File No. 4152

CCR 3 Meet. 324

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

held by the

CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

to the

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

taken at

404 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California 90071

on

Saturday, June 9, 1984

9:00 A.M.

ORIGINAL

Reported by Pamela S. Couturier, CSR No. 2520

MARY LANG & ASSOCIATES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
1736 No. McCadden Place • Los Angeles, Calif. 90028 • (213) 464-6121

CCR
3
Meet.
324

APPEARANCES:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Helen Hernandez, Chairperson

Van Perkins

Nadine Hata

Jack Share

Carnella Barnes

Ellen Endo

Art Gearring

Frank Orme

Grace Davis

Shirley Thomas

Pat Fillippini

Bob Takasugi

GUEST SPEAKERS

DR. CHARLES LEYBA

JOSEPH DUFF

RUBY AGUILAR

EUGENE MORNELL

ZANE MECKLER

RAUL CARDOZA

MARSHA HIRANO-NAKANISHI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1984

9:00 A.M.

MS. HERNANDEZ: We would like to get started. All be seated, please.

The meeting of the California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission of Civil Rights is now called to order.

What we would like to do, since we have some guests, is to perhaps identify all the members of the State Advisory Committee. Judge Robert Takasugi, Van Perkins, Nadine Hata; Jack Share, our attorney, Laurie Campbell; I am Helen Hernandez, the chairperson; Ellen Endo, Frank Orme, Deputy Mayor Grace Davis, and Shirley Thomas.

Those of you that are not members of the State Advisory Committee, we would like you to introduce yourselves, please.

DR. LEYBA: Chuck Leyba, Cal State University of Los Angeles. This is Yo Yamasaki, who is on our staff. Gene Mornell from the L.A. County Human Labor Relations Commission.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I do believe we have a change in our agenda. Zane Meckler, who is a staff member with Los Angeles Unified School District, will not be able to attend until later on. We are going to jump ahead. Dr. Leyba will be giving us a presentation. Dr. Leyba is the Director of the Bilingual Center for the California State University at Los Angeles.

DR. LEYBA: Prior to showing the slide presentation, I would like to say that I thank you very much for the opportunity to be with you to see individuals that I have met and seen before and to meet new individuals also.

Bilingual education is certainly a controversial subject. This is the topic of our film.

As all of you know, bilingual education is fundamentally and exclusively an equal access issue. However, to the popular mind it is mostly politically and socially disruptive. It carries the view, in the popular mind, of carrying enclaves across the United States where a language unintelligible to the majority will be spoken and the culture alien to the majority will be practiced.

Bilingual education, since its very beginning, has been nothing more than an assimilative and linguistically destructive, if you want to put it that way, element. It has no intention of maintaing either the language or the culture of the minorities being served.

When Columbus came to the shores, there were about 500 native American languages spoken. Today there are about 250, of which only two or three have more teenage speakers this decade than a decade ago. This indicates that the majority culture in this country, as it has been in all other countries, is intolerant of the continued existence of the languages of minorities, at least in terms of fostering them in schools.

Bilingual education, when it was first authorized and received its appropriation in 1968, was of

a historical piece with this particular mentality. It had no intention in terms of the language of fostering either the culture or the language of the minorities being spoken. The Lau decision of 1974 had nothing other in mind than the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI, which, in fact, says one should not discriminate.

If you look through the historical development of the Bilingual Education Act, Senator Yarborough, the year before it finally received its first appropriation, had authored the American Bilingual Act, which indicates very clearly that this was not an attempt on the part of the federal government to develop Swiss cantons over here in the United States, but simply and solely the intent to serve students in the most powerful medium they could understand; namely, their home language while they are gradually being elevated to the point where they can understand academic content in what is the language of wider communication in this country, and that is English.

I have expatiated on this at some length, simply because I think it is important for informed individuals to know fully well that if there is a conflict in bilingual education, it arises from misunderstandings, and what I would like to do is give you at least two reasons for these misunderstandings; one of which, unfortunately, is the responsibility of people that have been in bilingual education, and the other one I would label as simply discriminatory, racist, or whatever you want to call it.

Let's talk about the first one first.

Contextually, bilingual education came into existence within the time of the student revolts on our campuses and revolts of minorities in cities. Contextually, if you go back to those days, communities were taking federal programs and forcing these federal programs into instruments of their own community ideologies. If you remember those days, there were always people who said, "I speak for the community," and the community always said, through these individuals, "I want such and such." The inability of the federal government and its general paralysis at that time created a condition in which certain federal programs in fact took on the coloration of the community in which they were lodged. That coloration became one of protest, and in the case of the bilingual programs here in Los Angeles, with which I am acquainted from the beginning, bilingual education became a cosa neustra, "our thing." Contextually, that is one of the reasons.

I mentioned a second one, and that is a feeling that in the United States individuals that do not participate in the broad context of the culture of the United States are considered to be deficient in some respect or another, and, therefore, in need of a rapid acculturation. The early years of this century showed a great deal of this. You probably are aware of the masters thesis at SC, which was chaired by Henry Bogardis, who started the American Journal of Sociology in which it said: "The Mexicans are not immoral, they are amoral. They do not participate in the morals of this society. They are basically alien to this society."

This is a way in which individuals generally

view others that do not participate totally in the language and in the culture.

I have mentioned two points; one, a historic contextuality for bilingual education causing a great deal of the controversy that surrounds it, and then a second broader context, that is, that there is a dominant culture which is messianic in nature and when one comes to live according to its standards, one becomes an obvious participant and an authentic member of it.

I don't have to remind you that in a play in the early part of this century it was mentioned there "that you stand here my brothers in your fifty languages and cultures, but the great man is coming, the American that will be the fusion of all of these, and that when this is born there will be supermen on earth."

This mentality continues to lurk; namely, that there is a sublimic culture and perhaps it is ours and we will transform the planet by providing it with jeans, rock and roll, and other instruments that are evidence that we are the least common denominator mentality on the planet.

Enough of that.

We had this particular slide show developed which is a jargon-free expression of what good sense and research shows should govern the education of young children. The theories are based on a USC professor, Krashen, and a Canadian professor, Cummins, which attempts to indicate to the viewer how you can teach children in such a way that they do not lose academic content while they are developing the

greater language here; that is, the language of the majority; namely, English.

Because it is jargon free, it is excellent for presentations to board members, to community people, and generally to individuals who are not participators in the kind of education needs that characterize a great deal of conversation when you get specialists together.

You are specialists, so you will appreciate how this brings the level of discourse to a point where everybody can participate and learn something from it.

I am not going to continue any further. I will turn it over to Yo Yamasaki and have him show us the film.

MR. PERKINS: While we have a one-minute break, there is one administrative matter. I have been advised by members of the staff members that were absent this morning have presented valid reasons for their absences. I move that the Committee formally take note of those reasons for their absences and accept them as being valid.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Is there a second?

MS. DAVIS: I will second it.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Discussion?

All those in favor?

(All Committee members responded "aye.")

MS. HERNANDEZ: Motion carried. Thank you.

We will just take a very short one-minute break.

(Recess.)

MS. HERNANDEZ: If you would like to entertain any questions to Dr. Leyba.

DR. LEYBA: I would like to mention one thing. This slide presentation was developed by the Evaluation Dissemination Assessment Center, which I am sure would not have received the funding by the federal government if it had not had the strong support of Deputy Mayor Grace Davis. I have your letter in my file supporting this.

In 1976, she was so gracious as to provide that letter to us. It was pretty potent in helping us get funded.

MS. DAVIS: Is there something in writing on this subject, because all of us are constantly having to defend bilingual education publicly and just in our contacts? I know I have had some exposure to some kind of explanations during the desegregation movement, when we had people from Cal State come over and deal with the citizens' groups, and so on.

This is probably the most comprehensive for me that I have been able to get a handle on. If you have something from the center that could be useful to the members of this Committee, I certainly, for one, would appreciate it.

DR. LEYBA: We do have that. We have it in two forms. We have it in a small resume from Sacramento, from the Office of Bilingual-Bicultural Education. There are actually two things, a book itself and also the resume of the book. I would be perfectly happy to provide everyone of you with a copy of it, of both or either one, as you let me know. I imagine you could do that through Phil. He could send me a list and send both to everybody, or send

one to whoever. I will be glad to do that.

MR. MONTEZ: I will send you a list of the whole Committee.

DR. LEYBA: We sell these materials at cost, at the cost of printing. We don't factor in any salaries. By federal government policy we are supposed to make these available to everybody where there is a need. Obviously, if we start making a profit on them, we put them beyond the reach of the individuals that are clients.

This particular slide presentation is disseminated at a cost of $70. The National Conference of Christians and Jews had set aside $10,000 to develop their own presentation. When they saw this, they said, "We don't need to spend this money anymore."

MR. PERKINS: Can you tell us something about your relationship with the Los Angeles School District; what you are doing with them and what the nature of your working relationship is?

DR. LEYBA: We have two ways in which we contact all school districts. The first one is through the Evaluation Dissemination Center, which was listed there, and through that we disseminate books, instructional materials for children in the classroom, or for the professional development of the teachers themselves. This is done for school districts in what they call Regions 9 and 10. Those are one of the relationships.

Los Angeles Unified School District does have this slide presentation and bought 3,000 of the books on which

this slide presentation is based and disseminated it to their teachers.

MR. PERKINS: Do you have any knowledge regarding the effectiveness of bilingual education actually as it is carried out in the Los Angeles School District, or do you have an opinion on the effectiveness, the openess of the board, anything you can tell us about how well bilingual education is not working there?

DR. LEYBA: I have to issue a disclaimer on that simply because I operate at several steps removed from direct classroom contact. I don't have any direct view of how bilingual education is working in any school district.

I did produce one of the evaluations which is nationally quoted when they want to cite the advantages, however, it is not the school district in this state.

With respect to school districts in general, I simply am too far removed.

MR. PERKINS: I would be in the same position if I were asked a similar question. I understand. I just wondered.

DR. LEYBA: What I can say is that, strangely enough, as the arguments against bilingual education mounted, and as funded, contracted, it has come down from a hundred eighty million to about a hundred thirty-five million.

The interest in bilingual education has increased geometrically at the school-district level. The need to train, to teach teachers, is inexhaustible and is in demand daily.

MS. DAVIS: On the training of teachers, one of the

things that through the years we have observed is that teachers seem to develop their own approach to bilingual education, and I know that some of the evaluations that I have seen, that was one of the things that seemed to impact on the negative aspects of it, because people will go someplace and observe a class or maybe have contact with teachers or students and find that, indeed, they are not getting any English, they are only -- it appears they are only getting the native language, and the fact that you have teacher aides and all that.

There is talk about standardizing the approach to bilingual education. Do you have some input into those aspects, and what is the trend in terms of standardizing?

DR. LEYBA: I imagine that part and parcel of the tendency to improve the performance of children in a classroom will contribute to the whole idea of standardizing teacher outputs or presentations, whatever you want to call them.

We train teachers at our center. We have about 30 teachers in training, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Spanish-speaking, and fundamentally the training that we provide is to have experts come to speak to them and augment their regular classroom work at the university, plus require that they spend 10 to 20 hours a week in the classroom functioning as a teacher aide.

To answer your question directly, the system in which they finally operate will determine the standardization of their performance.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I would like to know how often are you called upon to make this presentation?

DR. LEYBA: Too often. No. It is not too often. I would say Yo can tell you over here. I can never find out where you plug in these wires. Yo is always so generous to come over here. I think it is about four times that we have done this now in the last six, seven months.

MS. HERNANDEZ: It seems a tremendous tool to educate people.

DR. LEYBA: It is. You would think that some of the media would want to show it between 3:00 and 4:00 in the morning.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Any other questions?

Dr. Leyba, thank you very much for your most enlightening presentation.

DR. LEYBA: My pleasure.

MS. HERNANDEZ: We have with us --

MS. DAVIS: Can I just suggest that maybe the Educational Committee may want to sometime maybe schedule a meeting to visit the center. I have been there and it really provides a good background and basis for the kind of things that are being done that we need to know about. I am sure they could provide some little room where we could meet.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Also for the record, I would like to welcome our Committee member Art Gearring.

We have with us this morning Joseph Duff, an attorney with the Los Angeles Branch of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People, who will speak on the legal developments in the L.A. Unified School District desegregation and quality education.

Mr. Duff, welcome. Thank you for being with us.

MR. DUFF: It is indeed a pleasure for me to be able to address you. I know some of your work over the last couple years. I did have occasion to read your report done on state education officials' liability and responsibility in school desegregation. I commend you for that work.

We have been trying to continue that effort, as you know, in the federal court. I am going to take a few moments to address you on updating you as to the legal situation in school desegregation in Los Angeles. My remarks may touch on some other cities that are involved also in California. I know a little bit about some of them, mostly about the Los Angeles situation, which I have been involved in personally since 1977, as one of the counsel in the Crawford case in the state court that was before Judge Egly.

I have continued in the capacity of local counsel for the NAACP and other branches in a case called "NAACP, et al., versus LAUSD, et al.," a school desegregation case in the federal court.

Let me say this about Los Angeles school desegregation: As you all may or may not know, there is a long history of desegregation litigation in Los Angeles, beginning in 1963 with the filing of the Crawford case. The Crawford case started off on the theory that was based on "Jackson versus Pasadena," another 1963 decision, and that theory essentially was based on a finding by the California Supreme Court that school officials were required to

desegregate school districts when there was racial imbalance in the schools; that is, they were not required -- they were required to act not just when they were intentionally segregated schools, but when there was racial imbalance, that is, in the so-called de facto-de jure situation. That opinion had limited authority.

School districts in 1963 believed that the language indicating there was an obligation to act was dictum and not a rule of law. When the Crawford case was filed in 1963, the Los Angeles School District took the position that that rule did not apply to them and litigated the case forcefully, and it was not until 1976 that the California Supreme Court in Crawford versus the Board of Education very directly said that the rule under the California State Constitution, different from the Federal Constitution, would be that school desegregation would be required regardless of cost or regardless of fault; that school desegregation would be required in both the de facto-de jure situations they found in Los Angeles, and even though there was proof in the record that there was de jure decisions, that they did not rest their decision on those grounds. They were going to rest their decision on the broader ground of requiring action regardless of cause.

What that caused for us is that we were in court in 1976 trying to implement a plan in the second largest district under a record that essentially had shown some evidence of intentional acts between the years 1963 and 1968. Essentially a record that had been so divorced in time that

the public did not understand what we were doing and the language of the Supreme Court said "you did not have to prove fault."

Many people in the general public did not understand what was being corrected in the Los Angeles school case, what were the deficiencies and thought, as the press attention and the attention of some of the parties in the case focused them on the school bus as being the issue and, more particularly, focused upon this school bus when white children were riding on the school bus, and the issues of whether or not you could have voluntary or mandatory desegregation.

We got ourselves bogged down in those kinds of controversies from 1976 all the way through 1980. As you know, in 1980 -- 1979, actually, Proposition 1 was formulated and passed by the voters by a large majority vote. That was a proposition promoted by Alan Robbins. That proposition sought to reverse the rule of the Supreme Court that said that school districts had an affirmative obligation to act regardless of cause. That proposition was cleverly written to state that there was no obligation that could be enforced by the court on a school district unless there was a finding of segregation under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, and the Fourteenth Amendment required proof of intent on the part of the plaintiffs to prove intentional acts and purposeful acts to bring about school segregation.

That put us basically in Los Angeles what I

refer to as "back to the drawing board." Some 17 years later we were back to trying to prove intentional segregation.

The theory that we were abdicating the federal court now is the intentional segregation theory. In this case we are going on the traditional cases that have been proven in Columbus and Dayton, Ohio, where principally the NAACP has demonstrated through courts, through the use of factual and historical background, that school districts were segregated as of 1954 intentionally, and after 1954, which is the date of the Brown case, that the school districts did not take affirmative action to undo the previous segregation that was in place in 1954.

When we filed our action in 1981, we sought to start a case and to prove it in the traditional way. The school district again has very forcefully resisted our efforts. We have been bogged down for three years on appeals over the question of whether we will be allowed to go forward and to prove the case in the manner in which it was to be drawn.

The Ninth Circuit ruled last September that we would not be permitted to go into any proof of any issues prior to 1981, which was the time that Judge Lopez dismissed the Crawford school desegregation case, which would leave us in the position of trying to prove intentional segregation.

It was a very compromising type position and we asked the Ninth Circuit to allow us to reargue the matter and to redecide that question. They did agree to allow reargument. We had a reargument in April before the 11

members of the Ninth Circuit and we expect a decision within the next few weeks on that question.

In Los Angeles, the Los Angeles federal case, we also took the opportunity to prove liability against state educational officials. As you did in your research, you showed some of what the responsibility is of state educational officials for the desegregation processes in California.

This is a strong state system that we operate in and has always been a strong state system. State education officials have very strong powers to do very specific things with respect to administration of school districts and specifically with respect to school desegregation both in creating the circumstances that bring about school desegregation and for undoing the conditions of present segregation.

There have been eras in California history, especially in the late '60s, where the California state officials were very active and influential in trying to do something about the school segregation problem in California. With respect to the Los Angeles district, the state has taken a strong hands-off policy, allowing the Los Angeles district and the plaintiffs to fight it out, and whatever came out in the litigation, the state would be satisfied with.

