

SHELTON

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JOHNSON v. JACKSON PARISH SCHOOL BOARD	No. 23,173
BANKS v. CLAIBORNE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD	No. 23,192
UNITED STATES v. CADDO PARISH SCHOOL BOARD	No. 23,274
UNITED STATES v. FAIRFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION	No. 23,331
BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF BESSEMER	No. 23,335
UNITED STATES v. JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION	No. 23,345
UNITED STATES v. BOSSIER PARISH SCHOOL BOARD	No. 23,365
APPELLANTS	APPELLEES

APPENDIX TO BRIEFS
OF UNITED STATES

REVISED VOLUME I

U.S. v. Jefferson County Bd. Of Ed.



SD-AL-001-002

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

VOLUME I

- A. Introduction
- B. A Statistical Compilation of Judicial Proceedings in School Desegregation Cases Arising in the Fifth Circuit
- C. A Statistical Analysis of Court Approved School Desegregation Plans in the Fifth Circuit
- D. Plan Analysis Charts

VOLUME II

Procedural Histories of School Desegregation Suits - - - Alabama, Florida, Georgia

VOLUME III

Procedural Histories of School Desegregation Suits - - - Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas

VOLUME IV

- A. Proposed Decree
- B. Annotations to Proposed Decree

A. Introduction

This joint Appendix to the Government's briefs in seven school desegregation cases focuses on the relief issues common to all of the cases.

The first school case subsequent to the second Brown decision reached this Court in 1955.^{1/} As of April, 1966, 42 cases had been appealed to this Court,^{2/} all concerned with the development of means to effect the transition from segregated to desegregated school systems. When the appendix was filed in April, 1966, the district courts in the Fifth Circuit had considered 128 such cases^{2/} in the same period. Between May 1, 1966 and March 1, 1967, at least 32 additional school desegregation cases have been filed in district courts, bringing the total to 160.^{3/} The history of these cases shows that present modes of school litigation have substantially burdened the courts of this circuit; that the process has failed to produce uniformity in the application of the law of school desegregation; that there exists a substantial time lag between the enunciation of principles by this Court and their application by the district courts; that there is even some variance between this

^{1/} Bell v. Rippey, N.D. Texas, Civil Action No. 6165, Notice of Appeal filed on October 4, 1955. Decided, sub nom. Brown v. Rippey, 233 F. 2d 796 (1956).

^{2/} See the Chart of Procedural Histories of Fifth Circuit School Desegregation Suits, infra. The procedural histories have not been updated. They are current as of April, 1966.

^{3/} These are suits filed by the United States. Additional cases may have been filed by private parties.

Court's decisions and later District Court decisions; that the law has not been successful in developing local responsibility to administer schools in compliance with the Constitution; and that the results of the process, measured by the number of Negro children being educated in integrated schools^{4/}, have been limited. The facts and our briefs in these seven cases suggest that the Court should adopt a uniform and comprehensive decree which would govern the transitional stages of school desegregation in the seven school districts before the Court. It would, moreover, be unmistakable precedent for all school systems desegregating by free choice plans. The adoption of a uniform and comprehensive decree by this Court would have the effects of lightening the judicial burdens of school litigation and relitigation, bringing uniformity to the application of the law of school desegregation, enhancing local responsibility and compliance with a clearly defined law of school desegregation, and producing effective desegregation.

^{4/} In the seven cases here before the court only 0.19% of the Negro students were attending formerly white schools in 1965-1966 (Affidavit of St. John Barrett in support of motion to expedite and consolidate these cases). No enrollment statistics for 1966-67 are in the record. The Statistical Summary by the Southern Education Reporting Service, December 29, 1965, reflects the following statewide percentages: Alabama - 0.43%; Mississippi - 0.59%; Louisiana - 0.69%; Georgia - 2.66%; Florida - 9.76%; Texas - 17.2%.

B. A Statistical Compilation of Judicial
Proceedings in School Desegregation
Cases Arising in the Fifth Circuit 5/

1. Case Load

	<u>District Court</u>	<u>Court of Appeals</u>	<u>Supreme Court</u>
Number of Cases	128	42	5
Number of Orders Entered	513	76	10

2. Frequency of Appeals to this Court

Number of Cases With One or More Appeals	42
Number of Cases With Two or More Appeals	21
Number of Cases With Three or More Appeals	8
Number of Cases With Four or More Appeals	4
Number of Cases With Five or More Appeals	2

5/ These tables are based on the procedural histories in Volumes II and III of this Appendix. The procedural histories have not been updated. They are current as of April, 1966, and do not include suits filed after that date.

3. Chronology of Case Loads

	<u>Cases Filed in District Court</u>	<u>Appeals Noticed</u>
1954	0	0
1955	4	1
1956	4	6
1957	0	1
1958	2	1
1959	2	4
1960	5	5
1961	7	4
1962	12	7
1963	14	15
1964	16	10
1965	56	25
1966 ^{6/}	5	1

^{6/} This table is based on the procedural histories in Volume II and III of this appendix. The procedural histories have not been updated and are current as of April, 1966. Suits filed after that date are not included.

C. A Statistical Analysis of Court-Approved School Desegregation Plans in the Fifth Circuit

When this appendix was filed in April, 1966, there were 99 court-approved choice plans in the circuit, 44 did not desegregate all grades by 1967; 78 failed to provide specific, non-racial criteria for denying choices;^{7/} 79 failed to provide any start toward faculty desegregation; only 22 places provided for transfers to take courses not otherwise available; 4 included the Singleton transfer rule.

Currently there are at least 129 court-approved choice plans in the Fifth Circuit.^{8/} Based on the plan analysis charts in the following section (The suits in which the United States is a party or amicus have been updated and new suits filed by the Government have been included. Private cases in which the United States is not participating have not been updated and are current as of April, 1966), 39 of these plans do not desegregate all grades by 1967; 80 fail to provide specific, non-racial criteria for denying choices;^{7/} 79 fail to provide any start toward faculty desegregation; only 29 places provide for transfers to take courses not otherwise available; 27 include the Singleton transfer rule.

^{7/} We show here the number of plans without provisions that fall within these categories in our Plan Analysis Charts (which are attached to this Appendix): "Overcrowding Only" and "In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only."

^{8/} This includes court-approved choice plans in suits filed by the Government since April, 1966. There may be additional plans in suits filed by private parties since that date.

The chart which follows on the next eight pages, broken down by judicial districts, tabulates in greater detail the number and type of provisions to be found in court-approved plans. It shows the degree of nonuniformity between judicial districts and the extent to which the nonuniform court-approved plans in the Fifth Circuit lag behind judicial standards and H.E.W. procedures.

FIFTH CIRCUIT	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS
DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	All Grades Covered By 1967	Personal Notice	News-paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
<u>ALABAMA</u>									
Northern (8)	5	1	8	8	1	0	0	1	0
Middle (5)	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	5
Southern (4)	3	4	3	4	4	0	3	4	2
<u>FLORIDA</u>									
Northern (4)	1	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
Middle (9)	4	4	4	9	1	2	0	1	0
Southern (4)	4	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0
<u>GEORGIA</u>									
Northern (1)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Middle (5)	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Southern (2)	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
<u>LOUISIANA</u>									
Eastern (18)	11	16	12	18	3	3	3	3	2
Western (24)	17	21	20	24	0	0	0	0	0

- 7 -

FIFTH CIRCUIT DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By 1967	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>									
Northern (12)	12	11	12	12	7	10	7	3	0
Southern (20)	20	18	18	20	12	11	6	6	6
<u>TEXAS</u>									
Northern (1)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Southern (6)	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern (4)	2	2	2	4	0	0	2	2	0
Western (2)	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Subtotals</u>									
Alabama (17)	13	10	16	17	10	1	8	10	7
Florida (17)	9	11	7	17	1	2	0	1	0
Georgia (8)	2	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana (42)	28	37	32	42	3	3	3	3	2
Mississippi (32)	32	29	30	32	19	21	13	9	6
Texas (13)	6	2	2	13	0	0	2	2	0
<u>TOTALS</u> (129)	90	93	88	129	31	27	26	25	15
- 8 -									

FIFTH CIRCUIT		CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
DISTRICTS	(No. of Plans)	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
<u>LABAMA</u>									
Northern	(8)	1	3	1	0	0	5	0	0
Middle	(5)	5	5	0	0	1	3	1	1
Southern	(4)	4	3	0	0	0	3	1	0
<u>FLORIDA</u>									
Northern	(4)	0	1	3	0	0	3	0	1
Middle	(9)	1	3	1	0	2	4	0	0
Southern	(4)	0	0	4	0	1	1	0	0
<u>BORGIA</u>									
Northern	(1)	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Middle	(5)	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	0
Southern	(2)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<u>LOUISIANA</u>									
Eastern	(18)	11	3	10	15	3	3	0	1
Western	(24)	0	3	0	21	0	14	0	0

FIFTH CIRCUIT DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>								
Northern (12)	5	11	0	0	9	9	1	10
Southern (20)	15	18	0	0	12	15	1	14
<u>TEXAS</u>								
Northern (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Southern (6)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern (4)	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	0
Western (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Subtotals</u>								
Alabama (17)	10	11	1	0	1	11	2	1
Florida (17)	1	4	8	0	3	8	0	1
Georgia (8)	4	4	1	0	1	2	0	0
Louisiana (42)	11	6	10	36	3	17	0	1
Mississippi (32)	20	29	0	0	21	24	2	24
Texas (13)	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0
<u>TOTALS</u> (129)	48	56	20	36	29	62	6	27

