

**PROGRESS TOWARD DESEGREGATED EDUCATION**  
**IN METROPOLITAN HARTFORD**

**A REPORT TO THE PLAINTIFFS**

**March 2004**

**Leonard B. Stevens, Ed.D.**

PROGRESS TOWARD DESEGREGATED EDUCATION IN METROPOLITAN HARTFORD:  
A REPORT TO THE PLAINTIFFS

March 2004

To: Counsel for the Plaintiffs, *Sheff v. O'Neill et al*

From: Leonard B. Stevens, Ed.D.

This report is based on analysis of data and information pertaining to implementation of the Stipulation and Order of January 22, 2003 in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, as well as site visits to 13 schools, including interviews of their principals, and other interviews conducted in the period December 8-12, 2003. A list of the schools visited and the interviewees is attached. I was accompanied on the site visits and interviews by another of your consultants, Marcia B. Yulo.

**I. The Agreement**

A. The Agreement<sup>1</sup> covers the schools years 2003-04 through 2006-07, a period of four years.

B. The core goal of the Agreement is to place at least 30 per cent of the Minority students who are resident in Hartford in "reduced isolation," i.e. in desegregated schools as defined by the Agreement, by the end of the term of the Agreement (2006-07).

C. The Agreement defines desegregated schools as those with Minority populations not exceeding the aggregate Minority enrollment in the Sheff Region<sup>2</sup> plus 30 percentage points.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stipulation and Order, January 22, 2003, *Sheff v. O'Neill et al*.

<sup>2</sup> The Region is 22 school districts, including Hartford. See Attachment A.

D. The Agreement envisions the use of three instruments to attain the goal: inter-district magnet schools, the Open Choice program, and inter-district Cooperative Programs. The first two programs--magnet schools and Open Choice--clearly are intended to be the major contributors to the goal.

1. With regard inter-district magnet schools, the Agreement recognizes two types: 1) Regional Magnet Schools serving students from multiple school districts including Hartford, and 2) Host Magnet Schools governed by the Hartford Public Schools and serving students from suburban school districts as well as Hartford.

2. With regard to attainment of the 30% goal, the desegregative results of the three programs are fungible--that is, a quantity of desegregation not accomplished by one program can be made up for by the others so long as the combined result of the three programs attains the 30% goal. The practical effect of this is to provide flexibility to the implementation process.

E. The Agreement requires the opening of two new Host Magnets in each of the four years of the Agreement, beginning in 2003-04. Each such Host Magnet is required to enroll approximately 600 students. As a result, by 2006-07 the Agreement is to produce eight Host Magnets that would enroll a total of approximately 4,800 students.<sup>1</sup>

F. The State, the Defendant in *Sheff*, is designated by the Agreement as "the convener and lead agency in the planning, design, implementation and evaluation of annual progress toward achieving the goal" of the Agreement. In other words, the State is charged with being Head Implementer of the Agreement.

G. The Agreement constitutes a "start-up plan."

1. The Agreement recognizes that even full attainment of the goals of the Agreement "may not obviate the need for further efforts at reducing student isolation" in the schools of

<sup>1</sup> The Agreement permits the State at its sole discretion to make one or more of these eight schools a Regional Magnet.

the Region.

2. With a view toward expanded desegregation efforts after 2006-07, the Agreement terms it "vital" that inter-district magnet schools, Open Choice and inter-district Cooperative Programs each "be developed to a meaningful level during the start-up plan so that each is in position to play a meaningful role in the final plan."

3. The Agreement provides that at least six months before the end of the term of the Agreement in 2006-07, the Parties will discuss progress made and possible future actions. At that time, absent an agreement on future action, each Party may seek Court intervention.

## II. Key Questions

This report is driven by these questions:

- A. Is implementation in compliance with the Agreement?
- B. What compliance problems, if any, have emerged?
- C. What is the outlook for attainment of the goals of the Agreement by 2006-07?

