

THE MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM AS A DESEGREGATION TOOL
IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDS FROM THE
MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN 1995

by

Willie P. Carrington

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

APPROVED:

Stephen R. Parson, Chairman

Alfred W. Lebold

David J. Parks

Travis W. Twiford

Peyton Williams, Jr.

October 2, 2001

Blacksburg, Virginia

Key Words: Magnet School Programs, Desegregation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	i
EXHIBIT	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
Chapter 1.....	1
The Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose and Significance of the Study.....	5
Constitutive and Operational Definitions.....	7
Limitations of the Study.....	9
Chapter II.....	10
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	10
The History of Integration in American Education.....	10
Historic Desegregation Court Cases.....	13
The Origin and History of the Magnet Program.....	17
Federal Legislation for Magnet Programs.....	18
Types of Choice Plans.....	19
Characteristics of the Magnet Program.....	21
Admission Criteria.....	21

Theme identification.....	23
Selection procedures.....	24
Marketing strategies.....	26
Transportation practices.....	26
Funding allocation.....	28
Program location.....	31
The Magnet Schools Assistance Program Award Process.....	33
Student Achievement in Magnet Schools.....	35
Parental Involvement and Perceptions of Magnet Schools.....	37
CHAPTER III.....	38
METHODOLOGY.....	38
Population.....	38
Instrumentation.....	39
Data Collection Procedures.....	41
Survey Distribution and Results.....	42
Method of Analysis.....	42
CHAPTER IV.....	45
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	45
Descriptive Data on the Districts and Schools Studied.....	45
Analysis of Data by Research Question.....	66
CHAPTER V.....	84

Conclusions, Discussion, Implications for Future Study, Implications for Practice, and Researcher Reflections	84
Conclusions	84
Discussion.....	85
Implications for Future Study.....	88
Implications for Practice	90
Researcher Reflections.....	91
REFERENCES	93
Appendix A: Magnet Schools Assistance Program Fiscal Year 1995 Grant	
Recipients.....	101
Appendix B - Demographic Information of 1995 Magnet Schools Assistance	
Program Districts	110
Appendix C - Profile of Magnet Schools Receiving Funding in 1995 from the	
Magnet Schools Assistance Program.....	116
Appendix D - Sample Letter to District/Central Office Administrators... ..	146
Appendix E - Postcard follow-up to non-respondents after two weeks... ..	149
Appendix F - Websites and Internet Sources.....	150
Appendix G - Variables and Codes for Magnet Schools Assistance Program	
Districts	152
Appendix H - Variables and Codes for Magnet Schools Assistance Program Schools	
.....	153

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Geographic Location of Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts, 1994-95 Through 1997-98.....	46
Table 2 Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts at the End of the 1994-95 Through 1997-98 Funding Cycle	47
Table 3 Distribution of Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts by Geographical Region, 1994-95 Through 1997-98.....	48
Table 4 Mean District Minority Enrollment by Region for 1994-95 and 1997-98.....	49
Table 5 Grade Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in 1994-95	50
Table 6 Geographic Location and Grade-Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98	51
Table 7 Geographic Region and Grade-Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98	52
Table 8 Themes of Magnet Schools Assistance Programs, 1994-95 Through 1997-98..	54
Table 9 Themes by Geographic Region for Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98	56
Table 10 Themes by Geographic Location of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98	59
Table 11 Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995) and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)	61
Table 12 Change in Proportion of Minority Enrollment in Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program from 1994-95 Through 1997-98.....	67
Table 13 Change in Proportion of Minority Enrollment by Grade Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program 1994-1995 Through 1997-98.....	69
Table 14 Minority Group Isolation (MGI) by Region in 1994-95	71

Table 15 Minority Group Isolation (MGI) by Region in 1997-98.....	72
Table 16 Changes in Minority Enrollment by Geographic Region Among Schools Receiving Funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program between 1994-95 and 1997-98.....	75
Table 17 Incremental Changes in Proportion of Minority Enrollment Between 1994-95 and 1997-98 in Schools Receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program Funding by Region.....	76
Table 18 Minority Group Isolation (MGI) by Location in 1994-95 and 1997-98.....	77
Table 19 Changes in Minority Enrollment by Geographic Location Among Schools Receiving Funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program between 1994-95 and 1997-98.....	79
Table 20 Incremental Changes in Minority Enrollment Between 1994-95 and 1997-98 in Schools Receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program Funding by Location	81

EXHIBIT

1. Survey Instrument Used to Collect Data from Districts and Schools.....40

THE MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM AS A DESEGREGATION TOOL IN SCHOOL
DISTRICTS RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDS FROM THE MAGNET SCHOOLS
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN 1995

By

Willie P. Carrington

Steve R. Parson, Chairman

College of Human Resources and Education
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies Department

(ABSTRACT)

Over the last three decades, the magnet school program has been employed as a desegregation tool to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in public schools in America. By definition, the magnet school program has three essential elements: a unified curriculum based on a special theme or method of instruction, enrollment of students beyond the geographic attendance zone, and student and parent choice. The impetus for magnet school programs emerged from debates covering busing, choice programs, educational quality, and racial balance. The early development of the magnet concept as a desegregation tool can be traced to judicial engagement of well-known court cases such as Brown v. Board of Education, 1954, where de jure segregation was ruled unconstitutional based on the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. In the late 1970s, the federal government began to provide financial support for magnet school programs through the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA, 1972) and established the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in 1984.

Recent findings suggest that the magnet program may not be obtaining the desired

results of eliminating, preventing, or reducing racial imbalances. Furthermore, it is believed that some districts receiving grants have little chance of reducing minority group isolation due to the limited pool of white students. This study was designed determine the extent of the reduction of minority group isolation in magnet school programs that received funding in the 1995 Magnet Schools Assistance Program. A survey instrument designed to gather enrollment information was mailed to the central office personnel who were responsible for the oversight of magnet school programs in sixty-four federally funded school districts.

Findings of this study indicate that school districts with a significant population of minority students are unlikely to reduce minority group isolation using the Magnet Schools Assistance Program standard of at or no more than fifty percent minority enrollment in selected magnet programs even with financial assistance. Schools with high populations of minority students are unlikely to attract non-minority students.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife who has helped with the highs and lows over the years of struggle. Her support and wisdom provided the strength and patience needed to undertake such an academic endeavor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The efforts of numerous individuals collectively contributed to the completion of this study. I am especially indebted to my co-chairs, Dr. Stephen Parson and Dr. Robert Richards. Their encouragement and guidance over the years provided a much needed compass that kept me traveling in the right direction.

I am also very appreciative of the work of Dr. David Parks, Dr. Alfred Lebold, Dr. Twiford and Dr. Peyton Williams for their tireless efforts and critical feedback throughout the study.

Dr. Alfred Lebold, who served as the cognate professor, provided invaluable feedback on the magnet program. His expertise and practical experiences can be found throughout the study.

Dr. Peyton Williams, a leader of leaders, offered guidance, technical expertise on desegregation and spiritual inspiration to complete this work; for this I will be ever grateful.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

The magnet school program, as an educational program and concept, has been utilized as one solution for desegregating public schools in America. Entering its third decade as a hybrid of specialty schools such as the Boston Latin School, the Bronx School of Science, and the Lowell High School of San Francisco, this 1960s strategy has evolved into a popular controlled choice program. By definition, the magnet school program has three essential elements: a unified curriculum based on a special theme or method of instruction, enrollment open to students beyond the geographic attendance zone, and student and parent choice (Yap, 1991). Together, these elements are designed to attract students to reduce minority group isolation.

The impetus for magnet school programs is attributed to the national debate covering racial desegregation, busing, parental choice, and educational quality. For more than twenty-five years, the issue of desegregation has divided communities, states, and the nation (Rossell & Hawley, 1983). The discussion of desegregation involves different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups, all of which are concerned about the economic and social institutions that govern the cohesiveness of their lives and communities. Rossell and Hawley (1983) suggest that "school desegregation, perhaps more than any other social policy, threatens to tear down the walls we build around our lives" (p. 3). Recognizing the communal needs of a progressive society, court decisions such as Brown

v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, (1954) and Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, (1968) cleared the path for desegregation by declaring de jure segregation unconstitutional based on the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Federal court decisions regarding school desegregation provide a framework for equal educational opportunities, but they have not eradicated racial isolation due to the countervailing influence of demographic trends toward increased minority enrollment in some school districts (Steele & Eaton, 1996).

In the early 1970s, judicial engagement gave rise to the federal government's efforts to promote desegregation through the establishment of magnet schools. Initially, the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) of 1972 was the sole funding source for public schools promoting integration (Blank, Dentler, Baltzell, & Chabotar, 1983). In 1984 the federal government provided support for magnet school programs as a desegregation strategy by establishing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP). Steele and Levine (1994) report that between 1985 and 1991, over 739 million dollars have been awarded to school districts for desegregation purposes.

Faced with white flight and minority population increases, many urban education centers have become racially unbalanced but remain committed to desegregation, despite changes in the nation's demographics and housing patterns (Ascher, 1993). The commitment to reduce minority group isolation is in the forefront of the American education debate. At its 1997 annual conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) debated the organization's commitment to

desegregation. Despite differing opinions within the organization, the prevailing position was to stay the course with desegregation of schools in America (Hendrie,1997c).

The discussion of desegregation is driven by limited finances and political influences, both of which affect the make-up of classrooms in America. As debated within the NAACP, the need for desegregation is deeply rooted in educational equity and quality. The belief that minority children receive a better education when they are seated next to white children has long been held by proponents of desegregation within and outside of the NAACP.

The strategic placement of magnet schools in minority isolated neighborhoods often results in a resegregation of students. Designed to attract students of other races, magnet programs receive additional resources to maintain their attractiveness to white middle class students (Jeter, 1998). The efficacy of the magnet school program as a desegregation strategy is in the midst of this national debate.

Statement of the Problem

Schmidt (1994) suggests that the magnet school program as a desegregation strategy may not be obtaining the desired results of eliminating, reducing, or preventing minority group isolation. It is believed that some districts receiving grants have little chance of reducing, preventing, or eliminating racial isolation due to the limited pool of white students. While there has been a proliferation of magnet school programs over the past decade (Steel & Levine, 1994), research of the elimination, reduction, and

prevention of minority group isolation in federally funded magnet school programs is not abundant. Research into magnet school programs, as a desegregation tool is needed as policymakers struggle with reform initiatives that impact all aspects of education. A plethora of literature is available on the various desegregation strategies attempted over the last thirty years, but there is little agreement on which methods are effective. Magnet programs that seem to be marginally successful in reducing racial isolation (Steel & Levine, 1994) face issues of equity and quality. In the midst of limited funding for education, it is imperative that federal desegregation funds provide support for strategies that are efficient and effective.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program was commissioned in 1984 to ensure that racial isolation is reduced, eliminated, and prevented, and that all students have an equal opportunity regardless of race to participate in magnet programs. How money is spent on public education is just as important as how much is received, as evidenced by Serrano v. Priest (1971), and Rodriguez v. San Antonio School District (1973), two notable school finance court cases. The Serrano case involved a school district that relied on the wealth of the community to determine education funding, a method that negatively impacted the quality of education. In the 1973 Rodriguez court case, the Supreme Court ruled that education was not a fundamental right under the United States Constitution, and that property wealth per pupil was not a suspect class (Thresher, 1993).

The efficacy of appropriating federal funds for magnet school programs as an alternative to charter schools, voucher plans, and other forms of voluntary student

assignment plans evokes the following research question: To what extent are federally-funded magnet schools successful in reducing minority group isolation in a school? The following research questions associated with minority group isolation are addressed in this study:

1. What is the relationship between the region of the country of magnet schools and changes in minority group isolation and enrollment in schools receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding from 1994-1995 through 1997-1998?
2. What is the relationship between the location (urban, suburban, rural, and combined) of magnet schools and changes in minority group isolation and minority enrollment in schools receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding from 1994-1995 through 1997-1998?

Purpose and Significance of the Study

An investigation of the magnet school program as a desegregation tool designed to eliminate, reduce, and prevent minority group isolation has implications for educational reform. Although many studies have been conducted on the growth, academic achievement, and school choice aspects of magnet programs, research is limited in determining the impact of federal funding to school districts to offset minority group isolation (Steel & Levine, 1994). The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which magnet schools receiving federal funding are successful in reducing

minority group isolation. The significance of the study comes from the importance of providing a quality educational program that meets the needs of students, communities, and society.

As school districts serving minority populations become more racially and ethnically isolated along socioeconomic class lines (Orfield, 1992), the challenge to identify effective desegregation strategies adds to the complications faced by some districts in addressing minority group isolation. Over three decades, the magnet school program has been an innovative program designed to correct racial imbalances (Wright, Chance & Smith, 1990) while diffusing political debates over mandatory busing (Dentler, 1991).

Efforts to improve racial imbalances with the implementation of the magnet concept may be inadequate (Schmidt, 1994) due to the increasing minority population. The available literature is limited, however, in determining the characteristics that promote white enrollment in minority dominated schools. School districts with a disproportionately high percentage of minority students are successful in attracting and retaining white students, provide useful data for other districts.

Another significant aspect of this study is the fact that federal funds are used for the start-up and maintenance of magnet programs. With start-up costs averaging about 10-15 percent more per student in magnet than regular programs (Wright, Chance, & Smith, 1989), the efficacy of how and where funds are spent needs to be assessed. As the

sole federal funding source for magnet programs, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program has a fiduciary role in ensuring that the taxpayers' dollars are maximized in reducing racial imbalances within the public schools.

Constitutive and Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions apply:

Admission criteria. Requirements that may determine admittance and selection into a magnet program, e.g. grade point average, faculty recommendations, creative ability, and standardized test scores.

Dedicated magnet. A whole school magnet program that draws students from all areas of a district and gives no preference to students living in the school's neighborhood attendance area.

Desegregation. A plan for the reassignment of children to remedy the illegal separation of minority group children in a school; or a plan for the reduction, elimination, or prevention of minority group isolation. (Magnet Schools Assistance Program Indicator Guidebook, 1998).

Eliminate minority isolation. An objective for a minority-group isolated school that aims to reduce minority enrollments to at or below 50 percent of the total enrollment (Magnet Schools Assistance Program Performance Indicator Guidebook, 1998).

Magnet school program. A strategy that promotes a special curriculum designed for attracting substantial numbers of students of different racial backgrounds.

Marketing strategies. Organized outreach activities designed to provide information on magnet programs to prospective parents and students.

Method of identification of magnet theme. A process of determining a specialized curriculum or method of instruction for a program of studies within a magnet program.

Minority group isolation. The dependent variable of this study where minority children identified as Black, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, and American Indian constitute more than fifty percent of the enrollment of a school.

Narrow tailoring. Limiting the use of race in selecting students for a magnet program (Magnet Schools Assistance Program Performance Indicator Guidebook, 1998)

Program structure. An educational format that determines the amount of time, theme(s), and grades included in a magnet school.

Program within a school. A magnet program that serves some but not all of the students in a school.

Selection procedures. A prescribed method incorporating predetermined and weighted variables of identifying students for admission into a magnet program.

Transportation. A district's policies on transporting students to and from school within or

beyond a prescribed attendance zone.

Whole school magnet. Magnet programs that are offered to every student in a school.

Limitations of the Study

The magnet schools in the study were limited to those in sixty-four school districts that received financial assistance from the federal Magnet Schools Assistance Program for the years 1995 - 1998 (see Appendix A for a list of these districts). These magnet schools were organized with the specific intent of eliminating, reducing, or preventing minority group isolation. All districts included in the study are currently, or were at one time, under court-ordered desegregation plans. The quality of magnet schools was not evaluated. These limitations may restrict the generalization of this study to magnet schools organized with an intent other than addressing minority group isolation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this literature review is to examine the nature and scope of desegregation in American education and its impact on magnet schools. A historical overview of the origin of the magnet program, the federal government's support of magnet programs, historic desegregation court cases, types of choice plans, characteristics of magnet programs, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program award process, student achievement in magnet schools, and parental involvement and perceptions will be presented.

The History of Integration in American Education

The United States Supreme Court decisions in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (Brown I, 1954; Brown II, 1955) laid the foundation for America to begin providing equal educational opportunities regardless of race. In effect, the court in Brown I declared de jure segregation unconstitutional based on the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States. This decision turned back more than sixty years of judicial case law supporting separate but equal educational opportunities predicated on race. Gordon (1989) reports that the affirming opinion of the Supreme Court in Brown II stated:

The courts will require that the defendant should make a prompt and reasonable

start toward full compliance. The burden rests upon the defendants to establish such time is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date. The District Courts (shall) take such proceedings and enter orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases (p. 189).

Although Brown I laid the foundation for integration, Brown II stated that school districts act with "all deliberate speed." Unfortunately, the Court did not address procedures for accomplishing its mandate.

A lack of direction and definition by the court(s) led to a historical shaping of the court's mandate. In 1957 President Dwight D. Eisenhower authorized the National Guard to enforce desegregation in Little Rock, Arkansas. The Governor of Arkansas had refused to allow nine black students to attend Central High School, which had been ordered to desegregate. The defiance of the Governor led to the first national desegregation incident, which resulted in federal troops providing security for those now known as the Little Rock Nine (Silberman & deBose, 1997).

Subsequently, in 1959, in New Kent County, Virginia, the Board of Supervisors refused to provide financial funding for its dual school systems rather than desegregate (Reutter, 1985). In the face of a court order to desegregate, the board established a public foundation that provided funding for the operation of white schools only. When the case

was taken to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1964, the Court ruled that immediate relief was in order as students had been assigned to schools based on race, which was against the 1954 Brown I, decision.

Further support for desegregation came in 1964 when Congress passed the Civil Rights Act - Title IV, which outlawed discrimination in federally funded programs on the basis of race. For the first time federal funds became linked to desegregation. The now-defunct Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) were charged with issuing guidelines and ensuring that progress was being made. As a requirement in the south, school districts with a suspect classification were required to submit desegregation plans if they were not under a court order to desegregate.

In the years following the Brown decisions, school districts across the country both refused and avoided desegregation by offering educational concepts such as freedom of choice and neighborhood schools (Inniss, 1993). The idea behind these plans was to convince parents that the democratic process was in full effect by allowing them to choose a school for their child. In many instances, students who lived within a certain geographic attendance zone were given their first choice; all others were aided in selecting a school by school personnel who often worked to keep segregated schools as the status quo.

In the struggle to find ways to desegregate, busing became an integral tool in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The impetus for busing originated as a result of the 1971

Supreme Court decision in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (Reutter, 1985) where busing was ruled acceptable as a method of achieving racial balance. The Swann decision forced many urban districts that did not have transportation systems to begin purchasing buses for transporting students, thereby impacting their operating budgets.

Historic Desegregation Court Cases

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program, as a tool to eliminate, reduce, and prevent minority group isolation, evolved from several court cases that cleared the way for the desegregation of schools in America. Through years of litigation for the integration and desegregation of public education, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program and other desegregational strategies find their linkage to judicial engagement.

