of the disenchantment of African-American and Latino citizens. Orfield (1995) in his article, "Public Opinion and School Desegregation," states:

Media reports and social commentators often assume that Whites, African-American, and Latinos are now uniformly disenchanting with racial integration. Meanwhile,

recent Supreme Court rulings allow for the termination of school desegregation plans may lead communities to consider entering a court battle to end such plans. It is therefore increasingly important that community leaders have the facts about what the public and parents and students affected by desegregation actually believe. Public opinion surveys reveal a reality of public opinion on desegregation far more nuanced and complicated and far more positive than media reports and common assumptions would have us believe. (p. 654)

Carter (1995) feels that "greater care by those expressing sweeping conclusions about the nature and direction of public opinion on sensitive racial issues" (p. 619) need to be undertaken. However, I can only speak of the leadership of the African-American movement here in Urbana. They continue to feel that perhaps there were too many promises that went unfulfilled. In my study, most of the African-American leaders that I interviewed felt that the desegregation efforts did work--to a point. However, many felt that the promise of desegregation was not met. In the summer edition of Teachers College Record, Orfield (1995) reviews the findings of surveys conducted by USA Today and Cable News Network (CNN) on the subject of race. One of the more interesting findings in this national Gallup poll on race was the percentages that supported the 1954 Brown decision. The surveys found that 87% of Americans believe the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on Brown to strike down Southern segregation was right, a sharp increase from the 63% support in the early 1960s. It seems that many respondents to these surveys felt that segregation was not right; however, they also felt that bussing was also not the proper solution to this problem.

In these surveys, the value of school desegregation was also reviewed in regards to race relations. The survey by Gallup in 1994 showed that 62% of Whites and 75% of Blacks said that "integrated schools had improved race relations" (as cited in Orfield, 1995, p. 656). There was also an increase in the number of Whites who felt that "more should be done to

integrate schools." This number has increased from 37% in 1988 to 56% in 1994. Among Blacks, 84% support more efforts to achieve integrated schools.

The issues of overrepresentation in discipline reports, overrepresentation in special education, underrepresentation in gifted and accelerated courses. These issues are real all over the nation; we can say that desegregating of our public schools was a moral hurdle that the nation had to clear. The results are very mixed, socially it has definitely changed the nation. However, from an educational standpoint the record is dismal at best. The nation continues to battle with the issues of poverty, racial isolationism and the unwillingness of our political leaders to address the issue of housing segregation. Until these issues are address, the record of Brown will continue to be called into question. Depending on how you assess the effects of Brown will determine your view of Brown and what followed. It is true that our society is a great deal better off then it was before Brown from the standpoint of apartheid in this nation. However, from a purely educational standpoint, I have yet to see facts or data to support the theory of success for African-American students in the time period after Brown. Perhaps the challenge in one of looking at the Brown decision from more than an educational view. In Urbana the debate continues; the desegregation plan is no longer in existence and at least three of six of our elementary buildings are seemingly resegregating themselves.

Racism still exists in this country, and it exists within our public school system. Unfortunately, the color of one's skin still determines how many individuals view a person's potential and. in many instances, those individuals are educators. How many children have had their dreams crushed because of racial stereotyping and prejudice? Will we ever know? Can we ever stop it under the present system?

REFERENCES

- African-American History Committee. (1995, Spring). Black history in Champaign County (Newsletter, Urbana-Champaign, IL), p. 1.
- Alkin, M. C. (1972). Wider context goals and goals-based evaluators. Evaluation comment. The Journal of Educational Evaluation, 3-4, 10-11.
- Alkin, M. C., Daillak, R., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Alvarez v. Lemon Grove School District. Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Diego, Petition for Writ of Mandate, No. 66625 (1931). -
- Bacharach, S. B., & Mundell, B. L. (1993). Organizational politics in schools: Micro, macro, and logics of action. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(4), 423-452.
- Becker, E. S., Geer, S. B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, D. (1995). The key writings that formed the movement. In K. Crenshaw, Gotanda, N., Pellev, G., & K. Thomas (Eds.), The critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement (pp 20-28). New York: The New Press.
- Blaustein, A. P., & Ferguson, C. C. (1957). Desegregation and the law: The meaning and effect of the school segregation cases. New York: Vintage.
- Blocker v. Manhasset, 229 F. Supp. 709, U.S. Dist. Eastern Dist. NY (1964).
- Board of Education of Oklahoma v. Dowell, 498 U.S. 237 (1991).
- Brickman, W. (Ed.). (1966). Federal steps v. school desegregation. School and Society, 94, 261.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294 (1955).
- Burgess, R. (1984). In the field: An introduction to field research. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Carter, R. L. (1995). The unending struggle for equal educational opportunity. Teachers College Record, 96(4), 619.

