

[1965]

D. Horner

INFORMATION AND DATA RELEVANT

TO

COURT ORDER REQUIRING THE DESEGREGATION

OF THE

STARKVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Information compiled by:  
B. Hal Buchanan, Superintendent  
Starkville Municipal Separate School District

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. BACKGROUND OF INFORMATION ON RACIAL SEGREGATION	3
II. THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964	4
III. A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS IN THE STARKVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS - JULY 1, 1965 TO PRESENT DATE	5
A. July 1, 1965 - June 30, 1969	5
B. July 1, 1969 - To Date	9
IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF COURT ORDER AND STATUS OF DESEGREGATION PROCESS THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 1969	10
A. General Implementation of Court Order	10
B. Preparation for Transfer of Teachers	11
C. Transfer and Orientation of Teachers	12
D. Involvement of Patrons, Taxpayers, and Voters	12
E. Alternatives Open to School Board	13
F. Building Needs For This School District	14
G. Status of Bonded Indebtedness and Capabilities of the District	15

## THE DESEGREGATION OF THE STARKVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

### I. BACKGROUND OF INFORMATION ON RACIAL SEGREGATION

- A. The first Judicial test of racial segregation, which occurred not in the South but in Boston, Massachusetts in 1849, was brought by Benjamin F. Roberts on behalf of his daughter when he applied for admission to the nearest primary school; was refused and the case ended up before the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. This Court held that "maintenance of segregation is not an unreasonable act". This case came 29 years after the first elementary school for Negro children had been established in Boston, Massachusetts in 1820.
- B. After the Civil War the Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery. The Fourteenth Amendment, among other things, stated "No state shall on the basis of race, creed or color deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws". The Fifteenth Amendment gave the Negro the right to vote.
- C. Then came the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which gave citizenship and civil rights to Negroes the same as for white men. The Civil Rights Act of 1875, so the history books infer, was necessary to implement the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution.
- D. Education in the South after the Civil War provided no schools for Negroes at all. It was a crime in some states to teach slaves to read and write. Education of Negroes was done primarily by private, philanthropic and religious agencies and the Federal Government.
- E. Between 1865 and 1877 when the last federal troops were withdrawn from the South, the Freedmens Bureau established over 4,000 elementary schools for Negroes alone. (Note: We see from this historical record that segregated schools for Negroes in the South was set up not by Southerners, but by the Federal Government.) Custom kept segregated schools through the years.
- F. By 1896 every Southern state and some Northern states had laws requiring segregation of the races in schools.
- G. In 1896 the Supreme Court of the United States recognized state imposed segregation as constitutional in the Plessy vs. Ferguson decision which was handed down in 1896. Homer Plessy, an octoroon, boarded a train to travel from New Orleans to Covington, Louisiana; sat in a coach reserved for whites; the conductor told him to move; Plessy refused; the case ensued and finally came before the U. S. Supreme Court. The Court turned to the Massachusetts

opinion in Roberts vs. The City of Boston in formulating its decision and held that state imposed segregation was not prohibited by the Fourteenth Amendment. Segregation was not considered "a badge of servitude". In a dictum, or a side remark, the Court referred to the Massachusetts case and said that public education is "social" and that segregation in public education offered an example of a states power to segregate where social rights are involved. The Court added that while a state might segregate, it must secure "to each of its citizens equal rights before the law and equal opportunities for improvement and progress". Thus the "separate but equal" doctrine was established in 1896.

- H. Only three cases involving the question of racial segregation in education came before the Supreme Court between the years of 1896 and 1930. None of these cases was on the issue of segregation itself, but was on the issue of whether educational facilities for non-whites were equal to those provided for whites.
- I. Five cases before the Supreme Court, 1930 - 54, with each case involving "separate but equal principle" in regard to graduate and professional schools. In each case the courts decided that the states must provide equal facilities for Negroes within its borders or allow the Negroes to attend the white institutions with equal opportunities. With these five cases the Supreme Court chipped away bit by bit at the "separate but equal" doctrine.
- J. Then came the 1954 decision in "Brown vs. The Board of Education in Kansas City". This case involved five separate cases, all in one decision. The unanimous court opinion reads, "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."
- K. The "Brown decision" of the U. S. Supreme Court remanded the five cases to the lower courts "to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper. To admit to public schools on a racially, non-discriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases". Thus the United States Supreme Court established a new constitutional principle.
- L. During the period 1954 - 1966 over 400 law suits were filed on school desegregation and related issues. Over 400 laws and resolutions dealing with school desegregation have been passed by southern legislators. Over 300 lawsuits have been received in the South with the North coming in for some of them also.