The following historical timeline of notable desegregation court cases provides the foundation for equal opportunity within public education.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896, where the practice of separate but equal doctrine was found to be in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment by the Supreme Court.

Although not an education case, its result was applied to the integration of public education.

Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada, 1938, the constitutionality of a Missouri law prohibiting Blacks from attending the University of Missouri Law School

(Alexander & Alexander, 1992) was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. This case aided in the application of the Equal Protection Clause in desegregating public education.

Sweatt v. Painter, 1950, where the Supreme Court ruled that intangible factors, e.g. facilities, curriculum, faculty, educational atmosphere, and professional development, did affect the quality of education received under the separate but equal doctrine.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1954, the preeminent case where the Supreme Court ruled that separate but equal facilities based on race were unequal and unconstitutional based on the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 1964, where the Supreme Court ruled that the action of the county in providing financial support to private segregated schools while closing local schools was discriminatory and unconstitutional.

Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia, 1968, where the Supreme Court declared freedom of choice plans that failed to create a unitary educational system unconstitutional (Alexander & Alexander, 1992).

Swann v. Mecklenburg Board of Education, North Carolina, 1971, where district-

wide transportation as a means of overcoming racial separation where de jure segregation had existed was permitted as ruled by the Supreme Court.

Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, 1973, where the Supreme Court ruled that de facto segregation must be viewed with the same intensity as de jure segregation. The court's ruling resulted in a district-wide mandatory reassignment plan for desegregation.

Morgan v. Kerrigan, 1975, resulted in support of the need to desegregate the teaching staff in schools where de jure segregation was practiced as determined by the First Circuit Court.

Bradley v. Milliken, 1973, a landmark white flight case, where a federal court in Detroit, Michigan ruled that neighboring suburban school districts could be joined with urban districts to improve racial imbalances (Orfield, 1996).

Milliken II, 1977, the follow up case in which a lower federal district court ruled that additional monies could be allocated to districts to ensure that students received a quality education. The precedence for compensatory education programs was now established as a desegregation remedy for minority isolated schools.

Missouri v. Jenkins, 1977, where the Kansas City Missouri School District, parents, and students joined forces against the state of Missouri, its suburban

school districts, and various federal agencies for perpetuating racially segregated school systems. The Supreme Court dismissed the case but found the school district and the state liable for an intradistrict violation. The court's first mandate in 1985 was for the Kansas City Missouri School District to reduce class sizes, develop student-centered programs, implement a capital improvement plan to upgrade facilities, and commission a study on magnet school programs.

Jenkins II, 1990, followed three years of litigation declaring that the Kansas City Missouri School District take financial responsibility for implementing the desegregation plan decreed in the original court case. The court granted the federal judiciary the authority to impose a tax increase to fund desegregation.

Jenkins III, 1995, where a federal trial order allowing salary increases for school personnel and a quality educational program through choice and magnet schools was reversed. The Supreme Court contended that providing expenditures to districts to attract white students from suburban districts was not valid.

Additionally, the court reversed an earlier ruling that allowed low test scores as justification for requiring the state to pay quality educational programs (magnet school programs) to improve urban schools.

William Capacchione v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 1999, where the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina ruled that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools had exceeded its authority to assign students to

certain schools based on race violated provisions of the Equal Protection Clause.

The court further declared the district unitary citing that present racial imbalances were no longer a result of past vestiges of dual school systems predicated on racial separation.

The Origin and History of the Magnet Program

The magnet program concept as a choice program is rooted in the 1960s movement of integration, busing, quality programming, desegregation, white flight, and parental choice. Combined, these factors acted as a catalyst for many school districts to address the dissatisfaction of parents, as well as to respond to federal court decisions requiring public school desegregation, by implementing magnet programs (Young & Clinchy, 1992).

Prior to the 1954 Supreme Court ruling in Brown v. Board of Education, many school districts operated de jure educational systems where students were assigned to schools based solely on race. The Court ruled this practice discriminatory and illegal. The dismantling of dual school systems provided the impetus for many districts to develop magnet programs based on the specialty school concept which originated with the Boston Latin School, the Bronx School of Science, and the Lowell High School of San Francisco in the early 1960s. These schools offer a unified curriculum based on a special theme or method of instruction, enrollment of students beyond the geographic attendance zone, and student and parent choice.

Although court intervention for desegregation framed the creation of magnet programs, the rulings did not provide requirements for racial balance across schools, only that schools refrain from discriminatory practices (Steel & Levine, 1994). Thus, the federal government provided funding for the implementation of magnet programs.

Federal Legislation for Magnet Programs

Federal support for magnet programs began in the early 1970s as a means of promoting desegregation within the public schools. Originally, the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) was the single funding source for public schools promoting integration (Steel & Levine, 1994). Between 1975 and 1981, over 30 million dollars per year provided support to school districts for desegregation (Blanks, et. al.,1983). In 1985 Congress authorized the Magnet School Assistance Program under the Education for Economic Security Act (P.L.93-377, Title VII). The Magnet Schools Assistance Program was reauthorized in 1988 in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) (P.L 100-297) and is reauthorized annually with a legislative expiration of September 30, 1999. Steele and Eaton (1996) indicate that in 1995 the Improving America's Schools Act broadened the scope of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program to provide assistance to local education agencies to develop innovative and systemic reform initiatives.

The reauthorization of federal funds for the Magnet School Assistance Program by Congress suggest that magnet schools are vital to the Nation's effort to achieve

voluntary desegregation in America's schools. The ESEA [available [HTTP://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/sec5101.HTML](http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/sec5101.HTML)] suggests that under the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, the Federal Government has learned the following:

“(a) where magnet programs are implemented for only a portion of a school's student body, special efforts must be made to discourage the isolation of:

(i) magnet school students from other students in the school; and

(ii) students by racial characteristics;

(b) local educational agencies must be creative in designing magnet schools for students at all academic levels, so that school districts do not skim off only the highest achieving students to attend magnet schools;

(c) consistent with desegregation guidelines, local educational agencies must seek to enable participation in magnet school programs by students who reside in the neighborhoods where the programs operate; and

(d) in order to ensure that magnet schools are sustained after Federal funds ends, the Federal Government must assist school districts to improve their capacity to continue to operate magnet school at a high level of performance.”

Types of Choice Plans

Prompted by perceptions that today's present system of public education is

bankrupt, several alternative educational programs have emerged within recent years. Both charter schools and voucher plans are a result of political forces taking an active interest to present educational alternatives. The present discussion of choice proposals is directly related to the reform movement that spawned the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report, "A Nation At Risk," which challenged state and local task forces with the formidable task of improving the present educational system.

Historically, choice schools can be traced to the late 1950s, when economist Milton Friedman first proposed the concept of the voucher plan. His plan was to create a "free market" system of educational services with a voucher (credit) that would allow students to attend sectarian and nonsectarian private schools at public expense.

Although the voucher plan has been touted as one of the panaceas for educational reform in America, proponents rarely discuss the perceived concerns held by a large segment of the affected population. Sorting students by race, economic status, and religion may directly influence admission into such a plan. There is also concern that the voucher plan could absorb the present financial support for public education as well as increase the cost of private or public schools (Hawley, 1996).

Opinions are varied on the concepts of charter schools and the voucher plan and their potential impact on educational improvement. Although the literature is abundant, much of the discussion centers around the academic and economic aspects of educational choice for students and parents, and not on the potential impact on resegregation in

American schools.

Characteristics of the Magnet Program

Admission criteria.

In the last two years, magnet programs have experienced a proliferation of legal challenges regarding admission requirements and racial quotas. The foundation for litigation has been based on higher education lawsuits challenging admittance to medical and law schools based on racial preferences and quotas. The 1996 court ruling of Hopwood v. University of Texas, where a federal appeals court struck down the use of racial preferences in admission as discriminatory based on the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, sets the stage for public school districts across the country to face similar challenges regarding racial preferences for admission to specialty programs such as magnet schools.

Presently there are a number of legal challenges from white students who have filed suit against their local school districts claiming discrimination as a result of not being admitted into a magnet program (Hendrie, 1997b). Faced with legal challenges, many school districts have begun to question the authority under which they are authorized to determine admission to magnet programs where race is applicable for desegregation purposes. Historically, magnet programs have found authorization for their practices and procedures under Title I desegregation waiver authority, section 1113(a)(7) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In the wake of legal challenges, the

Boston Latin School, a forerunner to the present magnet concept revised its admission policies by using the practice of narrow-tailoring which refers to the limited use of race in determining admission.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program requires applicants to meet the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution when race is taken into account in admitting students to magnet schools. The use of race must be narrowly tailored to achieve the goal of reducing, eliminating, or preventing minority group isolation. To ensure that the applicant meets this requirement, five criteria have been established: (1) whether the district tried or seriously considered race-neutral alternatives and determined that those measures have not been or would not be similarly effective, before resorting to race-conscious action; (2) the scope and flexibility of the use of race, including whether it is subject to a waiver; (3) the manner in which race is used, that is, whether race determines eligibility for a program or whether race is just one factor in the decision making process; (4) the duration of the use of race and whether it is subject to periodic review; and (5) the degree and type of burden imposed on students of other races. Applicants are urged to conduct a lottery for student admission following recruitment of eligible students that depict the racial and ethnic composition of the school district.

Recent court litigation indicates that practices of race-conscious and narrow-tailoring strategies may be revised or rescinded. A 1998 ruling by the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in Wessmann v. Gittens affirmed that the use of narrow-

tailoring is unconstitutional based on the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court affirmed that there was no legal justification for the Boston Public Schools to use race in considering admission for half of the slots at three of their most selective magnet schools. The Court's ruling is only binding in the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Puerto Rico (Walsh, 1998).

Theme identification.

The appeal of the magnet program is rooted in its curricular theme, method of teaching or pedagogical tenets. Coupled with student interest, these characteristics define the school's academic mission for innovative programming. The 1997 Report on Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights, indicates that 99 percent of parents within the Nashville Public Schools magnet programs based their participation on the academic reputation of the school. Parents of all races tend to select magnet programs based on the theme and academic reputation of the program. Steel & Levine (1994) report that math; science and technology, aerospace technology, and Montessori are the most popular themes for elementary programs, with high school popularity based on vocational or career themes. The method(s) of identifying a theme or curricular focus can be varied, e.g., student and parent survey, school district/community task forces, a review of the literature, or central office determination. With varying approaches to identifying a theme, the research is limited as to which approach is best in designing a program to eliminate or reduce racial isolation.

Selection procedures.

Steel and Levine (1994) indicate that the number of districts offering magnet programs has increased by 67 percent during the past decade. As recently as 1996, over 123,000 students were on the waiting list for specific magnet programs (Fuller & Elmore, 1996). With increased interest for admission into a magnet program, many districts employ a lottery system to select students. Most lottery systems typically include the following random selection procedures used in the Hillsborough County Public Schools, Florida (1996 Magnet Schools Assistance Program Grant Application):

1. A seven-digit number is randomly assigned to every student.
2. Each randomly assigned student number is divided into a random set of numbers, i.e. 9-0-4-1-4-9-3.
3. Numbers are generated beginning with the digit 1 followed by a decimal carried out to 10 places.
4. The five digit random number used to determine placement is constructed using the digits found in decimal places 6-10.
5. The sequence is ascending.

Other factors which may be considered in the selection process include first come first served, priority selection based on a sibling already enrolled, race, geographical

attendance zone, e.g. shadow zone (less than four tenths of a mile from the school), and, in some cases, admissions criteria.

Acceptance, or a lack thereof in some cases, has resulted in litigation from students not admitted. Districts with magnet programs are well advised to ensure a "level playing field" for potential candidates based on some predetermined selection procedure that allows equal access for eligible students.

As recently as 1997, the courts have begun to reject race as a factor in determining admission or selection to magnet programs (Hendrie, 1997c). The Arlington County Public Schools, Virginia, had denied admission to a kindergarten magnet program for a white student who was not selected because of her race. The district traditionally filled magnet seats based on race as a means of ensuring racial balance and ethnic diversity. The court recommended that the lottery be used as the single method of selection.

While the seats may be limited in a magnet program, the courts have historically upheld the use of the lottery system as a method of selection. In Bennett v. City School District of New Rochelle, 1985, the lottery system was challenged by parents of gifted children who were eligible for admission but not selected. The court ruled that the lottery system did not violate the Constitution or any New York state statutes governing the local school district's authority to provide a free and appropriate education of children in the state.

Although the concept and practice of implementing a lottery system as a selection tool for magnet programs is judicially supported by the courts, the race factor remains open to judicial review and action. Admission practices that allow racial preference are under litigation throughout the country. Since the discussion of selection procedures and admission requirements are interrelated, a discussion of admission practices to magnet programs warrants review, as both embrace race as a component of magnet participation.

Marketing strategies.

Participation in magnet programs may be attributed to the availability of information to students and parents. Outreach activities may include newsletters, forums, visitations, brochures, television advertisements, and district fairs. The 1997 Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights (CCCR) reports a positive correlation between magnet participation and higher socio-economic status. Affluent parents often have greater access to information and resources in identifying educational programs and resources for their children. These parents often rely on information received from friends, family and self-conducted research about a given program. Additionally, low socio-economic parents often do not have access to the same information, which affects their decision-making processes in determining their child's participation in magnet programs.

Transportation practices.

Participation in a magnet program is directly related to the accessibility of the program to students. Districts receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funds are

not authorized to use federal funds for transportation. Subsequently, the absence of transportation for students within a geographical area may preclude their participation (Steel & Levine, 1994). Although federal funds for transportation are forbidden, districts are encouraged to use state or local funds to offset their transportation costs for magnet programs.

The discussion of magnet schools and transportation is founded in early case law mandating busing as a desegregation remedy. The 1971 North Carolina case of Swann v. Mecklenburg Board of Education, where the Supreme Court ruled to allow busing to achieve desegregation, set the stage for busing in public education, which has been controversial since its inception.

Within recent years, much of the attention surrounding magnet programs and transportation have been devoted to costs, as magnet schools generally require additional funding. In 1995 the Dekalb County Public Schools sued the state of Georgia for \$34 million dollars as compensation for busing magnet school students over an eight year span. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit found that the state could not be held liable for such claims.

Simmons (1995) reported that the Wake County Public Schools in Raleigh, North Carolina spends approximately \$2.4 million dollars annually to bus white students into magnet programs and black students to white schools. Limited funding for transportation has sparked alternate proposals for transporting magnet students, such as set-asides and

limited busing to students who live within a certain geographic region of a school (Walsh, 1997).

Against this backdrop of new proposals, many parents have become disenchanted with public education desegregation. Frazier (1995) reports that Black parents who once supported court intervention to achieve racial integration now resent it. The inaccessibility of magnet programs based on racial balance and the recruitment of white students (Schmidt, 1994) adds resentment. Rossell and Armor (1982) argue that Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding has been awarded to magnet programs with little or no chance of racial balance as white flight impacts the recruitment of white students to these programs. Furthermore, Black parents who once believed that integration would increase black achievement are disillusioned as academic gains have not been accomplished (Reese, Miller, Mazzeo, & Dossey, 1997).

Funding allocation.

The magnet program as a choice option may require special facilities, teachers, and other related resources (Armor, 1989). Choice options allow parents the opportunity to choose a school with a unique curricular or instructional approach often requiring financial support beyond that appropriated to traditional programs. Historically, proponents of the magnet concept have been faced with federal cutbacks, inflation, and local taxpayer initiatives, all of which directly influence implementation (Blank, Dentler, Baltzell, & Chabotar, 1983). The struggle for financial support for magnet programs can

be in direct conflict with a school district's desire for racial balance.

Recognizing this struggle and the need for financial support, the federal government established the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) by offering grants to school districts seeking to establish magnet programs for improving racial balance and reducing racial isolation. Since 1984, over 841 million dollars has been awarded to school districts for magnet programs through the Magnet Schools Assistance Program successor to the ESAA (Electronic Data, 1997). (See Appendix D for appropriations as of June 1995, the most recent funding cycle.)

Magnet Schools Assistance Program funds often are used as seed money for the establishment of new programs and the expansion of existing programs. In the most recent study on the growth of magnet schools, Steel and Levine (1994) found that 39 percent of grantees during that funding cycle used Magnet Schools Assistance Program funds to institute a magnet program with an additional 39 percent adding one or more new programs. While Magnet Schools Assistance Program funds are not exclusively for the establishment or maintenance of magnet programs, authorization for school districts to offset racial imbalances at feeder schools is permissible and frequently utilized.

The procurement of Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding in many instances may determine the establishment of magnet programs in a school district. Unfortunately, the opposite can occur with the loss of funding. School districts that have lost funding have eliminated or reduced their programs, thereby limiting opportunities to

improve racial imbalances and isolation. Steel and Levine (1994) report that the loss of funding may affect the quality of a magnet program through a reduction in supplies, staff, curricular offerings, outreach activities, equipment, extra-curricular activities, capital improvements, and transportation, all of which (excluding transportation costs) are permissible as Magnet Schools Assistance Program expenditures.

Magnet Schools Assistance Program applicants and recipients are required to demonstrate their capacity to maintain the program following the conclusion of the funding cycle. The prudence of identifying financial resources beyond the Magnet Schools Assistance Program can reduce the prospect of losing important gains that have been made. Many school districts seek local and state funding sources to support or replace Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding, thus ensuring the continuation of their programs. Blank et al. (1983) suggest that the magnet program should be positioned for inclusion into the fiscal mainstream by following these methods:

1. Solicit a commitment from the school board, superintendent, and top administrators to magnet schools as part of the regular budgetary and administrative structure. Programs that remain part of the "federal programs office" or "special programs" budget are likely, at some point, to be viewed as peripheral to the central district objectives.
2. Develop a publicity program that focuses on the outcomes of the school's performance after its initial period of operation. Positive public relations for

magnet programs should match the publicity attached to the goals and expectations during planning and development.

3. Express interest in replicating successful programs, which will signal that the magnet concept has educational importance in the district.
4. Continue the active involvement of the community through advisory committees, special instructors, support functions, and shared community resources. The community involvement in magnet schools is critical to keeping the program as a high priority item on the district agenda. It also helps the curriculum and teaching methods to remain unique and different in the view of students, parents, and district leadership (p. 40).

The increased cost of maintaining any educational program is a constant fact; the same educational resources cost more each year.

Program location.

Wright, Chance, and Smith (1989) suggest that site selection and building modifications are paramount in the establishment of a magnet program. Lack of consideration of these factors may support longstanding beliefs that magnet programs, often located in minority neighborhoods, are incapable of delivering a quality education. With the magnet program designed to address desegregation and racial imbalances, site selection among parents seeking entry is a primary reason for participation, particularly

among white parents.

Historically, white parents have engaged in white flight when their children are assigned to minority schools (Lord, 1977). Questions of educational quality, safety, and academic achievement arise when they think of their children attending a school in a distant or unfamiliar neighborhood (Rossell and Hawley, 1983).

