

# **TUSD**

## **Tucson Unified School District USP Status Report July 2013**

On October 1, 2013, the District will submit its first Annual Report focusing primarily on activities and programs that occurred while the District was technically under the Post-Unitary Status Plan (PUSP), and prior to the beginning of implementation of the Unitary Status Plan (USP). This Report provides an implementation status of each and every USP and USP-related activity from February 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014. While it is too early to assess the effectiveness and outcomes of most USP implementation activities, some measures are available for analysis and discussion. This status report is not required under the USP; however, the District submits this report in the interests of transparency, accountability, and good faith.

Timelines and activities will undoubtedly shift throughout SY 2013-14 to adjust to unforeseen circumstances and realities. The timelines within this report are meant as guidelines to ensure timely and effective implementation, but are always flexible to address the needs of students, of the District, and of the Special Master and Parties in the *Fisher-Mendoza* lawsuit<sup>1</sup> and court ordered remedy – the Unitary Status Plan.

The Report includes:

- (I) USP Implementation Status – Overview
- (II) USP Implementation Status – Detailed

---

<sup>1</sup> The Special Master is Dr. Willis Hawley. The Parties include attorneys from the Department of Justice representing the United States, and attorneys representing the *Fisher* plaintiffs (African-American students and families) and the *Mendoza* plaintiffs (representing Mexican-American students and families)

the Office of Accountability and Research. The plan shall include professional development targeted toward the specific challenges these teachers face.” [IV.E.6]

Description: In March 2013, the District began developing the pilot plan. The plan is incorporated into the New Teacher Induction Program. The criteria for identifying the schools in which the program will be piloted include (a) schools that are below the District average on the state assessments from SY 2012-13 (AIMS), and (b) and the Office Accountability and Research will assist in creating a control group and a subject group for the pilot. The third criterion is necessary to ensure that we can evaluate the effects of the pilot at the end of the year.

Under the New Teacher Induction Program, all first-year teachers are assigned a full-time release mentor that mentors them throughout their first year. First Year Teachers are expected to develop and follow a Plan of Action, which includes creating a schedule with specific times for observation cycles, feedback, weekly collaboration, creating individualized learning plans, analyzing student work and data, etc.

Mentors who mentor First Year Teachers identified to participate in this pilot, will provide:

- additional scheduled time for implementing their action plans, and
- additional professional development targeted toward the specific challenges they face at their respective sites (this is embedded into the mentoring process)

At the end of the year, the Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development Department, in conjunction with the Office of Accountability and Research (A&R), will evaluate the success of the program through two criteria:

- Comparisons of benchmark assessment data, by grade level, from First Year Teachers in low-achieving schools with the same data from First Year Teachers in low-achieving schools who participated in the pilot
- Evaluations of the end-of-the-year surveys from three stakeholders (the Administrator, the Mentor, and the Teacher)

Special Master and Party Review is Specifically Required by the USP: The District will send the finalized pilot plan to the Board, the Parties, and the Special Master in July 2013. In August 2013, the District will consider feedback from the Board, Parties, and Special Master and finalize the plan by September 1, 2013.

#### **Review, Amend, and Adopt Teacher and Principal Evaluations**

**July 1, 2013**

Status: Complete

Project: 12

USP Language: “By July 1, 2013, the District shall review, amend as appropriate, and adopt teacher and principal evaluation instruments to ensure that such evaluations, in addition to requirements of State law and other measures the District deems appropriate, give adequate weight to: (i) an assessment of (I) teacher efforts to include, engage, and support students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds using culturally responsive pedagogy and (II) efforts by principals to create school conditions, processes, and practices that support learning for racially, ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse students; (ii) teacher and principal use of classroom and school-level data to improve student outcomes, target interventions, and perform self-monitoring; and (iii) aggregated responses from student and teacher surveys to be developed by the District, protecting the anonymity of survey respondents. These elements shall be included in any future teacher and principal evaluation instruments that may be implemented. All teachers and principals shall be evaluated using the same instruments, as appropriate to their position.” [IV.H.1]

Description: In October 2011, the District began developing new teacher and principal evaluation instruments to align with Arizona Revised Statute §15-203. The District-developed instrument was piloted in the fall of 2012, but the pilot failed because the reliability and validity of the instrument did not meet state requirements. The District then explored alternative instruments beginning in December of 2012, and selected the current instruments in February 2013. The District, in analyzing alternative instruments, considered the requirements set forth by the State and by the USP. In April 2013, the Governing Board approved both instruments, and staff training began in May 2013 and will be ongoing throughout SY 2013-14.

**Amend New Teacher Induction Program**

**July 1, 2013**

Status: Complete

Project: 12

USP Language: “By July 1, 2013, the District shall amend its New Teacher Induction Program (“NTIP”) to provide new teachers (*i.e.*, teachers in their first two years of teaching) with the foundation to become effective educators. The NTIP shall, at a minimum: (a) build beginning teachers’ capacity to be reflective and collaborative members of their professional learning communities (*see* Paragraph 4 below); and (b) engage thoughtfully with students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds using culturally responsive pedagogy. The District shall hire or designate an appropriate number of New Teacher Mentors based on the best practices for such mentoring/coaching in the field. These Mentors shall not have direct teaching assignments.” [IV.I.1]

Description: In February 2013, the District began the process of evaluating the NTIP, and amending the program to reflect the USP requirements. The USP requirements were incorporated into the responsibilities of the NTIP stakeholders (mentors, participating teachers, site administrators), into all relevant training, and will be highlighted in the implementation of the program.

