

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

CASE: 2006-2
DATE: 12/13/06

**THE CASE OF VOLUNTARY BUSING IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS:
THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY (METCO)¹**

“A pilot program of this type could well be put into effect by the fall of 1966. All the elements for success are present: the need, the desire on the part of suburban towns to share in the metropolitan planning, the organizational effort necessary to draw together the diverse factors involved. The creative, innovative nature of this project should make it relatively easy to secure initial funding. In addition, the program itself would serve as model for other areas.”

- Astrid Haussler, MA Federation for Fair Housing and Equal Rights²

METCO, founded in 1966 by a collaboration of black parents, black community activists, and suburban school educators, is a government-funded program that transports inner-city K-12 minority students to suburban public schools that volunteer seats. Over the past forty years, METCO has grown significantly from when its first group of 220 students (out of a possible 17,000 black students) was funded by the Carnegie Foundation and Title III United States Office of Education.³ Today, METCO continues to exist with substantial financial support from the state,⁴ buses about 3,200 enrolled in Boston’s urban public schools (7% of the possible 49,000 minority students out of a total of 57,000 students) to 34 suburban school districts in metropolitan Boston and at four school districts outside Springfield,⁵ and currently manages a long waiting list of more than 16,500 students.⁶ Meanwhile, it is likely that METCO will continue to exist for many years more, as METCO challengers are often met with harsh opposition from parents, school districts, and activists alike.

Though much academic attention has been given to the hostility surrounding Boston’s two-phase desegregation busing practices from 1974-1975 and 1975-1976, very little has been

¹ Christine D. Tran prepared this case under the supervision of Professor Daniel A. McFarland for the purpose of class discussions. Stanford University grants permission to reproduce and distribute this case for the sole purpose of education and research. Users may not create derivatives of the case without the express written permission of Stanford University and they may not commercially exploit the case or any material derived from it. The case is provided "as is" without any warranty. Stanford University makes no claims on the accuracy or currency of information within the case, and is not liable for how it is used. All copies must include the following notice on the inside cover: “©2007 The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved. All or portions of this material include copyrighted materials belonging to Stanford University. To obtain a commercial license please contact Imelda Oropeza at Imelda@stanford.edu." Any other use of the case in whole or part is prohibited. © 2007 The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.

² Ruth M. Batson, *The Black Educational Movement in Boston: A Sequence of Historical Events; A Chronology* (Boston: Northeastern University, 2001) 229-230.

³ Efreem Sigel and Gary F. Jonas, “Metropolitan Cooperation in Education,” *The Journal of Negro Education* Spring 1970.

⁴ Although the funding of around \$15 million each year remains stable, government cuts in school programs, social services, and youth jobs in the past 10 years has meant that though METCO costs have risen, a comparable rise in funding has not happened.

⁵ Focus on Children: Boston Public Schools, “Facts and Figures: Enrollment,” 1 Dec. 2006, <www.boston.k12.ma.us/bps>.

⁶ Jennifer Wolcott, “Schools that Embraced a Change,” *Christian Science Monitor* 11 May 2004.

written about the origins and development of METCO, which was created in response to the Massachusetts' 1965 Racial Imbalance Law.⁷ Since this year marks METCO's 40th anniversary, almost all current literature focuses heavily on the academic and life outcomes of METCO students.

According to the MA Department of Education, METCO was founded "to provide enhanced educational opportunities for urban minority students, to help integrate suburban school districts, and to reduce segregation in city schools. In addition, the purpose of the Metco program is to provide students of participating school districts the opportunity to experience the advantages of learning and working in a racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse setting."⁸ More than half of each year's 425 new student placements are from K-2nd grade, and as of 2003, 62% of students are African American, 30% are Hispanic, and 10% Asian – mirroring Boston Public School's minority composition.⁹

How did such a small program become so influential and capable of rapidly expanding after its inception, of garnering press throughout the 1960s, and of survival despite the massive unpopularity of mandatory busing practices in the 1970s, and what did this mean for the founding black activists' vision of community control?