Blank et al. (1983) suggests that where a school district locates its magnet program, as well as racial, economic, and political forces, may influence the potential of the program to desegregate. However, in a study of 15 school districts with magnet programs in unsegregated, mixed income neighborhoods and impoverished minority neighborhoods, a negative correlation was reported between magnet location and the attainment of racial balance within the magnet program.

The location of a magnet program can affect the racial balance of a district where magnet programs are put in racially and socioeconomically neutral or mixed sites (Blank et al., 1983) by drawing students from segregated schools in ways that contribute to increasing racial isolation. Often judicial and political directions affect the location of a magnet program. Blank et al. (1983) identify five scenarios that support political pressure in the location of a magnet program:

- 1) A facility has been closed for school use but has been mothballed rather than demolished or sold. A magnet program is preferable to standing empty.

- 2) A wealthy white neighborhood loves its walk-in elementary. A magnet program is preferable to losing it and having students lured elsewhere.
- 3) An impoverished black neighborhood contains a school that is all black. A magnet program is installed that will draw whites to the school.
- 4) All groups want an elite high school for competitively gifted students. It is located wherever a facility, appropriate or not, can be found.
- 5) The magnet program preceded all aspects of desegregation, and its location is a by-product of early land use. Its popularity is preserved by continuing it desegregatively but apart from other parts of a system's plan.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program Award Process

Grants from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program are awarded to eligible school districts that develop programs to address four components:

- (1) the elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in public elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group children;
- (2) the development and implementation of magnet school projects that will assist in achieving systemic reform and providing all children the opportunity to meet challenging State content standards and challenging student performance standards;
- (3)

the development and design of innovative educational methods and practices; and (4) courses of instruction within magnet schools that will substantially strengthen the knowledge of academic subjects and the grasp of tangible and marketable vocational skills of students attending those magnet schools (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, [OESE], 1998).

Applicant eligibility requires that the local education agency or consortium implement a desegregation plan under court jurisdiction as approved by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (OESE, 1998). The applicant must meet specific assurances in order to be eligible.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program frequently conducts regional seminars for districts seeking to enter competition; program requirements and other technical questions are addressed. The application format requires prospective grantees to respond to five topics with several sub-topics, e.g. application for federal assistance, assurances and certification, budget form and information, program narrative, and desegregation plan information.

Following the receipt of all eligible applications, reviewers determine applications worthy of funding. A team of reviewers assesses each applicant based on standards in accordance with the 1993 Government Performance and Results Act (Magnet Schools Assistance Program Performance Indicator Guidebook, [MSAPPIG], 1998). With the assistance of the American Institutes for Research in conjunction with the U. S.

Department of Education, performance indicators were developed through focus groups, telephone interviews, expert work groups, and draft reviews by Education Department stakeholders (MSAPPIG, 1998). Review teams typically spend five to six days in a central location determined by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, where applications undergo an extensive review process.

During the review process, regional leader polls each reviewer for points awarded to each section of the application. Each reviewer may award a total of 150 points to the application. The regional leader is challenged with the responsibility of engaging reviewers to come to a consensus of total points given to each application. The review process continues, following an internal recommendation by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program staff, by forwarding the top applications to the Office of Civil Rights, where a determination is made regarding their desegregation plan.

Student Achievement in Magnet Schools

The magnet school program designed to reduce, eliminate or prevent racial isolation through controlled choice may yield higher student achievement rates (Viadero, 1996). The proliferation of the magnet school is in part directly related to the perception of quality and innovative programming that meets the academic needs of urban students (Metz, 1986).

Magnet schools have been shown to have a positive effect on student outcomes in comparison to the traditional comprehensive school. Gamoran (1996b) conducted a study

using data compiled by the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) in which 24,000 eighth-grade students from public and private schools were monitored for two years. Results suggest that magnet school students scored higher on science, reading, and social studies tests than did students in public comprehensive schools. It is important to note that Gamoran's study did not take into account varying types of magnet themes or organizational formats e.g., whole school, partial school, full-time or part-time.

Studies of student achievement in magnet programs (Gamoran, 1996a; Gamoran, 1996b; Blank et al., 1983; Blank, 1982) attribute better student performance to greater resources than comprehensive schools, choice, specialized curriculum, and a program with high academic expectations. Additionally, the selection process, coupled with competition for a limited number of seats; the dissemination of information; and networking favor better students in applying for magnet schools.

Although most magnet schools do not use academic criteria in student selection, it does appear that "at risk" students are not served at the same levels as other students (Blank, 1982).

Although there have been several studies on student achievement of magnet school programs versus non-magnet programs, surprisingly little research has been conducted on minority and low-income student achievement in magnet programs.

The 1997 Report of the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights, which profiled magnet School programs in the Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Nashville school districts, report that Minority and low-income students do derive benefits from attending a magnet school.

Parental Involvement and Perceptions of Magnet Schools

Parental involvement is one of the most important factors in school success. Parents can influence and reinforce positive attitudes toward school and the value of an education. Blank (1984) reports that parents with children in magnet programs typically have a higher level of interest and involvement in the education of their child than parents in traditional schools.

The strong perception among parents, students, and the community that magnet schools provide a more focused and academic experience strengthens the desire for higher achievement. Parents consistently rank academic reputation as the number one reason for selecting a magnet school (Report of the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights, 1997). Academic reputation outweighs race and economic status when parents seek the best possible education for their child.

Collectively, parental choice, parental involvement, high academic expectations, and accountability are factors, which place a higher level of scrutiny on magnet schools to meet their mission.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This investigation is a descriptive study of federally funded magnet schools and their level of success in reducing minority group isolation. This chapter contains information on the population of 1995 Magnet Schools Assistance Program districts and schools, survey instrumentation and development, data collection procedures, survey distribution, and analytical methods.

Population

The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, assisted the researcher by providing a list of school districts and contact persons along with their addresses and telephone numbers, grant applications, and performance reports for districts that received desegregation funds for magnet schools. Sixty-four school districts throughout the United States received three years of funding in 1995 with renewal or continuation scheduled for 1998 (see Appendix A for a list of 1995 Grantees). A profile of each school district is included in Appendix B.

School districts in the 1995 Magnet Schools Assistance Program award cycle are in 25 states and all regions of the United States, i.e. northeast, midwest, south, and west. The schools that received funding have a wide variety of structures, enrollments, themes, and populations. A profile of each school is included in Appendix C.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument, (see Exhibit 1) designed by the researcher to gather specific enrollment information about the reduction of minority group isolation, was sent to each of the sixty-four school districts receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding in 1995. The survey was developed and sent out because the grant application at the time of the award contained only enrollment data for 1994-95, the baseline year. The survey collected enrollment data for the total district and minority enrollment for participating magnet schools for each year of the award, geographic location, and desegregation status.

Enrollment data for the district and magnet schools determined what changes occurred in total enrollment and minority group isolation during the three year funding cycle. The inclusion of geographical location data provided useful information relative to population changes by region and community definition, i.e., urban, suburban, and rural. Desegregation status, a requirement for initial funding, was included to provide information on court oversight for school districts mandated to implement desegregational strategies. Questions included in the survey instrument were developed to determine proportional changes in minority group isolation based on the standard of minority children at or above fifty percent of a magnet school's enrollment. The availability of data and documents on file with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education allowed for a four item survey.

Exhibit 1

Survey Instrument Used to Collect Data from Districts and Schools

The magnet school program as a desegregation tool in school districts receiving federal funds from the magnet schools assistance program in 1995

School District:

1. What was the total enrollment of students and minority students in your district during the years of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program award?

Total Enrollment 1995-96	Minority Enrollment 1995-96	Total Enrollment 1996-97	Minority Enrollment 1996-97	Total Enrollment 1997-98	Minority Enrollment 1997-98

2. What was the total enrollment of students and minority students in your magnet program(s) during the years of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program award?

School/Program	Total Enrollment 1995-96	Minority Enrollment 1995-96	Total Enrollment 1996-97	Minority Enrollment 1996-97	Total Enrollment 1997-98	Minority Enrollment 1997-98

3. Which best describes the location of your district? Rural Urban Suburban
4. Was your district under a court-ordered desegregation plan in 1998? Yes No
5. Do you wish to be sent a copy of the survey report? Yes No
-

Data Collection Procedures

The survey instrument was mailed to magnet program directors in all districts included in the population who are responsible for magnet programs or student assignment. Sending the survey to the district office allowed for collection of school data which was on file. Prior to distributing the survey, all districts were contacted by telephone for address and position verification. Following this initial contact, a cover letter (see Appendix D), survey instrument, and a stamped reply envelope were mailed to the appropriate administrator in each district.

A postcard reminder was mailed to non-respondents after two weeks (see Appendix E). When a second follow-up was necessary, a second letter was sent with a replacement survey and reply envelope. Following Dillman's (1978) procedures, a final mailing was sent after five weeks. With the assistance of electronic mail and addresses on file with the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Magnet Schools Assistance Program, data were requested and acquired by electronic means to reduce non-respondents.

Additionally, data were obtained from the NCES Common Core of Data for 1994 through 1997 as well as the initial grant applications and final performance evaluation reports which were provided to the researcher by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. Data was collected via the Internet for school districts and state departments of education, which maintain membership data on their websites. A complete list of all

websites and Internet sources included in the study are listed in Appendix F.

Survey Distribution and Results

Surveys were mailed to all sixty-four school districts, which received funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. Of the sixty-four surveys mailed thirty-seven (58%) were returned. Approximately thirty surveys were returned within the first week. The remaining seven surveys were returned following a second request by mail. Data for sixteen districts not responding was collected by electronic means where available via the Internet. Data from the Internet consisted of enrollment data not available from reports on file or not contained in reports submitted to the Magnet Schools Assistance Program Office. Internet sources consisted of district and state departments of education enrollment data files.

Additionally, the researcher conducted a two-day field visit to the United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, where district data were on file. Of the 1995 Magnet Schools Assistance Program recipients only thirty-seven districts had submitted their final performance evaluation report as of April 5, 1999.

Method of Analysis

As the survey instruments were received from each district, the data were entered into an SPSS 8.0 spreadsheet for analysis. Two spreadsheets were set-up; one for district

data and a second for school data. The district spreadsheet incorporated demographic information, i.e., location, region, community population, local industry as well as enrollment data for the total district and minority enrollment for the years 1994-95 through 1997-98 (see Appendix G). The magnet program spreadsheet included location, region, grade organization, program status, and enrollment figures for 1994-95 through 1997-98 (see Appendix H). All descriptive data were coded for each spreadsheet. Numeric data were directly entered into the spreadsheets.

District minority enrollment and total district enrollment determined the percentage of minority enrollment for the baseline year (1994-95) and the final year of the award (1997-98). By dividing the minority enrollment count by the total enrollment count and multiplying the result by 100 a percentage was obtained. Changes in minority enrollment for each district were determined by subtracting the 1994-95 percentage of minority enrollment from the percentage of 1997-98 minority enrollment.

The variable minority group isolation was determined for each data set for 1994 and 1997 which was defined as minority children constituting more than fifty percent of the school enrollment. Minority group isolation as defined by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program provides a standard for determining the number of schools that reduced, increased, or stayed the same in the number of minority students enrolled.

Magnet schools that reduced, increased, or had no change in minority isolation were tabulated by location (urban, suburban, rural, and combination) and region. Minority

group isolation is computed by dividing the minority enrollment by the total district enrollment and multiplying the result by 100 which yields a percentage. The researcher developed a simple spreadsheet which aided in tabulating changes in minority group isolation and enrollment by region and location.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

There were three purposes for this study: (1) to determine the extent federally funded magnet schools were successful in reducing minority group isolation, (2) to determine the relationship between the region of the country (northeast, midwest, south, west) of magnet schools and minority group isolation, and (3) to determine the relationship between the location (urban, suburban, rural, combined) and minority group isolation in districts receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding.

This chapter contains descriptive data on total district and minority enrollment in 1994-95, type of desegregation plan and demographics (enrollment in 1994-95, grades served, type of structure (whole school or program-within-a-school), minority enrollment in 1994-95, theme/subject and status which refers to a new program or revised program) for three hundred thirty-eight schools from which data were collected. A detailed analysis is provided for each research question included in the study (see above purposes of the study).

Descriptive Data on the Districts and Schools Studied

Data were collected from three hundred thirty-eight schools within sixty-four districts that received funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program for the 1994-95 through 1997-98 funding cycle (see Appendix A for a list of recipients). Fifty (78.1%)

school districts identified themselves as urban, nine (14.1%) suburban, three (4.7%) rural, and two (3.1%) as a combination of the three locations (see Table 1). Data were not available for some schools in both 1994-95 and 1997-98. Therefore, except for some descriptors the analyses were conducted on the three hundred twenty-two schools reporting data for both years.

Table 1
Geographic Location of Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Location	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Urban	50	78.1
Suburban	9	14.1
Rural	3	4.7
Combination	2	3.1
Total	64	100.0

All sixty-four districts were under a desegregation plan, either mandatory or voluntary. The plan was a pre-requisite for participation in the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. At the conclusion of the award cycle (1997-98) sixteen (25.0%) had been released from court oversight. Two districts entered into a consent decree where both parties agreed to a judgement approved by a court. One district achieved unitary status. Unitary status is given to school districts when student assignment is no longer based on race (see Table 2).

Table 2
Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts at the End of the 1994-95 Through 1997-98 Funding Cycle

Desegregation plan	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Under court oversight	45	70.3
Released from court oversight	16	25.0
Consent decree	2	3.1
Unitary	1	1.6
Total	64	100.0

The districts covered all regions of the country, i.e., northeast, midwest, south, and west (see Table 3). The northeast and south had more districts than the midwest and west. District enrollment ranged from under 10,000 to over 125,000 students. Minority enrollment by region for 1994-95 (baseline year) and 1997-98 is in Table 4. A profile of all Magnet Schools Assistance Program districts in the 1994-95 through 1997-98 funding cycle is in Appendix B.

Table 3
Distribution of Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts by Geographical Region, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Region	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Northeast	20	31.2
Midwest	7	10.9
South	25	39.1
West	12	18.8
Total	64	100.0

Each of the four geographic regions experienced an increase in their minority enrollment between the school years of 1994-95 and 1997-98. Districts in the west reported the highest percentage increase in the four geographic regions. Collectively, the twenty districts in the northeast had the second highest increase in minority enrollment followed by the south and midwest.

Table 4
Mean District Minority Enrollment by Region for 1994-95 and 1997-98

Region	Number of districts	Minority enrollment		% change
		1994-95	1997-98	
Northeast	20	13396.05	14879.65	11.07
Midwest	7	17526.57	19176.29	9.41
South	25	42056.72	46153.92	9.74
West	12	37822.00	45320.00	19.82
Total	64	29623.27	33273.67	12.32

Sixty-four school districts and three hundred and thirty-eight schools were recipients of funding. Schools in the Boston Public Schools, Massachusetts, were not included because the district chose not to participate in the study. The organization of grades in the participating schools consisted of twenty-six different elementary and secondary configurations.

Eighty-eight schools had a K-5 organization followed by sixty schools with a 6,7,8 (middle school) configuration. The 9-12 (high school) organization accounted for forty-eight schools with an additional forty-three schools utilizing a K-6 grade-organization. All grade-group organizations are in Table 5.

Table 5
Grade Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in 1994-95

Grade organization	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
K-5	88	26.0
6,7,8	60	17.8
9-12	48	14.2
K-6	43	12.7
PK-5	24	7.1
PK-6	18	5.3
K-8	10	3.0
K-3	6	1.8
K-4	6	1.8
7-9	5	1.5
7-8	5	1.5
K-2	3	.9
5-8	3	.9
1-4	3	.9
K-7	2	.6
1-6	2	.6
3-5	2	.6
PK-K	2	.6
PK-3	1	.3
PK-4	1	.3
PK-8	1	.3
4-8	1	.3
5-12	1	.3
1-5	1	.3
1-3	1	.3
4-5	1	.3
Total	338	100.0

The twenty-six grade organizations by location are in Table 6. Of the 338 schools where grade organization data were collected 307 were located in urban areas. The remaining schools were located in the following areas; suburban 15, rural 12, and

combined 4.

Table 6
Geographic Location and Grade-Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Grade organization	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Combined	Total
K-5	76	3	7	2	88
6,7,8	58	2			60
9-12	39	5	2	2	48
K-6	43				43
PK-5	22	2			24
PK-6	18				18
K-8	10				10
K-3	5		1		6
K-4	6				6
7-9	5				5
7-8	5				5
K-2	2		1		3
5-8	3				3
1-4		3			3
K-7	2				2
1-6	2				2
3-5	2				2
PK-K	2				2
PK-3	1				1
PK-4	1				1
PK-8	1				1
4-8			1		1
5-12	1				1

(table continues)

Table 6 (Continued)
Geographic Location and Grade-Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Grade organization	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Combined	Total
1-5	1				1
1-3	1				1
4-5	1				1
Total	307	15	12	4	338

Grade-organization by geographic region of schools receiving funding is in Table 7. Of the three hundred thirty-eight schools, forty-two located in the south, twenty-one in the northeast, seventeen in the west, and eight in the midwest had a K-5 grade organization. A complete display of the grade-organization by geographic region is in Table 7.

Table 7
Geographic Region and Grade-Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Grade organization	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
K-5	21	8	42	17	88
6,7,8	18	6	23	13	60
9-12	7	4	19	18	48
K-6	18	4		21	43

(table continues)

Table 7 (Continued)
Geographic Region and Grade-Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Grade organization	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
PK-5	15		9		24
PK-6	11	1	2	4	18
K-8	4			6	10
K-3			1	5	6
K-4	3		3		6
7-9	4			1	5
7-8	2			3	5
K-2	2		1		3
5-8			2	1	3
1-4	3				3
K-7	2				2
PK-K	1		1		2
1-6	1			1	2
3-5	1		1		2
PK-4		1			1
PK-3	1				1
PK-8	1				1
4-8			1		1
5-12			1		1
1-5	1				1
1-3			1		1
4-5			1		1
Total	116	23	109	90	338

Over the three-year funding cycle, Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding was awarded to schools with forty-two different thematic programs as determined from the district grant applications on file with the Magnet Schools Assistance Program Office.

Sixty (17.8%) schools implemented a math, science, or technology theme, and thirty-eight (11.2%) schools utilized a fine and performing arts theme. Additional themes

include a wide variety of subject areas from media to military service. Variations in themes often reflect the interests of a particular community based on student interest, parental involvement, financial resources, local economy, physical plant, and program location. The Magnet Schools Assistance Program encourages and supports themes that a local community identifies as meeting the academic and thematic interests of its students. A complete list of all themes of the schools in this study are in Table 8.