That particular stance has been something that has, in our view, created conditions that allow the state to participate in the segregation. It is our intent to prove on a historical basis and up to a contemporary basis that

state officials have been involved in both the intentional segregation situation in Los Angeles, and have acted ineffectively to undoing the situation. The state, again, has forcefully resisted any attempts to bring them into the lawsuit and the latest action that came out of the Supreme Court two weeks ago I believe was a denial of the state's writ asking that they be granted immunity from involvement in school segregation cases, recognizing some immunity under the constitution for the state, asking that state education officials be given that same state immunity.

The Ninth Circuit had ruled that they did not have immunity and a statute that was passed by Congress -- I don't remember the whole name of the act -- but it is an act that really deals with remedies in school segregation cases, that that statute had advocated the immunity of state officials and, therefore, they could be sued in a federal court by plaintiffs such as the NAACP branches on behalf of black students.

The Ninth Circuit gave us a favorable decision and the United States Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal of the case. Now we have in the case the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, three of the principal leadership developments in education. They will be asked to answer the Complaint. We will go through the discovery process with them to put them in the trial and prove the case up against them also.

I wanted to say about the present situation of

segregation in Los Angeles, we were very much in the spotlight during the period I am talking about, especially in the '80s when buses were actually rolling and children were required to ride buses in both directions. There still is a very large program involving minority children bussing into essentially white-area districts. When I say "minority children," I used "minority" only in quotes because, as you all know, in Los Angeles the minority group that is referred to is a so-called combined minority. It is actually a conglomerate of nonwhite groups. The white group is actually in a minority position in Los Angeles. I think the percentages are in the 20s for the white group, 23 for the black group, close to 20 percent for a conglomerate of Asian groups. I think the Hispanic group is in the high 50s now. Again, a conglomerate of Hispanic groups.

The Los Angeles program that is existing now is a so-called voluntary program. The definition of volunteerism that is used is one that says a parent can either be involved in a desegregated experience or not be involved, as that parent decides.

The Magnet School Program is one option. The so-called voluntary PWT is another. They have one called "Continuing Voluntary Pairs," which is a voluntary program that was left over from the previous pairing program, where they allowed students who wanted to continue going to the other school to have that opportunity and they would provide the transportation, which is essentially like the PWT Program. There are in excess of 30,000 students participating in those

so-called voluntary bussing programs. They are 99 percent of the combined minority, mostly black, some Hispanic, a few Asians that are riding their buses to school in white areas of the district in the West Side and the San Fernando Valley and some in the south of the district.

The Magnet School Program was very highly touted in Los Angeles. The program never was very large or significant in relationship to the entire district. It was one of the largest in the country and most aggressive. In terms of its promotion, it only affected 50,000 students in the district.

The Magnet Program has, in my view, and in the view of my organization, been a quasi-successful program. It has been successful for students that have participated in the program, from my own experience, that the Magnet schools that are operated in Los Angeles are essentially more active and interested in vital schools than the regular schools that operate in Los Angeles. Some of them are the best-kept secrets.

My children attend one of the schools that operate under that system. On the whole, the district has been diminishing its support even for the Magnet schools. If I was to be permitted a little bit of advocacy in this situation, I will say to you that one of the driving forces for the whole of putting energy and reform and some equity in education is having a school desegregation order. I think that our experience in Los Angeles has demonstrated that is true.

When the desegregation order was disbanded, the energy for innovation, for equity for sure, and for putting some more stimulus into the fairness of the school system has dwindled away and very fast. If I was going to make any advocacy to this organization, I would advocate that you pay special attention in your efforts to look at how quickly the support for school desegregation has gone away and how quickly that lack of desegregation support has affected the educational process in the schools, the very segregated schools that we are dealing with now.

We have now in Los Angeles schools called "hard-to-staff schools." It is another euphemism term for segregation and one that is calculated to put the problem in terms of the people who are administrating to the schools, the teachers and administrators. They called it hard to staff because they don't want to teach there. The students are still required to attend those schools. They are still going there from kindergarten to sixth grade and junior high to high school. They are receiving what I believe is an inferior education on the rationale that their schools are hard to staff.

These problems are, I think, a tremendous -- should be a tremendous embarrassment to the district because the desegregation process has not been placed because there is no court order because the court is given the power over running the school district completely and totally backed by a school board. The attention on these problems have dwindled and they are mounting. I saw the slide, the bilingual education slide, and I agree with the author of that.

Bilingualism also was a beneficiary of school desegregation and not an adversary. We were able in Crawford in the state court to focus a great deal of attention on the need for bilingual education and also the identification process of identifying students who needed bilingual education. There is a tremendous undercount of students who need a bilingual education.

We were focusing a lot of attention on that before Judge Egly. That has kind of dwindled away dramatically. The Center for Law and Justice, who was one of our co-counsel, was making great strides in both presenting the matter to the court and doing some community organization. That has dropped away. The problem with school overcrowding, which is another friend of the desegregation process, not an adversary of school desegregation. Another one of the issues on which we were able to start to focus on was the school desegregation order going away. The schools overcrowding issue has now arisen to more than crisis proportion. Next to segregation, it is probably the most critical issue now. The fact that there are admittedly inferior overcrowded situations for a great number of children in this district, almost again 80 percent nonwhite students who are experiencing this with the band-aid of the so-called year-round school only alleviating the problem, which is that the schools are too big to have good teaching, too big to have the children develop the same kind of experiences that the children in the underutilized or the children in the normally enrolled schools are achieving.

It is one of the most dramatic issues, again, that this board could point to and look at and call it what it is. It is worse than the bussing-versus-Ferguson situation, which was in the '50s. We were allowing it to exist under rubrics, which are really platitudes.

The students are still required to attend those schools. The only avenue that they are given is the avenue of riding the bus to another school.

I was told that I would be a target for a while. I would invite questions.

MR. SHARE: Would you have some specific recommendations that you feel could be effective at this time as it relates to the L.A. City schools?

MR. DUFF: The most specific suggestion I would make is, number one, there should be a cry, a call, or some kind of a statement made to the Los Angeles School District to continue to make public assessments of what is happening in the desegregation process. That has completely stopped and dried away. There are no community groups that have influence that can require even a report from the district.

When Judge Lopez terminated his jurisdiction, he made an order that said that the school district was to give a public report on the status of their voluntary program, and he did not require the report to be made to him. He said it had to be a public report. The report only came out this year, 1984, or late in 1983. The report was an abomination, and they spent, again, thousands of dollars on this process, only to do something that has no effect.

At one point when Judge Egly had a monitoring committee, there was a great amount of energy. There is no one looking at what happens in the Los Angeles School District, no one with authority, no one with resources. The Los Angeles School District is an enormous institution with enormous resources. If this group were to do anything, a call for accurate, frank statements about school segregation from the Los Angeles School District would be something that would be my recommendation.

The second would be, as you speak to the California Board of Education, because you have authority, you have influence there, too. Their participation has been one of hands off, and they have continued that type of background. They have considerable authority in not only Los Angeles, but throughout the state to require this kind of specific information and require that it be done on a certain schedule. Those kinds of requirements, opening up the system again to public light so that these euphemisms and half-actions don't rule the days as they have been. That would be my No. 1 recommendation.

Secondly, I think that the litigation has to happen, has to be supported. Without the litigation we don't have any real movement. I would recommend that you take actions to find about litigation that is going on and the litigation resources and keep yourselves informed, especially in the Hispanic area.

The groups that are in litigation on the Hispanic issues on overcrowding have been more or less kind

of hedging around the issue. They want to come in, but they are afraid of the resource commitments that it takes, the political animosity that comes about in the community.

If this group could speak to some of those kinds of issues and give support to some of the litigation aims, even if it is just vocal support.

MR. MONTEZ: Does the State Board of Education generally -- I think you are more aware of it than we are -- generally operate under what the state superintendent brings to them, or do they have any flare for independence at all?

MR. DUFF: I am going to speak historically. I don't know what the working relationship with the board and Superintendent Honig has been, but the greatest times, the State Board of Education, they have been essentially independent people.

The strongest regulations for desegregation were drawn up by the state board superintendent. Rafferty was the superintendent. Those were basically shoved down his throat. When Superintendent Riles came in with a so-called affinity or like for desegregation, he took again the hands-off approach. The board became less independent and less was done.

I know they have independent powers.

MR. MONTEZ: They have that authority to take whatever action they decide they want to do; it just generally has been of late a hands-off attitude?

MR. DUFF: Yes.

They have had a continual struggle with the

superintendent as to who was going to exercise the authority. The superintendent is the chief executive operator of the board. Some of the strongest times of the board has been when they intended and have been assertive.

MR. ORME: A few moments ago you talked about three different entities. One was the State Board of Education, the other was the Department of Education.

MR. DUFF: And the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

MR. ORME: Should any approach go to each of those departments separately, any approach from this Committee?

MR. DUFF: It is our opinion that, yes, I think that they should be separate; that the superintendent has powers, especially his persuasive powers in this area of desegregation which are enormous but are not used and would take a separate type of approach from the superintendent from this kind of body, and, obviously, from the national commission to affect Mr. Honig and get him to move.

He has basically got a clean slate in this issue. His participation has been, again, hands off. He did participate in our San Francisco case.

Just at the time administration was changing, we were having a settlement in our San Francisco school case in which the state was also a defendant and Superintendent Honig did come in to say that he was not going to get involved in trying to undo what had been done previously. He had a favorable approach that way. There had been some foot-dragging in terms of the state support. It has mainly been by the San Francisco School Board.

MR. ORME: You are referring to the Superintendent of Public Instruction?

MR. DUFF: Yes. I think the State Board of Education is a board that has been amenable to inquiries by this kind of organization, this kind of advisory council and, obviously, from a national commission that there are many people on that board that do listen to what you say. What you say is influential and obviously what you say can be used by community groups when they present matters to the board and to back them up.

As far as the State Department of Education, your inquiries to the state superintendent would really be the same as the State Department of Education. He really covers and controls that organization.

MR. PERKINS: Mr. Duff, I have a couple of specific questions and then a more general one.

For my information, you said that the Ninth Circuit had limited the period that can be used. Was that original hearing before the full circuit or was that a three-member panel?

MR. DUFF: It was a three-member panel.

MR. PERKINS: There is a good possibility that the full bench may reverse that?

MR. DUFF: Yes. It is hard to call them ahead of time. In arguments it looked like there was some support. It was 11 members of the 22 members.

MR. PERKINS: The Ninth Circuit, as a whole, has been pretty good on these issues. Just for the record, I think

we should note, and I want to be sure that I have your figures correct, I think you indicated that there are approximately 30,000 students involved in these desegregation projects that you have described.

Is the number correct?

MR. DUFF: No. I said that there were 30,000 that were doing the PWT plus the so-called CVP, which is Continuing Voluntary Pairs. Then there are the Magnet schools which are probably about 15,000.

MR. PERKINS: That might be a total of 45,000.

MR. DUFF: They have another group of students that are involved in satellite bussing, which is for overcrowding purposes. I don't know the full numbers in the satellite program.

MR. PERKINS: What would you estimate; 10,000, 20,000? Are we talking very large numbers?

MR. DUFF: Small numbers. Less than 5,000.

MR. PERKINS: According to the information that we have, the population of the district is approximately 556,000 and approximately 20 percent of that is white, which means that about 445,000 students in the district are minority students. If we take 45,000, we are talking around 10 percent, so if you add the satellite bussing, we are probably still only talking about only 12-percent maximum minority students who are involved in any kind of desegregated education programs and all in the district.

Is that essentially correct?

MR. DUFF: Yes. It is even more startling, because

in the neighborhood schools the segregation is very stark, so that you cannot even assume that there is a lot of mixture in the neighborhood schools, especially in the black community you have a lot of hundred percent -- combined minority, either black or Hispanic in the school. The plan in Los Angeles would really only affect, I think at the most, only 60,000 students, even when the bussing was going on. Most of the minority students were not ever affected.

MR. PERKINS: I personally am distressed and have been about the fact that the school board and school board officials, and so forth, used the bussing issue saying, "This is very bad. If we didn't have to do this, we would do good and important things."

The evidence since bussing has stopped is that there has not been very much of that done at all. I would like to ask your opinion whether or not you think that a fact-finding session, investigatory session, by this Committee, involving members of the LAUSD School Board, the State Board of Education, and educational officials hired by those two agencies and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, whether that kind of general fact-finding session involving a full day or something like that would be useful?

MR. DUFF: I think it would be useful, as long as you required a good deal of information in advance. You ask for specific things to be given you in advance of your actual testimony. I know from experience with the LAUSD that if they have a one-day fact-finding hearing, they are very good at skillfully playing the hours away and not giving you any

information.

If you have the staff people ask the right questions and have certain requirements beforehand, much as the Little Hoover Commission did, you will have much greater impact.

MR. PERKINS: We have done that kind of thing.

Madam Chairman, I would like to offer a motion in that regard.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Seconded by Jack Share.

MR. PERKINS: I would like -- excuse me. Is this the right time?

MS. HERNANDEZ: If you like, certainly.

MR. PERKINS: You want the motion now? All right.

I would like to move that the State Advisory Committee conduct a full-day fact-finding session involving officials and members of the Los Angeles Unified School District, State Board of Education, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and that the -- did I say that we move that we do that? I guess I would prefer to move that the staff investigate the feasibility of doing that and doing the preparatory work and the Committee then to make a judgment subsequent to that.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Is there a second? Jack Share seconds.

Any discussion?

All those in favor?

(All Committee members responded "aye.")

MS. HERNANDEZ: Opposed?

Motion carried.

MS. HATA: You gave us an assessment of the Magnet schools. Will you evaluate for us the success and the failures with the program?

MR. DUFF: PWT is the permits with transportation, which has been around for a long time, since 1968. It was started on the theory that a student could transfer to a school in which they were in the majority to one which they were in the minority and have transportation provided. It was one of the outcomes of the 1970 trial. It wasn't being supported prior to then.

PWT has two large effects: Number one, on the students that ride the bus, that go out from the majority school to where they are the minority. I think that the years have shown that those efforts by those children have been worthwhile, that is why the program continues to be a popular program.

The students have been able to get into more integrative activities in the outlying areas in the west and the Valley and the areas that PWT is very popular, which are mainly the west part of the black area and the southwest part. Those programs have been popular and they have lasted and brothers and sisters have gone on this program.

The larger question for PWT is that in a system like this where PWT is the only alternative, the impact of PWT on the sending school and the children at the sending school, I think, has been probably the greatest detriment that can happen to those schools having such an outlet.

Number one, what it causes at the other

schools, resources leave to follow the children. There are programs where money actually goes with those children out to the Valley or West Side and leaves the center city school.

Number two, the premise of the program is without having it as part of an old comprehensive program is that you create conditions in the neighborhood where you make children believe they are not going to get a decent education in their neighborhood school and they do believe that. What that means is that they are promoted to leave. Some people call it a "brain drain."

What happens is you have some children who are the most aggressive, maybe sometimes the most bright, where parents are the most upwardly mobile, leave the neighborhood, which leaves a situation in the neighborhood school which is harmful to the children that remain. They are not a representative group of the neighborhood. Many of the other students have pulled out.

Finally, the PWT Program has caused I think the district to be less involved in what happens at those sending schools, because the program essentially cannot work if the schools are performing well. It has allowed them to rationalize the failure. They say, "We don't promote PWT," but in reality they do promote PWT by keeping the learning levels, reducing the curriculum offerings at the school.

That is PWT. It is a critical assessment of the program, even though I think that the process of riding the buses has not been harmful to the individual students.

MS. HATA: The pairs?

MR. DUFF: We had 52,000 pairs in 1980. When it went to the continuing voluntary pairs, it shrunk down to less than 5,000. Only one pair remained as a formal pairing, Canfield-Crescent Heights pairing. None of the other schools kept their pairings. It just allowed the students from the minority school to stay at the predominantly white school.

The Canfield-Crescent Heights pairing was a pairing that existed before the desegregation plan. It is a neighborhood-to-neighborhood continuous pairing.

I live in that neighborhood. I can attest it has helped our neighborhood in terms of having that kind of a greater sense of neighborhood. The pairings around the rest of the city were done away with. They have not been revived. We are back to the neighborhood school process with the one wave of minority kids going to the predominantly white schools. The pairing was really the target of the Robbins amendment.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much for being with us this morning and for the very important information you have been able to share with us.

We have with us this morning Ruby Aguilar, who is a community liaison, Parents Involved In Community Action, who will speak on the Los Angeles Unified School District student achievement and community relations.

MS. AGUILAR: My title is really executive director. I serve as a community liaison and I prefer that title.

Before I get into my discussion, which is going to be in the area of student achievement, I wanted to address a couple of things that surfaced with the previous speaker;

one dealing with overcrowding, because that is almost strictly a Hispanic problem, and he forgot to mention one aspect of the integration process that caused the problem, and that is when we went from a 30, 35-to-1 teacher/student ratio. Because of the integration case it was changed to 27-to-1. That automatically threw a lot of schools into overcrowdedness. Not to say that even without this we would not have overcrowded schools. We would not just have them to the magnitude we have today.

The intent for reducing the number of the student/teacher ratio was hopefully to increase student achievement. I have got to say that that has not been the outcome.

The other thing he brought up was on the diminishing participation in the PWT Program. The problem exists at the sending school. I must say that part of the problem exists at the receiving school. There has never been any great attempt at the receiving schools in the area of human relations to accept these children, make them feel like they are actually part of the family and not just poor relations.