ENVIRONMENT: BOSTON'S CLIMATE IN THE 1960S

METCO's formation happened during a period of heightened tensions around Boston public schooling, when the conflicts between the NAACP and the Boston School Committee were peaking. In the midst of public struggles between the black community and political leaders, METCO finally arose as a possible – if temporary – answer to the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965. METCO's development was heavily dictated by an established pattern of local black activist initiative against the Boston School Committee, which had refused to help alleviate educational inequalities in its inner-city neighborhoods. In 1954's *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled that legally sanctioned school segregation violated the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. By 1963, several members of Boston's NAACP Public School Subcommittee, led by METCO's eventual founder, Ruth M. Batson, started a battle with the School Committee to force them to find a solution to the inequities in black urban schools. With the cooperation of local organizations and black parents, they launched a school boycott, established their own Freedom Schools in 1964, organized a protest at the School Committee's headquarters, and started sit-ins in individual Committee members' offices.¹⁰

In 1954's *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* decision, the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled that legally sanctioned school segregation violated the 14th Amendment protecting civil rights and equal protection. Prompted by the Supreme Court's decision and frustrated with the Boston School Committee's resistance against alleviating segregation and its resistance against acknowledging Boston's problems with *de facto* segregation, black community activists rallied to take action, "recognizing that segregation in housing had restricted certain racial and ethnic groups, including African-Americans and Latinos, to neighborhoods whose schools were inferior to schools in predominately white communities."¹¹ Several members of

⁷ Enacted to reduce racial segregation, the law awarded funding from the state to local school districts where more than 50% of students were racial minorities so that they could devise desegregation plans.

⁸ MA Department of Education Website, 4 December 2006, <www.doe.mass.edu/metco>.

⁹ Gary Orfield et al, "City-Suburban Desegregation: Parent and Student Perspectives in Metropolitan Boston" (Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, September 1997).

¹⁰ Steven J. Taylor, *Desegregation in Boston and Buffalo* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998) 42.

¹¹ Blenda J. Wilson, "Untitled," *Connection: New England's Journal of Higher Education* Fall 2005.

Boston's NAACP Public School Subcommittee, led by Batson, started challenging the School Committee to find a solution to the inequities in black urban schools.

Finally, in 1965, Governor John A. Volpe introduced and the state legislature approved the Racial Imbalance Act (RIA), which prohibited school committees from allowing racial imbalance in their public schools (even in light of *de facto* segregation and housing patterns) and discouraged schools from having enrollments that are more than 50% minority at the risk of losing state funding. The act required that the state Board of Education request written desegregation plans from school committees in segregated parts of Massachusetts, including Boston and Springfield. RIA unsurprisingly saw much resistance from many parts of the state, and the Boston School Committee immediately challenged the law in U.S. District Court, which eventually ruled against the school board.¹² In 1965, the MA Board of Education also filed a suit against the Boston School Committee for noncompliance with the MA Supreme Judicial Court and won, prompting the School Committee to initiate a four-stage plan to address problems with segregation. The first stage involved opening a new school, supporting an Open Enrollment Program (which allowed students, regardless of color, to enroll in schools in any section of the city if there were available seats and if students provided their own transportation), and support of Operation Exodus and METCO.¹³

Taking advantage of Boston's open enrollment policy, Operation Exodus was planned, initiated on September 9, 1965, and executed by a local group of black parents. Led by director Ellen Jackson, who organized transportation for black students to schools outside of their Boston neighborhood, "Parents were in command at every level and took pride in the absence of professional educators."¹⁴ Though Operation Exodus remained in existence for six years (until METCO became the primary vehicle for voluntary busing in the early 1970s after stable state funding led to its expansion), the program encountered serious impediments to enrolling black students into receiving schools. Activists criticized one prominent member of the Boston School Committee, Louise Day Hicks, who was well known for her stances against busing and desegregation, by exposing her hypocrisy and writing that for Hicks, "Open enrollment was fine until exercised by blacks through Operation Exodus."¹⁵ Black parents and their children would be denied access to certain buildings, would need to produce non-existent yellow slips for admittance, and would be told their children had to sit in the back of the classroom. Judge W. Arthur Garrity of the MA District Court would later rule that the Boston School Committee only supported the Open Enrollment Program so that white students could leave predominately black schools. Additionally, the Boston School Committee did little beyond public support to alleviate Operation Exodus' challenges.¹⁶