## II. THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

- A. The Act contains eleven titles; we are primarily interested in Title IV which deals with desegregation of public education and with Title VI, dealing with federally assisted programs in education. Many people, quite erroneously,

believe that if school districts choose to forgo federal funds that desegregation is not required. Nothing could be farther from the truth because Title IV deals with desegregation of public education and provides that court decrees or Justice Department action might be brought against any school district simply from as little as a postal card which charges discriminatory treatment of the races in the schools.

- B. It was under the authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that the Commissioner of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was directed to report to the President and the Congress within two years of the enactment of this Title concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin under Title IV of the Act. Likewise, Title VI of this Act placed upon each federal department and agency the responsibility for devising regulations under which non-discrimination in federally assisted programs was to be implemented.

III. A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS IN THE STARKVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS - JULY 1, 1965 TO PRESENT DATE

A. July 1, 1965 - June 30, 1969

1. Prior to July 1, 1965 the School Board (Superintendent C. A. Johnson) submitted a desegregation plan in compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. This plan was rejected and the School Board was requested to submit another plan. The School Board requested a consultant from U. S. Office of Education - the consultant never reported to assist the School Board in drawing up a plan.
2. July 16, 1965 - The School Board (Superintendent B. Hal Buchanan) met with Dr. Elizabeth Cole of USOE and State Department of Education officials in Jackson and approved a desegregation plan which called for the desegregation of schools in three equal steps beginning with the 1965-66 session. These steps were:
  - a. 1965-66 - Freedom of Choice assignment of pupils in Grades 1, 2, 3 and Grade 12.
  - b. 1966-67 - Freedom of Choice assignment of pupils in Grades 1-6 and Grades 11 and 12.
  - c. 1967-68 - Freedom of Choice assignment of all children throughout the school district.

3. August 28, 1965 - U. S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, informed the School Board and Superintendent that complaints had been received about the implementation of the desegregation plan. The School Board's reply was to the effect that reports concerning this implementation were erroneous and that the plan was being implemented in good faith.
4. March 24, 1966 - A committee of school men from Mississippi, including the State Superintendent of Education and four school superintendents (which included Superintendent B. Hal Buchanan), held a conference in Washington with Mr. Harold Howe, II, U. S. Commissioner of Education, concerning desegregation in Mississippi. The group pointed out "in all good faith we would point out that harsh and intransigent enforcement of the law through a period of rapid transition could bring agony and distress to all elements of our population".
5. April 27, 1966 - A letter from Mr. David S. Seeley, Assistant Commissioner for Equal Educational Opportunities Programs of USOE, informed the School Board that the desegregation plan is subject to review periodically by the USOE to determine its adequacy to accomplish the purposes of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
6. April, 1966 - June, 1967 - Things went along rather smoothly with the desegregation plan which was in effect. Several efforts were made by USOE officials to get more integration of pupils and faculty. The School Board continually expressed its view that we were doing all we thought could be done under the circumstances in this school district.
7. June 26, 1967 - A letter was received from Mr. Harold B. Williams, Acting Assistant Commissioner of the Equal Educational Opportunities Program of the USOE, informing us that representatives of his office would visit us in the near future to evaluate the operation of the plan to determine whether it is adequate to satisfy the requirements of the Civil Rights Act and whether it will eliminate the dual school system in the district.
8. August 7-8, 1967 - Three representatives of the Equal Educational Opportunities Section of the U. S. Office of Education visited in Starkville, talked to teachers, administrators and parents, and subsequently made a report to USOE that progress was not satisfactory in eliminating the dual school system.
9. August 16, 1967 - Mr. Richard L. Fairley, Acting Regional Director, Equal Educational Opportunities Program of USOE, sent a letter advising us that it is the responsibility of school officials to adopt and carry out a desegregation plan which would provide for a unitary, non-racial system.

