

RUSING LOPEZ & LIZARDI, P.L.L.C.

6363 North Swan Road, Suite 151
Tucson, Arizona 85718
Telephone: (520) 792-4800
Facsimile: (520)529-4262

J. William Brammer, Jr. (State Bar No. 002079)
wbrammer@rllaz.com
Oscar S. Lizardi (State Bar No. 016626)
olizardi@rllaz.com
Michael J. Rusing (State Bar No. 006617)
mrusing@rllaz.com
Patricia V. Waterkotte (State Bar No. 029231)
pvictory@rllaz.com

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

LEGAL DEPARTMENT
1010 E. TENTH STREET
TUCSON, AZ 85719
(520) 225-6040

Julie Tolleson (State Bar No. 012913)
Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org
Samuel E. Brown (State Bar No. 027474)
Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org

Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. One, et al.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Roy and Josie Fisher, et al.,
Plaintiffs

v.

United States of America,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

Anita Lohr, et al.,
Defendants,

and

Sidney L. Sutton, et al.,
Defendants-Intervenors,

CV 74-90 TUC DCB
(Lead Case)

**NOTICE OF FILING OF
ADVANCED LEARNING
EXPERIENCES ACTION PLAN
SUPPLEMENT**

CV 74-204 TUC DCB
(Consolidated Case)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Maria Mendoza, et al.
Plaintiffs,
United States of America,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,
v.
Tucson Unified School District No. One, et al.
Defendants.

The Tucson Unified School District, No. 1, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby files the Defendant, Tucson Unified School District No. One’s Advanced Learning Experiences Action Plan Supplement pursuant to the Court’s February 13, 2015 Order (ECF 1771). *See Exhibit A.*

DATED this 14th day of April, 2015.

RUSING LOPEZ & LIZARDI, P.L.L.C.

s/ J. William Brammer, Jr.
 J. William Brammer, Jr.
 Oscar S. Lizardi
 Michael J. Rusing
 Patricia V. Waterkotte
 Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. One, et al.

ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed via the CM/ECF Electronic Notification System and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing provided to all parties that have filed a notice of appearance in the District Court Case, as listed below.

ANDREW H. MARKS
 Attorney for Special Master
 Law Office of Andrew Marks PLLC
 1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
 Suite 1100
 Washington, DC 20004
 amarks@markslawoffices.com

Rusing Lopez & Lizardi, P.L.L.C.
 6363 North Swan Road, Suite 151
 Tucson, Arizona 85718
 Telephone: (520) 792-4800

Rusing Lopez & Lizardi, P.L.L.C.
6363 North Swan Road, Suite 151
Tucson, Arizona 85718
Telephone: (520) 792-4800

1 LOIS D. THOMPSON CSBN 093245
2 JENNIFER L. ROCHE CSBN 254538
3 Attorneys for Mendoza Plaintiffs
4 Proskauer Rose LLP
5 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200
6 Los Angeles, California 90067
7 (310) 557-2900
8 lthompson@proskauer.com
9 jroche@proskauer.com

6 JUAN RODRIGUEZ, CSBN 282081
7 THOMAS A. SAENZ, CSBN 159430
8 Attorney for Mendoza Plaintiffs
9 Mexican American LDEF
10 634 S. Spring St. 11th Floor
11 Los Angeles, CA 90014
12 (213) 629-2512
13 jrodriguez@maldef.org
14 tsabz@maldef.org

11 RUBIN SALTER, JR. ASBN 001710
12 KRISTIAN H. SALTER ASBN 026810
13 Attorney for Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs
14 177 North Church Avenue, Suite 903
15 Tucson, Arizona 85701-1119
16 rsjr2@aol.com

14 ANURIMA BHARGAVA
15 ZOE M. SAVITSKY CAN 281616
16 JAMES EICHNER
17 Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor
18 Educational Opportunities Section
19 Civil Rights Division
20 U.S. Department of Justice
21 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, SW
22 Patrick Henry Building, Suite 4300
23 Washington, DC 20530
24 (202) 305-3223
25 anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov
26 zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov
27 james.eichner@usdoj.gov

