

Lesson Plan 2:

Desegregation in the National Context: *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971)

Purpose/Rationale: To introduce landmark Supreme Court cases to students in order to provide background knowledge for the unit.

Goal: Students will be able to comprehend why *Brown v. Board of Education* was a pivotal Civil Rights Supreme Court decision.

Objectives:

- Students will explain how the Supreme Court case *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* relates to *Brown v Board of Education* and Portland.
- Students will apply and use specific vocabulary relating to both segregation and desegregation.

Common Core Standards:

9-10.RH.1 Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.

9-10.RH.2 Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text.

9-10.RH.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including vocabulary describing political, social, or economic aspects of history/social studies.

9-10.RH.8 Assess the extent to which the reasoning and evidence in a text support the author's claims.

Time Needed: Approximately three 50 minute class periods (150 minutes)

Materials Needed:

- Computer with access to the internet
- Projector
- Document camera
- Article from Teaching Tolerance, "BROWN V. BOARD: An American Legacy."
- *Brown v. Board of Education* Political Cartoons
- *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971) document from the DBQ

Instruction:

Procedures (Day 1):

- As a class, read the article, "BROWN V. BOARD: An American Legacy," from <http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-25-spring-2004/departments/brown-v-board-american-legacy>
 - While reading, teacher should model close reading skills for students: highlighting and margin notes. It is most helpful for teachers to put the article under the document camera so that students can follow the teacher's example for highlighting and margin notes.
 - Students should be practicing close reading skills while reading the article along with the class.

- Teacher should stop to discuss important points with students during reading. Students should be questioning information that applies to the “separate but equal” doctrine that they have been studying over the last few days. Teacher should highlight this type of information as the stopping points for discussion, really focusing in on the legislation that legally ended the “separate but equal” doctrine, but also focusing in on how the decision was implemented throughout the country. Another way to approach the stopping points for discussion would be to stop and discuss the information after each section of the reading, pulling out the most important points. (35-40 minutes)
- If class is unable to complete the entire article, students should finish the article as homework. Students should complete the reading and use the close reading skills modeled by the teacher in their individual work.

Procedures (Day 2):

- Debrief article. Follow up with discussion questions that apply to article, from Teaching Tolerance: <http://www.tolerance.org/toolkit/brown-v-board-general-discussion-questions>.
- If unfamiliar with facilitating academic discussions, here is a helpful resource that gives you several options for approaching discussions in a social studies classroom: <http://www.socialstudies.org/system/files/publications/se/6502/650206.html>
- Also keep these following tips in mind:
 - It is helpful when having a conversation surrounding issues that can incite strong emotional responses that you set the tone for the room. Lay some ground rules for students for engaging in this important discussion. Examples: maintain confidentiality-conversation does not leave the room; be respectful and mindful of others’ experiences; be honest and genuine in your responses. This is a serious subject and your discussions should reflect that.
- Once you have laid ground rules, you are ready to engage in the discussion.
 - Have students break into teams. Assign each team a question to discuss in their groups. They should alternate speakers. EVERYONE in the group must speak for 30 seconds to 1 minute. While the speaker is talking, all other members of the team should be silent. Other students in the group may take notes on how they would like to respond once the speaker is finished. After the speaker is finished, the team should respond and expand the discussion with the team. This part of the discussion should take 10-20 minutes, depending on how the team discussions go. At the end, the teams should choose a group representative to report out for the group.
 - Once time is up for group discussions, expand the discussion to the entire class. Begin by asking the question and having the group who responded share their thoughts. Once they have shared, you can open the question to the rest of the class for response. Limit to 5 minutes for each question.

