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Segregation has been, and continues to be, a reality for a substantial number of Chicano children and youths in elementary and secondary public schools. In that segregation practices and conditions are not conducive for optimal learning, it is not surprising that school segregation is inextricably linked to Chicano school failure. As noted by Valencia (Chapter 1, this volume), the segregation of Chicano students constitutes a major obstacle in their schooling experience, meaning that such racial/ethnic isolation can be considered a key institutional process in denying Hispanics equal educational opportunities.

This chapter offers a comprehensive update of what we presented in the first edition of Chicano School Failure and Success (Donato et al., 1991). Our current chapter is organized around four sections. First, there is the "Introduction" in which we cover: (a) prevalence of segregation, and (b) adverse effects of segregation. Second, we present "Racism and Chicano school segregation: a historical perspective." This section includes: (a) racism and the structural foundation of segregation; (b) the rooting of Chicano school segregation; (c) early Chicano desegregation litigation. Third, we offer a section on "Contemporary issues in Chicano segregation." Here, we present discussions on: (a) community studies of Chicano segregation: a silent problem; (b) language segregation: old problems, new issues; (c) academic desegregation. Fourth, we present a section on "Towards integration," in which we discuss: (a) community case studies of historical segregation; (b) residential segregation; (c) busing; (d) Chicano/African American coalitions; (e) Chicano school board membership; (f) two-way bilingual education; (g) "critical theory" in teacher education.

Introduction

The forced separation of Chicano children and youths from their White peers in public schools has its roots in the post-1848 decades following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Subsequently, racial/ethnic isolation of schoolchildren became a normative practice in the Southwest—despite states having no legal statutes to segregate Chicano students from White students (San Miguel and Valencia, 1998). What follows is a capsulation of the historical and contemporary prevalence of Chicano school segregation and the adverse effects of such segregation on Chicano academic achievement.

Prevalence of segregation

Local officials such as city council and school board members established schools for Mexican-origin children in the post-1848 period, but given that they were more interested in first providing White children with school facilities, the Mexican schools were few in
number. Local and state political leaders' lack of commitment to public schooling, racial prejudice, and political differences among Anglos and Mexicans accounted for this practice (Atkins, 1978; Friedman, 1978; Hendrick, 1977; Weinberg, 1977).

After the 1870s, the number of schools for Mexican-origin children increased dramatically due to popular demand, legal mandates, increasing financial ability, and a greater acceptance of the idea of common schooling by local and state political leaders (Atkins, 1978; Eby, 1935; Pearis, 1962). This educational access occurred, however, in the context of increasing societal discrimination and a general subordination of Mexican Americans. Out of this relationship between society and education there emerged a pattern of institutional discrimination that was reflected in the establishment of segregated schools for Mexican-origin children. In New Mexico, for instance, officials began to establish segregated schools in 1872. By the 1880s, over 90 percent of the territory's school-age population, most of whom were Mexican children, were enrolled in these segregated schools (Chaves, 1892).

Despite the influx of Mexican immigrant students, California officials did not build any additional schools for Mexican children until the turn of the century. Those that existed continued to be segregated and, in some cases, were inferior to the Anglo schools (California Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1869). In Texas, officials established segregated schools for Mexican working-class children in the rural areas during the 1880s and in the urban areas in the 1890s. The need to maintain a cheap labor source in the ranches probably accounted for the earlier presence of Mexican schools in the rural areas (Friedman, 1978; Weinberg, 1977). In the early 1900s, segregated schools were established by large-scale growers as a means of preventing the Mexican students from attending White schools. One of the first Mexican schools was established at the turn of the century in Central Texas (Seguin), and afterwards the process of constructing separate Mexican schools became a common practice throughout the state (Rangel and Alcala, 1972).

The segregation of Mexican American students in the Southwest continued to rise into the 1890s and spilled over to the 20th century. By the beginning of the 1930s, the educational template for Chicano students—one of forced, widespread segregation and inferior schooling—was formed. In California and Texas, the Mexican American population increased dramatically, and local school boards instituted practices that led to the further segregation of Mexican American students from their White peers. By 1931, 85 percent of California schools surveyed by Leis (1931) reported segregating Mexican American students either in separate schools or separate classrooms (also, see Hendrick, 1977). Leis, with the cooperation of the County Superintendent of San Bernardino, surveyed 13 school districts in California. These districts had nearly 28,000 students enrolled—25 percent of whom were Mexican American. Leis reported that 11 (85 percent) of the 13 districts surveyed stated that they segregated Mexican American students for the first several grades. Reasons given for the separation of White and Mexican American children was "entirely or partly . . . for educational purposes" (p. 25). More specifically, Leis reported that generally segregation ends in the fourth, fifth, or sixth grade because the language handicap has practically disappeared and social adaptation has fitted the Mexican child to go into the grades with the white children if he remains in school. Excessive dropping out at these levels is a large factor in discontinuing segregation.

(1931, p. 66)

The school segregation of Mexican students was also widespread in Texas and coincided with a period of dramatic growth in the immigrant population (Montejano, 1987). As in
California, segregated schools were a direct outgrowth of residential segregation, increasing Mexican immigration, and in particular, racial discrimination. Moreover, in the late 1920s school segregation became more intense and it coincided with the growth of the Mexican immigrant population (Montejano, 1987). In the areas where the newcomers were concentrated, such as the lower Rio Grande Valley, the school segregation of Mexican students radically increased. Reconstructing the educational histories of local communities in the lower Rio Grande Valley, Montejano concluded that Mexican immigration and residential and school segregation were inextricably part of the same process:

The towns of Edinburg, Harlingen, and San Benito segregated their Mexican school children through the fourth and fifth grades. And along the dense string of newcomers towns of Highway 83—the "longest mile" of McAllen, Mercedes, Mission, Pharr-San Juan, and Weslaco—Mexican school segregation was an unbroken policy. On the Gulf Coast plains, Raymondville, Kingsville, Robstown, Kennedy, and Taft were among the new towns where segregation was practiced. And in the Winter Garden area, Mexicans were segregated through the fifth grade in Crystal City, Carrizo Springs, Palm, Valley Wells, Asherton, and Frio Town.

By 1930, 90 percent of the schools in Texas were racially segregated (Rangel and Alcala, 1977).

With the increase in the Mexican-origin population and the escalating barrioization of Chicano communities, school segregation from the 1930s to the 1970s became fairly entrenched for many Chicano students throughout the Southwest. In 1971, the Mexican American Education Study (MAES) report on the racial/ethnic isolation of Mexican American elementary and secondary students in the five Southwestern states (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas) confirmed that the historical segregation of Mexican American students persisted into the contemporary period (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1971). In 1968, one in two Mexican American students attended schools in which they comprised the predominant racial/ethnic group (i.e., 50 to 100 percent Mexican American enrollment); one in five Mexican American students attended schools that were 80 to 100 percent Mexican American.

Later studies showed that Mexican American student segregation intensified from the MAES 1968 baseline date. For example, Orfield (1988a) compared Latino student segregation regionally and nationally from 1968 to 1984 (also, see Orfield, 1988b). The data in Table 3.1 show that for this 16-year period, Orfield's analysis of national data revealed that the percentage of Latinos enrolled in predominantly White schools dropped by 36 percent. For Latino students enrolled in 90 to 100 percent minority schools, Latino enrollment increased 35 percent. For the West, Latino enrollment in predominantly White schools declined by 45 percent; in 90 to 100 percent minority schools, Latino enrollment soared by 92 percent.

Orfield and associates have continued to study school segregation trends (see, e.g., Orfield, 2001; Orfield et al., 1997; Orfield and Yun, 1999). Regarding Chicanos/other Latinos, these students presently maintain a pattern of hypersegregation that was reported in the first edition of the present volume (Donato et al., 1991, p. 28; Valencia, 1991, p. 7). In their recent study, Orfield and Yun found that one of the most important trends "is the continuation of a long and relentless march toward even more severe segregation for Latino students as they become our largest minority" (p. 11). Orfield and Yun also noted: "Latino


Table 3.1 Latino segregation by region: 1968-1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-44.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-32.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>242.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-35.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Orfield (1988a). With permission of author.

Students are significantly more segregated than African Americans and segregation has been rapidly growing in the states where they have the largest enrollments (p. 21).

The most recent reports by Orfield and associates—Orfield (2001), and Orfield and Yun (1999)—contain rich data on Latino segregation trends. Here we glean three of the authors' major findings.

National trends

In the 1968-1969 school year, 45 percent of Latino students attended majority White schools. The next generation of Latino students has significantly less contact with White students. In the 1998-1999 school year—three decades later—only 25 percent of Latinos were enrolled in majority White schools (see Orfield, 2001, p. 33, Table 9).

Another manner of viewing national trends in school segregation is to examine changes over time of the presence of Latinos and African Americans in predominantly and intensely segregated schools. Orfield (2001) has done just such. These data are presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Percentage of Latino and African American students in predominantly and intensely segregated minority schools: 1968-1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Predominantly Latino/African American school (50-100% minority)</th>
<th>Intensely Latino/African American school (90-100% minority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1987</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Orfield (2001, p. 34, Table 9). With permission of author.
Two major points can be gleaned from these data:

- Whereas African American presence in intensely segregated schools (90 to 100 percent minority) has dropped from 64.3 percent in 1968-1969 to 36.5 percent in 1998-1999 (decline of 27.8 percentage points), Latino percentage in intensely segregated schools actually increased 13.5 percentage points during the same period (from 23.1 to 36.6 percent).

- Regarding presence in predominantly segregated (50 to 100 percent) minority schools in the 1968-1969 to 1998-1999 time period, African Americans declined by 6.4 percentage points (from 76.6 to 70.2 percent). By sharp contrast, Latino presence increased 20.8 percentage points. In 1968-1969, more than half (54.8 percent) of Latino students attended predominantly minority schools across the nation. By 1998-1999, however, three-fourths (75.6 percent) of Latino students were enrolled in such schools. Orfield noted: "By this measure Latinos have been substantially more segregated than black students since 1980, although black segregation gradually narrowed the gap in the 1990s" (p. 34).

In sum, these national trends clearly point to hypersegregation of Chicano/Latino students. Unfortunately, such patterns often go overlooked. As Orfield (2001) commented: "The more dramatic and largely ignored [segregation] trends are those affecting Latinos" (p. 34).

**Regional trends**

In the 1998-1999 school year, the Northeast was the most segregated region for Latino students (79 percent attended 50 to 100 percent minority schools); the Midwest was the least segregated (56 percent). The South and West regions were slightly behind the Northeast in Latino student segregation. In the West, where the vast majority of Chicano/other Latino students attend school, 78 percent were enrolled in 50 to 100 percent minority schools, and 35 percent of those students were enrolled in 90 to 100 percent minority schools (see Orfield, 2001, p. 46, Table 18).

**State trends (Southwest)**

Orfield and Yun (1999) noted: "The scope of the changes in Latino segregation has not been widely recognized because Latinos are concentrated in the Southwest, where they play a very large and historic role in the society" (p. 22). As such, we focus on the five Southwestern states from the data Orfield (2001) presents in his Table 19 (p. 47). Table 3.3 shows the changes in the percentages of White students attended by a typical Latino student, from 1970 to 1998. The five Southwestern states are listed alphabetically.

