Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

9-2001

Special Focus Programs, Magnet Programs and Schools, and Early Childhood Education Centers: Equal Access in Portland Public School's Elementary Options

Nancy Seidule Hauth
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Early Childhood Education Commons](#), [Education Policy Commons](#), [Public Affairs Commons](#), [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Hauth, Nancy Seidule, "Special Focus Programs, Magnet Programs and Schools, and Early Childhood Education Centers: Equal Access in Portland Public School's Elementary Options" (2001). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 5589.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.7461>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Nancy Seidule Hauth for the Master of Urban Studies were presented September 12, 2001, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

Sy Adler, Chair

Carl Abbott

Dilafruz Williams
Representative of the Office of
Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL:

Michael Fogarty, Director
School of Urban Studies and
Planning

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Nancy Seidule Hauth for the Master of Urban Studies presented September 12, 2001.

Title: Special Focus Programs, Magnet Programs and Schools, and Early Childhood Education Centers: Equal Access in Portland Public School's Elementary Options.

As parents and educators demand more choice programs in their school districts, it is important for district officials to govern issues around equal access. When specialty programs are designed by grassroots groups and school staff without district-level guidance or funding, as it is in Portland, Oregon, equal access provisions can be overlooked resulting in lower ethnic and socio-economic diversity.

The purpose of this study was threefold: to determine if all families in Portland Public School district have equal access to special focus/magnet programs at the elementary grades; to better understand the link between Portland's past desegregation policies and current choice policies; and to project the likelihood that a school or community group will implement a special focus/magnet program in schools located in low-income/minority neighborhoods. This research focused on district and grassroots implementation efforts in two clusters of schools: Early Childhood Education Centers (ECEC), pre-kindergarten through fifth grade schools created during the district's thirty-year effort to desegregate; and magnet/special

focus programs and schools (choice programs), implemented since 1986 by grassroots groups and schools without desegregation-type goals.

Interviews were conducted with four high-level district officials, one former superintendent, two school principals, two staff members, a current and former school board member, and two school activists. Data concluded that a number of financial and political variables restrict equal access to special focus/magnet programs, particularly for low-income students. Those variables controlled by the state or district include Measure 5 (a state-wide tax initiative), tacit policy and planning, kindergarten - grade tuition requirements, location in primarily middle class neighborhoods, and lack of transportation provisions. At the school or program level, a complex application process and kindergarten-only applications further diminish equal access. Language immersion programs show higher numbers of minority students enrolled. Data suggest low feasibility for implementing a special focus/magnet program in an ECEC unless the district provides financial and technical assistance. These results suggest Portland's approach to special focus/ magnet programs conflict with past desegregation goals of combining integration and equal access with educational opportunities.

SPECIAL FOCUS PROGRAMS, MAGNET PROGRAMS AND
SCHOOLS, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION CENTERS:
EQUAL ACCESS IN PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOL'S
ELEMENTARY OPTIONS

by
NANCY SEIDULE HAUTH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF URBAN STUDIES

Portland State University
2001

This thesis is dedicated to my husband, Dennis Hauth, who as always, makes everything work. Thank you for your patience, love, and support. Now it's your turn.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the principals, teachers, staff, school board members, and district officials who took time from their schedules to talk to me about special focus and magnet programs and Early Childhood Education Centers. Thank you to my committee members including Sy Adler for his encouragement in the area of urban education; Carl Abbott for his careful readings of drafts and his suggestion that I push the research further; and Dilafruz Williams whose perspective helped me understand the complexities and challenges of creating special focus programs. Thank you also to Nina Johnson for her encouragement in pursuing this research and her valuable insights in the area of education options.

I am lucky to have family members who have been so supportive and helpful. Thank you to Marie Hauth for the many hours of entertaining her granddaughters while I was studying, and for her eagle eye in proofreading; to my Mom, Molly Gouge, for her immense support financially and emotionally, and for showing me years ago that parenting and schoolwork is a good combination; to Jim Seidule for the Calloway scholarship fund that gave me the opportunity to be a student again; and to my ever-creative and helpful daughters Abby and Sophie -- you are my inspiration!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Methodology	6
Definitions	7
Literature Review	11
Portland Public School District	22
Early Childhood Education Centers	27
Magnet/Special Focus Programs	34
Analysis of the Framework	47
Top-down Analysis	48
Bottom-up Analysis	63
Discussion	77
Recommendations	93
Policy Changes	94
Changes in District Practices	96
Conclusion	99
Terminal References	101
Appendices	110
Appendix A. Options in Portland Public Schools Brochure and Letter from the Superintendent	110
Appendix B. Woodstock Elementary School's Mention of the Mandarin Language Immersion Program	115

Appendix C. Desegregation Detail, Portland Public Schools	118
Appendix D. Implementation Ranking	120
Appendix E. Sample of A Magnet School's Application for Enrollment	124
Appendix F. St. Paul Public School District Options Catalog	131
Appendix G. Locations of Special Focus, Magnet and ECEC Schools and Programs	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	ECEC schools: impacts on majority /minority populations	28
Table 2	Integrative effect of ECECs: 1970-1980	30
Table 3	Transfers in / out of ECEC #1 by race and early vs primary grades, 2001	31
Table 4	Racial concentrations of ECEC schools: 2000	33
Table 5	ECEC #1 minority percentage: 1977-2000	34
Table 6	Enrollment trends by ethnicity for magnet program #1	39
Table 7	Enrollment trends by ethnicity for magnet school #2	41
Table 8	Elementary-level special focus/magnet programs *1998- 99/2000	44
Table 9	Facts about all-day and half-day kindergarten programs	62

“...we consider the issue of equity of access to educational options to be one of the great challenges facing the district in the near future. How we address this problem will undoubtedly affect every department and every school in the district.” (Portland Public School District Board member from e-mail correspondence dated July 3, 2001.)

INTRODUCTION

Portland Public School district serves approximately 55,000 students in 100 schools with 50 special needs programs. (Portland Public School Home Page) Like many large urban school districts, PPS suffers from budgetary woes due to a shift in funding streams, difficulty in retaining superintendents, and threats of school closures based on lack of enrollment. Nonetheless, Portland still prides itself on an intact public school system supported by the city's middle and upper class. Huffman and Powell in their popular guide to Portland area schools said in 1996, "The Portland Public School District is one of the two or three best large urban school systems left in the United States.(It) attracts students from across the socioeconomic spectrum (Huffman and Powell 1996, pg. 43).

Part of the success of the Portland School District is in the variety of education options for families with elementary age children. These include the assigned neighborhood school or any other neighborhood school, Early Childhood Education Centers (pre-kindergarten - fifth grade schools) and Head Start programs, magnets (defined as language immersion programs, an integrated arts program, and an individualized learning k-12 school) and special focus programs (thematic curriculum programs). Only the Early Childhood Education Center schools have integration as a goal. ECECs provide amenities to encourage enrollment from outside the attendance zone including transportation and free, full-day kindergarten (most are tuition-based).

In Portland Public School District, special focus and magnet programs are created by grassroots groups and defined by innovative curriculums. These are thematic programs (around the arts, sciences, and foreign languages) that are very popular in urban districts across the country. The distinctiveness in these programs, Portland style, is their development and implementation outside of policy planning or an overall district vision. One district official described the process as “policy planning willy nilly” (District official #2). Though there is no one at the district stopping innovation, there is also no one at the district encouraging implementation of these programs in neighborhoods where specialty schools are not represented. There is no top-down managing and few criteria required at the design stage because no one at the district is in charge of special focus and magnet programs.

From the perspective of staff, this situation offers the freedom to create new programs without bureaucratic red tape. On the other hand, once the program is established this lack of policy creates tension around the District’s role in governing the more autonomous staff of special focus and magnet programs. From the perspective of the low-income family interested in enrolling in a specialty program, the lack of district policy and governance impacts equal access. For instance, special focus and language immersion or magnet programs offer little or no transportation by the district, are located outside of minority neighborhoods, require complex application processes geared toward college-educated parents, and require monthly tuition for kindergarten from parents (with one exception).

Yet the innovation, which is often the result of parent - teacher teams or a principal, is

groundbreaking: two-way language immersion programs, a creative science program, a Mandarin Chinese program, a family cooperative school, a sign-language school for the hearing impaired, an integrated arts program. The grassroots energy coming from committed educators and parents creates the tenacious spirit (perhaps lacking in a large bureaucracy like a school district) needed to successfully design and implement a new school program.

In the old Albina neighborhood, where African Americans have resided in Portland since the 1920s and 1930s, are eight Early Childhood Education Centers or ECECs. These were designed to provide enhanced education while encouraging families outside the attendance zone to enroll as part of a number of local desegregation plans. ECECs are highly *inclusive* schools willing to accept students district-wide without an application process. Prior to the emergence of specialty programs at the elementary level and other political and financial pressures, ECECs were the “prize of the district” (interview with former school board member) -- well-funded programs with good teachers and leaning toward racial balance. Many ECECs are now racially isolated schools; one has recently undergone reconstitution and others are struggling (with some succeeding) to raise mediocre test scores and improve parent involvement.

In 1999, desegregation policy was reviewed and lightly edited but retained this quote from 2.10.011 (1) “The Board acknowledges the affirmative duty of this District to reduce and eliminate through equitable means racial isolation of minority children in its schools, achieve and maintain a racially integrated educational program for the benefit of all students of this District, and eliminate barriers to education attainment resulting

from prejudice, racism, class differences, and/or institutional discrimination.”

(Policies and Regulations, Portland Public Schools, District Administration) Locating at least one innovative special focus or magnet program in an existing Early Childhood Education Center school seems intuitive and clearly aligned with district policies and regulations. Why wasn't this considered back when ECECs began declining in the early 90's and moving back to racial isolation percentages reminiscent of the 1960's? Why isn't it being considered now?

The “what happened?” question is important to ask now as the city (and the nation) becomes more accustomed to and demanding of a growing menu of education options. Just 15 years ago in Portland there were two magnet programs at the high school level and one alternative/magnet school spanning kindergarten through 12th grade. Today all but one high school has a magnet program, four middle schools have special focus programs (two of which include elementary grades) and ten special focus and magnet programs exist at the elementary level. In school year 2001-2002, a new charter school will begin operation in the city's new children's museum. What will the choice menu look like in 2030? And more to the point, how diverse will the student population of choice programs be?

This topic is timely because for the first time all education options in Portland Public School district are being analyzed and aligned by the district, at the request of the school board. Will issues surrounding equal access be on the agenda for the new policy or are education option programs successful enough “as is”, with high enrollment trends and increasing popularity among the city's elite? This study is also

timely because the school district will soon lose an important exemption to the draconian Measure 5 law which has allowed state desegregation funding to go untouched. In school year 2004-5, desegregation funding will no longer be available as part of the Measure 5 framework (Memorandum to the Desegregation Committee, 11/22/1999).

This thesis researches not only the current status of equal access to specialty schools but also their separate philosophies surrounding curriculum and enrollment. It also explores the context for the district's politically unaware and conflicting policies and practices. For instance, after years of substantial restructuring efforts of elementary and middle schools to encourage integration, why did the district move in an entirely different direction -- education options -- without bringing integration or equal access efforts along? Finally it suggests the need for the district and its constituents to plan and develop new policy for voluntary integration driven by academic opportunities for all families in the form of more equitably located education options.

This thesis begins with a look at the history of both ECECs and specialty programs to unravel policies and practices that create separate programs for different social classes of student populations. It also pays close attention to the political landscape both nationally and locally that may have influenced the district's perspective on education options. While recognizing the need for families in all district neighborhoods to have access to specialty schools, this thesis focuses on the particular access difficulties that children from the Albina area experience. It asks:

- 1) Are the goals of specialty programs and ECEC's conflictual, based on earlier desegregation policies and current statements about equal access? Why or why not?
- 2) Do all students in PPS district have equal access to specialty programs? What are policies and practices that encourage or discourage equal access?
- 3) What is the likelihood of a school or community group implementing a specialty program in an Early Childhood Education Center school?

Special focus, magnet, and ECEC policies are analyzed through a top-down, district-level implementation policy framework and then through a bottom-up, school building and community perspective. In discussing this framework, barriers to both enrolling in and launching a new special focus program are examined. Finally, in the implications section, policy and practice changes are discussed.

Methodology

The methodology for this research includes intensive interviews with four district officials, a former PPS superintendent, two school principals, two school staff members, and two school activists. A brief but informative interview was conducted with a three-term former school board member and a current school board member heading a committee on education option policy. In addition, I held ongoing discussions with an independent policy analyst contracted by the District occurred. Secondary research includes historical documents written about Portland Public School District's desegregation and education options efforts both by the district and

by neutral researchers.

Research questions listed above are analyzed using Mazmanian and Sabatier's *Implementation and Public Policy* (1989), a top-down or "center" approach, and Michael Lipsky's *Street Level Bureaucrats* (1980), a bottom-up or "periphery and target" approach. This framework shapes the analysis of implementation efforts that both encourage and discourage equal access to choice programs and suggest the feasibility for implementing a special focus or magnet program at an existing Early Childhood Education Center.

Definitions

Unlike many national models, Portland Public Schools' interpretation of magnet and special focus programs include academic innovation without integration goals. This is confusing in light of terminology found in the literature, but it is also confusing at the Portland District level because district officials use different terms for choice programs. As Johnson (2001) states in her analysis of PPS education options, "The difficulty around what to call various education options is complicated by the fact that many of the education options look very similar to each other but are called different things." (page 5) Some officials define "magnet" as any choice option. Others link magnets to those programs that provide incentives for voluntary integration. A former Portland Public School principal who created an arts magnet school described it as both a magnet and a special focus.

In light of these differences, education option terminology is defined below and align

strictly with the district's definitions. In addition, other frequently used terms are defined here.

•Magnet schools and programs At the elementary level for PPS District, the official categorization for magnet programs includes language immersion programs, an integrated arts magnet school, and the alternative K-12 Metropolitan Learning Center (MLC). Though Early Childhood Education Centers act like magnets, they are marketed as their own category without using the term "magnet." Special focus programs are considered separate entities from magnets, although they often are similar in curriculum design and implementation.

•Special Focus programs Special focus programs are integrated curriculums around a particular theme. There are four at the elementary level: American Sign Language at Sunnyside, the Creative Science School at Bridger, the Family Cooperative School at Sunnyside, and the WinterHaven School at Brooklyn.

The term "special focus" was coined in 1994 after Board members approved policy to encourage bottom up implementation of new thematic programs. When asked about the differences between special focus and magnet programs, Jack Bierwirth, the former superintendent who encouraged the development of special focus programs said, "I can't think of any practical reason to (use) separate (terms). Who gets to go to a magnet school versus a special focus school doesn't require anything different. In practical matters, there is zero reason to differentiate."

The term “specialty program” is used throughout the paper and includes both special focus and magnet programs.

- Early Childhood Education Center Conceived under the Model School plan as a way to improve achievement levels for minority students, these were also designed to draw majority families by virtue of free pre-school and all-day kindergarten, lower teacher-student ratios, and multicultural curriculum. Though rarely referred to as a magnet program, its original design of placing a unique program open to the district in a minority neighborhood, most closely matches national models of magnet programs.

Pappas (1984), in her thesis on the history of early childhood development programs, defines Portland Public Schools’ Early Childhood Education Centers as magnet schools: “...though generally thought of as high school programs, the elementary schools in the Model Schools Program were designed for purposes of integration,” (8) One district official describes ECECs as the only “true magnets” in the District. (Informational interview)

- Title I schools This term is used throughout the paper because all Early Childhood Education Centers in Portland Public Schools are designated Title I schools. Title I is the first of five provisions of the federal 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Title I or the longer name “Financial Assistance to Local Education Agencies to Educate Children of Low Income Families” grants millions of dollars to school districts to provide more educational opportunities to ‘educationally deprived children.’ (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989, 80)

•Albina area All Early Childhood Education Centers are located in what is termed locally as the “Albina area” of Portland. Not one elementary level magnet or special focus program is located in the Albina area. Nor are they located in many other neighborhoods. Please see Appendix H for a map identifying the location of specialty and ECEC schools and programs.

In “The History of Portland’s African American Community (1805 to the Present)” written by the Portland Bureau of Planning (1993), the authors define Albina as “...mean(ing) different things to different people.” To some Portlanders it simply means neighborhoods on the inner east side with a concentration of African Americans. However, for the purposes of this paper, the definition of “Albina” is more distinct. It adopts the more current definition as described by the Portland Bureau of Planning and used in writing the Albina Community Plan: “During the Model Cities program the boundaries associated with Albina expanded to include Eliot, Boise-Humboldt, Woodlawn, Vernon-King-Sabin and Irvington (Irvington has since lost its status as an ECEC due to higher socio-economic status of the neighborhood). Nineteen square miles of land bounded by Broadway on the south, Columbia Boulevard on the north, Chautauqua on the West and roughly 33rd as the eastern boundary....” (Portland Bureau of Planning 1993, li) Because of the geographic separation between the two types of choice options analyzed here -- ECECs and special focus/magnet -- equal access among Albina area families is explored.

Literature Review

In 1997, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) under the U.S. Department of Education defined magnet programs as, "A strategy that promotes a special curriculum capable of attracting substantial numbers of students of different racial backgrounds." (DuBois et al. 1997,46) Many school districts implement these types of magnet programs -- marrying desegregation goals with educational innovation.

Raywid in Tannenbaum (1995) describes magnet programs as designed to "promote desegregation; develop an image of a 'high quality' public education; provide unique (or alternative) curricula or educational structures; retain public school students and draw nonpublic school students (page 310)." Raywid quotes David Tyack (1974) who suggests magnet programs are "the means of institutionalizing diversity within a system highly resistant to novelty and change (Raywid 1995, 312)."

Magnet programs were court approved in 1975 as a legal supplement to both voluntary and mandatory desegregation plans. In 1976 federal assistance through the Emergency School Aid Act and the Magnet Schools Assistance Program helped school districts across the country implement magnet programs (Eaton and Crutcher 1996, 265-66). In its original interpretation, magnet programs offered dual goals: to develop programs designed to enhance curriculum while encouraging voluntary desegregation.

The growing school choice movement, however, has altered how school districts interpret "magnet." Today, the politically attractive goal of increasing innovative curriculum programs overshadows the less popular goal of retaining racial balance.

The literature discusses the outcome of this shift as a resegregating one. For instance, Gardner et al. (2000) discuss the disadvantages of the resulting resegregated schools in low-income, minority neighborhoods. He cites Orfield's (2000) concern that "restoring neighborhood schools forces more minority children into isolated, high-poverty schools that almost always have low levels of academic competition, performance, and preparation for college or jobs. " (Gardner et al. 2000, 76)

Gardner describes district bureaucracies as being unable to make the transition from desegregation to "genuine integration with schools that produce clear gains for minority students." (Gardner et al., 77) He states "integrated classrooms have a profound effect on the performance levels of all students. " (page 80) Again quoting Orfield (1996), he suggests the invaluable benefits of powerful parent groups; "Once you get the resegregation in there, these are powerless schools. " (Gardner et al., 80) Still, Gardner cites examples where students living in concentrations of poverty overcome their disadvantages "under the right conditions" (page 80). He lists these conditions as 1)"an intense focus on academic achievement"; 2) a basic skills curriculum; 3) constant testing; 4) improving home-school links (primarily after school programs). (Gardner et al. 2000, 80)

The last decade could be characterized as the "choice era" for school reform. With the growth of charter schools, interdistrict transfers, magnet programs, and alternative programs, parents have more opportunities to enroll their children in schools that are not traditional neighborhood schools. This brings up issues in choice literature which debate equal access to specialty programs. Yair writes, "Choice policies are riddled

with conflicts between parents' right to decide where their children will study, and the government's responsibility to ensure equal opportunities for all." (Yair 1996)

In 1991, over 1.2 million students were participating in magnet programs in over 230 school districts (Blank 1996, 157; Smrekar and Goldring 1999, 7). Fifty nine percent of magnet programs in the country are at the elementary level (Raywid 1995, 311). These popular programs (75 percent of these school districts have waiting lists for magnet programs) are primarily in big city school districts, (Smrekar and Goldring 1999, 7) and part of either a mandatory or voluntary desegregation plan. Their popularity today has grown out of a nationwide school choice movement and its promotion of parent involvement, competition among schools, and special focus curriculum (Blank 1996, 156). For instance, a cover article in *U.S. News and World Report* in 1991 reported 32,000 applications in the Los Angeles school district for only 10,000 spaces; Buffalo received 8,900 applications for 2,300 available seats. (Linnon et al. 1991)

Much of the empirical research to date suggests that magnet schools amplify social stratification (see Orfield and Eaton 1996; McDermott 1999; Smrekar and Goldring 1999; and contributing authors in Fuller and Elmore 1996), although they are successful in voluntarily integrating. That is, middle class minority and majority families take greater advantage of magnet programs than lower class families.

Magnet school plans look very different from district to district. The scale and design have varying impacts on desegregation goals. In short, in analyzing the particulars of

magnet programs, design matters. Fuller (Fuller and Elmore 1996) states that magnet schools and other choice methods "don't preclude racial integration; neither does it necessarily advance integration. Rather, it is in large measure the institutional framework -- the specific design of the choice program and the will and capacity of the educational bureaucracy to implement its provisions -- that determines whether choice will complement or confound the pursuit of racial integration." (page 98) What design elements in magnet programs draw the most diverse students? The literature suggests a variety of indicators such as number of magnets offered, location, transportation, informational and outreach, and the type of magnet program.

The scale of magnet programs may be the biggest indicator of equal access. The St. Paul Public School District offers 31 elementary level magnet schools and one tri-county magnet school. These schools were restructured incrementally over the last fifteen years from the traditional neighborhood model to magnets as part of their voluntary desegregation plan. (St. Paul Public Schools, School Choices and Services Catalog, 2001-2002) In Kansas City, Missouri, most of the district's schools have magnet programs. This is the result of a court-ordered desegregation plan that has helped reach the goal of 60 percent African American to 40 percent European American in every school. (Harrison 1991) In Dade County, Florida, there are 48 magnet programs, which until recent changes were designed to improve the quality of the curriculum in the schools rather than to improve racial balance (Harrison 1991, 5) The Dade County superintendent reported that many traditional neighborhood schools mirror some of the curriculum innovations of the popular magnet programs "in order to keep students from transferring to magnet programs." (Harrison 1991, 5)

Magnet school program designs typically fall into one of three categories: 1) a program within a school (PWAS) in which a separate program is housed in a larger traditional neighborhood school building; 2) dedicated magnet in which the entire school is enrolled in the program and there is no attendance zone; 3) dedicated magnet in which all attendance zone students are automatically enrolled in addition to the transfer students (Eaton and Crutcher in Orfield and Eaton 1996). The latter is by far the most equitable, particularly when the magnet school is located in a low-income or minority neighborhood. In this design, families are automatically enrolled and aren't filtered through complex applications or academic requirements. (Blank 1996,157)

Design elements also include thematic curriculum components integrated throughout the program. Examples include language immersion programs, arts or science programs, or programs based on a philosophical approach such as Waldorf, Montessori, or Piaget. Other programs can include a more basic skills curriculum. Henig argues that the sticking point for parents in deciding where their children will attend is less about how the program is designed and more about how their child fits in with the racial balance of the school. For instance, Henig says, "The concern about social integration... lead both white and black parents to be unhappy when their children are in the distinct minority. (Henig 1995) This contributes to some of the tensions school districts face when promoting magnet programs that integrate while supporting neighborhood schools.

