

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Student Integration Services

HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION IN LAUSD – CHRONOLOGY OF THE INTEGRATION PROGRAM

CRAWFORD V. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES

August 1, 1963	Original complaint filed by parents of Mary Ellen Crawford and several others under co-sponsorship of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The suit, brought to Los Angeles County Superior Court, was filled against the Los Angeles City Board of Education as a class action on behalf of all “Negro and Mexican American pupils.”
October 28, 1967	Trial begins.
May 2, 1969	Trial ends.
February 11, 1970	LA Superior Court (Judge Alfred Gitelson) rules that school district operates segregated schools and gives initial order to integrate.
May 12, 1970	Court issues findings, conclusions and judgment.
May 18, 1970	LAUSD Board files notice of appeal.
March 6, 1974	Oral arguments presented to State Court of Appeal.
March 10, 1975	Court of Appeal rules in school district’s favor.
March 25, 1975	ACLU petition for rehearing is denied.
April 7, 1975	Court of Appeal denies the ACLU request for a rehearing.
April 18, 1975	ACLU petitions for a hearing before the California Supreme Court.
July 1, 1975	State Supreme Court agrees to hear the case.
January 8, 1976	Oral arguments presented to State Supreme Court.
June 28, 1976	State Supreme Court upholds Judge Gitelson’s decision but reverses a portion of the initial judgment which defined desegregation in terms of specific racial/ethnic percentages. The school district is required by the latest ruling to take reasonable and feasible steps to alleviate the harms of segregation regardless of the cause – and demonstrate meaningful progress in that task. State Supreme Court shifts jurisdiction of the case back to L A Superior Court.
July 19, 1976	Board of Education declines to seek further legal review by California Supreme Court or U S Supreme Court.
February 22, 1977	Judge Paul Egly is appointed to hear the remedial part of the case.
March 18, 1977	Proposed Integration Plan submitted to Superior Court.
March 23, 1977	Court hearings begin on Integration Plan.

April 1977	Four intervenors accepted as parties to the suit: Bustop (April 18), BEST-Better Education for Students Today (April 19), Integration Project (April 19) Diane E. Watson (April 25). Board member Watson, representing the interests of the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Student Integration (CACSI), later stepped down as an intervenor, to be replaced by CACSI members Dr. Robert M. Loveland and Mary Keipp.
July 6, 1977	Superior Court Judge Paul Egly issues minute order rejecting the plan submitted by the Board of Education and requiring the board to fully examine alternate plans and return to court in 90 days with a plan which promises to meaningfully desegregate the district beginning with the semester which starts in February of 1978.
October 3, 1977	New Integration Plan (approved by Board of Education September 26) submitted to L A Superior Court.
October 19, 1977	Pre-trial hearings begin in court of Judge Paul Egly.
December 13-21, 1977	Judge Egly holds private, out-of-court conferences with attorneys in an attempt to reach pre-trial agreement on some issues relative to proposed integration plan. No agreements or settlements were made. Trial date delayed to January 4, 1978 at request of ACLU.
January 4, 1978	Trial date postponed because of Bustop motion to disqualify Judge Egly on grounds of "bias and prejudice."
January 5, 1978	Superior Court Judge Lester E. Elson appointed to hear Bustop disqualification motion against Judge Egly.
January 17, 1978	Judge Olson rules that Judge Egly may remain on the case.
January 23, 1978	Trial on plan resumes in L A Superior Court.
February 7, 1978	Judge Egly issues minute order approving implementation of plan, as submitted, beginning in September 1978 as a "first step" in the desegregation of the district's schools. He withholds final approval pending resolution of disputed matters on which the court will seek recommendations from a panel of experts. The Board of Education, by December 31, 1978, must change its plan to reflect improvements that are developed by the board and/or any of the expert's recommendations that are approved by the court.
February 22, 1978	Judge Egly appoints panel of eight experts.
May 3, 1978	Court referee Monroe Price recommends 10-member Citizen's Monitoring Committee to the judge.
August 3, 1978	Judge Egly denies motion by Bustop to: 1) dismiss case from further court jurisdiction 2) delay implementation of plan; or 3) order a specific limit on busing travel time. Bustop indicates Egly ruling will be appealed to State Court of Appeals.
August 31, 1978	State Court of Appeal (2 nd Appellate District) sustains Bustop's motion to stay implementation of plan pending full hearings.
September 5, 1978	ACLU/NAACP/Center for Law and justice asks State Supreme Court to overturn the stay and allow implementation of plan. Board of Education asks State Supreme Court to take jurisdiction of the case to allow the "highest state review" of issues raised regarding the plan,.. The school board also asks that the stay now not be vacated because of major administrative problems (such as not having sufficient time to notify parents about school opening on September 12. (The board originally opposed the stay in the Court of Appeal.)

