

SLATE, GREGGORY R., Ed.D. *From Integration to Segregation: A Case Study History of T. Wingate Andrews High School, 1968–2008.* (2017)  
Directed by Dr. Craig Peck. 213 pp.

The purpose of this study is to tell the story regarding the events and outcomes of T. Wingate Andrews High School, which was founded as an integrated high school in 1968 in High Point, North Carolina. The study captures the events of Andrews High School from the period prior to its creation, through the 1993 High Point City Schools' merger with Guilford County Schools, until 2008 when Andrews High School had moved to segregated status. In my research, I considered primary source documents including school board meeting minutes, school district documents, and articles from local newspapers in order to examine plans, comments, and quotes from school board members, community members, and lobbying groups. Primary source documents were supplemented with secondary sources such as existing studies concerning the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews High School and High Point City Schools' history.

The findings of this study reveal how and why Andrews High School moved from an integrated high school that mirrored the demographics of High Point in 1968 to a segregated high school that was 90% students of color in 2008. Throughout the history of T. Wingate Andrews High School, the Boards of Education of High Point City Schools and the later merged Guilford County Schools attempted to prevent the school from becoming segregated but ultimately were unable to avert the tide. Four central themes emerged in the history. First, the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews as an integrated, newly built school was a unique attempt at desegregation in the South. In addition, the merger of two school systems promoted rather than prevented segregation, a development

that differs from findings in existing scholarship. Third, the impact of race on the High Point community and its neighborhood schools resonated throughout the high school's history. Finally, the good intentions represented in the two Board of Educations' ongoing policy efforts that were meant to preserve integration at Andrews ultimately met with hard inevitabilities such as White flight, residential segregation, and community apathy.

The story of T. Wingate Andrews High showed the necessary moral obligation of a progressive school board to fight to maintain integration. By continuing to make evident the struggle for equity and social justice in educational settings, the Guilford County Board of Education's efforts in redistricting and policy were essential.

FROM INTEGRATION TO SEGREGATION: A CASE STUDY HISTORY OF  
T. WINGATE ANDREWS HIGH SCHOOL, 1968–2008

by

Greggory R. Slate

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of The Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

Greensboro  
2017

Approved by

---

Committee Chair

©2017 Gregory R. Slate

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation, written by Gregory R. Slate, has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Final Oral Examination

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee. I owe an enormous amount of gratitude to Dr. Craig Peck who had the patience and ability to guide me through this process. His knowledge and leadership served me well for which I will always be indebted. Other members of the committee, Dr. Carl Lashley, Dr. Ann Davis, and Dr. Rick Reitzug also provided me with excellent guidance as well.

Secondly, I would like to thank my family. My wife, Amy, and my son, Will, have been my support and inspiration throughout this process. I know that both of them sacrificed countless hours and even days so I could dedicate my time to T. Wingate Andrews and Guilford County Schools. Thank you both for your love, strength, and constant nudges to help me complete this study.

I would also like to thank my mother and father, Belenda and Rick Slate. Your love and parenting instilled the work ethic and determination in me to complete this work. Without your guidance, I would not be the man I am today.

Finally, I want to thank all the educators and historians I have had the honor to work with along the way. Whether an educator at UNCG, Lexington City Schools, Guilford County Schools, or Rockingham County Schools or a historian at one of several libraries I worked at, please know that you have impacted me in ways for which I can never thank you enough. The conversations, directions, and assistance you gave along the way blessed my journey and made it truly memorable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY .....	1
Background and Significance .....	1
Methodology .....	5
Research Questions .....	7
Data .....	8
School board meeting minutes .....	8
School board policies and newspaper articles .....	10
Time Periods .....	11
Researcher Perspective and Experiences .....	12
Trustworthiness .....	13
Outline of the Chapters .....	14
II. NATIONAL HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE .....	17
Introduction .....	17
School Desegregation: A Brief History .....	17
State Historical Context .....	21
The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Push to Achieve the Goal of <i>Brown</i> .....	24
The End of Desegregation and the Beginning of Resegregation .....	25
Policies Leading to Resegregation .....	29
Attempts to Prevent Resegregation .....	31
Impact of Resegregation .....	33
Benefits of Integration .....	35
Unintended Consequences of Integration .....	37
Summary .....	39
III. T. WINGATE ANDREWS HIGH SCHOOL: 1968–2003 .....	41
Introduction .....	41
From <i>Brown</i> to the Creation of T. Wingate Andrews High School .....	41

The Principalship of the New T. Wingate Andrews High School .....	46
Merger of High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools.....	53
Redistricting Efforts from 1997 to 1999 .....	56
Redistricting Committee .....	57
Mapping Committee Results.....	61
Community Response .....	62
Dr. Terry Grier and Attempted Implementation of the 1999 Redistricting Plan .....	65
High Point High Schools’ Facilities Study .....	65
Reassignment plans and redistricting plans .....	66
The Andrews Academy and other redistricting options .....	70
The 2003 Bond.....	76
The Phase VI Reassignment Plan and Progress of the Andrews Academy.....	81
Problems with the 1999 Reassignment Plan.....	82
High Point high schools’ capacity .....	83
Demographics for the High Point high schools .....	85
Ninth-grade capacity .....	87
Free or reduced lunch numbers within the ninth grade .....	88
Summary .....	89

IV. THE HIGH POINT HIGH SCHOOLS CHOICE PLAN AND THE SEGREGATION OF ANDREWS: 2003–2008 .....	91
Introduction.....	91
Creation of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan .....	92
Goals of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan .....	93
Board Discussion and the Beginnings of Community Pushback.....	95
The High Point High Schools Choice Plan Operational Plan for Implementation .....	97
Specific Details of the High Point Choice Plan .....	101
Andrews High School Center for Advanced Research and Technology .....	102
Southwest Institute of Visual and Performing Arts .....	105
High Point Central Institute for International Studies and Languages.....	106

Marketing and recruitment of students within the High Point Choice Plan .....	108
High Point Area Choice Plan Transportation .....	110
Explanation of the Choice Plan and frequently asked questions .....	112
Emphasis on socioeconomic diversity .....	115
Community Reaction to the Plan .....	115
Initial Opposition .....	115
Community Action Regarding the Choice Plan.....	119
Initial Student Assignment and Community Reaction.....	119
Community group problems .....	123
Year One of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan .....	125
The election of 2004 .....	125
Continued opposition to the High Point Choice Plan and first semester results .....	127
Year Two Student Assignment Problems .....	130
Board of Education Response to the Community.....	132
Board of Education begins to focus on redistricting .....	132
Redistricting plan .....	134
Collapse of the Plan and Redistricting.....	139
Neighborhood Schools Focus .....	141
Final Proposed Plans for High Point High Schools.....	143
Map A proposal.....	143
Map B proposal.....	144
Map C proposal.....	144
Map D proposal.....	145
Community Action and the Move to Redistrict.....	145
Effects on Schools and Student Achievement and Demographic Shifts.....	147
What is Left of the High Point Choice Plan .....	152
Summary .....	153
V. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS .....	155
Introduction.....	155
A Unique Attempt at Integration .....	156
Merger Leads to Segregation .....	159
Race Still Mattered .....	164
Good Intentions Meet Hard Inevitabilities .....	167
White Flight .....	168
The Price of Residential Neighborhoods .....	170

Court Decisions.....	172
Loss of Desire for Integration.....	174
Summary.....	176
VI. CONCLUSION.....	178
Lessons Learned.....	178
Was it Worth the Effort?.....	181
Final Thoughts .....	183
REFERENCES .....	185

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Baseline Data .....	103
Table 2. Performance of High Point High Schools on North Carolina Standardized Tests .....	148
Table 3. Demographic Shifts of the Three High Point High Schools.....	151

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY**

This dissertation is an account of a historical investigation into the unfortunate outcome of an integrated T. Wingate Andrews High School built in 1968 in the city of High Point, North Carolina in the Southern United States. Although the high school began as an integrated institution, it slowly moved from being a school that was 70% White and 30% African American (a racial balance that mirrored demographics in the city of High Point) to a school that in 2008 was 90% minority (Student Accounting Reports, 2008). This study is based on primary and secondary documents including school board minutes, school board policies, newspaper articles, political agendas, housing patterns, and demographic data. The primary sources contained comments and insights from former school board members, senior school system staff, and concerned citizens over time from the development of Andrews as an integrated high school to its final chapter as a minority majority school.

#### **Background and Significance**

In 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States heard a case involving racial segregation in public education. The case was built around two Black sisters in Topeka, Kansas who were required to walk past a White school and through a train switchyard to catch a bus to their all-Black school. The federal court agreed that this was dangerous but ruled that since the facilities, teachers, books, etc. were of equal quality, the Board of

Education was not violating the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees equal protection and access under the law. The Brown family disagreed and enlisted the help of Thurgood Marshall to argue their case before the United States Supreme Court (Patterson, 2001). Marshall argued “separate was inherently unequal” and thus violated the equal protection clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. The Court, under new Chief Justice Warren, ruled unanimously that segregation in public schools was unconstitutional and directed attorney generals from each state to define how they would proceed. *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) was a groundbreaking decision by the United States Supreme Court in the 20th century. The U.S. Supreme Court’s decision not only defined the way public education would serve students of different races, it also defined the role public education would play in shaping the attitudes of society in general (Sitkoff, 1981). By the 1950’s, public schools had become the battleground for the Civil Rights Movement and the ensuing evolution of the American society. Public schools throughout the United States, but predominantly in the Southern United States, would now be required to do what much of society had refused to do on its own: desegregate and provide equal access to education for all students (Patterson, 2001).

The stories surrounding desegregation efforts have many facets that split into a variety of directions. Some desegregation stories discuss legal issues, others target the school systems’ struggles to become unitary or desegregated, and then others tell the effects of desegregation on students and schools as noted in Stalnaker (2013). This story focuses on the failure of what was seen initially as a desegregation success. Although the initial accomplishments of T. Wingate Andrews High School can be seen throughout the

annals of the former High Point City Schools, the ultimate disappointment of the school to stay balanced racially is noteworthy. As years pass, individuals who were instrumental in the integration of T. Wingate Andrews age and die without their story being told. Subsequently, the belief that T. Wingate Andrews High School has always been a minority majority school permeates throughout the community along with the unfortunate stigmas associated with schools that are inner city with high poverty and minority student bodies. By focusing on the historical truth behind the misfortune of T. Wingate Andrews High School, I hope to reveal the more important issues that led to the turn of events that brought us to today's demographics and situation involving the high school. The initial resistance to integration in High Point, movement to accept desegregation through the establishment of Andrews, and the ultimate regression of the integrated school into a minority majority school is a compelling story that needs to be told. By exploring this success story that turned to disappointment, I detail how a community dealt with a social struggle that led to dramatic changes that have undone the vision of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Through the research conducted on T. Wingate Andrews, I focused on studying the central problems regarding the school that moved the institution toward resegregation within the progressive school district of Guilford County Schools. Guilford County Schools' promotion of policies that focus on equity, inclusion, and diversity categorize the district as progressive throughout the years of this study. In its initial years, T. Wingate Andrews was originally part of the High Point City Schools district prior to consolidation with Guilford County Schools. Andrews was a successful model for other

school districts in the Southern United States to follow. However, the ultimate success of Andrews did not pass the test of time. The story of Andrews High exposed the flaws of humanity in the American South and showed that desegregation, to be maintained, needed more than a good-faith initial effort. Andrews High School and the policies that led to its resegregation demonstrated how public passive resistance within a progressive school district subtly undermined the vision of *Brown v. Board of Education* and the hope that once a school was desegregated, it would remain as such.

Furthermore, this dissertation focused on one school that was different from other desegregation stories. T. Wingate Andrews was built initially for the purpose of desegregating High Point. Similar to other desegregation success stories, T. Wingate Andrews remained desegregated for over 20 years. However, the initial bravery shown in the historical record during the 1960s would eventually give way in the 1990s and 2000s to de facto segregation forces similar to those in the Northern United States, where residential segregation and fractured school districting allowed for the avoidance of the issue of integration. Consequently, Andrews's story was unique because it not only started contrary to other models throughout the American South, but it also showed multiple attempts by a large, consolidated school district from preventing the tragedy of resegregating.

The unfortunate events that led to this historic high school's resegregation should not be lost. The history of Andrews showed that integration, when focusing on creating the benefits of a new school with a strong African American principal, was worth the effort. The unique beginnings of Andrews High School changed slowly over time from

1968 to 2008. The school that was once designed to hold 1,420 students only housed 744 students in 2013, just five years after the parameters of this study (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2013). Moving from its initial success in 1968 to the 1990s, Andrews High slowly became a victim to resegregation due to the merger of High Point City Schools with Guilford County Schools. Additionally, the attempts to prevent the resegregation of Andrews were stymied due to the fact that race still mattered 30 to 40 years after the school opened. Therefore, the eventual resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews was a victim of hard inevitabilities that shattered the initial good intentions that led to the establishment of the school.

### **Methodology**

This dissertation is a historical policy case study grounded in methods from the qualitative tradition. More history and policy focused than traditional qualitative studies, this study engages and extends the work of other policy analysts who examined resegregation throughout the United States and considered how and why the nation is moving away from the vision of *Brown*. The key difference with this research is its specific attention to a school within a progressive district that started as an integrated model to be emulated in 1968 and has changed to a very segregated school in 2008. This study provides a timeline of the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews, descriptions of events related to school board discussions, and details of policies, local community decisions, and political pressures within the city of High Point and Guilford County as a whole. It references archival research, school board minutes and discussions, political agendas of local school board candidates, and community housing demographic shifts to

gain insight into the slow social changes at T. Wingate Andrews High School.

Additionally, the study considers how school board policies and community backlash, when acting in concert, can impact a city and a progressive district. Thus, this study focuses on school board policies and subtle socio-cultural issues to show how a good faith effort imploded over time due to larger forces.

Similar to the approaches of Cuban (2010), Orfield (1991), Frankenberg (2009), Siegel-Hawley (2013), and Mahoney and Rueschemeyer (2003), this study uses historical research methodology. Using historical research, I inspected information from primary and secondary sources. The primary sources I reviewed and studied were Board of Education minutes, archival materials, policy documents, and newspaper articles. The secondary sources I studied and considered were existing historical studies and other research studies. Combining primary and secondary sources, I looked to correlate information in order to interconnect past events and find historical meaning about policies and overall outcomes for T. Wingate Andrews High School. I discovered many of the sources cited in this study while reviewing past historical research on desegregation failures throughout the United States and efforts within Guilford County Schools to combat resegregation within the former High Point City School System, which merged into Guilford County Schools. The overall collection of data for this topic of study started in 2013 and continued until 2016 when I completed the formal research surrounding this dissertation study. Over the course of this study, I spent over 300 hours in both the University of North Carolina at Greensboro archives and High Point Public Library reviewing documents appropriate for this research. I also spent over an

additional 500 hours sorting, reading, coding, and documenting primary and secondary sources that were critical to the findings associated with this research.

### **Research Questions**

The research questions I sought to answer in this study focused on the complex changes that T. Wingate Andrews High School encountered from its inception in 1968 until 2008. Each change that T. Wingate Andrews High School faced created a pathway that ultimately led to the resegregation of the school after a storied beginning as an integrated school. I addressed the research questions through suitable historical research methodology and historiography, which are both grounded in the larger body of qualitative research. My research questions were:

1. What was the story of T. Wingate Andrews High School?
2. How and why did the school move from an integrated high school to a segregated high school?
3. Was the resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews High School inevitable?
4. Was the integration of T. Wingate Andrews High school worth it in the end?

In reviewing the research questions, the purpose of this dissertation should be evident that the story of T. Wingate Andrews is different and must be told. Simply, as a historian, I needed to not only focus on the guiding research questions, but also delve into what Rury (2006) described as the “situational, describing how events grow out of given contexts” (p. 325). Additionally, this research allowed me to bring under-examined themes to light regarding resegregation and how T. Wingate Andrews was a historical ground zero for undoing *Brown* over a period of 40 years.

## Data

**School board meeting minutes.** In the process of reviewing archival information on T. Wingate Andrews High School and its desegregation failure, I found little information on the story of this high school since the High Point City School System merged with the Guilford County School System in 1993. However, one important source of information was the past school board meeting minutes of the High Point City School System and Guilford County School System. I began accessing the meeting minutes through internet searches surrounding the 2003 High Point High Schools Choice Plan, which eventually became the last attempt to prevent the resegregation of Andrews by Guilford County Schools. The internet searches within the Guilford County Schools' database of meeting minutes was time intensive and led to deeper internet searches through government digital documentation of local school board meeting minutes housed in state data bases. The state data bases of minutes continued to lead to the history of T. Wingate Andrews High School's creation in 1968 and the High Point City Schools Board of Education's meeting minutes. These minutes shed light on the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews High School and the further maintenance of an integrated high school within High Point. Furthermore, archival study of post-1993 Guilford County School Board minutes and policies allowed me to investigate who was involved in the resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews, when the resegregation happened, and subsequently to try to locate other pertinent information from other sources on how this resegregation occurred. The Guilford County Board of Education's meeting minutes shed light on the slow population shifts of White students from T. Wingate Andrews to

Southwest Guilford High School and how the school district attempted to prevent the increasing White flight of students that was making Andrews High more and more a segregated school with a high minority population. The minutes of both High Point City and Guilford County provided access to insights from Board members and key community stakeholders. To analyze these major meetings, I either downloaded meeting minutes from digital archives or photocopied the minutes from digitized manuscripts available in archives. It should be noted that the meeting minutes are related directly or indirectly to understanding the reason for school board decisions connected to T. Wingate Andrews High School.

When conducting archival research, I became a private investigator searching for clues and other insights that would lead to greater understanding. Similar to an investigator, I read through the manuscripts of board meetings looking for context clues that would explain how decisions were made regarding Andrews High School. Throughout my research, I attempted to follow only leads that showed how Andrews became a minority majority school. The leads allowed me to understand the policies that were created, the reasoning for school board decisions, and how the High Point community received the policies and decisions. However, each document opened many different paths of information that could derail the research making it necessary for me to narrow my scope of examination to focusing solely on decisions that led to resegregation. Therefore, my research only referenced key pieces of information that will allow others to follow my path on how Andrews became an integration disappointment in a progressive school district.

**School board policies and newspaper articles.** My archival research into school board minutes led me to consider published school board policies and newspaper articles that were directly or indirectly related to the eventual resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews. School board policies, particularly those from Guilford County Schools in the post-merger era of Andrews High School, demonstrate how the elected school board dealt with sensitive topics like race and student assignment. Each board policy reviewed allowed me to put together a complex puzzle that explained how Andrews moved from an integrated high school to a segregated high school. By connecting the policies that impacted Andrews High, Southwest High, and the city of High Point, I was able to draw connections between policies that shifted students or encouraged White flight of students to and from Andrews. The connections among the policies and outcomes that impacted Andrews and its move from integration to segregation were critical in my research and also led me to dig deeper into community reactions often recorded in newspaper articles.

My review of the policies led me to deeper reviews of newspaper articles from key times in Andrews High School's history. Throughout each key period in T. Wingate Andrews High School's history, newspapers were able to capture community sentiment regarding school board decisions. The newspaper articles presented the ideas and opinions of community members, board of education members, and other key political figures. By researching the thoughts and beliefs of community members as well as board of education members, my research was able to show how the community, school board members, and parents viewed the changes to T. Wingate Andrews. Additionally, newspaper articles allowed me to see the perspectives of those within the community that

supported changes to Andrews and those who did not. Consequently, my research into the articles gave me a deeper understanding of how various stakeholders viewed integration, merger, race, and politics. Therefore, by using newspapers within my research, I was able to comprehend the difficult realities surrounding Andrews' move to resegregation.

In the end, archival documents such as newspapers, board policies, and board meeting minutes offered rich historical details and provided the substance of the story of how a progressive school district in the American South could eventually create conditions ripe for resegregation. The archival research allowed me to weave together findings that showed how the harsh inevitabilities of resegregation occurred at Andrews.

### **Time Periods**

I collected information on two separate time periods in the history of T. Wingate Andrews High School. First, I collected information on the establishment of the school and its subsequent early history within the High Point City School System. This research represented the years 1968 to 1993. I used this data to demonstrate how a progressive school district could handle the difficult prospect of integrating an all-Black High School, William Penn High School, and an all-White High School, High Point Central High School. Moreover, data from the first time period also demonstrated how and why T. Wingate Andrews High School operated as a model for desegregation. The second time period within my research shows the story of the school after High Point City Schools merged with Guilford County Schools in 1993 until 2008. Many of the resources I

studied regarding the post-1993 period were school board policies that provided an outline of political movements impacting the school district.

Using the board policies and the archival research from both before 1993 and after 1993, I was able to create a timeline of events that demonstrated milestones for the ultimate story of the resegregation of Andrews. After establishing this timeline and piecing together the story of the school, I reexamined the data more intensely in order to determine the specific factors that led Andrews from integration to segregation.

### **Researcher Perspective and Experiences**

When I started the research on T. Wingate Andrews High School, I wanted to understand how a school that I remember from my childhood as a racially balanced school became a minority majority school in 2008. As a citizen of the High Point, North Carolina area who attended a rival high school near Andrews High, I looked back on particularly the athletic contests between Andrews and my alma mater during the early 1990s in which I saw a balance of Whites and African Americans on the opposite sideline competing in sports. Andrews was, in my eyes, a school that had a balance in racial groups and was solidly middle-class in nature. After my transition from childhood to adulthood, how I viewed Andrews as a working professional educator changed upon my return to High Point and the Guilford County area. Prior to beginning my tenure as an administrator in the Guilford County Schools in 2006, I was employed elsewhere in North Carolina and Louisiana and was not present for the changes that occurred at Andrews after my departure from the area in 1994.

The massive demographic changes that occurred at Andrews in the time period of my 12- year absence led me to research the school. Accordingly, as a historian, my focus on Andrews and how it became the minority majority school it is today compelled me to search for central themes within the historical context of Andrews' story. I was motivated to focus on the nuances of the historical record, policies, and stories that came alive during my deep review of articles, school board minutes, school board policies, and other historical records. By balancing my memories of Andrews from 1976-1994 with the reality of Andrews in 2006 and thereafter, I attempted to make sense of the history of the school's founding, the effects of the merger of High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools, and the attempts to return Andrews to its storied past. Moreover, through this in-depth study of the history of T. Wingate Andrews, I attempted to lift up this unique story that was vastly different from other desegregation stories and different from what I remembered as a child.

### **Trustworthiness**

While it is my hope and goal to use proper historical and qualitative methods through this research on the history of T. Wingate Andrews High School, I must remember that I gathered and analyzed the data through my own White, middle-class male perspective. Noting this potential bias, as recommended by Glesne (2011) I reflected upon my own subjectivity and how I potentially used it when selecting and analyzing the sources. By focusing on historical details and how the events of Andrews' past influenced the outcomes of the school, I attempted to explain the details of the school's story as objectively as possible. In using triangulation as noted by Creswell

(1998), I also concentrated on using multiple sources and multiple perspectives to ensure trustworthiness. Noting that I held my own perspective from my past as a student who encountered an integrated Andrews as well as my contemporary opinions due to my recent employment with Guilford County Schools, I attempted to tell the story of T. Wingate Andrews by using thorough historical research methods which would provide a rich description (Creswell, 1998).

By researching public documents such as historical school board minutes and policies along with first hand published accounts from newspapers, I focused on providing an accurate account of the totality of the Andrews' story from 1968 to 2008 by considering the perspectives of individuals and groups who were present during the events. Moreover, by using primary and secondary sources, I was able to verify the information and ensure that the evidence presented within the findings was directly related to the historical record. Thus, by using a thorough historical analysis of sources surrounding the story of T. Wingate Andrews High School, I was able to provide a process for others to follow in retracing how Andrews moved from integration to segregation.

### **Outline of the Chapters**

Chapter II provides an overview of the national and state historical background regarding segregation, desegregation, and resegregation research literature. In this review of the literature, I also highlight the context of both advocates and opponents to segregation, resegregation, and integration from multiple perspectives. Additionally, in the second chapter I dive deeper into how and why school resegregation has occurred by

considering other cases throughout the United States where desegregation has failed and resegregation has developed over time after a school district was declared unitary or desegregated by the federal court system.

Once I establish the national and state perspectives along with the context for how resegregation occurs and impacts a school community in Chapter II, I focus my efforts on telling the story of T. Wingate Andrews High School from its inception in 1968. In Chapter III, I describe how High Point City Schools created a completely integrated high school that mirrored its population demographics, through combining students from the all-Black William Penn High School and the all-White High Point Central High School. In Chapter III, I also explain events that led to the merger of High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools to form a large school district with over 120 schools. Lastly, Chapter III sets the stage for initial attempts by the Guilford County School Board to prevent the resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews by implementing redistricting plans and potential magnet options.

Subsequently, in Chapter IV I offer a closer examination into the most controversial plan to prevent resegregation at T. Wingate Andrews High School: the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. I describe the High Point High Schools Choice Plan in detail along with the community reactions to it. In Chapter IV I also provide a deeper examination into how the Board of Education of Guilford County Schools responded to community backlash to the Plan as well as to how the community worked to preserve the districting status quo of the early 2000s.

In the final two chapters of this dissertation, I analyze the research found in Chapters III and IV and draw conclusions as to why Andrews became segregated. In Chapter V, I zero in on four major themes that emerged across the forty-year history of the historical case study. These themes include how High Point City Schools uniquely created an integrated high school different from other attempts in the American South, how the merger of High City Schools and Guilford County Schools led to resegregation, how race still mattered when Andrews was becoming resegregated, and how good intentions met with hard inevitabilities. Finally, in Chapter VI, I will conclude with answering whether it was worth it in the case of Andrews' integration and why the case of T. Wingate Andrews High School matters.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **NATIONAL HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE**

#### **Introduction**

In this chapter, I discuss both past and current research literature that explains the importance of desegregation and the history surrounding efforts to desegregate schools. The research contained in this chapter not only concerns the history of desegregation in the United States, particularly the American South and the State of North Carolina, but it also describes efforts conceived both judicially and legislatively to counter the progress of desegregation. Furthermore, I discuss literature that explains how school resegregation has become more prevalent and the impact of such resegregation. Similarly, in reviewing the research surrounding desegregation, I examine research on the benefits and unintended consequences of integration. My intent in conducting this literature review is to ground my historical research into T. Wingate Andrews High School in scholarship that focuses on how resegregation occurs and the impact of resegregation.

#### **School Desegregation: A Brief History**

The United States Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* not only defined the way public education would serve students of different races, it also defined the role public education would play in shaping the attitudes of society in general (Sitkoff, 1981). By the 1950's, public schools had become the battleground for the Civil

Rights Movement and the ensuing evolution of the American society. Public schools throughout the United States, but predominantly in the Southern United States, would now be required to do what much of society had refused to do on its own: desegregate (*Brown*, 1954; Patterson, 2001).

To challenge and circumvent the 14th and 15th Amendments, many southern states had created Jim Crow laws in the late 19th century. Jim Crow laws effectively established systematic discrimination of Blacks in the American South through the implementation of laws that allowed a “separate but equal” policy as it pertained to an array of public and private services (Patterson, 2001). Jim Crow was formally challenged in the Supreme Court in the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* case. In the case, Homer Plessy, an African American man who claimed to be 7/8s White took a seat in the White section of a train instead of the Black section of the train as required by Louisiana law (Plessy). Homer Plessy was then arrested under a Louisiana law that required him to move to the “Blacks-only” section of the train. Plessy in turn sued on the grounds of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment claiming he was not equally protected under the law (*Plessy*). However, the Supreme Court ruled that it was not a violation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause. This Court finding not only upheld separate but equal practices, but in essence mandated them.

It would not be until the mid-1930’s that a coordinated effort to attack Jim Crow laws would be mounted. Two young African American attorneys, Charles Houston and Thurgood Marshall, were the legal team of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and they developed a plan to address Jim Crow as it related

to education. What would follow would be a series of Supreme Court cases, mostly argued by Thurgood Marshall, that would chip away at the separate but equal ruling of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (Patterson, 2001.).

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court combined five separate petitions, all of which proposed challenges to state sponsored segregation in public schools. In addition to the *Brown v. Board of Education* case, the other cases brought before the high court were *Briggs v. Elliott* filed in South Carolina, *Davis v. Board of Education of Prince Edward County* filed in Virginia, *Bolling v. Sharpe* filed in the District of Columbia, and *Gebhart v. Belton* filed in Delaware (Brown, 1954). Therefore, the issue of school segregation had become, by 1954, a nationwide concern.

The case of *Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, KS, et.al* was built around two African American sisters in Topeka, Kansas who were required to walk past a White school and through a train switchyard to catch a bus to their all-Black school. By using a case in Kansas, the United States Supreme Court superficially avoided a direct approach to the Jim Crow laws of the American South, particularly in education. The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision would be followed up one year later by what has come to be known as *Brown v. Board of Education, No. 2* (348 U.S. 886, 1955). Amid resistance to the decision the Supreme Court rendered in the first case, the second case addressed the question of what means would be used to implement the Brown decision and instructed states to desegregate with “all deliberate speed” (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954). The second case would be followed by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This legislation

shored up the *Brown* decision and expanded it into all areas of the public sector (Civil Rights Act of 1964).

The landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954 determined that the “separate but equal” doctrine had no place in public education (*Brown*, 1954). As Morris (1989) argued, the dispute presented by the plaintiffs in the case was that separating students “from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone” (p. 438). The principal assumption of the first *Brown* ruling, as noted by Epps (1999), was that “desegregation would have a positive impact on African-American students” (p. 2). The second *Brown* ruling, however, was not as aggressive, as the ruling directed school districts to desegregate “with all deliberate speed” (*Brown*, 1955, p. 349). By creating an ambiguous timeline and uncertain direction, the high court allowed school systems to integrate their segregated schools on their own schedule and with their own strategies (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). As Morris (1989) noted regarding the ruling in *Brown II*:

the “all deliberate speed” formula had encouraged some creative lawyers and others dedicated to racial segregation to find ways that might postpone desegregation forever. Progress toward integration was nearly nonexistent, and by 1964, with only 2.14% of Black students attending desegregated schools in seven of eleven southern states. (p. 444)

Furthermore, as Cecelski (1994) notes, the tactic of slow speed created “freedom of choice” plans for school districts where a single African American student could request re-assignment to a White school and thus allow the school system to avoid school

assignment plans that would desegregate fully or in great numbers (p. 33). The lack of a straightforward mandate and a strong challenge within the legal system would therefore allow states and school systems to move slower than a snail's pace toward desegregation.

### **State Historical Context**

In 1956, after the ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the state of North Carolina General Assembly, like many other state legislatures in the United States South, passed a series of legislative actions that created school choice options in an effort to hinder desegregation efforts. The plan, known as the Pearsall Plan, was created to ease tensions regarding desegregation, but subtly promoted a continuation of segregation through school choice (N.C.G.S. 115C, 1956). As Batchelor (2015) noted, "North Carolina, the state that prided itself on moderation in race relations, initially modeled its response to *Brown* after Alabama and Mississippi, the states that arguably maintained the worst race relations in the nation" (p. 50). Under the Pearsall Plan (1956), local school districts were given control of student assignment and also allowed parents to not enroll their student in a desegregated school. The core of the plan was sections 274 and 275. Section 274 of the Pearsall legislation outlined the policy and purpose of the plan (NC General Statutes, 115C-274). Attempting to tie the law to morality, the General Assembly also stated that public education is "related to the customs and feelings of the people of each community" (p. 1) and emphasized that it is impossible to have public schools without the "conformity of community attitudes" (NC Statutes, 115C-274, p. 1). Noting that the General Assembly was directly relating public education to the norms of a predominantly White society in North Carolina is critical. Likewise, the legislature also

emphasized its segregationist view by stating in the law “our people need to be assured that no child will be forced to attend a school with children of another race” (NC Statutes, 115C-274, p.1). Therefore, a clear segregationist approach was outlined in the initial purpose of the law.

It is important to understand that the underlying purpose of the Pearsall Plan was to circumvent the recent United States Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, even as the legislation attempted to ease tensions on the surface. Also, the language of law indicates that it was written for educated people and intended for a predominantly White government to utilize existing public school structures to maintain separate schools for White students and students of color. The unique portion of 115C-274 and its subsequent sections was the creation of a system of State grants to assist students in avoiding integration of public schools. Section 275 outlined that children being “assigned to a public school attended by a child of another race against the wishes of his parent” could apply for a grant (NC Statutes, 115C-275, p.1). Consequently, the law created an intended system of state funded vouchers to sustain and even foster segregation. The intent of the Pearsall Plan appeared to be to establish a system that perpetuated racial segregation and even limited uneducated people from having knowledge of the voucher system. Without adequate schooling, it was possible an uneducated parent would not understand their “right” to a state grant and would jeopardize their child under this legislative value system. Simply, students of color and students who came from lower socio-economic homes with limited education would be kept separate based on the Pearsall Plan.