FIFTH CIRCUIT DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
<u>ALABAMA</u>					
Northern (8)	0	1	1	1	0
Middle (5)	0	5	5	5	5
Southern (4)	0	3	0	3	1
<u>FLORIDA</u>					
Northern (4)	1	0	0	1	1
Middle (9)	1	5	0	3	2
Southern (4)	0	2	0	1	0
<u>GEORGIA</u>					
Northern (1)	0	0	0	0	0
Middle (5)	0	0	0	0	1
Southern (2)	0	0	0	0	0
<u>LOUISIANA</u>					
Eastern (18)	0	3	3	3	5
Western (24)	0	0	0	0	1

FIFTH CIRCUIT DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>					
Northern (12)	2	10	0	9	12
Southern (20)	5	17	5	12	15
<u>TEXAS</u>					
Northern (1)	0	0	0	1	0
Southern (6)	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern (4)	1	2	0	2	2
Western (2)	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Subtotals</u>					
Alabama (17)	0	9	6	9	6
Florida (17)	2	7	0	5	3
Georgia (8)	0	0	0	0	1
Louisiana (42)	0	3	3	3	6
Mississippi (32)	7	27	5	21	27
Texas (13)	1	2	0	3	2
<u>TOTALS</u> (129)	10	48	14	41	45
			- 12 -		

FIFTH CIRCUIT DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
<u>ALABAMA</u>				
Northern (8)	1	1	0	1
Middle (5)	5	1	4	4
Southern (4)	2	0	0	0
<u>FLORIDA</u>				
Northern (4)	0	0	0	1
Middle (9)	0	0	0	0
Southern (4)	0	0	0	0
<u>GEORGIA</u>				
Northern (1)	0	0	0	0
Middle (5)	0	0	0	0
Southern (2)	0	0	0	0
<u>LOUISIANA</u>				
Eastern (18)	1	3	3	8
Western (24)	0	0	0	0

FIFTH CIRCUIT DISTRICTS (No. of Plans)	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>				
Northern (12)	0	8	2	4
Southern (20)	1	11	6	4
<u>TEXAS</u>				
Northern (1)	0	0	0	0
Southern (6)	0	0	0	0
Eastern (4)	0	0	0	0
Western (2)	0	0	0	0
<u>Subtotals</u>				
Alabama (17)	8	2	4	5
Florida (17)	0	0	0	1
Georgia (8)	0	0	0	0
Louisiana (42)	1	3	3	8
Mississippi (32)	1	19	8	8
Texas (13)	0	0	0	0
<u>TOTALS</u> (129)	10	24	15	22
			- 14 -	

D. Plan Analysis Charts

The following charts analyze the component provisions of the court-approved choice plans in this Circuit. Plans are listed on the charts by state and judicial district. Notation has been made of geographic plans but these have not been analyzed. Suits which have not yet resulted in court-approved plans have also been noted. Cases in which the United States is a party or amicus have been updated, and new suits which have been filed by the Government between May 1, 1966 and March 1, 1967 have been included. Private cases in which the United States is not participating have not been updated. They are current as of April, 1966.

The charts are in four groupings. Each grouping includes several categories and subcategories describing the provisions which may be found in school plans. The categories in each grouping are as follows:

- Group 1: Reach of Plan
Notice
Mechanics for Exercising Choice
Nonracial Assignment of Nonchoosers
- Group 2: Criteria for Denying Choice
Special Transfers
- Group 3: Faculty Desegregation
Desegregation of Programs, Facilities,
Services and Activities
- Group 4: Equalizing Educational Programs and
Facilities
Provision for Reporting to Court

This format makes it possible to obtain a circuit-wide view of the extent to which each type of provision has

been incorporated in school plans. An explanation of the category and the subcategory headings precedes each grouping.

Explanation of Category Headings

REACH OF PLAN

All Grades Covered by:

This column gives the year when all twelve grades will be reached by the choice plan. Thus, if the plan provides that as of the 1967-1968 school year, children in all grades may choose integrated schools, the column would be marked "1967". The chart does not show how many grades or which grades are now covered.

NOTICE

Personal Notice:

An "X" in this column signifies that some form of personal notice of the rights of free choice is given to students or parents of students entering desegregated grades. The chart does not differentiate between notices mailed home and notices sent home with the students. It does not reflect the completeness and clarity of the notice.

Newspaper Notice:

An "X" signifies that the desegregation plan requires the local school board on or shortly before the opening of the choice period, to publish notice of the desegregation plan in at least one newspaper serving the community. The chart does not differentiate publication in the "Legal Notice" section of the newspaper from other more conspicuous forms of publication. It does not show whether repeated publication is required, or whether the notice must appear in all news media serving the community.

MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE

Annual Choice:

An "X" signifies that students are given a chance each year to choose an integrated school rather than, for example, being offered a choice in the first grade which would be binding until transition is made to junior high school in the seventh grade.

All Students Must Choose:

An "X" signifies that in desegregated grades, all children, both white and Negro, must make a choice, even if they wish to remain in the school they previously attended. This element differentiates true freedom of choice plans from transfer plans. Under transfer plans, only those students wishing to change to another school are required to make an affirmative choice.

Second Choice:

An "X" signifies that if, for any reason, a student's first choice of schools is denied, the plan provides that he be given a second choice of all other schools in the system, at least where space is available.

Officials Not to Influence Choice:

An "X" signifies that the plan provides at least a general provision barring action by officials of the school system - principals, teachers, staff - to influence the choice of students.

Routing Buses to Accommodate Choice:

An "X" signifies that the plan provides at least for reasonable rearrangement of bus routes so that students who choose to go to an integrated school will be able to get there. A blank in this column does not necessarily represent a deficiency in the plan; some school districts, particularly urban districts, do not provide bus transportation.

NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS

An "X" signifies that students in desegregated grades who have not affirmatively chosen a school are assigned on some basis other than race or prior attendance. Proximity to the school is the predominant non-racial basis for assignment. If a plan makes no reference to non-choosers, it is assumed that prior assignments would continue.

ALABAMA Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Armstrong v. Bd. of Ed. of Birmingham	1969		X	X					
Bennett v. Madi- son Co. Alabama Bd. of Ed.	1969		X	X					
Boykins v. Fair- field Bd. of Ed.	1967		X	X				1/	
Brown v. City Bd. of Ed. of Bessemer	1967		X	X				1/	
Hereford v. Cy. of Huntsville, Ala. Bd. of Ed.	1969		X	X					
Hutton v. Lee (Greene Co.)	1967 ^{2/}	X	X	X	X ^{3/}			X	
1/ No school transportation system.									
2/ Plan states only that by 1/1/67, Bd. will submit plan for desegregation of grades 1-8, grades 9-12 covered by 1966, Bd. Resolution, 2/18/66, adds grade 1 to grades covered by 1967.									
3/ Transfer plan: non-choosers remain in school previously attended.									

ALABAMA rthern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Miller v. Bd. of Ed. of Gad- sden, Alabama	1967		X	X					
Stout v. Jef- ferson Co., Bd. of Ed.	1967		X	X					

ALABAMA	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News-paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
iddle District									
Carr v. Montgomery Co. School board	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Harris v. Bullock Co. Bd. of Ed.	1967	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Harris, et al. v. Crenshaw Co. Bd. of Ed.	1967	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Lee v. Macon Co. Bd. of Ed.	1966	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
U.S. v. Lowndes Co. Bd. of Ed.	1967	X	X	X	X		X	X	X

ALABAMA	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News-paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Southern District									
Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of City of Demopolis		Suit filed August 13, 1965. No court approved desegregation plan.							
Davis v. Bd. of Commissioners of Mobile County		1960 Geographic Plan with First Graders having a choice of the school in their district or the nearest school formerly attended exclusively by their race.							
J.S. v. Choctaw Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	1967	X	X	X	X		X	X	
U.S. v. Hale Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	1967	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
U.S. v. Perry Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	1967	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
U.S. v. Wilcox Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	1968 ^{1/}	X		X	X			X ^{2/}	
<u>1/</u> Court order 8/31/66, as to grades 1-3, 7-9 only for 1966; other grades by spring semester 1967-68 or, if Fifth Circuit does not rule by 60 days before opening of spring term of 1967, by fall semester 1968-69.									
<u>2/</u> As to certain transfer students only. Court order, 1/16/67.									
* As of April, 1966									

FLORIDA Northern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
		Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*Augustus v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Escambia County	1973	x		x					
Steele v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Leon County	¹ 1974	x		x					
*Wright v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Alachua County	1965	x	x	x					
Youngblood v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Bay County	² 1973	x ³	x	x					
<u>1/</u> 1963 - Grades 1 - 12 Transfer.			Abolishment of	dual zones	one grade	a year.			
<u>2/</u> 1964 Grades 1 7,9 Transfer.									
<u>3/</u> As to 115 named students only.									
* As of April, 1966									

FLORIDA Middle District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Blalock v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Lee County	1969		X						
*Bradley v. Belot Pub. Inst. Pinellas County	1966	Geographic Plan							
*Braxton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Duval County	1972	Geographic Plan							
*Ellis v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Orange County	1967	X				X			
*Harvest v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Manatee County	1965		X	X					
*Lawson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Suwannee County	This suit was filed January 25, 1965. It does not have a Court approved desegregation plan.								
*Mannings v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Hillsborough Co.	1973	X							
*Mays v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Sarasota Co.	1963								
*Mills v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Polk Co.	1968								
* As of April, 1966									

FLORIDA Middle District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
* Scott v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. of St. John's County	This suit was filed April 6, 1962. It does not have a court approved desegregation plan.								
* Tillman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Volusia County	1972				x				
* Weaver v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Brevard County	1967	x	x	x					
Zimmerman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Columbia County	1965	x	x			x		x	
* As of April, 1966									