The data presented in Table 3.3 show that in all five Southwestern states, Latino students attended schools with higher percentages of White students in 1970 than they did in 1998. For example, in California in 1970 Latino students were enrolled in schools with an average 54 percent White enrollment. In 1998, however, Latinos attended schools where the average White enrollment had sharply declined to 22 percent. Table 3.3 also shows data from the Orfield (2001) report that suggest segregation/desegregation trends in the Southwestern states. Drawing from the slightly earlier report of 1999, Orfield and Yun explained the trends as follows:
Texas and Colorado Latinos actually had an increase in integration from 1970 to 1980, probably from busing orders, but Texas was one of the first states to end its urban desegregation plans and Latinos were more segregated in 1996 than they had been 26 years earlier. Colorado Latinos were far more integrated than those on the other Southwestern states through 1996, but since then the federal court has ended desegregation in Denver and state law forbids busing for desegregation without a federal court order. (p. 22)

National, regional, and Southwestern reports certainly provide data on the prevalence of Chican/o student segregation. It is also important, however, not to forget segregation at the local district level. As a case in point, we present a profile of one school district—the Austin Independent School District (AISD), which is 1 of 1,041 districts in Texas. In the 1998-1999 school year, AISD had a total of over 78,000 students in its 92 elementary, middle, and high schools. The percentage breakdowns by race/ethnicity were: Hispanic (43.9 percent), White (36.0 percent), Black (17.3 percent), Asian/Pacific Islander (2.5 percent), and American Indian (0.3 percent) (Texas Education Agency, 2000a). Similar to many other racially/ethnically diverse school districts in Texas, AISD is highly segregated. To quantify the extent of this racial/ethnic isolation, Valencia (2000) divided the AISD into three school levels—elementary, middle, and high—and then calculated the number of racially/ethnically “balanced” and “imbalanced” schools. The rule of thumb Valencia used to determine balance/imbalance was the “±15%” rule (see, e.g., U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1971). One takes the percentage of the combined total enrollment of minority students in a school district, and then adds 15 percentage points to obtain the upper limit of the band and also subtracts 15 percentage points to obtain the lower limit of the band. Individual schools that fall within the band’s upper and lower limits in combined minority percentage are deemed racially/ethnically “balanced.” Schools that fall outside the lower or upper limits are considered “imbalanced.” Table 3.4 presents the results of Valencia’s analysis for the AISD elementary, middle, and high school levels—which Valencia viewed as independent units for the sake of illustration, although all together they constitute one school district. The data show that at the elementary level (N = 67 schools), 76 percent of the schools (n = 51) are imbalanced (61 percent being predominantly minority, 39 percent being predominantly White), and only 24 percent of the schools (n = 16) are deemed balanced using the (±15%) rule. Of the 31 predominantly minority schools, 24 are majority Chican/o/other Latino, five are majority African American, and two are neither majority Chican/o/other Latino or African American. Table 3.3 also shows similar segregation patterns for the middle and high school levels. One can only conclude that AISD is a highly segregated school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Orfield (2001, p. 47, Table 19). With permission of author.
Table 3.4 Segregation in Austin Independent School District 1998–1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Segregation status (racial/ethnic mix) of schools</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity of imbalanced schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Imbalanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total schools</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>62,356</td>
<td>14,038 (33.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total schools</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>16,023</td>
<td>5,988 (37.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>19,697</td>
<td>8,105 (41.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Valencia (2000, p. 449, Table 1). Data source is Texas Education Agency (2000a).
district. The degree of segregation in AISD is typical of Texas' K-12 public schools. In the 1993-1994 school year, close to two in three (64 percent) of all Chicano/other Latino students in the state attended schools in which 70 percent or more of the students were racial/ethnic minorities. About one in two (49 percent) of all African American students were enrolled in such schools. By sharp contrast, about one in fourteen (7 percent) of all White students were enrolled in these 70 percent or greater minority schools (Brooks and South, 1995). This pervasive pattern of school segregation in Texas schools continues to the present.

Adverse effects of segregation

Historically, the context for learning in Chicano segregated schools has been extremely poor. González (1990) described these early conditions (1930s) as such:

- Inadequate resources, poor equipment, and unfit building construction made Mexican schools vastly inferior to Anglo schools. In addition, school districts paid teachers at Mexican schools less than teachers at Anglo schools, and many times a promotion for a teacher at a Mexican school meant moving to the Anglo school. Quite often, however, teachers in Mexican schools were either beginners or had been "banished" as incompetent.

There are a number of accounts from decades past that document the considerably poor conditions endured by Chicano students in segregated schools. For example, Menchaca and Valencia (1990) contrasted the Mexican and Anglo schools built in the mid-1920s in Santa Paula, California. The Mexican school enrolled nearly 1,000 students in a schoolhouse with eight classrooms (grades K-8) and contained two bathrooms and one administrative office. On the other hand, the Anglo school enrolled less than 700 students and contained 21 classrooms, a cafeteria, a training shop, and several administrative offices. In short, the Mexican school—compared to the Anglo school—had a much higher student per classroom ratio and inferior facilities. Fifteen miles away from Santa Paula, in the coastal city of Oxnard, Chicano students fared no better in segregated schools. McCurdy (1975) in a Los Angeles Times article reported how several past school superintendents described the deplorable schooling conditions Chicano children experienced in the 1930s.7

One school was described as "literally no more than a chicken coop. It had a dirt floor, single thickness walls, very run down, some stench from the toilet facility." Another school had a floor made from "just black asphalt of the type you would see placed on street pavement," a former superintendent said. "In the classroom, there was a single light bulb, not a large one... It may have been a 100-watt bulb, screwed into an outlet in the center of the ceiling," he said. "It was one of the least desirable learning environments that one could devise."

The inferior conditions in Mexican American schools were further documented by Calderón (1950) in his master's thesis, which consisted of case studies of two Mexican American schools and one Anglo school in Edcouch-Elsa, Texas (lower Rio Grande Valley).8 Calderón reported that average class sizes in the Mexican American schools were in the high 30s and low 40s, while the average size in the Anglo school was 33. Regarding promotion
practices, he noted that the Mexican American “children were compelled to spend two years in the first grade without regard to the ability of the student to do the work” (p. 20). The Anglo school had a band, cafeteria, and students had regular access to dental and medical services, whereas the Mexican American schools did not have such access to these facilities and services. Additionally, Calderón noted that Anglo and Mexican American children traveled to school together, but the latter students “were traditionally seated in the rear of the bus” (p. 40). Calderón’s thesis is particularly insightful as his report contains contrasting, highly detailed photographs of facility conditions at the schools. The Anglo school had inside lavatories, with walls separating the commodes, and tile floors. Water fountains, electrically cooled, were also located inside the school building. Classroom light bulbs were shielded, thus providing diffuse lighting. By sharp contrast, the Mexican American schools had lavatories outside the building, no separating stalls, and bare concrete floors. Drinking fountains with non-cooled water were also located outside. Finally, bare light bulbs hung from the ceilings.

Another example of the early inferior schooling conditions in the Southwest that Mexican American students faced comes from the study by Maddux (1932) who described schooling conditions for Mexican American children in separate classrooms in Weld County, Colorado. Mexican children often attended “rooms . . . located in basements [of schools] with bad lighting and poor ventilation. The Mexican room in [the town of] Kersey is in the basement under the gymnasium,” said Maddux. “When the gymnasium is in use the noise is deafening. . . . [In this school] the small children have to sit on cigar boxes” (pp. 34–35).

It is not surprising that during the 1930–1960 time period, segregated and inferior schooling conditions for Mexican Americans would frequently lead to poor academic performance, progress, and attainment. In a comprehensive report, titled The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in Five Southwestern States, Reynolds (1933) quoted an Arizona study as follows: “In general, the type of Mexican child taken into the Arizona school tends to be backward in rate of mental development, lags a year behind other pupils, shows a heavy failure percentage, and an early elimination from school” (p. 38). An example of such school failure was the finding that for every “100 Mexican children in grade 1 there are 7 in grade 8, while for 100 non-Mexican children in grade 1 there are 52 in grade 8” (p. 39).

The above study by Reynolds (1933) was sponsored by the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of the Interior. Though ambitious in scope, the study provided scattered information about schooling conditions of “Mexican” (i.e., Mexican American) students attending schools in the five Southwestern states. Major findings were:

1. Mexican American children frequently attended segregated schools, and such isolation, it was noted, was based on “instructional” reasons (usually to learn English). Reynolds noted: “In the opinion of the many experienced teachers and supervisors the fourth or fifth is the grade at which separate instruction form Mexican pupils should end” (p. 11). Reynolds also commented: “Practically, however, so few Mexican pupils reach the upper elementary grades that the opinion has not to date received much of a test” (p. 11).
2. “Teaching materials adequate in amount and of the right kind for Mexican children are conspicuously absent” (p. 18).
3. “Teachers, even experienced ones, reported they were ill-equipped to teach the Mexican American students (particularly Spanish-speakers), and received ‘little supervisory guidance’” (p. 22).
4. The percentage of Mexican American teachers was extremely small; based on a survey of seven selected counties in the five states, “the total number of teachers . . . is 2,320. This number includes 26 (1.1 percent) Mexicans” (p. 23).
In sum, there is considerable historical evidence that Chicano students experienced massive schooling inequalities. This segregated and inferior schooling led to school failure for many of these students (e.g., poor academic achievement; early exiting from the schooling process). It is not surprising that the Chicano community mounted a campaign for educational equality, a topic we cover later in this chapter (also, see Donato, 1997; San Miguel, 1987; San Miguel and Valencia, 1998; Valencia and Black, 2002).

Suffice it to say, the inadequate educational conditions experienced by Chicano students in the past were detrimental to promoting an optimal learning environment. Although the current facilities in Chicano segregated schools may not be as deplorable as in the past, the legacy of inferiority certainly continues. A major contributing factor to the maintenance of inferior conditions—as manifested in limited resources for Chicano segregated schools—is school financing inequities (see Valencia, Chapter 1, this volume).

Notwithstanding the extreme importance of attaining equity in school financing for Chicano schools (e.g., more funds to build new schools; money to purchase computers), there remains the stubborn relation between school segregation of Chicanos and lowered academic achievement. The studies we discuss next clearly point to the reality that school segregation of Chicanos leads to limited equal educational opportunities, and these limitations, in turn, manifest in poor academic achievement. For example, Jaeger (1987) examined the relation between achievement test scores and percent Black and Latino high school students in metropolitan Los Angeles (1984-1985 school year). The observed correlations were very strong: mathematics (−0.89), reading (−0.50), and writing (−0.85). That is, as minority enrollment increased, achievement decreased. Jaeger reported that the correlations between school enrollment percentage of White students and achievement test scores were likewise of very high magnitudes (0.80\text{a}), but of the opposite direction (i.e., as White enrollment in the high schools increased, test scores also increased). Finally, Jaeger disaggregated the data and found that when only the percentage of Latino students in the high schools was correlated with achievement, the relations were not as strong for the Black/Latino aggregate, but still quite substantial (mathematics, −0.53, reading, −0.58, and writing, −0.53).

Espinosa and Ochoa (1986) have also provided supporting evidence for the connection between Chicano segregation and diminished achievement in California—a state in which Chicano school segregation has also increased in the last 30 years. Using a large statewide sample (4,268 public elementary schools and 791 public high schools), Espinosa and Ochoa correlated California Assessment Program (CAP) scores (average of math and reading achievement) with percent of Latino students in grades 3, 6, and 12. The relation between Latino concentration and CAP achievement was strongly defined (e.g., at grade 12 the observed \( r \) was −0.49).

In another investigation, Valencia (1984a) also found a substantial relation between minority concentration in schools and academic achievement. The setting for the study was the Phoenix Union High School District (PUHSD) No. 210. Valencia—as part of his work as an expert witness in a school closure trial in the PUHSD—calculated the correlation between the percentage of Black/Latino enrollment with mean stanines of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills for grades 9 through 12 in the District’s 11 high schools. Table 3.5 lists the ranking of the 11 schools by minority student enrollment accompanied by each
school's respective rank (lowest to highest) on achievement. The statistical analysis (Spearman rank correlation coefficient) computed by Valencia revealed that the association between Black/Latino percentage of the various high schools with their respective test scores was very strong ($r_s = 0.96$)—once again underscoring the ubiquitous connection between school segregation and low academic performance.

Orfield (1988a) reported that the Black/Latino percentage of schools was very negatively associated ($r = -0.92$) with average college admissions test scores. When the analyses were disaggregated by ethnicity, the correlations for Latino high school students were $-0.40$ (percent Latino with graduation rate) and $-0.43$ (percent Latino with college entrance scores).

Still yet another example of empirical research investigating the relation between Chicano (and other minority student) segregation and achievement test scores is the study by Valencia (2000). He correlated failure rates on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS—all test sections, all students; 1998–1999 school year) with the percentage of combined minority student enrollment in the 67 elementary schools in the Austin Independent School District (AISD; see previous discussion on "Prevalence of segregation" for a description of the racial/ethnic distribution of the AISD). The cornerstone of Texas' accountability system is the TAAS test, which is administered annually in grades 3 to 8, and 10, and consists of reading, mathematics, and writing. Figure 3.1 graphically presents Valencia's results via a scatter-plot of the correlational analysis. It can be clearly seen that as the percentage of minority enrollment increases in the schools, there is a tendency for the percentate of students who fail TAAS to increase. The observed Pearson product-moment correlation of 0.87 suggests a very strong relation between the two variables. Though Valencia did not graphically present the correlational analyses for the middle and high schools in the AISD, he reported that the correlation coefficients were also robust—0.84 for the 15 middle schools and 0.96 for the ten high schools (see Table 3.3 of the present chapter for racial/ethnic distributions of the middle and high schools, and for segregation patterns).

