

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1992

Attitudes and actions of affirmative action

Robert Randall. Sorenson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sorenson, Robert Randall., "Attitudes and actions of affirmative action" (1992). *Theses Digitization Project*. 608.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/608>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

California State University

San Bernardino

ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

A Project Submitted to

The Faculty of the School of Education

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the

Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Educational Administration

By

Robert R. Sorenson, M.A.

San Bernardino, California

1992

APPROVED BY:



Advisor: Dr. David O. Stine



Second Reader: Dr. Billie G. Blair

ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Robert R. Sorenson, M.A.
California State University, San Bernardino, 1992

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this project was to examine the development of Affirmative Action efforts throughout the United States, while giving special emphasis to California education. Developments that have led to successful implementation of Affirmative Action programs were of special interest.

Affirmative Action in the United States has been an ongoing process for many years. It has been punctuated by legislative, court, and violent street battles. The writer of this project wanted to know if any real progress had been made which has, or will likely, translate into improved representation and employment opportunity for minorities and women.

The study of Affirmative Action is relevant to educational administrators because they must work with the very people it concerns. Administrators may no longer turn a blind eye to discrimination. Furthermore, it may be shown that Affirmative Action is of benefit

both to teachers and students alike, and thus it is the proper concern of administrators.

Procedure

After a workable definition of Affirmative Action had been developed, the history of various elements of America's Affirmative Action struggle were examined in order to lay a foundation. Thereafter, questionnaires were sent to California schools at random. The questionnaires were sent specifically to teachers, principals, and to district-level administrators. The questionnaires asked for a report on district involvement with Affirmative Action and opinions on certain aspects of the subject. Materials from three districts were examined for specific insights into what is presently being done to combat segregation and lack of employment, and educational opportunity.

Results

The results of the project, though limited, indicated a need to develop methods to improve recruitment procedures in California school districts. Further examination of the materials received from the three districts gave a great deal of insight into this. The questionnaires also indicated that poor communication is

a problem in numerous districts.

Conclusions and implications

There are many avenues of endeavor open to a district which seriously wants to take Affirmative Action toward improved race and sex hiring practices in education.

Among them are voluntary efforts (as opposed to court ordered plans), recruitment, training, promotions, and improved communication.

Districts have had to and will continue to take stands regarding Affirmative Action. The subject is not going to go away. One major hurdle that must be crossed is the question of finances. In light of the growing budget deficit in California, districts will have to find a balance between funding needs and commitment to Affirmative Action.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. David O. Stine for helping me finally get started, and for providing questions that made me take care to be accurate. Dr. Stine also worked through what must have been quite a bit of proof reading. I would also like to thank Dr. Billie G. Blair who served as my second reader when several others had either been unable to serve, or seemed disinclined. Lastly, I would like to thank my wife, Carolyn, who kept the kids quiet, and who also suffered through several rounds of proof reading. Thank you!

Table of Contents

Section I:

Introduction.....	1
-------------------	---

Section II:

Review of Related Literature.....	4
-----------------------------------	---

"Affirmative Action" Defined.....	4
-----------------------------------	---

The Civil Rights Act of 1964.....	6
-----------------------------------	---

Affirmative Action in the Courts.....	7
---------------------------------------	---

Quotas and Percentage Goals.....	11
----------------------------------	----

Busing.....	13
-------------	----

Higher Education.....	16
-----------------------	----

Issues Involving Blacks, Hispanics, and Women....	20
---	----

Criticism of Affirmative Action.....	24
--------------------------------------	----

Designing Affirmative Action Programs.....	25
--	----

A Final Thought.....	27
----------------------	----

Section III:

Research.....	29
---------------	----

Focus, Expectations, and Limitations.....	29
---	----

Questionnaire Design.....	31
---------------------------	----

Section IV:

Analysis of Findings.....	34
---------------------------	----

Examination of the Folsom Cordova, and the San Francisco Affirmative Action Programs.....	40
--	----

Table of Contents (Continued)

Section V:

Conclusions.....	51
Busing.....	51
Voluntary Affirmative Action.....	52
Recruitment.....	52
Staff Training.....	53
Promotions.....	54
Staff Awareness.....	54
Finance.....	55
Resources.....	57
Appendix.....	61

List of Tables

Responses to Question One.....	35
Responses to Question Two.....	35

THE ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Section I

Introduction

Article four of the California Education code indicates that, "It is educationally sound for the minority student attending a racially impacted school to have available to him the positive image provided by minority classified and certificated employees," and that this is similarly true for children of majority groups. It further states that it is important for children to see that women can fill responsible and diverse societal roles as well as men (Ed. Code 44100). Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, and Usdan (1990) quote A Nation Prepared, by the Carnegie Forum (1979), as saying, "The race and background of their teachers tells [students] something about authority and power in contemporary America. These messages influence children's attitudes toward school, their academic accomplishments, and their views of their own and others' intrinsic worth" (p. 323). Although texts often contain assignments or articles dealing with this very concept, other than the occasional essay or poster contest around Martin Luther King's birthday, this writer rarely hears any discussion, or sees any evidence of overt action on the part of faculty and/or

administration to emphasize the contributions of women and minorities to our culture.

Certainly this is not true in all schools or districts. No teacher is privy to the daily occurrences in each classroom in his or her school. Furthermore, one might assume that part of the reason little action is seen, or discussion is heard about this subject, must involve geographical area. One might expect that if one were employed in a more urban environment, where racial percentages and tensions are more pronounced, one would hear more discussion and see more action to achieve equity in the interaction of race and education.

Affirmative Action has been an important issue in American education and industry for years. It will undoubtedly continue to be such for years to come. To varying degrees school administrators will be faced with the need to deal with this subject. In a profession where people are everything, their needs and concerns become of paramount importance. Education is just such an industry. Furthermore, if one accepts, even to a small degree, the idea that Affirmative Action can be a positive influence in today's society, then there is all the more reason for educators to be informed about Affirmative Action.

The history of Affirmative Action efforts

throughout the United states will be examined, with emphasis given to some of the issues that have risen to the front in this conflict. This paper will focus on the efforts in Affirmative Action on behalf of Blacks, Hispanics, and Women. Though they are without doubt a worthy group of people, Asians, and other ethnic groups will be largely excluded from the scope of this work. Some of the current events in affirmative action in California will be noted. Attention will be given to what certain specific school districts are doing and saying about the state of Affirmative Action in California. An effort to identify trends and changes, obstacles and successes, and make some suggestions for the future for districts and individuals in California who are concerned about Affirmative Action will also be made.

It should be noted that a great deal of the previously written material concerning Affirmative Action does not specifically deal with education. However, Affirmative Action is a problem which crosses over into many realms of endeavor.

Section II

Review of the Related Literature

"Affirmative Action" Defined

The term "Affirmative Action" was first used by the late President Johnson. In Executive Order number 11,246 he wrote that federal contracts were to, "Take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated . . . without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin" (Sobel, 1980, p. 1). Not only has the subject of Affirmative Action itself been controversial over the years, but one finds some variety in various definitions of the term.

Frances Holloway (1989) sites two definitions of "Affirmative Action." According to the government's Office of Federal Contractor Compliance Programs manual Affirmative Action is:

Those results oriented actions which a contractor by virtue of its contracts must take to ensure equal employment opportunity. Where appropriate, it includes goals to correct under-utilization, correction of problem areas, etc. It may also include relief such as back pay, retroactive seniority, make-up goals and timetables, etc.

(p. 10).

Holloway goes on to cite Title 41 of Chapter 60 of the Federal Regulations. "An Affirmative Action program is a set of specific and result-oriented procedures to which a contractor commits itself to apply good faith effort. The objective of those procedures plus such efforts is equal employment opportunity" (p. 10).