Comparable to Pearsall, communities and school districts across the nation reacted to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* and created policies and laws that would assist in desegregation in the short term, but created barriers to prevent the long-term success of integration (Sitkoff, 1981). Thus, as United States' public schools began a journey to integrate schools and provide equal educational opportunities for all students, particularly those of color, after the landmark Supreme Court decision in *Brown*, many Southern states developed legislative roadblocks to prevent desegregation. Therefore, a decade after *Brown*, the schools in the Southern United States, most notably Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas, Arkansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, specifically were still predominantly single-race schools (White or African-American).

Although the Pearsall Plan was repealed in 1969, the value system of separation and segregation of races and students of poverty was created and promoted for thirteen years (NC Statutes, 115C). Knowing that Pearsall was a smokescreen to help maintain the status quo of segregation, a future value system was created by the Pearsall Plan that would perpetuate over time. Furthermore, the value system of Pearsall also created the potential for a separate educational system for students of poverty and color hidden within the confines of the current educational system and future choice programs. Lastly, the value system of the Pearsall Plan is critical in helping to understand the roots of the debate surrounding busing and integration in the early 1970s in North Carolina.

### **The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Push to Achieve the Goal of *Brown***

In 1964, a massive piece of federal legislation—the Civil Rights Act—moved integration of schools back into the limelight and quickly forward. Within the Civil Rights Act was Title IV which, according to Stalnaker (2013), authorized the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare “to provide technical assistance and incentives for districts engaged in desegregation efforts” (p. 28). Morris (1989) argued that “federal courts began ordering immediate desegregation, even while litigation was pending. No longer could litigation serve to preserve the status quo until litigation had ended” (p. 446). Therefore, by 1968-69, 32% of African American students were attending public schools with White students (Klarman, 1994). However, it should be noted that Southern African American students were being integrated into White schools and not Whites into African American schools. Consequently, by 1972-73, 91.3% of Southern African American students were integrated (Klarman, 1994).

In North Carolina, desegregation efforts were documented in several studies, including the powerful text by William Chafe (1981), *Civilities and Civil Rights*, which narrated the Civil Rights Movement in Greensboro and Guilford County. Similar to events in High Point, the external pressure to desegregate Greensboro, the passivity of plans created by the local communities, and the reaction of individuals led to struggles that awakened both the African American community and the White community (Chafe, 1981). By awakening both African American and White communities, desegregation occurred successfully, but also created a passive resistance within the White community which stemmed from the de jure segregation ideas of the Pearsall Plan of the late 1950s.

Comparable to the choice plans within the Pearsall Plan, a more subdued de facto segregation, similar to that of the Northeast United States, compelled the South, including North Carolina, to integrate schools, but also created unwritten options. The unwritten options were outside of the educational arena and allowed the continuance of segregated schools through the avenues created in the idea of neighborhood schools in which children attended schools close to where they lived. As noted in *Milliken v. Bradley (1974)*, which allowed segregation through the continuation of de facto segregated neighborhood schools, the American South, North Carolina, and more specifically High Point could continue segregation by fostering neighborhood schools (Clotfelter, 2004). Consequently, as Patterson (1997) noted:

the political decisions during the eighties, combined with recent Supreme Court rulings, have produced clear signs that progress is coming undone and that the nation is headed backwards toward greater segregation of Black students, particularly in the states with a history of de jure segregation. (p. 20)

### **The End of Desegregation and the Beginning of Resegregation**

A report in 1999 from the Office of Civil Rights demonstrated that the percentage of Black students attending majority White schools in the American South reached its peak in 1988 and schools in the American South began resegregate in the 1990s (NCES, 1999). Approximately 45% of Black students attended majority White schools in 1988 (NCES, 1999). Within four years, the percentage of Black students in the American South that attended predominantly Black or minority schools began to increase substantially with 60.8% of Blacks attending minority schools (NCES, 1992). Hence, 30.2% of Black students attended majority White schools, a decline of 14.8% in four

years. This decline would continue with more African American students attending majority minority schools by the 1998–1999 school year (NCES, 1998–2013). By the 1998–1999 school year, 29.7% of Black students attended schools with more than 90% minority populations. Accordingly, the Office of Civil Rights noted that in both 1968 and 1998, the number of Black students in majority White schools was less than 34% (NCES, 1999). Also, according to Siegel-Hawley and Frankenberg (2012), “since 1991, Black students in the South have become increasingly concentrated in intensely segregated minority schools” (p. 4). They noted further that by 2009–2010, 33.4% of Southern Black students were enrolled in racially segregated schools as compared to 1980, when only 23% of Black students in the South were in segregated schools (Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). This increase of more than 10% from 1988, the statistical peak of desegregated schools, suggests a need to understand the decline of desegregation and the increase in resegregation in schools.

Understanding the impact that segregation had on many areas of the American South, school districts began to shift policies and even district boundary lines to resegregate areas within school districts and make schools predominately one race under the guise of redistricting, merging school districts, or splintering of merged districts into several fragments. By the 2000s, the rapid resegregation of schools was occurring and gains of integration were being lost every day through student reassignment plans (Frankenberg, Lee, & Orfield, 2003; Frankenberg & Orfield, 2007). The basis for this shift stemmed from the rapid repeal of federal desegregation assistance starting in President Ronald Reagan’s administration (Orfield, 2001). Within President Reagan’s

Justice Department, a shift in how to handle segregation issues emerged. This shift was to oppose the continuation of litigation for integrated schools and adopt a policy within the courts of the United States to advocate against desegregation (Orfield, 2001). This trend established in the 1980s under the Reagan administration continued in the 1990s under George Bush with a focus on ending desegregation orders and moving to declare all school districts within the American South as unitary. Therefore, the court policy established by the Reagan and Bush administrations ending desegregation plans did not create stable pockets of White students in neighborhood schools and move the American South to a more unitary status, but rather it helped promote White flight and the focus on neighborhood schools which eventually became resegregated schools (Orfield, 2001).

Although the policy of ending a focus on desegregation was promoted more as a return to local control over schools, a 1999 Gallup poll showed support for desegregated schools (Orfield, 2001). However, public support for desegregation was coupled with a support for neighborhood schools and opinions against forced busing as well. As Batchelor (2015) explained, “when boards of education were freed from judicial supervision, they tended to end busing and other policies supporting desegregation and reassign students to neighborhood schools” (p. 141). Therefore, when school districts ended programs that reassigned students to schools based on diversity, students returned to more neighborhood-based schools. Combining with the prevailing public support for neighborhood schools, city school districts were losing White students due to White flight from urban neighborhoods to more suburban neighborhoods (Orfield, 2001). Knowing that school districts could never move back to de jure segregation, but that

neighborhoods would remain effectively segregated through de facto residential segregation, school resegregation began to develop (Batchelor, 2015). With the rise of rapid White flight of students and families to the suburbs, neighborhood schools went through racial change more rapidly causing resegregation in the schools to move quickly as well.

As noted earlier, resegregation began to gain momentum in the 1990s and was at the same level of segregation in 1998 as in 1968 (NCES, 1999). The resegregation of large Southern metropolitan areas also demonstrates the lack of Black-White exposure (Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). Thus, by “2009, the typical Black student in the metro went to school where Whites accounted for about 45 percent of their peers, compared to about 54 percent in 2002” (Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012, p. 4). By the end of the 2001 school year, data showed White students, on average, attended schools that were 80% White throughout the United States (Frankenberg et al., 2003).

However, the American South had more likelihood of interracial schools. Focusing more on the American South, and noting the rapid resegregation particularly in the suburban areas since the mid to late 1980s, countywide school districts have had more extensive and long-lasting desegregation with opportunities for Black students to cross barriers (Frankenberg et al., 2003). Unfortunately, “during the 1990s, the proportion of Black students in majority White schools decreased by 13 percentage points, to a level lower than any year since 1968” (Frankenberg et al., 2003, p. 17). This decline in desegregated schools is related directly to United States Supreme Court decisions from 1991 through 1995 (*Oklahoma Board of Education v. Dowell*, 1991; *Freeman v. Pitts*,

1992; *Missouri v. Jenkins* 1995) which changed the direction in the American South to allow resegregation. Furthermore, data from the 2000 census showed persistently high levels of residential segregation for African Americans. Therefore, with the power of White flight to create residential segregation, segregated neighborhood schools grew without programs focused on desegregation and became a predominant fixture of the late 1990s and 2000s (Frankenberg et al., 2003).

### **Policies Leading to Resegregation**

As neighborhood schools and national policies produced pockets of resegregated schools, school districts also began to move toward resegregation via policies that would produce resegregated schools. Frankenberg (2009) notes that Jefferson County, Alabama, a large metropolitan school district including Birmingham, chose to splinter or subdivide into several small districts. By changing boundary lines, the school districts in Jefferson were able to create “boundary lines that exacerbate existing segregation and inequality; thus, housing costs are the drivers that dictate school areas and attendance zones” (Frankenberg, 2009, p. 870). The practice of school attendance zones based on geographical lines effectively shifted to school attendance zones based on specific residential neighborhoods. In effect, the splintered districts were based on neighborhood schools that perpetuated White privilege through laissez-faire racism and White families living within all White neighborhoods (Bobo, 2001; Shapiro, 2004). To further emphasize the splintering or fragmentation, Frankenberg cited changing enrollments, district size, racial composition of schools within splintered districts, district boundary lines, changes in socio-economic status, population variation, home values, population

income, and higher education attainment of the fragmented districts in Jefferson County (Frankenberg, 2009). Frankenberg's research also noted that by splintering the larger district into smaller districts, each individual school district could then rely on the Supreme Court precedent in *Milliken* and not be forced to bus students across district lines. This is an important detail as the minority districts created in Jefferson County became poorer and more racially concentrated for minority students. Once the minority majority districts in Jefferson attempted to demonstrate the problems with the fragmentation, Frankenberg (2009) noted that the 1990s Supreme Court decisions shifted to more of a local focus on school district issues. Simply, the splintered minority school districts were unable to regain the integrated status they had had under *Brown* and pre-fragmentation.

Similar to the issues within the Jefferson County, Alabama research conducted by Frankenberg (2009), Orfield (1991) noted that segregated housing had become an accepted norm by the 1980s. Housing and residential segregation led to neighborhood segregation. Neighborhood schools then became segregated schools. School districts which followed a neighborhood school model, like those in Jefferson County, Alabama, then became more segregated. Consequently, White suburban and inner city Black neighborhoods fed schools within their respective neighborhoods, thus creating segregated neighborhood schools (Orfield, 1991).

Building on these ideas from Orfield (1991), Frankenberg and Diem (2013) contended that the fluctuating politics in the mid- to late-1990s and into the early 2000s created school boards that were able to use one election to overturn desegregation

policies. With suburbanization and continued White flight to the suburbs, pockets of Whiteness and affluence emerged throughout the American South (Frankenberg & Diem, 2013). As school boards, even in progressive school districts, began to represent certain neighborhoods that were less likely to support desegregation policies and more likely to support neighborhood schools, school board members were forced to side with their neighborhood constituencies or be voted out of office in favor of a neighborhood school advocate. This political shift found support in the 2007 *Parents Involved in Community Schools* Supreme Court decision that further promoted the neighborhood school ideology and, in effect, created more segregated neighborhood schools in the American South (Frankenberg & Diem, 2013). The decision held, in essence, that race could no longer play a factor in the assignment of students to schools that were part of school districts that were declared unitary.

### **Attempts to Prevent Resegregation**

With the onset of resegregation in the 1980s and into the 1990s, many desegregation advocates began to develop strategies that were intended to counter the momentum of resegregation (Orfield, 1993). One of the primary methods to re-integrate many White students, who had moved with their families to the suburbs, was magnet schools or magnet programs. Magnets began as an attempt to assist in parental preference and accomplish broader school district goals of preventing resegregation and promoting racial diversity (Siegel-Hawley, 2013). Growing out of a need to prevent White middle-class flight from cities to the suburbs, magnet schools or programs did not stop the continued spread of residential segregation. Nor did magnet schools overcome

judicial reluctance regarding race-conscious policies like those struck-down in the Supreme Court decision in *Parents Involved* (Siegel-Hawley, 2013). Moreover, school district efforts and reforms intended to prevent resegregation, such as magnet programs, did not focus on the White, middle-class suburban neighborhood schools that represented the root cause of resegregation (Cuban, 2010). The failure of magnet programs to prevent resegregation can be seen in several Southern school districts including Charlotte, North Carolina, Louisville, Kentucky, and Chattanooga, Tennessee (Siegel-Hawley, 2014). Simply, the concept of using magnet schools focused on bringing White students back to schools that are now predominantly Black or minority in effect accepted de facto resegregation by continuing to allow segregated neighborhood schools (Cuban, 2010). Many advocates of magnet and school choice reforms argued that “the growth and continued popularity of school choice policies represents another avenue for hope for more integration” (Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012, p. 10). However, popular magnet and choice programs designed to prevent resegregation have only focused on achievement increases and have failed to address segregation and the inequities that led to an increase in the actual achievement gap based on problems generated from the actual resegregation of schools (Cuban, 2010). Furthermore, the lack of equity and unrealized potential for quality integration of choice programs and magnet schools is rarely recognized (Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). Therefore, the idea of preventing resegregation through creating schools or programs that reintroduce White students in Black or minority majority schools fails to address the issue at the root: neighborhood

segregation and policies that sustain neighborhood schools based on segregated neighborhoods.

### **Impact of Resegregation**

Ultimately, the impact of resegregation and the demise of desegregation trace their roots to the immediate aftermath of *Brown* with choice plans and litigation designed to delay or end the process of integrating schools in the South. However, the administrations of President Reagan in the 1980s and President Bush in the early 1990s created a conservative anti-desegregation judiciary (Orfield & Yun, 1999). By placing William Rehnquist as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the Reagan Administration started a move away from accepting litigation designed to desegregate school systems (Orfield & Yun, 1999). Similarly, the retirement of Justice Thurgood Marshall and the selection of his replacement, the conservative Clarence Thomas, finalized a swing in the high court away from responding to cases involving school district segregation. By the mid-1990s, more than 60% of district court judges, 70% of appellate judges, and five United States Supreme Court Justices were appointed by Presidents Reagan and Bush and all tended to hold a philosophy against desegregation litigation (Orfield & Yun, 1999).

To add to the further decline of judicial willingness to hear desegregation cases, residential patterns remained racially divided with White politicians having little to no African American constituents who would advocate for racially-focused politics (Orfield, 1991). White flight out of urban areas into more suburban areas continued to increase during the 1990s (Clotfelter, 2001). Moreover, despite the significant interracial contact

that increased from the 1960s to the 1980s, a reluctance of White parents to accept racially diverse schools began to emerge and prevented an even greater impact from integration (Clotfelter, 2004). Subsequently, school districts began to create options for student movement and reassignment plans which led to school boards of education's willingness to accommodate White wishes. The reassignment plans which allowed Whites to stay in neighborhood schools or choose a magnet option to attend a school with a specialized program had a strong impact on the White community. By allowing White students to stay in White neighborhood schools, school districts had created the conditions for maintenance of status quo segregated neighborhood schools. Since White parents typically wanted their students to attend the local neighborhood school, there was a clear loss of desire for mixed race schools and desegregation which would move their children from the local neighborhood school (Clotfelter, 2004). As politicians, justices, and school boards helped create an environment that discouraged desegregation litigation and policies that accommodated student movement away from diverse environments, resegregation had a fertile bed in which to grow and become more strongly established.

This fertile bed that prevented desegregation policies and litigation eventually led to stronger judicial precedents that allowed resegregation to occur in the 1990s and 2000s. Those precedents such as the *Parents Involved in Community Schools* mentioned earlier and the *Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education (2007)* case, which mirrored *Parents Involved* and the denial of using race-conscious school board policies, set a standard that fostered further resegregation. Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor (2008) noted that North Carolina schools continued to see an increase in segregation in the 2000s

similar to the increase to resegregate in the 1990s. Consequently, Guilford County, North Carolina, which contains the city of High Point and T. Wingate Andrews High School, saw an increase from 11.8% of nonwhite students in 90 to 100% nonwhite schools in 1994-1995 to 30.9% in 2005-2006 (Clotfelter et al., 2008). More specifically, grade 10 segregation increased from a rate of 0.20 in 1994-1995 to 0.25 in 2005-2006 across the state of North Carolina, with larger increases in the larger school districts of Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Wake County, Guilford County, Cumberland County, and Winston-Salem/Forsyth County (Clotfelter et al., 2008). Therefore, the judicial precedents established by the federal courts during the era of desegregation faded once the race-conscious student assignment programs were dissolved under the *Parents Involved in Community Schools* and *Meredith* decisions. The U.S. Supreme Court decision in the *Parents Involved* case allowed school segregation due to residential segregation within the same school district and thus created the conditions for the resegregation of school districts in North Carolina, particularly in the larger districts with significant minority populations. Simply, school composition from 2007 forward would resemble neighborhood composition and therefore schools would be more segregated.

### **Benefits of Integration**

There are both ethical and practical reasons to seek integration. If schools remain segregated, they become:

grim propagators of America's most persistent social pathology. The pity is that desegregation has proven, by and large, an effective antidote, yet the nation has been casting it aside as an inconvenience, with no appreciable protest from the Black community. (Klarman, 2007, p. 773)

With a lack of action from the African-American community to counter resegregation and advocate for integration, Bobo (2001) notes that Whites have been unwilling to give up their privilege and segregated schools. Likewise, White attitudes toward desegregation are favorable, but there is no call to action to disrupt the status quo (Bobo, 2001). With data showing “integrated classrooms where there is positive student contact,” Orfield indicates, “high academic achievement and access to networks of information and opportunities and that integrated schools tend to lead to integrated lives” (Orfield & Frankenberg, 2007, p. 292). Therefore, as noted by Rumberger and Palardy (2005) from the Coleman Report, “where students attend school has a major impact in how much they learn” (p. 2018).

Understanding that where a student goes to school impacts how much they learn leads to the question how does desegregation impact students, particularly, African Americans? The answer is simple: desegregation improves outcomes for African American students. As Klarman (2007) indicated, by nearly every measure including overall education, housing, employment, cultural recognition, and self-concept, African Americans fare better in the United States than they did in the early 1950s. Clotfelter (2004) explained further, “in 1995, more than 95 percent of Whites favored integrated schools.” Further studies from Patterson (1997) note “White adults’ openness to interracial marriage and integration of neighborhoods has increased over time due to the effects of *Brown* and integration” (pp. 163–164).

Psychological and educational research has also demonstrated that racism has decreased across the United States (Ladson-Billings, 1999/2012). However, with all the

rationale behind promotion of integrated schools, studies also show that both explicit racism and implicit bias still exist throughout our nation's schools, affecting students on a daily basis (Lopez, 2003; Valencia, 1999/2015). Rumberger and Palardy (2005) also note the conclusion from the Coleman Report: "the results of the study confirm a widely-held belief of many parents: that whom you go to school with matters" (p. 2020). Thus, parents and students with the power to move to different neighborhoods, choose a reassignment plan, advocate for "different school culture," push candidate agendas that are not inherently race-based, and display enough political clout will be able to assert influence on issues in school systems that affect racial balance in school houses (Brantlinger, 2003; Rumberger & Palardy, 2005).

### **Unintended Consequences of Integration**

Although desegregation had a plethora of benefits, there are other scholars who point out that much was lost, particularly for the African American community, during desegregation. For example, the demise of predominantly African American High Schools due to closure and the moving of those students to predominantly White high schools are noted in many scholarly articles. Consequently, as noted by Siddle Walker (2009), Black educators and Black principals were also dismissed or fired after the traditionally Black High Schools were closed. These dismissals were part of the destruction of a system of African American education that was destroyed at the expense of federal desegregation orders (Siddle Walker, 2009). Therefore, the loss of Black educational leaders and the voice they gave to Black students within the educational environment prevented true integration.

The loss of Black educators and Black principals generated pushback against desegregation from the Black community that had an established culture with storied successes (Tillman, 2004). Segregated schools within the African American community served as “a channel for enacting values, solidarity, and shared aspirations” (Siddle Walker, 1996, p. 201). The gains of the African American community during desegregation were significant, but as Klarman (2007) and Cecelski (1994) both note the losses were significant as well. With the losses of educational employees and Black schools, the “human relationships that existed between the major participants and the institutional structures” in African American schools were also lost (Siddle Walker, 1996, p. 201). Accordingly, the environment of the “segregated school had affective traits, institutional policies, and community support that helped African American children learn in spite of the neglect their school received from White school boards” and this resiliency was eliminated with the closure of the African American schools (Siddle Walker, 1996, p.3). Therefore, the losses from African American school closures would be felt in the resegregation movement of the 1990s and 2000s.

As Orfield and Lee (2006) noted, schools of today lack equitable resources chiefly in schools that have large numbers of poor students and minority students. Siddle Walker (2009) explained that this inequity came from the lack of truly integrating schools and educational systems. Due to this desegregation-driven inequity, students who were part of desegregated schools had experiences that unfortunately did not translate into ensuring future policies that would promote further integration (Wells, Holme, Revilla, & Atanda, 2009). Thus, there has been a failure “to import the ideology of Black educators

into current discussion about racial desegregation in our schools” and this failure is not only a community failure but also a failure within education systems (Siddle Walker, 2009, p. 270).

Furthermore, desegregation only ensured Black students’ access to facilities and some resources. However, as Siddle Walker (2009) explained, desegregation “ignored school climate, involvement of Black parents, equity, and inspiration in the formula for success” (p. 279). Hence, the modern movement of resegregation in the Southern United States has created a painful historical truth that the hopes of *Brown* were not realized. Additionally, the acceptance of resegregation demonstrates that America retreated from its vision of equality for all citizens, particularly its students. Instead, the United States has accepted a disappointing ideology that desegregation failed in integrating White and African-American students while also destroying the African American educational community during the process of desegregation (Siddle Walker, 2009).

### **Summary**

The aforementioned literature creates a strong base for the study of resegregation in the American South. The case study of T. Wingate Andrews will add scholarly value to the established literature regarding desegregation and resegregation because it demonstrates how an integration success story became a failure. T. Wingate Andrews is a critical story for desegregation research because it started as an integrated school without a history of segregation. Without the specter of segregation at the school, both White and African-American students could attend Andrews High School as equals. The

unique attempt to create an integrated high school from its inception is distinct, but also how this apparent success faded should also be noted.

Furthermore, the story of T. Wingate Andrews High School will also show how, contrary to existing scholarly research on resegregation efforts, the merger of smaller school systems led to the resegregation of a school. After the merger of High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools, the case of Andrews will illustrate how the good faith effort of a progressive school district met with the harsh reality that race still mattered 30 to 40 years after the creation of the integrated high school. The story of Andrews will also demonstrate how the hard inevitabilities of White flight, residential housing costs, court precedents, and the loss of desire to fight for desegregation in the 1990s and 2000s moved a progressive school district toward resegregation through policies, attendance lines, and political influences. By helping readers understand how the goals of *Brown v. Board of Education* failed to be realized within High Point City and Guilford County Schools, this dissertation provides insight into the steps taken by school districts that lead to resegregation.

## CHAPTER III

### T. WINGATE ANDREWS HIGH SCHOOL: 1968-2003

#### Introduction

Chapter III explores the history of T. Wingate Andrews High School from its inception in 1968 until 2003. This historical research will start with the creation of the school out of the desegregation movement in the 1950s and 1960s. Highlighting the initial success of Andrews High School, this chapter proceeds through the early years of the school and through the merger of High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools. Additionally, after establishing the past success of desegregation at Andrews High, I will demonstrate how the school's student demographics began to drastically change in a merged Guilford County School system. Consequently, I describe how the progressive Guilford County School system attempted to initially disrupt resegregation at T. Wingate Andrews.

#### **From *Brown* to the Creation of T. Wingate Andrews High School**

Following the 1954 and 1955 *Brown v. Board of Education* decisions, the High Point City Schools Board of Education followed suit with the Pearsall Plan issued by the State of North Carolina General Assembly that put forth "freedom of choice" plans (NC General Statutes, 115C-274). These plans allowed reassignment of students and gave choice options to students on where they wanted to attend school. By following the Pearsall Plan, the High Point City Schools Board of Education would review assignment

requests of both White and African American students. However, most requests for both Whites and African Americans were denied (Pierce, 1993). This denial allowed maintenance of the status quo, keeping High Point Central High School as the White high school and William Penn High School as the African American high school.

From the time after *Brown* in 1954, until desegregation was fully implemented in the High Point City School System in 1968, the makeup of the Board of Education began to move to a more progressive group of individuals who would focus on equity and inclusion. As noted in Mackey's (1978) case study on High Point desegregation, the school board had a substantial number of Quakers, members of the Society of Friends, whose faith favored desegregation and equality for all. In the period of 1954-1961, there were two Quakers elected to the board of five (Mackey, 1978). This gave a more progressive voice within the school board and opened the door for promoting desegregation. To counter this development in 1960, the school board was increased to seven members. However, the increasing of members also brought in another Quaker member. Therefore, the stage was set for a more supportive foothold within the actual board of education for desegregation within High Point. Furthermore, this group of progressive Quakers consolidated its strength with each Quaker serving as chair during the period from 1964-72 and adding a Quaker Board of Education attorney, D.P. Whitley, who favored ending segregation within High Point.

To begin to accommodate the requests of African Americans in the High Point community, the High Point Board of Education integrated one African American student at High Point Central High School and one African American student at Ferndale Junior

High School in the 1959-60 school year (Pierce, 1993). The students were siblings and females from the northern United States. The school board believed that integrating a northern Black student would be easier than a local student (High Point Board of Education, 1959, August 27). Starting at the January 12, 1962 Board of Education meeting, local African American clergy began to push for neighborhood desegregation as there were no neighborhood lines within the district's school assignment plan (High Point Board of Education, 1962, January 12). Following the push from the African American clergy, a civil case was brought to the United States District Court for Middle North Carolina on behalf of several African American minors, specifically Sheila Gilmore and Barries Gilmore, to force High Point City Schools to formally desegregate. The compelling efforts from the local African American clergy and the ensuing legal action within the Gilmore case forced the Board to begin to review neighborhood assignments in May of 1963 and created a movement from de jure segregation based solely on race to de facto segregation based on neighborhoods (Gilmore, 1963). After the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, the High Point City Schools Board of Education became more progressive and developed a Compliance Plan for desegregation which was approved on September 30, 1965 (Pierce, 1993). The Compliance Plan was further approved by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on October 3, 1965 which codified how High Point City Schools would use geographic districts that included multiple neighborhoods to generate school zones coupled with freedom of choice plans for students requesting reassignment (High Point Board of Education, 1965, September 16).

Starting in the Spring of 1966, there were multiple threats of protests coming from the African American community due to the slow speed at which High Point City Schools was moving regarding the Compliance Plan (Mackey, 1978). The lead spokesperson for the African American community was Reverend B. Elton Cox. Cox encouraged students from the all Black William Penn High School to partake in protests in the Spring of 1966. All the protests were led through the support of the Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) and under the leadership of Cox (Mackey, 1978). Each protest was noted for its non-violent nature, which many attributed to the leadership of the African American clergy and the fact that the High Point Police Department had integrated in the late 1950s, including having 10-12 Black officers in leadership roles. The 1965-66 school year ended with protests and the High Point City School Board of Education voting to close William Penn High School on June 16, 1966 (High Point Board of Education, 1966).

The closure of William Penn High School demonstrated the desire of the school board to create a completely new high school that would start as an integrated high school from its inception. The new school was originally named Northeast Senior High School and would be located next to Northeast Junior High School (known today as Welborn Middle School). This new school was a joint idea from both the Board of Education and Superintendent Dean Pruette (Pierce, 1993). T. Wingate Andrews High School, which was the name given to the school in honor of the High Point City Schools' Superintendent T. Wingate Andrews who served from 1924-37, would be a completely integrated school from its inception and house close to 1500 students (Mackey, 1978).

The students who would attend Andrews High School would be pulled from the closing William Penn High School and High Point Central. Similar to the pattern seen in other southern cities pursuing desegregation (Stalnaker, 2013) then, the all Black William Penn High School would be closed and the students assimilated into the student body of the much larger T. Wingate Andrews High School.

Although the plan was to create an integrated high school at its inception, the African American community was led to believe that T. Wingate Andrews High School would be all Black and would replace William Penn High School (Mackey, 1978). Contrary to this belief, the Board of Education denied all student reassignment requests from African American students who wanted to leave the High Point Central High School geographic zone under the Compliance Plan and attend T. Wingate Andrews (High Point Board of Education, 1966, June 16). The belief that Andrews High would be integrated from the beginning assisted the school system in shifting to the approved Compliance Plan and forcing neighborhoods, particularly all Black neighborhoods, to start attending High Point Central High School and send other all White neighborhoods to Andrews High School for the benefit of making both High Point Central High School and T. Wingate Andrews High School desegregated in the 1968-69 school year (High Point Board of Education, 1966, June 16). By creating a new state of the art school that would be integrated from its inception, there was little resistance from the Black community to closing Penn and opening Andrews.

### **The Principalship of the New T. Wingate Andrews High School**

In April of 1968, the High Point City Board of Education began to discuss the principalship of the new T. Wingate Andrews High School and the closing of William Penn High School. The superintendent of the school system was Dr. Dean Pruette who would recommend W.E. Rogers, Jr. for the principalship of T. Wingate Andrews and the promotion of Samuel Burford, an African American and the current principal of William Penn, to the position of Director of Secondary Education during the April 18, 1968 board meeting (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 18). In an effort to solidify this process, Pruette met with Burford prior to the Board of Education meeting to share his plans and gain Burford's acceptance. However, prior to making his recommendations to the Board of Education, Pruette met with members of the press to share his recommendation of Rogers for the Andrews High principalship (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 18). With this public announcement of his intentions, Pruette created a rift with both the school board and several members of the African American community. To further complicate the matter, a member of the news media met with Samuel Burford anonymously and shared that Burford would not accept the position offered by Pruette (Mackey, 1978). Furthermore, attorney Samuel Chess, an African American civil rights leader within Guilford County and High Point, used time during the public comments portion of the Board of Education meeting on April 18, 1968 to push forth a recommendation endorsing Samuel Burford to become the first principal of T. Wingate Andrews High School (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). Noting the major concern from the African American community and the publicity generated by

Pruette surrounding the appointment, the High Point City Schools Board of Education decided to move the naming of the principal for Andrews High to an Executive Session closed to the media for April 25, 1968.

When the school board reconvened on April 25, 1968 for the Executive Session to discuss the naming of the principal of T. Wingate Andrews High School, Dr. Pruette argued passionately that the move of Burford to the position of Director of Secondary Education was a major promotion (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). Pruette further explained that most of the students from the all Black William Penn High School would be geographically zoned to attend High Point Central High School and Burford, who was a skilled communicator, would be needed to assist in the desegregation efforts at both High Point Central High and Ferndale Junior High Schools. This position presented by Pruette was created with a focus on parents, students, and the community. Furthermore, Pruette argued that Burford, who was a 62-year-old diabetic with heart problems, should not have to endure the extra stress of opening a new school in the heat of desegregation. The Board of Education took an unofficial vote on Dr. Pruette's recommendation. In a 5 to 2 vote, Pruette's recommendation failed to pass.

There was a recommendation by the Board of Education members, all of whom were White, to move Burford to the new T. Wingate Andrews High School against the wishes of Pruette (Pierce, 1993). Asserting the previously listed reasons, Pruette wanted to move Burford to the Central Office to supervise secondary curriculum and instruction, and he vigorously defended his recommendation. The Board of Education asked Pruette for an alternate recommendation. Dr. Pruette recommended Samuel Burford as an

Assistant Principal at High Point Central High School. This recommendation was denied two votes “for” to five votes “against.” Subsequently, the Board asked Pruette for another alternative recommendation. Pruette’s second alternative recommendation placed Samuel Burford as an Assistant Principal at T. Wingate Andrews. The recommendation was defeated in the same two to five vote. A third alternative was requested by the Board of Education. Dr. Pruette recommended moving Samuel Burford back to the classroom to teach high school English. This recommendation was defeated zero to seven. A fourth alternative was requested in which Pruette recommended O.F. Hudson, the Director of Federal Programs, to become the new principal of T. Wingate Andrews High with Samuel Burford being named to Hudson’s post. Likewise, the board voted zero to seven against this recommendation. Upon another request for a recommendation, Pruette proposed the appointment of Gaither Frye, Principal at Ferndale Junior High, to be the new principal at T. Wingate Andrews with Burford being placed at Ferndale. This recommendation was also defeated two to five. After the fifth request, Dr. Pruette asked the Board of Education Attorney Whitley if he had given enough recommendations. D.P. Whitely noted that enough choices had been shared and Pruette asked for the Board to vote on if they wished for him to make any more recommendations. The School Board voted seven to zero in favor of ending Pruette’s recommendations and proposals for the principalship appointment of T. Wingate Andrews High School.