In addition to the type of magnet program, the location of the program impacts equity

issues. Rossell (1990) finds that although about half of all magnet programs are located in minority communities, a full one third are located in white neighborhoods with the remaining twenty percent found in integrated neighborhoods. Though she admits that integrating a magnet school in a minority location is more difficult, Rossell is still surprised with these findings: "Since school districts have limited resources, one would think that they would put their money into the most difficult-to-desegregate schools -- those located in minority neighborhoods." (Rossell 1990 p. 124)

Researchers have agreed on general trends related to the location issue. For instance, Rossell (1990) and Smrekar and Goldring (1999) agree that minority and low-income students are unlikely to leave neighborhood schools for magnet programs due to lack of transportation and knowledge about programs outside the neighborhood. They also agree that whites are less likely to apply to magnet schools within schools that are predominately minority than they are in more diverse or all-white settings. Rossell also notes that "elitism generated by magnet schools with superior resources is a problem that policymakers must address, and it is the reason I recommend putting magnets in minority neighborhoods." (Rossell 1990, 202) In St. Louis' extensive magnet program, the courts required many magnet programs to be located in the inner city. (Smrekar and Goldring 1999,16)

Linked to location is transportation and its cost. During the height of desegregation when busing was often court-ordered, transportation subsidies were budgeted into the magnet program, at the elementary level at least. This was often economically feasible because it was geographically efficient: a group of schoolchildren from one

neighborhood are picked up and transported to one school in another neighborhood. Yet with magnet programs, the costs are much higher because transfer students are dispersed district wide (Orfield, 103), attending a variety of nonneighborhood schools. In a city-county program like St. Louis and Cincinnati, where a number of suburban magnet schools draw a high number of city kids (Smrekar and Goldring 1999), costs are diminished and are covered by the plan. Finally, only McDermott (1999) touched on the issue of transportation planning for students interested in staying after school for extracurricular activities (McDermott 1999,137-138). As Orfield states in his chapter titled "Unexpected Costs and Uncertain Gains", "Ironically, more choice may equal more busing, implying higher costs." (page 103)

A key component to creating a choice program that offers equal access to all students is information dissemination. The literature draws different conclusions about the ability district offices and individual schools and programs have to not only inform families about specialty programs but also to reach out to populations who tend to participate less in these programs. Blank (1996) was impressed with the overall effort of magnet schools in publishing information for interested parents. Blank found six different outreach strategies though only 39 percent of the districts surveyed routinely sent information to all parents (page 169). Likewise, Rossell (1990) was equally impressed with district efforts to get the word out to parents about choosing magnet schools. She notes, "School districts with magnet schools prepare elaborate, detailed booklets, leaflets, and newsletters with enticing descriptions of their magnet programs. (page 111) But Linnon (1991) found that complex admissions and lack of outreach were barriers for low-income families. "In many school systems, ...the magnet-

admission process is a maze of complex requirements that aren't generally publicized." (Linnon et. al 1991 quoting Davenport) Smrekar (1999) found admissions processes to be difficult with middle class expectations (reliable car and a stay at home parent or flexibility in work).

Difficulty in accessing information about magnets and navigating the application process impacts school demographics. Minority parents are less likely to be aware of a magnet program. For instance, 40 percent of African American parents and 60 percent of Hispanic parents had not heard the term "magnet schools or magnet program" (Henig 1996, 110). In St. Louis and Cincinnati, Smrekar and Goldring found that parents who choose to enroll their children in magnet schools had higher social status in the areas of income, education, and occupational status. A more middle class orientation provides a network offering "stable and predictable channels of information and referral for questions critical for enhancing the educational experiences of children..." (Smrekar and Goldring 1999, 108.) Henig agrees: "...parents fall back on other criteria, including... informal word-of-mouth...." (Henig 1995)

Some school districts are more systematic in blanketing the community with school information. For instance, Cincinnati Public School District publishes an annual guide to their school district, which includes applications and deadlines for magnet programs. The parents of every child enrolled in CPSD receive magnet school brochures. And the district advertises magnet programs via television, radio and the newspaper (Smrekar and Goldring 1999). Likewise, St. Paul Public School District sends out a catalog to all district families describing education options including applications and

transportation details. Researchers note, however, that low-income and minority parents are still not hearing the pitch, are unaware that transportation is provided, or are overwhelmed by the process of applying. For instance, the first-come first-served approach to many magnet lottery systems puts low-income families, who may have problems with childcare or transportation, at a disadvantage. (Linnon et al. 1991)

In the St. Louis and Cincinnati school district case studies, the results were clear: magnet schools are integrating successfully and voluntarily: 60 percent of African Americans enroll in magnet programs in St. Louis, though a large proportion remain on waiting lists (Smrekar and Goldring 1999, 102-103). Linnon found that magnets are not as elitist as they were once reported to be. "Fully a fourth of Bronx Science (a renowned magnet school) students qualify for federal aid to the poor." Linnon continues saying that schools with such high standards offer an exit for some students because they represent "real avenues to success for minority students." (Linnon et al. 1991) This avenue must be supported by amenities like transportation or else located in neighborhoods convenient to this population of students.

The research also mentions the "creaming" approach that complex application processes have on family enrollment demographics. Where once designed to balance racially isolated schools, magnet programs today "focus on student outcomes and on a unique mission. Nonmagnets have diffuse missions, a great variety of programs, and are controlled by piecemeal demands, rules, claimed entitlement, and contractual provisions (Inger 1991)." The result, Inger says, can be "student creaming. He says, "Magnets do draw to their halls -- and away from nonmagnets -- better, more highly

motivated students.“

Yet some school districts encourage integration and innovation by offering substantial equal access provisions. For instance, magnet programs in the Flint Community Schools, Flint, Michigan, provide transportation to all students enrolled in magnet programs and they support “accessibility to all students at the appropriate grade levels school-districtwide within a racially integrated setting.” (Flint Community Schools web site) St. Paul Public School District offers transportation to all elementary students who choose to attend one of 31 magnet schools in the District. So, in addition to providing transportation, this District offers access simply through the number of thematic magnet schools that families can choose from. (St. Paul Public School web site, informational interview with St. Paul Curriculum team)

In terms of designing magnet and specialty programs, “controlled choice” is a goal for some districts attempting to diminish the exclusive nature of specialty programs. For instance, in five large urban school districts in Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey, all students in all grades must choose the school they attend. In other words, every school is a choice. The district, however, places controls on enrollment based on racial balance. Glenn (1995) says it “...places restrictions on choice to promote integration (but) does not deprive it of its liberating power.” (page 327) Four positive attributes of controlled choice include: 1) All students have equal access to all schools. 2) Controlled choice encourages all parents (“not just the most sophisticated”) to make decisions about school enrollment. 3) Lack of “guaranteed enrollment” based on attendance zone encourages school-level improvements. 4) Voluntary racial

desegregation is a goal of every school not just magnet or specialty schools. (Glenn 1995, 330)

Criticisms of controlled choice are: the selection process can track students; some parents are either not able to make decisions about schooling for their children or do not want the choice; and district officials may "mislead" families about their options. The criticism that is perhaps the most salient is that the strength of controlled choice is dependent on the ability of districts to create a large number of innovative curriculums to meet the needs of a diverse population. (Glenn 1995, 331)

The literature agrees that magnet programs are often exclusive, and with only fifty percent of elementary level magnet programs located in minority neighborhoods, are often out of reach of lower income families. Understandably, some Districts want to have both choice and integration, and the literature says this requires some intervention, some controls and oversight. Without clear goals for both equal access and integration, the same chronic problems will be repeated with magnets: underperforming schools in low-income communities and high performing schools in middle and upper income communities. Henig argues "...unless aggressively regulated by authorities -- the direction in which choice points may exacerbate, rather than ameliorate, racial segregation." (Henig 1995)

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

There are three significant eras that have shaped policy and practice for Early Childhood Education Centers and special focus and magnet schools and programs in Portland Public Schools. These eras are: 1) the Compensatory Model School era which embraced district-wide goals of voluntary integration and racial balance; 2) the Blanchard-era (named after a superintendent) which stressed both integration and the promotion of neighborhood schools; and 3) the Measure 5/choice era.

• **Model Schools Program** This successful and innovative local program, funded by a federal HUD grant beginning in 1965, was the result of a report written by a community group called Committee on Race and Education (otherwise known as the Schwab Committee). The group found that minority children in Portland's Albina area were receiving unequal educational opportunities: "Substantial numbers of disadvantaged children, concentrated in a limited number of schools were receiving an education unacceptable in quality, achievement, and effectiveness" (Pappas 1984, 75). The Schwab committee suggested two main strategies for achieving equal educational opportunities: 1) restructuring nine elementary schools with low achievement levels and a high concentration of minority students by lowering class size, adding free preschools, special teacher training, improved materials, and eliminating the upper grades (5-8); 2) implementing the administrative transfer program, to "relieve the concentration of blacks in the schools" (Pappas 1984, 77-78).

A strategy aimed at reducing racial isolation, the Administrative Transfer (AT) program

which began in 1966 transferred 888 children out of their neighborhoods.

Administrative Transfers differ from the voluntary transfer program which allows students to attend any district school based on space availability and providing one's own transportation. The AT program was designed to encourage, through transportation and other means, disadvantaged inner city children to attend schools with more affluent student bodies.

In 1965, the Portland School District received a federal grant from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for almost \$2 million, about \$1 million of which was designated for elementary level schools. This grant officially launched the Model Schools Compensatory Program. In 1967, the first Early Childhood Development Center was implemented at the Holladay Elementary School with a Follow Through program to the second grade. The program's enhanced curriculum included summer school programs, tutors, a reading improvement center at one school, community agents, teachers aides and a teacher corps were implemented in nine Albina area elementary programs.

•Blanchard era In 1970 Robert Blanchard, recommended improving the Model Schools program. He proposed converting all "Albina area" elementary model schools into magnet programs consisting of pre-school through 5th grade. The strategy was that all neighborhood children would attend the schools, as well as families who chose to transfer in to these programs. Under Blanchard's recommendations, transportation would be provided for those transferring into these elementary schools. In 1972, Holladay Elementary closed, leaving eight model schools

that would become Early Childhood Education Centers or ECECs under the Schools for the 70s plan. The ensuing implementation of ECECs was swift and effective, and along with Administrative Transfers began reducing racial isolation among these schools.

Under the Portland Schools for the Seventies, the Administrative Transfer program accelerated due to the increase in ECEC programs. Resolution x3533, March 23, 1970, converted all Albina area elementary schools to ECEC programs. This increased the number of Administrative Transfers because most of these schools had previously been kindergarten through 8th grade. With the restructuring to an ECEC (pre-k through 5th grade), older children in grades 6-8 had to be relocated to schools outside the neighborhood using the Administrative Transfer program. At the time, there was no Albina area middle school; as a result, administrative transfers became synonymous with forced busing. (Geddes 1982) The result was "the scattering of AT students throughout the District. For example, in 1977-78, 415 administrative transfer students from one of the more overcrowded ECEC schools "...were bused to thirty-nine different schools throughout the District." (Geddes 1982, 111).

The growing controversy around administrative transfers was one of the issues the Community Coalition for School Integration focused on in their report entitled "Equity for the 80's." The Coalition group requested two-way busing, which Blanchard refused to endorse in negotiations (Geddes 1982). Instead, he allowed all children who were forced to relocate outside of their neighborhood under the AT policy the option of returning to their neighborhood schools. This Board-approved

policy, allowing all Administrative Transfer students a space in their neighborhood school, remains District policy today. Though District and community groups had different strategies, their objectives in the end were fairly aligned. In response to the Desegregation Plan, the Black United Front said: "... (We) champion pluralism and neighborhoodness, denigrate assimilation, and place no emphasis on desegregation." (Geddes 1982, 118)

The Comprehensive Desegregation Plan improved the Early Childhood Education Center design with the following components: 1) smaller classrooms 2) focus on basic skills 3) "learning maps" structured to individual learning styles 4) "continuous progress" approach which allows children to progress at their own rate 5) multi-cultural education-based curriculum, and 6) better home-school links including "learning contracts (Geddes 1982). It also succeeded in securing significant state funding for integration efforts, including the all-day free kindergarten program in ECECs (PPS Finance Department). Though the Desegregation Plan attempted to continue pushing for voluntary integration through improved minority-area neighborhood schools in the form of ECECs, it does mark the District's movement back to promoting neighborhood schools at the expense of integration policies.

• Measure 5 and the growth of choice options Matthew Prophet's tenure as superintendent began just as the 1980 Desegregation Plan had been approved and implementation of the first phase of stabilizing ECECs had started. Soon, the beginning of grassroots-level demand for more choice options grew louder in more middle class neighborhoods outside of the Albina area of Portland. During his tenure

and between the years 1986 and 1989 three magnet programs were implemented in nonminority neighborhoods (in response to organized parent pressure). These programs operated outside of the recently approved desegregation policies.

Soon after these programs were in place, Measure 5 passed as a state-wide property tax initiative. The result was to make school districts more dependent on the state general fund. It put a cap on the amount local government could increase property taxes and thus greatly decreased the school budget as well as district control of school funding. From an historic perspective, Measure 5 seems to be the political impetus for a district-level push for more innovation in education option programs. In an early 1994 board meeting, one board member articulated this link. According to informal minutes, he said, "one of the interesting outcomes of Measure 5 is it has forced us to look at programs and look at what we do. ...(T)his is a constructive thing to change this policy, and show that we can respond to the community's need and that we are looking at things differently." (Informal Board minutes January 1994)

The first superintendent to face the continuing budget crisis was Prophet's successor, Jack Bierwirth. During Bierwirth's five year tenure (1992-1997), five new programs emerged at the elementary level and four at the middle school level with two of those closing. Meanwhile, in inner Northeast Portland, the Early Childhood Elementary Schools began losing their status as an appealing option for some families. A number of circumstances were steering the district away from updating these schools and focusing on rebuilding the curriculum. Perhaps the most damaging was in the original ECEC design -- its lack of thematic, "magnet-style" curriculum.

Early Childhood Education Centers

The Early Childhood Education model set a new district precedent emphasizing the primary grades by restructuring eight Albina area K-8 elementary schools into pre-k through fifth grade schools. Unlike many magnets developed during this time, Portland's ECECs were not built around an integrative thematic curriculum or early education philosophy. Though curriculum development was a priority, the measurements of success and the foundation of ECECs was clearly around the goal of integration: "The Board acknowledges the affirmative duty of this District to reduce and eliminate through equitable means racial isolation of minority children in its schools," (Policy and Regulations 2.10.011)

Policy around ECECs is detailed, directive, and generously funded. Policies include how children are transported (4.10.050 c), admission and transfers (4.10.053), supervision and evaluation by the central office with intervention requested if racial concentration increases (2.10.011 j), and reorganization of these schools to a pre-kindergarten through fifth grade design rather than kindergarten through sixth or eighth (2.10.010). Interestingly, the policy then includes language suggesting the possibility of mandatory desegregation should parents and staff shirk their integrative duty: "...Declares that in implementation of these policies the District will avoid and eliminate such inequitable compulsory burdens as may be imposed by desegregation." (2.10.011 5)

Table 1**ECEC schools: impacts on majority /minority populations**

School & Year ECEC began	1977 Min # Min %	1977 Total Enroll.	1977 Maj. non-res	1978 Min# Min %	1978 Total En- roll.	1978 Maj non res	1979 Min# Min%	1979 Total enroll	197 9 Maj. non- res
Humboldt 1974	208 52.1%	399	151	220 50.8%	433	182	268 55.6%	482	167
Irvington 1967	280 41.8%	669	107	319 47.3%	674	74	290 44.7%	648	82
Eliot 1969	231 48.1%	480	190	304 58.2%	522	208	272 52.6%	517	222
King 1975	370 61%	605	123	369 58.7%	628	155	436 64.0%	681	129
Sabin 1976	226 57.2%	395	53	230 52.8%	435	119	277 53.4%	518	147
Vernon 1977	323 62.2%	519	44	320 65.8%	486	52	309 63.0%	490	53
Woodlawn 1978	189 58.3%	324	n/a	260 54.5%	477	38	268 55.6%	482	51
Boise 1980	326 84.4%	386	n/a	388 82.9%	468	N/A	485 90.9%	533	6

Data from *Chronology and History: Desegregation/Integration, Portland Public School, Office of the Superintendent 1981. (Chart G)*

Note: This chart includes only the years 1977 to 1981. Transfer in/out were otherwise only offered by the District for the most recent school year.

How effective were ECEC schools in providing incentives for majority families to enroll their children? Based on this supply and demand, Table 1 shows that for a time, families outside the attendance zone were enrolling in ECECs. By 1979 when most of the ECECs had been implemented for at least two years, racial balance percentages were primarily in the 50-60 percentage range. For instance, one hundred sixty seven majority children from outside of the neighborhood were enrolled in Humboldt, which today has the highest minority concentration in any Portland elementary school (92.6 percent). The data reveal that ECECs succeeded in drawing majority families from outside of the area to these schools. This conflicts with much of the literature, like Rossell (1990) and Smrekar and Goldring (1999) who agreed that whites are less likely to apply to magnet schools in predominately minority neighborhoods.

Table 2 shows the effects of desegregation policies on racial balance percentages. Voluntary integration through ECECs and administrative transfers diversified most of these Albina-area neighborhood schools by the early 1980's. King, Humboldt, Irvington, and Boise had the most dramatic responses to District integration strategies with racial balance percentage points increasing at least 25 points over ten years. Vernon and Woodlawn are the exceptions with racial balances decreasing -- Vernon decreased 5 percentage points and Woodlawn seven percentage points. This may be due to an increase in African American population in these neighborhoods.

Table 2**Integrative effect of ECECs: 1970-1980**

School, Yr. ECEC began	Afr. Amer '70-71	Afr Amer '72-73	Afr. Amer '74-75	Afr.Amer 76-77	Afr. Amer 78-79	Afr.Amer 80-81	% points change in racial balance '70-80
Humboldt 1974	85.8%	88.3%	64.7%	54.8%	49.0	57.3	28.5
King 1975	90.8%	81.4%	92.9%	63.5%	56.1%	58.5%	32.3
Irvington 1967	62.7%	49.7%	51.8%	39.6%	42.7%	37.6%	25.1
Sabin 1976	58.4%	58.4%	61.8%	51.9%	46.7%	49.2%	9.2
Vernon 1977	47.4%	52.6%	59.6%	58.3%	57.4%	52.8%	-5.4
Eliot 1969	55.9%	59.0%	66.0%	53.7%	51.3%	39.1%	16.8
Woodlawn 1978	39.1%	38.6%	42.4%	51.8%	47.0%	46.2%	-7.1
Boise 1980	91.4%	90.8%	89.2%	81.8%	72.9%	57.3%	34.1

Data from *Chronology and History: Desegregation/Integration, Portland Public School, Office of the Superintendent 1981*; p.68.

Part of the strategy behind the development of the ECEC program was that the mix of families would remain through the fifth grade. However, one ECEC principal estimated that 95 percent of his nonresident, nonminority students return to their neighborhood school before completing the fifth grade. Pappas wrote: "The desire of those working on the comprehensive desegregation program was to make offerings in grades 1-4 so special that nonminority parents would elect to keep their children in these schools through their entire Early Childhood Education period of schooling." (Pappas 1984, 106).

Table 3 suggests a number of trends around who transfers to an ECEC, how long transfer students remain at the school, and different patterns based on disaggregating race. The name of the ECEC school represented in Tables 3 and 5 is listed as ECEC #1, to protect the identity of the school.

Table 3

Year 2001, Transfers in / out of ECEC #1 by race, early vs primary

Race	Transfer In Pre-k/K	Transfer out Pre-k/K	Transfer In 1-5	Transfer Out 1-5	Net
African Amer	89	18 (8)	211	73 (41)	+209
Euro Amer	28	14 (1)	15	24 (8)	+5
Other min	26	3	27	33	+17
TOTAL	143	35	253	130	231

Data from *Portland Public Schools, Research, Evaluation & Assessment, 4.18.01*

Note: Data in bold are number of transfer outs to other ECEC schools.

- Families within the North/Northeast Portland clusters exhibit mobility when it comes to school enrollment. For instance, forty one percent of ECEC #1's total enrollment is from students transferring in from outside the attendance zone, with 84 percent of those coming from North/Northeast cluster schools. Likewise, of those in the primary grades at ECEC #1's transferring out, 56 percent enroll in other Albina area ECECs.

- European Americans transfer out at a higher rate in the primary grades than in the pre-k/kindergarten grades. Inversely, European Americans transfer in to ECEC #1 at a higher rate at the pre-k/k level. Unlike African American enrollment trends, only one third of European Americans transferring out of ECEC #1 enrolled in another ECEC program.

- A large number of students (211) or 29 percent of total enrolled students transfer in to ECEC #1 at the primary grades. Of the European American families transferring in from outside the ECEC #1 attendance area in the pre-k/kindergarten program, the vast majority -- 85.7 percent-- transfer out by the fifth grade. This data generally supports the belief discussed by many district officials in the district (as well as ECEC #1's principal), that families enroll in the program to receive a tuition free year of kindergarten, and then eventually move back to their neighborhood school.

Data from Table 4 reflect low racial balance percentages for most ECECs today. Beach (the two-way language immersion program) and Boise Eliot are the only

programs with racial balances below 80 percent. Humboldt has both the lowest racial balance at 92.6 percent and the lowest enrollment at 325 students. In 1979, five years after implementation of its Early Childhood Education Center, Humboldt had an enrollment of close to 500 with a 55 percent minority balance.

Table 4

Racial concentrations of ECEC schools: 2000

ECEC	Afr. Amer %	Total minority %	Euro Amer	Enrollment
Beach	28.7%	68.8%	31.1%	553
Boise-Eliot	50.9%	69.4%	30.5%	685
King	71.3%	87.3%	12.3%	733
Humboldt	76.6%	92.6%	7.4%	325
Sabin	63.9%	80.9%	19%	394
Vernon	66.3%	88%	12%	502
Woodlawn	70.7	86.7%	13.2%	547

Data from Portland Public Schools Enrollment Report, October 2000

Note:* Under Beach ECEC minority, 66.2% minority (other) is Hispanic. Beach acquired ECEC status in 1998 when Irvington lost desegregation funding.