METCO, in contrast to Operation Exodus' model, would require widespread support from local and state politicians, suburban school districts, and the local black community to thrive and to avoid some of the problems and confrontations that Operation Exodus faced from the Boston School Committee. These successfully established networks – many of which were with crucial educational leaders in suburban school districts who would see to it that METCO would be implemented in their district even if suburban voters disapproved the program – would effectively diminish over time the overall vision of black activist leaders. METCO would eventually develop lasting power, but at the expense of being only a temporary solution to

¹² Taylor 42.

¹³ Taylor 41-65.

¹⁴ Emmett H. Buell and Richard A. Brisbin, Jr., *School Desegregation and Defended Neighborhoods* (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company Lexington Books) 85.

¹⁵ Buell 85.

¹⁶ Buell 85.

address the Racial Imbalance Act and alleviate problems with segregation for the next three to four years as METCO's founders had hoped.

FORMATION OF METCO

Originally conceived in late 1965 by Dr. Leon Trilling, Chairperson of the Brookline School Committee, METCO sprung from a series of collaborative meetings between black community activists, parents, politicians, suburban school superintendent and principals. One of METCO's original founders, Ruth Batson, began her activist work for better Boston public schools for black children when she was appointed as the Chair of the Education Committee of Boston's NAACP in 1964. While at the NAACP, she was one of the principal organizers of the Boston Public School boycott and the Freedom Schools movement in 1963-64. In December 1965, Batson met with Trilling and Dr. Robert Sperber, Superintendent of the Brookline Public Schools, to talk about possible solutions to the problems with segregation in the Boston schools. The two men proposed a metropolitan plan to transport Boston school children to suburban school systems, with Brookline as the first receiving district.

With the support of the Massachusetts Federation for Fair Housing and the involvement of other suburban schools in the voluntary busing program, METCO was born on December 14, 1965 during a meeting between suburban school superintendents and school committee members, representatives from the MA Department of Education, and community leaders. Five suburban school districts – Brookline and Newton (with the most seats), Lexington and Wellesley, and Winchester – indicated that they would support METCO's business project. In the summer of 1966, METCO received a \$259,000 grant from the U.S. Office of Education and a grant of \$126,700 from the Carnegie Corporation to cover METCO's staff salaries, office expenses, and transportation costs for the first two years.¹⁷ Joseph Killory, the MA Education Department director of elementary and secondary education, took a year leave to be the director, and Batson would be named associate director (and later director a position which she held until 1969).¹⁸

These local meetings between suburban school districts and black community leaders coupled with concurrent political legislation (i.e., Racial Imbalance Act of 1965) led to a key window of opportunity for METCO's establishment as a "metropolitan solution" involving both urban and suburban partnerships. More importantly, METCO was a compromise solution that was inherently "non-threatening" because it a) was voluntary in nature, b) did not force white suburban parents to send their children into inner-city schools, 3) gave the Boston School Committee an easy plan to present to the MA Board of Education that would address racial imbalance in Boston's segregated schools.

On February 25, 1966, the State Board of Education rejected the Boston School Committee's imbalance plan, citing "The open enrollment policy has proved to be unsatisfactory in alleviating imbalance. It places the burden on parents, rather than the public and the schools."¹⁹ The Board also cited that the School Committee's anti-busing policy was 'unresolved and unacceptable' – soundly opening up a chance for METCO to pass. It was no surprise that on March 28, 1966, when Trilling presented to the Boston School Committee the METCO plan, the "Cooperative Program of Education between Urban and Suburban Schools" was approved 3 to 2

¹⁷ Batson 265.