As we get into student achievement and we make comparison, you are going to see that just because these children are being bussed, they are not necessarily receiving the same level of education that the other children were receiving who were from that immediate neighborhood. These children's scores, the school district did it only once. I don't think they published it. That showed that while these

kids were performing higher than the sending-school children, they were still not at par with the children from that neighborhood. This information will show it.

I am sorry, but somehow I thought there would be about 10 people. I only made that many copies. Some people are going to have to share this material. I was hoping to be on after Zane Meckler. What I deal with piggy-backs on the demographic material I know he presents. You will just mesh it as we go along later.

What I have done, and everybody is familiar, and this is the kind of information that you see that has probably turned people onto this issue, and that is that the newspapers continually print information about school achievement. When you think about it, it is the only way we have to measure it. If you are producing parts in a manufacturing plant, you have a quality control person. When we talk about students being put through the educational process, we must have some sort of measurement. We use reading and math and writing ability as that measurement. Before we get into this, we have got to discuss briefly again are these tests culturally biased? What are we measuring?

Simply stated, yes, tests are culturally biased, simply because the tests are done within context of vocabulary. I don't know why this is so difficult for people in education to grasp. When you stop to think of language, culture is inherent in the language. If I were to ask you is there a left sock and a right sock, and you happen to be Asian and you don't deal in the area of absolutes, you would say, "If I

am wearing those toed shoes, there is a right sock and a left sock." If I ask a child, "What color is an apple?" the child may have a green apple in his lunch bag, but he has got to say red because he has got to think in absolutes.

That is not to say that a child cannot learn that and we do learn that, but that is the basic problem that we have with the tests. Children may learn how to decode well enough by the third grade, but then when you get into this area of vocabulary, that is where we fail.

The other aspect that is important is that of economics. As we look at this, we are going to see that there is a strong correlation between the economic level of that school, the families that send their children to that school, to the achievement level of the students.

The one that you have there compares school district to school district, because we focus in on L.A. Unified and well we should. It is the biggest school. It has over 500 elementary schools and lots of junior high schools and high schools. You can see on the second page that I can put all of West Covina schools on half a page and all of El Monte on the other half. We are comparing the gigantic system to a little school system.

L.A. Unified on this list is 220 average. You can see that the state average for this CAP test is 253. L.A. Unified is 3 points below the state average.

You would say there are some schools, for instance, Basset is 217 and El Monte is 219. I would like to comment that they should be investigating those school districts,

because while there is poverty there, it is certainly not to the same degree and extent as we have in the inner city.

Just looking at it, I would say there is definitely a strong feeling there of discrimination against mostly predominant Hispanic children.

Let's look at the second page, and you can see West Covina, and this was done only for comparisons. We have West Covina and El Monte. If the state average is 253, you can see that Contada and Loma and Mullhull and Wilkerson, all in El Monte, are performing within the hundred-eighty and below the two-hundred range, way below.

Many of the people who have gone to these neighborhoods have left barrio schools thinking they were going to get a better education out there. The houses cost a little more, the neighborhoods look a little better, so they moved out of East Los Angeles and the end result is they are getting an education equal to, and in some cases, lower than East Los Angeles schools.

West Covina is a little bit more affluent, but those schools that are lower, the 260 at California, for instance. You will find that that school has more Hispanic youngsters than, for instance, Cameron or any of the others that are listed as being above 260. These children may be also, again, poorer in this neighborhood, in the neighborhood of California, than they are at Cameron. Nevertheless, these children are probably better able to learn in that they are coming from Hispanic homes where economically they should be pretty much at par with the other kids.

If socioeconomic levels make a difference, then kids coming from the same level economically should be performing the same, and that is not the case in West Covina. That is definitely due for an investigation.

Let's look at Los Angeles. The third page shows Area G, which is where East Los Angeles begins, and I was limited to the schools that are listed in the newspaper. I never did get all the other outlaying areas. I am limited to San Gabriel Valley and Metro, which is where most of our people are anyways, although we are everywhere, but in larger numbers.

There is no school in L.A. Unified that does not have Hispanics in it. From 99.9 percent Hispanic, now there is usually a Vietnamese in there somewhere to at least 5, 10 percent in the Valley. We cannot say we are not integrating. We are spreading. I am an integrationist and I did bus my own kids for that purpose. You do not integrate for purposes of achievement. You integrate for other reasons and I believe in all the reasons. Achievement is another matter.

The schools in Area G, and here we have a profile. If you will look to where you have -- I am going to point out a couple things. Look back to where it says "Area H" and "B," and put your finger on Area H, B, and G. H -- and Grace Davis is from H. Of all the Hispanic areas, H is the one that does the best. You can see that they at least have three schools that are way above the state norm and you have schools that are above the district's norm, which is 220, the

district's average. You do have some schools and you can -- they are the poorest schools in the neighborhood. Usually they are located near a housing project.

You have Placentia, for instance, and Virgil Junior High.

Area H is probably the best of our regions. Region G is the next best, and you have a few schools that are doing reasonably well.

Robin Hill Lane at 285, they have 65 percent Hispanic, the other part is Asian. They have always done well. They also seem to attract gifted youngsters, although it is not Magnet, as far as I know. Then you have a unique school, City Terrace, which is right in the heart of East Los Angeles. City Terrace, and I would like you to compare City Terrace to Kennedy Elementary, because they are only blocks apart, drawing from the same community. City Terrance is only 3 points below the state norm, not the district's norm, and Kennedy, which is on the second page, is at 190, one of our schools in Region G.

The reasons are a few. For instance, City Terrace was one of the original five exemplary bilingual schools, and so they set in practice there the concept that these children could learn and then the children performed and then, sure, some of the teachers left, but the history was made in people's minds. It was implanted in teachers' minds that these kids could learn, and as teachers come in, they are expected to perform.

One gal who just started working there, a friend

of mine, an acquaintance, she had been in the region office. She had been at other schools. She came into City Terrance and she said, "My God, I never had to work so hard in my life."

She had been an advisor at the region office. That is the bottom line, hard work. What you see then is that even though a school may be economically disadvantaged, whatever that means, at City Terrace, if the teachers work hard, then the children perform. Another thing that these schools that are performing high have intensive programs that deal with language building. Why schools do not implement that, I don't know.

To make that point, you can look at a page that is called C. C is a predominantly black neighborhood, Watts -- just west of Watts. These schools continually perform even lower than Hispanic schools in spite of the fact that these children are English speakers. It is a matter of vocabulary. It is also a matter of discrimination.

Your reports have pointed out that color has to do with teacher expectation. We have color interfering, we have teacher expectation, we have economic level, and if somehow that could be addressed, I think we would start to progress in our schools.

I was told 10 minutes. I have got to say this: The legislature is always trying to do something and they are always coming up with bills. We are inundated with all kinds of bills that are supposed to address this issue, and people drafting programs to deal with it. In my participation with

these committees, I find that they always go back to the thinking of Title I or Chapter I, which is a deficit concept, deficit thinking. They are always coming up with the kids' health programs to get glasses and trips for kids. They are always rebuilding. All that hasn't worked.

Another aspect that does work, and that is parent participation. This little sheet, turn to that one. I did a study of Region G and Region B and I averaged out the growth in each of the regions over a three-year period, and I found that they grew about a percentile, 1.2, more or less, per year. Those schools that allowed us to come in, their growth was almost double that, 6.2, in the same period of time. Not to say that the P.I.C.A. Program was a major factor. I think it is important that a principal or school that opens itself up to outside participation and parent involvement is more willing to make changes within their school and that is unique. That administrator at that school is a key factor.

Let's look at B, and almost identical figures happen. The average growth was 3.8, while for those schools that opened themselves up to our program, it was 6.6.

Parent involvement is crucial to the achievement at these schools. I passed out this little article from the Times. It says that the worse students improve the most because of Title I. They mention the same 1.4 percent growth that shows in the regions as well. They mention it in this article that it was statewide. Then they say that all the emphasis has been placed there. No. Very little emphasis

has been placed. It is just merely taking its course. As people get used to taking the tests, they get a little better. It says that the top quartile is not growing, but seems to be dropping, and the reason for that, they explain at the end, is that the emphasis has been placed on the bottom level.

That is not true. The fact is that teachers tend to teach to average, and if in their perception the average kids in the group are low, then that is where they are going to be presenting the level of their curriculum. If we continue to give youngsters less than challenging work, they are not going to grow. Again, it focuses back on the teacher, on the staff, on people and not programs.

MR. ORME: You have a date for this Times article?

MS. AGUILAR: This came out when this other thing came out, so that was January the 8th. About January the 8th.

MS. DAVIS: Getting back to City Terrace, I could understand how the teachers can kind of perpetuate themselves, but how did that happen with the principal? Since the district has a lot to do with the assignment of principals, how do you explain that? How have we been able to maintain the level of the administrator there?

MS. AGUILAR: Community involvement. The president of UNO is a parent at that school. That has an impact on whoever is an administrator.

MS. DAVIS: I remember that school long before I had children of my own. It was so outstanding, I thought it was a private school. It was long after that I discovered that

it was part of the school system, because it was so unique. The Japanese community was predominant in the early days in that school.

MS. AGUILAR: They set a standard, yes. It did drop right before it was picked up as a bilingual school. They had slipped.

The problem at Kennedy also is that they have an open-structured situation. It is very noisy. I have gone in there. You should go and visit those open-structured programs and try to hear a teacher. Sit at the back of the class and try to hear what the teacher is saying and you cannot. You have got to hear in order to learn. Why they haven't put up walls there, I don't know.

MS. HERNANDEZ: What is an open-structured school?

MS. AGUILAR: It is simply a whole hall, huge hall, and then they just set up -- Kennedy has about four teachers giving instruction, 27 each, within this huge hall.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: There used to be a theory that it was a closed room that was messing up the kids. They also thought that the open structure would be useful for setting up learning centers so that kids could move to different places. That type of instruction needs enormous discipline on the part of the teacher and extraordinary abilities to work individually and in small groups. It takes a very special set of people to pull off that type of situation.

MS. DAVIS: I just want to share with you this: I rode the bus both ways early on, and when I went over to the West Side, the reception of there -- of course, I didn't sit

in on the classroom, it certainly was an indication. First of all, and Ruby was a monitor in some schools, they would not allow the buses to come to the front of the school and it was only through the efforts of the actual bus drivers that said, "Hell no. We have liability responsibility. We are not going to let them off over there. They are likely to go someplace else."

Then when they got off, they lined them up like prisoners and did not allow them any opportunity to mingle with the other students that were around there, and they literally marched them directly to their classroom. That was just the way.

When you talk to the principal or the other administrators there, they thought they were handling this very well. On the other hand, when you drove from the West Side to the East Side, it was unbelievable, especially the first week. The schools made an effort to bring in the parents, they had banners welcoming students, they had a snack. In one school there was obviously Jewish children coming. They found the one Jewish teacher they had and made sure she was there. They paired friends so they wouldn't feel isolated and they held students who cried. It was just unbelievable. The whole school focused on those students that were coming in and they quickly integrated into the whole thing.

That was just because I think our nature is one in terms of being so sensitive to people, and so on. It wasn't the other way around. I want to say that if we can,

for the future, you have got two people there that participated in the whole desegregation thing. Joe was one of several community-oriented attorneys who spent hours and hours burning the midnight oil relating to the community. I know Ruby was responsible, with some of the other people, in bringing teachers and principals who publicly could not jeopardize their positions, but who shared in very personal experiences.

The briefs that they prepared, I am sure they are a matter of public record, the judge never allowed us to actually present. We never got our day in court in terms of all the knowledge that they accumulated.

If we are going to be doing the whole day hearing that we could have access, just pick their brains more, but also have access to some of the records that were developed during that period, it was an incredible experience that should be brought out.

MR. SHARE: I also shared a similar experience growing up in East L.A. in going to some of the schools you are discussing. My memory is kind of a police action around the schools.

Getting back to the point on the principal, I also agree, like the head of a ship, I think it is extremely important to get the kind of principal that has a commitment and dedication to children.

Is there - data that you know of in terms of how principals are elected or selected to go into some of the schools?

MS. AGUILAR: Yes, there is a testing that goes on, and depending on their training and experience, and they are selected by peers, and what happens is the committee historically has been made of men in polyester suits and they continue to pick men in polyester suits of the same color and blues eyes that most of them had. Most of them graduated from USC. That is changing very slowly.

When you sit on a committee, you tend to pick people much like yourself. There has been an attempt to change that committee. It has been a very slow process. We are still not to the degree where we can have enough people on those selection committees to start giving the necessary points for our people to surface.

MR. PERKINS: Specifically in that selection process, is any part of it focused on the matter of sensitivity as opposed to general education training? Is there a point system?

MS. AGUILAR: Not for that.

MR. PERKINS: Is there a general point system?

MS. AGUILAR: Yes.

MR. PERKINS: In that point system, no points are given for bilingualism or sensitivity to minority needs or any of those kinds of things, so I can draw the conclusion that this is additional evidence that there really is not any serious ongoing concern for the problem.

MS. AGUILAR: It depends on who controls the committee.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: There was the first form, which is the personnel form that is filled out. Then if you

make that cut, there is an interviewing process. During that -- presumably that is where questions are raised about experiences you have had in integrated settings and minority settings and working with language minority students and their parents. Those points are supposed to be racked up, added to the rest, and from that a priority list of the people who make a certain cut point is laid out. Usually there are about 50 potential principals placed on a list.

MR. PERKINS: Are the interviews scored? If I am conducting an interview, I have a sheet here that says I should get 20 percent for this?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: The problem is that the questions are not uniform across every interviewee.

MS. AGUILAR: It is up to the panel to ask the questions.

DR. HIRANO-NANKANISHI: It is a Gestaldt type of thing; how many points should we give this person's ability to convey information.

MS. AGUILAR: I have a girlfriend who got on this panel. I don't know how. She gave all the Hispanics a hundred points and everybody else 50 or less, and that was to offset everybody else who had it the other way around.

MR. PERKINS: I want to be sure I understand. If I am part of the interview panel, I make a judgment and say that this candidate scored 72. In arriving at that 72, does my interview provide any categories at all or is it entirely at my descretion as to how I decide to give that 72?

DR. HIRANO-NANKANISHI: There are not, to my knowledge,

any written instructions.

MR. PERKINS: It would be possible to have an interview sheet that would say "Maximum 25 points for this," "Maximum 25 points for this," and "Maximum number points for this," and "Maximum 25 percent for sensitivity to minority students," and that would guarantee some input?

MS. AGUILAR: But then it depends on who makes that up.

MR. PERKINS: It makes even more difference who is writing it down. If they have got a block to fill in, at least they have got to think about that. What I am thinking is that my suspicion is that, given your description of the panels, that they probably don't even think in those terms and that is a very minimal kind of thing that could be done. That would be a very tiny first step that would help.

MS. HATA: I want to thank you for bringing the materials with you. Maybe the final question can be, What recommendations do you have for our committee?

MS. AGUILAR: I did want to share one last sheet. That is the one that deals with the high schools. That is the end of the line for your kids, our kids.

The high schools only do as well or as poorly as the sending schools. I think if we are thinking long term and real change, it has got to happen at the lower grades, the elementary level.

As far as getting more culturally sensitive people, it is going to be more difficult. We are dropping out all but 36 percent of our students and that 36 percent that manages to get out is performing very poor in comparison

to other parts of the community. We are not getting any -- few professionals out of our high schools.

What can be done as far as your Committee is concerned? I thought about it. To the degree that you can focus on all the different types of biases, that should not be used to lower a teacher's expectations and the same ones that I mentioned, that, is, socioeconomic levels, color, race, and the kinds of things that you are doing, having it surface. I don't know what else could be done from this Committee. You are really talking about changing individual teacher's perceptions. That is where the key is; that is what we are having the difficulty with.

The shortcut seems to be community.

MS. DAVIS: Can I ask Joe a question about this?

Looking at the high schools, you look at the high schools that are in the black community, and Ruby made reference to. I am asking this in light of the advocacy for bilingual education.

Since reading and vocabulary seem to be a problem with the black student, is there any way that you can see the situation between the need to teach English or vocabulary to the black community as something that could tie into our advocacy to bilingual education?

MR. DUFF: The scores are horrible. The problem of language acquisition is central to one of the deficiencies in black high schools. That is what bilingualism is all about. I have been one of the silent advocates for bilingualism. We have had a big controversy over this question of what they

call black English, as to whether or not that should be pushed. Our organization has taken a position over the last couple decades against the introduction, against so-called black English programs in the district. We believe that there should be instruction in what we call standard English on a very strong basis in the schools, but we also recognize that there is a great problem in the dialectical, what they referred to as a conversational.

It exists for the black students just as it does for Hispanics and other non-English-speaking students. It is not as well accepted in the public's mind.

Bilingualism and language acquisition is a very important part of any program. It is not happening to a great extent in the black schools.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

MR. MONTEZ: I know you have been very much involved with the Mexican-American Commission. One of the things that the staff in our work of preparing, not only for this open meeting, but for the future, which we are going to do with Los Angeles City schools, we have heard an awful lot about the Los Angeles City schools being an isolated and insulated institution. We on the staff of the Civil Rights Commission have a very difficult time getting information from the district. Beyond that, how much is there to that? Besides the commissions, I know they don't have any human relations components. They don't have any community relations anymore. Does that tend to insulate them more?

MS. AGUILAR: Yes.

MR. MONTEZ: That fact that we have heard you feel is a truism, that it really exists that way?