## III. Findings

A. At the time the Agreement was executed (the 2002-03 school year), 6% of Minority students in Hartford attended desegregated schools.<sup>4</sup>

October 2002 Enrollment				
	Minority	White	Total	% Minority
Hartford	21,691	1,042	22,733	95%
Desegregated	6%			
Sheff Suburbs	22,112	61,425	83,537	26%
Region Total	43,803	62,467	106,270	41%

<sup>4</sup> The Agreement estimated this number to be "approximately 10%." My calculation discounts Hartford Minority students in inter-district magnet schools that failed to meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement. If they were included, the figure would be 11%. This may account for the difference between my calculation above and the estimate in the Agreement.

B. At October 2003, Year I of the Agreement, 7% of Minority students in Hartford attended desegregated schools.

**October 2003 Enrollment**

	Minority	White	Total	% Minority
Hartford	21,587	1,012	22,599	96%
<b>Desegregated</b>	<b>7%</b>			
Sheff Suburbs	23,092	61,264	84,356	27%
Region Total	44,679	62,276	106,955	42%

1. For calculation of the 6% and 7% figures, see Attachment B.

2. Although a 1 percentage point gain over the prior year does not constitute non-compliance with the Agreement, the gain is so minimal as to represent a lost year on the four-year compliance path. Instead of four years in which to raise the 6% level to at least 30%, the State now has just three years.

C. The requirement to open in 2003-04 two Host Magnet schools enrolling a total of approximately 1,200 students was not met.

1. Two Host Magnets were opened. However, neither has an enrollment of approximately 600. One enrolls 450; the other enrolls 82. See Attachment C.

2. This represents non-compliance with the Agreement.

**Host Magnets Opened in 2003-04**

	Planned Grades	Hartford Enrollment	Suburb Enrollment	Total Enrollment	% Minority
Classical School	6-12	441	9	450	96%
Pathways to Technology	9-12	77	5	82	95%

3. Further:

- a) Neither school is desegregated.<sup>5</sup>
- b) Classical operated with no Grade 6.
- c) Pathways opened with Grades 9-10 only. It intends to add one grade a year until it houses Grades 9-12
- d) Both schools opened in temporary quarters.
- e) As of February 25, 2004, permanent homes for these schools in Fall 2004 had not been confirmed.<sup>6</sup>
- f) Although Classical will house Grades 6-12, plans to house all grades on one site are uncertain, and provision of athletic facilities for the high school is also uncertain.<sup>7</sup>

D. In 2004-05, Year II of the Agreement, three new Host Magnets are planned to open.

1. However, according to the plan of operation for each school, none of these schools will open with a magnet enrollment approximating 600. Nor will any two of them combined total approximately 1,200 seats in 2004-05.

Hartford's plan is to open these schools with one or two grades, then add a grade each subsequent year until the schools house their full complement of grades.

2. As a result, non-compliance in Year II of the Agreement is foreseeable with regard to the requirement to open two new Host Magnets with enrollments of approximately 600 each.

<sup>5</sup>At October 2003, the Minority student population in the Sheff Region was 42%. Therefore, schools must be 72% Minority or less to meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement (Region percentage plus 30 points). See Table above.

<sup>6</sup> Interview, Hartford Director of Magnet Schools, February 25, 2004.

<sup>7</sup> Interview, State staff, December 11, 2003.

**Planned Host Magnets to Open in 2004-05**

	Projected Grades	Projected Enrollment 2004-05	Enr @ Full Implementation
Noah Webster Elementary	PK-8	130	630 in 2008-09
Simpson-Waverly Elementary	PK-5	100	500 in 2008-09
University High School of Science & Engineering	9-12	100	400 in 2007-08

See Plans of Operation for these schools, October 2003.

E. The strategy of 'growing' magnet schools--opening with one or two grades, then adding a grade a year over subsequent school years until the full complement of grades is in place--is not uncommon with magnet schools, and it has planning advantages.