¹⁸ "Tributes to Ruth Batson and Elma Lewis," *Proclaim Her: Newsletter of the Boston Women's Heritage Trail* Spring 2004.

¹⁹ Batson 237.

– but only if METCO “shall not require the expenditure of funds by the city of Boston.”²⁰ The Boston School Committee, however, added that it would “assign a senior member of the staff of the Boston Public Schools to (a) Participate in the preparation of plans for the implementation of the cooperative program and (b) Take part in the drafting of the proposals necessary to seek support for such plan.”²¹ The plan had been accepted – apparently as a compromise solution – but with some strict limitations that would ensure that the School Committee still had some oversight of its activities. But METCO opponents like Hicks eventually realized by 1973 the danger that could come from not supporting METCO. The possibility of mandatory busing was looming, and people realized that mandatory busing could mean two-way transport that would force white students to attend predominately black schools. According to one source, liberal suburban parents felt that “METCO would be good for the black and white kids, that it wouldn’t cost the town any money, and that it maybe would help ward off a court decision someday that would force suburbs to cross-bus.”²²

Finally, the shift away from Operation Exodus’ model came in the form of relinquishing local autonomy for greater regional/metropolitan cooperation with suburban school districts. When it came to bringing suburban school districts to approve the METCO program in their area, the role of local “wisdom of educational and community leadership can tip the balance in a town where there is opposition to busing and other programs.”²³ For example, when superintendents in certain districts (such as Trilling or Charles E. Brown) backed the program on educational grounds, even if certain suburban voters voted against the program, they were still successful in getting the district to collaborate with METCO.²⁴

PARTICIPANTS: METCO, INC., SUPPORTERS & OPPONENTS

As a current service provider for the state’s Department of Education, METCO’s primary function is to oversee the registration and placement of students into the program and to be the liaison between the METCO community and receiving school districts. Overseen by a Board of Directors, METCO has 18 full and part-time staff that deals with the application and enrollment process, coordinates some after-school tutoring, holds parent information meetings, and provides counseling. METCO also works with the DOE to carry out policy recommendations; one such requirement is that the student demographic enrolled in METCO receiving districts reflects the racial diversity of the minority enrollment of the Boston Public Students. According to the DOE, METCO ensures fairness and objectivity in placement and student oversight through a set process that places students in receiving districts based on their application date. Jean McGuire, METCO’s current Executive Director since 1973, is a well-known community leader and vocal advocate for quality education for minorities in Boston.

The DOE is responsible for the general oversight of policy issues (i.e., intake and placement, termination, special education, academic and disciplinary expectations, etc.), for the proper administration of the METCO grant, and for funding to participating school districts. The MA Department of Education’s FAQs section on METCO states that the DOE “. . . serves as the primary conduit of information regarding the program to the Board of Education, the Legislature, the media, and the public. The Department, through the Commissioner of Education, has ultimate responsibility and authority related to the grant program and the service provider

²⁰ Batson 237.

²¹ Batson 237.

²² Alan Lupo, *Liberty’s Chosen Home* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977) 308.

²³ Sigel and Jonas 151.

²⁴ Sigel and Jonas 151.

contract.” The DOE has a METCO Advisory Committee – consisting of representatives from the METCO community, directors, superintendents, METCO, Inc. staff and its Board of Directors, and a parent representative – that helps guide DOE policy decisions.

Another group, the METCO Directors’ Association (MDA), comprised of the professional METCO Directors or Coordinators in the 30+ suburban communities in the Greater Boston area, was founded in 1975 “to provide educational leadership in the areas of school desegregation, academic achievement for students of color, multicultural education, and parent empowerment.” Their mission is to provide “a quality academic and social experience for all students, strengthening our own personal and professional development and, ultimately, to creating avenues for positive challenge and growth among all with whom we interact.” The MDA puts on an annual MDA Conference for adults involved in METCO and an annual Youth Conference. In addition, it administers a college scholarship fund for successful graduates of the METCO program.