FLORIDA Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*Gibson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Dade County	1960	X							
*Hall v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Broward County	1963	X							
*Holland v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Palm Beach Co.	1962	Geographic Plan							
*Major v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Monroe County	1965	X							
*Sharpton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Indian River Co.	1970		X						
* As of April, 1966									

Northern District

* As of April, 1966

GEORGIA Middle District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*Bivins v. Bd. of Pub. Ed. & Orphanage for Bibb Co.	1968			X					
*Gaines v. Dougherty Co. Bd of Ed.	1967	$\frac{2}{X}$		X					
*Harrington v. Bd. Colquitt Co. Bd. of Ed. & City of Moultrie Bd. of Commissioners	1968	$\frac{3}{X}$		X					
*Lockett v. Bd. of Ed. of Muscogee Co. Sch Dist.	1968	$\frac{1}{X}$		X					
*Thomie v. Houston Bd. of Ed.	1968	$\frac{1}{X}$		X					
1/ "adequate notice" only.									
2/ "timely notice" only.									
3/ Type not specified									
5 day prior notice of transfer time required.									
* As of April, 1966									

GEORGIA

Southern District

REACH OF
PLAN

NOTICE

MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE

NON-
RACIAL
ASSIGNMENT
OF
NON-
CHOOSERS

All
Grades
Covered
By

Personal
Notice

News-
paper
Notice

Annual
Choice

All
Students
Must
Choose

Second
Choice

Officials
Not to
Influence
Choice

Routing of
Buses to
Accommodate
Choice

^{1/}
*Acree v. Richmond
Co. Bd. of Ed.

X

*Gibson v. Glynn
County Board
of Education

No Court-Approved desegregation plan.

Stell v. Savannah-
Chatham Co. Bd.
of Education

1966

X

X

Turner v.
Goolsby
(Taliaferro Co.)

Suit filed September 10, 1965. No Court-Approved desegregation plan.

^{1/} Available information on this plan insufficient; first three grades to have been desegregated in 1964.

* As of April, 1966

LOUISIANA	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News-paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Banks v. St. James Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X <u>1</u> /		X					
Boyd v. Pointe Coupee Parish Sch. Bd.	1968	X <u>1</u> /		X					
Bush v. Orleans Parish Sch. Bd.	1970	Geographic Plan							
*Carter v. Sch. Bd. of West Feliciana Parish	1967	X <u>1</u> /		X					
Charles v. Ascension Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X <u>1</u> /		X					
*Danbridge v. Jefferson Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
*Davis v. East Baton Rouge Sch. Bd.	1968		X	X					
Dunn v. Livingston Parish Sch. Bd.	1968	X <u>1</u> /	X	X					
-/ " . . . adequate notice to the extent that all students affected are given a reasonable and conscious opportunity to apply for admission."									
* As of April, 1966					- 30 -				

LOUISIANA Eastern District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Dunn v. Living- ton Parish Sch. Bd.	X <u>1</u> /		X <u>1</u> /	X				
*George v. Davis (East Felici- ana Parish)				X <u>2</u> /				
Hall v. St. Helena Parish Sch. Bd..	X <u>1</u> /		X <u>1</u> /	X				
*Harris v. St. John the Bap- tist Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /				
*Hill v. Lafourche Par- ish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed December 13, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 requiring board to submit plan.							
Jenkins v. City of Bogalusa Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /				
*Moore v. Washing- ton Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /				
1/ Initial assignments on a freedom of choice basis must be made on a first come, first served basis. Pupil placement criteria are used for denying transfers.								
2/ The other criteria are desires of students and parents, availability of space and of desired course and comparison of age.								
*As of April, 1966				- 61 -				

LOUISIANA Eastern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Smith v. St. Tammany Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <u>1</u> /
*Thomas v. West Baton Rouge Parish Sch. Bd.	1968	X <u>2</u> /		X					
Williams v. Iberville Parish Sch. Bd.	1970			X					
U.S. v. St. Bernard Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X <u>1</u> /
U.S. v. Plaque- mines Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<u>1/</u> For 1966-67 only, any student failing to exercise a choice shall be assigned to the school to which he was previously assigned, subject to his right to request a transfer.									
<u>2/</u> ". . . adequate notice to the extent that all students affected are given a reasonable and conscious opportunity to apply for admission."									
* As of April, 1966									

LOUISIANA Western District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*Andrews v. City of Monroe	1967	X		X					
Banks v. Clai- borne Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X		X					
*Battise v. Acadia Parish Sch. Bd.	1968 ^{1/}	X	X	X					
*Boudreaux v. St. Mary Par- ish Sch. Bd.	1965 ^{2/}		X	X					
*Celestain v. Vermillion Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed April 4, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.								
*Conley v. Lake Charles Sch. Bd. & Calcasieu Parish Sch. Bd.	1968	X		X					
*Gilbert v. Webster Parish Sch. Bd.	1967		X	X					
1/ Original plan	- all grades by 1968. Amended plan added two grades in 1965 which may result in all grades by 1967.								
2/ 1965 - Transfers	in all grades. 1966 - Transfers and initial assignments in all grades not based on race and dual zones abolished.								
* As of April, 1966					- 33 -				

LOUISIANA	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News-paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*Gordan v. Jeff Davis Parish Sch. Board	1968 ^{1/}	X	X	X					
*Graham v. Evangeline Parish Sch. Board	1968 ^{1/}	X	X	X					
*Henderson v. Iberia Parish School Board	1965		X	X					
Johnson v. Jackson Parish School Board	1967	X	X	X					
Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board	1967	X	X	X					
Lemon v. Bossier Parish School Board	1968	X	X	X					
*Monteilh v. St. Landry Parish School Board	1968 ^{1/}	X	X	X					
*Robertson v. Natchitoches Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
^{1/} Original plan - all grades by 1968. Amended plan added two grades in 1965 which may result in all grades by 1967.									
* As of April 1966									

LOUISIANA Western District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Smith v. Con- cordia Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
*Trahan v. La- fayette Parish Sch. Bd.	1968 <u>1/</u>	X	X	X					
*Thomas v. St. Martin Parish Sch. Bd.	1965 <u>2/</u>	X	X	X					
Valley v. Ra- pides Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
*Williams v. Kimbrough (Madison Parish)	1967	X	X	X					
U.S. v. Bie- ville Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
<u>1/</u> Original plan - grades by 1968. Amended plan added two grades in 1965 which may result in all grades by 1967.									
<u>2/</u> 1965 - Transfers in all grades. 1966 - Transfers and initial assignments in all grades not based on race and dual zones abolished.									
* As of April, 1966									

LOUISIANA Western District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
S. v. DeSoto Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit	filed January 11, 1967. No court-approved desegregation plan.							
S. v. Grant Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
S. v. LaSalle Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
S. v. Lincoln Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
S. v. Richland Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X		X					

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Ayers v. Wes- tern Line Cons. School District	Suit	filed January 11, 1966. No court-appointed desegregation plan.							
Baird v. Benton County Board of Education	1967	X	X	X		X	X		
Bell v. West Point Mun. Sep. Sch. Dis. (Clay County)	Suit filed August 13, 1965. No court-approved desegregation plan. District operating under HEW plan.								
Cowan v. Boli- var County Bd. of Education	1967	X	X	X		X			
Henry v. Clarks- dale Mun. Sep. School District	1967	Geographic Plan							
U.S. v. Aber- deen Mun. Sep. School District	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
U.S. v. Calhoun County Board of Education	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
* As of April, 1966					- 37 -				

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
U.S. v. Carroll Co. Board of Education	1967	X	X	X		X			
U.S. v. Corinth Mun. Separate School District	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X		
U.S. v. Green- wood Mun. Sep. School Dist.	1967	X	X	one school operating under geographic plan.					
U.S. v. Indianola Mun. School Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X		X		
		portion of district operating under geographic plan							
U.S. v. Iuka Spec. Mun. Sep. Sch. Dis.	1967		X	X	X	X	X	X	
U.S. v. Leflore Co. School District	1967	X	X	X		X			
U.S. v. Louis- ville Municipi- pal Sep. Sc. Dt	Suit	filed October 3, 1966. No court-ordered desegregation plan.							
U.S. v. Sun- flower County School Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X		
U.S. v. Humpreys County School District	1967	X	X	X	X				

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
Alexander v. Holmes Co. Bd. of Ed.	1967	X	X	X					
Anderson v. Canton Munic. Sch. Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X			X
Anderson v. Madison Co. School Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Barnhardt v. Meridian Sep. Sch. Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X			X ^{1/} X	
Blackwell v. Issaquena Co. Bd. of Ed.	1967		X	X					
* Gladney v. Mos Pt. Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.	1967	X	X	X					
Hudson v. Leake Co. Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
1/ Within desegregated grades routing of transportation determined by school enrollment without regard to race.									
* As of April, 1966									

- 39 -

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*Killingsworth v. Enterprise Consld. Sch. Dis.	1967		X	X					
Lee v. U.S. (Forrest Co.)	1967	X	X	X	^{2/} X				
Mason v. Biloxi Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.	1967	X	X	X					
Singleton v. Jackson Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.	1967	X	X	X					
U.S. v. Amite County School District	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Cov- ington Co. School Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Hinds County School Board	Suit filed January 11, 1967. No court-approved desegregation plan.								
^{2/} "All pupils be admitted	enrolled in the 1st, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grades shall to any of the schools.								
* As of April, 1966					- 40 -				