One long-time PPS District official currently in the Transfer Office said, "Originally, ECECs had a lot more money. Originally, they had enriched programs through the 5th grade. Money dried up and ECECs were cut back to the most basic concerns -- to give the youngest children basic skills and all-day kindergartens. The program is adrift."
(Informational interview, Transfer Office, April 2001)

Table 5

ECEC #1 minority percentage: 1977-2000

1977	1980	1983	1986	1989	1992	1995	1998	2000
61%*	64.4%	69.3%	71.4%	75.0%	77.5%	82.0%	88.0%	87.7%

Data from *Portland Public Schools, Enrollment Trends. And Chronology and History: Desegregation/Integration, Portland Public Schools, Office of the Superintendent, 1981.*

Note: *Lists only African American percentage rather than minority

Today, Early Childhood Education Center #1 has racial balance percentages that harken back to pre-Model School days in the 1960s (see Table 5). In the District's October 2000 Enrollment Report, the minority percentage for ECEC #1 is almost 88 percent, one percentage point less than the average minority percentage take from 1970-1975 for this same school.

Magnet/Special Focus Programs

Unlike ECECs, magnet and special focus programs are bottom-up, grassroots efforts with curriculum, governance, and enrollment criteria unique to each program. There is very little guidance or funding from the District for groups interested in starting up new programs as well as for those in operation. Although these option programs have existed for about fifteen years, there has been no attempt by the district to engage the community or on just a district-school level in an effort to devise a long-term plan for education options in Portland School District.

Essentially, these programs operate under tacit policy, and this has caused tension and

potential instability from the perspective of staff and advocates for magnet and special focus programs. For instance, a 1999 Special Focus Task Force report says, "...other than allowing the SFS to establish themselves, the dialogue and support have been inconsistent in regards to how the schools should function, govern, and interact within the PPS system. This has led to many problems and confusion over the years." (May 27, 1999, 2) This thesis argues that lack of policy impacts not only the sustainability of the specialty schools (as described in the bottom-up analysis section), but also equal access issues for all students (as described in the top down section).

Strategies and goals A series of interviews with the superintendent who encouraged the growth of special focus programs suggest his strategy was on loosening central regulation to allow for grassroots innovation. Bierwirth discussed the goals he wanted to achieve by encouraging more specialty programs:

- Offer learning options for pedagogical reasons. "I wanted to have a variety of learning options available. That's easier to do in a larger district."
- Offer learning options for political reasons. "Portland school district is the only major American city in the United States that had a reasonably whole district with middle and upper income families supporting it. We were offering something that the suburbs couldn't offer. It's fascinating to me hearing Chamber of Commerce members or banking executives telling people about language immersion programs. We have a great public school system. You can live in the city and send your kids to the public schools."
- It's what parents wanted. "We have five times the applications in language immersion programs than we had spaces for. Why not respond to it?"

•To provide opportunities for innovation. While great innovation can occur at any school, “I’ve always felt it was more likely to occur in an option program. Magnet/special focus programs are most likely to be places where nifty new ideas would be implemented.”

Bierwirth highlighted basic tensions around special focus programs in a memorandum distributed to board members. These included the level of District involvement in light of “locally-derived needs”, the potential controversy around extra funding (creating more conflict between neighborhood and magnet programs), the goals (“should they serve purposes such as desegregation?”), and how to expand successful models (from Informal Minutes, Board of Education, September 23, 1993) . These issues, and the District’s long-time promotion of and commitment to strong neighborhood schools, suggest enough complexity to warrant a full scale policy plan. This never happened.

Instead, an incremental shift toward option programs emerged quietly during the noisy controversy of Measure 5. Bierwirth’s bottom-up strategy, with no district funding or oversight, gave the board and district little political or financial reason to reject these programs. On the other hand, only those groups with the most resources with members from the education elite could survive. When asked if it was a Darwinian approach to education innovation, he said, “Completely! If anyone can climb to the top of Mt. Everest they should be rewarded!”

When asked who came forward with special focus school proposals, Bierwirth said, “Mostly white, middle and upper class with teachers, and on their own.” He was

asked, "So students whose parents don't have the money or the time to start-up schools because they're dealing with poverty-related issues get stuck in ...underachieving schools?" the former superintendent replied, "it's not either/or... They had their opportunity."

In September of 1993, Superintendent Bierwirth first approached the Board with suggestions of "more flexible programs." One former board member, interviewed informally for this paper, said at the time, *"if you leave it entirely to the schools to generate ideas, it is not part of a long term plan and things such as equity issues have arisen from that. That is one problem with not having the Board identify the purpose of magnets."* (Informal Minutes, Board of Education, September 23, 1993)

Later in the same meeting, the minutes show the same board member saying, "One point that has not been listed is that we are a city of neighborhoods and it is a significant part of our city. If we were to increase the number of elementary school options, (I) wouldn't want it to diminish the strength of our neighborhoods. " (Informal Minutes, Board of Education, Portland Public Schools, Regular Meeting, September 23, 1993)

That board member was recently asked if there were discussions about the potential inequities around option programs. The board member said, "That political issue didn't play out in magnet versus ECEC. Herndon's group (what is now called the Crisis Team, an advocacy group for minority families) didn't look at programs. They were arguing equity -- better neighborhood schools -- but not access to other schools.

“ The board member also pointed out that ECECs and magnet programs experience different political pressures due to funding streams. For instance, ECECs receive their money from the federal government and state government rather than locally.

When asked why the special focus/magnet movement was so quiet, so lacking in controversy, this former board member said, “ Things happen slowly from a grassroots approach. So no policy was approved.” (Informational Interview) Two Oregonian articles following Bierwirth’s resignation suggest the public was unaware of the growth of option programs. None of the articles mentions his encouragement and facilitation of special focus programs. Rather, the articles focused on his leadership style and on the severity of budget cuts he made (Hammond and Carter, December 24th 1997; Carter, September 19, 1997).

Enrollment trends Although not mentioned in Bierwirth’s list of goals, improved enrollment trends was certainly an outcome for neighborhood schools adding a special focus or magnet program. Magnet #1 (program name not identified to protect the school’s anonymity) is a good example as illustrated in Table 6. Their low enrollment of 271 students with an 8.4 percent minority rate in 1985 changed to a high of 565 students in 1999 with an improved (though decreasing annually since 1995) minority percentage of 15.7 percent. For the magnet, the breakdown of minority enrollments remained fairly static except for the Hispanic population which increased from zero in 1983 (with a district percentage of 1.9 percent of total student population) to a high of 63 Hispanic students (12 percent) in 1995 (compared with the district percentage of 5.2 percent).

Table 6**Enrollment trends by ethnicity for magnet program #1**

Year	Amer Indian	Euro Amer	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Total Min% District Min%	Total Enrol
1983	3	440	16	15	0	<u>7.1%</u> 26.2%	474
1985	2	248	9	11	1	<u>8.4%</u> 26.4%	271
1987*	5	320	14	10	12	<u>11.3%</u> 27.0%	361
1989	9	355	16	14	43	<u>15.7%</u> 27.4%	437
1991	10	388	19	23	62	<u>22.7%</u> 28.6%	502
1993	9	404	18	16	57	<u>19.8%</u> 29.9%	504
1995	8	410	21	19	63	<u>21.3%</u> 32.0%	521
1997	5	429	22	21	53	<u>19.0%</u> 33.3%	530
1999	4	476	21	16	48	<u>15.7%</u> 35.9%	565

Data from School Enrollment Summary, 1983-1999, Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, Portland Public Schools

Note: *1987 is the year after magnet #1 implemented their program. Also, this data is not disaggregated for those students enrolled in the neighborhood school, and those students enrolled in the special focus program.

For Magnet #1, implementation of a language immersion program improved enrollment numbers significantly, with European American students participating the most -- increasing by 47.8 percent from 1985 to 1999. Hispanic enrollment increased significantly from 1 in 1985 to 48 in 1999. African American enrollment almost doubled from 11 to 21 in those same years.

Table 7**Enrollment trends by ethnicity for magnet school #2**

Year	Amer Indian	Euro Amer	African Ameri- can	Asian American	Hispanic American	<u>Min.@ magnet#2 District Min%</u>	Total En- rol
1983	16	214	36	54	28	<u>38.5%</u> 26.2%	348
1985	11	174	25	50	24	<u>38.7%</u> 26.4%	284
1987	17	200	32	46	14	<u>35.2%</u> 27.0%	309
1989	17	217	32	50	28	<u>36.9%</u> 27.4%	344
1991*	24	354	58	41	33	<u>30.5%</u> 28.6%	510
1993	24	362	56	42	32	<u>29.8%</u> 29.9%	516
1995	27	378	45	24	34	<u>25.6%</u> 32.0%	508
1997	20	397	51	20	37	<u>24.4%</u> 33.3%	525
1999	17	422	48	18	42	<u>24.8%</u> 35.9%	503

Data from *School Enrollment Summary, 1983-1999, Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, Portland Public Schools*

Note: *1991 is the year after the magnet opened enrollment district-wide through a competitive application process.

For Magnet #1, Table 7 shows an increase in enrollment from 344 in 1989 (when the program was implemented school-wide) to 510 in 1991, a year after the magnet accepted students district-wide. This chart also shows the correlation between implementation of the magnet program and the increase in majority enrollment. Majority enrollment jumped from 217, the year before the arts program to 354, the year after the program was implemented district wide, a 38.7 percent increase in majority students. The total number of minority students remained fairly steady. On the other hand, while minority enrollment has been steady during the magnet years, the percentage minority (underlined and in bold) has decreased in comparison to the overall district minority percentage (not in bold) -- a benchmark comparison level. Prior to implementation of the magnet program, the opposite occurred with school minority enrollment approximately 10 percent above the districts percentage minority enrollment. In 1999, the magnet's percent minority was ten points less than that of the District's, almost a complete reversal from the year 1983.

Table 8, below, shows some key attributes of each special focus and magnet program, including year of implementation, location, transportation provisions, enrollment, minority percentage, and if tuition is required at the kindergarten grade. Some of this information was difficult to obtain from the District because enrollment data are not listed separately for programs within a school, and all but two have this status. Also, in the District's School Enrollment Summary (Enrollment Report, October 2000), only two of ten programs (that include elementary grades) are listed under Alternative Schools and Programs, including the Metropolitan Learning Center (a magnet and

alternative school, k-12) and Winterhaven (a special focus program within a school, k-8). The remaining eight programs are not listed in that data set. To attain data regarding ethnicity and enrollment for other programs within a school, staff from these programs were called. Atkinson, Woodstock, and Bridger were not able to give racial balance percentages for their magnet or special focus programs. The latter two programs did not have access to the disaggregated data. A few points should be made regarding language immersion programs and the diversity of school populations:

- All language programs save at least 20 percent of their spaces at kindergarten grade for children whose ethnicity matches the language taught or who speak the language. In the case of Richmond and Woodstock's Japanese and Chinese Mandarin (respectively) immersion programs, they save a certain percentage for Asian heritage children rather than specifically of Japanese or Chinese descent (staff at both schools). Atkinson reserves 50 percent of their kindergarten spaces for Spanish speaking and Hispanic heritage children.
- Hispanic and Asian children are the dominant minorities enrolling in language immersion programs.
- There are no spaces held specifically for African American children.
- Ainsworth, Richmond's and Woodstock's language immersion program also save a percentage of their kindergarten spaces for children in the attendance zone of their school. All students living in Buckman's attendance zone are automatically enrolled in the magnet.

Table 8**Elementary-level special focus/magnet programs *1998-99/2000**

Program or school (see Note 1)	Design	Year program began	Loca- tion	Transp?	Enroll- ment	Minority (Dist min % = 37.6%)	Full-day K'ten tuition
Ainsworth Spanish Immersion (Magnet)	PWAS K-5	1986	SW	Limited	296	14.8% (H)	Full-day Tuition
Metropolitan L.C. (Magnet/Alternative)	whole school K-12	1967	NW	No	155 k-5	17.7%	Half-day only
Atkinson Two-Way Spanish Immersion (magnet)	PWAS K-5	1997- 98	SE	No	160	42.8% (H and C) (school- wide)	Full-day Free
Buckman Arts (magnet)	Whole school K-5	1990- 91	SE	Limited	547	22.9% (AA/H)	Full-day tuition
Creative Science at Bridger (special focus)	PWAS k-5	1994	SE	only in SE	160	27.5%(A /H) (school- wide)	Full-day Tuition
Family Cooperative Sunnyside (special focus)	PWAS K-8	1994	SE	No	130	3-5%	Half-day only
Japanese Immersion Richmond (magnet)	PWAS K-5	1989	SE	Limited	312	27% (A) 9% (other)	Full-day Tuition

WinterHaven School Brooklyn (special focus)	PWAS K-8	1996	SE	No	150	10%	Full-day Tuition
Mandarin Chinese Immersion Woodstock* (magnet)	PWAS K-5	1998	SE	Limited	89	35% (A)	Full-day Tuition

Data from *Options in Portland Public Schools, 2001 - 2002*, *Portland Public Schools and Enrollment Trends 2000*, *Portland Public Schools*; and *Pacific Research Associations' 1999*.

Schools and the District do not disaggregate minority percentages for special focus and magnet programs within a school and the neighborhood schools. Those included here are estimates from school staff. Data for language immersion programs come from a 1998-99 study; minority percentage data come from staff.

Note 1: Atkinson, Woodstock, and Creative Science did not have disaggregated data. Enrollment and minority % are combined for neighborhood and magnet/special focus.

Note 2: * Atkinson and Woodstock are "growing" their school each year by grade. Data include K-3 for Woodstock and grades K-2 at Atkinson

Note 3: American Sign Language special focus program at Sunnyside is not included because applications are restricted to hearing-impaired children.

Note 4: Under the minority column, the dominant ethnicity(ies) is in parentheses.

Language immersion programs seem to be designed to better raise minority percentage rates, as seen above. Richmond's Japanese Immersion program suggests that the combined effort of recruiting and saving twenty percent of kindergarten spaces for Asian-heritage students increases the number of Asian students enrolled. Twenty seven percent of the Richmond's magnet is of Asian heritage; district-wide, the percentage of Asian students is only 9.5 percent (Enrollment Report 2000). Likewise, Atkinson's high percentage of minority children enrolled (42%) can be attributed to recruiting and saving spaces for children of Hispanic descent. One third of Atkinson's student

population (neighborhood and magnet) speak a language other than English at home (Portland Public School Home Page). Ainsworth's Spanish Immersion program, on the other hand, saves 20 percent of their spaces for students of Hispanic heritage, but have less than 15 percent Hispanic students. District-wide, the percentage of Hispanic students is 9.2 percent.

Magnet programs that are not language immersion have mixed results in enrolling minority students. Buckman, a whole school magnet, has 22.9 percent minority students (15 percent points below the District average), but the dominant ethnicity is African American. MLC's minority population is 17.7 percent. Minority percentage rate of special focus programs are all less than 10 percent, with the Family Cooperative at a scant 3-5 percent. Yet the overall minority population of students district-wide is 37.6 percent.

Although more disaggregated data is needed, data around language immersion programs suggest that the combination of saving kindergarten grade spaces for particular ethnicities, recruitment, and location in neighborhoods with ethnic populations increase ethnic percentages. Hispanic and Asian students are well-represented with two Spanish, one Chinese and one Japanese Immersion program. There are no designated spaces held for African American children.

ANALYSIS OF THE FRAMEWORK

Daniel Mazmanian and Paul Sabatier's (1989) scheme point out that implementation policy must be analyzed in light of many controlled and uncontrolled forces. By unraveling both statutory (policy) and nonstatutory (externalities) variables, this framework clarifies: 1) how much access all students have to enroll in these schools, and 2) conflicts among choice policies and 3) larger political and economical barriers that limit the success and replication of these programs.

The scheme for analyzing both choice policies include both statutory and nonstatutory variables. Statutory variables are: clear and consistent policy objectives; causal linkage and leverage for goal attainment; a policy structured to maximize success (including hierarchical integration, adequate funding, and access to supporters); and formal access and evaluation by outsiders. Nonstatutory variables are skillful leadership and leadership committed to the implementation goal and conflicting policies emerging during implementation or changes in the political landscape. In their terms, as with their entire framework, the authors are referring to legislative statutes with state and federal governments as implementing agencies. However for this study, the framework is applied to the District, which is the implementing agency, and schools, which are the target group.

In addition to the top down analysis, Michael Lipsky's *Street Level Bureaucrats* provides a conceptual framework for the school building perspective. The extent of

what Lipsky calls "street-level bureaucrats as policy makers" is explored. This is particularly important to analyze in Portland since teachers and parents are the primary designers and implementors of special focus and magnet programs.

Variables for evaluating the impacts of policies from both the teacher/principal and parent perspective include: street-level discretion in design; "worker" conditions; racial balance and recruitment; taking risks in underperforming schools.

Top-down Analysis

Clear and consistent policy objectives (statutory)

"Integration shall be viewed as the complete elimination of barriers to educational attainment resulting from prejudice, racism, class differences, and/or institutional discrimination." (Comprehensive Desegregation Plan 1980, p. 6)

"When individuals have equitable and just access to opportunities....they can realize their full potential....(Portland Public Schools Strategic Plans, August 29, 2000, 2000-2001 Action Summary)

The two quotes above from Portland Public School policy, separated by twenty years of time, illustrate the change in the district's integration objectives. The dual goals of integration and choice can be conflicting when not monitored and evaluated at the district level. This section points out how policy conflicts encourage choice for middle class families at the expense of Albina area families. This creates a "notable obstacle to effective implementation" of ECECs. (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989,167)

•ECECs and special focus programs are separated geographically. There is no Early Childhood Development Center located in a special focus program. Likewise, there is no special focus program included at an ECEC. In fact, none of the ten special focus programs is located in Northeast Portland (see Appendix H for a map locating these programs). The one exception to this pattern is Beach Elementary in North Portland. It is the district's ESL center and it serves a largely Hispanic population. Beach includes a partial Title I program with an ECEC. Although Beach launched a two-way Spanish Immersion program this year, it is not yet open to students outside the attendance zone and will most likely remain a neighborhood school (Johnson 2001).

Location of special focus programs and magnets are in the realm of District control. According to district officials, available space in school buildings has historically been outside of the Albina region. When asked "...would you make it a policy to first look for available space for a new special focus program in inner North and Northeast neighborhoods" District Official #1 responded: "Yes I would. There has been in Northeast Portland since 1980 a belief that students should be able to get equal access to quality programs in their own neighborhoods. This was a major part of the rewrite of the district's desegregation plan in 1980. These schools have historically been very full. However, since the overall decline in district enrollment due to birthrates, it now seems appropriate to me to look for space in Northeast for experimental and innovative programs.... *I do not think I would make it a formal policy. However, looking at all available space is a part of the new Best Use of Facilities Task Force recommendations.*" (3/13 /01 e-mail correspondence with District Official #1).

A District official from the Maintenance Office clarified that the Best Use of Facilities Task Force mentioned above found “inefficient use” of school building space in North/Northeast neighborhood schools. For instance, the official noted, a classroom might only be used on a Monday or Wednesday and be empty the rest of the week, but be considered by principals as fully utilized. Schools that were declared “underutilized” created a controversy among parents fearing the school might close.

•Enrollment in ECEC’s can lock families out of special focus programs. In the *Options in Portland Public Schools for Elementary School Students 2001-2002* brochure, Ainsworth, Atkinson, Buckman, and Richmond request “applications for incoming kindergartners only” or “primarily kindergarten applications” (Appendix A) Others that aren’t listed still have the same few spaces for a great deal of demand and accrue long waiting lists at the kindergarten grade. Some low-income families rely on Early Childhood Education Centers because they need the all-day, free kindergarten. Because of their inability to pay kindergarten tuition fees of \$200 or more a month and their need for full-day classes because of work schedules, they cannot afford to participate in special focus and magnet programs until first grade, when the school program is free. But at first grade there are typically no openings.

•District restricts recruitment of special focus programs PPS Board Policy 6.10.022 4d under Alternative Education says: “Programs may use appropriate public or private funds to produce and distribute written information about an alternative education program but shall not otherwise recruit students to apply for enrollment.”

This includes restricting outreach to ECEC families, primarily minority children (Transfer office, Portland Public Schools). It is District practice to send outreach letters to kindergarten families, day care centers, and to a mailing list that captures five year olds (Transfer office), *however it is not District practice to send these letters to ECEC families*. In comparison, the St. Paul School District sends a catalog of all options including details about transportation and applications to all St. Paul families (St. Paul curriculum team member, information interview).

However, there is disagreement that this policy is consistently regulated. For instance, staff from language immersion programs do recruit families who speak the native language or whose heritage matches the language of the immersion program. As a result, the percentage of minority student enrollment in immersion programs is greater in particular ethnicities compared with the district's overall percentage. (Pacific Research Group 1999) Likewise, an advocate for one middle school special focus program said they have had success at recruiting in schools with large populations of minority children.

- Lack of transportation and lack of information about transportation options

Only two magnet programs (Buckman and Ainsworth) provide transportation to and from Albina area schools (where all eight ECECs are located). However the District does not include this in brochures or web sites featuring education options. Special focus programs do not provide transportation.

- District officials support a double standard for enrollment criteria Two different

District officials suggest a double standard with regard to ECEC schools and special focus schools. First, a DOSA (district official #3) who assisted in the implementation of a number of special focus programs, expressed opposition to an ECEC restructuring to a special focus program. The philosophy was that Title I schools (which all ECECs are) need to accept everyone; the lack of exclusivity in ECECs are part of their strength. Second, District official #1 said this about locating special focus programs in the Albina area: "I think equal access is a key factor. I also think there may be some cultural barriers at work here.My recruiting efforts at an alternative school were not always well received because the school was not seen as a good school by many minority parents.....So, in addition to equal access, I think cultural appropriateness is also an issue. " The official then linked "cultural appropriateness" to the "very conventional thinking" of the crisis team's basis skills curriculum. (District official #1. E-mail correspondence 3.13.01)

These comments suggest that district officials may be less supportive of *placing* special focus programs in Albina area schools. It suggests two types of thinking, both equally damaging to inner Northeast Portland families 1) Minority families' ideas about education are all the same, and are represented by the Crisis Team. 2) Minority families wouldn't enroll in specialty programs anyway. In an e-mail correspondence, District official #1 wrote about problems he experienced in recruiting minorities for an alternative program during his tenure as principal there. The example is skewed because that particular school is also an alternative program as well as a magnet and is less mainstream than other specialty programs.

Causal linkage and leverage for goal attainment (statutory)

For Early Childhood Education Centers which were designed around the politics of the time -- desegregation -- the explicit causal linkage was that equal opportunity, measured by racial balance percentages, was necessary for all students for educational success. The strategy to achieve that in Portland was through the Early Childhood Education Centers, which provided incentives for majority families to enroll in minority neighborhood schools. In addition, the district also used administrative transfers or mandatory busing to enroll minority students to majority schools.