Table 8
Themes of Magnet Schools Assistance Programs, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Math, science or technology	60	17.8
Arts	38	11.2
Media	31	9.2
Business or careers	18	5.3
International studies	17	5.0
Technology	16	4.7
Science	15	4.4
Montessori	15	4.4
Gifted, talented or honors	14	4.1
Missing	13	3.8
Foreign language	11	3.3
Basic skills	11	3.3
Humanities	8	2.4
Accelerated school	8	2.4
Traditional	7	2.1
Technical	7	2.1

(table continues)

Table 8 (Continued)
 Themes of Magnet Schools Assistance Programs, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Arts and science	5	1.5
Health	5	1.5
Multicultural	4	1.2
Enrichment	3	.9
Other	2	.6
Computer science	2	.6
Open education	2	.6
Democracy	2	.6
Professional development	2	.6
Renaissance	2	.6
Authors & illustrators	2	.6
School of discovery	2	.6
School of inquiry	2	.6
Individualized education	1	.3
College prep and work	1	.3
Legal and environmental	1	.3
Multiple intelligence	1	.3
21 st century	1	.3
Language	1	.3
Aviation	1	.3
Community service	1	.3
Early childhood and lang. dev.	1	.3
Paidea	1	.3
Latin grammar	1	.3
Contemporary academy	1	.3
Public service	1	.3
Military service	1	.3
Total	338	100

Data were collected on the themes by geographic region for the three hundred thirty-eight schools that received funding. Among the four regions there were several themes that were prominent. Main themes in the northeast included the arts, media,

business or careers and technology. Midwestern schools implemented a technology, media, and math, science or technology theme more than any other. Popular southern themes included Montessori, the arts, media, and math, science or technology. Western schools relied more on themes in the arts, media, business and careers, and math, science or technology.

Among each of the four regions themes that were associated with technology or the arts were popular. The math, science or technology theme was consistently the most implemented thematic program among school districts in the northeast, midwest, south and west. Programs themes associated with the humanities and service learning, such as military or public service were implemented the least across all four regions. Table 9 has a complete breakdown of themes by geographic region.

Table 9
Themes by Geographic Region for Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Math, science or technology	7	3	27	23	60
Arts	13	1	11	13	38
Media	9	2	10	10	31
Gifted, talented or honors	3		6	5	14
International studies	4	2	5	6	17
Basic skills	7	2	2		11
Business or careers	8		2	8	18

(tables continues)

Table 9 (Continued)
Themes by Geographic Region for Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Montessori	1	2	10	2	15
Others	2				2
Foreign language	3	1	4	3	11
Computer science			2		2
Multicultural	3			1	4
Technical			4	3	7
Health	1		3	1	5
Open education	1			1	2
Individualized education				1	1
Traditional	3		2	2	7
Science	6	1	4	4	15
College prep & work		1			1
Technology	8	5	2	1	16
Democracy	2				2
Enrichment	1		2		3
Legal and environmental	1	1			
Professional development	1		1		2
Humanities	6		1	1	8
Renaissance	2				2
Arts and science	4		1		5
Multiple intelligence	1				1
21 st Century	1				1
Language	1				1
Authors & Illustrators	2				2
Aviation	1				1
School of discovery	2				2
Community service	1				1
School of inquiry	2				2

(table continues)

Table 9 (Continued)
Themes by Geographic Region for Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Accelerated school	3		4	1	8
Early childhood and language development	1				1
Paidea			1		1
Latin grammar			1		1
Contemporary academy		1			1
Public service			1		1
Military service			1		1
Missing					13
Total	111	21	107	86	338

Data were collected by geographic location (urban, suburban, rural, combined) and theme for the schools that received funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in 1994-95. Of these 338 schools, 298 were urban, 14 suburban, 11 rural and 2 combined.

Among all schools in the study there were 42 different program themes. The most prevalent theme among urban schools include math, science or technology, the arts, media, gifted, talented or honors, international studies, basic skills, business or careers, and science. Popular suburban themes included international studies and technical. Rural locations used the math, science or technology and Montessori theme more frequently. The combined locations implemented a gifted, talented or honors and others theme. Overall, urban schools utilized all 42 themes with suburban schools using 10, rural 6 and combined locations with 2. The most popular theme across all four geographic locations was math, science or technology. Table 10 has a complete breakdown of themes by

geographic location.

Table 10
Themes by Geographic Location of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Combined	Total
Math, science					
technology	54	1	5		60
Arts	37	1			38
Media	29	1	1		31
Gifted, talented or					
honors	13			1	14
International studies	12	4	1		17
Basic skills	11				11
Business or careers	18				18
Montessori	12	1	2		15
Others	1			1	2
Foreign language	11				11
Computer science	2				2
Multicultural	4				4
Technical	5	2			7
Health	5				5
Open education	2				2
Individualized					
education	1				1
Traditional	6		1		7
Science	14	1			15

(table continues)

Table 10 (Continued)
Themes and Geographic Region of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Theme	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Combined	Total
College prep & work	1				1
Technology	15	1			16
Democracy	1		1		2
Enrichment	3				3
Legal and environmental	1				1
Professional development	2				2
Humanities	8				8
Renaissance	2				2
Arts and science	4	1			5
Multiple intelligence	1				1
21 st Century	1				1
Language	1				1
Authors & Illustrators	2				2
Aviation	1				1
School of discovery	2				2
Community service	1				1
School of inquiry	2				2
Accelerated school	7	1			8
Early childhood and language development	1				1
Paidea	1				1
Latin grammar	1				1
Contemporary academy	1				1
Public service	1				1
Military service	1				1
Missing					13
Total	298	14	11	2	338

Given the district enrollment and minority enrollment of grantees awarded funding in the 1994-1995 through 1997-1998 cycle, data in Table 11 indicate that seven

school districts experienced a decline in the proportion of total enrollment that is minority. Moreover, these districts represent all regions of the country in urban, suburban, rural, and combined geographic locations.

Table 11
Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995) and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)

District	State	Min. enroll/ total enroll 1994-95	%	Min. enroll total enroll 1997-98	%	% change in proportion minority
Aldine Independent	TX	33740/43818	77	41297/48585	85	8
Beacon City	NY	2142/3060	70	1501/1701	88	18
Bibb County	GA	16000/25000	64	16383/23707	69	5
Boston	MA	50227/61253	82	53460/63762	84	2
Broward County	FL	98311/199011	49	122185/224383	54	5
Charlotte Mecklenburg	NC	39237/85483	46	39660/95797	41	-5
Clark County	NV	57663/155845	37	83341/190822	43	6
Cleveland	OH	55643/72727	77	58495/73257	80	3

(table continues)

Table 11 (Continued)
Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995)
and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)

District	State	Min. enroll/ total enroll 1994-95	%	Min. enroll total enroll 1997-98	%	% change in proportion minority
Corpus Christi	TX	31007/41902	74	31141/40975	76	2
Dade County	FL	292982/334444	88	300915/345861	87	-1
Dallas	TX	126792/145270	87	139867/155223	90	3
Darlington	SC	6507/11552	56	6416/11149	58	2
Denver	CO	44818/62771	71	50768/68007	75	4
District of Columbia	DC	77198/80450	96	74020/77111	96	0
Durham	NC	14699/25766	57	18078/29341	62	5
Duval County	FL	53341/121255	44	60285/126696	48	4
Edgecombe County	NC	4611/7936	58	4558/7222	63	5
Escambia	FL	15257/46234	33	19182/47868	40	7
Freeport	NY	4819/6484	74	5495/6928	79	5
Fresno	CA	58500/78000	75	60743/78176	78	3
Gadsden City	AL	2940/5952	49	2978/5695	52	3

table continues)

Table 11 (Continued)

Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995)and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)

District	State	Min. enroll/ total enroll 1994-95	%	Min. enroll total enroll 1997-98	%	% change in proportion minority
Hillsborough County	FL	56939/138876	41	69411/152727	45	4
Indianapolis	IN	25875/45000	58	26614/42939	62	4
Lee County	FL	15123/50166	30	15181/52133	29	-1
Long Beach	CA	60514/77116	78	69212/85908	81	3
Metropolitan	TN	28549/68978	41	31439/71313	44	3
Montgomery	AL	23331/34746	67	24840/34605	72	5
New Bedford	MA	3890/14061	28	4342/14728	29	1
New Britain	CT	5456/8743	62	6304/9654	65	3
New Haven	CT	15812/18483	86	16954/19385	87	1
NYC 1a	NY	8359/8855	94	8722 /9269	94	0
NYC 2	NY	14845/21228	70	14376/21268	68	-2
NYC 3	NY	12458/14399	87	12685/14851	85	-2
NYC 10	NY	28800/32000	90	2754/45483	94	4
NYC 20	NY	13850/23388	59	15326/27569	56	-3

(table continues)

Table 11 (Continued)

Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995)and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)

District	State	Min. enroll/ total enroll 1994-95	%	Min. enroll total enroll 1997-98	%	% change in proportion minority
NYC 22	NY	17197/26704	64	19303/28387	68	4
NYC 25	NY	15750/23370	67	17216/23994	72	5
NYC 26	NY	8586/15179	56	10053/18023	56	0
Palm Beach	FL	53768/125043	43	68136/142621	48	5
Portland #1 Project	OR	17030/54849	31	18447/55321	33	2
Learn	CT	140/310	45	222/449	49	4
Redwood City	CA	3189/8178	39	6225/9162	68	29
River Rouge	IL	1065/2316	46	1322/2546	52	6
Rochester	NY	27438/35177	78	30387/37254	82	4
Rockford	IL	9565/27408	35	10306/26531	39	4
Roanoke	VA	5299/12925	41	6044/13514	45	4
Sacramento	CA	34198/49562	69	39837/51042	78	9
San Diego	CA	84943/123106	69	97304/136283	71	2

(table continues)

Table 11 (Continued)

Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995)and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)

District	State	Min. enroll/ total enroll 1994-95	%	Min. enroll total enroll 1997-98	%	% change in proportion minority
San Jose	CA	20477/31097	66	22798/32993	69	3
Springfield	MA	16845/24064	70	17239/23778	72	2
St. John Parish	LA	4264/7140	60	4945/6719	74	14
St. Lucie	FL	11085/26214	42	11255/27797	40	-2
St. Paul	MN	21058/40605	52	26659/43703	61	9
Stockton	CA	27642/34000	81	30053/35645	84	3
Tacoma	WA	12075/31776	38	12920/31283	41	3
Topeka	KS	5216/14489	36	5893/14518	41	5
Tucson Unified	AZ	32815/62624	52	34953/63335	55	3
Tuscaloosa	AL	6772/10419	65	6833/9792	70	5
Utica	NY	2948/8178	36	3207/7941	40	4
Victoria	TX	8150/14606	56	8620/14862	58	2
Wake County	NC	24180/78000	31	29551/89548	33	2

(table continues)

Table 11 (Continued)
Minority Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Enrollment for Baseline (1994-1995)
and Final (1997-98) Years of Funding by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, (N=64)

District	State	Min. enroll/ total enroll 1994-95	%	Min. enroll total enroll 1997-98	%	% change in proportion minority
White Plains	NY	3096/5649	55	3541/6104	58	3
Wichita Falls	KS	5600/16000	35	5573/15570	36	1
Yonkers	NY	15263/20987	73	17739/23027	77	4

^aNYC = New York City.

Analysis of Data by Research Question

Minority group isolation occurs when minority children are equal to or more than fifty percent of a school's membership (Magnet Schools Assistance Program Performance Indicator Guidebook (MSAPPIG, 1998)). A reduction in minority group isolation occurs when the proportion of minority children decreases within the total enrollment. Elimination of minority group isolation occurs when the proportion of minority children within a school decreases to less than 50 percent (MSAPPIG, 1998) of the total enrollment.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent federally-funded magnet schools were successful in reducing minority group isolation between 1994 -1995 and 1997- 98. Complete enrollment data were available on 322 schools from the total of 338 schools that received funding. Sixteen schools did not report enrollment information

between 1994-1995 and 1997-98 although they were listed in the grant application as recipients of funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program.

At the conclusion of the three-year award in 1997-98 110 (34.2%) schools decreased the proportion of minority membership, 65 (20.2%) schools reported no change, and 147 (45.7%) had an increase in the proportion of minority membership (see Table 12).

Table 12
Change in Proportion of Minority Enrollment in Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program from 1994-95 Through 1997-98

Changes in minority enrollment	Schools	Percentage
Decreasing minority enrollment	110	34.2
No change in minority enrollment	65	20.2
Increasing minority enrollment	147	45.7
Total	322	100.1

Note. Enrollment data not available for 16 schools.

Among all 322 schools the impact of minority enrollment by grade organization between 1994-95 and 1997-98 varied in terms of increases, no change, and decreases. The elementary organization had more schools decreasing, no change and increases in minority enrollment than any other grade organization. Within the elementary structure the K-5 grade organization reported the greatest number of schools with decreases, no change and increases. Schools with decreases and no change in their minority enrollment were more likely to meet the MSAP standard of reducing and preventing minority group

isolation. This result is based on the fact that some schools were already less than fifty percent. A complete overview of all grade organizations and their minority enrollment is included in Table 13.

The middle school, high school and miscellaneous grade organizations also experienced changes in their minority enrollment. The middle school, which accounted for fifty-six schools, had twenty-two schools decrease eight with no change and twenty-six experiencing an increase in minority enrollment. Of the forty-four high schools eleven decreased, ten had no change, and twenty-three increased their minority enrollment. Schools with decreases and no change in their minority enrollment could be considered to have made some progress toward reducing their minority group isolation if at or below the Magnet Schools Assistance Program standard (see Table 13).

Table 13
Change in Proportion of Minority Enrollment by Grade Organization of Schools
Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program 1994-1995 Through
1997-98

Grade	Decreased in proportion minority	No change in proportion minority	Increased in proportion minority	Total
Elementary (PK-6)				
PK-K	2			2
PK-3	1			1
PK-4			1	1
PK-5	9	5	10	24
PK-6	6	2	9	17
PK-8		1		1
K-2	2		1	3
K-3	1	2	3	6
K-4	3		3	6
K-5	34	17	32	83
K-6	8	11	24	43
K-7			1	1
K-8	1	2	7	10
1-3		1		1
1-4	1		2	3
1-5			1	1
1-6	1	1		2
3-5	1		1	2
4-5		1		1
Total	70	43	95	208
Middle (6-8)				
6-8	22	8	26	56
High (9-12)				
9-12	11	10	23	44

(table continues)

Table 13 (Continued)
Change in Proportion of Minority Enrollment by Grade Organization of Schools Receiving Funds from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program 1994-1995 Through 1997-98

Grade	Decreased in proportion minority	No change in proportion minority	Increased in proportion minority	Total
Miscellaneous				
4-8	1			1
5-8	2		1	3
5-12	1			1
7-8	3	1	1	5
7-9		3		3
Total	110	65	147	322

Note. Enrollment data not available for 8 schools.

The success of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in eliminating minority group isolation in schools receiving funding was assessed by region of the country and location (urban, suburban and rural). The Magnet Schools Assistance Program defines minority group isolation as a condition where minority children in a school constitute more than fifty percent of a school's total enrollment. Data on the proportion of minorities in the school were collected on three hundred twenty-two schools during the 1994-95 and 1997-98 school years by region and minority group isolation. Only schools with baseline year and final year data are included although there were 338 schools that received funding. The number of schools with 50% or less and schools with more than 50% minority enrollment during the baseline year of the 1994-95 program award cycle by region are in Table 14.

Table 14
Minority Group Isolation (MGI) by Region in 1994-95

Region	Schools <50% minority		Schools \geq 50% minority		Total
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
Northeast	23	42	92	34	115
Midwest	2	4	16	6	18
South	15	27	89	33	104
West	15	27	75	28	90
Total	55	100	272	101	327

Note. Enrollment data not available for 1 school.

Among the fifty-five schools reporting minority enrollment of less than fifty percent, twenty-three (42%) were located in the northeast, two (4%) in the midwest, and fifteen each (27%) in the south and west. Collectively, 272 schools reported having a minority enrollment above fifty percent, ninety-two in the northeast (34%), sixteen (6%) in the midwest, eighty-nine (33%) in the south, and seventy-five (28%) in the west.

Table 15
Minority Group Isolation (MGI) by Region in 1997-98

	Schools <50% minority		Schools \geq 50% minority		Total
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
Northeast	19	36	93	34	112
Midwest	2	4	18	6	20
South	22	42	86	31	108
West	10	19	80	29	90
Total	53	101	277	100	330

Note. Enrollment data not available for 8 schools.

At the conclusion of the award cycle (1997-98), fifty-three schools reported having less than fifty percent of its total enrollment consisting of minority students, nineteen (36%) in the northeast, two (4%) in the midwest, twenty-two (42%) in the south and ten (19%) in the west. Over this three-year period 277 out of 330 schools reported an increase in their minority group isolation where minority children were equal to or more than fifty percent of the school's total enrollment. Of these schools ninety-three (34%) were in the northeast, eighteen (6%) in midwest, eighty-six (31%) in the south, and eighty (29%) in the west (see Table 15).

The objective of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program of reducing minority group isolation to less than 50 percent of the total enrollment of a school may be unrealistic. The goal of reducing minority group isolation in a district which has increasing minority enrollment is difficult to achieve.

Although few schools were able to obtain the goal of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program to reduce its minority enrollment to less than fifty percent, changes were experienced among all regions included in the study. Some schools noted a decline in their minority group isolation while others observed an increase. The following discussion provides information on the amount of change that occurred between 1994-95 and 1997-98 by geographic region.

Among the schools where enrollment data were available for both years (1994-95 and 1997-98), more schools in the south experienced declines in the proportion of minority enrollment than schools in other regions. Schools in the northeast were second followed by the west and midwest. Collectively one hundred ten schools decreased the proportion of minority membership over the three years of the award cycle.

Sixty-five schools within all four regions reported no change in the proportion of minority enrollment between 1994-95 through 1997-98. Schools in the south, west, and northeast were at about the same level in reporting no change; i.e., twenty-three in the south, twenty-one in the west, and twenty in the northeast. Only one school in the midwest had no change in its minority enrollment.

Increases in the proportion of minority enrollment occurred the most in schools located in the northeast region followed by schools in the west, south, and midwest. Overall a total of one hundred forty-seven schools reported increases in the proportion of minority enrollment. A complete review of all changes in minority enrollment by geographic region is included in

Table 16.

Table 16
Changes in Minority Enrollment by Geographic Region Among Schools Receiving
 Funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program between 1994-95 and 1997-98

Region	Decreased min. enrollment		No change min. enrollment		Increased min. enrollment		Total	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Northeast	31	28.1	20	30.7	62	42.1	113	35
Midwest	6	5.4	1	1.5	8	5.4	15	5
South	56	50.9	23	35.3	25	17.0	104	32
West	17	15.45	21	32.3	52	35.3	90	28
Total	110	99.85	65	99.8	147	99.8	322	100

Among the three hundred twenty-two schools where changes in the proportion of minority enrollment were observed, changes ranged from declines of greater than 16% or more to increases of 16% or more in all regions except the midwest. One hundred ten schools had declines with sixty-five indicating no change, and one hundred forty-seven schools noting increases in minority enrollment.

Regionally, ninety-three schools in the northeast had more changes in minority enrollment as compared to fourteen in the midwest, eighty-one in the south and sixty-nine in the west. Incremental changes suggest that some schools improved their minority enrollment while others may have gotten worse based on the Magnet Schools Assistance Program objective of reducing minority group isolation. A complete analysis of increases, no changes, and decrease is included in Table 17 for each region.