Mr. Fairley also advised that unless we can implement a plan to accomplish the elimination of the dual school system that federal financial assistance might be withheld.

10. August 31, 1967 - Letter sent to Mr. Fairley indicating that a long-range plan for the elimination of the dual school system is to be considered by the School Board.
11. September 20, 1967 - A proposal for faculty desegregation of Starkville Public Schools was sent to USOE.
12. November 7, 1967 - A letter was sent to USOE advising of additional efforts to make long-range plans for the elimination of the dual school system.
13. January 23, 1968 - A letter was received from Dr. Lloyd Henderson, Chief of the Office for Civil Rights, U. S. Office of Education, indicating that administrative proceedings would be instituted against the Starkville School District because no long-range plan or intention to submit one had been sent to the U. S. Office of Education.

A telephone call with Mr. Richard Baldau on January 23 forced him to read paragraph four from the School Board letter of November 7 that the School Board did intend to formulate a long-range plan to eliminate the dual school system. Mr. Baldau said, "This is one of the evils of the bureaucracy of the federal government".

14. February 6, 1968 - A letter from Mr. Peter Libassi, Director, Office for Civil Rights, USOE, indicated that administrative proceedings for cut-off of federal funds had been instituted against the school district.
15. February 10, 1968 - The "brown envelope" from USOE arrived which rather forcefully informed us that compliance proceedings for cut-off of funds were underway. The School Board continued to work on a plan for the elimination of the dual school system.
16. February 20, 1968 - The School Board authorized Chairman Millsaps, Superintendent Buchanan, Assistant Superintendent Muse to represent the School Board with the U. S. Office of Education in the presentation of a long-range plan for the elimination of the dual school system.
17. February 28, 1968 - Special meeting of the School Board to hear a report of the delegation to USOE. The following points constitute a resume of the report:
  - a. Board President Paul Millsaps made an opening statement emphasizing the sincerity of the School Board and school administrative officials and our desire to serve the youth of our school district.

- b. Background information between USOE and the school district relating to difficulty in communicating with USOE.
- c. Copies of proposed long-range plans were presented and briefly discussed with Dr. Lloyd Henderson. Dr. Henderson said, and we quote, "I can not see how the implementation of this proposed long-range plan will in any way eliminate the dual school system of the district".

In defining "elimination of the dual school system", Dr. Henderson stated, "Generally speaking, when one enters any school in the district for observation purposes, he would be unable to determine if the school had previously been all Negro or all white".

- d. Mr. Daniel, Attorney from the Office of the General Council of USOE, discussed faculty desegregation, the unification of the activities program, to include clubs, student organizations, bands, athletics, etc., in order for the unitary plan to meet the needs in eliminating the dual school system.
  - e. Following the discussion of the meeting with officials in Washington, the School Board directed that a revised long-range plan be resubmitted to the Board on the March 4, 1968 regular meeting.
  - f. The School Board requested the Superintendent to write a letter to the Office of the General Council of USOE acknowledging receipt of the "Notice of Hearing and Admission of Facts and Genuineness of Documents" and that a hearing before the USOE General Council would not be requested.
18. March 4, 1968 - The School Board unanimously approved the revised long-range plan for desegregation and authorized the forwarding of copies to USOE, Senator John Stennis, and the Mississippi State Department of Education.
  19. March 20, 1968 - Special Board meeting to consider letter of disapproval of long-range plans from Dr. Lloyd Henderson.
  20. June 3, 1968 - The School Board discussed the possibility of submitting long-range plans for elimination of the dual school system based upon court ordered desegregation of districts nearby. The Superintendent was directed to prepare a proposal which would be considered by the Board.
  21. June 17, 1968 - The Board approved a Resolution based upon the West Point Separate School District Court Order for the elimination of the dual school system and directed that it be sent to the U. S. Office of Education.