22 JULIE TOLLESON ASBN 012913
23 Tucson Unified School District
24 Legal Department
25 1010 E 10th St
26 Tucson, AZ 85719
27 520-225-6040
28 Julie.Tolleson@tUSD1.org

26 s/ Jason Linaman
27 _____
28

EXHIBIT A



To: The Court, Special Master and Counsel
From: Michael Konrad, Interim Director of Advanced Learning Experiences
Re: ALE Action Plan Supplement with Comprehensive Goals ("ALE Supplement")
Date: April 14, 2015

Background

On March 3, 2014, the District submitted its proposed ALE Access and Recruitment Plan to the Special Master and Plaintiffs. The Plan was designed to address the USP mandate that TUSD develop an "Access and Recruitment Plan" for its Advanced Learning Experiences (ALE)

which shall include strategies to identify and encourage African American and Latino students, including ELL students, to enroll in ALEs; to increase the number of African American and Latino students, including ELL students, enrolling in ALEs, and to support African American and Latino students, including ELL students, in successfully completing ALEs.

Unitary Status Plan § V(A)(2)(c).

Following objection and comment by the Parties, the District revised the Plan and circulated its revised Plan on May 30, 2014. The Plaintiffs' objections were "limited to the annual goals set by TUSD, not the specifics of the detailed plan of action to be undertaken to increase the numbers of these students, and ELL students, in ALEs." ECF 1771, p. 2.

Following further exchanges among the parties, a few aspects of the Plan remained in dispute. On August 13, 2014, the Special Master filed a Report and Recommendation regarding those matters, all of which related to how goals should be crafted (i.e., whether they should be program specific, how they should be developed for ELLs, and the level at which recruitment goals should be set generally).

On February 13, 2015, the Court issued its order (ECF 1771) (“ALE Order”) granting in part and rejecting in part the Report and Recommendation, directing the District to prepare and submit several items. The ALE Order called for three primary actions: a “20% report¹ and ELL Supplement to the Plan (both due within 20 days of the Order), followed by creation of this ALE Supplement that would include unitary status goals and annual targets, disaggregated by program, to achieve such goals by the end of the Unitary Status Plan in 2017 (due within 60 days of the Order). The Court wrote:

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TUSD shall, in consultation with the Plaintiffs and the Special Master, develop the comprehensive goals for attaining unitary status by ensuring that African American and Latino students have equal access to the District’s Advanced Learning Opportunities. Withing (sic) 60 days of the filing date of this Order, TUSD shall file a Supplement to the ALE Action Plan, which shall include these unitary status goals and annual goals for attaining unitary status by the end of SY 2016-17.

ECF 1771, pp. 9 - 10.

The following is the ALE Action Plan Supplement as directed by the Court. It contains comprehensive goals for attaining unitary status developed in response to the ALE Order and pursuant to a collaborative process described below.

Development of This Supplement

Before beginning the process of creating this supplement in response to the ALE Plan the District made efforts to include representatives of both plaintiff groups by extending personal invitations. Counsel for both Plaintiff groups sent communications declining participation in the Plan development, stating that they would review and comment on the submission after the committee had completed its work. On March 4, 2015, Michael Konrad (Interim Director of Advanced

¹ In creating annual goals for progress monitoring, the District proposed a “20% Rule”, as suggested by Vanderbilt University professor Donna Ford, Ph.D. to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in *Mcfadden v. Board of Education*. Dr. Ford offers a relatively simple rule for identifying discrimination: Her “20% rule” presumes that discrimination may be present if any subgroup has a participation rate that is 20% less than their enrollment rate. For example, if African American students are 10% of the student population, then they should be at least 8% of ALEs. The 20% Rule is discussed in some detail in the ALE Action Plan, Section II (and appendices).