However, when an Agreement requires minimum enrollments by a particular year and when the timeline for completing the implementation of magnet schools stretches beyond the timeline of the Agreement, such a strategy is at odds with the terms of the Agreement.

Specifically, with regard to the timeline point, Host Magnets that are incomplete as of 2006-07 will not be in position to make their maximum contribution to the goal of the Agreement.

F. The plan for Host Magnets may well produce inter-district magnet schools that do not meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement. If this occurs, the Hartford Minority students in them will not contribute to meeting the goal of placing at least 30% of Hartford Minority students in desegregated schools.

1. The reason is this: with one exception (Capital College Magnet School), the plan for Host Magnets allocates seats in each Host Magnet so that 70% of the seats will be filled by Hartford students and 30% of the seats will be filled by students from suburban districts.

Given the demographics of Hartford (96% Minority), nearly all of the Hartford seats predictably will be filled by Minority students.

Given the history of the Regional Magnets, it is likely that a substantial percentage of the suburban seats in the Host Magnets will be filled by Minority students from the suburbs. This has been and is the experience of the Regional Magnets.

As a result, it is likely that the Minority percentage of enrollment in the Host Magnets will exceed the desegregation standard set forth in the Agreement.<sup>8</sup>

2. To illustrate: This year, the maximum Minority percentage allowable for a desegregated school is 72%.

If a hypothetical Host Magnet in 2006-07 enrolls 600 students on a 70-30 seat allocation; and if 91% of its Hartford students are Minority; and if 46% of its suburban students are Minority, the school's enrollment would be 78% Minority. See Table below.

At that level, the school would not meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement.<sup>9</sup> Thus, its 382 Minority students from Hartford would not count toward compliance with the 30% goal of the Agreement.

Should the Host Magnets attract white students from the suburbs at a lesser rate than the Regional Magnets to date, the compliance problem would be exacerbated.

---

<sup>8</sup> In my interview with State officials, it seemed clear that this matter had not been the subject of prior discussion and analysis.

<sup>9</sup> As with any desegregation standard, in this instance a Minority ceiling of metropolitan average plus 30 points, it is not wise enrollment planning to point schools precisely at the ceiling but, rather, to point them a number of points below it. Then, leeway is built into the construction of actual student enrollments for individual schools, and compliance with the standard is made more likely. This applies to Regional Magnets and Host Magnets alike.



**Hypothetical Host Magnet with 600 Seats**

	Enrollment		
	Seats	Minority	% Minority
Hartford seats	420		
Filled @ 91% Minority		382	
Suburban seats	180		
Filled @ 46% Minority		83	
TOTAL	600	465	78%

NOTE: 91% is the actual % Minority of the 2,153 Hartford students enrolled in inter-district magnets in 2003-04.

46% is the actual % Minority of the 2,202 suburban students enrolled in inter-district magnets in 2003-04.

See Attachment D.

G. The Regional Magnets, as a group, have no evident strategic approach to attaining enrollments whose racial composition comports with the desegregation standard of the Agreement. As a result, six do and three do not meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement. See Attachment C.

1. In 2003-04, three of them have a racial composition that does not meet the standard. If this pattern persists, their Hartford Minority students will not count toward compliance with the 30% goal of the Agreement in 2006-07.

**Regional Magnet Schools in Non-Compliance with the Desegregation Standard of the Agreement**

	% Minority Oct 2002	% Minority Oct 2003
Maximum % Minority per Agreement	71%	72%
Metropolitan Learning Center	76%	75%
Montessori Magnet School	79%	80%
Hartford Magnet Middle School	91%	85%

See Attachment C for percentages for all inter-district magnets.