On a final note, there is evidence that the relation between school segregation and schooling problems is not confined to test score outcomes. For example, Orfield (1988a) found
that the correlation between the percentage of Black/Latino students and graduation rate in metropolitan Chicago high schools was a staggering -0.83. Furthermore, a correlation of -0.47 was observed between percent minority high school students and percent of students taking the college entrance examinations.

In a more recent study demonstrating that minority school segregation is linked to higher dropout rates, Valencia (2001) examined the high schools in the AISD. Of the ten high schools, campus graduation rates ("% graduated") for the class of 1999 were available for eight schools (Texas Education Agency, 2000a). Valencia correlated percentage of combined Hispanic and African American students (grades 9–12) with campus graduation percentage. The observed $r$ was -0.89, suggesting a very strong negative correlation between percent minority enrollment and rate of graduation in the AISD's high schools. An example of this relation is illustrated by examining two extreme schools (of the eight). Johnston High School, a predominantly Chicano/other Latino and African American school (combined 84.1 percent; 15.3 percent White), had a campus graduation rate of 67.7 percent. By sharp contrast, Anderson High School (predominantly White [67.3 percent]; 27.6 percent combined Chicano/other Latino and African American) had a campus graduation rate of 90.6 percent. What this above $r$ of -0.89 means is that Chicano/other Latino and African American students who attend the more highly segregated high schools in the AISD have a lower probability of graduating from high school, and subsequently matriculating to four-year college.

Valencia (2001)—in his investigation of the AISD high schools—also investigated an indirect indicator of student success in college—"TAAS/TASP equivalency." The TAAS, which we described previously, is Texas' mandated testing program. The TASP (Texas Academic Skills Program), on the other hand,

is a test of reading, writing, and mathematics, required of all persons entering undergraduate programs at Texas public institutions of higher education for the first time. This indicator [the TAAS/TASP equivalency] shows the percent of [high school]"
Valencia correlated the percentage of combined Hispanic and African American students with the TAAS/TASP equivalency (a percentage) for the ten high schools in the AISD. The observed $r$ was a strong -0.79. This relation suggests that Chicano/other Latino and African American students, as a group, who attend the more highly segregated minority high schools in the AISD have a lower probability of doing well on the TAAS/TASP equivalency indicator. Thus, these students—on the average—have a smaller chance of passing the TASP compared to their White peers, who—on the average—have a higher TAAS/TASP equivalency. For example, Reagan High School (92.9 percent combined Chicano/other Latino and African American enrollment) had a campus TAAS/TASP equivalency of only 39.1 percent, which means that only four in ten Reagan graduates did well enough on the TAAS to have a 75 percent chance of passing TASP. Strikingly different is Anderson High School (27.6 percent combined Chicano/other Latino and African American), which had a campus TAAS/TASP equivalency of 70.9 percent. This means that about seven in ten Anderson students scored well enough on TAAS to have a 75 percent chance of passing TASP. Similar test score discrepancies are clearly seen statewide in Texas’ highly segregated high schools. The most recent data show the following TAAS/TASP equivalencies, which are for the aggregate (state) and disaggregation (race/ethnicity) (Texas Education Agency, 2000a, p. 42):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>TAAS/TASP Equivalency (%)</th>
<th>Class of 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implication of these data does not fare well for Texas’ public high schools. The vast majority of Latinos and African American students who graduate from high school do not perform well enough on TAAS to even have a 75 percent chance of passing the TASP. It is important to reiterate that there is a statistical connection between school segregation and TAAS/TASP equivalency at the campus level. As racial/ethnic isolation of Chicano/other Latino and African American students increases at the high school level, there is a tendency for the TAAS/TASP equivalency indicator to decrease. Furthermore, when Chicano/other Latino and African American students enroll in four-year public universities, their TASP pass rates are considerably lower than their White peers. Although such data are not available by race/ethnicity, examining TASP pass rates at traditionally White (e.g., The University of Texas at Austin; 63.6 percent White), Hispanic (e.g., The University of Texas, Pan American; 83.5 percent Hispanic), and African American universities (e.g., Prairie View A&M University; 87.8 percent African American) suggest that different racial/ethnic patterns exist (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2001). The TASP pass rates for UT Austin, UT Pan American, and Prairie View A&M in the 1998–1999 school year were 71.2 percent, 32.3 percent, and 20.4 percent, respectively.
In conclusion, there is a great deal of historical and contemporary evidence that the school segregation of Chicano students in our nation's public elementary and secondary schools is related to school failure, hence inequality. Findings from various studies and reports indicate that segregated Chicano schools tend to be schools characterized by a disproportionately high percentage of low-income students, low funding, high dropout rates, low achievement test scores, few college preparatory courses, and low matriculation rates to college. There is no doubt that the isolation of Chicano students in schools that suffer from deficiencies in facilities, resources, and curricula offerings is far from desirable. The desegregation of Chicano schools and the subsequent integration of Chicano/other minority and White students in equitable learning contexts is a commendable goal. Later, we share our thoughts and ideas how such integration could be realized. But first, it is necessary to understand the historical roots of segregation. Our proposition is that in order to move toward the goal of desegregation and integration of Chicano students, one must have a good grasp of the events and forces that helped shape the educational isolation of Chicanos.

Racism and Chicano school segregation in the Southwest: a historical perspective

In this section we offer our perspective on the historical development of Chicano school segregation. We do so by discussing three major aspects: racism and the structural foundations of segregation, the rooting of Chicano school segregation, and a brief overview of early Chicano school desegregation litigation.

Racism and the structural foundations of segregation

There is ample evidence that the ideological foundations of school segregation date back to the 19th century racial belief that White groups should not socially interact with biologically inferior colored races (Kovitz, 1946; Menchaca, 1987, 1997; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990). During the 19th century, White supremacy ideologies helped to promote the belief that racial minority groups were inherently inferior and helped to provide the rationale to segregate the “colored races” (Comas, 1961; Jackson, 1986). Racism was institutionalized within the academic, religious, and governmental spheres and it culminated in the passage of de jure segregation (Menchaca and Valencia, 1990). Within the academic sphere, historians were at the forefront in proselytizing a White superiority ideology and argued in favor of eugenics to ensure that the White races would remain pure (Pagin, 1989; Gossett, 1953, 1977). Historians also favored the social segregation of the colored races as being the most practical method of preventing racial intermingling. The religious sphere was also included in the racist ideologies of the era, in which some churches practiced segregation. The belief that the Anglo-Saxons were “God’s chosen people” provided the rationale to support the view that God did not intend the races to mix because he had “not created all the races equal.” Within the Protestant Church, White supremacist pastors interpreted the doctrine as God’s plan to rid the world of the “colored” races and thus make room for the superior White races. For example, the genocide of the American Indian was figuratively interpreted to be the result of God’s predestined will to improve the racial makeup of the world (Gossett, 1953, 1977; Newcombe, 1985). In many congregations, racism was manifested in the total exclusion of racial minority groups. “Colored people” were expected to attend services in their own churches, and in more tolerant congregations racial minorities were allowed to attend church but were expected to sit apart from the White congregation (Cadena, 1987; Glazer and Moynihan, 1963; Menchaca, 1989, 1995; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990).
White supremacist views also surfaced in the governmental sphere and culminated in the legislation of segregationist laws. The passage of “separate but equal legislation” in the 19th century reflected the government’s endorsement of the widespread racial ideologies of the period (Feagin, 1989; Hendrick, 1977; Wollenberg, 1978). At the federal level, the passage of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 was a blatant example of the government’s approval of the rationale that the colored races should not mix with Whites. Though *Plessy* was passed with the specific intention of segregating Blacks, the case was used to justify all forms of social segregation. At the local level, city governments used the legislation to segregate other racial minority groups by arguing that the spirit of the law applied to all “coloreds” (Hyman and Wierck, 1982; Konvitz, 1946; Menchaca, 2001). Moreover, *Plessy v. Ferguson* represented a symbolic action on part of the federal legislators to enact an undisputable law that gave the states the right to practice segregation.

By the early 1900s, most states practiced some form of social segregation and had institutionalized school segregation as the main vehicle to maintain a segregated society (Feagin, 1989). The rationale being that if the children of the White and “colored” races were socialized not to intermarry, the groups would not marry, and thus the purity of each race would be retained (Konvitz, 1946). Racial minorities questioned the extension of segregationist legislation to the educational domain and therefore took their plight to the U.S. Supreme Court. In several U.S. Supreme Court cases, however, the court asserted the states’ rights to segregate the “colored races” and ruled against anti-segregationist practices. For example, in 1927 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Gang Law v. Rice* that the separation of the colored races in the schools was within the discretion of the State and not in conflict with the 14th amendment (Konvitz, 1946). Over a decade later, the rule of separate but equal facilities in educational institutions was reasserted in the U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1938 in *Guam v. Canada*. Although the federal courts did not legislate a mandate that “all colored children must be segregated,” they supported the states’ rights to institute school segregation if desired by the legislators.

Paradoxically, although Chicanos were not specifically mentioned in the “separate but equal legislation” there is ample evidence that they were often treated as “colored” and were consequently segregated in most social spheres. Historically, the rationale used to socially segregate Mexicans was based on the racial perspective that Mexicans were “Indian,” or at best “half-breeds savages” who were not suited to interact with Whites (Menchaca and Valencia, 1990; Paredes, 1978; Schaeve, 1982). Although the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo had guaranteed Mexicans the political privileges enjoyed by Whites (Griswold del Castillo, 1990), state legislators in the latter half of the 19th century and early 1900s attempted to violate the agreement (Menchaca, 2001). Legislators sought to limit the Mexicans’ political and social rights based on the rationale that Mexicans were Indians. They argued that because Indians by law were prohibited from voting, residing in White neighborhoods, and attending schools with White children, these laws also applied to Mexicans (Heizer and Amquist, 1971). For example, in California the state constitution prohibited Mexicans who were Indian, Black, and mestizo (White/Indian) from voting, and only extended that privilege to “White-looking Mexican” males (California State Constitution of 1849, Article II, Section 1; Menchaca, 2001; Padilla, 1979). In the area of naturalization the federal government also attempted to deny Mexican immigrants their right to apply for citizenship on the basis that they were Indian (Hull, 1985; *In re Rodriguez*, 1897; Kansas, 1943; Konvitz, 1946; *People v. De La Guerra*, 1870).

Racial discrimination against the “Indianism” of Mexicans was also manifested in the form of residential segregation. This exclusionary practice eventually provided the underlying structure for the school segregation of Mexican students, and thus it is important to examine
the structural relation between residential and school segregation. By 1870, the residential segregation of the Mexican was firmly entrenched in the multiethnic structure of the Southwest, and such housing patterns were viewed by Anglo Americans to be the natural division between the inferior "half-breed Mexican" and the "superior" White race (Acuña, 1988; Camarillo, 1984a). Using 19th century archival records, historian Alberto Camarillo attributed the early stages of Mexican residential segregation to Anglo American racial prejudice. Camarillo stated, "The old Mexican pueblos were viewed by most Americans as 'foreign,' "backward," and undesirable locations in which to live" (p. 224). For example, in California the residential segregation of the Mexican began as early as 1850 and the process was completed by 1870: In San Francisco, San Jose, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Cruz, and Monterey, Anglo American settlers restructured the old pueblos by constructing new subdivisions in the towns and prohibited Mexicans from moving into Anglo neighborhoods. Throughout California the residential segregation of the Mexican was enforced by the use of racial harassment and violence, and in many cities by the use of housing covenant restrictions prohibiting Mexicans from residing in the White zones (Hendrick, 1977).

Social historian David Montejano (1987) also reported that a similar process of residential segregation became widespread and provided the foundation for school segregation in Texas. Throughout the state, Mexicans were segregated in separate sections of the cities, and in many Anglo American farm communities, local de jure laws were used to prevent Mexicans from establishing residence. Residential segregation was planned by the ranchers and town developers and maintained through local laws and real estate policies. For example, in Weslaco, Texas, Mexicans were only allowed to buy property in designated areas near the Missouri Pacific Railroad tracks, and municipal ordinances required that Mexican neighborhoods and businesses only be established in those areas.

By the early 1900s, the intensification of Mexican residential segregation became more complex in Texas, California, and other parts of the Southwest. Contributing factors were the industrial and urban development of the Southwest. It is very clear, however, that the growth of such residential segregation accompanied school segregation and was strongly linked to Anglo American racial prejudice. Later, we will discuss the need for policymakers to explore strategies that might lead to residential integration—a major solution to eliminate school segregation.