Learning Experiences) invited a diverse panel of educators to assist in reviewing and crafting of goals for ALE access and recruitment. Participants were:

Frances Banales, Tucson Education Association President (Hispanic)
Juliet King, Accountability & Research (American Indian/Alaska Native)
Richard Langford, Student Success Specialist /AP Mentor (African American)
Helen LePage, GATE Program Coordinator (Hispanic)
Murray Lewis, GATE Itinerant Teacher/Technology Integration Specialist (African American)
Dean Packard, Principal of University High School (Anglo)
Tamela Thomas, Teacher Mentor (African American)

The committee that was convened included experienced education professionals familiar with our district. The committee met three times, for approximately 1.5 hours each session: on March 9th, 16th, and 23rd, 2015. During the meetings the committee reviewed the ALE Order, the 20% goals, and created a draft ALE Supplement. Additional work, including data collection and drafting of the supplement, was done by some members outside of the scheduled meetings. The draft supplement included program goals based on the 20% rule as well as proposed Action Steps that would supplement the recruitment and access activities already reflected in the ALE Action Plan.

On March 27th, 2015, District representatives, the Special Master, along with counsel and representatives for all of the plaintiffs in the case, met for the quarterly “Desegregation Summit.” At that meeting, Michael Konrad shared the draft ALE Supplement which included data tables with preliminary goals and proposed adjustments to the existing District strategies. He answered various questions and gathered Requests for Information (RFIs) in which the parties sought data to use in providing further input. This consultation resulted in a great deal of feedback as well as suggestions for strategies that would support equal access to ALEs for African American and Latino students. On April 8th the District forwarded written responses to those summit RFIs that pertained specifically to this Supplement and sent these responses to the Special Master and plaintiffs. The Mendoza plaintiffs responded on April 10th with additional feedback. Suggestions offered during this process, such as wide scale testing of students for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), are incorporated in this supplement (see proposed Action/Study Items section).

Format of This Supplement

This Supplement to the ALE Action Plan is designed both to explain in narrative form some of the issues surrounding increased ALE access and recruitment and to provide the specific statistical goals against which the District will evaluate its efforts. It contains the following sections:

- I. A narrative discussion regarding overall ALE Access and Recruitment Goals.
- II. Data Tables including goal percentages based on 40th day enrollment.
- III. Action/Study Items that may be adopted as part of the ALE Action Plan.

I. Goals for Ensuring Equal Access to the District's Advanced Learning Experiences for African American and Latino Students.

TUSD proposed the use of the 20% rule to confirm a recruitment goal that would show equity of access for students into Advanced Learning Experiences based on the Ford research. Specifically, the ALE Plan submitted last year proposed increasing the overall participation of African American and Latino students so that their ALE participation rate is within 20% of their representation in the District. In its ALE Order the Court directed, as the Mendoza plaintiffs suggested, that goals be disaggregated by program. It next noted that the 20% rule could be used as a general guideline but that more specific goals should be developed in consultation with the Plaintiffs and the Special Master.

Initially, TUSD believed that goals based on the 20% standard would be practicable. After further consultation with the Plaintiffs and the Special Master, TUSD decided more ambitious goals should be implemented. Accordingly, TUSD has used the 20% rule to set the goals for the upcoming 2015-2016 school year. That is, the District will, in the first instance, seek to increase access/recruitment for African American and Latino students such that their participation rate in ALEs rises to at least 80% (using 20% Rule) of their district enrollment rate. Thereafter, the targets continue to rise. For example, the goal for school year 2016-17 is representation commensurate within 85% (15% "Rule") of district enrollment for both African American and Latino student groups. After attaining Unitary Status, the District would continue to strive for equity by increasing representation to within 90%

(10% “Rule”) of district enrollment rate for African American and Latino students for 2017-2018. These goal percentages can be reviewed in the tables that follow.

