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DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to the late Reverend L. Francis Griffin who served as the spiritual leader in Farmville during the school closures. I never had the pleasure to meet him, but his words inspired me to take this study on.

So, when I lie on my bed at night and contemplate life, I tremble at the grim realities facing us. What will we tell the generations yet unborn? What can we say to poor everyday man, a victim of the system of injustice now in existence? … I, for one, will not be guilty, I must speak out against injustice, and everywhere I see it (The Richmond Afro-American, July 28 1961, para. 32).

This study is also dedicated to the individuals that were interviewed in order to develop a better understanding of what it means to be a recipient of the Brown Scholarship Fund as well as the gatekeeper who welcomed me and provided support throughout the research process. This study is truly their study. Moreover, these individuals work to secure justice everyday through their actions and words and I was inspired by their stories of bravery, and perseverance.
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ABSTRACT

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE UNFULFILLED: A CASE STUDY OF AFRICAN AMERICANS FROM PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Linda J. Mann, Ph.D
George Mason University, 2015
Dissertation Director: Dr. Penelope Earley

This study explored the perceptions of 14 African Americans from Prince Edward County, Virginia regarding their lived experiences as scholarship recipients for the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund. Using the lens of critical race theory, the purpose of this study was to better understand how students perceived the fund and to understand how and to what extent the fund provided educational restoration for their denied education due to massive resistance over fifty years ago. Individual interviews were conducted with each participant and generated a number of themes relevant to each case. Further, a cross-case analysis revealed four common themes amongst the data and included: (a) necessary structures (b) characteristics of the recipients, (c) policy impact, and (d) restoration revisions. The findings from this study suggested that a more comprehensive restorative justice program might better address the many losses incurred as a result of the school closings. Further, a comprehensive restorative justice program would not exclude displaced student populations and would
be sensitive to the fact that participants are older adults. Moreover, policymakers should consider extending funding to relatives of affected students to mitigate generational impact.
CHAPTER ONE

The deprivation and the restoration of education for a group of African Americans from Prince Edward County, Virginia was at the core of this study. From 1954-1964, the Virginia General Assembly passed legislation to bypass Supreme Court directives from the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954) decision. As a result of Virginia’s resistance legislation, localities were provided legal ways to avoid desegregation including the complete closure of schools. In the fall of 1959, the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors utilized Virginia’s resistance strategies to cease operations of their schools for five years. As a result, from 1959-1964, approximately 2,300 African Americans were deprived of an education (House Joint Resolution 613, 2003). The deprivation of education for the Prince Edward County students resulted in loss of potential income and employment (Brookover, 1993; Hale-Smith, 1993; Heaton, 2008). Moreover, studies demonstrated that these students experienced long-term socio-emotional consequences such as humiliation and sadness due to the loss of an education (Brookover, Dudley & Green, 1993; Green, Hofmann, Morse, Hayes & Morgan, 1964). During the school closures many families sought education in distant communities and as a result these students reported a loss of childhood and family relations (Hicks & Pitre, 2010; Turner, 2003, 2004).
In 2003, the Virginia General Assembly acknowledged their role in the denial of education to the students of Prince Edward County African Americans. House Joint Resolution 613 expressed regret to the students and outlined Virginia’s historical legislative policies that lead to the denial of education. Moreover, this document acknowledged the losses incurred as a result of the school closures (House Joint Resolution 613, 2003). The Virginia General Assembly followed the Resolution with the creation of the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund in 2005. This program extended Virginia’s acknowledgement of school closings to include Warren County, and the cities of Norfolk, Arlington and Charlottesville. These school systems were closed in 1959 for one year only. The goal of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund is to provide “restoration of education” to students denied an education from Warren County, Prince Edward County and the cities of Norfolk, Arlington and Charlottesville as a result of Virginia’s historic resistance policies (*Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Policies of the Committee, 2013, p. 7). Scholarships are awarded through application once a year in the month of July. The *Brown* Scholarship Fund application can be viewed in Appendix A. These scholarships can be used for educational training or degrees at any Virginia accredited institution.

Walker (2006) and Williams (2005) analyzed the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. Both studies explored the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship and Fund as a type of restorative justice program in its attempts to transform a historical wrongdoing. Yamamoto (1997,1998, 1999) presented that restorative justice programs are a type of critical race praxis used to address past wrong doings. Restorative justice programs often
acknowledge and provide material change in an attempt to make amends (Walgrave, 2011; Yamamoto, 1998; Zehr, 2002). Controversy exists surrounding the design of restorative justice programs and the analysis of what these policies are able to restore (Walker, 2006; Yamamoto, 1997, 1999). Walgrave (2011) posed that in order to understand the restorative abilities of a program, researchers should explore the recipients’ perceptions and how they make sense of their restorative justice experience. Walker (2006) and Williams (2005) analyzed the Brown Scholarship Fund from a theoretical standpoint only. Absent from the literature was an examination of the recipients’ perceptions of the scholarship program. This study explored what it meant to be a scholarship recipient and what, if any, was the impact of the scholarship program on their lives.

Chapter One provides the historical antecedents that are relevant to this study. According to Delgado and Stefancic (2012), “A group’s history is so distinctive that placing it at the center of analysis is, in fact, warranted” (p. 77). This chapter begins with an overview of resistance policies passed by the Virginia General Assembly to deny desegregation as mandated by Brown. Further, the historical overview demonstrates how these resistance policies resulted in the complete closure of the Prince Edward County public school system and a five-year denial of public education. Although the history of education deprivation for the Prince Edward County student was important to this study, this study was firmly situated in the present. This study centered on a restorative justice policy, the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund, created in 2005 by the Virginia General Assembly and sought to understand recipients’ perceptions of the
scholarship program. The Brown Scholarship Fund was created to make amends for denied education due to Virginia’s massive resistance policies and the resulting closure of school systems in order to deny Brown v. Board of Education, 1954. Information on the Brown Scholarship Fund and its goal to provide restoration of education is included in this chapter. The statement of the problem follows, including the goals of this study. The conceptual framework places the perceptions of the Brown Scholarship Fund recipients at the core of this study and further frames this study in critical race theory. This chapter also includes the organization of the study with a brief description of the literature review and methods that support the research questions. Finally, Chapter One explores the potential contributions this study may make to the field of education policy.

**Historical Overview and Background to the Problem**

The following historical overview follows the desegregation battle in one location, Prince Edward County, Virginia. Prince Edward County is geographically located approximately 75 miles southwest of the Commonwealth of Virginia’s capital in Richmond, Virginia. This region is often referred to as the state’s Black Belt. According to contemporary research, the Black Belt is comprised of the “11 formal confederate states – Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia” (Wimberley, 2010, p. 105). Geographically, these regions are noted for their dark rich soil historically used for plantation farming and also comprise the area referred to as the South (Wimberley, 2010). Because plantation farming was commonplace, the Black Belt is also noted for its slave and Civil War history and further, its resistance to social-political advances that favored African
Americans (Bonastia, 2012). Following is the story of one such community, Prince Edward County, and how the policies implemented by the Virginia General Assembly resulted in the complete closure of public schools for five years in order to deny *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954).

At the turn of the 20th century, local governments that offered public schooling to both African American and White students often operated under a segregated dual public school system run by an all-White school board (Anderson, 1988). As a result, the inequality and inequity of the African American schools compared to the White schools was apparent (Siddle Walker, 2005). Prince Edward County, Virginia’s schools exemplified this inequity. The White-only Farmville High School was constructed in 1939 and housed an auditorium, stage, lockers and gymnasium (Titus, 2011a). In comparison, the African American-only high school, Robert Russa Moton (R.R. Moton), consisted of one room with three additional tarpaper shacks that housed the overcrowded facility (Peeples, 1963). The original school was built to hold a capacity of 180 students. By 1951, the Prince Edward County African American school population totaled 477 students (Titus, 2011a). The school also lacked adequate heating.

Siddle Walker (2005) reported that as a result of the segregated dual school system, African American educators had to speak “continuously and emphatically on the inequality in factions, length of school term, buses, teacher salaries, and vocational education opportunities evident in their education system” (p. 358). However, in Prince Edward County, it was not the educators who spoke out against the inadequate facilities; in this case, it was the students. In 1951, students from R.R. Moton High School led a
strike demanding that the Board of Supervisors address the need for an adequate school facility (Kluger, 2011).

The students’ request was initially met with indifference, in part because White leaders dominated the Board of Supervisors, which demonstrated the White supremacist political structures of the time (Darder & Torres, 1999). As the Board of Supervisors delayed their response to the student strike, an unidentified member of the Prince Edward County African American community contacted the Richmond, Virginia branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) for assistance (Bonastia, 2012). The NAACP agreed to support the African American community on the condition that they sue the county for desegregation rather than equalization of facilities (Titus, 2011a).

The shift from equalization to desegregation was a modification in practice for the NAACP. The emphasis on desegregation began in the 1950s and originated from a desire to end Jim Crow practices (Cochran, 2006). Prince Edward County’s African American community did not readily join the battle (Patterson, 2001). In general, there was a fear of losing control of the African American schools (Cecelski, 1994). Additionally, there was general apprehension over the control and coercion that the Prince Edward County White majority population could wield (Titus, 2011a). However, through the steady support provided by the spiritual leader of Prince Edward County’s African American community, Reverend Francis L. Griffin, and the NAACP, the students and parents moved forward with their desegregation suit (Bonastia, 2012; Titus, 2011a; Turner, 2003). The NAACP desegregation suit filed on the behalf of the Prince Edward County
students in 1952 was *Dorothy E. Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward*. Although the suit was filed in the name of Dorothy Davis, there were more than 160 plaintiffs to the Prince Edward County desegregation suit (The *Brown* Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research, 2014). The plaintiffs were African American parents and children from Prince Edward County.

*Davis v. County* argued that the segregation of schools went against the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Due to the constitutionality of the case, *Davis v. County* was heard before a three-judge federal district court panel. The panel ruled against the plaintiffs (Bonastia, 2012; Peeples, 1963). Per the advice of the NAACP, the plaintiffs appealed, and the United States Supreme Court agreed to hear the *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward*. *Davis v. County* along with *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Kansas; *Briggs v. Elliot*, South Carolina; *Davis v. Board of Education of Prince Edward County*, Virginia; *Boiling v. Sharpe*, District of Columbia; and *Gebhart v. Ethel*, Delaware comprised of the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 1954 desegregation case (Muse, 1961; Titus, 2011a).

The NAACP presented the five cases to the United States Supreme Court to demonstrate that segregated schools were unequal. *Brown v. Board* was an attempt to address the prevailing racist paradigm and the “separate but equal” doctrine as outlined in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). In 1954, the United States Supreme Court *Brown v. Board* ruling countered *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The determination stated that segregated schools resulted in educational deprivation and therefore, did not provide equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. Chief Justice Warren’s opinion of the Court read:
We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. (Warren, 1954, p. 486)

As suggested by Mead (2009), there is often a gap between the aspirations of a law and its social consequences. In 1955, the Black Belt states demonstrated their resistance by collectively requesting an exemption from the Brown ruling (Brown v. Board of Education, 1955). The exemption request resulted in the United States Supreme Court ruling for Brown v. Board of Education II. The Brown II ruling did not exempt the Southern states. Instead the Court’s response was to reiterate the call to desegregate with “all deliberate speed” (p. 349). Additionally, the Supreme Court decreed that all desegregation cases return to district courts for final determinations. However, the ambiguous rulings of both Brown cases and Brown II’s emphasis on local solutions allowed states to interpret the desegregation of schools differently (Klarman, 2004). This resulted in the Supreme Court’s Brown v. Board decision to be a minimally effective and often inadequate mandate.

**Virginia’s resistance.** Similar to other Southern states, Virginia took advantage of Brown’s ambiguity and adopted an intransigent position against the integration of public schools (Muse, 1961). Virginia first conveyed its resistance position by signing the Southern Manifesto (Leidholdt, 1997). This document was signed by all but five
congressional delegates from the states that formerly constituted the Confederacy and, therefore, demonstrated Southern solidarity. The signing of the Southern Manifesto was mostly symbolic, and merely proclaimed commitment to legally halting the implementation of Brown (Muse, 1961). Following the signing of the Southern Manifesto, a well-known United States Senator, Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, presented the South with a legal way to stop Brown through the concept of interposition (Day, 2007). Interposition provided states a legal means of interference with federal government policies if said actions were deemed outside their constitutional boundaries (The Doctrine of Interposition, 1956). Senator Byrd capitalized on interposition, citing that education was constitutionally a states’ right, and used the concept to frame Virginia’s massive resistance in 1956 (Tobias, 1996). Guided by Senator Byrd and other pro-segregationist organizations, the Virginia General Assembly created massive resistance policies with the purpose of preventing the desegregation of public schools (Sweeney, 2008). As reported by Patterson (2001) many of the Southern states followed suit and adopted similar massive resistance programs.

Virginia’s massive resistance laws, known collectively as the Stanley Plan, were passed at an Extra Session of the General Assembly in fall 1956 (Tobias, 1996). This legislation provided several options to cease or avoid desegregation as well as offered citizens options to avoid desegregation. Following is an outline of Virginia’s massive resistance policies as presented by Tobias (1996). These policies were successfully implemented from 1956-1959 and included:

- the creation of a Pupil Placement Board;
• the provision of tuition grants to support nonsectarian private schools;
• governor authority to close any school that tried to integrate;
• the cession of state funds for any school that attempted to integrate;
• the creation of Anti-NAACP laws;
• the authorization of heretofore financing of local school systems;
• the repealing of the Compulsory Attendance Act.

The Pupil Placement Board was designed to halt attempts to desegregate. The board oversaw all student applications to attend or transfer schools and assured that African Americans applications were denied acceptance to established White institutions (Tobias, 1996). Additionally, in the event that any school attempted to integrate, the Governor of Virginia was given the authority to close the school (Sweeney, 2008). The General Assembly made sure that maintaining segregation was taken seriously by passing an additional law that ceased funding of any school that desegregated (Muse, 1961). Moreover, localities had the option to fund their schools on a heretofore, or month-to-month, basis in order to protect the finances of a town should they receive a court order to desegregate (Sweeney, 2008).

The General Assembly passed other laws to control desegregation at the local level. A tuition grant program was devised to provide parents funds towards private schooling. Private schooling was viewed as an alternative to public schools and the threat of integration (Tobias, 1996). The passage of laws to support the tuition grants was an elaborate undertaking, as it required amending Virginia’s constitution (Sweeney, 2008). Voters first had to approve a constitutional convention and then constitutional
amendments. The public overwhelmingly voted in favor of both. The General Assembly echoed the public’s support for tuition grants and unanimously voted to amend the constitution (Sweeney, 2008). In addition to the tuition grants, the compulsory attendance statute was amended, giving parents the option to forego public education all together (Tobias, 1996). The successful amendments to the constitution demonstrated the general support for segregated schools within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Virginia General Assembly was also concerned with halting the efforts of pro-integration organizations such as the NAACP (Muse, 1961; Titus, 2011a). As part of Virginia’s massive resistance policies, the General Assembly passed legislation known as the anti-NAACP bills. The anti-NAACP bills required pro-integration organizations to register and provide membership lists to the State Corporation Commission. Additionally, the Commission supported an independent investigation into the NAACP activities in Prince Edward County. The role of the NAACP in Prince Edward County was of special interest because Prince Edward County was the site of one of the five cases that constituted Brown (Titus, 2011a). The anti-NAACP legislation effectively delayed the efforts toward desegregation in Virginia (Morland, 1964). In total, the Virginia General assembly passed “twenty-three acts…dealing with the school segregation issue or aimed at the NAACP” (Muse, 1961, p. 31).

Court ordered desegregation occurred for several Virginia school systems during the 1958-1959 school year. These communities included Warren County, and the cities of Norfolk, Arlington and Charlottesville (Sweeney, 2008). When the courts ordered these
schools to integrate, the Governor of Virginia responded by following massive resistance protocol. Schools in all four communities were closed.

Court challenges and subsequent decisions that stemmed from the 1958-1959 Virginia school closures determined massive resistance policies to be unconstitutional. The first was a decision made on an appeal by the Virginia Supreme Courts in *Harrison v. Day* (1959), which ruled the school closings unconstitutional according to the Virginia Constitution. The second decision came from the Federal District Court in Norfolk on *James v. Almond* (1959). Here too, the court ruled the school closing unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment (Gates, 1964). In response to these court rulings, the schools were reopened in January 1959. Virginia’s massive resistance was defunct and accordingly, the General Assembly was faced with the creation of post-massive resistance policies and the desegregation of public schools.

Virginia’s post-massive resistance policy, the Perrow Plan, 1959, mimicked similar Southern state legislation, which emphasized local control of desegregation. These post-massive resistance policies were referred to as freedom of choice plans (Titus, 2011a). Freedom of choice plans placed school choice in the hands of the individual and in a less overt way, maintained a racist agenda (Brown, 1968). Cochran (2006) provided an overview of Virginia’s freedom of choice legislation, the Perrow Plan and demonstrated, in particular, the support for private education via the following practices:

- tuition grants of $125 per student;
- transportation grants;
• the repeal of compulsory attendance laws making school attendance a local option;

• the sale of public property for private school usage.

As outlined by Cochran, the Perrow Plan provided localities additional financing for nonsectarian segregated institutions. Fuquay (2002) suggested that private academies safeguarded segregationist beliefs and protected them from imposed federal rules. Ultimately, this assured a legal way to secure segregated education. Financing of private schools included the continued use of tuition grants (Muse, 1961). Communities could vote to sell public school property to use toward private schools as well (Tobias, 1996). Additionally, families could apply for free private school transportation (Bonastia, 2012).

In March 1960, the General Assembly passed additional legislation “permitting local governing bodies to deduct contributions to local nonsectarian private schools from real and personal property taxes in amount not to exceed 25 percent of taxes due” (Titus, 2011a, p. 35).

The Virginia General Assembly passed other legislation that supported parent and local control of their children’s education. The compulsory attendance to public schools was reinstated; however, localities were given the power to apply the law or not (Bonastia, 2012). There were even attempts by Virginia’s General Assembly to amend the state constitution to make public education voluntary (Sweeney, 2008). These efforts were unsuccessful (Cochran, 2006). With the demise of massive resistance, Virginia slowly moved toward desegregation.
**Prince Edward County.** Federal Courts’ decisions notwithstanding, localities responded to the Perrow Plan and the demise of massive resistance with continued resistance (Cochran, 2006). As outlined by Mead (2009), “treatments of the law may also point out the entrenched nature of the status quo and the frequent inadequacy of litigation as a mean to effect meaningful change” (p. 288). Mead’s statement was particularly true for the community of Prince Edward County. One might assume that because Prince Edward County’s desegregation case, *Davis v. County*, was part of the *Brown* decision, the community would desegregate their public schools immediately following *Brown*. However, as mandated by *Brown II*, *Davis v. County* was sent back to the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia for its determination (Peeples, 1963). The return of the case to the district court provided Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors and community leaders time to organize and prepare against a desegregation order.

Both Prince Edward County leaders and the White community at large created specific organizations and passed town ordinances to continue segregation. Following the *Brown* ruling, the Prince Edward Corporation was created to explore the option of private White-only schools for Prince Edward County students (Titus, 2011a). Additionally, in May 1955, over 1,300 White citizens gathered at a town meeting to discuss school appropriations and fund-raising activities to protect the White teachers’ salaries (Muse, 1961). As a result of this meeting, the Board of Supervisors used massive resistance legislation to protect the town’s finances and implemented heretofore financing for their public schools as outlined by the Stanley Plan (Morland, 1964).
From 1956-1959, *Davis v. County* rulings resulted in support of desegregation with no set deadlines. In 1958, the NAACP requested that the case be heard again by the United States Supreme Court. Their request was denied (Bonastia, 2012). Finally, in 1959, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on *Davis v. County* and ordered immediate desegregation (Bonastia, 2012). This ruling coincided with the demise of massive resistance (Titus, 2011a). The Prince Edward School Corporation, now the Prince Edward School Foundation, was ready. The community demonstrated overwhelming support for the enactment of a non-profit, nonsectarian private segregated school known as Prince Edward Academy (Titus, 2011a). Over 1,000 people pledged their support for the Academy (Schuler & Green, 1967), and even the “County’s white churches offered the new Prince Edward Academy use of their buildings free of charge” (Titus, 2011a, p. 334). This action demonstrated a racialized social system that included most community members (Bonilla-Silva, 1997).

The Board of Supervisors responded accordingly. Using Virginia’s Perrow Plan legislation as their rationale, the Supervisors refused to levy taxes or appropriate funds for the operation of Prince Edward County’s public schools (Titus, 2011a). The Board of Supervisors argued that according to the Perrow Plan, localities were not required to enforce the Virginia compulsory education and therefore, the county was not required to provide public schools (Bonastia, 2012; Morland, 1964).

Several of the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors were instrumental in the organization of the Prince Edward Academy as well. In synchronicity, the Board of Supervisors and the Academy school board employed other aspects of Virginia’s Perrow
Plan in order to provide the White population financial support for the Academy tuition. For instance, as discussed, Virginia provided transportation and tuition grants to pay for private schooling. According to Bonastia (2012), Prince Edward County “dispersed over $163,000 in local tuition and transportation grants to families sending their children to the academy” (p. 110). Virginia’s 1960 legislation also allowed local governments to deduct taxes donated to private schools and demonstrated the General Assembly’s concern and support for the Prince Edward School Foundation (Titus, 2011a). This manipulation of taxes allowed Prince Edward County property owners to deduct as much as one-fourth of their taxes owed to donate the funds to the Prince Edward Academy (Bonastia, 2012). The Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors capitalized on this funding base and also approved a county ordinance in June 1960. This ordinance provided an additional $100 tax break to community members that sent their children to private schools (Bonastia, 2012). Titus (2011a) provided an outline of the specific resistance policies enacted by the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors, which ultimately secured the success of the Prince Edward Academy:

- The Board of Supervisors refused to levy taxes or appropriate funds for school operations.
- The Board of Supervisors effectively closed public schools in fall of 1959 citing the repeal of compulsory attendance.
- A county ordinance was passed in 1960 and included an additional $100 for private school tuition.
• The Board of Supervisors provided tuition grants to be used in conjunction with the Virginia’s tuition grants of $125.

• A transportation grant was created to provide $35 to students who lived greater than a half mile from the private school of their choice.

• A 25% property tax credit was available to those who contributed to private school of choice

Ultimately, it was the General Assembly’s legislative revisions that “allowed local officials to levy taxes and appropriate public funds to create state scholarships to finance pupil attendance at nonsectarian private schools or public schools outside their home districts” (Titus, 2011a, p. 35). Table 1 provides an overview of the massive and passive resistance policies passed by the Virginia General Assembly from 1956-1960. This table also illustrates how policies were implemented at the local level to support the complete closure of public schools and the opening of a private segregated institution.

Table 1

Virginia Resistance Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement of students</td>
<td>Pupil placement Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Tuition grants to support nonsectarian private schools</th>
<th>Tuition grants of $125 per student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation grants</td>
<td>Tuition grants to be used in conjunction with the VA’s tuition grants of $125.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$35 grant for transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Ceased state funding if mixed education</th>
<th>Public property sold for private school usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heretofore financing</td>
<td>Up to 25% of property taxes used to fund private schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refused to levy taxes or appropriate funds for school operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25% property tax credits contributed to private schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| School closure | Closed any school that tried to integrate.            | Closed all public schools                   |

| Compulsory Education | Repeal of compulsory education       | Repeal of compulsory attendance laws making school attendance a local option | Board of Supervisors cited the repeal of compulsory attendance for school closures |

*Note:* Information from Cochran, 2006; Sweeney, 2008; Titus, 2011a; Tobias, 1996.

By the close of the 1959-1960 school year, the Prince Edward Academy received Virginia Department of Education board accreditation. The Academy consisted of eight private schools with a student population estimated at 1,446 White students. According to Wolters (1984) this constituted all White public school-aged children from Prince Edward County.
For five years the Academy remained the only formal educational facility in Prince Edward County. During that time, the Prince Edward County African American community successfully petitioned President Kennedy to support the Prince Edward County displaced students. In 1963, the Free School Association was created through the support of private funds and the Kennedy administration (Titus, 2011a). After four years of school deprivation, students were given the opportunity to learn under the guise of educators and volunteers who supported the Prince Edward County battle to desegregate (Brinson, 2004).

The NAACP continued their legal battle. *Davis v. County* was refiled as *Allen v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*, 1961, and finally as *Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*, 1964. Each name change was due to the fact that the main plaintiffs eventually exceeded school age and therefore, could not petition the courts for the reopening of the schools (Titus, 2011a). From 1955-1963, the legal battle to desegregate Prince Edward County public schools remained within the courts of the Commonwealth of Virginia. In 1963, however, the NAACP and the plaintiffs petitioned the United States Supreme Court to rule on the school closures in *Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County* petitioned. They argued that the federal courts would ultimately need to resolve the constitutionality of public school closures (Morland, 1964). The Supreme Court agreed to hear the case and arguments were made before the Supreme Court in March 1964.

On May 25, 1964, the legal battle over Prince Edward County’s public school closure was finally determined by the United States Supreme Court and ruled
unconstitutional. The determination on *Griffin v. County* stated that the school closure violated the Fourteenth Amendment under the Equal Protection Clause due to the fact that public schools were open in all other Virginia counties (*Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County*, 1964). The determination additionally stated that while the school closures were “not something which the State has commanded Prince Edward to do” the school closures were made possible “with state acquiescence and cooperation” (*Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County*, 1964, p. 377). The Supreme Court’s ruling required the Board of Supervisors to levy taxes and appropriate funds for the operation of the Prince Edward County public schools. The Supreme Court ordered the Board of Supervisors to reopen the schools effective fall 1964.

**Virginia sponsored policies to make amends.** As suggested by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), discussions on race and racism are often muted. Such was the case for Prince Edward County, Virginia residents following their long desegregation battle. However, in the mid-1990s, the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors announced the potential razing of the Robert Russa Moton High School (R.R. Moton High School), and awakened African American sentiments for the school (Bonastia, 2012). According to Ward (2014), the land was to be sold to the local Longwood University for use as a recreation field. In response to the potential demolition threat, African American leaders called for a community meeting at a local church to discuss options. Members present argued that the school held significance to their community as well as the fight for civil rights in education. A grassroots African American organization known as the Martha E. Forrester Council of Women volunteered to start a fundraising campaign to save the
school from being razed (Williams, 2011). The Council and supportive community members began negotiations to purchase the land surrounding the school, allowing for the rest of the site to be sold to Longwood University (Ward, 2014). As a result of this proposition, the Council worked alongside preservationist groups and successfully secured the school as a site on the National Register of Historic Places. Following the nomination, the Martha E. Forrester Council of Women committed to purchasing the building from the Board of Supervisors for $300,000 (Titus, 2011a). In 1997, a newly created Board of Directors took control of the school from the council in order to establish the R.R. Moton Museum, a museum dedicated to the study of civil rights in education. The R.R. Moton Museum successfully opened its doors in 2001. Vera Allen, a teacher from the R.R. Moton High School, alongside Oliver Hill, the NAACP legal defense lawyer for Davis, spoke to a crowd of a thousand community members to commemorate the day (Titus, 2011a).

In 2004, the Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary Commission spent several days visiting the R.R. Moton Museum. The 23-member commission visited the five Brown v. Board of Education sites to heighten awareness and commemorate the fight for civil rights in education. The commission members initially met with members of the Virginia General Assembly, Governor Mark Warner, and Oliver Hill in Richmond at the capital. This was followed by a visit to Prince Edward County. The visit to Prince Edward County included three community sessions where the commission partook in roundtable discussions featuring plaintiffs from the original Davis v. County suit (Robert Russa Moton Museum, 2004). As reported by Titus (2011a), commission members noted
how impressed they were by county leaders, museum officials, and the displaced students’ efforts to preserve their civil rights in education history.

Kingdon (1995) suggested that increased interest from multiple institutions could often result in an adoption of new policies. The preservation of the R.R. Moton H.S. as a national historic site, the establishment of R.R. Moton as Virginia’s only civil rights in education museum, and the approaching visit by the *Brown v. Board* of Education 50th Anniversary Commission spurred Virginia policymakers to address their role in the historic school closures. In 2003, the General Assembly acknowledged and expressed regret through the passage of House Joint Resolution, no. 613 in 2003. Democratic representative Viola O. Baskerville, an African American from Richmond, sponsored House Joint Resolution, no. 613 in 2003. Baskerville had no connection to Prince Edward County but felt that the General Assembly should acknowledge its racist past. In an interview with the *Washington Post*, Baskerville discussed the wording for the resolution and stated, “We didn't do this, so why should we apologize?” (Sieff, 2011, para. 25). As a result, sponsors decided on the wording of “profound regret [for] the deep, contentious division created by the denial of public education to the African-American community.” (Sieff, 2011, para. 26). In the resolution, the Virginia General Assembly not only acknowledged its role but also outlined the loss incurred by the Prince Edward County displaced students:

The closing of the Prince Edward County schools severely affected the education of African-American students, wounding the human spirit and ultimately contributing to job and home losses, family displacements and separations, and
a deep sense of despair within the African-American community. (House Joint Resolution 613, 2003, para. 13)

A writer for Prince Edward’s newspaper, *The Farmville Herald*, seized the General Assembly’s willingness to express regret and put forth a policy proposal to provide educational funds to Virginia’s displaced students. According to Janofsky (2005), “Ken Woodley, the current editor of The Farmville Herald . . . was all too familiar with his newspaper's [racist] past and, as a white man, felt ashamed of it” (para. 26). The article’s referral to the newspapers racist past centered on the owner of *The Farmville Herald* during the school closings, Barrye Wall. Wall played a significant role in maintaining Prince Edward County’s segregated agenda due to his dual role as a Board of Supervisors member and owner of the local newspaper. Wall effectively used the newspaper to advocate for segregated schools.

Therefore, as a result of the newspapers racist past and Woodley’s sentiments that the General Assembly’s “regret” was simply a “piece of paper,” Woodley “started a one-man campaign” (Janofsky, 2005). Woodley lobbied Governor Mark Warner and other Virginia delegates to sponsor a bill establishing a multi-million dollar endowment for displaced students and their families. Woodley believed that, similar to the GI Bill, an endowment should provide funds for the victims, their children and grandchildren toward educational opportunities. Woodley, alongside African American community leaders and other community supporters campaigned and successfully gained the support of the Virginia General Assembly resulting in the creation of the scholarship program (Eversley, 2006). The program was named the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship
Program and Fund, and the resolution initially suggested an appropriation of 50 thousand dollars. When philanthropist John Kluge heard of the amount of money appropriated to the fund, he challenged the Commonwealth of Virginia to match his gift of one million dollars to the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program. Governor Mark Warner requested a budget approval to match the million-dollar contribution. In 2005, the Virginia General Assembly approved the creation of the program and the total funding of two million and 50 thousand dollars (Janofsky, 2005). Prince Edward’s African American community responded to the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund by providing transportation to the signing of the resolution. As reported by Titus (2011a), “five busloads of former Prince Edward students squeezed into Governor Mark Warner’s office for the signing ceremony” (p. 213).

*Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund, 2005. Fifty years post *Brown v. Board*, the Commonwealth of Virginia developed the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund to provide scholarship funding to any Virginian denied an education from 1954-1964. Scholarship funds may be used for educational opportunities at an accredited two-year or four-year public or private higher education institution. Scholarships can be used to obtain undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees as well as technical training (*Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program Fund, 2013). Applications are accepted once a year and are awarded during the month of July. The *Brown* Scholarship Fund requires Virginia educational agencies to work with the scholarship Committee to provide pertinent information including the accreditation status of the institution and eligibility of the student (*Brown v. Board of
The *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee is comprised of 11 people. Four of the members are from the House of Delegates and two are Senators appointed by the Joint Rules Committee. The remaining five members are non-legislative and include a college admissions representative, an expert in the field of academic counseling, and three residents from Virginia’s geographic regions affected by the historical school closings. All members have an equal vote. According to the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Awards Committee (2005), the Scholarship Awards Committee meets several times a year for the purpose of implementing the Program. Moreover, the Committee works “with representatives of the Department of Education, the State Council of Higher Education, the Virginia Community College System, public and private institutions of higher education” in order to make sure the program is administered according to the program’s bylaws (para. 4). Since the onset of the Program and Fund, a total of 219 scholarships have been awarded to 83 individuals totaling $1,013,838.48 in awards (*Brown v. Board* Committee meeting, December 10, 2013).

Two features of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund received criticism. First, the *Brown* Scholarship Fund is offered only to those that were directly impacted by the school closing. The *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund Policies of the Committee (2013) state:

The *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program is designed to provide educational opportunities to persons who were "directly" affected by public school closings during Massive Resistance, and who were unable either to begin,
continue, or complete their public education. It is acknowledged that, in the many years preceding Massive Resistance, public education for African Americans throughout the Commonwealth was grossly inferior, dismal, and replete with inequalities and indignities. Massive Resistance deprived many Virginians—African American and White—of an education when the public schools were closed. Although this tragic course of events may have precipitated generational repercussions, nevertheless, the progeny of the persons affected by school closings were not denied an education in Virginia's public schools. Therefore, the purpose of the Scholarship Program is not reparation. The sole and only purpose of the Scholarship Program is "restoration of education" to those who were "directly" affected. (p. 3)

Therefore, contrary to Woodley’s vision of the Brown Scholarship Fund, no children are entitled to the scholarship funds. As suggested by Bonastia (2012), “the limits imposed on the scholarship awards marginalized the profound ways that disadvantage can be passed from generation to generation (p. 251).

Additionally, as suggested in the policies outlined by the Committee, an unintended consequence of the school closures included the loss of an education for poor Whites (Bonastia, 2012). This was particularly the case following the previously mentioned court ruling against the use of tuition grants in 1963 (Titus, 2011b). Therefore, the General Assembly made a decision to make the Brown Scholarship Fund race-neutral. This aspect of the fund was not been well received (Green, 2011; Sieff, 2011). As stated
by Titus (2011b), “the scholarships have always been understood as a good-faith effort to right historic wrongs committed in the name of maintaining white supremacy” (para. 3).

Statement of the Problem

This section presents the problem statement. It begins with a discussion on the use of education by policymakers as a way to address systematized racism and focuses on the desegregation mandate of Brown. This section explores the difficulties in mandating societal changes surrounding race and racism. This is followed by an introduction to critical race theory (CRT) as a way to explain the persistence of racism. Further, this section explores the tenets of CRT and its goal to serve as a transformative model. The final part of the problem statement explores restorative justice programs as a possible vehicle to address critical race issues and emphasizes the use of restorative justice to address past wrongdoings. The Brown Scholarship Fund is one such program, which seeks to transform the loss of an education to a group of African Americans. These individuals were denied an education as a result of Virginia’s historic racist resistant policies. This section presents that we cannot know the value of this policy and its impact without exploring the perceptions of the Brown Scholarship Fund recipients.

Brown unfulfilled. Historically, education was viewed as the way to address the inequity and unequal policies that were a consequence of racism. Tate, Ladson-Billings and Grant (1993) reviewed the Brown decision and demonstrated that a desegregation case, Roberts v. City of Boston, 1850 in Massachusetts established education as the arena for civil rights: “104 years before Brown, the transitive property of social equality equating desegregation with quality schools and increased opportunities in the
marketplace formulated” (p. 37). As a result, education remained central to the issue of segregation within the United States and became the NAACP’s battle for equality (Bell, 1976). But what was required of Brown was more than overturning the judicial precedent of Plessy v. Ferguson (1896). As suggested by Bell (2004) and demonstrated by the previous history on Virginia and Prince Edward County, achieving equality and equity would mean overturning an unspoken covenant of White superiority over the African American race.

Research supports the “silent covenant” of White supremacy. Tobias (1996) explored the desegregation efforts in Virginia post-Brown decade and demonstrated that particularly in the Black Belt region, local authorities wielded political, social and economic avenues in order to preserve segregated education. Tobias’ reported that the General Assembly cited integration as an endangerment to the health of White Virginian children and concluded, “The efforts to integrate Public education trenchantly illustrate the inherent limitations of essentially legal approaches to issues as intractable as racial discrimination” (p. 1262).

Resistance efforts to maintain segregation continued for decades as evidenced by White flight (Coleman, 1968). The Coleman report suggested that Whites were leaving racially diverse cities for suburbia in order to maintain segregated education. White flight resulted in new efforts to enforce Brown with metropolitan desegregation plans. However, the Supreme Court ruling in Milliken v. Bradley (1974) demonstrated the persistence of racism as the court’s ruling did not support such desegregation plans (Bell, 2005).
Klarman (1994) suggested that the efforts to desegregate schools actually resulted in a backlash of heightened racism. According to Klarman, the interference of the federal government was reminiscent of the Civil War and proved to incense White Southerners. As a result, race issues were elevated over class. Klarman suggested that the backlash to *Brown* also inspired Black Belt Whites, such as those in Prince Edward County, to exhaust all efforts in maintaining segregation. Last of all, *Brown* pushed southern leaders who were not initially transfixed on race, to take a distinct side. Klarman presented that the backlash to *Brown* resulted in new patterns of strong organized resistance, “Racial moderation was submerged, as *Brown* collapsed southern racial opinion into two polar positions, integrationist and segregationist” (p. 97).