The rooting of Chicana school segregation

We noted how the increasing Mexican immigration to the United States in the 1920s became a period when racism turned into a strong ideological force that pushed forward the growth of all forms of segregation, especially in housing and schools (Camarillo, 1984a; 1984b; Montejano, 1987). As the Mexican population increased in the Southwest, Anglo Americans responded by demanding residential and school segregation (San Miguel and Valencia, 1998; Wollenberg, 1978). In addition to housing and schools, however, it also became common to segregate Mexicans in swimming pools, theaters, restaurants, and other public facilities (Kibbe, 1946; Menchaca, 1995). In California, the segregation of Mexicans became such a priority during the 1920s and 1930s that government officials attempted to classify Mexican students as Indians in order to segregate them on the basis that they were "colored." On January 23, 1927, the Attorney General of California stated that Mexicans could be treated as Indians, thereby placing them under the mandate of de jure segregation (Hendrick, 1977). In 1930, the California Attorney General once again issued an opinion on the racial background of the Mexican students. According to Attorney General Webb, Mexicans were Indians and therefore should not be treated as White. Webb stated, "It is
well known that the greater portion of the population of Mexico are Indians and were [sic] such Indians migrate to the United States, they are subject to the laws applicable generally to other Indians" (cited in Weinberg, 1977, p. 166). Webb's opinion was used by school boards to classify Mexicans as Indians and therefore attempted to segregate them on the basis that they were not White. Finally, in 1938, the California legislature passed a law to segregate officially Mexican students on the basis that they were Indian. Without explicitly mentioning Mexicans, the 1925 school code prescribed that schools segregate Mexicans who descended from Indians. The California school code of 1935 stated:

The governing board of the School district shall have power to establish separate schools for Indian children, excepting children of Indians who are the wards of the U.S. government and children of all other Indians who are the descendants of the original American Indians of the U.S., and for children of Chinese, Japanese, or Mongolian parentage.

(cited in Hendrick, 1977, p. 57)

Although the school code did not mention Mexicans by name, it was explicit that the state's intention was to segregate dark-skinned Mexican students. Thus, Mexican children became the principal target of the discriminatory school code without being identified, and American Indians, though named directly, were released from legally mandated segregation.

Language was a second rationale used to segregate Mexican students. Allegedly, Mexican students were not permitted to attend classes with their Anglo American peers because they needed special instruction in English (González, 1990; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990; San Miguel, 1986, 1987; San Miguel and Valencia, 1998). The pedagogical rationale was that the limited- or non-English-speaking Mexican children would impede the academic progress of the Anglo children. The racial overtones of these practices were blatantly seen when Mexican American students, who did not speak Spanish, were also forced to attend the Mexican schools (Alvarez, 1986; Menchaca, 1987). The need to acculturate Mexican students in special Americanization classes was a third major excuse used to justify segregation (San Miguel and Valencia, 1998). Mexican students were characterized as dirty, dull, unchristian, and lacking any social etiquette. Therefore, the educational belief was that Mexicans needed special classes where they would learn to emulate their Anglo American counterparts (García, 1979; González, 1990).

The results of IQ tests were also used, in part, to segregate Mexican students and provided the alleged scientific rationale (González, 1990; Valencia, 1997a). Lewis Terman, Professor of Education at Stanford University, and other researchers presented many findings from "race psychology" studies of intelligence testing research supporting the view that Blacks, Indians, and Mexican Americans were intellectually inferior to Whites (Blum, 1978; Valencia, 1997a). Regarding Mexican American children, Garth's (1928, 1930) race psychology reviews showed that these children were frequent participants in intelligence testing research (Valencia, 1997a). Based on Valencia's (1997a) analysis, and drawing from Sánchez (1932), there are eight such studies published between 1920–1929 in which Mexican American children were participants (Garrettson, 1928; Garth, 1923, 1928; Goodenough, 1926; Koch and Simmons, 1926; Paschal and Sullivan, 1925; Sheldon, 1924; Young, 1922). The point of most interest is that in all eight studies the author(s) concluded that the lower intelligence test performance of the Mexican American children—compared directly to their White peers or White normative data—was due to heredity. In some cases, the hereditarian conclusions of inferior genetic constitution of Mexican American children were made explicit (e.g., Garretson, 1928; Young, 1922) or were suggestive (such as, Goodenough, 1926).
Historically, IQ tests had practical purposes and significant social functions (Valencia, 1997a). Such tests (along with achievement tests) were widely used in the schools to sort students into homogeneous groups. This general practice is referred to as “curriculum differentiation,” which Valencia (1997a) defines as “the sorting of students into instructional groups based on perceived and/or measured educability” (p. 71). A good case in point is what transpired in the Los Angeles public schools in the 1920s. González (1974a, 1974b, 1990) found the institutionalization of mass intelligence testing, homogeneous groupings, curriculum differentiation, and counseling programs in Los Angeles schools were used in ways that effectively stratified students along racial/ethnic and socioeconomic status (SES) lines. Mexican American elementary school children were frequently placed in classes for “slow learners” and the “mentally retarded.” Gonzalez also found that vocational education in Los Angeles public junior and senior high schools was designed to prepare poor students of color for manually oriented occupations (skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled).

Early Chicano desegregation litigation

The Mexican community in the Southwest did not idly stand by while its children were being segregated in inferior facilities. The legal struggle for school desegregation was initiated in Texas and California in the early 1930s. The Independent School District v. Salazar (1930, 1931) case, which was brought about by Mexican American parents in Del Rio, Texas, was significant for several reasons (San Miguel, 1987). First, the constitution of the State of Texas, adopted in 1875 and ratified in 1876, allowed for the segregation of White and “colored” children—colored meaning only “Negro.” Thus, Salazar was a landmark case in determining the constitutionality of separating Mexican American children on racial grounds. Second, the findings of the court would serve as the basis for future legal challenges of segregation of Mexican American students. Third, the counsel for the plaintiffs in Salazar were lawyers of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the newly established Mexican American advocacy organization, which had its first opportunity to flex its muscles in this important test case.

The District Court ruled in Salazar that the school district illegally segregated Mexican American students on the basis of race (Rangel and Acuña, 1972), although they were considered to be members of the White race—a strong point argued by plaintiffs’ lawyers.

The court granted an injunction that restrained the district from segregating the Mexican American children, but the school board appealed the injunction (Álvarez, 1986). The District Court’s judgment, however, was overturned by the Texas Court of Civil Appeals on the basis that the school district did not intentionally, arbitrarily segregate the Mexican American children by race, and given that the children had special language needs (i.e., to learn English), the school district had the authority to segregate Mexican American students on educational grounds. This latter ruling would serve as a major obstacle in desegregation rulings for years to come. The Texas Court of Civil Appeals’ decision in Salazar was appealed by LULAC to the U.S. Supreme Court, but the case was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (Balderrama, 1982; cited in Álvarez, 1986).

In Álvarez v. Lemon Grove (1981), the school board of the Lemon Grove School District (Lemon Grove, California, near San Diego) sought to build a separate grammar school for the Mexican American children, claiming overcrowding at the existing school where both Anglo and Mexican American students attended (Álvarez, 1986). Mexican American parents organized a protest, forming the Comité de Vecinos de Lemon Grove (The Lemon Grove Neighborhood Committee). The parents instructed their children not to attend the so-called new school, which the children called La Caballería (the stable). Judge Claude
Chambers, Superior Court of California in San Diego, ruled in favor of the plaintiffs on the basis that separate facilities for Mexican American students were not conducive to their Americanization and retarded the English language development of the Spanish-speaking children. Judge Chambers also found that the school board had no legal right to segregate Mexican American children, as California law had no such provisions. Although the *Alvarez* case was deemed the nation's first successful desegregation court case, "it was isolated as a local event and had no precedent-setting ruling affecting either the State of California or other situations of school segregation in the Southwest" (Álvarez, 1986, p. 131). Nevertheless, *Alvarez* is noted as the first successful legal challenge to school segregation in the country (Álvarez, 1986; González, 1990).

The *Méndez v. Westminster* (1946, 1947) case in California, which preceded the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* by nearly a decade, was the first federal court decision in the area of school segregation and marked the end to *de jure* segregation in California (González, 1990). In this class action lawsuit, Gonzalo Méndez et al. claimed their children were denied access to a White school simply because they were Mexican (i.e., in appearance; Spanish surname). The historical importance of this landmark case rested on the judge's ruling regarding a new interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment (i.e., a break from the prevailing *Plessy v. Ferguson* [1896] doctrine of "separate but equal"), as well as his decision on the legality of segregating Mexican Americans on linguistic grounds. The court concluded that the school board had segregated Mexican American children on the basis of their "Latinized" appearance and had gerrymandered the school district in order to ensure that Mexican American students attend segregated schools. The court concluded this was an illegal action, as there was no constitutional or congressional mandate that authorized school boards in California to segregate Mexican American students. Judge Paul McCormick stated that the Fourteenth Amendment had guaranteed Mexican Americans equal rights in the United States. Particularly significant about Judge McCormick's ruling is that it differed substantially from the rulings in *Saballos* and *Delgado* regarding the nature of segregation:

McCormick contended that no evidence existed that showed segregation aided in the development of English proficiency, that on the contrary, evidence demonstrated that segregation retarded language and cultural assimilation. Consequently, the segregation of Mexican children had no legal or educational justification [italics added].

(González, 1990, p. 153)

According to González (1990), Judge McCormick departed from the prevailing separate but equal doctrine of *Plessy*.

In so stating, the Judge broke with *Plessy* and clearly defined a distinction between physical equality (facilities) and social equality. In this case, separate but equal facilities were unconstitutional because they created a social inequality. Thus, rather that acting as a protection for the practice of segregation, the Fourteenth Amendment served to repeal segregation.

(p. 153)

Although the *Méndez* case helped to end *de jure* segregation in California, the school segregation of Mexican American students remained widespread (Hendrick, 1977) and, in fact, increased over the following decades. Moreover, as González (1990) has noted when speaking of *Méndez* and its aftermath: "Eventually, de jure segregation in schools ended..."
throughout the Southwest, but not before an educational policy reinforcing socioeconomic inequality severely victimized generations of Mexican children” (p. 29).

In 1948, the centennial of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Delgado et al. v. Bastrop Independent School District of Bastrop County et al. was litigated in the U.S. District Court for the Western Division of Texas, and was backed by a cadre of powerful Mexican American individuals and organizations. Minerva Delgado and 20 other plaintiffs sued several school districts in Central Texas, claiming that “school officials ... were segregating Spanish-speaking [Mexican American] children contrary to the [Texas] Constitution” (San Miguel, 1987, p. 123). It appears that the catalyst for bringing forth Delgado was the momentous victory in Mendez (Gonzalez, 1990; San Miguel, 1987), as the plaintiffs believed that Delgado would do for Texas what Mendez did for California—bring an end to school segregation. Judge Ben Rice ruled that segregation of the Mexican American students was discriminatory and illegal, and violated the students’ constitutional rights as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment (see San Miguel, 1987). A major setback for the plaintiffs, however, was the ruling that the school district could segregate first-grade Mexican American students who had English-language deficiencies. Such segregation was to be on the same campus attended by all other students.

Initially viewed by plaintiffs as the decision that could bring an end to segregation in Texas, these hopes were never realized (San Miguel, 1987). In what Allsup (1979) described as a clash of White obstinacy and Mexican American determination, school districts throughout Texas failed to comply with the Delgado decision. This was made easy, in part, by the State Board of Education and its creation of a complex bureaucratic system of grievances and redress and the noncompliance of the Delgado proviso through evasive schemes designed at the local level. San Miguel (1987) has noted:

The mid and late 1950s can probably be called the era of subterfuge [italics added], since it was during this period that a multitude of practices—for example, freedom of choice plans, selected student transfer and transportation plans, and classification systems based on language or scholastic ability—were utilized by local school districts to maintain segregated schools.

(p. 134)

In conclusion, the early history of Chicano school segregation is a troubled one, filled with numerous events of forced isolation. History informs us that racism was a driving force in the relation between school segregation and subsequent Chicano school failure. But, Chicano communities were resolve in their struggle for educational equality. Salvatierra, Alvarez, Mendez, Delgado, and other early desegregation lawsuits are testimony to the Chicano’s campaign for desegregated schools and equal educational opportunity. Notwithstanding these legal accomplishments, one can argue that to some degree these were pyrrhic victories: That is, although Chicanos won the battle against de jure segregation, their isolation in segregated schools continued. We now turn to an analysis of a modern form of school segregation in desegregated schools—re segregation.