Table 17
Incremental Changes in Proportion of Minority Enrollment Between 1994-95 and 1997-98 in Schools Receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program Funding by Region

	<u>Northeast</u>		<u>Midwest</u>		<u>South</u>		<u>West</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Decline \geq 16%	3	2.6	2	14	13	12	0	0	18	6
Decline of 11 - 15%	3	2.6	3	9	2	2	0	0	8	2
Decline of 6 - 10%	8	7.0	0	0	17	17	0	0	25	8
Decline of 1 - 5%	17	15.0	1	14	24	31	16	17.78	58	18
No change	20	17.6	1	7	23	8	21	23.33	65	20
Increase of 1 - 5%	38	33.6	2	31	16	20	34	37.77	90	28
Increase of 6 - 10%	17	15.0	3	14	5	5	13	14.44	38	12
Increase of 11 - 15%	4	3.5	3	14	1	2	2	2.22	10	3
Increase of \geq 16%	3	2.6	0	0	3	3	4	4.44	10	3
Total	113	99.5	15	100	104	100	90	98.98	322	100

Note. Enrollment data not available for 16 schools.

Data were disaggregated to investigate the relationship in minority group isolation by location (urban, rural, suburban and combined). Fifty-five of three hundred twenty-seven schools reported having fifty percent or fewer minority students in 1994-95. Forty-nine schools were urban schools, three were suburban, one was rural, and two were combined (see Table 18).

Across the four locations two hundred seventy-two schools had a minority

enrollment greater than fifty percent of their total school enrollment. Most of these schools were urban. Twenty schools located in suburban and rural areas reported minority enrollments larger than fifty percent. Two schools located in a combined area were also above fifty percent (see Table 18).

Table 18
Minority Group Isolation (MGI) by Location in 1994-95 and 1997-98

Location	Schools <50 minority 1994-95		Schools <50 minority 1997-98		Schools \geq 50 minority 1994-95		Schools \geq 50 minority 1997-98	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Urban	49	89	45	85	250	92	255	92
Suburban	3	5	6	11	10	4	9	3
Rural	1	2	1	2	10	4	10	4
Combined	2	4	1	2	2	1	3	1
Total	55	100	53	100	272	101	277	100

Note. Enrollment data not available for 1994-95 on 1 school and 8 schools in 1997-98.

Upon further analysis of minority group isolation by location for 1994-95 and 1997-98, the reader will note that there were discrepancies in terms of missing data. The absence of missing data might suggest that these schools were not in existence during either school year. Therefore, baseline enrollment data against which to measure is not possible. However, in terms of the MSAP standard of minority children not constituting more than fifty percent of the total enrollment of a school by location data were available.

In 1997-98 fifty-three schools among the four locations reported having enrollments where minority children were less than fifty percent of the total enrollment. Urban schools reported having forty-five (85%), suburban six (11%), rural one (2%), and combined one (2%). Of the remaining 277 schools equal to or over fifty percent in minority enrollment, two hundred fifty-five were urban (92%), nine suburban (3%), ten rural (4%), and three combined (1%).

Minority enrollment data were collected by geographic location over four years: 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98. One hundred ten schools among the four locations reduced their proportion of minority enrollment, sixty-five reported no change, and one hundred forty-seven noted an increase. Among the three hundred twenty-two schools, ninety-four urban schools decreased their proportion of minority enrollment. Eight suburban and eight rural schools experienced a decrease. There were no combination schools with a decrease (see Table 19).

Sixty-five schools across the four locations had no change in the proportion of minority enrollment during the four years of the award cycle. Of this total, sixty-two schools were urban with the remaining three locations reporting one school without any change in proportion of minority enrollment. Schools showing no change in the proportion of minority enrollment may have improved or stayed the same depending on the proportion of minority children within the school at the onset of the award. Conversely, one hundred forty-seven schools experienced increases in the proportion of students enrollment over the four years of the award. Of these schools one hundred thirty-

eight were urban, four suburban, two rural, and three located in combination areas.

Table 19
Changes in Minority Enrollment by Geographic Location Among Schools Receiving Funding from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program between 1994-95 and 1997-98

Location	Decreased proportion min enrollment	No change proportion min. enrollment	Increased proportion min. enrollment	Total
Urban	94	62	138	294
Suburban	8	1	4	13
Rural	8	1	2	11
Combined	0	1	3	4
Total	110	65	147	322

Note. Enrollment data not available for 16 schools.

Table 20 contains incremental changes in the proportion of minority students ranging from declines of sixteen percentage points or better to increases of sixteen points or better. Eighteen schools reported they had decreased their minority enrollment by sixteen percentage points or greater between 1994-95 and 1997-98. Eight urban schools were in the declining range of eleven to fifteen percentage points. Within the same range there were no schools in other locations. Among urban, suburban and rural schools, twenty-five schools reported a decrease in their minority enrollment within the range of six to ten percentage points. The most active decline of minority enrollment among all locations occurred at the one to five percentage points range where fifty-nine schools had decreases; fifty-four urban, three suburban, and two rural. Collectively, one hundred ten

schools among all four locations reported declines in their proportion of minority students. Declines in minority enrollment would suggest that these schools were successful in reducing the proportion of minority students enrolled in their schools.

In comparison to declines and no change, one hundred forty-seven schools across all locations reported varying increases in the proportion of minority students. One hundred thirty-eight urban schools among all incremental ranges experienced increases followed by suburban, rural and combined locations. Ten schools among the four locations had increases in their minority enrollment of sixteen percentage points or better. An additional ten schools noted an increase of eleven to fifteen percentage points. Thirty-seven schools reported increases of six to ten percentage points. Ninety schools had increases of one to five percentage points more than twice as many schools as any other range. Increases in minority enrollment are contrary to the objectives of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program to reduce minority group isolation.

Table 20
Incremental Changes in Minority Enrollment Between 1994-95 and 1997-98 in Schools Receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program Funding by Location

	<u>Urban</u>		<u>Suburban</u>		<u>Rural</u>		<u>Combined</u>		<u>Total %</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
Decline \geq 16%	12	4	3	23	3	27	0	0	18 6
Decline of 11 - 15%	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8 2
Decline of 6 - 10%	20	7	2	15	3	27	0	0	25 8
Decline of 1 - 5%	54	18	3	23	2	18	0	0	59 18

No change	62	21	1	8	1	9	1	25	65 20

Increase of 1 - 5%	87	30	1	8	1	9	1	25	90 28
Increase of 6 - 10%	33	11	3	23	1	9	0	0	37 11
Increase of 11 - 15%	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	25	10 3
Increase of \geq 16%	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	25	10 3
Total	294	100	13	100	11	100	4	100	322 100

Note. Enrollment data not available for 16 schools.

At the onset of the grant award in 1994-95 twelve schools reported enrollment data where minority students were less than fifty percent of the total student population. Of these schools eleven were urban and one combined representing all four geographic regions. The significance of these schools centers around the fact that their enrollment trends were counter to the purpose of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program to reduce minority group isolation at the conclusion of the award cycle. Schools once at or below the minority group isolation standard, but ended the project not meeting the standard, supports the increasing minority enrollment trends noted

across the country. A complete list of these schools, their magnet theme, and grade organization is listed below.

<u>School</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Grade Organization</u>
BTW	Hillsborough	Urban	South	International Studies	6,7,8
Attucks	Broward	Urban	South	Media	6,7,8
Washington	Rockford	Urban	Midwest	Media	K-6
Gomes	New Bedford	Urban	Northeast	Technology	K-6
Valley	Clark County	Combined	West	Gifted/ Talented	9-12
PS 3	Com. 10	Urban	Northeast	Language	K-8
Billingsville	Charlotte	Urban	South	Montessori	PK-4
Camage	Wake County	Urban	South	Math, Science Technology	6,7,8
Lincoln	Tacoma	Urban	West	Business/ Careers	9-12
McIlvaigh	Tacoma	Urban	West	Business	6,7,8
Lister	Tacoma	Urban	West	Media	K-5
McCarver	Tacoma	Urban	West	Technology	K-5

Results of analysis in terms of schools not meeting the Magnet Schools Assistance Program standard at the start of the award cycle but meeting the criteria the final year were limited to nine schools all located in the south. All but two were located in urban areas. The average

percent of decline in minority group isolation among these schools was -9.96%. The highest decline was noted at Bugg Elementary with a three-year decline of -23.06% followed by Michigan Elementary with -16.82%. A complete list of all schools is located below.

<u>School</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Grade organization</u>
Shore	Hillsborough	Urban	South	Media	K-5
Michigan	Lee County	Suburban	South	Montessori	PK-5
Edgewood	Lee County	Suburban	South	International Studies	PK-5
Oakhurst	Charlotte	Urban	South	Paidea	K-5
Bruns	Charlotte	Urban	South	Latin Grammar	K-5
Bugg	Charlotte	Urban	South	Arts and Science	K-5
Pearl-Cohn	Metropolitan	Urban	South	Media	9-12
Wharton	Metropolitan	Urban	South	Arts	5-8
Lincoln Terrance	Roanoke	Urban	South	Media	K-5

CHAPTER V

Conclusions, Discussion, Implications for Future Study, Implications for Practice, and Researcher Reflections

The major purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which magnet schools receiving federal funding were successful in reducing minority group isolation. Additional questions investigated were (1) what is the relationship between the region of the country of magnet schools and changes in minority group isolation and enrollment in schools receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding from 1994-1995 through 1997-1998? (2) What is the relationship between the location (urban, suburban, rural, and combined) of magnet schools and changes in minority group isolation and minority enrollment in schools receiving Magnet Schools Assistance Program funding from 1994-1995 through 1997-1998? This chapter presents conclusions, implications for future study and implications for practice based on the findings in Chapter 4 as well reflections from the researcher.

Conclusions

The results of this study offer support for the following conclusions:

1. There was a small change in the proportion of schools between 1994-95 and 1997-98 that met the criterion for a reduction in minority group isolation as defined by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. Fifty-five out of three

hundred twenty-seven schools (16.8%) met the standard in 1994-95 as compared to fifty-three schools out of three hundred thirty (16.1%) in 1997-98.

2. Minority group isolation increased among schools in the northeast, midwest and west, with the south experiencing a small decline in minority group isolation.
3. Two locations, urban and combined, experienced an increase in minority group isolation, with the rural remaining the same and suburban experiencing a decline.
4. Despite financial support from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program few schools were able to reduce their minority group isolation between 1994-95 and 1997-98.

Discussion

While the challenges for major desegregation have ceased, the emphasis has now shifted to closing the gaps in student achievement between minority and non-minority students. This shifted emphasis embraces programs with a special curriculum designed to attract students of different racial backgrounds. These programs attempt to select students without violating the constitutional rights of any ethnic group.

The need to address racial diversity while maintaining equitable methods of student selection and admission can be witnessed by the growing number of school districts such as Boston, MA, Buffalo, NY, Houston, TX, San Francisco, CA and Charlotte, NC that have agreed, through litigation, to end the use of race as the predominant factor in determining who participates in magnet programs. White and black parents are turning to federal courts to eradicate racial quotas that determine school assignment. Recent court decisions where race has been a factor have resulted in declarations of unitary status and injunctive relief for the plaintiff.

Despite judicial intervention for racial integration, many minority children are forced by factors related to economic development, housing, zoning and transportation to live in poor urban communities where educational resources are limited. Of greater significance is the fact that minority and non-minority children alike are separated and will not have the chance to learn to interact with each other, as they will as adults living and working in a multicultural society. This interaction is an important element of quality education, and benefits both minority and non-minority groups alike. Schools are an important socializing institution, which impart shared values that maintain stability and social order. When children attend racially isolated schools, these shared values are jeopardized. If children of different races, economic and social groups do not have the opportunity to know each other and live together in a school, they cannot be expected to gain the understanding and mutual respect for the cohesion of a diverse society.

While the goal of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program is to provide for

minority students not constituting more than fifty percent of the student enrollment in a school, this standard may be unrealistic based on the demographics of certain regions and locations of the country. As a voluntary means of desegregation, the magnet program provides opportunity for parental choice; a unified curriculum based on a special theme or method of instruction, and enrollment beyond a geographic attendance zone. Shifts in demographic trends seem to influence participation of students in a magnet program especially whites. With minority populations growing at a faster pace than the non-minority population as reported by the most recent U.S. census data, public schools will continue to become heavily populated with minority students. Additional support is evidenced by 54 of 60 urban, suburban, and rural school districts in this study that increased in minority student enrollment between the 1994-95 through 1997-98 school years. These increases were observed in all geographic regions (northeast, south, midwest, and west) where data were collected.

Compounding the quest for racial balance, school districts across the country are faced with political forces seeking to reshape public education. The calls for options that include neighborhood schools, parental choice, charter schools, schools for profit, and vouchers are signals of educational reform. This reform movement which is driven by perceptions of low academic performance, poor attendance, increased spending, and the absence of parental freedom for educational options. The belief that such options will spur competition thereby improving the quality of public education provides a basis for reform.

Opponents of these reforms suggest that children of color will suffer with limited funds for public education being diverted to other non-public school options. These options may continue to broaden the racial divide within public education programs resulting in dual educational systems predicated on race and economics.

Implications for Future Study

As a desegregation strategy designed to reduce, eliminate, and prevent minority group isolation, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program provides the financial support to school districts seeking to offset racial imbalances. Despite this financial support for the magnet program, districts utilizing the magnet concept for desegregation may wish to investigate characteristics that influence participation by parents and students. These include admission and selection policies, academic achievement of students in magnet programs, availability of transportation, the benefits of social integration, and the financial support and available support services.

As magnet programs continue to gain in popularity, attention will undoubtedly continue to focus on selection policies. Presently, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program only requires that the selection process be “narrowly tailored”, meaning that race should not be the primary factor that determines who participates. Further study of selection practices, which allow for equal opportunity and diversity, will help to prevent future litigation.

Next to selection policies the academic achievement of students participating in

magnet programs is of paramount concern. To date there have only been two significant studies (Gorman, 1996 and Gorman, 1996b) that have researched the academic achievement of magnet versus non-magnet students. For many parents both minority and non-minority alike, the goal of providing a strong academic background is a primary motivation for choosing a magnet program. An in-depth look into the instructional practices that promote increased academic achievement for students in magnet programs can be translated to other magnet and non-magnet programs.

Having made the decision to participate in a magnet program parents are often left to identify their own transportation arrangements to and from the program. The Magnet Schools Assistance Program does not provide financial support within the grant for student transportation. Research has not been conducted in terms of the transportation practices within varying school districts that offer magnet programs. Are there students who are eligible to participate in a magnet program but are unable due to a lack of transportation? Is the available transportation program efficient in transporting students to and from magnet programs? Are there specific policies that should be implemented when establishing a magnet program? What financial resources for transportation are available and how can they be accessed? Research into these and other transportation questions may provide information that could assist a school district in establishing or maintaining a program designed to provide equal opportunity for all participants.

Questions regarding the benefits of integration and the costs of desegregation have come to the forefront as evidenced by the reform movement, judicial engagements,

and the limited number of white students choosing to enroll in magnet programs. More importantly, the benefit of interracial exposure created by the magnet program is being called into question despite *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954. Blacks have questioned whether the magnet program is the best opportunity for their children to receive a quality education when and if seated next to whites. With recent enrollment trends suggesting that minority children will continue to be the largest population within public education, the questions and benefits of interracial exposure seem to become louder. Further study of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program would greatly aid districts with a growing minority population to determine if the present grant requirements and enrollment targets are realistic.

Implications for Practice

As a desegregation strategy designed to provide choice, a special method of instruction, and enrollment beyond geographic boundaries, the magnet program is the most popular form of desegregation. The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Magnet Schools Assistance Program may wish to consider refining reporting timelines and requirements from recipient districts for better monitoring and accountability. The present system allows periodic reporting without standards for what should be documented. Without specific and enforceable regulations, districts are free to report when and what they wish. Providing more accountability for reporting and record keeping will allow for ongoing assessment and evaluation, and the institution of sanctions for non-compliance will aid in maintaining accountability.

Additionally, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program is in an excellent position to compile and disseminate many of the instructional and programmatic strategies contained within the grant applications. These strategies could be presented to school districts through a best practices program, which would incorporate documented success of their effectiveness through field studies. Providing documented strategies would aid school districts across the country in developing instructional programs and practices that enhance the quality of the magnet program.

In the wake of the many challenges faced by public education, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program has the opportunity to encourage experimentation in designation of schools for magnet programs. Paired magnet zoning, district-wide controlled choice are two strategies where further experimentation would address greater opportunities for more children to participate in magnet programs.

Researcher's Reflections

With recent enrollment trends suggesting that minority students will become the predominant population in many school districts across the country, additional information is needed in comparing the racial make-up of magnet schools in relationship to the total school district. Success or failure of magnet programs within a school district should be viewed in terms of local conditions. Critical questions such as, what other programs are going on in the district? Are other schools becoming racially isolated? Is the overall minority enrollment within the district increasing? What are the perceptions of

parents, students, and teachers of magnet programs? Are the associated program costs worth racial integration? Longitudinal data in these areas would yield essential information in projecting methods of school assignment as well the development of programs which influence student enrollment.

In the end, this study reveals that even if with financial assistance school districts receiving funding were not able to offset their racial imbalances to meet the Magnet Schools Assistance Program standard. The reluctance of non-minority students to enroll in magnet programs hinders the reduction, elimination or prevention of minority group isolation. Relying on the participation of one ethnic group to balance a magnet program may be unwise in light of the many challenges facing public education. As noted within this study, the academic achievement of students regardless of race or ethnicity is a top priority in preparing students to become contributing members of a pluralistic society.

As the only federal program that provides financial support for desegregation, Congress should continue to appropriate funding for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. Racial targets may never be achieved but the program does provides educational opportunities to those seeking a specialized curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, D., & Alexander, K. (1992). American public school law (3rd ed.). St Paul, MN: West.
- Armor, D.J. (1989). After busing: education and choice. Public Interest, 95, 24-37.
- Ascher, C. (1993). The changing face of racial isolation and desegregation in urban schools. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, n19. Institute for Urban and Minority Education.
- Blank, R.K. (1984). The effects of magnet schools on the quality of education in urban school districts. Phi Delta Kappa. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.
- Blank, R.K., Dentler, R. A., Baltzell, D. C., & Chabotar, K. J. (1983). Survey of magnet schools. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Blank, R.K. (1982). Analyzing educational effects of magnet schools using local district data, Spring 1:1 40.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294 (1955).
- Dentler, R.A. (1991). The national evidence on magnet schools. Paper presented at the Regional Conference on Magnet Schools: Equity and Excellence II, San Jose, CA. October 1990, sponsored by the Southwest Center for Educational Equity.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Fleming, P.S., Blank, R.K., Dentler, R.A., Baltzell, D.C. (1982). Survey of magnet schools: Interim report for the U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: James H. Lowery and Associates.