The Impact of Setting Goals by Program

As the District discussed in the original Plan, ALE growth, particularly efforts to gain concurrently in *all* ALE programming, is more complex than it might seem at first glance. One issue discussed by the committee and, reviewed during the Summit, is that many of the ALE programs compete with each other for students. For example, a student at the middle school level may be offered enrollment in Self-Contained GATE (Gifted and Talented Education) but decide instead to attend a different middle school and enroll in GATE Resource. Another student may have to decide between GATE Resource and a Middle School Class for High School Credit. A high school student must decide between IB and AP programs. Also, as a student advances in ALE programming he or she will, by definition, be leaving one kind of program to enroll in another. For example, a sophomore student qualifying for and taking a Pre-AP Honors English class likely will move into an AP English class the Junior Year. Growth in Advanced Placement draws in the first instance from honors and pre-AP course. Growth in self-contained GATE tends to draw from the pool of students participating in pull-out GATE. So, although the District seeks a system in which the rising tide of equity will lift all boats, there will continue to be challenges associated with the interplay between competing ALE programs.

The ALE Order recognized this dilemma discussed in the Plan (i.e., that some programs compete with each other for students) but noted that the disaggregation of reporting and tracking by program would assist for both reporting and program evaluation purposes and enhance accountability. ECF 1771 at pp. 6-8. The ALE Order thus requires data sets to be reported for each of the eleven ALE programs separately.

The District has thus adopted below increased goals, by program, above and beyond those that would be dictated by strict adherence to the “20% Rule.” However, it also recognizes that the realities discussed above² (that growth in certain programs can lead to decreases in others) will be an ongoing challenge in which continued referral to total ALE participation remains a meaningful barometer. In an effort to combine increased programmatic targets with a system-

² The only way to minimize this impact would be to combine competing programs into singular data points (i.e., combine all GATE, combine Honors/AP, pre-AP) for analysis and reporting as an adjunct to – not replacement for – individualized program monitoring.

wide goal, these realities negatively impact TUSD's ability to reach 100% of its goals. The District instead suggests that its commitment to individualized growth of programs be ultimately viewed in tandem with evidence of system-wide ALE participation increases for the plaintiff classes. Accordingly, to satisfy the Court's directive while recognizing the inherent push-pull described above, TUSD expresses its goal as follows:

The Tucson Unified School District shall show it has obtained unitary status in the area of Advanced Learning Experiences when it reaches meets the below listed goals for 2016-17 in 80% (37 out of 46) of the individual programs with a corresponding overall ALE increase for African American and Latino students so that their ALE participation rate is within 15% of their enrollment rate in the district.

To the extent the District falls short of this specific target (and it does not intend to) it must demonstrate its good-faith efforts to meet those goals to the extent practicable.³

With the current included ALE areas there are 46 different data points. Currently the district has reached the 20% rule in 30 of these 46 data points and has reached the 2016-2017 goals in 17 of the 46 data points. This leaves room for growth over the next two years as TUSD strives to attain unitary status.

The Challenge of English Language Learner Goals

The ALE Order directs that the District include English Language Learners (ELLs) in its analysis and planning for expanded ALE access and recruitment. The Court directs that the District

shall develop goals for increasing participation of ELL students in specific ALE programs, where practicable, and provide explanation to the Plaintiffs and the Special Master as to how these goals were derived. Within 20 days of the filing date of this Order, TUSD shall complete this ELL Supplement to the ALE Action Plan Report and provide it to the Plaintiffs and Special Master for review and comment.

ECF 1771, p. 9. In its ELL Supplement, TUSD created goals for ELL participation students in 1) Dual Language Self-Contained GATE; 2) Middle School for High School Credit Courses; 3) Dual Language Program; and 4) Advanced Placement. These four

³ *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 515 U.S. 70, 89 (1995); See also *Fisher v. Tucson Unified School District*, 652 F. 3d 1131, 1143-44 (9th Cir. 2011)

programs were targeted because they are offered in the primary language(s) of the majority of the district's ELL students (e.g., Spanish).

Increasing ELL enrollment in ALEs presents some challenges unique to that population. "English Language Learner" is a specialized term. According to the Arizona Department of Education, the ELL label refers to those K-12 students who do not obtain a composite proficiency level of "proficient" score on the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA). Students designated as ELL are, by definition, not proficient in English and thus are not positioned to succeed in those programs offered only in English.