Contemporary issues in Chicano school segregation: re segregation

Thus far, we have examined the inequalities Chicanos experienced over time in American public schools. Given the Mexican American community’s resoluteness in bringing an end to the segregation of “Mexican schools,” school desegregation in the Southwest slowly began to unfold. However, given society’s neglect of Chicano school segregation—and the lack of
appreciation of its magnitude—desegregation over the past decades touched only a small number of Chicanos and contained a number of pitfalls. In this section, we examine these problems by analyzing the reality of segregation—that is, the process of Chicanos being further segregated in racially/ethnically isolated schools, and Chicanos being segregated within desegregated settings. We discuss three aspects of current school desegregation and resegregation. First, we briefly look at Chicanos as a silent problem; second, language segregation as an old problem but with new issues brought forth; and third, the implications of academic resegregation.

Chicano school segregation: a silent problem

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education stated that public schools could not place students in separate facilities based on race, religion, or national origin. Racially segregated schools were deemed "inherently unequal" and practices fostering them were unconstitutional (Brown, 1954). The impact of Brown was so dramatic that many social scientists believed the case helped launch the modern civil rights movement. Indeed, school desegregation became one of the most controversial issues in American educational history (Welch and Light, 1987). The problem with Brown, however, was the court's failure to establish a deadline for dismantling segregated public schools. This omission gave segregationists time to pressure federal officials to delay its enforcement. On May 31, 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court judges passed Brown II and delegated the responsibility of determining the pace of integration to federal judges (Solomone, 1986). This created the mechanism to retain segregated school systems, as most judges throughout the United States did not favor immediate and total desegregation.

At the national level, local school boards manipulated school assignments to prevent desegregation. Some schools allowed racial/ethnic minority students to attend White schools, but failed to place Whites in minority schools. In the South, the courts allowed parents the "freedom of choice" to send their children to specific schools. In this way, a desegregation plan was laid out on paper—but without actually desegregating schools (Moye, 1999). Once parents were given the choice to send their children to White or minority schools, the federal mandate was allegedly met, even though racial mixing had not been done. This was a mockery of Brown throughout the South because employers and White parents placed pressure on Black parents not to send their children to White schools. In Texas, White voters and the state government blatantly defied Brown. In 1956, a referendum on interposition (state sovereignty) was approved by the voters (see Houston, 2000). It upheld the state's right to protect itself from major federal action. The referendum, for example, prohibited integrated schools in Texas. To support majority rule, legislators introduced 12 school segregation house bills, of which two passed and became law. In 1957, House Bill 65 allowed communities to hold elections to determine if school districts shall have a dual school system of integrated and segregated schools. Furthermore, House Bill 231 allowed school boards to determine pupil assignments, thus determining which schools would remain exclusively White and which would be racially/ethnically mixed. The latter bill became the safety valve for anti-desegregationist legislators, who wanted to comply with federal law, but without mixing White students. Many school boards began desegregating Black schools by busing Mexican students (Carreras v. Corpus Christi Independent School District, 1970; Houston, 2000). By 1965, at the national level, only the District of Columbia had desegregated completely (Solomone, 1986).

In the initial stages of school desegregation, scholars focused on the American South. But as the policy gathered momentum, scholars started to look to the east, midwest, and the
part of the United States (Grain, 1968; Edwards and Wirt, 1967; Kirp, 1982; Rist, 1977). Given the attention school desegregation received, most Americans saw the process the Black/White issue (Donato, 1997). While Chicanos had always been actively involved in court cases for desegregated schooling throughout the Southwest (see previous discussion; San Miguel and Valencia, 1998), their efforts were not publicized and recognized at a national level (Orfield, 2001). It was not until the early 1970s that the courts truly recognized the right of Chicano/Latino students to desegregated education (Orfield and Smid, 1982; San Miguel and Valencia, 1998), and it was not until the 1970s and 1980s that judges began to speak directly to Chicanos segregation in schools. As Orfield et al. (1997) noted, “School segregation has been widely understood as a problem for blacks. It is little public discussion of the fact, however, that black students are now less likely to attend schools with less than half whites than are Hispanics” (p. 24).

The two most important cases in the post-Brown era concerning the desegregation of Chicanos children were Cámara v. Corpus Christi Independent School District in Texas (1970) and Keyes v. School District No. 1 (1973, 1975) in Denver, Colorado. A landmark case in the history of desegregation lawsuits initiated by Mexican Americans, Cámara set off a flood of similar cases (Salinas, 1971). Prior to Cámara, some school districts in the Southwest were desegregating their schools by pairing African American and Mexican American students, given that the latter group was considered “other White.” In Cámara, the judge ruled that Mexican Americans were an ethnically identifiable minority group, and thus were entitled to the protection of the Brown (1954) decision (see, e.g., Salinas, 1971; San Miguel, 1987). As such, the court found, the mixing of African Americans and Mexican Americans for purposes of desegregation did not produce a unitary school system. This case demonstrated how Mexican Americans thought it was necessary to be identified as a separate but identifiable minority group in order to benefit from Brown. Because the court ruled that Mexican Americans were indeed an identifiable ethnic minority group, they were found to be unconstitutionally segregated in Texas public schools. As San Miguel (1987) noted, Mexican Americans wanted to discard “the ‘other white’ legal strategy used... during the 1940s and 1950s to eliminate segregation and substitute the equal protection argument used in black desegregation cases” (p. 178; also, see Note 17 in present chapter).

In Raw v. Eckals (1970), a desegregation case in Houston, Texas, in which Mexican American students were similarly paired with African Americans, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals held that Mexican Americans were not an identifiable minority group for purposes of desegregation. Ironically, the Cámara and Raw rulings were made by the same court. This confusion was finally settled in Keyes by the U.S. Supreme Court. In Keyes, which involved a desegregation case in Denver, Colorado, the court was compelled to make a decision on “how to treat Mexican American children in the desegregation process” (San Miguel, 1987, p. 180). The court decided that Mexican Americans were an identifiable minority group, and thus could be paired with African Americans in the desegregation process. Yet, despite the importance of Cámara and Keyes, the educational isolation of most Chicano students continued in both segregated and desegregated public schools. This isolation, as we have earlier discussed, now exhibits patterns of hypersegregation. Chico/ Latino students in 1998-1999 were considerably more segregated in predominantly minority schools than they were in 1968-1969—a whole generation ago (Orfield, 2001).

Language segregation: old problem and new issues

After Chicanos gained “minority status” in the early 1970s, a number of legal cases emerged, changing the nature of schooling for them in the United States. As we noted earlier, language
Segregation, desegregation, and integration

Segregation of Chicano English language learners (ELLs) had always been an issue. Since the early 20th century, educators segregated Chicano children because of their (alleged) inability to speak English. In the previously discussed Salubriano, Álvarez, Márquez, and Delgado cases, defendants all ventured, to some degree, to use the argument that Chicanos needed to be in separate schools or classrooms (apart from mainstream students) until they learned English.

In the 1970s, however, a major legal case brought attention to the education of ELLs in the United States. Brought forth by the Chinese American community in San Francisco, the *Law v. Nichols* (1974) decision held that public schools needed to provide an education that was comprehensible to students who could not speak English. Because English was the only vehicle of instruction, ELLs were being denied access to a meaningful educational experience. The U.S. Supreme Court recognized that in order for ELLs to participate in schools, they first had to understand the English language. This was seen as an educational contradiction and thus made “a mockery of public education” (*Law*, 1974). It was after the *Law* decision that educators began to wrestle with alternative ways to serve ELLs in the United States.

Although *Law* did not prescribe specific remedies or pedagogical strategies for ELLs, this ruling paved the way for new reforms. In California, for example, Assembly Bill 1329 was passed in 1976. The Bill required bilingual education in schools that had specific numbers of ELLs (California State Department of Education, 1976 [AB-1329]; 1982 [AB-507]). This passage spurred interest in equity for ELLs and provoked many influential policymakers throughout the nation to respond to the educational needs of this student population. Other states followed suit and passed bilingual education policies (Crawford, 1989).

Meeting the needs of ELLs, however, became challenging for many educators. Early on, researchers began to notice the conflicting implications from the joint applications of the Supreme Court’s ruling of *Law* and *Brown* (Cardenas, 1975). Although it was recognized that bilingual education and desegregation were both essential approaches in promoting better opportunities for Chicano ELLs, the issue was much more complicated than it appeared. For example, Zerdel (1977) pointed out that bilingual education and desegregation had different, if not opposite, meanings. Desegregation, he argued, typically meant “scattering Black students to provide instruction in ‘racially balanced’ settings. Bilingual education, on the other hand, usually meant the clustering of Spanish-speaking students so they could receive instruction through their native language” (p. 181). Even if bilingual education and desegregation were not completely conflicting remedies, Zerdel argued, “they were not fully compatible” (p. 181). He further asserted that bilingual education and desegregation were at conflict because the two mandates competed with each other in school systems with limited resources.

Most educators were familiar with the school desegregation debate. How to factor in the ELLs within the desegregation process, however, was confusing, counterintuitive, and political. After the landmark *Law* case, Cardenas (1975) pointed out that some school districts were pitting bilingual education against school desegregation. He claimed that some Chicano ELLs were enrolled in either segregated bilingual education or were integrated without the benefits of bilingual education. In many cases, educators were taking an either/or approach. That is, some school systems were circumventing the implementation of bilingual education by scattering ELLs throughout their districts; others were using bilingual education as an opportunity to segregate them (Cardenas, 1975). While some educators understood that Chicano ELLs needed to be educated in integrated classroom settings, limited resources and other problems drove educators to ask the following questions: Was it better for Chicano ELLs to forgo their curricular and pedagogical needs in integrated class-
In the early 1980s, this issue became noteworthy for a number of educators (Arias and Wiese, 1983). Astute researchers began to point out that bilingual education and desegregation were not necessarily the same thing. Stephen and Feagin (1980) noted, for example, that successful desegregation plans should "include ... provisions to preserve existing bilingual programs" (p. 323). In 1983, the California State Department of Education sponsored a conference to discuss this issue. Presenters from various institutional interests (U.S. Department of Education, the Office for Civil Rights, and the California State Department of Education; scholars and legal experts) came together to examine the relationship between bilingual education and desegregation. In most cases, researchers, policymakers, and educators argued that "integration and bilingual education [were] in effect, looking at the different but valid definitions of equality" (California State Department of Education, p. 7). Most presenters at the 1983 conference believed that "integrated education and bilingual education [were] partners in the social enterprise" (p. 15). There seemed to be a consensus that schools could provide quality education to ELLs in integrated classrooms. Bilingual education and desegregation were seen as two important components of educational opportunities for ELLs.

Bilingual education became highly political in the late 1980s. Ironically, critics began to blame the increasing segregation of Chicano ELLs on bilingual education. One critic, for example, noted that, "for the sake of bilingual education, some thirty-five years after Brown v. Board of Education, we have resegregated the classroom along ethnic and linguistic lines" (Biales, 1989). While there was an increasing segregation trend, the notion that bilingual education was the culprit was called into question because, at the time, only a small percentage of Chicano ELLs were being served in bilingual classes. A study conducted by Nieto (1986) found that "68% of eighth-grade and 82% of seventh-grade language minority students received neither bilingual or English-as-a-second language instruction" (Valdivieso, 1986, p. 191). To imply that bilingual education was responsible for ethnic segregation was inaccurate because most ELLs were not being served in bilingual education classes. Valencia (1988) found that 75 percent of ELLs in California public schools received little, if any, instructional support in their native language (also, see Macias, 1993; Valencia, Chapter 1, present book). To charge bilingual education as the cause for ethnic segregation distorts a more complicated issue.

By the late 1990s, an anti-bilingual education sentiment in California reached its peak. With the passage of California's Proposition 227 in 1998, many public schools were forbidden to use native language instruction to educate ELLs (see Garcia and Wiese, Chapter 5, current book). The proposition called for transitional programs of structured English immersion that was not to last more than one year. Ironically, most studies on Proposition 227 generally examined school district responses to the new law, how it impacted the nature and organization of instruction, how it influenced teacher training programs, and how bilingual teacher recruitment was going to be affected (Gándara et al., 2000). Very little was mentioned about how the proposition was going to influence earlier concerns—that is, the potential conflict between bilingual education and desegregation. If one considers the potential impact of Proposition 227 on Chicano ELLs, one could reasonably conclude that language segregation will no longer be an issue because bilingual education is, for the most part, forbidden in the state. With this in mind, Chicano ELLs ought to be easily integrated in mainstream classes. We do not believe that Proposition 227 will have an effect on the segregation of Chicano students because their numbers in bilingual classes were small in the first place. As Gándara et al. noted, only "29% of English learners were in a primary language
program prior to 227, and only 12% assigned to one after the implementation of 227" (Abstract). How California's proposition will affect Chicano ELLs, however, is for future researchers to investigate.