Holloway also says that in a case where one seeks to increase representation of a minority from a small percentage to a larger percentage that, "Differentially vigorous recruiting efforts may be in order" (p. 16).

The Affirmative Action Compliance Program for Contractors and Vendors manual issued by San Bernardino County (1977) defines Affirmative Action as,

. . . a commitment to increase the number of members of protected classes in the work force by setting employment goals and timetables . . . through reform of the system. . . . through the removal of artificial and unnecessary barriers to employment and promotion and [to] ensure that all job actions are related to job performance measures. (p. 2)

James Newman (1989) gave his own definition. He said, "Affirmative Action is defined as any race- or sex-conscious employment practices devised with the intention of redressing past racial or gender imbalances

and injustices. . . . [which] may include preferential treatment to members of a targeted class of people" (p. 32).

There seem to be certain commonalties between these definitions. First, we see that Affirmative Action is oriented toward results rather than actions. Secondly, it seeks not only to solve a present problem, but to redress grievances of the past at the same time. Lastly, it makes use of various forms of preferential treatment as a tool to cure an ill. With this in mind, for the purposes of this paper, Affirmative Action is defined as action(s) taken with the express purpose of correcting present-day problems, as well countering the results of past injustices in employment with regard to race or sex. Furthermore, these actions may evidence concern for the victims at the expense of non-victims.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964

One of the weapons used in the war against discrimination in the United States is the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In 1972 it was extensively amended as a result of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. It was in 1972 that Title VII of the Act was extended to include state and local governments and educational institutions. Title VII outlaws discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

It is interesting to note that the word "sex" was not included in the original bill. It was a later addition. A Southern senator added the word as an amendment. His intention was to muddy the waters so that the bill would fail (Samuels, 1975). Instead, he opened doors for women's advocates that might otherwise have remained closed for some time.

One other result of the Act and its later changes in 1972 was to create the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). It was originally created to investigate and conciliate complaints. Once created, it was given greater authority in 1972 (Samuels, 1975).

However, the EEOC did not just run out and start solving the nation's civil rights problems. In fact, in the beginning it was rather ineffective. When Eleanor Holmes Norton joined the organization as its head, it had amassed a tremendous backlog of cases, so that complainants were waiting far too long for help. The entire organization had to be streamlined. Eventually, a process of counseling, investigation, and fact-finding face-to-face conferences was developed which have helped considerably.

Affirmative Action in the Courts

There are both federal and state laws that affect Affirmative Action cases. Both by statute and by court

decision there are guidelines that govern the scope and jurisdiction of these laws. States may make Affirmative Action laws that are broader than the federal government. However, they may not permit a form of discrimination that has been outlawed by the federal government. As per the Constitution, if there is a conflict between state and federal laws, the federal statutes take precedence (Newman, 1989).

There have been literally thousands of Affirmative Action cases in American courts. One could probably make a case that the famous Dred Scott decision of the 19th century was an affirmative action case. Certainly Plessy v. Ferguson (1898), in that it established a benchmark for the separation of races within American Schools for over 50 years, was an Affirmative Action case. A few other Supreme court cases are notable.

In Brown v. Board of Education (1953) the Plessy v. Ferguson decision was overturned. The High Court ruled that the "separate but equal" concept of Plessy v. Ferguson was inherently unequal (Newman, 1989). This opened the doors for civil rights suits that sought to force states and communities to do away with separation of the races in their schools. This, in turn gave rise, among other things, to forced busing, and alteration of attendance zones (Campbell et al., 1990, p. 160).

In 1978, in Bakke v. Board of Regents the first major reverse discrimination suit was settled. One important question that was broached in this case was that of quotas based on race. Justice Powell stated that, "The attainment of a diverse student body was a 'constitutionally permissible goal for an institution of higher learning.' [However] this goal was improper . . . if it was attained through a system of quotas based [solely] on race or ethnicity" (Sobel, 1980, p. 146).

It should be noted here that Supreme Court decisions are very limited in their scope. They only apply to the particular case which is decided and any conditions that are identical. If there is any variance, a different case must be decided.

In 1979 the United Steelworkers of America v. Webber case (known as the Webber case) was decided. At the time, it seemed to some to be a reversal of the Bakke case. The union had reached an agreement with Webber's employer that called for one Black to be admitted for every White who was admitted to the company's skilled labor training program until there was a ratio of Blacks to Whites that approximated the community. At face value, this looks somewhat like reverse discrimination when there are Whites that are competing for the positions that were given to Blacks.

The union's contract was upheld. The court noted favorably the facts that, (a) the program was voluntary, (b) the program was temporary, (c) the program was designed to remediate an existing problem, and (d) it did not "Unnecessarily trammel the interests of the white workers" (Newman, 1989, p. 36).

In Wygant V. Jackson (1986) the question before the Court was whether or not an employer could enforce a voluntary Affirmative Action plan that provided relief to people who were not proven to have been victims of discrimination. Their answer was "No." However, one of the bases for the decision was that the state had not shown that it had a compelling interest to justify unequal treatment (Newman, 1989, p. 37).

In a recent conversation with a California State Board of Education employee who asked to remain anonymous for fear of losing his/her job the following was indicated: Just recently an interesting case at the state level has come up in California. In 1979, legislation was enacted which required districts with segregated schools to submit a plan for dealing with that segregation to a department of the Board of Education. In a recent case involving Long Beach the court has ruled the requirement falls under the heading of state mandated funding. In other words, the state

has to pay for such planning. Accordingly, since there is no money to pay for this, the requirement has been dropped.

Quotas and Percentage Goals

Almost from the beginning while Congress was debating the Civil Rights Act of 1964 there were charges that such a law would result in the unfair use of quotas. The late Senator Hubert Humphrey countered that quotas were not required by the Act (Sobel, 1980, p. 2). Another time the subject came up in Congress Rep. Holt contended,

. . . but the civil rights bureaucracy believes that race quotas should govern employment in both public and private sectors Private employers having federally funded contracts are required by Executive order to meet quotas in their hiring and promotion practices. . . . The imposition of quotas has been rampant inside the federal bureaucracy for years (Sobel, p. 3).

Senator Jesse Helms (R, N.C.) added to this debate in 1979 that,

Proponents of discriminatory quotas and goals have been partially successful in blurring the distinction between non-discrimination and affirmative action. . . . This confusion between

non-discrimination and affirmative action has promoted a system in which discrimination is being institutionalized under the guise of a nondiscrimination program (Sobel, p. 3).

He went on, on the same page to clearly state that quotas under the guise of "goals" are still quotas. Rep. Parn J. Mitchell firmly believes in quotas. He said that, "Quotas are an effective mechanism to enhance the effectiveness of legislation meant to address discrimination" (Sobel, p. 2).

The Philadelphia Plan (1970) was the first federal minority hiring agreement. It did not require contractors to hold to a specific percentage of representation for a minority group. Instead, it gave goals to approach. It was upheld in the federal courts for that very reason (Sobel, 1980, pp. 20-21, 103). In reference to it, Labor Secretary James Hodgson indicated that it was a system of, "goals and timetables," to be followed by a contractor in a "good faith effort" (Sobel, p. 104). In a letter dated August 18, 1972, President Nixon instructed all executive departments that minority goals were not to be interpreted as quotas and went on September 3, to refer to quotas as being "a dangerous detour away from the traditional value of measuring a person on the basis of ability" (Sobel,

1980, p. 104).

When all is said and done there seems to be a practical side to the use of quotas. They have been hailed as a necessary part of the solution to a problem. When used properly, they help alleviate racial imbalances. The federal government uses them. States and their interior mechanisms have used, or tried to use them, with varying degrees of success. Private industry has used them. Furthermore, as Frederick Lynch (1989) puts it, "Quota systems are good insurance against law suites" (pp. 144-146).