MS. AGUILAR: Yes. They have taken it away from that level of citizen participation, at least receiving information, and they have taken away by the restructuring of the commissions, they have taken away much of its power and authority. It is simply an advisory committee now. They are focusing more at the local level and parent involvement, as far as student achievement goes, they are not doing away with that. They encourage that, at least the superintendent and the staff do, not the local schools necessarily. They do not like that participation at the higher level and that is the one that got the information. That is the one that had access to whatever reports were being made.

The district is real clever. Somebody mentioned the district is very clever about the information that it does let out. They will have in-house reports and those don't get out no matter what, unless you steal them off of somebody's desk. Much of the information -- they do a lot of research, but it is kept in-house.

MS. DAVIS: Could you mention this; this is a famous graph.

MS. AGUILAR: Yes. It hasn't changed from that time. It is still the same. We doubled. The norm at the time we started in '71, when the commission, the Mexican commission, started pushing the district to do something about reading at that point, the norm in the minority schools was 15 percentile. This is on the CTBS. It is a different test than the ones

before. After seven years of pushing, it doubled. It went from 15 norm to 31 percentile points. Integration came on and we were pushing hard, then all of a sudden reading took a back-burner position to integration and there it's been stagnant and integration has left for all intents and purposes and the refocus on reading has not been made.

The bottom scale from zero to a hundred is the percentage minority at a given school. The ones that are at the hundred, those are your predominantly minority schools. The test is from zero to a hundred. 50 is norm. You can see that 50 norm, in the minority schools, there are very few schools and they are all saturated at the bottom below the 50; whereas those schools that are more integrated are above that norm, above the 50 percentile norm.

MS. DAVIS: Even if the minorities moved up, the white schools also moved up, so that the gap between the predominantly white schools and the minority has never closed. We move up, but they also move up.

MS. AGUILAR: I should have brought the chart for 1970 that showed this school here and these schools down here. It shows you one thing, Reading 1 being taught at any school.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Any other questions?

Thank you very much for being with us.

We are going to take a short break. Before we do, I would like to acknowledge the presence of Committee members Pat Fillippini and Carnella Barnes.

(Recess.)

MS. HERNANDEZ: We have with us today Dr. Marsha

Hirano-Nakanishi, Associate Director of the Institutional Research and Managerial Information Systems, California State University at Los Angeles, who will address educational concerns of ethnic advisory committees to the L.A. Unified School District.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Let me give you just a brief history. I was previously the president of the former structured Asian-American Education Commission. Ruby Aguilar used to be the president of the Mexican-American Education Commission. We both worked together on a study of the Unified School District. Some of your questions with respect to insulation were addressed. I was also technical consultant to Monroe-Price and worked with the monitoring committee. My last job before the one at Cal State L.A. was as a research director of the Los Angeles Center for Bilingual Work.

The commissions, as they were originally structured, were started off by the Mexican-American Education Commission way back in '68-'69 when students in East Los Angeles schools walked out in protest of total lack of education that they were receiving in those schools.

Headed by a group of people, the school board at the time was forced to set up a group of people who would be the eyes and ears of the community with respect to the school board, and the eyes and ears for the school board on behalf of the community. They were also in the position to make strong recommendations on the nature of the instruction, personnel, curriculum, and the like, in the schools. As the years progressed, I think increasingly it became difficult

for each of the commissions to get much feeling of give-and-take with any of the school board members or with the administration. I think many of the commissions moved to trying to do it themselves. All of the commissions, in one way or another, managed to handle grievances arising from the schools, from parents, even from teachers who had to remain anonymous or their jobs would have been on the line, trying to set up programs the schools did not provide regularly and taking on issues, trying to continue on taking on issues.

I think as desegregation became more and more prominant in the area, everyone pretty much got cut off from having any kind of impact on major decision-making at the district level, such that things would happen overall. Our commission, one of the smaller ones, the Asian-American Education Commission, was probably the only group in Los Angeles Unified School District that paid any attention to Asians. Being 7 1/2 percent of the population makes everyone think that your problems can't possibly be very major.

The point is that today there are well over 40,000 Asian-Pacific students in the Los Angeles Unified School District, the largest concentration of Asians of any school district in the continental United States. The problems are not minor.

Looking at the census projections through the year 2000, you know that Asians and Hispanics are expected to grow enormously and largely through integration. One series of issues I guess that our commission is particularly concerned about are language minority students. Those are

primarily Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Samoan, students.

It was the Lau versus Nichols Supreme Court decision, plus the Office of Civil Rights' May 25th memorandum which clarified what was to be provided to students with English language deficiencies. A two-pronged approach is supposed to be given to all students.

Their English deficiency is supposed to be addressed, that is, insofar as they can't follow the instructions or the materials which are standard English in a classroom. I think to some extent the black-English-dialect issue is an issue here, too. People here have not focused on the instructional implications of everything being written in a certain form and the dialect difficulties. One problem is supposed to be directed at that.

There is English as a second language or that type of instruction that is given at USC. That is done on how to present students so that you can understand what you are saying, what the book is saying, and respond to you.

There are a whole series of techniques that almost every teacher in this school district ought to be trained in. Language minority students are not found in only X numbers of schools. There is at least one in every school and many, many more.

It is this type of technique that really ought to be part of the standard teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District. The second problem, I think -- this is important and almost always forgotten -- is that while you are teaching someone English, this does not mean that the child

does not have something in their head. They have learned concepts. They know what blue is, but they might call it azul. They may know how to read already in another language. Certainly many of the Asian students coming from Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Japan are far advanced in mathematics. They don't simply know what the teacher is talking about in English.

Studies have shown that the textbooks in the foreign countries in mathematics are far advanced, even in Mexico than in our standard textbooks here. The students are coming in with a contextual knowledge. While they are learning English, that is not supposed to be slowed down. If they are coming in ahead, I think there is a real reason to continue to teach them in their primary language.

In any case, that is the general setup for language minority students. The problems come, in one sense, because we don't have enough qualified teachers generally and specifically for language minority students. With the bilingual aspect, we are talking about bilingual. I think all too often what we found in the classrooms are teachers who are monolingual either in the language other than English or in English. This does not help the child at all, particularly those who only know Korean.

The role model that is presented to the child in English is not quite what is expected in the textbooks as well as what is in the classroom. I think much more has to be directed toward insuring the teachers are, in fact, bilingual when you are calling them bilingual. To my

knowledge, no real test is given of their English competency at all. I think that needs to be thought through and addressed. There is a real problem when I go into a bilingual classroom and I can't understand the teacher who is speaking in English, and that is what I understand.

The more massive problem with the quality of the instruction is that many of our teachers simply are not qualified. I think one step that has been taken is some basic level of competency to the subject matter they are supposed to know. I think if that test is fair and this is the best test that is given in California -- I have never seen one and I think what needs to be done is a validity study of that test. If it does show very basic things, like can this person read and do arithmetic and people cannot pass that test, then we need something like that. At least it will screen out people who have no business attempting to convey information that they don't really know.

I think more importantly a good teacher has probably been well defined by the work being done by the late Rod Edmonds, and I think carried on by Larry Lazott. Essentially Rod's idea, and he is a black educator and superintendent of schools in Michigan and a firm believer that poor children and minority children and language minority children can learn. There is absolutely -- they can learn. Anything the school districts have said about their inabilities to learn was garbage was his initial premise.

He went about proving it by going to

predominantly minority-poor schools. He identified that there were effective minority-poor schools, went in to look at what was going on in those schools and found there was strong leadership from the principal. That made that person the captain of the ship, made the teachers work, invited the parents in, listened to what their problems were. The teachers were respected as the instructional leaders in the classroom. Their work paid off because they were doing what they were hired to do. They were given the kind of resources and support that is important to have before you can get going.

If you have the wrong books and no materials, you have to be very resourceful to pull off a classroom. It sounds very common-sensical.

As many of you may know, for decades the Coleman Report was always referred to as proving that schools don't matter and those poor minority kids are just dumb that way and that is the way it goes. It is all in the home.

This new line of research which focuses much more on what goes on in the schools is very important. I think that was the point that Ruby was trying to make. Desegregation has important social commitment behind it.

When we put our children in those programs, it is because we believe in people integrating. Instruction can take place anywhere and perhaps not in grossly overcrowded schools where they are now teaching in the bathrooms, but in any kind of a normal school setting, quality instruction can take place and there has been very little attempt by most

school districts to do this with more than a demonstration point of view.

The Rod Edmonds approach is being tried on South Central Los Angeles with the Washington High School preparatory complex. Washington High School, which many of you may have seen on "60 Minutes," it was heralded as the worst school in the nation, worst violence, et cetera, has been reorganized and they have had remarkable changes in their violence and truancy, and et cetera, statistics. Largely because it was put under the same type of notion regarding their principal and the type of instruction that goes on and cooling down the whole environment and making the students feel that the school, in fact, was their domain and not someplace that they were visiting.

If you have the opportunity, you may want to speak with George McKenna, who runs Washington High School or prepatory high school. There is a middle school that is connected to it --

MS. AGUILAR: While environment has improved, teacher perception has not changed and, therefore, academic levels have not increased.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: The situation had to cool down first. That is now the next thing they are working on. That is a demonstration project. It is not something they are trying to do in every school. Appropriate materials are also, as you know, probably not well available in the school district. Beyond that, the problem essentially is you have to know what to expect of kids at every year as they proceed.

We tend to have something written like that now.

A check that then has to be made is that the books that you provide the teachers with for each of the grade levels matches kinds of skills and concepts you want the kids to know. It is very hard to teach the kids the things you would like them to do unless you give the teachers the materials to do it. That has never been done. Moreover, the books have to be written at the level that you want kids to be able to read them, be able to test that, be able to read at.

There has been a continuing problem of late to gear the reading level of the books down low so that you can teach the content, but then the kids go to take the CCBS and they can't read the test; hence they miss the item, but it doesn't give you a valid picture of what their problem is. Did they not know the content or could they not read the sentences?

That is of a particular issue for language minority people. I think it is a continuing problem as the text-books are being written downward to equivalent to taking a full-scale novel and writing it at the Readers Digest level. That is a problem. If your expectations for kids are here and what you are providing them with is down here, they will score at this level. They will do pretty much whatever you give them. I think that is another problem connected to expectation, but really a resource-in-materials issue.

Particularly for Asian students and their parents, one problem that we face with the Los Angeles Unified

School District was the translation of things that are supposed to go out to parents, parent consent forms, what the goals of the district are, programs that are offered. All the desegregation options were not made available to the Asian parents because while the student may speak English, many of the parents are not English speaking and reading. They rely a great deal on their children to tell them what they brought home from school.

We had tried very, very hard to press for a centralized translation center. They didn't like the idea. Everything is fairly decentralized and basically what happens now is the resourceful principals translate everything. People who know them call their people and try to pick up copies so they can make copies. We figure we need ten to twenty thousand of those forms going out to our parents. It seems it is a waste of money how it is done now. It depends on the resourcefulness of the principal or teacher in any given school.

It is also required in state law for schools that have 15 percent or more students of the same language in any given school, I think. Something like that. We also tried to organize, before the district decided to shut down our commission, a college fair for the parents of Asian kids, again with the notion that for those of us who read English the financial aid form and all the requirements that parents have to make to a college endeavor are hard to understand, but for our language minority parents of Asian students, it is impossible. They have no idea how to fill out any of these

things.

We had made arrangements with some of the best counselors in the school districts and arranged for translators to run sessions for Asian-Pacific parents, except the school district decided to shut the commissions down. There are many stereotypes of Asians. One of them prevailing is they are all engineers, accountants, or nurses. The schools again tend to reinforce that by suggesting that Asian students take more math courses and the like.

The second thing that we were also trying to organize was a career sort of conference where we would bring in people like Judge Takasugi, who is not an engineer or accountant, or Tricia Toyota or Gary Shirikawa, who is an associate producer for television, social scientists, other journalists that run against the stereotype. That is another thing we did not get done.

I guess another thing that all the commissions worked on was the textbook review with respect to race necessity. One was the depiction of "the homeland," which is often inaccurate. A recent study done by Rochell Beck and Nancy Anderson reviewed standard textbooks with respect to Latin America. It is incredible the things that are said about the indigenous independents and the like. It was horrible and those textbooks are still in the schools. The second part of textbook review has to do with the experiences of minority people here in the United States. There is state law with respect to not approving textbooks that are misrepresentations and distortions. What has happened is

that textbook people have either eliminated everything; that was there are no misrepresentations or distortions, or the old textbooks are still sitting there. We really have not seen, except for one good shot in the '70s, any incorporation into our standard textbooks of the Black, Hispanic Native American, Asian-Pacific Islander; even white ethnic experiences here in America. It is still waspy in its presentation of American history and literature. I guess that is the other thing that the commissions used to do.

The commissions -- frankly, I have not kept up with them -- I think I received one notice that I could resubmit something to the commissions. Essentially what had happened is that each of the commissions functioned pretty independently and had different styles. The Asians' commission was not terribly fiesty, but we tried to do what we could. One has to go along with one's group of people.

The point is that the board really did not like, I guess, to be told that there were problems; one, in their operations, because many of these things that we pointed out are law. They are supposed to be implementing things according to the law. There were bottlenecks all along the way in terms of implementing and making operational many of the programs geared for minority youth, language minority youth, and even just the regular students. The regular students aren't even getting what they should be.

I didn't think they wanted to hear too much about that, let alone raising anything novel. With respect to your question on personnel, I was also on the Commission

for Sex Equity. There is a consent decree that is currently in force that a certain percentage of women must be taking the exam for any level of administrative test, must make the list, then after a certain point they actually must be placed somewhere in those positions. That is about the only thing that I know of that directly addresses administration with respect to sex.

MR. PERKINS: The decree only addresses sex?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: The statistics were better there.

MR. PERKINS: Better there than in most areas?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: The problem with Asians is we were very over-represented. There is sort of a unity -- I am a Japanese-American. Most of the promotions were going to Japanese-Americans, some were going to Chinese-Americans. Virtually none were going to Filipinos, Koreans, Samoans, or Vietnamese. I think that is a travesity of the whole thing. If you are going to do an affirmative-action-type approach, then you can't let the Japanese take all the positions. There is a problem there. People were told that it was too complicated to keep statistics otherwise, that there was something wrong with the Samoans because they just wouldn't take the test to begin with. A lot of things occurred with every ethnic group before. I think that was a bizzare way to go about things.

The last point I wanted to make is still about Asians, and it is a difficult one to raise, but it is a growing issue in the Asian community, and I was asked it by

several people. There has been an interest in whether there has been violence towards Asians. I guess when I was a commissioner I received calls from parents and distraught students. In fact, one horrible case where a young girl was raped waiting for one of the buses on one of those satellite things, and she did not speak any English and she got back on the bus and she didn't tell the bus driver, and she wasn't going to tell anyone what had happened, but she told her friend and her friend told a teacher at the other end who called us, and we put them in touch with the Pacific-Asian Rape Hotline.

We couldn't do very much with the case because the parents and the student really did not want to pursue anything regarding the situation and that is typical of what happens. I think when we read the papers where the Chinese woman was pushed and killed in the New York subways by a deranged white teacher, I think, or the student who was murdered in Davis or the Chinese engineer who was murdered in Detroit by auto workers, basically you are finding out about Asians being victims of violence only when they die, because that is when it will become public.

There is an undercurrent of, I think, anti-Asian sentiment reemerging that is really hard to get any handle on because someone has to die, essentially, for it to hit the papers. I don't know how your group can really go about looking at much of this, because it is very hard to investigate when people will not come forward. There appears to be increasing stress, racial stress. Should any of you be very

creative about it, it is worth addressing.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. Does anyone have any questions?

MS. DAVIS: Has there been an increase in mental health problems of the Asian people, immigrants that have come in here? We keep talking about how we react to them, that there must also be some kind of reaction to encounter all of these situations.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Yes. Under the National Institute of Mental Health there is an Asian-American Mental Health Institute in Chicago, and they have been encountering through their studies a lot of difficulties once the immigrants come from a more technologically advanced place to a place where they have had gold-paved-streets kinds of images about. And they having to deal with the realities that are very difficult; the language barrier plus so many of the Asians have come at the time of the economic recession that there has just been a lot of tension that occurred. That has been very hard.

MS. DAVIS: Also the thing I have encountered is where parents had a professional -- have had professions in their country and when they come here, because of the licensing difficulties and what-have-you, and I would imagine that they have high educational expectations for their students and yet because of our system and the language barriers, I imagine they are encountering that kind of shock of not being able to obtain for their children what they were able to obtain.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Asians have historically made

enormous contributions in their education. There is a backlash of the state level now because so many Asians are receiving Cal grants. Generally what I have noticed, at least in the statistics that I have been able to see, is that the Asians tend to score very, very high on the SAT math and score very, very low on the SAT verbal. As a result, they are getting into colleges from the CSU level on up.

I think the expectations are always a little disappointing but it is hard, for example, for those who are professionals in Korea who are now shop owners here to adjust to their kids sort of not quite making the levels that they had reached in Korea. Generally students appear to be doing all right. The problem is on the verbal end, and once they get to college it is a very, very difficult problem.

At most institutions where children are not native born, they are severely handicapped in their ability to read and write at a college level.

MS. HATA: Do you have any specific recommendations as to how the various communities could provide meaningful input? Would you go back to the old advisory system, or do you have any other suggestions?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: I think it has to be multilevel. The study I worked on ---

MS. HATA: Could we get a copy of that?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: It is about that thick. I can see if we have one left. It is called "How Do You Impact On A Decision-Making Body When It Has Got 600,000 Kids And A Structure That Is Bigger Than Most Cities In California?"