METCO’s strongest supporters tend to be the minority parents who are enrolling their children in the program, but they do not necessarily advocate the program for reasons of integration or racial equality. The Harvard Project on School Desegregation, now part of The Civil Rights Project, conducted a research study in 1995-96 and surveyed all of the approximately 3200 families participating in the program: “The research shows that the families are not social planners. Their goals are very much like that of suburban parents. They want the best possible education for their children and they are willing to make great sacrifices to get it. Academic goals overwhelm other concerns. . . Although neither the parents nor the students rank goals of interracial experience anywhere near the top, many do share those goals and the vast majority [is] convinced that they are realized to a very considerable degree. 49% of parents say it has been an excellent experience in learning ‘how to get along with people from different backgrounds’ and 43% more say the experience has been ‘good’ while only five of 2409 parents point to serious problems.”²⁵

Opposition to METCO has come from many parties, including local black community leaders who argue that “METCO less resembled community control than it did a private school system for blacks . . . METCO indeed was a classic privatist solution to a general social problem – the inferior education of black children – that addressed it by setting up a funnel system through which only a few could pass to a better education and increased life opportunities.”²⁶ The Boston Teachers’ Union has also been involved with METCO in instances when funding for METCO has been considered for reduction (such as in 2004 and 2006 under Governor Mitt Romney’s administration) or when the Union proposed that METCO students return to their own public schools in 1989.²⁷

FUNDING

The vast majority – about 70% – of METCO’s funding comes directly from the MA Department of Education, which oversees distribution of the METCO grant program.²⁸ METCO’s first group of 250 students were funded first by the Carnegie Foundation and the United States Office of Education; funding by the state did not begin until the early 1970s and pushed enrollment numbers to more than 3,500 at METCO’s maximum. Cuts over the past two decades have now meant steady enrollment of about 3,300 students each year, though some

²⁵ Orfield.

²⁶ Ronald P. Formisano, *Boston Against Busing* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991) 231.

²⁷ Formisano 208.

²⁸ Wolcott.

suburban school districts contribute to the funding. From 1986 through 2001, METCO had operated with \$12 to \$12.4 million in state funding.

This year, state funding levels were based on October 2005 enrollment figures: Each pupil will receive a \$3,700 allotment for instructional and support services, while the base transportation allotment level will remain the same as FY2005 unless transportation costs have risen. The FY07 House budget line item for METCO reads: "For grants to cities, towns and regional school districts for payments of certain costs and related expenses for the program to eliminate racial imbalance established under section 12A of chapter 76 of the General Laws; provided, that funds shall be made available for payment for services rendered by METCO, Inc. and Springfield public schools: \$19,615,313."

GOALS: CHALLENGES OF SEGREGATION THAT METCO SOLVES

Among the literature reviewed, three principal explanations have surfaced from various proponents and opponents of METCO: 1). METCO is a "community-control" system to alleviate problems of segregation in Boston schools and a way to provide better educational opportunities for minority children (METCO's perspective, black activists founders, and low-income parents); 2). METCO is a method of promoting student experiences with diverse populations & future social flexibility (perspective of suburban schools and parents); 3). METCO is privatization of education for a select few in pursuit of life advancement (opposition's view).

METCO's website states that its mission "Our mission is to provide, through professional leadership and voluntary citizen action, the development and promotion of quality integrated educational opportunities for urban and suburban students in the Greater Boston community and to work towards the expansion of a collaborative education program with the Boston and suburban school systems."²⁹ Elaborating on its mission, it lists three main purposes:

- To provide the opportunity for an integrated public school education for children of color from racially imbalanced schools in Boston by placing them in suburban schools.
- To provide a new learning experience for suburban children.
- To provide closer understanding and cooperation between urban and suburban parents and other citizens in the Metropolitan Boston area.