Fuller, B., Elmore, R.F. (1996). After 15 years; magnet schools in urban education, who chooses? who loses. New York. Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Frazier, L. (1995, October 30). Busing is hurting black children, some in P.G. say; parents point to vacant slots in gifted, magnet programs. Washington Post, pp. A3, A4.

Gordon, W. M.(1989). School desegregation: A look at the 70's and 80's. Journal of Law & Education, 18, 199-214.

Gamoran, A. (1996a). Do magnet schools boost achievement? Educational Leadership, 54, 42-46.

Garmoran, A. (1996b). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive, and private city high schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18, 1-18.

Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 377 U.S. 218 (1964).

- Hawley, W. (1996, April 10). The predictable consequences of school choice. Education Week, p. 35.
- Hendrie, C. (1997a, April 30). Racial preferences challenged in Houston. Education Week, p. 3.
- Hendrie, C. (1997b, May 21). Judge rejects race-based admissions to Virginia magnets. Education Week, p. 8.
- Hendrie, C. (1997c, August 6). NAACP wrestles with evolving views on desegregation. Education Week, p. 12.
- Hillsborough County Public Schools, Magnet School Assistance Grant Application, 1996 p. I-212.
- Hopwood v. University of Texas, et al., 95 U.S. 1773 (1996).
- [HTTP://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/sec5101.HTML](http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/sec5101.HTML).
- Inniss, L. (1993). School desegregation: Too high a price? Social Policy, 24, 6-16.
- Jeter, J. (1998, February 13). Integrated magnet school leaves students poles apart. The Washington Post, pp. A1, A12.
- Kelley, P., Miller, W. (1989). Assessing desegregation efforts: No best measure. Public Administration Review, 2, 431-437.

Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colo., 413 U.S. 189 (1973).

Lord, D.J. (1977). School Desegregation policy and intra-school district migration. Social Science Quarterly, 57, 784-796.

Metz, M.H. (1986). Different by design: The context and character of three magnet schools. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U.S. 717 (1974).

Milliken v. Bradley, 433 U.S. 267 (1977).

Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada, 305 U.S. 337 (1938).

Missouri v. Jenkins II, 495 U.S. 33 (1990).

Missouri v. Jenkins III, 000 U.S. U10251 (1995).

Norusis, M.J. (1998). SPSS 8.0: Guide to data analysis. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Orfield, G. (1992, April). Contemporary metropolitan school segregation and its consequences. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Orfield, G. (1996). Dismantling Segregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education. New York. NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Owens, H. (1992). What kind of choice. Equity and Choice, p.12.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

Reese, C.M., Miller, K.E., Mazzeo, J., & Dossey, J.A. (1997).

National assessment of educational progress 1996 mathematics report card for the nation and the States. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Report of the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights. (1997). Difficult choices: Do magnet schools serve children in need? Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Reutter, E.E. (1985). The law of public education (3rd ed.). Mineloa, NY: Foundation Press.

Rossell, C.H. (1983). Strategies for effective desegregation. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rossell, C.H., & Hawley, W.D. (1983). The consequences of school desegregation. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1, 93 S.Ct. 1278, 411 U.S. 959 (1973).

Schmidt, P. (1994, November 30). New magnet-school law emphasizes desegregation. Education Week, p. 3.

Serrano v. Priest, 5 Cal.3d 584, 96 Cal.Rptr. 601, 487 P.2d 1241 (1971).

Silberman, T., & deBose, C. (1997, May 18). Look back: Key dates for integration.

The News & Observer Publishing Co.

Simmons, T. (1995, May 30). A new look at busing. The News & Observer.

Steele, L., & Eaton, M. (1996). Reducing, eliminating, and preventing minority isolation in American schools: The impact of the magnet schools assistance program.

Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.

Steel, L., & Levine, R. (1994). Educational innovations in multiracial contexts: The growth of magnet schools in American education. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.

Swann v. Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

Sweatt v. Painter, 339 U.S. 629 (1950).

Thresher, D.M. (1993). Merging educational finance reform and desegregation goals. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 7, 1-14.

United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (1998). Magnet Schools Assistance Program Guidebook, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Viadero, D. (1996, March 6). Students learn more in magnets than other schools study finds. Education Week, p. 12-13.

Walsh, M. (1997, October 29). Chicago, San Francisco consider admissions changes for magnets. Education Week, p. 12.

Walsh, M. (1998, November 25). Court blocks race-based school policy: Boston Latin must admit white student. Education Week, p. 1.

Wessmann v. Gittens, 98-1657 U.S.C.A. (1998)

William Capacchione v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 482 U.S. W.D.C. (1999).

Wright, D.E., Chance, W.G. & Smith, D.L. (1990). Magnet schools: An attractive alternative. The Clearinghouse, 63, 414.

Wright, D.E., Chance, W.G. & Smith, D.L. (1989). Educators, not judges, should take the reins in desegregation. The Executive Educator, p. 28.

Yap, K.O. (1991). Educational empowerment: A formative look at choice and equity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Young, T.W., & Clinchy, E. (1992) Choice in public education. New York. Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform. (1983). Washington, D.C.:
National Commission on Excellence in Education.

Appendix A: Magnet Schools Assistance Program Fiscal Year 1995 Grant Recipients

ALABAMA

Gadsden City Schools
 P.O. Box 184
 Gadsden, AL 35999
 Contact: David Asbury at (205) 442-4516

Montgomery City Board of Education
 P.O. Box 1991
 Montgomery, AL 36102-1991
 Contact: Cheryl Deaton at (334) 269-3997

Tuscaloosa City Schools
 1100 21st Street East
 Tuscaloosa, AL 35404
 Contact: Charlotte Wheeler at (205) 759-3773

ARIZONA

Tucson Unified School District
 OCR/Desegregation Office
 1010 East 10th Street
 P.O. Box 40400
 Tucson, AZ 85719
 Contact: Roger Pfeuffer at (520) 617-7356

CALIFORNIA

Fresno Unified School District
 Planning and Development Dept
 Tulare & M Streets
 Fresno, CA 93721
 Contact: Georgina Takemoto at (209) 441-3506

Long Beach Unified School District
 701 Locust Avenue
 Long Beach, CA 90813
 Contact: Karen Bustrum at (310) 436-9931 ext 1460

Redwood City School District
 Magnet School Department
 815 Allerton Street
 Redwood City, CA 94063-1361
 Contact: John Baker at (415) 365-1550
 Sacramento City Unified School District
 520 Capitol Mall

Sacramento, CA 95814
 Contact: Pat Skover at (916) 264-4000

CALIFORNIA San Diego Unified School District
 School Services Division
 4100 Normal Street
 San Diego, CA 92103
 Contact: Patricia Trandal at (619) 686-6624

San Jose Unified School District
 855 Lenzen Avenue
 San Jose, CA 95126
 Contact: Norris Hill at (408) 535-6073

Stockton Unified School District
 Educational Services
 701 North Madison Street
 Stockton, CA 95202
 Contact: Leonard Cayton at (209) 953-4723

COLORADO Denver Public Schools
 900 Grant Street
 Denver, CO 80211
 Contact: Mary Apodaca at (303) 399-4228

CONNECTICUT New Britain Consolidated School District
 1 Liberty Square
 New Britain, CT 06051
 Contact: Candace Jones at (203) 827-2222

New Haven City School District
 Gateway Center
 54 Meadow Street
 New Haven, CT 06519
 Contact: Ed Linehan at (203) 946-7415

Project LEARN
 165 Boston Post Road - Box 220
 East Lyme, CT 06333
 Contact: Richard Spindler-Virgin at (203) 437-7775

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA District of Columbia Public Schools
 415 12th Street, NW

Washington, DC 20004
Contact: Judy Aaronson at (202) 724-4222

FLORIDA

Duval County School Board
1701 Prudential Drive - Second Floor
Jacksonville, FL 32207
Contact: Sally Hague at (904) 390-2082

Escambia County School District
Plans, Projects & Research
215 West Garden Street
Pensacola, FL 32501
Contact: Linda R. Gulley at (904) 469-5329

Hillsborough County Public Schools
901 East Kennedy Boulevard
Tampa, FL 33602
Contact: Maryellen Elia at (813) 272-4050

Palm Beach County School Board
Instruction & Pupil Services Division
3324 Forest Hill Boulevard
West Palm Beach, FL 33406-5813
Contact: Jake Sello at (407) 434-8755

School Board of Broward County
Division of Instruction
600 SE Third Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
Contact: Diane Carr at (305) 765-6613

School Board of Dade County
1450 NE Second Avenue - Suite 500
Miami, FL 33132
Contact: Miriam Stoodt at (305) 995-1922

School District of Lee County
2055 Central Avenue
Ft. Meyer, FL 33901
Contact: Vivian Smith at (813) 337-8169

St. Lucie County School Board

2909 Delaware Avenue
Ft. Pierce, FL 34947
Contact: Mary Bennett at (407) 468-5256

GEORGIA Bibb County Board of Education
484 Mulberry Street - Box 6157
Macon, GA 31213
Contact: Eileen Bell at (912) 751-6788

ILLINOIS Rockford Public Schools
201 South Madison Street
Rockford, IL 61104-0292
Contact: Barbara Pulliam at (815) 966-3250

INDIANA Indianapolis Public Schools
120 East Walnut Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Contact: Renee Jones at (317) 226-4884

KANSAS Topeka Public Schools
624 SW 24th Street
Topeka, KS 66611
Contact: Betty Horton at (913) 233-0313

LOUISIANA St. John the Baptist Parish Public Schools
P.O. Drawer AL
104 West 10th Street
Reserve, LA 70084
Contact: Nora Pierre at (504) 535-2717

MASSACHUSETTS Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA 02108
Contact: Charlotte Harris at (617) 635-9488

 New Bedford Public Schools
455 County Street
New Bedford, MA 02740
Contact: Louise Anthony at (508) 997-4511

 Springfield Public Schools
195 State Street

P.O. Box 1410
 Springfield, MA 01102-1410
 Contact: Teresa Regina at (413) 787-7184

MICHIGAN

River Rouge City School District
 Curriculum Office
 1411 Coolidge Highway
 River Rouge, MI 48218
 Contact: Marie Miller at (313) 297-9600 ext 1630

MINNESOTA

St. Paul Public Schools
 360 Colborne Street
 St. Paul, MN 55102
 Contact: Maureen Flanagan at (612) 293-5150

NEVADA

Clark County School District
 2832 East Flamingo Road
 Las Vegas, NV 89121
 Contact: Glenn Cooper at (702) 799-5479

NEW YORK

Beacon City School District
 88 Sargent Avenue
 Beacon, NY 12508
 Contact: Ophelia Richards at (914) 838-6920

Community School District #1
 80 Montgomery Street
 New York, NY 10002
 Contact: Nancy Villarreal de Adler at (212) 602-9739

Community School District #2
 333 Seventh Avenue - 7th Floor
 New York, NY 10001
 Contact: Anita Batisti at (212) 330-9413

Community School District #3
 300 West 96th Street
 New York, NY 10025
 Contact: Gilbert Turchin at (212) 678-2918

Community School District #10
 1 Fordham Plaza

Room 809
Bronx, NY 10458
Contact: Barbara Harris at (718) 584-7070

Community School District #20
1031 59th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11219
Contact: Steven Radin at (718) 692-5222

Community School District #22
2525 Haring Street
Brooklyn, NY 11235
Contact: Robert Radday at (718) 891-8499

Community School District #25
70-30 164th Street
Flushing, NY 11365
Contact: Harold Schwartzapfel at (718) 480-4164

Community School District #26
61-15 Oceania Street
Bayside, NY 11364
Contact: Anita Saunders at (718) 631-6982

NEW YORK

Freeport Public Schools
Office of Magnet Schools Planning
Administration Building
235 North Ocean Avenue
Freeport, NY 11520
Contact: Fern Eisgrub at (516) 867-5227

Rochester City School District
131 West Broad Street
Rochester, NY 14614
Contact: Woodrow Hammond at (716) 262-8776
Utica City School District

Magnet Schools Office
13 Elizabeth Street
Utica, NY 13501
Contact: Richard Pfister at (315) 792-2216

White Plains City School District
5 Homeside Lane
White Plains, NY 10605
Contact: Saul Yanofsky at (914) 422-2019

Yonkers City School District
145 Palmer Road
Yonkers, NY 10701
Contact: Gladys Pack at (914) 376-8213

NORTH CAROLINA

Charlotte-Mecklenberg County Public Schools
P.O. Box 30035
Charlotte, NC 28230-0035
Contact: Mildred Wright at (704) 343-5031

Durham Public Schools
511 Cleveland Street - Box 30002
Durham, NC 27702
Contact: Anita Tanner at (919) 560-3667

Edgecombe County Public Schools
412 Pearl Street
P.O. Box 7128
Tarboro, NC 27886
Contact: Doris Dunn at (919) 641-2635

Wake County Public Schools
P.O. Box 28041
Raleigh, NC 27611
Contact: Gerry Ritter at (919) 850-1753

OHIO

Cleveland City Schools
Student Assignment Division
1380 East Sixth Street
Cleveland, OH 44114
Contact: Gerrie Krieger at (216) 574-8696

OREGON

Portland School District No. 1
Office of Grants Management
P.O. Box 3107
Portland, OR 97208

Contact: Maurice Caba at (503) 331-3220

SOUTH CAROLINA

Darlington County School District
Mayo HS for Math, Science & Technology
405 Chesnut Street
Darlington, SC 29532
Contact: Rainey Knight at (803) 398-5050

TENNESSEE

Metropolitan School District
Curriculum & Administration
2601 Bransford Avenue
Nashville, TN 37204
Contact: Nancy Tirrill at (615) 259-8687

TEXAS

Aldine Independent School District
14910 Aldine-Westfield Road
Houston, TX 77032-3099
Contact: Kay Massey at (713) 985-6430

Corpus Christi Independent School District
P.O. Drawer #10
Corpus Christi, TX 78403-0110
Contact: Linda Reed at (512) 886-9115

Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75204
Contact: Maria Impink-Hernandez at (214) 426-3234

Victoria Independent School District
102 Profit Drive
P.O. Box 1759
Victoria, TX 77902
Contact: Jan Jacob at (512) 576-3131

Wichita Falls Independent School District
P.O. Box 2570
Wichita Falls, TX 76307
Contact: Ruth Ann Huffhines at (817) 720-3247

VIRGINIA

Roanoke Public Schools

40 Douglass Avenue, NW
Roanoke, VA 34012
Contact: R. Faye Pleasants at (703) 981-2502

WASHINGTON

Tacoma School District No. 10
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, WA 98401-1357
Contact: Charlie Walker at (206) 596-2534

Appendix B - Demographic Information of 1995 Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts

School District	City/County	State	Pop. (1995)	Industry	District Membership 1994-95	Min. Membership 1994-95	Deseg. Plan
Indianapolis Public Schools	Indianapolis	IN	731,327	Ag/Manuf	45,000	25,875	Yes
Denver Public Schools	Denver	CO	467,610	Tourism	62,771	44,818	No
New Britain Consolidated School District	New Britain	CT	76,000	Public Service/ Tech.	8,743	5,456	No
Tucson Unified School District	Tucson	AZ	Over .5 Million	Tourism Tech./ Hlth/Ser.	62,624	32,815	Yes
St. John Parish Public Schools	Reserve	LA	42,200	Agricul.	7,140	4,264	Yes
Community School District #22	Brooklyn	NY		Varied	26,704	17197	Yes
Redwood City School District	Redwood City	CA	70,000	Prof./ Tech.	8,178	3,189	Yes
Wichita Falls Independent School District	Wichita Falls	TX	100,000	Manuf./ Military	16,000	5,600	Yes
Beacon City School District	Dutchess County	NY	19,725	Service	3,060	2,142	Yes
Palm Beach County Public Schools	Palm Beach County	FL	863,351	Tourism Service	125,043	53,768	Vol.
Dade County Public Schools	Miami	FL	1,937,194	Tourism Varied	334,444	292,982	Yes

School District	City/County	State	Pop. (1995)	Industry	District Membership 1994-95	Minority Membership 1994-95	Deseg. Plan
Corpus Christi Independent School District	Corpus Christi	TX	257,453	Varied	41,902	31,007	Voluntary
Portland School District No. 1	Portland	OR	437,319	Varied	54,849	17,030	Voluntary
Clark County School District	Las Vegas	NV	986,152	Tourism Gaming	155,845	57,663	Unitary
New Haven City School District	New Haven	CT	804,219	Varied	18,483	15,812	Voluntary
Charlotte- Mecklenberg County Public Schools	Charlotte	NC	511,481	Varied	85,483	39,237	Court- ordered
Metropolitan School District	Nashville/ Davidson County	TN	510,481	Varied	68,978	28,549	Court- ordered
Edgecombe County Public Schools	Tarboro/ Edgecombe County	NC	59,381	Manuf./ Agricul.	7,936	4,611	Court- ordered
Utica City School District	Utica	NY	68,000	High Tech.	8,178	2,948	Yes
Bibb County Board of Education	Macon/Bibb County	GA	149,967	Agricul.	Over 25,000	16,000	Yes
District of Columbia Public Schools	Washington DC	DC	606,900	Varied	80,450	77,198	No
Boston Public Schools	Boston	MA	575,000	Varied	61,253	50,227	Court- ordered

School District	City/County	State	Pop. (1995)	Industry	District Membership 1994-95	Minority Membership 1994-95	Deseg. Plan
Cleveland City Schools	Cleveland	OH	505,616	High Tech./ Varied	72,727	55,643	Court- orderd
School District of Lee County	Lee County	FL	400,000	Tourism	50,166	15,123	Court- ordered
Sacramento City Unified School District	Sacramento	CA	1,041,219	Varied	49,562	34,198	Voluntary
Topeka Public Schools	Topeka	KS	120,000	Varied	14,489	5,216	Court- ordered
Gadsden City Schools	Gadsden	AL	42,523	Tourism Agricul.	5,952	2,940	Court- ordered
Hillsborough County Public Schools	Tampa/ Hillsboroug County	FL	834,054	Manuf./ Agricul. Tech.	138,876	56,939	Court- ordered
Aldine Independent School District	Houston/ Harris County	TX	2,818,101	Heavy Industry Tech. Agricul.	43,818	33,740	Court- ordered
River Rouge City School District	River Rouge/ Wayne County	MI	11,314	Heavy Industry	2,316	1,065	Court- ordered
Dallas Independent School District	Dallas/Fort Worth	TX	1,852,810	Varied	145,270	126,792	Court- ordered
White Plains City School Distr	White Plains	NY	48,000	Varied	5,649	3,096	No
Rochester City School District	Rochester	NY	231,636	High Tech	35,177	27,438	No