2. These schools represent a desegregation anomaly: in the name of desegregation, they are drawing Minority students in quantity from school districts in the suburbs where their presence would contribute to racial diversity to a magnet school whose racial composition does not meet an agreed desegregation standard.

a. For many of these Minority students, this is a segregative pattern of student assignment since they are leaving districts with lesser concentrations of Minority students than the magnet school they are attending. The only exception to this pattern would be Minority students drawn to these magnets from Bloomfield, where the Minority proportion of enrollment (95% in 2003-04) is higher than at these three schools.<sup>10</sup>

b. At each of these three schools the majority of their suburban populations is comprised of Minority students.

c. By contrast, the University of Hartford Magnet School meets the desegregation standard of the Agreement. It does so because its admissions have a functional desegregative balance: mostly (but not all) Minority students from Hartford, and mostly (but not all) white students from the suburbs. A similar pattern prevails at Two Rivers Magnet Middle School, the International Baccalaureate (IB) Academy, Great Path Academy, and the Academies of the Arts and Mathematics & Science. See Attachment D.

3. In brief, the quantity of Minority students from Hartford is not the cause of failure of the above three schools to meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement. Hartford Minority students account only for 34% of all students in the Regional Magnets in 2003-04. (1,111 of 3,259. See Attachment D.)

4. The cause (and the cure) lies in the racial composition of their respective suburban populations. See Table

<sup>10</sup> In 2003-04: of 897 Minority students from the suburbs in Regional Magnets, 211 are from Bloomfield (24%); of 119 Minority students from the suburbs in Host Magnets, 27 are from Bloomfield (23%). Combined, the inter-district magnets enroll 1,016 Minority students from the suburbs; 238 are from Bloomfield (23%).

below.

**Students in Selected Inter-District Magnet Schools Fall 2003 by Residence**

	Maximum % Minority per Agreement				72%	
	Hartford Students Minority	Hartford Students White	Suburban Students Minority	Suburban Students White	Total	% Minority
Metropolitan Learning Center	162	7	270	134	573	75%
Montessori Magnet School	114	19	121	41	295	80%
Hartford Magnet Middle School	366	35	142	54	597	85%
UH Magnet School	188	17	54	136	395	61%

See Attachment D for student counts in all magnet schools.

H. The Host Magnets have a similar problem--none yet meets the desegregation standard of the Agreement. See Attachment C.

If this pattern persists their Hartford Minority students will not count toward compliance with the 30% goal of the Agreement in 2006-07.

**Host Magnet Schools and the Desegregation Standard of the Agreement**

	% Minority Oct 2002	% Minority Oct 2003
Maximum % Minority per Agreement	71%	72%
Breakthrough Magnet School	81%	75%
Sport & Medical Sciences Academy	96%	84%
Classical School		96%
Pathways to Technology HS		95%

1. Of the four Host Magnets, the only one to date that has succeeded at the threshold desegregation task--enrolling more white students (39) than Minority students (29) from the suburbs--is Breakthrough Magnet School. See Table below.

2. This year, 2003-04, the Host Magnets enrolled 54 white students from the suburbs while enrolling more than twice as many Minority students (119) from the suburbs. See Table below.

This pattern must be reversed if the Host magnets are to serve as instruments of desegregation.

### Students in Host Magnet Schools Fall 2003 by Residence

	Maximum % Minority per Agreement				Total	% Minority
	Hartford Students		Suburban Students			
	Minority	White	Minority	White		
Breakthrough Magnet School	124	13	29	39	205	75%
Sport & Medical Sciences	224	44	77	14	359	84%
Classical School	422	19	9	0	450	96%
Pathways to Technology HS	74	3	4	1	82	95%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>54</b>		

See Attachment D.

I. The Open Choice program enrolls less than two thirds of the students who wish to participate in it.

1. As a result, the contribution of Open Choice to attainment of the 30% goal in the Agreement is stunted.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Open Choice seats should be made available in the suburbs in direct relation to demand--in the interest of the Agreement. If 15 children arrived in a suburban school district on August 15 from Nebraska, there is no question that seats for them would be found when the school year opened. Indeed, if the families of 15 Open Choice applicants relocated from Hartford to the suburbs on August 15, seats for the children of the new residents would instantly be found. The issue is not seat availability; it is treating Open Choice students on the same basis as resident students. Currently, a dual standard applies: instant seat availability for resident students, situational availability for Open Choice students.