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
U.S. v. Kemper County School Board	1967	X		X		X			
U.S. v. Nat- chez Special Munic. Sch.Dis.	1967	X	X	X	X	X			
US. v. Neshoba Co. School District	Suit filed. No court-approved desegregation plan.								
U.S. v. North Pike Consld. School Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X		
U.S. v. North Tippah Cons. School Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X		
U.S. v. Noxubee Co. School District	1967	X		X	X	X			
U.S. v. Phila- delphia Mun. Sep.Sch. Dist.	Suit filed August 18, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.								
U.S. v. Lauder- dale County Sch. Dist.	Suit filed August 18, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.								
					- 41 -				

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
U.S. v. South Pike Co. Cons. Sch. District	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Wil- kinson Co. Sch. Dist.	1967	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

- 42 -

TEXAS Northern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
* Avery v. Wichita Falls Ind. Sch. Dist.	This Case Was Closed in 1962 Without a Desegregation Plan.								
* Britton v. Folsom (Dallas Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1967	Geographic		Plan					
* Flax v. Potts (Ft. Worth Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1967			X					
* Jackson v. Rawdon (Mansfield Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Order that defendants "...are hereby forever restrained from refusing admission to Mansfield High School to any of the plaintiffs shown to be qualified in all respects for admission."1								
* Rainwater v. Smith (Carrollton Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1971	Geographic		Plan					
1/ Decree August 29, 1966, p. 2.									
* As of April, 1966					- 43 -				

Texas Southern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
* Eastland v. Northeast Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.	1975			X					
* Evans v. Brooks (Texas City Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1972			X					
* Gibbs v. Bd. of Trustees of Port Isabel Ind. Sch. Dist.	1962	General injunction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis.							
* Hernandez v. Driscoll Consoli- dated Ind.Sch. Dist.	This case involved Mexican students. It was closed in 1957.								
* Robinson v. Evans (Galveston Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1973			X					
* Ross v. Peterson (Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1967			X					
* Sampson v. Aldene Ind. Sch. Dist.	1967	Geographic Plan.							
* Thomas v. Bowen (Bryan Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1975			X					
* Washington v. A. & M. Ind. Consoli- dated Sch. Dist.	1967								
* As of April, 1966									

TEXAS Eastern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
		All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	
Adams v. Mathews (Longview Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1967	x	x	x			x	x	
*Brown v. Hendrix (Beaumont Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1974			x					
*Price v. Denison Ind. Sch. Dist.	1967		x	x			x	x	
*Richard v. Christ (Hamshire- Fannett Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1974			x					
* As of April, 1966									

- 45 -

Texas Western District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON- RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON- CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News- paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
* Carter v. Hix (Gatesville Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1963	General injunction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis.							
* McGrue v. Williams (Waco Ind. Sch. Dist.) 1/	1967			X					
* Miller v. Barnes (Georgetown Ind. Sch. Dist.)	1976			X					
1/ Desegregation plan not available.									
* As of April, 1966									

- 46 -

Explanation of Category Headings

CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE

Overcrowding Only:

An "X" signifies that no choice or transfer request can be denied for any reason other than overcrowding.

In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only:

An "X" signifies that once it is determined that granting all choices would cause overcrowding, the only criteria for determining which choices should be rejected is the comparative proximity of students' homes to the school -- choices of students living farthest from the school would be rejected. No plan based on initial racial assignment and subsequent right of transfer can be marked in this column, for all such plans involve a preference for students already attending the school.

Pupil Placement Criteria:

This column applies only to transfer plans. An "X" signifies that transfer applications may be denied by the School Board for such criteria as the desire or wishes of the pupil or his parents, the pupil's scholastic record, ability and aptitude, and his expected compatibility in the school to which he has requested transfer.

Unlike most columns in the chart, a mark in this column signifies what we consider to be a negative element of the plan.

"Comparable School" Provision:

An "X" signifies the inclusion of a provision substantially as follows:

"In the event a transfer is requested to a particular school, but it develops that there is available space in another school in all respects comparable to the one to which transfer is requested, closer to the applicant's residence, the School Board may, if it deems it advisable, make the transfer to the comparable school closest to the pupil's residence, rather than to the school to which the transfer was requested."

It is not clear whether the racial composition of schools is considered in determining whether one school is comparable to another.

SPECIAL TRANSFERS

To Take Courses Not Available:

An "X" signifies provision for a right to transfer, applicable to all grades, in order to take a course which is not offered at the school to which the student has been assigned. This column does not differentiate a transfer right which is absolute from a transfer right which may, in the discretion of the School Board, be denied.

Newly Enrolled Students:

An "X" signifies that any student newly enrolling in the school system is given either a free choice of all schools, or is initially assigned by race and then given a right to transfer to an integrated school.

Students Who Move:

An "X" signifies that a student already enrolled in the school system who changes his residence within the area served by the school system, is given either a free choice of all schools, or is initially assigned by race to a new school and then given a right to transfer to an integrated school.

Singleton Transfer Rule:

An "X" signifies that any student in a grade not yet desegregated has an absolute right to transfer to an integrated school. Inclusion of the Singleton transfer rule in a plan obviates the need for other forms of special transfer rules.

ALABAMA Northern Dis- trict	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Armstrong v. Bd. of Ed. of Birmingham						X ^{1/}		
Bennett v. Madi- son Co. Alabama Bd. of Ed.		X	X					
Boykins v. Fair- field Bd. of Ed.						X		
Brown v. City Bd. of Ed. of Bessemer						X		
Hereford v. City of Huntsville, Ala. Bd. of Ed.		X ^{2/}				X ^{1/}		
Hutton v. Lee (Greene Co.)	X	X						
1/ On same time schedule as for whole plan.								
2/ And "all other relevant factors."								

[illegible]

ALABAMA	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Middle District								
Carr v. Montgomery Co. School Board	X	X			X	X	X	X
Harris v. Bullock Co. Bd. of Ed.	X	X						
Harris, et al v. Crenshaw Co. Bd. of Ed	X	X				X		
Lee v. Macon Co. Bd. of Ed	X	X						
U.S. v. Lowndes Co. Bd. of Ed	X	X				X		

ALABAMA	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Southern District								
*Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of City of Demopolis	Suit filed August 13, 1965. No court approved desegregation plan.							
*Davis v. Bd. of Commissioners of Mobile County	1960 Geographic Plan with First Graders having a choice of the school in their district or the nearest school formerly attended exclusively by their race.							
U.S. v. Choctaw Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	X ^{1/}					X	X	
U.S. v. Hale Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	X	X				X		
U.S. v. Perry Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	X	X				X		
U.S. v. Wilcox Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	X ^{2/}	X						
1/ "No choice will be denied for any reason."								
2/ "...no choice shall be denied except for good and sufficient reasons related to the administration of the school system such as over-subscription beyond the physical capacity of a given school...." Court order 8/31/66.								
*As of April, 1966								

FLORIDA	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Northern District								
Augustus v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Escambia County			x			x		
Steele v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Leon County						x		
Wright v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Alachua County		x	x			x		
Youngblood v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Bay County			x					x ^{1/}
1/ As to certain limitation as to proximity; applicable to 115 named students only. Court order 9/15/66.								

*As of April, 1966

FLORIDA Middle District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Blalock v. Bd. of Publ. Inst. Lee County								
*Bradley v. Belot Pub. Inst. Pinellas County		Geographic Plan						
*Braxton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Duval County		Geographic Plan						
*Ellis v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Orange County		x			x			
*Harvest v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Manatee County		x						
*Lawson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Suwanne County		This suit was filed January 25, 1965. approved desegregation plan.			It does not have a Court			
*Mannings v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Hillsborough Co.		x						
*Mays v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Sarasota County								
*Mills v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Polk County			x			x		

*As of April, 1965

FLORIDA Middle District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Scott v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. of St. John's County	This suit was filed April 6, 1962. It does not have a court-approved							
*Tillman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Volusia County						x		
*Weaver v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Brevard County					x	x		
*Zimmerman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Columbia County	x					x		

- 55 -

*As of April, 1960

FLORIDA

Southern District

CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE

SPECIAL TRANSFERS

	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Gibson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Dade County			X			X		
*Hall v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Broward County			X					
*Holland v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Palm Beach Co.		Geographic Plan						
*Major v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Monroe County			X					
*Sharpton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Indian River Co.			X		X			

GEORGIA

Northern District

CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE

SPECIAL TRANSFERS

	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
* Calhoun v. Latimer (Atlanta)	X	X			X <u>1/</u>			
1/ This reason will be considered; no absolute right to transfer for this reason.								
As of April, 1966								

GEORGIA
Middle
District

CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE

SPECIAL TRANSFERS

	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Bivins v. Bd of Pub. Ed. Orpha- nage for Bibb Co.	X	X ^{1/}				X		
*Gaines v. Dougherty Co. Bd of Ed.	X	X						
*Harrington v. Colquitt Co. Bd. & City of Moultrie Bd. of Commns.								
*Lockett v. Bd. of Ed. of Muscogee Co. Sch. Dist.								
*Thomie v. Houston Co., Bd. of Ed.	X	X				X		
<u>1/</u> For high school - transportation also a criteria.								
*As of April, 1966								

GEORGIA	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Southern District								
Acree v. Richmond County Bd. of Ed.								
Gibson v. Glynn County Board of Education	No court-approved desegregation plan.							
Stell v. Savannah-Chatham Co. Bd. of Ed.			X ^{1/}					
Turner v. Goolsby (Taliaferro County)	Suit filed September 10, 1965.			No court-approved desegregation plan.				