Upon voting to end the proposals and recommendations supported by Superintendent Pruette, the High Point City Schools Board of Education asked Attorney

D.P. Whitley to further explain North Carolina General Statute 115C-21 which outlined the appointment of principals and teachers upon recommendations by the Superintendent of city administrative units (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). D.P. Whitley explained that the process of recommendations had been exhausted and therefore the board should consider also the “problems with assignments to duties that shall be made by the superintendent of schools” within statute 115C-142. Noting that the superintendent was an employee of the Board of Education, D.P. Whitley explained that the Board could ask about the abilities of employees and make recommendations as well.

After noting the advice of D.P. Whitley, the Board of Education asked Superintendent Pruette why he did not recommend Samuel Burford for the principalship of T. Wingate Andrews High School (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). Pruette responded that he felt his original recommendation was “professionally and in the best interest of children’s well-being” (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). Consequently, several members asked Dr. Pruette questions repeatedly on the qualifications of Samuel Burford. Specifically, the board asked if Burford was qualified to be the principal of T. Wingate Andrews High School. Pruette responded that he was doubtful that Burford could lead Andrews and he would not recommend his appointment. The Board then motioned to nominate Samuel Burford over the objection of Superintendent Pruette. This recommendation was then tabled until the media was allowed into the board room. Upon allowing the media to re-enter the room, Chairman Clinard stated,

The Superintendent made recommendations that Mr. Burford be made Director of Secondary Education, based on his professional judgment that his [Mr. Burford's] talents in the field of counseling, guidance, and education could best serve the total student body of our secondary schools. However, the majority of the Board differs with the Superintendent's opinion and names Mr. Burford principal of Andrews High School. No other changes in position are directed by the Board at this time. (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25)

A vote was called on the recommendation stated by Chairman Clinard. The vote was five to two with Clinard and another member voting against the statement and appointment (Pierce, 1993). Following the Board meeting, a press conference and public announcement by the Board of Education announcing the appointment of Burford against the wishes of Pruette occurred and generated further animosity between the Board of Education and the Superintendent.

Three weeks later at the May 16, 1968 Board of Education meeting, the Board of Education witnessed the attendance of over 100 supporters for Superintendent Pruette, many of whom came to speak during public comments (Pierce, 1993). The Board issued a statement explaining that the line of authority came from the Board through the Superintendent. This statement was designed to further explain to the public that the decision to place Burford and other principal or administrative appointments must have Board approval or direct appointment.

To further show support for Mr. Burford, the Board of Education allowed him to bring Mr. John Russell, the Dean of Students at William Penn and an African American, to T. Wingate Andrews to be Mr. Burford's Assistant Principal (Mackey, 1978). Burford and Russell worked countless hours in Russell's basement in secrecy from May 1968

until the opening of school in August of 1968 to create a plan that would help the integration process for T. Wingate Andrews High School (Mackey, 1978).

In August of 1968, T. Wingate Andrews High School opened to a completely integrated student body composed of 30% Black students from William Penn High School and 70% White students from High Point Central High School. These percentage proportions mirrored the racial demographics of the city of High Point (Mackey, 1978). Andrews High School gained notoriety as a state of the art facility and was considered a model for how to handle integration. However, the elementary and middle schools that fed into Andrews High School were to remain neighborhood schools and were almost entirely still segregated (Gilmore, 1969, July 16). Although the high school student body was integrated, the school succeeded through its first years with relatively few problems related to race (Pierce, 1993).

Even though Andrews High initially started with few problems, the policies from the High Point Board of Education that governed the student feeder patterns and staffing of Andrews High came under fire more and more (Mackey, 1978). In January of 1969, the *Gilmore v. High Point Board of Education* case reopened in federal court. Over the course of the next six months, Judge Edwin M. Stanley heard the case. He gave an order on July 16, 1969 for the faculty and staff to be desegregated at all High Point City Schools (Gilmore, 1969, July 16). The order to desegregate faculty and staff from the court pushed the High Point City Board of Education the next day in a six to one vote to compel Superintendent Pruette to assign staff to schools racially proportional to the student body (High Point Board of Education, 1969, July 17).

The desegregation of faculty and staff caused the White community to protest and create the “Citizens for Justice” Committee, which advocated stopping the desegregation of faculty and staff. A member of the school board called a vote at the August 2, 1969 meeting in which the Board chairperson and a supporting member were absent along with *Gilmore* plaintiff attorneys (High Point Board of Education, 1969, August 2). The vote stopped the desegregation of staff and junior high students. However, Judge Stanley called a meeting on August 19, 1969 to further assert the legal ramifications of the July ruling. Judge Stanley stated, “It is not a matter of what you or I think should be done. It’s the law and people must understand that” (Mackey, 1978, p. 81). Therefore, in a memorandum issued that same day, Judge Stanley ordered Superintendent Pruette to assign teachers based on the ratio of 30% Black and 70% White to schools. Many White teachers met with Superintendent Pruette after learning of their assignments to Black schools (Mackey, 1978). Some teachers were so upset they resigned; however, all classrooms were fully staffed on August 26, 1969 when school began.

To further consolidate the idea of desegregation of both students and staff, the Board of Education under the leadership of Chairperson Evelyn Thompson, approved a plan in November of 1969 put forth by Attorney D.P. Whitley, who was White, which stated that “no school shall have a percentage of its student body made up of black students which exceed 15 percent above the percentage of black students in the High Point City Schools” (High Point Board of Education, 1969, November 20). In effect, the Board of Education moved to prevent having any school be all-Black. Additionally, the school board issued a statement explaining that the school district was instructed to

desegregate by judicial authority, members of the board were mindful of their oaths of office, and the board recognized that neighborhood segregation created segregated schools (High Point Board of Education, 1969, November 20). Furthermore, the board attempted to also address the fear of many White community members of perceived deterioration in educational quality and promote the fairness of transporting students to achieve desegregation without having an outside entity such as the court system determine what is best for the students of High Point. This statement offered testimony to the desire of the Board of Education to maintain the path toward desegregation that they had started with the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews High School.

### **Merger of High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools**

T. Wingate Andrews High School maintained its desegregated and highly successful model throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Although there was some White flight to the rural county schools in Guilford County, particularly Southwest High, Andrews High School was still very balanced racially in the 1980s and into the 1990s (NCES, 1992). However, during the 1980s, High Point City Schools along with Greensboro City Schools began to discuss the possibility of merging their two school systems with the more rural Guilford County Schools. The merger would effectively consolidate resources and potentially strengthen the financial position of a much larger school district as High Point and Greensboro were limited in tax bases and facilities.

Contrary to the position of the school districts in 1983, the High Point Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Council conducted a survey of parents to garner feedback on

the issue of merging with Greensboro City Schools and Guilford County Schools (Perry, 1983, April 4). The survey concluded that parents in High Point City Schools opposed merger at a rate of three to one. The survey highlighted that many of the parents who completed the survey opposed consolidation on the grounds of fairness and the belief that “High Point would get dumped on” or not “get a fair shake” (Perry, 1983, April 4, p. B1). Additionally, High Point Enterprise Sunday Editor David Perry noted that, in the survey, parents also believed that consolidation would increase the number of White students due to High Point and Greensboro having close to 50% minorities in the schools (Perry, 1983, April 4). Although the survey results were tilted heavily against the prospect of merger, the High Point City Schools Board of Education allowed a consolidation feasibility study to continue and offer options for the district in the future.

As the merger study continued, the movement within the High Point community gradually started to warm to the idea that merger would be best for all High Point City Schools. By the summer of 1986, the High Point City Schools Board of Education had reviewed and endorsed the findings of the consolidation study. On June 19, 1986, the Board of Education adopted a resolution that called for merger on many grounds, but specifically to counter five major challenges identified by the study (High Point Board of Education, 1986, June 19). The challenges that were identified and moved the Board toward merger were:

1. Declining enrollment within High Point City Schools
2. Changing pupil population patterns
3. Eroding tax base

4. Facilities utilization
5. Need for a unified commitment to quality education

Interestingly enough, the identification of changing pupil population patterns showed that race issues were still a concern for the school district. Noting that minority populations were growing in High Point City Schools, especially at T. Wingate Andrews and High Point Central High School, demonstrated that the Board of Education was becoming more and more aware of the community's desire to prevent minority majority schools and have racially balanced schools. Consequently, the preferred message from the pro-merger groups was centered on the fiscal issue rather than the race issue in order to prevent the backlash surrounding potential concerns over schools becoming more diverse and less White. Thus, the High Point Board of Education moved to push merger on the aforementioned grounds.

Contrary to the support within High Point for merger, residents of the more rural and suburban Guilford County School System were heavily against merger (Herrin, 1986, August 29). Using survey information from an independent research firm, the Guilford County Commissioners shared that 61% of residents outside of High Point and Greensboro opposed the merger (Herrin, 1986, August 29). Due to this fact, the Guilford County Schools Board of Education was resistant to merger versus the support for merger in both High Point and Greensboro. To counter the opposition, the High Point Board of Education along with the Greensboro Board of Education reached out to their respective legislative delegations to urge for a bill authorizing a referendum on the merger proposal (High Point Board of Education, 1990, May 17). The legislative pressure created Senate

Bill 612 which created the legislative thrust to allow for a countywide referendum on merger. Although the bill was slow to move through the North Carolina House of Representatives, it was eventually adopted on March 18, 1991 (Pierce, 1993). Consequently, the United States Justice Department gave preclearance to a potential merger on desegregation grounds on September 20, 1991 as well. Lastly, the referendum was held on November 5, 1991 and passed. Therefore, the future of T. Wingate Andrews High School would now be held in the newly merged Guilford County Schools.

### **Redistricting Efforts from 1997 to 1999**

After the merger of Guilford County Schools, High Point City Schools, and Greensboro City Schools, T. Wingate Andrews began to change demographically at a rapid rate. The merger in 1993 delineated clear attendance zones for students attending each school in the newly formed Guilford County Schools. Each school's attendance lines allowed parents to know which school their student or students would attend, particularly in high school since many elementary schools were neighborhood schools. With clear attendance zones, T. Wingate Andrews, located in the city of High Point, began to lose students to the nearby suburban Southwest High School, which was in the former Guilford County School system. The vast majority of the students leaving were White. Therefore, the newly merged school district would need to soon address rapid White flight to Southwest and population shifts that would cause T. Wingate Andrews to lose many students and become demographically different from its creation as the integrated school it was known to be.

### **Redistricting Committee**

As 1996 closed, the Guilford County Board of Education began the process of reviewing school demographics and school populations throughout the county (Guilford County Board of Education, 1996, December 10). Realizing that redistricting was a major issue for the county and a hot topic for election politics, the Board of Education created a 60-person Redistricting Committee to create maps and formulate options for redistricting the district's schools. With significant overcrowding at some schools in Guilford County, particularly the growing concern at Southwest High School in High Point, the Board of Education advised the Redistricting Committee to look to use underutilized facilities or schools that were losing numbers such as T. Wingate Andrews (Coryell, 1997, January 13). Once this comment surfaced at the January 10, 1997 Board of Education meeting, many citizens in High Point began to take notice regarding the redistricting process. Similarly, at the same January 10 meeting, the Board of Education also considered facilities consultant Joe Hill's recommendation to move students from the Cambridge area of north High Point from the Southwest High attendance zone to T. Wingate Andrews, even though many families expressed a desire to stay at Southwest. Hill noted that the aforementioned Cambridge area would "better balance the population" and "help with diversity of Andrews" which was increasing in minority population (Coryell, 1997, January 13). Therefore, many parents in this northern area of High Point began to be concerned about shifting their students to a different school.

To assist the 60-person Redistricting Committee, the Guilford County Board of Education decided to lay out parameters for the redistricting process by specifically

emphasizing a desire for schools to have racial diversity and maximum facility usage (Guilford County Board of Education, 1997, January 10). As noted in the *High Point Enterprise*, the Redistricting Committee needed to take into consideration “population growth, availability of school facilities and prospects for new and expanded school facilities, sensible feeder patterns from elementary schools to middle schools to high schools, racial diversity, potential bus routes, and numerous other factors” (Deacle, 1997, January 28, p. B4). Considering the issues presented to them, the Redistricting Committee made a priority of neighborhood schools while also attending to the goal of racial and economic diversity the Board of Education desired (Deacle, 1997, January 28). However, as the committee’s bylaws required a three-fifths majority for action, the ability to make neighborhood schools that were also diverse without busing or shifting lines drew constant debate and no passage of any redistricting plan early on in the process. Simply, the pursuit of racial diversity at the schools in High Point could not coexist with the maintenance of neighborhood schools in the city.

As the Redistricting Committee continued to struggle with prioritizing neighborhood schools versus prioritizing racially diverse schools, more and more community members from poor minority areas of High Point began to voice concerns about feeder patterns and a lack of voice on the committee (Deacle, 1997, February 11). Although these concerns registered with many Redistricting Committee members, the overall committee lobbied for the idea of creating maps for the community to review. Therefore, by late March 1997, the Redistricting Committee released four maps to the Board of Education on March 27, 1997 (Guilford County Board of Education, 1997,

March 27). The four maps created zones for each area of the county. Although there were four options, each map grouped either all or most of the former High Point City Schools in a zone with Southwest High School added (Deacle, 1997, March 28).

After the publishing of the four proposed maps, the Guilford County Board of Education focused on clarifying the issues, particularly racial diversity and neighborhood schools, in an effort to assist the Redistricting Committee. Under the leadership of Board Chairperson Susan Mendenhall, who was from High Point, the Board of Education issued a statement regarding diversity and neighborhood schools (Guilford County Board of Education, 1997, April 8). The statement said, “the Board of Education is committed to the concept of community [neighborhood] schools as long as schools are made as racially diverse as feasible by applying the other guiding principles” (Deacle, 1997, April 8, p. A1). Therefore, the emphasis for the Redistricting Committee would be on creating racially diverse schools first with community schools as a secondary objective.

Noting the preferences of the Board of Education, the Redistricting Committee moved to focus on the aforementioned maps that allowed for increased diversity. By focusing on increasing diversity, the committee preferred keeping the old High Point City schools together with the addition of the Southwest schools and the other Jamestown schools (Holeman, 1997, April 27). Unfortunately for the committee, significant dissent came from the predominantly White areas that would be redistricted to more diverse schools, especially in High Point. When the issue of racial equity arose in the committee meetings, Black committee members “argued strongly for racial equity and against what they said was a misguided fear” of predominantly Black schools (Holeman, 1997, April

29). To further intensify the debate, White committee members stated that White community feedback was against the focus on diversity due to more violence in predominantly Black schools. As Holeman (1997, April 29) noted, White committee members and White parents at community forums wanted to keep their children in “their neighborhood schools” (p. A2). The arguments within the committee meetings were constant through late April and throughout May of 1997. As June approached, the separation between the Black community and the White community over redistricting centered more on race than any other topic.

With race at the forefront, community members from both the White community and Black community lined up in support of various map options that pushed either diversity or neighborhood schools. As noted earlier, the Redistricting Committee advocated for a map that essentially returned Guilford County Schools back to a pre-merger system that appeared fragmented into inner-city systems and suburban systems all contained in one large county system (Schwarzen, 1997, June 3). The two maps supported by the two different racial groups showed clear divisions aligned to how each group viewed the schools in both inner-city High Point and suburban High Point. Supporters of the map that allowed for diversity at T. Wingate Andrews argued that the school would benefit from more equity and prevent a return to segregation. However, the predominantly White supporters of the more suburban map argued that students should go to schools closer to home, which would prevent diversity at T. Wingate Andrews and increase the White population at Southwest High School.

After eight months of meetings and significant heated debate, the Redistricting Committee voted on June 16, 1997 to adopt a map that essentially mirrored the pre-merger map of the High Point City Schools (Martin, 1997, June 17). The committee voted 33 to 17 in favor of the map after two hours of debate in which members accused each other of having political agendas, incorporating racial undertones, and even proposing to alter the process altogether. Following the approval of the map by the Redistricting Committee, the Board of Education held community forums on the map in July and early August 1997.

After holding public forums on the redistricted maps, the Guilford County Board of Education halted the Redistricting Committee's work to share how the Board wished to move forward regarding maps, diversity, and community schools. At the August 12, 1997 meeting, the Board of Education separated the ideas of neighborhood schools and community schools (Martin, 1997, August 12). "A 'community school' pulls from a broader area than a neighborhood school so that school can be more diverse," argued several of the Board of Education members. However, Board member Pam Allen noted, "I would not vote for busing simply to fill up schools" (Martin, 1997, August 12, p. B1). Thus, resolving the impasse over community schools and diversity would depend on maps and bus routes.

### **Mapping Committee Results**

When the redistricting process moved into the mapping phase in September of 1997, the 18-person committee focused heavily on High Point. The major problem for the mapping committee centered on the rapidly growing neighborhoods near Southwest

High School (Martin, 1997, November 21). As the committee drew lines for the feeder patterns that would determine where students ultimately went to high school, diversity was initially not addressed. As Martin notes, “housing patterns in High Point dictate that some schools will have little diversity without the use of busing” (1997, November 21, p. B1). Once the maps were completed, attendance lines shifted students who had traditionally been attending Southwest area schools to T. Wingate Andrews area schools. The shift would incorporate busing to alleviate overcrowding at Southwest and increase diversity at Andrews. Therefore, the hopes of the Board of Education’s goal of diversity and community schools would have to be accomplished through busing, which some on the board and in the community already opposed.

### **Community Response**

By the winter of 1999, tensions had boiled over regarding the proposed maps for High Point schools within the larger Guilford County Schools. Residents of the predominantly White Gordon Road area in High Point united against a proposed shift that would send their students to T. Wingate Andrews High School as opposed to their current destination of Southwest High School (Coryell, 1999, January 12). Gordon Road parents focused on Andrews’ minority majority status and recent academic performance. Although the attendance line shift had been more than two years in the making, parents also argued that Andrews was not closer to home than Southwest and thus not a neighborhood school. Without the shift of the Gordon Road area, Southwest and Andrews would have dramatic racial imbalances. According to Coryell (1999, January 12), Andrews would be composed of “70 percent minority students while Southwest

High School would have 80 percent White students” (p. A2). The issue can best be summed up in a quote from a Gordon Road area resident, who stated, “I don’t have a problem with Andrews. I have a problem with diversity” (1999, January 12, A2).

Economically, many business owners were also concerned about the attendance line shifts. As the economy boomed, residential neighborhoods were being built rapidly in the Southwest attendance zone while there was limited construction in the areas that fed into Andrews (Coryell, 1999, January 13). A real estate developer noted that he was concerned that the proposed lack of diversity at Andrews would deter potential home buyers from buying in a proposed 150 home neighborhood which would harm his \$44 million investment. The developer further stated that, “If I have to tell people that are looking at homes that they will be going to a predominantly Black school,” then “they will buy over on Barrow Road in the Southwest school district” (Coryell, 1999, January 13, p. A2).

As the Board of Education moved closer to adopting the proposed map that would shift White students from the Gordon Road area to Andrews from Southwest while doing little to change the White supermajority at Southwest, each forum in the High Point area grew larger in number and more tense. With more than 300 parents and community members in attendance at the January 19, 1999 Board of Education forum, Board members listened to concerns from those in attendance at the former High Point City Schools Central Office administrative building (Coryell, 1999, January 20). The bulk of the January 19 forum entailed comments from Southwest parents and Andrews parents, with the Andrews’ parents as more vocal.

Although the Southwest parents who were Gordon Road area residents voiced concerns about going to Andrews, the issue many Andrews parents had was the removal of the predominantly White areas of Oak View and Shadybrook being moved to High Point Central High School from T. Wingate Andrews (Coryell, 1999, January 22). As noted by a Shadybrook resident, “you realize (that) making Southwest feeder schools more White and Andrews feeder schools more minority does nothing other than splinter High Point” (Coryell, 1999, January 12, p. A2). Other Shadybrook residents advocated for keeping the schools “integrated and public, not privileged” (Ibid.). Additional concern from a Black High Point resident focused on the return to segregation. The Black resident stated, “this plan opens the door for a return to what used to be – a school that can easily be dismissed” (Ibid.). By clearly sharing their concerns, the Andrews’ community strongly advocated for maintenance of the 1998-1999 demographics which had approximately 40% White students and 60% minority students at the school (Coryell, 1999, January 28).

However, as the Board of Education listened to further arguments from both sides of parents, Andrews and Southwest, the tensions continued to mount eventually leading to fifteen arrests due to protests at the February 23, 1999 meeting (Coryell, 1999, February 23). As hostility and political agendas started to emerge in 1999 and into 2000, Superintendent Dr. Jerry Weast resigned from Guilford County Schools for a position in Montgomery County, Maryland. Thus, the Board of Education moved to adopt a phased model for redistricting that would allow future Boards of Education to adjust the plan if needed.

### **Dr. Terry Grier and Attempted Implementation of the 1999 Redistricting Plan**

With increased tensions in the district and better opportunities elsewhere, Dr. Jerry Weast left Guilford County Schools for Maryland and was succeeded by Dr. Terry Grier as superintendent in 2000. Within 3 years, Dr. Grier and his administration realized that dropping enrollment at Andrews was becoming a significant problem. In 2003, Dr. Grier's administration reported that T. Wingate Andrews' enrollment had decreased and was down from 1490 students in 1993 at the time of merger to less than 1000 (NCES, 2003). Furthermore, the student body that was celebrated as integrated in 1968 at 70% White and 30% African American was now over 75% minority. To complicate matters, Southwest High School, which was built to hold 1000 students, had increased enrollment and was over capacity by 300 students with an enrollment of 1300 (Guilford County Schools, 2003a).

**High Point High Schools' Facilities Study.** During the 2001–2002 school year, the Guilford County Board of Education and Superintendent Dr. Terry Grier commissioned the facilities and operations department within the school system to study the efficiency and overall effectiveness of the schools within Guilford County (Guilford County Board of Education, 2002). The yearlong study concluded in December of 2002 with a report to the Board of Education at the December 2002 Board meeting. The facilities study led the Board of Education to review declining enrollment and growing enrollment concerns throughout the district. The most noticeable enrollment challenge was in High Point at T. Wingate Andrews High School.

Andrews High School, as noted earlier, was designed to hold 1,420 students and had an enrollment of 1162 in the 2001-02 school year. However, enrollment was declining at a rapid rate due to White flight to the suburban area of High Point and to Southwest High School which had a classroom capacity of 775 students (Guilford County Schools, 2002), but had an enrollment of 1175 (DPI, 2016). The facilities study brought to light the enrollment concerns and overcrowding of Southwest High School which needed 19 mobile classrooms to accommodate the overcrowding (Guilford County Schools, 2003a). The potential concerns in reassignment pressed the school district to examine the Phase V assignment plan created in 1999 under then Superintendent Jerry Weast (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 14).

**Reassignment plans and redistricting plans.** Following the redistricting maps and plans adopted in 1999, Dr. Grier and the Board of Education moved forward with the proposed phased approach at implementing the redistricting plan. The Phase V portion of the redistricting plan, or *reassignment plan* as it would be referred to at Board of Education meetings, originally had no mention of T. Wingate Andrews High School (Guilford County Schools, 1999). In noting the concerns for overcrowding and lack of success for the Andrews Academy, the Board of Education under the leadership of new chairman Alan Duncan reviewed the Phase V assignment plan during the January 14, 2003 Board meeting. During the meeting, Dr. Delores Fogg, Associate Superintendent for School Improvement and Mr. Eric Hoekstra, Program Administrator for Planning and Demography, presented the student assignment plan that was created originally in April of 1999 (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 14). During the presentation, Dr. Fogg

noted that parents of rising 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students would be notified in February 2003 if their address would be impacted for reassignment and thus, the parents could apply to be grandfathered in to their current school per the school board's grandfather clause. This particular element is vital in noting that although Andrews was not slated to have any students reassigned from its zone, Southwest High could potentially have its attendance zone shift. The shift in Southwest's zone, the previously mentioned Gordon Road area, could potentially reassign students from the Southwest area schools to Andrews. After the presentation, the Board Chairman noted that the topic would be further reviewed at the Board of Education retreat on January 18 and 19, 2003 (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 14).

On January 18 and 19, 2003, the GCS Board of Education held its winter retreat in Greensboro with the majority of the agenda dedicated to magnet and redistricting issues (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 18). The Saturday discussion led by Dr. Fogg centered on current and proposed magnet programs at 14 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 9 high schools. However, the discussion Sunday was heavily focused on schools within High Point (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 19). Initial discussion concentrated on Andrews High School and possible changes to its attendance zone. "Board members were in agreement that the options presented were not options that they wanted to further pursue," regarding potential solutions to Andrews declining enrollment (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 19, p. 2). Furthermore, Chairman Duncan requested that school district staff present possible magnet options for Andrews at the school board's January 30, 2003 work session.

During the Board of Education's work session on January 30, 2003, the dialogue surrounding Andrews High School concentrated on both magnet options and redistricting options (Guilford County Schools, January 30). The redistricting options presented by Mr. Hoekstra revolved around a shift between Andrews High, Southwest High, and Ragsdale High (a school in neighboring Jamestown). Under the proposal, Andrews would receive 145 students from Southwest of whom 10 students had free or reduced meal status. Free or reduced meal status indicated students of poverty who were eligible for the federal free or reduced lunch program within each student demographic shift proposed. Similarly, Ragsdale High would gain 200 students from Andrews of whom 182 were estimated to have free or reduced lunch. Lastly, Southwest High would gain 197 students from Ragsdale High of which 8 were estimated to have free or reduced lunch. The three-way switch would potentially create more economic, if not racial, diversity at Andrews and Ragsdale High Schools. Consequently, Andrews would have an enrollment of 1207, Ragsdale would have an enrollment of 1157, and Southwest would have 1285 students enrolled. The Free or Reduced Lunch percentage for Andrews would decrease from 46% to 34%. Concurrently, Ragsdale would increase its free or reduced lunch percentage from 25% to 40% and Southwest would decrease from 15% free or reduced lunch to 14% (Guilford County Schools, 2003, January 30). Under the direction of the Board, district staff was requested to arrange meetings with the families potentially affected and garner feedback for discussion during the February 11 Board of Education meeting. Additionally, the Board of Education discussed possible changes to Phase V of the 1999 Redistricting Plan. Within the redistricting discussion, the Board

held further conversation regarding potential redistricting of students to Ragsdale from areas that had traditionally been assigned to High Point area schools.

Following the Board's directive, GCS district staff along with ten school board members held a public forum concerning Andrews, Ragsdale, and Southwest High Schools on February 6, 2003. The opening remarks from Chairman Duncan gave way to over 3 hours of public comments about the proposed reassignment shift and redistricting options presented during the January 30 work session (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 6). Noting the significant amount of public commentary regarding the reassignment shift and redistricting plan, the school board held another Special Called meeting on February 10, 2003 to continue discussions surrounding Andrews, Southwest, and Ragsdale. During the Special Called meeting, twenty citizens spoke during public comments with twelve individuals speaking directly about the proposed changes from the January work session (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 10). Additionally, the school district administration suggested that due to the feedback given by the community, the Board "reject the most recent option regarding Andrews High School" and the redistricting shift of the "approximately 500 students in the Andrews High, Southwest High, and Ragsdale High attendance zones" (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 10). Furthermore, the administration would continue to explore options to fill the roughly 200 vacant seats at Andrews High. Also, in response to the redistricting of students to Ragsdale from traditional High Point areas, Mr. Hoekstra reminded the Board that letters would need to be sent to parents regarding their deferred reassignment to

Ragsdale under Phase VI of the 1999 Redistricting Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 10).

**The Andrews Academy and other redistricting options.** One day later, February 11, 2003, the GCS Board of Education held its regularly scheduled meeting in Greensboro. Due to the recent community response to the proposed redistricting and reassignment plans, eleven out of fifteen speakers for public comments came to share their views regarding the aforementioned plans (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 11). After public comments, Superintendent Grier presented a proposal to create a choice program at Andrews similar to the Early College Academy at Dudley High School. Within Dr. Grier's proposal, 75 seats would be available to students "not currently zoned to attend Andrews High" (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 11). Additionally, another 75 seats would be reserved for students zoned for Andrews. The curriculum of the Andrews Academy would be a rigorous curriculum focused on Health Careers, Education, and Business/Furniture Industry. Under Superintendent Grier's plan, the Andrews Academy, a school within a school, would also have students finish high school within three years and then take college classes at one of the many local universities and community colleges in the Triad or at minimum, students would be eligible for dual enrollment at both Andrews and local colleges or universities. According to Grier, Andrews would not need to hire additional staff with students enrolled their senior year at colleges. Consequently, the lack of need to hire staff would allow the district to fund the cost of the college courses taken by students. Grier further

explained that the Andrews Academy would bring more Advanced Placement courses to the school thereby giving more students access to higher-level coursework.

Following the presentation by Dr. Grier, Board member and Vice-Chairwoman Dot Kearns from High Point made a motion to ask district staff to suggest other options for Andrews High School (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 11). However, the motion failed during a roll call vote tie, five to five. The Board recessed briefly and then returned with Chairman Duncan making a motion to reconsider Dot Kearns' motion. The motion failed again on a tie vote with Chairman Duncan and Board member Johnny Hodge switching position in support and opposition respectively. Immediately following the outcome of the vote, Board member Anita Sharpe requested to change her vote in favor of the motion, thus the motion passed six to four.

After the passing motion, GCS district staff presented additional options for Andrews High School. The first additional option would add 167 students to Andrews, 14 of the 167 students were minority and 2 would be free or reduced lunch (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 11). This redistricting option for students pushed the Andrews' attendance zone into the Oak Hollow Lake basin area and bordered the Skeet Club Road area, an area served by Southwest High. This area was predominantly White and middle class in population. Middle school students would also need to be shifted as well to accommodate this proposal. Additionally, this proposal would shift 60 students to High Point Central from Andrews from an area in the lower attendance zone of Andrews High that served lower income and minority students.

The second option presented by Mr. Hoekstra would split the attendance zone for Florence Elementary School on the east side of the Andrews attendance zone (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 11). The 121 students in this attendance zone which currently attend Southwest High School were comprised of 70 minority students, which contained 16 free or reduced lunch students, and 51 White students. This proposal met resistance by the Board of Education and a motion was made to remove this proposal. The motion passed nine to one. Following this vote, Chairman Duncan asked Dr. Grier to have GCS staff arrange meetings in the community with Andrews parents and other affected schools in order for the Board to receive additional feedback.

Due to the Board's request for additional feedback and more options for Andrews High School, GCS held another Special Called Board of Education meeting on February 17, 2003 to hear more information on facility needs and proposals for Andrews. During the meeting on February 17, Dr. John Wright, Associate Superintendent of Administrative Services shared capital improvement projects from Phase I of 1999-2000 Capital Outlay Budget which included \$200 million bond which addressed fifty-four schools including Southwest High School (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 17). As conversations continued about the needs to address Andrews High's decreasing enrollment, the budgetary and capital needs of the district garnered particular interest for the Board, especially enrollment concerns that were not matching facility needs. The facility needs discussion led the Board back to the conversation surrounding enrollment shifts at T. Wingate Andrews and Southwest High and the proposals developed to change the tide with regard to these two schools.

The third proposal recommended by Dr. Grier for changing the enrollment concerns at Andrews and Southwest would move students residing in the Oak Hollow area from Southwest High to Andrews and move students on the western side of Andrews's attendance zone to High Point Central High School (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 17). After this proposal, there was a motion made by the Board to remove consideration at that time of shifting students south of Skeet Club Road from Southwest High to Andrews High. This motion passed eight to two with the Board recommending Dr. Grier to present the Early College Academy proposal at the February 20, 2003 High School Options Fair "to inform parents and gauge interest in the program" (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 17).

