

EXHIBIT 1

From: Willis D. Hawley
To: TUSD; Sanchez, HT; Taylor, Martha; Brown, Samuel
Cc: Rubin Salter, Jr.; Juan Rodriguez; Thompson, Lois; Andrew Marks; Zoe Savitsky; Eichner, James (CRT); Balentine, Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti)
Subject: Comprehensive Evaluation Plan
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 2015 6:16:56 PM
Attachments: USP CEP Agreement.docx

Dr. Sanchez,

Please confirm that the understandings on the attached memo are correct. This will obviate the need for me to submit objections to the Court. Thanks.

Bill Hawley

February 18, 2015

To: TUSD

From: Willis Hawley

Re: Resolution of Objections to the District's Comprehensive Evaluation Plan for 2014-15

Introduction

On October 22, 2014, the Court ordered the District to work with the special master to develop student support criteria and forms for evaluating program effectiveness for USP student support/student support services and programs. The District submitted its response to this mandate on February 4, 2015. The special master and plaintiffs were given 15 days to express their objections, if any, to the District's proposals.

The District and I worked collaboratively for several weeks to reach agreement on several aspects of what the District calls a Framework for TUSD's Comprehensive Evaluation Plan for 2014-15 (hereafter, CEP).

I submitted a draft of objections to the District and met with staff. I believe we have agreed on the issues below and that there is no need to submit these. However, please see below to confirm the agreements.

Objections

Objection 1. The District's proposed limits on evaluation of "programs" should be amended.

On page 4 of the CEP, the district says it will evaluate one program a year. The District implies that I endorse the idea of one comprehensive program evaluation each year and takes this not only as a justification for not looking at student equity personnel and their roles (an issue I address below) but sets this as a guideline for the future.

On page 12 of Document 1763 (which is Exhibit 1 of its February 4 submission) my proposal to the District is provided and says:

Each year when the District submits its annual budget the budget would include:

1. Particular USP-related *programs and activities* that would be the focus of evaluation [emphasis added].

It would be foolish to limit comprehensive program evaluation to a single program. For example, suppose one wanted to understand how to reduce discipline problems? One would look at several programs and ask which of these are most effective and efficient. And, what more is needed?

The District agrees to this change.

Objection 2. Evaluation of Learning Support Coordinators be support personnel should be conducted simultaneously.

The District agrees to conduct an evaluation of Learning Support Coordinators but rejects my repeated proposal that this evaluation include the role of equity student support staff whose functions overlap those of the Learning Support Coordinators. Given that the plaintiffs are concerned about both Learning Support Coordinators and the deployment of equity staff personnel, and given the significant overlap in the functions of these individuals, it is difficult to see why the District would not want to examine these two sets of activities simultaneously.

The District says that it will consider studying the student equity personnel in the next school year. But in order to do that well it would need to collect baseline data now and figure out how it would answer issues of effectiveness with respect to student outcomes. Should be noted that despite claims to be studying the a fact of Learning Support Coordinators on student outcomes, the District's plans for studying Learning Support Coordinators in 2015 do not address issues of effectiveness with respect to student outcomes. In my discussions with District staff, it was recognized that such a study would require an additional year of inquiry. The District

acknowledges that it might well studying the role of equity student support personnel in 2015-16 so it is difficult to understand why the District would not want whether a very significant share of 910 G funds are being used effectively.

The District agrees to beginning the evaluation of the equity support personnel this year in a coordinated way that synchs with the LSC study. This would not be in lieu of another study to be defined next school year. See below.

Objection 3. The issue of adequate resources for evaluation needs to be addressed.

A major goal of the USP is to create conditions in the District that facilitate evidence-based decision-making. This goal is repeated throughout the USP and is emphasized in Section X. moreover, the importance of database decision-making is emphasized in the districts strategic plan. In my initial proposal and in the District's February 4 plan, attention is drawn to the need for additional financial resources to ensure adequate staffing and technology to undertake comprehensive evaluation. However, while this need is recognized by the CEP, the matter is then dropped.

The District should be required to provide an estimate of what it will cost to adequately staff and provide technological capabilities to implement the types of assessments of students and programs anticipated by the CEP.

The District agree to this provision with the understanding that this funding could be phased in over time.

Objection 4. The need for a multiyear strategic comprehensive evaluation plan.

In my proposal on which the District built its plan, I emphasized the importance of developing a multi-year plan for intensive evaluation of one or more sets of activities. While the CEP asserts that the plan must be multiyear (see p.4), the District's plan deals only with the current year. The purpose of establishing tentative priorities for evaluation is that this helps to shape the data that are collected in the meantime and to design studies

that build on one another. Moreover, such a plan may well affect the professional expertise that staff current and future staff will need.

The District should be required to develop a tentative multiyear plan for evaluating such programs and activities relevant to the attainment of priority goals for students. It should be understood that this plan can be amended by the District, if necessary, as its priorities change.

I agreed to withdraw this objection since the wording of the District proposal implies such a multiyear plan.