

INTEGRATION TASK FORCE

Minutes of Meeting

Thursday, October 5, 1978

(Special Meeting)

KOLENDER distributed copies of the Judge's charge to Task Force Members.

Judge WELSH thanked the Task Force for their time in laboring over the problem, stating he came to the meeting to answer questions. He also stated he chose the Task Force from a cross section of the community as judges to be objective on behalf of the community; and came to the meeting because of misunderstanding or confusion concerning his Order.

Tom JOHNSON: First page of Judge's Order - two terms - asked Judge to define between Desegregation and Integration.

WELSH: Desegregation: The physical act of breaking up segregated pockets of racial groups.

Integration: To cause an actual acceptance. Cause people to become one rather than separated and isolated parts.

GRISSOM: You stated we will serve as judges and be objective "coordinate efforts of civic and community agencies and organizations interested in assisting the implementation of the integration plan...." It seems to break down as a hands off relationship -- they are to assist in the success of the program.

WELSH: Judges are not to sit and wait for someone to do something, used the word judge to be objective, not advocate help in promoting objectives -- evaluate suggestions.

WELSH: I have ordered counsel for both sides not to appear before you except when invited, and because of the understandable conflict of them representing different points of view, and hearing each other's conversations; when those occasions arise they will attend only when you want them.

I will be available in my courtroom when you need me. Any questions you might have of the Counsel should go through the Chairman or Vice Chairman first.

Another thing you have questioned is whether or not any of your sessions should be executive and closed to the public. When you believe it is necessary or advisable to have an Executive Session, closed to the public, please do so, but not at great frequency; as you can better communicate and exchange ideas when these people are not around. I'm not commanding, just suggesting.

HUNSAKER: You indicated the task force is to report to you three times a year a year, are you talking about written reports?

KOLENDER: The report will come from me to the Court based on the group; information will be taken from the monitors, evaluated and put in a report to the Judge.

WELSH: Any more questions?

YIP: We are not responsible then for making integration work, just evaluate and make a report?

WELSH: Correct. Your job is to evaluate and report on what's happening and whether it is working or not -- the strengths and weaknesses. If you have a suggestion to make it better, you should make it; focus on evaluation, not creation, but in the process, you may find that creative idea and if you do, I want to hear about it; responsible for benefits/detriments, any problem; and recommend to make suggestions.

? How many schools and what schools should be monitored?

WELSH: The monitors should cover all minority schools involved also cover all schools participating in the program, including receding schools, predominately white neighborhoods. If there is a situation where so many bus loads of Black, Hispanic and Asiatic are taken to predominately white neighborhoods and treated as pariahs in the school community, I want to know.

GRISSOM: Attorney for plaintiff - Human Relations Program throughout the system - every teacher and employee required to participate in the program -- one of our responsibilities is to see how well working -- should have monitors in every school.

WELSH: I would like to agree that there should be monitors in every school for that purpose, practically; take on priority first are minority schools involved directly in the program. Almost the same priority are the receiving schools. Try to cover both at first; once going, go on further. Those are the priorities.

Kolender asked Hal Brown for an update.

Hal stated that a letter with applications went out for monitors to be placed in the principals' offices of every school in the system. We will form a screening committee to develop criteria on how to evaluate applications -- committee will be broken into groups. Also develop a training program for monitors -- what to do and what to be looking for based on Judge's charge -- develop a reporting structure back to us and then to the Judge. It is going slow, but want to be sure it is done right.

WALSH: Understand that the program will not be working at optimum until second semester. If working well then, you'll have an opportunity to make judgments based upon how things go second semester.

Tom JOHNSON: Are we free to do anything in our judgment to help implement the charge --- bring in outside assistance; experts to assist in selecting monitors?

KOLENDER: We have found ourselves having some problems in getting some staff. We have asked the school system to pay for a secretary for us; they will think it over. Problem is the expense for ID cards for monitors for them to wear in schools so people will know who they are - problem in getting the money .

Mel LOPEZ: Training procedures for the monitors -- mileage be reimbursed as they are volunteering their time. Babysitting money available for mothers able to help; otherwise, asking too much.

KOLENDER: Maybe we could get a grant - Chamber of Commerce?

WELSH: Mothers come from neighborhood.

KOLENDER: Not to have children in school they are monitoring.

Hal BROWN: There have been a few questions regarding our thoughts about integration versus desegregation and what it means and what we are looking for; and the question arose concerning the order - what is desegregation and how you (Judge) looking at it. From the opening a 80/20% criterion there; I'm not sure school district. Desegregated, isolated schools 20% majority children now becomes \_\_\_\_\_ integrated school.