One notion is to go inside. That is essentially what the commissions did, as well as well-intentioned teachers and administrators who moved their way up. It is very hard to work inside with the bureaucracy and the best things that those groups did was to have access to information that no one else would even know about. That is certainly what I used it for.

Most of the people on the inside could help to provide information to others who are interested in doing things. I think in order to put issues more strongly on the table you need some sort of well-financed and organized structure outside the auspices of Los Angeles Unified School District, which has the information seeking and analytic interpretation kind of role, so they can lay out what is going on and how you can fix it and then bring together powers that be to rest on school board members.

The people who have the time to collect the information are usually not those who have the power to influence school board members. I think that is sort of hardball politics.

I think what Ruby has been working with, and most of us, is working at the school level parent work. In the absence of a strong principal, well trained and organized parents can bring to bear pressure on whoever is there to provide instruction to their students. They can find the teachers who care, they can find anybody in the school that they can work together with to make the ship run. If you are stuck with Captain Blye, but you got a bunch of people who

really care, you can take it over essentially, and the very sophisticated ones don't even look like they take it over; they just make it run.

It is very, very hard to do district-level activities for citizens who for any type of group it is very daring and much of what you do results in very little that is major policy.

It actually was mandated that schools had to pick one way to teach kids how to read, where in grade one you get phonics and in grade two you get phonics. Since that nothing really statewide has occurred.

MS. FILLIPPINI: I had a question about the newspaper clipping that we received this morning regarding the San Marino School District and some of the problems that have arisen in San Marino as a result of a major increase in predominantly Chinese population in a district that had been formerly probably as segregated as any school district in California.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: It is hard to keep people out that have capital.

MS. FILLIPPINI: I grew up in that area.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Currently the L.A. County Human Relations Commission is doing some work informally in trying to bring the groups together in dialog. What seems to be happening on the campuses is sort of the San Marino natives are having difficulty dealing with the wealthier Asians who have moved into that school district. Also kids who are used to being at the top of their class are being

beaten out by the Asians who do better, especially in math.

The children aren't doing very well at living at that.

MS. FILLIPPINI: One of the things I noticed in the article was that apparently, in reading the article, there were some efforts on the part of some students and some faculty to involve parents who did not really want to be involved because of their cultural experience outside the school as opposed to being part of the school. That does give a different kind of problem because in most places we are looking at parents who want to be involved and no one will let them.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Historically Asians have not -- parents have not been involved in the schools. It is primarily cultural. The teacher knows what is right. Trying to explain to Asian parents that that is not the way things work here runs against everything they have lived with. Essentially you are seeing second-, third-generation people coming out where you see Asian parents active. I am not quite sure. We did a terrible job of trying to involve first-generation Asian-Pacific parents in a lot of things, because they were either afraid or just plainly reluctant to get involved in things on behalf of their kids, just as they were reluctant to even bring in complaints which were quite insulting, where kids were asked to change their names when they got to schools to Robert, things like that. There is a real reluctance to come forward at all.

MS. AGUILAR: I would like to add that because of the success that I have been having, our organization has been

having in Hispanic schools, recent arrival-type parents, that the Asian group has asked me to come in and do a session. I found those parents just as receptive to participation once they understand why their involvement is crucial. They are just as receptive as the Hispanic parents once they know. It is getting them to understand their role.

MS. THOMAS: You were talking about the lack of translation. What seems to be the bottom line there?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: I read them a section of the state code. I showed them what they said was available and translated for them, because they say it is. I called the warehouse where I was supposed to get these forms in the right language and they don't exist. I went back and explained they didn't exist, so they checked and found out things did not exist and it took two years just to get that far.

One problem that is very clear is that there is no centralization of anything having to do with minority students. You would think that the head of bilingual education would probably be in charge of making sure that everything that was bilingually related got taken care of. Absolutely wrong. That office does not even have the information on where the bilingual certified teachers are located.

One thing that is important to us that have only 7 percent of the kids was to make sure our language minority kids were, with the second column being how many of the teachers are bilingual in the English language. They don't have any chart. I think the Office of Civil Rights

went in and got the school computer printout, then copied everything, because you can't get a copy of that; then you run over to personnel or something else and you try to find whoever is in charge of that with the per-school placement of people who are certified. This is basic management stuff.

How do you know you are doing a job unless you place the people at the right places. When it comes down to translation services, nothing is centralized. The district office translates what they need to translate, the school level translates what they need to translate. If the legal office has a form, they find their own translator, and nobody knows that anyone has translated any of this, although it is apparently at the warehouse.

They told me that they had translated the thing, so I asked them what the problem was, and they said they couldn't find printers, so I reminded them that there were Asian-language newspapers for every community and I am sure they had printers. There was essentially no commitment. If there had been a commitment, and someone had been placed in charge, it would have been a lot clearer. Many of us have been arguing for a centralized translation so that anything that would go out to a parent would be translated, and it just never came off.

I am waiting for a kid to get hurt on a trip and the lawyers should come in and take them to the wall because there couldn't have been parent consent.

MR. MONTEZ: I am sort of bothered by, pardon my expression, only because I am sort of bothered that we have

made sort of a systematic assumption, which I would call an Anglo-urban assumption, that if parents are involved in the education of their kids and it came to mind when you mentioned that Asian parents generally are not involved in the educational system. What are we satisfying by bringing parents in? That seems like a cop-out for the system that they can't educate the children unless the parents are there. Is it a shortcoming on the part of the system? Are there facts and data today that really indicate that if parents are involved in this system that they do better, or is it that parents create pressure for teachers to be better, teachers with that particular child or whatever? It almost seems that the Asian prerogative not to be involved with education should be respected.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: This is from having taught some graduate courses at UCLA and having a lot of foreign students in my classes, that the educational systems in Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, are centralized, built from the British model. There are tests you take along the way. Everyone learns the same thing and expectations are high; very, very centralized system. It doesn't matter what anyone thinks. It has already been set and is all there. In the United States we have this sort of split-brain. We sort of have centralization but we also believe in local control, which is premised on every little local having a say about what to go on.

In our study of the politics of school districts, we looked at Los Angeles, Boston, and Atlanta. Los Angeles

was the most decentralized, the most local control. It was the most permeable in a sense, because you couldn't really pin anything on anyone. It is not really an insulated system. What we found was lots and lots of information was flowing. In fact, Ruby, most anyone, if you kind of figure it out, can get pieces of paper, not the most important ones. You can't do that in most school districts. Los Angeles Unified is very permeable. It is very consultative. They will set up another ad hoc committee again and each of us must have sat on at least 10 or 20 of them. They are real good at responding. It is just that the decision-making structure is one that is hard to identify.

It sometimes does not appear -- it is not clear that the board is the decision maker or the superintendent or the superintendent and the board meets outside. It is just unclear how decisions are made in that school district. I think that is what made it especially hard in Crawford was that you get a plan that is this thick and it was very hard -- it was impossible to make sure that everything was going on. It was impossible to even review that entire document to make sure that what they were saying they would do was, in fact, something new as opposed to something they were required to do under the law anyway.

I think after reviewing it pretty carefully, it was very hard to find what was new.

MS. AGUILAR: To answer your question, you were referring to student achievement and parent involvement. It is the same thing for Mexican students as well, where they

do have the same structure as the European. Parents are not used to participating. The reason you need parent involvement is because a child can be in the sixth grade, and be functioning at the first- or second-grade level. If the parent is relying on the report cards that are going home that shows your kid has a C average, you don't really know what your child is doing. You need to be involved enough to go in there and find out what level is your child functioning at. That is where the involvement comes in and that is why it is important.

The perception of the teachers is that Asian students are brighter, so you have a higher expectancy level of Asian students. The child's perception is that these kids can do better and therefore they teach higher skills. That doesn't happen to us. A classic example was that the L.A. Times carried an article that said east-side school has three, four kids that placed at the top level at a state science competition. Those children were ESL students, Asian youngsters.

We have Mexican youngsters who are two, three years above grade level in chemistry and math, but the perception of the school is that those kids cannot do as well, therefore these kids were not placed into chemistry and math, but they were placed into the lower classes where you find all the retarded, not mentally, so these kids are bright kids that drop out because they are wasting their time.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: I just finished a study on Hispanic drop-outs. Basically 42 percent of all Hispanic drop-outs, based off of some census statement of 1976, drop out

of school before they reach high school. All of the drop-out programs are in high school, which means that almost half of the Hispanics in the United States don't even make it to that point where they get that last shot.

MR. PERKINS: 42 percent drop out before they get to high school?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Right. I think that reaffirms all of the efforts that they intended came in too late. My study tended to show that it is junior high school that breaks their neck. You are in the elementary level. At least there is one teacher that you can halfway relate to. You see the same group of kids in your class. If you are already inclined toward not being terrific, you get to junior high and now you are one of thousands, you are run into seven different classes, you see people for 30 minutes.

When we interviewed a bunch of kids about what they thought about elementary school, they could always remember something negative and positive. When we asked them about junior high, they said, "I didn't feel one way or another about it." They just pulled away from it entirely, a total alienation. They didn't make it into the high-school door. They had been completely cut-off in that junior-high-school age. That is not too surprising. That is also when all your chemicals and hormones are going crazy and you hit this structure which is very, very hard to deal with, and if you are already on the road for not having done well in school and felt good about yourself, I think it is those junior-high-school years that can kill you, and it turns out that it is

also a period of time where a lot of Hispanics are held back again.

That is a critical time not to do something quite so disruptive to a young person. Again, they are teen-agers and they are already a bit out of sync with the world. They have been with these other kids all through elementary school and now they are not going to the eighth grade. They are going to be stuck with these little sixth-graders coming in.

I think a lot of kids are playing "kiss it off." You can't handle that extra level of humiliation.

MS. HERNANDEZ: This study, was it state level or national level?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: I used national data. A copy of the report can be received from the National Center for Bilingual Research.

MR. PERKINS: Seems to me there are a number of pressure points and we can't very well attack them all. I would be interested in all of you or any of you as to whether or not you think we might do more good if we tried to put some pressure on the state level or whether we would be more effective in dealing directly with LAUSD.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: I think the state level probably won't help a lot at this point. Part of the problem is that half of the students in the state are in L.A. County and L.A. County is mostly made up of LAUSD, when they talk about the Big 8, the Big 8 school districts, but LAUSD is like a major powerhouse force. Everyone has difficulty dealing with

Los Angeles Unified.

I think one thing that everyone has brought up, it has been a long time since anyone has hit them for the need for information again. They are specifically asking them for reports.

MR. PERKINS: Let me ask: It seems to me we have got two definable issues here; one is quality, and the other is access. I wasn't thinking that when I asked the question, but in thinking of about what Mr. Duff said earlier, would there be a difference in the answer to my question if we are talking about access segregation, desegregation versus quality? Maybe on the issue of quality the school district may be on the issue of segregation, the state board and superintendent of public education. Would that be an appropriate distinction there? Do you understand what I am saying?

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Yes. Besides the state board and the superintendent, it would seem to me important to somehow hook with the Legislature. They ultimately make most of everything that shows up in the school districts.

MR. PERKINS: Seems to me the only way we can really deal with the Legislature would be to hold something like a fact-finding commission, develop a report which we could then be put in the hands of legislators.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: Or contact some of the people in the Assembly research office. I am sure they have done things there in support of the various committees.

They are the ones that came out with the recent report on where the horrible schools are in California, and the

like. Certainly the difficulties of segregation in Los Angeles Unified are massive. I hate to bring up, and I suppose some set of alternatives include more metropolitan notions, although we have gone that route before with the expert reports.

MR. PERKINS: You can't even do that under Proposition 1 until the suit that Mr. Duff was talking about is won. You can't address metropolitan until you establish the ability to deal with the district.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: You get from them some better data. My own sense of -- I think they will have better data because the 1980 census is complete. It may give you some better sense of how far one would have to think. I know that back when we were working with the experts, just trying to drive people to different counties and school districts was painful. People doing any kind of analysis in that area will have to be very creative about thinking through what are feasible solutions if one gets broader than Los Angeles Unified. I think that needs to be done in advance of a lot of things, because it is a hard planning process to do. It is very, very tricky.

One of the problems in Crawford was people were asked for things tomorrow and things take more time to collect information and to analyze and think through what possible solutions there may be. The court may not have been presented with sufficient and thoughtful recommendations. I think that is part of what went askew in that whole case.

L.A. is very, very complex and I am not a lawyer or a judge, but I don't think he got enough information to

really proceed with the full breadth of the situation. It is very massive and very complex.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Doctor. We are running, again, behind schedule and we need to move ahead. Your comments and information were very helpful to us. Thank you very much.

This is Eugene Mornell, the Executive Director of the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission who will address remedies for educational inequality.

MR. MORNELL: Thank you. I was very interested to listen about what each of the speakers have said. I agree with it all, but it was a sense of dejavu, because I think, beginning perhaps in 1963, those of us who have been involved with the school district have heard very much the same thing. The details have changed.

In response to one of the last questions, if I were to advise you what to do, it would be not to get bogged down in all the details that have been presented to you this morning.

Dr. Nakanishi mentioned the rising anti-Asian violence. The L.A. County Human Relations Commission held a hearing in November of last year on rising anti-Asian bigotry. Our report is coming out next week. It received good coverage in the Asian press. It resulted on another hearing being held in San Jose, one in Sacramento. The Orange County Human Relations will be holding another hearing. I understand the Civil Rights Commission in Washington is planning on some sort of study. I think the fact is there the question is what to do about it. We have been involved in two projects in the past

two years connected with the Los Angeles City schools. One we called an exemplary schools project, where jointly with the Los Angeles superintendent of schools' office, we sponsored a contest where parents, school administrators, school board members, citizen groups, civic groups, could identify, could nominate what they consider to be exemplary schools in Los Angeles County by some very loose criteria, including academic achievement, intergroup climate, and various aspects of human relations.

The nominations, I think we had about 45 schools nominated. The nominations were then reviewed by a voluntary committee of university faculty who visited the schools and selected 10. 5 of the 10 schools were in the Los Angeles Unified School District, including Washington High School, 95th Street Preparatory School.

There are some good things happening in the Los Angeles Unified School District. They are happening because there is an excellent principal, excellent teachers, excellent regional superintendent. Another event we held, we held a hearing on what has happened since the McCone Commission Report following the Watts Riot. We had some interesting testimony from Phil Jordan, who is doing some excellent work in one area of the city. Good things are happening, but at the same time there is this decentralization that some of the speakers have talked about. At the same time, there is no such thing as a district-wide policy on multicultural education. At the same time, there are these problems of translation, at the same time the district is a mess. Nothing is happening uniformly

throughout the district.

If we were to -- I would say that the most intractible civil rights or human relations problem in Los Angeles County is the school district. Our commission held a series of five hearings throughout the county two years ago in which we asked groups to come in and identify the critical issues of the county. The second most important issue was education. Everyone believes that education is the way to solve our problems. It is the way to solve human relations problems. It is the way to help the next generation to achieve good jobs. It is the way to solve the economic problems of our time and everything else.

At the same time that people are identifying education as the primary problem, they are also identifying Los Angeles School District as the most flagrant violator, and they are saying it is the most discriminatory school district in the county. I say all that because all these problems have been going on for 20 years. The conservative school boards of recent years have done no more damage or no more good than the liberal school boards of 1963, '65, '67.

If that is true, then the problem is so complex -- I don't want to say there is nothing we can do about it; I think there is. The problem is not with the school board. The problem is with the administration of the district and some of the problems that have been mentioned before.

I think the problem before the Advisory Committee, if you want to look at this issue, do you handle it piecemeal and look at each of the individual problems that

have been described by the previous speakers or do you say the problem has been going on for 20 years and why get bogged down in the administration's program. That is what they would like you to do; let them set up a committee to deal with them and solve an individual problem and meanwhile the problem will go on for another 20 years.

We have been asking ourselves at the County Human Relations Commission how we can go about dealing with the Los Angeles Unified School District and not get bogged down. How can we pressure the district to make massive changes without getting bogged down in the details, without coming back 20 years from now and listening to the same types of testimony and listening to the same problems.

If, in fact, you take that point of view, then if you proceed to hold a hearing, as you voted earlier today, then I would suggest you have to develop an approach to that hearing where you do not let the school district, the administration, snow you with lots of details and with lots of reasons why this has not been done this year, but it was done 17 years ago, but somehow the program petered out or something like that.

We have been looking at what are the pressure points on the school district; in what ways can the district be forced to change substantially, and we are in the process of this discussion. We are trying to develop a project of our own. We would be happy to work with you on a project, if that is feasible. We have been looking at what does the district fear. The district fears, first of all, decentralization or

the breaking up of the school district into smaller school districts. It fears the loss of money and the administrators fear the loss of jobs. It fears the federal government and the state government no longer allowing it to waive requirements that the federal government and state government have imposed on it, but the district is continually allowed to waive.

We don't know where we are going with all of this and we know that many of these approaches run contrary to what we have always believed. The idea of breaking up the school district or the idea of looking at voucher systems -- I was talking with Joe earlier about that ---runs contrary to everything we believe. I think there is a certain reality involved here.