22. July 19, 1968 - A letter from Dr. Lloyd Henderson, Chief of the Education Branch of the Office for Civil Rights, disapproving the Resolution of the Starkville Board which agreed to accept and abide by the original order of Civil Action No. E.C. 6560 (Bell vs. West Point Municipal Separate School District, July 29, 1966). Dr. Henderson pointed out that the West Point order did not "necessarily mean that this Department has approved the desegregation plan the Court has ordered carried out nor does our action preclude the possibility that the Department of Justice will at a later date seek modification of the Court Order or otherwise act in regard to this proceeding".
23. September 9, 1968 - A letter from U. S. Office of Education indicating that Starkville Municipal Separate School District would go out of compliance on September 13 - no further federal funds would be available to this school district until it comes into compliance by HEW Guidelines or by court order.
24. Things went smoothly while out of compliance, September 13, 1968 until court action of July 2, 1969.
25. June 2, 1969 - The School Board considered a memorandum from Mr. Clark Reed, State Chairman of the Republican Party, concerning the operation of schools under the Nixon Administration. The School Board requested the Superintendent to contact officials of the State Department of Education, the Regional Office of HEW in Atlanta, and U. S. Office of Education, if necessary, in an effort to get suggestions from them as to how the school district might be brought into compliance.

B. July 1, 1969 - To Date

1. July 2, 1969 - The Superintendent of Schools and all School Board members were served papers by a United States Marshal styled Civil Action File No. EC 6937-S, which was issued by Judge Orma R. Smith of United States District Court of Mississippi and involved the Starkville Municipal Separate School District along with the Oktibbeha County School District in a joint complaint concerning the operation of the dual school system. Attorneys of the McKee and McDowell Law Firm in Starkville were retained by the School Board to represent the school district in this Action. Mr. Tom Tubb of West Point was associated with McKee and McDowell as Attorneys for the Defendants. The complaint must be answered within 20 days of the date of service which was July 2.
2. July 8, 1969 - Civil Action No. EC 6937-S - "Take notice that the above entitled case has been set for hearing at Greenville, Mississippi on August 5, 1969 at 2:00 o'clock p. m. in the United States Court Room, New Federal Building, before Judge Orma R. Smith."

3. July 10, 1969 - Civil Action EC 6937-S Interrogatories to Defendants of the Starkville District to be sent to the Court and the Attorneys for the Plaintiffs.
4. July 16, 1969 - Request for additional time to prepare information called for in Interrogatories.
5. July 23, 1969 - Attorneys answered Bill of Complaint in the summons which was received on July 2nd, preparatory to the Hearing which was set for August 5, 1969.
6. August 5, 1969 - Hearing before Judge Orma R. Smith in Greenville - Motion for severance of the case from Oktibbeha County was sustained by the Judge and pleadings were made before Judge Smith.
7. August 6, 1969 - Judge Orma R. Smith issued Civil Action No. EC 6937(A)-S Order to Superintendent and School Board members of the Starkville Municipal Separate School District.  
  
(See official copies of orders for content.)
8. September 4, 1969 - Notice of Appeal to the Fifth U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals from the Order entered in Civil Action No. EC 6937(A)-S which was issued by Judge Orma R. Smith on August 6, 1969.

#### IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF COURT ORDER AND STATUS OF DESEGREGATION PROCESS THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 1969

##### A. General Implementation of Court Order

On August 26, 1969 the School Board discussed the implementation of Court Order, Civil Action No. EC 6937(A)-S, regarding the elimination of the dual school system for the district. The following is a general outline of an action approach to the implementation of the Court Order:

1. August 9, 1969 - Published Order verbatim in Starkville Daily News.
2. August 12, 1969 - Discussion of the Court Order with central office and administrative staff.
3. August 21, 1969 - Discussion of the Court Order with the Parent-Teacher Association Councils and the administrative staff of the school system.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
EASTERN DIVISION

HORACE WILLIE MONTGOMERY, ET.AL.

Plaintiffs

VS.

STARKVILLE MUNICIPAL SEPARATE  
SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET.AL.

