

EXHIBIT E

From: Brown, Samuel [<mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org>]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 3:27 PM
To: Willis D. Hawley; Rubin Salter, Jr.; Nancy Ramirez; Thompson, Lois;
Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov; Savitsky, Zoe (CRT); Smith, Lisa Anne; Stamps, Sesaly O.
Subject: RE: Timelines

All: just a few things...

- (1) The Marketing Plan will be shared within a few days, or at most, a couple of weeks. The Marketing Plan has to be implemented during the peak enrollment period (Nov 1 through Feb 1) so that it can actually impact student assignment/magnets. This is an area where we have had to develop the plan while the implementation was ongoing. The Family Engagement plan, as described in the USP, cannot be developed until the Family Engagement Assessment is complete (the proposed due date for that plan is Feb). Also, the Marketing plan is clearly about student assignment; the Engagement Plan is much broader than student assignment. Both plans should not be due at the same time.
- (2) The teacher and principal evaluations (new revisions) are tricky because of the numbers of multiple stakeholders (new state statute language, bargaining units, Board, etc.). It could be complete in April if all goes well, but it could also not be voted on until May or June (unlikely since they need to be approved with enough time that folks can be trained on the new instruments). But I just want to flag this issue now because it is one of the more complicated issues.
- (3) I also want to flag an issue with the TCI. Our propose approach will be to complete a TCI by January, but perhaps we should change the date to 1.15.14, since the District will effectively shut down for two weeks in December and it is unlikely that, if it hasn't been approved yet, it will be approved before everyone comes back. Also, our approach with the TCI is to move forward with the first TCI under three of the four USP requirements (leaving out the more complicated issue of teacher proficiency). Between now and April/May we will work with an outside firm (as yet unselected) to develop the most effective way to measure teacher proficiency with technology in the way the USP requires – this was a seemingly simple task when we were writing the USP but is not so simple and we want to do it right, not just do it. By May/June, when we do the second TCI for the year, we will have the teacher proficiency piece developed. Thus, we will use the first TCI to identify and address immediate needs re Technology Access, but will likely not develop the “Multi-Year Technology Plan” until the summer (in addition, the current efficiency audit will give us valuable information to help guide the development of a multi-year tech plan. If anyone has comments/feedback on this approach, please share with me soon so we can incorporate that feedback into the TCI development.

From: Willis D. Hawley [<mailto:wdh@umd.edu>]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 8:05 AM
To: Rubin Salter, Jr.; Nancy Ramirez; Thompson, Lois; Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov; Savitsky, Zoe (CRT); Smith, Lisa Anne; Stamps, Sesaly O.; Brown, Samuel
Subject: Timelines

please see attached. Sorry aout the formatting but I think it is clear in that respect. I look forward to your comments. Bill