^{1/} Proximity, also.
As of April, 1966

LOUISIANA	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Banks v. St. James Parish Sch. Bd.	X <u>1</u> /		X <u>1</u> /	X				
Boyd v. Pointe Coupee Parish Sch. Bd.	X <u>1</u> /		X <u>1</u> /	X				
Bush v. Orleans Parish Sch. Bd.	Geographic Plan							
Carter v. Sch. Bd. of West Feliciana Parish	X <u>1</u> /		X <u>1</u> /	X				
Charles v. Ascension Parish Sch. Bd.	X <u>1</u> /		X <u>1</u> /	X				
Danbridge v. Jefferson Parish Sch. Bd.			X	X				
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Sch. Bd.	X <u>2</u> /		X <u>2</u> /	X				
1/ Initial assignments on a freedom of choice basis must be made on a first come, first served basis. Pupil placement criteria are used for denying transfers.								
2/ Students apply at any school within their district on first come, first served basis. Excess registrants to to other schools in district, without regard to race. Placement criteria are used for denying transfers after initial registration.*As of April, 1966								

LOUISIANA Eastern District	REACH OF PLAN	NOTICE		MECHANICS FOR EXERCISING CHOICE					NON-RACIAL ASSIGNMENT OF NON-CHOOSERS
	All Grades Covered By	Personal Notice	News-paper Notice	Annual Choice	All Students Must Choose	Second Choice	Officials Not to Influence Choice	Routing of Buses to Accommodate Choice	
*George v. Davis (East Feliciana Parish)	1967	X	X	X					
Hall v. St. Helena Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
*Harris v. St. John the Baptist Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
*Hill v. La-fourche Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed December 13, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 regarding board to submit plan.								
Jenkins v. City of Bogalusa Sch. Bd.	1968	X	X	X					
*Moore v. Tangipahoa Parish Sch. Bd.	1968	X	X	X					
*Moses v. Washington Parish Sch. Bd.	1967	X	X	X					
*Redmond v. Terrebonne Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed June 1, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 requiring board to submit plan.								
* As of April, 1966									

LOUISIANA Eastern District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Moses v. Washing- ton Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1/</u>				
*Redmond v. Terre- bonne Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed June 1, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 requiring board to submit plan.							
Smith v. St. Tammany Parish Sch. Bd.	X	X <u>3/</u>			X	X		X
*Thomas & West Baton Rouge Parish Sch. Bd.	X <u>2/</u>		X <u>2/</u>	X				
Williams v. Iverville Parish Sch. Bd.			X	X				
U.S. v. St. Bernard Parish Sch. Bd.	X	X <u>3/</u>			X	X		
U.S. v. Plaque- mines Parish Sch. Bd.	X	X <u>3/</u>			X	X		
1/ The other criteria are desires of students and parents, availability of space and of desired courses, and comparison of age.								
2/ Initial placement on a freedom of choice basis must be made on a first come, first served basis. Pupil placement criteria are used for denying transfers.								
3/ Preference may also be given in order to permit siblings to attend the same school, or to permit a child to attend a school where his parent is regularly employed.								

*As of April, 1966

LOUISIANA Western District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
* Andrews v. City of Monroe				X ^{1/}		X		
Banks v. Claiborne Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{1/}		X		
* Battise v. Acadia Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{1/}				
* Boudreaux v. St. Mary Parish Sch. Bd.		X ^{2/}						
* Celestain v. Vermillion Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed April 4, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.							
* Conley v. Lake Charles Sch. Bd. & Calcasieu Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{1/}				
* Gilbert v. Webster Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{1/}		X		
1/ The other criteria are desires of students and parents, availability of space and of desired courses, and comparison of age.								
2/ The other criteria are class size, multiple children in family, parental request, special recommendations.								
*As of April, 1966								

LOUISIANA Western District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Gordan v. Jeff Davis Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{2/}				
*Graham v. Evan- geline Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{2/}				
*Henderson v. Iberia Parish Sch. Bd.		X ^{1/}						
Johnson v. Jackson Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{2/}		X		
Jones v. Caddo Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{2/}		X		
Lemon v. Bossier Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{2/}		X		
*Monteilh v. St. Landry Parish Sch. Bd.				X ^{2/}				
1/ The other criteria are class size, multiple children in family, parental request, special recommendations.								
2/ The other criteria are desires of students and parents, availability of space and of desired courses, and comparison of age.								
*As of April, 1965								

- 64 -

LOUISIANA Western District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Robertson v. Natchitoches Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /				
Smith v. Concordia Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /		X		
*Trahan v. Lafayette Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /				
*Thomas v. St. Martin Parish Sch. Bd.		X <u>2</u> /						
Valley v. Rapides Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /		X		
*Williams v. Kim- brough (Madison Parish)				X <u>1</u> /		X		
U.S. v. Bienville Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /		X		
1/ The other criteria are class size, multiple children in family, parental request, special recommendations.								
2/ The other criteria are desires of students and parents, availability of space and of desired courses, and comparison of age.								
*As of April, 1956				- 65 -				

LOUISIANA Western District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
U.S. v. DeSoto Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit	filed January	11, 1967.	No court-approved desegregation plan.				
U.S. v. Grant Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /		X		
U.S. v. LaSalle Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /		X		
U.S. v. Lincoln Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /		X		
U.S. v. Richland Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /		X		
<u>1</u> / The other criteria are desires of students and parents, availability of space and of desired courses, and comparison of age.								

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Ayers v. Western Line Cons. Sch. District		Suit filed January 11, 1966.		No court-approved desegregation plan.				
Baird v. Benton County Board of Education	X	X			X			X
*Bell v. West Point Mun. Sep. Sch. Dist. (Clay Co.)		Suit filed August 13, 1965. District operating under HEW Plan.		No court-approved desegregation plan.				
*Cowan v. Bolivar County Board of Education	X	X			X			
*Henry v. Clarks- dale Mun. Sep. Sch. District		Geographic Plan						
U.S. v. Aberdeen Mun. Separate Sch. District	X	X			X	X		X

*As of April, 1966

MISSISSIPPI	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Northern District								
U.S. v. Calhoun County Board of Education		X				X	X <u>2</u> /	X
U.S. v. Carroll Co. Board of Education		X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Corurth Municipal Sep. Sch. District	X	X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Greenwood Municipal Sep. School District		X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Indiana Municipal Sep. School District		X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Inka Special Mun. Sep. Sch. Dis.	X	X				X		X
U.S. v. Leflore Co. Sch. District		X <u>1</u> /			X	X		X
U.S. v. Louisville Mun. Sep. Sch. District	Suit filed October 3, 1966. No court-ordered desegregation plan.							
U.S. v. Sunflower County Sch. District		X			X	X		X

1/ "Provided that for justifiable administrative reasons other factors not related to race may be considered."

2/ "Or for valid other reasons not related to race." - 68 -

	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	<u>Singleton</u> <u>Transfer</u> Rule
MISSISSIPPI Northern District								
J.S. v. Humphreys County School District								

- 69 -

MISSISSIPPI

Southern District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Alexander v. Holmes Co. Board of Education	X	X						
Anderson v. Canton Munic. Sch. District	X	X ^{1/}			X	X		X
Anderson v. Madison Co. Sch. District	X	X ^{1/}			X	X		X
Barnhardt v. Meridian Separate Sch. Dist.	X	X ^{1/}				X		X
Blackwell v. Issaquena Co. Bd. of Ed.						X		X ^{2/}
Gladney v. Moss Pt. Munic. Sep. School District	X	X						
Hudson v. Leake Co. Sch. Board		X				X		X
1/ "except that to race may be applied."						unrelated		
2/ Subject to the requirements and criteria applicable equally to all students without regard to race.								
s of April, 1966								

MISSISSIPPI	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Southern District								
Killingsworth v. Enterprise Consolidated	X	X				X		X
Lee v. U.S. (Forrest Co.)		X			X			
Mason v. Biloxi Munic. Sep. Sch. District	X	X			X			
Singleton v. Jackson Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.	X	X			X	X		X ^{1/}
U.S. v. Amite County School District	X	X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Covington Co. School District	X	X						
U.S. v. Hinds County School Bd	Suit filed January 11, 1967. No court-approved desegregation plan.							
1/ Subject to the requirements and criteria applicable equally to all students without regard to race.								
s of April, 1966				- 71 -				

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
U.S. v. Kemper County School Board					X	X		X
U.S. v. Natchez Special Munic. School District	X	X			X	X		^{1/} X
U.S. v. Neshoba Co. School Dist.	Suit filed. No court-approved desegregation plan.							
U.S. v. North Pike Cons. Sch. District	X	^{2/} X			X	X		
U.S. v. North Tippah Cons. School District	X	X				X		X
U.S. v. Noxubee County School District		X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Phila- delphia Mun. Sep School District	Suit filed August 18, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.							
^{1/} Subject to the requirements and criteria applicable equally to all students without regard to race.								
^{2/} Except that for justifiable and administrative reasons, other factors unrelated to race may be applied.								

MISSISSIPPI	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Southern District								
U.S. v. South Pike Co. Cons. School District	X	X			X	X		X
U.S. v. Wilkin-son Co. School District	X	X			X ^{1/}	X	X	X
U.S. v. Lauderdale County Sch. Dist.	Suit Filed August 18, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.							
1/ Or in order to attend a school that a relative in the household is attending as a result of the desegregation plan.								