The Portland Schools for the Seventies, Resolution No. 3553 (Adopted March 23, 1970) states: "...improvements in curriculum organization, administration and physical plant, and designation of attendance areas should be carried out in a manner which will achieve the integration of students of all races and reduce concentrations of racial minorities." (as cited in Geddes 1982) The causal linkage for magnet programs in this era was race-based rather than academically oriented. When interest in desegregation began declining in favor of stronger neighborhood schools and choice programs after the 1980 Desegregation Plan, the leverage for attaining racial balance goals faltered. For instance, Senior Official #1 said, "No one cares about integration anymore. What we care about is the achievement gap among majority and minority students."

For special focus and magnet programs the causal linkage seems implicitly academically driven. But it is only suggested as a causal link in PPS Board Policy 6.10.022 which states in 1. "A separate school or class group designed to assist students to achieve the goals of the curriculum in a manner consistent with their

learning styles and needs. “ This policy includes all alternative education programs which includes a long list of programs targeted to at-risk populations in primarily the middle and high school grades.

Regarding leverage for goal attainment, Geddes (1982) points out that Early Childhood Education centers lack a focused curriculum -- they were primarily basic skills curriculum. She says, “In order for there to be a complete elimination of educational barriers, where specialized programs designed to meet particular individual needs or talents are established, enrollment would have to be based on some factor other than race.” (Geddes 1982, 430).

A policy structured to maximize success (statutory)

Mazmanian and Sabatier include in this condition: hierarchical integration, adequate funding, and access to supporters.

•Hierarchical integration This criteria speaks strongly to the problems of the ad hoc policy around special focus and magnet programs that impact issues around enrollment and implementation of new programs. The way in which Portland Public School District is organized has the effect of decreasing the opportunities to fully evaluate option programs.

First, the DOSA or Director of Student Achievement cluster approach disorganizes and disperses programs, particularly in evaluating whole programs like magnets or special focus programs or Early Childhood Education Centers. For instance, Early

Childhood Education Centers are located in three different clusters governed by three different district officials DOSAs or Director of Student Achievements (Roosevelt, Jefferson and Grant clusters). Special focus and magnet programs are located in five different clusters governed by five different DOSAs including Lincoln, Benson, Cleveland, Franklin, and Marshall clusters (refer to the map in Appendix H).

In terms of Mazmanian and Sabatier, DOSAs are individuals with a lot of power to “veto” policy through discretionary practice. Because DOSA’s are geographically clustered rather than by type of program or even by level (such as elementary programs) all ECEC’s, for example, do not get evaluated together (they are in two different geographic clusters). There is **no** official or DOSA in charge of overseeing the implementation of new special focus or magnet programs. The director of Alternative Programs (District Official #2) listed this as a major gap. “For instance, all programs should have an administrative support person at the district level and evaluation system in place. They don’t.” District Official # 3 agreed with this saying only that the policy handbook was under revision. Lack of funding due to Measure 5 may be one reason the district is not be providing an official to oversee specialty programs.

When asked who was in charge of special focus programs, District Official #2 said, “there is no office of magnet schools because of the decentralized cluster-based system.” (Informational interview, August 2000). When asked more informally, “who is the ‘big picture’ person for policy with these types of programs?” the response was “that would be me.” Then restating the question, “What if I were a parent with a great

idea for a new special focus program and I had site council and staff buy-in, who in the central office would I go to?" The official's response was, "I'd send you to (District Official #1), and he would send you to me. It's not clear what the steps are." (ibid) This suggests too much veto power (with no policy guidelines, discussed below) for district officials working with groups organizing special focus programs.

In addition, it agrees with complaints from a 1999 Special Focus Task Force paper: "Although SFS (Special Focus Schools) were given the opportunity to create themselves, (there is) day to day lack of consistency in how Central Administration interacts with SFS, and confusion about how governance structures interact with each other and with the administrators above us...."

This also impacts how the public hears about these programs. Although the District web site includes descriptions of all schools, programs within a school which include most special focus and magnet programs are mentioned only as a bulleted point. The District has not created specific descriptions for magnet and special focus programs. (See Appendix B) Likewise, a parent interested in comparing achievement levels (reading and math test scores) of their neighborhood school with a special focus or magnet program, would not be able to access that because the district does not disaggregate that data or any data for programs within a school.

•Adequate Funding From the perspective of the framework of Mazmanian and Sabatier, there is no reliable funding base for either ECECs or special focus or magnet programs because the local control of budget matters has been replaced with

state control.

Early Childhood Education Centers are funded primarily with state desegregation money, which will no longer be available in three years because of the Measure 5 framework. For now, Title I and desegregation money have increased the per student funding compared with nonTitle I neighborhood schools. A comparison of funding for ECEC schools show higher per student funding compared with students attending nonECEC that are not Title I (such as special focus and magnet programs) schools. For instance, one ECEC receives an additional *\$507 per student* in Title I, TAG, and Portland Public School Foundation funding. In addition, each student receives an additional \$956 from state desegregation funds, and \$86 for ESL programs. Another ECEC that was reconstituted in 1996 (discussed later in the discussion section), has benefitted from a three year infusion of desegregation dollars totalling \$2270 per student per year in addition to \$620 for Title I programs and \$92 for ESL. This is on top of the typical per student funding that all school children benefit from. (See Appendix C for Desegregation Detail.)

Special focus programs receive only FTE formula based on student enrollment, and building and maintenance. They are not initially budgeted salary for principals (Community Activist #1, Task Force for Special Focus Programs, 1999). To make up for lack of funding, most special focus and magnet programs have powerful parent groups who write grants and organize sophisticated fundraisers -- the arts magnet hosts a highly publicized art auction with donations from local artists. Others have created nonprofit foundations to buy materials and fund international trips. A former

long-time PPS School Board member said that special focus and magnet programs would look very different today if they had been developed during a different time. That is, budgetary restrictions due to Measure 5 created a more exclusive option program by decreasing equal access amenities.

- Formal Access and evaluation by outsiders Racial balance is no longer a priority for the district and is not used a measuring tool for school success. This is confusing particularly in Early Childhood Education Centers that were designed to voluntarily draw majority families. As Bierwirth said in a discussion of ECECs, “I just don’t think it’s that important to the community to integrate, to mix people up or to face the fact that the district historically has done a terrible job educating minority kids.”

However equal access is a priority as mentioned in the 2000-01 PPS Strategic Plan (see page 1 of introduction) but there is no index to measure equal access that is shared with the public (such as test scores and school report cards). Referring back to the literature, there was no attempt at “genuine integration “ (Gardner et al. 2000). Rather, ECECs remained unevaluated, while external factors like all-day kindergartens dilute the draw of ECECs. And special focus programs remained unevaluated as they consistently failed to match the districts percentage of minority students.

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989, 29) summarize characteristics needed to successfully implement policy. Using their ranking system of Low, Moderate, and High, the variables are measured for ECECs and special focus programs. This ranking is included in Appendix D.

The following variables describe the externalities that influence the impact magnet and special focus choice policies had on each other at the District and which impacted the success of implementing and sustaining these programs.

Skillful leadership and leadership committed to the implementation goal (nonstatutory)

Skillful leadership might have recognized the vulnerability of ECECs in the wake of growing education options. Rather than allowing separate but equal policy approach, a more politically astute leader might have woven ECEC and option policy into one strong magnet program. Instead, the best ideas from desegregation efforts (early childhood education, free kindergarten, transportation) and options (challenging, thematic curriculum and choice) were kept apart. Matthew Prophet was superintendent of Portland Public Schools from 1980 to 1992; Jack Bierwirth succeeded him in 1992, staying for five years. Though these superintendents came from entirely different areas of interest, (Prophet wrote his dissertation on desegregation, Bierwirth on alternative education), their efforts in the area of education options ultimately led toward one result -- promoting educational options without incorporating District goals around integration and equal access.

For instance, in 1984, just two years into his term, Prophet requested an Education Options Task Force Report which concluded: "It is the overall recommendation of this Task Force that education options (alternatives) become an integral part of Portland Public School's efforts to meet the instructional and developmental needs of the District's students." This is an extensive exploratory report that begins the district's

journey into linking magnet (or what will later be referred as special focus) programs to alternative education policy. Alternative education programs are inherently flexible and autonomous designed to meet the needs of at-risk students or students unable to achieve in the traditional classroom setting. In many cases, the District has contractual relationships with private programs designed to address specific special needs. *By placing programs under this umbrella rather than existing desegregation policy, the goal away from integration and toward choice in curriculum based on different learning needs, becomes more pronounced.* The Task Force explicitly recommended ways to provide equal access to alternative education options including: District led options to be specifically located in North/Northeast Portland, development of District policy to guide the growth of education options, and improved District infrastructure to “support, maintain, evaluate, and extend education options programs.” (Task Force 1984) Soon after this Task Force submitted their report, the first three elementary magnet programs were implemented.

By tweaking alternative education policy, Bierwirth linked special focus programs to perhaps the broadest, most highly flexible department in the district. For purposes of innovation, it opens doors and frees parent groups from the burden of red tape and bureaucratic trappings. For instance, under the heading Discrimination (6.10.022 4I) the policy states: “The proposed criteria for selecting students for enrollment in the education program must not unfairly discriminate among applicants and must reasonably relate to the educational goals of the District.” And under, (d) Notification and Enrollment: “Programs may use appropriate public or private funds to produce and distribute written information about an alternative education program but shall not

otherwise recruit students to apply for enrollment.” Essentially, the policy provides no incentives for building a diverse student body or equal access for all students. Policy even implies that one can “fairly discriminate” among applicants.

Conflicting policies emerging during implementation (nonstatutory)

Below are two nonstatutory shifts that show how interconnected the success of ECECs and special focus and magnet programs are with one another.

•Kindergarten Until just six years ago, kindergarten options in the Portland Public School District were limited to half-days only. Early Childhood Education Centers were the exception with free, full-day kindergarten. In 1994, Richmond elementary’s Japanese language immersion magnet program introduced the first full-day tuition-based kindergarten; they later expanded it to their neighborhood school.

As Table 9 illustrates, there are eighteen schools or programs with 23 sections of full-day, fee-for-service kindergartens used by 590 students -- more than half of all elementary schools offer full-day programs, leaving 29 who offer only half day. (Fee for Service, Full-Day Kindergarten program, 2001-2002, General Information). All special focus kindergarten programs that are full day require families to pay monthly tuition. All magnet programs except one require the same. The exception is Atkinson’s Spanish Immersion program, which offers free, all-day kindergartens. Monthly tuition range from \$200 - 250. In addition most of these programs also offer half-day programs, which are free, but a hardship for families with two working parents. Others offer only free half-day programs (*Options in Portland Public Schools for Elementary*

School Students 2001-2002). Scholarships are offered for families who qualify for the free lunch program, but the school must have six fully paying families to pay for one scholarship family. (E-mail correspondence, PPS District, April 9, 2001)

Table 9

Facts about all-day and half-day kindergarten programs

<u># of schools</u>	<u>Type of kindergarten program</u>
7	ECEC -- tuition-free
7	Tuition-free all-day but not ECECs (funded by General Fund/Deseg)
18	Tuition-based all-day
1	Free all-day in sp.focus/language programs (Atkinson)
7	Tuition-based all-day in sp.focus/language programs
27	Total number of half-day programs
33	Total number of schools offering full day kindergartens

Data from Portland Public Schools, 2001.

According to the District's finance department, "some of those free, full-Day, options that are not ECECs may convert to Fee for Service or discontinue." (2/12/01 Finance Department presentation to the board.)

•Grassroots politics A shift in minority groups' goals and an increase in middle class school activism provided disincentives for the District to pursue integration and equal access policy. During the eighties, organizing efforts from groups like the NAACP

and the Black United Front moved away from integration and toward improving neighborhood schools (District Official #1). Now they are no longer “watchdogs of integration efforts” (Community Involvement and Communications Department at PPS, and District Official #1). In the early 1990’s racial concentrations began spiralling up in all but two of the Early Childhood Education Centers.

At the same time, a more middle class grassroots movement was building around the choice movement. Nationally, the early 1990’s were a time of interest and controversy in privatizing public education, such as the interest in school vouchers. Portland’s approach to privatizing public education was incremental, innovative, and without a small or large scale community discussion about it. As mentioned previously, Measure 5 had and continues to have the effect of promoting education options without the funding needed to provide equity. In essence, Board members turned the research and development and implementation responsibility over to involved parents and activist teachers and principals. Had community groups representing students from all classes and races pressured the District for equal access to special focus and magnet programs, there might be more of a merging between ECECs and education options today.

Bottom-up Analysis

Michael Lipsky’s framework helps categorize school and community dynamics based on internal and external pressures, and this in turn informs the larger question of the feasibility of Title I schools implementing special focus programs.

Street-level discretion in design

Community activist #1 discussed the extent of involvement the district had in approving and developing the design of the special focus middle school, and said: “The district was not involved with the process.” When asked how they devised the program including models and level of research, the activist said “ We didn’t do tons of research. We just knew what we wanted. And we didn’t have the educational background like (a teacher who created a special focus curriculum for another middle school and is now principal).”

This lack of governance and oversight and light approach to policy for special focus programs and magnet programs can have the effect of inflating the amount of discretion afforded staff of these programs. These areas are particularly vulnerable to equal access issues:

•Application process Applications can help staff filter out student who may not be a good match with the specialty program. The goal of special focus programs’ staff is to enroll children whose families are committed to a nontraditional program (Principal #1, Community Activist #1, staff at a magnet school). Typically, applications require a parent essay or letters of recommendation in addition to filling out a variety of forms. In the case of language immersion programs, staff want assurances that parents plan to keep their child in the program through the fifth grade, and that they will provide support for learning the foreign language at home. Most special focus programs, especially start-ups, do not have staff for special needs children (Ainsworth and Buckman, two of the oldest magnet programs, are the exception). One application

requests information about the child's development and asks the child to draw a self-portrait. (See Appendix E) This provides staff with the ability to choose their student body, a discretionary device not available to ECEC staff or staff at other neighborhood schools.

It is practice at all special focus schools at the elementary level **not** to send out applications to interested families. It was unclear whether this practice is encouraged at the District level or created at the school level. The Director of Community Involvement and Communications at PPS was unaware of this practice. (Informational interview with a district official) Applications are handed out during designated tours at the special focus schools which are scheduled in advance during the day or parents can drive to the school to pick them up. For families who do not have transportation or have difficulty getting time off from work or are simply experiencing a family crisis during the two weeks of the designated tours, they will have a difficult time getting the application in hand. Certainly, exceptions may be made, but it is a disincentive for families with transportation and scheduling hardship.

•Criteria for acceptance The District requires that community and school groups develop a plan (Project Guidelines, Matarazzo 1995) but there are no requirements for number of minority or special needs children. In one special focus program, one school staff member was in charge of deciding who would be accepted. The criteria was a rating system that she and other parents involved in the design and implementation of the school had devised. It was based on two teacher recommendations, the parent essay and the student essay required in the application.

After some parents questioned their decisions, staff decided that it was “too subjective and you can make mistakes.” (Community leader #1) They then implemented a “controlled lottery process”. “Before we randomly pick names from a hat, we make sure the kids, not just the parents, want to be here.” And: “In the controlled lottery system everyone who really wants to be in the program and can get along with other kids gets their name in the lottery. We don’t have staff for special needs kids. “

At one special focus school staff are looking for “key words” from preschool teachers in letters of recommendations. For instance, they want to know that the child is “self motivated” and a “self-starter” and “not easily frustrated.” (staff from a special focus program)

So although it is district policy in the case of alternative education programs (for which special focus programs fall under departmentally) to “not unfairly discriminate among applicants...” (PPS Board Policy 6.10.022), it is practice for these schools to have a right to turn away any student (such as a special needs student) if the school does not feel that there program is a match with the enrolling student (interview with Community Activist #1). From the perspective of school staff, this is valid because of the lack of extra funding. And, though special focus programs may want to build a more diverse student population, it is district practice to deny these schools access to recruit minority students. This is an interesting interplay here between policy and practice, district criteria and guidance (or lack of it) and school level autonomy.

Worker conditions

•Teacher autonomy Michael Lipsky says, “For the most part, society is not willing fully to circumscribe street-level discretion. However, there may be some contexts in which it *is* desirable to circumscribe it.” (Lipsky 1980, p.196) In Portland, the Crisis Team has found a reason to encourage circumscribing teacher discretion: underperformance in reading and math scores. The Crisis Team, is supportive of basic skills driven, scripted curriculum like Success for All (a reading program) because it limits teacher discretion and discourages tracking “unteachable” children through special education classes. By stressing that all students are teachable, teachers’ bias for particular students whose skills may be less advanced, have limited discretion. The unintended result of controlled teacher behavior may be that the most veteran and creative teachers transfer to a more autonomous teaching environment. Teachers have complained that Success for All doesn’t work well for veteran teacher’s who have cultivated a more individualized approach to reading. Likewise it doesn’t allow for “that teachable moment.” (Staff #2)

At the arts magnet school teachers have more autonomy. The arts program focuses on the “whole child” and individualized learning projects. Teachers encourage children to express themselves through dance, visual arts, and theater. Teachers work together on devising themes that will engage children in exploring basic skills. For example, at the fifth grade level, children were learning about electricity by building doll-sized houses in art class, wiring the houses in science class, and then writing about the process (school observation).

Perhaps this type of discretion, that benefits the student, is the result of seasoned teachers and principals "owning" the school -- creating the school climate. This is a type of "creaming" mentioned in the literature, but for teachers rather students.

Lipsky links autonomy to success for teachers (and other service providers):

"...street-level bureaucrats more than other organizational workers are able to retain a concept of the notion of need in relation to what is actually being provided. This residual awareness may provide a resource that can be tapped." (Lipsky 1980 pg. 190)

•Teacher morale Current political pressures may negatively impact teachers and parents from developing and implementing special focus programs. For instance, the Crisis Team's public labeling of ECECs as crisis schools, and staff's chronic struggles with raising reading and math test scores create extra pressures for teachers in these schools. On top of these highly publicized issues, a more subtle District pressure keeps these schools in "survival mode" -- threat of closure or reconstitution.

Superintendent Bierwirth initiated the first school reconstitution with Humboldt Elementary, a Title I ECEC elementary with reading and math scores in the teens. From the year of reconstitution in 1996 to 2000 enrollment data, Humboldt lost 30 percent of its enrollment (Enrollment reports 1996-2000). Though district officials that were interviewed for this paper remain convinced that this dramatic and punitive action was necessary, one wonders what Humboldt would be like today if it had been restructured into a special focus school rather than reconstituted.

The result of intense political pressures aimed at Albina schools has been a basic-

skills-driven, regimented curriculum. Three ECECs adopted the Success for All program. All of the ECEC principals are under fire from the District (to raise test scores) and the community (in the form of the Crisis Team) to increase performance in the school. Are principals thinking that now is the time to restructure into an innovative special focus program? When one ECEC principal was asked, he said, "It would have to be a timing thing. Are they ready (staff) for the change. Staff is so important. If they feel like they've been through a lot already, they might not want to make more change." (Principal #2 interview)

•Socio-economic status of school families The socio-economic status of families impacts the teaching environment. As mentioned before, ECEC and special focus programs, by design, draw two different populations. The open door policy of ECECs allow all students to easily enroll without an application process. ECEC's all day, tuition free kindergarten is geared for the population they primarily serve -- low-income families. By virtue of location -- all ECECs are located in the Albina area -- participants are primarily minority and low-income. Parent involvement is lacking, particularly in school governance groups like site council meetings and PTA (ECEC principal, District official #1).

Special focus programs, on the other hand, typically ask for a written description of parent buy-in in the application process. They require that parents have the ability to transport their child to and from the school. By simply learning about the school, attending the school tour (the only time the school will distribute the application) almost 9 months prior to the following school year, the school is filtering parents who

are geared to support and help their child in school. Tannenbaum (1995) reiterates this point in saying that “selective schools attract the most successful students, often leaving non-select schools to deal with the most serious learning problems (page 262)

•School planning The application process also allows specialty programs to control enrollment peaks, allowing them to plan better (Tannenbaum 1995). Since there is no attendance zone, staff are not required to raise enrollment based on demand. However, according to PPS policy, ECECs and all neighborhood schools must find space for every attendance zone student.

When interviewing a crisis team member about the process for applying to special focus programs, he said, “It’s not equal access. The district has never done a good job at spreading the wealth, and they fail at getting out the information. For integration to work, the district needs to find ways to attract folks of color. Those who need it the most can’t access it. The deadlines and the applications, yeah, that’s very middle class. The policy is understandable -- the district doesn’t want to be held accountable.” (Community Activist #2).

As mentioned in the literature review, the district that wants choice and equal access has to balance “parents’ right to decide where their children will study, and the government’s responsibility to ensure equal opportunities for all.” (Yair 1996) With Portland Public School District’s more hands-off approach to equal access issues in relation to specialty programs, middle class families are able to choose among ten competitive “private” public schools, schools that are less accessible to low-income

families. This begs the question, does a separate program negatively impact low-income neighborhood schools? Again, going back to the literature, “once you get resegregation in there, these are powerless schools.” (Gardner et al. 2000 pg. 80)

•Improving racial balance Except for the arts school, magnet and special focus programs have no attendance zone. Every student must apply. So recruitment efforts of students and criteria for accepting applications literally make the school population. For the special focus middle school where Community Activist #1 is on staff, the competition is intense with three times the number of applications for spaces available at the sixth grade level. The application breakdown by race is 76 percent European American and 14 percent African American (which closely mirrors the District’s overall racial balance). Middle school staff members want to increase the number of minority students. But this activist pointed to the following District directives on racial balance and recruitment that make this difficult. “We were told by the district that we can’t preference race. That it wouldn’t hold up in court. So our strategy was to recruit heavily from low-income neighborhoods. We took our tap dancers to the elementary schools, and that got the kids really excited. We were then told by the district to stop recruiting. As a direct result our minority application percentage went down a few points. “ This is supported by a District official in the Transfer Office.

With high concentrations of minority students in ECEC schools and high concentrations of majority students in special focus schools, the “pick and choose” discretion of school staff is worth more analysis. So is the language immersion program’s recruitment of certain ethnic populations. District officials said that racial

balance is no longer an issue. Community activist #2 said this about racial balance theories: "With racial balance, too many black kids make a bad school. Too many white kids -- that's never a bad school. I'm not a strong proponent of racial balance. " Principal #2, whose school is an Early Childhood Education Center stated he was not interested in racial balance. What is conflicting here at both the district and street-level is closing the door on what was a respected measuring tool for success without a policy discussion or a tested replacement tool for measuring equal access.