WELSH: We can count; and I want you to count. Two approaches:  
(1) Emphasis on quantity.  
(2) Monitoring emphasis on quality (unique experience).  
Main reason to look at numbers is to see what's going on in the schools.

DEL CAMPO: Following your charge to the Task Force re numbers, we are looking at how to do this qualitatively; are they quality programs -- it is rather difficult.

WELSH: Would counsel like me to make comment on any subject?

STERN: Not really - just want to reiterate school district's support of the group. Would it be possible to make a tape of the Task Force meetings?

KOLENDER: We'll take care of the taping.

ROSER: Quality versus quantity. Quantity should be considered, but we are more concerned with quality. Is it the job of the Task Force also to make recommendations -- on the last page of your charge, No. 6, as to -- What additional steps should be implemented to integrate

the school system and fulfill the mandate of the California Supreme Court? Also, solicit recommendations from the Task Force on how to increase the quantity as well as the quality of desegregation/

WELSH: Emphasis should be on evaluation.

STERN brought up the fact that suggestions come from the monitors to the Task Force members, to KOLENDER and then to Judge WELSH.

GRISSOM mentioned the need for clerical assistance -- should the Board of Education provide? Conflict of interest?

WELSH in turn stated it would be appreciated if the school district could finance, but we would not obligate them to do so.

DEL CAMPO brought up the point that monitors are not there to run the schools -- just observe -- guidelines should be established.

KOLENDER stated that the monitors should develop a relationship between themselves and the administration of the school.

ROSER cited Page 4 of the Charge to the Task Force, Item 5 -- Could you offer any further clarification in terms of criteria by which the Task Force would make a determination as to whether these programs are producing meaningful progress toward desegregation?

WELSH stated can't give check list because has to be a subjective reaction.

DEL CAMPO suggested looking at special programs -- learning centers -- include as part of duties of monitors.

KOLENDER read portions of Del Campo's material.

WELSH stated in response glad committees working in the right direction; standards/goals and criteria. Might consider having a specialized Task

Force of monitors (12 people) who are specialists in education and have sufficient background and whose duty, periodically, would be to make the rounds and evaluate that portion of the program.

KOLENDER asked for comments.

LOPEZ Should give some thought to specialized Task Force above and beyond.

KOLENDER responded it would be difficult -- didn't know whether we can make judgments.

LOPEZ asked about other criteria.

KOLENDER stated there should be a workshop meeting -- no press -- no one else -- to discuss values in private.

DIAZ asked to get to the housekeeping subject

KOLENDER brought up the fact that he would be out of town on the 10th and Hal Brown could chair the meeting. There was a discussion as to when the next meeting should be held. It was decided that the meeting of the 10th would be cancelled and the next meeting would be an Executive Session, closed to press and public, to be held the 17th of October at 3:30 in the Training Classroom.

KOLENDER related that the monitor applications were distributed to all schools and that six of the P.D. Community Relations officers distributed the applications to the store fronts throughout the city; also applications were given to various groups and agencies within the area from La Jolla throughout the city.

The following Task Force members requested 10 monitor applications each: DIAZ, MC KINNEY, O'CAMPO, YIP, ROHAN and Tom JOHNSON.

HUNSAKER brought up feed back received about the confusion of the word "the" in the first sentence, second paragraph, of letter sent with monitor application.

KOLENDER stated that there will be only one school for every monitor.

KOLENDER asked Hal Brown to give a report on his meeting with the Human Relations Office.

BROWN reported that he, Judy McDONALD and Beverly YIP met with Ed Fletcher and Yvonne JOHNSON this morning and he hadn't had a chance to really digest everything as yet, but would give highlights of the meeting. He stated the meeting was very helpful in providing background as to how Human Relations for the school district got started.-- their philosophy behind decisions. General impression was that they are doing a lot in terms of setting up the program. Monitors job becomes more important as they get further into the process. The organization of Human Relations effort is a good one. Budget allotment for Human Relations Program allocated to schools is \$200 per school plus 40¢ per student. Look into how this is utilized for purpose of Human Relations Program, and support being given to Human Relations Program in terms of how active teachers can be -- examine.

YIP suggested a special task force be formed to look at academic program.

ROHAN stated it would be more feasible for this group to evaluate Human Relations Program.

BROWN stated that in addition to the 64 monitors, 32 schools, and two for each, there would be an additional monitor for the 32 schools in the Human Relations program. (to be discussed at next meeting)

McDONALD queried as to how vast and varied from school to school -- should look at -- part of the Task Force?