Defendants

No. EC 6937(A)-S

ORDER

Pursuant to the proceedings had in this cause at a hearing held at the United States Courthouse, at Greenville, Mississippi, on August 5, 1969, as shown by the Reporter's notes, it is

ORDERED:

- 1) That defendants shall prepare and file with the Court, not later than December 1, 1969, a plan for the operation of the schools of the Starkville Municipal Separate School District, to be effective commencing with the 1970-71 school year, which plan shall be effective to disestablish the dual system of schools now in effect in said district;
- 2) That said plan shall include along with such other provisions as defendants may elect to incorporate therein, provisions as follows:
  - a) For the disestablishment of the dual system of schools in the district by the pairing or consolidation of grades or zoning or combination of the two, in approximate equal steps, one step to take effect for the school year 1970-71, and the other and final step to be effective for the school year 1971-72;
  - b) That any new construction and the extension, enlargement, or changes of existing facilities shall be undertaken with the object in view of removing and eliminating all vestiges of the dual school system;
  - c) For the employment and assignment of administrative personnel, faculty and staff of each school in the district, irrespective of race, to the extent that when the implementation of said plan has been completed no faculty or staff on account of racial composition, may be identifiable as being tailored for a heavy concentration of Negro or white students;
  - d) For a unitary system for transporting the children attending the schools of the district;
  - e) For the integration of all school activities, both curricular and extra-curricular;
  - f) For such reports to the Court as may be required to keep the Court currently informed as to the progress and achievements of the plan.

It is further ORDERED:

A) That for the school year 1969-70:

1) The defendants shall cause all buses used for the transportation of school children and operated by or on behalf of the school district to be integrated, and students assigned to such buses irrespective of race. Routes shall be adopted so that there will not be any overlapping of routes, except where necessary for the economical operation of the system, and all children, of whatever race, living on designated routes, shall be transported on a bus to the school or schools serving the area in which the children reside;

2) The defendants shall within the full extent of their ability to do so, employ and assign faculty and staff members, to each school in the district, so that each such faculty and staff shall have approximately one out of every six full time faculty and staff members of a race different from the majority of such school faculty and staff;

3) The defendants shall permit any student in the district to transfer from a school wherein he is attending and in which his race is in the majority to any other school in the district where his grade is taught wherein his race is in the minority; provided however that the request for such a transfer must be made by the student or his parents within two weeks after the opening of school;

4) The defendants shall permit any student or his parents to withdraw any choice of schools heretofore made by such student or his parents, at any time prior to August 28, 1969, and select any other school in the district for the school year 1969-70 wherein his grade will be taught during said school year.

B) If the desegregation plan submitted by defendants contemplates the changing or shifting of grades to be taught at the attendance centers of the district, the abandonment of existing construction or new construction, defendants shall, before the submission of said plan to the Court, submit the plan to the Mississippi State Educational Financial Commission for its approval or disapproval. The Commission's approval of the plan shall be noted thereon. Should the Commission disapprove of the plan, the fact shall be made known to the Court at the time the plan is submitted.

C) That defendants shall not, without prior order of the Court, extend or renew the contracts presently in force for the school year 1969-70 with the Oktibbeha County School District for the transfer of students between the schools of the two districts or otherwise contract with said Oktibbeha County School District for the transfer of students.

D) That jurisdiction of this action shall be and the same is hereby retained for all purposes.

E) That the parties when filing plans, reports, or other pleadings, motions, or appearances herein, shall serve every other party with copies thereof, service to be made as provided by the Rules of Civil Procedure, on the party or his counsel of record.

F) That plaintiffs shall have until January 1, 1970, within which to file objections to any plan submitted to the Court by defendants.

G) That the feasibility of the plan and any objections thereto, will be considered and heard by the Court at such place and time after January 1, 1970, as appears appropriate to the Court.

H) That a certified copy of this order shall be sent to counsel for the parties herein by certified mail, and a notation of such mailing shall be noted on the docket of the case.

Entered this August 6th, 1969.