Taking risks in underperforming schools

Perhaps one reason that educators and families aren't attempting to introduce a special focus or magnet program to the Albina area is due to the failed Northeast Community School (NECS), a special focus school in inner Northeast Portland. A group of Northeast Portland teachers and parents developed a curriculum for 4th through 8th grade students around the idea of community. District official #3 and Mary Scheetz, principal of NECS for two of its four years, felt that school staff took on too much at once. For instance, a major goal for the staff was to purchase and renovate a building that would house the school. In addition, children enrolling in the school were predominately an "at risk" student population. When asked if the District was a barrier to the success of the program, the former principal responded, "Even in the end, I think that there were district efforts to and interest in trying to maintain the program but the initial groups that founded the program had pretty much disappeared and the program had become somewhat of an "alternative" rather than a "special focus." (Mary Scheetz, e-mail correspondence, 4. 17.01)

Northeast Community School is worth more investigation because it brings up funding questions related to achieving Title I status. Is it difficult for street-level and community groups to obtain Title I funding for a new special focus program requiring applications? In hindsight, would the program have succeeded if staff had focused entirely on school operations and curriculum than property acquisition? Were families less inclined to apply to NECS because of its location? Its curriculum focus? Its perceived targeted population (that is, low income Albina-area families)? These question would greatly inform the feasibility of implementing a special focus program at an Early Childhood Education Center.

Bierwirth said about special focus and magnet program staff, "They are more into taking risks in the first place because they are all volunteering to be there. You don't get most movement forward without risk taking." Who is likely to initiate a special focus program?

- Seasoned teachers and principals Raywid (1995, 314) says, "The experience of autonomy is important since feelings of control over one's own fate are associated with a sense of ownership and affiliation; (and) with teacher satisfaction..." This might include teachers who are tired of scripted curriculums or in low-enrollment or crisis schools who are being pressured by the District and community.

- Parent groups seeking more choice options This was the case with Sunnyside's parent cooperative. It was launched when parents were frustrated that their children weren't accepted into another magnet (Interview with District Official #1). Language

programs at Ainsworth and Richmond were created by parents with design and implementation coordination by the District. Finally, this was also the situation with the arts middle school as described by Community Activist #1 who wanted to continue with an arts program like the arts magnet model. This was also the situation with the Northeast Community School.

•Community leaders unhappy with the status quo Community Activist #2

discussed a plan to open a charter school to be operated by nonprofit he directs. This activist described being a counselor to minority youth attending majority high schools in the height of PPS's administrative transfer program between Lincoln and Jefferson: "School district bureaucracies keep folks from doing what they need to do to turn things around. You can bring the process to them, but you can't bring leadership. " This activist originally hoped to bring the model of mentorship teaching applied to the nonprofit to a Title I middle school in the form of a special focus program. However, more autonomy, especially around hiring staff, was a concern. As a result, this activist has chosen to develop a charter school.

The last example is the only one suggesting implementing a special focus program in an underachieving school, and it would be realized as a charter program, which provides the most independence for initiators. The other two examples are more likely to happen within the District but outside of the Albina area. This supports other data that suggest the District needs to help facilitate a school restructuring if it is to happen in a Title I, ECEC school.

Perhaps the most likely scenario of a special focus or magnet program coming to North/Northeast would be along the lines of the arts magnet model -- restructuring an entire school around a theme or language. Below is a synthesis of the data suggesting the feasibility of this happening. There are a variety of reasons why this might not happen without some level of district involvement. Many Early Childhood Education Centers might be **less likely** to consider a whole school restructuring because of the following reasons:

- Overworked staff focused on raising test scores. Bad timing for restructuring toward a more innovative curriculum.
- Past threats of school closures and reconstitution create a survival mode and discourages long-range visioning.
- External political pressures from the Crisis Team reduces the chances for ECECs to attempt a dramatic restructuring.
- Many ECEC schools have high enrollments, and low enrollment is a key incentive for this type of restructuring. Implementing a special focus problem might create overcrowding.
- Implementation might ultimately result in loss of desegregation funding or Title I status.

In addition, the District may be unable to provide the necessary support needed to restructure because of current political/financial struggles.

- Poor leadership and constant reshuffling of personnel . As mentioned before there is no champion or department head of all ECECs.
- District pressures schools to adopt expensive comprehensive plans (such as Success

for All) which may discourage schools from creating more individualized and innovative special programs.

- Leadership vacuum at two levels. The District is “between” superintendents with only an acting interim superintendent. The seven member school Board is very new with only two members who have more than two years experience.
- No District-level goal or external/community pressure to integrate or innovate, which might encourage an ECEC to restructure to a magnet program.

DISCUSSION

This paper asks three questions:

- 1) Are the policies of specialty programs and Early Childhood Education centers conflictual?
- 2) Do all students in Portland Public School District have equal access to special focus and magnet programs. What are the barriers?
- 3) What is the likelihood of a school or community group implementing a specialty program in an existing ECEC?

To answer these questions, multiple issues within the District and out in the community were analyzed. The most perplexing issues and those that conflicted most often with the literature included:

- **Terminology** In the literature, most urban school districts refer to all programs and schools with dual goals of integration and thematic or innovative curriculum as “magnets.” Although the interpretation of magnets may have shifted toward more of a focus on curriculum and less on racial balance percentage, the “integration amenities” (transportation, information and outreach, top-down management of enrollment and acceptance) remain in most school districts with magnet programs. At the elementary level, Portland Public School District provides very few integration amenities, and due to lack of funding, is continuing to reduce existing meager efforts (for instance, increasing tuition-based kindergarten).

Portland also clearly markets Early Childhood Education Center schools outside of the cluster of special focus/magnet schools (see Education Options brochure in Appendix A), linking them with the needs-based Head Start program. This is very confusing from a parent perspective and from a policy perspective, because based on national standards, ECECs are magnets; this categorization downgrades ECECs by not affording them the status of the term “magnet.” Portland’s definition of magnet and special focus is strictly curriculum-driven based on a competitive application process rather than a blend of curriculum components with the national definition which includes integration.

Policy and regulation at PPS tend to complicate matters in the choice terminology. Separating magnet and special focus policy by aligning some magnet policy with old desegregation language and special focus with alternative education policy is confusing. *And, it is at odds with national definitions to include magnets that can have the effect of excluding minorities.* A move to call all ECECs, magnets, and special focus programs “magnets” , would encourage policy alignment and equitable guidelines. This is played out later under question number 1 by actually incorporating magnet and special focus schools and programs in ECEC policy.

•Enrollment criteria/ Integration Amenities As Fuller (1996, 98) writes, “....the specific design of the choice program and the will and capacity of the educational bureaucracy to implement its provisions -- that determines whether choice will complement or confound the pursuit of racial integration.” Portland’s choice

programs at the elementary level, with ECECs in minority neighborhoods and special focus/magnet program in mostly middle and affluent neighborhoods without equal access amenities, suggests PPS is “confound(ing) the pursuit of racial integration.”

One variable that exposes this lack of commitment to equal access beyond all of the logistical difficulties is enrollment criteria. Most magnet and special focus programs don’t have the staff to attend to special needs children. Staff to provide some level of special attention to children with attention deficit disorder or other learning impairments or even a part-time social worker can dramatically alter the enrollment patterns, especially at the kindergarten level. By not including these provisions in all special focus and magnet programs, the level of exclusivity is increased -- this is a fiscal matter in the realm of district control.

The St. Paul Public School District, which on paper seems similar in size and delivery to Portland Public School District, has 100 schools serving 44, 000 students. Its student population reflects more diversity with 65 percent minority including 31 percent Asian American, compared with an overall 37.6 percent minority in PPS. All but one of the magnets offer an on site social worker and speech/language therapists, and all but one magnet school offer itinerant services for a cluster of special education services including “deaf/hard of hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, and visually challenged.” In the St. Paul School District, all of the magnets are schools (rather than small programs) at the elementary level (Saint Paul Public Schools 2001-2002). Another argument for the whole school magnet model is that it allows for school services that programs within schools (receiving only the FTE formula) are not

budgeted for.

- Scale St. Paul offers another comparison point -- number of children served by magnet programs. Portland has nine elementary magnet or special focus programs. Only two magnet/special focus programs operate as whole schools; others are programs within a school. All of the programs within schools are small, enrolling under 200 students. St. Paul, on the other hand, serves 10,000 fewer students, but at the elementary level, has converted a majority of elementary schools (not just small programs) into magnets. This level of scale expands choice from a small number of elite families to a majority of families with the benefits mentioned above provided an entire school building. St. Paul's approach seems more equitable -- all families decide what school their children should attend and are accepted on a first come first serve basis (St. Paul curriculum team). Variables such as scale, integration amenities, and design in no way suggest the strength of the curriculum, an area in which Portland Public Schools' magnet and special focus programs excel.

- Funding Nationally, most magnets receive extra funding (Blank in Fuller and Elmore 1996, and Rossell 1990) to support the specialized curriculum and other amenities to lure a diverse population. However, Portland's special focus and magnet programs are underfunded (receive only the FTE formula of teacher salary per a certain number of students) but oversubscribed. District wide, Measure 5 created a cash-starved setting that gave Superintendent Bierwirth the political setting to hand over curriculum innovation and school/program design to the grassroots. This formula frees up parents to more easily innovate without bureaucratic meddling, yet at the

expense of equal access to these programs. A combination of better funding and direct district involvement could mean more equal access. One result is a systemic lack of information about option programs for families. Compare, for instance, the description of option programs in Portland's brochure (Appendix A) with the description of option programs in St. Paul (Appendix F).

In addition, tuition-based all-day kindergartens immediately introduce issues of equal access and class separation at a time when parents should be making decisions based on where they want their children to attend school rather than on the affordability of a public school option. This can only be corrected at the state level since the Oregon Department of Education only requires that Districts fund half-day programs (Finance Department)

•National perspective Desegregation history in Portland shows intense resistance to the continuation of administrative transfers of minority children outside of their neighborhood. The reaction in 1980 was to improve and expand neighborhood schools in minority neighborhoods, thus ECECs. What District and community groups failed to respond to at the time was the importance of curriculum innovation, and the national growth of magnets and alternative programs. The 1984 Task Force on Education Options shared the rich opportunities alternative education programs were offering nationally not only at-risk students but also mainstream students. In hindsight it seems like a missed opportunity (during a time of top down control and generous property tax-based funding) not to incorporate an innovative special focus in one of the ECECs during the 1980 Desegregation Plan negotiations.

•Leadership The Board's written goals of equal access were ignored in the development of special focus and magnet programs. As other school districts have shown, it does not have to be "either innovation or integration." The Board could have demanded, at the very least, that Bierwirth (or Prophet) include a few corrective provisions when opening up the doors to education innovation to ensure some level of equal access. These could have included: 1) The lure of some desegregation funding if access for low-income families was encouraged. 2) A basic clustering process for transportation for families who were enrolled in but could not get to a special focus school. In other words, providing bus routes from certain ECEC schools to certain special focus/magnet schools. 3) An outreach official from the Department of Community Involvement and Communications that shared information about all option programs to families. 4) Siting guidelines designed to systematically determine where room was available in geographic areas underserved by option programs.

•Policy In the leadership variable above, the lack of Board intervention is perplexing. In the area of policy and planning around special focus and magnet programs, it is illogical that the Board, whose purpose is to write and oversee policies and regulation, did not require updated policy on desegregation and education options. As one former board member said, "why fix what isn't broke." From the Board's perspective politically, if new programs engage the middle and upper class thus stabilizing the District as a whole, why tinker?

Based on the above variables and other points, the questions around this paper are

addressed.

1) Are the strategies and goals of specialty programs and Early Childhood Education center's conflictual?

Yes and no. The goal of ECECs is to voluntarily integrate while improving achievement in minority neighborhoods. The goal of special focus and magnet programs is to encourage innovation in academics. As discussed in the framework sections, collectively, the ECECs lack the exciting curriculum components of special focus and magnet programs. And, special focus and magnet programs lack the inclusiveness of ECECs. Together, with a variety of conflicting policies and practices discussed below, these two types of programs appeal (for very different reasons) to different families, and the differences primarily fall along class and race lines. The result is a resegregating effect.

Does this make the strategies and goals conflictual? It does in the sense that these programs could be aligned. For instance, so much of policy 2.10.011 around ECECs and integration could be directed in a meaningful way to special focus and magnet programs without creating a top-heavy, directive approach to these programs. In fact all eleven points of number 6 of 2.10.011 could and should be applied to all option programs with some modifications, especially if the goal is equal access to all programs rather than "integrated education programs -- affirmative action" which is how this policy is titled. Below is section 6 with explanations regarding equal access in parenthesis. The first point (a) is not addressed because it relates to the middle

school. New language is in parenthesis. Editorial notes are in italics.

“Resolved that this School Board Directs the Superintendent in order to achieve these goals to:

b. “Encourage voluntary student transfers which will result in multicultural/multiethnic education for all children (by providing an array of education options in a variety of locations that appeal to a variety of learning styles);

c. Encourage increased enrollment in the administrative transfer program to the fullest extent practicable, with particular emphasis on recruitment of new nonminority transferees in the early elementary grades (to Early Childhood Education Centers) (and to all children to choose the appropriate school based on learning environment of neighborhood and option program. It is therefore the responsibility of the District to disseminate information widely about the choices available and to be explicit about transportation opportunities, application deadlines and expectations.);

d. Encourage and assist students who enroll in the administrative transfer program to continue in the program through Grade 12; (It is the district’s responsibility to continue the articulation of elementary level option programs through the high school level.) *For instance there is currently no magnet language program for middle school. Also, the District might be more likely to encourage the nonattendance zone family enrolled in an ECEC to remain in that cluster, at least through the fifth grade if not through high school, by offering nontraditional/innovative programs;*

e. Assure that space for resident students is available in schools serving the Albina area. (Assure that a percentage of space for ECEC students is available at special focus/magnet programs for those enrolling at the first grade.);

f. Continue staff development programs in human resources....to work successfully with children of different races, cultures, and economic backgrounds (by encouraging opportunities for staff from ECEC and special focus/magnet programs to share information);

- g. Make such assignments of staff as will facilitate the availability of spaces for administrative transfer children in receiving schools and maintain and improve the quality of instruction of those schools (including not only Early Childhood Education Centers but also special focus and magnet programs);
- h. Continue efforts to facilitate opportunities for parents of all children attending receiving schools to have close relationships with the receiving school staff;
- i. Encourage awareness of all parents and staff of the goals stated and enlist their continued cooperation and support;
- j. Recommend to the Board from time to time such additional programs and actions as are necessary and review annually with the Board the progress made and such operational guidelines as are appropriate. Furthermore the Superintendent shall analyze on November 1 of each year each school in the District which approaches a minority student enrollment of 50% to determine whether the minority student population since the preceding year remained essentially stable, increased or decreased. (Likewise determine whether the majority student population at special focus and magnet programs approaches a majority student enrollment of 50% or more and determine if there are access issues that should be assessed by the Board.) If either the minority student enrollment or percentage of minority students in the school has increased, the Superintendent shall present promptly to the Board his analysis of the causes of the increase. The Superintendent shall also recommend to the Board steps to attempt to reverse the trend toward and to prevent racial isolation (or a lack of equal access for all students in Portland Public Schools.).

By shifting the focus from racial balance to equal access and including Early Childhood Education Centers, Special Focus programs and Magnet Schools and programs under the same policy, some of the resegregating effects caused by differing strategies and goals might even out voluntarily. Clearly, the example above is from the

perspective of desegregation rather than choice. In a more equitable choice program, all families would still need to go through the application process. A crucial part of special focus and magnet programs is that families choose to participate in a unique curriculum. In a district-wide effort to integrate and offer more educational opportunities, parent support however should include more than the ability to transport the child or pay for kindergarten tuition.

2) Do all students in PPS district have equal access to specialty programs? What are policies and practices that encourage or discourage equal access? Included in this question are policy conflicts.

Students living in inner North and Northeast Portland are at a distinct disadvantage when participating in special focus and magnet programs as mentioned in the first variable of Mazmanian and Sabatier's framework. Conflicts arise primarily in the area of Enrollment and Attendance (4.10.053) for magnet programs in the broad language afforded Alternative Education Policy when applied to Special Focus programs (6.10.022):

Conflict 1: The "space available" criteria for Magnet Programs conflicts with the district's goal of minority enrollment in magnet programs.

Space is typically not available for new applicants in first through fifth grade at magnet programs because of long waiting lists and sibling preference. For families attending ECECs based on financial need, they will typically find themselves locked out of attending a Magnet program due to Criteria C "Space available in the program" under

“Criteria for Admission to Magnet Programs.” Yet, Section E of this policy section states: “The District goal is for minority student enrollment in Magnet School Programs to be within five percent of the Districtwide minority enrollment.” There is no procedure that allows students entering ECEC kindergarten based on financial need to then enter a magnet or special focus program at first grade to ensure minority enrollment.

Conflict #2 Language in 4.d and 4.I are conflictual and negatively impacting equal access to all students in Portland Public School District. PPS Board Policy 6.10.022 4.d says, “Programs may use appropriate public or private funds to produce and distribute written information about an alternative education program but shall not otherwise recruit students to apply for enrollment.” Policy 4.I says, “The proposed criteria for selecting students for enrollment in the education program must not unfairly discriminate among applicants and must reasonably relate to the educational goals of the district.” Families in inner North and Northeast Portland may be less aware of education options than families in other sections, simply because there are no existing models of special focus or magnet programs in this area.

Secondly, district officials are aware that minority families (excluding those whose ethnicity matches the language taught in language immersion programs) are underrepresented in option programs. Yet the policy states that option programs cannot recruit. On the other hand, policy states that these alternative (which includes special focus) programs must “not unfairly discriminate...and must reasonably relate to the education al goals of the district.” One explicit goal of the district is “equitable and

just access to opportunities...” (PPS Strategic Plans, 2000). North and Northeast families with elementary age students are at a disadvantage by having no elementary option programs in their geographic area. If schools are not allowed to recruit in this area, the district has created a policy framework for “unfairly discriminating” against a geographic segment of the population.

Conflict #3. Location of magnet and special focus programs hinder equal access to families living within the attendance zone of Early Childhood Education Centers.

6.10.022 4(d) says, “Any student in the Portland Public Schools may apply for enrollment in an alternative education program; the location must be accessible to all residents of the district.” Accessible by city bus? School bus? Max line? For young children entering kindergarten, these are important distinctions to make; this ambiguous policy in Alternative Education (which applies to special focus programs) provides little guidance to new programs.

6.10.022 4(g) is ambiguous regarding where programs should first attempt to locate: “Location of the proposed education program must conform to applicable district policies and state laws related to health, safety, and access for physically handicapped students and staff, and constitute an efficient use of district resources.” Lack of transportation *combined* with programs located outside of North/Northeast Portland suggest that these programs are not created to benefit all students equally, which is District policy for these programs: “These programs shall be designed to benefit all students equally....” (6.10.022 4d) Policy should require a thorough exploration of available sites in the district, with approval of new programs in areas underserved by

such programs.

Conflict #4 Tuition based full-day kindergarten creates an instant class barrier in conflict with 2.10.011. Due to lack of current policy for magnet and special focus programs, there are “barriers to educational attainment resulting from prejudice, racism, class differences, and/or institutional discrimination.” (Policies and regulations 2.10.011) This is due to the combination of tuition-based kindergartens at all special focus/magnet programs offering full-day programs (except one and it becomes tuition-Based in school year 2002-2003) and kindergarten-only applications for most special focus/magnet programs. Tuition-based kindergarten is increasing rather than decreasing at Portland Public School District. During the writing of this paper, another magnet implemented a tuition-based kindergarten rather than a free half-day program. The implications are very serious with desegregation funding disappearing from the budget in 2004-2005. State desegregation funding pays for all-day kindergarten at all Early Childhood Education Centers. Without the all-day option at ECECs, the draw for even neighborhood families lessens.

The collective equal access issues have a resegregating effect that only some level of top-down imposition will change. Perhaps the most fundamental way to correct this would be to encourage a more equitable geographic representation of special focus and magnet programs. With these programs developing one at a time from a grassroots level, the separating effect grows more and more pronounced. When will the tide shift and these programs become located in minority neighborhoods? Question number three addresses that point.

3. What is the likelihood of a school or community implementing a specialty program in an Early Childhood Education Center school?

The answer to this question rests, in part, on the Districts willingness to become involved in the process of restructuring. While this has been a bottom-up endeavor since Bierwirth's tenure as superintendent (since 1992), it is possible that the District and Board may recognize the current resegregating effects of a strictly bottom up approach to special focus and magnet implementation. There are a number of issues pointing in the direction of recrafting ECECs.

As this paper has mentioned, the District is in the process of analyzing all education option programs to identify gaps, ambiguities and conflicts. Although the focus is less on equal access issues and more on policy alignment and infrastructure, it may have the effect of suggesting some inequities. Also, the Board committee on education options is concerned about equal access as mentioned in an e-mail by one board committee member: " we consider the issue of equity of access to educational options to be one of the great challenges facing the district in the near future." (7/3/01)

The research, based on data collected around enrollment and history, suggest that low enrolling schools in low-income neighborhoods would benefit the most from a full-scale whole school restructuring. Low enrolling schools have in the past been threatened with possible school closures. In the 1980's for instance, Buckman was slated for closure. As a magnet, it enrolled all of its attendance zone children while

saving 50 percent of their spaces for children to apply as magnet students, ensuring a much larger student population. Using a current example, Humboldt, an Early Childhood Education Center, has had chronic low enrollment trends. Its current enrollment is 325 when at the height of desegregation its enrollment was 482 (in 1979). However, if enrollment trends remain low, this might be the ideal school to implement a special focus program because it has the most to gain, literally. It might also reduce the stigma around its recent reconstitution by giving it the status of magnet. Some may view the failed Northeast Community School, a special focus school in grades 4 through 8, as a reason not to attempt to implement a specialty program in the inner Northeast Portland. This particular program, however, spent a great deal of time and resources attempting to buy their own school building. In addition, as mentioned before, NECS had trouble attracting mainstream students and instead found itself with a growing special needs school population without the funding to support these students. A more successful approach might be to refocus an existing school in a low-income neighborhood like inner North-Northeast Portland, around an exciting, academic-based focus like geography or history.

In this case, implementors might want to change the magnet model to better match the more inclusive nature of Early Childhood Education Centers. For instance, the application process could simplify. All those in the attendance zone would automatically be enrolled. Those who want to apply would become part of the lottery or a first come first serve process. Also, information and outreach could upgrade and have a positive effect on local awareness of choice. Some families may be unaware of their options outside of their neighborhood school based on limited outreach by the

district and special focus schools. Starting a program within a school would increase awareness for Albina area families of special focus programs around the city. It is important to note that throughout the district, many low-income families have less access to special focus and magnet programs. An increase in the number of programs and a renewed focus on equitable location of new programs would begin the process of shifting special focus and magnet programs from its exclusive nature to a more inclusive one.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In a 1993 board meeting that first began the discussion of promoting special focus schools, board member Mr. Howard, said, "...the public schools, as an institution, are desperately in need of the freedom to let people loose to do good things and to essentially create constructive competition and a market of sorts. Schools need freedom to innovate, to reap rewards of good performance, and freedom to fail." Yet Henig (1995) provides a word of caution: "... Unless aggressively regulated by authorities -- the direction in which choice points may exacerbate, rather than ameliorate, racial segregation." This section discusses ways to balance freedom and regulation to achieve the goal of equal access for all option programs and to increase the likelihood for a special focus or magnet program to be located at an ECEC school.