After the presentation regarding the Early College Academy program for Andrews High at the High School Options Fair, the Board of Education held a public forum at T. Wingate Andrews High School on February 24, 2003 to hear concerns and answer questions about the new magnet programs being proposed, specifically the Early College Academy (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 24). The public forum lasted over two hours with a variety of community members voicing their concerns and asking questions about the program to both the Board of Education and senior GCS administrative staff.

Consequently, after the public forum on the 24<sup>th</sup> of February, a Special Called Board of Education Meeting was held on Monday, March 3, 2003 to review the feedback and the Early College Academy Proposal (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 3). Superintendent Grier reviewed the program and provided key details regarding the Early

College Academy program. According to Dr. Grier, the Early College Academy program would include “50-60 students at each grade level” nine through twelve (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 3). The breakdown of the students would have 20-30 students from within the Andrews attendance zone and 20-30 students from across the county who would be accepted into the program. Containing three themes (Health Careers, Education, and Business/Furniture Industry) the Academy would help students complete the majority if not all high school course work in three years and then be eligible to enroll in university classes their senior year. As mentioned earlier, the school district would not need to fund additional staff for this program and could use the leftover monies to help pay for the college courses. Similarly, the program would increase the number of Advanced Placement Courses at Andrews and thus increase access for all students to higher level rigorous courses at the school. After a period of discussion, a motion was made and passed on an eight to one vote to start the Early College Academy program at T. Wingate Andrews High School in the fall of 2003 (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 3).

Once the Early College Academy proposal passed, Chairman Duncan proposed a pilot zone program for schools that were under enrolled (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 3). This proposal would include zonal choice pilots to accommodate Western High School in Greensboro, Southern High School in Greensboro, and Andrews High School in High Point as well. With regard to T. Wingate Andrews, the aforementioned area south of Skeet Club Road that was served by Southwest High School would be allowed to transfer to Andrews High. Similarly, the Oak View area, which borders the

western Andrews attendance line and was served by High Point Central, would also be included as a zone choice area and thus allow students to transfer to Andrews High as well. The zonal choice pilot would operate in conjunction with the Andrews Early College Academy program and provide the course offerings to all students in the transfer zones. Superintendent Grier specified his desire to know the number of seats identified for Andrews High to ensure that the school did not become overcrowded as a result of the combination of the two programs. After some brief discussion, a motion was made and the Board passed the zonal pilot program with an additional motion made to accommodate transportation for students wishing to participate in the zonal pilot choice program (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 3). Subsequent to the Board meeting on March 3, 2003, the GCS Board of Education held a regularly scheduled Board meeting on March 11, 2003 and heard 13 out of 26 public comments directed at the board regarding the future magnet and zonal choice pilot programs for High Point and T. Wingate Andrews (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 11).

Due to the approval of the Board of Education, T. Wingate Andrews was therefore slated to start the Early College Academy Magnet Program in the fall of 2003 and also participate in the pilot zonal choice program in efforts to counter the decreasing enrollment at the school and encourage students at particularly Southwest High to attend Andrews High. The idea that students would enroll in the Early College Academy was an effort to also balance the rapidly changing racial and socio-economic dynamics that were making Andrews into a school of poverty and a minority majority school. To further help with the dire situation at T. Wingate Andrews, the Board of Education

approved a recommendation by Dr. Grier to expand Title I Schools for the 2003-2004 school year at its May 29 meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2003, May 29). By increasing the number of Title I schools, GCS was able to include Andrews High School as a Title I school and make the school eligible to receive part of the district's increased federal funding. Andrews would now be eligible to receive part of the additional \$2.9 million that the district was slated to receive in 2003-2004 (Guilford County Schools, 2003, May 29). However, there were other factors in play that would also impact T. Wingate Andrews High School in the coming years despite gaining the potential for additional students and more monies.

### **The 2003 Bond**

As previously discussed, the Guilford County Board of Education and Superintendent Dr. Terry Grier started 2003 by reviewing the 2002 facilities study. The study denoted areas of concern for GCS due to student enrollment growth and facilities that were overcrowded or simply out of date with regard to capacity and technology. The facilities study led the Board of Education to generate options for countering the declining enrollment at T. Wingate Andrews High School and the increasing enrollment of the much smaller facility of Southwest High School in the city of High Point. The facilities study also led to discussions of magnet programs and redistricting multiple schools, but many of the ideas were simply moving around students and families to counter the ever-changing population within the High Point area.

In February of 2003, Dr. John Wright, Associate Superintendent of Administrative Services, reported to the Board of Education facility needs, known as

Phase II, which would address district growth. The report focused on district priorities established under the Phase I capital project initiative that emphasized building “additional seats to meet growth demands and providing the technology infrastructure to support educational programs” (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 17). The information within the report was important for the Board of Education as it emphasized a starting point for Phase II facilities’ needs, which included compensating for growth at the overcrowded Southwest High School. The information presented by Dr. Wright pulled from the aforementioned 2002 Facilities Study and generated discussion for facilities’ needs at Southwest to accommodate the issue that Southwest had a capacity of 775, but an enrollment of 1173 students (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 17). Furthermore, Dr. Wright shared that enrollment at Southwest was projected to grow to 1199 by the start of the 2003-04 school year.

As the Board of Education worked to create programs that would assist T. Wingate Andrews, it also continued to work to address the facility concerns shared within the Phase II plan presented by Dr. Wright in February 2003. On March 18, 2003, the Board of Education held a joint meeting with the Guilford County Commissioners to discuss Phase II facility needs (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 18). During the meeting, the county commissioners and the Board of Education approved a motion to create a special joint task force to develop a potential bond referendum that would allow the county’s voters to decide on whether to fund potential facility upgrades. The special task force would be comprised of three Board of Education members and three county commissioners (Guilford County Schools, 2003, March 18). Once the timing for

implementation of the bond creation was approved by the Board of Education at the next Board of Education meeting on March 27, 2003, the Guilford County Commissioners voted to allow the bond referendum to be on the November 2003 ballot.

Starting in June of 2003, the GCS Board of Education and district senior staff began a series of public forums to gain insight into the needs the public felt were pressing within the Phase II plan and any other needs they felt should be addressed through the bond. The main bond meeting in High Point occurred on June 4, 2003 at High Point Central High School. During this meeting, board members were present as well as Mr. Hoekstra, Program Administrator for Planning and Demography, and staff members who worked closely with plan development for facilities' needs (Guilford County Schools, 2003, June 4). Consequently, after receiving initial feedback and using the facilities study from 2002, the GCS Board of Education consistently discussed potential bond projects starting at the June 10, 2003 meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2003, June 10). During the June 10 meeting, the board discussed several bond project school items, specifically Southwest High School's need to add:

1. 10 Classroom Additions
2. 4 science classrooms
3. Kitchen/cafeteria addition
4. Auxiliary gym
5. General renovations
6. Site upgrades (grading, paving, canopies, etc.)
7. Technology (new addition only)

8. Furniture and Equipment
9. Accessibility and Life Safety Upgrades (Guilford County Schools, 2003, June 10)

The needs at Southwest High School emphasized the growth of the school as mentioned earlier. To further garner public input, the board also heard further public comments on the bond project during regularly scheduled board meetings throughout the summer of 2003. Specifically, the Board of Education held a Special Called Meeting on June 22, 2003 to hear public comments about the items laid out in the June 10 meeting including the aforementioned needs at Southwest High (Guilford County Schools, 2003, June 22).

On July 1, 2003, the GCS Board of Education approved the final costs to the items that would be included on the November 2003 Bond Referendum (Guilford County Schools, 2003, July 1). Specific to High Point and the Southwest High/Andrews High problem, Southwest High was in line for a total proposal amount of \$21,383,000 in capital improvements (Guilford County Schools, 2003, July 1). However, final costs specifically for Southwest would be much lower due to a need to only generate an addition to the school and not renovate much of the facility as originally proposed. Under the approved final costs for Southwest High, the school would increase in capacity from 775 classroom capacity to 1040 classroom capacity (Guilford County School, 2003a). Furthermore, the overall current student core capacity, which included the cafeteria and media center, would increase from 770 students to a proposed core capacity of 1600 students. By increasing the classroom capacity, Southwest could accommodate the current enrollment of 1173 students with the continued use of mobile classrooms.

Also, by increasing the core capacity, the school could accommodate more students via mobile classrooms, if necessary, up to 1600 students. Therefore, Southwest would be able to accommodate the growth it was experiencing as a result of population movement from the area serving T. Wingate Andrews High School to the current attendance zone serving Southwest High.

Once the monetary proposal was passed in July of 2003, the continued feedback from the community and review of that feedback by Dr. Wright and the facilities and planning teams generated some revisions that the Board of Education reviewed in August 2003. At the August 5, 2003 Special Called Meeting, Southwest High School's specific dollar amount for capital improvement was added formally to the bond package at a total of \$7,541,000 (Guilford County Schools, 2003, August 5). This dollar amount would fund the aforementioned list of classrooms, cafeteria additions, auxiliary gym, renovations, site upgrades, technology, furniture, equipment, and accessibility. Consequently, during a Special Called joint meeting with the Guilford County Commissioners, the Board of Education shared the proposed financial needs for capital improvements (Guilford County Schools, 2003, August 28). The financial items discussed were agreed upon by the joint task force of three commissioners and three school board members created in the Spring of 2003. Within the context of the Special Called meeting, the School Board Chairman explained that through the joint task force, the school district was about to move from \$600 million in needs to \$300 million in needs which included four high schools, including Southwest High, three middle schools, ten elementary schools, five replacement schools, and six new schools. Upon conclusion of

the Special Called Meeting, the County Commissioners would take the recommendations from the School Board and joint task force and formulate a final bond proposal for the November ballot.

After the County Commissioners approved the final placement of the bond on the November ballot, voters went to the polls and passed the \$300 million bond. The bond would generate the money needed for many facility projects including the expansion of Southwest High School in High Point.

### **The Phase VI Reassignment Plan and Progress of the Andrews Academy**

In December of 2003, Mr. Eric Hoekstra, GCS district planner and demographer, presented to the Board of Education Phase VI of the 1999 Reassignment Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2003, December 9). The Reassignment Plan was for all intents and purposes a redistricting plan. Within the presentation, Mr. Hoekstra shared that the Phase VI of the Reassignment Plan would move 74 students from Southwest High School to Ragsdale High School. Although this shift of students did not impact Andrews High School, the fact that Southwest was slated to receive an addition due to the passage of the 2003 bond and the fact that Andrews had created an Early College Academy with a pilot zonal choice plan created a considerable amount of notice.

Furthermore, with magnet discussions during the November 2003 School Board meetings, Board members were acutely aware of the 2003-2004 high school options and their success. As presented during the board meetings in November 2003, the Andrews Academy had garnered 54 enrollments out of the possible 360 slots (Guilford County Schools, 2003, November). Additionally, the hope that the students attending the

Andrews Academy would potentially pull more White students to the program, particularly from the Southwest High attendance zone, was failing as 61% of the students attending the Andrews Early College Academy were minority students and only 39% of the students were White. As compared with the model Early College program at Dudley High which had 211 students for 480 slots, Andrews' Academy was not producing the desired result. The lack of success of the Andrews Early College Academy, the continued overcrowding at Southwest High School that would persist until the completion of the bond project, and the shifting of students from Southwest to Ragsdale suggested that T. Wingate Andrews' problems with declining enrollment appeared to be continuing if not potentially getting worse.

### **Problems with the 1999 Reassignment Plan**

In 2004 Dr. Terry Grier decided against redrawing the lines and moved instead to adopt the 1999 Redistricting Plan that would reassign White students from Southwest area neighborhoods to T. Wingate Andrews and would also shift Black students from High Point neighborhoods to Southwest. However, as noted earlier, the 1999 Redistricting Plan generated a large amount of controversy and resentment throughout the City of High Point. Dr. Grier would either entertain the redistricting option at the Board of Education's request or create an alternative choice plan that would be created to alleviate the "extreme overcrowding at Southwest High School and an overabundance of space at Andrews and High Point Central High Schools" (Guilford County Schools, 2004a, p.1). While the Board of Education reviewed the possibility of implementing the 1999 Redistricting Plan, Dr. Grier and GCS Staff developed a one page question and

answer document for the purpose of identifying a need for change. This document became the background to a proposed choice plan to “promote diversity and relieve the persistent overcrowding at Southwest High” (Guilford County Schools, 2004a, p.1). In noting the two main concerns addressed in only the short question and answer document, it is evident that race would be an issue along with general student population size for each school located within High Point.

As the proposal was developed, the Board of Education debated instituting Phase VI of the 1999 Redistricting Plan and other critical pieces that drove the proposed choice plan idea. These critical pieces were school capacity, demographics of each school (T.W. Andrews, High Point Central, and Southwest High), ninth grade capacity with and without the plan, number of students on free or reduced lunch entering the ninth grade, and the maximum number of non-free or reduced lunch student enrollment (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). To ease tensions surrounding the potential demographic shifts, Guilford County Schools would grandfather in students who were already enrolled at Andrews, Central, or Southwest from the 2004-05 school year in grades 10 through 12. The demographics shared with the public through School Board Meetings and also noted within the plan were focused primarily on economic diversity. However, the factor of racial diversity was not shared, though the subject was clearly known throughout the High Point Community (Coryell, 1999, January 13).

**High Point high schools’ capacity.** Guilford County Schools used school capacity as one measure to demonstrate a need for creating the choice plan proposal. In the 2003-04 school year, the school capacity for T. Wingate Andrews High School was

1,420 students (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). High Point Central High School had a capacity in the 2003-04 school year of 1,675. The smallest capacity of all three High Point High Schools was Southwest High School which had a capacity of 1,040 after the construction project expanding that school's capacity completion in the spring of 2004. Therefore, the total number of student slots for Guilford County Schools to split among the three schools was 4,135.

However, the decline in enrollment for Andrews and Central are of key importance to this statistic. Andrews had seen enrollment declines since the redrawing of lines during from 1997 to 1999 school year under Dr. Jerry Weast. In 1997-98, Andrews had an enrollment of 927, High Point Central had an enrollment of 1,043, and Southwest High had an enrollment of 1,131 (NCES, 1998). In the years that followed the redrawing of the attendance lines for the High Point area high schools, each school saw changes to their overall enrollment numbers. T. Wingate Andrews saw a decrease from 927 in the 1997-98 school year to 887 in 1998-1999, and increasing to 1,149 by the 2002-03 school year (NCDPI, 2004). Similarly, High Point Central High School saw a change in enrollment from 1,043 in the 1997-98 school year to 1,069 in 1998-1999 to 1,204 by the 2002-03 school year. However, Southwest High School saw an increase in enrollment from 1997-98 with 1131 students to 1,140 in 1998-1999 to 1,159 students in the 2002-03 school year.

It was under these changes in enrollment patterns that Dr. Terry Grier zeroed in on changing the enrollment patterns to compensate for lack of school efficiency and overall use, particularly of T. Wingate Andrews.

**Demographics for the High Point high schools.** The primary demographic information used to promote the choice plan and the zonal pilot program was students who received free or reduced lunch according to federal guidelines. However, it is imperative to also explore the racial demographics not discussed within any of the potential options considered for T. Wingate Andrews High School. The racial makeup of each of the three High Point area high schools changed from the time of the merger of the High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and the Guilford County Schools. Although High Point Central High School and T. Wingate Andrews High School were both in the former High Point City Schools zone, Southwest High School was in the more rural Guilford County Schools. The annexation of the area around Southwest High School into the City of High Point in the 1990s did little to change the more rural nature of that specific school compared to High Point Central and T. Wingate Andrews.

As previously discussed within this chapter, the population shift of White students to Southwest High School and the departure of these students and their families from High Point Central and T. Wingate Andrews in the 1990s led to the redrawing of attendance lines under the administration of Dr. Jerry Weast. Weast and the Board of Education attempted to compensate for the White flight by redrawing attendance lines. However, the new attendance lines exacerbated the growth of larger minority populations at T. Wingate Andrews and High Point Central.

With the new lines drawn, there were 1,149 students at T. Wingate Andrews 2002-2003 with a demographic breakdown of 65.3% Black, 28.2% White, and 5.6% other [Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, and Multi-racial] due to the addition of the

Deep River Road and Gordon Road areas (NCDPI, 2002). These numbers as compared to High Point Central's 1,204 students with a breakdown of 42.3% Black, 40.8% White, and 17% other highlighted the changes within the City of High Point's oldest high schools. However, the significant demographic numbers compared the two former High Point City High Schools to Southwest High School. Southwest had a total student body of 1,159 with 23.3% Black, 66.9% White, and 9.9% other for the 2002-2003 school year. These significant imbalances were made more evident by the fact that the overcrowding of Southwest which had a capacity of 1,040, but was being forced to use mobile classroom units to accommodate its 1,159 students, which was 119 students over capacity.

The following school year, 2003-2004, when the choice plan was being developed, the demographics of each High Point High School continued the trends started in the 1990s. Although T. Wingate Andrews High School maintained its enrollment with 1,148 students, one shy of the previous year, the percentage gap between students of color and White students grew. In the 2003–2004 school year, Andrews High was made up of 67.8% Black students, 24.3% White students, and 7.9% of other students (NCDPI, 2004). This increase in minority students was also evident at High Point Central High School which saw an increase in Black students from 42.3% in 2002–2003 to 45.8% in 2003-2004 as well as an overall increase in total student population from 1,204 to 1,310. Likewise, High Point Central saw a decrease in White students from 40.8% in 2002-2003 to 38.5% in 2003-2004. However, Southwest High School had a significant student body increase from 1,159 to 1,228 students. Furthermore, the

demographics at Southwest High saw minimal changes with a slight increase in Black students from 23.3% to 23.7% and slight decrease in White students from 66.9% to 64%. Southwest High saw the greatest change in other racial groups with an increase from 9.9% to 12.4%. Therefore, the growth of overall student numbers played a major role in the proposal of the choice plan by Dr. Grier.

**Ninth-grade capacity.** Another key component of the demographics of the High Point area high schools was ninth grade capacity. After reviewing the total student body at T. Wingate Andrews, High Point Central, and Southwest High, Guilford County Schools' staff would also need to look at projections for incoming ninth grade students to each of the high schools. The projections for ninth graders at each school were based on 30% of school capacity for the ninth graders (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). Andrews had a ninth-grade capacity of 426 students, High Point Central had a ninth-grade capacity of 502, and Southwest High had a capacity of 312 ninth graders. The 1,240 projected ninth graders would need to also account for possible retentions and any potential growth of students to the respective attendance zones as well. The review of this ninth-grade data re-emphasized the desire of Dr. Grier to phase in the Choice Plan and work to resolve the overcrowding needs starting with freshman, which were the largest group of students typically at any high school. In reviewing the ninth-grade projections, Guilford County Schools' staff developed prediction models for enrollment at each high school without a plan to address enrollment shifts. The projections for each school mirrored the declining numbers at T. Wingate Andrews and High Point Central as well as the growth at Southwest High School. Under the projections, Andrews was to

receive an incoming ninth grade class of 357 students, High Point Central would receive 441 incoming ninth graders, and Southwest High would obtain 361 ninth graders (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). In reviewing these numbers, Andrews would be losing 69 students, High Point Central would be losing 61 students, and Southwest would be gaining 49 additional students over projection. Therefore, the projected numbers reiterated the changing in demographics and total population for each high school in High Point.

**Free or reduced lunch numbers within the ninth grade.** The projections for each high school's rising ninth grade class also focused on economic indicators, specifically the federal free or reduced lunch program. Without incorporating any change in assignment to the High Point area high schools, the 3 schools would need to maintain at or below a 52% rate for final enrollment of ninth graders who qualified for free or reduced lunch. The 52 percent level would be to maintain the Guilford County Schools' threshold of maximum students at those particular schools who qualified for free or reduced lunch without pushing those schools into a different federal Title I classification (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). Thus, of the 357 projected students slated for T. Wingate Andrews High School, 222 students would be the maximum allowed in order to comply with the district's guidelines. Similarly, 261 students would be the maximum for High Point Central and 162 would be the maximum for Southwest High School.

Within the projections generated by Guilford County Schools, Andrews would receive 214 students who qualified for free or reduced lunch, 60% of the 357 projected, and 143 students who do not qualify for the federal meal program. High Point Central

saw an even higher rate of students of poverty in their projections by receiving 313 students who qualified for the free or reduced lunch program, 71% of their projected 441, and 128 students who did not qualify for free or reduced lunch. Lastly, Southwest saw an increase of students who did not qualify for the federal free or reduced lunch program. Southwest would receive 72 students who qualified for the federal free or reduced lunch program, 20% of their projected 361, and 289 students who would not receive free or reduced lunch.

Therefore, based on the maximum number of students needed within the rising ninth grade class who would not receive free or reduce lunch at each school, Andrews would need 204 students, High Point Central would need 241 students, and Southwest would need 150 students. To maintain this balance of 52% free or reduced to 48% non-free or reduced lunch, Guilford County Schools would need to develop a plan to shift students from Southwest High to Andrews and High Point Central to relieve the proportion of students from poverty assigned by the district.

### **Summary**

In this chapter I explored the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews High School in a post-*Brown* High Point City School system. As noted, Andrews was established by closing the all Black William Penn High School and taking White students from High Point Central High School. The combination of the two student populations housed in a state of the art facility under the leadership of Samuel Burford, the African American principal, created a model integration plan for other school districts to follow. However,

the successes at Andrews High School would soon move toward major changes with regard to student demographics.

The drastic changes in student population at T. Wingate Andrews began to change in the late 1980s as High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools moved toward merger. As the talks of merger happened, suburban White flight from the city of High Point to suburban Guilford County started to occur. Once the merger between all three school systems was finalized in 1993, massive White flight out of High Point to the areas near Southwest High School occurred. With clear attendance zone lines delineated, White parents could explicitly move their students from High Point's more urban environment to the predominantly White suburban environment of Southwest High School. Consequently, the Guilford County Schools Board of Education attempted to counter the massive White flight through redistricting schools to accommodate overcrowding at Southwest and underutilization at T. Wingate Andrews.

Giving way to the new Superintendent in 2000, Dr. Terry Grier, and Guilford County Schools attempted to implement the redistricting options created under Jerry Weast. These redistricting options failed and led Dr. Grier and the Board of Education to try other options such as an early college academy, magnet options, and removal of attendance lines. However, the final chapter of how T. Wingate Andrews moved from a successfully integrated high school to a segregated high school will be highlighted in the next chapter. Chapter IV will explore the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. This plan was the last major attempt to prevent Andrews from segregating.

**CHAPTER IV**  
**THE HIGH POINT HIGH SCHOOLS CHOICE PLAN AND THE**  
**SEGREGATION OF ANDREWS: 2003-2008**

**Introduction**

In this chapter of the case study of T. Wingate Andrews, I will explore the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, which represented the last major effort attempted by Guilford County Schools to prevent the resegregation of the school. In the previous chapter, I explained the history behind the establishment of a successfully desegregated T. Wingate Andrews High School in High Point, North Carolina. Furthermore, Chapter III explained how the school became an active arena for resegregation due to massive White flight from the City of High Point to the suburban area near Southwest High School in the 1990s after the merger of High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools. Additionally, Chapter III concluded by exploring the major effort of redistricting to counter resegregation by the Guilford County Board of Education. However, the redistricting efforts eventually collapsed in High Point due to constituent pressure. Under the new superintendent, Dr. Terry Grier, the final chapter of T. Wingate Andrews' resegregation fight would come to pass.

In this chapter, I describe the significant efforts of Dr. Terry Grier and the Guilford County Board of Education regarding the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. The efforts of both the school system's executive staff and Board of Education in contrast

to outside groups regarding the Choice Plan would ultimately seal the fate of the once successfully integrated T. Wingate Andrews High School.

### **Creation of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan**

At the January 13, 2004, meeting of the Board of Education, Chairman Alan Duncan reminded the Guilford County Board of Education of the scheduled Public Forum for January 15 to receive input regarding the proposed changes to the 1999 Student Assignment Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 13). The Phase VI portion of the Redistricting Plan that was discussed in the December 2003 meeting would also highlight the upcoming Board of Education retreat to be held January 24 and 25. Mr. Duncan also recapped the Board's concerns made by citizens in High Point regarding school issues, particularly progress at T. Wingate Andrews High School. The Board of Education was reminded by Mr. Duncan of the creation of the Andrews Early College Academy and the open enrollment zones created to try to increase and balance Andrews' enrollment. However, Mr. Duncan noted the programs had had little effect.

Within the "Reports from the Chairman" portion of the Board Education meeting agenda, Mr. Duncan described a plan for consideration that "would eliminate the three High Point area high schools' attendance lines and create one attendance zone" (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 13). The idea, according to Chairman Duncan, would be for each school to adopt a major magnet theme with additional programs and/or academies. Accordingly, the plan would be phased in over the next three to four years beginning with rising ninth graders. Registration for the magnet high school options would be based on first, second, or third choices. The district would monitor the three

high schools' enrollments to make sure no school would "have an enrollment with more than a determined percentage of students who receive free or reduced priced meals; the exact percentage to be determined by [district] staff" (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 13). This potential plan would require Board approval and further discussion at a future Board meeting.

### **Goals of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan**

The future Board meeting referenced by Chairman Duncan came very quickly after the January 13 meeting. On January 24th and 25th, 2004, the Board of Education held its Winter Retreat. The main topic on the morning of Saturday, January 24, 2004 was the High Point High Schools Choice Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 24). Shortly after the meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m., the Board heard a presentation from Superintendent Dr. Terry Grier. Dr. Grier explained that the goals of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan were to increase academic achievement by providing an economically diverse student population in each of the three High Point area high schools. Secondly, the plan would provide stability in the assignment of students by allowing students to attend the same high school all four years of high school, ninth through twelfth grades. Thirdly, the plan would provide equitable access for all students to "high quality, rigorous curriculum" (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 24). Fourth, to meet the needs of the aforementioned 2002 facilities' study, the choice plan would generate equitable utilization of the three High Point Area High Schools [T. Wingate Andrews, High Point Central, and Southwest High] and provide greater

flexibility in efficiently using the school facilities. Lastly, the choice plan would provide more high school program options for students in the City of High Point.

Dr. Grier went on to explain that the third provision of a “high quality, rigorous curriculum” would be met via generating magnet themes at each of the three high schools including additional academy options and academic cluster programs (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 24). According to the Superintendent, each school would have the comprehensive core instruction and extracurricular activities found at all GCS High Schools including a “minimum of 15 different Advanced Placement (AP) courses in each school” (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 24). The magnet options for each school were to further entice students to attend a specific school according to student interests. T. Wingate Andrews would house a “Center for Advanced Research and Technology,” High Point Central would have the “Institute of International Studies and Languages,” and Southwest High would offer an “Institute for the Visual and Performing Arts” (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 24).

With the aforementioned magnet programs, each high school would phase in the program of study with the rising ninth grade class in the fall of 2004. Each year after 2004-2005, the schools would add an additional grade level per year until full implementation in 2007-2008. To ease concerns about current student enrollment, the students who were already enrolled as ninth through eleventh graders at the High Point area high schools would be grandfathered in and remain in their current schools. Furthermore, each rising ninth grade student, starting in the fall of 2004, would select their choice of high schools by selecting a first, second, and third choice. Ultimately, the

school district's goal would be to assign students to schools so that each school is within "plus or minus two percentage points of the three schools free and reduced meal average of the incoming ninth grade students" (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 24).

Therefore, the focus of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan would be to address the problems generated from White middle and upper middle class population flight from the urban areas of High Point to Southwest by eliminating the school attendance lines. The Plan would hopefully lure students to programs that would eventually balance demographics through student choice rather than neighborhood loyalties. The Plan would use economic factors as the balancing factor in determining school choice. By using economics, particularly the percentage of free or reduced lunch students, the High Point High Schools Choice Plan would hopefully be able to eliminate decreasing enrollment at T. Wingate Andrews High School and overcrowding at Southwest High School. As a result of the plan presentation, the GCS Board of Education tabled significant discussion of the plan for the next Board meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> of January.

### **Board Discussion and the Beginnings of Community Pushback**

At the January 29, 2004 GCS Board of Education meeting, the Boardroom was full of many community members with 31 recorded public comments (Guilford County Schools, 2004, January 29). Of the 31 citizens who spoke, 19, or over 61%, were individuals who resided in the proposed High Point High Schools Choice Plan zone. After hearing public comments, many of which concerned the proposed Choice Plan, the Board shifted to the discussion of the Choice Plan. To assist in the process, Dr. Grier

reviewed the specifics of the plan and provided answers to the questions raised by Board members. Once the discussion was completed, a consensus of the Board moved to hold meetings in the High Point community on Thursday, February 5 and Sunday, February 8 to receive community input. Once input was received, the Board would review the information and the Choice Plan at the Board's February 10, 2004 meeting.

The public forums held in High Point on February 5th and 8th drew significant crowds. The first public forum held on February 5th was held at T. Wingate Andrews High School and commenced at 6:40 p.m. with Chairman Alan Duncan delivering opening remarks (Guilford County Schools, 2004, February 5). Superintendent Grier reviewed the proposed plan followed by community members asking questions and sharing comments regarding the proposed plan. The public forum lasted until 8:28 p.m. Similarly, public forums were held at both High Point Central High School and Southwest High School on Sunday, February 8, 2004. Each of these two public forums was conducted in comparable fashion to the forum held at Andrews High. The meeting at High Point Central High School started at 1:07 p.m. and concluded at 2:30 p.m., while the forum at Southwest High started at 3:08 p.m. and concluded two hours later. After receiving community feedback, the Board of Education intended to review the information at the February 10th meeting and continued its discussion regarding the High Point High Schools Choice Plan.

Consequently, after the January and February Board of Education meetings and public forums, the GCS Board of Education, through Chairman Duncan's "Reports from the Chairman" agenda item, pressed Dr. Grier on the updated progress concerning the

High Point High Schools Choice Plan during the March 2, 2004 meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2004, March 2). Dr. Grier shared with the Board that district staff continued to develop curriculum for each school, proposed operating principles, and the Magnet Schools Assistance Program grant. Furthermore, Superintendent Grier noted that a series of meetings were held with students, teachers, counselors, school leadership teams, and the faculties of all three High Point area high schools. To further promote the future programs at each high school, Dr. Grier also stated that administrative staff continued to review draft course offerings and operating guidelines. Moreover, Dr. Grier invited the Board to an administrative briefing to review proposed course offerings and operating principles for the plan. Also, GCS would create parent groups to support parents in understanding the Choice Plan as well as the impact of cultural diversity in schools. Lastly, Guilford County Schools was in contact with both the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ) and Cross Roads Ministry to provide programs for students, and cultural diversity training for staff.

### **The High Point High Schools Choice Plan Operational Plan for Implementation**

Following the information presented by Dr. Grier at the March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Board of Education held a Special Called Meeting to review attendance zones and the operating principles for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan on March 16, 2004. Noting that the Choice Plan removed attendance lines from the 1999 Redistricting Plan, Dr. Grier as well as Dr. Beth Copenhaver, Chief Student Services Officer, Dr. John Wright, Chief Administrative Officer, and Mr. Eric Hoekstra, District Planner, presented to the Board about the key operating principles (Guilford County Schools, 2004, March

16). The operational plan for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan provided the Board with a timeline for implementing the plan for rising ninth graders in the 2004-2005 school year. Dr. Grier also noted that siblings of current ninth through eleventh grade students enrolled in High Point area high schools would be allowed to attend the same school as their sibling if the students and parents signed a letter of enrollment by April 1 of the younger sibling's eighth grade year. Starting on April 8<sup>th</sup>, GCS staff would verify the sibling preference requests and notify parents of student assignment. The second group of students that Guilford County Schools would work with regarding assignment within the Choice Plan would be students who attended the companion programs at High Point area middle schools. For example, if a student was enrolled in the arts program at Penn Griffin Middle School, she/he would be given preference to attend the arts magnet at Southwest High School. The same aforementioned timeline for siblings would be followed for companion magnet program students with April 1<sup>st</sup> being the deadline for parental and student signatures and notification on April 8<sup>th</sup>. In addition to the companion magnet students, other magnet students in High Point area middle schools would be allowed to apply for other magnet programs that were not companion to their current programs during the period of April 1 through 8 with notification on April 15<sup>th</sup>. These non-companion magnet student slots would be limited based on the number of slots available after companion and sibling slots were filled.