Beyond the consequence of heightened racism and strong resistance, *Brown* had even more enduring consequences. Epps (2002) and Fairclough (2004) documented the loss of African American teachers and administrators. Traditional African American schools were often closed as well. As stated by Irvine (1988), “Desegregation brought about dramatic changes in the existing social order. Previously semiautonomous Black schools became controlled and dominated by White administrators who generally ignored the Black schools” (p. 504).

As demonstrated in Prince Edward County, segregated academies were another enduring result of *Brown*. Many segregated academies were created and maintained for years to come (Ladson-Billings, 2004). For instance, the Prince Edward Academy remained segregated until the late 1980s (Sieff, 2011). As stated by Fuquay (2002) “segregationist parents hoped to recreate the social, culture, and ideological environment
of their own upbringing and thus nurture in their children a set of beliefs then being rejected by the outside world” (p. 161).

Irons (2002) explored the relationship between contemporary segregated education patterns and academic achievement. His research suggested that America’s persistent achievement gap is connected to the legacy of Brown as well. Fryer and Levitt (2004) reported that African American students continue to perform poorly on tests compared to Whites. Vanneman, Hamilton, Anderson and Rahman (2009) reported similar findings for the National Assessment of Educational Progress; “White students had average scores at least 26 points higher than Black students in each subject, on a 0-500 scale” (p. iii). Meara, Richards and Cutler (2008) added that the achievement gap between African Americans and Whites continues to widen with age and potentially leads to a higher risk of mortality. As suggested by Bonilla-Silva (1997), “the result is… a racialized social order… distinguished by this difference in life chances” (p. 470).

Critical race theory. As a result of Brown’s unfulfilled promise, researchers began to explore ways to further understand race and racism. In the 1970s, critical race theory (CRT), developed out of critical legal studies and radical feminism, and provided researchers a way to explore and understand the reasons Brown remained unfulfilled. CRT suggests that the issues surrounding Brown are due to the fact that racism is an enduring aspect of society. Further, CRT suggests that the consequences of widespread systematized racism are policies that fail to promote equality (Bonilla-Silva; 1997; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). The results, as previously highlighted in the Prince
Edward County school closings, are real emotional, physical, economic and political outcomes for African Americans (Bonilla-Silva, 1997).

CRT additionally offered guidance on how to develop and assess policy to ensure that African Americans’ rights and privileges are forefront. According to Delgado and Stefancic (2012) the tenets for critical race include:

- acceptance of racism as a normal part of society;
- acknowledgement of institutions that support Whites over African Americans;
- acknowledgement of policies made only to benefit Whites;
- the social construction of race;
- the real negative consequences to racism for African Americans;
- African American narratives as an essential part in developing policy (pp. 6-10).

Theorists such as Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), and Torres and Van Heertum (2009) suggested that addressing racism often requires the political and moral analysis of a specific time in history. There is also strong support for taking a cross-disciplinary approach to solving race issues (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Stovall, 2006; Tate, 1997; Yamamoto, 1997). Ultimately, the goal is to transform society to provide greater rights and privileges (Bonilla-Silva, 1997; Torres & Van Heertum, 2009). As outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2012), “critical race theory contains an activist dimension. It tries not only to understand our social situation but to change it; it sets out not only to ascertain how society organizes itself along racial lines and hierarchies but to transform it for the better” (p.7).
Yamamoto (1997) presented that critical race theorists face an apparent “performative contradiction - employing theoretical tools that deny law’s authenticity while seeking to remake law practically so that it performs for the end of racial justice” (p. 869). Gewirtz (2006) suggested that the application of justice is under-theorized when dealing with racism and argued in favor of broad application of justice programs within education. Yamamoto (1997) furthered the connection between CRT and restorative justice by suggesting that restorative justice programs might bridge the gap “between progressive race theory and political lawyering practice” (p. 828-829). Yamamoto (1997, 1999) then provided “goal posts” based on CRT and feminism and outlined the practice of restorative justice to achieve transformation. Yamamoto (1997) stated that restorative justice provides a workable framework to address critical race issues, and thus named it critical race praxis. He (1998) argued that critical race praxis can be effectively applied to reparative efforts for historic wrongdoings against African Americans including slavery and Jim Crow acts. According to Yamamoto (1998), reparation framed within CRT advocates for restitution for the African American. The repair paradigm outlined by Yamamoto is as follows:

This repair paradigm of reparations redirects attention away from individual rights (recognized by law) and legal remedies (monetary compensation). It focuses instead on (1) historical wrongs committed by one group, (2) which harmed, and continue to harm, both the material living conditions and psychological outlook of another group, (3) which, in turn, has damaged present-day relations between the groups, and (4) which ultimately has damaged the larger community, resulting in
divisiveness, distrust, social disease—a breach in the polity. (p. 522)

Put in simpler terms, Yamamoto’s (1998) repair paradigm includes:

1. recognition of wrongdoing;
2. responsibility for wrongdoing;
3. reconstruction or active steps toward healing wrongdoing, i.e. an apology;
4. reparation or material to change social economic or political structure.

**Brown Scholarship Fund**

As presented earlier in this chapter, starting in 2003, the Virginia General Assembly developed several policies to address their role in the historic school closings. House Resolution 613 expressed profound regret and was followed in 2005 by the Brown Scholarship Fund. According to Virginia’s Division of Legislative Services (DLS), the goal of the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund is to provide educational restoration. This policy is viewed as a restorative justice program, and the DLS additionally dismisses any claims that the fund provides reparation despite claims to the contrary (*Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Policies of the Committee, 2012).

The creation of the Brown Scholarship Fund as a policy of education restoration some 50 years later therefore, leads to policy questions and concerns. The goal of the Brown Scholarship Fund is to restore education. Similar to *Brown v. Board*, the Brown Scholarship Fund centers on education as a way to address Virginia’s historic racist policies. Moreover, education is viewed as the equalizer for losses incurred over fifty years ago.
Research on the Prince Edward County school closures suggested that the educational impact for the African American students was considerable. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sponsored a research team in 1963 from Michigan State University to explore the educational impact of the school closures. This study reported that students experienced significant academic delay; many were illiterate (Green & Hofmann, 1965; Lee, 2010). Peeples (2004) reported that as many as three-fourths of affected students failed to participate in any education during the five year school closure. Many students never returned to school and failed to obtain high school degrees (Green & Hofmann, 1965; Green, Hofmann, & Morgan, 1967; Hicks & Pitre, 2010). Heaton (2008) combined administrative data on the Prince Edward County displaced students to assess the long-term educational loss and the resulting outcomes of a denied education. The results of Heaton’s study suggested that older students lost four years of educational attainment, compared to African American students from neighboring school systems.

However, educational attainment was only a small part of what was lost as a result of the school closings. The loss of an education also impacted the students economic and employment potential. Hale-Smith (1993) surveyed over one hundred displaced Prince Edward County students and reported that as adults, the displaced students had low average income levels and worked in low-skilled jobs. Brookover (1993) and Heaton (2008) suggested the loss of an education placed individuals below the poverty line throughout their adulthood.
Turner (2003, 2004) explored the socio-emotional impact for the African American students deprived an education and reported that students experienced social exclusion, separation from families, and loss of other childhood norms (Turner, 2003, 2004). Long-term, the lack of an education resulted in humiliation and a deep mourning (Brookover, 1993; Brookover, Dudley, & Green, 1993; Green et al., 1967). Students reported to Turner (2004) that what haunted them most was not knowing what they could have achieved had they been provided an education. Turner (2003) reported, “With few exceptions, the closings wreaked havoc on the educational and emotional lives of black children and on the vitality of the black community as a whole” (p. 1683).

Brookover (1993) explored the relationship between the school closings and contemporary educational issues such as the achievement gap and learning opportunities for the Prince Edward County African American students. He reported, “For those who believe that desegregation would result in equality of education for all students, Prince Edward County’s public schools, like most schools in the United States, do not fulfill that expectation” (p. 160).

Findings from these studies suggested that the loss of public education resulted in more than the failure to obtain a high school degree. An education would have nourished a different adulthood and impacted the many resulting consequences of a denied education. Moreover, as demonstrated by the research performed on Brown, education was only one piece of a greater struggle by society to address racism. Therefore, questions remain as to the impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund.
Research on the Brown Scholarship Fund. Williams (2005) applied Yamamoto’s (1998) repair paradigm along with CRT to analyze the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund. She determined that the Brown Scholarship Fund falls short of providing adequate reparations for the damage done to the displaced students. Walker (2006) also analyzed the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund and suggested that the fund is a restorative justice policy that attempts to address historical wrongdoing at the state and local level. Walker argued that historical wrongdoings could not be repaired solely through reparation; however, the use of reparation within the restorative justice framework has the potential to heal. Therefore, Walker posed that programs like the Brown Scholarship Fund should not be dismissed due to their small scope. Rather, she argued that these programs should be viewed “as multiple, local initiatives that might be better understood under the rubric of restorative justice” (p. 390). Moreover, she postulated that, cumulatively, these types of local restorative justice programs might help to heal racial relations in America. Both studies are further explored in the literature review in Chapter Two.

Whose voice? Walker (2006) and Williams (2005) analyzed the fund from a theoretical standpoint. Missing from their research are the voices of the African American recipients. What does it mean to be the recipient of a policy aimed to restore an education denied 50 years prior by the same government? How can we know what the impact of this policy is? The African American recipients of the Brown Scholarship Fund can better inform researchers what the policy means to them. According to Delgado and Stefancic (2012) the narratives of African Americans can provide a type of “legal
storytelling” used to assess laws. Gillborn (2005) also suggested that the analysis of policy framed within critical race theory (CRT) places the voice of African Americans front and center to a study. Further, the voice of the African American is important to both CRT as well as the practice of restorative justice. Stovall (2006) wrote that policies that merge CRT and social justice practice should aim to legitimize the voices of people of color. Similar to CRT, restorative justice originates from critical legal studies and values the voice of the victim (Matsuda, 1987; Zehr, 2002). As stated by Matsuda (1987), “those who have experienced discrimination speak with a special voice to which we should listen” (p. 416).

**Purpose of the Study**

This study explored the restorative justice program of the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund through the perceptions of the scholarship recipients. According to Williams (2005), the *Brown* Scholarship Fund “makes Virginia the only state to provide such relief to persons harmed by its intransigence in the face of the Court’s [*Brown’s*] mandate” (p. 422). Students who lost an education and were later awarded a scholarship from the *Brown* Scholarship Fund provided insight into whether and to what extent the fund was able to provide “restoration of education.” The goals of this study included:

- to better understand how Prince Edward County scholarship recipients perceive the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund;
- to explore the resulting outcomes of the fund through the perceptions of the Prince Edward County displaced student;
• to document the Prince Edward County African American perspectives on their lived experience as a fund recipient after being denied an education by the same government.

**Research Questions**

The research questions that guided this study were as follows:

Q1. What are the Prince Edward County African American scholarship recipients’ perceptions of the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund?

Q2. What if any, has been the impact of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund on the lives of the recipients?

**Conceptual Framework**

Maxwell (2005) stated that the framework for a study should consist of concepts and theories that support and help to understand a phenomenon. The goal of this study was to explore the participants’ perceptions of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund in regards to their experience as a recipient of the program. In order to develop a study that placed the voices of the Prince Edward County African Americans forefront, critical race theory (CRT) was used to frame this study (see Fig. 1). Critical race theory was an appropriate framework based on the following principles. Critical race theory values the ahistorical, emphasizes counter narrative, places the African American voice center to the analysis of policy, and ultimately seeks to transform democracy (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995).
Restorative justice was included in the framework as a CRT method. Yamamoto’s (1997, 1998, 1999) design of critical race praxis, a type of restorative justice program, suggested that policies such as the Brown Scholarship Fund might be a way to achieve the transformative component of CRT. Moreover, both restorative justice and CRT value the voices of the marginalized populations when developing and analyzing policy. Combined, CRT and restorative justice theory again placed the Brown Scholarship Fund recipients’ voices center to this study. Restorative justice and CRT are explored further in Chapter Two, Literature Review.

Critical race theorists suggested that addressing racism often requires an analysis of a specific time in history (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Torres & Van Heertum, 2009). Therefore, part of the framework included the historical antecedents specific to Prince Edward County, Virginia. This history included the creation of the fund and its goal to provide restoration of education.

Finally, the framework provided the type of methodology that supported the analysis of the fund framed within CRT and based upon the voices of the African American fund recipients. Interviews were used as a way to explore the perceptions of their experiences as scholarship recipients. Instrumental case study provided a way to explore the connectivity of the cases and analyzed for common themes or patterns. Chapter Three provides a more thorough discussion on methods.
Figure 1. Conceptual framework.

Note. This visual representation demonstrates the interactions between concepts and the knowledge base that inform this study. This conceptual framework is based on Maxwell (2005).
Organization of the Study

This chapter provided an introduction and framework for this study. Chapter Two presents a review of literature that informs this study. The first section offers a more in-depth review of Brown unfulfilled including the resulting outcomes of continued racism and segregation and the resulting outcomes of education deprivation for the Prince Edward County African American. As stated, the research on civil rights in education offers evidence of the consequences of America’s long history of racism and leads into a discussion on CRT. The literature on CRT further explores its origins, its relation to critical legal studies, its tenets, and its application to education. The review on restorative justice follows a similar format but emphasizes ways in which restorative justice is applied in an effort to address historical wrongdoings.

Chapter Three is the methods section and provides the design for this study. A qualitative research design is appropriate for the exploration of perceptions. Instrumental case study was selected to examine the complex perceptions that developed based on participants’ deprivation and restoration of education. Through the use of instrumental case study, the participants for this study became the subcases or subunits embedded within a single case study (Merriam, 2009). Instrumental case study provided the framework to explore the stories of these “subcases” and the connectedness, the “interactivity” (Stake, 2005) of each case through a cross-case analysis. The use of interviews explored the Prince Edward County African American perceptions. The goal of the interview was to develop a deeper understanding of what it meant to be the recipient of the Brown Scholarship Fund and what if any impact the program had on their
lives. Findings from the interviews along with field notes and analytical memos were analyzed to develop thematic categories.

Chapter Four presents the individual case findings along with the themes present in the cross-case analysis. Four common themes emerged from the data and included: (a) necessary structures, (b) characteristics of the recipients, (c) policy impact, and (d) restoration revisions.

Chapter Five discusses how the findings from this study fit within the existing literature and also how this study contributed to the field of education policy. The findings suggest that Yamamoto’s repair paradigm remains at risk of hegemonic influences. As a result, restorative justice has the potential to be unfulfilled. This section also presents that the Brown Scholarship Fund results in an unfulfilled restorative justice policy and that a comprehensive design would better meet the needs of the displaced students. Further persistent racism experienced as a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient impacted the potential of the Brown Scholarship Fund to achieve restoration.

**Significance of the Study**

This study explored the perceptions of a group of Prince Edward African Americans on their lived experiences as Brown Scholarship Fund recipients. Documenting the voices of the Prince Edward County members has value due to their unique lived experiences. These individuals not only participated in the struggle to obtain civil rights in education, but additionally received funds to restore an education once denied by the same government 50 plus years apart.
As a result, this study added to the research on government-sponsored programs intended to make amends for past wrongdoings. Few studies exist on the analysis of such programs. Scholarship done on restorative justice programs often focus on the theory or the legal applications of such programs similar to those performed on the *Brown* Scholarship Fund by Walker (2006) and Williams (2005). The issue of exploring the value of restorative justice programs is further discussed in literature review, however; in general it is argued that restorative justice programs lack a prescriptive design (Walker, 2006; Zehr, 2002). As a result researchers struggle on how to analyze the long-term value of such programs (Walgrave, 2011; Zehr, 2002). As such, this study may add a dimension to restorative justice analysis based on the perceptions and lived experiences of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund recipients.

Moreover, this study contributed to the conversation on the legacy of *Brown* and America’s efforts to heal from its racist past. As suggested by Williams (2006), Virginia’s educational restoration program is unique in its attempt to restore education as a result of government policies implemented to deny desegregation as outlined by *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954. Therefore, this study explored the potential of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund to address the type of historic and persistent racism outlined by critical race theory.

**Definition of Terms**

African American. A term used to refer to members of the United States who believe to have an African heritage.
Black. According to the US Census Bureau (2010), Black is used to identify individuals from African American descent. However, for this study, the term African American will be used unless it is part of a direct quote from other scholarly work.

Black belt. According to Wimberley (2010), the Black Belt is comprised of the “11 formal confederate states – Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia” (p. 105) and is further noted for its dark rich soil, and historical plantation use (Wimberley, 2010). The Black Belt is also noted for its slave and civil war history as well as, its resistance to social-political advances that favored African Americans (Bonastia, 2012).

Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Programs and Fund will additionally be referred to as the Brown Scholarship Fund.

Displaced students. According to Merriam-Webster (2014), displace means “to remove from the usual or proper place; specifically: to expel or force to flee.” Therefore, a displaced student is a student that is forced to leave their usual educational institution.

Massive Resistance. According to Virginia Historical Society (2013), Massive Resistance laws were passed to resist desegregation as outlined by Brown and facilitated by United States Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. (Virginia). The massive resistance plan for Virginia was known as the Perrow Plan.
Negro. According to the United States Bureau of the Census (1962), the term Negro was used from 1900-2013 to refer to individuals of African descent. For the purpose of this paper the term African-American will be used. However, if historical research is cited and the term Negro was used, the citation will remain true to its original form.

Reparation. According to Feagin (2004) Reparations are compensations provided to individuals or groups of people in an effort to make amends for wrongdoings.

Restoration. Based on Zehr (2002), restorations occur through methods that attempt to repair or bring back something that was taken away.

Wrongdoing. According to the Merriam-Webster (2014), a wrongdoing is a behavior that is morally or legally wrong. Synonyms for wrongdoing include a crime, a violation, a misdoing and a transgression. For this study the term used to describe any of the behavior that goes against a moral or legal wrong will be referred to as a wrongdoing unless used differently in a citation.
CHAPTER TWO

This literature review provides an analysis of the research that frames this study. It begins with research on Brown v. Board. This section explores the theories on why Brown remains unfulfilled, as well as the consequences of Brown, including the scholarly work on educational deprivation for the Prince Edward County displaced students. This provides context for the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund and its emphasis on educational restoration. This is followed by a literature review on critical race theory (CRT) and an overview of theoretical tenets. Additionally, this section reviews literature that suggests that CRT includes an activist component to transform and improve democracy for African Americans that is often overlooked. The final section is on the practice of restorative justice. The review includes an overview of the principles and features of restorative justice programs. Included in this section is the research of Walker (2006) and Williams (2005) that analyzed the Brown v. Board Scholarship Program and Fund as a type of restorative justice practice.

Brown v. Board

Scholars view the implementation and success of Brown with a critical eye. Brown was an attempt to secure civil rights for African Americans and potentially served as a catalyst for future American civil rights legislation (Bell, 1976; Wells, Revilla, Holme, & Atanda, 2004). However, research suggests that the goal of Brown to secure
civil rights for the African Americans through school desegregation remains unfulfilled. Further research proposes that Brown met resistance and experienced inconsistent results due to the fact that communities remained governed by the White majority. The following literature section reviews literature on the implementation of Brown, as well as the consequences of school desegregation. Additionally, it includes research that suggests that schools are now resegregated, demonstrating Brown’s unfulfilled promise.

**Concerns about Brown.** Bell (1976) provided a law review of Brown by analyzing the historical determinations of the United States Supreme Court in cases related to school integration. According to Bell, lawyers held onto the ideal of desegregation. He suggests that desegregation litigation such as Brown was more about group policy directives by organizations such as the NAACP than about supporting clients in the overall quest for civil rights. As a result, Bell presented that desegregation litigation was not in the best interest of their clients and resulted in “serving two masters” (p. 129). To further support his theory, Bell reviewed the United States Supreme Court’s 1963 decision in *NAACP v. Button*. As part of this determination, Justice Harlan suggested that the policies of the NAACP “serious[ly] depart[ed] from ethical professional conduct” (p. 130). Through the examination of the group lawyering performed by the NAACP, Bell suggested that the selection of school desegregation as the cornerstone of civil rights litigation resulted in a conflict of interest. Bell argued that, “public schools were chosen because they presented a far more compelling symbol of the evils of segregation and a far more vulnerable target than segregated railroad cars, restaurants, or restrooms” (p. 237). Bell further presented that Justice Harlan’s concerns
applied to integration litigation decades after *Brown*. He posed that litigation for the African American population required "an extraordinary display of ethical sensitivity and self-restraint" (p. 135). Furthermore, Bell suggested that school desegregation is an ideal that contemporary lawyers remained committed to but was not the peoples’ solution to segregated America.

Bell (1980) followed this law review with another examination of *Brown*. Bell reviewed the work of Professor Herb Weschler. Weschler was a respected constitutional lawyer at the time of *Brown* who delivered the annual Oliver Wendell Holmes Lecture at Harvard Law School in 1959. In this lecture, Weschler provided his interpretation of the United States Supreme Court’s determination on the *Brown v. Board* case. Weschler stated that the NAACP’s argument that segregation violated the fourteenth amendment was ungrounded. He posited that the *Brown* determination was made based on a merger of interest between Whites and African Americans. Essentially, Weschler argued that the *Brown* decisions rested on the first amendment and focused on the “freedom to associate” (p. 521). Bell concurred with Weschler and suggested that underlying the decision on *Brown* was a White hegemonic perspective that segregation was good for Whites; however, African Americans desired the freedom to associate. Bell countered this hegemonic perspective and stated, “To doubt that racial segregation is harmful to Blacks and to suggest that what Blacks really sought was the right to associate with Whites is to believe in a world that does not exist now and could not possibly have existed then” (p. 522).
Bell furthered Weschler’s argument on the freedom to associate and suggested that *Brown* occurred due to interest convergence. Bell wrote, “The interests of Blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with interests of Whites” (p. 523). Bell argued that at the time of *Brown*, desegregation made sense for the federal governing Whites. He stated that ending racial segregation was positively viewed by foreign nations and potentially impacted the Southern economy. However, Bell made a point to demonstrate that the *Brown* ruling was not in the interest of localized regions, particularly the South. As a result, White hegemonic opposition to *Brown* was strong and resulted in defiance and resistance strategies that further impacted African Americans and their fight for civil rights.

*White hegemony*. Sweeney (2008) provided an insider’s view on White governance during Virginia’s massive resistance era. He acquired and analyzed the diary of David J. Mays, the lawyer and Chairman of the Commission on Constitutional Government (CCG). The CCG was a commission established by Virginia’s General Assembly to research legal ways to deny *Brown*. Mays’ diary demonstrated that the elected members of the commission were outspoken segregationists that published writings to promote their agenda. Sweeney used Mays’ writings to demonstrate how tremendous legal scrutiny went into establishing resistance laws. For instance, in his diary, Mays discussed the commission’s concern with having enough White teachers available to educate African Americans in the event of a court-ordered desegregation ruling. As a result, the General Assembly created a temporary license to assure “a ready supply of White teachers” (p. 44). In a 1955 diary entry, Mays wrote that,
constitutionally, the avoidance of *Brown* could not be committed at the state level and must be solved by putting power in the hands of municipalities. However, Mays also wrote that sentiments to deny integration were so strong that the General Assembly passed massive resistance policies regardless of his legal analysis.

Sweeney suggested that the strong segregationist stance taken by Mays and his CCG colleagues reflected the perceptions of race at the time. However, Klarman (1994) argued that post World War II African Americans were gaining in civil rights without extreme racial responses from White government leaders. Klarman analyzed voting registration, poll tax records, Southern African American civil rights efforts, and municipal records in Birmingham and Montgomery Alabama to demonstrate that prior to *Brown*, African Americans experienced civil rights progress. He presented that by influencing state congressmen rather than courts, African Americans saw increases in representation among voters, Southern politicians, and police force in cities such as Montgomery, Alabama.

Klarman stated that, particularly in the South, *Brown* countered the progress made by producing a backlash response, which resulted in racial extremism. He suggested that the call to desegregate by the federal government was too reminiscent of government interactions during the Civil War. Additionally, *Brown* aimed to change race relations in grade schools. Klarman argued that this stirred strong emotions among White parents. As a result, the *Brown* decision required Southern politicians to support segregation regardless of their position prior to the *Brown* ruling. Therefore, policies on race superseded policies on class. Klarman wrote, “*Brown* inspired rural Black Belt Whites to
exert their disproportionate power in state politics to exact racial conformity from Whites less preoccupied with race” (p. 98). Moreover, any moderate treatment toward African Americans was dismissed and replaced with strong resistance policies.

Kruse (2004) provided a similar perspective; however, he suggested that the extreme positions taken by White government officials ultimately resulted in non-conformity. Kruse evaluated massive resistance policies created by the Georgia General Assembly to demonstrate how extreme governance failed to secure the support of the “ordinary White Southerner” (p. 1009). Kruse demonstrated how, under the leadership of strong segregationist Governors, the General Assembly created the Georgia Commission on Education (GCE) in response to Brown. The GCE worked to create a statewide private school system. Their efforts included permanent revocation of teachers’ licenses as penalty for support of any kind of “mixed class” education. The state additionally organized under the States’ Rights Council of Georgia to cease the presence of the NAACP and unite the “ordinary segregationists Whites” (p. 1034). However, when the state refused to allow Georgia Tech to play in the 1955 Sugar Bowl against a university with one Black player, the students expressed outrage and publically vilified the Council and their segregationist stance. Kruse provided other examples of the “ordinary” persons’ reluctance to join the Council in their extreme quest for segregation. Kruse argued that people were willing to give their vote to the segregationist cause; however, there was no depth to the commitment.

Fultz (2004) further analyzed the struggle to implement Brown due to continued White governance. Fultz provided a historical overview of how Brown’s goal to unite the
previously dual systems of Southern public education lead to in a continued imbalance of power as Whites controlled the desegregation process. Fultz reviewed three separate scholarly writings in 1951 by prominent African Americans who forewarned that Brown would result in the loss of African American educators. Fultz reviewed legislative policies in the South that derailed Brown, including anti-NAACP laws and modified tenure laws that ceased the employment of African American teachers. Fultz writes, “Within eighteen months after Brown I, Southern School News reported that efforts had been made to modify tenure laws in Alabama, Florida, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Virginia” (p. 19). As a result of Southern defiance and White government control, he reported that the implementation of Brown resulted in an increasing number of displacement policies. According to Fultz, “Displacement became the phase which subsumed the many policies and practices of southern school boards, school superintendents, and politicians, which sought to undermine the employment and authority of African American school staff” (p. 14).

**Outcomes of Brown.** As presented by Fultz, displacement policies resulted in the loss of African Americans educators. Fairclough (2004) studied this loss of African American educators through an analysis of the relationship between African American educators and the NAACP. He reviewed the historic efforts made by African Americans to secure an education post Reconstruction. In particular, he analyzed the relationship between African Americans and their churches. Fairclough described how the Methodist and Baptist churches perceived “schools [as] vital to the success of their religious goals” (p. 12-13). As a result, Fairclough offered that communities worked to secure African
American teachers and educational facilities of their own. However, Fairclough presented that by the 1940s these schools were “taken over by the school boards” (p. 13). As a result, African American educators made new alliances to maintain control of their schools. Fairclough posited that African American educators’ relationship with the NAACP was reflective of Bell’s (1976) theory on *Serving Two Masters*. Initially educators supported the NAACP’s agenda to secure the employment of African American teachers and the early stages of desegregation litigation. However, African American educators expressed great concern over the potential loss of employment and the education of African American students should schools’ desegregation litigation proceed. Fairclough stated, “The national leadership of the NAACP knew full well that integration would jeopardize the livelihoods of Black teachers” (p. 6). He continued that African American educators were ultimately “bullied into silence” (p. 7).

**White-only private schools.** White dominance not only resulted in displacement policies but, as presented by Kruse, the creation of White-only private schools. This served as an additional type of resistance that assured a segregated schooling option. Fuquay (2002) explored the development of private school systems in Mississippi from 1964-1971 by reviewing the records of White Citizens Councils in their efforts to create all-White private school systems. According to Fuquay, private schools were seen as a way to avoid “federal interference and maintain local control of public education” (p. 179). Fuquay stated that elected officials supported the segregated school agenda by passing legislation that supported legal avenues to pay for segregated education. These policies included school vouchers, the repeal of compulsory education, grants for bus
travel and the application of property taxes toward private schools. Fuquay demonstrated that, even after the demise of massive resistance and freedom of choice policies, segregated schools flourished.

**Educational deprivation.** Fuquay’s study briefly discussed the private White schools in Prince Edward County, Virginia. He reported that the creation of the Prince Edward Academy allowed for the complete and successful five-year closure of Prince Edward’s public school system and accordingly the deprivation of education to the students of Prince Edward County. Green and Hofmann (1965) explored the educational deprivation of Prince Edward County African American students by administering the Stanford Bidet intelligent quotient (I.Q.) test and the Stanford Achievement tests. Random subsets of participants were selected based on age, gender, and educational experience during the school closures. Each subset was compared to African American students attending school in neighboring communities. The findings of the study demonstrated that “rural Negro children in a neighboring county whose schooling was uninterrupted demonstrated a level of achievement significantly higher than the limited and no education groups” (p. 340). Other findings from this study suggested that short-term remediation did not improve academic achievement or intelligence scores. However, Green and Hofmann reported, “formal schooling was shown to be a significant factor in the measured academic achievement and intelligence of the Prince Edward County sample” (p. 337). Language deficits were most profound for students between the ages of 6 and 11, whereas math discrepancies were greater among the older students. The findings of Green and Hofmann are interesting; however, this study was limited to the
Stanford I.Q. and achievement tests only. Therefore, this study did not provide an in-depth analysis on the impact of the school closings for the Prince Edward County African American students.

Green, Hofmann, Morse, Hayes and Morgan (1964) performed a more comprehensive case study. This study was sponsored by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare and was accessed on microfilm through the Interlibrary Loan Internet accessible database (Illiad). Green et al. explored the overall effects of education deprivation, as well as the social and emotional concerns that developed as a result of the deprivation. Researchers collected background information on family members of the displaced students. Participants were also interviewed to understand displaced students’ aspirations and concepts of self. Parents were surveyed to further understand their perceptions on education during the public school closures. Finally, students were tested using the Stanford Bidet I.Q. test.

Green et al. reported that many parents attempted to take over the functions of school as best as possible during the school closures. Further, researchers obtained information on educational opportunities offered to the students by outside agencies. With this information, the researchers placed students into cohorts to examine how the closure of the schools impacted each group and to determine if any of the educational options served to mitigate the impact of the school closures. Outside educational options included moving out of Prince Edward County to live with a host family and attend school elsewhere through the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC). Students could also attend a community program through the Prince Edward County Christian
Association (PECCA) centers. Outside organizations such as Virginia Teachers Association created concentrated remedial winter and summer learning programs. Finally, parents offered their children at-home education.

Students who received at-home education reported lower self-esteem and a lack of future aspirations when compared to neighboring African American students with similar demographics. Green et al. reported that even those students who participated in education programs from outside agencies had lower self-esteem. Displaced students who attended alternative formal schooling expressed the difficulty of attending school elsewhere. For many of the displaced students, moving to a different geographic location to live with a host family and attend a new school was too hard. Consequently, many students dropped out of the program. These students reported that they were embarrassed that they did not complete their education. As a result of the students’ reported difficulties with self-esteem, family relations, and returning to school, Green et al. concluded that the school closings not only resulted in education deprivation, but also impacted students socially and emotionally.

Hale-Smith (1993) compared the long-term implications of the school closings on the Prince Edward County displaced students. Similar to Green et al., Hale-Smith compared students that attended alternative education programs to those who were educated by family members at home. Her goal was to explore how each set of students perceived their educational opportunities as adult learners. She wondered if having educational experiences during the school closures hindered or helped their long-term outlook on education. Additionally, she hoped to compare and further understand the
relationship between education deprivation and adult occupations and income levels. Hale-Smith obtained the 1958-1959 African American student enrollment lists from the Prince Edward County public school system. Students were randomly selected to participate from this list. Two hundred ten students were contacted. Forty-five participants received formal education, and 165 students received no education during the school closures. Fifty-five percent responded and took part in the study. Participants were given a multiple choice and short-answer questionnaire. Participants who agreed to be interviewed took part in an unstructured interview. The goal of the interview was to develop a deeper understanding on the long-term impact of the school closings. Findings from this study indicated that 79% of the participants who attended formal education completed their high school degree, versus 49% of those that did not. Moreover, students who continued to receive an education during the school closing were more likely to hold managerial and professional jobs. Accordingly, these students had higher incomes as adults. Students who did not receive any formal education during the school closure viewed desegregation as a problem and were not optimistic about the future. Both groups were similarly involved in community programs.

Heaton’s (2008) quantitative analysis examined to what extent the Prince Edward School closings impacted the educational attainment, economic status, incarceration rates, and mortality levels of the displaced students. Heaton used multiple data sets and compared the data to a neighboring community with similar demographics. Data sets included the Natality Detail files from the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) demographics, income data from the Census Bureau, and incarceration statistics from the
National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP). Heaton examined these statistics and placed the students into cohorts based on birth year. The first cohort consisted of students born 1942–1945. These students missed the later years of high school. The second cohort comprised of students born from 1946–1949. These students missed middle and early high school. Students born 1950–1953, who missed elementary school, comprised the third cohort. The final group consisted of students born 1954–1957, who missed the beginning of elementary school.

In general, Heaton did not find the Prince Edward County displaced students to be at greater risk for incarceration or death. However, the education distribution for students born in the 1946-1949 cohort contrasted greatly to that of the same-age neighboring community cohort. Statistical data from the neighboring community cohort in this age bracket demonstrated that 37% of the African American population did not complete high school. Heaton reported that this differed from the Prince Edward County students in the same cohort with 66% of the students failing to complete a high school degree. However, despite the failure to complete high school, Heaton reported that in general, the economic earnings for the Prince Edward County displaced students demonstrated only a modest impact. Heaton reported there was a lack of statistics for incarceration data prior to 1985 and therefore, the study could not comment on incarceration prior to the available data. Additionally, he relied on statistical data and demographics for those that remained in Prince Edward County and therefore, this study could not take into consideration data on families that left the community due to the school closings. Moreover, as stated by Heaton, this study could only report on factors that were measurable. Therefore, Heaton
suggested qualitative studies should explore the resulting outcomes of the school closures that could not be quantified.

Further insight into the resulting consequences of the school closures and the impact on the lives of the displaced students are provided by Turner (2004). Turner performed 39 in-depth interviews and reviewed archival newspaper articles as well as minutes from the Prince Edward County School Board meetings in an effort to further understand the history of African American education in Prince Edward County from 1870-1995. She suggested that Prince Edward County African Americans had a similar relationship with the NAACP as that presented by Bell (1976) in *Serving Two Masters*.

According to Turner, the NAACP did not provide appropriate legal counsel to the Prince Edward County African Americans; rather, they focused solely on the desired outcome of desegregation. As a result, Turner suggested that the Prince Edward County African Americans were both victims and victors. Turner reported that Moton High School was considered a valued place, and that for many African Americans integration was not desired. As a result, Turner wrote, “with few exceptions, the closings wreaked havoc on the educational and emotional lives of Black children and on the vitality of the Black community as a whole” (p. 1683). Students reported that they felt cheated by the loss of school. Many expressed bitterness and anger. Turner stated, “Even students who continued their schooling during the closings often experienced intense emotional losses due to their dislocation from their home community” (p. 1686). Participants also expressed a loss of self-worth. Overall, participants shared that the loss of schooling resulted in the loss of intellectual capabilities and accordingly, the loss of personal
achievements.

Contemporary studies on Brown. Patterson (2001) provided a historical analysis of Brown’s legacy. He examined previous scholarly work on Brown, a review of the legal determinations between the NAACP and the United States Supreme Court, the long-term implementation and impact of school desegregation, and a review of major media outlets. The goal of the study was to evaluate Brown as the civil rights milestone it set out to be. Patterson’s analysis suggests that Brown had mixed results. For instance, Patterson demonstrated that Brown positively impacted the lack of African American education, particularly in the South where students often attended for only three months of the year. However, similar to Klarman, Patterson suggested that civil rights activism in the South was on the rise post-World War II and accordingly questioned Brown’s impact on politics. Using examples of desegregation in the Border States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, Patterson countered that Brown was somewhat successful in certain school systems dependent upon context and setting. Finally, by using data including recent desegregation court cases, housing trends, per capita spending on schools and racial and ethnic makeup of schools, Patterson demonstrated that contemporary schools are mostly segregated based on race and ethnicity. In closing, he suggested that the goals of Brown were designed with the best of intentions, but ultimately courts are limited in their ability to enact social change.

Wells, Revilla, Holme, and Atanda (2004) explored how the implementation of Brown impacted students and suggested that researchers need to view Brown with a “dual consciousness” (p. 1730). According to Wells et al., a dual consciousness is needed by
researchers in order to understand Brown’s struggle to effectively desegregate, while giving recognition to the progress made by schools that implemented desegregation policies. In order to demonstrate the need for this understanding, Wells et al. selected six high schools to study. The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the schools’ desegregation programs implemented in the late 1970s. Schools were selected from geographic diverse locations that also had a diverse racial and ethnic makeup. Interviews were performed with key policy makers as well as approximately fifty graduates. The participants for this study were selected to represent the diverse school population. The final part of the study involved selecting four to six graduates to do a second interview. The goal of the second interview was to develop a deeper understanding of what it meant to be a part of the desegregation process at their high school. This was a robust study and not only included a total of 540 interviews, but each school site was analyzed as a historical case study. Researchers analyzed a collection of documents related to the school desegregation program such as school board minutes, media articles, and legal papers.