TEXAS	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over-crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
Northern District								
Avery v. Wichita Falls Ind. Sch. Dist.	This case was closed in 1962 without a desegregation plan.							
Britton v. Folsom (Dallas Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Geographic Plan.							
Flax v. Potts (Ft. Worth Ind. Sch. Dist.)							x	
Jackson v. Rawdon (Mansfield Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Order that defendants "...are hereby forever restrained from refusing admission to Mansfield High School to any of the plaintiffs shown to be qualified in all respects for admission -							
Rainwater v. Smith (Carrollton Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Geographic Plan.							
1/ Decree August 29, 1955, p. 2.								
As of April, 1966								

TEXAS Southern District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
*Eastland v. Northeast Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.								
*Evans v. Brooks (Texas City Ind. Sch. Dist.)								
*Gibbs v. Bd. of Trustees of Port Isabel Ind. Sch. Dist.	General injunction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis							
*Hernandez v. Driscoll Consoli- dated Ind. Sch. Dist.	This case involved Mexican students. It was closed in 1957.							
*Robinson v. Evans (Galveston Ind. Sch. Dist.)								
*Ross v. Peterson (Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.)								
*Sampson v. Aldene Ind. Sch. Dist.	Geographic Plan.							
*Thomas v. Bowen (Bryan Ind. Sch. Dist.)								
*Washington v. A. & M. Ind. Consoli- dated Sch. Dist.								
As of April, 1966				- 75 -				

Texas Western District	CRITERIA FOR DENYING CHOICE				SPECIAL TRANSFERS			
	Over- crowding Only	In Case of Overcrowding, Proximity Only	Pupil Placement Criteria	"Comparable School" Provision	To Take Courses Not Available	Newly Enrolled Students	Students Who Move	Singleton Transfer Rule
* Carter v. Hix (Gatesville Ind. Sch. Dist.)	General	injunction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis.						
* McGrue v. Williams (Waco Ind. Sch. Dist.) <u>1/</u>								
* Miller v. Barnes (Georgetown Ind. Sch. Dist.)								
<u>1/</u> Desegregation plan not available.								
*As of April, 1966								

Explanation of Category Headings

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

Faculty Meetings and In-Service Training:

An "X" signifies a provision in the plan requiring that faculty meetings and in-service training programs be held and operated on an integrated basis.

Elimination of Race in New Hiring and Assignment:

An "X" signifies a provision barring further racial discrimination in the hiring and assignment of teachers. The column does not differentiate plans which also provide for non-discrimination in dismissals, demotion, retention, or promotion.

Correction of Past Racial Assignment:

An "X" signifies that some provision is made for eliminating past racial assignments of teachers. The column does not differentiate between plans which contain general provisions, and those which set up specific machinery such as filling teaching vacancies from within the system with teachers of the opposite race.

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES

General Provision:

An "X" signifies a general provision barring discrimination in the various activities related to education. These would include parent meetings, locker rooms, waiting periods for athletic eligibility when prior assignment was based on race, graduation ceremonies, choir, and the like.

Transportation:

An "X" signifies that the plan contains a specific requirement that transportation facilities be desegregated.

ALABAMA

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

Northern District

Faculty
Meetings &
Inservice
TrainingElimination
of Race
in New Hiring
& AssignmentCorrection
of Past
Racial
AssignmentsGeneral
Provision

Transportation

Armstrong v.
Bd. of Ed. of
BirminghamBennett v. Madi-
son Co. Alabama
Bd. of Ed.Boykins v. Fair-
field Bd. of Ed.Brown v. City
Bd. of Ed. of
BessemerHereford v. City
of Huntsville,
Ala. Bd. of Ed.Hutton v. Lee
(Greene Co.)

X

X

1/1/1/ No school transportation system.

[illegible]

Middle District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Carr v. Montgomery Co. School Board		X	X	X	X
Harris v. Bullock Co. Bd. of Ed.		X	X	X	X
Harris, et al. v. Crenshaw Co. Bd. of Ed.		X	X	X	X
Lee v. Macon Co. Bd. of Ed.		X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Lowndes Co. Bd. of Ed.		X	X	X	X

- 81 -

ALABAMA Southern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
*Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of City of Demopolis	Suit filed August 13, 1965. No court approved desegregation plan.				
*Davis v. Bd. of Commissioners of Mobile Co.	1960 Geographic Plan with First Graders having a choice of the school in their district or the nearest school formerly attended exclusively by their race.				
U.S. v. Choctaw Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.		X		X	X
U.S. v. Hale Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.		X		X	
U.S. v. Perry Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.		X		X	
U.S. v. Wilcox Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.					
* As of April, 1966			- 82 -		

FLORIDA	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Northern District					
Augustus v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Escambia County					
Steele v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Leon County					
Wright v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Alachua County	x			x	x
Youngblood v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Bay County					
* As of April, 1966					
			- 83 -		

FLORIDA Middle District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Blalock v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Lee County		X			
* Bradley v. Belot Pub. Inst. Pinellas County		Geographic Plan			
Braxton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Duval County		Geographic Plan			
* Ellis v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Orange County		X		X	
* Harvest v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Manatee County		X			X
* Lawson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Suwanne County	This suit was filed January 25, 1965. desegregation plan.			It does not have a court approved	
* Mannings v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Hillsborough Co.		X		X	
* Mays v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Sarasota County					
* Mills v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Polk County					
* As of April, 1966					

FLORIDA Middle District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Scott v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. of St. John's County	This suit was filed April 6, 1962. It does not have a court approved desegregation plan.				
* Tillman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Volusia County					
* Weaver v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Brevard County		x		x	
* Zimmerman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Columbia County	x				x
* As of April, 1966					

FLORIDA

Southern District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
*Gibson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Dade County					
*Hall v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Broward County					
*Holland v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Palm Beach Co.		Geographic Plan			
*Major v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Monroe County		X		X	
*Sharpton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Indian River Co.		X			
* As of April, 1966					

GEORGIA

Northern District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
*Calhoun v. Latimer (Atlanta)					
* As of April, 1966					

GEORGIA Middle District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Bivins v. Bd. of Pub. Ed. & Orphanage for Bibb Co.					
* Gaines v. Bougherty Co. Bd. of Ed.					
* Harrington v. Colquitt Co. Bd. of Ed. & City of Moultrie Bd. & Commissioners					
* Lockett v. Bd. of Ed. of Muscogee Co. Sch Dist.					
* Thomie v. Houston Co. Bd. of Ed.					X
* As of April, 1966					

GEORGIA
Southern District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Acree v. Richmond Co. Bd. of Ed.					
* Gibson v. Glynn County Board of Education	No court-approved desegregation plan.				
Stell v. Savannah-Chatham Co. Bd. of Education					
Turner v. Goolsby (Taliaferro Co.)	Suit filed September 10, 1965. No court-approved desegregation plan.				
* As of April, 1966					

LOUISIANA Eastern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Banks v. St. James Parish Sch. Bd.					
Boyd v. Pointe Coupee Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Bush v. Orleans Parish Sch. Bd.	Geographic	Plan			
* Carter v. Sch. Bd. of West Feliciana Parish					
Charles v. Ascension Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Danbridge v. Jefferson Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Davis v. East Baton Rouge Sch. Bd.					X
Dunn v. Livings- ton Parish Sch. Bd.					
* George v. Davis (East Feli- ciana Parish)					
* As of April, 1966					

LOUISIANA

Eastern
District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Hall v. St. Helena Parish Sch. Bd.					X
* Harris v. St. John the Bap- tist Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Hill v. Lafourche Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed December 13, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 requiring board to submit plan.				
Jenkins v. City of Bogalusa Sch. Bd.					
* Moore v. Tangipahoa Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Moses v. Wash- ington Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Redmond v. Terrebonne Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed June 1, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 requiring board to submit plan.				
Smith v. St. Tammany Parish Sch. Bd.	X	X	X	X	X
* Thomas & West Baton Rouge Parish Sch. Bd.					
* As of April, 1966					

LOUISIANA Eastern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Williams v. Iberville Parish Sch. Bd.					
U.S. v. St. Bernard Parish Sch. Bd.		X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Plaquemines Parish Sch.Bd.	X	X	X	X	X

LOUISIANA Western District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Andrews v. City of Monroe					
Banks v. Claiborne Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Battise v. Acadia Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Boudreaux v. St. Mary Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Celestain v. Vermillion Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed April 4, 1966.			No court-approved desegregation plan.	
* Conley v. Lake Charles Sch. Bd. & Calcasieu Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Gilbert v. Webster Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Gordan v. Jeff Davis Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Graham v. Evan- geline Parish Sch. Bd.					
* As of April, 1966					

LOUISIANA Western District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Henderson v. Iberia Parish Sch. Bd.					
Johnson v. Jackson Parish Sch. Bd.					
Jones v. Caddo Parish Sch. Bd.					
Lemon v. Bossier Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Monteilh v. St. Landry Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Robertson v. Natchitoches Parish Sch. Bd.					
Smith v. Concordia Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Trahan v. Lafayette Parish Sch. Bd.					
* Thomas v. St. Martin Parish Sch. Bd.					

LOUISIANA

Western
Section

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Valley v. Rapids Parish Sch. Bd.					X
*Williams v. Kimbrough (Madison Parish)					
U.S. v. Bienville Parish Sch. Bd.					
U.S. v. DeSoto Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed January 11, 1967. No court-approved desegregation plan.				
U.S. v. Grant Parish Sch. Bd.					
U.S. v. LaSalle Parish Sch. Bd.					
U.S. v. Lincoln Parish Sch. Bd.					
U.S. v. Richland Parish Sch. Bd.					
* As of April, 1966					

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
*Ayers v. Wes- tern Line Cons. School District	Suit filed January 11, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.				
Baird v. Benton County Board of Education	X			X	X
* Bell v. West Point Mun. Sep. Sch. Dis. (Clay Co)	Suit filed August 13, 1965. No court-approved desegregation plan. District operating under HEW Plan.				
* Cowan v. Boli- var County Bd. of Education					X
* Henry v. Clarks- dale Mun. Sep. School Dist.		Geographic Plan			
U.S. v. Aber- deen Mun. Sep. School Dist.		X		X	X
U.S. v. Calhoun Co. Bd. of Education	X	X		X	X
* As of April, 1966					

MISSISSIPPI
Northern
District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
U.S. v. Carroll Co. Board of Education		X			X
U.S. v. Corinth Mun. Sep. Sch. District		X		X	X
U.S. v. Greenwood Mun. Sep. School District		X		X	X
U.S. v. Indianola Mun. Sep. Sch. Dist.		X		X	X
U.S. v. Iuka Spec. Mun. Sep. School District		X		X	X
U.S. v. Leflore County School District		X			X
U.S. v. Louisville Mun. Sep. School Dist.	Suit filed October 3, 1966. No court-ordered desegregation plan.				