The remaining rising ninth graders in the High Point high school zone would need to apply by April 22 choosing their first, second, and third choices for high school. School selection for students would be a random selection process that took into account

student preference, capacity, and socioeconomic diversity (Guilford County Schools, 2004, March 16). Notification of school assignment for this last group of students would be by April 29. After April 29, students would be allowed to register for the remaining seats in specialized programs within their assigned high school with all registration expected to be completed by May 10, 2004. Consequently, any student living outside of High Point would be allowed to apply for a magnet assignment to a High Point area high school by May 14 as well as any High Point area student would be allowed to apply for any magnet slot outside of High Point by May 14 following the same criteria outlined above. All final magnet notifications would occur on or before May 21<sup>st</sup>.

After additional Board discussion, Dr. Grier noted that the High Point High Schools Choice Plan should be reviewed annually and presented to the Board for modification as needed. The Board of Education discussed this idea as well and eventually a motion was made by Board member Susan Mendenhall to adopt the operational plan of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. The motion carried and the plan was passed on a six to four vote with both Board of Education members from High Point voting for the plan (Guilford County Schools, 2004, March 16).

The GCS Board of Education continued to monitor the implementation of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan throughout the rest of the Spring of 2004. Although Dr. Grier informed the Board of Education that registration materials for the magnet programs at the respective high schools within the plan would not be available until March 29, 2004, the deadline periods mentioned earlier would only need to be adjusted by one week (Guilford County Schools, 2004, March 25). Therefore, sibling

preference and magnet applications would both be delayed only one week. To further promote the plan, Dr. Grier also had the GCS magnet Director, Lisa Cooke, share that all three High Point high schools were holding open houses on Saturday, April 3, 2004 and would schedule tours for parents interested in that particular school. The open house and magnet adjustments allowed the Board to also review policies that would connect the Choice Plan to operating procedures for the years ahead.

Additionally, the Board of Education moved in both March and April 2004 to adopt “Educational Operational Guidelines” that promoted the same ideas noted within the Choice Plan concerning equitable facility usage with regard to capacity (Guilford County Schools, 2004, April 20). These guidelines were important to the High Point High Schools Choice Plan and the use of each High Point area high school because they ensured that no school should be occupied more than 110% of core capacity (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). Subsequent to the approval of the guidelines, the goals of the Board for facilities throughout the school district were to be equitable and also to attempt to “provide students an equitable opportunity to attend school as close to home as practical while utilizing fully and efficiently all school facilities” (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). Simply, the Board of Education was trying to ensure neighborhood schools, equitable use of facilities, and diversity. Furthermore, the guidelines stated with regard to diversity,

the goal of the Board of Education to ensure that every student has the opportunity to attend a diverse school. When it is not feasible to provide diversity in an attendance area, the Board will offer opportunities for diversity, such as attendance in magnet or option schools . . . [and] ensure that magnets and option

school sites are located to ensure equitable access to all students located throughout the district. (Guilford County Schools, 2004a).

By outlining and codifying the policy and procedural guidelines concerning educational operations, the Board was attempting to cater to both neighborhood school advocates and equity advocates.

### **Specific Details of the High Point Choice Plan**

During the March 16, 2004 Guilford County Schools' Board of Education meeting, Superintendent Grier shared the operational logistics for the High Point High Schools Choice/Magnet Plan. Noting that Guilford County Schools (GCS) would be committed to improving socioeconomic diversity within High Point high schools through “a program of controlled school choice to support academic success for all students and to increase the effective use of school facilities,” the Choice Plan would be designed to balance diversity and facility use efficiency. Furthermore, the Choice Plan would “set as a goal that the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch at each high school should be no greater than 50 percent and the enrollment at each school should be between 85 percent and 120 percent of the building capacity” (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). Therefore, the operational logistics for each school's enrollment would need to be broken down into multiple components.

As noted earlier, the enrollment periods for implementation of the High Point High Schools Choice plan were laid out for the community and students with multiple dates in April and May of 2004 for each specific criteria for enrollment at the high schools within High Point—sibling preference, prior magnet student experience in

middle school, acceptance into a high school magnet program, early college academy acceptance, student choice (first through third), and students from outside of High Point (Guilford County Schools, 2004a). To create the favorable balance that Dr. Grier and the Board of Education desired, GCS staff adopted baseline data at the March 16, 2004 meeting, as shown in Table 1. Upon using the data, the Board of Education directed the school district staff and Dr. Grier to further develop each magnet program for the High Point Area high schools.

**Andrews High School Center for Advanced Research and Technology.** Once the GCS Board of Education approved the operational plan for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan in March of 2004, school district staff was directed to develop the magnet programs for each High Point area high school. T. Wingate Andrews, the focus of this dissertation, was to house the Center for Advanced Research and Technology. Adopting a mission that focused on “combining rigorous academics with technical, design, process, entrepreneurial, and critical thinking skills,” the magnet program at T. Wingate Andrews was to emphasize “career-specific laboratories, designed to replicate high performance business atmospheres” within “a comprehensive cross-curricular program” (Guilford County Schools, 2004c). Also, the magnet program would “enable students to complete industry-based projects and get a jumpstart on reaching future career and secondary education goals” according to the details of the Choice Plan.

Table 1

## Baseline Data

School	Current School Capacity	Maximum School Capacity (Up to 120%)	Maximum Ninth-Grade Capacity (30% of total School Capacity)	2004–2005 Ninth-Grade Enrollment Without “Plan” (Including Projected Retentions & Growth)	2004-05 Maximum Free/Reduced Ninth Graders (Final Enrollment not to Exceed 50%)	2004–2005 Possible Non-Free/Reduced Ninth Graders
Andrews	1,420	102% = 1,448	434	357 214 Free/Reduced = 60% 143 Non-Free/Reduced = 40%	217	217
HP Central	1,675	102%=1,708	512	441 313 Free/Reduced=71% 128 Non-Free/Reduced=29%	256	256
Southwest	1,040 (After Construction)	120%=1,248	374	361 72 Free/Reduced=20% 289 Non-Free/Reduced=80%	187	187
TOTAL	4,135	4,404	1,320	1,159	660	660

To reach the goals of the mission of the magnet program at Andrews High School, GCS noted that there would be collaboration with local businesses, universities, and community agencies to help students along the way (Guilford County Schools, 2004c). The collaborative partnerships were based around three “clusters” of study – “Advanced Information Technology, Advanced Engineering Technology, and Professional Sciences.” The Advanced Information Technology cluster was designed to help students in the areas of animation, network engineering, network administration, computer engineering, wireless technology, network design, database fundamentals, and graphic design according to the magnet plan laid out by GCS. With regard to the second cluster, Advanced Engineering Technology, GCS created course work that would “apply scientific and mathematical principles, experience, judgment, and common sense to make things that benefit people” (Guilford County Schools, 2004c). In other words, the Advanced Engineering Technology cluster was designed to help students to move toward mechanical, electronic, and civil engineering areas of study. Lastly, the Professional Sciences Cluster was created to matriculate students in scientific principles and methods in order to conduct research and develop solutions to “medical, forensic, and environmental issues that impact our community” (Guilford County Schools, 2004c).

In addition to the aforementioned areas within the Center for Advanced Research and Technology, T. Wingate Andrews High School would continue to offer the Early College Academy focused on Health Sciences that was developed prior to the Choice Plan. This academy would continue to prepare students to complete all required courses for high school by their junior year and then progress on to college and university level

courses their senior year. In addition to the Early College Academy and the Center for Advanced Research and Technology, Andrews would also offer courses that would combine with the overall themes of research, technology, and health science including courses in automotive, construction, business, and public service technologies.

The courses, strands, and clusters offered at T. Wingate Andrews were created to attract students for not only the magnet foci but also to entice high achieving students, particularly White middle-class students, to attend the school. This effort was aligned with the Board of Education's Educational Operational guidelines that promoted diversity and student achievement as well as the desire of the district to prevent schools of poverty.

**Southwest Institute of Visual and Performing Arts.** Similar to the magnet option for T. Wingate Andrews High School, Southwest High School's magnet program was designed to attract a niche of students GCS felt would help diversify the student body. Outlining a mission goal for the magnet program at Southwest, the idea was to create the "leading pre-professional public arts high school in the country" (Guilford County Schools, 2004e). As noted in the demographic data and the GCS Board of Education data from the previously shared chart, Southwest was a predominantly White and middle-class school. By creating a magnet program in the visual and performing arts, GCS was placing a magnet program at the school that could potentially attract more minority students and students who were not traditionally attracted to academic curricula like engineering and technology.

The Institute of Visual and Performing Arts was to provide highly specialized training for students who possessed talent in "dance, theatre, vocal and instrumental

music, and visual arts” (Guilford County Schools, 2004e). Similar to the clusters found at Andrews High School, Southwest would have strands focused on study in dance, vocal and instrumental music, visual arts, theatre, and marketing and advertising. These strands were to help students excel in their specific talent area and then learn how to use marketing and advertising in promoting their respective talent.

Additionally, Southwest was to add an early college academy similar to T. Wingate Andrews. However, the early college academy at Southwest High was to focus on education (Guilford County Schools, 2004e). This program was designed to entice students to complete high school coursework by the end of their 11<sup>th</sup> grade year and enroll in college courses toward a degree in education their 12<sup>th</sup> grade year. The Early College of Education at Southwest High was to eventually have 40 students enrolled in college course work during the students’ senior year of classes. Lastly, similar to Andrews, Southwest would offer specialized components within the curriculum that would couple and even assist students in areas similar to the arts. Southwest would develop and offer a journalism and broadcast media course of study in addition to the arts strands with the idea that the various hands-on experiences gained would help in an array of areas surrounding the technical aspects of visual and performing arts.

**High Point Central Institute for International Studies and Languages.** The last of the High Point area high schools within the Choice Plan was High Point Central High School. High Point Central was to adopt a magnet model for international studies. With Central High already operating as an International Baccalaureate (IB) school, the logical move for GCS was to continue the trend into a more diversified magnet toward

global entrepreneurship and world languages in addition to the IB programme (Guilford County Schools, 2004d). By creating a mission goal for the magnet program to focus on international studies organized around global dynamics, GCS was promoting cross-curricular programs that would use technical design, process, entrepreneurial, and critical thinking skills.

To reach the magnet program's focus, High Point Central would create a Center for Global Entrepreneurship and Language Exploration. The Center on Global Entrepreneurship would be to develop students in the areas of marketing, finance, economics, law, and public policy. Developing students in these previously identified areas would help students understand the shifting needs in society and global affairs.

To further promote the ideology of the Institute for International Studies and Languages, High Point Central would also work to have students explore cultures and peoples including foreign languages (Guilford County Schools, 2004d). Through language exploration and cultural understanding, the international focus of the magnet program would require a minimum of four consecutive semesters of the same language while also offering language instruction for up to eight consecutive semesters as needed.

In addition to the language exploration and global entrepreneurship strands, GCS would also promote the International Baccalaureate (IB) program at High Point Central to continue to attract strong students and promote diversity similar to the ideas surrounding the Andrews Center for Advanced Research and Technology. Likewise, in keeping with the Early College options presented at both Andrews and Southwest, Central would offer an Early College Academy in Business (Guilford County Schools, 2004d). The Early

College Academy in Business would follow the same system as the other two Early College Academies by having students complete high school course work by the end of their 11<sup>th</sup> grade year and enter into university and/or college coursework their 12<sup>th</sup> grade year.

Finally, High Point Central would also offer courses within the curriculum that mesh with the international studies theme. By including courses in information technologies, health sciences, industrial technologies, and public service technologies, High Point Central would be able to blend cross-curricular connections into the international studies magnet theme.

**Marketing and recruitment of students within the High Point Choice Plan.**

After the development of the magnet options for each high school within the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, GCS developed a detailed plan regarding how to recruit and market each magnet program and how to recruit students to the specific programs at the high schools. Within the formal plan documents, GCS noted multiple strategies to meet the marketing and recruitment goals. The strategies laid out within the plan focused on direct implementation of certain strategies and development of future strategies designed for promotion of the unique educational opportunities at each of the High Point area high schools (Guilford County Schools, 2004h).

The school district's marketing and recruitment plan's initial strategies were focused on marketing to students and families, administrative actions, promotion of diversity, and overall recruitment of students (Guilford County Schools, 2004h). Primary marketing strategies for the overall High Point High Schools Choice Plan were designed

around explaining the program through developing a video, brochures, posters, and other materials that were attractive to families and students. Similarly, GCS would further market the program through open houses at each school where principals and staff could provide opportunities for families to ask questions, tour facilities, and learn about prospective areas of interest. Additionally, the marketing and recruitment plan created venues to work with local media outlets to highlight the application period for the Choice Plan as well as the open houses showcasing the schools. After working with media outlets, GCS worked with schools on enhancing their websites as well as the district's website. Consequently, to further development of websites and media cooperation, GCS advertised enrollment periods and the application process both in the media and on the aforementioned websites. Lastly, the marketing and recruitment plan involved an extensive amount of effort in encouraging principals and the district to develop strategies and campaigns to attract diverse student populations. Furthermore, administratively, GCS would monitor the student applications throughout the application period to ensure that schools were attracting sufficient numbers of diverse applicants. If a school was not generating sufficient numbers of diverse applicants, the district would create special outreach programs to attract additional candidates. To make sure that each school received a diverse population of students, GCS would examine all levels of diversity including "students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals and those who are not [and] students who are English language learners and those who are not" (Guilford County Schools, 2004h). Therefore, GCS would not only focus on advertising each school and their respective magnet programs, but also the district would ensure that no

school would become demographically homogeneous, particularly in the areas of students from poverty and those who were English language learners.

In addition to the initial strategies designed to recruit students and market the three High Point area high schools, GCS would also assist schools with creating future strategies to promote the unique opportunities offered at each site. The future strategies were also centered around administrative actions and marketing efforts just like the initial strategies. To market the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, GCS would develop video clips for the school district's educational television channel, create a logo or slogan for the program, generate a frequently asked questions document from parent feedback, encourage future students to visit special events at the three high schools, and promote high profile events within the community to showcase the magnet program's theme (Guilford County Schools, 2004h). Also, school district administration would mail pre-printed applications in the future to expedite the process, work to develop more visually exciting brochures and websites regarding the programs, and establish partnerships and communication structures with local businesses, educational institutions, and community-based groups to highlight projects. By noting future actions, the Board of Education and GCS administration outlined potential efforts that would hopefully create a sustainable program.

**High Point Area Choice Plan Transportation.** As with any major undertaking, Dr. Grier and the Board of Education knew that the financial burden of redoing how High Point high schools enrolled students would need to be reviewed due to the need to transport the students across traditional school attendance zone lines. Accordingly, the

High Point High Schools Choice Plan also had a transportation plan. The plan focused on using traditional bus routes to each high school for students traditionally zoned to that school. Then, each high school would serve as a school bus hub and students that were to go to another High Point high school would be transported from the current school to the other high school. For example, a student traditionally zoned to Southwest High School would ride a school bus to Southwest and then take a magnet bus to T. Wingate Andrews as their choice high school. To accomplish this feat, the transportation had to account for mileage, students, and costs.

The transportation plan noted the furthest distances from high school to high school (Guilford County Schools, 2004g). With the maximum bus run at 18 miles, operating two runs a day, buses from High Point Central High to Southwest High would cost the district \$95.34 a day. The cost to operate a bus from T. Wingate Andrews High to High Point Central would be \$63.56. Similarly, the cost to run a bus from T. Wingate Andrews High School to Southwest High would be \$79.45 a day. Therefore, the total cost per day to transport students for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan over the total of 90 miles was \$476.70 due to each high school operating as a hub and then sending a bus on two trips daily to another High Point high school.

The transportation plan also outlined the number of potential students riding a bus from one high school to another at 10% (Guilford County Schools, 2004g). The 10% student allotment aligned with the previously mentioned numbers for magnet options at each high school. Simply, 10% of T. Wingate Andrews High School freshmen would be 36 students potentially riding a bus. The same formula was applied to High Point Central

with 44 students and Southwest with 34 students for a total of 114 students for all three high schools in year one of the Choice Plan. Consequently, the total annual added estimated cost for 10% ridership under the Choice plan for year one of one bus for each school was \$85,806 (Guilford County Schools, 2004g).

In contrast with the estimated cost to operate one bus as noted above, GCS's standard operational cost per bus in 2002-2003 was \$33,276. So, there was a significant difference in operating cost for a Choice Plan bus and a standard bus. To further complicate the matter, GCS noted that the average annual cost to transport one magnet student in 2003-2004 was \$7.67 per day. Thus, the cost to operate buses for the prospective 10% magnet students noted within the transportation estimate based on the standard magnet rate of \$7.67 per day on a standard 180-day school calendar was \$157,388.40. Simply, there would be significant additional costs for busing the 10% of students transported via bus within the High Point High Schools Choice Plan.

**Explanation of the Choice Plan and frequently asked questions.** The final element of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan was an explanation to the community and parents about why the plan was needed. To this matter, Guilford County Schools' staff created two separate documents that were shared via webpage, television news briefs, flyers, and print media to explain the importance of creating the plan. The documents created were an overview of the issues, goals, and generic explanation of how the plan works as well as a frequently asked questions document.

The overview document explained the issues generating a need for the Choice Plan. Within the explanation of issues, GCS noted that Southwest was built with a

capacity of 775 and would only house 1,040 after new construction was completed (Guilford County Schools, 2004c). Additionally, another issue that was noted was the fact that the City of High Point had recently approved new neighborhoods that would add 2,000 homes to the Southwest school zone. Without the additional homes, Southwest would still have an enrollment in 2004-05 of 1,195 and would be over capacity significantly. To that end, the explanation of the plan shared that T. Wingate Andrews had 258 seats available and High Point Central had 306 seats available. Lastly, the issues section of the explanation document reiterated the previously mentioned need for equitable use of facilities and thus the use of Andrews and Central would alleviate approximately 409 seats for High Point area high school growth.

Following the issues portion of the explanation document, GCS described its goals for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. The goals, as outlined within the document, highlighted a need to increase student achievement by providing an economically diverse population at each of the three High Point area high schools (Guilford County Schools, 2004b). Furthermore, the goals elaborated that students would be allowed to attend the same high school from ninth to twelfth grade as well as provide options for high school programs such as the arts, technology, and international studies as mentioned earlier. Subsequently, by reaching these goals, the Choice Plan would allow for rigorous curriculum to be shared with students in equitably used facilities which would provide greater flexibility in use of each high school.

The last portion of the explanation document provided a brief explanation of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. As noted earlier in this dissertation, each school

would have a magnet focus. Students who already attended a specific high school along with their siblings would be grandfathered into attending that specific school as well. Assignments to any of the high schools after factoring in sibling choice would be based on magnet programs attended prior to high school, the percentage of students who were provided free or reduced priced lunch, and school choice rank provided by the student and family (Guilford County Schools, 2004b). Finally, the overview of the plan shared that GCS would review the Choice Plan annually with the Board of Education.

The final piece of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan documents was a frequently asked questions (FAQ) document to answer any questions or concerns from parents and the community. Throughout the FAQ, GCS staff attempted to foresee the potential questions being posed by parents and community members. Many of the questions focused on the application period and how students should apply to the various magnet options presented. Additionally, the FAQ document explained topics such as out of county tuition, needs for late applications to go through the student assignment office, and how tenth through twelfth graders would fall under the previous guidelines that were in place prior to the Choice Plan. The 13 FAQ points presented also explained sibling privilege, appeals to the Board of Education regarding assignment to a particular school, hardships for parents, applications for students residing outside of High Point, and how sports would be factored into the plan. Consequently, the FAQ ended by explaining that all points of the High Point Choice Plan would be reviewed annually and could be potentially modified.

**Emphasis on socioeconomic diversity.** As the High Point Choice Plan began to take shape, the GCS Board of Education started to hear from community members and parents both in support of the plan and against the plan. To quell some of the anti-plan voices, the Board of Education had Dr. Grier add another attachment to the Choice Plan documents that outlined the benefits of socioeconomic diversity (Guilford County Schools, 2004f). The attachment, featuring information from the *Coleman Report* (1966), multiple references to the work of Richard Kahlenberg (2001), and the work from Lippman, Burns, and McArthur (1996) regarding urban schools and poverty was designed to show that the efforts of the district were grounded in research and would benefit students. However, by outlining the benefits of socio-economic diversity within the High Point Choice Plan, GCS would soon be also looking at the phenomenon of White Flight and how race would eventually surface within the plan.

### **Community Reaction to the Plan**

#### **Initial Opposition**

As previously discussed, the High Point High Schools Choice Plan drew reactions from many parents, students, and community members once the plan was unveiled in January of 2004. In reviewing the chronology of events, it is important to highlight the plan and then community's reaction to the plan so one can clearly see how the two aspects, plan and public reaction, affected the Board of Education. To further explain the community reaction to the High Point Choice Plan, I start with the presentation of the plan in January and February 2004 and move forward.

As mentioned earlier, GCS and the Board of Education held community forums in High Point to discuss the need for the High Point area high schools to be used more efficiently. During the February 5, 2004 public forum at T. Wingate Andrews High School, over 200 parents and students gathered to voice concerns and support for the proposal of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan presented to the public in January 2004 (Olsen, 2004, February 6). A senior at Andrews High, Brittany Lewis, advocated for the plan saying that “she strongly agree(s) with the plan” (Olsen, 2004, February 6, p. A1). The audience at Andrews advocated for the plan noting that it would bring equity to the high school and elevate the quality of education throughout the city of High Point. Furthermore, members of the audience at the Andrews’ forum agreed with school district officials that the plan would assist in making the best use of empty seats at both T. Wingate Andrews and High Point Central.

However, at the next public forum at Southwest High School, parents argued against the Choice Plan. Southwest parents said the plan was “forced choice that will amount to busing students across high school district lines to achieve socioeconomic balance and that the plan will drive down real estate values in their district” (Olsen, 2004, February 6, p. A1). Moreover, a Southwest Middle School eighth grader asked the school board “Has anyone asked the eighth graders what they think?” (Olsen, 2004, February 6, p. A1). Another Southwest area parent noted that she felt students learn better when they are happy and not forced to attend a school that they do not wish to attend. Conversely to the Andrews forum which had significant applause according to reports from the *High Point Enterprise*, the Southwest forum witnessed multiple boos

directed toward the Board of Education. In addition to the boos, Southwest parents, which were present in numbers over 100, explained to the Board that they were well organized and had even hired an attorney to pursue legal action against the Board should the plan pass.

On February 10, 2004, the night the High Point High Schools Choice plan passed on a 7-4 vote, the GCS Boardroom had a significant contingent of Southwest parents in attendance. Multiple shouts of anger erupted after the Board voted in approval for the plan with one mother shouting at the Board to observe her middle school daughter crying in the back of the room (Olsen, 2004, February 11). The angry parents continued to direct their ire against Board Members Gary Burnett, Dot Kearns, and Susan Mendenhall, who all had voted in favor of the plan. Burnett, Kearns, and Mendenhall represented school board districts in High Point or were from High Point. A Southwest parent explained that a group of over 250 Southwest parents were going to act by lobbying local, state, and federal government officials to act and have several members of the group run for the school board in opposition to Board members who voted for the plan (Olsen, 2004, February 11). Furthermore, one middle-schooler in attendance questioned, "How are we supposed to be with our friends that we grew up with?" (Olsen, 2004, February 11). Board member Susan Mendenhall said during her public comments that the plan was not perfect, but addressed education and educational programming needs at all three schools. However, concerns from Southwest parents grew even more pronounced when Chief Financial Officer Sharon Ozment noted that the High Point High Schools Choice

Plan would cost approximately \$4.2 million with \$2.1 million in new funding (Guilford County Schools, 2004, February 6).

Following the February 10, 2004 Board of Education meeting, Tim Mann and his Southwest parent group formally became known as Adults Believing in Children of Guilford County or simply, ABC of Guilford County (Buchanan, 2004, February 23). Although the Choice Plan was specific to High Point, ABC of Guilford County had begun sharing messages discounting the trustworthiness of the Board and Superintendent Grier. The messages promoted by the ABC group said that the Choice Plan could be expanded to the rest of Guilford County Schools. However, Board members and Dr. Grier both stated repeatedly that the High Point Choice Plan was for High Point only. Bruce Buchanan of the *Greensboro News and Record* further explained how race was a factor even though the Board of Education was focusing on socio-economics and poverty. Buchanan noted that Southwest was predominantly White and middle-class while Andrews and Central were both minority schools and schools of poverty. Drawing comparisons to other GCS schools, Buchanan explained that the balance in High Point was not unique. However, Dr. Grier stated in an interview with the *News and Record* that diversity was one of several factors in the Choice Plan decision and facility usage was another major factor (Buchanan, 2004, February 23). In addition, Dr. Grier also noted that some parents from Andrews High School had repeatedly asked the Board to make their school more diverse.

### **Community Action Regarding the Choice Plan**

The weeks after the passage of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan in spring 2004 were filled with various groups of parents, community members, and organizations establishing positions either for or against the plan. Shortly after the fervor of anti-plan parents establishing the ABC of Guilford County, the High Point Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) came out in support of the High Point Choice Plan. The ABC of Guilford attorney stated that he felt the NAACP was “out of sync with other Black organizations in Guilford County” and that when the High Point Chapter “realizes the full ramifications of the plan, they will reverse their decision” (Combs and Olsen, 2004, April 8, p. A1).

Subsequently, after the High Point Chapter of the NAACP endorsed the Choice Plan, ABC of Guilford began using its political muscle by lobbying the Guilford County Commissioners. ABC of Guilford lobbied the commissioners effectively to block certain financial provisions within the GCS budget that required funding from the county (Hoggard, 2004, April 14). Additionally, the anti-Choice Plan group was mounting a campaign to block the Magnet School Assistance Proposal Grant submitted by GCS to the federal government. As stated earlier, Chief Financial Officer Ozment explained that \$2.1 million of the Choice Plan’s funding would need to be new funding, much of which would come from the magnet grant.

### **Initial Student Assignment and Community Reaction**

In April of 2004, GCS began the process of having students apply for their respective choice high school in High Point. The initial application period was for

siblings, middle school magnet students, and then others. Although the initial community division between supporters of the Choice Plan and the ABC group were in full force, Guilford County Schools pressed on with the directive from the Board of Education regarding the timeline of applications and implementation of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan.

The primary group going through the application process for the Choice Plan were rising high school ninth graders (current eighth graders). Of the 190 rising ninth graders eligible for sibling preference, all of them requested to attend the school that their older sibling attended (Fernandez, 2004, April 14). Not only did the 190 students request sibling preference, but they were also given the assignment request to attend the school of their sibling. Interestingly, GCS noted that four of the 190 students were also from home schools or private schools. Furthermore, another 30 students were guaranteed a spot at Southwest due to the fact that they had taken enough classes through the arts magnet program at Penn-Griffin Middle School. Similarly, according to the *High Point Enterprise*, the “overwhelming majority of High Point’s freshmen got their first choice in the High Point High Schools Choice Plan” (Olsen, 2004, May 9, p. A1). Thus, all students who met the April 22 deadline got their first choice of school as noted by Dr. Grier in an interview with the *Enterprise*.

However, in a breakdown of the overall numbers, students who missed the deadline on April 22 fared a little differently. Of the students assigned to T. Wingate Andrews, 101 of those students requested to attend the high school (Olsen, 2004, May 9). 61 of the students who requested Andrews were from the Andrews attendance zone while

26 were from High Point Central and only 14 were from Southwest. Andrews also had 36 students use sibling preference while the Early College Academy program at the high school attracted 40 students (20 from Andrews, 11 from High Point Central, and 6 from Southwest). Unfortunately, 130 students from the Andrews attendance zone missed the deadline with 25 of those being assigned to Southwest High School.

High Point Central fared similarly to Andrews in terms of student assignments. 73 students received their first choice of attending Central of which 13 were from Andrews, 46 from Central, and 14 from Southwest (Olsen, 2004, May 9). Additionally, 74 students used sibling preference at High Point Central while the Early College of Business attracted 16 students from Andrews, 22 from Central, and 2 from Southwest. The International Baccalaureate program attracted 5 students from Andrews, 33 from Central, and 12 from Southwest as well. Lastly, 136 students at High Point Central missed the deadline with none of those students receiving their second choice.

Southwest High School had by far the most first choice applications according to the *High Point Enterprise*. Of the 126 students requesting Southwest High, 92 were from the Southwest attendance zone while 21 were from the Andrews attendance zone, and 13 were from the High Point Central attendance zone (Olsen, 2004, May 9). Moreover, 71 students used sibling preference to attend Southwest while the Early College of Education attracted 11 students from Andrews, 5 from High Point Central, and 24 from Southwest. As noted earlier, the arts magnet of Southwest also enticed 24 students. Finally, Southwest High had the fewest number of students missing the deadline – 71 – with 25 of those students being assigned to T. Wingate Andrews as a second choice.

Once the data was released, the Board of Education and GCS Superintendent Terry Grier responded with a positive message. Grier extolled that “every student who registered by last Thursday (April 22) got their first choice” (Olsen, 2004, May 9, p. A1). Board of Education Chairman Alan Duncan also shared a similar sentiment by stating, “I am extremely pleased that the vast majority of students were able to get into the program that they chose” (Olsen, 2004, May 9, p. A1). However, an ABC of Guilford County parent noted, “What we should be striving to do is send kids to schools they want to go to, and not force them. This High Point choice plan does nothing but disrupt all that” (Fernandez, 2004, April 14, p. A1). In contrast, a new group of parents and community members supporting the plan, Working Solutions, emerged after the assignments. A Working Solutions member from the Southwest area shared that “people are going to have to give this some time, and just interpreting beginning numbers doesn’t say anything. Five years from now, if you had the same numbers, it would tell us more” (Fernandez, 2004, April 14, p. A1).

Although the results of the initial application process appeared to be a success at the outset, further commentary from outside of High Point noted that the ABC group should have lost some momentum (Hoggard, 2004, April 27). However, yellow anti-Choice Plan signs were being noticed more and more frequently in High Point calling for school district leadership changes. In addition to the yard signs popping up all over High Point, businesses began to get involved in opposition to the Choice Plan. High Point’s Carter Brothers Barbeque Restaurant posted anti-school lottery stickers on the doors of their building (Olsen, 2004, April 27). The manager of Carter Brothers said “We feel a

responsibility to the public because that's who supports us" (Olsen, 2004, April 27, p. A1). ABC of Guilford County used the anti-Choice Plan stickers and yard signs to build momentum against the High Point High Schools Choice Plan by attempting to persuade people who frequented certain businesses to see and hear their message. By increasing its visibility, ABC of Guilford had bolstered its ranks to over 400 people according to the *High Point Enterprise* (Olsen, April 27).

Conversely, another group, School Solutions Committee, worked with GCS to improve schools and work within the confines of the Choice Plan (Olsen, 2004, April 27). The School Solutions Committee was not pro-Choice Plan nor anti-Choice Plan. It was a group that wanted to work to change the plan from within the limitations of the School Board's decisions as well as within GCS operations. Although the pro-High Point Choice Plan movement was less vocal and visible, it was never the less present as well. Therefore, High Point had three distinct groups focusing on the High Point High Schools Choice Plan: one for the plan, one against the plan, and one attempting to change the plan from within the system.

**Community group problems.** As the 2003–2004 school year ended, the various community groups in support or against the Choice Plan began to have problems. On May 28, 2004, leaders within the Working Solutions Group, Greg and Lori Hawkins, resigned from the committee (Whitehorne, 2004, May 28). The Hawkins noted that the group began to shift to politics and move away from the initial goal of helping students. This fracturing within the group also showed that the group was losing momentum due to lack of parent participation, according to the Hawkins. With low parent participation and

leadership leaving the group, Working Solutions would become less of a factor in the debate surrounding the High Point Choice Plan.

Similarly, ABC of Guilford County also began to have problems of its own. A formal complaint was filed on June 7 by an anti-ABC leader against ABC on the grounds that the group was acting as a political action committee, or PAC, and that it had not filed as one (Whitehorne, 2004, June 16). The complaint noted that the ABC group was raising money to influence the election and had violated state statute regarding political fundraising. Also, the complaint was sent to the North Carolina Board of Elections for investigation by Guilford County Board of Elections director George Gilbert (Whitehorne, 2004, June 16). Board of Elections director Gilbert stated “It seems pretty evident to me that the group needs to come in and file as a PAC. They have clearly stated they are supporting candidates” (Whitehorne, 2004, June 16, para. 9). The complaint further noted that “everyone is entitled to their opinion . . . but you can’t operate outside the law” and intimidate businesses into feeling that they may lose patrons by not supporting ABC as well (Whitehorne, 2004, June 16, para. 16). Thus, the legal problems for ABC and the tactics noted by community members created problems for the anti-High Point Choice Plan group. ABC of Guilford also suffered another setback in July of 2004. After lobbying county commissioners to withhold local funding for the Choice Plan, the political body reversed course on July 22 and released \$2 million in funding to the school system to build technology labs at Southwest and more specifically at T. Wingate Andrews (Fernandez, 2004, July 23). ABC of Guilford County said “if they hadn’t got the money, the board might have to re-look at this (High Point High Schools Choice

Plan)” (Fernandez, 2004, July 23, para. 8). ABC leadership also added that ABC was focused on “November—that’s our goal, to change the composition of the school board enough to have an impact” (Fernandez, 2004, July 23, para. 19).