Desegregation is much less possible today than it was 20 years ago; if we are talking about black or Latino or Asian or white desegregation, because the numbers of students aren't there. Demographically the district has changed. What does desegregation mean today? No one in the civil rights or the human relations field is going to disagree with the idea of desegregation and integration as a goal, as something that is desirable. It is simply not realistic. Metropolitan desegregation is not realistic in the current political context. The only thing that is realistic, I am suggesting, in coming out of our discussions, is that we say we have had 20 years of trying to get at the school district to improve the quality of education for the children who are receiving the poorest quality of education, now what

can we do to change that within a relatively short period of time?

We have said we can attack the district in one of these areas, at one of these pressure points. How we go about that, we are not sure; whether we hold a hearing of our own, having speakers come in and talk about how the district might be broken up or decentralized. "Decentralized" is the wrong word. How do we create out of this one school district five or seven or eight school districts? How do we create smaller schools? How do we get away from the overcrowded and year-round schools? How do we deal with the condition where there is no school district in the county and perhaps in California that has so many substitute teachers and those substitute teachers are in black and Latino schools primarily and the teachers are not coming out of the state universities and the University of California to become permanent teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District?

Those are teachers generally. I am not talking about minority teachers. What I would urge you to do is, having heard all these details, and you have a couple speakers more, take all those details into account, gather all this information, but then attempt to put that together in a big picture of what is going on. The big picture is that for 20 years nothing has changed. The children have changed, but the problems have remained the same.

Change does not come from the educators themselves. Is it possible for a group such as the Civil Rights Commission or any outside group to effect change? I think there is

probably a better chance, because there is more political leverage.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Questions?

MR. PERKINS: I think that is very good advice. What I would like to suggest is that all of you who have taken the time and come to talk to us this morning, if you are willing to do so, take a little bit more time and sometime in the next little while send a brief note to the Western Regional Office, putting down your thoughts as to how we might best attack this. Maybe kind of three different categories: what are the pressure points, what are the most effective places we can attack it. There is no point in the Western Regional Office staff reinventing the wheel which your Commission has already done. Then within that, how can we most effectively get people on the carpet and put some politcal pressure on them in regard to the teen-ager issues, desegregation and quality.

MR. MORNELL: The question arises in my mind to what extent the Civil Rights Commission in Washington will allow the California Advisory Committee to do what the California Advisory Committee might want to do.

MR. PERKINS: Phil is a paid employee of the Civil Rights Commission and, therefore, he has to give you what is the right answer from that point of view. I am not. I don't have to.

There are two things. First of all, I note just in the last few days in hearings before the House Committee, the House Committee dealing with appropriations,

I believe the article was kind of sketchy, indicating they are writing into the budget language two things at least. One, the Civil Rights Commission is a continuing commission, not a new commission. That is an internal matter, but it does have to do with the way the state advisory committees are viewed and operated and that was the specific purpose of it; and, secondly, that the Commission's present position, that state advisory commission reports must be cleared with the Commission before they are issued are not to be followed. That policy is to be reversed. If that prevails, then we are back to where we used to be. We can hold our hearing, issue a report, and do what we wish with it without the approval of the Commission.

The other possibility is that if the present situation remains, whatever is done with the formal report is only part of the process and the very process of holding the investigatory, the fact-finding hearing, if we can get that into the public domain via the news media, that in itself is as important as or maybe more important than the formal report.

I think there are things that we can do through that kind of fact-finding hearing regardless of the status of the Committee in relationship to the Commission. Obviously the changes, if we can do both, that is better. As I have listened this morning, I come more and more to the feeling that this is of a sufficient level of priority that instead of a day, maybe we ought to spend two or three days on it, attacking different parts of it. I can't think of

anything that we can better spend our time on. I wouldn't be willing to spend the time myself if I didn't think there was something useful to come out of it.

I certainly recognize the validity of what you are saying. The problem has been there for 20 years. Desegregation is obviously no solution. The Detroit case, the Chicago case, both dealing with metropolitan desegregation, have not provided remedies. Because there are no remedies doesn't mean we ought to throw up our hands and say we shouldn't do what we can to provide some partial remedy.

To come back to what Mr. Duff was saying, I don't think that anything that we do is going to be that effective until we get a ruling now from federal court regarding desegregation.

I don't care if it is one or five, the school district is going to do what is mandated. The voluntary is helpful but is not going to do it.

MR. MONTEZ: I have to admit to you, Gene, as long as I have known you, that in all my years with the Civil Rights Commission, I have never seen the independence of fact in state advisory committees ever being jeopardized by any political body, especially the California Advisory Committee. They will probably cease to function as a committee before they would give up their independence. I think that is the question that Congress is dealing with.

You have in your statements given the Committee some strong direction or goals that we can -- we all have to go through the process of fact-finding; that is, listening

to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board, and officials of the L.A. School District and board members before we can come to the conclusions you have already given us, which I think is really the direction we are going. I think we would agree with you that that is -- you have given us our closing chapter. We still have to go -- we can't do what other people are doing now and not having fact-finding meetings and concluding without listening to the facts. We wouldn't want to catch ourselves in that trap.

You have given us some good direction.

MR. DUFF: I would like to take the liberty of putting in context some of Gene's remarks with respect to our position. I do respect the historical work of the Human Relations Commission. I think we certainly don't agree with the proposition that says that desegregation is not realistic in this day and age. It has to be realistic or we won't have proceeding into the next day and age -- I think this Committee would be mistaken if it formulated its policies for California simply on the experience of the Los Angeles district or simply on the demography of the Los Angeles School District.

California is a multi-ethnic state and the policies that this body addresses it to should be formed on a multicultural basis and should not depend upon simply the number of whites that happen to reside in a particular area. I think your comment about it being unrealistic is based on that assumption that there is 20 percent whites, where in 1970 it may have been 60 percent whites. We can't make a policy on a statewide basis on that fact. We have gotto take into

account where people are and who is there and what is available.

The multi-ethnic State of California is an opportunity for us to say something to the nation that is different than what has been said in the past. I think desegregation is a viable method. It is almost a theology for all of us to carry us into the multi-ethnic and multicultural approach. We can't dismiss it because of the demography of a particular part of California. There are many cities here with a typical type of problem.

MR. MORNELL: I agree with everything you have said. I think what I was trying to say is that for the Los Angeles Unified School District 10 or 15 years ago, I doubt that any of us would have said that dividing up this district into five or seven or eight smaller school districts would have been the way to go, because it would have foreclosed all possibility of desegregation. We would not have wanted to move in that direction because of the goal of desegregation.

What I am suggesting is that for the Los Angeles Unified School District today there are issues, I don't want to say quality education. I don't want to distinguish between quality education and desegregation. There are issues of basic education for black, Latino, and Asian youngsters that make it necessary to look at how we can change the administrative structure of this district so we are not here another 20 years from now asking the same questions, and that perhaps breaking up the district is one way to at least put pressure on the district and that there are other ways to put pressure on the district.

I don't want to rule it out. I don't want to say it is not possible for most of the districts in this county. I don't want to say it is possible for state or even a goal for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

The way we look at putting pressure on this district today and improving the quality of education in this district today, I think has to be different from the way we were looking at things even five years ago.

DR. HIRANO-NAKANISHI: All of your solutions are also alternative solutions that were raised 20 years ago; political decentralization in a very watered-down form. They are currently functioning under something like that. Basically they still have had to address the quality issue separately. They haven't made great strides forward. It has lots of problems, when you think it through.

You are not hearing a -- everything has been thought about, is one way of looking at it. Each of the strategies have long histories that have been relatively well documented in many of the nation's large school districts.

MR. MORNELL: There are two basic ways to go, I think. One is to look at all the exemplary programs that are going on now, the things Phil Jordan is doing and say let's identify those outstanding programs and let's try to convince the district that they ought to put them on a districtwide basis, somehow take the programs and not just limit them to South Central L.A. or this or that portion of the district. Let's put some pressure on the district to implement these small programs in this district.

Another way would be to say this has been going on for 20 years, marvelous things are happening, but there has to be some way to make massive changes in the district and that has to be done politically. I am saying we are choosing, I think, to approach it the second way. Maybe we are just tired and we don't want to be around here 20 years from now.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Any other questions?

Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Zane Meckler, who is a staff member for the Los Angeles Unified School District and will be addressing the demographic changes affecting the Los Angeles School District.

Thank you very much, Mr. Meckler, for being so patient.

MR. MECKLER: All of you know about demographic change. Where I normally make a presentation of it, it would be silly to do it here. I want to offer you glimpses of four maps. I do not represent the district. The Community Analysis Bureau some years ago made four maps that really deal with the county. I will work backwards because we already know what has happened.

This is the county and the colored system is allowing for the Foothills. The county is white. Where you see a purplish-black color, it is heavily black. Where you see patches of yellow, it is Asian-American, and I am not going back to 1950 yet, and where you see mustard color, it is Hispanic.

The colors, in and of themselves, don't really tell you that much because it does not say "this is 75-percent white," or "87-percent Hispanic." It does tell you, in terms of 1950, '60, '70, and '80, that the ethnic enormities have expanded, particularly Hispanic.

If you went back to '50, '60, '70, and '80, you would see enormous Hispanic movement in other directions. This is the San Fernando Valley. There is much more Hispanic Valley residents in the East San Fernando Valley. If you divide San Fernando into where the freeway system bisects San Fernando, East San Fernando is heavy Hispanic. The traditional East L.A. is no longer the East L.A. It has moved into the San Gabriel Valley.

The black residents, if you had started with '50, '60, '70, and '80, it would have been where my fingers are. It would have begun to move south and west, and schools which were previously white were impacted by black expansion when blacks continued to come into L.A. County from elsewhere. That black immigration has much altered.

As you begin to look at barometers, such as L.A. Unified School District, the black population is about 23 percent and has really gone down from a high point of about 25 percent. Blacks, from a judgment point of view, are not mobile. They are either trapped in ghettos, or they choose to stay in affluent middle-class black areas.

Hispanic is enormously mobile. Almost every school district in L.A. County, with very minor exceptions, is about to change from white to multi-ethnic. The exception

are the Palos Verdes million-dollar estates and the San Diegos and a few others. Arcadia continues to be predominantly white. With that exception, the 95 school districts that really compose L.A. County have, which our unified is half the population of the school population, but the other 94 are significant. They are all changing enormously.

Really what I would say to you is in about two minutes is what I find is the obvious; that we are seeing enormous ethnic demographic social change and that while people know it, when they pause to reflect on it, they don't really know it. They are living in some sort of a world where I visit many of the classes as a guest and make these presentations. Maybe one little thing yet would just kind of make the point.

I made a presentation with slides that are now very outdated at Cal Poly in Pomona. It is a very integrated city. The Cal Poly staff is virtually all white and the student is virtually all white. I come along and what I am about to say does not communicate itself in these maps. I said, "Do you know that the entire San Gabriel Valley gathering at school districts together is already 43 percent nonwhite?" I thought there was a major heart attack that just went around the room.

There were two Hispanics in the room and they were as unprepared for this. It was as if you were to say there was a colony of Martians that decided to live in the San Gabriel Valley. What I am in a sense saying is that the ethnic data that confronts us in every dimension of life

does not seem to be digested. It does not seem to be presented and it is not coming through. As you look at graduate students and talk to them and ask, "What are you majoring in? What is it you are going to do professionally? Who do you think the constituency of what you are going to do is? Unless you live in an isolated ivory tower, you are going to be working with people. If you want to be a city administrator, are you cognizant of the fact that you are going to be dealing with a city that is different than you thought? Have you seen the school from which you graduated, no matter where it is in the United States?"

It begins to penetrate. Atlanta has changed or Fresno has changed. It doesn't come through as an organized body of knowledge. In talking with Laurie on the phone, and I mentioned the article about the Chinese students in San Marino and she decided to Xerox it for you today, I said public schools tend to be the barometer as to what is happening in a community. In some ways it is a misleading barometer. If you don't like what is happening in public schools and you are affluent, you can withdraw and send your kid to a private or parochial school and hide.

Public schools are more visible and to an extent reflect what is happening. I usually take the ethnic reports, as you may know, each two years. The school districts in the state are required to do a racial ethnic survey. It goes to Sacramento and is published and nothing happens to it, but I take that data and I do a running profile of, say, what Burbank Unified School District was like in '66, '71, '75,

'81, whatever, and I have got that data with me. You can see enormous changes where the white population has gone down more than 50 percent, where the major group growing in district after district after district is Hispanic; where in many of the districts the Asian is growing, and in almost all of the districts the black percentage is negligible. I wish it weren't so, but it is.

If you are a school administrator or if you are a university person preparing school administrators or if you are teaching in other areas of education, I wonder what they are communicating to the students. You are going to be managing social change and that ain't very pleasant. It could be, but it isn't now.

The chamber of commerce are all for the rich Chinese coming in. The social tensions come with this. It used to be a good neighborhood and they are wondering what is happening. I am being a little facetious here. Other areas have changed so dramatically that it raises questions. I have made presentations before the public librarians and you say, "Are you having people coming in here asking for books in foreign languages?"

"Oh, yeah, we are."

It doesn't dawn on them, until you are making a point, that North Hollywood is changing or whatever. "Are you having people who are coming in that don't read English? Do you have people on the desk who can speak to them in their language?"

Each become embarrassing questions because like

this LAUSD, they aren't translating into other languages. If I might for a moment try to avoid LAUSD, we are dealing in LAUSD as if the constituency was white middle-class and English-speaking. It was quite obvious that the figures for whites in LAUSD averaged out is 20 percent, but it averages that the white youngsters are more numerous in high school and less numerous in the elementary school. If you look through the birth date and youngsters being produced from the lower grades into the higher grades, the whites are about 16 percent in the elementary school, but because you add the secondary and elementary together, they come out at a higher figure. When you look at what is happening in other school districts, Burbank, the superintendent of Burbank School District, who retired, looked at his school district. It had been 90 percent white a few years ago and it dropped down to a little below 80 percent and it was declining slightly where it was 3-to-1 white. He looked at his kindergarten and was startled to discover that the kindergarten was 43 percent nonwhite.

Is there anybody sitting in here that does not believe that the Burbank schools will rapidly become 50-50, especially if you know who is giving birth and who is not? Hispanics tend to be younger and much more of child-bearing age, and besides how many youngsters they want to have, and the whites are older and nonchild-bearing age.

I brought pages. I could have flooded you with more material. I would be happy to provide it for you. I brought the county birth-rate trend and there is one local

page of generalizations that deals with L.A. County's schools which includes L.A. City. If you look at that fourth page you will see the trend in terms of birth rate. The birth rate is ascending rapidly for Hispanics. The Hispanic birth rate exceeds the white birth rate. The white birth rate has been dropping from 50 to down in the lower 40 percent. It may stabilize but it isn't going up.

If you look ahead to who is coming into the public schools, it is going to be more Hispanics and less whites. You could walk into a school anywhere, just close your eyes and say, "You people teach, don't you? I am going to make two generalizations? I bet your white enrollment is dropping."

You don't have to know very much to know that. Where the hell are they going to get more white kids from? The only way is if there was new housing being built. If it is a stable community without new housing being developed, the white youngsters are going to decline in number and that is happening all over the county, rather than school extraction -- school closing becomes the challenge. In the middle of the barrios in ethnic areas, the population is growing. We have higher birth rates and that complicates it. Generally where the whites are, it is a contradicting operation in terms of child-bearing age and youngsters who would come into the public school.

Let me move from talking about the numbers to some of the implications, again avoiding LAUSD. To me, one of the critical issues in an institute where you are raising --

I didn't hear the word mentioned before, the issue of equity. Equity, meaning whether minority youngsters are getting a fair or equal share of what is being offered. The issue of equity is becoming a very rapid political issue and a lot of people who don't know much about the issue recognize that that word is something you are vulnerable on.

The Commission on Excellence of Education reporting to the President had two dramatic paragraphs. I would be happy to make it available through Phil. In effect, Dr. Gardner, now the Chancellor of the University of California system, had said, "Excellence and equity are both absolute necessities and one cannot be achieved at the expense of the other." If one were to pursue one and not the other, if you had excellence and not equity, we would have elitism in America, a tremendous phrase. People are going to pick up on it. If you had only equity and not excellence, it was a form of demagoguery. You would be just paying lip service and not pursuing excellence.

If you are going to pursue excellence and not equity, and in my own bias, most people in talking about improvement of schools are talking about excellence, not equity. I brought with me --- I was up all night and didn't get any sleep because I was mailing this thing out. This is our California Task Force For Integrated Education. I wanted to distribute to you the publication. Running through the issue in 50 different ways are articles and documentation that basically say equity is not happening in America. The drop-out is one example of it, the underachievement is another

example of it, and so on and so on.

Education Week, which is an outstanding weekly publication, had an article which says that as reform in education proceeds, and almost every state is proceeding somewhat similar to the Hart bill or Senate Bill 813, that more drop-outs will occur. They quote the Assistant Secretary of Education for New Jersey, who says, "If we don't develop some alternative, we are going to find more minorities pushed down, fall down, or whatever." Whatever the word "equity" means to you, you might want to look into it.

Mr. Honig is vulnerable to that. He has been challenged on it. Mr. Honig is largely to the issue of excellence. It is largely to middle-class whites. I am not demeaning him when I say that. He knows that he is running major risks. Just two days ago -- many of you know Rose Cooperman. She knew that there was going to be a meeting with Dr. Handler, the Board of Education of LAUSD, and Honig, and Honig was going to announce the standards by which the state would assess the degree of progress being made by local districts under the Senate Bill 813, because if there aren't measureable improvements, where is the money going? You have got to improve the high school graduation requirements, this, that, and the other.

He came and met with the board and Rose Cooperman said, "Can I come to the meeting?"