The relative ease with which the District has handed over the development of education options to the grassroots level, is surprising. It is not up to teachers and parents to monitor an equitable program, especially without the funding needed for transportation, free kindergarten, and information dissemination. It is up to the board and district officials to create an infrastructure designed to support equal access for all students to potentially attend any choice option.

After 15 years of operating special focus and magnet programs without a plan, the Board now seems interested in at least understanding the extent of the inequities. For example, for the first time a new school board committee is working with the

Alternative Education Department and a local policy analyst to identify gaps, ambiguities, and conflicts in education options. This committee may be the first stirring of a renewed interest in equal access and in developing a larger vision to create a more equitable education option plan. Based on the data collected for this thesis, the following revisions to current policy are advised:

Based on data gathered for this report, district goals should be geared toward aligning its choice program:

To increase choice options equitably by location;

To improve access to option programs for all students, particularly minority and low-income students;

To provide incentives for option programs to accept special needs children; To provide incentives for Early Childhood Education Programs to enhance their curriculum through the implementation of innovative option programs.

Policy changes

The data from this thesis support the following revisions. Policy changes takes into account funding restrictions due to Measure 5 budget cutback, and therefore do not require significant additional funding:

- Terminology Refer to ECECs, magnet, and special focus programs as education options and align policy to minimize segregating tendencies as described in the first part of the discussion section.

•Information sharing Create school partnerships with ECEC schools and special focus program schools (like the Atkinson and Beach partnership that helped the latter implement a Spanish Immersion program) to encourage shared programs and ideas. Every ECEC partners with a special focus program.

•Equity in Location First consider placing new magnet and special focus programs in geographic locations that have no or few special focus programs. Senior district officials interviewed for this thesis agreed that location of magnet programs was inequitable, but disagreed that more equitable placement should be policy. The goal should be geographic dispersal of these programs for equal access to students underserved by special focus programs. Politically, this could be divisive if these programs are separate from neighborhood schools. For instance, a special focus program located near a struggling ECEC could have the effect of reducing enrollment as ECEC families transfer to the special focus. Ideally, an entire ECEC school restructuring to a special focus would diminish that threat.

• First-grade applications Reserve 10 - 15 percent spaces in special focus/magnet programs for first graders transferring from ECEC schools, using the same criteria in the application process. For instance, if the ECEC student wanted to attend a language immersion program, the family would have to articulate that they would support their child in the challenge of learning a second language. This policy change would simply correct the conflict around kindergarten -only applications and the tracking mechanism of kindergarten tuition. This is similar to the policy written for language immersion programs which reserve 20 percent of their incoming kindergartners to children whose

heritage matches the language taught.

- **Governance** Create a voluntary board in charge of Early Childhood Education Centers, special focus and magnet programs. Representatives could include principals and teachers and parents from each type of program mentioned above. The District would only need to supply a support person on a part-time basis. Supporting education organizations such as Portland School Alliance (which promotes parent organizing in the schools) and Portland Public School Foundation (which provides technical and financial assistance to schools) could have permanent board positions.
- **Measuring Equal Access** Implement an equal access measuring device for all choice programs, with governance by the voluntary board mentioned above. This should be published whenever school report cards and benchmarks are disseminated. Those special focus and magnet programs receiving high grades for equal access could be rewarded financially through grants and seed money provided supporting organizations.
- **Recruitment** District should allow special focus programs to recruit at Early Childhood Education Centers. This could include sending out letters from the principal of the special focus programs to a mailing list of ECEC families. Likewise, special focus programs should be allowed to perform or show exhibits (in the case of arts and science programs) to ECECs.

Changes in District Practices

In addition to specific Board-approved policy changes, this section also suggests

changes in current District and school building practice.

- Recruitment** District should send parents of pre-school ECEC children the letter from the superintendent describing choice options and how to go about enrolling, including an application and the brochure. See appendix A.

The District should generate consistent and thorough descriptions of special focus and magnet programs. Literature should include applications, deadlines, criteria specific to each school, deadlines, and a description of equal access amenities. This should be sent to all District-area families.

- Application process** Districts should encourage schools to send out applications if families are unable to get to the school rather than requiring families to receive them only at the school during scheduled tours, and if they are unable to access applications from the district's web site (see below). Also, all applications should be available on-line. Libraries should have information posted about how to access special focus program websites. (Note: Opal School, a start-up charter includes their application online)

- Assistance** All applications should include a note telling families where they can receive help in filling out applications. This person could be the District's Title I coordinator, an ECEC family support person, or a designated person at the special focus school itself.

- Transportation** Change language regarding transportation to special focus programs in District choice literature. Clarify that although the District cannot guarantee transportation, school buses are often available for some programs. A web site and phone number to the transportation office at the district should be made

available on all choice literature since routes change.

- Kindergarten tuition relief Kindergarten tuition is a real barrier for low-income families and difficult for the District to fund. Clearly, a state level program to increase the number of full or partial scholarships should increase. Where some schools have no need for scholarships, another school might have a growing need. Therefore the pool of money available should be district wide and not be allocated per school, but under a District-wide scholarship fund.

CONCLUSION

The Model School Plan and the 1980 Desegregation Plan articulated policy to improve educational opportunities to minority and low-income families living in the Albina area. Yet this is the population (along with other low-income families across the district) of district families that can be locked out of attending the substantial educational opportunities found in special focus and magnet programs. Huffman and Powell (1996) write that the Portland Public School District “attracts students from across the socioeconomic spectrum.” This is the same point Superintendent Bierwirth was enthusiastic about: “It’s fascinating to me hearing Chamber of Commerce members or banking executives telling people about language immersion programs. We have a great public school system. You can live in the city and send your kids to the public schools.”

What the data in this thesis support is that Portland’s small-scale options program offer the upper and middle classes an opportunity to experience a private-like public school or program by offering a challenging curriculum with a narrow door of access - - only a few low-income children can squeeze through, especially at the elementary level. This research also concluded that low-income families attending Early Childhood Education Centers in the Albina area are literally locked out of attending special focus and magnet programs due to kindergarten only applications and tuition in specialty programs.

The District and Board's movement away from policy development has had the accumulated effect of moving education options away from integration and equal access goals, which have, in turn, been exacerbated by the economic context of Measure 5. This thesis argues that conflicting and ambiguous policy and practice and the political and financial landscape blur the equal access problems around Portland's special focus and magnet programs. What comes into focus instead are innovative option programs developed by tenacious grassroots groups who are succeeding in engaging the interest of middle and upper class families. So, "why fix what ain't broke?" (Former board member)

As this study demonstrates, however, the system is not working for those families who are lower income -- in fact, it is broken. And the reasons that the system doesn't work as well for low income families stems, in the end, on a lack of long-term planning for education options. The result is a kind of education redlining. These are harsh indictments, but the accusations are pointed to the Board and District, not the groups creating innovative programs. As mentioned in the bottom-up section, weak or unwritten policy especially in the area of governance and infrastructure, could eventually have a weakening effect for some extraordinary special focus and magnet programs. A long-term plan for education option programs, especially a plan focused on elementary options, could improve the equal access and sustainability of all choice options -- special focus, magnet and ECECs.

TERMINAL REFERENCES

Blank, Richard, 1996. In Fuller, Bruce and Richard F. Elmore, editors, 1996. *Who chooses? who loses? culture, institutions, and the unequal effects of school choice*. Teachers College Press, New York.

Carter, Steven. *Bierwirth: Too good to pass up. Colleagues blame the jump to Outward Bound on the district's finances*. The Oregonian, September 19, 1997.

Collins, Huntly, *Neighbors decry closing Buckman*. The Oregonian, February 13, 1981.

DuBois, Phyllis A., Julia L. Duff, Evelyn K. Hawkins (American Institutes for Research), 1997. *Magnet schools assistance program (MSAP) performance indicators: guide for MSAP applicants and grantees*. U.S. Department of Education.

Eaton, Susan and Crutcher in Orfield, Gary and Susan E. Eaton (and the Harvard Project on School Desegregation) 1996. *Dismantling desegregation: the quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*. The New Press, New York.

Farmer, Barbara Wilson and Edgar I. Farmer, 2000. *Organizational structures of teachers in traditional and magnet schools in a large urban school district*. Education and Urban Society, Vol.33, No.1, Corwin Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Flint Independent School District web site

Fuller, Bruce and Richard F. Elmore, editors, 1996. *Who chooses? who loses? culture, institutions, and the unequal effects of school choice*. Teachers College Press, New York.

Gardner, Ralph and Carolyn Talbert-Johnson (2000) *School reform and desegregation: the real deal or more of the same?* Education and Urban Society, Vol. 33 No.1, November 2000.

Geddes, Elizabeth M. 1982. *Desegregation/integration -- policies and practices: Portland Public Schools, Portland, Oregon, 1970-1981*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of educational Administration, Brigham Young University.

Gerstner, Louis V., Roger D. Semerad, Denis Philip Doyle, and William B. Johnston, 1994. *Reinventing education*. Dutton, New York.

Hammond, Betsy and Steven Carter, *Bierwirth legacy influences search*. The Oregonian, December 24th 1997.

Harrison, Charles, 1991. *Public schools USA: comparative guide to school districts*. Peterson's Guide.

Henig, Jeffrey, 1995. *Race and choice in Montgomery County, Maryland, magnet schools*. Teachers College Record, Summer 95, Volume 96, Issue 4.

Huffman, Molly and Julie Powell, 1996. *School choices in greater Portland: a parent's guide to public and private education from preschool through high school*. TACT (The Authors Communication Team), Portland Oregon.

Johnson, Nina, Tashman Johnson LLC, June 8 2001, *Policy analysis: Portland public schools' education options*. For Portland Public Schools.

Koberstein, Paul. *Blackboard paradise: Portland schools could learn some lessons from Buckman Elementary*, Willamette Week, December 2, 1993.

Linnon, Nancy, Mike Tharp, Anne M. Arrarte, Patrick Barry, Thomas Toch, and Matthew Cooper. *Schools that work: magnet schools that limit admissions are a proven way to educational excellence, but they raise some difficult questions about equity*. U.S. News and World Report, May 27, 1991, v110 n20 p. 58.

Lipsky, Michael, 1980. *Street-level bureaucracy: dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Mazmanian, Daniel A. and Paul A. Sabatier, (1989). *Implementation and public policy*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD

McDermott, Kathryn A. 1999. *Controlling public education: localism versus equity*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.

Morris, Jerome and Ellen Goldring, 1999. *Are magnet schools equitable? An analysis of the disciplinary rates of African American and White students in Cincinnati magnet and nonmagnet schools*. Equity & Excellence in Education, v.32 n3.

Orfield, Gary and Susan E. Eaton (and the Harvard Project on School Desegregation) 1996. *Dismantling desegregation: the quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*. The New Press, New York.

Ottey, Michael A.W., *Community group may call for school boycott*, The Oregonian, August 29, 2000, B2.

Pacific Research Associates, 1999. *Second language immersion programs in portland public schools: a description of program components 1998-1999*. Portland Public Schools

Pappas, Dolores Jean (Robinett), 1984. *Early childhood education and compensatory education in the Portland, Oregon, public schools: 1965 - 1984*. Thesis, Portland State University.

Portland Bureau of Planning, 1993. *Portland's Albina community: the history of Portland's African American community (1805 to the present)*.

Portland Public Schools, *Resource manual*, Carol Matarazzo, 1995.

Portland Public School, *Ainsworth elementary public school's district wide Spanish immersion program*. School disseminated literature, 2000.

Portland Public School, Beck, Candace, Principal: *Presentation on Buckman school, November 20, 1996*.

Portland Public Schools, *Memorandum to Superintendent Canada and school board re: status report of desegregation committee*, Bruce B. Samson
November 22, 1999.

Portland Public Schools School Bus Schedule, *Student Transportation, 2000-2001*

Portland Public Schools, *Chronology and history: desegregation /integration, Portland public school, Office of the Superintendent 1981*.

Portland Public Schools, Department of Communications and Community
Involvement, *Options in Portland public schools for elementary school students 2001-2002*

Portland Public Schools, Informal Minutes, Board of Education, Regular Meeting,
September 23, 1993.

Portland Public Schools, Informal Minutes, Board of Education, Regular Meeting,
January 27, 1994

Portland Public School Board Policy 6.10.022 Alternative Education Programs.

Portland Public School District, *Special focus schools: providing innovation and choice in public education*, May 27, 1999. (No author listed)

Portland Public Schools, *A Statistical portrait of the multicultural/multiethnic student population in Portland public schools : A Summary Report, January 1986*. Northwest Educational Laboratory

Portland Public Schools, *Strategic Plan, August 28, 2000: 2000-2001 Action Summary*

Portland Public Schools Web site, general (www.pps.k12.or.us)

Portland Public Schools web site: www.pps.k12.or.us/schools/specprog.shtml

Raywid, Mary Anne 1999. Education Digest, May 1999, Vol. 64, Issue 9.

Raywid, Mary Ann 1995 in Tannenbaum, Margaret D., Edited, 1995, *Concepts and issues in school choice*. Mellen Studies in Education, Volume 23, The Edwin Mellen

Press Lewiston.

Rossell, Christine H., 1990. *The carrot or the stick for school desegregation policy: magnet schools or forced busing*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Smrekar, Claire and Ellen Goldring, 1999. *School choice in urban America: magnet schools and the pursuit of equity*. Teachers College Press, New York.

St. Paul Public Schools, School Choices and Services Catalog, 2001-2002

St. Paul Public Schools web site (www.spps.org)

Tannenbaum, Margaret D., Edited, 1995, *Concepts and issues in school choice*. Mellen Studies in Education, Volume 23, The Edwin Mellen Press Lewiston.

Yair, Gad 1996. *School organization and market ecology: A realist sociological look at the infrastructure of school choice*. British Journal of Sociology of Education, Dec96, Vol. 17 Issue 4.

LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Intensive Interviews

Board member (former)

Board member (current)

District Official #1

District Official #2

District Official #3,

District Official #4

Jack Bierwirth

Principal #1

Principal #2,

Staff #1

Staff #2

Community activist #1

Community activist #2

Informational Interviews

(via telephone call, e-mail, mailings, meetings)

DeAnne Bolzer, Richmond Japanese Immersion Program, Informational

Rosemary Brown, Portland Public Schools, Transfer Office

Betty Downing, Childcare Coordinator, Portland Public Schools

Lew Frederick, Portland Public Schools, Department of Communications and

Community Involvement

Nina Johnson, Tashman Johnson Consultants

Dona Lehr, Finance Department, Portland Public Schools

Charlie McAlister, Portland Public Schools, Routing Supervisor, Student
Transportation Services

Mary Scheetz, Portland Public School District

Staff from Ainsworth Spanish Immersion program, Atkinson Spanish Immersion program, the Family Cooperative at Sunnyside Elementary, Woodstock Chinese Mandarin Immersion program, Bridger's Creative Science program, the Winterhaven program at Brooklyn, Buckman Arts magnet school, and King Early Childhood Education Center.

**APPENDIX A. OPTIONS IN PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS BROCHURE
AND LETTER FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT**

Your Neighborhood School

Neighborhood schools are the heart of the Portland School District. For our youngest students, attending elementary school in their own neighborhood is usually the best possible option for learning.

Portland's comprehensive elementary schools serve students in kindergarten through Grade 5. They offer innovative programs, the latest technology, dedicated teachers — and something more than other magnet or special focus programs can provide.

Students who attend school in their own neighborhood build friendships with classmates who live, and play, nearby. After-school activities, before- and after-school childcare, and evening family events take place close to home when children attend their neighborhood school.

Many of Portland's 63 elementary schools offer full-day kindergarten programs. (In some schools, families pay for the second half of the day on a tuition basis.) Most schools also have on-site childcare available. Bus transportation is available for elementary students who live a mile or more from their neighborhood school.

As a place for families as well as children, our neighborhood schools are at the center of many community activities. To find out which school serves your neighborhood, call the school district's Department of Communications and Community Involvement, 916-3304.

REGISTRATION PROCEDURES

To register in your neighborhood school:

Children must be 5 years old on or before Sept. 1 to enroll in kindergarten. Children who reach their sixth birthday on or before Sept. 1 are eligible to enter first grade. Parents should bring student birth certificates or proof of age at registration. All students entering any Oregon school for the first time are required by state law to provide evidence of immunization for diphtheria, tetanus, polio, hepatitis B, chicken pox, Hib, mumps, rubella and measles — unless parents wish to seek medical or religious exemptions. Check with your medical provider for more information.

New students should register as soon as possible at their neighborhood school. Most schools will hold open houses and kindergarten 'round-ups' in the fall and spring. Families also can attend open house at any other schools that they are interested in. For more information, contact the school.

To apply for a transfer to a school that is not your neighborhood school:

Parents interested in having their child attend a school outside their neighborhood, including magnet and special focus programs, must request a transfer. This request is a two-step process:

1) Obtain an **Application to Transfer Out** form at your child's current school (or your neighborhood school if your child is not currently enrolled in a Portland public school). Complete the form, have it signed by the principal of your neighborhood school and return the form to the Student Transfer Office, 531 S.E. 14th, Portland, OR 97214.

Families are limited to three choices for consideration during the priority transfer period (Oct. 26 – Jan. 19). If you are applying for more than one transfer, you will need to complete separate forms for each school that you request and you will need to indicate which school is your first, second and third choice.

Applications are available after Oct. 26 and are due before Jan. 19 for priority consideration. Complete the **Application to Transfer Out** form only once, even if you will be applying for transfer to more than one out-of-neighborhood school.

2) Go to the school you would like your child to attend and complete an **Application to Transfer In** form.

Some schools and programs require additional application procedures, such as teacher recommendations and attendance at informational meetings. Allow enough time to complete all required application procedures, then return the **Application to Transfer In** to the requested schools before Jan. 19. Transfer applications received after Jan. 19 are considered only if there is space available.

Students who transfer to schools outside their neighborhood can remain in that feeder-school pattern through high school. When students transfer to a magnet/special focus program, the transfer is limited to the highest grade offered in the magnet/special focus program.

ELEMENTARY MAGNET/SPECIAL FOCUS PROGRAMS

A number of elementary magnet and special focus programs are available to students living within the Portland School District area. These programs suit a variety of student needs, learning styles and interests. Call the school to find out about information nights or tours, and to learn if additional application materials are required.

Space is limited in many of these programs. Some programs enroll incoming kindergartners only, while others have limited openings for students in Grades 1-5. Application can be made to up to three programs before the Jan. 19 priority application deadline. Families will be notified in writing in February after program enrollment decisions are made.

- **Ainsworth Elementary – Spanish Immersion Program** (*Kindergarten entry program. Occasional openings occur at 2425 S.W. Vista Avenue (97201) • 916-6288*
Grades 1-5, depending on space available.)

Students gain second language competency and cultural understanding through partial immersion in the Spanish language program. Students receive half of their instruction in Spanish (with Math and Science content focus) and half in English (with Language Arts and Social Studies content focus). Students learn to listen, speak, read and write in Spanish. Kindergarten program is tuition-based to provide instruction for the full day.

- **American Sign Language at Sunnyside Elementary**
3421 S.E. Salmon (97214) • 916-6226

American Sign Language (ASL) program makes Sunnyside the first school in the nation where all students learn American Sign Language from certified ASL instructors.

- **Atkinson Elementary Spanish/English Two Way Immersion Program** (*applications for incoming kindergartners only*)
5800 S.E. Division (97206) • 916-6333

Mixed groups of native English- and native Spanish-speaking students will receive 2 and 1/2 days of instruction in English and 2 and 1/2 days in Spanish in mixed-age classes to build proficiency in both languages through age-appropriate, real-world experiences.

MSYEW0001-09_G0

- **Buckman Elementary – Arts Magnet Program** (*primarily kindergarten applications; limited openings through Grade 5*)
320 S.E. 16th Avenue (97214) • 916-6230

Magnet program teaches arts content, as well as integrates art into teaching of other subjects. All Buckman students are involved in arts activities, meeting regularly with art teachers to receive specialized training in drama, dance, music and visual arts.

- **Creative Science School at Bridger Elementary**
7910 S.E. Market (97215) • 916-6336

This science-based program is based on the research of psychologist Jean Piaget. Program is designed to build literacy and math concepts through the scientific activities of observation, interaction, experimentation and theorizing. Additional application procedures are required for this program. Contact the school office for more information.

- **Family Cooperative School at Sunnyside Elementary (K-8)**
3421 S.E. Salmon (97214) • 916-6226

More than a school, FCS is a diverse, dynamic community of families and teachers. Parental participation is a cornerstone (50-100 hrs/yr.). The K-8 mixed-age classrooms develop independent learners using a thematic, interdisciplinary approach. Building a strong school community is central to the FCS vision.

- **Metropolitan Learning Center (K-12)**
2033 N.W. Gisan (97209) • 916-5737

MLC affiliated with Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound in Fall 1999 and provides experiential, hands-on teaching and service learning. Emphasis is on independence, personal excellence and responsible decision making. This small, K-12 school offers a noncompetitive atmosphere featuring written evaluations instead of grades, cooperative learning and cross-age activities.

- **Richmond Elementary - Japanese Immersion Program** (*applications for incoming kindergartners only*)
2276 S.E. 41st Avenue (97214) • 916-6220

Students gain second language competency and cultural understanding through partial immersion in the Japanese language program. Students receive half of their instruction in Japanese and half in English, enabling them to use their second language in work and play. Kindergarten program is tuition-based to provide instruction for a full day.

- **WinterHaven School at Brooklyn Elementary (K-8)**
3830 S.E. 14th (97202) • 916-6200

WinterHaven is a program that emphasizes the development of intellect, character and creativity with a special focus on math, science and technology. K-8 classes use an accelerated, rigorous, cross-disciplinary approach to learning. Special interest classes and community service are integral parts of the program. WinterHaven also offers a comprehensive (6-8) theater arts program to balance out the special focus program.

- **Woodstock Elementary Mandarin Chinese Immersion Program**
5601 S.E. 50th Avenue (97206) • 916-6380

Students gain second language competency and cultural understanding through 50/50 immersion in the Mandarin language program. Students receive half of their instruction in Mandarin and half in English, enabling them to use their second language in work and play. Kindergarten program is a tuition-based model which provides instruction for a full day.