- Champaign County African-American History Committee. (1995). Through the years: Black history in Champaign County. Urbana, IL: Author.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241.
- Clark, K. (1969). Dark ghetto. New York: Viking Press.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, G., McPartland, C. J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 275 UD002122)
- Crain, R. L., Inger, M., McWorter, G. A., & Vanecko, J. J. (1966a). School desegregation in the North: Eight comparative case studies of community structure and policy making. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 010 045 24)
- Crain, R. L., Inger, M., McWorter, G. A., & Gerald, A. (1966b). School desegregation in New Orleans: A comparative study of the failure of social control. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 010 046 24)
- Cunningham, J. O. (1905). History of Champaign County. Urbana, IL: Urbana Free Library.
- Delgado et al. v. Bastrop Independent School District of Bastrop County et al. (1948).
- Denzin, N. (1989). Interpretive interactionism. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dexter, L. A. (1970). Elite and specialized interviewing. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley.
- Downs vs. Board of Education. 336 F.(2d) 988 (1964).
- Dworkin, R. (1986). Law's empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Edelman, M. (1977). Political language. New York: Academic Press.
- Fine, M. (1992). Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fowler, F. J. (1988). Survey research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Fischer, D.H. (1970). Historians' fallacies: Toward a logic of historical thought. New York: Harper & Row.
- Franklin, J. H., & Starr, I. (Eds.). (1967). The Negro in 20th century America: A reader on the struggle for civil rights. New York: Vintage.
- Freeman v. Pitts, 503 U.S. 467 (1992).
- Friedman, L. (Ed.). (1969). Argument: The oral argument before the Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1952-1955. New York: Chelsea House.
- Garber, L. (1966, February). Courts rule both ways on de facto segregation. The Nation's Schools, 77, 71.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Greenberg, J. (1959). Race relations and American law. New York & London: Columbia University Press.
- Greenstein, F. I., & Polsby, N. W. (1975). Strategies of inquiry. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanson, E. (1966, February). School integration in Rock Island. The National Elementary Principal, 45, 41-47.
- Henry, T. (1999, July 22). Is school desegregation fading? USA Today, p. 1-2A.
- Independent School District v. Salvatierra, 33 S.W. 2d 790 (Tex.Civ.App.--San Antonio, 1930), cert. denied, 284 U.S. 580 (1931).
- Jones, L. (1979). From Brown to Boston: Desegregation in education, 1954-1974 (Vol. I: Articles and books, Foreword). Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.
- Kirby, D., Harris, R., & Crain, R. (1973). Political strategies in Northern school desegregation. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Vol.1: Qualitative research methods series. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Kreidt, L. (1966, October). A lesson on school integration. CTA Journal, 62, 39-42.