### **Year One of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan**

As the school year began, community members and parents continued to advocate against the High Point Choice Plan even though the plan was underway at all three high schools in High Point. During the Public Comments section of every Board of Education meeting, starting in August of 2004 until the election in November, citizens from High Point and the surrounding areas spoke out against the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. At the meeting on August 26, the week school started, there were five individuals from High Point and the surrounding area (Guilford County Schools, 2004, August 26). In September, there were seven speakers against the Choice Plan followed by seven more speakers against it in October (Guilford County Schools 2004, September 23, September 27, October 12, and October 28). The continued outspokenness of the ABC group and others would ultimately climax in the election of 2004.

**The election of 2004.** Although the 2004–2005 school year started with few problems surrounding the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, ABC of Guilford County revved up efforts to convince others in Guilford County that the plan was a bad idea. With 2004 being an election year, ABC focused on financial problems due to busing students for the Choice Plan and backed a slate of school board candidates who opposed the Choice Plan.

The initial attack during the 2004–2005 school year on the Choice Plan surrounded the use of buses to transport students. As noted earlier, the cost to bus students within the High Point High Schools Choice Plan was significant. ABC of Guilford latched onto the financial burden of bussing and began to not only speak at every school board meeting, but also write multiple editorial letters to both the *Greensboro News and Record* and the *High Point Enterprise*. Jeff Peeler from ABC noted in one such letter that “[Superintendent] Grier will now be forced to spend additional funds to make this work” (Peeler, 2004, September 2, para. 4). Similarly, Peeler also stated that the Choice Plan would overload the bus system next year when fewer students get their first choice. Lastly, Peeler along with others began to revisit a desire to remove Dr. Terry Grier from the Superintendency of Guilford County Schools. Many ABC parents echoed the same refrain of Peeler when he stated, “help us stop Terry Grier and the school board from destroying the education of our students” (Peeler, 2004, September 2, para. 7).

By claiming that Dr. Grier and the school board were harming students, ABC was moving into the realm of political mudslinging that became ugly. “Get Terry Grier Outta Here!” and “I have been Grier-ended” were two major rallying cries heard from ABC parents and supporters. Bumper stickers, store signs, and yard signs could be seen throughout High Point and surrounding areas prior to the November election (Anonymous, 2004, November 2). The ABC Group shifted into full gear and promoted a slate of candidates who promised to end the Choice Plan. The political advertisements created significant negative press by showing, in one instance, Board members Dot

Kearns and Kris Cooke, as cheerleaders for Dr. Grier (Anonymous, 2004, November 2). Other ads purported that GCS was going to somehow “tax YOU” even though North Carolina does not allow local school boards that authority.

However, the direct attacks on the Board of Education failed in turning over the Board. The two main targets of ABC were Kearns and Cooke, and both women won reelection. All three candidates supported by ABC of Guilford lost. As detailed by the *News and Record*, school board races “are as much about the superintendent as they are about the board members on the ballot” (Anonymous, 2004, November 2, para. 6).

**Continued opposition to the High Point Choice Plan and first semester results.** After the election of 2004, the Board of Education continued to hear criticism regarding the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. Realizing the election results were not in their favor, the ABC group increased the number of individuals speaking at school board meetings and public forums. From December 2004 until the High Point Public Forum in February 2005, the Guilford County Schools Board of Education heard over a dozen more speakers complaining about the Choice Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2004, December & 2005, January). Consequently, at a High Point community forum early in February 2005, 26 people spoke in two minute segments voicing concerns about High Point area schools with the majority criticizing the High Point High Schools Choice Plan (Knopfler, 2005, February 1). Subsequently, the comments at the public forum regarding the Choice plan began to highlight another issue that was emerging in High Point: trust (Knopfler, 2005, February 3). Several of the speakers explained that due to the Choice Plan, GCS was losing, if it had not already lost, the trust of the people of High

Point. This theme would become more and more prevalent as opposition to the plan continued.

Thus, due to the pressure of the community in High Point, the Board of Education requested an update on the Choice plan for the February 8, 2005 Board meeting. During that meeting, Dr. Delores Fogg, Associate Superintendent for School Improvement, shared that 53% of Andrews High School ninth graders were receiving free or reduced lunches as compared to 56% of the total school population (Guilford County Schools, 2005, February 8). High Point Central had 55% of its ninth graders receiving free or reduced lunches as compared to 59% of its total population. Lastly, Southwest High had 32% of its ninth graders receiving free or reduced lunches as compared to 22% of the total school population. Dr. Fogg also shared student academic data noting that all three schools saw an increase in honor course enrollment from six to 11%. To conclude, Dr. Fogg noted that the application process for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan would be a single document which would be mailed on February 11 and due to GCS on March 18. After the presentation, the Board of Education requested first semester data for the three high schools.

At the February 24, 2005 Board of Education meeting, three Southwest parents continued their criticism of the Choice Plan and they also included a Southwest Middle School student as well (Guilford County Schools, 2005, February 24). The parents and student came to also hear the report regarding first semester data of the three high schools within the Choice Plan. Dr. Grier reviewed the data for the ninth graders impacted by the plan. He shared data on attendance, short-term suspensions, drop outs, number of

students failing one or more courses, number of students enrolled in honors courses, and the number of students enrolled in state tested subjects and percent proficient on those state tests first semester. Grier also cautioned the Board against using one semester's worth of data to judge a school's performance. As Dr. Grier noted, "first semester data in itself is inconclusive and to attempt to determine whether or not the High Point Choice Plan has had an impact on this data would be inaccurate" (Guilford County Schools, 2005, February 24). Once the presentation was completed, the Board requested to look at the same cohort of students from the previous year when they were enrolled in eighth grade.

As the school year shifted into the spring semester, ABC parents continued lobbying against the Choice Plan through public comments at board meetings. The public comments forced the Board to always have the Choice Plan and its impact on the agenda at some level. With double digit speakers in both March and April, ABC continued to vocalize its concerns with the Choice Plan and compel the Board to ask for more and more information on the impact of the program after one semester. Therefore, at the April 5, 2005 Board of Education meeting Dr. Fogg presented data that showed an increased level of socio-economic diversity at Andrews, Central, and Southwest High Schools (Knopfler, 2005, April 6). The data on diversity was positively received, but other Board members wanted more data particularly on discipline. Board member Darlene Garrett stated, "I'm hearing that there are significantly more (discipline) problems than the year before" (Knopfler, 2005, April 6, p. A1). Fogg explained that she had not seen a spike in any discipline numbers at any of the three high schools.

Consequently, the Board wanted more data surrounding discipline at the three high schools as the school district moved to finalize student assignments for the 2005-06 school year.

Parents of ABC of Guilford County seized upon the discipline piece and began focusing on security and safety for students during the public comments. “Andrews, Central, and Southwest are nobody’s home schools. Please come up with a new plan that will give every student the security of a home school” clamored a Southwest parent who spoke during public comments. Others, as noted by the *High Point Enterprise*, shared stories of how things were different due to the plan (Knopfler, 2005, April 6, p. A1). Although the voices continued to lobby for change, the Board of Education resisted the urge to change anything with the High Point Choice Plan.

### **Year Two Student Assignment Problems**

Similar to the 2004 application process for the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, GCS used the same rules for students entering the ninth and tenth grades in High Point for the 2005-06 school year. The major differences during the application period for 2005 were an earlier application period, February 11 to March 18, and the addition of another grade level, ninth and tenth (Guilford County Schools 2005, March 24). Shortly after the application deadline on March 18, GCS released data to the media on April 6, 2005 regarding student choice assignments under the High Point High Schools Choice Plan (Knopfler, 2005, April 7). Within the data shared by GCS was an unfortunate piece of data revealing that 30% of students missed the application deadline. Furthermore, the data also noted that most of the students chose to attend schools within their attendance

zone or neighborhood. Although this potential setback seemed counter to the goals of the Choice Plan, GCS officials explained that the plan was to be phased in over four years and was moving the High Point area closer to the goal of more diversity and equitable use of facilities.

The problems for year two implementation were greater than just students picking schools closer to home and 30% of students missing the deadline. As noted by the *High Point Enterprise*, one in five students did not get their first choice for 2005–2006 (Knopfler, 2005, April 7). In other words, nearly 19% of students who completed a choice application did not receive their first choice according to GCS data. When compared to the 2004 data, when 100% of students who completed an application under the Choice Plan received their first choice, the community response was significantly more severe. To further clarify the issue, GCS stated that of the 791 students who submitted the application on time 149 did not get their first choice (Knopfler, 2005, April 7). The approximately 30% of students who missed the deadline, or 267 applications, were assigned to schools that had space and allowed for balancing diversity criteria as mentioned earlier. Interestingly enough, the majority of students denied their first choice requested Southwest High School. Of those denied their first choice, GCS shared the disaggregated data of first choice denials: 107 students requested Southwest, 26 requested T. Wingate Andrews, and 15 requested High Point Central (Knopfler, 2005, April 7). Due to building capacity, Southwest had the largest number of requests denied according to GCS. In answering questions regarding the data, GCS Executive Director for Communication Sonja Conway said, “Certainly there are perceptions in the community

that some schools are better than other schools, and certainly some of those are people who would have been assigned to Southwest as a neighborhood school” (Knopfler, 2004, April 7). Therefore, the successes of the 2004 student assignments within the High Point High Schools Choice Plan were countered by the drastic change of more denials in 2005. Consequently, the problems with student assignment fueled the anti-High Point Choice community and set the stage for more confrontations regarding the plan as the district moved into the 2005-06 school year.

### **Board of Education Response to the Community**

With the continued pressure on the Board of Education and Superintendent Terry Grier, Guilford County Schools consistently heard and focused on issues related to the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. The pressure that started in the winter of 2004 continued through the election of 2004, in November, and into 2005. As the school district prepared for the 2005-06 school year, the Board of Education used the building of new schools, demographic shifts, population growth, and socio-economic factors, particularly poverty, to open the door to discussions about redistricting in August of 2005 before the start of the school year.

**Board of Education begins to focus on redistricting.** With the continued pressure from parents at Southwest, particularly the ABC group, against the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, the Board of Education set an agenda for the upcoming school year to be dominated by redistricting (Hayes, 2005b, August 7). Redistricting was a long and tedious process that often upset many in the community. Board member Susan Mendenhall from High Point noted that with redistricting, “traditionally, people don’t

want to move” (Hayes, 2005a, August 7, p. A2). Students and parents “want to stay where they are familiar” according to Mendenhall. However, with continued pressure on the Board regarding the Choice Plan and a need to accommodate students in schools being built, GCS would need to go through the redistricting process.

The key component of the new Redistricting Plan was how the efforts would impact High Point and the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. Although several board members noted that the Choice Plan, which had only been in existence for one year, needed more time to bear results, population growth and changing demographics were becoming significant forces in High Point. New Board member Walter Childs, who replaced the deceased Gary Barnett, agreed with the majority of board members that the Choice Plan needed more time, but the population was growing quickly in the Southwest area (Hayes, 2005c, August 7). Therefore, at the August 9, 2005 Board of Education meeting district demographer and planner Eric Hoekstra began to present potential redistricting options (Guilford County Schools, 2005, August 9).

As noted earlier in Chapter 3, the redistricting efforts pertaining to T. Wingate Andrews and Southwest High in 2003 failed to become a reality which led the Board of Education to eventually create the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. Similar to the plans from the 1999 redistricting efforts, Hoekstra explained in his report to the Board that students would need to shift in the Southwest High School attendance zone and attend T. Wingate Andrews (Guilford County Schools, 2005, August 9). According to Hoekstra, approximately 197 middle and high school students would be affected by the shift from Southwest to Andrews. Additionally, to maintain diversity at Southwest,

Hoekstra explained that students from the traditionally Black Parkview area in High Point should shift to Southwest.

Response to the redistricting report was primarily from Southwest parents. As noted from the *High Point Enterprise*, some parents said the Redistricting Plan “was illegal” (Hayes, 2005, August 13). Moreover, Board member Susan Mendenhall, who represented the Southwest area, stated that the new redistricting maps were very similar to areas considered for redistricting three years ago. Consequently, Mendenhall noted that balancing the racial and economic populations at T. Wingate Andrews, High Point Central, and Southwest became a focus that led to the High Point Choice Plan. Parents, however, were concerned about the possibility of a new attendance zone and were confused about how redistricting would affect the High Point Choice Plan. A Southwest parent stated that she moved 10 years ago to the Southwest zone (Hayes, 2005, August 13). The aforementioned Southwest parent, along with other parents, felt that the new potential lines were unfair and would shift students, who lived close to Southwest, to Andrews. By shifting predominantly White middle class students to Andrews, GCS would be able to balance the diversity at the school. However, similar to the Choice Plan, the redistricting options presented in 2005 were similar to the 2003 redistricting options creating controversy in High Point again.

***Redistricting plan.*** At the August 25, 2005, Guilford County Board of Education Meeting, the Board of Education heard further details regarding the designs to redistrict the areas affecting T. Wingate Andrews and Southwest High Schools. The proposal on August 25 would dissolve the Andrews attendance zone entirely and create an arts and

technology magnet high school that would serve all of High Point and the surrounding area (Guilford County Schools, 2005, August 25). Under the proposal, High Point Central and Southwest High would both skyrocket in student population. High Point Central would increase from 1,307 students to 2,091 students (Guilford County Schools, 2005, August 25). Similarly, Southwest High School would increase from 1,196 students to 1,860 students. The dissolution of Andrews' attendance zone and adoption of this potential model would also dissolve the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. After presenting this proposal, the Board decided to gather community feedback at a public forum to be held at Penn-Griffin Middle School on September 20, 2005.

Prior to the September 20 public forum, the Board of Education heard an additional proposal regarding High Point area high schools at its September 13 meeting. During the meeting, GCS district demographer and planner Eric Hoekstra presented a plan to move 59 students from Southwest to High Point Central as well as 361 students from Southwest to Ragsdale High, a Jamestown area high school near High Point (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 13). To make up for the significant loss of students from Southwest, Hoekstra proposed shifting approximately 415 students from heavily minority areas between High Point and Jamestown to Southwest High. Additionally, Hoekstra presented a proposal to create a mini-attendance zone for Andrews to relieve the student pollution spike that would accompany the August 25<sup>th</sup> proposal of dissolving Andrews' attendance zone and the High Point High Schools Choice Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 13). The mini attendance zone would incorporate roughly 250 students living closest to T. Wingate Andrews. The mini

attendance zone and shift of students from Southwest/Ragsdale met with little support from the Board of Education and both were voted down (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 13). Moreover, Superintendent Terry Grier noted that “staff wonders why we are talking about this (redistricting)” because they were tasked with implementation of the High Point Choice Plan (Knopfler, 2005, September 14, p. A1). Consequently, a motion was made by Board Vice-Chairwoman Anita Sharpe for GCS staff to create a map detailing an attendance zone where every child attends a school closest to their home until all seats are filled, including mobile units (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 13). The motion by Ms. Sharpe also requested that the map should contain current magnets, use natural boundaries, major thoroughfares, and not split neighborhoods. Lastly, the map should also note bus routes. Therefore, the motion by Ms. Sharpe created a redistricting map that would outline neighborhood schools.

Following the September 13 Board of Education meeting, GCS staff and Board of Education members held a public forum at Penn-Griffin Middle School in High Point on September 20, 2005 to gather community input on the redistricting options. At the forum, Mr. Hoekstra presented the proposed change in attendance lines from the August 9, 2005 Board of Education meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 20). The community then voiced their opinions about the shifts in students from Southwest to Andrews and the potential of using Andrews High as a dedicated magnet school for the arts and technology. Public comments started shortly after the initial presentation at 7:05 p.m. and concluded at 8:50 p.m.

After gathering feedback from the community, the Board of Education discussed options and ideas at the fall retreat on September 25. The Board of Education conversed about using a “one county” approach versus targeting specific parts of the county for programs (Hayes, 2005, September 26). By potentially adopting this long-range approach, the Board of Education would be looking to counter the fragmentation that some board members said was residual from the days of merging High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools. Due to this topic of conversation, the Board shifted its focus to the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. To bolster this point, Anita Sharpe stated, “how do you justify leading a one county movement when you differentiate on how you treat your constituents?” (Hayes, 2005, September 26, p. A1). Sharpe suggested omitting the long range one county goal from the Board’s plan. However, the motion failed five to three (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 25). Thus, the Board of Education adopted an approach to focus on the county as a whole and attempt to prevent using programs for specific areas.

After adopting the one county approach at the retreat on September 25, the Board of Education continued to hear potential redistricting proposals from Hoekstra at the September 29 meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 29). Hoekstra sought direction from the Board of Education regarding the variety of proposals put forth since August 9 regarding High Point area high schools. Due to this request, the Board of Education voted to remove the proposal of the T. Wingate Andrews mini attendance zone on a seven to one vote. Also, the Board moved to remove the proposed shift in students from Southwest to Andrews on a five to three vote with all three High Point area board

members in favor (Guilford County Schools, 2005, September 29). Therefore, all the original proposals, regarding High Point, presented to the Board from GCS staff were voted down leaving the High Point High Schools Choice Plan still the primary program within High Point to alleviate overcrowding and increase diversity.

After receiving the Board's directive regarding developing a map for neighborhood schools and noting that the Board had moved against the previously developed redistricting plans, GCS staff created the map of neighborhood schools as requested and shared the information with the Board of Education at the October 27, 2005 meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2005, October 27). Board members noted that the neighborhood schools map looked incredibly similar to the current attendance zone map (Hayes, 2005b, October 29). Furthermore, when district demographer Eric Hoekstra used capacity for each school to balance the populations and use the schools more efficiently, Southwest High students shifted to T. Wingate Andrews and High Point Central High as in previous proposals. However, if the neighborhood map was put in place, T. Wingate Andrews and High Point Central would receive an influx of minority students who were also low income (Hayes, 2005a, October 29). Thus, Southwest High would lose minority students who were also poor to Andrews and Central. The raw data presented summarized the potential shift by explaining that High Point Central would increase its low-income student population from 47 to 63% and also increase the number of non-White students from 63 to 73% (Hayes, 2005a, October 29). Conversely, Southwest High would decrease in non-White population from 44 to 36% while the number of low income students would fall drastically from 25 to 13%.

After reviewing the maps, Board Member Dot Kearns from High Point pointed out that the redistricting neighborhood schools map was similar to the 1999 plan, but failed to address diversity and poverty (Hayes, 2005a, October 29). Kearns also noted that the High Point Choice Plan adopted in 2004 was created to address the issues with diversity and poverty that could not be fixed by using a neighborhood school model. Therefore, the Board of Education would need to review the proposal and take into account that neighborhood high schools within High Point, particularly, would be problematic due to where school attendance lines fell and how those lines were impacted by poor and minority neighborhoods.

### **Collapse of the Plan and Redistricting**

After reviewing potential maps for redistricting and consistently hearing community pushback for over nearly two years, the Guilford County Board of Education at its December 19, 2005 meeting continued its discussions surrounding High Point area high schools, the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, and potential school attendance lines that promoted a neighborhood schools concept (Guilford County Schools, 2005, December 19). With review of the maps presented at the November school board meetings, the Board of Education finalized discussion regarding High Point. During discussion regarding various elements of the High Point Choice Plan and potential reassignment plans, Board members Darlene Garrett, Kris Cooke, and Dr. Nancy Routh advocated for changes (Hayes, 2005, December 20). Garrett even called the High Point High Schools Choice Plan “a failure.” Thus, Board member Dr. Nancy Routh made a motion seconded by Darlene Garrett to have GCS administration:

1. Identify the programs at the three High Point High Schools that will be the option (options) offered by each school and to specify the number of seats to be made available in each program for rising ninth grade students.
2. Eliminate the lottery as a means of assigning students [to High Point area high schools] and allow students to apply for a program of their choice.
3. Determine the total capacity of each high school and recommend adjustments to district lines as needed to utilize each facility effectively.
4. Assure that all students currently enrolled in an existing academy or Early College program will be able to remain in their chosen program to completion
5. Assign rising ninth graders who do not apply for an option program, and those in a waiting pool, to their designated district school according to Guilford County Schools' Student Assignment Policy (Guilford County Schools, 2005, December 19).

The motion passed upon majority vote seven to four with all three board members from High Point voting in opposition [Kearns, Childs, and Mendenhall]. The High Point High School Choice Plan was dead.

After the vote, Mr. Hoekstra presented a plan that would prioritize neighborhoods and attempt to balance poverty and diversity for each of the three High Point area high schools (Guilford County Schools, 2005, December 19). Under Mr. Hoekstra's plan, Southwest High would have a capacity of 1,030 students with 49% non-White and 40% low-income [free or reduced lunch] students. Southwest would return to being a traditional high school with only having a dance program as a program offering. High

Point Central High School would serve 1,455 students with 66% non-White and 71% low income students. The programs retained at Central would be the International Baccalaureate program and an international language option. Lastly, T. Wingate Andrews High School would serve 1,217 students with 66% non-White and 47% low income students. Andrews would retain the biotechnology program as well as health careers program (Guilford County Schools, 2005, December 19). Following the proposal, the Board of Education voted to table the proposal to garner public feedback as it looked to change how students were assigned to high schools within High Point.

### **Neighborhood Schools Focus**

After the vote by the Board of Education to move the high schools within High Point back to attendance lines, the January Board of Education meeting would need to start the process of how to move High Point area high schools forward now that the Choice Plan had ended. The goals of the now defunct Choice Plan would need to somehow factor into the future attendance lines of all three high schools (Hayes, 2006, January 9). Although the Board motion in December dissolved the lottery system of assigning students within the Choice Plan, students with the magnet programs they chose would be allowed to continue until they graduate. However, the Early College programs at both Central and Southwest were not attracting significant numbers according to Dr. Grier (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 10). Grier suggested that the Early College of Education at Southwest be dissolved and the Early College of International Business at Central be converted to Hospitality and Tourism. Consequently, the Board

moved into deeper discussion of redistricting plans for the High Point Schools during the January 10 meeting.

To voice the concerns surrounding High Point and the new potential redistricting lines, many people from High Point attended the January 10, 2006, Board of Education meeting and spoke. Of the 17 public speakers at the board meeting, 11 were from High Point area high school attendance zones including High Point City Councilman John Faircloth (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 10). Faircloth urged the Board to be fair and to stop singling out the City of High Point (Hayes, 2006, January 11). Additionally, Garth Hebert of High Point asked the Board to “heal wounds” and “put aside differences.” Hebert also used his public comments time to ask the district not to use High Point for social change and integration, stating that “gerrymandering attendance lines does not solve the problem” (Hayes, 2006, January 11, p. A2). Although vocal, the High Point contingent was still perplexed by the GCS presentation regarding future attendance lines.

Under the presented plan shared by Eric Hoekstra, T. Wingate Andrews would serve 1,170 students with a population of 66% non-White students and 39% students of poverty or low income (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 10). This proposal would have decreased Andrews non-White population by 13% and also decreased its low-income population by 16%. Also, the presented plan would change High Point Central’s overall population to 1436 students with changes in demographics from 63% non-White to 66% non-White and from 49% low income to 60% low income. However, the population change at Southwest would move to serve 1010 students with a shift from

44% non-White to 49% non-White and from 26% low income to 33% low income. Additionally, Penn-Griffin would become a full magnet school of the arts with no attendance zone. After the presentation by Hoekstra, the Board moved to reconsider the August 2005 map of High Point that shifted students from Southwest to Andrews with the inclusion of demographic data for further review (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 10).

### **Final Proposed Plans for High Point High Schools**

Once the Board of Education moved away from the High Point High Schools Choice Plan with its December 19, 2005 vote, the need to finalize plans for student attendance zones in High Point became a priority. Throughout the Fall of 2005 and into the Winter of 2006, the Board of Education heard various proposals and scenarios from district demographer and planner Eric Hoekstra. During the Public Forum at Providence Place in High Point on January 19, 2006, the Board of Education gathered feedback from the community regarding four proposed final plans (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 19).

**Map A proposal.** The initial proposal known as Map A was a combination of all the proposals shared with the Board of Education over the Fall of 2005 (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 19). Within the Map A proposal were moving students from the Southwest Middle and High feeder elementary school, Florence Elementary, to T. Wingate Andrews and Welborn Middle School. Also, students who lived closer to Southwest High and Middle in the Blairwood area near Oak Hollow Lake would shift from Andrews and Welborn to Ferndale Middle and High Point Central High schools.

Furthermore, Andrews's students south of Kivett Drive would move to High Point Central. The Oak View area would shift its students from Penn-Griffin and High Point Central to Southwest High. Similarly, students from the Kirkman Park area would move from Andrews to Southwest. Lastly, Penn-Griffin would become a 6-12 grades school with a small attendance zone west of North Main Street.

**Map B proposal.** The Map B proposal would have followed the presentation model requested by the Board in October and shared with the Board of Education in November (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 19). This proposal would have created a map that placed students closest to their home. However, due to capacity issues, Map B would have forced problems with feeder pattern schools and generated a need to divide neighborhoods when students attended middle and high schools in High Point.

**Map C proposal.** The Map C proposal was originally shared with the Board of Education in August of 2005 and removed from consideration (Guilford County Schools, 2006, January 19). However, at the January 10, 2006 meeting, the Board of Education voted to reconsider this map. Map C would have created the shift of students from Southwest Middle and High Schools to T. Wingate Andrews High and Welborn Middle Schools. Consequently, Southwest Middle and High Schools would receive students from the Parkview area of High Point and students from north of East Green Drive. This proposal would move predominantly White middle class students from Southwest to Andrews while replacing those students at Southwest with predominantly Black or non-White students.

**Map D proposal.** The final proposal for the Board of Education to decide upon was Map D. Map D followed the original 1999 Redistricting Plan that was voted down in 2003. Interestingly enough, Map D was the proposal that created neighborhood schools but also created serious imbalances in race and wealth within the three High Point Area High Schools. Thus, Map D was the proposal that led to the creation of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan that the Board of Education voted to dissolve in December 2005.

### **Community Action and the Move to Redistrict**

After hearing public comments at the January 19, 2006 public forum, the Board of Education resolved to discuss each redistricting map proposal and decide on a final plan by the February 21, 2006 Board of Education meeting (Guilford County Schools, 2006, February 9). With a packed boardroom on February 9, 2006, the Board of Education began the process in earnest and continued to hear feedback particularly from parents who resided in the Southwest area and identified with the ABC of Guilford County Group which had shifted from anti-Choice Plan to pro-neighborhood schools. Of the 22 public comments on the 9th of February, 15 were from parents from the Southwest area. The speakers advocated for the Map D proposal which would create neighborhood schools and generate deep inequities between Southwest and the other two High Point Schools, Central and Andrews. Additionally, the ABC Group reached out after the board meeting to the print media and promoted the idea that Map D should be implemented. An ABC Group parent and Southwest Middle School parent, not only spoke at the Board of Education meeting, but also spoke to the *Jamestown News* regarding the proposal

(Whitehorne, 2006, February 15). The Southwest Middle School parent, as with other ABC parents, developed a petition for Map D. The petition collected over 1,100 signatures and was presented to the Board of Education. Noting student achievement data, ABC parents stated that they did not want their children attending “failing schools or one that is unsafe” (Whitehorne, 2006, February 15, para. 14). Simply, parents aligned with ABC did not want their children to attend Andrews and would rather home school their kids than send them to those schools.

The Board discussion and community dialogue continued through the month of February until the board meeting on February 21. At the February 21, 2006 meeting, the Board of Education reviewed the four proposals for redistricting in High Point. After discussion regarding transportation costs an additional change was made to the Map C proposal, which would add the Blairwood area south of Oak Hollow Lake to T. Wingate Andrews High. A motion was made by Board member Kris Cooke to remove Map A proposal (Guilford County Schools, 2006, February 21). However, a substitute motion was made by Dot Kearns seconded by Walter Childs, both from High Point, to adopt the Map C proposal with the addition of the Blairwood area being reassigned from Andrews to High Point Central. The substitute motion passed on a narrow six to five vote with all three High Point Board Members, Kearns, Childs, and Mendenhall, voting for the measure. Therefore, Andrews would now have a student population of 1,042 students with 68% being non-White and 43% being low income. Likewise, High Point Central would have 1,458 students with 62% being non-White and 53% being low income. Lastly, Southwest would house 1,242 students with 54% being non-White and 31% being

low income. Consequently, the Board of Education's adoption of the Map C proposal with the addition of the Blairwood area's student moving to High Point Central set the attendance lines for all three High Point area high schools for the future.

Although the lines became set according to the Board of Education, additional anger was generated particularly by Southwest parents whose students were reassigned under the Map C proposal. The parents continued the ABC of Guilford County approach to lobbying, using signs, and stickers to advocate for the removal of Superintendent Grier and promotion of school board candidates that would hopefully advocate for the changing of school attendance lines (Hayes, 2006, April 21). The ABC campaign continued with "Oust Grier" as the new slogan until Terry Grier eventually left in early 2008 for the San Diego Unified School District (Guilford County Schools, 2008).

### **Effects on Schools and Student Achievement and Demographic Shifts**

The policies of the Board of Education of Guilford County Schools and GCS administrative staff over the time period from 2001–2002 to 2008–2009 affected student achievement at the three High Point area high schools. Starting in 1997-98, the state of North Carolina released school report cards detailing overall school performance and whether the school grew student achievement or not. The state generated a model that showed if a school made expected growth, exceeded expected growth, or failed to make expected growth. Additionally, the state used a testing performance composite to numerically show the schools performance. Lastly, under the Federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) enacted in 2002, the State of North Carolina further disaggregated

school performance so parents and other stakeholders could see how various student demographic groups performed.

Table 2 illustrates how the three High Point area high schools performed in the pre-NCLB era and post-NCLB era on North Carolina standardized tests (NCDPI, 1997–2009). In reviewing the information from 1997–1998 to 2002–2003, the three High Point area high schools remained stable in student achievement performance. However, T. Wingate Andrews’ student performance composite declined during the period of 2003–2004 through 2007–2008. This decline coincided with the period of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan and significant student population declines. Furthermore, Table 2 also highlights the impact of student academic growth as measured by the State of North Carolina. Noting this key area, T. Wingate Andrews High School failed to meet expected student growth during the 2003–2008 time period, the same time period as the turmoil with the High Point High Schools Choice Plan.

Table 2

Performance of High Point High Schools on North Carolina Standardized Tests

School Year	High School	Met Expected Growth	Exceeded Expected Growth	Performance Composite
1997–1998	T. Wingate Andrews	Yes	Yes	53.1
	High Point Central	Yes	Yes	53.2
	Southwest High	Yes	Yes	70.2

Table 2

Cont.

School Year	High School	Met Expected Growth	Exceeded Expected Growth	Performance Composite
1998–1999	T. Wingate Andrews	Yes	Yes	57.6
	High Point Central	Yes	Yes	50.8
	Southwest High	Yes	No	66.5
1999–2000	T. Wingate Andrews	Yes	No	57.6
	High Point Central	No	No	57
	Southwest High	Yes	Yes	66.8
2000–2001	T. Wingate Andrews	No	No	56.4
	High Point Central	Yes	No	56.7
	Southwest High	No	No	70.3
2001–2002	T. Wingate Andrews	Yes	No	56.4
	High Point Central	Yes	Yes	60
	Southwest High	No	No	66.2
2002–2003	T. Wingate Andrews	Yes	No	51.7
	High Point Central	yes	Yes	60.7
	Southwest High	yes	No	72.2
2003–2004	no testing due to re-norming under the NCLB Act			
2004–2005	T. Wingate Andrews	No	No	35.2
	High Point Central	Yes	Yes	52.4
	Southwest High	Yes	No	73.7

Table 2

Cont.