SIGNED: ORMA R. SMITH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

4. August 28, 1969 - Discussion of the Court Order in general faculty meeting at 9:00 o'clock a. m. with the entire professional staff of the school system.
  - a. School Board Attorney and the School Board President were present for this discussion and for amplification where needed.
  - b. Refer to the publication of the full text of the Court Order in the Starkville Daily News on August 9 and again with the full page advertisement of the operation of the school system on August 26, 1969.
5. Conduct a 100% survey of attitudes of parents, voters and taxpayers in our school district concerning the various plans and the necessary bond issues to implement them.
6. Present the essence of the same information as in "5" above for those in the community who might wish to be heard on the matter but who do not have children in school. This could be done through a newspaper coupon which could be clipped and sent in to the Superintendent's Office.
7. When the tabulation of ideas from the survey has been received, set up committees to sort the various ideas and work out several general plans for consideration.
8. Selection of the most feasible plan by the administrative council to be presented to the School Board for its consideration.
9. Submission of the plan which is approved by the School Board to the Court on or before December 1, 1969.
10. Send notice to all parents of the plan which has been submitted to the Court in order that all concerned can be fully informed of the most feasible plan.

B. Preparation for Transfer of Teachers

On August 26, 1969 the School Board considered the possibility of assignment of teachers across racial lines for the 1969-70 school session in keeping with the Court Order. Only those teachers who indicated a willingness to serve across racial lines and who are qualified would be considered. Administrative officials were directed to proceed with the preliminary work necessary to the transfers which might be possible for the 1969-70 school session, reporting to the Board for approval before final arrangements and transfers are made. Transfers are to be made after the opening of the 1969-70 school session.

### C. Transfer and Orientation of Teachers

September 3, 1969 - After some discussion of the implementation of the Court Order for the desegregation of faculty for the 1969-70 school session, the following teacher transfers, all of which have been agreed to by the faculty members and principals concerned, are to be made to take effect on September 8, 1969:

Mrs. Velma Rucker, transferred to Sudduth Elementary School, 2nd Grade, to replace Mrs. Martha Hines, resigned.

Mrs. Mary Ann Johnson, transferred to Sudduth Elementary School, 6th Grade, to replace Mr. David Wasson, transferred.

Mr. David Wasson, transferred to Ward Middle Grade School, to replace Mrs. Johnson, transferred.

Miss Beverly Shumake to teach one class per day at Henderson High School to replace Mr. Perkins, transferred.

Mr. Alfred Perkins, transferred to teach one hour per day at Starkville Junior High School to replace Miss Shumake, transferred.

Orientation for faculty members, teachers and pupils to be completed by Friday, September 5, and all teachers are to assume new responsibilities on Monday, September 8, 1969.

### D. Involvement of Patrons, Taxpayers, and Voters

September 16, 1969 - The School Board heard a report of the Superintendent on actions which have been taken and plans which involve the preparation for the survey of attitudes of patrons, taxpayers and voters concerning the formulation of a plan for the elimination of the dual school system in order to comply with the Court Order. The School Board gave its approval to the working plans as follows:

1. The involvement, as consultants, of Social Science Research Personnel (Dr. Jim Wall), Educational Research Director (Dr. Emmett Kohler), the Department of Educational Administration (Dr. Lamar Moody), the Head of the Political Science Department (Dr. Gordon Bryan) and the Head of the Business Research Department (Dr. Guy Peden), in evolving an instrument by which the "survey of attitudes" might be obtained.

2. A meeting was held with the Education Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Starkville - Oktibbeha County to discuss the Court Order and the implementation of it by the School Board.
3. The Chamber of Commerce Education Committee formed an Ad Hoc Committee, consisting of community leaders (about 225 people), which met on September 30, 1969 for an orientation on the Court Order and the Board's approach to the implementation of it. The Education Committee agreed to assist in the dissemination of information through leaflets, brochures, news releases and radio spots. When the "survey of attitudes" form is sent to patrons, voters and taxpayers, logical responses might be returned to the School Board.
4. After the survey forms have been turned in and studied, the school administrative officers will present two or three possible plans based upon the information derived from the survey of attitudes.
5. Consideration of plans developed and approval by the School Board.
6. Submission of plans to the Educational Finance Commission for approval.
7. Submission of approved plans to the Court.