The findings from this study demonstrated that strong White hegemony within each of the communities impacted the way schools desegregated. Policy makers were careful to design desegregation plans that appeased the needs and wants of the White population. As a result African American students were often the ones bussed to the traditional White-only high school. This occurred despite the success of some of the African American-only schools. In one community, this additionally resulted in the complete closure of the African American high school despite its success and the
significance it had to the community. Many communities that attempted to reassign White students to an African American school demonstrated White flight as students overwhelmingly enrolled in private schools.

Wells et al. reported that internally the schools demonstrated a two-tiered education system in which White students were predominantly placed in advanced classes. Students reported that African Americans were not provided information on SAT test-taking and other college admissions information. These race-based outcomes were not discussed among teachers or students. All schools reported that, in general, conversations on race were silent.

The study performed by Wells et al. occurred twenty years after the desegregation programs were implemented and therefore, they additionally reflected on the state of the schools status decades later. Two of the schools showed concentrated poverty and gang activity. Three of the schools lost their majority White population over time, and with this came a perception of a failing school. In closing, Wells et al. presented that it was unrealistic to assume that the desegregation of schools would occur without the support of the greater community.

Irons (2002) analyzed desegregation court cases since the advent of Brown, as well as a contemporary evaluation of the original five Brown v. Board court case sites. He offered a conclusion similar to that of Patterson and Wells et al.: schools are resegregated. Irons and Patterson emphasized the reversal of metropolitan busing with Milliken v. Bradley in 1974. They analyzed the only dissenting vote by Court Justice
Thurgood Marshall and stated that his dissent served as a forewarning of contemporary resegregation. Marshall’s dissent read as follows:

Desegregation is not and was never expected to be an easy task. Racial attitudes in our nation’s childhood and adolescence are not quickly thrown aside in its middle years. But just as the inconvenience of some cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the rights of others so public opposition no matter how strident cannot be permitted to divert this court from the enforcement of the constitutional principles at issue in this case. Today’s holding, I fear, is more a reflection of a perceived public mood that we have gone far enough in enforcing the constitution's guarantee of equal justice than it is the product of neutral principles of law. In the short run it may seem to be the easier course to allow our great metropolitan areas to be divided up each into two cities – one White and one Black, but it is a course, I predict, our people will ultimately regret. I dissent.  

*(Milliken v. Bradley, 1974, para. 44)*

Irons proceeded to offer additional evidence of more contemporary United States Supreme Court desegregation rulings where the Court appeared to support a return to segregation. As stated by Irons, “the Supreme Court’s trio of rulings between 1991 and 1995 in the *Dowell, Freeman, and Jenkins* cases effectively closed the doors of federal courts to Black parents whose children were now consigned to ‘separate and unequal’ schools” (p. 289). As a result, he presented that urban schools returned to Jim Crow status and demonstrated both inequitable conditions and unequal opportunities. Irons made a connection between urban segregated schools and concentrated levels of poverty by using
statistical data on income, educational levels, and academic achievement. Irons wrote, “These are children at great risk of receiving such an inferior education that they leave school, whether as dropouts or graduates, barely able to read, write, or do simple calculations” (p. 297). Irons book closed with a return to the Brown v. Board sites to provide further evidence that even the schools that were a part of the original desegregation case experienced limited desegregation. The overall sentiment by Patterson (2001), Irons (2002) and Wells et al. (2004) was that despite Brown, racism remains at the forefront of America’s public education school system.

**Critical Race Theory**

*Brown* was an attempt to address America’s unequal school system and to end segregation. However, as suggested by Tobias (1996):

> It was probably unrealistic to expect that Whites and Blacks would immediately, or even, “with all deliberate speed,” overcome generations and centuries of engrained racism, destruction, resentment, fear, and hatred and become fully committed participants in a common endeavor whose ultimate outcome promised to be uncertain. (p. 1296)

With the realization that *Brown* and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s were both unable to change America’s segregated landscape, new theories began to emerge. Derrick Bell, Allen Freedman and Richard Delgado began to develop CRT to explain why *Brown* continued to be unfulfilled (Caldwell, 2000; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). CRT, grounded in postcolonial theory, provides a theoretical lens that places the African American perspective at the forefront (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). CRT evolved out of critical
legal studies, which offered lawyers a legal framework. Specifically, critical legal studies provided a neutral way to approach law and focused on equality and other democratic rights. However, Bell (1980) argued that critical legal studies failed to acknowledge racism and its impact on lawmaking. Bell stated that law cannot be apolitical, despite its desire, and offered examples of historical legal decisions to support racist perspectives. Therefore, CRT criticizes traditional liberalism and the Civil Rights Movement in that it did not recognize nor adequately address the endemic and persistent characteristics of racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). As a result, CRT seeks to critically assess law and counter the hegemonic cultural narrative that persists in America’s society. Following is an outline of CRT and its tenets based on those outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2012).

Race is socially constructed. Haney-López (1994) demonstrated that race is socially constructed by reviewing Hudgins v. Wright in 1806. Haney-López reviewed the verdict from Hudgins v. Wright, which determined whether the Wrights were slaves or not based upon their distinct characteristics of a “flat nose and wooly head of hair” (p. 139). In Hudgins v. Wright, the Wrights were freed because they had straight hair. Haney-López explored other laws that further demonstrated the construct of race and suggested that the legal world struggles to define exactly what race is and isn’t. Therefore, Haney-López offered a definition of “race” as “a vast group of people loosely bound together by historically contingent, socially significant elements of their morphology and/or ancestry” (p. 193).
Gotanda (1996) provided further support of race as a social construct by examining several applications of race by the United States Supreme Court. Gotanda expressed concern for their use of formal-race where descriptions of skin-color such as those outlined in Haney-López. Gotanda advocated for a better understanding of culture-race. As outlined by Gotanda, culture-race included the history of the African American community including their customs, practices and institutions. Gotanda stated that the construction of race resulted in very distinct social and political connections and as a result, law must acknowledge and understand race.

**Racism is normal.** Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) provided a cross-disciplinary analysis of scholarly work to demonstrate that race is not only a construct but also a reality. Ladson-Billings and Tate suggested that race “as an ideological construct denies the reality of a racialized society and its impact on ‘raced’ people in their everyday lives” (p. 49). With this in mind, they sought to further CRT as a way to understand how race impacts education and could be used as a tool to explore school inequality. Using statistical and demographic data as well as the work of sociologists, they suggested that race, “unlike gender and class, remains untheorized” (p. 49). As a result, they presented that race must be systematically applied to analyzing America’s education system. Further, they suggested that gender and class alone couldn’t explain inequities that exist within education and therefore, race must be applied to education analysis.

The second suggestion they made to demonstrate that race is normal is to review the work by Bell (1988), which explored the tension within the Constitution and its emphasis on property ownership versus human rights. According to Bell, the Constitution
was developed to provide property owners with civil rights. Because African Americans were perceived as property, civil rights were never afforded to them. Ladson-Billings and Tate furthered this discussion by presenting how, even today; there is a continued imbalance between property and equality, as demonstrated in the application of property taxes to pay for the operation of schools. They supported the work of Marable (1995) in stating that the capitalistic structures of America must be critiqued in order to better understand how power and privilege connect to property. In conclusion, Ladson-Billings and Tate argued that racism is “endemic and deeply ingrained in American life” (p. 55).

**Whiteness.** The concept of property as providing a position of power is further explored in Harris (1994). Harris suggested that Whiteness developed over time into a type of property that excluded people of color. Accordingly, Whiteness as property resulted in economic hegemony and privilege over African Americans. Harris explored how the concept of property played a part in *Brown v. Board*. Harris argued that *Brown v. Board* attempted to alter Whiteness as property, but desegregation alone could not alter the racist institutional structures that assured White privilege. She argued that the constitution is devised in such a way that it emphasizes individuals’ rights and fails to acknowledge culture and group identity. Therefore, according to Harris, legal decisions often overlook how groups inherit the loss of property, privilege and power from generation to generation.

Crenshaw (1988) suggested that racism serves to unite Whites by establishing a group classified as “other” that is in opposition to the White race. Further, Crenshaw suggested that White privilege is maintained as an unspoken social norm, which for some
Whites may not even be a part of their awareness. As presented by Macpherson (1999), institutional racism is often unwittingly implemented without consideration for minorities. As a result, Crenshaw argued “to bring a fundamental challenge to the way things are, Whites would have to question not only their own subordinate status, but also the economic and the racial myths that justify the status quo” (p. 1380).

**Interest convergence.** To better understand how power and privilege impacts American policy, Bell (1987) wrote a book on America’s racist history. He wrote this story from the perspective of his alter ego, Geneva, to demonstrate how pervasive racism is in policymaking, including the creation of the Constitution. Bell suggested that American civil rights laws for African Americans will only be supported when polices additionally provide benefits to Whites as well. Bell (1980) stated that this type of Interest Convergence is the reason Brown v. Board occurred. As a result, Bell argued that in reality, changing the status of the African American requires “altering the status of Whites.” Bell wrote that as a result, “Whites simply cannot envision the personal responsibility and the potential sacrifice” (Bell, 1980, p. 522) required to achieve race equality.

**Counter-storytelling.** Matsuda (1987) explored the significance of tapping into the perspectives of individuals that experienced injustice. Her work encouraged the use of counter-storytelling as a way to secure reparations for African Americans. In a review of critical legal scholars, Matsuda presented that in order to address issues of justice for people of color, lawyers must seek the perspectives of those least privileged. Matsuda stated that critical legal scholars must view the “history, culture, and intellectual tradition
of people of color in America” (p. 325). Further, she explored how law is dominated by the White majority and as a result fails to develop laws that are just. To demonstrate White American dominance, she explored the creation of the Japanese American internment camps during World War II and the military action taken against the Hawaiian monarchy at the turn of the 20th century. Matsuda suggested that in order to make amends for these wrongdoings, reparations must be provided to the victims. She presented that when creating such reparations, lawmakers must explore the experiential knowledge of the victims. As stated by Matsuda (1987), “the victims of racial oppression have distinct normative insights” (p. 326).

Within CRT, the use of counter-storytelling is viewed as an essential principle when analyzing policy. Delgado and Stefancic (2012) suggested that the African American narrative provides a type of “legal storytelling” and a way to assess law developed from a hegemonic perspective. Torres and Van Heertum (2009) echoed this sentiment, stating that policymakers must consider both the racial history and the context of policy issues in order to counter the influence racism has on policymaking. As a result, CRT challenges ahistoricism and accordingly provides a grassroots understanding of how policy impacts African Americans.

**Transform democracy.** Ultimately, the goal of CRT is to transform the relationships between race, power, and policy. Delgado and Stefancic (2012) stated that CRT “not only tries to understand our social situation, but to change it; it sets out not only to ascertain how society organizes itself along racial lines and hierarchies, but to transform it for the better” (p. 3). To demonstrate how the theory of critical race can be
put into practice and achieve transformation, Stovall (2006) explored combining CRT with social justice in education. Stovall reviewed the use of CRT within the field of education and identified a need to bridge theory with ways to remake democracy. He raised concerns on whether policymakers are able to apply the theory of critical race to more practical application and a reidentification of democracy. Stovall suggested that the transformative goal of CRT is possible through the application of social justice in education. He provided a case narrative of a multi-cultural and highly segregated community that was unable to achieve transformation. Stovall suggested that CRT alone was unable to transform democracy for the members of this community. Stovall argued that in order to transform communities, policymakers must unite the theory of critical race and counter-storytelling with the practices of social justice education. Only then can communities offer members a more just democracy.

**Concerns on CRT and Transformation**

Despite the application of CRT within the field of education, there is continued concern about how this theory might be put into practice to transform America’s racist structures and attitudes. Matsuda (1991) explored the application of antidiscriminatory law. She posited that in order to consider how to move away from discrimination, Americans must consider “what kind of world we want to live in” (p. 1330). She framed her work in critical legal, critical race, and feminist theories on law and suggests that in order to truly transform democracy it will require a revolution. She provided several examples of antidiscriminatory litigation to demonstrate how engrained racism is. The examples she used demonstrated that something as simple as the accent of our voice
could lead to discrimination. Although her article focused on discrimination based on speech, Matsuda argued that similar to the work of Lawrence (1987), *The Id, The Ego, and Equal Protection*, the sentiment is the same. She stated, “All of us in this society have absorbed cultural messages of racial inferiority, which invade out seemingly neutral evaluations of others” (p. 1356). As a result Matsuda wrote that transforming America is no easy task: “To do this is Reconstruction; it is looking realistically at what our history has laid at our feet, and figuring out what steps we need to take to rectify, to repair, to make whole our scattered family” (p. 1405).

The concern presented by Matsuda is further supported by Bonilla-Silva (1997). Bonilla-Silva explored the concept of racism based on existing race and ethnic studies. He posited that racism has yet to be clearly defined and understood and as a result existing theories fail to advance democracy. He argued that the real struggles experienced by African Americans are maintained as long as the existing racialized social order remains. Bonilla-Silva stated that in order for CRT to be effective, it must consider a social praxis where community members focus on how to transform a specific racial struggle. Additionally, he claimed that all community members must play a part in the practice of CRT in order to eliminate systemic racism. Similar to Matsuda, Bonilla-Silva advocates for a revolution. He wrote “social systems and their supporters must be ‘shaken’ if fundamental transformations are to take place” (p. 474).

DeCuir and Dixson (2004) suggested that educational researchers’ applications of CRT are limited to counter-storytelling and the permanence of racism. They argued that the other aspects of CRT are not fully practiced yet when evaluating and developing
educational policy. Giroux (1997) presented that critical theory should be combined with critical practice. Skrla, Scheurich, Johnson Jr. and Koschoreck (2001) considered whether state policy has the potential to influence social justice. Their work urges researchers to ask what methods of education policy can lead to more equitable solution for people of color. Darder and Torres (1999) argued that what must be developed is a CRT that confronts the "fundamental nature and consequences of structural inequalities as reproduced by the historical process of racialization in United States society and around the globe" (p. 185).

Restorative Justice

Yamamoto (1992, 1997, 1998, 1999) explored how to achieve CRT transformation through restorative justice praxis. Much of Yamamoto’s work is dedicated to his conception of critical race praxis. This section reviews several of Yamamoto’s writings on critical race praxis as well as Zehr’s (2002) restorative justice principles. Zehr is often perceived as the “father of restorative justice.” Other scholars dedicated to the exploration of social justice add to the discussion on what constitutes a restorative justice program capable of transforming historical racism. This section ends with a discussion on the analysis of the Brown v. Board Scholarship Program and Fund by both Walker (2006) and Williams (2005). Walker’s analysis relies heavily on Zehr’s work, whereas Williams’ relies heavily on Yamamoto. Neither study analyzed the resulting outcomes of the program or provided recipient perceptions of the program.

“restorative justice” (1999). Following is a review of Yamamoto’s work and the evolution of critical race praxis as a way to address racism and transform democracy.

Yamamoto (1992) reviewed the redress movement for the Japanese Americans and the resulting Civil Liberties Act of 1988. Yamamoto demonstrated that the Civil Liberties Act was a result of separate efforts by lawyers, lobbyists and United States congressmen who shared the similar objective of securing redress for Japanese Americans who were interned during World War II. His analysis explored the views of redress and reparation based on the successful procurement of reparations for the interned Japanese Americans. Yamamoto presented that some researchers viewed the Civil Liberties Act as evidence that governments are willing to right historical wrongs and alter racist policies. However, Yamamoto disagreed with this interpretation and cited Bell’s (1980) interest convergence theory. He suggested that in reality, governments are rarely interested in supporting redress for historical transgressions due to the high cost. Yamamoto therefore argued that reparation such as that provided through the Civil Liberties Act only occurs when it also serves the government. He argued that reparation might feel positive without altering racial relations. As a result, Yamamoto stated that reparation is yet another law that has a limited impact on racial structures. He raised the question of whether reparation restructures the government, changes social attitudes, or transforms social relations. Yamamoto asked what meanings might be sought to construct if we truly want to effect race relations. In closing, Yamamoto called scholars to consider how government policy actually achieves transformation and addresses the root causes of power.
Yamamoto (1997) answered his own questions on how policy might transform structural racism and race relations by proposing a way to practice CRT called critical race praxis. He first considered a lawsuit in San Francisco, California that threatened to cease racial and ethnic diversity mandates previously established for the city in 1983. Yamamoto discussed the “historical linkage of law and cultural representations to legalized racial oppression” (p. 828) and offered that the lawsuit is another example of the disconnect between “progressive race theory and political lawyering” (p. 828).

Yamamoto proceeded to develop a way to bridge this divide; he provided a framework for critical race praxis based on CRT and other progressive theories such as feminist legal theory. Yamamoto suggested that in order for CRT to transform race relations, it must first explore racial experiences within communities and seek to understand specific racial injustices. This part of Yamamoto’s discussion is reminiscent of the emphasis of Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) on the exploration of historical and context driven racial issues.

However, Yamamoto expanded CRT and demonstrated that critical race praxis offers a practical way to address racial injustice at the local and state level. According to Yamamoto, theorists, lawyers and activists remained unsuccessful in achieving CRT transformation due to the fact that a divide exists between lawyering and theory. He presented that CRT must be pushed to consider how to actually deconstruct racist structural institutions and attitudes. He questioned where the “scholar-lawyer-activists” were who could address complex issues at the ground level. Yamamoto further explored historical United States Supreme Court decisions such as Plessy v. Ferguson to demonstrate that between the years of 1700 and 1950, legislation was enacted that
deliberately assured that African Americans as well as other people of color where seen as “others” and less deserving of civic rights. According to Yamamoto, modern anti-discriminatory laws such as the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and Brown v. Board attempted to reverse racist policies but in reality these anti-discriminatory laws created a distorted belief that justice was done. Furthermore, Yamamoto argued that anti-discriminatory laws cannot repair communities and the societal rifts created at the local level.

Yamamoto offered that CRT assures the revelation of race-blind policies, however, the transformative value of CRT is often overlooked. He cited the work of Harris (1994) and Lopez (1992), who argued that CRT should include a community practice with the potential for redemptive policies. Yamamoto presented that critical race praxis must therefore include “frontline action” and provided a definition stating “critical race praxis, as I conceive it, combines critical pragmatic socio-legal analysis with political lawyering and community organizing for justice practice by and for racialized communities” (p. 875). The framework for critical race praxis includes four parts: conceptual, performative, material and reflexive. Following is a brief overview of the phases of critical race praxis.

**The phases of critical race praxis.** The conceptual phase requires an assessment of the setting and the racial conflict. Additionally, this stage explores whether local racial issues are part of a bigger justice grievance. The goal of this stage is to explore actions to address discriminatory grievances. The performance phase requires action; it requires the identification of parties responsible for racial subordination and those who might be responsive to policies addressing the structures that support racism. The material phase
explores how to actually change the material subordinate conditions that exist.

Yamamoto argued that change must be both representational and material. Finally, the reflexive phase includes the analysis of the implementation and outcomes of critical race praxis to further theory and practice. This phase allows theorists to develop a repertoire on ways that effectively alter historical wrongdoings and accordingly transform democracy. Yamamoto suggested that critical race praxis ultimately allows for a multi-disciplinary approach and the expansion of new alliances in an effort to address “real-life racial conflicts and prospects of remediation or healing” (p. 881).

**Traditional reparation.** Yamamoto (1998) further explored the Civil Liberties Act and its implications in securing reparations for African Americans. Similar to his previous work, he questioned whether reparation legislation has the potential to promote change in the way that race relations are viewed and addressed. Yamamoto reviewed the benefits and costs of reparation, asking if it is possible to calculate the amount of money necessary to compensate historical racial injustice. Yamamoto argued that traditional reparation is unable to truly address historical injustices; he presented the case of the 1980 United States Supreme Court ruling in *United States v. Sioux Nations of Indian*. According to Yamamoto, *United States v. Sioux Nations of Indian* provided an example of failed reparations. The Supreme Court ruled in *United States v. Sioux Nations of Indian* that the previous Manypenny Treaty of 1877, which effectively removed the Great Sioux from the Black Hills region, was unconstitutional. In response to this ruling, a trust account was established for the Great Sioux Nations reparation fund. However, to this day, the Great Sioux refuse to accept the reparation money on the grounds that their
acceptance would cease any claims they had to the land and moreover, that the policy failed to address the emotional and spiritual loss they experienced. Tsosie (2007) further studied this case and concurred that this was an example of how reparation failed to be meaningful to subordinated minorities.

Yamamoto (1998) refuted Bittker (1973), who argued that reparations are in order for all African Americans as a result of slavery and Jim Crow laws. Yamamoto asserted that Bittker’s proposal was too broad and counters that what is needed are “bite sized” programs similar to that enacted for the victims of Rosewood, Florida. Yamamoto’s reference to Rosewood pertains to the Rosewood massacre and the resultant Rosewood Compensation Act of 1995. The Rosewood massacre occurred in 1923 when White men burned homes, slaughtered animals, and murdered six African Americans. Two White men were killed as well. African Americans hid for days in the woods or escaped to nearby towns. As a result of the massacre, Rosewood was abandoned (Dunn, 2013). The Rosewood Compensation Act was created to make amends for the massacre and includes the Rosewood Family Scholarship Fund. The scholarship program provides postsecondary scholarship funds to direct descendants (Nuun, 1999).

Jordan (2004) studied the Rosewood Compensation Act and suggested, like Yamamoto, that the reparation provided to the Rosewood victims was a transformative model. Jordan stated that a transformative model of reparation challenges “the intellectual history of racism, and def[ies] the definition of self that is a large part of the continuing psychic injury” (p. 25). According to Jordan, the program achieved this partially by breaking the silence of past wrongdoings.
**Reparation as repair.** Both Jordan (2004) and Yamamoto (1998) suggested that the practice of reparation as repair differs greatly from the practice of reparation as payment that is utilized within the legal community under the tort model. Minow (1998) and Zehr (2002) supported this view of reparation, stating that reparation can serve as a symbolic gesture that may assist with repair but cannot restore a balance of relationships.

As stated by Yamamoto (1998), “Reparations by government or groups should be aimed at a restructuring of the institutions and relationships that gave rise to the underlying justice grievance” (p. 518). Yamamoto continued that reframing reparation as repair can ultimately mend the “tears in the social fabric” (p. 519). Moreover, reparation as a transformative vehicle can potentially provide a sense of justice and change racist attitudes resulting in institutional restructuring. Yamamoto (1999) argued that an additional strength of critical race praxis is that it allows for recognition and consideration of interracial issues by valuing distinct community histories. Yamamoto summarized that through critical race praxis, joint transformation and new understandings occur among community members and, as a result, new relational bonds occur. As stated by Yamamoto, the result is “restorative justice” (p. 25).

**Restorative justice guideposts.** Although Yamamoto developed guideposts for critical race praxis, according to Zehr (2002) “restorative justice is not a particular program or blueprint” (p.8). However, to provide practitioners guidance on what restorative justice is and is not, Zehr wrote the *Little Book of Restorative Justice*. In this book, Zehr specifically outlined three core principles for the practice of restorative justice. According to Zehr (2002), the three principles are: the transgressor must
acknowledge wrongdoing, the transgressor must address the needs of victims and commit to repairing the mistreatment, and the resolution must be developed collaboratively. Zehr emphasized that these principles allow for improved evaluation of restorative justice programs.

Zehr further explored the goals and outcomes of restorative justice. For instance, Zehr stated that forgiveness is dependent upon the victims’ perceptions and therefore, forgiveness is not a goal of restorative justice. Zehr argued that forgiveness may occur as a result of restorative justice practice, but it is not essential to the design of a program. Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, and Platow (2008) supported Zehr, stating that the mending of victim-offender relationship cannot heal the victim, but it can help in the process of rebuilding their life after a wrongdoing. Yamamoto (1999) added, “Justice restoration aims at re-establishing some moral order and sense of justice” (p. 378). Doolin (2007) summarized, restorative justice is a problem-solving medium focused on repairing the communities directly wronged. Healing the relationships that were severed as a result of the wrongdoing is what separates restorative justice from other programs.

Zehr also stated that restorative justice does not require that both parties communicate directly via mediation or a similar type of negotiation. However, there is a need for some form of communication that allows the victim to understand why the wrongdoing occurred, as well as to provide an opportunity for individuals to tell their story so that the offender might understand the impact of the wrongdoing. Zehr (2002) stated that developing a resolution together should occur “to the extent it is possible” (p.
Yamamoto’s (1998) critical race praxis similarly requires involvement by members of a racialized system.

**Reconciliation.** Brooks (2004) explored the distinct history of America’s racist past and argued that without some type of reconciliation, the African American community will never heal. Brooks developed a model of atonement that offers similar markers to Yamamoto’s critical race praxis and Zehr’s restorative justice core principles. However, Brooks emphasized that an apology and reparation are both necessary in order to reconcile past wrongdoings. Comparable to Yamamoto (1998), Brooks suggested that government programs must first acknowledge their responsibility, followed by an act that supports their apology.

To demonstrate Brooks’ atonement model, he provided an example of a restorative justice policy developed by a private insurance company, Aetna of Hartford, Connecticut. Brooks stated that Aetna’s policy offered meaningful repair for past racist policies, which is necessary for reconciliation and justice. According to Brooks, during the mid-1800s, Aetna wrote life insurance policies on slaves and made the slave owners the beneficiaries. In 2000, Aetna formally apologized and developed both a diversity scholarship program and an internship program for African Americans in an effort to transform their historical racist policies.

**Lack of design.** As suggested by Zehr, the fact that restorative justice programs are not deliberately designed makes the determination of what qualifies as a restorative justice program difficult (Walgrave, 2011). For instance, Schimmel (2012) wrote that reparation programs such as the Japanese-American Civil Liberties Act are restorative
justice programs in that they are victim-oriented. Brooks (2004) does not refer to his model of atonement as a restorative justice program; however, Walker (2006) suggested that Brooks’ model is a type of restorative justice. The writings of Zehr (2002) and McCold and Wachtel (2002) argued that the ambiguity of restorative justice stems from the fact that instead of theory guiding practice, practice is leading theory.

**Evaluation concerns for restorative justice.** Walgrave (2011) suggested that the lack of theoretical and design clarity makes the assessment of restorative justice programs difficult. In order to address the lack of clarity, Walgrave contended that the assessment of restorative justice should be outcome based versus process based. First, Walgrave discounted the need for a prescriptive design. Walgrave stated that restorative justice designed through a deliberate process does not guarantee that the program will meet the needs of the victim. Specifically, Walgrave argued that restricting the process of restorative justice could limit its potential. As a result, Walgrave further argued that restorative justice should be assessed based upon victim satisfaction and program outcomes.

Walgrave asserted that research should strive to examine restorative justice program in three specific phases of development. First, research should explore the initial feelings of those involved in the development of a restorative justice program. The second phase should include investigating the program during its implementation. Finally, the program should be evaluated based on the long-term experiences of the victims. Walgrave emphasized that the analyses of restorative justice programs after implementation are often overlooked. She stated that the final analysis should be
performed several years after a restorative justice program is implemented. She suggested that because restorative justice emphasizes the needs of the victim, analyzing programs based on recipients’ perceptions and experiences keeps the marginalized population at the forefront of the program. In this way, researchers can gain a better understanding of a restorative justice program’s success or shortcomings. Walgrave cautioned researchers that there is a continuum of success within restorative justice programs and sometimes, restorative practice may result in only partial repair.

**Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Fund and Program**

Two studies exist on the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Fund and Program. The findings of these studies differ and demonstrate the complexities of determining what constitutes a restorative justice program. Accordingly, how to analyze such programs presents a unique challenge for researchers.

Walker (2006) elaborated on Zehr (2002) and outlined six core values within the restorative justice framework. Walker reviewed Zehr’s principles, which state that programs should meet the needs of the victims, hold offenders accountable, and, if possible, involve communities in the process. In addition, Walker elaborated that restorative justice should be designed to address those directly impacted. She posited that when programs are designed to address those directly impacted, programs provide more meaningful repair. Walker concurred with Zehr that no two programs are designed alike. Further, she stated that the concept of community may not be the same collectively and therefore, the design of restorative justice practice requires flexibility.
Walker expanded on Zehr and further explored the relationship between restorative justice and reparations. Walker argued that reparation cannot repair historical wrongdoings; however, the use of reparation within the restorative justice framework has the potential to heal. Walker reviewed the work of Feagin (2004) and Ogletree (2004) to demonstrate that African Americans continue to have difficulties achieving redress. Therefore, she suggested that reparation within the restorative justice framework is important to consider. She continued that restorative justice might provide the framework for a different type of reparation that will be better received by the greater American community. As a result, Walker posited that “government action on more local—state and municipal—levels might represent in a more immediate way communities with which people identify, especially if those communities address their own local histories of racial violence, exploitation, or exclusion” (p. 389).

In support of Yamamoto (1997), Walker provided examples of restorative justice programs at the state and municipal levels that effectively repaired wrongdoings. The first restorative justice program reviewed by Walker was the Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission of North Carolina. In 1979, a group of Klansmen and neo-Nazis killed five community activists. In 2005, a private organization developed the Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission and gave the community an opportunity to discuss the massacre and restore relationships. Walker’s second example focused on the development of a steering committee at Brown University. The goal of the steering committee was to research the university’s ties to slavery. Walker’s review of restorative justice programs additionally discussed Virginia’s Brown v. Board of
Education Scholarship and Fund Program. Walker noted that the General Assembly agreed to match private funds in order to create an education scholarship program. She presented that this program provides scholarships directly to the displaced students of Virginia as a result of past massive resistance strategies.

Walker suggested that local programs should not be dismissed due to the small scope of the programs. Rather, Walker argued that these programs should be viewed “as multiple, local initiatives that might be better understood under the rubric of restorative justice” (p. 390). Walker suggested that these programs qualify as restorative justice programs because they allow victims to end their silence and provide offenders practical ways to repair historical wrongdoings. Moreover, Walker believes that, cumulatively, these types of local restorative justice programs may help to heal racial relations in America.

Williams (2005) countered Walker’s (2006) suggestion that the Brown v. Board Scholarship Program and Fund is a restorative program by analyzing it as reparation. Williams argued that the fund is reparation and that the state is avoiding using the term. According to Williams, the Virginia General Assembly refused to name the fund as reparation because reparation for African Americans remains controversial. Williams proceeded to analyze the fund framed within CRT and critical legal studies (Matsuda, 1987) and framed his study using Yamamoto (1998). The application of Yamamoto for Williams study is interesting as Yamamoto’s theory emphasized a repair paradigm and deemphasized reparation. Yet, Williams argued that the Brown Scholarship Fund is reparation. Williams provided a historical analysis of Virginia’s race divide and
suggested that the *Brown* Scholarship Fund falls short as it looks at only one small piece of Virginia’s lengthy history of abuse toward the African American. Williams used quotes from Prince Edward County African American interviews done by reporters for the *Boston Globe* and the *Washington Post* about what it was like to be one of the displaced students. Only one quote responded to the *Brown* Scholarship Fund and states that the individual is too old to use a scholarship for school. Williams specifically brought attention to the fact that the scholarship is race-neutral and stated that this policy goes directly against CRT. Additionally, Williams argued that, framed within Yamamoto’s reparation as repair model, the scholarship does not provide repair to the Prince Edward County African American displaced students. Williams suggested that the funds would be better used as a trust fund for families, or for teacher education programs on Prince Edward County’s civil rights in education history.

Walker’s (2006) analysis of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund as a restorative justice program and Williams’ (2005) analysis of *Brown* Scholarship Fund as reparation both emphasized repair. For Williams, the repair provided by the *Brown* Scholarship Fund does not do enough to mend the social relationships damaged by Virginia’s racial wrongdoings. Walker’s analysis of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund focused on state and local restorative justice initiatives that address the repair for very distinct acts of wrongdoing. However, Walker did not perform a thorough analysis of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, but rather stated that the fund fit the framework of a restorative justice program. Moreover, neither study assessed the restorative capabilities of the program based on recipients’ satisfaction as outlined by Walgrave (2011).
Summary Discussion

The literature review provides context for this study. Each section builds upon the other to collectively demonstrate several distinct and unifying ideas that frame this research. First, persistent and endemic racism alongside the ambiguity of *Brown* resulted in initial and continual defiance. As a result of resistance policies developed by the Virginia General Assembly, the Prince Edward County public school system was closed from 1959-1964 (Cochran, 2006). Accordingly, approximately 2300 Prince Edward County African Americans were deprived an education (Peeples, 2004). Research on the Prince Edward County school closings reported that students potentially experienced educational delay, illiteracy and long-term income potential (Green & Hofmann, 1965; Green et al., 1967; Hicks, & Pitre, 2010), as well as, socio-emotional impact such as loss of childhood norms, families, and humiliation (Brookover, 1993; Green et al., 1967; Turner, 2003, 2004).

Critical race theory states that the defiance experienced as a result of the *Brown* mandate was normal. According to CRT, racism is endemic and therefore, structures are in place to support racism (Bell, 1980; Delgado, & Stefancic, 2012; Hooks, 1990). As a result, African Americans are often the recipients of both intended and unintended negative consequences of structural racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Critical race theorists suggested that addressing racism often requires a political and moral analysis of a specific time in history (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Torres & Van Heerten, 2009). As a result, legal storytelling, or using the narratives of those who have experienced prejudice, offers a way to inform policy (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Gillborn, 2005;...
Matsuda, 1987; Stovall, 2006). The goal of CRT is to transform policy to support a more democratic society. However, concern exists on CRT’s ability to transform. Therefore, research continues to explore ways in which CRT can be put into practice.

In recent years restorative justice programs developed as a way to provide justice for past wrongdoings (Brooks, 2004; Stovall, 2006; Walker, 2006; Yamamoto, 1992, 1997, 1998, 1999). Research suggests that restorative justice may serve as the transformative vehicle needed to put critical race theory into practice. However, applications of restorative justice to address historical wrongdoing for African Americans are limited (Feagin, 2004; Ogletree, 2004).

In 2005, the Virginia General Assembly created the Brown Scholarship Fund as a way to make amends for the denial of education during massive resistance. Walker (2006) and Williams (2005) analyzed the fund as a restorative justice program. These studies were done from a theoretical standpoint only. According to the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Policies of the Committee (2013) the goal of the scholarship is to provide “restoration of education” (p. 7). However, neither study assessed the outcomes or experiences of the scholarship recipients in order to understand the funds ability to provide restorative justice.

Walgrave (2011) presented however, that in order to understand the success and shortcomings of a restorative justice program, the perceptions and long-term experience of the recipients must be explored. She suggests that by keeping the victims’ views forefront in the analysis of restorative justice programs, researchers can better understand the programs ability to provide restorative justice. Similar to CRT, restorative justice
practice places the voice of the “victim” center to the policies (Walker, 2006; Weyeneth, 2001).

Therefore, although Walker (2006) and Williams (2005) both analyzed the Brown Scholarship Fund as a type of restorative justice policy, questions remain as to how this policy provides justice and restoration to its recipients. Analyzing victim satisfaction and program outcomes for the Brown Scholarship Fund is an important next step to take in the analysis of the fund. Informed by the literature review, the goal of this study is to explore the restorative justice aspects of the Brown Scholarship Fund based on recipients’ perceptions and long-term experiences. How participants describe their experience will provide an understanding of whether they feel that restorative justice of some sort has occurred. Moreover, the perceptions of the recipients may provide insight on what it means to be the recipient of educational deprivation and educational restoration policies legislated by the same government fifty plus years apart. Following are the research questions that inform this study.

Q1. What are the Prince Edward County African American scholarship recipients’ perceptions of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund?

Q2. What if any, has been the impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund on the lives of the recipients?
CHAPTER THREE

The research questions for this study focused on developing an understanding of what it means to be a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient. Following is a discussion of the methodological decisions made to answer the following research questions:

Q1. What are the Prince Edward County African American scholarship recipients’ perceptions of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund?

Q2. What if any, has been the impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund on the lives of the recipients?

Phenomenology

The research questions for this study valued personal knowledge and subjectivity and believed that the participants’ perceptions could provide an understanding of what it means to be a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient. This is in line with phenomenological research, which emphasizes the lived experiences and perceptions of individuals (Englander, 2012). van Manen (1990) suggested that because phenomenological research is based on the perceptions of individuals, research findings have the potential to challenge normative assumptions. As a result, the selection of phenomenology additionally supported the theoretical framework of this study to place the counter
narratives of the African American, Prince Edward County displaced students forefront to the study. Moreover, through the participants’ perceptions, the goal of this study was to additionally examine the Brown Scholarship Fund and develop insights on the scholarship program as a restorative justice policy. Phenomenology again supported a study that aims to develop a theory on that which is experienced. Within phenomenology there is a belief that participants have shared meanings and that these shared meanings also have the potential to inform researchers on the phenomenon that is being studied (Patton, 2002; van Manen, 1990).

van Manen (1990) also suggested that researchers should study a phenomenon of interests. Several aspects about Brown Scholarship Fund and its attempt to provide restoration are of interest to researchers. First, the historic school closings provided an example of the extreme resistance put in place by the White controlling government to deny desegregation as mandated by the Supreme Court in Brown (Cochran, 2006; Hicks & Pitre, 2010; Sweeney, 2008). Further, the research done on the historic school closures revealed the effects that Virginia’s resistance policies had on the African American displaced students in Prince Edward County, which included literacy issues and long-term decreased vocational and economic opportunities (Hale-Smith, 1993; Heaton, 2008). The goal of the Brown Scholarship Fund to restore the education once denied by the same government and to potentially provide a sense of justice is supported by critical race theory and restorative justice policy. This study provided an opportunity to explore what it means to be a recipient of a restorative justice policy that aimed to provide restoration. It also provided an opportunity to further our understanding of how policies might
address past wrongdoings against African Americans as part of the legacy of Brown unfulfilled.