- Relevant Discussion Questions:
 - What do you think segregated schools were like in pre-1954 America? In what parts of the country were schools segregated? Were schools in your state segregated? How was the experience of a black student in public school different from that of a white student?
 - The *Brown* decision called for school desegregation to happen with "all deliberate speed." How quickly — and how fully — do you think schools de-segregated?
 - Is your school segregated? In what way or ways? What could you do to work against that segregation, bringing more integration to your school?
 - Do you believe in what *Brown v. Board* stands for? How close to — or far from — fully embracing the *Brown* decision are we, as a society? What else needs to happen for us to move closer to the ideals of *Brown*?
 - How would schools have looked in your area had the Supreme Court not ruled against segregation in 1954? How would your life, and the lives of other students, be different?

- Exit Slip: Have students write down two words that define their emotions following the class discussion today. Remind students that they should be completely honest, as these will be entirely confidential. Teacher should read these and talk about the overall mood of the room to begin the following day's lesson.

Procedures (Day 3):

- Review the exit slips and discuss the emotional climate of the class following the discussion. These things can be difficult to talk about and incite a range of emotions, so taking an emotional pulse several days into the unit can be helpful for maintaining a safe environment for all students. If necessary, review expectations regarding respect to keep the conversation in the room on point as the unit continues.

- Explain to students that desegregation did not happen quickly or easily throughout the country. There were several other significant Supreme Court decisions and legislation that led to more enforced desegregation. The decision having the greatest effect on Portland was *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971).

- Hand out the *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971) from the DBQ for students to analyze.

- Have the students work in their DBQ teams and use the Origin, Value, Purpose, Limitations (OVPL) format for this analysis. The OVPL gives students a structured tool to break down a complicated primary source. This tool guides their reading of the document with pointed questions that aid in overall comprehension of what they are reading. Teams should read through the document cold first. Then they should read through the document again, working through each question on the OVPL sheet. Encourage students to highlight or underline key points. Then they should record the answers to the OVPL questions on their sheet. (See materials/handouts section below)

- Exit Slip: When finished with analysis, have students write a short hypothesis about how they think Portland compared to the national picture in regard to desegregating schools. Inform them that we will be talking about how these national events impacted desegregation in Portland Public Schools over the next several days.

Assessment of Student learning: Informal: exit slips (days 2 & 3); Formative: Completed close reading of Article (Day 1); OVPL (Day 3)

Extensions/Modifications:

- To extend the discussion of Day Two, students could create newspaper headline posters, political cartoons, or newsletters that emulate the headlines published in local area newspapers and reflect the reactions of their local communities.
- Optional Activity following discussion on Day Two that would take *an additional class period*. This could also be used as an additional extra credit activity for TAG students.
- After discussion of selected questions, inform students that they will be looking at public reaction to the decision through political cartoon analysis. Complete the activity: Political Cartoon Analysis from http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page/509/Political_Cartoon_Analysis
 - Have students work on their own to begin with. Ask them to silently analyze the cartoons and answer the following questions:
 - What do you see in the cartoon? Make a list.
 - Which of the items on the list from Question 1 are symbols? What does each stand for?
 - What is the artist's message in the cartoons? Is there a political bias in the cartoons? Who would agree with the message? Who would disagree?
 - They will complete this process for each of the four cartoons.
 - When finished going through the cartoons, teacher should lead a class discussion to incite conversation around the images. The teacher should allow for a student led discussion, acting as a facilitator/mediator when necessary. The images should spark different opinions and discussion from students with similar and opposing points of view.
- Brown readings for struggling readers and ELL students:
 - Brown v. Board of Education on Social Studies for Kids Website <http://www.socialstudiesforkids.com/articles/ushistory/brownvboard.htm>
 - Level one or two reading on Street Law website, with clarifying questions http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page/492/Background_Summary_Questions (Level 1) http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page/491/Background_Summary_Questions (Level 2)
- Swann reading for struggling readers and ELL students:
 - Swann on Britannica website <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/973269/Swann-v-Charlotte-Mecklenburg-Board-of-Education>

- Struggling readers and ELL students should use vocabulary from Lesson 1 to aid in their reading of these articles. Teachers may also require these students to pick out 3-5 words per article that they need additional help with.