In addition, as the principal funder and METCO's contractor, the MA Department of Education states that its funding priorities are "1) provide Boston and Springfield students further opportunities to achieve at high levels the learning standards of the state curriculum frameworks; and 2) enrich both the urban and suburban communities by providing opportunities and support for cross-cultural understanding and appreciation."³⁰

For parents whose children are enrolled in METCO, their primary goal has always been to seek and find a better education for their children; in METCO's initial year in 1966, no parents

²⁹ Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity, 4 December 2006 < www.metcoinc.org/aboutus.htm >.

³⁰ Chapter 76, Section 12A of Massachusetts General Laws states that "the school committee of any city or town or any regional school district may adopt a plan for attendance at its schools by any child who resides in another city, town, or regional school district in which racial imbalance exists." This plan "shall tend to eliminate racial imbalance in the sending district" and, as the law states, "to help alleviate racial isolation in the receiving district." The definitions of 'racial imbalance' and 'racial isolation' are found in Chapter 71, Section 37D (also referred to as Chapter 636, section 37D). In summary, 'racial imbalance' is the condition of a public school in which more than fifty percent of the pupils attending such school are non-white. 'Racial isolation' is the condition of a public school in which not more than thirty percent of the pupils attending such school are non-white."

indicated that they wanted an integrated school experience.³¹ According to Harvard's Civil Rights Project study on METCO, almost three fourths of METCO parents in 1995-96 said that suburban academic were the "most important" reason for enrolling their child in METCO.³²

METCO, though widely characterized at the time by black activists as a method of community control, was never meant to be a comprehensive solution to Boston's problems with school segregation. The black activist founders always saw it as part of a greater community effort to find or create better educational opportunities for their children.³³ The immediate and long-term need for funding and school seats as well as for broad political support from different stakeholders, however, made METCO a metropolitan program that effectively limited METCO's community control and its capacity to create any permanent structural changes to the educational system. The rise of mandatory busing policies in 1972-74 demonstrated that even for the years following METCO, problems with resource allocation to Boston's urban schools persisted. Even today, when the percentage of minorities enrolled in BPS exceeds even what it was in 1966, the Department of Education still only provides a "Controlled Choice" program, but the program still fails to alleviate sufficiently the overall inequities in Boston's public schools. However, METCO continues to maintain stable enrollment and funding throughout the past three centuries.

TECHNOLOGY: HOW METCO WORKS

Student Enrollment and Program Placement

Under the guidelines listed on the DOE's website, parents and students must apply for the waiting list in-person at METCO's Boston headquarters. Once their application is approved an all enrollment papers have been processed, METCO forwards the student's file to school districts with openings for the appropriate grade level. Final placement decisions are made based on:

- completion of the Metco application packet;
- submission of all school records;
- date of registration;
- district grade and seat availability;
- presence of siblings on the waiting list;
- special education status (students with existing special education placement determinations that call for out-of-district placement are generally not participants in Metco since the purpose of the program is participation in the district schools); and
- race (in the past seven years, Hispanics and Asians have been given some preference to openings in an effort to have the Metco program reflect better the minority population of the Boston Public Schools).³⁴

The DOE disclaims that METCO is prohibited from screening out students for any reason beyond participants' unwillingness to complete the registration procedures. In addition, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students and Special Education (SE) students (with some limitations depending on their Individualized Education Program [IEP]) cannot be excluded from METCO placements; the DOE states that doing so would be a "civil rights violation." The receiving

³¹ Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity, 4 December 2006 <www.metcoinc.org/history.htm>.

³² Orfield.

³³ See Batson's work and her collection of activists' accounts for further information.

³⁴ MA Department of Education, 4 Dec. 2006 <www.doe.mass.edu/metco/faq.asp?section=c>.

school district shoulders the responsibility of providing appropriate language and support services for these students.³⁵