Busing

One of the most divisive of the issues that falls under the heading "Affirmative Action" is busing. Even by those who are willing to use it, busing has been referred to as a "... racially based penalty" (Sobel, 1980, p. 8). Congressman Mottl, a detractor of busing said,

The case for court-ordered busing has never been proven. . . . Court-ordered busing has not worked. . . . It is a social policy imposed by an activist judiciary, and it is a mistaken social policy that is leading to the virtual destruction of public education . . . where it is used" (Sobel, p. 8).

Rep. Cardiss Collins (D, Ill.) did not agree, and accused those who oppose busing of trying "to undercut desegregation--to undercut efforts to provide equal educational opportunity for all of America's school children" (Sobel, p. 8).

Part and parcel with busing is the use of the term "racial imbalance." According to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts "racial imbalance was defined as 'a ratio between non-white and other students in public schools which is sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the society in which non-white children study, serve and work'" (Campbell et al., 1990, p. 160). In order to solve the problems of racial imbalance within schools the courts in conjunction with school districts and other litigants have used "cures" which include magnet schools; special emphasis schools; busing; intradistrict and interdistrict transference of pupils, administration, and faculty; racially based special education programs; and interdistrict administrative bodies (Campbell et al., 1990, p. 159-161).

There were various attempts at outlawing forced busing. In 1979 a ban on such by the state of Washington was declared invalid by the Supreme Court. That same year an attempt to amend the Constitution to

ban forced busing was defeated 216 to 209. A two-thirds majority was needed to pass the amendment (Sobel, 1980, p. 166).

One should note the difference between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation. Campbell et al. (1990) explains that *de jure* segregation is segregation as the result of state action. *De facto* segregation is the result of more natural shifts in housing patterns (p. 193). For instance, if one legislates the separation of races within the schools, that is *de jure* segregation. On the other hand, if as has been the case, after much legal battling and of course expenditure of funds a desegregation plan results in a gradual change in housing patterns within an area, then one has witnessed *de facto* segregation. *De jure* segregation is considered meat for the courts' control. However, although definitions of *de jure* and *de facto* segregation have changed over the years, it is generally understood that districts are not required to work toward the elimination of *de facto* segregation (Campbell et al., 1980, 193-196).

The effort to end racial imbalances through busing and other means has given rise to mixed results. One unpleasant result was that between 1954 and 1972 the integration of public schools resulted in the loss of

30,000 jobs for black school employees. When employees were integrated along with the students, it was Blacks who lost jobs or Whites who got the new jobs. On the other hand, in 1963 one poll indicated that when asked if they were willing to send their children to an integrated school, 61% of the parents polled replied in the negative. Seven years later, the same question was asked with far different results. Only 16% of those asked replied in the negative. Surprisingly, as of 1979 the South had more integrated schools than any other portion of the nation (Sobel, 1980, p.48).

Higher Education

One focal point where higher education and Affirmative Action intersect is that of representation of the races. It is important in higher education (Gillett-Karam, S. D. Roueche, and J. E. Roueche, 1991, p. 22). Minority enrollment in Higher Education is declining (Gillett-Karam, S. D. Roueche, and J. E. Roueche, 1991, p. 22). Although there is a larger percentage of Blacks and Hispanics being graduated from High School of late, as a group there are fewer going on to college (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 7). Gillett-Karam, S. D. Roueche, and J. E. Roueche (1991) make the point that "underrepresentation in Higher Education will result in drastic shortages in skilled job markets" (p.

22).

It is interesting to note that birth rates play an important roll here. Mexican-American and Black birth rates are higher than that of Whites. According to Hodgkinson (1991) the problem is not high fertility among minorities, but rather the low fertility of Whites (p. 9).

In the case of Higher Education Affirmative Action programs depend on two things, staff development and new hirings (Andrews and Marzano, 1991, pp. 27-28). Accordingly these new hirings must come from the realm of higher education. Currently about 18.4% of the new enrollees in higher education are of minority decent. In California, 65.3% of those minority students enroll in two-year institutions. Overall these figures represent a drop in enrollment. However, when only junior colleges are considered one sees significant growth (Andrews and Marzano, 1991, p. 28).

In 1982 it was predicted that there would be a significant teacher shortage about now. Generally that has not materialized except in some large cities (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 6). Daresh (1989) points out one factor that might help account for this. He says "that teachers often come from families who cannot be selective when it comes to choosing a college . . . this

characteristic serves to entice people into teaching in the first place (p. 180).

As more and more of the teachers hired during the 1950s and 1960s retire their positions will need to be filled. Furthermore, in the 15 years prior to 1986 it has been shown that salaries for teachers in higher education actually dropped, thus providing less impetus for some individuals who may otherwise have wished to enter the field (Andrews and Marzano, 1991, pp. 26-30). It should be noted here that in light of the present, well known, condition of the nation's economy in general, and California's in particular, one might hardly expect this trend to end in the near future. Accordingly, it has been projected that between 1985 and 2010 over 500,000 positions will need to be filled, just in higher education. Although the general teacher shortage that was predicted in 1982 has not materialized, the preceding information might cause one to feel that it is still a viable possibility.

Besides the fact that attrition will leave many openings in the field of teaching, another factor figured into such a prediction must be the fact that in 1997 elementary and High school enrollment will peak at about 44 million, which is up from 39.7 million in 1983 (Andrews and Marzano, 1991, pp. 26-30). Then again,

according to Andrews and Marzano, "herein lies the silver lining of the impending shortage: Only a major hiring phase presents the opportunity to significantly advance racial diversity among faculty" (Andrews and Marzano, 1991, pp. 26-30).

One way to improve minority enrollment in higher education is to make it more desirable and attainable for them. According to Kappner (1991) the Borough of Manhattan Community College has an interesting plan for enhancing pluralism and diversity. Some of the salient factors of this plan are:

1. In candidate searches the college president has veto powers. That means that if he or she feels that the search has not been broad enough, he can force a restart of the entire process.

2. There is an annual "Diversity in the Workplace" forum. The aim of this is to encourage the integration of women, minorities, and the disabled into the workplace.

3. The subject of faculty development has also been addressed. Opportunities for professional development are provided. Release time is regularly granted so that faculty members can complete work on doctoral dissertations. This in turn helps fill in the blank spots where there is underrepresentation of

minorities, women, and the handicapped among faculty members with advanced degrees. Release time is also provided for participation in seminars dealing with balancing the curriculum for gender, race and ethnicity. This includes time for reading.

4. Staff training is provided in the area of sensitivity to various cultures.

5. Summer programs to improve basic skills of incoming freshmen are provided. This has resulted in improved retention of second year students.

The governing philosophy of this plan is found in this statement:

An institutional plan is most effective when it can be integrated into the everyday goals and work of specific areas, teams or committees . . . when individuals can be held accountable for outcomes and when the chief executive officer makes it a major priority (pp. 16-21).

Issues Involving Blacks, Hispanics, and Women

The need for progress in Affirmative Action involving Blacks, Hispanics, and Women is clearly visible in a multitude of areas. The following is only a few:

Blacks are not treated the same as non-blacks in many schools, even though (or perhaps because) they are

enrolled in integrated schools. It has been documented that there has been a disproportionate number of suspensions involving black students in integrated schools (Sobel, 1980, p. 17).

In the workplace equity for non-whites has not yet been achieved. Wohlstatler and Coleman referred to a kind of "occupational segregation" dealing with the fact that non-whites are greatly overrepresented in some types of jobs, while in other jobs they are greatly underrepresented (1972, p. 84). Arrow states, "[The] bulk of the difference is accounted for by differences in wage rates, partly because Blacks are concentrated in low income occupations, and partly because they receive lower wages even within given occupations (1972, p. 84).