MISSISSIPPI
Northern
District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
U.S. v. Sunflower County School District		X		X	X
U.S. v. Humphreys County School District		X		X	X

MISSISSIPPI
Southern
District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Alexander v. Holmes Co. Bd. of Ed.					
Anderson v. Canton Munic. Sch. Dist.		X	X	X	X
Anderson v. Madison Co. Sch. District		X	X	X	X
Barnhardt v. Meridian Sep. Sch. Dist.	X	X			X
Blackwell v. Issaquena Co. Bd. of Ed.		X		X	X
* Gladney v. Moss Pt. Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.					
Hudson v. Leake Co. Sch. Bd.		X			X
* As of April, 1966			- 99 -		

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
*Killingsworth v Enterprise Con- solidated					X ^{1/}
Lee v. U.S. (Forrest Co.)		X			
Mason v. Biloxi Munic. Sep. Sch District	X	X			
Singleton v. Jackson Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.	X	X ^{1/}			
U.S. v. Amite County School District		X		X	X
U.S. v. Coving- ton Co. School District		X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Hinds County School Board	Suit filed January 11, 1967. No court-approved desegregation plan.				
1/ Quitman County School District only.					
* As of April, 1966			- 100 -		

MISSISSIPPI
Southern
District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

Faculty
Meetings &
Inservice
Training

Elimination
of Race
in New Hiring
& Assignment

Correction
of Past
Racial
Assignments

General
Provision

Transportation

U.S. v. Kemper
County School
Board

X

1/
X

X

X

U.S. v. Natchez
Spec. Munic.
School. Dist.

X

X

X

X

U.S. v. Neshoba
Co. School
District

Suit filed.

No court-approved desegregation plan.

U.S. v. North
Pike Consoli-
dated Sch. Dis.

X

X

X

X

U.S. v. North
Tippah Cons.
School Dis.

X

X

X

U.S. v. Noxubee
Co. School
District

X

X

X

U.S. v. Phila-
delphia Mun.
Sep. Sch. Dist.

Suit filed August 18, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.

1/ If any exists.

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
U.S. v. South Pike Co. Cons. School District		X	X	X	X
U.S. v. Wilkinson Co. School Dis.		X		X	X
U.S. v. Lauderdale County Sch. Dist.	Suit filed	August 18, 1966.	No court-approved desegregation plan.		

- 102 -

TEXAS	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
Northern District	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Avery v. Wichita Falls Ind. Sch. Dist.	This case was closed in 1962 without a desegregation plan.				
* Britton v. Folsom (Dallas Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Geographic Plan.				
* Flax v. Potts (Ft. Worth Ind. Sch. Dist.)				x	
* Jackson v. Rawson (Mansfield Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Order that defendants "...are hereby forever restrained from refusing admission to Mansfield High School to any of the plaintiffs shown to be qualified in all respects for admission." ¹				
* Rainwater v. Smith (Carrollton Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Geographic Plan.				
1/ Decree August 29, 1956. p. 2.					
* As of April, 1966					

- 103 -

TEXAS Southern District	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
* Eastland v. Northeast Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.					
* Evans v. Brooks (Texas City Ind. Sch. Dist.)					
* Gibbs v. Bd. of Trustees of Port Isabel Ind. Sch. Dist.	General injunction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis.				
* Hernandez v. Driscoll Consoli- dated Ind. Sch. Dist.	This case involved Mexican students. It was closed in 1957.				
* Robinson v. Evans (Galveston Ind. Sch. Dist.)					
* Ross v. Peterson (Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.)					
* Sampson v. Aldene Ind. Sch. Dist.	Geographic Plan.				
* Thomas v. Bowen (Bryan Ind. Sch. Dist.)					
* Washington v. A. & M. Ind. Consoli- dated Sch. Dist.					

TEXAS Eastern District.	FACULTY DESEGREGATION			DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS, FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND ACTIVITIES	
	Faculty Meetings & Inservice Training	Elimination of Race in New Hiring & Assignment	Correction of Past Racial Assignments	General Provision	Transportation
Adams v. Mathews (Longview Ind. Sch. Dist.)	x	x		x	x
* Brown v. Hendrix (Beaumont Ind. Sch. Dist.)					
* Price v. Denison (Ind. Sch. Dist.)		x		x	x
* Richard v. Christ (Hamshire-Fannett Ind. Sch. Dist.)					
* As of April, 1966					

Texas
Western
District

FACULTY DESEGREGATION

DESEGREGATION OF PROGRAMS,
FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND
ACTIVITIES

Faculty
Meetings &
Inservice
Training

Elimination
of Race
in New Hiring
& Assignment

Correction
of Past
Racial
Assignments

General
Provision

Transportation

* Carter v. Hix
(Gatesville Ind.
Sch. Dist.)

General in junction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis.

* McGrue v. Williams
(Waco Ind. Sch.
Dist.) 1/

* Miller v. Barnes
(Georgetown Ind.)
Sch. Dist.)

1/ Desegregation plan not available.

* As of April 1966

Explanation of Category Headings

EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

Closing Inferior Schools:

An "X" signifies that the plan provides for the closing of Negro schools which are so below standard in size and facilities that they cannot be improved to the standard of the community's white schools.

Equalization of Expenditures, Curriculum, or Facilities:

An "X" signifies the inclusion of any provision which looks towards raising any aspect of a Negro school or schools to equivalence with the community's white schools.

Remedial Educational Programs:

An "X" signifies a provision which calls for remedial instructional programs designed to eliminate educational deficiencies in Negro students resulting from their having been taught in years past under inferior educational conditions in racially segregated schools.

PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT

An "X" signifies the inclusion in the plan or in the court order approving the plan of any provision, however limited, requiring the school board to make a report to the district court.

ALABAMA Northern Dis- trict	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Armstrong v. Bd. of Ed. of Birmingham				
Bennett v. Madi- son Co. Alabama Bd. of Ed.				
Boykins v. Fair- field Bd. of Ed.				
Brown v. City Bd. of Ed. of Bessemer				
Hereford v. City of Huntsville, Ala. Bd. of Ed.				
Hutton v. Lee (Green Co.,)	X	X		X ^{1/}
<u>1/</u> As to certain named transfers only. Court order 9/19/66.				

ALABAMA Northern Dis- trict	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Miller v. Bd. of Ed. of Gad- sden, Alabama				
Stout v. Jeffer- son Co., Bd. of Ed.				

ALABAMA Middle District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Carr v. Mont- gomery Co. School Board	X		X	X
Harris v. Bul- lock Co. Bd. of Ed.	X		X	X
Harris, et al. v. Crenshaw Co. Bd. of Ed.	X	X		X ^{1/}
Lee v. Macon Co. Bd. of Ed.	X		X	X
U.S. v. Lowndes Co. Bd. of Ed.	X		X	
<u>1/</u> One specified report on transportation only.				
			- 110 -	

ALABAMA

Southern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of City of Demopolis		No court approved desegregation plan. Suit filed August 13, 1965.		
*Davis v. Bd. of Commissioners of Mobile Co.	1960 Geographic Plan with	First Graders having a choice of the school in their district or the nearest school formerly attended exclusively by their race.		
U.S. v. Choctaw Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.				
U.S. v. Hale Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	X			
U.S. v. Perry Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.	X			
U.S. v. Wilcox Co. Bd. of Ed. et al.				
* As of April, 1966			- 111 -	

FLORIDA
Northern District

EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

PROVISION
FOR
REPORTING
TO
COURT

Closing of
Inferior
Schools

Equalization of
Expenditures
Curriculum, or
Facilities

Remedial
Educational
Programs

*Augustus v. Bd
of Pub. Inst.
Escambia County

Steele v. Bd.
of Pub. Inst.
Leon County

*Wright v. Bd.
of Pub. Inst.
Alachua County

Youngblood v.
Bd. of Pub. Inst.
Bay County

X^{1/}

1/ As to 115 named students only. Court order 9/15/66.

* As of April, 1966

FLORIDA Middle District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Blalock v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Lee County				
*Bradley v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Pinellas County		Geographic Plan		
*Braxton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Duval County		Geographic Plan		
*Ellis v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Orange County				
*Harvest v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Manatee County				
*Lawson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Suwannee County	This suit was filed January 25, 1965. It does not have a Court approved desegregation plan.			
*Mannings v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Hillsborough Co.				
*Mays v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Sarasota County				
*Mills v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Polk County				

FLORIDA Middle District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Scott v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. of St. John's County	This suit was filed April 6, 1962. It does not have a court approved desegregation plan.			
*Tillman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Volusia County				
*Weaver v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Brevard County				
*Zimmerman v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Columbia County				
* As of April, 1966			- 114 -	

FLORIDA

Southern District

EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

PROVISION
FOR
REPORTING
TO
COURT

	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Gibson v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Bade County				
*Hall v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Broward County				
*Holland v. Bd. Pub. Inst. Palm Beach Co.		Geographic Plan		
*Major v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Monroe County				
*Sharpton v. Bd. of Pub. Inst. Indian River Co.				