On a final note, there are national data pointing to the continued segregation of Chicano/Latino and other ELL students by language status. Based on 1993-1994 survey data, Ruiz-de-Velasco et al. (2000) found:

Near half of all LEP (limited-English-proficient) students attend schools that are at least 31 percent LEP... The segregation of LEP from other students is particularly pronounced in elementary schools; 53.3 percent of LEP primary school students versus 31.3 percent of LEP secondary school students attend schools in which 30 percent or more of the students are LEP... Nationwide, almost two-thirds of students attend schools where less than 1 percent of students are LEP... These findings suggest that many immigrant children are attending schools that are not just ethnically segregated but linguistically isolated.

(pp. 3, 14)

**Academic Resegregation**

Another form of segregation in desegregated schools is referred to as "academic" or "intellectual" resegregation. This type of segregation "generally takes place when schools that have been racially desegregated go to a system of academic tracking or ability grouping" (Hughes et al., 1980, p. 14). It is widely acknowledged that racial/ethnic minority students, on the average, achieve at lower levels than their White peers (Valencia, Chapter 1, present volume). Thus, under circumstances when minority and White students attend the same schools, there is likely to be a stratified and hierarchical structure in the delivery of instruction (see Valencia, Chapter 1, present volume).

Aside from the broad issue of ability grouping, and tracking, is there evidence that Chicano students experience academic resegregation in desegregated schools? There is some research that provides indirect and direct confirmation that academic resegregation occurs. For example, Valencia (1984a) examined potential curriculum differentiation (i.e., indirect evidence) in a Phoenix, Arizona high school that was likely to undergo considerable racial/ethnic mixing in light of a school closure court case (Castro et al. v. Phoenix Union High School District #219 et al., 1982).21 The anticipated enrollment of Central High School—a 90 percent White, high-achieving, high-SES background school was to increase in size by 57 percent in the 1982-1983 school year (a jump from 2,044 to 3,200 students). This dramatic 1,000 plus increase in enrollment would be predominantly Chicano and African American students from two high schools that were being proposed for closure (Phoenix Union, 94 percent minority; East, 56 percent minority). In the Castro case, Chicano and African American plaintiffs sued in order to keep their schools open. Valencia (1984a)—an expert witness for the plaintiffs—predicted that academic resegregation would occur at Central High School, the host school. This hypothesis was given considerable credence based on Valencia's analysis of 1982-1983 resegregation statistics in which preregistration course-by-course enrollments were listed by ethnicity. In court, Valencia testified that because of the very sharp differences in average academic performance between the high-achieving Central High White students and the incoming, low-achieving Chicano and Black students, there would be serious academic resegregation at Central High. To provide some support for this claim of resegregation along lines of achievement, Valencia did a comprehensive analysis of the preregistration data and prepared exhibits for the court (see Donato
et al. (1991), p. 48, for a capsule discussion of the analysis). Valencia's analysis showed that minority students were overrepresented in the basic, non-college preparatory courses and were underrepresented in the advanced, college preparatory courses. White students' enrollment patterns were the opposite.

Although the Phoenix situation was not a desegregation case per se, it had all the ingredients of one (e.g., the typical one-way transfer of minorities to a White host school; mixing of low-achieving minorities with high-achieving White students). Thus, one can draw inferences from this case to understand more fully the potentialities of academic segregation within a desegregated setting. As Valencia (1984a) concluded, there was sufficient predictive evidence that Central High School would undergo considerable curricular stratification between White and Chicano/Black students. Such a separation—as in other instances of academic resegregation—would likely result in the raising of barriers to equal educational opportunity for minority students. The bottom line, as Valencia underscores, is “that resegregation on intellectual grounds is just as invidious as segregation on racial grounds” (p. 94). The lesson we learn from academic resegregation is that desegregation planners and educators must work with commitment and vigor to avoid widespread curriculum differentiation. Integration, in its truest sense, has as a cornerstone the goal of equity, in which all students in a desegregated school should have equal access to knowledge.

There is also some direct evidence available that points to the academic resegregation of White and racial/ethnic minority students in schools that have undergone court-ordered desegregation. The district of concern is the preceding Phoenix Union High School District (PUHSD) in Arizona.22 The PUHSD has been under a desegregation plan via a 1985 Consent Decree and Desegregation Order (see Valencia, 1996a, for background). In the 1995–1996 school year, the PUHSD had eight comprehensive high schools (grades 9–12) and enrolled about 21,000 students at its high point. District enrollments by race/ethnicity were—in descending order—Chicano/other Latino (55 percent), White (27 percent), African American (12 percent), and other (6 percent). In 1996, Valencia was asked by plaintiffs' lawyer to prepare a consultant report on the PUHSD's desegregation plan and efforts (see Valencia, 1996a). As part of this work, Valencia also undertook an analysis of possible academic resegregation (Valencia, 1996b).

In his investigation of the PUHSD, Valencia (1996b) analyzed Fall, 1995 enrollments by race/ethnicity in mathematics, science, and English courses at the eight high schools to ascertain overrepresentation and underrepresentation patterns. Valencia performed 685 individual disparity analyses across the three types of courses at each of the eight schools. He observed a consistent, glaring, and strong pattern: Chicano/other Latino students (as well as African Americans) were overrepresented—albeit a small number of exceptions—in the non-college preparatory courses and underrepresented in the college preparatory courses, particularly honors courses. By sharp contrast, White students showed the converse pattern. Table 3.6 presents these racial/ethnic patterns for mathematics in one high school. The data in Table 3.6 strongly point to the existence of academic resegregation. Chicano/other Latino and African American students are overrepresented in the lower-level courses (e.g., Consumer Mathematics 1–2) and underrepresented in the higher-level courses (e.g., Integrated Mathematics 3–4, Honors). The general pattern for the White students is a mirror image.

These findings in Phoenix appear to be consistent with the observed academic resegregation in many of our urban, inner-city, racially/ethnically mixed schools across the country that have undergone desegregation (see, e.g., Mickelson, 2001; Oakes, 1995; Welzer and Oakes, 1996). What is so disturbing, however, about the Phoenix situation is that the PUHSD had been subject to a court-ordered, court-monitored, multi-million dollar desegregation plan for ten years when Valencia (1996b) performed his analyses. This goes to show...
### Table 3.6 Racial/ethnic enrollments in mathematics at one PUHSD high school: Fall semester, 1995-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Dist. %</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Dist. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. 1-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-55.8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Math. 1-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>-46.4</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math. 1-2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math. 1-2 Honors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>-68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math. 3-4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>-20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math. 3-4 Honors</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>-60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math. 5-6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>-49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math. 5-6 Honors</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>-82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Calculus 1-2 Honors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>-59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Geo. and Cal. 1-2 AP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* PUHSD = Phoenix Union High School District; Dist. % = Disparity (over- or underrepresentation).
Desegregation, without true integration, is very likely to fail. As such, poorly implemented and monitored desegregation plans do little in closing the racial/ethnic achievement gap. As noted by Mickelson, “even in an ostensibly desegregated school system, Whites retain privileged access to greater opportunities to learn” (2001, p. 243).

Towards integration

Although there have been scattered attempts in recent decades to desegregate our nation’s schools, very little has improved in the reduction of racial/ethnic isolation. As Orfield et al. (1987) commented, much of the standoff in desegregation struggles is related to opposition at the national level:

Three of the four Administrations since 1968 were openly hostile to urban desegregation orders and the Carter Administration took fewer initiatives in the field. There have been no important policy initiatives supporting desegregation from any branch of government since 1971.

More recently, Orfield and Yun (1999) updated matters, as such:

After 12 years of intense and focused opposition to desegregation orders under Presidents Reagan and [George H.] Bush and successful confirmation of hundreds of conservative federal judges, the law is now much closer to Reagan’s vision than to that of the Warren and Burger Courts. Mandatory desegregation orders are being dissolved on a large scale and voluntary ones are being challenged in the courts. There has been no significant countervailing intellectual, political or legal force from the Clinton administration that might reverse trends.

As we noted, the continuous conditions that maintain school segregation are complex. What is certain, however, is that the dismantling of school desegregation started in the mid-1970s. Both Congress and the federal courts did not consider racial balance to be a remedy for Brown. In 1974, Congress passed the “Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974” (EEOC Act of 1974) to redefine compliance with Brown. This legislation followed the successful political activism of White parents opposing school integration in general and busing in particular (Smekal and Goldring, 1999; Solomone, 1986). Under the Act, Congress rejected racial balance as the goal of desegregation and ruled that this did not constitute denial of equal educational opportunity or equal protection, as required by Brown. Desegregation was redefined as the assignment of students without regard to race, color, sex or national origin—and not the assignment of students to overcome racial imbalances (Solomone, 1986). Alternative methods to busing could be used to comply with Brown.

In 1976 and 1977, Congress amended the Act and added stronger language to oppose any state’s intent to comply with Brown by reaching racial balance. Congress prohibited the use of federal funds for the transportation of any student other than the school that was nearest to a student’s home. The exception to this policy were magnet schools that gave parents the choice of selecting schools for their children beyond a regular attendance zone (Varady and Raffel, 1995). In the 1970s, magnet school plans became a popular vehicle to fulfill voluntary or court-ordered desegregation, particularly in areas where busing was staunchly opposed. Thus, the EEOC amendments effectively destroyed the financial basis of
using busing in states and districts where racial balance was considered to be a method of alleviating school segregation.

Concurrent and complementary rulings were rendered by the federal courts. In a series of federal cases, the courts ruled that racial balance was not the only remedy for Brown. The most devastating case was Swann v. Board of Education (1971), where the remedy for Swann v. Bradley (1974) was delineated. The federal judges ruled in Swann v. Bradley (1974) that alternate methods besides busing could be used to desegregate schools. Such remedies included the use of voluntary student transfer programs, magnet schools, and an enriched curriculum. The same year in Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman (1977), federal judges offered a similar interpretation. The court added that local control of schools was a national tradition that needed to be upheld—thus effectively creating an infrastructure to remove school desegregation conflicts away from the courts and delegate it to communities. Though the ruling appeared to be race neutral, it retained Whites in control of the schools and gave them the opportunity to dismantle any opposition. Given that Whites constitute the majority of voters in most communities, they were able to determine educational policy through the electoral process, and select to comply with Brown through programs of “choice” rather than racial balance.

Desegregationists questioned the legality of Milliken and Dayton, but faced a series of defeats until 1980. Under Brown v. Califano (1980) the use of busing for desegregation purposes was allowed, thus reaffirming the principles enunciated in earlier desegregation busing cases (Keen v. Denver, Colorado, No. 1, 1973; Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 1971). The significance of Brown v. Califano is that it effectively diluted the full impact of the anti-busing EEOC Act of 1974. Furthermore, this ruling could now be used to enforce Green v. County School Board of New Kent (1968) where the federal court ruled that racial balance could be used as a criterion in a desegregation plan after “choice programs” failed to eliminate the vestiges of school segregation.

These rulings were significant victories that could be used to desegregate students when choice plans failed because, after Milliken (1977), school districts throughout the country turned to magnet schools and voluntary student transfer programs to desegregate schools (Donato, 1997; Varady and Raffel, 1995; Smrek and Goldring, 1999). The problem with magnet schools and voluntary student transfer programs, however, is that they can easily be manipulated to intensify school segregation. School districts and school boards can manipulate school policies because they have legal control over pupil assignments, the designation of which schools will be magnets, and the student selection procedure for magnet programs (e.g., priority enrollment given to neighborhood children; lottery; first-come, first-serve basis; test scores). Thus, local control allows administrators to develop the structure to determine the makeup of the schools. For example, under a magnet school district structure, where neighborhood children are given priority in student assignments, a school in a middle-class White residential area can retain its racial imbalance while in theory it is open to students beyond its regular attendance zone. In this scenario, the middle-class students are the only ones that have “choice” because they can remain in that location or attend another school. During the 1970s, this scenario was found to be widespread, for example, in the state of Missouri (Smrek and Goldring, 1999). Conversely, magnet schools or voluntary school transfer programs do not necessarily alleviate the vestiges of school segregation in racially isolated working-class minority communities—as White or middle-class students are not mandated to attend those schools (Donato, 1997; Solomone, 1986).