Blacks and Hispanics generally earn less than Whites. As late as 1972 documentation shows that Blacks were still only earning about 65% of what Whites were earning. According to Arrow (1972, p. 84), these figures were on a slow and unsure climb. Among other things, one contributing factor may be that Blacks and Hispanics, on the average, have larger families. (It was earlier mentioned in this paper that their birth rates are higher than that of Whites.) "It is apparently a well-established fact that individuals with

many siblings earn less" (Arrow, 1972, p. 85). It should also be noted that Arrow states that racial income differences are greater at higher levels of income (1972, p. 85).

Hispanics, for a long time were not even recognized as a minority group to be considered. And when considered, there has long been confusion as to just who should be included in the group so labeled. There are two major factors that account for this. They are Caucasian, some of whom are very light skinned, of European decent, and share a Christian heritage with Whites. Also, for centuries they have been concentrated in the Southwest (Schmidt, undated, pp. 1-3), and therefore they were out of sight and out of mind.

Blacks, Hispanics, and women are soon to be a force in the work force of America with whom there must be a reckoning. In 10 years Blacks and Hispanics will constitute 25% of the population in the Unites States. By the year 2,000 80% of all people entering the workforce will be minorities, women, and emigrants. At the same time 47% of the total workers in America will be women, and 61% of all women in America will be employed (Andrews and Manzano, 1991, pp. 26-28).

On the other hand, the roll of Whites will be diminishing. In California, during the 1989-1990 school

year minorities made up 52.9% of the K-12 enrollment. During that same year in California 861,531 students were classified as LEP (limited English proficient). By the year 2,000 English will be a second language for more than half of the California population (Melendez, 1991, p. 8). Sometime after the year 2,000 Whites will become a minority in America (Andrews and Manzano, 1991, pp. 26-28).

There is a serious disparity between the certificated staffing of California schools and the racial composition of those schools. Although 33% of all California students are Hispanic, only 7.5% of the certificated school employees in California are Hispanic. Only about 1.4% of the Certificated Superintendents in California are Black. Only about 4.4% of them are Hispanic. Blacks make up about 11%, and Hispanics comprise only about 9% of the total number of principals in California (Melendez, 1991, p. 9).

In the area of Higher Education women have had an uphill battle. In 1973, a special section of the President's Economic Report to Congress dealing with the status of working women stated that "the low representation of women in positions of responsibility is striking" (Sobel, 1980, p. 114). At one point in or around 1972 fully half of the staff of the Office for

Civil Rights was concerning itself with university Affirmative Action plans, and much of the problems with which they dealt concerned women (Sobel, 1980, p. 116). In 1978 it was reported that the percentage of women in full-time faculty positions in United States colleges and universities had not risen since 1972. Furthermore, a study by Educational Testing Service, also released in 1978 showed that women holding doctorates were making less and being promoted less than men of comparable education. Furthermore, as years of experience increased, the differences became even more pronounced (Sobel, 1980, pp. 158-159). Even today, according to Darish (1990) "the historic tendency for the percentage of male teachers to increase at more advanced levels of schooling (ie., as one moves from elementary to secondary schools) continues (p. 181). In other words, there are still more men at the top.

Criticism of Affirmative Action

Frederick R. Lynch (1989) refers to Affirmative Action as a "Silent Social Policy Revolution" (pp. 5-8). He makes the following assertions regarding Affirmative Action:

Affirmative Action has been implemented by bureaucrats and judges (and is therefore not a product of the peoples' will). Affirmative Action is largely an

informal oral policy which results in (reverse) discrimination which is hidden to make sure quotas have been reached. The constitutional and legal foundations of Affirmative Action are unclear. Accordingly, "baby-boomer white males" have been shouldered with the burden of Affirmative Action. In other words, it is these baby-boomers who are paying for Affirmative Action in lost jobs, wages, opportunity, and self esteem (Lynch, pp. 8-5).

He goes on in the same passage to discuss what he calls a "New McCarthyism." The gist of what he intimates is that dissenting discussion of Affirmative Action has been so suppressed that one is given the misconception that the majority of Americans favor Affirmative Action. For this reason, and perhaps because they often feel that legal recourse is futile the victims are guilty of complicity. He states that Whites are reluctant to openly complain or take legal action in cases of reverse discrimination. They often feel or find that it is too hard to prove reverse discrimination in the courts for their efforts to be worth while (Lynch, pp. 8-5).

Designing Affirmative Action Programs

Before one can design a good Affirmative Action program one needs to remember one important thing about

discrimination. Discrimination is not always blatantly racist (or sexist). One must consider what Stasz (1981) called "statistical discrimination" (p. 174). She states that the human capital (or value) of a group is often judged by the performance of a test group (p. 175). Individuals end up being evaluated for their worth on the basis of the group average, or worse yet, on the basis of someone's perception of group performance. This, in turn, can be based on something as limited as one person's poor performance (Stasz, p. 175).

Consider the "token" employee(s). He/they are more visible by virtue of their differences from the other workers. They are more likely to be scrutinized. They are therefore, more vulnerable (Stasz, p. 186). Accordingly, when something goes wrong, and one quits, or does poorly, he becomes the "all-Indians-walk-in-single-file-ask-me-the-one-I-saw-did" excuse for discrimination.

Webb, Greer, Montello, and Norton (1987, pp. 74-75) quote Harris, McIntyre, Littleton, and Long (1979) in describing Affirmative Action plans:

Normally, affirmative action plans enumerate the following considerations provided for in the EEOC affirmative action guidelines:

A policy statement communicates the board's commitment to affirmative action.

The plan provides for public information, both internal and external, to explain it.

A school official has the responsibility and commensurate authority to administer the plan.

The plan includes a work-force utilization self-analysis to determine if current employment practices operate as restrictions to equal employment opportunities (Affirmative Action Guidelines, 1979).

The plan provides for modifications of present practices to eliminate discriminatory practices.

When underutilized minority group members and women have been identified, the plan includes goals for improving their conditions and a time-table for implementing the goals.

The plan includes a system for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting to respond to the effectiveness of the plan's implementation process.

A Final Thought

One should consider the contrast between homogeneity and diversity. Stasz (1981) said, "...behavioral science has well established that homogeneous groups are prone to insularity,

narrowmindedness, and self-serving prejudice . . . (p. 176). Gillett-Karam, S. D. Roueche, and J. E. Roueche (1991) make the following statement about cultural diversity, which goes hand in hand with developing an overall Affirmative Action policy:

The value of Cultural diversity lies in its exposure and acceptance as a part of the "quality of life" of all citizens. There should be no barriers for gender or ethnicity if selection is based on credentials and experience and if selection is directed toward seeking out diversity (Juliet Garcia, president, Texas Southmost College, p. 21).

Section III

Research

Focus, Expectations, and Limitations

This paper has covered portions of what federal and state institutions have done, or attempted to do, about Affirmative Action. It has also mentioned some of what has happened in the private sector. It should be noted here that for purposes of practicality, the research portion of this project has been limited to that which may be reasonably affected by school districts.

For that reason, the reader is reminded of the comment by Andrews and Marzano (1991, pp. 26-30) which says, ". . . Only a major hiring phase presents the opportunity [for an educational institution] to significantly advance racial diversity among faculty." To accept this as gospel is to miss numerous other opportunities. However, it does serve to help focus this research. Schools, at least elementary and secondary schools, can do little or nothing about the makeup of their students. But the makeup and attitudes of their faculties can be affected. And in the case of higher education, even the makeup of the student body can be affected by virtue of the fact that higher education is not compulsory.