School Year	High School	Met Expected Growth	Exceeded Expected Growth	Performance Composite
2005–2006	T. Wingate Andrews	No	No	42.1
	High Point Central	Yes	Yes	61.1
	Southwest High	Yes	No	70.7
2006–2007	T. Wingate Andrews	Yes	No	47.4
	High Point Central	Yes	Yes	62.1
	Southwest High	Yes	No	56.9
2007–2008	T. Wingate Andrews	No	No	44.3
	High Point Central	Yes	No	67.3
	Southwest High	No	No	62.5

Major issues, specifically desegregation in the 1960s through the attempted changes supported by the Board of Education in the 2000s with the High Point High Schools Choice Plan and redistricting, that have affected the schools' demographics have been noted throughout this dissertation. The shift in the number of Black students, White students, and other students of color from the time period beginning in 2002-2003, with the failure of the Phase VI portion of the 1999 Redistricting Plan, through the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, and eventually ending at the 40-year anniversary of T. Wingate Andrews High School in the 2008-2009 school year is also critical in understanding the High Point Area high schools. Table 3 outlines the demographic shifts

at all three high schools using Average Daily Membership (ADM) of total student population and the three subgroups, White, Black, and Other students of Color from 2002 to 2009 (NCDPI, 2002–2009).

Table 3

## Demographic Shifts of the Three High Point High Schools

School Year	School	ADM	Black	White	Other
2002-2003	TWAndrews	1149	65.3	28.2	5.6
2003-2004	TWAndrews	1148	67.8	24.3	7.9
2004-2005	TWAndrews	1115	69.6	20.8	9.6
2005-2006	TWAndrews	1037	69.8	17.9	12.0
2006-2007	TWAndrews	945	69.5	15.9	13.9
2007-2008	TWAndrews	886	71.8	13.0	13.4
2008-2009	TWAndrews	860	78.2	8.4	13.2

School Year	School	ADM	Black	White	Other
2002-2003	HP Central	1204	42.3	40.8	17
2003-2004	HP Central	1310	45.8	38.5	15.8
2004-2005	HP Central	1307	45.5	36.6	17.9
2005-2006	HP Central	1278	43.0	37.5	19.4
2006-2007	HP Central	1208	41.3	35.9	22.2
2007-2008	HP Central	1193	41.1	37.5	21.3
2008-2009	HP Central	1255	47.1	29.4	23.5

School Year	School	ADM	Black	White	Other
2002-2003	Southwest	1159	23.3	66.9	9.9
2003-2004	Southwest	1228	23.7	64.0	12.4
2004-2005	Southwest	1196	26.0	61.1	12.7
2005-2006	Southwest	1262	30.4	55.7	13.9
2006-2007	Southwest	1354	38.3	45.8	15.5
2007-2008	Southwest	1349	37.9	44.2	17.8
2008-2009	Southwest	1395	40.8	41.8	17.2

Within Table 3, T. Wingate Andrews High School's demographics shift rapidly during the time period of the High Point High Schools Choice plan and subsequent redistricting in the post-Choice Plan era. As noted below, Andrews' Black population and other students of color population increased from a combined total of 70.9% in 2002-2003 to 91.4% in 2007-2008. However, Andrews' White student population decreased from 28.2% in 2002-2003 to 8.4% in 2007-2008. Additionally, the impact of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan on Southwest High can be noted in the increase in the combined minority populations from 33.2% in 2002-2003 to 58% in 2007-2008. However, the total student population shown within the chart illustrates that Andrews had a significant student population decline from the post-redistricting population increase in the 2002-2003 school year, as evident in the decline from 1,149 students in 2002-2003 to 860 in 2007-2008, while the other two High Point area high schools saw student population increases.

### **What is Left of the High Point Choice Plan**

Throughout the winter and spring of 2004, the Guilford County Board of Education held many meetings and community forums to discuss the High Point High Schools Choice Plan (Guilford County Schools, 2004b). As the meetings developed and reaction of community members became more antagonistic, community protests and larger public commentary against the plan surfaced throughout the High Point and suburban High Point area (Guilford County Schools, 2004b).

The community discontent eventually led to the collapse of the High Point Choice Plan in 2005. In 2005, the Guilford County School Board of Education moved to

discontinue the high school reassignment plan that families, especially those from the Southwest High area, opposed (Guilford County Schools, 2005). This move to end the reassignment plan started the dismantling of the pieces of the High Point Choice Plan that impacted the remaining students matriculating in the magnet options under the original High Point Choice Plan. By 2008, the last group of students who started magnet options under the High Point Choice Plan had graduated and the Board of Education had lost support for making changes due to the difficult nature of the redistricting efforts after the Choice Plan. Similarly, Superintendent Dr. Terry Grier had left Guilford County to go to San Diego creating a vacancy for another superintendent to either focus on the imbalances in High Point and Guilford County or not.

Therefore, the results of the collapsing High Point Choice plan along with the other failed attempts to stabilize the vast amounts of White flight from T. Wingate Andrews High School led to decreasing enrollment at the high school. By 2008-2009, T. Wingate Andrews had an enrollment of 860 students with over 90% of the students being students of color (Guilford County Schools, 2008).

### **Summary**

Throughout this chapter, I explored the research surrounding the most significant attempt by Guilford County Schools to prevent resegregation at T. Wingate Andrews High School, the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. The High Point High Schools Choice Plan was grounded in the idea of magnet options and removal of attendance zones throughout the City of High Point. With the idea of using each high school facility to its fullest potential, the Choice Plan would also use diversity and socio-economic status to

prevent any one of the three high schools in High Point from becoming too homogeneous.

However, the pushback from the White community in and around Southwest High School led to an unravelling of the Choice Plan. Through significant community resistance and ultimately the Board of Education's loss of will, the Choice Plan collapsed and moved Andrews High School toward a heavily segregated population with over 90% of its students being students of color in 2008-2009. The progressive efforts to prevent a segregation tragedy at T. Wingate Andrews, a school with a storied integrated past, failed due to a plethora of factors including a strong, organized community movement to resist the plan, desire to hold the status quo of the past with clear attendance lines, and the inability of T. Wingate Andrews to become the beacon of success it was in the past. Ultimately, the story of T. Wingate Andrews demonstrates that history presents both successes and tragedies. However, with the school continuing to struggle after the 40 years of this case study, the research of T. Wingate Andrews brings to light some compelling findings.

In the next chapter, I will analyze the findings I presented in this dissertation. Using the scholarly literature and the findings of the historical research surrounding T. Wingate Andrews, Chapter V will bring clarity to how Andrews moved from success to segregation.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

#### **Introduction**

The establishment of T. Wingate Andrews High School in 1968 ushered in a new era in High Point, North Carolina and Guilford County that promoted desegregated schools through the creation of a model high school which was created from its inception to be completely integrated. By creating a school that would eliminate the segregation that had persisted in High Point, the city intended Andrews High School to serve as a model for other school districts in the American South to follow. However, the success of Andrews High School eventually faded over the next forty years. Within the 40-year span of this study, 1968 to 2008, T. Wingate Andrews changed from an integrated high school that mirrored the population of High Point with 70% White students and 30% Black students, to a school that in 2008 housed 90% students of color [over 70% Black] (DPI, 2009).

In the previous chapters, I explained both the historical record and research in the case of T. Wingate Andrews High School from its inception in 1968 until the end of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan in 2005. Throughout this chapter, I will analyze my findings on T. Wingate Andrews High School by considering the academic literature regarding resegregation and desegregation that I first examined in Chapter II. By doing so, I will show how Andrews was a unique attempt by the High Point City Schools to

create a desegregated high school that was integrated at its creation. This unique attempt was successful for 25 years, but ultimately moved from integration to segregation. Consequently, this analysis will also show how the merger of three smaller school districts into one large district led to segregation, which is a finding contrary to established academic research. Additionally, I will explain how race played a pivotal role in the outcome of T. Wingate Andrews. Lastly, the reasons for the final collapse from 1998 to 2005 of Andrews' status as an integrated school can be found in the fact that the good intentions propelling integration could not overcome the hard inevitabilities of White flight, preference for neighborhood schools, court decisions, and the loss of a desire to fight for policies that promoted desegregated schools within High Point and Guilford County Schools.

Analyzing the history of Andrews High School in relation to the existing research literature provides a clear portrait of how a well-intentioned, progressive school district failed to prevent resegregation despite a series of policies, attendance line revisions, and political influences. Ultimately, the goals of *Brown v. Board of Education* failed to be realized within High Point City and Guilford County Schools, thus resulting in a segregated T. Wingate Andrews High School.

### **A Unique Attempt at Integration**

As I researched T. Wingate Andrews from its inception in 1968 through the next forty years, it became apparent that the efforts by High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools were an honest, good-faith effort to fight segregation and prevent resegregation. However, forces exterior to both the boards of education in High Point

City and Guilford County undid the progressive efforts to prevent segregation and resegregation.

At its inception, T. Wingate Andrews was very different from other desegregation efforts in the American South. During the 1960s, High Point City Schools modeled many other school districts by closing the traditionally all-Black high school in the district (Siddle-Walker, 2009). In the case of High Point City Schools, William Penn High School was closed in 1968 and the students at this all-Black high school were forced to attend either High Point Central High School or the newly built T. Wingate Andrews High School (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). Although not the focus of this study, the loss of history for the all-Black high school, William Penn High School, was in line with other similar events throughout the American South (Stalnaker, 2013). However, the differences between the closure of William Penn and the establishment of T. Wingate Andrews and other desegregation efforts ended there. First, T. Wingate Andrews was built for the sole purpose to house students in an integrated high school. Unlike models seen across the Southern United States, Andrews was not an existing school but rather a new state of the art facility. Students who attended Andrews were welcomed into a new building. In particular, African American students were starting at a school that was built for them and their integrated White counterparts. The historical research from Chapter III noted that unlike other desegregation efforts, the students at William Penn did not offer significant pushback to the closing of their school because they were entering into a brand new state of the art school. As Siddle Walker noted (2009), most African American students who were part of desegregation efforts were

forced to attend the all-White high school. Although many, including Siddle Walker, have explained that the African American community lost much during desegregation, T. Wingate Andrews was for all intents and purposes a success, as many Andrews alumni later reflected upon (Coryell, 1999, January 12). Andrews was an exception. This exception was potentially what kept the school successfully integrated for 25 years.

Additionally, the initial efforts by High Point City Schools' Board of Education to have Samuel Burford, an African American educator, as the first principal at T. Wingate Andrews were contrary to the norm as well. Tillman (2004) found that when schools in the South integrated, most African American principals and teachers were fired, placed at Central Office, or demoted. In the case of Andrews, Burford was moved from the principalship at the all-Black William Penn High School to the principalship at T. Wingate Andrews (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). The fight to place Burford at Andrews was noted in Chapter III with then Superintendent Pruette fighting to move Burford to the Central Office and other places against the wishes of the Board of Education. Furthermore, the support by the Board of Education in High Point City Schools in 1968 regarding Burford's placement as principal at Andrews was also significantly different. According to Tillman (2004) and Siddle Walker (2009), personnel decisions regarding African American employees made during desegregation were often subtle, secret, and not publicized. African American communities accepted the unwanted placement of Black school district employees as a cost of student integration, according to Siddle Walker (2009). However, the High Point City School Board's overruling of Superintendent Pruette's recommendation for Burford on five

separate occasions led ultimately to a public press conference in which the Board of Education placed Burford at Andrews. This action not only differed from other school districts' desegregation personnel decisions, but it also provided a public display of support for an African American educational leader (High Point Board of Education, 1968, April 25). Although Burford did not stay at T. Wingate Andrews for more than three years due to his eventual retirement, the progressive stance by the High Point City Schools Board of Education was very different from other desegregation efforts in the American South.

### **Merger Leads to Segregation**

As High Point City Schools, Greensboro City Schools, and Guilford County Schools developed into a new larger school district of Guilford County Schools in 1993, subtle changes were occurring in the background that led to resegregation in High Point. Once High Point City Schools merged with Guilford County Schools, parents were able to move within the much larger Guilford County proper for schools that matched their desires. Thus, the trend that started slowly in the late 1980s of White families moving to the suburbs from the city of High Point accelerated in the early 1990s with rapid White flight out of the urban areas of High Point. This accelerating White flight became more and more the norm in the new Guilford County Schools, where the massive shift in demographics went unaddressed until the late 1990s at the end of Dr. Jerry Weast's tenure as superintendent.

Correspondingly, the rapid White flight of the early to mid-1990s accelerated the growth of Southwest High School, which initially was part of Guilford County Schools

and not High Point City Schools. Southwest was also originally not located within the city of High Point and drew from a more suburban and rural White student population. Similarly, the previous district lines between T. Wingate Andrews High School and Southwest High School were eliminated due to both schools now being in the same school district, Guilford County Schools. To further eliminate the clear dividing lines between the areas that fed into both T. Wingate Andrews High School and Southwest High School, the City of High Point annexed the area surrounding Southwest in 1995 (Annexations, 2015) and increased its overall population from 69,428 before the merger in 1990 to 85,839 after the annexation of the Southwest area and during the 2000 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

The merger with Guilford County Schools created a large county district, which eliminated the need for geographic city lines and generated a larger educational agency that would encompass all of High Point into Guilford County Schools. This shift from geographic lines led to a need to create school attendance lines based on neighborhoods. The attendance lines based on neighborhoods would harm the past integration efforts at Andrews. Similarly, the area's success at integration also created a latent passive resistance within the White community which stemmed from the de jure segregation ideas of the Pearsall Plan of the late 1950s (Chafe, 1981). In other words, the integration of T. Wingate Andrews promoted success superficially, as noted by 25 years of successful integration, while it allowed for a continuation of de facto neighborhood segregation even as High Point expanded. Therefore, White families who lived in High Point during the 1980s and early 1990s promoted desegregation on the surface, but

continued to live in all-White or predominantly White neighborhoods until they had the means to move to more segregated all-White neighborhoods in the Southwest area in the mid to late 1990s and 2000s.

Additionally, the American South, North Carolina, and more specifically High Point continued a level of segregation by fostering neighborhood schools (Clotfelter, 2004). Simply, the separation of the districts before the merger of High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools allowed for geographic lines to slow White flight to the more rural Southwest High School area which had fewer resources than Andrews High. However, once the merger was completed, the disparity in resources between T. Wingate Andrews and Southwest High were eliminated due to both being in the same school district. This merged district allowed for the acceleration of White flight on another note by creating two equally resourced schools initially.

In summary, this study found that the merger of two smaller districts into one larger district led to more segregation, which differs significantly from accounts in the established research literature. As noted in Siegel-Hawley and Frankenberg (2012), for example, the large school district in Jefferson County, Alabama (the area that houses the city of Birmingham) split into multiple school districts thereby creating a splintering effect that would ultimately lead to more segregation in that city and area. Conversely, High Point City, Greensboro City and Guilford County school districts merged and did not splinter. Ironically, however, this merger generated negative effects to school integration similar to places like Jefferson County, Alabama that splintered. After the combining of two smaller city districts with the larger county district, T. Wingate

Andrews High School experienced resegregation. School attendance zones established after the merger created neighborhood-based school attendance lines that eventually accelerated Andrew High School's emergence as a segregated urban school that stood in contrast to the more rural, more White Southwest High School. The neighborhood-based attendance lines allowed previously all White or predominantly White neighborhoods to continue to remain in the Southwest attendance zone and generate perpetual White privilege, a national phenomenon noted by Bobo (2001). Moreover, families in the White neighborhoods were allowed to continue sending their students to predominantly White neighborhood schools including Southwest High School.

To further emphasize the significance of the merger and the use of neighborhood lines, both High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools were declared unitary and desegregated prior to merger (Gilmore, 1972). Simply, since both prior school systems were declared unitary the combined system was considered unitary under judicial precedent (Freeman, 1992). This declaration of unitary status allowed the merged system to avoid any concerns from the federal courts regarding issues of potential racial segregation. Therefore, the use of residential neighborhood lines that reflected separate White neighborhoods and minority neighborhoods as school attendance zone lines created corresponding neighborhood schools in the 1990s in High Point which were essentially predominantly White or predominantly minority in nature.

Additionally, after the merger, Guilford County Schools under the leadership of Superintendent Dr. Jerry Weast, realized that the neighborhood model was accelerating resegregation at T. Wingate Andrews with White flight to Southwest High School as the

primary culprit. As noted in Chapter III, Weast and the Board of Education attempted to design a Redistricting Plan to prevent this resegregation from occurring. The Redistricting Plan of 1999, which contained Phases V and VI, was designed to redistrict High Point and prevent resegregation. However, as I noted, this plan was eventually voted down by the Guilford County Board of Education during the implementation timeframe which arrived in 2003 under the new Superintendent Dr. Terry Grier (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 10). The proposed Redistricting Plan would have shifted neighborhood lines to allow for more White students to attend T. Wingate Andrews and more students of color to attend Southwest High School. Unfortunately, the attendance lines drawn according to residential lines had the unintended consequence of also allowing parents to know which neighborhoods to buy homes in to avoid attending T. Wingate Andrews and the more urban population that attended that school (Coryell, 1999, January 28). As Siegel-Hawley (2013) explained, the lure of neighborhood schools only allowed for further residential segregation. Residential segregation which led to school segregation generated a perpetual cycle that left unchecked would continue a pattern of predominantly one race schools.

Similar to Cuban's (2010) research regarding schools in Austin, Texas, the failure of redistricting efforts by the Guilford County Board of Education led to creating magnet and choice programs to attract White students to minority schools to counter de facto segregation based on residential segregation. This strategy however failed to focus on the main issue, which was the existence of White neighborhood schools (Cuban, 2010). The increased growth of White neighborhoods like those around Southwest High allowed

parents to stay in their status quo comfort zone of sending their child to their neighborhood school. Even with programs and policy changes in High Point such as magnet options and the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, the enduring lure of neighborhood schools was too powerful.

Accordingly after 2003, Superintendent Grier and the Board established magnet options in the hopes of creating racial balance without directly confronting the existence of White neighborhood schools and White flight. However, similar to the cases of Louisville, Kentucky, Charlotte, North Carolina, and Chattanooga, Tennessee, as described by Siegel-Hawley (2014), magnets in High Point did not stop the lure of neighborhood schools due to the desire of students and their families to attend schools with their peers from their neighborhoods. Ultimately, the High Point High Schools Choice Plan collapsed under pressure from Southwest area parents and lobbying groups (Guilford County Schools, 2005; Hayes, 2006, January 9). In the case of T. Wingate Andrews, White parents knew the neighborhood-based school attendance lines after the 1993 merger and the 1999 Redistricting Plan, and thus parents could buy a home and move into an area that allowed the perpetuation of White neighborhood school privilege and the opportunity for their children to attend Southwest High.

### **Race Still Mattered**

As the previous section suggests, lying subtly beneath the political and policy efforts in High Point, race still surfaced as a major factor in the outcome of T. Wingate Andrews. In the mid- to late 1990s, the economy in the United States and in particularly High Point, North Carolina was thriving and created a housing boom that saw homes

being built at a rapid pace. As noted in Chapter III, this housing boom in High Point was primarily noticeable around the Southwest High School area (Coryell, 1997, January 13). The houses being built were for middle to upper class families. As noted in Siegel-Hawley (2014) in her studies of Charlotte, Richmond, Chattanooga, and Louisville, the boom in housing for middle class and upper class families led to greater White flight to those neighborhoods. Similarly in Guilford County, with the growth of new neighborhoods near Southwest, High Point witnessed accelerating White flight from the urban area of High Point to the suburban area near Southwest (Coryell, 1997, January 13). As noted by Orfield (2001), cities, in this case High Point, were losing White students to suburban areas rapidly. Furthermore, with the accelerated movement of White families to the suburban areas near Southwest, rapid neighborhood segregation was causing the schools in High Point to see rapid resegregation (Deacle, 1997, January 28).

With the significant relocation of White families to the suburbs around Southwest High School, issues related to racial diversity and disparity at both Southwest High School and T. Wingate Andrews were of grave concern for the Guilford County Schools Board of Education as noted in Chapter III. I explained how the Board of Education advocated having more White students attend Andrews High School under the 1999 Redistricting Plan. In the pursuit of diversity, the Board of Education attempted to counter White flight by redrawing attendance lines in ways that would have compelled White families to send their students to T. Wingate Andrews High School and African American families to send their students to Southwest (Martin, 1997, November 21).

These efforts were intended to stall the demographic shifts at the two schools. As noted in Chapter III, Black community members “argued strongly for racial equity and against what they said was a misguided fear” in attending Andrews High School (Holeman, 1997, April 29, p. A2). However, there was significant resistance against what White families considered to be forced busing throughout the White community in High Point (Martin, 1997, August 12). The idea of busing students to create the desired level of diversity upset many White parents who had specifically bought homes in the Southwest area to avoid Andrews and, as they noted, its lower test scores and safety issues (Martin, 1997, August 12). Hiding behind the pretext of safety and test scores allowed White parents in the Southwest area to avoid using race as an issue. However, the inevitable resistance due to race became overwhelming in the fight that saw the Redistricting Plan of 1999 fail. The resistance of White Southwest area families can best be summed up in a quote from a Gordon Road area resident, “I don’t have a problem with Andrews. I have a problem with diversity” (Coryell, 1999, A2).

Although the Redistricting Plan of 1999 was not implemented completely, GCS attempted one last time to increase racial diversity at T. Wingate Andrews with the High Point High School Choice Plan. As I noted in Chapter IV, parent resistance to potential busing under the High Point High School Choice Plan generated similar negativity to the Redistricting Plan in 1999 (Olsen, 2004, February 6). The development of constituent groups such as the noted ABC of Guilford County that was dominated by White Southwest High School parents, created more racial tension and complicated the effort designed to alleviate the resegregation struggles at Andrews High School (Buchanan,

2004, February 23). In addition, as Siegel-Hawley (2013) and Frankenberg and Diem (2013) noted, school choice can potentially deepen inequalities at predominantly minority majority schools by allowing some high performing students to depart to predominantly White schools. Indeed, under the Choice Plan, some Andrews students departed in order to attend Southwest (Olsen, 2004, May 9). This loss of students at Andrews only decreased enrollment and did little to promote the overall diversity goals within the Choice Plan. In the end, the Choice Plan was not only being resisted by White parents on the exterior of the program, but also was being hurt from the interior by having students leave T. Wingate Andrews High School. Such events at Andrews demonstrated how race still mattered in schooling in the early 2000s in the Southern United States.

### **Good Intentions Meet Hard Inevitabilities**

The last key finding in this historical case study regarding T. Wingate Andrews was how the good intentions of the Board of Education were unsuccessful against the seeming inevitability of resegregation in High Point. Knowing that T. Wingate Andrews was created as an integrated model school for others to follow in 1968 and that it remained racially balanced until the 1993 merger, the realities of fighting for desegregation against maintenance of the status quo created some hard inevitabilities for the school board to fight. These hard inevitabilities included White passive resistance to desegregation that resulted in White flight, residential neighborhood costs that served as impediments to desegregation, court decisions that weakened the legal basis for desegregation, and the loss of desire to fight for integration. Through an explanation of how these hard inevitabilities impacted Andrews, I explain how the initial good

intentions of continuing an integrated T. Wingate Andrews by the Board of Education were unsuccessful in the end.

### **White Flight**

T. Wingate Andrews High School was established as an apparent success in 1968 with an integrated student body and an African American principal. However, there was passive White resistance stemming from the traditions of the Pearsall Plan (1955). The passive White resistance as noted by Chafe (1981) allowed White families to move to the suburbs around Southwest High School and create segregated neighborhoods in the late 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s. The segregated neighborhoods around Southwest operated under a set of unwritten rules that allowed for the students from those neighborhoods to attend segregated neighborhood schools (Chafe, 1981). Additionally, with White flight from the urban area of High Point, White families were allowed to create pockets of Whiteness in the suburbs around Southwest similar to the findings of Frankenberg (2013). Thus, T. Wingate Andrews' student body would draw from an urban zone of minority neighborhoods while Southwest High would draw students from a suburban zone of White neighborhoods. By having two distinctly different attendance zones that were racially segregated due to White flight, passive resistance would shift to active resistance in the late 1990s and 2000s.

Consequently, the passive White resistance noted by Chafe (1981) would eventually become political power for the aforementioned White parents who moved to the Southwest zone in the 1990s and 2000s. Since the Southwest area had little to no Black constituents who would advocate for promotion of desegregation and attendance of

their students to T. Wingate Andrews, political power became more consolidated in the hands of parents near Southwest. With the power of the constituency holding greater sway over the Board of Education in Guilford County, elections were used by parents to change the direction of the Board of Education similar to other areas noted by Frankenberg (2013). The political prowess of the Southwest area parents undid the 1999 Redistricting Plan, particularly the Phase V and Phase VI portions previously mentioned, and allowed for a continuation of de facto segregation based on residential lines. Also, the use of political power also undid the High Point High Schools Choice Plan as seen in Chapter IV. The Choice Plan would be eventually undone due to the same factors mentioned regarding redistricting and parental desires to promote neighborhood schools over desegregated schools. Resistance to the High Point Choice Plan showed the powerful nature of de facto segregation in Guilford County and led to the ultimate loss of desegregation. Thus, the failure of the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, against the wishes of Board of Education representatives from High Point who attempted to fight de facto segregation, was a loss due to the power of the parental constituencies that elected Board of Education members who shared the same neighborhood school ideology (Guilford County Schools, 2005, December 19). By shifting the Board to a more pro-neighborhood philosophy, the political will of the Board to fight resegregation at T. Wingate Andrews slowly faded. Therefore, the power of de facto segregation echoed the sentiment that Whites would advocate for desegregation, but were unwilling to give up their White neighborhood school privilege gained during White flight.

### **The Price of Residential Neighborhoods**

Additional economic factors compounded issues regarding the fight for neighborhood schools over desegregated schools and the increased political power of the Southwest community due to White flight. After the merger of High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools in 1993, the suburbs around High Point experienced a housing boom. White parents used this period of economic growth to move to the areas around Southwest High School as previously mentioned. Additionally, the benefits of living in the City of High Point, where many White families had moved from, were granted to the zip codes and areas around Southwest High once High Point annexed that area in the 1990s (Annexation, 2015). So, the families who fled the urban nature of T. Wingate Andrews High School but wanted the benefits of living in the city were able to get the best of both worlds in the Southwest area.

In High Point, the shift at T. Wingate Andrews and Southwest was less noticeable until the 2000s, when High Point granted housing permits for another 2000 homes in the Southwest area (Guilford County Schools, 2003, February 17). This additional housing was promoted by strong housing growth in the Southwest area and a desire for families to move from inner city High Point. However, the new homes demonstrated the financial separation between Southwest's and T. Wingate Andrews' constituencies and its accompanying racial imbalance. Similar to Frankenberg's (2003) research, the national economic boom benefited Whites more than populations of color and in the case of High Point this was very true. Furthermore, data from the 2000 census, as referenced by Frankenberg (2003), showed growing levels of persistently high residential segregation

for Blacks and the growing power of White flight to create commanding fixtures of neighborhood segregation in the 2000s.

With the growth of the economy, it should be noted that the buying of homes in the Southwest area became a key point also in the resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews. As noted by ABC Guilford member Garth Hebert, who eventually won a seat on the GCS Board of Education, “families are using their feet and wallet to avoid” the High Point High Schools Choice Plan (Talent, 2007, April 12, p. A1). This comment also reemphasized the ideology that White parents, who would also determine the election of the Board of Education outcomes, continued to use their power at the ballot box, the residential housing market, and vocal protests to avoid sending their students to T. Wingate Andrews. Accordingly, as Clotfelter noted (2001), nationally the racial patterns of enrollment shifted in urban areas due to the power of White family purchasing power in the residential market. In other words, Hebert was alluding to the fact that parents, particularly White parents in this case, were spending their money to move away from T. Wingate Andrews’ attendance zone. Thus, as Siegel-Hawley (2013) noted, attendance lines for schools would be determined by residential lines, which were determined by housing costs and property values.

Knowing that inner city families lacked the economic resources often to move to the Southwest area, Southwest’s attendance zone and neighborhoods were primarily driven by the power of middle class and upper middle class families, who were predominantly White. Simply, poor minority families could not afford to move to the Southwest area. Additionally, this urban poverty, which was heavily connected to racial

lines, created economic differences that led to racial differences in neighborhood housing and ultimately school demographics. In the case of T. Wingate Andrews, the research showed that White flight was connected directly to neighborhoods, which were often out of the price range of the poor minority parents living in the Andrews' attendance zone (Whitehorne, 2006, February 15). Thus, the predominantly White parents who moved away from Andrews' attendance zone did not want their student or students to be subjected to a return to the school which they just left. Therefore, the redistricting efforts in 1999 and the High Point High Schools Choice Plan created deeper resentment among families that had just used their purchasing power to flee the Andrews' attendance zone for Southwest High School.

### **Court Decisions**

During 1990s and 2000s, court decisions that placed the power of schooling in local control also emphasized a shift which would further impact resegregation. As noted in Chapter II, United States Supreme Court decisions in the 1990s moved away from desegregation policies and leaned more to providing local control to school districts which were previously declared unitary or desegregated. The local control decisions also allowed school districts to disregard de facto segregation, as in the case of Southwest High and T. Wingate Andrews, since the combined Guilford County School system was unitary. Similar to Orfield and Eaton's research (1996), the judicial decisions took an approach that would de-emphasize desegregation litigation by claiming that the school district was already desegregated in the past and therefore the courts had no standing to become involved. Consequently, by allowing for de facto segregation and emphasizing

local control of schools in policy development, the judiciary was taking a hands-off approach that would ultimately place all control regarding school demographic makeup to be in the hands of the local board of education. This shift under the court system allowed for a perpetuation of White constituency control within the Southwest area due to the aforementioned White flight that occurred in the 1990s and 2000s.

Noting the power shift from a hands-on approach designed to litigate any potential segregation issues in schools to a more hands-off approach that allowed school districts to handle segregation in house, Orfield (2001) noted the judiciary created an environment for resegregation. In the case of T. Wingate Andrews, the merged Guilford County Schools could do little judicially to fight resegregation. Furthermore, with boards of education being elected by their constituencies in Guilford County, the power of the White constituency near Southwest High School, which had few constituents of color, led to a political shift ending decades of progressive approaches fighting segregation in the Guilford County and High Point areas. Hence, the move to have more local control over school districts counter to the prior years in the 1970s and 1980s, which saw litigation in support for desegregation from the federal level, created an environment which left little desire for local communities to push against resegregation by using the court system.

In the 2000s, two other court cases moved the school districts away from desegregation policies. The United States Supreme Court moved the nation further away from promoting desegregation in the *Parent Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No.1* case which the Court famously struck down using race in creating balance in school systems. Chief Justice Roberts stated, “The way to stop discrimination

on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race” (*Parents Involved in Community Schools*, 2007). Additionally, the U.S. Supreme Court also ruled that race-based student assignment programs were no longer necessary if the school system was declared unitary (*Meredith*, 2007). Thus, Guilford County Schools was in a no-win situation as community groups held the power of the ballot box and the power of the courts to promote the desire to maintain the status quo over the will to fight for desegregation at T. Wingate Andrews.

### **Loss of Desire for Integration**

As noted in Chapter II, the peak percentage of Black students attending majority White schools was in 1988 and began to fall in the 1990s (NCES, 1999). Similarly, Andrews was racially balanced in 1988 with 55% White students and 45% Black students (NCES, 1988). However, the decline of Black student populations attending majority White schools coincided in High Point with the merger of High Point City Schools and Guilford County Schools. This unique coincidence would ultimately be the beginning of a lack of desire among the people of High Point, and more specifically the Southwest High School area in High Point, to fight against the rapid increase of racial segregation that developed in the 1990s and 2000s at the expense of T. Wingate Andrews.

Within the case of T. Wingate Andrews, I exposed the fact that community groups promoted political agendas at both the Board of Education level as well as the County Commissioner level in order to force their issues surrounding neighborhood schooling over desegregation efforts (Hoggard, 4/14/2004). With both economic power and lobbying power due to a large constituency, the Southwest High area in High Point

was able to leverage its neighborhood power to lobby political will and ultimately the GCS Board of Education. With little to no desire to fight strong neighborhood groups like ABC of Guilford County, desegregation advocates and progressive Board of Education members lost sway over the direction of policies in GCS. To further prevent the tide of desegregation from returning to High Point, the lobbying power ABC of Guilford County also politicized educational issues such as the Redistricting Plan of 1999 and the High Point High Schools Choice Plan. The politicization of the education system in Guilford County, more specifically High Point, would eventually force progressive Board members and desegregation advocates to accept the status quo resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews. Accordingly, the power of the predominantly White constituency of Southwest parents over the Board of Education led to school board members being forced to either side with the constituency or be voted out of office. Thus, the community of High Point and eventually Guilford County as a whole used its political control to move the Board of Education further away from the progressive ideology that wanted to eliminate the inequities generated at T. Wingate Andrews and Southwest High toward an acceptance that although segregation was wrong, neighborhood schools and allowing students to stay in areas where they lived was more important than promoting desegregation (Guilford County Schools, 2006, February 21). Therefore, the idea of preventing resegregation was unattainable at all levels due to lack of desire to stymie the status quo and perpetuation of de facto segregation in neighborhoods where students attended schools with students who look just they do.