Magnet school student assignments can also be manipulated to cluster White students. In Phoenix, Arizona in 1985, after a court-ordered desegregation mandate was issued to the Phoenix Union High School District (PUHSD), a magnet school desegregation plan was
This choice program was accompanied by unbalanced district school financing, overwhelmingly disadvantaging the racial/ethnic minority students because the magnet schools were better financed and disproportionately served White students. On average, per-pupil expenditures in magnet school programs were $4,288, and $2,479 in regular programs—a per-pupil expenditure difference of $1,809. Valencia (1996a)—who was commissioned by plaintiffs’ attorney to prepare a report on the PUHSD’s desegregation plan—zeroed in on the magnet program, which led to his recommendation to discontinue the entire program. He wrote:

The existing magnet programs are quite costly, not cost-effective, disproportionately benefit Anglo students, have had a small effect on District-wide racial/ethnic balance, enroll only a small fraction of the District’s students, and will likely have little impact on the racial/ethnic balance of the District in years to come (due to a low capture rate of Anglo students from the feeder districts and the explosive growth of the Hispanic student population).

(p. 39)

In other cases where the clustering of White students has been identified was in the Northwest section of Washington, DC. The school district worked with parents to select six schools that would be converted into magnets. The outcome of this selective process was a student transfer program that allowed the concentration of upper-class students in the Six School Complex Magnet program, as 63 percent of students participating in this magnet school system were from affluent upper middle-class backgrounds (Varady and Raffel, 1995). Similar problems have been identified in Boston, Cincinnati, and Buffalo (see Varady and Raffel). Although we are critical of magnet programs, this does not mean we are against implementing them as a desegregation strategy. Magnet programs can be useful if they are implemented and monitored in ways that avoid academic resegregation and the maintenance of White privilege, and lead to a substantially positive effect on district-wide racial/ethnic balance.

During the 21st century, Chicanos and other racial/ethnic minorities that want to desegregate their schools are confronted by a governmental structure that has left the choice to local communities. The irony is that racial/ethnic minority communities that have traditionally suffered from inferior school facilities and resources have been delegated the burden of struggling, legally, against the very same systemic structure that places them at a great disadvantage with privileged Whites.

In closing, we end on an optimistic note by discussing a number of research/policy suggestions that perhaps can serve as starting points to help reverse the intensification of Chicano school segregation and to help promote integration. We offer discussions on the following ideas: (a) community case studies of historical segregation, (b) residential integration, (c) busing, (d) Chicano/African American coalitions, (e) Chicano school board membership, (f) two-way bilingual education, and (g) “critical theory” in teacher education.

Community case studies of historical segregation

To understand the origins and persistence of school segregation of Chicano students, historical community case studies can provide the methodological base to explore this longstanding practice (Álvarez, 1988; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990). Case studies may be useful
in providing the background for the litigation of school segregation cases. In light of the very limited amount of current Chicano and other Latino-initiated desegregation litigation (see Orfield et al., 1987), perhaps such lawsuits may be forthcoming in the 21st century as Chicano segregation further increases. A bonanza in these cases would be expert testimony, for example, on the roots of de jure segregation at the particular school district level. As Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) attorney Leticia Saucedo recently underscored, “Historical experts must continue to study and document the patterns of discrimination in education; they must create analyses that more clearly show the causal connection between current practices and past discrimination in education” (2000, p. 420).

An approach to community case studies of historical segregation includes: a collection of oral histories, analysis of residential patterns, analysis of the dates and construction of schools, and a review of available school records. Oral histories can provide data indicating if people attended segregated schools. Studying residential patterns will suggest whether the barrioization of the Mexican community was voluntary or involuntary, or both. Collection of school records may provide a documented history of the school board’s intentional or unintentional plans in overall school district development, and can also be used to verify or discredit the oral histories. And, most important of all, an analysis of the dates and location of the construction of schools can possibly provide data to discern if the “Mexican” schools were constructed for the specific purpose of segregating Chicano students. For example, could the “Mexican” schools have been located in zones where both Mexican and Anglo students may have attended, rather than constructing the Mexican schools in the interior of the barrios or the Anglo school in the Anglo residential zones? And, did the construction of new schools follow a historical pattern indicating that the size of the student population did not necessitate the construction of new “Mexican” or “White” schools? Was the Chicano community included in the decision-making process in the construction and location of schools?

It is equally important to collect data on “choice plans” implemented by school districts complying with federal or state inquiries. Given that racial balance was no longer required by the government after 1974, we must examine if alternate plans failed or improved the quality of education in segregated schools. If programs fail, under Green v. County School Board of New Kent (1968), a Chicano community may have the legal basis to take their case to court. To determine the effectiveness of choice programs “state report cards” offer a rating system of schools. Likewise, to compare the quality of education in high-density racial/ethnic minority schools an analysis of (a) student-teacher ratio, (b) programmatic per-pupil expenditures and (c) the percentage of certified teachers, will reveal if the quality of education is better in schools serving a predominantly White population (see Valencia, Chapter 1, current volume).

A close inspection of magnet programs can also reveal if they lead to the clustering of White students or if school segregation has intensified (see Valencia, 1996a). In cities where sections have been gentrified or in rural communities where orchards and fields have been replaced by housing developments, a close analysis of where the magnet schools are located may reveal how city policymakers use magnet schools to attract high-income newcomers. In such cases, an analysis of the impact on voting patterns will be useful. That is, by attracting new residents will the voting size of the minority populations be diluted? If so, how does this impact the school boards?
Residential integration

As we have discussed earlier, a contributing source of Chicano segregated schools has historically been attributed to residential segregation or ethnically isolated residential zones (Camarillo, 1984a; Montejano, 1987; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990). We agree with Gottlieb (1983) that “school and housing segregation are so deeply intertwined that much greater attention needs to be given to the interrelationships” (p. 106). As Gottlieb argues, ideally the best solution for bringing an end to school segregation is to terminate housing segregation. Of course, this will not be an easy goal to obtain.

One approach to attack this problem is for public policymakers to lobby assertively for residential integration. Although it will be difficult to integrate existing neighborhoods, it can be achieved through long-term urban and suburban planning. For example, in order to attract minority families, affordable housing (i.e., single-family homes) will need to be constructed near or in White middle-class neighborhoods. Furthermore, in White neighborhoods that are racially/ethnically isolated, but are located adjacent to Chicano neighborhoods, the construction of new schools in the border zones might lead to racial/ethnic mixing in the local schools. That is, when a school is constructed in the border zone of two racially/ethnically isolated neighborhoods, a racially/ethnically mixed school community would be formed (however, see Orfield [2001] for a discussion of the instability of neighborhood schools that form in border zones). Although the neighborhoods would not be integrated, the students of the racially/ethnically isolated neighborhoods would attend the same school and this may lead to the formation of interracial/ethnic friendships. Possibly these friendships may encourage the students to cross the residential boundaries, and this may, in turn, lead to racial/ethnic mixing on a social basis. Although such urban planning may not lead to residential integration, per se, it can at least contribute to the formation of interracial/ethnic community bonds.

In conclusion, we strongly support efforts to achieve residential integration. Given the sharp increase in the Chicano school-age population and the growing desire for many Chicano families to buy homes, segregated municipalities have grand opportunities to realize residential integration. As Gottlieb (1983) notes, for those cities that remain silent on this issue, they reinforce their reputations as being closed communities. We recommend that scholars undertake research on housing policy and urban planning. Mexican American communities need information on how urban growth will impact their schools. As cities and towns expand, policy recommendations are needed to avoid segregation or resegregation. Mexican American parents need advice on whether communities should establish magnet school programs or construct new schools. Magnet school programs with racial/ethnic balance formulas can be particularly useful in gentrified cities where liberal, middle-class White families wish to live near the downtown areas (Varady and Raffel, 1995). Likewise, the construction of large schools in border zones between new and old neighborhoods can be used to avoid resegregation.

Busing

The desegregation of schools through the use of busing has created enormous controversy (Coles, 1974; Mills, 1973, 1979; Pettigrew, 1975; Varady and Raffel, 1995). Criticisms, typically from White parents, have ranged from charges that busing is dangerous to complaints that bus rides are much too long. Pettigrew contends that such opposition to busing reached such virulent levels in the 1970s that a national mania occurred. As discussed earlier,
during the mid-1970s Congress and the federal courts opposed busing and favored less effective methods to desegregate.

It was not until 1980 that under Brown v. California the federal courts once again upheld the legality of busing. Two years later, however, though the federal courts did not overturn Brown v. California in Crawford v. Board of Education the City of Los Angeles (1982) and Washington v. Seattle School District No. 1 (1982), the judges upheld the state right to pass anti-busing referendums in cases where there was no proof of intentional segregation (see Donato, 1997). These rulings were a compromise. On the one hand, busing remained a vehicle of desegregation and allowed states to use busing as a remedy in cases where intentional segregation had been proven. On the other hand, it has allowed voters to use referendums to limit busing in communities where intentional segregation has not been proven.

By the 1990s, court-ordered busing programs experienced a severe blow. The federal court under Board of Education of Oklahoma City v. Dowell (1991; cited in Orfield, 2001) allowed school districts that had sufficiently implemented desegregation strategies to be released from their orders and be free to resume the assignment of students to neighborhood schools. Across the nation, large school districts (e.g., St. Louis, Boston, Denver, and Oklahoma City) were released from court-ordered busing. Since then, the political slogan has been for America to return to “neighborhood schools” and “magnet school choice” programs.

Given that busing has come to an end in many locations, racial segregation has dramatically increased. As we previously discussed, Orfield and Yan (1999) noted that Latinos in Colorado were greatly more desegregated, through 1996, than their counterparts in the other Southwestern states. This, however, has dramatically changed. In the Denver Public Schools (DPS), the court released it from mandatory busing in 1995. The return to neighborhood schools began in 1996. In a recent article in the Rocky Mountain News (Yettick, 2001), “Dwindling diversity: Ethnic groups tend to cluster in DPS’ post-busing era,” recent data suggest that the racial and ethnic composition in the DPS has dramatically changed since busing ended. A major theme of the news article was how Latino school segregation has intensified. Although the growth of the Latino population in Denver has exacerbated this segregation trend, other factors add to the problem. Taking the situation as a whole, there has been an overall decrease in Anglo enrollments, Anglo parents are choosing to send their children to charter and magnet schools, and there is a problem with transportation opportunities (i.e., busing) for some groups. DPS officials argue that parents are allowed to send their children to schools of their choice. Critics maintain, however, that poor families have very little choice. For example, although “students get free school bus rides from anywhere in Denver to most of the district’s magnet programs . . . to attend a charter school or a neighborhood school other than their own, students must provide transportation” (Yettick, 2001, p. 26A). In other words, White parents generally have the economic means to exercise choice. The city’s poor are not in positions, however, to take advantage of the choices offered. Of the district’s 127 schools, 45 are now over 56 percent Latino. Of those, 39 are 75 percent Latino, and 12 are over 90 percent Latino. There is no doubt that in the post-busing era Chicano youths are destined to become more segregated. In Denver, many Latino parents are cognizant of this problem. Latino parent, Donaciano Archuleta, for example, lamented the fact that his child attends “Valdez Elementary in north Denver, the school with the highest percentage of Hispanics in the District, 95.5 percent. Archuleta regrets that [his child] is not experiencing the diversity he and his wife knew as DPS students during court-ordered busing” (Yettick, 2001, p. 26A). With this in mind, the courts need to rethink the elimination of busing. We believe that busing is still a viable means to desegregate schools and, ultimately, to integrate them.
Chicano-African American Coalitions

Even though Chicanos and African Americans have historically gained power independent of one another (Marable, 1995), we believe these groups would have greater political impact by working collaboratively. In many ways, Chicanos and African Americans share common histories, concerns, and predicaments in American schools and society. Both groups are generally segregated in schools that are less well-funded, have higher rates of teacher turn-overs, suspensions, and special education placements (in some categories); are under-represented in gifted programs; and both score—on the average—below the national norm on standardized tests (Anyon, 1997; Fine, 1991; Kozol, 1991; Valencia, Chapter 1, present volume). Given the many challenges Chicanos and African Americans face in realizing greater educational achievement, both groups might benefit from establishing a united front to lobby for their common interests. This is particularly true in the Southwest, where many Chicano and African American students attend the same segregated schools.