KOLENDER stated that people who are known to be competent to do this are very expensive -- volunteers??



Tom JOHNSON stated the Task Force needs to get people who can adequately report what is happening -- what they observe; people with reasonable intelligence to look and report -- more important to report what they find.

BROWN stated it will take a little sophistication to evaluate whether people are going through the motions.

DEL CAMPO mentioned discipline in southeast schools versus others; looking at school management -- is there a uniform code? Highly support a special group -- general quality of education -- set guide lines. Is program educationally sound?

GRISSOM - somebody to evaluate has to be pretty well trained -- special training.

BROWN stated that Human Relations is very much a part of the in-service training, but race relations is not.

KOLENDER - continuing along lines developed -- evaluation of Human Relations training. Clarify and make recommendations needed for outside assistance.

KOLENDER - should review applications by reading them -- form a committee to interview.

BROWN - suggested that two or three members of the committee meet in a classroom at a school and each group would interview 15 or so applicants rather than appoint a committee of three to interview 100 some people.

HUNSAKER - supports this idea.

KOLENDER - to develop criteria so that interviews are uniform for each group - each group to ask same questions of applicant. Appointed CASTRO as chairman and he will pick committee. Committee to screen applications. Kolender stated he would meet with committee some Saturday to talk about applications.

McKINNEY - Volunteered to help.

KOLENDER - Need time to digest Del CAMPO's report - place on Agenda (No. 1) next time.

HUNSAKER - Ethnic information (1.2) not to delve into length of service. Who makes selection -- what is rationale included in the duties of monitors in evaluating these three things?

YIP - Teachers and staff most important element -- monitors to interview principals -- committee make evaluation.

McDONALD - First comments generally applicable to monitoring.

Del CAMPO - Will go into a format - cover letter what charge is -- what to do. Beverly and Judy and Hal to meet next week -- set up Human Relations/Race training for the monitors.

There was a general discussion on STERN's suggestion to tape Task Force meetings -- it was decided to advise STERN that the Task Force meetings would not be taped.

LOPEZ - Next meeting will present committee report

ROHAN - indicated he was troubled as to where these 32 sites are -- schools that are stated by the charge to be segregated schools for special programs -- other schools involved with VEEP -- around 50 schools.

HUNSAKER - 16 active programs - 32 total.

McDONALD - Next agenda - schools specifically by name.

Del CAMPO - We'll look at draft - see what we don't like -- to have ready when monitors go to the schools.

KOLENDER - we will read and discuss at next meeting.

BROWN - opened discussion to talk about next meeting -- develop some clarity in what Task Force is looking for -- how to measure certain things. Decide what to do and in what order.

KOLENDER - DEL CAMPO committee and LOPEZ Committee to report at next meeting what schools to be monitored.

LOPEZ - stated there should be a discussion on merits of special Task Force capabilities of evaluating the educational programs. In addition, select a special committee the task to evaluate quality of the educational program -- criteria.

BROWN - stated there has to be a clarification of thinking before Task Force can advise monitors what to look for.

HUNSAKER posed the question as to what mechanisms will be used to select replacement monitors when originally selected monitors don't work out -- what process?

KOLENDER - we will gather suggestions and ideas.

KOLENDER - reminded Task Force that the meeting scheduled for October 10th will be cancelled and the next meeting will be October 17th which will be an Executive Session, closed to press and public, starting at 3:30 and last until 6:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

-----  
Members not present: Castro/Friedman/Gildred/Keep/Ragsdale

(these members were notified by phone that Oct. 10th meeting was cancelled)

# Adult and Continuing Education

5350 University Ave., San Diego, CA 92105 (714) 280-7610, Ext. 141



Office of the President  
Philip del Campo, Ph.D.

October 19, 1978

MEMO TO: Members, Integrated Task Force  
FROM: Subcommittee - Duties of Monitors  
SUBJECT: DRAFT OF GUIDE FOR MONITORS

Attached for your review is a draft of the MONITORS GUIDE which has been developed by the subcommittee assigned to this area.

This will be presented for discussion at the meeting of the Task Force scheduled on Tuesday, October 24, 3:30 PM in the Training Classroom at the Police Department.

Your comments and suggestions will be appreciated.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Philip del Campo".

Philip del Campo, Chairman  
Subcommittee - Duties of Monitors

Beverly Yip, Member  
Judy McDonald, Member  
Hugh Friedman, Member  
George McKinney, Member

PdC:lb

MONITORS GUIDE

Prepared by San Diego School Integration Task Force

1.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR MONITORS

Monitors are responsible for fact-finding, information-gathering, observation, information-evaluation, and reporting to the Task Force.