The METCO Experience

METCO's voluntary busing model relies on participation from METCO parents, students, and sponsoring suburban schools. Minority parents place their children on METCO's waiting list years before they are a year old, and METCO works out placement with involved suburban school districts and transportation with bus companies which pick up children from Boston and Springfield and bring them out to suburban schools. Logistically speaking, METCO is fairly difficult on students and their parents. Many students rise as early as 5 AM and return as late as 6 or 7 PM after commuting as much as two hours each way. In addition to transportation costs and school placements, METCO offices will sometimes offer students additional services including but not limited to additional staff support for METCO students, academic counselors who monitor student progress, academic tutors, host families/family friends' initiatives, or special motivational speakers. In addition, the state provides funding that will contribute "in a measurable way to enhanced educational opportunity and academic achievement as well as diversity enrichment."³⁶ While enhanced educational opportunity and academic achievement usually includes academic support for students and parents, it can also cover the cost of professional development for teachers and staff geared toward understanding and assessing the achievement gap. Diversity enrichment includes training and in-school and after-school activities that promote cross-cultural and racial understanding.

METCO Program Demographics³⁷

Number of Students in Program

As of October 1, 2005 3,284 students were enrolled in the METCO program. Of this number, 3,149 originate from the city of Boston; the remaining 135 come from Springfield.

In the **2005-2006 school year** the racial breakdown of METCO students was as follows:

Race	Percent	Count
Black	77%	2,533
Hispanic	16%	515
Asian	4%	121
Other	3%	115
Total	100%	3,284

Most METCO receiving districts are predominantly white. Over half of the districts are greater than 90% white, with only two less than 70% white. Boston, the sending district for the vast majority of METCO students, is 43% African-American, 33% Hispanic, 14% White, and 9% Asian.

³⁵ MA Department of Education, 4 Dec. 2006 <www.doe.mass.edu/metco/faq.asp?section=c>.

³⁶ MA Department of Education, 4 Dec. 2006 <finance1.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants07/rfp/317.html>.

³⁷ MA Department of Education, 4 Dec. 2006 <www.doe.mass.edu/metco/laws.html>.

FY07 METCO DISTRICTS AND GRANT ALLOCATIONS

District	Per Pupil Allocation	Transportation Allocation	Total Grant
ARLINGTON	373,700	88,050	461,750
BEDFORD	296,000	96,480	392,480
BELMONT	466,200	128,660	594,860
BRAINTREE	166,500	77,040	243,540
BROOKLINE	1,110,000	165,286	1,275,286
COHASSET	173,900	55,040	228,940
CONCORD	410,700	106,599	517,299
DOVER	51,800	15,571	67,371
EAST LONGMEADOW	166,500	48,481	214,981
FOXBOROUGH	185,000	71,286	256,286
FRAMINGHAM	48,100	109,354	157,454
HINGHAM	144,300	64,810	209,110
LEXINGTON	976,800	429,250	1,406,050
LINCOLN	336,700	104,400	441,100
LONGMEADOW	188,700	72,900	261,600
LYNNFIELD	114,700	69,826	184,526
MARBLEHEAD	266,400	148,573	414,973
MELROSE	436,600	184,533	621,133
NATICK	222,000	99,665	321,665
NEEDHAM	536,500	212,200	748,700
NEWTON	1,550,300	683,404	2,233,704
READING	159,100	105,000	264,100
SCITUATE	210,900	135,275	346,175
SHARON	236,800	131,800	368,600
SHERBORN	14,800	5,190	19,990
SPRINGFIELD	35,000	0	35,000
SUDBURY	244,200	103,860	348,060
SWAMPSCOTT	99,900	78,180	178,080
WAKEFIELD	129,500	48,467	177,967
WALPOLE	177,600	58,683	236,283
WAYLAND	488,400	128,592	616,992
WELLESLEY	573,500	239,615	813,115
WESTON	588,300	216,275	804,575
WESTWOOD	155,400	52,545	207,945
CONCORD CARLISLE	296,000	84,901	380,901
DOVER SHERBORN	77,700	32,871	110,571
HAMPDEN WILBRAHAM	74,000	41,400	115,400
LINCOLN SUDBURY	333,000	92,010	425,010
SOUTHWICK TOLLAND	70,300	47,320	117,620
TOTAL	12,185,800	4,633,392	16,819,192

