

RAYMOND GRUENDER ON EDUCATION

Highlights:

- Raymond Gruender consistently ruled against federal desegregation monitors and programs for Arkansas public schools.
 - Gruender wrote in a dissent that a 2004 plan to help African American achievement in Little Rock school districts had been inappropriately imposed on the school districts and should therefore be thrown out.
 - In 2011, Gruender joined the majority and reversed a district court's order to refrain from granting the North Little Rock School District Unitary Status.

Gruender Ruled Against Safe Schools

GRUENDER CONSISTENTLY RULED AGAINST SAFE SCHOOLS

2004: The Little Rock School District Asked To Be Given Unitary Status And The District Court Gave Them A Compliance Remedy (2004 Remedy) To Follow In Order To Receive Unitary Status

2004: Little Rock School District Asked To Be Declared Unitary But The District Court Concluded They Had Not Complied With Their Obligations. According to Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, "On March 15, 2004, following what it believed was its substantial compliance with section 2.7.1 and the 2002 Remedy, LRSD asked to be declared unitary. Joshua opposed the request. On June 30, 2004, the district court concluded that LRSD had not substantially complied with its obligations, denied unitary status, and imposed a new compliance remedy (2004 Remedy). It is from this judgment that LRSD now appeals." [Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, No. 04-2923, [6/26/06](#)]

- **Schools Achieved Unitary Status When Were Able To Demonstrate The District Was No Longer Operating Segregated School Systems.** According to the Midwest and Plains Equity Assistance Center, "Unitary status is achieved when a school district demonstrates it is no longer operating dual segregated school systems, has implemented its school desegregation order in good faith, and eliminated past vestiges of school segregation to the extent possible under the Green factors." [Midwest and Plains Equity Assistance Center, Accessed [6/26/24](#)]

Remedy 2004 Included The Hiring Of A Professional With A P.H.D. To Improve Academic Achievement In African Americans

Remedy 2004 Mandated That Little Rock School District Hire Staff That Would Help Improve Academic Achievement With African Americans. According to Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, "LRSD must promptly hire a highly trained team of professionals to reinvigorate PRE. These individuals must have experience in: (a) preparing and overseeing the preparation of formal program evaluations; and (b) formulating a comprehensive program assessment process that can be used to determine the effectiveness of specific academic programs designed to improve the achievement of African-American students. I expect the director of PRE to have a Ph.D.; to have extensive experience in designing, preparing and overseeing the preparation of program evaluations; and to have a good understanding of statistics and regression analysis. I also expect LRSD to hire experienced statisticians and the other appropriate support personnel necessary to operate a first-rate PRE Department." [Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, No. 04-2923, [6/26/06](#)]

2006: Gruender Dissented From The Eighth Circuit And Wrote That The District Court Abused Their Discretion In Imposing The 2004 Remedy On The Little Rock School District

Gruender Dissented From The Court Because He Found "The District Court Abused Its Discretion In Imposing The 2004 Remedy." According to Gruender's dissent in Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, "Like the Court, I would affirm the district court's finding that LRSD was not in substantial compliance with section 2.7.1 of the Revised Plan as embodied in the 2002 Remedy. However, I respectfully dissent from the Court's judgment because I find that

the district court abused its discretion in imposing the 2004 Remedy.” [Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, No. 04-2923, [6/26/06](#)]

- **Gruender Wrote The Dissent.** According to Gruender’s dissent in Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, “GRUENDER, Circuit Judge, concurring in part and dissenting in part.” [Little Rock School District vs. The State of Arkansas, No. 04-2923, [6/26/06](#)]

2011: THREE ARKANSAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS APPEALED THE DISTRICT COURT’S DECISION DENYING THEM UNITARY STATUS

2011: Three Arkansas School Districts Appealed The District Court’s Decision To Deny Them Unitary Status.

According to Little Rock School District v. Arkansas via PDF, “In these consolidated appeals regarding continuing school desegregation efforts in the Little Rock, Arkansas metropolitan area, North Little Rock School District (‘NLRSD’) and Pulaski County Special School District (‘PCSSD’) each appeal the -3- district court’s denial of their petitions for a declaration of unitary status.” [Little Rock School District v. Arkansas, No. 11-2130, [12/28/11](#)]

2011: Gruender And The Majority Of The Eighth District Court Of Appeals Argued For The Reversal Of The Partial Denial Of North Little Rock School District’s Unitary Status Claim And For Them To Be Granted Unitary Status In Full

2011: Gruender And The Eighth District Court Of Appeals Directed The District Court To Declare Unitary Status For The North Little Rock School District.

According to Little Rock School District v. Arkansas via PDF, “For the foregoing reasons, we reverse the partial denial of NLRSD’s petition and direct the district court to declare unitary status for NLRSD, affirm the partial denial of PCSSD’s petition for unitary status, vacate the portion of the order terminating of the State’s funding obligations, and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.” [Little Rock School District v. Arkansas, No. 11-2130, [12/28/11](#)]

- **2011: Gruender Wrote For A Panel Of Appeals The Court’s Decision To Reverse A District Order That Denied North Little Rock School District Be Granted Unitary Status.** According to SCOTUS Blog, “In Little Rock School District v. Arkansas, in 2011, Gruender wrote for a panel of the appeals court in related, consolidated school-desegregation cases. The court reversed a district court order denying the request of the North Little Rock School District to be freed from federal desegregation monitoring in the area of staff recruitment, concluding that “there was no basis for the district court to impose upon NLRSD, with no advance notice, a more extensive set of collection and reporting requirements with respect to staff recruiting.” [SCOTUS Blog, [1/12/17](#)]