#### E. Alternatives Open to School Board

According to Judge Smith's Court Order, there can no longer be the traditional elementary schools, junior high schools, and high schools designated for Negroes and for whites. In the place of these Negro schools and white schools must be a "unitary system" of education for all children. From the Court Order we find three basic ways by which the dual system may be eliminated. (It is also possible to utilize combinations of the three basic plans or to devise other ways of combining two or more of these basic ways to make variations.) These alternatives are:

1. PAIRING OF SCHOOLS---The assignment of children who are in specific grades (Example---Grades 1, 2 and 3) to a designated building with children of both races. Other grades (Example---Grades 4, 5 and 6) would be assigned to another school with children of both races. This method could apply at the elementary, junior high, or high school level.
2. ZONING---The establishment of zones for all schools of the district wherein all children of both races in a particular zone would be assigned to the school in that zone.
3. CONSOLIDATION OF GRADES---The building of an "educational center" which might include Grades 1 - 12 at one location. This could also apply to other grades which might not include Grades 1 - 12. It could also mean that some schools would be closed after the new center had been established.

4. COMBINATION OF PLANS---An illustration would be zoning for some schools and pairing for others; another illustration could be zoning combined with consolidation of grades; another illustration could be pairing and consolidation of grades. Variations from those illustrated above would be indicative of this type of plan.

#### F. Building Needs For This School District

Shortages of facilities now exist. Children are now occupying a church and many sub-standard classrooms. Badly needed facilities are not provided in some cases. Inadequate facilities are being used in others. The following condensed list of items are woefully short of accreditation standards of Mississippi and the Southern Association. Some of these shortages are listed below:

1. Four sections of children, approximately 130 pupils, are being housed in a nearby church.
2. We are now housing children in 18 different locations which are considered "sub-standard classrooms".
3. There is great need for additional classrooms for Special Education.
4. When all needs are considered, we are now 24 to 26 classrooms short of needs in this district.
5. We have one cafeteria in Henderson Elementary School which must serve approximately 1600 children in Henderson Elementary, Ward Middle School, and Henderson High School. There is no cafeteria in Ward Middle School or Henderson High School.
6. There is no Band Hall at Henderson High School.
7. Starkville High School has inadequate choral facilities and classrooms.
8. Overstreet Elementary School badly needs renovations and repairs of a capital outlay nature.
9. Starkville Junior High School is rapidly reaching the point when condemnation procedures will be mandatory, making it a necessity that we plan for space for the junior high school.
10. There are no auditorium facilities at the Starkville High School.
11. A central equipment compound, maintenance shop, furniture refinishing shop, and warehousing area is badly needed for the system.

12. As the system continues to grow, additional space is a necessity for School Board offices.

#### G. Status of Bonded Indebtedness and Capabilities of the District

Mississippi Law provides that not more than 15% of the assessed evaluation of the school district may be encumbered as bonded indebtedness.

Evaluation of this district as of June 30, 1969 was \$21,686,645.

$$\$21,686,645 \quad \times \quad 15\% \quad = \quad \$3,252,997$$

Present outstanding  
indebtedness 860,000

Amount which could be  
added by law \$2,392,997

The present indebtedness requires 5.3 mills on the assessed evaluation of the Municipal Separate School District for the 1969-70 year. As bonds are paid out, this amount will decrease.

Let us suppose that the School Board requests and the electorate passes a Bond Issue for \$1,600,000. Add the \$1,600,000 to the present indebtedness of \$860,000. The total would be \$2,460,000, still almost \$1,000,000 under the amount allowed by law.

"What would be the cost of defraying the bonded indebtedness over a period of 25 years at 5%?"

Answer: The minimum amount of principal plus interest which would be payable at the end of the first year would be \$227,000. To determine how many mills would be required to provide the principal and interest, divide \$227,000 by the assessed evaluation of the school district, which is \$21,686,645. This would give 10.5 mills which would be required to pay off the indebtedness, beginning with the first year. This is an increase of 5.2 over the present 5.3 mills.

In all probability, these requirements will decrease each year as bonded indebtedness obligations from previous years are paid out. Therefore, the requirements should become less each year instead of more as time passes.

NOTE: The Starkville Municipal Separate School District has on file with the Educational Finance Commission of Mississippi \$219,000 worth of credit which can be used in the construction of classrooms.