Other Early Childhood/Elementary Options

Early Childhood Education Centers, or ECECs (preK/all-day kindergarten). Prekindergarten and all-day kindergarten programs that offer children enriched learning opportunities in an ethnically diverse population are features of the ECECs. These centers have supplemental resources available to provide materials, staff and educational opportunities for students in prekindergarten through fifth grade. Centers serve both neighborhood children and, on a space available basis, other children whose parents want these special programs. For further information on ECECs, call the school district's Department of Communications and Community Involvement, 916-3304 or the school where the ECEC or kindergarten program is located.

Beach Elementary, 1710 N. Humboldt.....	916-6236	Sabin ECEC, 4013 N.E. 18th.....	916-6482
Boise/Eliot ECEC, 620 N. Fremont.....	916-6171	Vernon ECEC, 2044 N.E. Killingsworth.....	916-6415
Humboldt ECEC, 4915 N. Gantenbein.....	916-5468	Woodlawn ECEC, 7200 N.E. 11th.....	916-6282
King ECEC, 4906 N.E. 6th.....	916-6456		

- **Head Start Programs**

Head Start serves primarily low-income, inner-city children, with preference given to 4-year-olds (though some children age 3 may be enrolled where space is available). Head Start families must meet federal guidelines regarding income. Head Start focuses on individualized education, parent involvement, health and family services. Call 916-5724.

- **Year-Round Schools – Two elementary schools provide year-round programs.**

Edwards Elementary
1715 S.E. 32nd Place (97214) • 916-6204

Peninsula Elementary
8125 N. Emerald (97217) • 916-6275

For more information, call the Department of Communications and Community Involvement, 916-3304, or visit the website: www.pps.k12.or.us

**Options In
Portland Public Schools
for
Elementary School Students
2001 - 2002**

October 2000

Dear Parent:

It's never too early to begin exploring the options your child will have when he or she begins kindergarten. Portland Public Schools offers a variety of choices in school programs that respond to the needs and interests of young children and their parents.

Portland's neighborhood schools are the heart and strength of the school district. Parents surveyed about their children's education voted strongly in favor of Portland's schools and teachers. Our students made impressive gains on state achievement tests last year and the percentage of students reaching state benchmarks increased significantly.

Our 63 neighborhood elementary schools offer more than strong academic programs. They are a place where young children build friendships with classmates who live nearby. They are community centers where families join together to support and encourage their children.

- Many of our elementary schools offer all-day kindergarten. Before-and-after school childcare is available at all of Portland's elementary schools, and most is provided on-site. (Space may be limited in childcare programs so parents are encouraged to apply early.)

Most Portland students attend their neighborhood school. For some students, choosing a school outside of the neighborhood makes sense. Magnet schools and special focus programs, which enroll students from across the school district, suit the different learning styles and interests of some students.

Beginning this month, you'll have a number of ways to hear more about Portland's outstanding public schools. Mark your calendar so you won't miss these events:

- **School Fair** is a free, annual event designed to inform families about Portland Public Schools. The fair will feature elementary schools and programs on **Tuesday, Oct. 24 from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at Benson High, 546 NE 12th Ave.** (On Wednesday, the second evening of the fair, the focus is on middle and high school programs.) Information on counseling services, the Talented and Gifted (TAG) program, English as a Second Language (ESL), Special Education and other offerings will be available. Free childcare also is offered.
- **Tours, Kindergarten Round-Ups and information nights** are earlier this year so parents can learn about programs and begin preparing their children for kindergarten. Check the enclosed listing for the date of your neighborhood school's sessions. Feel free to attend sessions at any other schools that you are interested in learning more about.

Families of elementary students have four choices available when choosing their child's school:

- **Your neighborhood school**
Each neighborhood elementary school has its own personality, traditions and strengths. You can learn more about your neighborhood school on the PPS webpage at www.pps.k12.or.us.
- **Other neighborhood schools**
Students may apply to transfer into another neighborhood school.
- **Magnet schools and special focus programs**
These schools and programs include language immersion, environmental learning, arts and science-based programs. Space is limited in most programs and not everyone who applies can be accepted.
- **Early Childhood Education Centers and Head Start Programs**
These programs are specially geared to the needs of young children, including pre-kindergartners.

The enclosed brochure, "Options in Portland Public Schools for Elementary School Students", describes these choices in detail. It also provides information and deadlines for requesting a transfer from your neighborhood school to another school or program.

Your child's first day in kindergarten is a big step into a lifetime of learning. You can prepare your child for that 'big step' by:

- Making sure all immunizations are up to date;
- Teaching your child some 'basics', such as how to tie shoes, put on a jacket, wash hands after using the bathroom;
- Helping your child learn his or her first and last name, address and phone number, parent's name (not 'Mommy' or 'Daddy');
- Showing your child what good behavior is, such as listening, taking turns and sharing.

In Portland Public Schools, we make every effort to work together with families to ensure that kindergarten is the beginning of many happy school years. Please feel free to call your neighborhood school for answers to any questions you may have. The Office of Student Services at 916-5840, Ext. 330, also is available to help.

Sincerely,

Benjamin O. Canada, Ph.D.
Superintendent

Enclosures

**APPENDIX B. WOODSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL'S MENTION OF
THE MANDARIN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM**

Woodstock Elementary School

5601 SE 50th Ave.
Portland, OR 97206

[View a map of the surrounding area](#)

Phone: 503-916-6380
Voice Mail: 503-916-3692
Fax: 503-916-2688
E-mail: Woodstock.Office@pps.k12.or.us

Grade levels: K-5
Middle Schools: Kellogg Middle School
Principal: Cheryl Johnson Woodstock Elementary

Before and after school programs

- Before and After School Day Care is provided by the YMCA.
- Ethos offers music lessons after school and is sponsored by the Woodstock PTA.
- A variety of sport activities (tennis, open gym, basketball, etc.) are offered through the Portland Park Bureau and/or our P.E. instructor. Times and events are scheduled on a quarterly basis.

Community partnerships

- Close relationships have developed with the Woodstock business community, many within easy walking distance of school.
- Reed College science majors team with our 4th and 5th grade teachers to implement and instruct the new science curriculum to our students. This is a two-year program that began in the fall of 2000.
- Ping Khaw-Sutherland will be working with all of our students in the area of visual arts. This is made possible through a grant from the Regional Arts and Culture Council and Run For The Arts/Young Audiences.

Student learning environment

- A warm, caring environment sets the stage for students, families and community members to participate at Woodstock School.
- Cooperative efforts of students, families and staff help provide maximum growth in intellectual, social, emotional and physical development.
- Outstanding, dedicated and professional staff.
- Native Mandarin speakers provide instruction to our Immersion classes and provide support to the distance learning program.
- Individual needs are carefully monitored to provide instruction at appropriate levels of intervention. Mixed- age groupings, real-life learning experiences and peer involvement techniques are used to facilitate instruction.
- At Woodstock School, we believe that the purpose of the elementary school is to provide a foundation for the positive growth and development of individuals who will become productive, responsible citizens. We also believe that elementary students are diverse learners with unique needs who need a variety of learning experiences in order to be successful. This success enhances self-concept, which is critical to the development of young learners.
- Early intervention and prevention of mathematics and reading problems are targeted through Title I.

Curriculum components

- Guided reading instruction is provided to all students through a schoolwide Title 1 project.
- C.O.R.E. (Consortium On Reading Strategies) strategies are an integral part of the curriculum at Woodstock.
- Students with needs for accelerated learning are accommodated through the Woodstock TAG program. opportunities for acceleration are met through Level and Rate Instruction.
- WOAI is Woodstock's Mandarin Immersion Magnet Program (<http://school.oregonlive.com/school/Mandarin>). Established in the fall of 1998, students spend one half of their academic day immersed in Mandarin. Currently we are serving 75 students in Kindergarten through grade 3.
- Classroom instruction focuses on content areas integrated with basic skills development.

Staff

- 20 certified classroom teachers, 1 PE specialist, 1 Integrated Arts teacher, 1 Title 1 teacher, 1 media assistant, 7 educational assistants, 1 secretary, 1 principal.

http://www.pps.k12.or.us/schools/profiles/location_id=297

Parent and family support

- Woodstock families support our school through the Parent Teacher Association(PTA), Shu Ren(Immersion Parent Group), Local School Advisory Committee(LSAC) and Site Council. PTA meetings are held the last Friday of the month. Shu Ren meets on the 2nd Monday of each month at 6:30 p.m.
- Parents and other neighbors volunteer as reading assistants, classroom helpers, clerical assistants and special projects coordinators.
- Parents are included in curriculum events each year. All students participate in those activities.
- Parent involvement is desired so that our students may not only excel but also experience the support of a strong community.

Special programs and features

- Woodstock is the home of the school district's Mandarin Chinese Magnet Program. This is a 50-50 immersion experience.
- All Woodstock students will participate in learning Mandarin Chinese. These lessons will be taught in the regular classroom setting using distance learning techniques. This is part of our district's commitment to have all children learn a second language.
- Use of technology is becoming a focus learning objective at Woodstock. Students, staff and parents are involved in exploring technology. Continuous work is being done to upgrade hardware. Internet access is now available in each classroom.
- Woodstock Student Management Plan is based on positive reinforcement. The Junior Coach Program and the Pride Inside reward systems are ongoing.
- Woodstock communicates with families through a monthly newsletter and through classroom newsletters.
- Three self-contained special education classes are housed at Woodstock.

Statistics and test scores

[Demographics](#)

[Test Scores](#)

[Enrollment Statistics \(PDF File\)](#)

(Top of Page | [PES Home](#))

© 2001 Portland Public Schools. All Rights Reserved. All Terms of Use. All Updated May 06, 2001

**APPENDIX C. DESEGREGATION DETAIL, PORTLAND PUBLIC
SCHOOLS**

DESEGREGATION DETAIL

		1997-98	1998-99	1998-99	1999-00 Proposed			
		Actual	Current	Current	Deseg	Deseg	GFund	GFund
		\$	\$	FTE	\$	FTE	\$	FTE
Early Childhood Education	Ball	183,918	197,725	2.75	91,156	1.38	91,156	1.38 -
	Beach	160,721	126,680	2.00	66,295	1.00	66,295	1.00 -
	Boise-Eliot	193,601	126,055	2.00	132,590	2.00		
	Humboldt	59,453	32,745	0.75	49,721	0.75		
	Irvington	148,309	117,682	2.00	0	0.00	66,295	1.00 -
	King	228,881	169,497	2.50	165,738	2.50		
	Sabin	124,676	72,260	1.00	66,295	1.00		
	Vernon	145,016	119,789	2.00	132,590	2.00		
	Woodlawn	113,535	89,885	1.50	99,443	1.50		
	Total	1,358,109	1,052,318	16.50	803,827	12.13	223,746	3.38
Extra elementary FTE	Beach		131,000	2.00	65,500	1.00	65,500	1.00
	Boise-Eliot	317,469	277,253	4.75	293,143	4.75		
	Humboldt	143,042	185,492	3.25	195,462	3.25		
	Irvington	280,511	289,774	4.25	0	0.00	151,853	2.13
	King	341,165	306,616	4.75	326,563	4.75		
	Sabin	248,076	265,796	4.25	279,757	4.25		
	Vernon	221,801	223,757	4.25	235,753	4.25		
	Woodlawn	291,908	269,708	4.25	283,962	4.25		
	Sch Prog Cos	3,712	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	Total	1,843,972	1,949,396	31.75	1,680,140	26.50	217,353	3.13
Full-day kindergarten (assumes half of K FTE)	Ball	76,079	84,050	1.38	72,666	1.13	72,666	1.13
	Beach	146,469	146,358	2.50	77,284	1.25	77,284	1.25
	Boise-Eliot	171,112	165,549	3.13	181,889	3.25		
	Humboldt	106,557	79,891	2.00	84,484	2.00		
	Irvington	166,852	150,684	2.38	0	0.00	83,430	1.25
	King	176,315	189,057	3.62	207,830	3.75		
	Sabin	116,936	114,062	2.00	120,724	2.00		
	Vernon	118,907	110,870	2.50	117,254	2.50		
	Woodlawn	132,192	133,422	2.50	140,975	2.50		
	Total	1,211,419	1,173,941	22.00	1,003,106	18.38	233,379	3.63
Extra middle FTE	Tubman	409,587	442,345	8.24	479,657	8.25		
	Tubman	33,469	14,852	0.00	14,842	0.00		
	Whitaker	0	31,296	0.50	311,534	4.75 -		
	Total	443,056	488,493	8.74	806,033	13.00		
Turnabout at Jefferson		1,181,499	1,252,623	19.43	1,295,889	19.43		
High school integration services		421,165	420,752	6.30	449,434	6.30		
Restructuring	Humboldt	537,520	436,000	7.90	449,080	7.90		
	Jefferson	60,663	0	0.00	0	0.00 -		
	Total	598,183	436,000	7.90	449,080	7.90		
Multicultural/multi-ethnic		178,195	282,151	3.70	299,062	3.70		
TOTAL		7,235,597	7,055,674	116.32	6,786,570	107.33	674,477	10.13

APPENDIX D: IMPLEMENTATION RANKING

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989, 29) summarize characteristics needed to successfully implement policy. Using their ranking system of Low, Moderate, and High, the variables are measured for ECECs and special focus programs.

1. It's objectives are precise and clearly ranked. Low for both types of programs. The objectives for ECEC were initially high then deteriorated as district officials and school staff moved away from racial balance and integration to supporting neighborhood schools. The objectives for special focus programs are too individualized to measure. That is, due to their grassroots nature, they all have very different goals and objectives. Policy is very ambiguous about goals for these programs.

2. It incorporates adequate causal theory. Low for ECECs: Originally the philosophy behind these schools was very clear: focusing on primary years and lowering racial concentrations to improve outcomes for disadvantaged youth. This is dated language. District officials are outspoken about no longer focusing on integration. Rather, they simply support neighborhood schools with enrollment patterns that naturally occur. Low for special focus programs: choice and innovative curriculum create a healthy school district are the implicit causal theory, but for who? The policy is mostly tacked on from other departments or ECEC language and is ambiguous or nonexistent. Its failure to zero in on equal access suggests innovation at any cost.

3. It provides adequate funds. Low for ECECs. Built around Title I and Desegregation funding, Early Childhood Education Centers once benefitted from a much higher per-student funding.

Now, they are threatened with losing all desegregation funding. The inability of the district to acquire stable operating funds is particularly threatening to neighborhood schools in low-income neighborhoods. Low: Special focus programs are not funded by the District for research and development stage. Principals are not funded. FTE based on number of students and building and maintenance are provided by District. This sparse funding can disorganize very strong existing programs -- especially in the area of sharing building space and curriculum development (Task Force paper 1999, Community Organizer #1, current Board member).

4. There are few veto points in the implementation process -- High for ECECs which were designed as a one-size fits all program (Geddes 1982). School staff were largely not involved in the implementation process. There are few veto points for changing the model at the school level.

Low for special focus programs. There is enormous discretion at the staff level. The program began with involved community groups working closely with the district and evolved into community groups working on their own (following District proposal guidelines, attached) and presenting to a District committee, and then working with the district to locate the program if not already connected to the school.

5. The decision rules of the implementing agencies are biased toward the achievement of statutory objectives - Low for both. Lack of district commitment in integration has weakened the strengths of ECECs and their ability to draw majority families. For special focus and magnet programs, there is conflicting policy and practice in choice options and a lack of district accountability for equal access. There is no existing

measuring device for equal access (or at least one that is made public).

**APPENDIX E. SAMPLE OF A MAGNET SCHOOL'S APPLICATION FOR
ENROLLMENT**

Appendix E

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
MAGNET / SPECIAL FOCUS PROGRAMS
2000 - 2001

APPLICATION FORM

Student name		Application Date	Grade level on entering	Date received - office use only
Address		City	State	Zip
Mailing Address		City	State	Zip
Birth date	☐ male ☐ female	Home phone number:	Day phone number Father: Mother:	
Name of Mother/Guardian		Name of Father/Guardian	Neighborhood School	

Race/Ethnic category most closely characterizing the student:

☐ American Indian ☐ White ☐ Black ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ Hispanic

Is your student presently part of any of these Portland Public Schools programs?

☐ Title I ☐ Special Education ☐ English as Second Language ☐ Talented and Gifted ☐ Early Entry ☐ Head Start

Does your student have any special needs? Please explain _____

School currently attending _____

Address of the school _____ Phone # _____

☐ I authorize the release of my child's records to school staff for placement review.

Signature Date

Please check with the school about other requirements in the application process (attendance at informational meetings, additional written materials, etc.)

Completed applications are due in the _____ Office by 4:30 p.m., Friday, March 17, 2000.

Preschool Survey

Parent/guardian: Please complete the top portion, add a stamp to the envelope, and give to your child's teacher or care giver to complete and return to _____.

Child's name _____ Date _____

Child's teacher or child care giver's name _____

School or Day Care _____

Parent/Guardian signature

The parents of the child listed above have made application to the . .

School. This is a full day language immersion program taught in . . . As a magnet program, it is available to any student living in the Portland Public School District who qualifies on a space available basis. This program is designed to give every child language proficiency in . . . basic academic skill competencies, opportunities to develop relationships with children of different cultures and understand cultural differences.

We want to provide the best opportunity for each child's future educational success and appreciate your time and comments. **Please mail the survey** on the reverse side to School in the stamped envelope provided by March 29, 1999.

Would you like us to contact you for further information? Yes _____ No _____

Signature _____ Telephone No. _____

Best time to be contacted: DAY _____ EVE _____ TIME _____

Thank you for your assistance in identifying children who are most likely to successfully complete six years of two way . . . immersion. We are not necessarily looking for students who already have . . . skills, rather for students with the ability and willingness to tackle the possible challenges involved in receiving the majority of their instruction in a second language.

Please contact ,

3, if you have further questions or comments.

PRESCHOOL SURVEY

1. Learning a second language can be stressful. Will this child have the stamina and flexibility to deal with transitions and the challenges learning in a full day kindergarten where 90% of the instruction is in _____ ?
2. How well does the child listen and follow directions of the teacher and other adults? Is the child able to stick with a task?
3. How well does he/she get along with peers?
4. What does the child do when frustrated?
5. How does he/she communicate his/her needs?
6. Is the child interested and attentive at story time (can sit and listen for up to 20 minutes at a time?)
7. What are the child's strengths? Which areas need improvement?
8. Have there been any questions about whether this child might have special needs? What, if any, assessments have been done?
9. Are the parents involved/supportive of their child's education? (i.e. volunteer in class, positive support to teachers, etc).
9. Is there anything else you want to tell us?

Child's Name _____

SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION

1. HAS YOUR CHILD EVER ATTENDED A SCHOOL OR CLASSES IN _____ ?
Yes _____ No _____

If so, please tell where _____ and how many hours
a week _____.

2. Have any of the child's siblings participated in the _____ / Immersion
Program? No _____ Yes _____ If so please list their names

3. Does either parent/guardian speak _____ ? Yes _____ No _____
If no, are you willing to learn some to be able to support your child's learning in the
program? yes _____ no _____

4. What is your child's first (primary spoken) language? _____

5. What is the language most commonly spoken in your home? _____

6. What kind of cross-cultural activities does your family participate in?

7. Why do you want your child to participate in this program?

8. Are you willing to volunteer time at school or at home to benefit this program? _____

This is a 6- year commitment. We have attended an informational meeting and will attend the mandatory parent meeting. We look forward to becoming involved and fulfilling the parent commitments through the program.

We understand that the immersion process is most successful over an extended period of time and are willing to make a long term commitment. We also understand that the _____ and English homework will not be translated into the other language.

_____ Yes _____ NO

Parent/guardian signatures

Date

HOME READINESS SURVEY

FOR CHILDREN WHO HAVE NOT HAD A PRESCHOOL EXPERIENCE

1. Has your child been enrolled in any formal learning experiences such as park and recreation programs, library programs, art and music programs or lessons, church groups, etc.?

Please explain: _____

2. Have your child write their name in this space:

3. Have your child write any numbers they know here:

4. Use this space for your child to create their own self portrait.

5. What are your child's special interests or favorite things to do?

Please return this with your child's application.

Thank you.

**APPENDIX F. ST. PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT OPTIONS
CATALOG**

Important Dates

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

FEBRUARY - MARCH 2001:
ELEMENTARY MAGNET/CITYWIDE OPTION
OPEN HOUSES

MARCH - MAY 2001:
NEIGHBORHOOD KINDERGARTEN
ORIENTATIONS

MARCH 16, 2001:
ELEMENTARY MAGNET/CITYWIDE OPTION
APPLICATIONS DUE

MAY - JUNE 2001:
ELEMENTARY MAGNET/CITYWIDE OPTION
ACCEPTANCE NOTIFICATION
AND KINDERGARTEN MAGNET
ORIENTATIONS

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

FEBRUARY 2001:
SECONDARY SCHOOL SHOWCASES

FEBRUARY 28, 2001:
SECONDARY SCHOOL
APPLICATIONS DUE

MID-MARCH 2001:
SECONDARY SCHOOL
ACCEPTANCE NOTIFICATION

KEY PHONE NUMBERS

STUDENT PLACEMENT CENTER
(651) 632-3700

ELEMENTARY PLACEMENT INFORMATION
(651) 632-3760

SECONDARY SCHOOLS INFORMATION
(651) 632-3761

OPEN ENROLLMENT
(651) 632-3728

GENERAL DISTRICT INFORMATION
(651) 767-8100

WEB SITE:
www.spps.org

Saint Paul Public Schools

2001-2002

SCHOOL CHOICES & SERVICES CATALOG

Elementary Schools	Page 14
Secondary Schools	Page 42
Early Childhood Information	Page 57
Adult Learning Opportunities	Page 60
Parent Information Fair	Back Cover

RAISING EXPECTATIONS

FOR INFORMATION IN OTHER LANGUAGES, SEE PAGES 61 AND 62

YOG KOJ TSIS PUAB HAJIS
THIAB TSIS PAUB NYEEM
NTAWY AAS KIV
MAS THOV KOJ XYUAS
PHAB 61 LOS
PUAS PHAB 62.

SI USTED NO PUEDE
LEER O HABLAR EL
INGLÉS LEA LA PÁGINA
61 O 62.

Nếu quý vị không
có nói hoặc viết
được Anh Ngữ,
xin coi trang 61
hoặc 62

HADDII AADAN KU
HADLIN AMA AKHRIN
AFKA INGRISIIGA
WAXAAD EEGTAA BOGGA
61AAD IYO 62AAD.

បើអ្នកមិនចេះនិយាយ
ឬអានភាសាអង់គ្លេស
សុំមើល
ទំព័រ ៦១ ឬ ៦២

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

RAISING EXPECTATIONS

WHAT ARE ELEMENTARY MAGNET AND CITYWIDE OPTION SCHOOLS?

Elementary magnet and citywide option schools offer a particular program focus in addition to the basic curriculum that all schools offer. Magnet and citywide option schools draw students from all parts of the city and are part of the school district's voluntary desegregation efforts. Families must apply to a magnet or citywide option school.

