So Darlan gover

U. S. LISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TOXAS

EIFED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

APR 3 0 1984

<u> </u>			
<u> </u>			
	£		
_			
事 。	<u> </u>		
•	•		
1			
•		Ву	
			Deputy
<u> </u>			
1			

Plaintiffs

v.

DR. LINUS WRIGHT, GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT, DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL.

Defendants

Civil Action No.3-4211-H

the January 30 Motion; the Coalition has not filed a response to the April 20 Motion, but its counsel has advised the Court that the Coalition opposes the Motion.²

The Court has determined that there is no necessity for a hearing; it appears from conferences with counsel that the material figures and facts set forth in the Motion are not in dispute.

In deciding this Motion the Court is bound to observe

course, is the continuing affirmative duty of every previously

segregated school system to bring about "the maximum desegregation

Second, the Court must view the school district as a

it is the purpose of school desegregation to make whole the victims of past unlawful discriminatory practices. 5

It is also basic that in school desegregation the district court has broad powers to establish equitable remedies. 6 Such remedies should accommodate the interest of school officials in administering school affairs consistent with the Constitution. Milliken II, 433 U.S. at 281; Rapides II, 702 F.2d at 1226.

The district court should make use of its insight into local conditions and use "creativity in the fashioning and implementation of a desegregation plan". Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board, 721 F.2d 1425, 1437 (5th Cir. 1983);

crisis by providing these students instruction more concentrated than is available at the 4-6 Centers which they currently attend. Motion, Appendix A. Put another way, the district proposes ď,

(Field and Hexter), and to exclude ten of the current Centers from the transportation program entirely. April 20, 1984, Motion, 16 (Remoral galustum)

Figure 2.0. Seventeen 4-6 Centers will remain. Id., Figure 1.0.

remaining 4-6 Centers will likely be stabilized, and in some instances improved, by the proposed revision. Compare Figure 1.0, January 30 Motion with Figure 1.0, April 20 Motion.

With respect to the ten 4-6 Centers recommended for exclusion, the Court finds that only one (Reilly) will become predominantly anglo. The Court is familiar with time/distance patterns in the district and finds that Reilly. in the

	Busing Plan for the 4-6 level (April 20 Motion, Figure 1.0) will
	pot advocably affect desergedation in the RISD. The Court makes

· 14 :	
	the same finding with respect to proposed 1984-85 desegregation
	·
	assignments for 7-8 Centers (April 20 Motion, Figure 3.0), which
_	and all the series of direct 7-9 areignments
* ——	
`	,- <u> </u>
÷	
Hotch	The Court further finds that relocation of the
11 30 1	The Court further finds that relocation of the
Hoto	Montessori program, K-8, to Hotchkiss will not adversely affect
	The state of the s
n	
	·
1	
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u></u>	ju
, 14.	
, t	
7	•
-	
	-

the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		idents than it now has. The Court finds that this move
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the) [
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the	<u> </u>	
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
the Motion, it should be understood, and the Court will require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the	1 2	
require that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the		
	the Moti	on, it should be understood, and the Court will
	require.	that the majority-to-minority transfer provisions of the
	· ,	
	T.o.	
		·
	.	
	-	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	•	

Dallas Educational Centers as may appear to be necessary to enable the district to fulfill its commitment.

Plaintiffs urge that a readily identifiable person or office be designated as responsible for the success or failure of

urge that specific standards be established for teacher qualifications, salaries, and pay incentives at the Centers. Plaintiffs' suggestions have much merit. However, in view of the district's commitment, upon which the Court relies, to improve the

1 --- 1 -- E 12--- sttasding the Centere and the

all 4-6 students, see Motion, Appendix B, at 22, the district-wide

all 4-6 students, see Motion, Appendix B, at 22, the district-wide goal may not be changed without prior court approval.

Finally, the Court commends the school district for its initiative and creativity in this matter. The Court especially commends counsel for the parties (plaintiffs, the district and the Black Coalition) who have negotiated diligently and in good faith for many weeks.