School District	City/County	State	Pop (1995)	Industry	District Membership 1994-95	Minority Membership 1994-95	Deseg. Plan
San Diego Unified School District	San Diego	CA	2,498,016	Tourism High Tech.	123,106	84,943	Yes
Tacoma School District #10	Tacoma/ Pierce County	WA	176,664	Agricul. Industry	31,776	12,075	Yes
Duval County School Board	Jacksonville	FL	672,971	Tourism Argicul.	121,255	53,341	Yes
St. Lucie County School Board	Ft. Pierce	FL	150,171	Varied	26,214	11,085	Yes
Community School District #10	Bronx	NY	1,203,789	Varied	32,000	28,800	Voluntary
Community School District #25	Flushing	NY		Varied	23,370	15,750	Voluntary
San Jose Unified School District	San Jose/ Santa Clara County	CA	800,000	High Tech	31,097	20,477	Court-ordered
New Bedford Public Schools	New Bedford	MA		Varied	14,061	3,890	Voluntary

Appendix C - Profile of Magnet Schools Receiving Funding in 1995 from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Indianapolis Public Schools	Evans Academy 11	227	K-5	Whole School	163	Communications Arts and Technology	New
	Bell 21st Century	425	K-5	Whole School	306	Math, Science & Technology	New
	Kilmer Academy	422	K-5	Whole School	312	Basics	New
	Arlington	1,344	9-12	Whole School	941	College Prep & School To Work	New
Wichita Falls Independent School District	Hirschi	782	9-12	Whole School	473	Math, Science & Technology	New
San Jose Unified School District	Willow Glen High	1103	9-12	Whole School Dual Programs	722	Medical, Tourism, International Studies	Revised
	John Muir Middle	662	6-8	Whole School	454	Environmental Science and Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
San Jose Unified School District	John Muir Middle	662	6-8	Whole School	454	Environmental Science and Technology	New
	Steinbeck Middle	734	6-8	Whole School	558	Finance, Business & Telecommunications	New
	Gunderson High	1310	9-12	Whole School	786	Finance, Business & Telecommunications	New
Cleveland City School District	Mooney Middle	962	6-8	Whole School	731	Fundamental	Revised
	Lincoln Middle	812	6-8	Whole School	710	Contemporary Academy	Revised
	Spellacy Middle	N/A	6-8	Whole School	N/A	Computer Technology	Revised
	Jefferson Middle	836	6-8	Whole School	610	Computer Technology	Revised
	Gallagher Middle	N/A	6-8	Whole School	N/A	Foreign Language International Studies	Revised
	Montessor	457	6-8	TBA	422	Montessor	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Cleveland City School District	Academy of Travel & Tourism	TBA	11-12	TBA	TBA	Travel & Tourism	New
	School of Manufact. & Auto. Tech.	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	Manufacturing & Auto Technology	New
	Collinwood	1031	9-12	Partial School	949	Technology	New
Utica City School District	King Elem.	316	K-5	Whole School	266	Math & Science	Revised
	Jones Elem.	485	K-6	Whole School	96	Computers & Technology	Revised
	General Herkimer	565		Whole School	169	Communications	Revised
	Watson Williams	502	K-5	Whole School	281	Performing Arts	Revised
	Kernan Elem.	643	K-5	Whole School	173	Humanities, Arts, Media, Drama	Revised
	Thomas Jefferson	426	K-5	Whole School	164	International/ Multicultural Studies	Revised
	Hughes Elem.	380	K-6	Whole School	99	Literature/Humanities	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Utica City School District	Columbus Elem.	458	K-6	Whole School	183	Early Child./ Language Development	New
	Albany Elem.	494	K-6	Whole School	107	Careers	New
	Kennedy M.S.	891	6-8	School Within a School	357	TBA	New
	Donovan M.S.	837	6-8	School Within a School	285	Communications/ Environmental Science	New
	Proctor S.H.	1,493	9-12	Program Within a School	436	Careers	New
Darlington County School District	Mayo H.S.	488	9-12	Partial School Full-time	439	Math, Science & Technology	New
School Board of Broward County	Parkway Middle	1,715	6-8	Whole School	1269	Performing Arts	New
	New River Middle	901	6-8	Whole School	631	Marine Science	New
	Attucks Middle	628	6-8	Whole School	301	Communications/ Broadcasting	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
	Driftwood Middle	1,140	6-8	Whole School	388	Academic	New
Wake County Public School System	Center for Accelerated Studies	TBA Open yr. 3 of award	9-12	Partial School	40 (projected with magnet)	Careers	New
	Poe Elem.	444	PK-5	Whole School	266	Montessori	New
	Bugg Elem.	559	K-5		280	Arts & Science, Technology	New
	Camage Middle	1,034	6-8	Whole School	507	Science, Math & Technology	Revised
	Ligon Middle	1,025	6-8		482	Technology/Gifted	Revised
	Enloe High	1,926	9-12	Programs within a School	886	Gifted & Talented (IB)	Revised
Portland Public Schools	Jefferson High	1117	9-12	Programs within a School	833	Performing Arts/Health	New (Health)
	Harriet Tubman Middle	501	6-8	Whole School	389	Science Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
	Whitaker Middle	947	6-8	School within a School	629	Ecosystem Research	New
River Rouge City School District	Sabbath Elem.	317	K-5	Whole School	246	Math & Science	Revised
Rochester City School District	School No.15	524	PK-5	Whole School	293	Missing	New
	School No. 20	828	K-5	Program Within a School	811	Missing	New
	Audubon No. 33	1,005	K-6	Program Within a School	864	Dual Language	New
	Thomas Learning Ctr.	1,064	6-8	Program Within a School	904	Arts & Communications	New
	Monroe Middle	1,138	7-8	Program Within a School	990	International Studies	New
	Middle College High	86	9-12	Whole School	80	Pre-college/ Careers	New
Yonkers Public Schools	Foxfire	320	PK-5	Whole School	250	Experimental & Investigative Learning	New
	School 9	431	K-6	Whole School	353	Humanities	Revised
	Early Childhood Center	175	PK-K	Whole School	168	21 st Century Learner, Basic Curriculum	New
	School 14	568	K-5	Whole School	409	Math, Science, and Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Yonkers Public Schools	Scholastic Academy	685	PK-6	Whole School	525	Traditional	Revised
	Enrico Fermi	831	PK-5	Schools Within a School	690	Montessori, Arts	Revised
	Martin Luther King	530	PK-5	Whole School	432	Accelerated Schools	New
	School 32	435	PK-3	Whole School	336	Accelerated Schools	Revised
	Burroughs J.H.	858	7-8	Whole School	630	Business, Technology, Ecology	New
	Roosevelt High	1,519	9-12	Program Within a School	1148	Careers	Revised
	Lincoln High	1,558	9-12	Program Within a School	1157	Economics and Business	New
	Paideia	Open Sept. 1997	PK-4	Whole School	Open Sept. 1997	Paidea	New
Community School District #10	PS 7	813	3-5	Whole School	756	Science and Humanities	Existing
	PS 8	1,441	K-5	Program Within a School	992	Arts and Science	Existing
	PS 37	402	K-2	Whole School	378	Multiple Intelligence	Existing
	PS 56	704	K-5	Program Within a School	563	Communication and Technology	Existing
	PS 94	1110	K-5	Program Within a School	1055	21st Century	Existing

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Community School District #10	PS 95	1568	K-7	Program Within a School	1348	Multi-Media	Existing
	PS 207	676	K-2	Program Within a School	635	Technology and Arts	Existing
	PS 3	546	K-8	Whole School	197	Language	New
	PS 20	983	K-4	Program Within a School	973	Basic	New
	Bronx Academy	152	K-6	Whole School	150	Performing Arts	New
	Lehman Collaborative	3,372	9-12	School Within a School	2,159	Missing	New
Dallas Independent School District	Business and Management Center	817	9-12	Program Within a School	792	Business	Revised
	Education and Social Services	129	9-12	Program Within a School	118	Other	Revised
	High School for Health Professions	686	9-12	Program Within a School	637	Health	Revised
	Magnet Center for Public Services	293	9-12	Program Within a School	261	Other	Revised
	Science and Engineering	132	9-12	Program Within a School	108	Science and Engineering	Revised

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Dallas Independent School District	Talented and Gifted	141	9-12	Program Within a School	85	Talented and Gifted	Revised
Hillsborough County	Dowdell Middle	948	6-8	Whole School	597	Environmental Studies	New
	B.T. Washington Middle	820	6-8	Whole School	238	International Studies	New
	Shore Elementary	502	K-5	Programs Within a School	261	Visual/Performing/Communications Arts	New
	Sligh Middle	1,072	6-8	Whole School	643	Health Explorations	New
	Young Middle	1,215	6-8	Whole School	547	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Dunbar Elem.	459	K-5	Whole School	220	Math, Science and Technology	New
White Plains City School District	School for the Humanities	Missing	6-8	Whole School	Missing	Humanities	New
Bibb County Board of Education	Northeast High School	1,229	9-12	Program Within a School	1,180	Health Science	New
Community School District #25	PS 20	979	PK-6	Whole School	893	Global Studies	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Community School Dist. 25	PS 22	940	K-6	Whole School	794	Humanities	New
	PS 24	877	K-6	Whole School	818	Authors & Illustrators	New
	PS 120	822	K-6	Whole School	726	Careers	New
	PS 79	934	K-6	Whole School	361	Publishing Center	Revised
	PS 193	681	K-6	Whole School	248	School of Discovery	Revised
	PS 250	144	7-9	Whole School	58	Community Service	Revised
	Community School Dist. 1	PS 15	382	PK-6	Whole School	363	Foreign Language /Multiple Intelligence
PS 34		431	K-6	Whole School	418	Literacy	New
PS 61		370	PK-6	Whole School	326	E.C. Arts and Cultural Center	New
PS 134		470	PK-6	Whole School	456	Social Responsibility	New
PS 137		652	PK-6	Whole School	632	Astronomy	New
JHS 56		1,174	7-9	Program Within a School	1127	Technology and Education	New
JHS 60		527	7-9	Whole School	511	Career Awareness and Performing Arts	New
PS 19		745	PK-8	Program Within a School	656	Cultural and Linguistic Arts	Revised
PS 20		983	K-6	Whole School	973	Technology and the Arts	Revised

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Community School Dist. 1	PS 63	524	PK-6	Whole School	440	Math, Science, and Computer Education	Revised
	PS 64	468	PK-6	Whole School	426	Literacy and Telecom	Revised
	PS 110	561	PK-6	Whole School	511	Enrichment	Revised
	JHS 22	692	7-9	Programs Within a School	678	Legal and Environmental Studies, Journalism and Performing Arts	Revised
Springfield Public Schools	Chestnut Middle	936	6-8	Whole School	711	Visual and Performing Arts	Revised
	Brightwood Elementary	524	K-5	Whole School	466	Global Language	Revised
	Gerena Elementary	996	K-8	Whole School	787	Visual and Performing Arts	Revised
	DeBerry Elementary	347	K-8	Whole School	288	Micro-Society Through Technology	Revised
	Lincoln Elementary	464	K-5	Whole School	390	Medical Science	Revised
Gadsden City Schools	Donehoo Elementary	257	K-5	Whole School	216	Math and Science	Revised
	Adams Elementary	435	K-5	Whole School	322	Math and Science	Revised
	Cory Middle	295	6-8	Whole school	246	Math and Science	Revised
	Litchfield High	316	9-12	Whole School	292	Math and Science	Revised

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Topeka Public Schools	Scott	NA	K-5	Whole School	NA	Technology	New
	Williams	NA	K-5	Whole School	NA	Science	New
Sacramento City Unified School District	Oak Ridge Elementary	670	K-6	Whole School	639	Waldorf Inspired Academy	New
	Anthony Elementary	505	K-6	Whole School	476	Multicultural	New
	Elder Creek Elementary	738	K-6	Program Within a School	691	Young Author's Academy	New
	Kenny Elementary	648	K-5	Programs Within a School	596	Arts, Lang. & Culture	New
	Hopkins Elementary	675	K-6	Whole School	630	University/School Partnership	New
	Freeport Elem.	423	K-6	Whole School	388	Literature and Tech.	New
	Smith Elementary	395	K-3	Whole School	364	Technology and Communications	New
	Woodbine Elementary	353	K-3	Whole School	315	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Maple Elementary	272	K-6	Whole School	234	International Studies	New
	Warren Elementary	525	K-6	Whole School	454	Traditional	New
	Ridge Elementary	634	K-6	Whole School	536	International Studies	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Sacramento City Unified District	Anderson Elementary	580	K-3	Whole School	491	Creative Arts	New
	Pacific Elem.	548	K-6	Whole School	476	Lang./Arts/Science	New
	Goethe Middle	957	6-8	Program Within a School	824	Math, Science, and Career Exploration	New
	Burbank High	1,809	9-12	Program Within a School	1,518	Career Professional Studies	New
Tacoma Public Schools	Lincoln	1,345	9-12	Program Within a School	663	Business	Revised
	Wilson	1,811	9-12	Program Within a School	580	Missing	Revised
	Baker	804	6-8	Program Within a School	401	Business	Revised
	Jason Lee	740	6-8	Program Within a School	407	Fine Arts	Revised
	Mason	852	6-8	Program Within a School	247	Missing	Revised
	McIlvaigh	641	6-8	Whole School	318	Missing	Revised
	Jefferson	461	K-5	Whole School	184	Humanities	New
	Lister	427	K-5	Whole School	197	Communications	Revised
	McCarver	499	K-5	Whole School	241	Technology	Revised
	Sheridan	542	K-5	Whole School	286	Foreign Language	New
	Stanley	487	K-5	Whole School	270	Science	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Tacoma Public Schools	Whitman	405	K-5	Whole School	150	Accelerated School	New
San Diego Unified School District	Baker Elementary	712	K-6	Whole School	699	Montessori	Revised
	Balboa Elementary	1,067	K-6	Program Within a School	697	International Baccalaureate	Revised
	Burbank Elementary	580	K-3	Whole School	536	Language Arts and Communications	Revised
	Encanto Elementary	1,205	K-6	Program Within a School	1013	Science and Technology	Revised
	Fulton Elementary	539	K-5	Whole School	471	Science, Health & Physical Fitness	Revised
	Horton Elementary	915	K-6	Program Within a School	806	Humanities and Performing Arts	Revised
	Kennedy Elementary	1,210	K-6	Program Within a School	1183	Medical Science and Technology	Revised
	Knox Elementary	774	K-6	Program Within a School	685	Academics and Telecommunications	Revised
	Logan Elementary	1,032	K-6	Program Within a School	1002	International Communication and Journalism	Revised
	Sherman Elementary	1,147	K-5	Program Within a School	1111	MicroSociety	Revised

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
San Diego Unified District	Roosevelt Junior High	1042	7-9	Program Within a School	839	Science/Humanities and Technology	New
School District of Lee County	Edgewood Elementary	610	PK-5	Whole School	317	Global Studies	Revised
	Michigan Elementary	587	PK-5	Whole School	294	Montessori	Revised
	Fort Meyers Middle	826	6-8	Whole School	322	Global Studies	Revised
	Lee Middle	950	6-8	Whole School	409	Math, Science, Technology and Environmental Studies	Revised
Edgecombe County Public Schools	Princeville Elementary	252	K-2	Whole School	241	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Coker-Wimberly Elementary	367	K-3	Whole School	273	Montessori	New
	Phillips Middle	477	4-8	Whole School	380	Math, Science and Technology	New
	N. Edgecombe High	427	9-12	Whole School	356	Missing	New
Metropolitan School District	East	861	5-12	Whole School	568	Literature	New
	Pearl-Cohn	1,118	9-12	Program Within a School	794	Communications	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Metropolitan	Wharton	673	5-8		390	Arts	New
	Hull-Jackson	Open 96-97	PK-4	Whole School	Open 96-97	Montessori	New
Montgomery City Board of Education	Bear	385	K-5	Whole School	258	Math, Science & Technology	New
	MacMillan	234	K-5	Whole School	216	International Humanities/Communications	New
	Magnet Mall	N/A	9-12	Dedicated Magnet School	N/A	1. Creative and Performing Arts 2. Creative Studies 3. Advanced Tech. 4. Professional Teaching Academy 5. Communication Arts	New
	Floyd Middle	652	6-8	Whole School	565	Missing	New
Corpus Christi Independent School District	Chula Vista Academy	455	1-5	Whole School	291	Fine Arts	Revised
	Wynn Seale Middle	911	6-8	Program Within a School	840	Fine Arts	New
	Miller High	1811	9-12	Program Within a School	1719	Communications and Technology	New
School Board of Dade County	Pine lake Elementary	538	PK-5	Whole School	468	Communications and Humanities	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
School Board of Dade County	Richmond Elementary	465	PK-6	Whole School	442	Math, Science & Technology	New
	Tucker Elementary	498	PK-5	Whole School	483	Medical and Environmental Sciences	New
	Horace Mann Middle	1,901	6-8	Program Within a School	1,745	Computer Science Technology	Revised
Rockford Public Schools	Lemon GSA	407	K-6	Dedicated	216	Global Studies	Revised
	RSTA	638	K-6	Dedicated	351	Science and Technology	Revised
	Washington	732	K-6	Whole School	337	Communication Arts and Technology	Revised
	Montessori	N/A	PK-6	Program Within a School	N/A	Montessori	New
Tuscaloosa City Schools	Stafford Global Studies Center	426	K-5	Whole School	379	Global Studies	New
	University Pl.	311	K-5	Whole School	246	Montessori	New
	New Angles	Open 97-98	K-5	Whole School	Open 97-98	Traditional	New
Stockton Unified School District	Kohl	180	K-6	Whole School	138	Open Education	New
	Stockton Skills	1078	K-8	Program Within a School	860	Basic Skills	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Stockton Unified	Garfield	328	K-6	Whole School	315	Visual and Performing Arts	New
	Grant	275	K-3	Whole School	256	Math and Science	New
	Hazelton	834	K-6	Whole School	775	Academic Center for the Talented	New
	McKinley	948	P-6	Program Within a School	897	Technology	New
	Monroe	548	K-6	Program Within a School	515	Visual and Performing Arts	New
	Nightingale	423	PK-6	Whole School	400	Accelerated School	New
	Taft Elem.	462	1-6	Whole School	439	Montessori	New
	Taylor Elem.	978	PK-6	Program Within a School	880	Science	Revised
	Van Buren	496	PK-6	Whole School	487	Science and Math	New
	Hamilton	1118	7-8	Program Within a School	1021	Arts and Pre IB	Revised
	Marshall	1285	7-8	Program Within a School	1137	Science, Math and Communications	Revised
	Edison	2219	9-12	Program Within a School	1861	Missing	Revised
	Franklin	2219	9-12	Program Within a School	1861	Cluster Program e.g. IB	Revised
Clark County School District	Rancho High	2,836	9-12	Program Within a School	1815	Missing	Revised