**Case Study**

Phenomenological studies are often explored by case study. However, there are many different definitions of what makes a case study. A case study can mean the study of a particular situation, event, or an individual person (Patton, 2002). For the purposes of this study, a case constituted an individual who experienced the Brown Scholarship Fund as a scholarship recipient of the program. What criterion was used to determine a case is further addressed later in this chapter in Participant Selection. Each case was analyzed separately with the belief that the conditions and context for that individual resulted in their own unique experience as a scholarship recipient (Stake, 1995).

**Instrumental case study.** However, the goal of this study was not solely to develop an understanding of each individual case, but rather to develop an understanding of what it means to experience the phenomenon of being a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient. Stake termed this type of research instrumental or collective case study. Instrumental case study analyzes each case as its own unique unit (Merriam, 2009). After the analysis of each case, the data is further analyzed across cases (Patton, 2002). Often this results in shared meanings of the phenomenon. As stated by Stake (1994) “the case is of secondary interest; it plays a supportive role, facilitating our understanding of something else” (p. 237).

**Policy analysis.** The goal of instrumental case study provided a way to explore the reoccurring themes and patterns that existed within the data from each case (Merriam,
The goal of the cross-case analysis was to explore research question, (Q2), and accordingly provide an understanding of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund as a restorative justice policy. As suggested by Ryan and Cousins (2009), case study research can be uniquely effective in developing an understanding of policy programs.

Several examples of existing case studies that explored issues within the field of education policy informed the design of this study. Morris (2001) performed a case study on the perspectives of African American educators in order to develop an understanding of desegregation plans implemented after the passage of *Brown*. Siddle Walker (1996) performed a comprehensive case study, which explored the success of an African American-only school prior to desegregation in Caswell County, North Carolina. Additionally, Siddle Walker & Byas (2003) examined the policies and practices of one principle in a case study of an African American-only school in the segregated south. The research performed by these scholars demonstrated the use of case study as a way to explore educational policies and further influenced the selection of interviews as a way to collect data. This is discussed later in Data Collection.

**Site Selection**

Prince Edward County, Virginia was chosen for this study. Following is a description of the site selection. This section also discusses the importance of long-term involvement at Prince Edward County, which led to gaining access to the African American community and the development of a relationship with a community gatekeeper. This part also provides researcher reflections on the significance of logging time within the site of study.
**Prince Edward County.** The *Brown* Scholarship Fund is available to students who were displaced during Virginia’s massive resistance from the following five school systems: Warren County and Prince Edward County, as well as the cities of Norfolk, Arlington and Charlottesville (Sweeney, 2008). All locations were closed for one year from 1958 to 1959 with the exception of Prince Edward County, which was closed for five years from 1959 to 1964. As stated by Hicks and Pitre (2010), no other community persisted longer in the quest to maintain segregated education. Further, the research presented in Chapter Two, Literature Review, supported Prince Edward County as an extreme case. Research demonstrated that the school closings impacted the Prince Edward County displaced students both materially through the loss of an education (Heaton, 2008), as well as socio-emotionally, through the loss of childhood norms (Hicks & Pitre, 2010). As suggested by Maxwell (2005), the selection of an extreme situation can better “illuminate what is going on” (p. 90). Therefore, Prince Edward County was selected as the site of study due to its extreme resistance against desegregation and the existing research on the effects of the school closings. Moreover, Prince Edward County’s lengthy desegregation battle resulted in the largest pool of potential scholarship recipients with approximately 2300 students denied an education (House Joint Resolution 613, 2003).

**Previous Research.** Stake (1995) presented that researchers who performed case study must seek out what is unique to the case. In order to perform this case study well, it was necessary to develop an understanding of the historical background on the Prince Edward County school closures. Moreover, it was important to develop an understanding
of this history from the African American perspective. This was not only key to supporting the theoretical framework for this study, but also in negotiating entry to the community. As a White researcher, keeping the African American perspective front and center was of particular importance to gaining entry to the Prince Edward County African American community. In order to develop this historical understanding from the African American perspective and to minimize cultural misinterpretations (Duubar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2003), archival-type research was performed from July 2012 to December 2012. This research included analysis of historical photos, correspondence, newspaper articles, architectural drawings, speeches, and Public Works Administration records. Documents were viewed at the Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia; Virginia State University Library, Petersburg, Virginia; the National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library, Washington, District of Columbia; and the Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, Washington, District of Columbia.

This research resulted in approximately 380 documents that provided a historical presentation of the school closings. Further, many of the newspapers and documents that were analyzed were African American-only newspapers such as the Richmond Afro-American, which provided the African American perspective. These data also provided an understanding of how race was socially constructed at the time of the school closures, which accordingly impacted Virginia’s massive resistance policymaking. Moreover, this research elucidated the Prince Edward Board of Supervisors’ implementation of resistance policies to assure segregated White-only education during the school closures.
For instance, one document published by the Lynchburg News, Lynchburg Virginia, located approximately 48 miles east of Prince Edward County published the White-only Prince Edward Academy creed, which described their desire to keep the races separate. “That oneness of purpose being to provide the very best education possible for all the children of our county who may be permitted the freedom of accepting such an education in racially-separate classroom” (Lynchburg News, September 13, 1962, Column 2, para. 3).

The archival-type research also provided primary source information on the organized efforts made by African Americans and civil rights activists to support the displaced students. For instance, NAACP documents held at the Library of Congress in Washington, District of Columbia revealed the efforts put forth by the African American community leaders and the NAACP to secure outside educational opportunities for the displaced students during the school closures. Within these data was information on the role the Martha E. Forrester Council of Women played in fighting for the civil rights in education during the 1950s. This was the same Martha E. Forrester Council of Women that helped to raise money in the 1990s in an effort to save the Robert Russa Moton High School (R.R. Moton) from being razed as discussed in Chapter One. This type of knowledge was of assistance when negotiating entry into the Prince Edward County. It provided a deep understanding of the historic school closings and, moreover, provided knowledge on how the community continues to honor its past. Ultimately, knowledge gained through the archival-type research allowed for easier entry into the community.
**Negotiating entry.** Part of employing successful case study methodology also included consideration of how to enter a research site. Through the archival-type research there was an understanding of both the local players and the infrastructure of the community (Smith, 1978). For instance, the R.R. Moton Museum was referred to in many newspapers, such as the Richmond Times of Richmond, Virginia, during the 1990s when the African American community successfully purchased the school from the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors. The R.R. Moton Museum held particular significance for potential entry into the community for several reasons. First, the museum was the original Prince Edward County African American-only high school prior to the school closures and the site of the original *Davis v. County*, 1952 that served as one of the five cases in *Brown v. Board*. In 1997, the school was established as the R.R. Moton Museum and opened its doors to the public in 2001. The museum hosts numerous functions to educate the community about Prince Edward County’s role in the fight for civil rights in education. The museum also host distant programs at other educational centers throughout Virginia.

With an understanding of what the museum potentially meant to the Prince Edward County African American Community, efforts were made to attend educational programs offered through the museum. One such event occurred at the Tredegar Civil War Museum in Richmond, Virginia. This event featured the stories of three displaced students as a result of the Prince Edward County School closing (The American Civil War Center, 2013). This program provided personal accounts and reflection on how families tried to maintain an education during the historic school closures and what
impact it had on their life as an adult. It was at this event that one of the women, Ruth [pseudonym], extended an invitation to me to attend a Brown Bag Lunch at the R.R. Moton museum in Farmville, Virginia. The Brown Bag Lunch meetings became the avenue to gaining access to the Prince Edward County African American community and to developing a relationship with Ruth who became the gatekeeper for this study.

**Gaining access.** Glesne (2011) wrote, “gaining access to people within a site is best achieved by first logging time. Just being around, participating in activities, and talking informally with people gives them time to get use to you and learn that you are okay” (p. 58). Table 2 provides an overview of the activities attended in order to gain entry to the Prince Edward County African American community and to further develop an understanding of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund program. Following is a discussion of the events and some of the field notes that provided insight for this study.

**Table 2**

*Gaining access*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tredegar Civil War Presentation</td>
<td>The American Civil War Center at Historic Tredegar</td>
<td>Feb. 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 Tredegar St, Richmond, VA 23219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brown</em> Scholarship Fund Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Virginia General Assembly 1000 Bank St, Richmond, VA 23218</td>
<td>June 19 2013, July 15 2013, December 13 2013, February 11, 2014, August 15 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Moton Community Awards Banquet

- **Location:** Hampden-Sydney College, 1 College Rd, Farmville, VA 23901
- **Dates:** Oct. 17 2013, Oct 2 2014

### R.R. Moton Alumni Banquet

- **Location:** Twin Lakes State Park, 788 Twin Lakes Road, Green Bay, VA 23942
- **Date:** April 26, 2013

### Brown Bag Lunch Meetings

- **Location:** Robert Russa Moton Museum, 900 Griffin Blvd, Farmville, VA 23901

*Note:* This data does not include interview dates, which are provided in Table 3.

---

**Brown bag lunch.** Ruth’s invite to the Brown Bag Lunch meetings ultimately served as a way to log time. Held every Monday at noon, the series provided presentations on topics related to civil rights in education such as the NAACP’s historic role in Prince Edward County and the story of the Moton Museum’s founding. Woodley (2012) reported in the local newspaper that citizens came to “listen to a StoryCorps oral history interview with a local resident and then talk about what they heard and what they feel about it” (paragraph 5).

**R.R. Moton alumni banquet.** Consistent attendance at the Brown Bag Lunch series served as a way to negotiate entry and develop a rapport with the Prince Edward County African American community. As a result there were other invites to special functions such as the R.R. Moton Alumni Banquet and the Annual Moton Community Awards.
Banquet. The R.R. Moton Alumni Banquet is a high school reunion for graduates from the R.R. Moton African American-only high school, which ceased to exist as R.R. Moton after the schools desegregated in 1964. This event is held bi-annually and focuses on student fellowship.

*Annual Moton community awards banquet*. The Annual Moton Community Awards Banquet is held yearly at Hampden-Sydney College. The purpose of the Awards Banquet is two-fold. First, it serves to honor and celebrate individuals who were important to the success of the museum and Prince Edward County’s civil rights in education history. It also serves as a major fundraiser. Prince Edward County families create sponsorship sites via the museum website and compete to raise money for the museum. At the third Annual Banquet an awardee came to the podium and provided the following remarks about his role with the museum. His remarks demonstrated the significant role the museum played in the lives of the displaced students.

> You [Moton Museum] made us feel that we are proud to be a part of this community and this history-building, because we recognized that this was an important story that needed to be told and so for that reason I feel truly honored” (Award recipient, Oct. 17, 2013).

*Brown Scholarship Fund Committee meetings*. It was important to also attend the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund Committee meetings. The Committee meets approximately four times a year to discuss scholarship awards and procedures for informing communities about the scholarship program. These meetings are open to the public at the Virginia State Capitol in Richmond. The Brown Scholarship
Fund Committee website provides meeting summaries but lacks policy details and committee discussions. I attended meetings from April 2013 to present. Attendance at these meetings led to the possession of important documents such as financial reports (Appendix B). These documents and field notes taken following the committee meetings were important in analyzing the role of the St. Paul’s College satellite bachelor’s degree program offered to the displaced students at the R.R. Moton Museum. This is further discussed in Chapter Four, Necessary Structures and Chapter Five, Comprehensive Restoration.

Additionally, the Committee meetings further supported the site selection of Prince Edward County for this study. The financial advisor reported at the August 2014 meeting that, to date, the majority of applicants were students from the Prince Edward County school closings (Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund Committee, August, 2014). For example, the above-mentioned St. Paul satellite program resulted in 30 scholarship awards to students from Prince Edward County, Virginia.

**Gatekeeper.** Flyvbjerg (2011) presented that entry into the field of study requires acceptance of, and negotiation with, a gatekeeper. Through interaction at the museum and attendance at Tredegar, I began to develop a relationship with an R.R. Moton Alumni Association board member, Ruth. As stated Ruth invited me to attend the Brown Bag Lunch series. However, the first sign of acceptance from her was an invitation to the 2013 R.R. Moton alumni reunion. As suggested by Duubar et al. (2003) and Patton (2002), the potential existed to be considered with suspicion as an outsider; therefore, these invitations were significant. My relationship with Ruth was further solidified by my
attendance at the 2013 and 2014 R.R. Moton Annual Banquets. During the summer of 2014, Ruth agreed to assist with the study in any way possible and added me to the R.R. Moton Alumni Facebook group to demonstrate her support of the research. The R.R. Moton Alumni group consists of African Americans who attended the R.R. Moton High School during the 1950s and 1960s. As stated, R.R. Moton no longer functioned as an African American-only school with the onset of desegregation and the reopening of the Prince Edward County schools in 1964.

After the acceptance of the proposal defense, Ruth and I met in Farmville to discuss her help in obtaining a potential list of participants and the creation of the recruitment letter. An audiotaped field note captured the significant role Ruth played in this study.

The relationship with [Ruth] is huge. She has done everything from vetting me for the community to introducing me to the person who safeguards the community of scholarship recipients in order to obtain the list (Field note, Oct. 20, 2014).

The list referenced in this field note was the list of 107 potential Prince Edward County Brown Scholarship Fund recipients that were used for the letter campaign discussed later in Recruitment.

**Participation awareness.** Upon reflection of this study, the significance of logging time cannot be undervalued. Several field notes speak to the importance of spending time within Prince Edward County and demonstrated that despite two years of logging time, cultural misinterpretation still occurred. On one particular occasion, the researcher was questioned on her Whiteness. The museum director questioned if, as a
White researcher, I was there to rescue them (Field note, Feb. 10, 2014). Had it not been for the long hours of previous research, which were dedicated to combing archives in order to develop an understanding of the Prince Edward County history, this moment could have hurt relationships that were essential to gaining entry. However, as a result of the knowledge gained through previous investigation, I was able to respond in a way that showed trustworthiness.

Further, logging time resulted in the relationship with not only Ruth but also the director of the museum. During one conversation with the museum director, the significance of the Martha E. Forrester Council of Woman was discussed in regards to the preservation of the museum. I was able to add to this body of knowledge by discussing documents discovered at the Library of Congress, which demonstrated the role played by the Council of Woman during the desegregation battle in the 1950s. The depth of historical understanding assured the director of the museum that my intentions were authentic and he eventually gave his verbal support of the study. This later allowed for the advertisement of the study on the R.R. Moton Facebook discussed later in Recruitment.

Logging time also resulted in a nuanced understanding of events as described by participants. For example, during the interview process, several participants discussed attending school in neighboring Cumberland during the historic school closings. The word “neighboring” could suggest close proximity. However, as a result of time spent in the community, there was an understanding that the drive from Prince Edward County to Cumberland involved an approximately 15-mile ride on winding, twisting roads through...
farmland and was discussed in a field note on November 6, 2014. This knowledge offered an appreciation for the drive some parents made to obtain an education for their children during the five-year school closures.

**Participant Selection**

The goal of participant selection was to select participants who were both R.R. Moton alumni and recipients of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund as this ensured that the participants experienced the most extreme example of Virginia’s resistance (Hicks & Pitre, 2010). The following discussion further outlines the selection and recruitment of a case for this study.

**Criteria.** Based on the literature review, the school closures impacted individuals differently depending on their age at the time of the school closures. For instance, individuals born between 1942 and 1943 potentially attended Kittrell College, North Carolina through an outside placement program. As a result, some of these students were able to obtain high school degrees despite the school closures (Brinson, 2004). Heaton’s (2008) quantitative analysis on the long-term educational loss and the resulting outcomes suggested that students within Prince Edward County who were born between the years of 1946 and 1949 were most impacted. However, Turner (2004) reported that school closures were not discerning and the impact was significant regardless of age. Because the ages and potential influences were many, the goal of this study was to obtain as diverse a representation as possible. Therefore, the goal of participant selection was to select cases that represented a cross-section of the affected population in reference to age and gender.
The decision to obtain a cross-section of the population also supported several methodological concerns for this study. First, due to the amount of time spent in Prince Edward County there were concerns surrounding reactivity. As a result, it was best to not employ a sample method that required feedback from initial participants. Further, the decision to obtain a cross-section of R.R. Moton scholarship recipients was based on the theoretical framework, which placed the African American voice forefront to this study. Further, obtaining a cross-section of scholarship recipients provided internal generalizability (Maxwell & Chmiel, 2015, in print). Specifically, the extent to which the Brown Scholarship Fund provided restoration to the recipients might say something about the ability of the program to provide restoration at all.

**Recruitment.** The gatekeeper played a key role in the recruitment of participants for this study. Ruth agreed to promote the study through the R.R. Moton Alumni Facebook page, the R.R. Moton alumni email listserv, and the R.R. Moton Museum. The first attempt to recruit participants was done via flyers, which were posted at the R.R. Moton Museum and on the alumni Facebook page (Appendix C). After two weeks of posting the flyer, only one person expressed potential interest in the study. A backup plan called for the use of a letter campaign in the event that older adults did not respond to the flyers. Again, my relationship with Ruth was essential to the letter campaign. She contacted a secondary source that was in possession of the contact information for the Prince Edward County scholarship applicants and/or recipients’ information. This woman met with me in Farmville to discuss the letter campaign. After our meeting, in which I
assured her that the confidentiality of the participants would be protected, she sent the list to me via email.

**Recruitment letter.** A recruitment letter was drafted with assistance from the gatekeeper and is provided in Appendix D. The letter sent to participants mentioned Ruth’s support of the campaign. As suggested by Wegner (2003), the assurance of community connections can prove to be beneficial when recruiting older adults. Ruth’s name afforded credibility.

One hundred and seven letters were mailed with self-addressed stamped envelopes to ensure maximum response. Twenty-four individuals responded within a two-week time frame: five males and 19 females. Four participants stated that they were willing to take part in the study because they knew Ruth. The recruitment letter included a section for potential participants to provide information on how best to contact them. The majority of participants provided phone numbers and best times to call. Phone calls were made to potential participants in order to review the purpose of the study, ensure eligibility for the study, and schedule face-to-face interviews.

All five males were selected to provide as great a gender perspective as possible; however, one individual was unable to participate due to health issues. From the remaining 19 females that responded, the youngest and oldest respondents were selected. Random selection was used to select the remaining eight female participants who ranged from 58 to 68 years old. A more detailed description of the participants for this study is provided in Chapter Four, Individual Case Findings.
Older adults. The initial goal was to secure 13 to 15 participants. This exceeded the recommendation of ten participants for a qualitative study by Creswell (2007), but the surplus was necessary to safeguard against potential issues affecting older adult participants. Fourteen older adults were selected for this study ranging from the ages of 58-68 years old. These participants are described in detail in Chapter Four, Table 4. Wegner (2003) suggested interviewing older adults who are healthy is comparable to interviewing younger adults. The interview process for this study supported Wegner. Only one participant had a physical health issue and was interviewed via phone. Moreover, the interviewing process occurred quickly due to their availability as a result of retirement. Based on the methods employed for this study, it is recommended that the recruitment of older adults occur via written communication. The interviewing of older adults from this study resulted in rich data that recounted stories from their past as well as offered reflections and insights on the Brown Scholarship Fund. These data are provided in Chapter Four, Individual Case Findings. Issues surrounding the interviewing of older adults are further explored later in this chapter in Reliability and Trustworthiness.

Data Collection

Interviews were used to explore the perceptions of Prince Edward County African Americans of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program. Englander (2012) suggested that conducting interviews is an appropriate way for researchers to explore “the meaning of a phenomenon as it is lived by other subjects” (p. 14). Further, interviewing serves as an effective way to gather, record, and preserve personal narratives (Patterson, Mickelson, Hester & Wyrick, 2011). An interview guide was designed to address the
research questions, which focused on exploring the meaning of the phenomenon and the influence of the events experienced (Maxwell, 2009). Maxwell discussed the significance interview questions play in a qualitative case study. He stated, “Interview questions should be judged not by whether they can be logically derived from your research questions, but by whether they provide the data that will contribute to answering these questions” (p. 236). An interview guide was designed with this in mind. The following section describes the development of an interview guide, the interview protocol used for this study, and the logistics implemented to assure the data was organized and ready for data analysis.

**Interview guide.** A pilot interview was performed with Ruth prior to interviews to highlight any gaps or unnecessary repetition in the guide (Sampson, 2004). The pilot interview demonstrated that the interview guide was missing questions that explored why participants might be motivated to apply to the scholarship program. Overall, the pilot interview went well; the interview was conversational but also attended to key topics surrounding the scholarship program. Further, the interview questions elicited responses that required Ruth to describe, recollect, and make sense of her experiences as a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient. Ruth stated that it was a great interview. The revised interview guide was used during the interview process and emphasized key questions relevant to the goals of this study (Appendix E).

**Interviews.** The interviews for this study held significance as they served as the main source of data for this study. Therefore, great care was taken to develop an interview protocol that not only provided a comfortable environment, but also assured
that key topics surrounding the scholarship program were explored. Participants were asked to suggest a location of comfort and familiarity for their respective interviews (Maxwell, 2005). The first three participants suggested meeting at the Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library. These interviews revealed that the library held particular significance as scholarship recipients often met there for study groups and to use the computers for school assignments. A small sitting area located in the back corner of the library provided privacy and comfort. The library was suggested to other participants after the initial use. Other individuals readily agreed that the library was a great place to meet, and, as a result, nine of the 14 interviews took place there.

**Logistics.** The interviewing process occurred quickly. This was due to the fact that many individuals were retired. As a result, individuals were easy to contact and interviews were scheduled within a four-week period. One participant requested to be interviewed by telephone, due to a disability. The informed consent document was mailed to this participant and signed prior to the interview. Each interview began by reviewing the purpose of the study and the consent form (Appendix F). Participants were reminded that interviews would be audiotaped for later transcription. Further, participants were given an opportunity to ask questions. At this time participants signed the letter of informed consent and the interview began.

All interviews were audiotaped via an audiocassette player. The organization of the interviews was important due to the amount of data collected. Interviews were organized by citing characteristics of the participants on the interview notes and at the beginning of the interview. Pertinent information included the date and time of the
interview, as well as the participant’s age, gender, marital status, and other pertinent characteristics that provided orientation for later data analysis. These identifying characteristics were used for organizational purposes only.

Notes were taken during the interview to highlight key concepts, phrases, and noteworthy observations, responses or behaviors (Patton, 2002). Additionally, field notes were audio-recorded following all interviews. These field notes included critical reflections, insights, and additional questions (Maxwell, 2012). Both memo writings and field notes were used as part of the data analysis. Field notes and analytical memos are further discussed later in this chapter in Data Analysis. Before ending each interview, the interview guide was reviewed to make sure all questions were explored.

The length of each interview ranged from 42 minutes to one hour and 12 minutes. No more than three interviews were performed within a day with a minimum of 90-minute breaks between interviews in order to allow for field notes and reflection. As previously mentioned, nine of the 14 interviews occurred at the Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library. Two individuals requested interviews at a restaurant in Midlothian outside of Richmond, Virginia, which is approximately 50 miles north of Prince Edward County. One participant asked to meet at a local Farmville restaurant during her lunch break. One interview occurred at a participant’s home due to a family health issue that required her presence there. Another participant asked to be interviewed via phone due to a decline in physical health. Table 3 provides the date, location and length of each interview.
Table 3

*Interview Descriptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>December 18, 2015, 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Midlothian Restaurant</td>
<td>1:08:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>December 3, 2015, 3:00 PM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library</td>
<td>1:12:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>November 20, 2015, 11:00 PM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library</td>
<td>43:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>November 20, 2015, 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library</td>
<td>52:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>November 24, 2015, 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library</td>
<td>50:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>December 11, 2015, 11:00 PM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library</td>
<td>51:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilma</td>
<td>December 11, 2015, 3:30 PM</td>
<td>Home, Farmville</td>
<td>41:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>December 11, 2015, 6:00 PM</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>47:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie</td>
<td>November 20, 2015, 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Farmville restaurant</td>
<td>55:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>November 24, 2015, 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward Community Library</td>
<td>58:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>December 15, 2015, 12:30 PM</td>
<td>Farmville-Prince Edward</td>
<td>46:59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: The average interview lasted 61.88 minutes.

Interview reflection. Continued reflection occurred throughout the interviewing process. As stated by Roulston (2010),

During research interviews, interviewers must judge on a moment by moment whether they are generating the kinds of data that will be useful to examine their research questions and prompt participants to provide the kinds of descriptions that will provide in-depth details of the phenomenon of interest (p. 104).

Participants were encouraged to elaborate with statements such as (a) “Tell me more about that,” (b) “Can you provide a specific example?” and (c) “Can you explain what you mean by that?” It was equally important to note that there were many moments during the interview process where silence served as a mode of communication (Kim, 2008). The acceptance of silence was particularly important as individuals shared stories surrounding the school closings. As stated by Kim (2008), “there is a need, therefore, to articulate multiple meanings of silence in relation to race/ethnicity, gender and class which reflect unequal power relations” (p. 1362).
**Sensitive research.** Further, the process of interviewing individuals required continual reflection on positions of power and the need to offer attentive listening (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003). The need to be attentive to my position of power was particularly evident during two separate interviews were participants shared stories of a sensitive nature. Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen and Liampittong (2007) discussed the challenges researchers can face when performing potentially sensitive research. First Dickson-Swift et al. suggested that interviewing participants on potentially sensitive topics required a deep understanding that these individuals were allowing you into their private lives. Further, Dickson-Swift et al. suggested that if participants shared painful memories that researchers might find it necessary to respond as a fellow human and not a researcher. As stated, this occurred in two different interviews, in which participants shared personal and potentially painful memories of their youth. The body of research performed by Dickson-Swift et al. provided me with the knowledge and permission to acknowledge these interview moments with compassion, as well as the confidence to know that these moments would not jeopardize the rigor of the interviews.

**Data Analysis**

The participant interviews served as the main source of data analysis. Each participant was analyzed as a separate case for analysis followed by a cross-case analysis (Merriam, 2009). A cross-case analysis explored the connectedness, or the “interactivity” of the cases (Stake, 2005). The coding process is described below and outlines how data was categorized.
**Interviews.** Transcription served as the first step in the analysis of the interviews. The transcription is a time-consuming process, but it provided an opportunity to re-listen to interviews, and make note of voice pauses, tone, and inflections (Roulston, 2010). These intonations are noted in the Individual Findings in Chapter Four and give deeper meaning to the words spoken by the participants.

Part of the initial analysis also included reducing the data. Although the interview guide focused the discussion throughout the interview process, it was important to analyze the data for repetitive statements and to eliminate data that did not align with the focus of the study and the research questions. For instance, John provided a long narrative of a visit to St. Paul’s College with his dad. Although the story was genuine, the data from this narrative did not align with the research questions and this information was removed during the initial data analysis stage.

**Substantive categories.** The next step in the analysis was to highlight phrases for significance and meaning (van Manen, 1990). Key phrases or words were coded and placed into categories such as the importance of being a survivor as a result of the school closings, or valuing an education. Another key idea discussed how the scholarship had a trickledown effect to the next generation. At this point, the key phrases were placed into a matrix for organizational purposes in preparation to explore these key concepts further.

The next step of the analysis explored these concepts based on the participants’ perceptions. For instance, what did it mean to be a survivor, what characteristic demonstrated the value of an education, and how did the scholarship have a trickledown effect? Further analysis included “playing” with data by arranging the information into
different categories (Yin, 2009). Stake (1995) referred to playing with data as a teasing out of themes and categories. These “substantive” categories pay close attention to the participants’ perceptions and beliefs (Maxwell, 2005). As suggested by Holstein and Gubrium (2003), “oral sources are already analytic documents structured with complex codes and achieved meanings” (p. 365).

**Field notes and analytical memos.** The development of theoretical categories also required the analysis of the analytical memos and field notes. These data were also placed into a matrix and coded into categories to reflect topics explored (Maxwell, 2005). A total of 52 audio field notes and 33 composition-sized pages of handwritten notes were taken during the study. The audiotaped field notes ranged in time from .13 to 6.43 minutes. Further, ten separate audiotaped analytical memos served as an important tool to additionally confront and often challenge assumptions that impacted participation decisions (Mason, 2002). These notes and memos played two distinct roles during this study. First, as previously discussed in Negotiating Entry, they provided a way to reflect on the study as it progressed. During the data analysis stage the field notes and analytical memos served a second role and helped to make sense of the interview data.

**Theoretical categories.** The final step of analysis explored the relationships that existed between and within the cases (Yin, 2009). Further, as Creswell (2003) stated the analysis of all data allows for the researcher, “to generate or inductively develop a theory or pattern of meanings” (p.9). This is exampled in the following development of the theme, restoration unfulfilled.
One analytical memo that was audio recorded April 23, 2014 explored the
concepts of Yamamoto’s repair paradigm and the overall goals of restorative justice. As
discussed by Maxwell (2005) this memo provided a summary of how I was thinking
about the Brown Scholarship Fund in the context of restorative justice. In this memo I
discussed the Brown Scholarship Fund’s focus on economic transformation through the
award of a scholarship, but provided concerns for the lack of attention given to repairing
the societal rifts created as a result of the historic school closings. This memo was placed
in the matrix as a consideration. As the data from the participants also developed into
substantive categories, key phrases began to align with the analytical memo. These
phrases included Suzanne’s statement, “it cannot be replaced” or Mike’s statement “but it
can’t replace what’s done and you can never recapture the damage or undo the damage
that’s done.” The memo combined with the data from the interviews began to take shape
and form into a theoretical category. This category was later termed restoration
unfulfilled and is discussed in both Chapter Four in Cross-case Analysis and Chapter
Five, Restoration Unfulfilled.

Summary. The final data analysis resulted in interpretations of what it means to
be a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient based on the participants’ perceptions of their
lived experiences as a scholarship recipient. These interpretations are presented
thematically in the Chapter Four, Findings. Four themes emerged from these data and
included necessary structures, characteristics of recipients, policy impact and restoration
revised. Concerns for the reliability and trustworthiness of this study are discussed in the
next section.
Reliability and Trustworthiness

As suggested by Patton (2002), the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis. Therefore, it was important to reflect on how biases might influence the study: “The qualitative researcher must be conscious of assumptions and interest that inform the work and be aware of how and why these change during the researcher process” (Yow, 2005, p. 8). Following is an examination of reactivity concerns, Whiteness, and methods used to assure the trustworthiness of research findings.

Reactivity. Long-term involvement within a site of study can lead to reactivity and potentially impact the reliability of the findings (Maxwell, 2005). Therefore, several safeguards against reactivity were included in the design of this study. For example, Ruth was excluded from being interviewed for this study. Rather, as discussed, she took part in a pilot interview, which served to rework minor details with the interview guide. Further, although Ruth assisted with the recruitment letter she was removed from the actual selection of the participants. Ruth played a key role in the success of the overall study and as a result this important relationship was maintained; however, every effort was made to assure that she did not compromise the reliability of the interviews.

Whiteness. The examination of personal beliefs was ongoing throughout this study in order to resist being influenced by societal hegemonic norms (Kvale, 2006). As a White middle-class female, I was at risk for such biases. As suggested by Morris (2001), “one cannot discount the race, social class, or political views of the researcher from affecting the research process because researchers bring their own epistemological perspectives – ways of knowing –into the framing of researchable questions, data
collection and analysis, and interpretations and conclusions” (p. 580). Several methodological decisions were implemented to safeguard against Whiteness.

First, the rigorous study of the archival research led to a deep understanding of the history and culture of the Prince Edward County African American community. Further, time spent within the community helped to build trust as well as safeguard against cultural misinterpretations (Duubar et al., 2003). Continual reflection performed through field notes and analytical memos additionally demanded that personal biases were confronted (Mason, 2002). For instance, during a conversation with the museum director, I was asked if I thought the museum was an African American museum. He stated that it was not, but rather that it was an American museum dedicated to the American battle for civil rights in education. Two memos demonstrated my confusion over this question as I grappled with the significance of how to define the museum and my eventual recognition that the term African American could potentially cause further division between the races.

Further, the framing of this study in critical race theory provided a methodology that kept the study focused on the African American perspective and minimized the influence of the White hegemonic culture. As a result, all aspects of the study including data analysis and findings circled back to the voices of the African American participants.

Moreover, acknowledging Whiteness included remaining attentive to positions of power during the interview process (Kim, 2008; Kvale, 2006). Holstein and Gubrium (2003) supported two strategies previously discussed in this study that attended to positions of power: the practice of active listening and the recognition of the critical race
perspective. Additional safeguards were already embedded in the IRB form which required complete transparency of methods, an explanation of the intended use of the research, and an assurance that interviewees could depart from the study at any time (Duubar et al., 2003; Patton, 2002).

Respondent validation and review by participants. Further, the data analysis for this study relied on an accurate understanding of the scholarship recipients’ views and experiences. Therefore, this study included two triangulation approaches to assure the accuracy of data interpretation (Patton, 2002). First, during the interview process, respondent validation served to strengthen this study. Maxwell (2005) stated that respondent validation was one way to assure that the participant’s words are not misinterpreted. As previously discussed, I clarified and checked for understanding with the participant throughout the interview process.

The other triangulation approach used for this study included participant review of the findings (Glesne, 1999). Participants were sent a draft document of their personal interview findings prior to the cross-case analysis. The draft was sent through the mail to seven of the participants. Five individuals selected to receive their copy via email. Two members requested to not review the data due to travel or illness. Participants were encouraged to write comments on the draft or in a separate comment section. A self-addressed envelope was included in the mailing to make it as easy as possible for participants to complete their review. Sharing the findings and conclusions with the participants in this study assured the accuracy of the findings. Participants were able to provide feedback on any concerns or misinterpretations. Three participants requested
minor changes such as misheard names and places. The positive reactions to the data validated the credibility of the findings.

**Interviewing older adults.** The participants for this study were considered older adults (Patton, 2002; Wegner, 2003). Older adults may present some distinct challenges for the researcher. Specifically, older adulthood is often typified by loss including death of loved ones and the deterioration of personal health and mobility (Wegner, 2003). However, researchers should not dismiss interviewing older people; rather, each potential participant should be assessed on an individual basis (Patterson & Dupree, 1994; Wegner, 2003).

The individuals for this study were well. Although 11 of the 14 participants were retired, they were also active within their community and exhibited mental acuity. One participant was physically disabled. The decision was made to perform a phone interview with this participant in order to secure as many male participants as possible. There were no requests from family members to obtain information on the study due to the age of the participants. As suggested by Wegner (2003), “Interviewing well people in their 60’s and 70’s is comparable to interviewing younger well adults” (p. 113).

The additional effort to secure interviews with older people was worthwhile. Yow (2005) reports, “research indicates that older adults are better at telling stories of the past than are young adults” (p. 38). The older participants for this study were able to share recollections from their childhood and were able to provide insight on the emotional and material losses they experienced as recipients of policies that deprived and restored their education.
Audit trail. Several approaches assured the reliability of this study. Patton (2002) suggested that because the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, the reliability of the research rests on the researcher. Therefore, the first step in assuring the trustworthiness of this study centered on maintaining a consistent audit trail. As previously discussed all documents, procedures, insights, and findings were consistently documented. For example, all 380 archival type documents were either uploaded or scanned and saved within a password protected drop box. Memo writings and field notes were also stored in a password protected drop box. Each participant signed two letters of consent. Participants kept one for their personal records. The other copy was scanned, and securely saved with all other pertinent documents. The logistical methodology used for the interviews assured further data accuracy. All audiotaped interviews and transcriptions were also securely saved in a password protected drop box. Finally the analysis process including the cross-case analysis and participant review ensured the validity of the findings as the data from each case proved to confirm the findings.

Limitations

This study was limited in scope by the fact that only African American scholarship recipients from Prince Edward County were interviewed. This limited the potential for the study to provide the narratives of individuals who may be eligible for the Brown Scholarship Fund but chose not to participate in the program. Additionally, it did not explore the unintended consequence of the denial of education to a small number of White students. However, Virginia’s massive resistance policies were intended solely to
deny African American access to the traditional White public schools, as well as integration of the races. Therefore, framing this study within critical race theory appropriately provided the African American perspective as a way to critically view these policies.

The fact that the researcher was White had the potential to limit the findings of this study. However, as discussed in Reliability and Trustworthiness, every attention was given to assure that my Whiteness did not mitigate the potentials of this study including previous research and time within the site of study.

This study did not provide generalization or causality. However, this study may offer internal generalizability as discussed by Maxwell and Chmiel (2015, in print), in that the findings of this study are generalizable to those that were received a Brown Scholarship Fund award. The Prince Edward County African Americans’ experiences during the school closures were dependent on place and time as well as the culture of those around the participants (Salzman, 2002). Accordingly, their perceptions of the Brown Scholarship Fund are subjective. The goal of this study was to develop a deep understanding of the Prince Edward County African Americans view of the Brown Scholarship Fund by “encourage[ing] dialogue among perspectives” (Patton, 2002, p. 546). The findings provided valuable insight on the ability of Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund to provide educational restoration to a group of Prince Edward County African Americans once denied an education between 1959 and 1964.
Chapter Three outlined the methods used to collect and analyze data in order to explore the research questions. The central research question (Q1) that guided this study was: What are the Prince Edward County African American scholarship recipients’ perceptions of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund? The secondary question (Q2) was: What if any, has been the impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund on the lives of the recipients?