Affirmative Action has been a topic charged with emotion and diversity. There have been many solutions tried with a myriad of results. There also seems to be at least two differing opinions about every solution. For this reason the author does not expect to find agreement between the individuals poled about what should or should not be done. This same confusion is also expected to result in apathetic or even antagonistic attitudes on the subject. The most positive item which is expected is a general acceptance of the idea that Affirmative Action must be approached from the personnel office. That is, hiring and personnel training are a valid means by which to combat the problem.

Two limitations on the "randomness" of the selections were that care was used to insure that districts in both rural and urban areas were selected. Furthermore, an effort was made to insure that districts were chosen from numerous geographic areas within the state. However, no attempt was made to choose between large and small districts, or to choose well-known districts. Upon later reflection it can be noted that there does seem to be a wide variety of district sizes and locations to which questionnaires were sent.

Questionnaire Design

Questionnaires were designed to facilitate a broad base from which both opinions and information could be drawn. For that reason questionnaires were sent to numerous districts, and to three levels of employees, teachers, principals, and district-level administrators (generally superintendents).

Of the three different questionnaires, no two contained the exact same set of questions. It was not the intention of this project to detect differences of opinion. Rather, its intention has been to detect current trends.

Since there are two kinds of Affirmative Action plans, mandated and voluntary, questions were included to ascertain whether or not the district in question was involved in one or the other type of plan. If the district was involved in either type, a description of the plan, the reason(s) for its implementation, and its benefits and difficulties was requested. The respondent's opinion of the plan in question was also requested. These are people who are closely involved with Affirmative Action and therefore may have useful insights to share. This information was considered important because there have been so many different approaches to Affirmative Action over the years. This

author is most concerned with what is being done now. The questions relating to the above concerns were numbers one through 12 on the questionnaire to principals, numbers one through four on the questionnaire to teachers, and numbers seven through 10 on the questionnaire to administrators.

Information was also desired on the question of district needs. For instance, was it felt that the respondent's district needed to hire more minorities, or to provide more training of one sort or another, or that morale, or student development, was in need of help? Accordingly, question number 13 to the principals addressed this concern. Questions five through eight to the teachers also addressed this.

This concern was left out of the questionnaire to the administrators for two reasons. It was felt that a broad overview of curriculum and district Affirmative Action policies was likely to be available from district-level administrators, and an effort was being made to keep the questionnaires reasonably brief.

Whereas, in a democracy, public opinion is often the precursor to change, question number 14 to the principals asked for indications that trends are developing in the local community which might affect the district's involvement in Affirmative Action.

Although solutions to Affirmative Action problems generally involve district employees, they ultimately affect the student. For this reason, the administrators were asked in questions one through six if Affirmative Action was being addressed through the curriculum.

Lastly, as a final search for any more information which might relate to the subject, administrators were requested to include copies of board policies concerning Affirmative Action.

Samples of the three questionnaires may be found in the appendix.

Section IV

Analysis of Findings

The responses to the questionnaires were varied both in content and in locale of origin. Questionnaires were sent to administrators, principals, and teachers in 30 districts throughout California. People from at least 14 districts responded (one questionnaire was received from a principal without the name of the district). Twelve teachers responded. Four principals responded. Five district-level administrators responded. One Affirmative Action Program was received that was not accompanied by a questionnaire, nor was there a return address on the envelope. Accordingly it is impossible to know whether it was sent by a principal or a district-level administrator. Approximately 18 percent of the questionnaires sent were returned.

Question number one on the teacher questionnaire asks, "Is your district presently involved in a state or federally mandated affirmative action plan?" Question number two asks, "Is your district developing , or functioning under, a voluntary Affirmative Action plan?" (These are questions one and seven on the principals' questionnaire, and numbers seven and eight on the administrators' questionnaire.) The possible answers were yes, no, and unsure. Tables one and two provide an

overview of responses to questions one and two:

Table 1

Responses to Question One

Respondent Group	Possible responses		
	Yes	No	Unsure
Teachers	3	4	5
Principals	0	4	*
Administrators	1	4	0

* This option was not available to principals.

Table 2

Responses to Question Two

Respondent Group	Possible responses		
	Yes	No	Unsure
Teachers	2	2	8
Principals	0	4	*
Administrators	1**	3	0

* This option was not available to principals.

** One administrator did not respond to this question.

Question number three on the teachers' questionnaire asked for a description of the district's Affirmative Action plan if the teacher answered "yes" to either one or two. Of the five respondents, two showed little or no understanding of the workings of their district's plan. One went so far as to say, "We do not know how it works." Two mentioned efforts to hire minorities, and the last mentioned balancing teacher population with local population.

The next question was a subjective opinion question. It read, ". . . do you feel an Affirmative Action plan is necessary, or would be a positive move for your district? Why, or why not?" Eight people responded. Four people responded negatively, two of those because they felt their district was already doing what Affirmative Action is all about. One other opposed it because it was demeaning, and the fourth felt it was not necessary for "enlightened administrators," but also noted that it is difficult to attract people of color to rural areas. The four other respondents supported an Affirmative Action plan, but gave little meaningful reason for their support.

Questions five and six were related. Question five

asked, "Do you feel that the different races and sexes are adequately represented in your school staff? . . . in your district? Why, or why not?" Of the 11 who responded to this question, 10 noted some form of inadequacy, either in representation by race or by sex. It is interesting to note that seven of the 11 respondents mentioned difficulties involving finding qualified candidates willing to apply. Question 6 asked for suggested changes in regards to question five. Again, limited applicants and recruitment seemed to be the major concerns.

Eleven of 12 people responded to number seven. Of those 11, nine felt that the concepts of racial/sexual equality and mutual respect are adequately addressed with regards to school staff and student development. However, one rural and one urban teacher both felt that in the area of student development there was a need because of what they perceived as racism.

Question eight which asked for suggested changes in the addressing of racial/sexual equality issues, and question nine which simply asked for any further comments received little attention. However, community buy-in and the presence of more male role models were mentioned with regards to question eight.

The principals' questionnaire contained 15

questions. It was disappointing to receive so few responses from the principals. Further, it was disappointing to realize that, of the 4 respondents, none of them were in districts involving any mandated or voluntary Affirmative Action plan. Accordingly, there were no responses to questions two through six or eight through 12. Questions 1 and seven have already been discussed.

Question 13 says, "With regard to Affirmative Action, what are your district's greatest need(s) in the areas of . . . Personnel? . . . Student development? . . . Over-all district morale? As for personnel needs, the responses were varied, including female staff to stay, the presence of more blacks, and excellent educators. In the area of student development the responses urged more role models, characteristics of minorities (meaning unsure), and multi-cultural activities/learning opportunities. The responses concerning over-all district morale included money, and concern about changing demographics.

Question 14 concerned the perception of local trends which might result in (further) Affirmative Action for a given district. Two of the four who responded answered "No." The third wrote, "Value of Cultural Diversity," which this author understands as

saying that the public perception of the value of cultural diversity is increasing. The fourth mentioned a recent influx of non-English speaking Hispanic students.

There were no responses to question number 15.

There were five respondents to the administrative questionnaire. Four of the five responded positively to question number one which asked, ". . . does your district have any plans, programs, curricula, or such, which are specifically intended to address the concepts of interracial cooperation, equality, and/or respect?" The materials indicated were described as social studies curricula by two of the four and other less specific materials by the other two. Three of the four indicated that the materials were required to be taught, while all four felt that the materials were worthwhile, but none explained why they were worthwhile.

Questions four and five asked for benefits received from the use of the above materials and possible changes. Two of the four indicated that they had just implemented their use, and it is therefore too early to tell. The other two expressed that the community is satisfied and that the benefits vary from site to site because of variations in need and implementation. There was concern expressed that community involvement should

be improved.