* As of April, 1966

GEORGIA

Northern District

EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

PROVISION
FOR
REPORTING
TO
COURT

Closing of
Inferior
Schools

Equalization of
Expenditures
Curriculum, or
Facilities

Remedial
Educational
Programs

*Calhoun v.
Latimer
(Atlanta)

* As of April, 1966

GEORGIA Middle District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Bivins v. Bd. of Pub. Ed. Orphanage for Bibb Co.				
*Gaines v. Dougherty Co. Bd. of Ed.				
*Harrington v. Colquitt Co. Bd. of Ed. & City of Houston Co. Bd. of Commissioners				
*Lockett v. Bd. of Ed. of Muskegee Co. Sch. Dist.				
*Thomie v. Houston Co. Bd. of Ed.				
* As of April, 1966			- 117 -	

GEORGIA	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Southern District				
*Acree v. Rich- mond County Bd. of Ed.				
*Gibson v. Glynn County Board of Education	No court-approved desegregation plan.			
Stell v. Savannah Chatham Co. Bd. of Ed.				
Turner v. Goolsby (Taliaferro County)	Suit filed September 10, 1965. No court-approved desegregation plan.			
* As of April, 1966				

LOUISIANA	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Eastern District				
Banks v. St. James Parish Sch. Bd.				
Boyd v. Pointe Coupee Parish Sch. Bd.				
* Bush v. Orleans Parish Sch. Bd.	Geographic	Plan		
* Carter v. Sch. Bd. of West Feliciana Parish				
Charles V. Ascension Parish Sch. Bd.				
* Danbridge v. Jef- ferson Parish Sch. Bd.				
* Davis v. East Baton Rouge Sch. Bd.				
Dunn v. Livings- ton Parish Sch. Bd.				
* As of April 1966			- 119 -	

LOUISIANA Eastern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*George v. Davis (East Feliciana Parish)				X <u>1</u> /
Hall v. St. Helena Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>2</u> /
*Harris v. St. John the Baptist Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Hill v. Lafourche Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed December 13, 1965 board to submit plan.		Order of March 23, 1966 requiring	
Jenkins v. City of Bogalusa Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /
*Moore v. Tangipahoa Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /
*Moses v. Washington Parish Sch. Bd.				X <u>1</u> /
<u>1</u> / Board to submit to court single system of geographic school districts as dual system of zones is abolished. Combination geographic and transfer plan.				
<u>2</u> / Bus routing & scheduling plans are to be furnished to the Court as soon as practicable before the commencement of the 1966-67 school year.				
* As of April, 1966 - 120 -				

LOUISIANA Eastern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
* Redmond v. Terrebonne Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed June 1, 1965. Order of March 23, 1966 requiring board to submit plan.			
Smith v. St. Tammany Parish Sch. Bd.	X	X	X	X
* Thomas & West Baton Rouge Parish Sch. Bd.				
Williams v. Iberville Parish Sch. Bd.				
U.S. v. St. Bernard Parish Sch. Bd.		X	X	X
U.S. v. Plaquemines Parish Sch. Bd.		X	X	X
* As of April, 1966			- 121 -	

LOUISIANA Western District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Andrews v. City of Monroe				
Banks v. Claiborne Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Battise v. Acadia Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Boudreaux v. St. Mary Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Celestain v. Vermillion Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed April 4, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.			
*Conley v. Lake Charles Sch. Bd. & Calcasieu Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Gilbert v. Webster Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Gordan v. Jeff Davis Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Graham v. Fvan- geline Parish Sch. Bd.				

LOUISIANA Western District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Henderson v. Iberia Parish Sch. Bd.				
Johnson v. Jackson Parish Sch. Bd.				
Jones v. Caddo Parish Sch. Bd.				
Lemon v. Bossier Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Monteilh v. St. Landry Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Robertson v. Natchitoches Parish Sch. Bd.				
Smith v. Concordia Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Trahan v. Lafayette Parish Sch. Bd.				
*Thomas v. St. Martin Parish Sch. Bd.			- 123 -	

* As of April, 1966

LOUISIANA Western Section	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Valley v. Rapides Parish Sch. Bd.				
* Williams v. Kimbrough (Madison Parish)				
U.S. v. Bienville Parish Sch. Bd.				
U.S. v. DeSoto Parish Sch. Bd.	Suit filed January 11, 1967.			No court-approved desegregation plan.
U.S. v. Grant Parish Sch. Bd.				
U.S. v. LaSalle Parish Sch. Bd.				
U.S. v. Lincoln Parish School Board				
U.S. v. Richland Parish Sch. Bd.				
* As of April, 1966			- 124 -	

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Ayers v. Western Line Cons. Sch. District	Suit filed January 11, 1966.		No court-approved desegregation plan.	
Baird v. Benton County Board of Education		X		
Bell v. West Point Mun. Sep. Sch. Dt. (Clay Co)	Suit filed August 13, 1965. District operating under HEW		No court-approved desegregation plan. Plan.	
Cowan v. Bolivar County Board of Education		X		
Henry v. Clarks- dale Mun. Sep. School District		Geographic Plan		
U.S. v. Aberdeen Mun. Sep. Sch. District		X	X	X
U.S. v. Calhoun Co. Bd. of Education				X

* As of April, 1966

- 125 -

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
U.S. v. Carroll Co. Bd. of Education		X		
U.S. v. Corinth Mun. Sep. Sch. District		X	X	X
U.S. v. Green- wood Mun. Sep. School Dist.				
U.S. v. Indianola Mun. Sep. Sch. Dist.		X		
U.S. v. Iuka Spec. Mun. Sep. Sch. Dist.				X
U.S. v. Leflore Co. School Dist.				
U.S. v. Louis- ville Mun. Sep. School Dist.	Suit filed October 3, 1966.		No court-ordered desegregation plan.	

MISSISSIPPI Northern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
U.S. v. Sun- flower Co. Sch. District		X		
U.S. v. Humphreys County School District		X		

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Alexander v. Holmes Co. Bd. of Ed.				
Anderson v. Canton Munic. Sch. District		X	X	
Anderson v. Madison Co. School Dist.		X	X	
Barnhardt v. Meridian Sep. Sch. Dist.				
Blackwell v. Issaquena Co. Bd. of Ed.		X		X
*Gladney v. Moss Pt. Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist				
Hudson v. Leake Co. Sch. Bd.				
* As of April, 1966			- 128 -	

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
* Killingsworth v. Enterprise Con- solidated				
Lee v. U.S. (Forrest Co.)				
Mason v. Biloxi Munic. Sep. Sch. District				
Singleton v. Jackson Munic. Sep. Sch. Dist.				
U.S. v. Amite County School District		X		X
U.S. v. Coving- ton County Sch. District		X	X	
U.S. v. Hinds County School Board	Suit filed January 11, 1967. No court-approved desegregation plan.			
* As of April, 1966			- 129 -	

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
U.S. v. Kemper County School Board	X	X		
U.S. v. Natchez Special Munic. School District				
U.S. v. Neshoba County School District	Suit filed.	No court-approved desegregation plan.		
U.S. v. North Pike Consolidated Sch. District				
U.S. v. North Tippah Cons. Sch. District		X	X	X
U.S. v. Noxubee County School District		X		
U.S. v. Phila- delphia Mun. Sep. Sch. Dist.	Suit filed August 18, 1966.		No court-approved	desegregation plan.

MISSISSIPPI Southern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
U.S. v. South Pike Co. Cons. School Dist.		X	X	X
U.S. v. Wilkin- son Co. School District		X	X	
U.S. v. Lauder- dale County Sch. Dist.	Suit filed August 18, 1966. No court-approved desegregation plan.			

TEXAS Northern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Avery v. Wichita Falls Ind. Sch. Dist.	This case	was closed in 1962	without a desegregation plan.	
*Britton v. Folsom (Dallas Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Geographic Plan.			
*Flax v. Potts (Ft. Worth Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Jackson v. Rawdon (Mansfield Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Order that defendants "...are hereby forever restrained from refusing admission to Mansfield High School to any of the plaintiffs shown to be qualified in all respects for admission." ¹			
*Rainwater v. Smith (Carrollton Ind. Sch. Dist.)	Geographic Plan.			
<u>1/</u> Decree August 29, 1956,	p.2.			

* As of April, 1966

TEXAS Southern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
*Eastland v. Northeast Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.				
*Evans v. Brooks (Texas City Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Gibbs v. Bd. of Trustees of Port Isabel Ind. Sch. Dist.	General injunction requiring schools to operate on a non-racially discriminatory basis.			
*Hernandez v. Driscoll Consoli- dated Ind. Sch. Dist.	This case involved Mexican students. It was closed in 1957.			
*Robinson v. Evans (Galveston Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Ross v. Peterson (Houston Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Sampson v. Aldene Ind. Sch. Dist.	Geographic Plan.			
*Thomas v. Bowen (Bryan Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Washington v. A. & M. Ind. Consoli- dated Sch. Dist.				

TEXAS Eastern District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
Adams, v. Mathews (Longview Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Brown v. Hendrix (Beaumont Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Price v. Denison (Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
*Richard v. Christ (Hamshire-Fannett Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
* As of April, 1966			- 134 -	

Texas Western District	EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES			PROVISION FOR REPORTING TO COURT
	Closing of Inferior Schools	Equalization of Expenditures Curriculum, or Facilities	Remedial Educational Programs	
* Carter v. Hix (Gatesville Ind. Sch. Dist.)	General injunction requiring		schools to operate	on a non-racially discriminat
	basis.			
* McGrue v. Williams (Waco Ind. Sch. Dist.) <u>1/</u>				
* Miller v. Barnes (Georgetown Ind. Sch. Dist.)				
<u>1/</u> Desegregation plan not available.				
* As of April, 1966				