One of the challenges presented by the ELL designation is the limitation on their scheduling. For example, a four-hour block is required for all students who are not proficient in English. "All ELL students who have not tested proficient on the Assessment (AZELLA) must be enrolled in four hours of regimented, immersive, English Language Development (ELD) instruction. The only exceptions to the so-called "four hour block" requirement are half-day kindergarten students and middle/high school intermediate level ELL students in their second year of ELL status. ADE website; <http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/frequently-asked-questions/>. During this block, students remain with one teacher for four hours of instruction. Thus, the four-hour block presents challenges. For example, a student would be unable to participate in self-contained GATE, which is an all-day program.

Also, students who are classified as ELL lose that designation once they achieve English proficiency. They are no longer identified as ELL by the state or federal government (or, perhaps most importantly here, by the District's student information system). Accordingly, an ELL who has become English proficient may very well advance to ALE participation and the statistical tracking that is designed to inform these goals would not reflect that. Although they might be reflected as a member of either of the plaintiff classes, they would not show in data systems as an ELL participating in ALE.

Although the ELL goals are not reflected below, they are included in the ELL Supplement provided to SMP on March 5, 2015. For the reasons stated above, our ELL students are not the subject of the same goal-setting and analysis applied in this supplement.

University High School (UHS)

Because approximately 50% of the students coming into UHS are not District residents, it would not be appropriate to try and reach the 20% rule for this program. Neither Plaintiffs' objection nor the Special Master's submission directed a "20% rule" goal for UHS enrollment but instead UHS enrollment and recruiting is addressed separately, both by its own admissions plan and in separate parts of the ALE plan. Even when the ALE Order discussed the 20% rule, it also noted that "UHS is not at issue, here." Certainly the District will continue to strive for equity of enrollment but with roughly half the students enrolling coming from outside the district, it may be more appropriate to have a goal based on a reduction of disparity. Accordingly, there is no table with goal percentages listed below for UHS.

II. Data Tables: Data Tables including Goal Percentages

Each of the ten ALE programs⁴ has a chart below representing it. **“Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13”** reflects the enrollment percentage of the represented class on the 40th day of enrollment for that year.⁵ The 20% rule as it is applied in these charts therefore will need to be adjusted each year as the overall enrollment % will change. The next three columns (2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15) have the actual percentage of participation for the listed classes. The column titled **“2015-2016”** is the district’s first goal year and is based on the 20% rule. **“2016-2017”** is based on **15%** and **“2017-2018”** (theoretically one year after the district attains unitary status) is based on 10% (both as described on page 4 of this document).

⁴ 1) Self-Contained GATE; 2) Pull-Out GATE; 3) Resource GATE; 4) Advanced Placement (AP); 5) Pre-AP; 6) Honors Pre-AP; 7) Dual Credit; 8) International Baccalaureate (IB); 9) Dual Language; 10) Middle School Courses for High School Credit.

⁵ Upon first review, this 2012-13 column may lead to confusion because these percentages vary slightly among and between certain charts. There are a variety of factors that influence the percentage calculations for individual programs. For example, Pullout GATE is available for K-5, but self-contained GATE is available for grades 1-5 (at the elementary level). Resource GATE is offered only in grades 9-10, and AP classes are offered in grades 11-12. So, the demographics were calculated separately by program where necessary and in the interests of precision.

As a practical matter, the 2012-13 baselines become less relevant because the racial/ethnic percentages will be recalculated each year to be kept current. For the 2014-15 annual report, for example, current baselines (not 2012-13 figures) will be provided against which ALE enrollments can be measured. In 2015-16, new baseline enrollment figures will be calculated for the calculation of the “20% rule” by program.