"No, you can't come to the meeting. It is a closed meeting."

They finally said, "Grace Foster is coming. She

is a state PTA person, but you can't come."

She had the presence of mind to say, "If there are seven board members there, this is not a private session because that is illegal, unless they are dealing with personnel. I am walking into that goddamn meeting."

She walked into the meeting and nobody said a thing. Standing on one foot talking to her yesterday, she said Mr. Honig went through what it is he proposes to do about measuring achievement and so forth. Mr. Bartman was troubled by that. Then Jackie Goldberg got into the act and Rita Walters. I am not reporting what went on in the meeting, because I wasn't there. Mr. Honig said, "I have had 22 meetings like this. This is the first time anybody has begun to raise questions."

What Goldberg and Walters were raising was, "In your open session in trying to get scores that reflect what is happening, kids are going to get hurt and what are you doing about that?"

In a roundabout way, I am back to what I am saying. The minority youngsters in California are about to become the majority of public schools statewide. Forget LAUSD. They tipped a decade ago. LAUSD is not the exception. The minorities in California are becoming the majority in district after district after district. Black, Hispanic, Asian-American, as they become the majority -- incidentally, among the so-called whites, in an ethnic survey, we would be called white, but among the whites are going to be the Armenians, who are called white, but they are an ethnic cultural minority.

Even among the whites there are youngsters who are refugees from other places in the world who have serious problems to adjusting to the school system and to the society and who have the same bilingual problems that the other traditional groups have that you know. We need a way of coping with it. And these minorities, so-called, we know which minorities we mean in civil rights terms, become the majority, there is a grave question as to whether the system we call public education can really be fair to them, can deal with them, can understand them. I don't mean as bias against them, but where is the insight if Cal Poly, sitting in Pomona, can't see that sitting in front of it is a school system that has already become a majority-minority, if those teachers don't understand they are going to be teaching in systems that are already heading towards majority-minority, or at least in major transition.

One statistic I have tried to avoid: Do you know that with LAUSD with roughly 80 percent nonwhite that our teaching staff is 63 percent white? You look at almost every district in California and you will see a heavy white middle-class background. Admittedly, many of these are older teachers and retirement will catch up with them.

When you begin to look at how many minorities have made it into the majority ranks, it is small. There are many questions in education that have -- I am not saying that a minority person needs to be a teacher in order to understand. When the San Fernando Valley was predominantly white teachers, and we had the so-called 3.3 program, you took these two

courses and you suddenly were sophisticated in human relations terms. One course was a mosaic about minorities in general. The other was any ethnic minority you chose to learn.

If you took two courses, then you are all right. LAUSD said you got to take the two courses or you don't get points for salary increase. Many of the whites had minorities talking to them who thought they had a captured audience. I would come in and many of the whites were angry because they are really lost in a system and here is the office of civil rights saying you have got to spread yourself out. You can't just teach in the San Fernando Valley. You can't teach in the predominantly white schools, et cetera, et cetera. All of that is kind of below the surface.

At one point I said we are 80 percent nonwhite kids. Got that in your head? Our teaching staff at that time was about 70 percent white. How many of you --- would you really like to say, "I am white and I would like to teach white kids and blacks ought to be taught by blacks"?

What they are really saying to you is, "I have taught in the inner city. I have paid my dues. The blacks don't really want us down there. They want their own kind. I am just as happy to get out and/or I live in West Covina and I have got to commute home." In a lot of ways they are trying to tell you with body language, "I don't want to teach in the inner city."

I said, "Would you like to kind of think about a policy whereby blacks teach blacks and whites teach whites?" Nobody said a word. You can only do this when there is a

predominantly white audience out there. Obviously they know you can't make the policy, but nobody said that is outrageous, that is stupid. I said, "Let me pretend I have walked out and now I am back again. We are predominantly a nonwhite student body and a predominantly white faculty. We are now arranging to have ethnics to teach their kinds. Half of you whites are fired. You have got 70 percent whites in the faculty and we only at that time had 30 percent white student body. What do we need all these white teachers for?"

"We never said that."

"Bullshit. You were thinking it. If you are only going to teach whites because you are more comfortable with them, you are tying one hand behind your back saying, 'I don't feel comfortable teaching other kinds of kids.' You are saying something indirectly. There are certain kinds of kids you would not like to teach."

Let me say that the black teachers are about at the proportion of blacks in the schools. The blacks are not going to gain much by a racist policy whereby blacks teach blacks. There is one group that will gain enormously by that policy; that is the Hispanic group. Ed Moreno could see what was coming. He started to howl with laughter. We have about 5 percent Hispanics on the teaching staff, and we are damn close to 50 percent Hispanic in the schools. If I am Hispanic and I am going with this racist policy, okay, all of you can get the hell out of here, those jobs are mine. Now comes the serious question: How many of you are able to teach kids effectively understanding the multicultures and incomes from

whence those kids come? If you don't feel comfortable, that is understandable, because you may not have been trained that way. What is there that is enabling you to perfect your skills?

I heard a conversation before on how we pick principals. I don't feel very expert on that. As a Commission, let me alert you to a basic thing. What the hell are the university of schools of education doing to sensitize teachers to multicultural, inter-group relations, whatever other words you want?

I am saying the facts of life indicate that California is a third state, it is a third world. It is a multi-ethnic state. If teachers are not going to be equipped and able to teach kids from multi-ethnic backgrounds, or if they think they are subject matter specialists and therefore when the secondary school segregates and you know the Hispanics are here and the blacks are here and the Asians are here, you say, "I didn't have those kids segregated. That is not school policy. That is my choice of the kids. I feel comfortable with my own kind." That is a barometer of what you are not doing as a teacher, but the school is de facto segregated, even though it is a mixed campus.

A secondary school in LAUSD, where the campus reflects a multi-ethnic process in the yard or in the cafeteria or in the auditorium, which are the three ways in which the kids, if they are left to themselves, decide who it is they are going to pal around with. In the classroom you have got to sit next to somebody whether you care to or

not. When you begin to ask the question, and I did this once -- I don't know whether you see yourself as a subject matter specialist or you also see yourself as able to help kids understand each other and themselves -- I asked, "If you wonder if you have a self-segregated campus" -- I knew they didn't. I had worked with a small group of them -- "I wonder how you see yourself as a teacher. Are you a math or history or a PE teacher or are you also a teacher who is helping kids to relate to kids?"

At that point, though I didn't say if you were only teaching subject matter you were a lousy teacher, but the inference was that if you are not doing both, you are not a full teacher, there was an audible groan.

Venice High School is Asian, black, Hispanic, and white student body. It is a perfect laboratory for helping kids relate and yet these people see themselves as subject matter specialists. Bill Johnson didn't ask me if I was multiculturally oriented. If you teach math, fine, we will hire you and send you out.

Some jerk, Zane Meckler, or somebody comes along, no, you don't just teach math. Wouldn't it be better to help this kid to understand the heritage from whence he comes? They kind of look at you blankly, like I am not on yard duty, I am not the race relations person. You want to say, "Who is the race relations person?" If they knew who it was, and it is doubtful, they probably would think it is the boys' vice principal because he is the disciplinarian. Maybe it is the social studies teacher. If I am in a subject matter other

than social studies, seemingly I have no approach to multiculture or to inter group. Gene and I are on the same committee, created just a week or two ago, looking into what is the multicultural approach by L.A. Unified School District. We all know there ain't no such approach. Nevertheless, we are starting to document what we have a right to know, that is, what is happening multiculturally and what is the policy, and we think we know what the answers are.

If the policy is they are buried and no teacher, in a sense, is impressed by an obligation to do that, and secondarily the programs are fragmented so you can point to fragmented programs and say X is doing something positive at school A, but Y isn't doing something positive at school B.

I don't know of a region where a regional administrator has proclaimed human relations to be a major goal. It ain't the policy of the district. I have been told personally and privately that the multicultural center in East L.A. is closed. The films and other materials are not being used because the funds are not there and the policy isn't there. In the absence of policy, people are not going out on a limb unless you are unusually strong and convinced that you have got to do it in the absence of the direct-law policy.

I would close by saying ethnic demographic change is here to stay and nobody can reverse that. If you are a liberal or conservative or you believe or don't believe in schools, if you are denying youngsters and adults the opportunity to learn together peacefully and understand each other, you must be an idiot. In the absence of preparation

and the skills that are needed, these youngsters are not learning to cope with the social issues or with each other; therefore it is just a matter of time before the tensions explode.

Number two, if your educational philosophy is the one that I see very much, it is quite clear to them, and Dr. Handler exemplifies this, is he is back to the basics because what the public wants is reassurance that the 3 R's are being taught and being in Region H and watching the advisors who are the curriculum specialists, they are teaching the 3 R's. They are not spending a fraction of the time on either the social issues of the day and how do we problem-solve, whether it is peace or war or anything else that you can think of, these kids are not being taught to think, nor are they being taught to relate to each other across the ethnic and culture and heritage things we have talked about.

I think some real issues have to be posed even at the state level. There was a very impressive meeting at which virtually all of the brass at LAUSD was present. It was because groups said, "What are we doing to teach kids basic knowledge about the Constitution of the United States and all of the things that flow from a free society?" They have got enormous leverage and prestige behind them and some money. As a result of that, everybody in LAUSD was there. I don't know what is happening after that one all-day meeting at which these groups were showing how you teach about law in a free society in a very meaningful way. When grouped

around our table, it came time for Region H to say, "What are we going to do about it?" The brass said, "We are already doing it," which isn't true.

If you are going to turn to outside groups, and I am looking at you because there are so many behind you that could come in and say, "We can deal with the problems in a free society, the problems that might threaten a free society, but how are teachers going to cope with this?"

In a sense, if you are going to come in and say to take a little less time to do reading, writing, arithmetic and a little more time to do social problems, there is going to be a serious conflict in their minds.

"Are you telling me not to spend time on the 3 R's, because I have been taking all the time in the world to stress the 3 R's." They are not reconcilable to social problems and the 3 R's and human relations are intertwineable. Nobody felt that multicultural or human relations or race relations was a separate subject. It is supplemented when you teach music or reading or anything else. If it doesn't come in, then you don't understand the subject.

One of the things that can give you leverage is to raise some of the questions that have to do with a free society in which there is a lot of power groups that want to see a free society understood by youngsters and join those that are moving it ahead. They may not get immediately somewhere with LAUSD, but they are going to get somewhere with education as an institution or universities as an institution. It is kind of piggy-back and I am going to use

the word "coalition."

Government understands what happens when you have apathy in a free society or if you have anti-democratic movements in a free society; Communism or whatever presenting that alternative, as a free society is only understood when you practice it, not when you preach and teach about it and say, "This is when the Articles of Confederation were developed." That is just a date. Until youngsters on a campus can understand and practice it, and that doesn't happen very often, it just becomes, "Well, we covered a free society four weeks ago. That was the Bill of Rights."

We don't teach multicultural by stopping to observe Martin Luther King's birthday and Cinco de Mayo or whatever else. Somehow we have the notion -- we pause to say, "Okay, we will pause to salute in your direction." These one-day stands are blasphemy. Our systems seem to operate that way. For me to go back and say conceptually put it into a framework. When I talk with teachers, if I think they are somewhat responsive, I will say, "I know you know what Cinco de Mayo is. One is in May. July 4th is in July. One is in December. What do they have in common?" They kind of look at you.

"They have something to do with freedom and independence."

"Right. How can we teach it when it ain't her holiday?" She still understands what it is you are talking about.

"What country is your grandmother from? What

is the national independence day of that country? Go back and ask your grandmother or go to the public library. Who freed the country you came from? What were they freed from? Do you mean people all over the world want to be free rather than be colonies or whatever?"

You understand, when Venezuela got liberated, they went through the same process as the Mexicans. We talk about Cinco de Mayo as if it were the national holiday of Latin America. If you take a concept and call it "freedom" and say, "How do we teach freedom?" you don't teach it on July 4th or any other particular holiday, you teach it conceptually and use every example in the book.

AFTRA is going through all kinds of strains and stress and new countries are being born almost every day. Ours was 1776. Theirs was 1989. Same process. You weed this back and forth. If you are a skillful teacher, you bring in outside resources, you bring grandma in to tell what happened in Hungary. This becomes what a teacher can do if you have knowledge or resources. There are resources available to you, such as maps, Channel 28 having an excellent demographic study called "L.A.'s Tomorrow," and they will send you the transcript of the program. I don't know whether the videotape is available, but it is an outstanding half-hour program.

I brought with me something called "The Fourth Wave," which is a study of Asian-Americans coming into California. An awful lot of sources of demographic data. The Fourth Wave, California's newest immigrants, it is

available free by writing to the Weinberg Foundation here in Los Angeles.

MS. FILLIPPINI: My question has to do with a little different area of demographics than what you have covered. Maybe before I ask the question, I would like to comment on what you said at the last of your comments about the universality of certain concepts in education and certainly in multicultural education it goes beyond teaching of freedom, but teaching basics, literature, reading, languages per se of a universal quality, whether English, French, Chinese, whatever. I appreciated the fact that you brought that out as an area that can be addressed without going into more money or the significant problems in numbers of ethnic minorities or majorities of students.

My question has to do with the demographics of voting patterns. Since you showed us the figures on school enrollments and the population differences, I have not found in very many places throughout the state that voting patterns have, in fact, followed the increases in various ethnic groups within a community. If they did, you would see an entirely different composition in the L.A. School Board and in school boards of any other community like Santa Barbara, where I was on the school board at a time a few years ago when very few people in the community recognized the fact that 54 percent of the children in the Santa Barbara School District were minorities. Not only did the white parents in the community not accept that as a fact, the various minority groups didn't believe it either. At that time the

board was all white. There were no nonwhite members on the board.

Can you comment on that in L.A. and other places throughout the state?

MR. MECKLER: Let me go back. Carnella is sitting here. I met Carnella when she ran for the Board of Education on a slate that a couple of us old-timers were involved in, 1953, Bates, Bates and Haskell. Mrs. Bates was a republican, Mrs. Barnes was the head of the community center, and Reverend Bates. Two years later, Georgiana ran. We backed her. Two years later, Ralph Richardson and Mary Tingloff ran. We developed a coalition. It won't mean much to you for me to say that we ousted two arch conservatives from the board. This was in a period where LAUSD was growing. Growth was such an enormous factor that we had to build the equivalent of an elementary school a week. Nevertheless, the board started with an approach that said, "We will count on a bond issue of a certain amount and no higher." Every time there was a bond issue, you knew you were already licked because it wasn't adequate to the need. We got rid of them.

Mrs. Stafford ran in a three-way race and Mary Tingloff and she were in the same race. In the primary, Mrs. Stafford was the incumbent, reactionary, whatever, white, as was Mrs. Tingloff. In the black community in the primary Mrs. Stafford carried it. Luckily there was a third person so there had to be a runoff. Nobody got the majority. In the six weeks between the primary and the final election, the black community got organized. Primary black teachers

who realized they had to get rid of Mrs. Stafford, and we got reports that said, "Mommie, my teacher is at the door. She is ringing our bell." She turned out, in some cases, to be the Sunday School teacher for the church, whatever hat that teacher was wearing. The black teacher was out ringing doorbells. This is 1957, the black community reversed itself and Mrs. Tingloff won and ousted Mrs. Stafford.

It is not easy to build a coalition and there are all kinds of problems about quid pro quo. You can't run that kind of a ticket each time and say that is the only three people willing to run. There are minorities disaffected with the whole political system. You have to get out there and say, "We are not the established political process." Our focus is whatever it is. These are issues of education. Using LAUSD, which is no longer true, if you are the white San Fernando Valley, you ain't going to get better schools at the expense of the inner city or the harbor; nor are you going to get better schools if you are UNO in East L.A.

If you are going to move the school system ahead, coalition needs to reflect every portion of the community. With whites now the minority of kids going to school, it works two ways. There are a lot of distrustful people who have been hurt by the political process. Their needs are very clear. You are going to have to be somewhere between saying I am sensitive to your need and at the same time not saying I am pro-Hispanic, please accept me.

I had the privilege of being behind the scenes of masterminding the Pasadena board election where we took

the board back from the arch conservatives. A friend of mine who happened to be with the labor movement, I said we are building a coalition and I would like him involved. He said, "This is the first time somebody has come to the labor movement before the fact. Usually they come after the fact."

What we were saying is we haven't picked the candidates and getting in on the picking of the candidates is more important than me, the candidate, trying to tell you what a nice guy I am and you wondering what was the process by which I was picked.

MR. MONTEZ: I think probably in the future you will see a greater change in that ethnic for voting. The people that vote have never been a majority of the population. You are lucky if you get 15 to 20 percent of the people out there to elect a President.

I think you are seeing some changes taking place. You have Hispanic and black legislators. That is beginning to be an influence. I don't think it will ever be all blacks or Hispanics that vote. It is not a hundred percent black is what I am saying. People could care less about voting, which is a tragedy in our system.

MS. DAVIS: Politically in Los Angeles the school board elections are the only area in which we have racial coalitions. We have never gotten together to elect anybody else. The City Council, where we have tried to get a Hispanic elected, we have never been able to bring the black or Jewish community to help us. On the school board the only reason we finally got a Hispanic --

MR. MONTEZ: The only Hispanic ever elected was Ed Roybal. Jewish and black did play a part and there hasn't been one since.

MS. DAVIS: On the schoolboard it has been consistent. I think out of that came the black, Jewish, and Hispanic-Jewish dialogs.