- Kunen, J. S. (1955, August 15). With all deliberate speed. New York Times Magazine, p. 28.
- Larson, C. L. (1997). Is the Land of Oz an alien nation? A sociopolitical study of school community conflict. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33(3), 312-350.
- Leeson, J. (1966). How Southern states are desegregating. The Nation's School, 78, 53-56.
- Legislating virtue: How segregationists disguised racial discrimination as moral reform following Brown v. Board of Education. Duke Law Journal, 47(2), 399-424.
- Lewis, A. (1957, November). An appreciation of justice frankfurter. New York Times Magazine, p. 25.
- Lewis, A. (1953). The New York Times, portrait of a decade: The second American Revolution. New York: Random House .
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lipset, S. M., Trow, M. A., & Coleman, J. S. (1956). Union democracy: The internal politics of the international typographical union. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Lutz, F.W., & Iannacone, L. (1969). Understanding educational organizations: A field study approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Marshall, C. (1985). Appropriate criteria of trustworthiness and goodness for qualitative research on education organizations. Quality and Quantity, 19, 353-373.
- Marshall, C. (1987, March 24). Report to the Vanderbilt policy education committee. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Marshall, C., & Scribner, J. (Eds.). (1991). The micropolitics of education. Education and Urban Society, 23(4) (Special Issue).
- Massey, D., & Denton, N. A. (1988). Suburbanization and segregation in U.S. metropolitan area. American Journal of Sociology, 93(3), 592-626.
- Massey, D., & Denton, N. A. (1993). American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maxcy, S. J. (1994). Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective. New York: Bergin & Harvey.

- Méndez v. Westminster School District, 64 F. Supp. 544 (S.D. Cal, 1946), affirmed 161 F. 2d 774 (oth Cir., 1947).
- Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Metcalf, G. R., (1983). From Little Rock to Boston: The history of school desegregation. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. (1998). Harvard Education Review. 68(3), 343-395.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A source book of new methods. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage
- Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U.S. 717 (1974).
- Milliken v. Bradley II, 433 U.S. 267 (1977).
- Missouri v. Jenkins, 115 S. Ct. 2038 (1995).
- Muse, B. (1964). Ten years of prelude: The story of integration since the Supreme Court's 1954 decision. New York: Viking.
- Myrdal, G. (1944). An American dilemma. New York: Harper & Row.
- Noblit, G. W., & Pink, W. T. (Eds.). (1994). Elusive equality: Remembering the promise of Brown. The Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education. 26(4), 225-304 [Special Issue]. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Orfield, G. (1995). Public opinion and school desegregation. Teachers College Record. 96(4). 655-657.
- Orfield, G., & Eaton, S. (1996). Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education. New York: The New Press.
- Owens, R. G. (1982). Methodological rigor in naturalistic inquiry: Some issues and answers. Educational Administration Quarterly. 18(2), 2-21.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Peterson, P. (1976). School politics Chicago style. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Prestine, N. A. (1988). Systems theory and the struggle for the control of the governance of teacher education: A case study. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Ratcliffe, J. W. (1983). Notions of validity in qualitative research methodology. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 5(2), 147-167.
- Riddick v. School Board of the City of Norfolk, VA, 784 F2d 521 (4th Cir. 1986).
- Rist, R. C. (1982). On the application of ethnographic inquiry to education: procedures and possibilities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19, 439-450.
- Spring, J. (1998). Conflict of interests: The politics of American education. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Thomas, W. I. (1949). Social structure and social theory. New York: Free Press.
- Urbana-Champaign Courier. (1966, July 27). Urbana Plan, p. A1.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1966, June). Federal rights under school desegregation law (Clearing House Publication, No. 6). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 019 374 UD005803)
- Vanderbilt University School of Law. (1966a). Gertrude P. Fuller et al. v. Austin A. Volk et al., etc., Jerry Volpe et al., Intervenors, U.S.D.Ct., District of New Jersey, Civil No. 847-63. February 3, 1966, 250 F. Supp. 81. Race Relations Law Reporter, 11(2), 753.
- Vanderbilt University School of Law. (1966b). James Tometz et al. v. Board of Education, Waukegan City School District No. 61, etc., et al., Lake County, Illinois, Circuit Court, 19th Judicial Circuit, No. 65-3917, July 20, 1966. Race Relations Law Reporter, 11(4), 1742.
- Wells, A. S., & Crain, R. L. (1997). Stepping over the color line: African-American students in white suburban schools. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wilkins, R. (1995). Dream deferred but not defeated. Teachers College Record, 96(4), 614.
- Wilkinson, J. H. III. (1979). From Brown to Bakke: The Supreme Court and school integration: 1954-1978. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1995). Political organizations. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (1989). Schools in conflict. Berkely, CA: McCutchan.