**Hartford Minority Students and Open Choice**

	2002-03	2003-04
Enrolled	806	809
On Wait List	541	459
TOTAL	1,347	1,268
% Served	60%	64%

See Attachment E.

2. The number of applicants wait-listed in 2003-04 is lower than the number a year earlier.

However, this is not the result of program expansion--the number of participants was increased by only three students.<sup>12</sup>

Nor is it necessarily an indication of diminished or leveled off family interest in the program, since there is no incentive for the program operator (CREC) to step up recruitment activity in Hartford in light of the chronic shortage of seats in the suburban districts for applicants to this program.<sup>13</sup>

J. If the existing inter-district magnet schools and the Open Choice program were operated at peak performance for the purpose of desegregation the number of Hartford Minority students placed in desegregated schools would be substantially higher than it is.

<sup>12</sup> One of the basic problems with expanding the Open Choice program is its funding. A district in the suburbs, receiving Open Choice students from Hartford, counts the student in its enrollment at 0.5 for basic state funding, then receives an additional \$2,000. If the district is simply filling an empty seat in a classroom that it would operate anyway, the subsidy works as a financial incentive for the district to make the seat available. However, if the incoming student is a high-cost student, the district could end up spending more than the subsidy. In other words, the reluctance of districts to make seats available to Open Choice is in part financially related. The current state financial formula does not address this reality.

<sup>13</sup> The Open Choice program was not advertised for 2003-04 in light of projected limited seat availability. Interview, CREC staff, December 8, 2003.

1. In 2002-03, instead of 6% of Hartford Minority students in desegregated schools, the figure would be 14%.

2. In 2003-04, instead of 7% of Hartford Minority students in desegregated schools, the figure would be 16%.

3. The difference between the actual and potential figures is attributable to 1) inter-district magnets that fail to meet the desegregation standard of the Agreement and 2) Open Choice applicants not placed in Open Choice but instead placed on a wait list.

**Actual and Potential Desegregation 2002-03 and 2003-04**

	OCT 2002	OCT 2003
<b>ACTUAL DESEGREGATION</b>		
Hartford Minority students in Inter-District Magnet Schools that Meet the Desegregation Standard	373	469
Hartford Minority Students in Open Choice	806	809
Factor for Inter-District Cooperative Programs (1% of Hartford Minority Students)	217	216
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,396</b>	<b>1,494</b>
% of Hartford Minority Students	6%	7%
<b>POTENTIAL DESEGREGATION</b>		
Total Above	1,396	1,494
Hartford Minority Students in Inter-District Magnet Schools that Fail the Desegregation Standard	1,034	1,486
Hartford Minority Students on Wait List for Open Choice	541	459
<b>Potential Total</b>	<b>2,971</b>	<b>3,439</b>
% of Hartford Minority Students	14%	16%

See Attachment B.

4. In other words, if the Agreement were managed for maximum desegregative effect, the Agreement would be substantially farther down the path toward compliance than it is.

K. In my view, the shortfall is not a product of the performance of the operating heads of the programs critical to the Agreement (Regional Magnets, Host Magnets, Open Choice).

Based on interviews of the Open Choice administrator, the Regional Magnet principals, and the Host Magnet principals, it is my clear impression that uniformly the field-based administrators are enthusiastic about their respective schools and programs, convinced that they are bona fide instruments of desegregation, committed to the goal of desegregation, and of the view that desegregated education is expandable given resources and direction.

L. In my view, the shortfall between actual and potential desegregation to date is attributable to the absence of rigorous centralized management of the implementation process.