Chapter Four presents the findings of the study. Three sections are used in this chapter to (a) describe the policies and procedures of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund, (b) report individual case findings, and (c) explore cross-case themes. The chapter closes with a summary of the findings.

Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund

The Virginia General Assembly developed the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund in 2005. The program was designed to assist students who were eligible for public school education from 1954 to 1964 in Prince Edward County, Warren County, and the cities of Norfolk, Arlington and Charlottesville; however, due to massive resistance, these schools were denied funds and/or closed to avoid desegregation. Scholarship funds can be used to obtain undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees, as
well as the General Education Development certificate or career and technical training. Awards can be used for part-time or full-time enrollment in an accredited school that meets the standards of quality as outlined by the Virginia Constitution, Article VIII. Students who are enrolled in theological studies are ineligible for the scholarship program. Additionally, the program is available only to Virginia residents who meet the standards outlined by Virginia’s laws on eligibility for in-state tuition or who provide the Brown Scholarship Committee with sufficient documentation verifying Commonwealth residency (Eligibility for in-state tuition charges, 2011-2013). Perspective students must apply to the Brown Scholarship Fund. Awards are given on a yearly basis. Applications are available on January 1, and all applications must be submitted by March 1. Appendix A provides the application packet and further outlines the different processes for returning recipients or summer enrollment.

The last financial report for the Brown Scholarship Fund was presented to the Committee on December 10, 2013; it can be viewed in Appendix B. 219 scholarships were awarded to approximately 83 students totaling $1,013,838.48 of the $2,050,000.00 available through the fund (Brown v. Board Committee meeting, December 10, 2013).

**Individual Case Findings**

The selection of participants for this study was based on the literature review, which demonstrated that the loss of an education impacted individuals differently depending on their age at the time of the school closures. Potential participants for this study were born between 1943 and 1957 with a range between the ages of 17 and 3 years old when the schools closed. Research suggested that some of the older students were
given the opportunity to attend outside placement programs in order to complete high school (Hicks & Pitre, 2010). Other families sought education in distant communities for their children with host families (Turner, 2003), and a majority remained in Prince Edward County unable to participate in any formal education during the five-year school closure (Peeples, 2004). Research further suggested that the displaced students experienced a range of socio-emotional loss such as the loss of friends and family, humiliation and sadness (Turner, 2003). Therefore, as a result of the ages and potential influences, the desire of this study was to select cases that represented a cross-section of the affected population in reference to age and gender.

A letter campaign was used to contact 107 potential participants. Participants were informed that the criteria for inclusion in the study were (a) Robert Russa (R.R.) Moton High School alumni status; (b) Brown Fund scholarship recipient status; and (c) willingness to participate in an audiotaped interview. Twenty-four individuals responded; however, only five individuals were male. All five men were selected to assure as large of a male representation as possible. One male respondent was unable to participate due to health reasons. The remaining four male participants ranged from 58 to 65 years old. In an attempt to obtain as much of a cross-section of female participants as possible, the oldest and youngest female respondents were chosen. The remaining eight individuals were randomly selected. Ten females participated in this study ranging from 58 to 68 years of age with a median age of 64. Table 4 provides a brief description of the participants including their age, postsecondary education by means of the Brown
Scholarship Fund or not, and their vocation. Participants are presented in the order in which the individual case findings are reported.

Table 4

Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Degree via Brown Scholarship Fund</th>
<th>Post High School Degree</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science (B.S.), Business Administration, St. Paul’s College. Master’s in Executive Leadership, Liberty University.</td>
<td>Writer, current. Public School employee, retired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B.S., Business Administration, St. Paul’s College.</td>
<td>Writer, current. Firefighter, retired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B.S., Business Administration, St. Paul’s College.</td>
<td>Writing memoirs, current. Human resource specialist, retired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Master’s in Executive Leadership, Human Services, Counseling</td>
<td>Virginia Department of Social Services, local division, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Wilma  F  64  No  B.S., Business Administration, St. Paul’s College.  General Education Development (GED).


Miles    M  62  Yes  Master’s student, Counseling, Virginia State University.  B.S., Business Administration, St. Paul’s College.  Mental health counselor, current.

Debbie  F  63  No  LPN, Southside Community College.  Health care provider retirement facility, current.

Sally    F  67  Yes  B.S., Business Administration, St. Paul’s College.  Supervisor at local prison. Food services, current.

Carol    F  62  Yes  B.S., Business Administration, St. Paul’s College.  Previous course work, Southside Social worker, current.
Note: This data is further discussed in Theme Four: Characteristics of Recipients.

Suzanne. Suzanne is a 67-year-old retiree who worked for the Prince Edward County public school system and is presently writing a book about the historic school closings. Suzanne got involved in the scholarship program as part of a grassroots organization known as the Get on the Bus Campaign. Suzanne shared that the Get on the Bus Campaign was organized to “gather people in the community and the surrounding community and see if we could get people to go down to the general assembly on a bus.” The Get on the Bus Campaign experienced success; 50- to 70-year-old Prince Edward County displaced students and community members traveled in five buses to Richmond, Virginia to show their support for the Brown Scholarship Fund. Several members addressed the General Assembly to argue for the passage of the Brown Scholarship Fund. Suzanne was one of the individuals. Her testimony recounted an experience from her work at a Prince Edward County public school:

An older man came to my desk and he wanted to sign his grandchild out. I explained to him how he had to sign the child’s name and then he had to sign his name and he looked at me awkward and ah, I didn’t know why. So I explained it
to him again ‘cause I thought maybe he didn't hear me and he said, “Ma’am could you write it for me? I can’t write so good.” Right then and there I realized that this was a person who had not gotten an education and it was a white person.

Suzanne stated that as she completed her testimony to the General Assembly, she heard a member from the house murmur, “We are going to pass it.”

Suzanne believed it was important to tell the story because she wanted the General Assembly to understand that the whole community was affected by the school closings: “I wanted them to know to, you know, when you hurt one, you hurt everybody.”

Suzanne described the moment when the voting boards lit up to demonstrate that the scholarship would pass: “…it passed and everybody just screamed.”

For Suzanne, the scholarship was a positive opportunity. She always wanted to go back to school and therefore, the passage of the bill held great significance for her.

Suzanne believed that if the schools had not closed, she would have gone on to college after high school. Suzanne was almost 12 years old when the schools closed. For two years, she remained home with her mom. Her Girl Scout leader approached her parents and suggested that Suzanne could attend school in a neighboring community if she agreed to live with and offer care for a woman who was almost 100 years old as needed. Suzanne and her parents agreed for her to stay there and go to school. When the Prince Edward County schools reopened in 1964, Suzanne returned to complete high school.

Suzanne spoke of the emotional and academic effect the school closures had on her life. Suzanne discussed how her years living with the elderly woman impacted her: “The years that I was away from home and didn't know what was happening in Prince
Edward or anything about my family, it [sic] cannot be replaced.” Academically, Suzanne discussed feelings of academic insufficiency and stated that upon graduating from high school, she was not adequately equipped to go to a college “because of the lack of things [educational background] that you didn't acquire when you should have.”

As soon as the Brown Scholarship program became available, Suzanne applied and was awarded funds toward a Bachelor’s program offered by St. Paul’s College to the displaced students in Prince Edward County. St. Paul’s, a Historically Black College and University (HBCU) recognized that the commute to their home campus in Lawrenceville, Virginia was difficult. Lawrenceville is located approximately 58 miles southeast of Prince Edward County. Therefore, St. Paul’s provided a satellite program so that individuals could easily attend college. Classes were held at the historic R.R. Moton Museum, Farmville, Virginia.

Suzanne described the experience of attending classes at the museum as personally rewarding: “We walked into the museum and into the class, and seeing some of your old classmates that you hadn’t seen in 20 to30 years, [silence]. I mean it’s a feeling you can’t explain.” Moreover, Suzanne discussed the significance of St. Paul’s providing a program in the town of Farmville: “The only reason I was able to go to them was because they came to Prince Edward County and taught us in the walls of the Moton Museum.”

Suzanne continued to utilize the Brown Scholarship Fund and completed a B.S. in Business Administration in 2008 and a Master’s in Executive Leadership from Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia in 2013. Suzanne believes that by obtaining both a
bachelor’s and master’s degree, she successfully influenced her children to pursue post-secondary degrees. Suzanne summed up her scholarship experience by stating, “What occurred from 2003 to 2013, no one would ever dream of this. Dream your wildest dream ever…” Although Suzanne conveyed that completing her degrees gave her great pride, she qualified the impact of the scholarship on her life: “The scholarship did not impact me professionally as far as enabling me to get a better job. Because I was satisfied with my job and at my age I wasn’t looking for another job.” Suzanne continued, “…as far as the school closings it didn't restore anything for me because my education was taken away from me and it was taken away from me at a time when a young person needed an education.”

Finally, Suzanne provided some policy suggestions. She expressed disappointment that the program does not allow out-of-state displaced students to participate in the program. Suzanne discussed that many children had to leave the Commonwealth to obtain education elsewhere during the school closures, “so why punish them because they are in another state.” Suzanne also stated that the implementation of the program came too late, and that some of her peers died before the Commonwealth acknowledged the wrongdoing: “They died thinking nobody cared….I believe better late than never. But sometimes it’s almost the same. Never and too late.“

Cheryl. Cheryl is 63 years old and a retired firefighter. Currently, she is working on her memoir. She learned about the scholarship through community friends and decided to take advantage of the scholarship the same year she retired. Cheryl stated, “I really didn't want to go back to school ‘cause you know I’m thinking I’m retiring from
work so why am I going back to school.” Cheryl made up her mind to apply to the program on the last day of eligibility. Cheryl commented that she had considered traveling to Southside Community College in Cumberland, Virginia. However, when she found out about the satellite program offered by St. Paul’s at the R.R. Moton Museum, she jumped at the opportunity due to its convenient location.

Cheryl discussed her personal struggle with literacy upon her return to school. She began by recounting her return to Prince Edward County after the schools reopened in 1964:

And then when I started school. Because of the way they placed the kids in school, I can remember they placed me in the fifth grade or the sixth grade. But then you know because of our reading abilities, when we were like called on to read, you was so embarrassed ‘cause you couldn't pronounce words. You kind of stayed in the background and didn't come out.

Literacy remained a challenge for Cheryl throughout her career. Cheryl discussed her anxiety over potential job promotions within the fire department: “The unnecessary stress that you go through just knowing that I can’t get this promotion because I can’t do the math as fast as you, I can’t read like you. And you are so ashamed of it!”

Cheryl stated that she used to avoid discussing her literacy struggle and the school closings, but as a result of the St. Paul’s program, she is no longer silent. Cheryl stated that, during the St. Paul’s program, she spent so much time studying with other displaced students that they began to open up about their experiences: “Sometimes when you think you are going through some trauma yourself, you don't realize what other people are
dealing with.” Cheryl’s shame was replaced with the realization that she “…didn’t have anything to do with it.”

Cheryl discussed her required bachelor’s thesis project at length. “I was the only one able to pick anything dealing with the schools and my topic of my thesis paper was Brown vs. Board of Education: Time for Reconciliation.” Cheryl discussed that her thesis led to her desire to write a book, an aspiration that has given her purpose in life. Before exploring her thesis, Cheryl commented, “I had no reason, no purpose in my life whatsoever. I didn't know what I was supposed to be doing in life.” Cheryl stated that her faith has guided her in this process and helped her understand the need for forgiveness within the community: “When I finish my book. It’s going to bring more people together...” She continued, “What does a healed community look like?” I mean it….People don't realize the forgiveness and healing that we need.”

Cheryl believes that if the Commonwealth is serious about making amends, a support system must be put in place. Displaced students need counseling and tutoring in reading and computers. Out-of-state displaced students should be an equal part of the conversation, and more local satellite programs should be provided to communities who closed their schools.

John. John is 62 years old and recently retired from the Air Force. Currently, he is a bus driver for the Prince Edward County public schools. When the Brown Scholarship Fund became available, John was retiring from the Air Force and returning to Prince Edward County. John applied to the scholarship program with hopes to attend the satellite program offered through St. Paul’s College. John was accepted and completed
his B.S. in Business Administration from St. Paul’s College, through the satellite program in 2008.

John discussed that during the school closings, he was able to complete his education in a nearby community where his dad was employed as a school principal. After he received his high school degree, he entered the military and completed several higher-level classes. The Brown Scholarship Fund provided him the opportunity to complete a post-secondary degree. John stated that he believed the money earmarked for the Brown Scholarship Fund was due to the displaced students:

When they were going back and forth on whether they should give it or not and all of the black people were discussing what they could do to deserve that. All they just got to do is wait and ask, “Where was all the money that our parents paid in taxes while the schools were closed?”

John stated that the best way to utilize the scholarship program was through satellite programs similar to that offered by St. Paul’s College. In addition, he emphasized the importance of the support provided by the professors. However, despite his successful completion of a bachelor’s degree, John wasn't sure pursuing further education was worth the effort: “So with retirement it was stupid to take the time. Wasn’t like I was going to make more money.” Additionally, John was disappointed that the only local degree options offered by St. Paul’s were business administration and criminal justice. John ultimately felt that the money would have been more beneficial to the children of the displaced students.
**Rose.** Rose is a 66-year-old female who currently works for the Prince Edward County public school system. Rose also attended the satellite program offered by St. Paul’s College and received her B.S. in Business Administration from St. Paul’s in 2009. Previously, Rose worked in a factory. She heard about the scholarship through the media and remembers thinking, “the governor was willing to give us a pardon and give us money to go back to school ‘cause our education had been messed up. And I said that is beautiful!” Rose described going to the factory the next day and announcing her plans to go back to school to her boss, who commented that she was too old to continue her education. Rose responded, “Age is just a number!”

Rose discussed how she lost four years of schooling and returned to school when the Free School, an educational association sponsored by the Kennedy administration and private donors, opened in Prince Edward County in 1963. During those four years of educational deprivation, Rose did not receive any education, but worked on a farm. As a result, she stated that her math skills were deficient. Rose stated that when the schools reopened, students were given IQ tests to determine grade placement. Rose discussed the impact of the grade placement policy stating, “Now some of the students, they might have been put three years back. And that's why we had a lot of dropouts.”

Rose reflected that the loss she experienced at the time of the school closings could never be restored:

We were so young, so young. We were just so young to be doing it. I could see if we had gotten to maybe the 8\textsuperscript{th} or 9\textsuperscript{th} grade but they didn't even let us get there. We were just children. Children being punished for nothing. We didn't even
understand what was going on. You understand? We didn't understand. All we
knew was they were one color and we were another color and they said we
couldn't be together.

Rose credited the St. Paul’s program for enabling her to keep her job and
complete her degree: “It was just so beautiful because the teachers came all the way from
Richmond and St. Paul’s to us….Some days I worked 10 hours, some days I worked 12.
But I still went in and got that education.”

Receiving the scholarship and returning to school was a personally rewarding
experience for Rose:

The day I graduated from St. Paul’s, I felt like a young college graduate
[laughter]. We felt so- I mean it was such a feeling. I mean; I got a degree
[emphasis added]... After all these years. And I said, this lady that told me I was a
little old. I can’t wait to see her. And let her know I graduated. ‘Cause I did!

Besides the pride that came with achieving her B.S., Rose discussed that the scholarship
was a relief because people outside of Prince Edward County finally acknowledged the
school closings. “It made me feel like I was human,” she said, “They made me feel
human. I was visible.”

The degree brought a change in vocation for Rose. After her graduation, she went
to work for the local public school system. She discussed how tough the working
conditions at the factory had been and what a relief it was to work at a public school.
Rose also shared that at her new job, it was important to share her story as a displaced
student to the public school children:
I have a unique position ‘cause I tell them all the time that I got knocked out of school. And you have more than we ever had. You’ve got school. You have grants. You can get scholarships. You can apply for anything. We couldn’t do that. But today, hey, you all got it. It’s right here in your hands. Take advantage of it. Take advantage of the education! It’s yours!

Rose expressed disappointment that the scholarship is offered to Virginia residents only. She has three sisters that live out-of-state who are ineligible to participate. She stated, “A lot of people who left when the schools closed, they left. Some of them never came back.” Rose also wished that the Brown Scholarship Fund Committee would offer a scholarship program for each of the public school systems that closed as a result of massive resistance: “They need to give funds to a school system or scholarships to the schools and give them to the students.”

**Judy.** Judy is a 68-year-old retired government employee. When the scholarship program first started, Judy worked in the District of Columbia (D.C.) and lived in Northern Virginia. Judy’s sister, who lived in Prince Edward County, contacted her about the scholarship program. Even though Judy was approaching retirement, she decided to apply. Judy began taking business courses in 2005 from Marymount University, Arlington, Virginia, which allowed her to “leave work and go straight to class.” Judy conveyed her initial anxiety about returning to college late in life. “I was apprehensive ‘cause I thought everybody would be, you know, a lot younger. And I’m going to be around a lot of teenagers, and I wouldn't fit in.” However, Judy stated that her fellow students were supportive and her experience at Marymount was positive. Judy attended
Marymount for two semesters. During that time, Judy made a decision to retire and move to Prince Edward County. The following semester, as she prepared for retirement, Judy enrolled in the St. Paul’s satellite program offered at the R.R. Moton Museum in Farmville, Virginia. For a three-month period, she traveled from Northern Virginia to the museum for her classes and continued to work in D.C. She moved back to Prince Edward County in 2006 and completed her degree in 2010. She stated that her decision to receive her B.S. was “really just an opportunity to further something, you know, an education, and it wasn't going to cost me anything so I thought, why not take advantage of it.” Additionally, she suggested that completing her degree was a way for her to be a role model to her children.

Judy discussed the impact the historical school closings had on her life. The year the schools closed was also a time of loss in her life. Judy shared, “…the schools closed in ‘59 and my grandmother, who lived with us, she died in December of ‘59. And my father died in March of ‘60.” Despite their family’s loss, Judy discussed the sacrifice her mom made to assure her an education. Judy’s mom arranged to have her live with a relative in Baltimore and attend schools there. Judy said of her mother’s sacrifice, “…she was left to tend the farm and do domestic work and to work by herself.” Judy recalled her mother sending the host family fresh fruit from the farm as a way to pay them for their care: “They didn't share with us even though Mom sent it but ah [silence]. We got through it.” Judy expressed difficulty remembering her time in Baltimore and suggested that the memories of being away from home are just too painful to recall:
Growing up in the country where there are no streetlights, no sidewalks, no anything. You leave this and go to a place and it’s a whole different ballgame. And my memory of anything that had to do with Baltimore and there with the school is gone. I remember where I lived, I remember who was in the house. I don't remember the name of the school. I can’t remember or picture any of the students, the teachers. I can’t picture what I took. I don't remember any of the classes. It’s just all a blank. It’s like I, I have no knowledge of it.

As a result, Judy expressed that she feels that the Brown scholarship Fund cannot restore what was lost: “As far as restoration. I don't feel it impacted my life.”

Judy spoke at length about the fact that there were so many individuals who would or could not take advantage of the scholarship. She referred to her brother’s schooling experience in particular. After the schools reopened, her brother returned to Prince Edward County but did not finish his education. Judy shared that this was a reality for many other displaced students. She conveyed that when the schools reopened in 1964, many of the displaced students were placed in grades with children younger than they were. Judy stated, “They were not going to go back at a certain age with a bunch of first, second, third graders. ‘Cause they were a lot older, bigger. It was uncomfortable for them.” Judy continued that these individuals, including her brother, declined to take part in the scholarship program:

They aren’t accepting it. GEDs [General Education Development], all of that. They could do it, but I don't know if they are embarrassed, or they just feel like
maybe, they feel like, in his case, I think he feels like people don't know. So he’s not going to put himself out there pursuing something like this.

Judy spoke at length about the importance of creating awareness of the history of the school closings and cited the scholarship “as a good introduction, if you will.” Further, Judy stated that what was at the, “forefront of my head is that [silence]. I, I was willing at the age of 12 and 13 to give my life up for freedom and opportunities that everyone else had. And I felt very [emphasis added] strongly about that.” Judy spoke about her relationship with a granddaughter who continually encourages Judy to share her story:

…she was just a little girl when I first started talking to her about this. And what won me over was her interest. I mean even today we sit and talk about civil rights and black history for hours. And she, her appearance, her energy, everything she puts in to it makes me feel like she really wants to know.

This dialogue with her granddaughter holds significance to Judy. She talked about the fact that, from her experience, there is continued racism: “I went to a supervisory board meeting and things like that…and the same people that made the same decision, even though they are not the same people, got the same mentality. And you know it’s very sad.” Judy continued that she does not see the necessary dialogue on race relations in the Prince Edward community stating, “the only way you are going to heal. Is to talk about it.”

Jean. Jean is a 58-year-old woman who has worked for a division of Virginia’s Department of Social Services located in Prince Edward County for the past 30 years.
Currently she supervises seven other employees. Jean learned about the *Brown* Scholarship Fund from her sister-in-law. She was unsure whether she qualified for the program, because she was only three years old when schools were closed. However, by the time they reopened in 1964, she had lost two years of schooling. As a result, she was considered eligible for the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. When Jean applied to the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, she already had an associate degree, but she believed that to obtain her bachelor’s degree would be a good next step. She described the day she found out she was accepted to the program:

“That was the most exciting time! I was so excited. So excited and I remember thinking, saying, “Are you for real? *Is this for REAL?*” [emphasis added] ‘Cause I couldn't believe it. I didn't know what to say! As soon as I got off the phone, I called my husband to let him know I got it.

Jean attended the satellite program offered by St. Paul’s College at the R.R. Moton Museum in Farmville, Virginia. She completed her B.S. in Business Administration in 2008. Jean continued to apply to the *Brown* Scholarship Fund to use the award toward a master’s degree from Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia. She completed her Master’s in Executive Leadership and Human Services with a minor in counseling in 2012.

Jean considered herself fortunate. She was a high school dropout. Six years later, she landed a part-time summer job working for a government program within the Department of Health and Human Services. Her experience there prompted her to go back to school to get her General Education Development (GED). As a result, she was
hired by the same government agency and has worked there ever since. Jean said that as a result of her work experience, she decided to take post-secondary classes to obtain an associate degree. She continued to be promoted at work. At one point she realized she was training individuals with more advanced degrees than she had: “…I said, ‘Okay. I got to fix this.’ So that’s when I went back and got my bachelor’s.”

Even though Jean had her associate degree, she was still nervous on the first night of class. However, Jean stated that the St. Paul’s professors were very supportive. Additionally, she acknowledged the significance of having a satellite program at the local R.R. Moton Museum by stating that people her age would not drive any real distance to attend college. Jean also shared her surprise that other local post-secondary institutions did not offer similar programs. Jean conveyed, “Other universities nearby did not appear to be very receptive.”

Jean discussed her decision to obtain a master’s degree. “The master’s, I wanted to do that because I wanted to show my children.” Receiving her master’s degree allowed Jean to supplement her full-time work with part-time work as a qualified mental health provider. Moreover, Jean expressed that her management style changed as a result of her course work.

Throughout her reflections on the scholarship, Jean spoke continually of feeling empowered. When speaking about her decision to return to school, she remarked, “I have control of my life,” and also commented, “…if you empower yourself. You empower others.” Her pride surrounding her academic achievements was evident: “I have the
degrees on the wall of my office. If we get done here you should stop by and look at them.”

Regardless of the impact the scholarship had on her career, Jean stated that her education was more of “a personal journey.” Jean discussed her love for her job and her belief that the summer job that prompted her to get her GED saved her. She continued, “I will do this as long as I’m allowed to.” Further, most important to Jean was her ability to stay in her community: “I wasn't looking for a gain in money from the scholarship ‘cause I knew that wasn't going to happen here and I’m not willing to move.”

One of Jean’s concerns about the Brown Scholarship Fund was the extensive application process. Jean suggested, “Some people, you know, wouldn't know how to fill out the forms. You couldn't expect that of them. They wouldn’t even want or have a GED. There is a whole population that is not getting this.” Jean also spoke about her seven siblings and the fact that even though all seven were impacted by the school closings, only one other sibling participated in the scholarship program. She believed that this was due to the fact that “they needed to work and just didn't have the time.”

Wilma. Wilma is a 64 year-old female who works full-time as a Registered Nurse (RN). She has been taking courses toward her Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) since age 40, and she holds several certifications. Wilma saw the Brown Scholarship Fund as a great opportunity to complete her BSN. It was Wilma’s intention to take courses from the St. Paul’s satellite program and transfer the credits toward her BSN at Lynchburg College in Lynchburg, Virginia. She applied to the Brown Scholarship Fund and was accepted. After attending several classes at the beginning of the semester, she
began to question the course work: “To me it wasn't a real good learning experience.”

When she spoke to the instructors at Lynchburg about the St. Paul’s program, they
informed her that “some of those classes wouldn't transfer.” As a result, Wilma pulled out
of the St. Paul’s program and withdrew from the Brown Scholarship Fund program.

Wilma conveyed deep disappointment that the St. Paul’s program was not
applicable to her BSN degree. She spoke about her long journey to becoming an RN. She
was 11 when the schools reopened, but she had dropped out of school by ninth grade. She
married, got pregnant at 16, and moved to Maryland. At night, she attended classes
toward her GED. She became an LPN around age 24 and was determined to become an
RN by age 40. Wilma discussed her difficulty teaching herself prerequisite material that
was necessary to understanding college coursework:

…I’m wondering, what they are learning right now ‘cause I’m not sure. I have to
go home and look up what they are talking about, plus I have to learn from the
class. I am telling you, that was double work!

Wilma also discussed the financial burden of funding her post-secondary studies: “I
applied to every grant there was when I was in school. It was time consuming, but like I
said, if you want it bad enough, you've got to want something bad enough to do it.”

Although Wilma pulled out of the St. Paul’s program, she did use the Brown
Scholarship Fund for a computer course held at the historic, private, White-only, Fuqua
School. Wilma recognized that computer competency would be essential to the field of
nursing: “In medicine everything was getting pushed to computers. So I wanted to get
ahead and get ready for the computer change.” Wilma discussed her reasons for taking
the course at Fuqua stating, “I only took a computer class that was convenient. School was just two blocks around from here.”

Her experience in the computer class was challenging due to her age: “So I felt out of place, to be in this thing. You know, not with my peers, but with these 30-year-old young things. They already knew some things about computers so it would just kind of click for them.” Further, Wilma talked about the embarrassment she felt for not being computer literate:

I’m slowing the class down by calling her back to help me. So then, you really feel bad when they assign a student to come and help so they can move on. So you get to the point where you just aren’t going to ask anymore. You know, you know I felt dumb.

Fortunately for Wilma, taking the computer class and focusing on attaining computer literacy paid off. She reported, “We had the biggest bunch of people quit when we went from paper to computer. And I just hung in there.” Wilma summarized her lifetime efforts to be competent in her profession, saying, “It was a long climb and I had to push to do so.”

Overall, Wilma stated the Brown Scholarship Fund does not attend to the needs of displaced students: “It wasn't a strong program. It was just to pacify to kind of say they did it.” Further, Wilma suggested that the implementation of the program came too late. She communicated, “They are not so interested now. They’ve already got a job. They are settled in and if they didn't get that part of the education, they can barely read, write.”
Wilma further discussed that difficulties with literacy made the Brown Scholarship Fund application inaccessible to most displaced students. Wilma identified the application process as the biggest deterrent to potential applicants: “I mean it was a packet they sent you. A packet [emphasis added]! I wish I had one now. Ha! I think I threw them all out, but it was like a big, yellow manila folder and it was thick [emphasis added].” Wilma was annoyed by the scholarship application, which asked questions on personal goals, income, and school history.

Wilma summarized her feelings on the scholarship program: “I can’t say anything good about the scholarship. I just can’t. It didn't do anything for me and the way it was set up, what I wanted to get out of it, I couldn't get out of it.”

Joe. Joe is a 58-year-old male. He founded and operated a local business from 1978-2007, but he had to close his business due to a physical disability. Joe heard about the St. Paul’s College satellite program offered in the town of Farmville and decided to take advantage of the free opportunity. He applied to the Brown Scholarship Fund with hopes of attending the program. Like Jean, Joe was not enrolled in school when Prince Edward County schools closed in 1958, but by the time they reopened, he had missed two years of education. Joe was awarded a Brown Scholarship in 2005 and completed his B.S. in Business Administration in 2009.

Joe spoke about his decision to take part in the scholarship program: “I guess it’s something that I never thought that I would be doing. But I was glad to be doing it. ‘Cause you know right after high school, I went off to work.” Joe spoke about the reality of returning to school thirty years later: “It was, I would say, it was a little more difficult
‘cause I would say it was on a higher level. A much more higher level than I was use to. Even my running my own business was not on that high of a level.”

Joe spoke about how proud he was to receive his bachelor’s and what it felt like to graduate from St. Paul’s: “I never thought, I mean I was in business, and I never thought that I would get a chance to go to college. But I did [emphasis added] it! You see, through that scholarship I did [emphasis added] it.”

Joe believes his disability prevented him from achieving tangible gains as a result of his bachelor’s degree: “The disability kept me from it all. Even though I went through the class, I couldn't further myself anymore. ‘Cause maybe I could have kept my business and I could have advanced my business with more computer skills.” However, Joe credits St. Paul’s and the satellite program for his ability to complete his degree despite his failing health. He said, “If it hadn’t been offered to me and classes weren’t offered in Farmville…I would have never taken it.”

Joe conveyed his disappointment that no other colleges offered programs in conjunction with the Brown Scholarship Fund “And nobody, none of the other colleges in the area said anything. We don't have anyone to thank but St. Paul’s.” Joe was particularly disappointed that other institutions did not offer programs because local universities often benefitted from local business owners: “And I supported those universities though my business. And I mean it was never offered.”

Joe was disappointed in one other aspect of the Brown Scholarship Program regarding computer usage. Joe reported that students were required to use computers for their coursework. However, many students did not have a computer or the funds to
purchase one. Joe stated that several scholarship recipients went to Richmond to petition the Brown Scholarship Fund Committee to supply students with computers, however, their request was denied. This decision upset Joe, as he did not understand the Committee’s decision not to support them with resources that were essential to their learning. Additionally, Joe stated that they had to take a computer test at the end of the program. Joe did not believe that St. Paul’s provided adequate training in computer skills. Hence, Joe stated, “I had to go out on my own to get the computer skills to pass the test.”

Ellie. Ellie was involved in the Get on the Bus Campaign, a grassroots movement that lobbied the General Assembly to approve and provide funding for the Brown Scholarship Program. Ellie completed her B.S., from Johnson C. Smith College, Charlotte, North Carolina in 1972 and went on to work for a government agency for 31 years. She is now retired and has authored a book and continues to volunteer in the community.

Ellie discussed her involvement with the Get on the Bus Campaign and the decision by the organization to ride school buses to the General Assembly to lobby for the Brown Scholarship Fund. Ellie said the Get on the Bus Campaign was committed to persuading the General Assembly to offer more than the statement of regret they provided in House Resolution 613:

One of the ideas that came forward was to go on school buses. And we said okay, we wanna ride in on the school buses. To have these former students who didn’t have school buses come to the General Assembly, surely it’s got to have some sort of impact.
Like Suzanne, Ellie spoke to the General Assembly on behalf of the other displaced students. She explained how nerve-wracking an experience it was for her:

What am I gonna say, you know, what am I gonna do? And I was just, just terrified, you know, and uh, I started to write little things on a napkin, and I don’t know what I did with that napkin ‘cause when I got there the napkin went one way and I went the other, but I did, I did [emphasis added] address the General Assembly that day.

Because Ellie had completed her B.S. in 1972 shortly after high school, she explained that she was not originally interested in applying to the Brown Scholarship Fund. However, after several years, she decided to apply to the scholarship program and take courses from Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia, toward a master’s degree. Unfortunately, Ellie’s brother fell sick and her mother died during her program of studies. As a result, Ellie completed only two semesters before leaving the program to provide support to her family.

Ellie discussed the importance of her family and how they assured an education for her during the 1959-1964 closings. Her father, who worked for the railroads, knew of an abandoned home they could rent in a neighboring community. Every day during the period of the school closures, their dad would drive them to the house, and Ellie and her siblings would pretend they lived there. When the schools reopened, Ellie was unsure if she would return to Prince Edward County to complete her education. She expressed her hesitance to return: “I had established friends, my classes, my teachers so I didn’t wanna…go, you know. Um. At the same time, I knew that financially it was the best
thing for my parents to do.” Her parents, however, made the decision for Ellie not to return to Prince Edward County public schools.

Not all of Ellie’s siblings completed their schooling. Ellie shared that her brother, who lived in California, was “educationally illiterate.” Ellie described what happened in Prince Edward County as educational genocide: “Nobody rushed to the aid of the students of Prince Edward County. These were children, your most precious cargo, and yet they let them suffer for five years; the legislators let this happen.” Although Ellie believes the scholarship is a good opportunity, she also believes that there are those who simply cannot participate in the program: “It afforded the opportunity to those who had the strength to seek better educational opportunities, to do it. Those who were beaten so badly, they couldn’t go back, that was it.”

For those individuals who suffered most from the school closings, Ellie discussed the need for literacy training. Ellie shared that when she was working she often met people who were illiterate as a result of the school closings:

I’d see them every day in my office. They come to me ‘cause they see my face and they think, you know she may be able to help me. And so they come to me because they couldn’t read, or write, or fill out an application, or anything.

Ellie discussed the generational impact of this phenomenon and asserted that neither the Brown Scholarship Fund nor the Prince Edward County School system have recognized this. As a result, Ellie shared her concerns for families whose parents were illiterate due to the school closings.
Further, Ellie discussed that displaced students should be brought to the policy table to discuss the issues that remain in Prince Edward County. However, Ellie believes that this will not happen, as race relations remain strained. To support her belief, Ellie shared that during the Get on the Bus Campaign, the organization sent information to churches throughout the county, both African American and White. “No White churches responded, and it’s because of – I can’t say exactly, I feel like – it’s because of what’s happened and people still trying to cover things up.” Ellie continued that many individuals either want to cover it up or feel that people should just move on:

And I know people say, ‘Oh, you need to get over it,’ ‘move forward,’” move forward,” fine, but how am I gonna move forward if I don’t acknowledge that it happened, you know? How we gonna heal, how we gonna grow?”

**Miles.** Miles is a 62-year-old male who works full-time as a counselor. He found out about the scholarship program through his church. Additionally, Miles had a close friend who participated in the *Brown* Scholarship Fund program the first year and encouraged him to apply. Miles had been working towards his bachelor’s since he graduated from high school in 1970. He attained his associate degree but, because he changed his course of study several times, never completed his bachelor’s degree. Participating in the *Brown* Scholarship Fund was an opportunity for Miles to achieve a “life goal.”

Miles talked about his educational journey. When the schools closed, his parents secured different educational opportunities for their children. One of Miles’ brothers went to a military academy, and another was placed at a private prep school in New
Hampshire. The rest of the Miles’ siblings went to school in the neighboring community of Cumberland. As Miles was only five years old when the schools were closed, his parents sent him to a one-room schoolhouse close by. Miles said his parents would tell his siblings that going away to school was an opportunity: “They presented it as, this is an opportunity for you to go outside of Farmville, outside of Virginia, and to experience the world to a greater degree.” But Miles recalls that having his siblings live far away was difficult for his parents because they rarely heard from them: “It took a lot. It took a lot for them.”

Miles’ two brothers lived the rest of their lives outside of Virginia. He reported that both siblings would have participated in the program if it had been offered to non-state residents. Unfortunately, one of his brothers has died since the initiation of the program. Miles felt strongly about the fact that many individuals did not live long enough to reap the rewards of the scholarship program. As a result, Miles suggested that deceased individuals should be able to advance their scholarship funds to the next generation.

Miles expressed frustration over two Brown Scholarship Fund policies and procedures. First, he found the application process to be cumbersome. Miles believes the application needs to be shortened: “Any simplification and reduction in the application process would be great because a number of people who might qualify might be intimidated by the large numbers of papers to fill out and the processes involved.” Second, Miles shared that there was often a delay in the delivery and processing of Brown funds to the universities. As a result, Miles had to secure funds independently to cover the beginning of the semester:
School started in September, I think I received the funds in ah…two weeks before the semester was over. You know, so, that kind was a little challenging. Yeah, and the bills and you know. I was able to get some short-term loans and juggled things around, but that’s very expensive and very tiring, and in effect, eats up part of the scholarship that is meant to pay for the expense of going to school.

Miles further discussed his view on the Virginia General Assembly’s efforts to make amends through the Brown Scholarship Fund. He suggested that regardless of efforts made by the General Assembly, there remains much anger over the school closings: “It’s ah probably impossible really to restore the dignity, the pain. I don’t think that people who actually went through it, in terms of being displaced, in terms of an education, will ever forget, or ever let that die.” Miles explained that these emotions were valid due to the long-term impact the school closings had on their lives; for those “who felt the crush, the weight of the school closings on their lives for decades and decades, the pain is perhaps closer to the surface.”

Regardless of Miles’ belief that the Brown Scholarship Fund cannot make amends, Miles expressed gratitude for the program and the opportunity to complete his bachelor’s. Miles shared that as a result of his college degree, he was able to secure a job as a full-time counselor. Miles works with individuals who are diagnosed with both substance abuse and mental health issues. As a 19-year recovering alcoholic himself, Miles feels his work holds special significance. Not only can he empathize with his patients, but also he now has the tools to help individuals through their recovery. Currently, Miles is still receiving Brown Scholarship funding and is one semester from
completing his Master’s in Counseling from Virginia State University, Petersburg, Virginia.