### Summary

Throughout this chapter I analyzed the research surrounding T. Wingate Andrews High School and how its move from integration to segregation fits within the larger context of national resegregation research. Although there are several areas where Andrews' story mirror trends in other school districts that saw resegregation occur, my research highlights differences that show why Andrews' story must be told. By analyzing how T. Wingate Andrews High School was created and thrived for nearly 25 years, the unique attempt at cementing a legacy of integration was contrary to other desegregation attempts across the Southern United States. Likewise, as Andrews moved from an integrated school toward segregation in the 1990s due to the merger of High Point City Schools with Guilford County Schools, my research adds to existing research on resegregation by demonstrating that not only a fragmentation of a school district, but also a merger could lead to resegregation. Additionally, as Andrews moved to become a segregated school, I found that race still mattered and impacted a progressive school district attempting to prevent resegregation through redistricting and other assignment policies. Lastly, in reviewing the story of T. Wingate Andrews and the academic research on resegregation, I captured how White flight, the price of residential housing, court decisions, and the loss of a desire to fight for integration created the perfect storm which led to how the good intentions to prevent resegregation at Andrews met with the harsh inevitabilities of the 1990s and 2000s in High Point, North Carolina.

In the final chapter I will review the lessons learned from the disappointing story of Andrews' move from integration to segregation. Finally, I will conclude this

dissertation by answering the question of “Was the integration of T. Wingate Andrews worth it even though the school is now a segregated shell of its past self?”

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CONCLUSION**

In 1968, the creation of a completely integrated high school in High Point, North Carolina amidst the specter of segregation was viewed as an apparent major success. T. Wingate Andrews High School was a model school and considered by many in the American South to be the roadmap for how school systems could desegregate. Although the Black community lost William Penn High School, T. Wingate Andrews became a school that other districts attempted to emulate. Unfortunately, the storied beginnings of Andrews would soon fade into the past and the historic school would fall victim to resegregation.

#### **Lessons Learned**

The initial beginnings of T. Wingate Andrews High School showed a path for other school districts to follow in the late 1960s. Although not the focus of this study, the significant losses within African American communities elsewhere in desegregation efforts were not present for the most part at Andrews. By bringing together both White and Black students under the roof of a brand new high school in 1968, High Point City Schools avoided many of the issues cited in both Tillman (2004) and Siddle Walker's (2009) research. Additionally, the ability of T. Wingate Andrews to thrive as an integrated high school for the 25-year period from 1968 to 1993 showed that integration could survive and be successful in the post desegregation era. Furthermore, by starting

the high school under the leadership of an African American principal, Samuel Burford, Andrews High also illuminated that a recently integrated school could be successful under the leadership of a Black principal. Therefore, this unique attempt regarding the initial integration of T. Wingate Andrews High School should be considered the model for how to handle the difficult problems encountered during desegregation.

However, High Point City Schools eventually gave into the need to merge with Guilford County Schools and Greensboro City Schools due to declining enrollment, changing pupil population patterns, an eroding tax base, facilities utilization, and a need for a unified commitment to quality education (High Point Board of Education, 1986, June 19). Unfortunately, the merger led to the demise of the integration of T. Wingate Andrews. After the merger, the acceleration of White flight out of High Point to the suburbs near Southwest High School became a major problem that would ultimately create two very different high schools, T. Wingate Andrews serving predominantly minority students and Southwest High serving predominantly White students (NCDPI, 2002–2009). The White flight of students from Andrews High School to the Southwest High School area generated significant student population growth at Southwest High which would force the Guilford County Schools Board of Education to create a plan to deal with overcrowding and a significant lack of student diversity at both Andrews and Southwest. Through the use of Redistricting Plans and the High Point High Schools Choice Plan, the Guilford County Board of Education attempted to counter the aforementioned White flight and overcrowding. However, the enduring lure of

neighborhood schools and the lack of success of magnet programs created an environment where the progressive strategies failed in the end.

To further complicate matters, latent racism further prevented the actualization of goals established in the 1999 Redistricting Plan and High Point High Schools Choice Plan. With the powerful economic force of a residential housing boom near Southwest, White families fled the urban area of High Point and argued that T. Wingate Andrews was academically inept and unsafe. However, the arguments from the White families who fled Andrews to attend Southwest were clearly racial as noted from the comments of Southwest area parents, ABC of Guilford County, and real estate developers as seen in Chapters III and IV. Therefore, the impact of race on the outcome of T. Wingate Andrews was a major factor 30 to 40 years after the school's creation.

Additionally, the story of T. Wingate Andrews' move from integration to segregation demonstrated the politicization of education at the expense of a school. In the case of Andrews, the powerful constituency of Southwest area parents who used lobbying, economic power, and the ballot box created an environment where progressive policies would be undone by the desires of parents to maintain the status quo. Unwilling to change and accept the need for increased diversity, the powerful Southwest community was able to prevent redistricting attempts, magnet programs, and an aggressive choice plan from being successful. The coupling constituency power with the Board of Education's loss of desire to fight for desegregation forced T. Wingate Andrews to accept the outcomes of a community unwilling to promote diversity and integration. Simply, the strength of the forces against integration at T. Wingate Andrews in the 1990s and 2000s

made the demise of the once integrated school a reality and moved the school toward segregation.

### **Was it Worth the Effort?**

As I researched the story of T. Wingate Andrews High School, I became more and more convinced that the school was a victim of a perfect storm that ultimately led to the school's resegregation. Although the story is compelling, the reality that a strong progressive board of education failed to stop the school from becoming a segregated high school 40 years after its inception is concerning. However, the apparent success of Andrews' beginnings shows why the initial integration of T. Wingate Andrews was worth it. Consequently, the story of how Andrews became segregated after merger draws significant contrast to the accomplishments of the school's inception. Through the benefits of 25 years of being integrated, the efforts of the Guilford County Schools' Board of Education were necessary and worth it but failed to achieve the progressive outcomes needed to maintain the benefits of an integrated past in High Point.

Although Siddle Walker (2009) and Tillman (2004) argue that desegregation had unintended consequences for the African-American community, Andrews was an exception. The apparent benefits of integration at T. Wingate Andrews lasted 25 years from 1968 to 1993. By having an integrated school for 25 years, students at Andrews potentially benefitted psychologically and educationally according to Ladson-Billings (1999/2012). Although this study focused on the history of Andrews and not necessarily the students, the benefits of integration for the students at Andrews helped theoretically create a population of adults that may have further understood people of different races

and became more open to inter-racial marriage and integrated neighborhoods (Patterson, 1997). Additionally, African-American students who attended Andrews until 1993 potentially improved in overall education, housing, employment, cultural recognition, and self-concept as noted by Klarman (2007). Without the progressive thinking of the High Point City Schools' Board of Education in 1968, students in High Point would have not received the likely rewards that only come from an integrated school.

Moreover, Andrews High School and the efforts by the Guilford County Board of Education in the 1990s and 2000s were necessary because it created an environment that promoted high academic achievement and positive student contact with students of different races. As evidenced by the demographic information in Chapters III and IV, T. Wingate Andrews slowly shifted from integrated to segregated. However, over the majority of the school's history, Andrews was more integrated than segregated. Because of its integrated status from 1968 until the 1990s, Andrews' students had "access to networks of information and opportunities" as noted by Orfield and Frankenberg (2007, p. 292). Thus, by attending school in an integrated environment, students from T. Wingate Andrews were provided an opportunity to learn about each other in ways that help fight implicit bias and explicit racism like students profiled in Lopez (2003) and Valencia (1999/2015). Without the attempts of the Board of Education to fight segregation and slow resegregation in High Point, students at Andrews would have lost friendships with peers of different races as well as the ability to gain academic perspectives from their integrated peers in their classrooms. Simply, the need for

students to attend school with others who differ from them in race was a benefit as noted by Patterson (1997), Klarman (2007), and Orfield (2007).

Lastly, the efforts of combating the resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews by the Board of Education brought to light the need to continue the struggle for equity and social justice in educational settings that are slowly moving back to pre-*Brown* status (Orfield, 1996). Without the power of the judiciary, due to the more recent judicial reversals in the *Parents Involved* (2007) and the *Meredith v. Jefferson* (2007) cases, school districts must attempt to create policies and procedures that stifle efforts by communities to resegregate. Although de facto residential segregation is very difficult to prevent due to individual family economic decisions and overwhelming bias in residential housing (Seigel-Hawley, 2013), school districts must continue to create ways to generate the benefits of integrated schools and integrated classrooms. Consequently, the efforts made to fight for integration and prevent resegregation in the case of T. Wingate Andrews High School were necessary because of the moral obligation of the Board of Education and the need to fight for the storied past of Andrews. Andrews' apparent successes of the past showed that integration could not only work, but could have lasting benefits if school district efforts are continued for the benefit of students.

### **Final Thoughts**

With this dissertation focusing on the first 40 years of T. Wingate Andrews High School's history, the unfortunate events that led to this historic high school's resegregation should not be lost. The history of Andrews showed that integration, when focusing on creating the benefits of a new school with a strong Black principal, was

worth it. However, as Andrews High School moves closer to 50 years in age, the school that was once designed to hold 1,420 students only housed 744 students in 2013, just five years after the parameters of this study (NCES, 2013). Additionally, the school's demographic decline and resegregation can also be noted during the same post-five-year period observing that T. Wingate Andrews in 2013 only housed 9.5% White students and 90.5% minority students as compared to the 70% White and 30% Black student makeup found in 1968 (DPI, 2013). Therefore, as noted earlier, the eventual resegregation of T. Wingate Andrews was a victim of hard inevitabilities. Ultimately, the fate of T. Wingate Andrews continues to show that a once integrated model high school with a storied past could fall to a point that those currently attending will not have the benefits of a desegregated model but rather a tragic segregated school.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education, 396 U.S. 19. (1969).
- Annexations by Decade. (2015). City of High Point Planning and Development Department. Retrieved from <https://www.highpointnc.gov/DocumentCenter/View/551>.
- Anonymous. (1997). Editorial: Sooner or later someone must decide—School redistricting can't hope to answer all questions. *Greensboro News and Record*. Newspaper Clippings. Retrieved from UNCG Jackson Library.
- Anonymous. (2004, November 2). Local voters back Kearns, Cooke, but not ABC slate. *Greensboro News and Record*. Retrieved from [http://www.greensboro.com/editorial/local-voters-back-kearns-cooke-but-not-abc-slate/article\\_bc77b24c-50ce-5c21-9778-40b16523ea74.html](http://www.greensboro.com/editorial/local-voters-back-kearns-cooke-but-not-abc-slate/article_bc77b24c-50ce-5c21-9778-40b16523ea74.html)
- Apple, M. (2006). Producing inequalities: Neoliberalism, neo-conservatism, and the politics of educational reform. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalization, and social change* (pp. 468-489). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Batchelor, J. E. (2015). *Race and education in North Carolina: From segregation to desegregation*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Bobo, L. D. (2001). Racial attitudes and relations at the close of the twentieth century. In N. J. Smelser, W. J. Wilson, & F. Mitchell (Eds.), *America becoming: Racial*

*trends and the consequences Vol. I* (pp. 264–301). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brantlinger, E. (2003). *Dividing classes: How the middle class negotiates and rationalizes school advantage*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Brown v. Board of Education, 348 U.S. 886 (1955).

Brown, J. (February 23, 1986). School Merger: A point of View. *The High Point Enterprise*. Retrieved from High Point Enterprise Archives.

Buchanan, B. (2004, February 23). Only High Point gets ‘choice plan.’ *Greensboro News and Record*, p. A1. Retrieved from [http://www.greensboro.com/news/education/only-high-point-gets-choice-plan/article\\_52f34894-44d8-5151-b28a-8364bad1da00.html](http://www.greensboro.com/news/education/only-high-point-gets-choice-plan/article_52f34894-44d8-5151-b28a-8364bad1da00.html)

Celcelski, D. S. (1994). *Along freedom road: Hyde County, North Carolina and the fate of black schools in the south*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Chafe, W. D. (1981). *Civilities and civil rights*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Civil Rights Act of 1964. § 7, 42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq (1964).

Clotfelter, C. T. (2001). Are whites still fleeing? Racial patterns and enrollment shifts in urban public schools, 1987–1996. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(2), 199–221.

Clotfelter, C. T. (2004). *After Brown: The rise and retreat of school desegregation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2008). School segregation under color-blind jurisprudence: The case of North Carolina. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & The Law*, 16(1), 46–86.
- Coleman, J. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. OE-38001. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED012275.pdf>
- Combs, H., & Olsen, S. (2004, April 8). NAACP Oks ‘choice’ plan. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Coryell, H. (1997, January 13). School redistricting continues to spark questions. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Coryell, H. (1999, January 12). Andrews is ‘target.’ *The High Point Enterprise*, pp. A1–A2.
- Coryell, H. (1999, January 20). Parents flock to redistricting forum. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Coryell, H. (1999, January 22). Andrews backers speak out for diversity. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B2.
- Coryell, H. (1999, January 23). Redistricting plan gains supporters. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Coryell, H. (1999, January 28). Andrews Community delivers clear message. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Coryell, H. (1999, February 23). 15 arrested in redistricting protests. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.

- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cuban, L. (2010). *As good as it gets: What school reform brought to Austin*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Deacle, R. (1997, January 28). Redistricting committee targets major concerns. *The High Point Enterprise*, pp. B1, B4.
- Deacle, R. (1997, February 4). School redistricting gets serious. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Deacle, R. (1997, February 11). Redistricting committee fields flood of questions. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B4.
- Deacle, R. (1997, March 28). Redistricting maps. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. C1.
- Deacle, R. (1997, April 8). School board clarifies redistrict goals. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1–A2.
- Epps, E. G. (1999). *Race and school desegregation: Contemporary legal and educational issues*. Retrieved from <http://www.urbanedjournal.org/articles/article003.pdf>
- Fernandez, J. (2004, April 14). Students opt for siblings' schools. *Greensboro News and Record*, p. A1. Retrieved from [http://www.Greensboro.com/news/education/students-opt-f0r-siblings-schools/article\\_daf996db-769f-59e5-a594-a2385c015e9b.html](http://www.Greensboro.com/news/education/students-opt-f0r-siblings-schools/article_daf996db-769f-59e5-a594-a2385c015e9b.html)
- Fernandez, J. (2004, July 23). School to begin work on tech labs. *Greensboro News and Record*. Retrieved from [http://www.greensboro.com/news/education/school-to-begin-work-on-tech-labs/article\\_d140692d-be55-5cd0-aedf-ebf0d35ba7b0.html](http://www.greensboro.com/news/education/school-to-begin-work-on-tech-labs/article_d140692d-be55-5cd0-aedf-ebf0d35ba7b0.html)

- Frankenberg, E. (2009). Splintering school districts: Understanding the link between segregation and fragmentation. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 34(4), 869–909.
- Frankenberg, E., Lee, C., & Orfield, G. (2003). *A multiracial society with segregated schools: Are we losing the dream?* Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.
- Frankenberg, E., & Diem, S. (2013). School board leadership and policymaking in changing political environments. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 45(2), 117–142.
- Frankenberg, E., & Ryan, J. (2011). Five miles away, a world apart: One city, two schools, and the story of educational opportunity in modern America. *American Journal of Education*, 118(1), 91–95. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Frankenberg, E., & Orfield, G. (2007). *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Freeman v. Pitts, 503 U.S. 467 (1992).
- Gilmore et al. v. High Point City Board of Education, High Point, North Carolina, 51-G-63 (1963).
- Gilmore et al. v. High Point City Board of Education, High Point, North Carolina, 51-G-63 (1964).
- Gilmore et al. v. High Point City Board of Education, High Point, North Carolina, 51-G-63 (1969, July 16).

Gilmore et al. v. High Point City Board of Education, High Point, North Carolina, 51-G-63 (1969, August 19).

Gilmore et al. v. High Point City Board of Education, High Point, North Carolina, 51-G-63 (1970, May 19).

Gilmore et al. v. High Point City Board of Education, High Point, North Carolina, 51-G-63 (1972, March 22).

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1993). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1996, December 10). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1997, January 10). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1997, March 27). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1997, April 8). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1998). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting

Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (1999). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting

Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (2000). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting

Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (2001). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting

Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (2002). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting

Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (2002, December). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at Guilford County Board of Education Meeting Greensboro, North Carolina.

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003a). *Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project*

*Ordinance Revision*. [Meeting minutes revision]. Retrieved from

[http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

[\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, January 14). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

[Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, January 18). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

[Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, January 19). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

[Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, January 30). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

[Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, February 6). *Minutes of Board of Education*.

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

[Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, February 10). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from <http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/>

gcsnc/District/Board\_of\_Education\_-\_Group/Meeting\_Materials/2003\_ Meeting\_Materials

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, February 11). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_ Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_ Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, February 17). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_ Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_ Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, February 24). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_ Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_ Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, March 3). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_ Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_ Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, March 11). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_ Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_ Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, March 18). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, May 29). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, June 4). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, June 10). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, June 22). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, July 1). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, August 5). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, August 28). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, November). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2003, December 9). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2003\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2003_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, January 13). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, January 24). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, January 29). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, February 5). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, March 2). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, March 16). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, March 25). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, April 20). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, August 26). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, September 23). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, September 27). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from <http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/>

gcsnc/District/Board\_of\_Education\_-\_Group/Meeting\_Materials/2004\_Meeting\_Materials

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, October 12). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, October 28). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2004, December). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, January). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, February 8). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, February 24). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, March 24). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, August 9). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, August 25). *Minutes of Board of Education.*

[Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, September 13). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, September 20). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, September 25). *Minutes of Board of*

*Education.* [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)

- Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, September 29). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)
- Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, October 27). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)
- Guilford County Board of Education. (2005, December 19). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2005\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2005_Meeting_Materials)
- Guilford County Board of Education. (2006, January 10). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2006\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2006_Meeting_Materials)
- Guilford County Board of Education. (2006, January 19). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2006\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2006_Meeting_Materials)
- Guilford County Board of Education. (2006, February 9). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2006\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2006_Meeting_Materials)
- Guilford County Board of Education. (2006, February 21). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2006\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2006_Meeting_Materials)

gcsnc/District/Board\_of\_Education\_-\_Group/Meeting\_Materials/2006\_Meeting\_Materials

Guilford County Board of Education. (2007). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2007\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2007_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Board of Education. (2008). *Data console of student information*. Retrieved online from GCS Online May, 2014.

Guilford County Schools. (2004a). *Educational Operational Guidelines*. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/files/\\_sZBNn\\_/43d25cbec7b611943745a49013852ec4/ed\\_operational\\_guide.pdf](http://www.gcsnc.com/files/_sZBNn_/43d25cbec7b611943745a49013852ec4/ed_operational_guide.pdf)

Guilford County Schools. (2004b). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from [http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board\\_of\\_Education\\_-\\_Group/Meeting\\_Materials/2004\\_Meeting\\_Materials](http://www.gcsnc.com/pages/gcsnc/District/Board_of_Education_-_Group/Meeting_Materials/2004_Meeting_Materials)

Guilford County Schools. (2004c). *High Point High Schools Choice Program Outline*. Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA36\\_/aeb454ee8e27366e3745a49013852ec4/just\\_the\\_facts.pdf](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA36_/aeb454ee8e27366e3745a49013852ec4/just_the_facts.pdf)

Guilford County Schools. (2004d). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment A. Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA32\\_/d2c2609b903c6f1c3745a49013852ec4/attacha\\_andrews.pdf](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA32_/d2c2609b903c6f1c3745a49013852ec4/attacha_andrews.pdf)

Guilford County Schools. (2004e). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment B. Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA32\\_/8d74db1e39b2a1a33745a49013852ec4/attachb\\_highpointcentral.pdf](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA32_/8d74db1e39b2a1a33745a49013852ec4/attachb_highpointcentral.pdf)

Guilford County Schools. (2004f). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment C.

Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA33\\_/](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA33_/)

8acd1b13fa9429e93745a49013852ec4/attachc\_southwest.pdf

Guilford County Schools. (2004g). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment D.

Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA33\\_/](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA33_/)

d3cc0a5a8b216a2d3745a49013852ec4/attachd\_socio\_economic\_diversity.pdf

Guilford County Schools. (2004h). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment E.

Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA34\\_/](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA34_/)

dcc1090d75fef49d3745a49013852ec4/attache\_transportation\_estimate.pdf

Guilford County Schools. (2004i). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment F.

Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA34\\_/](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA34_/)

ce5131bf6cce2ca13745a49013852ec4/attachf\_marketing\_recruit.pdf

Guilford County Schools. (2004j). High Point High Schools Choice Plan Attachment G.

Retrieved from [http://www.edlinesites.net/files/\\_sZA35\\_/](http://www.edlinesites.net/files/_sZA35_/)

b20c161745a319d13745a49013852ec4/attachg\_questions\_answers.pdf

Hayes, K. (2005a, August 7). Board members aware of redistricting challenge. *The High*

*Point Enterprise*, p. A2.

Hayes, K. (2005b, August 7). Redistricting again? Guilford school board takes another

look at redrawing borders. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.

Hayes, K. (2005c, August 7). The right Choice Plan? Concept sought to adequately use

seats at two schools. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.

- Hayes, K. (2005, August 13). Redistricting revisited: Parents struggle to make sense of school proposal. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2005, September 26). Officials: Treat schools evenly. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2005, October 13). Grier discusses educating poor, minority students. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2005, October 18). Andrews to stay on track. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2005a, October 29). New map conflicts with intent of choice plan. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A3.
- Hayes, K. (2005b, October 29). School map shows few changes from existing plan. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2005, December 20). Choice plan may change: Board studies ways to revamp how students are assigned to schools. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2006, January 2). Ups and downs: School system passed and failed during 2005. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A3.
- Hayes, K. (2006, January 9). School board tackles districts. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Hayes, K. (2006, January 11). Redistricting talks resume. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A2.
- Hayes, K. (2006, April 21). New anti-Grier petition surfaces. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A2.

Herrin, J. (1986, August 29). Merger has most support in High Point. *High Point Enterprise*. Retrieved from High Point Enterprise Archives.

High Point Board of Education. (1959, August 27). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1962, January 12). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1965, September 16). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1966, June 16). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1968, April 18). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1968, April 25). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1969, July 17). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1969, August 2). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1969, November 20). *Minutes of Board of School Commissioners, City of High Point*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1983, April 7-8). *Minutes of Board of Education at Camp Caraway*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

High Point Board of Education. (1986, June 19). *Minutes of Board of Education*. [Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.

- High Point Board of Education. (1987, April 13). *Minutes of Board of Education*.  
[Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.
- High Point Board of Education. (1990, May 17). *Minutes of Board of Education*.  
[Meeting Minutes]. Meeting presented at High Point City Schools Board of Education Meeting, High Point, North Carolina.
- Hoggard, D. (2004, April 14). The High Point mess. *Hogg's Blog*, p. 362. Retrieved from <http://www.hoggsblog.com/?p=302>.
- Hoggard, D. (2004, April 27). A recruitment challenge? *Hogg's Blog*, p. 373. Retrieved from <http://www.hoggsblog.com/?p=373>.
- Holeman, J. (1997, April 27). Redistricting process clears another hurdle. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. D1.
- Holeman, J. (1997, April 29). School redistrict panel faces dissent. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A2.
- Hyams, B. K. (1997). Oral history. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), *Educational research methodology, and measurement: An international handbook* (pp. 91–95).  
Tarrytown, NY: Elsevier Science Inc.
- Joint Committee on Education. (1983, March 17). *Minutes of Joint Committee on Public Education at Guilford County Schools*. [Meeting Minutes].
- Kahlenberg, R. D. (2001). *All together now: Creating middle-class schools through public school choice*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.

- Klarman, M. J. (1994). How Brown changed race relations: The backlash thesis. *The Journal of American History*, 81(1), 81–118.
- Klarman, M. J. (2007). *Brown v. Board of Education and the civil rights movement*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Knopfler, V. (2005, February 1). Residents voice concerns. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Knopfler, V. (2005, February 3). Board hears concerns. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Knopfler, V. (2005, April 6). School issues unresolved. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Knopfler, V. (2005a, April 7). Many students get wish. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Knopfler, V. (2005b, April 7). Officials: 1 in 5 didn't get 1st choice. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A2.
- Knopfler, V. (2005, September 14). School plan stumbles: Creation of attendance minizone finds little favor with board members. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of a nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory, and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In P. Lurance, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is—race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2012). Through a Glass Darkly: The Persistence of Race in Education Research & Scholarship. *Educational Researcher*, 41(4), 115–120. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41477775>
- Lippman, L., Burns, S., McArthur, E., & National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Urban schools: The challenge of location and poverty*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Lockette, T. (2010). Unmaking Brown. *Teaching Tolerance*, 37, 28–32. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 68–94.
- Mackey, C. (1978). *A case study of desegregation in the public schools of High Point, North Carolina: 1954–1972*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Mahoney, J., & Rueschemeyer, D. (2003). *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, S. (1997, June 17). Redistricting panel approves map. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Martin, S. (1997, August 12). Board responds to redistricting panel's request. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Martin, S. (1997, November 21). Mappers struggle with attendance zones. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. B1.
- Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 551 U.S. (2007).

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

Missouri v. Jenkins, 515 U.S. 70 (1995).

Morris, A. A. (1989). *The constitution and American public education*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Morris, V.G. & Morris, C.L. (2002). *The price they paid: Desegregation in an African American community*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1988–1993), (1994–1997), (1998–2013). Common Core of Data. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/tableGenerator.aspx>

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2009). School report card: T. W. Andrews. *The ABCs of Public Education*. Retrieved from <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/abcs/>

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2013). School report card: T. W. Andrews. *The ABCs of Public Education*. Retrieved from <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/abcs/>

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2016). School report card: T. W. Andrews. *The ABCs of Public Education*. Retrieved from <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/abcs/>

North Carolina General Statutes. Ch.115C, Article 35, Sections 274–295. Former North Carolina General Statues. 1956.

Oklahoma City Board of Education v. Dowell, 498 U.S. 237 (1991).

Olsen, S. (2004, February 6). 200 Gather at Andrews. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.

- Olsen, S. (2004, February 11). Choice plan passes. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Olsen, S. (2004, April 27). Improving high schools remains goal. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Olsen, S. (2004, May 9). Students get school choices. *The High Point Enterprise*, p. A1.
- Orfield, G. (1991). *The closing door: Conservative policy and black opportunity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Orfield, G. (1993). School desegregation after two generations: Race, schools, and opportunity in urban society. In H. Hill & J. E. Jones (Eds.) *Race in America: The struggle for equality*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Orfield, G. (2001). *Schools more separate: Consequences of a decade of resegregation*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.
- Orfield, G., & Eaton, S. E. (1996). Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of *Brown v. Board of Education*. New York, NY: The New York Press.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (Eds.) (2007). *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in America's public schools*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2013). *Educational delusions?: why choice can deepen inequality and how to make schools fair*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E., & Garces, L. (2008). Statement of American Social Scientists of Research on School Desegregation to the U.S. Supreme Court in

- Parents v. Seattle School District and Meredith v. Jefferson County. *Urban Review*, 40(1), 96–136. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier.
- Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E., & Lee, C. (2003). The resurgence of school segregation. *Educational Leadership*, 60(4), 16–20.
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2006). *Racial transformation and the changing nature of segregation*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.
- Orfield, G., & Yun, J. (1999). *Resegregation in American Schools*. UCLA: The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6d01084d>
- Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, 551 U.S. 701 (2007).
- Patterson, J. T. (2001). *Brown v. Board of Education: A civil rights milestone and its troubled legacy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, O. (1997). The ordeal of integration: Progress and resentment in America's "racial" crisis. Washington, DC: Civitas/Counterpoint.
- Peeler, J. (2004, September, 2). Letters to the editor. *Greensboro News and Record*. Retrieved from [http://www.greensboro.com/editorial/letters-to-the-editor/article\\_f5321b42-666f-5fc3-bb3e-c6ac6d9885cc.html](http://www.greensboro.com/editorial/letters-to-the-editor/article_f5321b42-666f-5fc3-bb3e-c6ac6d9885cc.html)
- Perry, D. (1983, April 4). Editorial: Most Parents oppose school consolidation. *The High Point Enterprise*. Retrieved from High Point Enterprise Archives, p. B1.
- Pierce, M. (1993). *History of the High Point Public Schools: 1897–1993*. Charlotte, NC: Delmar Printing.

- Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Rumberger, R., & Palardy, G. (2005). Does segregation still matter? The impact of student composition on academic achievement in high school. *Teachers College Record, 107*(9), 1999–2045. New York, NY: Columbia University.
- Rury, J. L. (2006). Historical research in education. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 323–332). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schwarzen, C. (1997, June 3). Redistricting planners gear for segregation. *The High Point Enterprise*, pp. A1–A2.
- Shapiro, T. (2004). *The hidden cost of being African American: How wealth perpetuates inequality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Siddle Walker, E. V. (1993). Caswell County training school, 1939–1969: Relationships between community and school. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*(2), 161–182.
- Siddle Walker, V. (1996). *Their highest potential: An African-American school community in the segregated south*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Siddle Walker, V. (2009) Second-class integration: A historical perspective for a contemporary agenda. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(2), 269–284.
- Siegel-Hawley, G. (2013). Educational gerrymandering? Race and attendance boundaries in a demographically changing suburb. *Harvard Educational Review, 83*(4), 580–612.

- Siegel-Hawley, G. (2014). Mitigating *Milliken*? School district boundary lines and desegregation policy in four southern metropolitan areas, 1990–2010. *American Journal of Education*, 120(3), 391–433. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Siegel-Hawley, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2012). Southern slippage: Growing school segregation in the most desegregated region of the country. *The Civil Rights Project*. University of California Press.
- Sitkoff, H. (1981). *The struggle for black equality*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Stalnaker, A. (2013). *Desegregating Hickory High School, 1955–1975: Capturing the Untold Stories*. Greensboro, NC: University of North Carolina Greensboro Press.
- Student Accounting Reports. (2008). *Grade, race, sex reports*. Retrieved from <http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/fbs/accounting/data/>
- Talent, T. (2007, April 12). Board oks school choice plan. *The High Point Enterprise*. Retrieved from High Point Enterprise Archives, p. A1.
- Tillman, L. C. (2004). (Un)Intended consequences?: The impact of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision on the employment status of black educators. *Education and Urban Society*, 36(3), 280–303.
- Thomas, J. (1997). Placing diversity above quality. *Greensboro News and Record*. Newspaper Clippings. Retrieved from UNCG Jackson Library.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *High Point, North Carolina population: Census 2000 interactive map, demographics, statistics, quick facts*. Retrieved from <http://censusviewer.com/city/NC/High%20Point>
- Valencia, R. (1999). *The evolution of deficit thinking*. London: Falmer.

- Valencia, R. R. (2015). *Students of color and the achievement gap: Systematic challenges, systematic transformations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wells, A. S., Holme, J. J., Revilla, A. T., & Atanda, A. K. (2009). *Both sides now: The story of school desegregation's graduates*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Whitehorne, J. (2004, May 28). Leaders of school group step aside. *Jamestown News*. Retrieved from [http://www.jamestownnews.com/news/top\\_stories/leader-of-school-group-step-aside/article\\_13906f25-18f6-5b0f-9ae8-5b110a528427.html](http://www.jamestownnews.com/news/top_stories/leader-of-school-group-step-aside/article_13906f25-18f6-5b0f-9ae8-5b110a528427.html)
- Whitehorne, J. (2004, June 16). Complaint filed against ABC of Guilford County. *Jamestown News*. Retrieved from [http://www.jamestownnews.com/news/top\\_stories/complaint-filed-against-abc-of-guilford-county/article\\_6358ad75-f114-5e00-9a28-26cf51beac7c.html](http://www.jamestownnews.com/news/top_stories/complaint-filed-against-abc-of-guilford-county/article_6358ad75-f114-5e00-9a28-26cf51beac7c.html)
- Whitehorne, J. (2006, February 15). Family struggles with redistricting issues. *Jamestown News*. Retrieved from [http://www.jamestownnews.com/news/school\\_news/family-struggles-with-redistricting-issues/article\\_660d3c92-3565-506d-8b34-37f3a5a45904.html](http://www.jamestownnews.com/news/school_news/family-struggles-with-redistricting-issues/article_660d3c92-3565-506d-8b34-37f3a5a45904.html)