Questions nine and 10 were answered by the inclusion of materials from various districts. The least comprehensive of these was a seven-line statement by the district board which recognizes the need for equal opportunity for all and vows to uphold federal and state laws concerning such. Beyond that, it gives no indication as to how this is to be accomplished. The other two programs included are too long to be included word for word in this paper, though certain elements of them will be discussed. The two programs are the "Affirmative Action Program" from Folsom Cordova Unified School District, last revised in 1988, and the San Francisco Unified School District Affirmative Action Plan, dated 1988, and are available from the districts. Examination of the Folsom Cordova and the San Francisco Affirmative Action Programs

The Folsom Cordova Plan makes an interesting differentiation. Equal employment opportunity and Affirmative Action are seen as separate parts of the process whereby "Affirmative Action" will be achieved. In the Plan equal employment opportunity applies to all persons, "requires the elimination of any existing discriminatory practices and conditions whether purposeful or inadvertent" (p. 1), and shall be

periodically reviewed. Affirmative Action, on the other hand, involves "positive action . . . by the Superintendent to overcome the effects of any systematic forms of exclusion and discrimination" (Folsom Cordova, p. 1), and that brought on by neutrality which has fostered the status quo. Furthermore, the very next sentence indicates that Affirmative Action is "results oriented," and involves recruitment, employment, and promotion.

The same sentence goes on to use the phrase "who are qualified or qualifiable." This is an important concept. It has been noted previously in this paper that hiring new individuals is a valid way of solving problems of under-representation. It has also been noted that finding candidates from underrepresented groups to fill vacancies is not always easy. The idea of "qualifiableness" is that efforts to actually bring group members into a condition of hireability, or promotability, are not only appropriate, but may be necessary. The San Francisco Plan makes the point that "financial commitment to [increased representation] is essential" (p. 14). In other words, Affirmative Action plans are not enough, money must be put where the mouth is.

Third, the Folsom Cordova Plan goes on to say that

the heads of each administrative unit "shall be held responsible to apply the Affirmative Action Program whenever selections are made . . ." (p. 2). Unlike the seven-line "plan" earlier mentioned, specific individuals know that they are going to have to answer for their actions, or inactions in the area of Affirmative Action.

There are two other noteworthy points in the Folsom Cordova Plan. It does make use of Goals and timetables to ". . . provide a proportionate balance in minority personnel (ethnic and female) which approximates in ratio the student ethnic population of the district" (Folsom Cordova, p. 2). Second, the mechanism for communicating the plan not only within the district, but to the general public, and specifically to minority and women's groups is in place (p. 3). One thing that seemed common within many of the questionnaires, at least those from the teachers, was that they were unsure of the answers to some of the questions. Thus one can see the need for greater communication.

The Folsom Cordova Plan also leaves something unsaid that raises a valid and important question. The concept of training present personnel to move into other positions, particularly those of leadership, is brought

out in at least two places in the Plan (pp. 1 and 3). The question is this: "Who pays for it, and who provides the time for training?" This is again a matter of money. The Folsom Cordova Plan calls for "in-service and leadership training . . . to qualified employee candidates . . . when ever possible (usually in conjunction with two or four year colleges)" (p. 3).

The San Francisco Unified School District Affirmative Action Plan, dated 1988, is very detailed and quite long. The pages are not all numbered, but it is about three-fourths of an inch thick. Though it is dated, 1988, one interesting fact that came out of the questionnaires is that it was just recently implemented. Such a plan, if well prepared, is not likely to be an "overnight" deal. In fact, the introduction indicates that the process dates back to 1975 with further impetus given through the imposition of a court order in 1983 (p. 1).

There are several commonalties between the San Francisco and the Folsom Cordova plans. The first one is found before one gets past page 1 of the San Francisco Plan's introduction. The same words, "result-oriented," are used. The Federal Regulations, chapter 60, Title 41 also make use of the same phrase. The idea being that Affirmative Action is more a practice than an

idea and is only measurable by what it accomplishes.

Also, in common with the Folsom Cordova Plan is that it acknowledges that Affirmative Action plans need to deal not only with acquisition of outside resources (recruitment), but with promotions and training. Additionally, included in San Francisco's list are assignments, transfers, layoffs, and terminations. It should be noted here that the San Francisco Unified School District, as of 1988, had 76 schools (p. 2), and more than 60,000 students (p. 14). Smaller districts may not have the opportunity to work within all of these areas.

In the San Francisco plan, support training and internship are integral parts. However, again, the question of just who bears the cost of such training is not delineated (p. 5).

Goals and quotas for the purpose of racial sexual balance are to be used (P. 13). San Francisco goes on to state that they are to be subject to an annual schedule. Also, San Francisco has set not only short-term (one year) goals, but long-range goals which reflect a six year timetable.

One comment made on page 13 about goals and timetables is questionable. It asserts that ". . . the process, rather than numbers and percentages, guarantees

significant progress towards the goals." This assumes that there are no outside forces that successfully mitigate one's progress. It also assumes that the process is well planned and complete in its scope. One might further question the validity of the use of the word "significant" as being potentially overly optimistic.

Both districts' plans include an "Affirmative Action Officer" (San Francisco, pp. 4-5; Folsom Cordova, pp. 3-4). Their plans to utilize such a person contain numerous similar items. The responsibilities of the Folsom Cordova Affirmative Action Officer are here listed:

1. The development and implementation of a district-wide affirmative action program plan which shall contain specific, timely, relevant, and effective goals and timetables.
2. The development of procedures to assist in the identification of Equal Employment Opportunity problems, and recommendation of solutions to resolve any deficiencies.
3. To provide guidance to all management and supervisory staff on matters relating to the implementation of the affirmative action program plan.

4. Disseminate the Policy and Plan by maintaining communication with local community groups, recruitment sources, minority and women's organizations, and educational institutions.
5. Keep the Superintendent and Board of Education informed of all developments in the equal employment opportunity areas.
6. Determine the degree to which the District's goals, objectives, and timetables have been achieved.
7. Monitor records of referrals, placements, transfers, promotions, terminations, and other pertinent statistical data to insure that the District's Policy and Plan is carried out.
8. Keep the District's management and Supervisory staff informed of the latest developments, laws, legal interpretations, or shifts in emphasis, in the equal employment opportunity area to insure awareness of the need to update the District's program.
9. Developing and implementing results-oriented programs and procedures designed to eliminate under-utilization in areas where it exists.
10. Serve as liaison between the district and enforcement agencies.

11. Provide the Superintendent and Board of Education with an annual report, in December, on the results of the program, including statistics detailing the racial, ethnic, and sex composition of the district employee by category.

12. To endeavor to resolve allegations made by individuals or groups that Affirmative [Action] Policy and Plans are not being followed.

San Francisco has much to say about the subject of recruitment. Tied to the earlier mentioned belief that financial commitment is essential, their plan says, "Steps must be taken to increase the minority [teacher] applicant pool." They go on to show that Degrees in Education for Blacks and Hispanics dropped from 17% of the total number of Degrees in Education in 1981 to only 10.4% in 1985 (p. 14). It should be further noted that though the figure 17% includes only Blacks and Hispanics, the figure 10.4% also includes Asians and Native Americans. Since teachers are required to hold degrees, this means that there are far fewer minority applicants available from which to choose teachers.