**Debbie.** Debbie is a 63-year-old woman who was seven years old when the schools closed. When she returned to school at age 11 or 12, she was placed in the third grade. As a result, she did not graduate from Prince Edward County public schools until 1972, at the age of 20. Debbie continued her education by taking course work in nursing and completing her LPN. She works full time as a health care provider. She heard about the Brown Scholarship Fund through the local newspaper and decided it would be an opportunity for her to complete her Registered Nurse (RN) degree. When she applied to the Brown Scholarship Fund program, she had approximately three or four courses left in order to fulfill her degree requirements.

According to Debbie, she applied to the Brown Scholarship Fund and was accepted to the program in 2005. Debbie enrolled in four classes at Southside Community College, Keysville, Virginia in order to complete her RN degree, but dropped two during the semester. She stated, “With my age and everything, it was just too much.” As a seasoned student, Debbie reported that she made sure to drop the classes within the University required time frame: “I dropped the class in the time frame the university told me I had to drop it. I did not go over that. I made sure.” Debbie also stated that she was careful to maintain passing grades. However, at the end of the semester, the Brown Scholarship Fund refused to pay for her courses. She said, it really upset me because I had been going to college off and on for years.” Debbie tried to investigate why her courses were not paid for:
And I called back to the scholarship funds and all, and I kept calling the college. And calling and calling. And finally just gave up on it. I should have really stayed in there and fought. Why they wouldn't pay it? But to this day I do not know why they wouldn't pay for me and those classes.

Financial difficulties were not the only trials Debbie faced in her fight to get an education. Throughout her life, Debbie struggled with literacy as a result of the school closings. Debbie communicated, “they took all of my formal education from me, my elementary education. I had language wrong, verb agreement, noun agreement, stuff like that. All my formal word pronunciation, spelling, my formal reading.” Debbie continued to discuss how this impacted her as an adult learner: “Even when I went to the LPN program, you know, I had to carry a dictionary around with me to look up words and spellings. That’s why it took me longer to do my homework.”

As a result of Debbie’s disappointing experience with the Brown Scholarship Fund and her lifelong struggle with literacy, Debbie believes that the program does not restore anything and is simply an effort to change public opinion: “You know, they just wanted to put a patch on to make the public think that they doing something. But for us who had to struggle and live with it, they didn't.” Debbie continued, “if they wanted to do anything they should have helped us with tutoring.” Additionally, Debbie expressed disappointment in the Brown Scholarship Fund program and the decision not to fund theology studies:

Really they should be paying for any classes that we elect to go to. Just like I’m taking theology class now. But I pay my way. What’s the difference between me
trying to go be an evangelist and that type of study and someone else going to study to be a counselor?

**Sally.** Sally is 67 years old. She has worked as a supervisor in the food services division at a local prison for the past 15 years. She learned about the Brown Scholarship Fund from local media and signed up immediately. The same year, Sally suffered a heart attack. Rather than walk away from the scholarship, she renewed her scholarship in 2007 to attend the St. Paul’s College satellite program held at the R.R. Moton Museum in Farmville, Virginia. Sally discussed her decision to return to school at such a late age: “I did this because I was crazy, crazy! Because it was hard for me at that age and I hadn’t been in school all of that time.”

Sally graduated from St. Paul’s in 2010 with a B.S. in Business Administration. Sally believes that as a result of taking part in the Brown Scholarship Fund program she improved her literacy. “I didn't have the greatest reading ability when I came out of high school. St. Paul was beneficial to me because I learned my vocabulary. You know, my reading skills.” Sally also stated that completing the B.S. was a source of personal achievement:

It was unreal, really. I said, “Oh boy, I graduated from college.” And all of my kids came. And you go there and all these young people are graduating. You got all these young folks and you are standing there and you are almost 64 years. And you are graduating right along all of them.

Despite the successful completion of her bachelor’s degree, Sally had no intentions of changing her job. Her hope was to stay working as a prison supervisor until
retirement. Sally conceded that her decision not to change jobs assured that her salary stayed the same. However, Sally’s decision to return to school to obtain a bachelor’s was something she had “always wanted to do.”

Although Sally enjoyed being a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient, she stated that the program did not meet the needs of many of the Prince Edward County displaced students. Sally talked about her return to the schools in 1964: “They started me off in the eighth grade when I got back and it was like – not knowing anything almost.” Sally shared that her difficult return to the Prince Edward County public school system was not uncommon, and as a result, many students failed to complete their education. Sally stated, “that’s the way it was for a lot of people. They never graduated and some of them didn't go back to get their GED either.” Sally offered that the Brown Scholarship Fund should be more sensitive to this and offer tutoring or an easier way to obtain a GED. Sally reported that, “the GED was mostly offered in the afternoon. Some people were working at nights and they couldn't do it.” Sally summarized her thoughts about the Brown Scholarship Fund:

This didn't restore anything for me. ‘Cause you can’t go back and get that back. I mean I could never go back and get the education from the four years I lost. I lost a lot. And anyone who didn't go anywhere lost a lot by not being able to go to school during that time.

**Carol.** Carol is a 62-year-old woman who has worked for the local Community Services Board as a social worker for 30 years. Prior to her acceptance to the Brown Scholarship Fund program in 2005, Carol had completed course work at Southside
Community College, Keysville, Virginia and Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia. She often took one or two classes at a time because she was paying out-of-pocket. Carol learned about the scholarship through the local newspaper and was excited about the opportunity to potentially finish her degree using the scholarship funds. She applied to attend the St. Paul’s satellite program offered at the R.R. Moton Museum, Farmville, Virginia.

Carol was grateful that the St. Paul’s program was local, but expressed disappointment that only two degrees were offered, one in business and the other in criminal justice: “I was very disappointed because I really wanted the…um, the social work degree.” Carol’s completion of her degree in 2010 coincided with the Department of Mental Health’s implementation of a new requirement that employees possess a bachelor’s degree. Fortunately for Carol, even though her degree was not in social work, the department honored her degree, and she received a pay raise.

Carol described the educational journey that led to her eventual bachelor’s degree. Because of the school closings, Carol did not begin school until she was 10 years old. As a result, high school was particularly difficult. Carol shared, “because of my age, I went through social promotion. And so, I lost so many years.” Carol was employed directly after high school at a factory before leaving that job to work in food services at a nearby university. She stated that it was through her food service job at a university that she decided to return to school. She relayed her experiences listening to students talk: “I would stand and listen to ‘em talk and talk about the classes, and you know, in my spirit, I was telling the Lord, I can do that. I know I can do that given an opportunity. I can do
that.” Carol proceeded to enroll in general studies courses at a community college because she was unable to pass a test for enrollment into regular college courses. She was approximately 27 years old when she returned to school. She was also a single mother and caregiver to two adopted siblings she took in following the death of her parents. Carol described what was required to continue her education and eventually complete her bachelor’s degree: “I disciplined myself for my studies, full-time job, dealing with family, and it was overwhelming. But in the midst of everything I stayed focused as far as my classwork was concerned. ‘Cause I knew how important it was to me.”

Carol spoke of the great pleasure derived from her achievement. “It made me feel good, simply because…after everything with the closing of the schools and everything, I…I just didn’t think that I was able to achieve that.” Carol shared a story that demonstrated the bliss she experienced when graduating from St. Paul’s. It was the day of graduation rehearsal and she was walking across campus with a friend when she stopped her and stated that she was going to go into a dormitory building. When her friend asked why, Carol responded, “Who’s going to graduate from college and never have been in a dorm?” Carol proceeded to march into the dorm and reported, “And I did, I went in, I walked the halls and the rooms and looked in the showers, I mean I just went through the whole thing. And I came out. I was fine. So, it was complete.”

**Mike.** Mike is a 65-year-old male and the founder and operator of a small business located in Prince Edward County. He has been in business for the past thirty years. Mike’s second vocation is politics, and he has served many roles as a political activist since the late 1970s. As a result, Mike was involved in many of the initial
meetings where legislators developed a draft of The Brown Scholarship Fund: “We met with the, the legislative black caucus in Williamsburg the year before they passed it and they came on board.”

Mike spoke of the legislative patrons that supported the Brown Scholarship Fund. The following is a recap of Mike’s dialogue substantiated by information obtained online from Virginia’s Legislative Information System. According to Mike, there were three Senate patrons in 2004: Yvonne Miller, Mamie Locke, and Henry L. Marsh III. All three senators were African American. The chief patron from the House was Viola O. Baskerville, also African American (HB 846 Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund, 2004). The original bill had a total of 35 House patrons and three Senate patrons. The following year, another African American senator, Benjamin Lambert, became lead patron and put forth a change in the Brown Scholarship Fund program to provide funding for books and supplies (SB 443 Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund, 2006).

Mike was sure to bring attention to Senator Henry L. Marsh III. Marsh had served as the lawyer with Sam Tucker on several legal cases surrounding the Griffin v. Board, 1964 case. Mike presented that it was through Senator Marsh’s historic knowledge of the Prince Edward County school closings that other legislators took the bill seriously. Mike claimed that Senator Marsh deserved the credit for the creation of the scholarship program.

Mike was also involved in creating a relationship with St. Paul’s College and the satellite program in Prince Edward County: “They agreed that they would work with us
on this particular program and the most historical place to have this would be at Moton Museum.” Mike recognized that other areas in the Commonwealth had closed schools due to massive resistance, but Prince Edward County held particular significance due to the length of the closings.

Mike was initially not interested in applying to the Brown Scholarship Fund. In 1979, he had completed an Associate of Science from John Tyler Community College, Midlothian, Virginia. “I kind of felt that it was set up for people who was shut out of school or at least affected by it, but also who wanted to get a better job,” he commented. Mike went on to say that he was not interested in going back to school or finding another job, but on the encouragement of Senator Lambert, he decided to apply.

Mike described his emotions at his first class in the St. Paul program: “I was a little touchy the first night of classes. I mean I hadn’t been in school since the late 70s.” As a business owner, it was logical for Mike to get a degree in St. Paul’s Bachelors in Business Administration. Mike found the coursework in marketing to be applicable to his work. Additionally, Mike found the program to enrich his personal growth and development.

Overall, however, Mike expressed deep disappointment that the Brown Scholarship Fund did not achieve what he hoped it would:

But you know one thing that disturbed me more than anything. Most of the people that took it in Farmville with me never used it. I had kind of thought, in my own mind, that other members would use their degree to get a different job, a better job, or start some business on their own. But they didn't. I mean one person. He
died first part of the year. He never did benefit. I guess it benefitted him as a person. But it never benefitted him otherwise.

Mike also stated he was disappointed that local businesses did not capitalize on the Brown Scholarship Fund. “I’m shocked that some company didn't grab one of these Brown scholars and say, “Hey we hired one of these Brown scholars…Look we understand what happened back then.” Mike argued that a decision to hire a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient would be a great marketing tool. He suggested business could tout, “We’re sorry that happened and we have one of the scholars to advise us on race relations.”

Mike also expressed dissatisfaction with the program’s lack of support for displaced students who lived out-of-state. In conclusion, Mike stated that at this time, he believes the scholarships should be given to the next generation. In his words, “you missed the prime group ‘cause they are now in the twilight of their life.”

Cross-Case Themes

Fourteen individual Prince Edward County African Americans who were denied education as a result of massive resistance from 1959-1964 and were also recipients of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund were interviewed about their perceptions of the scholarship program. Interviews were designed to explore the research questions and therefore, explored (a) recipients’ perceptions of the Brown Scholarship Fund and (b) what if any, impact the program had on the lives of the recipients. Following are the themes identified as part of the cross-case analysis based on individual case findings. The first theme, restoration unfulfilled, explored both research
questions and suggested that recipients had an overall positive experience but that the policy did not positively impact the economic status of the participants. Additionally, the goal of restoration, which aims to achieve a sense of justice (Yamamoto, 1997) was also unfulfilled. All participants provided policy suggestions on how to revise the scholarship program in order to achieve restoration and these suggestions are presented in theme two. Theme three discussed what necessary structures must be in place for recipients to achieve any level of success in the program as it exists now. Theme four demonstrated that the recipients of the scholarship program have shared characteristics. This finding suggests that the scholarship program may attract individuals who exhibit these characteristics.

**Theme one: Restoration unfulfilled.** When exploring the recipients’ perceptions of the scholarship program, 11 individuals reported that the scholarship experience provided them an opportunity for personal growth and development. Two of the participants did not have a positive experience with the scholarship program and found no benefit to taking part in the program. The one remaining participant had completed a degree in the 1970s, and her scholarship experience was cut short due to family illness. Personal growth and development included feelings of immense pride, empowerment and visibility and are discussed in order of significance. Figure 2 provides a visual of (Q1) how the participants perceive the scholarship program and (Q2) what, if any impact the policy had on their lives. Further, this figure illustrates how the overall impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund resulted in restoration unfulfilled.
Figure 2. Theme one: Research questions and restoration unfulfilled.

**Pride.** By participating in the scholarship program, recipients developed a great sense of pride for their achievement. In particular, recipients discussed how significant the completion of their degree was to them on a personal level. Cheryl discussed that the completion of the degree made her feel positive about herself. Joe, Suzanne, Jean, Miles and Mike also discussed that fulfilling their life goal of completing college created a sense of pride. Mike stated, “Graduating had special significance. Now we were pushing to success despite all of the odds that we had put against us. And that probably means more than anything.”
Six participants also demonstrated that pride came as a result of participating in their graduation ceremonies. Suzanne conveyed her emotions the day of graduation:

It’s just unbelievable the feeling that you get walking and standing with thousands of people as you get ready to walk down this hill and ah, being on the screen as you walk down and just thousands of people just seeing you. That really made me feel like I had achieved. That I had finally achieved.

Additionally, the data demonstrated that the graduation ceremonies took on significance and were a source of great pride when witnessed by families and friends that knew of the participants’ struggle to be educated. Carol provided an example: “Pride! That’s all, that’s all I can tell you….My whole family was there and there’s 12 of us. All of ‘em, nieces, nephews, they were just cheering me on. It was awesome.” Carol continued, “I just didn’t think that I was able to achieve that. And it took me a long time to get there.”

**Empowerment.** Some individuals stated that the new skills they obtained gave them a sense of empowerment. Carol, Ellie, Jean, Joe, Mike, Miles, and Sally reported that they gained skills in reading or skills that were beneficial to their work. Sally said of the improvements she made in reading, “I mean I learned my vocabulary. You know my reading skills, everything, ‘cause I really had to buckle down and get it.” Miles discussed the significance of becoming a licensed professional counselor (LPC). Joe discussed the improved skills he gained as a result of his business degree: “I was really glad though ‘cause it gave you more of an outlook on business and financials. Ah, how to read the financial reports and things. I was in a much better situation by taking it.” Jean similarly
discussed the skills she obtained from her business degree that improved her management style. Jean commented, “I have control of my life.”

**Visible.** Four of the participants discussed that the experiences they had as a *Brown* Scholarship Fund recipient made them feel visible to the rest of the world. Ellie discussed how when she was in college in the 1970s she was embarrassed by the school closings, but now she is no longer silent about what happened in Prince Edward County. Miles discussed that it restored his self-esteem and allowed him to shed the negative connotations he once carried as a displaced student. Cheryl stated as a result of group work, fellow students would share their stories. She recalled, “we cried so much together just things that would come out that probably hadn’t come out and people needed to get out.” Rose summarized what it felt to be a *Brown* Scholarship Fund recipient, “It made me feel like somebody else knew how we felt.”

**Economic.** According to Mike, who was involved in the initial drafting of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, one of the goals of the policy was “to improve everyone’s economic condition and improve everyone’s level of education even down to a GED.” However, only three of the displaced students discussed an improvement in occupational and financial standing as a result of participating in the scholarship program. Suzanne, who worked for the public school system, received a small stipend, but retired within two years of completing her bachelor’s. The only others that reported a financial impact or change in vocation were Jean and Miles, who both became LPCs. However, it is important to note that neither of these individuals changed their full-time employment. Jean now provides counseling to a handful of individuals in the evening and Miles
continues to work for a program that provides services to the mentally ill. However, Miles was able to improve his position by becoming a fulltime counselor at his place of work. The rest of the participants in this study reported that they were either not interested in changing their vocations or were retired and therefore, there were no financial benefits to receiving a college degree. As reported by Wilma, “You know you’re not going to change and go back to school and get another career at 50 or 60 years old.”

**Restoration.** Thirteen of the 14 interviewees conveyed sentiments that the Brown Scholarship Fund did not provide education restoration. In addition, there was unanimity that those who were directly impacted by the school closings were too old to reap the benefits of the Brown Scholarship Fund. John said of completing his bachelor’s, “I mean, I’m proud of having it. But I didn’t use it….There could have been a smarter use ‘cause it’s just a piece of paper at my age.” Judy directly addressed the term “education restoration,” stating, “Education restoration doesn't mean a whole lot. I don't think we are restoring anything. I mean I hear people say, we’ve apologized. We’ve done this. We are not going to say this is reparation. It's a restoration.”

Cheryl discussed that the emphasis was on education, but there was more to restore than an education. To demonstrate her point, she discussed the trauma her younger brother experienced as a result of attending school elsewhere. She reported he cried so hard and for so long, they had to bring him home. Cheryl continued,

This program only concentrates on sending individuals back to school. This however, does not recognize the effect not going to school had on the Prince
Edward County students who were deprived an education and the trauma it caused. Healing is not all about going back to school and an education. This community is still so broken.

Mike shared similar sentiments stating, “you can’t replace what’s done and you can never recapture the damage or undo the damage that’s done.” Suzanne spoke directly to her regret that she could not attend college in her youth. She reflected, “that’s the hurting part, I mean, you know, that whether you think about it or not, you will never know what you would have done or you could have been cause that was taken away from you.”

Finally, Wilma challenged the intentions of the Brown Scholarship Fund. “Whom are you restoring for? And who is deciding what is being restored? It shouldn’t be restoration. That shouldn’t be the word they are using.”

Theme two: Restoration revised. Every participant had policy concerns and suggestions. Age was a common thread for all policy suggestions. Data from the interviews suggested that restoration for the displaced students would include programs that were sensitive to age, generational, offered more options, and featured a more streamlined application processes.

Age. Regardless of whether the Brown Scholarship Fund was used for attending one computer class or completing a master’s degree, interviewees agreed that age altered their experience as a scholarship recipient. Mike explained:

You’ve got to realize the youngest was in their fifties, late fifties. The youngest! Well, I was fifty-seven when I graduated. And the older ones at that time were 62,
63. And it wasn't like they were in the prime of life. And usually at that point in life people start thinking about retirement or ten years more. They are not trying to get started all over again.

All but one participant reported that the program was offered too late in life. Ellie, who was involved in the Get on the Bus Campaign, stated that when the policy was passed “I was very hopeful and prayerful that when the dollars came the people would jump on it and take advantage to show them there was a need for it.” But ultimately Ellie reported, “I feel like as long as it’s been there, that everybody who was going to take advantage of it has probably taken advantage of it.”

**Generational.** Thirteen out of 14 participants agreed that the scholarship should be given to the next generation. Participants believed this was the best way to appropriate the scholarship funds. Eight interviewees expressed that the consequences of the school closings continue to impact the next generation due to literacy and economic issues. Miles stated, “I have tutored students who were not able to be tutored by their parents because they didn’t have the education because of the school closing to teach their children and help them with their homework.” Wilma, Ellie, Mike and Jean spoke about the fact that the Brown Scholarship Fund had been in place for 10 years and that it was time to pass it to the next generation. Wilma asked, “What are you going to do, just let it sit there if no one wants to apply for it?” Finally, Rose provided the novel idea of creating a scholarship program to be offered at each of the school closure sites to deserving students. Rose stated this would provide a long-term solution and a way to honor Virginia’s battle for civil rights in education.
**Options.** Twelve participants suggested that the services and degree offerings provided through the Brown Scholarship Fund should be broadened. This included providing out-of-state scholarships, more degree options, and literacy tutoring. Interviewees argued that until the program expanded, applications would continue to decline.

**Out-of-state.** Expanding the Brown Scholarship Fund included offering scholarship to displaced students living out-of-state. Seven individuals stated they had friends or relatives that were also displaced students that lived outside of the Commonwealth of Virginia. These individuals reported that the scholarship program should be made available to non-Virginians. Suzanne summarized the sentiments of the participants on this topic:

They should allow anyone that was affected to use it and not lend it just to Virginia people. I mean we are not just Virginia people because they closed all the schools and they had to leave. So why punish them because they are in another state? They wouldn't be there if school hadn’t closed. And that should have been the connection they made.

**Degree options.** Although, the individuals that graduated from the St. Paul’s satellite program expressed gratitude, five individuals discussed their desire to have more accessible degree options. These participants stated that they would have pursued a different degree such as nursing, psychology or social work. However, St. Paul’s college only offered bachelor’s programs in criminal justice or business. Further, four participants voiced their disappointment that the Brown Scholarship Fund did not provide
funding for theology studies. These individuals could not understand why the Brown Scholarship Fund would pay for things such as technical training but not theological studies. Suzanne expressed the frustration felt by the African American community over this decision. “Why won’t they allow us to go and get a degree in theology? So many of us here are ministers now cause that’s an avenue a lot of people took without an education.” Despite the lack of degree options, Rose summarized, “ultimately, it didn't matter what the program was that was offered. Receiving the degree paramounted the options.”

**Literacy training.** Four participants expressed a desire to see more literacy programs offered within the community. This concern went hand-in-hand with the fact that they believed the Brown Scholarship Fund application to be too complicated for many displaced students. Cheryl communicated that there was simply a lack of a support to assure that the scholarship program was utilized. Wilma reported, “the scholarship just wasn't what it was supposed to be. It could have been better utilized and it went to a very select few.”

**Theme three: Necessary structures.** All participants in the study discussed the specific elements that made the Brown Scholarship Fund a feasible program. These structures included accessibility, support from the receiving institution, and support from the African American community. Providing a program that was local was most significant for participants due to their age.

**Access.** The age of the displaced students currently range between the ages of 58 to 72. The participants for this study ranged between the ages of 58 to 68 years of age.
All fourteen participants reported that convenience was important. In order for them to take advantage of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, approved institutions of higher learning needed either to be local or provide accessible satellite programs. Wilma reported that “even bringing the school to the people, even then it was difficult.” Joe talked about closing his store for the day and going directly to class at the R.R. Moton Museum. Suzanne stated, “the only reason I was able to go to them was because they came to Prince Edward County and taught us in the walls of the Moton Museum.” Many individuals, like Cheryl, shared that going back to school had not been a part of their plans, but convenient location and the fact that it was free precipitated her participation. Eleven of the 14 participants in this study graduated with a Bachelor’s in Business Administration offered by St. Paul’s College through the satellite program held at the R.R. Moton Museum in Farmville, Virginia.

**Support from the receiving institution.** St. Paul’s was a historic African American college that ceased operation in 2013. In 2011, the college was stripped of its accreditation, and despite two years of probation and efforts from alumni to secure the college’s financial wellbeing, the school closed in 2013 (Hawkins, 2013). Before St. Paul’s closed its doors, it provided a satellite program to *Brown* Scholarship Fund recipients from 2005-2010. The college offered two bachelor’s degree options at the R.R. Moton Museum located in Prince Edward County in Farmville, Virginia. St. Paul’s was the only college that developed a satellite program that made post-secondary degrees available to the Prince Edward County displaced students, despite the fact that there are
several state-approved institutions of higher learning located within a ten mile radius of the county.

Eight of the 14 participants made reference to this in their interviews. Jean reported, “Other universities nearby did not appear to be very receptive.” Joe shared, “And nobody, none of the other colleges in the area said anything.” Suzanne stated, “Other universities didn't try to make enough accommodations for us to have classrooms or anything like that.” As reported, 11 of the participants successfully completed a bachelor’s degree from St. Paul. The other three participants used Brown Scholarship funds towards state-approved institutions of higher learning outside of Prince Edward County. These three participants did not complete their degree programs. Two of these participants were nursing students, and both reported issues with payment and procedures.

Support from faculty. The importance of making college accessible to the Prince Edward County displaced students was also apparent when participants discussed the St. Paul’s professors. According to the participants, professors provided exceptional support to the displaced students by their commitment to come to the R.R. Moton Museum to teach. Debbie reported how much she appreciated the long distance that the professors traveled just to teach them. Further, she reported that it was ironic that the professors often expressed concern about the students driving late at night when the professors traveled back and forth to Richmond. Debbie stated, “They’d teach and they’d get up the next morning and come to teach the students down here….I will never get over that. I thought it was the nicest thing they could have done,” Judy shared a similar sentiment:
“’Cause we were at the museum and the instructors came to us in the evening ‘cause it was after work and it was more laid back.”

*Instructional support.* All 11 St. Paul participants discussed how important it was that the professors understood their unique history and age. Miles stated, “the professors were understanding, they understood that we were, you know, older students who were interested in doing the work, getting it done, and moving on, who had lives, and obligations, and family, and jobs...” Joe reported, “I mean they didn't give us anything, but they [sic] sure we made it.” Jean corroborated, “the teachers at St. Paul’s were wonderful teachers that gave you much [emphasis added] support.” Joe spoke about several teachers who had great confidence that he would graduate: “I can name all of their names right now.”

*African American community.* African American organizations within the Prince Edward County African American community helped to make the *Brown* Scholarship Fund realizable. Eight of the 14 participants reported learning about the *Brown* Scholarship Fund through their African American churches; the R.R. Moton Museum, a museum dedicated to Prince Edward County’s battle for civil rights in education; or from a fellow displaced student. Moreover, four of the participants were involved in the Get on the Bus Campaign, a grassroots movement created by the community of Prince Edward County African American displaced students to lobby the General Assembly to approve and provide funding for the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. Suzanne discussed the community’s efforts to generate support through the creation of the Get on the Bus Campaign: “The main people who had started it, we would have meetings and we
decided to gather people in the community and the surrounding community and see if we could get people to go down to the general assembly on a bus.” This campaign additionally offered community members like Ellie and Suzanne a chance to testify their support of the program to the General Assembly. For the other participants, the Get on the Bus Campaign offered the opportunity to be witness to the policymaking of the Brown Scholarship Fund. Sally recollected,

They got us off the bus and we went on in and they told us you got to be quiet and all that. And we went on in and sat down in the little preacher-type things and we got to listen to everything that was going on in the Assembly.

Finally, Mike reported the importance of several key Prince Edward County African American community leaders and civil rights activists, including himself, who worked with the Black Caucus to draft the Brown Scholarship Fund: “Before people got involved with a Get on the Bus Campaign, before that even happened, there was lot going on to determine the value of it and draft the legislation for it.” Additionally, Mike discussed the local Prince Edward African American community that rallied to support the Brown Scholarship Fund:

I was working a lot through the Martha E. Forrester Council of Woman. This program was in place when the first Black high school was built….There were about 10 or 12 meetings and took us over a year to draft the scholarship. The editor of the local newspaper had a lot to do with the scholarship idea too.

How much influence the efforts of the Prince Edward County African Americans had on the passage of the Brown Scholarship Fund cannot be determined from the
participants’ interviews. However, as stated by Ellie, influencing the General Assembly was the agenda of African American-only organizations such as the Martha E. Forester Council and other members within the Prince Edward County. “That’s what the whole conversation was about. Everyone was driven by the fact that we needed, they needed [the General Assembly] to do more than say sorry.”

**Theme four: Characteristics of recipients.** All participants discussed that they were survivors of the school closings. The findings from this study suggested that the Prince Edward County African American displaced students shared several common characteristics. The characteristics that were common throughout the interview data suggested that being a survivor included obtaining literacy, valuing education, persevering, becoming a role model, and drawing support from faith and parents. For instance, individuals who dropped-out of high school went on to receive their General Education Development (GED) certificates, several received associate degrees, and others earned licensures in nursing. Before the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, they had secured education and vocation. Their personal journey of valuing education led them to participate in the *Brown* Scholarship Fund even though they knew that the resulting positive outcomes of achieving a college degree would be lessened with age. Their decision to participate in the program also stemmed from their desires to complete the education they believed they would have as young adults had the schools not closed. These characteristics were important to explore because it suggested that the program appealed to displaced students that demonstrated these characteristics.
Literacy. All fourteen participants discussed literacy. Literacy was cited as a facilitator of his or her own participation in the scholarship program and a deterrent factor for community members who were eligible to participate but did not. Seven participants discussed literacy in general; they emphasized that they were fortunate to be literate, but that for the majority of Prince Edward County displaced students, literacy remained an issue. John stated that literacy was an issue particularly for the displaced students who were not able to secure educational opportunities outside of Prince Edward County during the school closures.

Four participants discussed that problems with literacy made the Brown Scholarship Fund application inaccessible to many formerly displaced students. Wilma reported, “A lot of the people from the school closings can’t read or write, so who’s going to fill those out.” Jean and Cheryl shared that the application precluded the participation of displaced students who struggled with literacy. Miles noted that the form was complicated and, for many, difficult to make sense of.

Three participants discussed their personal efforts to attain literacy. Jean stated, “I knew I couldn't spell and so I knew I had to get that poor little dictionary out and spell things.” Rose also spoke about her struggle with literacy: “If the public knew, you know, my poor reading skills and my poor spelling skills they would probably be surprised. But I just pushed my way through.” Cheryl talked about the fact that literacy was a lifelong struggle: “I still sometimes, I don't realize ‘cause I never really read a book basically until 1995.”
**Education value.** The efforts to secure literacy often went hand in hand with the value placed on education. This was evident from the fact that all fourteen participants discussed the importance of completing an education. In turn, this was one of the main motivators for participants to apply to the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. Suzanne discussed her sentiments regarding the passage of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund: “it was really nice ‘cause that was something that I always wanted to do, to go back to school.” Rose stated the same, “it was something I always wanted to do. I always wanted to go.” Carol spoke about the value she placed on learning, stating, “I always valued learning. The ability to learn. To take on knowledge. Knowledge is great! And I am always searching for something.”

**Perseverance.** Participants discussed their value of education in terms of the perseverance that was required for them to complete their education. Joe talked about how difficult it was to complete his bachelor’s degree: “Some of it felt so hard. But I said no, I’m going to do it, which I did. I still stayed with it and finished it.” Personal stories exemplified a similar resolve despite difficulties. For example, Miles returned to college and obtained both his bachelor’s and master’s degrees after years of struggling with substance abuse. Miles now works full-time as a counselor for individuals who have both mental illness and substance abuse issues.

Rose provided another narrative of an individual who, after years of working in a factory, utilized the *Brown* Scholarship Fund to obtain a bachelor’s degree. Rose discussed that perseverance was required her whole life to achieve an education. She discussed her resolve to complete high school after the school closings: “We all
graduated. We all told mom and dad, we’re gonna graduate. We are not going to stay out. They kept us out four years. We all made it and graduated. We all walked that aisle.”

Jean’s story also demonstrated perseverance. As a high school dropout, she returned to school to get her GED and associate degree, and, later, through the Brown Scholarship Fund, completed both her bachelor’s and master’s degrees. Jean shared, “…I went back and got my GED. And then I’ve been doing that ever since. And I started taking courses right away at Southside Community College. And as I told you I took one class at a time.”

Wilma also exhibited tenacity in her pursuit of computer literacy. Wilma talked about her personal commitment to learn and shared, “I would go down into the lab and, you know, a couple of hours a day. We had to learn the system.”

*Learning the system.* The participants’ perseverance to obtain an education additionally included learning how to operate within the Brown Scholarship Fund system. Learning the system including understanding the application process, managing the funding process, and learning how to work with the receiving institutions. The individuals who were successful in navigating the system were able to complete their college degree.

Individuals reported that the first step to securing a scholarship required understanding and completing the scholarship application. Four members reported calling the Senior Research Associate for the Division of Legislative Services to inquire about the application process. Three of these participants discussed the need to have Prince Edward County send their transcripts to prove they were a displaced student.
Additionally, participants discussed learning how to work with the receiving college or university. Of particular concern was how to secure payment by the Brown Scholarship Fund. Three members discussed the need to secure temporary funds due to the fact that the scholarship program delayed payment to the receiving institution. Scholarship recipients also reported that if they wanted to participate in the St. Paul’s satellite program, they had to accept the limited degree options regardless of their needs or desires.

**Role model.** Six individuals discussed the desire to share their stories as displaced students and to emphasize the value of education and the need to persevere regardless of obstacles. Three individuals conveyed that they consistently shared their philosophy on education to their children or to other youths. Rose, who now works for the Prince Edward County public school system shared, “You know, that's what I tell my students now. You all got to want to learn ‘cause nobody can open your head and put a thing in it. I was denied that for four years. But I went back.” She continued,

And I if I can make it, anybody can. You just have to have that desire. You've got to want it. So don't tell me you can’t [emphasis added] get an education, it’s just that you will not put what you need to put into it.

Sally shared a similar message with her grandkids: “I tell my grandkids that you’ve got to want it. You’ve got to want it. You have to stay up till 12 or 1 o’clock if that's what it takes to do your homework.”
Five individuals believed that their personal educational success influenced others to achieve. Suzanne discussed how her resolve to be educated served as a role model for her children:

I know this impacted my kids because my son had dropped out of college and the year before I was to graduate he reenrolled into college and he got his degree, his bachelor’s degree the year after I graduated. And my daughter has gone back to school just recently within the past couple of months to get her master’s degree. They are not going to let me outdo them.

Both Jean and Judy echoed the importance of being a role model. Judy stated, “Achieving my diploma offered an example to others. I thought it was a good thing, not only for me, but for my kids to see.” Cheryl also discussed that, as a result of her education, one of her goals is to help young kids find their purpose in life. Sally discussed the need to promote the value of education to young people: “Now is the time you need to go and explore different things. Don’t wait until you are oh, 60, 70 years old. And then you want to go back to school.”

**Parents.** Nine interviews contained data on the significant role parents played in securing educational opportunities for their children during the historic school closures. These data further exampled the value placed on education. Sally discussed that despite tight finances, “my parents did everything they could to get [me] through high school.” Joe discussed the financial burden that his parents endured as they paid for him and his siblings to attend school elsewhere during the school closings: “Both of my parents
worked jobs day in and day out, every day. Both of them had to get the crops, you know, to get them to pay for school.”

Miles discussed how his parents placed his siblings with different host families in different geographic locations throughout the Northeast. At age five, however, Miles stayed home to attend school at a local one-room schoolhouse. Mike’s story was similar to Miles’ in that after two years of the school closures, his parents rented a home in a neighboring community. Mike stated, “So they rented a house in the next county so we could go to school and that made a big difference.” Ellie’s parents also rented a home elsewhere. Ellie reported, “My mother always use to tell me, ‘Get your education. Get your education.’” Carol and Judy attributed the success of any displaced student to parents that secured their children an education during the school closures. She presented,

The generation that was really impacted by this was no longer here. My mom was gone. My dad was gone. Her sisters were gone. Her brothers were gone. Um. So I think for me, she sacrificed a lot and she didn't get a chance to see us.

**Faith.** The data from five interviews demonstrated a belief that faith either brought participants to the *Brown* Scholarship Fund or that God played a role in guiding them to the scholarship program. Jean stated, “I was there for a reason. I know firsthand, and I am sure that my experiences will impact someone.” Cheryl discussed that her life’s purpose was revealed through the scholarship program: “And then when I went through the *Brown* scholarship, then I found, that’s when God started showing me my purpose in life.” Rose told, “Until I finally figured out a way to spell those words, I had to read my Bible, you know.” Miles and Ellie discussed how thankful and blessed she was for God’s
hand that made sure she got an education. Ellie stated, “I look at it, and that’s why sometimes I see how blessed I am. Any of those people could have been me. Any of the people who did not get an education could have been me.” Cheryl furthered that God’s hand was far-reaching and she believed that God helped her with her literacy, “I think sometime the Lord is helping me to help my skills on reading ‘cause I guess that's possible for him to teach you how to read as you going along.”

**Summary**

Overall, the scholarship recipients interviewed for this study exhibited similar characteristics. These data suggested that in order for a displaced student to participate in the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, they needed to be literate and value an education regardless of the lack of economic or vocational benefit. Further, the participants reported that due to being an older adult, postsecondary programs needed to be local and provide a supportive environment. As a result, the *Brown* Scholarship Fund provided scholarships to a select group of displaced students. Further, although the perceptions of the scholarship recipients stated that the program was an opportunity for personal growth and development, there was a lack of restoration.

Ultimately, the *Brown* Scholarship Fund as a restorative justice policy did not achieve the goals of material change and accordingly, a sense of justice. Participants provided policy suggestions on ways that the program could more successfully achieve restoration for the displaced students. Based on the perceptions of the participants, the *Brown* Scholarship Fund is, at best, a starting point in developing restorative justice, and
ultimately does not repair what was lost. Further discussion on this study and the findings follows in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE

This study explored the perceptions of Prince Edward County African Americans who were students of the R.R. Moton High School during the historic school closures and also recipients of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund. The goal of this study was to develop an understanding of how the scholarship recipients perceived the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund. Two research questions guided this study:

Q1. What are the Prince Edward County African American scholarship recipients’ perceptions of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund?

Q2. What if any, has been the impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund on the lives of the recipients?