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Clark County	Valley High	2,660	9-12	Program Within a School	1224	International Baccalaureate	Revised
	Jo Mack	412	PK-K	Whole School	235	Missing	New
Victoria Independent School District	Dudley Elementary	733	PK-5	Whole School	567	Global Technology	Revised
	Gross Elementary	244	PK-5	Whole School	161	Montessori	Revised
	Hopkins Elementary	547	PK-5	Whole School	481	Communications/Fine Arts	Revised
	Juan Linn Elementary	677	PK-5	Whole School	461	Cyberspace	Revised
	O'Connor Elementary	683	K-5	Whole School	588	Foreign Language/ Technology /Multicultural Education	Revised
	Shields Elementary	659	K-5	Whole School	514	Accelerated Learning	Revised
Regional Program	Project Learn	540	K-5	Whole School	243	Other	Revised
Palm Beach County School Board	Kennedy Middle	1227	6-8	Program Within a School	1215	International Baccalaureate	New
	Roosevelt Middle	529	6-8	Whole School	497	Math, Science and Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
	West Riviera	717	K-5	Whole School	702	Math, Science and Technology	New
	UB Kinsey/ Palmview	441	3-5	Whole School	436	Visual/Performing/ Communications Arts	Revised
	Northmore	540	K-5	Whole School	525	Science, Math and Technology	New
	Lincoln	1122	K-5	Program Within a School	1093	World Lab	New
	Washington	558	PK-K	Whole School	554	Traditional	New
Freeport Public Schools	Archer Street Microsociety and Multimedia School	530	1-4	Whole School	530	Accelerated Learning	New
	Bayview Avenue	711	1-4	Whole School	530	Arts and Sciences	New
	Leo F. Giblyn	722	1-4	Program Within a School	514	Global Studies and Intercultural Communications	New
St. Paul Public Schools	Benjamin Mays	466	K-6	Whole School	280	Communications and Leadership	New
	Washington	633	6-8	Whole School	388	Technology	New
	Arlington High	N/A	9-12	Program Within a School	N/A	International Studies	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Fresno Unified School District	Southeast Middle	209	7-8	Whole School	198	Arts, Communication and Technology	New
	Roosevelt High	3317	9-12	Program Within a School	2946	Communications	New
	King Elementary	594	K-5	Whole School	592	Math, Science, and Technology	New
	Carver Academy	382	6-8	Whole School	376	Math, Science, and Technology	New
	Edison High	1561	9-12	Program Within a School	1230	Math, Science, and Technology	New
	Baird	259	5-8	Whole School	145	International Acad.	New
	Bullard High	2572	9-12	Program Within a School	961	International Academy	New
Charlotte-Mecklenberg County Public Schools	First Ward Elementary	410	K-5	Whole School	217	Accelerated Learning Academy	New
	Oakhurst Elementary	393	K-5	Whole School	224	Paidea	New
	Bruns Elementary	463	K-5	Whole School	232	Latin Grammar	New
	Garinger High	1,571	9-12	Program Within a School	1,068	Communications Arts	New
	Collinswood High	246	9-12	Program Within a School	160	Language Immersion	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Charlotte-Mecklenberg	Sedgefield Elementary	365	K-4	Program Within a School	266	Language Immersion	New
	Smith Middle	542	6-8	Program Within a School	287	Language Immersion	New
	Billingsville Elementary	376	PK-4	Whole School	120	Montessori	New
	University Park Elementary	N/A	K-5	Whole School	N/A	Visual and Performing Arts	New
New Haven City School District	Davis Elementary	393	K-5	Whole School	336	Multi-cultural	New
	East Rock Elementary	659	K-8	Whole School	564	International Studies	New
	Edgewood Elementary	313	K-7	Whole School	262	High Order Thinking Through the Arts	New
	Strong Elementary	294	K-4	Whole School	243	Traditional	New
	Sheridan Middle	497	6-8	Whole School	451	Intellectual Exploration	New
	Career High	416	9-12	Whole School	361	The Arts	Revised
	CO-OP High	357	9-12	Whole School	305	Health and Business	Revised
District of Columbia Public Schools	Brent Elementary	280	PK-6	Whole School	272	Museum	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
District of Columbia	Stuart Hobson Middle	367	5-8	Whole School	338	Museum	New
Escambia County School District	Spencer Bibb Elementary	409	K-5	Whole School	398	Math and Science	New
	O.J. Semmes Elementary	683	K-5	Whole School	636	Montessori	New
	Brownsville Middle	857	6-8	Program Within a School	489	Arts and Math & Science	New
New Britain Consolidated School District	DiLoreto Elementary	560	PK-5	Whole School	412	Communications/ Multi-cultural	New
	Smalley Academy	658	PK-5	Whole School	588	Science/Math	New
Tucson Unified School District	Catalina High	1,269	9-12	Programs Within a School	679	Aerospace/Aviation Health Careers	New
	Cholla High	1,527	9-12	Programs Within a School	1145	Global Village: International, Intercultural and Law Studies	New
	Palo Verde High	1,354	9-12	Programs Within a School	455	Engineering and Technology	New
	Pueblo High	1,938	9-12	Programs Within a School	1711	Communication Arts/ Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Tuscon Unified School District	Tucson High	2,241	9-12	Programs Within a School	1612	Visual/Performing Arts, Science and Technology	New
Beacon City School District	South Avenue Elementary	425	K-5	Whole School	356	Democracy 2000	New
St. John Parish Public Schools	Mt. Airy/ Garyville Elementary	259	K-5	Whole School	216	Science, Math and Technology	New
Redwood City School District	Clifford	646	K-8	Whole School	247	Marine Science/ Technology	New
	Cloud	542	K-8	Whole School	148	Communications Arts/ Technology	New
	Hoover	737	K-6	Whole School	709	Mathematics Technology	New
	Orion	242	K-8	Whole School	94	Open Alternative/ Spanish Immersion	New
	Selby Lane	734	K-8	Whole School	484	Aerospace and Space Science/Technology	New
	Taft Elementary	626	K-5	Whole School	539	Literacy/Technology	New
	Kennedy Middle	1029	6-8	Program Within a School	633	Math/Technology	New
	McKinley Middle	902	6-8	Whole School	664	Performing Arts/ Communications Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Community School District 2	P.S. 40	689	K-6	Whole School	397	Professional Development	New
	P.S. 41	849	K-6	Whole School	344	The Arts	New
	P.S. 111	662	PK-6	Whole School	603	Technology	New
	P.S. 116	784	PK-6	Program Within a School	523	Gifted and Talented	New
	P.S. 217	573	K-4	Whole School	447	Missing	
	I.S. 74	1071	6-8	Program Within a School	690	Global Communication and Information Systems	New
	M.S. 158	1126	6-8	Program Within a School	700	Math, Science, and Technology	New
	M.S. 172	1187	6-8	Program Within a School	630	Media Studies	New
	J.H.S. 216	1128	6-8	Program Within a School	801	Environmental Science	New
	Community School District 22	P 203	1,083	PK-5	Program Within a School	563	Aviation
P 217		1,198	K-5	Program Within a School	934	Communications Arts and Technology	New
P 222		1,007	K-5	Program Within a School	312	International Studies	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Community School District 22	P 139	1728	PK-5	Program Within a School	1624	Gifted and Talented Visual Performing Arts	Revised
	P 277	510	PK-5	Whole School	377	Marine Biology	Revised
Roanoke Public Schools	Lincoln Terrace Elementary	272	K-5	Whole School	143	Communication	New
Durham Public Schools	C.C. Spaulding Elementary	290	K-5	Whole School	290	Biosphere	New
	Y.E. Smith Elementary	423	K-5	Whole School	398	Engineering and Technology	New
	Morehead Elementary	215	K-5	Whole School	189	Montessori	New
	R.N. Harris Elementary	315	K-5	Whole School	312	Arts Integration	New
	Club Boulevard Elementary	515	K-5	Whole School	412	Humanities	New
	Burton	356	PK-K	Whole School	352	Other	New
Long Beach Unified School District	Birney Elementary	671	K-5	Whole School	599	Environmental Science	New
	Burbank Elementary	809	K-5	Whole School	749	Performing Arts	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
Long Beach Unified	Hudson	1059	K-8	Program Within a School	965	Business and Finance	New
	Lafayette Elementary	863	K-5	Program Within a School	836	Engineering	New
	Jefferson	1040	K-8	Program Within a School	923	Environmental Science	New
	Robinson Middle	573	6-8	Whole School	454	Foreign Language	New
Community School District #3	P.S. 9	779	K-5	Whole School	483	Renaissance	New
	P.S. 75	687	K-5	Program Within a School	495	Performing Arts	New
	P.S. 84	752	K-5	Program Within a School	677	Environmental Science Arts	New
	P.S. 87	1,073	K-5	Whole School	561	Humanities	Revised
Denver Public Schools	Hallet Elementary	300	K-5	Whole School	34	Technology	Revised
	Smith Elem.	478	K-5	Whole School	372	Arts	Revised
St. Lucie County School Board	C.A.Moore	642	K-5	Whole School	456	Multimedia	New
	Mariposa	791		Whole School	348	Math, Science and Technology	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
New Bedford Public Schools	Carney	735	1-6	Whole School	368	Communications	New
	Gomes Academy	716	K-6	Whole School	329	Career and Technology	New
	Pulaski	853	PK-6	Whole School	256	Math, Science and Technology	New
Community School District #20	PS 105	1,260	PK-5	Whole School	928	Basic Skills	Revised
	PS 160	679	PK-5	Whole School	511	Basic Skills	Revised
	PS 164	520	PK-5	Whole School	409	Math, Science and Technology	Revised
	PS 170	770	PK-5	Whole School	332	School of Discovery	Revised
	PS 179	1,132	PK-5	School Within a School	769	Open Education	Revised
	PS 314	1,656	PK-5	School Within a School	1,606	Other	Revised
	IS 62	1,418	6-8	School Within a School	1,299	Arts and Science	Revised
	IS 201	1474	6-8	Missing	693	Basic Skills	Revised
	IS 220	1409	6-8	Missing	1246	Arts and Science	Revised
	IS 223	1047	6-8	Missing	767	Traditional	Revised
	IS 227	1572	6-8	School Within a School	858	Renaissance	Revised

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment	Theme	Status
Community School District #20	IS 259	1552	6-8	School Within a School	773	Multicultural	Revised
Aldine	Anderson	213	#24	Whole School	187	Montessori	New
	Bethune	364	#25	Whole School	313	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Drew	0	6-8	Whole School	0	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Carver	0	9-12	Whole School	0	Technical	New
	Stovall	878	8	Whole School	781	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Inwood	874	8	Whole School	804	Media	New
DuVal County	Woodson	363	K-5	Whole School	357	Computer Science	New
	Ribault High	1079	9-12	Whole School	1005	Military Science	New
	Payne	541	K-5	Whole School	508	Gifted, Talented, Honors	New
	Raines	1235	9-12	School Within a School	1230	Math. Science and Technology	New
	Ribault Middle	1162	6-8	School Within a School	1040	Math, Science and Technology	New
	Daniels	584	K-5	Whole School	561	Montessori	New
	Carver	517	K-5	Whole School	515	Basic Skills	New
	M.L. King	627	K-5	Whole School	590	Arts	New
	Long Branch	400	K-5	Whole School	390	Basic Skills	New

District	Magnet School	Enrollment 1994-95	Grades Served	Structure	Minority Enrollment 1994-95	Theme	Status
DuVal County	Butler	925	6-8	School Within a School	899	Media	New
	Norwood	181	K-5	Whole School	172	Media	New
	Livingston	661	K-5	Whole School	647	Business/Careers	New
	Cookman	998	6-8	School Within a School	320	Accelerated School	New
	Bethune	591	K-5	Whole School	590	Accelerated School	New
	Windy Hill	925	K-5	School Within a School	295	Enrichment	New
	Hendricks	622	K-5	Whole School	157	Enrichment	New
Community School District #26	PS 67	1144	6-8	Program Within a School	601	School of Inquiry	New
	IS 74	1071	6-8	Program Within a School	690	Global Communication and Information System	New
	MS 158	1126	6-8	Program Within a School	700	Math, Science and Technology	New
	MS 172	1187	6-8	Program Within a School	630	Media Studies	New
	JHS 216	1128	6-8	Program Within a School	801	Environmental Science	New

Appendix D: Sample Letter to District/Central Office Administrators

February 1999
813 N. Lismore Ct.
Newport News, VA 23602

Mr. Michael Bell
Director of Magnet Programs
School Board of Dade County
1500 Biscayne Blvd. Room 237
Miami, FL 33132

Dear Mr. Bell:

I am a doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and a middle school principal in Newport News, Virginia. The attached survey is part of a nationwide doctoral study in educational administration. You have been selected to participate because your school district received funding in 1995 from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. The project is specifically concerned with collecting information on enrollment data associated with eliminating, reducing, or preventing minority group isolation in magnet schools or feeder schools.

I am aware of the limitations of your time in that the completion of the survey will require a review of past data. Your participation in this study will add to the literature in this area and perhaps highlight specific common needs where further financial support for magnet programs could be requested and provided in the future.

A prepaid addressed envelope is enclosed for easy return of the survey. It will be greatly appreciated if you could return it to me by February 19, 1999. I would be pleased to send you a summary of the results upon request. If you have questions about this doctoral study, please call me at (757) 877-7132. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Willie P. Carrington
Doctoral Student

February 1999
813 N. Lismore Ct.
Newport News, VA 23602

Mr. Michael Bell
Director of Magnet Programs
School Board of Dade County
1500 Biscayne Blvd. Room 237
Miami, FL 33132

Dear Mr. Bell:

Last week a survey asking for your assistance about magnet schools that received funding in 1995 from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program was mailed to you. Your district was selected because of this award.

If you have already completed and returned it, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so as soon as possible. Because of the nature of the study, it is extremely important to magnet school educators and policymakers that your district be included in the study to ensure accuracy of results.

If by some chance you did not receive the survey, or it was misplaced, please call me collect (757) 877-7132 and another one will be mailed to you today.

Sincerely,
Willie P. Carrington
Doctoral Student

Appendix F - Websites and Internet Sources

<u>Internet Source</u>	<u>Universal Resource Locator (URL)</u>
Alabama Department of Education	http://www.alsde.edu/
American School Directory	www.asd.com
California Department of Education	www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/files/ethsch.htm
Connecticut Department of Education	http://www.state.ct.us/sde/
Denver Public Schools	http://www.denver.k12.co.us/schools/Elementary/elementary2.html
Education Links	http://www.ed.asu.edu/coe/links/links.html
ESEA	http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/sec501.HTML
Florida Department of Education	www.firn.edu
Long Beach Unified School District	http://www.lbusd.k12.ca.us/msap/magnet05.htm
Massachusetts Department of Education	http://dns.doe.mass.edu/
National Center for Education Statistics	http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/search.asp
National Education Service	www.nes.org
National Public School Locator	http://nces.ed.gov/ccdweb/school/school.asp
New York State School Districts	http://www.nysed.gov/emsc/info/NYDIST.HTML
Ohio Department of Education	http://www.ode.ohio.gov/
Oregon Department of Education	www.ode.state.or.us/stats/students/idxstdnt.htm
South Carolina Department of Education	www.state.sc.us/edu/
Tacoma Public Schools	www.tacoma.k12.wa.us/distinfo/distinfo_index.htm
Texas Department of Education	www.tea.state.tx.us
United States Census Bureau	http://www.census.gov/

Internet Source

United States Department of Education

Virginia Department of Education

Universal Resource Locator (URL)<http://www.ed.gov/index.html>www.pen.k12.va.us

Appendix G - Variables and Codes for Magnet Schools Assistance Program Districts

Variable	Code
Region	1=northeast, 2=midwest, 3=south, 4=west
Location	1=urban, 2=suburban, 3=rural, 4=combination
Population	actual number of residents
Industry	1=agriculture, 2=business, 3=manufacturing, 4=service, 5=heavy industry, 6=tourism, 7=health services, 8=technology, 9=military, 10=educational, 11=varied
Enrollment	number of students enrolled
Minority enrollment	number of minority students enrolled
Desegregation plan	1=no, 2=yes, 3=consent decree, 4=unitary

Appendix H - Variables and Codes for Magnet Schools Assistance Program Schools

Variable	Code
Region	1=northeast, 2=midwest, 3=south, 4=west
Location	1=urban, 2=suburban, 3=rural, 4=combination
Grade organization	1=k-5, 2=6,7,and 8, 3=9-12, 4=k-6, 5=pk-6, k-8, 7=k-3, 8=k-4, 9=7-9, 10=7-8, 11=k-2, 12=5-8, 13=1-4, 14=k-7, 15=pk-4, 16=1-6, 17=3-5, 18=11-12, 19=pk-3, 20=pk-8, 21=4-8, 22=5-12, 23=1-5, 24=1-3, 25=4-5, 26=pk-5, 27=pk-k
Enrollment	actual number of students enrolled
Structure	1=whole school, 2=partial school, 3=program within a school, 4=dedicated
Status	1=new, 2=revised
Theme	1=math, science/technology, 2=arts, 3=media, 4=gifted/talented/honors, 5=international studies, 6=basic skills, 7=business/careers,8=montessori, 9=others, 10=foreign language, 11=computer science, 12=multicultural, 13=technical, 14=health, 15=open education, 16=individualized education, 17=traditional, 18=science, 19=college prep & work, 20=technology, 21=democracy, 22=enrichment, 23=legal & environmental, 24=professional development, 25=humanities, 26=renaissance, 27=arts and science, 28=multiple intelligence, 29=21 st century, 30=language, 31=authors & illustrators, 32=aviation, 33=school of discovery, 34=community service, 35=school of inquiry, 36=accelerated school, 37=early childhood and language, 38=paidea, 39=latin grammar, 40=contemporary academy, 41=public service, 42=military service

Willie Patrick Carrington

813 N. Lismore Court (757) 591-4900 (work)
 Newport News, VA 23602 (757) 877-7132 (home)
 wcarring@visi.net (e-mail)

Education	Virginia Polytechnic and State University Blacksburg, VA * C.A.G.S in Educational Administration - 1996 Old Dominion University Norfolk, VA * M.Ed. In Educational Administration - 1986 Norfolk State University Norfolk, VA * B.S. in Special Education - 1980
Experience	Newport News Public Schools Newport News, VA Principal - Crittenden Middle School 1995 - present Principal - Newsome Park Middle School 1991-1995 Assistant Principal - Huntington Middle School - 1990-91 Assistant Principal - Reservoir Middle School - 1989-90 Assistant Principal - Dunbar Erwin Middle School - 1988-89 Special Education Coordinator - 1986-88 Special Education Teacher - 1980-86
Professional Service	Chairman - Principals' Center of Hampton Roads - Old Dominion University - 1998 - present Technology Chairman - African-American Critical Issues Network 1997-Present
Professional Organizations	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Phi Delta Kappa Newport News Association of Middle School Administrators Principals' Center of Hampton Road Newport News Reading Council Newport News Sister City Steering Committee Board of Directors Hampton University Physics Department (CLASS) African-American Critical Issues Network
Presentations	Planning Schools for the New Millennium, Virginia Polytechnic and State University, February 22, 1999 Schools of Choice and Resegregation, Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, November 21, 1997
Awards/Recognitions Hampton Roads	United Negro College Fund Outstanding Administrator in 1991 National PTA Lifetime Achievement Award, 1997