

Exhibit T

November 17, 2014

From: Bill Hawley

Response to Revised CMP Received 11-17

Prologue

I understand that the district has made efforts to align this plan to my comments and to the draft R&R submitted many weeks ago. However, fundamental problems persist and I think it is time to cut bait.

I have put an asterisk on the points that I consider essential.

Overview of the Fundamental Problem*

The basic issue here is that the district has created a process that will not allow a current magnet school to lose its status until the time set to pursue unitary status. Moreover, a new magnet school could not be put in place until a full year after that. This, in turn, means that students would not be able to attend a magnet school until the fall of 2018 and, even then, they would have been applying to school that did not exist at the time they applied. And, the current plan allows a racially concentrated school to retain its status without making any progress towards integration until June 2017. In short, as has been the case all along, the district is not willing to make the tough decisions that will allow it to make meaningful progress in using the magnet schools to enhance the number of students who have the opportunity to attend an integrated school.

Specifics

*Page 18. Here and elsewhere, the district allows schools to set goals. It is fine to set goals for improvements to be made but not for whether the so-called pillars are being met. Later in the plan, the district seems to set the goals for attaining integration and achievement but then appears to back away from this provision of the plan (see p.21).

Page 19. I believe that creating categories of schools is unnecessary and potentially confusing. But apparently the district thinks this is important. * I do not think is acceptable to allow school to maintain magnet status unless it is making progress towards both of these goals and especially the goal of integration. It is unclear how long a school has to move from intensive to strategic status though that would be irrelevant if the pillars were applied in the ways I have outlined in previous responses to the plan and if a school had to be making progress toward the achievement of both of these pillars at the same time. *The provisions on this page make it clear that no school could lose magnet status until after 2016-17 school year.

Page 20. Would it be possible for a school to meet all of these standards and not become a B school? Or could they become a B school without meeting all four of these standards? If there are four different standards, how is progress to be measured? This chart shows that a racially concentrated school could retain its magnet status until the end of the 2017 school year.

Page 21. The plan talks about an “excelling school program” but since programs are not graded, how can there be an excelling magnet program? *On this page the district makes clear that it allows schools to set “measurable” outcome goals. This is not acceptable and undermines the concept of the pillars as standards.

Page 22. The requirement here for monthly reports seems unnecessary and burdensome. Progress towards the goals related to integration and achievement cannot be determined on a monthly basis and even progress toward implementing certain improvements are unlikely to be identifiable every four weeks.

Pages 24-27. The provisions here seem meaningless in that new programs cannot be put in place until the 2018-19 school year. Encouraging schools to devote energy to the development of proposals for magnet opportunities that may never occur and for which they have little capacity seems dysfunctional and likely to undermine morale.

*Page 27. It would be extremely unlikely that a school that pursued magnet status unsuccessfully through the 2016-17 school year would have the capacity to change in ways that would make it a successful magnets school. Holding out this lifeline, which most schools that are going under will grab for, only puts the tough decisions off yet again.

Page 28. The first bullet here is unnecessary. Moreover it suggests that a school that has been unsuccessful in getting beyond the 75% level as additional time to achieve that goal. *It is important to declare in this plan that the provisions pursued by the district in the development of the USP requires not only that 70% or less of a particular ethnic group be enrolled, but that the minimum number of white students be enrolled depending on the grade level.

*By providing that students currently enrolled in a program that is magnet status be allowed to complete that program “to the extent possible” will surely lead to conflict over what is possible. One imagines that parents as well as teachers will insist that the program be sustained. This is especially true because of the provisions of the USP itself. The USP provisions, need to be revised.

Page 33. To hold out the possibility of new magnet schools that Dietz and Kellond seems inappropriate. The district has already indicated that its budget problems severely constrain actions it would like to pursue and unless it intends to significantly increase the overall budget for magnet schools, should not hold out the possibility that new plants can be implemented.

Page 34. This discussion of the preliminary evaluation raises again the question of whether the categories make sense. Holladay is a D school moving backward on integration but is ensured magnet status for the next three years at least. Similarly, Ochoa could retain its magnet status until the end of 2017 and become less integrated than it already is.

Summary

We keep going over the same ground moving the pathways slightly, planting a new tree, and digging a couple of holes. The district seems, to belabor the metaphor, dug in on key issues. I have limited my concerns about the magnet plan to those issues that would allow programs to be eliminated and more promising strategies implemented. I do not argue for changes in themes nor do I debate the efficacy of

particular locations. I do fail to understand why the district is committed to a process that will effectively eliminate the possibility of introducing new programs and greater interest in integration.

I have a meeting scheduled with Dr. Butler Tuesday afternoon. If we cannot resolve these issues by then, I think we need to let the stakeholder know what the issues are and let the Court decide what to do.