These questions were explored through face-to-face, interviews with 14 Brown Scholarship Fund recipients. Four themes emerged from the data and included necessary structures, characteristics of recipients, policy impact and restoration revised. Following is a discussion of those findings and how this research fits into the existing literature. The first section suggests that despite Yamamoto’s attempt to create a repair paradigm that is attentive to the critical race perspective, restorative justice remains at risk of hegemonic influences. As a result, restorative justice has the potential to be unfulfilled as exampled
in the Brown Scholarship Fund. The next section suggests that in order to achieve restorative justice, the Brown Scholarship Fund must consider a more comprehensive design. This has implications for restorative justice policies in general. This is followed by a discussion on how persistent racism experienced as a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient further impacted the potential of the Brown Scholarship Fund to achieve restoration. The chapter closes with a discussion on the limitations of the study as well as suggestions for future research.

**Restorative Justice Analysis**

Yamamoto (1997) presented critical race praxis, or restorative justice, as a way to implement and achieve the goals of critical race theory (CRT). He suggested that restorative justice might bridge the gap between CRT and legal policies aimed to make amends for past wrongdoings (1997). The goal of critical race praxis was to address historical wrongdoings by transforming America’s structural inequalities and accordingly, to re-establish a sense of justice. To achieve restorative justice, Yamamoto (1998) developed a repair paradigm that included the following four goalposts: (a) recognition of wrongdoing; (b) responsibility for wrongdoing; (c) reconstruction or active steps toward healing wrongdoing, i.e. an apology; (d) reparation or material to change social economic or political structure.

Yamamoto’s repair paradigm was designed to offer a different avenue from traditional reparation. Yamamoto (1992) discussed the risks of traditional reparation and stated that traditional reparation was often influenced by hegemonic government structures. As a result, reparation often resulted in an illusion of progress without real
change. Further, Yamamoto (1992) stated that reparations are difficult to achieve as a result of Bell’s (2004) interest convergence theory. Yamamoto makes the distinction between traditional reparation and his theory on restorative justice and states that restorative justice should be viewed as reparation for repair. Moreover, Yamamoto suggested that unlike reparation, which tended to be too broad as discussed by Bittker (1973), restorative justice focused on addressing historical wrongdoings at the local level. He (1998) argued that by developing multi-disciplinary, site-specific restorative justice policies, the potential existed to restructure systematized racism and repair divided race relations.

**Restorative justice unfulfilled.** Yamamoto developed critical race praxis within the framework of critical race theory. However, one of Yamamoto’s challenges to his repair paradigm is that restorative justice, like traditional reparations, is often implemented within the legal system. As a result, despite Yamamoto’s attempt to distinguish restorative justice from traditional reparation, even policies designed based on his repair paradigm can be influenced by the same hegemonic government structures that influence traditional reparation. This deserves further analysis of Yamamoto’s repair paradigm.

**Repair paradigm.** In an analysis of the goalposts within Yamamoto’s repair paradigm, the first goalpost focused on the recognition of the wrongdoing. In this goalpost, Yamamoto stated that localities must explore a community’s race realities through the counter narrative. This goalpost is followed by the need for the wrongdoer to take responsibility by providing an apology and material. The overall goals of the
apology and material are to address and change the structural inequalities that exist as a result of the wrongdoing. These final three goalposts, responsibility, apology and material emphasize the role of the wrongdoer. As the repair paradigm exists, beyond the recognition stage, Yamamoto fails to provide voice to the disenfranchised population. Yamamoto (1997) calls for a reflexive phase in which he suggests that restorative justice policies should be assessed. But again he remains very vague on how and who considers the outcomes of the program. Further, Yamamoto stated, that the creation and implementation of an apology and material must be addressed within the law. However, the very fact that the repair paradigm must exist within the law and government structures further makes the implementation of restorative justice policies at risk to the hegemonic power structures as outlined within CRT (Bell, 2004; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Ultimately, although Yamamoto framed his work within CRT, the implementation and the goalposts themselves do not necessarily illuminate the voices of the disenfranchised (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ladson Billings & Tate, 1998; Matsuda, 1987). As a result, restorative justice is potentially unfulfilled within Yamamoto’s framework (1997).

**Brown Scholarship Fund Unfulfilled**

Based on the findings from this study, restorative justice is unfulfilled within the Brown Scholarship Fund. According to this research, the implementation and policy design of the scholarship program was influenced by hegemonic government structures that did not necessarily value the voice of the disenfranchised. Further, the findings from this study suggested that because the scholarship program did not attend to the voices of the policy recipients, the program failed to achieve the overarching goals of material
change and a sense of justice as outlined by Yamamoto’s restorative justice theory (1997, 1998). Following is a discussion on how the lack of voice from the Prince Edward County displaced students, throughout the creation and implementation of the Brown Scholarship Fund, resulted in a restorative justice policy that did not provide restorative justice.

**Brown Scholarship Fund.** Yamamoto stated that government-sponsored reparation programs are often influenced by hegemonic government structures. Further, the passage of such policies is often difficult due to Bell’s interest convergence (1992). This is exampled by the Brown Scholarship Fund. The findings from this study support that the passage of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund occurred due to an increase in interest on the historic school closings from multiple institutions (Kingdon, 1995). The year the scholarship program was discussed by the General Assembly was also the 50th anniversary of Brown v. Board, 1954. Moreover, the Prince Edward County African American community, through the established Martha E. Forrester Council, had recently secured the purchase of the original R.R. Moton High School, which was also the original African American-only high school and the site of one of the five cases that comprised Brown. (Titus, 2011a). Further, the R.R. Moton High School was accepted as a national historic site in 1997 and became the R.R. Moton Museum dedicated to Prince Edward County’s fight for civil rights in education (Williams, 2011).

These external pressures resulted in the development of the Brown Scholarship Fund; however, the Virginia General Assembly’s original allocation of only $50,000
demonstrated that the scholarship program was perhaps an emblematic gesture (Williams, 2005). The *Brown* Scholarship Fund did not develop into a legitimate funding source until philanthropist, John Kluge, challenged the Virginia General Assembly to match his donation of a million dollars. These data, suggests that the scholarship fund was created based on external policy pressures and was more symbolic as presented by Yamamoto (1998).

**Lack of policy voice.** The Virginia General Assembly also failed to consider the voices of the displaced students during the design phase of the scholarship program. Although the Virginia General Assembly acknowledged their role in the historic school closures through the passage of House Resolution 613, the policy makers muted the voices of the displaced students who advocated for the scholarship funds to go to direct descendants. Members of the Get on the Bus campaign, as well as Mike, who was involved in the drafting of the scholarship bill reported that the displaced students wanted the scholarship program to be offered to the next generation. Other restorative justice programs have successfully designed policies that provide scholarship awards to direct descendants such as that achieved by the Rosewood Compensation Act (Jordan, 2004); thus, this was potentially a workable option. The displaced students wanted the scholarship awards to go to direct descendants for several reasons. First, recipients were aware that their age would mitigate any real material change as a result of a scholarship. Additionally, the Prince Edward County displaced students had real concerns about the impact illiteracy had on the next generation. These concerns were based on both personal and professional experiences. The decision by the Virginia General Assembly to not
consider providing scholarships to direct descendants demonstrated that the General Assembly did not value the voices of the displaced students. Similar to Yamamoto’s repair paradigm, beyond the first goalposts of recognition of the wrongdoing, the voices of the policy recipients were muted in the Brown Scholarship Fund design.

**Application.** Further evidence of the need for the voices of the Brown Scholarship Fund recipients to be forefront to the policy is seen in the application design. Participants expressed concerns over the complexity of the application and stated that individuals needed advanced reading skills in order to complete the application (see Appendix A). The participants from this study unanimously expressed concern for family members or fellow displaced students who struggled with literacy suggesting that the application itself limited the number of applicants. Moreover, issues surrounding literacy were not new. Several past investigations explored the literacy and educational attainment levels of Prince Edward County displaced students. Green et al. (1964) performed a study immediately following the reopening of the Prince Edward County public schools in 1964; their study reported high levels of illiteracy. Studies done by Brookover (1993), Hale-Smith (1993) and Heaton (2008) also suggested lower educational attainment levels. These data further questions the Committee’s understanding of the challenges candidates might experience as a result of the complicated application.

**Local options.** St. Paul’s satellite program offered at the Robert Russa (R.R.) Moton Museum demonstrated another disconnect between the voices of the scholarship recipients and the Brown Scholarship Fund Committee. During attendance at the Brown Scholarship Fund Committee meeting in December 2013, the Committee discussed St.
Paul’s loss of accreditation and the resulting closure of the satellite program for the Prince Edward County displaced students (Appendix B, p. 3). This report demonstrated that St. Paul provided an education to 30 Brown Scholarship Fund recipients; the largest pool of Brown Scholarship recipients attended St. Paul’s satellite program. Additionally, the amount of funds awarded to attend St. Paul’s equaled slightly less than 50% of the total funds dispersed as of December 2013. The committee lamented the loss of St. Paul but there was a lack of understanding as to why this satellite program was effective.

The St. Paul program had been in place since the onset of the scholarship fund in 2005 and operated for six years. During that time, if the committee had explored the reasons for its success, they would have been aware of the importance of having a local postsecondary option. For instance, participants reported that despite the fact that St. Paul only offered two bachelor’s programs, local access to the school overrode their desire to achieve a different degree. All 11 students who successfully attained their bachelor’s degree, did so through the St. Paul satellite program. These data suggests that as a result, without the St. Paul’s College satellite program, this study may not have reported such high college-degree attainment levels. Further, these data suggests that without a satellite program, such as one offered by St. Paul’s College, the Brown Scholarship Fund program would have experienced overall less success.

**Comprehensive Restoration**

The findings from this study suggested that the Brown Scholarship Fund should also address the many outcomes of the historic school closings such as the socio-emotional losses. Participants from this study reported that restoration could not occur
within the existing Brown Scholarship Fund as it attended only to the material loss of an education. The need to attend to the many losses is another indication that the Virginia General Assembly did not fully understand how to achieve restoration. Reimund (2004) explored the legal issues of restorative justice and warned that policymakers’ often integrated only a few techniques to make amends for past wrongdoings, and therefore, failed to address the real needs of the marginalized population. She promoted the need for a more comprehensive application of restorative justice policies. Participants in this study suggested that the existing scholarship program should be revised and provided specific policy changes that are also suggestive of a more comprehensive restorative justice.

How to make a more comprehensive policy requires looking at the many systems that are part of a restorative justice program. As suggested by Honig (2009) the outcomes of an educational policy “depend on interactions between that policy, people who matter to its implementation and conditions in the places in which people operate” (p. 333). For instance, in Chapter Two, Literature Review, the research by Cochran (2006), Sweeney (2008) and Tobias (1996) demonstrated that the General Assembly was attentive to the multiple systems that were necessary to legislate in order to effectively deny desegregation in their creation of Virginia’s massive resistance policies. Resistance policies included attending to systems on compulsory education, tuition vouchers for nonsectarian private schools, changes in property tax laws, and the creation of anti-NAACP laws, which resulted in the successful denial of Brown (Cochran, 2006; Sweeney, 2008).
The findings from this study suggested that the Virginia General Assembly should also consider the many systems that are necessary to secure the success of the scholarship program. A comprehensive system would attend to the many losses incurred by the displaced students, remove any exclusionary policies from the scholarship program and promote buy-in from state approved colleges and institutions. Figure three provides a visual of the multiple systems that would comprise a comprehensive restorative justice policy. Following is a review of the participants’ perceptions on areas that must be addressed if the Brown Scholarship Fund is to provide restoration. This section concludes with specific policy recommendations on how the Virginia General Assembly might develop a comprehensive restorative justice program for the displaced students. These suggestions are also based on the perceptions of the participants from this study.
Additional losses. This study extends the literature on the socio-emotional losses incurred as a result of the school closings (Hicks & Pitre, 2010; Turner, 2004). The findings presented that individuals continue to struggle with the less tangible losses. Participants revealed the shame they experienced as a result of the school closings. Further they discussed the difficult familial separation that often occurred so that young students could attend schools elsewhere. Participants stated that the Brown Scholarship Fund focused on only one aspect of what was lost, and that the policy failed to consider other emotional losses. Williams (2005) theoretical analysis of the Brown Scholarship
Fund supported this finding. She stated that based on Yamamoto’s repair paradigm, the scholarship fund must provide redress for the school closings, but additionally, must address the emotional loss.

**Excluded populations.** Individuals who live outside the Commonwealth of Virginia are excluded from participating in the Brown Scholarship Fund. Hicks and Pitre (2010) and Turner (2003) reported that families often sought education in distant communities during the school closures. Participants from this study reported that many of their relatives resided in other states because they had to move out of Virginia to complete their education during the school closings and never returned. As a result, participants believed that their relatives were being penalized again. Participants did not understand why a program that was meant to provide education restoration, did not apply to all displaced students.

**Theological studies.** The Brown Scholarship Fund does not provide awards for studies in theology. However, the data suggested that church and faith are important to the Prince Edward County African American community. Williams (2011) reported that the Prince Edward County African American churches contributed to the civil rights movement. Anderson (1988) also discussed the role churches and faith played in African American activism. Five individuals discussed their belief that faith in God supported and guided them through their journey to obtain education and literacy. Additionally, three participants reported that they were involved in theological studies at the time of the study.
**Buy-in from state approved colleges and institutions.** Ultimately one of the key institutions that matter to the implementation of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund are state approved colleges and institutions. The findings from this study suggested that although students could apply to any state approved institutions, these colleges and universities were not sensitive to the needs of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund recipients. This included a lack of academic support for the displaced students as well as attention to the needs of being an older adult.

The lack of academic support circles back to issues on literacy and was evident in several narratives on participants’ experiences and concerns surrounding the application process, in class course assignments, as well as issues with computer literacy. In Chapter Four, cross-case theme one, Necessary Structures, participants discussed the importance of academic support provided by the St. Paul college professors. Participants emphasized that professors were sensitive to family and work schedules and additionally provided moral support during the program.

These findings differed from individuals who utilized the scholarship awards at programs other than St. Paul’s. For instance, Wilma’s narrative on her experience in a basic computer course revealed her anxiety and embarrassment as she struggled to keep up with classmates. Debbie shared similar frustrations with her experience at Southside Community College and the lack of support provided by the bursar’s office to help her secure funding from the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. The findings from this study, suggest that the only school that addressed the needs of the displaced students was St. Paul’s College through the creation of the satellite program offered at the R.R. Moton Museum.
**Policy suggestions.** Based on the findings from this study, developing a more comprehensive restorative justice program, included developing more local programs, incorporating the Prince Edward County fight for civil rights in education into the Virginia history curriculum, the promotion of literacy and counseling centers for the displaced students, and the development of an annual scholarship award for each of the communities that closed their schools due to massive resistance legislation. Following is a brief description on how the *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee might consider making these policy revisions.

**Developing local programs.** Avenues already exist within the *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund to facilitate buy-in to the program with state approved higher education institutes. According to section 30-§ 23-9.8:1, the “Powers and Duties of the Committee,” the State Council of Higher Education and the *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee must work together to implement and supervise the scholarship program (Virginia Legislative Information Systems, 2005). Moreover, the Council recently approved the Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education (2014), which, in many ways, aligns with the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. Specifically, the Committee could argue the application of the scholarship program is a great way for higher-level institutions to achieve the strategy goals outlined within the framework such as (a) degree completion and lifelong learning; (b) scholarship and diversity; (c) expansion of participation and engagement in public service and institutional service to the community (Framework for the Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education, 2014).
**Counseling and literacy centers.** The participants from this study suggested that the scholarship program should address literacy issues and the socio-emotional impact that the school closings had on the displaced students. The promotion of literacy and counseling centers could also be presented to the State Council of Higher Education. The Committee could argue that the promotion and development of said programs supported the vision of the Statewide Strategic Plan to transform lives and would be positive publicity for higher education institutes. Students enrolled within education or counseling degrees could perform internships at these sites.

**Excluded populations.** Several individuals suggested that if the General Assembly was determined to keep the funds at in-state institutions, then online programs should be made available to out-of-state displaced students through the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. Moreover, findings suggested that consideration should be given by the *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee to support studies in theology. Findings from this study suggested that entering the field of ministry was not only a viable vocation for many displaced students, but held significance to the African American community.

**Making the story known.** Although several participants reported that they were no longer silent about their personal loss of an education due to their involvement in the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, they reported there was a need for the Prince Edward County history to be known by the greater public. Participants offered that one way to achieve this would be to make the Prince Edward County fight for civil rights in education a part of Virginia’s required history curriculum. Further, making the story public knowledge
through the public school system would potentially assure that the information on the school closings was accurate.

**Next generation.** At the December 2013 *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee meeting, concerns about the viability of the program were raised. There were only 12 applications that year (*Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund Committee (December 10, 2013). At the following meeting in July, the General Assembly stated that if applications continued to decrease, the remaining scholarship money might be returned to Virginia’s General Fund (*Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund Committee, August, 2014). A brief dialogue ensued about the continued desire for the scholarship program funds to go to the next generation. However, Committee members stated that this was an unrealistic policy suggestion. The findings from this study however suggest that other solutions are worthy of policy consideration. For instance, Rose, who works in the Prince Edward County public school systems, posed that the *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee should create a scholarship program in honor of the displaced students. These scholarships would be given annually to a deserving student from the schools systems that closed schools to deny desegregation.

**Restorative Justice Considerations**

Although the findings from this study are not generalizable, there are several policy considerations for restorative justice. These include the need to place the voice of the marginalized at the center of policy design and implementation, the need to address
both material and emotional losses, and the need for policies to be implemented within a reasonable timeframe.

**Policy voice.** Walgrave (2011) presented that restorative justice policies should analyze restorative justice policies at three separate times based on the recipients’ perceptions. His analysis design included exploring the initial feelings of the recipients on the restorative justice program, examining the program during its implementation and evaluating the outcomes of the program based on the recipients’ lived experiences and perceptions of the policy. Based on the findings from this study, Walgrave’s analysis protocol for restorative justice policies provides a reasonable standard. Many misconceptions on how to provide restoration for the Prince Edward County displaced students could have been avoided had there been continual reflection and critique on the program based on recipients’ perceptions and experiences.

**Material and emotional loss.** The goals of restorative justice are to provide material change and a sense of justice. The findings from this study suggest that in order for restorative justice policies to develop a sense of justice, policies should provide redress for both material and emotional loss. Williams (2005) posed that “systemic reform should redress the less tangible aspects of the state’s history…” (p. 329). As suggested by the participants of this study, education was only one piece of what needed to be restored.

**Timely restoration.** Wenzel et al. (2008) discussed that restorative justice cannot heal a victim, but can help in the process of rebuilding their life. However, participants from this study reported that too much time had passed between the creation of the
restorative justice policy and the historic school closures to maximize the effectiveness of the program and accordingly, rebuild their lives. Bittker (1973) posed that reparations should focus on wrongdoings committed within the last century. However, the findings from this study suggested that restorative justice programs must be developed in a timelier manner.

Moreover, the goals of the restorative justice program must be practical and meet the needs of the victims. The Brown Scholarship Fund provided the opportunity to restore education, however, any material gain from the scholarship program was negated due to the ages of the recipients. Had the scholarship program been implemented in a timelier manner, education restoration could have impacted the economic and vocational status of the scholarship recipients. In this regard, the voices of those impacted do change over time and again supports the need of restorative justice programs to keep the victim voice at the center of the policy design. Further, based on the findings from this study, there is a time limit to the impact of restoration. As stated by Suzanne, sometimes late is never.

**Reflections on Race Relations**

Data from this study furthers our understanding of the Prince Edward County African American community’s continued efforts to secure an education (Turner, 2004). However, different from previous research on the historic efforts of African Americans to secure education for their children (Anderson, 1988), the efforts this time were to secure an education for the Prince Edward County displaced students. Continued community efforts worked to assure the passage of the Brown Scholarship Fund and to additionally make it a viable program. Their efforts were evident through the Get on the Bus
Campaign, African American legislative bill sponsorship, and the St. Paul’s College satellite program. However, participants reported the efforts of the African American community were often experienced in isolation and furthered their concerns that even when participating in a restorative justice policy such as the *Brown* Scholarship Fund program, the race divide remains.

**Continued racism.** As a result, the desire of restorative justice to heal divided race relations that were a result of a historic wrongdoing (Yamamoto, 1998) was also unfulfilled. The participants of this study reported that continued racism existed throughout their scholarship experience and mitigated the policy’s restorative justice potential. These data further supports the research on CRT and the endemic nature of race racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). As outlined by Matsuda (1987), the perspectives of the participants for this study experienced injustice and offer policymakers a special voice. Presented her are examples of continued racism experienced as a *Brown* Scholarship Fund recipient.

**Get on the Bus Campaign.** Participants in this study reported that the African American community continued to work on the ground floor to advocate for the *Brown* Scholarship Fund through the creation of the Get on the Bus Campaign. The campaign targeted all members of Prince Edward County in an effort to secure the passage of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. However, Ellie, who was in charge of soliciting support from all churches in Prince Edward County, reported that not one White churches provided assistance or support despite multiple requests. Members reported that the Get on the Bus Campaign provided the displaced students a presence during the General Assembly’s
discussion on the *Brown* Scholarship Fund. However, the lack of representation from the greater White community was disappointing to the Get on the Bus participants.

**Computers.** Joe shared a story about his fellow St. Paul’s classmates petitioning the *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee to provide computers to scholarship recipients. Joe discussed that very few of the scholarship recipients in his class had access to a personal computer, yet, in order to complete the bachelors program, students needed to pass a computer competency test. Further, many assignments were accessible only through the university website. The students in his class got together and decided to present their need for the computers to the *Brown* Scholarship Fund Committee at the capital in Richmond, Virginia. Joe was unable to attend the meeting but his peers came back devastated. The Committee would not support funds for accepted students towards the purchase of a computer. Further, the students reported to Joe that the Committee’s response was racist. He stated that his peers reported that the Committee would not provide computers because there were no guarantees that the scholarship recipients wouldn't sell the computers for profit at some point. Joe expressed his disbelief and conveyed that this type of a response to the scholarship recipients “was a slap in the face.” Joe furthered this conversation stating that although the scholarship program was a nice thing to do, he didn't believe that the scholarship program really supported the needs of the students.

**African American bill sponsorship.** According to five participants, Prince Edward County African American community leaders met with the Black Caucus to secure their support of the scholarship fund prior to the bill’s introduction to the General
Assembly in 2004. Further, participants commented on the fact that the main sponsors of the scholarship program were people of color. According to HB 846 Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund (2004) the senate sponsors were Yvonne Miller, Mamie Locke, and Henry L. Marsh III; all three were African American. The chief patron from the House was Viola O. Baskerville, also African American.

St. Paul’s College. St. Paul’s College provided an example of how the greater African American community supported the Brown Scholarship Fund. Mike stated that his relationship with the St. Paul College’s President resulted in discussions to develop a satellite program offered at the R.R. Moton Museum. St. Paul’s was a Historic Black College (HBC) and the only higher education institution to step forward and provide a satellite program to the displaced students. Unfortunately, St. Paul’s College closed its doors in 2013 and the satellite program ended in 2010. The St. Paul’s College satellite program was of significance to this study as 11 of the 14 participants received a bachelor’s degree through this program.

Impact. The fact that efforts to secure and support the Brown Scholarship Fund continued to be experienced through race divided efforts led the participants to be cautious of the government’s statement that this policy was to provide restoration. Participants discussed that as a result of continued racism experienced throughout their scholarship experience, they perceived the scholarship to be little more symbolic. Suzanne sentiments were representative of the 13 other participants when she reported that the scholarship program was not meant to result in repair but rather,
“it was more – “It’s off the board. We’ve done it and we don't have to think about it.”

One of the R.R. Moton members once asked, “When will African American history, become American history.”

Cross-cultural relationships. Further, participants stated that, because of continued racial segregation, they struggled with how to respond to cross-cultural relationships. Several participants offered that they often approach “cross-cultural” relationships on a “case-by-case basis.” However, three participants shared that some of their peers who have lived with the pain and consequences of the school closures their whole life are more sensitive to issues in terms of cross-cultural interactions. As presented by Cheryl, how to change hearts and minds remains at the core of healing the race divide.

Limitations

Several factors contributed to the limitations of this study; they include method and participants. The data used for this qualitative study was based on interviews and data obtained as a result of previous research, memos from the Brown Scholarship Fund Committee meetings and logging time within the Prince Edward County community, which resulted in numerous memo writings. However, the results of this study are not generalizable due to the limited number of participants and the data analysis, which emphasized the interview data based on their perceptions.

Participant selection. Participant selection was the biggest limitation of this study as it excluded many other potential stakeholders. The criterion selection excluded participants other than African Americans scholarship recipients. Therefore, the findings
of this study do not provide the views of any White displaced students who were eligible for the scholarship program. Further, this study does not include the views of the Brown Scholarship Fund policymakers or Committee members.

**Criterion assumption.** The participants of this study spoke often about the fact that the Brown Scholarship Fund made assumptions about the literacy of the displaced students. The design of this study made a similar assumption. Specifically, this study included only the voices of those that participated in the program. Underlying the criterion selection was an assumption that the views that mattered on the scholarship program were those that received an award. As a result, the views of the Prince Edward County displaced students that were eligible to apply to the Brown Scholarship Fund, but made a decision not to apply or could not apply are not present in this study. This design assumption was made evident by the participants, who continually discussed that there was a considerable Prince Edward County displaced student population that were unable to benefit from the Brown Scholarship Fund due to literacy. Eligible individuals who did not apply might provide a different view on the Brown Scholarship Fund and the phenomenon of education restoration.

**Methods.** The design of the study called for a cross-section of the population, but only five men replied to the letter campaign. As a result, the findings of this study may provide a female slant. The lack of male respondents may say something about the participants of the Brown Scholarship Fund program; however, this study did not have a large enough population to draw conclusions about the scholarship program’s appeal to females versus males.
Cross-section. Every attempt was made to get a cross-section from the 18 females that responded. First, the youngest and oldest respondents were selected. Random selection was used to select the remaining eight female participants. In an effort to maximize the male perspective, all five men were selected to participate in the study. Two men had physical health issues and as a result, one of the men had to pull out of the study. The other male with physical health issues requested a phone interview. Regardless of the efforts to obtain a cross-section, the study received a small number of campaign respondents. As a result, the findings from this study are relevant to only those that participated.

Future Studies

This study explored the perceptions of 14 Prince Edward County African Americans on their lived experiences as *Brown v. Board of Education* Scholarship Program and Fund recipients. Based on the limitations of this study, future research is warranted. Following is a discussion on potential research that may contribute to our understanding of the *Brown* Scholarship Fund and the phenomenon of education restoration.

Survey. This study focused solely on the perceptions of the 14 participants and, as reported, is not generalizable. According to House Joint Resolution 613 (2003), approximately 2,300 Prince Edward County students experienced the loss of education as a result of Virginia’s massive resistance policies. Therefore, it would be important to expand this study. Using the findings from this study, a survey could be developed and distributed to all Prince Edward County displaced students. This would provide a better
understanding of the perceptions on the *Brown* Scholarship Fund from a larger population.

**Replicated studies.** The methodology used for this study could be applied to explore the missing perspectives discussed in Limitations. In particular, a study on the individuals who were eligible for the scholarship program but did not participate may provide valuable perspectives. These individuals could add to the conversation on what, if any, government-sponsored policies might offer restorative justice for their loss of an education.

**Generational case study.** Participants continually suggested that the impact of the school closings was generational; the generational impact of the school closings has yet to be studied. Several case studies could be performed that explore generational perspectives within families. Cases studies could explore the *Brown* Scholarship Fund, but could also investigate perceptions on education, academic achievements, and views on Prince Edward County’s historic school closings. This would provide a more in-depth understanding of how the historic school closings impacted the next generation.

**Intervention study.** Several participants from this study suggested establishing literacy tutoring centers for the Prince Edward County displaced students. Researchers could establish a tutoring program and perform an intervention study. Tutoring programs could target solely the students directly impacted by the school closures. Intervention studies could also target descendants of the displaced students and explore the generational impact of literacy.
Summary

Based on the findings of this study, the Brown Scholarship Fund was more symbolic than restorative and did not achieve the overall goals of restorative justice to provide material change or a sense of justice. Ultimately, the program was available to a limited number of displaced students who gained personal growth and development and minimally impacted others as a role model.

Virginia policymakers must understand that when creating restorative justice policies they should be designed with the same rigor that resulted in Virginia’s resistance policies 50 plus years ago. First, the needs of the recipients must be forefront to the creation and implementation of the Brown Scholarship Fund. Further, the creation of a comprehensive restorative justice program would better address the many losses incurred as a result of the historic school closings. Moreover, any government-sponsored program must be implemented with consideration of the systems that are necessary to the success of that policy.

In closing, restorative justice policies should not be dismissed as an obligatory policy. The healing from racial injustice is both a personal and community experience that must be addressed. For the participants of this study, the impact of the school closings have lasted a lifetime and restoring justice continues to be a challenge.
ENDNOTES

1 See Bonastia, C. (2012). Southern Stalemate: Five Years Without Public Education in Prince Edward County, Virginia and Peeples (2004) Tragedy of Public Schools: Prince Edward County. History indicates that although the majority of Whites attended the White-only Prince Edward Academy, some poor or unwilling White students lost their education during the school closures as well. Estimates for the number of African Americans deprived an education range from 1750-2300 students.

2 See U.S. Department of Education (Bonastia, C. (2005). Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary Commission. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/brownvboard50th/index.html. The Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary Commission was created as an act of congress. Twenty-three members comprise the commission and include members from the Department of Justice, Department of Education, Supreme Court, and the NAACP to name a few. Each of the five cases that comprised Brown v. Board are represented as well. The purpose of the commission is to “provide and encourage the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education” (para. 1).
APPENDIX A

Brown Scholarship Fund Application

Pursuant to § 30-231.1 et seq., Code of Virginia

2015-2016 Application Packet

Application Deadline:
Postmark by March 1, 2015
BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION

FACT SHEET

The Historical Setting

State laws before the Civil War prohibited the education of African Americans, and the majority of African Americans that learned to read did so illegally. After Reconstruction, a system of laws, known as “Jim Crow,” were enacted to continue the rigid system of segregation that pervaded every area of society, including public accommodations, schools, housing, employment, restaurants, religious affiliations, health care services, criminal justice system, and transportation. This separation of the races was upheld under the doctrine of “separate but equal,” by the United States Supreme Court in 1896 in Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537. It was an era in which a set of unwritten social rules was imposed, requiring African Americans to be deferential to whites at all times. Beginning in 1915, a series of decisions questioning the constitutionality of segregation in institutions of higher education were heard in state and federal courts. Until this time, the doctrine of “separate but equal” had remained unchallenged for nearly 50 years.

Brown v. Board of Education: Virginia’s Role

Throughout the Commonwealth, school conditions for African American students, including curricula, textbooks and equipment, bus transportation, and school buildings were grossly inferior to the public education afforded white students. One example was Robert Russa Moton High School in Prince Edward County, Virginia, built in 1939 for African American children. The school was inadequate and overcrowded from the start. Unlike Farmville High School, which white students attended, Moton had no gymnasium, cafeteria, auditorium with fixed seats, locker rooms, or infirmary. As the enrollment at the school continued to grow, the county built temporary “tarpaper shacks”—outbuildings made of wood, covered in tarpaper, and heated with a single stove—which were invariably leaky and chilly. Parents, students, and PTA members were greatly disturbed by the inequities in public education and the gross inadequacies at Moton School, and tried to work through the all-white school board to bring about change. However, the school board was extremely unresponsive to their request for a new school and other improvements. Frustrated by the lack of progress and angry at the disparity between high schools for African American and white students, on April 23, 1951, students at the Robert Russa Moton High School, led by Barbara Johns and John and Carrie Stokes, staged a strike. Students either remained on school grounds and carried picket signs, or sat at their desks with books unopened, not participating in lessons, while the strike committee sought to meet with the Prince Edward County school superintendent and other officials. Those meetings were futile. The students also asked to meet with NAACP lawyers from Richmond. The student-led strike resulted in the case known as Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 103 F. Supp. 337 (1952), one of five cases consolidated as Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), that challenged the doctrine of “separate but equal” as unconstitutional under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The facts in the Virginia case provided the inspiration and legal basis upon which Brown v. Board of Education was argued before the Supreme Court.

Fifty years ago on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled unanimously in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, that the “separate but equal” doctrine adopted in Plessy v. Ferguson was unconstitutional. This historic decision struck the death blow to the era of Jim Crow and legally sanctioned segregation throughout American society. However, states were slow to desegregate public schools. Due to state resistance, the Supreme Court set guidelines for dismantling segregation without deadlines in a separate decision in 1955, known as Brown II, which contained the famous phrase “with all deliberate speed.”
Virginia's Response

Despite the Supreme Court ruling in Brown that school segregation was unconstitutional, public schools in Virginia did not immediately begin to desegregate. In fact, all levels of government demonstrated intense resistance to compliance with the Brown decision and the Commonwealth exhausted every possible means to avoid desegregation. The resistance lasted 10 years, during which time schools were closed in Charlottesville, Norfolk, Prince Edward County, and Warren County for various periods of time, and military enforcement of the law to desegregate schools that did stay open was necessary. In Arlington, state public education funds were rescinded because public schools did not remain segregated. However, Prince Edward County was the only jurisdiction that closed its public schools for five years. Thousands of African American students and hundreds of white students were denied education and could not graduate. In other parts of the Commonwealth, African American students—and there were very few—attending white schools were harassed, threatened, isolated, humiliated, and treated with contempt.

In 1964, the United States Supreme Court found in Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County, 377 U.S. 218 (1964), that "closing the Prince Edward County schools while public schools in all the other counties of Virginia were being maintained denied the petitioners and the class of Negro students they represent the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment" and called for "quick and effective relief" to "put an end to the racial discrimination practiced against these petitioners under authority of the Virginia laws." The plaintiff in Griffin, a school age child, won for school children throughout the nation the right to a public education when this right has been established in state constitutions. Notwithstanding the dismantling of the legal infrastructure and formal end of Virginia's Massive Resistance, desegregation cases continued to be heard in federal courts in Virginia until 1984. The last Virginia desegregation case was finally dismissed in 2001. In 2003, the General Assembly of Virginia passed a resolution expressing profound regret over the closing of the Prince Edward public schools. In 2004, in addition to several other related measures designed to seize and maximize Virginia's Redemptive Moment, the General Assembly established the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund to provide opportunities for the education of persons throughout the Commonwealth who were affected by the school closings.

BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Purpose

The Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund was created by the 2004 Virginia General Assembly to provide educational opportunities for persons who were enrolled or eligible to enroll in the public schools of Virginia during Massive Resistance between 1954 and 1964, in jurisdictions in which the public schools were closed to avoid desegregation. Eligible persons may use the award for transitional education programs that prepare them for success in GED and adult education programs, or to obtain the General Education Development (GED) certificate, an adult high school diploma, career or technical education or training, College Level Examination Program (CLEP) credit, and an undergraduate, master's, doctoral, or professional degree from an accredited two-year or four-year public or private Virginia institution of higher education, as approved by the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Committee.

Who Is Eligible

You are eligible to apply for a scholarship if you are a current domicile resident of the Commonwealth of Virginia as defined by § 23-7.4, and if, between 1954 and 1964, you were:
- A student in the public schools of Arlington, Charlottesville, Norfolk, Prince Edward County, or Warren County when the public schools were closed to avoid desegregation; and
- Unable to begin, continue, or complete your public school education during this time; or
- Relocated within or outside of the Commonwealth to begin, continue, or complete your public school education during these years due to school closings to avoid desegregation; or
- Ineligible to attend a private academy or foundation, in- or out-of-state, established to circumvent desegregation; or
- Unable to pursue postsecondary education opportunities or training because of the inability to obtain a high school diploma or its equivalency.

How Can the Scholarship Be Used and For How Long

Awards may be granted for full-time or part-time attendance for no more than one year of study for students enrolled in transitional education, adult education programs, and CLEP preparation programs and examinations. Awards may be granted for full-time or part-time attendance for no more than the minimum number of credit hours required to complete certification or degree program requirements, except as approved by the Committee. For students enrolled in the following approved education programs, Awards may be used to cover the costs of tuition, fees, textbooks, and certain course-related materials.
- Career and technical education or training
- Two-year degree program
- Four-year undergraduate degree program
- Five-year undergraduate degree program
- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree
- Professional degree program
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Educational Programs That Qualify

- Approved transitional education programs
- Recognized preparation programs for the General Education Development Certificate (GED) and College Level Examination Program (CLEP)
- Adult Basic Education Programs offered by Virginia public schools
- Comprehensive community college programs at Virginia community colleges
- Career and technical education or training programs at Virginia community colleges and licensed nonprofit career schools
- Two-year and four-year undergraduate degree programs at accredited Virginia public and private institutions of higher education
- Certain recognized five-year undergraduate degree programs at accredited Virginia public and private four-year institutions of higher education
- Master's level degree programs at accredited Virginia public and private four-year institutions of higher education
- Doctoral level degree programs at accredited Virginia public and private four-year institutions of higher education
- Professional degree programs at accredited Virginia public and private four-year institutions of higher education
- Career and technical education or training programs, and undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs offered through distance-learning by accredited Virginia public and private two-year and four-year institutions of higher education

*For purposes of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program only, an accredited Virginia public or private institution of higher education means a state-supported or private institution of higher education that is formed, chartered, incorporated, or established in Virginia whose main campus is within the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the institution is accredited by a national or regional organization or agency recognized by the United States Secretary of Education for the purpose of ensuring the quality of education or training provided by the institutions of higher education and the higher education programs they accredit.