1. Instead of goal-driven, centralized management of the process, implementation strategy and decision-making are delegated by the State to the operators of the programs that contribute to the results of the Agreement. Thus, Regional Magnets and Open Choice are delegated to CREC, and Host Magnets are delegated to Hartford.

2. Open Choice, Regional Magnets and Host Magnets are for all practical purposes compartmentalized operations, each left to its own affairs and essentially self-contained decision-making.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> As one example, the magnet themes for the Host Magnets--themes are a critical component in any magnet plan--were selected by Hartford in a school-based exercise unrelated to and pre-dating the Agreement. Yet, in light of the Agreement and the importance to it of the Host Magnets, the State did not revisit the themes to ensure they complemented the themes of the Regional Magnets, or made practical use of the popularity of certain themes in the experience of the Regional Magnets, or in fact had a survey-based promise to attract suburban students.

3. The overall process has no quarterback, no lead manager, no commander. On the other hand, and equally harmful to the process, the program operators have no Head Implementer to whom to turn for help, direction or coordination.

4. Instead of coordinating the program components, clearing away obstacles for the program operators, and monitoring for the purpose of identifying correctable needs--in brief, steering the process toward the 30% goal of the Agreement--the State permits the process to unfold virtually at will, limiting its role mostly to observation, unintrusive technical advice and distribution of state-level funding.<sup>15</sup>

5. In brief, the State does not play the role of Lead Agency in the implementation process as called for by the

---

<sup>15</sup>Undoubtedly, the State would disagree and would point to, among other things, its drafting of the Host Magnet plan, its staff monitoring of the process, its funding in the past of Regional Magnets and Open Choice, and its expected future funding of Host Magnets. In addition, subsequent to the Agreement, the position of Director of Magnet Schools was created in the Hartford Public Schools, and it was filled by a New Haven school administrator with magnet school experience. The position obviously was needed, and the State participated in funding it.

But creation of one position, plus three support staff, does not by itself cause eight Host Magnets to come on line by 2006-07 in a desegregated condition with approximately 4,800 seats. Nor does the drafting by the State of the master plan for the Host Magnets guarantee the translation of the plan into reality. Nor does sending State money to Hartford for the Host Magnets as they come into being pursuant to an established funding formula constitute hands-on involvement in the development and start-up of the schools. Nor, not incidentally, can the State point to the magnet school position in Hartford as an example of State engagement in the Agreement's implementation process, because the position is a Hartford Public Schools position, not a State position. Thus, the director is neither an agent of the State nor accountable to the State.

Simply put, the Agreement is not self-actualizing. The State performs as if it were.



Agreement.<sup>16</sup>

M. The Agreement makes reference to a task force convened by the Governor and General Assembly. The task force was to evaluate, among other things, "alternative funding methods for inter-district magnet schools" and report by January 15, 2003.

The task force disbanded after about two meetings and produced no report.

More recently, the State has proposed reducing by approximately \$11 million the funding of magnet schools statewide, including Regional Magnets in Greater Hartford (for example, see *Hartford Courant*, February 5, 2004, "Rowland Cuts Magnet Funding...").

---

" What would a Lead Agency do? For starters, it would uncover and address the types of problems identified in this Report.

For another, it would ensure that CREC's experience with successful magnet school development and operations was in fact brought to bear on the development and start-up of the Host Magnets in Hartford. From the vantage point of the Agreement, the issue is not who controls a magnet (CREC or Hartford) but whether the school works for the effectiveness of the Agreement.

For another, a Lead Agency would ensure that Hartford obtained access to start-up funding for Host magnets, since it is commonly accepted that the activities that precede the opening of magnets--staff training, program development, student recruitment, acquisition of instructional materials, etc.--are critical to a magnet's success. At present, supplemental State funds flow to magnets only after they open. The only potential source of pre-opening funds for the Host Magnets is the federal Magnet Schools Assistance Program, where Hartford is seeking funds but where funding is competitive and not guaranteed.