MR. MECKLER: You have to know LAUSD, we got two liberals elected to the board this past year. Both of them were products of coalition politics. Both of them are still feeling their way and are by no means the majority on the board. The process by which they got elected is encouraging.

MS. DAVIS: Mary Tingloff is living in Sun City and learning Spanish.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Any other questions? Thank you very much for your patience.

Dr. Raul Cardoza, I was informed that he received his doctorate just last Wednesday. Congratulations. He will be addressing the factors relating to college graduation .

DR. CARDOZA: I would like to mention that Dr. Leo Estrada regrets he cannot be here. He called me and informed me that he had a baby boy yesterday. I said, "That is okay."

It is interesting to hear what is going on. I have been involved in higher education since 1970. I saw some familiar faces. Joe Duff went to Occidental College. I got involved in community colleges around 1973. I worked at East L.A. College. Grace is not here to hear that. I know that she is very involved. I worked at Rio Hondo Community

College. I am now currently Vice President of Academic Affairs at L.A. Mission College, which is one of the nine colleges in the big L.A. community college district. We also have a monolithic kind of district.

I am not speaking for the L.A. Community College District, even though my study is obviously related to it. I would like to share some of the things that I found and how I came across doing it. I don't plan to give you some of the methodology kind of things and all the details I had to give my committee. I will give you the highlights of the findings.

One of the things that is very, very obvious to me, especially after hearing people talk before me, my study is concerned with Chicano students. I was around in the '70s when things were happening, so I am not used to the word "Hispanic."

It became very evident to me that the minority populations were highly represented in the two-year system and under-represented in the four-year system. There is data to show that blacks and Chicanos and other minorities are not represented as they should be in the four-year system. As a result, obviously, being in the community college system myself, I said I have got to do something that looks into my system to find out what is going on with my particular group, to find out why so many students do attend community colleges and why so many when they do transfer don't graduate.

There is a study that generated this whole dissertation. The state college system in Long Beach generates many research projects. I found out, surprisingly, there are

160 community colleges in California, and this particular report shows that the state college system asked all hundred sixty colleges, "How many students did you transfer in 1975?" and three years later they went back to the community colleges and asked them, "How many of these students graduated in 1978, if you have any idea?"

It turned out that seven of the nine colleges in my district were below the system average of graduation. The lowest three colleges in the State of California were Trade Tech, which is a multicultural, highly ethnic population. East L.A. was the second, and Compton was the third lowest. The minority colleges were at the lowest graduation level of all the California colleges.

I tracked down where all these students went to school after they transferred. There is another table in here which is interesting because it shows all 19 state colleges in California. It ranks the CSUC's and it asks the same questions: "You obtained so many students in 1975, how many graduated from your institution in 1978?"

It turned out that Cal State L.A. had the lowest graduation rate of all the state colleges.

Now I said, "Isn't that something?" If I am a student at East L.A. College, which represents about a 67 percent Hispanic population, which has one of the lowest graduation rates and the majority of those students transferred to L.A., which now has the lowest graduation rate, I have two strikes against me. What is going on? Once they transfer, what is happening? How come some don't make it and some do?

That was the purpose of the study, was to determine the factors that affected the graduation among the Hispanic students that transferred from the nine colleges in our district to the four local. I figured most of my experience has showed that the students transfer to Cal State L.A., Northridge, and Dominguez Hills.

With that I should mention that I had a survey mailed to many, many students, and I received about five or six hundred returned, and that was my data. I asked many, many questions about the students themselves. I asked them to give me some demographics, which I think is important. I also asked them to give me some information about their experiences at the state college. I asked them to give me some information about the environment as they saw it; was it a friendly place, was it a place where alienation was involved? I also asked them -- and a major part of the study was how much effort did they make in certain kinds of activities; what kind of behavior did they show in using the library or talking to the faculty; what kind of behavior did they show in the kind of things they did in a course. Did they take notes often or not take notes; did they redo them or not.

That turned out to be a significant item later on. Another thing I asked was about the working and living arrangement. There is a lot of data that shows if a student works full time, obviously it is going to interfere. At the same time I thought it was important, because I looked at various other studies. One thing I found that was not being

asked was the role of the parents and the role of language and the role of a role model that I could identify with. That is something I went through myself. I wanted to find out what happened there. Was that evident among these students that I surveyed?

I grouped the survey items. There must have been -- there are many. I would say about 65 or 70. I grouped the survey items into similar kinds of groups. I had a whole group on academic factors; what was their GPA in high school, community college, and CSUC; what was their major at the four-year school. I also asked them personal characteristics, how old they were. I got demographic information.

I grouped all of these questions into 14 subtopics and I did analysis of each one of the subtopics to find out which was the most important of the 14 groups.

To make a long story short -- and I should mention it very honestly that I was a little surprised as to what I found. I was a little confused. It turned out that I found out that the most important variable was the use of the library. The second most important variable was the ability to think analytically and logically. The third and fourth variables were graduation from Cal State L.A., graduation from Cal State Northridge. The fifth most important variable was the relationship with the faculty; did they have some rapport with the faculty. The last one, which was, I guess, logical, the use of academic support services.

When I saw these six variables, I didn't understand the message. What I then did, I separately analyzed

each one. I was trying to find out why a term paper, which is a library item, why is that the most important one. I found out the reason why these students rated or it came out No. 1 is that writing seemed to be the most important activity at the four-year school. The writing experience and activity they had in the classroom, it forced them to see the faculty member. It forced them to go to the library or any kind of those activities. It also affected their grades in the classroom.

I said to myself, "Wait a minute. I know that income and I know that father's education and I know that other kinds of demographic factors, SES, usually have a dominant role, so what happened?"

What is happening now since there is so much activity in Sacramento of the role of community collges? People are now very, very interested in what I found out because they think I might have found something very unique. It is not in my own little world. People would think that a person's income and the parents' education, and so on, would probably be more of a predictor of graduation in writing. That is basically what I found out, and I could give you some more information about it.

One of the things which I think was important in this study -- yes, writing was important. One of the things that also came out very interesting -- again, I can relate to this personally -- was the whole question of role models. I can go around the room and probably ask each one of you if you had a role model when you were going to school. I asked

the question. I asked the student to identify for me what was the highest degree he or she wanted. I asked the students what was the highest degree their parents wanted for them. Then I asked again what was the highest degree aspired by your role model.

Interestingly enough, the parents more often checked off an item saying "no preference." The parent had no preference in what they did in school. The role model, whoever that might have been, said "BA or higher."

I started thinking, "What is going on here?" I talked about it in the study that, I think, as I heard someone say many of our parents are still second and third generation who have not attended higher-education institutions. When you talk to them about an AA or BA or master's or a doctorate degree, they probably don't know that much about it. I think what they know about is, "Yes, I want to support you and go to school in any way that you can. I know that school is going to be important for you later on," but when you ask them specific questions, they couldn't answer it; yet a role model did. That is one of the things that I think is important to this group.

Obviously some of the other findings, which I will talk about later, are the role of counselors which always came up among the students; they are not satisfied with them, not getting the right information, and so on. Another point was made about the support services in four-year schools. Many of our students nowadays, you should know, are part-time students. They are no longer the 18-year-old student who

goes to school full time. Usually older people. The average age of our students population is about 29. They work part time or full time, so as a result support services are not being taken advantage of. That is what I found out and I am sure if Leo was here he would probably say some more, but I don't want to take up much more of your time.

MR. MONTEZ: What was the significance of the Northridge variable, the Northridge-Cal State L.A., did you say?

DR. CARDOZA: Yes, I graduated from Cal State L.A. and Cal State Northridge. In relation to Long Beach and Dominguez, they were not significant. I was over-sampled from the L.A. district to Cal State. When you are over-sampled you are going to get that kind of response.

My initial proposals, before I did this, was to look at East L.A. College and to Cal State L.A., because that seems to be the flow that I am familiar with in my community I grew up in and that is what I want to do. When I presented this topic to the faculty of UCLA, they said, "Why don't you look at the entire Hispanic population of the district that transfer to state colleges?"

It was East L.A. College, because I am familiar with that and I work there and I know people.

MS. HATA: You seem to have included some high school material in your survey. Can you relate what you learned with respect --

DR. CARDOZA: I didn't learn too much. I knew if I started to get too far into the high school or elementary, I knew I had to stop somewhere. I did ask them how they

enjoyed their experience and to do some comparisons. This sample I surveyed apparently were a satisfied group. They were satisfied with their high school experiences and went all the way through that satisfied with high school, community college, and Cal State.

There were the nongraduates that were not that satisfied. I talk about that, too. When you ask them -- "Did you like your Cal State University College experience?" -- this is the student that didn't graduate -- they would probably say, "I didn't graduate from that place. I didn't like it."

Then I say, "How come usually you get the answer I got?" That information from the counselors or faculty, "I got problems at home."

The high school questions were not a real major source of inquiry in my study, other than those two items. I was trying to see whether there was some kind of connection between all three of these different -- whether the GPA tended to increase or go up or down or whatever. They were a satisfied group. This was a unique sample. I can't really share anything on the high school scene, although I have enough data. I do know what high school they attended. I could probably go back -- I am getting encouragement to continue some of this study and say did it matter what high school they attended or community college they attended.

We can't bus. It is really the choice of the student where they want to go. We can't do that in our system.

MS. DAVIS: I am not sure that I can formulate a

question, but what is going through my mind is that the history of East L.A. and Cal State is based on the desire of the community to have an educational institution to meet the needs of our students and here we have buildings that are there and some faculty and what-have-you; yet from what I hear you saying, I hate to say this, but it looks like we failed or did the system fail? What is happening? I don't know exactly how to ask the question.

DR. CARDOZA: I think you are asking what I was asking myself at the beginning. When I saw that East L.A., Compton, and Trade Tech of 160 community colleges, and these three colleges, which are the heavy ethnic colleges in this area, were the bottom three colleges in California, with the lowest graduation rate, I asked that question, "What is going on? Are we failing them down there?"

There are just a lot of different things that come to mind now. I was trying to identify in this study what made the difference. I think I found some interesting things. When you ask the question, Have you failed? I don't think we failed. I think the institutions are confused as to what to do.

When institutions were set up for 18-year-olds out of high school and the entire structuring system was developed for that notion, and suddenly we have 29 and a lot of women and we are still dealing with that notion that used to be, the system has not caught up.

MS. DAVIS: Has it always been that way, like you are saying, the average age is now 29? I would say if we went

back 10, 15 years, that it probably wasn't that at all.

DR. CARDOZA: That is what I am saying. It was a younger student; it was a student transferring. Now we have an older population coming part time for one class, interested in just upgrading their skills, not interested in transferring.

MS. DAVIS: That is just at these schools?

DR. CARDOZA: At community colleges.

MS. DAVIS: There is kind of a contradiction with all the things that we are doing to get kids into school and then what we said earlier. Who was it that said that our kids are dropping out before they even get to high school? If that is happening, there is nobody to feed into that except the person who has gone out there and discovered that without an education he or she are not going to succeed and now these people are now coming to education, not even returning. It opens up all kinds of things in terms of our community.

DR. CARDOZA: There are some real major problems there. What happens, perhaps in our system, is it is an open door. Some people say it is a revolving door, too. It is an open door in the sense that anyone can attend a community college if you are 18 years of age or older or if you have a high school diploma. We accept everybody. Suddenly demographic shifts, ethnically and from an age perspective, has changed over time and we now have a whole different population, and I can tell you that Sacramento, both from the Legislature and also from the Chancellor's office and the Office of California for Secondary Education Issue are really wondering what community colleges are doing. They are really

questioning the transfer function.

In 1950, when the veterans were back, and '60s, we all wanted to go to a four-year school. That function was acknowledged.

Now there are a lot of other reasons why people come to see us or attend our schools. They are saying, "We will give you a lot of money," and we are noticing that the transfer rate has gone down in the UC system and state college system; even the few that do transfer, they are not making it.

"What are you people doing?" That is really the issue. Suddenly transfer education became a very political issue in California. It is something that we have to deal with.

MS. DAVIS: Did you track high school graduates of those schools that are feeding into East L.A., the ones that didn't go to East L.A. or went to SC or UCLA directly? What is their graduation?

DR. CARDOZA: I didn't go to the private schools. I only looked at the state universities.

MR. MONTEZ: If you looked at those three lower schools, those that did graduate I doubt would have been as successful as those that went to other junior colleges. Those that graduated from those three junior colleges and on to the four-year schools probably didn't do well, either.

DR. CARDOZA: I don't know.

MR. MONTEZ: We could assume that they went on to four-year schools. I would be curious as to what the graduation rate would be of the cream of the crop of the three schools

that did go on and did graduate. It would probably be minimal.

MS. DAVIS: You look at the students that are going into USC that are being helped by alumni associations. Those are the ones I look at. The disciplines, by the way, they are going into are incredible. They are not the usual things. They have a lot of doctors, but they are specializing. Where do they come from?

MR. MONTEZ: SC is an elite system. SC has about a 76 percent Chicano drop-out. Even though they are recruiting a lot of kids, they are not graduating.

DR. CARDOZA: Having been in the private higher education system, there is a pecking order in the system. The private schools, the Stanfords and Claremonts and SC's are looking at the cream-of-the-crop students. Those students can probably make it anywhere in spite of the system.

Then you have the UC system. That is really getting down on the requirements. They are adding more requirements. They are being much more selective and they are having some problems with recruitment with minorities. Then they have the state colleges which receives the next third of the high school graduate population. Their requirements are not as tough as UC or the private, and then everyone else goes to community colleges.

Having recruited personally Chicano students to Occidental College, I know academically they got what it takes. It was the environment. They couldn't handle a white environment. They go to the cafeteria and they say, "This food is bland. I don't belong here. Why did you recruit

me here?" They get mad at me. I kept on telling them, "Hang in there." I remember, I will never forget, a student, a freshman -- sophomore. He came to my office and he said, "I want to get out of this place." He says, "I happen to be rooming with Finch's son. Robert Finch's son. He asked me what I was going to do at Christmas break. I told him I was going to work at MacDonald's. I asked him and he said, 'I am traveling in my parents's yacht.' I can't relate to that."

The cultural shock of going to a predominantly white school is too much. I didn't experience it, but from what I pick up, it must have been something.

That is still happening at UCLA, when you take them out of their community into Westwood, et cetera.

MS. DAVIS: I have a daughter who went to USC and graduated and went to Brown University and it was still a cultural shock.

Let me ask you a question about East L.A. and Cal State. Do you think that a contributing factor to the whole thing is, if you remember when we were starting with Chicano studies and this was the environment that we built for them in terms of talking about your roots and speaking street language and all that kind of stuff, and I know that we have made -- the educators have made efforts. I don't know how well they have succeeded. Do you think that that may have contributed to the fact that the social environment has never changed for them; that there is no real integration with the outside system or something else?

DR. CARDOZA: By taking classes of Chicano studies?

MS. DAVIS: No. The whole attitude. For instance, in the institutions where they introduced Chicano studies, and that was probably the only thing, it became a dumping grounds for all the kids who were Hispanic were put in there. That was the only place they got supports systems, and so on.

I am wondering what we did at USC and Cal State --

DR. CARDOZA: I am going to speak for the system that I work in. I think ethnic studies had a role, a definite role in the '70s. I think it did it very well. It met its objectives.

What is happening now, because of everything that is going on in our society, the students are no longer enrolling in Chicano studies. Those departments are now threatened to be extinct. At one time you might have had seven or eight instructors; now you are down to one or two. If you don't have 30 students in your class, a class may be canceled. That is one of the big issues in our system. Ethnic studies in our system has not been doing very well as a discipline. I still think it has a role. It is not as visible and highlighted as it was several years back, but you are right, it did provide that for some students, they were able to hang onto something they could identify with at the school.

MS. HATA: Did they give you any indication of what the $50 enrollment will do --

DR. CARDOZA: No. But we are doing that now. There is a lot of concern about that. We definitely think it is going to hurt lower-income minority people; no doubt about it.

$50 may not sound like a lot.

I was telling people before, my own family, when they were going to vote for Deukmejian or vote against him, the old argument, $50, that is only three cassette tapes or maybe a poster. That is not the issue. The issue is it does cost to attend community college.

Do you know how much a book costs nowadays? $30 a book. How are they going to get there? Go down in their '56 Ford or Chevy? There are a lot of other costs, child-care costs, even though at that time we were at tuition free but no longer are we tuition free. We are concerned and so is Sacramento. The Deukmejian answer is put more money into financial aid. That was sort of a simplistic response to the problem, I think. It is going to hurt.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Any other questions?

Thank you.

These proceedings were conducted pursuant to all applicable rules, regulations, and statutes of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for its advisory committees. Education issues within the Los Angeles Unified School District was a focus of these proceedings. The Advisory Committee will review the data gathered today as part of its continued monitoring of education issues throughout the state.

The Advisory Committee would like to thank the participants for their contributions to our fact-gathering effort. A transcript of these proceedings will be made available in the future. For that we thank our court reporter.

This concludes the portion of the California

Advisory Committee's meeting. We will now have a brief business meeting before adjournment.

---oOo---

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Pamela S. Couturier, CSR No. 2520, a Notary Public in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings held by the California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights taken at the time and place herein set forth were taken down in shorthand by me and thereafter transcribed into typewriting and I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a full, true, and correct transcription of my shorthand notes so taken.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal this 10th day of July 1984.

Pamela S. Couturier

Notary Public in and for the State of California