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL MATERIALS

- “A Bird’s Eye View from Within – As We See It.” Freedom House, records, 1965.
- Batson, Ruth M. and Robert C. Hayden. *A History of METCO: A Suburban Education For Boston’s Urban Students*. Boston: Select Publications, 1987.
- Batson, Ruth M. *The Black Educational Movement in Boston: A Sequence of Historical Events; A Chronology*. Boston: Northeastern University (compilation), 2001.
- Bureau of Educational Opportunity, Massachusetts Department of Education. *METCO Handbook*. 1976.
- “Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts Statement on the Proposed Boston School Stayout.” And “List of Freedom Schools.” Phyllis M. Ryan Papers, 1964.
- “Job Description: METCO Coordinator”; “Lexington Metco Annual Report 1973-74”; “Lexington Metco Newsletter (June 1974 & April 1975)”. Lucille D. Turner Papers. Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University.
- “NAACP Community Info Newsletter.” Freedom House, records, 1964.
- “Tributes to Ruth Batson and Elma Lewis.” *Proclaim Her: Newsletter of the Boston Women’s Heritage Trail*. Spring 2004.

JOURNAL ARTICLES

- Durham, Joseph T. “Sense and Nonsense About Busing.” *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 42, No. 3, Education in the Black Cities. (Summer, 1973), pp. 322-335.
- Mahan, Thomas W. “The Busing of Students for Equal Opportunities (in Programs for the Improvement of Public Education).” *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 37, No. 3, Race and Equality in American Education. (Summer, 1968), pp. 291-300.
- Orfield, Gary, Jennifer Arenson, Tara Jackson, Christine Bohrer, Dawn Gavin, Emily Kalejs, et al. “City-Suburban Desegregation: Parent and Student Perspectives in Metropolitan Boston.” Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, September 1997.
- Richer, Matthew. “Busing’s Boston Massacre: A federal judge’s experiment in social engineering has unraveled neighborhoods and frustrated black achievement.” *Policy Review*, No. 92, (Nov.-Dec. 1998).
- Schofield, Janet Ward. “Inside Desegregated Schools: Understanding How and Why They Influence Students.” *American Journal of Education*, Vol. 109, No. 3. (May, 2001), pp. 383-390.
- Sigel, Efrem and Gary F. Jonas. “Metropolitan Cooperation in Education: The Greater Boston Case.” *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 39, No. 2. (Spring, 1970), pp. 148-157.
- St. John, Nancy H. “Desegregation and Minority Group Performance.” *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 40, No. 1, Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children. (Feb., 1970), pp. 111-133.

BOOKS & REPORTS

- Baraka, Amiri. *Crisis in Boston!: A Black Revolutionary Analysis of the Ruling Class Conspiracy to Agitate Racial Violence in Around Busing in Boston*. Newark: Vita Wa Watu – Peoples War Publishing, 1974.
- Buell, Emmett H. Jr. with Richard A. Brisbin, Jr. *School Desegregation and Defended Neighborhoods: The Boston Controversy*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company Lexington Books, 1982.
- Eaton, Susan E. *The Other Boston Busing Story: What’s Won and Lost Across the Boundary Line*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Formisano, Ronald P. *Boston Against Busing: Race, Class, and Ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

- Lord, Dennis J. *Spatial Perspectives on School Desegregation and Busing*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1977.
- Lupo, Alan. *Liberty's Chosen Home: The Politics of Violence in Boston*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.
- Podair, Jerald. *The Strike That Changed New York: Blacks, Whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Schrag, Peter. *Village School Downtown; politics and education; a Boston report*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.
- Taylor, Steven J. L. *Desegregation in Boston and Buffalo: The Influence of Local Leaders*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Walker, Vanessa Siddle. *Their Highest Potential: An African American School Community in the Segregated South*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

WEBSITES

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| METCO Website: | http://www.metcoinc.org/ |
| MA Department of Education: | http://www.doe.mass.edu/metco/laws.html |
| METCO Alumni Association: | http://www.metcoalumni.org/metcoex.html |
| Boston Public Schools: | http://www.boston.k12.ma.us/bps/ |