Supplementary Materials/Handouts:

Day 1:

- Article, “BROWN V. BOARD: An American Legacy,” from <http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-25-spring-2004/department/brown-v-board-american-legacy>

Day 2:

- Discussion questions from Teaching Tolerance <http://www.tolerance.org/toolkit/brown-v-board-general-discussion-questions>. This website also has additional discussion questions that you may use in addition to, or in place of, the ones provided in this lesson plan.

Day 3:

- *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971) from the DBQ (On following pages)
- Origin, Value, Purpose, Limitations (OVPL) for document analysis. (below)

Supplementary Materials/Handouts:

Document 5

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education Supreme Court Decision (1971)

Decided by the U.S. Supreme Court on April 20, 1971, *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* dealt with the desegregation plan adopted by Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. Chief Justice Warren Burger rendered the opinion of the court, and its decision was unanimous. The product of several years of NAACP litigation, the *Swann* decision lent the imprimatur of the Court to busing as a solution to inadequately desegregated public schools. (<http://www.northcarolinahistory.org/encyclopedia/296/entry/>)

The record in this case reveals the familiar phenomenon that, in metropolitan areas, minority groups are often found concentrated in one part of the city...

...it should be clear that the existence of some small number of one-race, or virtually one-race, schools within a district is not, in and of itself, the mark of a system that still practices segregation by law. The district judge or school authorities should make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation, and will thus necessarily be concerned with the elimination of one-race schools...

An optional majority-to-minority transfer provision has long been recognized as a useful part of every desegregation plan. Provision for optional transfer of those in the majority racial group of a particular school to other schools where they will be in the minority is an indispensable remedy for those students willing to transfer to other schools in order to lessen the impact on them of the state-imposed stigma of segregation. In order to be effective, such a transfer arrangement must grant the transferring student free transportation and space must be made available in the school to which he desires to move.

(<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/402/1>)

The most controversial topic in the opinion was busing. In his opinion, Burger stated that busing was a suitable "remedial technique" for achieving desegregation. White students in suburban Mecklenburg County had protested the very possibility that they be bused into Charlotte to attend school. Burger's ruling increased tensions. During the era of segregation, southern states had used busing to transport African American student's distances of 50 miles or more to attend black schools, so some believed that the Supreme Court was meting out retribution for segregation on southern white students.

(<http://www.northcarolinahistory.org/encyclopedia/296/entry/>)

Name: _____

Class Period: _____

Document Analysis for *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971)

OPVL	Questions:	Responses:
Origin:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who is the author?• When was it published?• Is there anything we know about the author that is pertinent to our evaluation?	
Purpose:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why did the author create this piece of work?• What is the intent?• Who is the intended audience?	
Value:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What can we tell about the author's perspectives from the piece?• How does it enhance your ability to answer the question?	
Limitations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What part of the story can we NOT tell from this document?• What does the author leave out and why does he/she leave it out (if you know)?• What is purposely not addressed?	

Websites:

- Britannica Encyclopedia online:
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/973269/Swann-v-Charlotte-Mecklenburg-Board-of-Education>

- Social Studies for Kids:
<http://www.socialstudiesforkids.com/articles/ushistory/brownvboard.htm>

- Street Law, Inc. and The Supreme Court Historical Society:
 - http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page/492/Background_Summary_Questions
(Level 1)
 - http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page/491/Background_Summary_Questions
(Level 2)
 - http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page/509/Political_Cartoon_Analysis

- Teaching Tolerance:
 - <http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-25-spring-2004/department/brown-v-board-american-legacy>
 - <http://www.tolerance.org/toolkit/brown-v-board-general-discussion-questions>

- United States Courts, History of Brown v. Board of Education (includes information on additional landmark Supreme Court Cases concerning Separate but Equal)
<http://www.uscourts.gov/educational-resources/get-involved/federal-court-activities/brown-board-education-re-enactment/history.aspx>