Chicano School Board Membership

There is a paradox in many communities across the Southwest and in other areas. The Chicano student population is tremendously increasing (Valencia, Chapter 2, present book). Yet, there is an immense underrepresentation of Chicanos on local school boards of education (Fraga et al., 1988; Rios and Alonzo, 1981). While Chicano representation has improved in some areas over the past three decades, they often lack political power to promote the success of their children. In most cities, it is very difficult for Chicanos to get elected on school boards. What we have are large Chicano school enrollments, and Whites controlling the schools. We believe that Chicano school board representation needs to increase, as it is at this level where changes can be brought about. In most situations, school boards generally determine who will administer their districts and schools, who will teach in them, what reforms will be made, and which issues will be taken up for discussion—including the issue of desegregation/integration.

Two-way Bilingual Education

The growing number of ELLs and the limited supply of certified bilingual education teachers will inevitably exacerbate language segregation in our nation’s public schools (see Valencia, Chapter 3, current book). Ovando and Collier (1985) maintain, however, that “two-way bilingual education” may be the only way to reduce the language segregation in desegregated schools. Two-way bilingual education is a model in which students of two different language backgrounds (e.g., Spanish and English speakers) are brought together in a bilingual class setting in order for both groups to become truly “bilingual” (see Guerrero, Chapter 6, current book). For example, the goal of a two-way bilingual education requires that English speakers learn Spanish and Spanish speakers learn English. But more importantly, “two-way bilingual education can be seen as an effective method of teaching a second language to English-dominant students in the United States as well as providing an integrated class for language-minority students” (Ovando and Collier, 1985, pp. 40–41).

Two-way bilingual education appears to be the only model that places and sensitizes English speakers in a second language learning environment; it also stresses linguistic integration in the classroom. There is no question that implementing two-way bilingual education programs will be difficult because of the continued resistance to bilingual education in general. The most challenging facet of two-way bilingual programs will be to convince
English-speaking parents about the value of their children learning a second language. Related to the politics and academic achievement in two-way bilingual programs, Crawford (1989) asked: "Could language-majority and language-minority children, learning side by side and assisting each other, become fluent bilinguals while making good progress, in other subjects?" (p. 165). Crawford contended that if public schools follow the criteria for effective two-way bilingual education programs, then it can be accomplished. We propose that once English-speaking parents recognize the lifelong value of bilingualism for their children, there will be more of a need to train additional bilingual teachers in the profession. Thus, both Mexican American ELLs and majority language students will benefit. In the final analysis, language integration as proposed in the two-way bilingual model should become more manageable.

Critical theory in teacher education

Given the nation’s changing racial/ethnic demographic patterns, more teachers are bound to have contact with Chicano children and youths. Within this context, future teachers need to be prepared to work with this student population. We are not referring to “what teaching strategies work for Chicanos.” Rather, we are talking about ways to expose preservice teachers to “critical perspectives” in teacher education programs. That is, teacher education programs can play a crucial role in preparing future teachers with critical perspectives of education that will allow them to see connections between everyday practices in schools and the larger society. If properly implemented, “critical theory” can offer preservice teachers a better understanding about school and society, new directions toward social justice, and democratic education. Landon Beyer (2001) said it best: “[critical theory] focuses on the social dimensions and consequences of educational practices; the ideological means of texts and experiences, the power relations in schools and other institutions” (p. 156). What is important about critical theory is that it allows preservice teachers to understand how curriculum favors certain forms of knowledge, affirms the dreams, desires, and values of selected groups, and how it marginalizes others (McLaren, 1989). Preservice teachers need to understand how people and events are represented in textbooks, curriculum materials, and how certain classroom practices benefit some groups and subordinate others. In short, critical theory in teacher education can allow preservice teachers to explore ways in which they may develop activities that work for social justice and toward social change (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1993; McLaren, 1989).

Conclusion

In closing, we want to leave the reader with several summary points that capture the core of this chapter. First, as history informs us, it is abundantly clear that racism is a driving force behind school segregation and Chicano school failure. Therefore, if we are to desegregate and integrate Chicano students, it is critical that we confront overt and institutional racism in the larger society, in particular within the educational system. Desegregation and integration of our schools must be viewed as important stages in the long struggle to combat and dismantle racism in the nation. Although adults are often resistant to accepting and building a culturally diverse and equitable society, our nation’s children and youths are considerably more open. If Chicanos and other students from racially/ethnically diverse backgrounds are properly integrated in classrooms, they should not only be exposed to a multicultural curriculum, but teachers should also have high expectations for them. Interracial/ethnic communication is important, but equally crucial are classroom environments where Chicanos
and other groups have equal status. Thus, school desegregation, as a first step, can be viewed as a tremendous potential leading to integration and to the promotion of and respect for cultural diversity.

Second, there is the issue of resegregation—especially among Chicano ELLs. Notwithstanding the significant advances made by Chicano parents in their desegregative legal battles, the reality is that Chicano students continue, to a large degree, to remain segregated within desegregated settings. This is a mounting concern that certainly requires the attention of school officials, researchers, and policymakers in the years ahead. We cannot forget the changing demography and the increasing number of ELLs in our public schools. If Chicano ELLs are to receive instruction in their native language, it must be done in “linguistically integrated” settings. Moreover, Chicano ELLs need to be educated in a way that will promote their academic success. To realize this, educators and counselors need to be trained to work with ELLs. Educators, in turn, need to value their language, have high expectations, offer challenging courses, encourage Chicano parents to become involved in schools, and to share a strong commitment to empower these students (Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1990). Anything less than this is unacceptable.

Our third point is concerned with the issue of pace. It has been well over five decades since Mendez and nearly five decades since Brown. There has been much deliberation, but very little speed in eliminating school segregation in our nation. As noted earlier, Chicano/Latino segregation has intensified to such an extent that they are now the most segregated racial/ethnic minority group in the United States. Given the projection that the Chicano/Latino population will account for a substantial portion of the increase in the country’s children and youths (see Valencia, Chapter 2, this volume), it is sad to predict that the next generation of Chicano students will very likely experience more segregation than previous generations. This issue alone should stir educators, politicians, and parents of the 21st century to challenge this insidious trend and demand integration in our schools. Now is the time for concerted action.

How can we move ahead? How can such action be realized in the context of concrete suggestions? To answer these important questions, we refer the reader to 11 policy recommendations—a number that we have also advanced and discussed in this chapter—that are proffered by Orfield (2001), Schools More Separate: Consequences of a Decade of Rersegregation. He suggests the following:

We should be considering the following policy issues if we wish to offer our children and our communities more opportunity for stable interracial education:

1. Expansion of the federal magnet school program and the imposition of similar desegregation requirements for federally supported charter schools.
2. Active support by private foundations and community groups of efforts to continue local desegregation plans and programs through research, advocacy, and litigation.
3. Creation of expertise on desegregation and race relations training in state departments of education.
4. School district surveys documenting the value (in legal terms, the compelling interest) of interracial schooling experience in their own cities.
5. Creation of many two-way integrated bilingual schools in which students of each language group work with, learn with, and help each other acquire fluency in a second language.
6. Provision of funding for better counseling and transportation for interdistrict transfer policies.
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7 Funding of teacher exchanges between city and suburban school districts and training of teachers in techniques for successful interracial classrooms.
8 Exploration of school and housing policies to avoid massive resegregation of large sections of the inner suburbs.
9 Federal and state funds and university sponsorship for the creation of integrated metropolitan-wide magnet schools.
10 Serious research to learn about the most effective approaches to effective education and race relations in schools with three or more racial groups present in significant numbers and two or more languages strongly represented.
11 Careful research and analysis documenting what happens to students in districts that restore segregated neighborhood schools.

(pp. 51–52)

Notes
1 The following four paragraphs are excerpted, with some modifications, from San Miguel and Valencia (1998, p. 357).
2 For a brief history (1848 to 1900s) of the origin and establishment of Catholic, Protestant, and public schools in the Southwest regarding the schooling of Mexican-origin students, see San Miguel and Valencia (1998, pp. 355–363).
3 Orfield (1988a) reported data for Latinos as a whole, not disaggregated by Latino subgroups (e.g., Mexican American; Puerto Rican). Given that Mexican American students comprise the strong majority of Latino students, any findings about Latinos (as a whole) in the present article can safely be generalized to Mexican Americans.
4 In his Table 19 (p. 47), Orfield (2001) lists segregation data on 12 states. We focus on the five Southwestern states in Table 3.3.
5 The following discussion of school segregation in AISD is excerpted, with minor modifications, from Valencia (2000, p. 448).
6 In Valencia (2000), there was a minor computational error. Valencia reported that there were 16 balanced and 52 imbalanced elementary schools. The correct count is 16 and 51 balanced and imbalanced schools, respectively.
7 McCarthy's (1975) references are testimonies by former Oxnard Superintendents who testified in a desegregation trial in Oxnard in the mid-1970s.
8 This paragraph is excerpted, with minor modifications, from San Miguel and Valencia (1998, pp. 371–372).
9 This and the following paragraph are excerpted, with minor modifications, from San Miguel and Valencia (1998, pp. 372–373).
10 This paragraph is excerpted, with minor modifications, from San Miguel and Valencia (1998, p. 373).
11 This note is excerpted, with minor modifications, from Valencia (2000, p. 456). Although correlational analysis does not allow us to conclude a cause-effect relation between the variables of interest, it can be very useful in generating hypotheses about particular patterns of events or behavior that, along with other analyses, help us build conceptual models to better understand those events or behaviors. In the present case, the observed correlation of 0.87 between percent minority enrollment and percent failing STAAR indicates a robust association between the two variables. A coefficient of 0.87, once squared, equals 0.76 (called the coefficient of determination (R²)). In the present analysis, as a statement of prediction, the correlation of 0.87 means that the variance in one variable predicts 76 percent of the variance in the other variable. This is substantial. If one assumes that school segregation is the predictor variable and STAAR performance the criterion variable, then the present analysis of AISD elementary schools suggests that school segregation is a fairly strong predictor of STAAR test scores.
12 The TASP is intended to "provide a comparison of the skill level of the individual student with the skill level necessary for a student to perform effectively in an undergraduate degree program" (Texas Educational Code, §31.206[c], 1999). Students who have accumulated 60 or more semester hours may not continue in upper-division coursework if they have not passed TASP. Students
who do not pass the TASP are required to enroll in "developmental" courses to remediate skill deficits in the areas not passed, then retake TASP or pass courses approved by the state as TASP-equivalent to continue with their degree programs (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 1999).

13. This section on early IQ testing and Mexican American children is excerpted, with minor modifications, from Valencia (1997b, pp. 64-65).

14. This section on curriculum differentiation is excerpted, with minor modifications, from Valencia (1997a, pp. 77 and 79).

15. The following discussion of these four early desegregation cases is excerpted, with minor modifications, from Valencia (1997a, pp. 374-377).

16. See Section 7, Article VII of the Texas Constitution.

17. Rangel and Alcala (1972) have commented that the "other White" strategy argued in Salasaters reared in the prevailing doctrine of the Patsy v. Fortson (1956) case. As Weinberg (1977) has noted: "In the absence of a state law requiring segregation of Mexican Americans, they claimed equal treatment with all other ‘whites.’ The crucial point was to leave little leeway to be treated as blacks under both state law and U.S. Supreme Court ruling" (p. 166). The other White strategy would be used in Mexican American desegregation cases for four decades, but was finally abandoned in Caminos (1970).

18. Although there were no de jure provisions for segregating Mexican American children under the California School Code of this era, the state did have the power to establish separate schools for "Indian," "Chinese," "Japanese," and "Mongolian" children (Alvarez, 1984).

19. Included in this cadre were attorney Gus Garcia, Dr. Hector Garcia, Professor George Sanchez, and the organizations LULAC, and the G.I. Forum, a newly founded Mexican American veterans advocacy group.

20. This section on post-Brown desegregation cases is excerpted, with minor modifications, from San Miguel and Valencia (1998, p. 385).

21. In the 1970s and early 1980s, thousands of schools across the country were closed due to declining enrollment, high inflation, and fiscal austerity. Not surprisingly, powerless working-class and racial/ethnic minority schools were pegged for closure. Some high-enrollment Chicano schools in California and Arizona were victims of this targeting, and subsequent plaintiffs in lawsuits (see Valencia, 1980, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c for coverage of these closures and litigation; also see San Miguel and Valencia, 1998, pp. 306-387, for a brief discussion).

22. This section on academic desegregation in the PuHSD is excerpted, with minor modifications, from Valencia (1997b, pp. 29-30).
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