For another, a Lead Agency would regularly convene the principals of Regional and Host magnets as a means of sharing strategies among themselves and, in addition, as a device for exposing them to ongoing professional development as magnet administrators.

For another, a Lead Agency would revisit the themes selected for the Host Magnets with a view toward confirming their promise to be attractive to suburban students, without whom the Host Magnets will not serve as instruments of desegregation. There is no evidence that the themes for the Host Magnets were selected on the basis, in part, of surveys of suburban students and parents. See also footnote 14.

Having discontinued a study of magnet school funding as a means of identifying ways to improve it, the State proposes to reduce existing funding. Thus not only does an unsystematic process go unimproved but, in addition, a new funding crisis is created.<sup>17</sup>

#### IV. Conclusion

A. Non-compliance exists in 2003-04 with regard to the requirement that two Host Magnets be brought on line that year, each enrolling approximately 600 students.

B. Non-compliance in 2004-05 with the same requirement is foreseeable.

C. The Agreement says the State "shall be the convener and lead agency" in the Agreement's implementation process. The State is not playing this role but, instead, is playing an essentially passive role in implementation of the Agreement.

D. Given continuation of the implementation process in its current form, it is unlikely that the the core goal of the Agreement--at least 30% of Hartford Minority students in desegregated schools by 2006-07--will be attained.

Should this in fact occur, it will be the result of ineffective management or non-management of the implementation process, not an inherent limit on the practicability of desegregation in the Region.

---

<sup>17</sup>Making a poor situation worse is the antithesis of playing the role of Lead Agency to implement the Agreement.

The fact is that if the current funding crisis were cured instantly, the Hartford regional magnets would not be better off, they simply would be back to status quo ante--a situation of unsystematic funding that demands *ad hoc* solutions on an annual basis. Obviously, the new funding crisis has adverse implications for the State's ability to implement the Agreement. At the same time, resolution of the funding crisis should not be seen as a fresh step forward for the Agreement but, rather, as merely the removal of an impediment that the State itself placed in front of its own implementation capacity.

E. Centralized management and oversight of the Agreement's implementation process, rigorously performed, is indispensable for the Agreement to succeed in meeting its key goals:

1. "Plan, develop, open and operate two new Host Magnet schools of approximately 600 students each ...each year of the four year period" of the Agreement ....

2. "...each of the three instruments [inter-district magnet schools, Open Choice, and inter-district Cooperative Programs] [to] be developed to a meaningful level during the start-up plan so that each is in position to play a meaningful role in the final plan."

3. "... by the end of the term of [the Agreement] at least 30 per cent of Minority students residing in Hartford will have an educational experience with reduced isolation ...."



Leonard B. Stevens

**Visits and Interviews, December 8 - 12, 2003, in Hartford**

*State Department of Education:*

Betty J. Sternberg, Commissioner  
Commissioner's Staff Members and Counsel

*Capital Community College:*

Ira H. Rubenzahl, President

*Capitol Region Education Council:*

Bruce E. Douglas, Executive Director  
Nessa Oram, Open Choice program director

*City of Hartford:*

Eddie A. Perez, Mayor  
Hernan LaFontaine, Common Council

*Hartford Public Schools:*

I. Michael Borrero, Board President  
Elizabeth Brad Noel, Board Member  
Robert Henry, Superintendent  
Ed Linehan, Director of Magnet Schools

*School Visits including interviews of Principals:*

Breakthrough Magnet School  
Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts  
Greater Hartford Academy of Mathematics and Science  
Greater Hartford Classical School  
Hartford Magnet Middle School  
Metropolitan Learning Center  
Montessori Magnet School  
Noah Webster School  
Pathways to Technology High School  
Simpson-Waverly School  
Sport & Medical Sciences Academy  
Two Rivers Magnet Middle School  
University of Hartford Magnet School

---

Since December 12, 2003, I have had one telephone discussion with Dr. Douglas of CREC and three with Mr. Linehan of the Hartford Public Schools.