[Type text]

September 6, 1978	State Supreme Court overturns the Court of Appeal stay, handing jurisdiction back to Court of Appeal for further hearing.
September 8-9, 1978	U S Supreme Court Justices William Rehnquist and Lewis F. Powell, Jr. turn down Bustop petition for hearing before the United States Supreme Court.
September 12, 1978	Implementation of Plan 2 begins
October 22, 1979	Trial for expansion of Plan 2 begins
November 6, 1979	Proposition 1 passes
November 13, 1978	Eight desegregation experts appointed by Judge Paul Egly submit individual reports with recommendations. Highlights: Expand present plan to include grades 1-3 and 9 next year and grade 10-12 the following year. Make State Department of Education a party to the development of a "metropolitan" solution utilizing students in predominantly White school districts elsewhere in Los Angeles County and several surrounding counties. Change definitions for integrated, segregated and desegregated school. Change some pairings and clusters to shorten bus rides and provide more equitable transportation burdens for all groups involved. Phase out voluntary Permits With Transportation program. Retain bilingual education programs. Hire additional minority staff. Change existing feeder school patterns to keep desegregated students together. (Pending further action by Los Angeles Superior Court and/or Los Angeles Board of Education, these are recommendations <u>only</u> .)
December 4, 1979	Board files a motion to eliminate mandatory reassignment requirements Because of Proposition 1.
December 18, 1978	Judge Egly grants Board of Education a two-month extension of deadline to provide court with expanded integration plan or to explain why expansion is not necessary or feasible. Extension was requested by the board. School board must respond by February 28, 1979; the date had initially been set as December 31, 1978.
March 16, 1979	Basic integration plan changes and future proposals submitted to Judge Paul Egly, along with district answers and evaluations of various alternative approaches to integration.
April 11, 1980	Trial to expand Plan 2 ends.
May 11, 1979	Judge Paul Egly sets June 4 for start for trial hearings on integration plan, proposed changes and other approaches.
May 22, 1979	District's attorneys file motion to postpone trial start until October or later in order to complete pre-trial preparations. Judge Egly agrees to hear motion on May 30.
May 30, 1980	Judge Paul Egly grants motion for postponement, and sets June 25 for next hearing to set trial date. Egly also orders board not to make any changes in integration plan without prior court approval.
June 4, 1980	Judge approves Year Round Schools Program,
June 8, 1979	Judge Egly takes under submission a motion by the Integration Project to make state and state education officials parties to the integration case, and to develop a metropolitan integration plan.
June 13, 1979	Board announces its intention to request court approval of previously submitted changes racially isolated minority (RIMS), magnet and currently integrated schools.

[Type text]

June 18, 1979	Board files motion to request approval of plan changes in RIMS program only.
June 20, 1979	United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) files motion to become an active intervenor in the integration case to protect teacher interest affected by RIMS program changes. Judge Egly takes request under submission.
June 21, 1979	Judge Egly grants tentative approval of district plan to improve RIMS program. He also approves budget and orders payment to consultant firm to develop alternate integration plan simulations. Refunding of court-appointed Monitoring Committee also ordered.
June 28, 1979	Judge Egly denies "without prejudice," the Integration Project's motion to Widen court case and develop a metropolitan integration plan. Judge Egly states school district plan must be judged before any other approaches can be considered.
July 7, 1980	Court orders Plan 3 to be implemented
September 8, 1980	Board files an appeal with the United States Supreme Court to stop implementation of Plan 3 because of Proposition 1.
December 19, 1980	The Court of Appeal upholds the Board's appeal regarding Plan 3 and declares Proposition 1 constitutional.
March 16, 1981	Board votes to mandatorily reassign students under Plan 3 to return students to resident schools. Judge Egly recuses himself from the case
April 17, 1981	Judge Lopez is assigned to the case.
September 10, 1981	Judge Lopez gives final order on the case approving the implementation of Plan 4
June 30, 1982	The United States Supreme Court upholds the constitutionality of Proposition 1.