These schools are described on pages 16-32.

WHAT ARE NEIGHBORHOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS?

Neighborhood schools are available to students based on their home addresses. Students who attend neighborhood schools live within the boundaries (attendance area) for that school or are reassigned from magnet school attendance areas. If you would like your child to attend your neighborhood school, you should call that school directly unless you are new or returning to Saint Paul. If you are new or returning to the school district and your child will be in grades 1-6, you should contact the Student Placement Center at (651) 632-3701 or (651) 632-3702 to schedule an intake appointment. Parents of students who will be starting kindergarten should see the information below.

These schools are described on pages 33-41.

Special Information for Families of Kindergartners:

All children who will be 5 years old on or before September 1, 2001, are eligible for kindergarten.* Families of kindergartners do not need to schedule an intake appointment with the Student Placement Center unless the family moves to Saint Paul after the start of the school year and the child is entering the school after October 1, 2001. All families of kindergartners should follow the steps outlined below.

- 1) An early childhood screening is required by state law for all kindergarten students. This screening includes a review of immunizations, health information, vision, hearing, height, weight, speech and development. Parents can also arrange this screening with their child's doctor or health clinic. For a physician's checklist or more information, call the Early Childhood Screening Office at (651) 632-3746.
- 2) Attend your neighborhood elementary school's kindergarten orientation. (Orientation dates are listed by each school description.) Even if you applied to a magnet school, it is a good idea to attend your neighborhood school's kindergarten orientation in case you are not accepted to a magnet/citywide option school. Bring your child's immunization records, Social Security number and birth certificate to the orientation.

For more information, call the Elementary Placement Office at (651) 632-3760.

Due to additional funds related to a successful property tax referendum, some schools that currently have half-day kindergarten are offering full-day kindergarten in 2001-2002. Other schools may offer both choices. Check with your schools of choice to find out more.

Elementary Schools Listing

See index for page listings of schools.

SCHOOL	GRADES	ADDRESS	PHONE
*ADAMS SPANISH IMMERSION MAGNET	K-6	615 S. Chatsworth St. 55102	(651) 298-1595
*AMERICAN INDIAN MAGNET at Mounds Park All Nations	K-6	1075 E. Third St. 55106	(651) 293-5938
AMES ELEMENTARY	K-6	1760 Ames Place 55106	(651) 293-8970
*BATTLE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL MAGNET	K-6	60 S. Ruth St. 55119	(651) 293-8850
*BENJAMIN E. MAY'S MAGNET at Rondo Education Center	K-6	560 Concordia Ave. 55103	(651) 293-8730
BRIDGE VIEW SCHOOL (Special Education)	5 yr-22 yr	360 Colborne St. 55102	(651) 293-8640
BRUCE F. VENTO ELEMENTARY	K-6	409 E. Case Ave. 55101	(651) 293-8685
*CAPITOL HILL GIFTED AND TALENTED MAGNET at Rondo Education Center	1-8	560 Concordia Ave. 55103	(651) 293-5918
CHELSEA HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	K-6	1557 Huron St. 55108	(651) 293-8790
*CHEROKEE HEIGHTS WEST SIDE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	4-6	694 Charlton St. 55107	(651) 293-8610
COMO PARK ELEMENTARY	K-6	780 W. Wheelock Pkwy. 55117	(651) 293-8820
*CROSSROADS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL—CITYWIDE OPTION	4 yr-6	543 Front Ave. 55117	(651) 767-8540
DAYTON'S BLUFF ACHIEVEMENT PLUS ELEMENTARY	K-6	262 Bates Ave. 55106	(651) 293-8915
*DOWNTOWN KINDERGARTEN MAGNET	4 yr-K	Pioneer Building, #115	(651) 290-8372
.....		336 Robert St. N. 55101	or 8373
EASTERN HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	K-6	2001 Margaret St. 55119	(651) 293-8870
*EASTSIDE WORKPLACE KINDERGARTEN MAGNET	4 yr-K	Metro 94 Business Center 475 Etna St., Suite 9 55106	(651) 228-7734
*EXPO FOR EXCELLENCE MAGNET at Harriet Bishop Center	K-6	540 Warwick St. 55116	(651) 290-8384
*FARNSWORTH OUTCOME BASED EDUCATION MAGNET	K-6	1290 Arcade St. 55106	(651) 293-8675
*FOUR SEASONS A+ ELEMENTARY—CITYWIDE OPTION	K-6	340 Colborne St. 55102	(651) 290-7595
*FRANKLIN MUSIC MAGNET	K-6	690 Jackson St. 55101	(651) 293-8620
*FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAM—CITYWIDE OPTION at Highland Park Elementary	K-6	1700 Saunders Ave. 55116	(651) 293-8770
*FROST LAKE MAGNET SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY AND GLOBAL STUDIES	K-6	1505 E. Hoyt Ave. 55106	(651) 293-8930
*GALTIER SCIENCE/MATHEMATICS TECHNOLOGY MAGNET	K-6	1317 Charles Ave. 55104	(651) 293-8710
GROVELAND PARK ELEMENTARY	K-6	2045 St. Clair Ave. 55105	(651) 293-8760
*HANCOCK-HAMLIN UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIVE MAGNET	K-6	1599 Englewood Ave. 55104	(651) 293-8715
HAYDEN HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	K-6	1863 E. Clear Ave. 55119	(651) 293-8815
*HIGHLAND PARK ELEMENTARY—CITYWIDE OPTION	K-6	1700 Saunders Ave. 55116	(651) 293-8770
HIGHWOOD HILLS ELEMENTARY	K-6	2188 Londin Lane 55119	(651) 293-8875
HOMECROFT ELEMENTARY	K-6	1845 Sheridan Ave. 55116	(651) 293-8955
*J. J. HILL MONTESSORI MAGNET	4 yr-6	998 Selby Ave. 55104	(651) 293-8720
*JACKSON PREPARATORY MAGNET	K-6	437 Edmund Ave. 55103	(651) 293-8650
JOHN A. JOHNSON ACHIEVEMENT PLUS ELEMENTARY	K-6	740 York Ave. 55106	(651) 793-7300
*LINWOOD A+ ELEMENTARY—CITYWIDE OPTION	K-6	1023 Osceola Ave. 55105	(651) 293-6606
*LONGFELLOW HUMANITIES MAGNET	K-6	318 Moore St. 55104	(651) 293-8725
MANN ELEMENTARY	K-6	2001 Eleanor Ave. 55116	(651) 293-8965
*MAXFIELD MAGNET SCHOOL OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE	K-6	380 N. Victoria St. 55104	(651) 293-8680
*MISSISSIPPI CREATIVE ARTS MAGNET	K-6	1575 L'Orient St. 55117	(651) 293-8840
MONROE ACHIEVEMENT PLUS COMMUNITY SCHOOL	K-8	810 Palace Ave. 55102	(651) 293-8690
*MUSEUM MAGNET at Rondo Education Center	K-6	560 Concordia Ave. 55103	(651) 293-5926
*NOKOMIS MONTESSORI MAGNET	4 yr-6	985 Ruth St. 55119	(651) 293-8857
NORTH END ELEMENTARY	K-6	27 E. Geranium Ave. 55117	(651) 293-8795
*OPEN SCHOOL—MAGNET	K-12	90 Western Ave. S. 55102	(651) 293-8670
PARKWAY ELEMENTARY	K-6	1363 Bush Ave. 55106	(651) 293-8845
PHALEN LAKE ELEMENTARY	K-6	1089 Cypress St. 55106	(651) 293-8935
PROSPERITY HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	K-6	1305 Prosperity Ave. 55106	(651) 293-8695
RANDOLPH HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	K-6	348 Hamline Ave. S. 55105	(651) 293-8780
*RIVERVIEW WEST SIDE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	K-3	271 E. Belvidere St. 55107	(651) 293-8665
*ROOSEVELT WEST SIDE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	K-3	160 E. Isabel St. 55107	(651) 293-8655
ST. ANTHONY PARK ELEMENTARY	K-6	2180 Knapp St. 55108	(651) 293-8735
*SATURN/RIVER FRONT ACADEMY at River Front Education Center	K-8	65 E. Kellogg Blvd. 55101	(651) 290-8354
SHERIDAN ELEMENTARY	K-6	525 White Bear Ave. N. 55106	(651) 293-8745
*TRI-DISTRICT SCHOOL—MAGNET	K-6	30 E. County Rd. B, Maplewood 55117	(651) 487-5450
*WEBSTER MAGNET	K-6	707 Holly Ave. 55104	(651) 293-8625
*WORLD CULTURES AND LANGUAGES MAGNET at Mounds Park All Nations	K-6	1075 E. Third St. 55106	(651) 293-5940

* Magnet/Citywide Option Schools, application required

Elementary Magnet and Citywide Option School Descriptions

OPEN HOUSE
MON., FEB. 26, 2001
6:30-8:00 P.M.

KINDERGARTEN ORIENTATION
MON., MAY 7, 2001
4:00-6:00 P.M.

ADAMS SPANISH IMMERSION MAGNET SCHOOL (K-6) **615 SOUTH CHATSWORTH STREET, 55102, (651) 298-1595**

This elementary magnet school helps kindergarten through sixth grade students learn both English and Spanish. For most students, all subjects in kindergarten and first grade are taught in Spanish. English language arts and English reading begin in the second grade. The school uses the same core curriculum taught in all Saint Paul elementary schools except students learn to comprehend, speak, read and write in both languages. Knowledge of Spanish is not required for students entering kindergarten. However, students applying for second through sixth grades must be comfortable with both oral and written Spanish.

SPECIAL FEATURES:

- All students are expected to become functionally bilingual by the end of sixth grade.
- Students develop increased creative and critical thinking skills, become more culturally sensitive and increase their intellectual potential in the process of learning a second language.
- Children improve skills in English speaking, reading and writing by exposure to a second language.
- The school has a Kindergarten Language Development Academy for students who are English language learners. Kindergarten students who qualify for this program are in a class where the teacher teaches morning classes in Spanish and afternoon classes in English.
- The school has an active parent volunteer group.
- The school has a diverse teaching staff from many Spanish-speaking countries.

OPEN HOUSE
THURS., MARCH 1, 2001
5:30-7:30 P.M.

KINDERGARTEN ORIENTATION
THURS., MAY 10, 2001
6:00-7:30 P.M.

AMERICAN INDIAN MAGNET SCHOOL AT MOUNDS PARK ALL NATIONS SCHOOL (K-6) **1075 EAST THIRD STREET, 55106, (651) 293-5938**

At American Indian Magnet, students study the rich culture, history and language of dominant area tribes including Ojibwe and Dakota/Lakota. A strong sense of community at the school is built through an emphasis on core values including respect, gratitude, humility, patience, cooperation and environmental responsibility. A strong academic program includes what is called a "balanced literacy" approach to reading and writing where literature is blended into every subject area. Students, parents, teachers, administrators and other school staff share the responsibility for the academic achievement of all students. Ojibwe and Dakota/Lakota teaching specialists also provide language and culture opportunities for students and staff.

SPECIAL FEATURES:

- Cultural activities such as language classes, culture fairs and artists-in-residence are an important part of the school's schedule.
- The school often works together with the school district's Indian Education Program.
- Students have access to the school's American Indian Culture Room.
- Computer and science labs offer students opportunities for hands-on learning.
- The school offers after-school programs run by the Area Learning Center (ALC) and Indian Youth Enrichment. Discovery Club offers extended-day programs before and after school (fee charged).

OPEN HOUSE FOR GRADES 1-6
THURS., MARCH 8, 2001
6:30-7:30 P.M.

OPEN HOUSE FOR GRADES 7-8
THURS., FEB. 8, 2001
6:30-7:30 P.M.

TO ARRANGE A SCHOOL VISIT
OR FOR MORE INFORMATION
ABOUT THE SCHOOL'S
ACADEMIC PROGRAM, CALL
(651) 293-5918 EXT. 1252

**CAPITOL HILL GIFTED AND TALENTED MAGNET SCHOOL
AT RONDO EDUCATION CENTER (1-8)
560 CONCORDIA AVENUE, 55103, (651) 293-5918
WEB SITE: www.spps.org/capitol/caphill.htm**

Capitol Hill Magnet School is a full-time program for academically gifted and talented students in grades 1-8. The rigorous and challenging academic program is specially crafted to develop critical and creative thinking. Learners have opportunities for acceleration (fast-paced learning) and enrichment (learning that extends beyond the regular classroom) within an environment of high expectations that includes regularly completing homework. Successful students have positive attitudes toward high achievement and have high levels of motivation, academic potential and commitment to completing tasks. A setting of team-building, civic responsibility and appreciation for diversity is fostered within the school community.

SPECIAL FEATURES:

- Students have an opportunity to participate in local, state and national competitions in academics, athletics and the arts.
- A music program for students includes Suzuki strings, orchestra, band and choir.
- The school partners with local colleges, businesses and community resource centers.
- Students in grades 1-5 learn from teaching specialists in art, music, technology and physical education. A specialist who uses multiple intelligences theories highlights multiple ways of learning and helps students share what they have learned.
- Students in grades 6-8 can choose a variety of elective classes including Spanish, French, photography, pottery, team sports, aerobic fitness and more.
- Students can participate in extracurricular sports, classes and clubs.
- The school has two computer labs and a computer in every classroom.
- Student leadership opportunities include student council, mentor programs and a "buddy" program with students of different ages.
- Discovery Club offers extended-day programs before and after school (fee charged).

Note: To apply to this school in grades 1-6, students must have been on waiting lists in past years or have been identified as eligible to receive gifted and talented services by the school district's DISCOVER Assessment. For information on waiting lists in past years, call (651) 632-3760. For more information on the DISCOVER Assessment, call (651) 767-8377. To apply for Capitol Hill in grades 1-6, see the special section on the Application for Magnet and Citywide Option Schools on page 32B. Check the box in this special section on the application to apply to the school. Indicate your other magnet school choices on the lines marked First Choice, Second Choice and Third Choice on page 32C. Eligible students who checked the box will be considered for Capitol Hill and for the other choices in the order listed. There is an attendance area preference for Capitol Hill, but sibling preference does not apply.

OPEN HOUSE
TUES., FEB. 13, 2001
6:30-7:30 P.M.

**CHEROKEE HEIGHTS WEST SIDE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE (4-6)
694 CHARLTON STREET, 55107, (651) 293-8610
WEB SITE: www.spps.org/cherokeehights/index.htm**

This school, which serves students in fourth through sixth grades, uses an innovative approach where teachers work in teams with an emphasis on reading, writing and math skills. Teachers use themes to help students understand concepts that cross boundaries of subject areas. Computers and other technology enhance the curriculum. The school also has a Schoolwide Enrichment Model program for gifted and talented students and a variety of other activities including vocal music, band and violin that enhance classroom learning. Cherokee Heights is part of the West Side Schools of Excellence with other Saint Paul schools on the city's West Side.

SPECIAL FEATURES:

- The school has a studio arts lab, Macintosh language arts lab and science lab.
- An indoor pool with American Red Cross swimming instruction is available.
- The Accelerated Reading Program and the math and reading Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC) Program help students improve skills.
- Students wear school uniforms.
- HOSTS (Help One Student To Succeed) Mentorship Program helps students by pairing them with adult volunteers.
- After-school Area Learning Center (ALC) and 21st Century Program enrichment opportunities build upon concepts students learn in the classroom.
- University of St. Thomas students provide tutoring services.

**SEND OR BRING THIS
APPLICATION TO:**

ATTN: ELEMENTARY
PLACEMENT OFFICE
STUDENT PLACEMENT CENTER
SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2102 UNIVERSITY AVE. W.
SAINT PAUL, MN 55114

FAXED APPLICATIONS
WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CALL
(651) 632-3760.

**DEADLINE
IS MARCH 16, 2001**

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE REC'D. _____

C.I.E. _____

GRADE 2001-2002 _____

SIBLING PREFERENCE _____

EA TO K _____

CORPORATE PREFERENCE _____

GEOGRAPHIC PREFERENCE _____

A/A SCHOOL _____

**APPLICATION
FOR ELEMENTARY MAGNET AND CITYWIDE
OPTION SCHOOLS, 2001-2002**

DEADLINE IS MARCH 16, 2001

An application must be completed for each elementary student who wishes to attend a magnet or citywide option school. One application per child. You may make copies of this application. This application is valid for the 2001-2002 school year only.

PLEASE PRINT

STUDENT NAME:
(LEGAL) LAST FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL

BIRTH DATE: / / ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE
MONTH DAY YEAR

PARENT/GUARDIAN NAME: _____

HOME ADDRESS: ADDRESS APT. #

CITY STATE ZIP

TELEPHONE: () ()
AREA CODE HOME AREA CODE DAYTIME

*ANY CHANGE IN ADDRESS OR PHONE NUMBER SHOULD BE REPORTED IMMEDIATELY TO THE
STUDENT PLACEMENT CENTER AT (651) 632-3760.

STUDENT'S CURRENT OR LAST SCHOOL ATTENDED: _____

APPLYING FOR GRADE: _____

OPTIONAL—TO BE COMPLETED BY THE PARENTS/GUARDIANS OF STUDENTS ENTERING THE SCHOOL.
PLEASE CHECK ONE ONLY.

☐ AFRICAN AMERICAN ☐ AMERICAN INDIAN/ ALASKAN ☐ ASIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER ☐ CAUCASIAN, NOT HISPANIC ☐ HISPANIC

CAPITOL HILL MAGNET SCHOOL

☐ **YES,**
I AM INTERESTED IN CAPITOL
HILL AS AN OPTION FOR MY
CHILD IN GRADE 1-6.

Capitol Hill is a gifted and talented program for students in grades 1-6. If you are interested in this school as an option, you must check the box to the left.

TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR CAPITOL HILL YOUR CHILD MUST:

have been on the waiting list in past years;

OR

have been identified as eligible to receive gifted and talented services by the school district's testing process called the DISCOVER Assessment.

Note: This is the only place to list your interest in Capitol Hill. You should not list Capitol Hill as a choice on the next page. If your child is eligible, and you have put a check in the box above, the school will enter his/her name in the pool of students to be considered for Capitol Hill. The student is not guaranteed a spot at the school. Sibling preference does not apply to Capitol Hill.

If you are interested in other magnet choices in addition to Capitol Hill, indicate those on the lines marked First Choice, Second Choice, and Third Choice on the next page. Eligible students who checked the box above will be considered for Capitol Hill and for the other choices in the order they are listed.

SEE NEXT PAGE TO COMPLETE APPLICATION.

Below is the list of Elementary Magnet and Citywide Option School choices available for this application. The two programs at the Crossroads School are separate choices—you must specify the Montessori or Science program.

PLEASE SELECT FROM THIS LIST ONLY*

GRADE	SCHOOL NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER
K-6	Adams Spanish Immersion	615 S. Chatsworth	(651) 298-1595
K-6	American Indian Magnet	1075 E. Third St.	(651) 293-5938
K-6	Battle Creek Elementary	60 S. Ruth St.	(651) 293-8850
K-6	Benjamin E. Mays	560 Concordia Ave.	(651) 293-8730
4-6	Cherokee Heights	694 Charlton St.	(651) 293-8610
4 yr.-Gr. 6	Crossroads Montessori	543 Front Ave.	(651) 767-8540
4 yr.-Gr. 6	Crossroads Science	543 Front Ave.	(651) 767-8540
4 yr.-K	Downtown Kindergarten (Fee)	336 N. Robert St.	(651) 290-8372
4 yr.-K	Eastside Workplace (Fee)	475 Etna St.	(651) 228-7734
K-6	EXPO Elementary	540 Warwick St.	(651) 290-8384
K-6	Farnsworth	1290 Arcade St.	(651) 293-8675
K-6	Four Seasons A+	340 Colborne St.	(651) 290-7595
K-6	Franklin	690 Jackson St.	(651) 293-8620
K-6	French Immersion	1700 Saunders Ave.	(651) 293-8770
K-6	Frost Lake	1505 E. Hoyt Ave.	(651) 293-8930
K-6	Galtier	1317 Charles Ave.	(651) 293-8710
K-6	Hancock	1599 Englewood Ave.	(651) 293-8715
4 yr.-Gr. 6	J.J. Hill Montessori	998 Selby Ave.	(651) 293-8720
K-6	Jackson	437 Edmund Ave.	(651) 293-8650
K-6	Linwood A+	1023 Osceola Ave.	(651) 293-6606
K-6	Longfellow	318 Moore St.	(651) 293-8725
K-6	Maxfield	380 N. Victoria St.	(651) 293-8680
K-6	Mississippi Creative Arts	1575 L'Orient St.	(651) 293-8840
K-6	Museum Magnet	560 Concordia Ave.	(651) 293-5926
4 yr.-Gr. 6	Nokomis Montessori	985 Ruth St.	(651) 293-8857
K-12	Open School	90 S. Western Ave.	(651) 293-8670
K-3	Riverview	271 E. Belvidere St.	(651) 293-8665
K-3	Roosevelt	160 E. Isabel St.	(651) 293-8655
K-8	Saturn/River Front	65 E. Kellogg Blvd.	(651) 290-8354
K-6	Webster Magnet	707 Holly Ave.	(651) 293-8625
K-6	World Cultures & Languages	1075 E. Third St.	(651) 293-5940

* See previous page to apply for Capitol Hill.

ON THIS APPLICATION, CHOOSE FROM THE LIST ABOVE ONLY.

FIRST CHOICE:

☐ My child has a sibling at our first choice school.

SIBLING PREFERENCE

APPLIES ONLY TO

FIRST-CHOICE

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

BY MARCH 16, 2001.

SIBLING'S NAME IS: _____

SIBLING'S DATE OF BIRTH: _____

SIBLING'S GRADE FOR 2001-2002 IS: _____

(Sibling information will be verified by the school district.)

SECOND CHOICE:

THIRD CHOICE:

Due to additional funds related to a successful property tax referendum, some schools that currently have half-day kindergarten may offer all-day kindergarten in 2001-2002. Other schools may offer both choices. Check with your schools of choice to find out more.

SIGNATURE OF PARENT /GUARDIAN: _____

DATE: _____

All of our choices on this application are schools that traditionally have limited spaces available, your chances of being accepted into any of the schools are greatly reduced. To increase your chances of getting into one of the schools you choose, consider a school that is likely to have available space. To discuss possible options, call the Student Placement Center at (651) 632-3760.

**APPENDIX G. LOCATIONS OF SPECIAL FOCUS, MAGNET, AND ECEC
SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS**

Key: Special focus programs and magnet schools and programs at the elementary level are in rectangles.
Early Childhood Education Centers are circled.

Note that Early Childhood Education Centers are located in three different clusters governed by three different district officials DOSAs or Director of Student Achievements (Roosevelt, Jefferson and Grant clusters). Special focus and magnet programs are located in five different clusters governed by five different DOSAs including Lincoln, Benson, Cleveland, Franklin, and Marshall clusters.