Yin, R.K. (1981a). The case study as serious research strategy. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 3, 97-114.

Yin, R. K. (1981b). The case study crisis: Some answers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 58-64.

APPENDIX A
PRE-INTERVIEW PHONE CONTACT

Pre-Interview Contact

Hello,_____. This is Preston Williams. I am Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources in Urbana, Illinois, and a doctoral student at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I am studying why and how Urbana School District 116 desegregated its elementary schools in 1966.

It is my understanding that you were involved in this process. In my study, I will be interviewing individuals who were a part of this process to gain information about how they were apart of this desegregation process. Your insights and experience would be invaluable to my investigation of the role of key individuals in this process.

I am calling today to give you some information concerning my work. If it sounds like a project that you would be willing to be involved in, I will schedule a time to complete a one-on-one interview with you. May I tell you more about the project?

The purpose of my study is to examine how and why Urbana School District 116 desegregated its elementary schools in the summer of 1966. You have been recognized as one of the key individuals responsible for this change. I plan to interview as many individuals who have been recognized as being a part of this process. I plan to identify differences or similarities to other small northern school districts and their efforts to desegregate their elementary schools.

I will tape each interview conducted. Information obtained from individual respondents will be kept confidential during the data gathering process and in reporting of findings. Responses of those who participate will be analyzed to see if there are any trends or strategies that are common across this setting and situation. Since there is so little information currently

available concerning the desegregation of Urbana elementary schools, this information should be helpful in providing a better understanding of this topic.

Do you have any questions concerning the study? Are you willing to be a participant?

(Note. If the respondent agrees to participate, an interview time would be scheduled at this point. If the answer is no, the researcher will thank the respondent for their time and end the contact at this point.)

A follow-up letter will be sent to those who agree to be interviewed. This letter will again provide a brief description of the study, and confirm the interview date, place, and time scheduled during the initial phone contact.

APPENDIX B
PRE-INTERVIEW CALL SHEET

Pre-Interview Call Sheet

DATE: _____

PERSON CONTACTED: _____

PHONE: _____

ADDRESS: _____

RESPONSE: _____

INTERVIEW DATE: _____

INTERVIEW TIME: _____

INTERVIEW PLACE: _____

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Dear _____:

In following up our phone conversation on _____, I would like to thank you for your willingness to participate in my study concerning the desegregation of Urbana elementary schools in 1966. As one of the key individuals in this process, your input on this topic will be invaluable.

As we discussed previously, I will be conducting one-on-one interviews with individuals that have been recognized as contributing to this process, in order to learn what actually took place. I will tape record and transcribe each interview. The comments of individual respondents will be confidential during the data collection process and in the reporting of study findings. The information obtained will be analyzed across respondents for any common trends or themes. I anticipate that interviews will run 40 - 55 minutes in length.

Your interview is scheduled for _____ at _____. Please contact me as soon as possible if we need to reschedule. I look forward to meeting with you and sincerely appreciate your assistance with my research.

Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this information.

Sincerely,

Preston L. Williams, Jr.
501 N. Abbey Rd.
Urbana, Illinois 61802
(217) 337 - 5318 (Home)
(217) 384 - 3641 (Business)

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol

DATE: _____ TIME: _____ PLACE: _____

INTERVIEWEE: _____

Introductory Statement:

Hello, _____. I'm Preston Williams. We're meeting to complete the interview that we scheduled previously in connection with my study of how and why Urbana School District 116 desegregated its elementary buildings in 1966. Before we begin, I would like to thank you again for agreeing to be a part of this study. Your time and willingness to share your experiences and knowledge in this issue are greatly appreciated.

I would also like to take this opportunity to remind you about the conditions under which this interview is being conducted. Our conversation will be taped recorded. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence throughout the study; findings will be reported in a format that maintains your anonymity.

During the interview, I will be asking you about your role in the desegregation of Urbana elementary schools. Specific question will address your role in community relations, school board participation, or other influences outside of the community. I expect the interview to take 40 - 55 minutes. Are you ready to begin?