San Francisco's plan also details numerous specific steps to be taken toward increasing the minority applicant pool (certificated and classified). Page 15 in total, and excerpts from pages 16 and 17 are here

reproduced:

- continue to recruit at all Bay Area Job Fairs.
- establish an administrative training program for those minorities interested in career advancement.
- Identify and attend job fairs and conferences where large numbers of minorities will attend.
- Hold interviews for administrative positions only after all efforts to have adequate representation from minority subgroups have been exhausted.
- Offer contracts to successful minority student teachers in the District.
- Encourage teacher training institutions to place minority student teachers in District schools.
- Seek referrals of qualified minority candidates through professional and social organizations and through District employees.
- Develop administrative internships to hire minorities from underrepresented groups.
- send all promotional job announcements (Classified and Certificated) to all minorities in the District.
- Encourage and participate in minority workshops to develop and improve interview skills.
- Seek funds to provide professional advancement training for minorities.

- Provide support to new teachers to ensure retention.
- conduct exit interviews for all minorities who resign from the District.
- seek linguistic minorities for every job classification.
- Recruit individuals who wish to change professions and retirees from industry in the areas of math, physics, and chemistry.

They further have plans to institute a "Future Teachers of America Club" at each high school and middle school. Six out-of-state trips for the purpose of recruitment were planned just for the 1988-89 academic year, with a budget of \$20,000. Their paraprofessional Career Program was to be expanded. The number of available minority administrators in the District was to be expanded, in part, by the institution of "a collaborative leadership training model between the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco State University." Available minority entry-level teachers were to be increased through the institution of "Teachers for Tomorrow." This is a five year plan to give financial support to 50 minority high school graduates (10 per year) who are working toward teaching credentials. The plan includes stipends to cover

tuition and a summer intern program. When finished they will receive a guaranteed job in exchange for a two-year commitment.

Section V

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be reached from the preceding material. One may have an idea not only what to do about Affirmative Action, but in some instances, what not to do. Busing, voluntary Affirmative Action plans, recruitment, promotions, staff training, and staff awareness have all been, and presently are, important issues if one wishes to foster action towards better representation of the races and sexes within education. Each of these has its own strengths and weaknesses.

Busing

Busing has been a conflict plagued practice which, even by its proponents, has been known as somewhat of a lesser evil. It has been fought in Congress. It has also been fought in the courts and in the streets. Admittedly, it has resulted in desegregation, which may be a positive measure. It has also resulted in changed demographics which are not fodder for the courts (De facto segregation). Accordingly, it may be more of a temporary cure for a symptom, than for a disease. Furthermore, it does little to change the makeup and attitudes of the faculties which are affected by it. In the district reorganizations that sometimes follow a

desegregation order, minority jobs may actually be lost. This, in turn, may result in fewer minority role models for students, which is just the opposite of Affirmative Action's aims. It is therefore reasonable to search for other more effective measures to combat segregation, lack of employment opportunity, and shortage of minority role models in the schools.

Voluntary Affirmative Action

Voluntary Affirmative Actions, besides being good insurance, have other benefits. A court ordered plan may involve specific goals set by the courts. A voluntary plan, by its very nature, may be tailored by the district, without outside intervention. Furthermore, it may serve to save the many dollars lost in court battles.

Recruitment

Recruitment is one of the most obvious means by which Affirmative Action may be achieved. Simply put, if there is a successful, and ongoing program of hiring qualified minority applicants, goals are likely to be met.

However, therein lies the rub. Recruitment is often difficult because of the lack of qualified minority applicants. At this point, a district must decide whether to see such a condition as a crutch or as

a hurdle. They may either hide behind the condition bemoaning its presence, yet failing to make any Affirmative Action headway; or they may adopt programs and procedures which may circumvent or alleviate the problem.

As has been shown earlier, there are many possible ways to improve recruitment pools. Some are relatively inexpensive. Others may require the expenditure of large amounts of money. Each district must balance its resources and level of commitment with its Affirmative Action needs.

Staff Training

Staff training is another area where one may make headway in Affirmative Action. Not all under-utilization is in entry-level positions. In fact, poor representation in leadership positions is sometimes the primary thrust of an Affirmative Action lawsuit. There are cases throughout American industry where the lower ranks are full of minorities lead by white administrators.

Staff training may take a multitude of directions, such as training in multi-cultural heritages, racial characteristics, and in view of the concept of "qualifiableness," higher level job skills are also appropriate. In addition to present employees,

employers may also find it necessary to train suitable job candidates. In the area of education this would most likely take the form of involvement in various forms of internships for certificated positions, and more common training programs for classified employees. Where potential teachers and administrators are concerned, and possibly where classified staff are concerned, this could involve partnerships with colleges, universities, and perhaps even trade schools.

Promotions

Hand in hand with recruitment and training is the issue of promotions. Besides recruiting new minority administrators, there is often a wonderful pool of potential administrators who are already well familiar with one's district. They are the certificated and classified staff already existent within the district. As in the case of the San Francisco plan (pp. 18-19), a commitment to fostering upward mobility within a district's staff is important. Not only might such a move fill an upper-level vacancy with a minority individual, it also opens up a lower-level position for similar action.

Staff Awareness

One appalling condition which seems born out through the research questionnaires that were sent to

the teachers is that there exists a level of ignorance which is far too high for comfort. Numerous teachers were unsure even if their district was involved in any Affirmative Action plan. Where court mandated Affirmative Action was concerned, 42% of them were unsure. For voluntary Affirmative Action plans, the figure climbed to 67%. One might also note that the "Yes" and "No" answers are not verifiable in all cases.

Teachers just don't seem to know what is going on. Whether the problem stems from apathy, poor communication on the part of the district administration, or some combination thereof is of no real concern here. However, the existence of the problem is. It bespeaks an area where there is a definite need. Teachers are on education's front lines. Of all the people who need to care about the dignity and worth of a person's heritage or sex, it is the teachers who will most influence the students simply due to their proximity to them.

Finance

One last area is that of finance. Hesperia Unified School District recently handed out a flier with the June first paychecks which indicated that a 0% COLA is a definite possibility. This is just one example of the dire straights the entire state of California is in

where finances and education interact. As was earlier noted in this paper, Affirmative Action will demand a commitment of money, as well as effort. It is therefore a time for a thoughtful evaluation of each district's priorities.

References

- Andrews, H. A. & Marzano, W. (1991). Meeting the Looming Faculty Shortage. Community, Technological, and Junior College Journal, 61(3), 26-30.
- Arrow, K. J. (1972). Models of Job Discrimination. In A. Pascal (Ed.), Racial discrimination in economic life (ch. 2). Lexington, MA: Lexington. Blanchard, F. A., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Introduction: Affirmative action and the question of standards. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 3-7). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- California Education Code. *Article 4-Affirmative Action Employment, 44100.*
- Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O., & Usdan, M. D. (1990). The organization and control of American schools (6th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Daresh, J. C. (1989). Supervision as a proactive process. New York: Longman.
- Etna Union High School District. (1987). Affirmative action plan. Etna, California:
- Folsom Cordova Unified School District. (1988). Affirmative action program (Policies numbered

4005.1 through 4005.8).

Gillett-Karam, R., Roueche, S. D. & Roueche, J. E.

(1991) Underrepresentation and the Question of Diversity. Community, Technological, and Junior College Journal, 61(3), 22-25.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1988). Demographics of Supply and Demand in the Western Region. The coming shortage of faculty. Addresses and proceedings of the annual meeting of the Western College Association, 6-9.

Holloway, F. (1989). What is affirmative action?

In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 9-19). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Kappner, A. S. (1991) Creating Something to Celebrate: Planning for Diversity. Community, Technological, and Junior College Journal, 61(3), 16-21.

Lynch, F. R. (1989). Invisible victims: White males and the crisis of affirmative action. New York: Greenwood.

Melendez, M. (1991). Minorities as majority. Thrust for Educational Leadership, 20(4), 8-11.