- 1.1 In order to accomplish their tasks, monitors will have contacts with principals, teachers, other staff, students and parents. In all such contacts monitors should remain independent and neutral. Every effort should be made to approach these contacts in a positive manner in order to promote free flow of valid information. Monitors must never assume an advisory role. Neither should they attempt to negotiate, resolve, or reconcile differences of positions regarding matters affecting the assigned school.
- 1.2 Monitors are observers and should perform their duties without disrupting school operations.
- 1.3 Monitors should receive and relay to the Task Force suggestions, petitions or complaints from interested groups or individuals. If information is offered on a confidential basis, this request must be honored. Names of students should not be reported. Many matters may be brought to the attention of the monitor which do not have a bearing on the court order. Monitors should not allow themselves to be involved in individual petty gripes or problems.

1.4 Monitors are expected to explain their role and function to persons and groups concerned with the affairs of the schools, but they should never presume to interpret publicly school compliance or non-compliance with the court order. Monitors should not publicly express personal positions on matters affecting the school, nor should they publicly evaluate or interpret actions or positions of the Integration Task Force, the school administration, or the court. Requests for speakers should be referred to the chairman or vice-chairman of the Integration Task Force.

1.5 Good judgment and sensitivity to any situation are probably the best possible guides. If a situation arises and the monitor has questions about getting involved, the monitor should call their assigned Task Force Member.

## 2.0 PROCEDURES FOR MONITORS

Monitors are not on the premises to run schools or interfere with school operation. At all times monitors will respect the authority of the principal as the chief administrator of the school. Under no circumstances should this authority be questioned, challenged or undermined. In order for the monitor to function effectively, the following principles should be observed:

- 2.1 Monitors will keep the principal informed at all times of his or her activities and maintain open, honest communication.
- 2.2 Monitors appointed to the same school may operate as a team. Effort should be made to conduct the initial interview with the principal as a team to avoid undue intrusion on the principal's time. Monitors are encouraged to conduct individual observation and review. However, reports and evaluations may be a team effort when monitor consensus prevails. Otherwise, monitors should feel free to submit reports and evaluations expressing an individual point of view. In any event, care should be exercised not to impose unduly on the time and attention of the principal.
- 2.3 Monitors shall have access to school building and grounds.
- 2.4 Monitors will have authority to monitor classes in session after establishing a procedure with the principal regarding classroom visitation.
- 2.5 Monitors may interview teachers or staff during school hours, but should not interfere with assigned school activities.
- 2.6 Monitors should feel free to interview students. Student names should not be reported.
- 2.7 Monitors are encouraged to interview or discuss school matters with parents or other concerned persons.
- 2.8 Monitors should have the authority to monitor the assigned school's transportation program, including the right to board and ride school buses when appropriate.



Committee on Chicano Rights, Inc

CCR Meeting of April 25, 1978

Members Present:

Herman Baca  
Betty Suarez  
Ralph Inzunza  
Pervy Inzunza  
David Avalos  
Charlie Vasquez  
Mike Castro

Reading of Minutes by Herman Baca. Motion to accept minutes. Seconded and passed.

Mexico

We've been invited to go to Mexico to meet with Jose Lopez Portillo. We went over the pros and cons of whether or not to go. Motion to go to Mexico and to come back next week with the details. Seconded and Passed.

Copier

Mike gave the information on the copier. We like it but we need to check on financing it.

New York

We'll find out tomorrow from the Rev. Rios.

Security

We'll need heavy security for the East County speech. We also talked about the crank call to Dan regarding Herman.

Georgetown

Charlie gave a report on having a legal Intern placed at the CCR for the summer.-

Sweetwater

The lawsuit will be ready to go in about 2 weeks.

1837 Highland Avenue, National City, CA 92050 (714) 474-8195





Committee on Chicano Rights, Inc

Newspaper

David gave an update from issue 1-3

Abe Tapia

We talked about the recent polls showing Abe ~~in~~ in a very respectable position. We also talked about having a gathering for him. Motion to ~~match~~ Match Pervy's \$25 for bumper stickers.

By-laws

They are being typed up. Mike to find out where they're at.

Jerry

He's unemployed and we should go on record as supporting him on the firing. Motion to support Jerry with letter of support and coming out publicly. Seconded and passed. Motion to give David all ad money for May as an incentive. Seconded and passed.

Finances

Outstanding bills are Pervy, Charlie, Maggie, Ralph. Motion to reimburse \$240. Seconded and passed.