1. Self-Contained GATE

								Post USP Goal
Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13 %	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	Elem	7.7%	4.0%	5.7%	5.9%	6.2%	6.6%	6.9%
African Am.	Middle	7.6%	4.5%	4.4%	3.8%	6.0%	6.5%	6.8%
Latino	Elem	61.0%	45.0%	45.0%	46.3%	48.8%	51.9%	55.0%
Latino	Middle	61.7%	48.9%	48.7%	51.0%	49.4%	52.0%	55.5%

2. Pull-Out GATE

								Post USP Goal
Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13 %	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	Elem	7.9%	4.2%	4.2%	4.0%	6.3%	6.7%	7.1%
	K-8	7.2%	6.2%	5.7%	5.0%	5.8%	6.1%	6.5%
Latino	Elem	60.4%	45.3%	46.6%	47.8%	48.3%	51.3%	54.4
	K-8	69.9%	55.0%	60.5%	60.3%	55.9%	59.4%	62.9%

3. Resource GATE

								Post USP Goal
Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13 %	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African American	K-8	7.9%	2.0%	5.0%	3.1%	6.3%	6.7%	7.1%
	Middle	7.6%	7.7%	6.1%	7.7%	6.0%	6.5%	6.8%
	HS	7.8%	6.5%	6.8%	8.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.0%

Latino	K-8	67.8%	92.0%	91.3%	72.1%	54.2%	57.6%	61.0%
	Middle	61.7%	41.0%	42.1%	39.4%	49.4%	52.0%	55.5%
	HS	55.1%	45.2%	44.3%	57.5%	44.1%	46.8%	49.6%

4. Advanced Placement

								Post USP Goal
Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African American	High	7.8%	5.3%	5.8%	6.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.0%
Latino	High	52.7%	41.6%	43.9%	44.1%	42.2%	44.8%	47.4%

5. Pre-AP

								Post USP Goal
Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	K-8	7.9%	7.8%	7.1%	8.5%	6.3%	6.7%	7.1%
	Middle	7.6%	5.2%	5.1%	7.9%	6.0%	6.5%	6.8%

Latino	K-8	67.8%	56.6%	52.1%	58.5%	54.2%	57.6%	61.0%
	Middle	61.7%	56.9%	57.4%	57.1%	49.4%	52.0%	55.5%

6. Honors Pre-AP

								Post USP Goal
Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	K-8	7.1%	7.0%	6.5%	7.4%	5.7%	6.0%	6.4%
	Middle	7.3%	6.2%	8.9%	8.9%	5.9%	6.2	6.6%
	High	7.8%	5.8%	5.9%	6.2%	6.2%	6.6%	7.0%

Latino	K-8	70.1%	60.6%	58.2%	63.4%	56.1%	59.6%	63.1%
	Middle	60.1%	44.0%	55.3%	51.0%	48.1%	51.1%	54.1%
	High	55.0%	47.2%	50.4%	52.9%	44.0%	46.8%	49.6%

7. Dual Credit

Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13						Post USP Goal
			2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	High	7.8%	7.4%	8.1%	10.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.0%

Latino	High	52.7%	38.9%	51.7%	52.2%	42.2%	44.8%	47.4%

8. International Baccalaureate

Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13						Post USP Goal
			2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	Elem	7.8%	4.8%	5.6%	6.9%	6.3%	6.6%	7.0%
	K-8	6.6%	5.9%	8.2%	7.9%	5.3%	5.6%	5.9%
	High	7.8%	6.6%	7.2%	6.6%	6.2%	6.6%	7.0%

Latino	Elem	60.2%	83.0%	84.1%	79.9%	48.2%	51.1%	54.1%
	K-8	71.7%	77.8%	72.9%	74.6%	57.3%	60.9%	64.5%
	High	55.0%	77.9%	76.9%	78.8%	44.0%	46.8%	49.6%

9. Dual Language

Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13						Post USP Goal
			2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	Elem	8.0%	1.8%	2.6%	1.9%	6.4%	6.8%	7.2%
	K-8	7.2%	1.7%	1.9%	3.3%	5.7%	6.1%	6.5%
	Middle	7.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	6.0%	6.5%	6.8%
	High	7.8%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	6.6%	7.0%

Latino	Elem	60.2%	87.9%	86.3%	87.1%	48.1%	51.1%	54.1%
	K-8	70.3%	87.8%	85.3%	85.1%	56.3%	59.6%	63.1%
	Middle	61.7%	93.3%	94.0%	92.8%	49.4%	52.0%	55.5%
	High	55.1%	69.6%	100.0%	98.9%	44.1%	46.8%	49.6%