Interview Roster

School Board Members (1966):

Harold Miller

Citizens Advisory Council (1966):

Paul Hursey

Council on Community Integration (1966):

Carlos Donaldson

Integration and Human Relations Committee Citizens' Advisory Council (1966):

Carlos Donaldson

Urbana School District #116 Administrator

Dr. Don Holste

Interview Procedures and Questions

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

I would like to begin with a few questions concerning your role in the desegregation process for Urbana elementary schools during the 1960s. The answers to these questions will give me some idea of your unique role and experiences in this process.

Questions:

1. At what point did you become involved in this process?
2. How long had you lived in Urbana prior to 1966?
3. Were you involved in any other desegregation movements prior to Urbana?
4. What factors and influences worked for and against desegregation?
5. Who were the individuals involved in desegregating Urbana elementary schools?
6. How did both building and district administrators react to the desegregation efforts?
7. Did the municipal/state government or university participate in this desegregation effort?
8. What strategies were used in developing the desegregation plan?
9. Who made the decision to desegregate the Urbana elementary schools and what were the priorities for implementation?
10. Were any of the African-American churches involved in formulating the plan?
11. How and why did the Urbana Public Schools desegregate their elementary schools when they did?

Is there anything that hasn't been addressed in these questions that you feel it would be especially important for me to know concerning the desegregation of Urbana elementary schools?

That concludes our interview. Thank you for your interest and for taking the time to be involved in my study. Your input as one of the key individuals in this event has been invaluable.

(Note. Probes to be used throughout the interview as needed would be neutral statements designed to obtain clearer or fuller responses such as the following:

"How do you mean?"
"What do you mean?"

"Tell me more about that"
"Anything else?"

Repeating the question or the response are also strategies that will be used for clarification as needed.)

VITA

PRESTON LEE WILLIAMS, JR.

EDUCATION

Ed.D., Educational Organization and Leadership, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000.

Ed.M., General Administrative, K-12, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1987.

B.S., Social Science/Black Studies, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN, 1979.

EXPERIENCE

1998-Present Assistant Superintendent/Curriculum and Instruction, Urbana School District 116, Urbana, IL.

1993-1998 Assistant Superintendent/Human Resources, Urbana School District 116, Urbana, IL.

1990-1993 Assistant Principal, Urbana Middle School, Urbana, IL.

1987-1990 Social Science Instructor, Head Men's Basketball and Baseball Coach, Urbana High School, Urbana, IL.

1983-1987 Special Education Instructor, Assistant Men's Basketball and Baseball Coach, Centennial High School, Champaign, IL.

1981-1982 Social Science Instructor, Assistant Men's Basketball and Football, Head Women's Softball, Centennial High School, Champaign, IL.

1981 Behavioral and Learning Disabilities Coordinator
Kankakee School District 111, Kankakee, IL.

1979-1980 Director of Alternative School Programming, Kankakee School District 111, Kennedy Junior High School, Kankakee, IL.

ASSOCIATIONS

Equity Steering Committee: Urbana School District 116
Phi Alpha Theta: International Honor Society in History

ASSOCIATIONS (continued)

**National Alliance of Black School Educators
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Urban League of Champaign County/Executive Board Member
Illinois Association of School, College and University Staffing
Champaign County Chamber of Commerce Project Partners Board
New Choice Community Advisory Committee
University of Illinois Educational Administrative Alumni Association
Cunningham children's Home: Committee on Planning and Development**

HONORS

**Vice-President/President-Elect, Illinois Association of School, College and University Staffing (1995-1996).
B.L. Dodds Award, Outstanding Graduate Student in Educational Administration, (1995-1996).
House Resolution No. 106 (1989).
Outstanding Young Men of America (1986).
Phi Alpha Theta Member (1979).
Indiana State University Dean's List (1975-1979).**

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**National Conference on Standards and Assessments
Drug Free Workplace
Section 504 Seminar
Reshaping Teacher Evaluation for School Improvement
GESA Training
FMLA Workshop
Sexual Harassment Seminar
Interviewing Seminar
Contractual Negotiations Conference
Effective Remediation Plans
Demystifying Assessment
Harnessing the Rainbow: A Mission for Today's Schools**