Educational Programs That Do Not Qualify

- Theological schools and Seminaries
- Private, for-profit career and technical education schools
- Out-of-state schools, including those with campuses in Virginia
- Out-of-state schools' online programs
- Correspondence schools
- Unaccredited programs and institutions of higher education

How to Apply

- Obtain and return a completed application form together with all documentation requested by the March 1, 2015 deadline. This deadline will not be waived or extended.
- Submit requested documentation verifying current Virginia domicile and residency.
- Provide all information requested on application regarding date of birth, social security number, and last grade and school attended.
- Apply for admission to the approved education program or institution of your choice.
- Submit, after admission to the program or institution, a copy of your admission letter.

How to Renew Scholarship

- Obtain and return a completed renewal application by the March 1, 2015 deadline. Updated information may be required.
- Affirm current Virginia domicile and residency.
- Submit a copy of your transcript for the 2014 fall semester together with the renewal application, and a copy of your final transcript for the 2014-2015 academic year to the Committee no later than June 1, 2015.

Application Deadline

All application and renewal forms must be returned by March 1, 2015. Applications postmarked after March 1, 2015, will not be accepted. As an option, applicants may fax the completed application form to Mrs. Brenda Edwards at (804) 371-0169, no later than 5:00 p.m. on March 1, 2015. The application packet may be obtained upon request from Mrs. Edwards at the address below. It is also available online at http://brownscholarship.virginia.gov and at designated sites throughout the Commonwealth (see listing enclosed).

Next Application Cycle

The deadline for applications for the 2016-2017 academic year is March 1, 2016.

Where to Request or Send Your Application

Mrs. Brenda H. Edwards
Division of Legislative Services
General Assembly Building, 2nd Floor
201 North Ninth Street•Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 786-3591 phone•(804) 371-0169 fax•bedwards@dls.virginia.gov
**Brown v. Board of Education** Scholarship Program Application

2015—2016 Academic Year: "Virginia’s Redemptive Moment"

All scholarships are awarded to begin in the FALL TERM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. / Ms. / Mrs.</th>
<th>Social Security Number: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not use post office box</th>
<th>(mailing address)</th>
<th>(city)</th>
<th>(state)</th>
<th>(zip code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Date: <strong>/</strong>/____</th>
<th>Phone Number: <strong><strong><strong>-</strong><strong>-</strong></strong></strong></th>
<th>E-mail address: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Where were you then?

Tell us where you were and how the school closings of 1954-1964 affected you.

1. Where did you live during the time that your school was closed? (list county or city)

2. What was the name of your school that was closed? *(Information will be verified)*

3. What grade were you enrolled in during the school closings?

4. How were you affected? (Check one)
   - Did not attend school
   - Attended an academy or foundation
   - Attended school out-of-state
   - Was Tutored
   - Attended school in another Virginia school division
   - Other (please explain)

5. What is the highest grade or level of education you have ever completed?
   - Did not attend school
   - Attended school in another Virginia school
   - Attended an academy or foundation
   - Was Tutored
   - Attended school out-of-state
   - Other (please explain)

### Where are you now?

In order to qualify, you must be a domiciled resident of Virginia for at least one year. Your application will not be processed without this information.

1. Have you always lived in Virginia? ___ YES ___ NO If "NO," in what year did you move back to Virginia?

2. Please list where you have lived during the past two years:
   - (list state and county or city)
   - (list month and year)

### To determine your domicile, check the appropriate box below. Also provide a copy of one of the documents below showing your name and a Virginia address that is at least one year old:

- Do you hold a current driver’s license or identification card in Virginia? ___ YES ___ NO
- Did you file a state income tax return in Virginia in 2013? ___ YES ___ NO
- Are you registered to vote in Virginia? ___ YES ___ NO
- Do you own a vehicle that is registered in Virginia? ___ YES ___ NO
- If active-duty military, a copy of your Leave and Earnings Statement (LES) showing Virginia as your domicile

If you checked "Does Not Apply" to any of the above, submit a document from the list below that is at least one year old in addition to the two requested.

4. To verify current residency, attach a copy of two of the following documents that are not more than 60 days old:
   1. Payroll check stub from a Virginia employer
   2. Monthly bank statement in your name to your Virginia address
   3. Utility bill in your name to your Virginia address (cellular phone and pager bills are not accepted)
   4. Cancelled check with your name and Virginia address imprinted
   5. "Virginia's Redemptive Moment" Scholarship Program Application

### Other (please explain)

"I hereby affirm the above information is true as presented and authorize the Brown v. Board of Education Committee and/or its agents to verify such information solely for the purpose of establishing my eligibility for the scholarship program.

Signed: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________

---
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Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program Application  
2015—2016 Academic Year: "Virginia's Redemptive Moment"  
All scholarships are awarded to begin in the FALL TERM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. / Mrs.</th>
<th>Social Security Number: - - - - - - - -</th>
<th>Ms. / Mrs.</th>
<th>Social Security Number: - - - - - - - -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. / Miss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle one)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address:**  
Do not use a post office box  
Phone Number: (____) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - E-mail address: ________________________

**Birth Date:____/____/____**  
**Phone Number:** (____) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - **E-mail address:** ________________________

**Social Security Number:** _______-_____-_________  
**Mailing Address:** ______________________________________________________________________________

**Name:** Ms./ Mrs. __________________________ Mr. / Miss __________________________

**Where were you from?**  
Tell us where you were and how the school closings of 1954-1964 affected you.

1. Where did you live during the time that your school was closed? (list county or city)  
2. What was the name of your school that was closed? (Information will be verified)  
3. What grade were you enrolled in during the school closings?  
4. How were you affected? (Check one)  
   - Did not attend school  
   - Attended an academy or foundation  
   - Was Tutored  
   - Attended school out-of-state  
   - Attended school in another Virginia school division  
   - Other (please explain)  

**Where are you now?**  
In order to qualify, you must be a domiciled resident of Virginia for at least one year. Your application will not be processed without this information.

1. Have you always lived in Virginia? YES □ NO □  
   If "NO," in what year did you move back to Virginia? ________________________

2. Please list where you have lived during the past two years.  
   (list state and county or city)  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  
   -  

3. To determine your domicile, check the appropriate box below. Also provide a copy of one of the documents below showing your name and a Virginia address that is at least one year old.

   - Do you hold a current driver's license or identification card in Virginia □ Other □ Does Not Apply □  
   - Did you file a state income tax return in 2013? Virginia □ Other □ Does Not Apply □  
   - Are you registered to vote in Virginia □ Other □ Does Not Apply □  
   - Do you own a vehicle that is registered in Virginia □ Other □ Does Not Apply □  

   If you checked "Does Not Apply" to any of the above, submit a copy of one of the documents below showing your name and a Virginia address that is at least one year old in addition to the two requested.

4. To verify current residency, attach a copy of two of the following documents that are not more than 60 days old:

   - Paycheck stub from a Virginia employer  
   - Paycheck stub from a Virginia employer  
   - Utility bill in your name to your Virginia address  
   - Utility bill in your name to your Virginia address  
   - Cancelled check with your name and Virginia address imprinted

In compliance with #3 and #4 above, submit a total of three (3) documents: one at least one year old and two less than 60 days old as requested.

**How do you plan to use the scholarship?**

- To enroll in a transitional education program  
- To enroll in a transitional education program  
- To complete a certificate program or two-year undergraduate degree  
- To complete a five-year undergraduate degree  
- To complete a professional degree  
- To complete a doctoral degree  
- To complete a master’s degree  
- To complete a master’s degree  
- To complete an adult high school diploma  
- To complete an adult high school diploma  
- Name of college or school where applied or admitted  
- Name of college or school where applied or admitted  
- Name of degree program, e.g., medicine, dentistry, law  
- Name of degree program, e.g., medicine, dentistry, law  

"I hereby affirm the above information is true as presented, and authorize the Brown v. Board of Education Committee and/or its agents to verify such information solely for the purpose of establishing my eligibility for the scholarship program."

Signed __________________________ Date: __________________________
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Committee's request for additional information is optional on the part of the applicant. Providing such information will not affect your application or eligibility for the scholarship. Please enclose your response to the question below with your application form.

Name: ___________________________________ SSN: ____________________
Mailing Address: ______________________________________________________

How can the Scholarship Program be improved? Please tell us what changes you would like the Virginia General Assembly to consider in improving the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program.
Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program
~ Award Renewal Application ~
2015—2016 Academic Year: "Virginia’s Redemptive Moment"

All scholarships are awarded to begin in the FALL TERM

| Mr. / Mrs. | Social Security Number: |__________________________|__________|
| Mailing Address: | (circle one) | Phone Number: | E-mail address: |
| Birth Date: | | | (if available) |

Where are you enrolled in school? Tell us where you are using your scholarship in the 2015-2016 academic year.

1. I am enrolled in a transitional education or CLEP preparation program (list name of program, institution, and address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. I am enrolled in a GED program (list name of program and address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. I am enrolled in an adult high school diploma program (list name of school division and address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. I am enrolled in a career or technical education or skills training program (list name of program, institution, and address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. I am enrolled in a two-year degree program (list your major and the name of program, institution, and mailing address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I am enrolled in a four-year degree program (list your major and the name of program, institution, and mailing address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. I am enrolled in a master’s degree program (name of master’s degree program, institution, and mailing address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. I am enrolled in a doctoral degree program (name of doctoral degree program, institution, and mailing address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. I am enrolled in a professional degree program (name of professional degree program, institution, and mailing address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>in the Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What was your academic achievement last year? To qualify for the renewal of your award, you must confirm that you plan to continue your education and demonstrate satisfactory academic achievement during the previous academic year. Your application will not be processed without this information. Please check the appropriate box and attach the documents that apply:

- [ ] Admission letter, if you have transferred to another institution of higher education, or enrolled in a master’s, doctoral, or professional degree program for first time
- [ ] Course registration schedule for the 2015-2016 Fall semester, if enrolled in college or a career and technical education or skills training program
- [ ] Course registration schedule, if enrolled in a transitional educational program or CLEP preparation program
- [ ] Transcript of 2014 Fall semester (must be submitted together with application), if enrolled in an institution of higher education
- [ ] Final transcript of the 2014-2015 academic year must be submitted by June 1, 2015, if enrolled in an institution of higher education
- [ ] Documentation of passage of GED Test or CLEP examination
- [ ] Documentation from educational program or institution indicating completion of program requirements, if enrolled in a transitional education program, an adult high school diploma program, career and technical education or skills training program, or two-year degree program

I hereby affirm the above information to be true as presented and authorize the Brown v. Board of Education Committee and/or its agents to verify such information solely for the purpose of establishing my eligibility for the scholarship program.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ___________
# Educational Opportunities Available in Virginia to Eligible Persons

## Local Contact Numbers for GED Preparation Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomack</td>
<td>(757) 789-1760</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>(757) 727-1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>(434) 296-3872</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>(804) 752-3465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>(703) 624-6633</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>(540) 879-2833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleghany</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>(804) 828-4085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>(434) 645-7854</td>
<td>Henry County</td>
<td>(276) 647-3688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>(434) 821-4184</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>(540) 468-2129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appomattox</td>
<td>(434) 821-4184</td>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>(703) 228-7220</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>(800) 831-8639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>(540) 245-5083</td>
<td>James City</td>
<td>(757) 259-3066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>(540) 839-2981</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>(804) 769-3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>(434) 821-4184</td>
<td>King George</td>
<td>(540) 898-8165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>(800) 322-7748</td>
<td>King William</td>
<td>(804) 769-3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botetourt</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>(804) 580-3152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>(800) 322-7748</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>(276) 386-2433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>(434) 848-6913</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>(540) 463-7386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>(276) 935-4551</td>
<td>Loudoun</td>
<td>(703) 771-6406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>(800) 711-8121</td>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>(540) 894-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>(540) 464-4774</td>
<td>Lunenburg</td>
<td>(800) 711-6121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>(434) 821-4184</td>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>(434) 522-3219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>(540) 898-8165</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>(540) 825-0476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>(276) 236-9221</td>
<td>Manassas City</td>
<td>(703) 791-8388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
<td>Martinsville</td>
<td>(276) 638-6777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>(800) 711-6121</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>(804) 725-3702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>(434) 245-2817</td>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>(434) 738-6111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>(757) 482-5680</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>(800) 895-9199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>(804) 768-6140</td>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>(434) 966-9693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>(540) 667-9744</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>(757) 628-3956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Forge</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>(757) 628-3956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Beach</td>
<td>(804) 580-3152</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>(800) 877-8455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Heights</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>(276) 386-2433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
<td>Nottoway</td>
<td>(434) 645-7854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>(804) 580-3152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>(540) 825-0476</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>(540) 825-0476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>(804) 492-4212</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>(540) 743-4465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>(434) 799-6471</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>(276) 694-6078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson</td>
<td>(276) 926-4643</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
<td>Pittsylvania</td>
<td>(434) 432-9416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
<td>Poquoson</td>
<td>(757) 727-1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>(703) 503-6441</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>(757) 393-6822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Church</td>
<td>(701) 503-6441</td>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>(804) 598-5710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauquier</td>
<td>(540) 347-4372</td>
<td>Prince Edward</td>
<td>(434) 315-2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>(540) 674-3600</td>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvanna</td>
<td>(434) 589-8208</td>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>(703) 791-8388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin City</td>
<td>(540) 483-0179</td>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>(540) 674-3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>(540) 483-0179</td>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>(540) 674-3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galax</td>
<td>(800) 322-7748</td>
<td>Rappahamock</td>
<td>(540) 825-0476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>(540) 674-3600</td>
<td>Richmond City</td>
<td>(804) 780-8311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>(804) 693-4795</td>
<td>Richmond County</td>
<td>(804) 333-8322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>(804) 556-5316</td>
<td>Roanoke City</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>(800) 322-7748</td>
<td>Roanoke County</td>
<td>(800) 853-1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>(434) 985-5239</td>
<td>Rockbridge</td>
<td>(540) 464-4774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensville</td>
<td>(804) 733-2670</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>(540) 879-2833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>(434) 476-5515</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>(276) 889-5424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Two-Year Undergraduate Institution

Richard Bland College
Office of Admissions
11301 Johnson Road
Petersburg, VA 23805
(804) 862-6100

Public Four-Year Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Institutions

Christopher Newport University
1 University Place
Newport News, VA 23606
(757) 594-7000

The College of William and Mary
Office of Undergraduate Admission
P.O. Box 8795
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795
(757) 221-4223

George Mason University
Office of Undergraduate Admissions
George Mason University
4400 University Drive, MS 3A4
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
(703) 993-2400

James Madison University
Office of Admissions
James Madison University
MSC 0101
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
(540) 568-5681

Longwood University
201 High Street
Farmville, VA 23909
(434) 395-2000

Norfolk State University
700 Park Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23504
(757) 823-8388

Old Dominion University
Office of Admissions
108 Alfred B. Rollins, Jr. Hall
Norfolk, VA 23529-0050
(757) 683-3885
Toll-free: (800) 348-7926

Radford University
RU Admissions
Martin Hall
P.O. Box 8903
Radford, VA 24142
(540) 885-5371
Toll-free: (800) 890-4265

University of Mary Washington
UMW Admissions Office
1301 College Avenue
Fredericksburg, VA 22401
(540) 654-2000

University of Virginia
Office of Admission
P.O. Box 400160
Charlottesville, VA 22904
(434) 982-3200

University of Virginia’s College at Wise
Office of Admissions
One College Avenue
Wise, VA 24293
Toll-free: (888) 282-9324
Virginia Commonwealth University
Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Services
Sittling House
901 Floyd Avenue
P. O. Box 843017
Richmond, VA 23284
(804) 828-7244

Virginia Military Institute
Col. Vernon L. Betzel, Director of Admissions
Office of Admissions
319 Letcher Avenue
Lexington, VA 24450
(540) 464-7211
Toll-free: (800) 767-4207

Private Two-Year and Four-Year Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Institutions

Averett University
Office of Admissions
334 West Main Street
Danville, VA 24541
(434) 791-4996

Bluefield College
Office of Admissions
3000 College Drive
Bluefield, VA 24606
Toll-free: (800) 872-0175

Bridgewater College
Admissions Office
Young Hall
402 East College Street
Bridgewater, VA 22812
Toll-free: (800) 769-9325 or (540) 828-5375

Eastern Mennonite University
Office of Admissions
1209 Park Road
Harrisonburg, VA 22802-2462
(540) 432-4000

Emory & Henry College
Office of Admissions
P.O. Box 947
Emory, VA 24327-0947
(276) 944-4121

Ferrum College
Office of Admissions
P. O. Box 1000
Ferrum, VA 24088
Toll-free: (800) 886-9197

Hampden-Sydney College
Office of Admissions
Hampden-Sydney, VA 23943
(434) 223-6900
(800) 755-0733 or (434) 223-6120

Hampton University
Office of Admission
Hampton, VA 23688
Toll-free: (800) 624-3328

Hollins University
Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
Roanoke, VA 24020
Toll-free: (800) 466-9595 or (540) 362-6401

Liberty University
Office of Admissions
1971 University Boulevard
Lynchburg, VA 24502
(434) 582-2000

Lynchburg College
Office of Admissions
1501 Lakeside Drive
Lynchburg, VA 24501
(434) 544-8100

Mary Baldwin College
Admissions Office
Staunton, VA 24401
(540) 887-7019 or (800) 468-2262

Marymount University
Office of Admissions
2807 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 2220D-4299
(703) 522-5600

Patrick Henry College
One Patrick Henry Circle
Purcellville, VA 20132
(540) 338-1776

Randolph-Macon College
Office of Admissions
P.O. Box 5005
Ashland, VA 23005-5505
(804) 752-7200

Randolph College
Office of Admissions
Prime Time and Adult Programs
2500 Rivermont Avenue
Lynchburg, VA 24503
(434) 947-8141
Regent University
Office of Admissions
1000 Regent University Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23464
Toll-free: (800) 373-5504 or (757) 228-4127

Roanoke College
Office of Admissions
221 College Lane
Salem, VA 24153
(540) 375-2500

Shenandoah University
Office of Admissions
1460 University Drive
Winchester, VA 22601
Toll-free: (800) 432-2266 or (540) 665-4500

Southern Virginia University
Office of Admissions
One University Hill Drive
Buena Vista, VA 24416
Toll-free: (800) 229-8420

Sweet Briar College
Office of Admissions
Sweet Briar, VA 24596
Toll-free: (800) 381-6142 or (434) 381-6100

University of Richmond
Office of Admission
28 Westhampton Way
University of Richmond, VA 23173
Toll-free: (800) 700-1662 or (804) 289-8840

Virginia Intermont College
Office of Admissions
1013 Moore Street
Bristol, VA 24201
(804) 451-1VIC

Virginia Union University
Office of Admissions
1500 North Lombardy Street
Richmond, Virginia, 23220
(804) 257-5600

Virginia University of Lynchburg
Office of Admissions
2058 Garfield Avenue
Lynchburg, VA 24501-6417
(434) 528-5278

Virginia Wesleyan College
Office of Admissions
1584 Wesleyan Drive
Norfolk/Virginia Beach, VA 23502
(757) 455-3200

Washington and Lee University
Office of Admissions
Lexington, VA 24450
(540) 458-8400

Designated Application Sites

Application packets are located at the following sites across the Commonwealth

The Honorable Betsy Carr
Virginia House of Delegates
General Assembly Building, Room 414
201 North Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Carl U. Eggleston Company, Inc.
914 South Main Street
Farmville, VA 23901

Charlottesville
Charlottesville City Hall
7th and Market Streets
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Norfolk
Norfolk City Hall
810 Union Street
Norfolk, VA 23501

Prince Edward County
The Farmville Herald
114 North Street
Farmville, VA 23901

Warren County
Reverend Alfred Woods, Pastor
Mount Vernon Baptist Church
240 Church Street
Front Royal, VA 22630

Applications may also be obtained upon request from
Mrs. Brenda H. Edwards
Division of Legislative Services
General Assembly Building, 2nd Floor
201 North Ninth Street/Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 786-3591 phone (804) 371-0169 fax bedwards@dls.virginia.gov
See http://brownscholarship.virginia.gov for further information on the Brown Scholarship Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Participating Colleges</th>
<th>Residency Requirement</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Application Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Common Market - Attending Non-Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Participating SRB</td>
<td>Virginia Residents</td>
<td>Eligible Degree Programs Only</td>
<td>In-State Tuition Rate of Host State is Charged</td>
<td>State Council of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Common Market - Attending Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Participating Virginia Public Institutions</td>
<td>Non Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Residency in SRB State, Eligible Degree Programs Only</td>
<td>In-State Tuition Rate is Charged</td>
<td>Virginia State and Federal Government Department of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown's Board of Education Scholarship Program</td>
<td>Eligible Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Residents directly affected by Virginia public school closings of 1954 - 2004 (see application for details)</td>
<td>Scholarship amount is based on tuition and fees and an allowance for books/supplies</td>
<td>The application deadline for 2016-17 is March 1, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Provider Scholarship Program</td>
<td>Eligible Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Working or planning to work in a child care program, first come first serve</td>
<td>Varies, (highest - maximum of eight classes or $2,688), whichever comes first</td>
<td>Virginia Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Survivors and Dependents Education Programs</td>
<td>Virginia Public Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents for Veteran</td>
<td>Dependent or Spouse of Veteran, MIA, POW, Killed, or 90% Disabled in War-Time Service</td>
<td>Waver of Tuition and Required Fees; annual stipend based on available funds - $1,800 maximum</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs (804) 225-2401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Program</td>
<td>Participating Virginia Private Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Full-Time Enrollment</td>
<td>Maximum 2014-15 Award Undergraduate approx. - $3,300</td>
<td>Institutional Financial Aid Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Women’s Institute for Leadership</td>
<td>Mary Baldwin College</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Enrollment into the VVLS program</td>
<td>Equivalent to TAG</td>
<td>VWC Admissions Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Need Based Undergraduate Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Participating Colleges</th>
<th>Residency Requirement</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Application Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Children</td>
<td>Virginia Community College System</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Foster Child</td>
<td>Varies Based on Need, Up to Tuition/Fees</td>
<td>Institute Financial Aid Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens Tuition Plans</td>
<td>Virginia Public Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Age 60+ &amp; Income Limitations</td>
<td>Waiver of Tuition and Required Fees</td>
<td>Institute Admissions Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth Scholarship</td>
<td>Virginia Public Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Financial Need</td>
<td>Varies Based on Need, Up to Tuition/Fees</td>
<td>Institute Financial Aid Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Dept. of Disability Services</td>
<td>Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Varies - Disability, Etc.</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Visit the DSS Website for further information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Part-Time Assistance Program</td>
<td>Virginia Community College System</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Financial Need</td>
<td>Varies Based on Need, Up to Tuition and Required Fees</td>
<td>Institute Financial Aid Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Need and Merit Based Undergraduate Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Participating Colleges</th>
<th>Residency Requirement</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Application Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grenville P. Mathews Scholarship</td>
<td>Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Complete High School in Virginia &amp; Competitive Solution</td>
<td>Approx. 5 Scholars Receive $2,000 per Year for Four Years</td>
<td>High School Principal's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year College Transfer Grant</td>
<td>Participating Virginia A- Year Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Full-Time enrollment in a participating institution during the fall/following receipt of an Associate’s degree from a Virginia 2-year public institution, 3.0 GPA, and $1,000 or under for students enrolling as of fall 2012</td>
<td>Up to $5,000, with an additional $1,000 for students in academic programs</td>
<td>No individual application for this program. Institutions verify student eligibility. Students should ensure that the four-year college has a copy of academic transcript denoting successful completion of Associate's degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Guaranteed Residence Program</td>
<td>Virginia Public Institutions</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Financial Need, Full-Time Enrollment, &amp; Some Merit</td>
<td>Varies Based on Need, Up to Tuition/Fees &amp; Books</td>
<td>Institution Financial Aid Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Participating Colleges</th>
<th>Residency Requirement</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Application Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV Pell Grant</td>
<td>Any 4-Year Institution in U.S.</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Essay, &amp; Virginia Born</td>
<td>Varies between $1,000 and $8,000</td>
<td>High School Principal's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV Nursing Scholarship Programs</td>
<td>Participating Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Dept. of Health (844) 864-7433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipyard Workers</td>
<td>Tidewater Community College</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Full-time employment, eligible Virginia shipyard plantation or machining repair company; Post-graduate work agreement; Eligible in an Associate in Applied Science degree program or a registered apprenticeship program</td>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>Barbara Murray (757) 862-7488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Scientist Program</td>
<td>Virginia Tech Students Only</td>
<td>Virginia Residents Only</td>
<td>Soil Scientist, Merr, Past Grad Work Agreement</td>
<td>Up To Tuition</td>
<td>Contact Virginia Tech (540) 213-6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Cadtish</td>
<td>VMI, Virginia Tech, and Mary Baldwin College</td>
<td>Not Restricted</td>
<td>Varies, Selection Process</td>
<td>Varies Based on Available Funding</td>
<td>Institution Program Office or Financial Aid Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Region Scholarship Program</td>
<td>Any accredited 4 year college or university in the U.S.</td>
<td>Residency in Southside or Southwest Virginia</td>
<td>Regional residency</td>
<td>$2,000 work incentive for those returning to region post-graduation.</td>
<td>Tobacco Region Scholarship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT Civil Engineering Scholarship Program</td>
<td>GMU, ODU, UVA, VMI, Virginia Tech, and out-of-state institutions with an ABET-accredited civil engineering program</td>
<td>Must be a Virginia state resident or attend a Virginia college or university</td>
<td>2.5 GPA; enrollment in an ABET-accredited civil engineering program as a Jr or Sr Post Grad Work Agreement</td>
<td>$1,000 and Paid Summer Internship</td>
<td>Small Virginia Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Army National Guard Tuition Assistance Program</td>
<td>Participating Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Not Restricted</td>
<td>Contact the Va. National Guard</td>
<td>Varies, up to full tuition</td>
<td>Dept. of Military Affairs (804) 296-6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Space Grant Initiative</td>
<td>Participating VSGC Institutions Only</td>
<td>Not Restricted</td>
<td>Earns a STEM degree program: Sciences, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics and shows interest in aerospace-related career</td>
<td>Undergraduate varies: $5,000 to $10,000 Graduate: $5,000 Fellowship</td>
<td>Virginia Space Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Teacher Scholarship/Grant Program</td>
<td>Participating Virginia Institutions</td>
<td>Not Restricted</td>
<td>Min. 2.7 GPA, Teacher Shortage Area, Merr, &amp; Past Grad Work Agreement</td>
<td>Up to $10,000</td>
<td>Director of Education Program at Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE:</strong> State Council of Higher Education (<a href="http://www.schev.edu">www.schev.edu</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carl U. Eggleston Foundation. Provides financial assistance to cover the costs of required institutional fees and assessments to persons who have received a scholarship award from the Board of Education Scholarship Awards Committee and have enrolled in an approved educational program in accordance with state law and policies of the Committee.

**Fastweb.** (www.fastweb.com). An online scholarship database.


**Finalaid.** An online financial aid database. See site for aid for older students. http://www.finaid.org/otheraid/older.phtml

**PELL Grant.** See http://www.ed.gov/programs/fpel/index.html

**SCHEV.** http://www.schev.edu/students/financialAidTypes.sp
## Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program

### Fiscal Status Report – December 10, 2013

**2005-06: Annual Maximum Tuition Award—$5,500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Tyler Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sargent Reynolds Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$733.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$693.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$944.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community College</td>
<td>5 students</td>
<td>$7,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Community College</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marymount University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$1,802.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$1,802.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards—$112,472.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2007-08: Annual Maximum Tuition Award—Full Tuition (plus $450 book allowance; maximum for each term)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Tyler Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sargent Reynolds Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,133.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$4,028.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community College</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>$7,515.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Community College</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>$5,303.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Baldwin College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,622.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s College</td>
<td>9 students</td>
<td>$52,445.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$9,361.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Union University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$3,292.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards—$189,156.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009-10: Annual Maximum Tuition Award—Full Tuition and Fees (plus $550 book allowance; maximum for each term)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$2,642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community College</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>$5,299.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Community College</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$7,782.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (TCC)</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$6,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>$6,885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>$9,361.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty University</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>$6,521.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Baldwin College</td>
<td>6 students</td>
<td>$42,054.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s College</td>
<td>5 students</td>
<td>$6,016.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards—$67,185.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Awards—$120,291.86**
### 2011-12: Annual Maximum Tuition Award—Full Tuition and Fees (plus $800 underg. and $1,000 grad. book allow.; max. for each term)

2012-13: Annual Maximum Tuition Award—Full Tuition and Fees (plus $800 underg. and $1,000 grad. book allow.; max. for each term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Sargeant Reynolds Community Clg.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community Clg.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013-14: Preliminary Fall Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Sargeant Reynolds Community Clg.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013-14: Sub Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$6,794.10</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (TCC)</td>
<td>$344.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013-14: Total Awards

Total Awards—$146,833.10

### 2014-15: Preliminary Fall Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Sargeant Reynolds Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014-15: Sub Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (TCC)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community Clg.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014-15: Total Awards

Total Awards—$34,080.00

---

228
Eight and Half Year Program Totals

84 individual students (includes several attending multiple institutions)

Two Year Institutions

- John Tyler Community College: 3 students, $2,941.00
- J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College: 10 students, $35,144.12
- Lord Fairfax Community College: 1 student, $5,000.00
- Northern Virginia Community College: 1 student, $693.00
- Piedmont Virginia Community College: 3 students, $12,971.00
- Southside Virginia Community College: 21 students, $53,428.00
- Tidewater Community College: 3 students, $10,973.90

Four Year Institutions

- Longwood University: 1 student, $1,793.00
- Norfolk State University: 1 student, $4,413.00
- Old Dominion University: 5 students, $35,883.00
- University of Virginia (@ TCC): 1 student, $21,332.00
- Virginia Commonwealth University: 4 students, $80,423.50
- Virginia State University: 1 student, $43,783.00

Four Year Private Institutions

- Averett University: 3 students, $23,603.00
- Liberty University: 10 students, $150,850.58
- Lynchburg College: 1 student, $3,398.00
- Mary Baldwin College: 1 student, $33,085.50
- Marymount University: 1 student, $8,459.00
- St. Paul’s College: 30 students, $480,569.88
- University of Richmond: 1 student, $1,802.00
- Virginia Union University: 1 student, $3,292.00

Total Awards — $1,013,838.48

Program Accounting Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>General Fund Contribution</th>
<th>$1,050,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Funds</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,050,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contributions from through Dept. of Taxation | $19,402.82 |
| Interest Earnings                              | $159,392.05 |
| Total Other Earnings                           | $178,794.87 |
| Total Available Funds                          | $2,228,794.87 |
| Awards through 2011-12 Award Year              | $1,013,838.48 |
| Balance                                        | $1,214,956.39 |

Note: No invoices received from Department of Education for GED related coursework
APPENDIX C

IRB Approved Flyer

Education Restoration for a Group of African Americans from Prince Edward County, Virginia

Seeking Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund recipients to participate in an interview for a study conducted by Linda J. Mann, Education policy, PhD candidate of George Mason University.

Interviews will last no more than 90 minutes

Contact Information:

For more information please contact:

- Linda J. Mann
- lmann4@gmu.edu; 703-593-2754
- IRB SBS # (insert)
Dear [Mr. / Ms. LAST NAME],

My name is Linda Mann. You may have met me through [gatekeeper] at R.R. Moton functions. I recently attended the Annual Banquet at Hampden Sydney and attended several R.R. Moton Museum Brown bag lunches over the past couple years. Last year I was grateful to be invited and attend the R.R. Moton Alumni Reunion at the Twin Lakes State Park and I am looking forward to the next reunion in 2015. I am writing to ask for your participation in a study I am performing through George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia. The study I am performing is on the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund. I am interested in interviewing you because you received a scholarship from the Brown Scholarship Fund. I would like to know what your perceptions of the program are based on your experiences as a recipient.

It is important to know that this letter is not to tell you to join this study. It is your decision. Your participation is voluntary.

If you are interested in learning more about this study, please review the enclosed information, complete the enclosed form, and mail it back to me. I am including a pre-paid envelope. If you have questions, you can email me at lmann4@gmu.edu or call my cell, 703-593-2754.

You do not have to respond if you are not interested in this study. If you do not respond, no one will contact you, but you may receive another letter in the mail, which you can simply disregard.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Linda J. Mann

Please complete this form and return in the pre-paid envelope provided:

I am interested in learning more about this study. Please contact me using the following information:

Name: ____________________________
Telephone(s): _____________________
Best time and day to call: ____________
Email: ____________________________
APPENDIX E

Interview Guide

Warm-up questions.
1. You were once a child in Prince Edward County. Can you tell me what it was like to be a kid there?
2. In what ways, if any, are you still connected to Prince Edward County?

Q1. What are the Prince Edward County African American scholarship recipients’ perceptions of the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund?
1. How did you first learn of the Brown Scholarship Fund? Tell me how you came to be a Brown Scholarship Fund recipient.
2. What was your response to your scholarship award?
3. Describe the first day you attended school as a result of the scholarship?
4. How did your experience of returning to school compare to what you expected?
5. Share a story that demonstrates why you wanted to participate in the Brown Scholarship Fund.

Q2. What if any, has been the impact of the Brown Scholarship Fund on the lives of the recipients?
1. Is there a story you can share that tells how you use the training or degree you received as a result of the scholarship?
2. If you were speaking to another Prince Edward County displaced student about the Brown Scholarship Fund, what would you say to them about your scholarship experience or about the scholarship program?
3. Is there anything you would like to say to the decision-makers that are in charge of the scholarship program? If you were in charge of the program what would you change or keep the same about the program?
4. Would you like to share anything else about your experience as someone who was denied an education and later rewarded a scholarship in order to return to school?
APPENDIX F

IRB Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form for Adult Scholarship Recipients
Prince Edward County scholarship recipients’ perceptions on Virginia’s Educational Restoration program known as the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program and Fund.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES
This research is being conducted to explore the Commonwealth of Virginia’s Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Fund and Program policy from the perspectives of Prince Edward County, African American recipients. If you agree to participate, you will be invited for a one-on-one, in-person interview that will last no more than 90 minutes and will occur on one day only. The interviews will be audio taped. The goal of this study is to develop an understanding of what educational restoration means from the perspective of African Americans who were recipients of the historic Prince Edward County school closings and the contemporary Brown Scholarship Fund.

RISKS
There are no more than minimal risks for participating in this study. It is possible that you may experience some discomfort with the interview questions as you reflect on the Prince Edward County public school closings. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer; there is no requirement that you answer all interview questions.

BENEFITS
There are no direct benefits to you as a participant.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The data in this study will be confidential. All interviews will be coded. 1) Your name will not be included on the collected data; (2) a code will be given to you and used for interview identification; (3) through the use of an identification key, the researcher will be able to link your interview to your identity; and (4) only the researcher will have access to the identification key.) The data obtained will also be protected through pseudo settings. Therefore, the coding of both your name and setting will assure that you cannot be identified by name or physical location. Only the researcher will have access to the interviews and tape recordings. These will be stored in a secure password protected lock box. All interviews will be recorded per consent. The researcher will use a personal tape recording device. The tapes will be used for transcription only and will be permanently erased once data analysis is finalized.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other party.

CONTACT
This research is being conducted by Linda J. Mann is a PhD student at the College of Education & Human Development at George Mason University. She may be reached at 703-593-2754 for questions or to report a research-related problem. The faculty advisor for Mrs. Mann is Dr. Penelope Earley. Dr. Earley can be reached at 703-993-3361. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research & Integrity & Assurance.
Mason University Office of Research Integrity & Assurance at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT
I have read this form and agree to participate in this study.

__________________________
Name

__________________________
Date of Signature
APPENDIX G

Determination of Exempt Status

Office of Research Integrity and Assurance
Research Hall, 4400 University Drive, MS 6D5, Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Phone: 703-993-5445; Fax: 703-993-8590

DATE: October 9, 2014
TO: Penelope Earley
FROM: George Mason University IRB
Project Title: [660303-1] EDUCATION RESTORATION FOR A GROUP OF AFRICAN AMERICANS FROM PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project
ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: October 9, 2014
REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category #2

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Office of Research Integrity & Assurance (ORIA) has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

Please remember that all research must be conducted as described in the submitted materials.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be submitted to the ORIA prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

If you have any questions, please contact Karen Motsinger at 703-993-4208 or kmotsing@gmu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within George Mason University IRB’s records.
DATE: November 4, 2014
TO: Penelope Earley
FROM: George Mason University IRB
Project Title: [660303-2] EDUCATION RESTORATION FOR A GROUP OF AFRICAN AMERICANS FROM PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
SUBMISSION TYPE: Amendment/Modification
ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: November 4, 2014
REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category #2

Thank you for your submission of Amendment/Modification materials for this project. The Office of Research Integrity & Assurance (ORIA) has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

Please remember that all research must be conducted as described in the submitted materials.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be submitted to the ORIA prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

If you have any questions, please contact Karen Motsinger at 703-993-4208 or kmotsing@gmu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within George Mason University IRB’s records.
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Linda J. Mann graduated from the University of Vermont in 1986 with a B.S. in Middle Level Education. In 1991 she received her Master’s in Education in Curriculum and Instruction. Her Master’s thesis was on the successful implementation of school-based mediation. Linda has 10 years middle-level teaching experiences. She also served in various capacities as a political activist and conflict resolution specialist within the field of education.