Newman, J. D. (1989). Affirmative action and the Courts. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 31-49). New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Norton, E. H. (1980). A conversation with Eleanor Holmes Norton. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Washington, D.C.
- Samuels, C. (1975). The forgotten five million: Women in public employment. Brooklyn, NY: Faculty Press.
- San Bernardino County. (1977). Affirmative action compliance program for contractors and vendors. San Bernardino County.
- San Francisco Unified School District. (1988) Affirmative Action Plan. San Francisco, CA: Personnel Services Department.
- Schmidt, F. H. (Undated). Spanish surnamed American employment in the Southwest. Colorado Civil Rights Commission.
- Sobel, L. A. (Ed.). (1980) Quotas & affirmative action. New York: Facts On File. Stasz, C. (1981). An American nightmare. New York: Schocken.
- Webb, L. D., Greer, J. T., Montello, P. A., & Norton, M. S. (1987). Personel administration in education: New issues and new needs in human resource management. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Witt, S. L. (1990). The pursuit of race and gender equity in American academe. New York: Praeger.
- Wohlstetter, A., Coleman, S. (1972). Race Differences in Income. In A. Pascal (Ed.), Racial discrimination

in economic life (ch. 1). Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Appendix

The Texts of the Questionnaires Which Were Sent to Administrator's, Principal's, and Teacher's

This appendix contains the texts of the instructions and questions found in the questionnaires which were mailed out. Also included, are copies of the texts of the cover letters which accompanied each questionnaire:

April 5, 1992

Dear Principal:

My name is Robert Sorenson. I am presently working toward the completion of a Master's Project at California State University, San Bernardino. My topic is Affirmative Action in California schools. Will you please help me by filling out the attached questionnaire. A timely reply will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, or additional comments I will be happy to hear from you personally. My address is (omitted). My phone number is (omitted).

Sincerely yours,

Robert Sorenson

PS. If you would like to receive a copy of my findings please note that on the top of the questionnaire when

you return it. I will be happy to send one to you.

Questionnaire

Directions: First of all, relax! Not all of this questionnaire will apply to any given district, so it will not be nearly as long as it might seem. Please take a few moments to answer the questions below as candidly as you are able. Feel free to make additional comments either on the back or to attach extra pages. For the purposes of this questionnaire Affirmative Action may be defined as "action(s) taken with the express purpose of correcting present-day problems, as well as countering the results of past injustices in employment with regard to race or sex."

School District _____

Your position (optional) _____ Date _____

1. Is your district presently involved in a state or federally mandated Affirmative Action plan?
Yes/No-->If you circled "No" please advance to question number 7, page 2.
2. Please briefly describe the circumstances that resulted in the mandate? Specifically, what complaint was made that resulted in Affirmative Action?
3. Please briefly describe what specific actions have been mandated to correct the above problem. Briefly

describe your district's Affirmative Action plan.

4. Please describe any benefits, tangible or otherwise, which have resulted from your plan's implementation.

P1

5. What difficulties have been encountered in implementing the plan?
6. If you could change, or add to, any facet(s) of the plan, what would you do? Why?
7. Is your district developing, or functioning under, a voluntary Affirmative Action plan?
- Yes/No-->If you circled "No" then please advance to question number 13, page 3.

8. What circumstances have led to the development of the plan?
9. Please briefly describe the plan.
10. Please describe any benefits, tangible or otherwise, which have resulted from your plan's implementation.

P2

11. What difficulties have you encountered in developing or administering the plan?
12. If you could change any facet(s) of the plan what would you change? Why?
13. With regard to Affirmative Action, what are your district's greatest need(s) in the areas of...
- Personnel? _____

Student development? _____

Over-all district morale? _____

14. Do you see any local trends developing, (positive or negative), which might result in (further) Affirmative Action for your district? Please describe them.
15. Do you have any other comments which you feel would be helpful? Thank you for your valuable time!

Please attach copies of your board policies and procedures regarding Affirmative Action and any brochures your district may have developed. Thanks! P3

April 5, 1992

Dear Teacher:

My name is Robert Sorenson. I am presently working toward the completion of a Master's Project at California State University, San Bernardino. My topic is Affirmative Action in California schools. Will you please help me by filling out the attached questionnaire. A timely reply will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, or additional comments I will be happy to hear from you personally. My address is (omitted). My phone number is (omitted).

Sincerely yours,

Robert Sorenson

PS. If you would like to receive a copy of my findings please note that on the top of the questionnaire when you return it. I will be happy to send one to you.

Questionnaire

Directions: Please take a few moments to answer the questions below as candidly as you are able. Feel free to make additional comments either on the back or to attach extra pages. For the purposes of this questionnaire Affirmative Action may be defined as "action(s) taken with the express purpose of correcting present-day problems, as well as countering the results of past injustices in employment with regard to race or sex."

School District _____

Your position (optional) _____ Date _____

1. Is your district presently involved in a state or federally mandated Affirmative Action plan?
Yes / No / Unsure
2. Is your district developing, or functioning under, a voluntary Affirmative Action plan?
Yes / No / Unsure
3. If you answered "Yes" to either 1 or 2, please describe your district's Affirmative Action plan.
4. If you did not answer "Yes" to either 1 or 2, do you

feel an Affirmative Action plan is necessary, or would be a positive move for your district? Why, or why not?

T1

5. Do you feel that the different races and sexes are adequately represented in your school staff?
 . . . in your district? Why, or why not?
6. In regards to question 5 would you like to make any changes? Please describe them.
7. Do you feel that the concepts of racial/sexual equality and mutual respect are adequately addressed in your school? . . . in your district? Why, or why not?
 With regards to school staff: _____
 With regards to student development: _____
8. With regards to question 7, if you would like to make any changes, please describe them.
9. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time? Please do so.

T2

Dear Administrator:

My name is Robert Sorenson. I am presently working toward the completion of a Master's Project at California State University, San Bernardino. My topic is Affirmative Action in California schools. Will you

please help me by filling out the attached questionnaire. A timely reply will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, or additional comments I will be happy to hear from you personally. My address is (omitted). My phone number is (omitted).

Sincerely yours,

Robert Sorenson

PS. If you would like to receive a copy of my findings please note that on the top of the questionnaire when you return it. I will be happy to send one to you.

Questionnaire

Directions: Please take a few moments to answer the questions below as candidly as you are able. Feel free to make additional comments either on the back or to attach extra pages. For the purposes of this questionnaire Affirmative Action may be defined as "action(s) taken with the express purpose of correcting present-day problems, as well as countering the results of past injustices in employment with regard to race or sex."

Your school district: _____

1. With regards to instruction of students, does your district have any plans, programs, curricula, or

such, which are specifically intended to address the concepts of interracial cooperation, equality, and/or respect?

Yes / No / Unsure

2. If you answered "Yes" to number 1, please describe your district's plans, programs, etc.

3. Again, if you answered "Yes" to number 1, are they...

...required to be taught?

Yes / No / Unsure

...considered by you to be worth while?

Yes / No / Unsure

Why, or why not? _____

A1

4. What has your district benefited from the plan's use?

5. What changes in this area would you like to make?

6. If there are any other comments you would like to make, please do so.

7. Is your district presently involved in a state or federally mandated Affirmative Action plan?

Yes / No / Unsure

8. Is your district developing, or functioning under, a voluntary Affirmative Action plan?

Yes / No / Unsure

9. If you answered "Yes" to either 7 or 8, please describe your district's Affirmative Action plan.

A2

10. If you did not answer "Yes" to either 7 or 8, do you feel an Affirmative Action plan is necessary, or would be a positive move for your district? Why, or why not?

Please attach copies of your board policies and procedures regarding Affirmative Action and any brochures your district may have developed. Thanks!

A3