10. Middle School Courses for High School Credit

Ethn	Grade Level	2012-13 %	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	2015-16 goal (20%)	2016-17 goal (15%)	Post USP Goal
								2017-18 goal (10%)
African Am.	K-8	7.9%	5.4%	4.2%	2.7%	6.3%	6.7%	7.1%
	Middle	7.6%	5.9%	6.5%	5.2%	6.0%	6.5%	6.8%
Latino	K-8	67.8%	75.9%	74.9%	80.2%	54.2%	57.6%	61.0%
	Middle	61.7%	53.3%	54.1%	55.7%	49.4%	52.0%	55.5%

III. Study/Action Items that may be adopted as part of the ALE Action Plan.

The following Study/Action Items were generated by combining the work of the ALE Supplement Plan Committee as well as suggestions from the plaintiffs and the Special Master made during the Spring Desegregation Summit. Some strategies were suggested during the review by the Special Master and his team of the TUSD Magnet Plan. Other strategies were suggested by district employees including Steve Holmes, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Martha Taylor, Acting Senior Director of Desegregation, Richard Foster, Senior Director of Curriculum, Victoria Callison, Director of Magnet Programs, Ignacio Ruiz, Director of Language Acquisition, Helen LePage, Program Coordinator for GATE, Juliet King, Accountability & Research, and Michael Konrad, Director of Advanced Learning Experiences.

Many of these now are being studied for potential use for improving our programs. As we begin to get cost estimates and data results returned, we will be able to determine which strategies may be implemented for 2015-2016.

1. Self-Contained GATE

- Explore testing all TUSD students and/or students in selected grade levels for Gate placement.
- Explore re-establishing the Self Contained GATE program at Tully Elementary including enrollment options such as a classroom combination of students eligible through test scores and through lottery.
- Explore the possibility of additional SCG sites including a program on the east side of Tucson.
- Explore the possibility of expanding services at current SCG sites.
- Analyze results of GATE Discover Pilot Assessment, a non-cognitive multiple measure, administered 2014-2015 as an alternative to the Raven's Progressive Matrices. Possibly make adjustments to admissions criteria based on pilot results.
- Increase enrollment cap for SCG middle school programs to 30 students in order to reduce wait lists at individual sites. Explore the inclusion of Elementary schools with this strategy.
- Explore admissions criteria including weighting of student race and/or ethnicity for placement and/or priority wait list placement.
- Continue and expand current efforts to recruit African American and Latino students to participate in GATE testing such as schools hosting open house events to increase students testing for Self-Contained programs.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

2. Pull-Out GATE

- Explore the possibility of increasing FTE allotment for Itinerant GATE services.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

3. Resource GATE

- Continue recruitment efforts and support programs to increase enrollment to increase enrollment of African American and Latino students.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

4. Advanced Placement

- Continue recruitment efforts and support programs to increase enrollment of African American and Latino students.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

5. Advanced Pre-AP

- Continue recruitment efforts and support programs in order to increase enrollment of African American and Latino students.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

6. Honors Pre-AP

- Continue recruitment efforts and initiate support programs in order to increase enrollment of African American and Latino students.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

7. Dual Credit

- Continue recruitment efforts and support programs to increase enrollment of African American and Latino students.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

8. International Baccalaureate

- Continue recruitment efforts and support programs to increase enrollment of African American and Latino students.

- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

9. Dual Language

- Explore marketing options that include information about how Dual Language can help test scores for SAT.
- Explore possibility of our Dual Language Elementary programs providing a certificate at the end of the program that might count for points for entrance into other ALE programs such as GATE, Honors, or UHS.
- Explore assigning Hollinger Dual Language GATE a feeder so that there is at least one other K-5 program to feed into their 6-8 program for Dual Language.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.

10. Middle School Courses for High School Credit

- Explore the possibility of implementing an Algebra readiness assessment to all students at the end of 6th and/or 7th grade in order to open access in an equitable manner to Algebra for HS credit in MS.
- Continue Action Steps detailed in the current ALE Action Plan.