**Develop and Implement an Underperforming/Struggling Teacher Plan**

**July 1, 2013**

Status: In Progress

**(Sept 1, 2013)**

Project: 12

USP Language: “By July 1, 2013, the District shall develop a plan for and implement strategies to support underperforming or struggling teachers regardless of their length of service. Teachers shall be referred to the program by school- or District-level administrators based on evidence (*e.g.*, from student surveys, administrator observations, discipline referrals, and/or annual evaluations) that the teacher requires additional professional development and mentor support. The support program shall utilize research-based practices such as those embodied in Peer Assistance and Review programs.” [IV.I.2]

Description: In February 2013, the District began developing the plan through a sub-committee, driven primarily by the USP requirements as stated above. The plan will integrate the current plan for improvement process to provide consistent support for underperforming and struggling teachers.

Special Master and Party Review is Specifically Required by the USP: The District will send the finalized plan to the Board, the Parties, and the Special Master in July 2013, and will have preliminary discussions with the Board on July 30, 2013. In August 2013, the District will consider feedback from the Board, Parties, and Special Master and finalize the plan by September 1, 2013.

# **TUSD**

## **Tucson Unified School District USP Status Report 2 January 2014**

In July 2013, the District submitted its first monitoring report, the USP Status Report 1 (USR 1), outlining the status of various USP and USP-related activities between February and July 2013. The USR 1 also included descriptions of activities to be performed between August and December.

In January 2014, the District submitted the 2012-13 Annual Report focused primarily on activities and programs that occurred while the District was under the Post-Unitary Status Plan (PUSP), and prior to the beginning of implementation of the Unitary Status Plan (USP).

This Report provides the implementation status of USP and USP-related activities from July 2013 through January 31, 2014, and includes descriptions of activities to be performed between February and July 2014. While it is too early to assess the effectiveness and outcomes of most USP implementation activities, some measures are available for analysis and discussion. This status report is not required under the USP; however, the District submits this report in the interests of transparency, accountability, and good faith.

Timelines and activities will undoubtedly shift throughout SY 2013-14 to adjust to unforeseen circumstances and realities. The timelines within this report are meant as guidelines to ensure timely and effective implementation, but are always flexible to address the needs of students, of the District, and of the Special Master and Parties in the *Fisher-Mendoza* lawsuit<sup>1</sup> and court ordered remedy – the Unitary Status Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Special Master is Dr. Willis Hawley. The Parties include attorneys from the Department of Justice representing the United States, and attorneys representing the *Fisher* plaintiffs (African-American students and families) and the *Mendoza* plaintiffs (representing Mexican-American students and families)

## **PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT**

### **23. Review (Amend) Evaluation Instruments**

Status: Completed (Updated Fall 2013)

Person Responsible: Richard Foster, Director of Professional Development

USP Language: “By July 1, 2013, the District shall review, amend as appropriate, and adopt teacher and principal evaluation instruments to ensure that such evaluations, in addition to requirements of State law and other measures the District deems appropriate, give adequate weight to [teacher efforts to use Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, teacher and principal use of data, and student and teacher surveys]...” [IV.H.1]

Completion Date: July 2013 (Updated Fall 2013)

#### Major Milestones:

- October 2011: Begin developing new evaluation instruments to align with state law
- Fall 2012: Pilot new instruments (the pilot failed to meet state requirements)
- Winter 2012-13: Explore, and select, alternative instruments that will comply with state law and conform to USP requirements
- Spring 2013: Governing Board approves new instruments
- Summer 2013 – ongoing: Train staff on new instruments
- Fall 2013: Consult with the developers of the new instruments to ensure alignment with USP requirements and with USP-related training that was under development
- Winter 2013-14: Committee meets to evaluate the 2013 evaluation instrument through the lens of CRP and the goals of the SAIL training

#### Major Reporting Dates:

- January 2014 (USR 2)

Description: While this activity was completed last year, it remains an ongoing activity as state laws change, as USP trainings are developed and adjusted, and as expectations for teachers and principals are evaluated and adjusted. In January 2014, a District committee met with the developers of the evaluation tools to begin an analysis of the Framework through the lens of CRP and the larger goals of SAIL. The committee incorporated the “Suggestions from Teaching Tolerance Panel for Teaching with Culturally Responsive Pedagogy” in the analysis, and considered ideas that might enhance the evaluation tools. The process also consisted of: reading and discussing a narrative of a selected component in the book, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (ASCD 2007); comparing the information in the book with the information included in the 2013 Evaluation Instrument to identify any gaps in the information; identifying key ideas in the component, information gaps in the 2013 Evaluation Instrument, alignment of the component with SAIL, and additional information or ideas needed; and reviewed the TUSD Tenets of CRP and made connections between the tools and each tenet.