

**MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS' ADDITIONAL OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED  
FRUCHTHENDLER/SABINO PLAN**

April 7, 2015

**Despite Pending Budget Cuts TUSD Moves Forward with the  
Fruchthendler/Sabino Grade Configuration Plan**

During the meetings held with all of the parties on March 26th and 27th, Chief Financial Officer Karla Soto stated the District might not be able to purchase leveled reading materials with M & O funds for those schools whose programs were not within the agreed 910(g) funding as a consequence of funding cuts recently imposed on school districts by Arizona Governor Ducey. She also indicated that there would be severe pressure on the District's spending given an anticipated reduction of about \$18 million in that funding.

During negotiations regarding the five million dollar carry-over from the 2013-14 school year to the 2014-15 school year, discussion had ensued among the parties about the proposal for blanket usage of desegregation dollars across all District schools for the purchase of a leveled reading program, which led the District to commit to purchasing the leveled reading program using M&O funds for the segment of schools which could not be tied to the USP. Yet, given the above referenced cuts, and the seemingly imminent failure to make good on its commitment to purchase the leveled reading program for those schools desegregation funding cannot cover, there has been no abandonment of the Sabino/Fruchthendler grade configuration modifications the District has proposed at a minimum cost of \$230,000 for renovations and \$260,000 per year for transportation. (See Fruchthendler/Sabino: Response to Objections and Request for Approval, March 4, 2015 ("TUSD Response") at p.14.)

At this point, it is impossible to know what other cuts the District will propose based on the noted state cuts but it appears that with little or no regard to such pending cuts, the District is committed to stand by its grade reconfiguration plan for Fruchthendler ES and Sabino HS, which may not increase overall enrollment and therefore may not lead to increased income to the District through such increased enrollment. It is alarming that the District is willing to forsake a successful, research-based reading program and rationalize doing so based on "state cuts" while insisting on going forward with the costs of a plan that is based largely on student enrollment projections that are not built on sound and credible numbers and that is explicitly directed to white families even as the District also is losing Latino students in ever increasing numbers, as discussed further below.<sup>1</sup> No parent surveys have been conducted, for example, as of April 6, 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> The District suggests that the costs of the Fruchthendler/Sabino plan are immaterial because they will not be paid for with 910(g) funds but that ignores the

It would seem most prudent for the District to move away from a costly plan to capture students who have left TUSD which is not grounded in solid projections; was put together without Sabino High School parent input; and was created in a particularly rushed fashion. For example, in response to some of the Plaintiffs' comments about the lack of inclusion of the Plaintiffs in the process, Julie Tolleson, legal counsel for TUSD, stated during the meetings of March 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>, that she herself had only a short period to review the proposal prior to it going to the Board.

The District's own memorandum of March 4, 2015 to the Special Master states, "**While there is little data to project the impact of the plan on Sabino High School**, the District **anticipates** that almost all of the Fruchthendler 6<sup>th</sup> graders would transition to 7<sup>th</sup> grade at Sabino and largely remain there through the completion of high school. In addition, the District **anticipates** that the Sabino 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade option (and the transportation available to it) will appeal to families within the Sabino attendance area that are presently choosing non-District options. Based on the 2010 census, there are 190 middle-school-age students per grade (580 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> graders total) in the Sabino area who are not attending TUSD schools....Thus, the District projects increases to Sabino enrollment between 80 to 110 students (the Fruchthendler transition only), and there is a strong **potential** to increase that enrollment by attracting some of the remaining students in the Sabino area not already attending TUSD schools." (TUSD Memo at 5; emphasis added.) That upper estimate is more than 300 students, as is noted in the January 27, 2015 TUSD Governing Board Agenda Fruchthendler/Sabino Plan materials which states, "The goal would be to add more students (up to 330 total) by recruiting students who don't now attend TUSD schools....Sabino has capacity to accept over 300 additional students in a separate, junior-high-school campus." (A copy of this Board Agenda is attached as Exhibit 1. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a copy of the Governing Board Agenda for February 10, 2015, also dealing with the Fruchthendler/Sabino proposal.)

---

facts that M&O funds are needed to support the USP in addition to 910(g) funds and that the District has an on-going obligation to spend all of its funds in a non-discriminatory manner. With respect to the non 910(g) funds, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the District allocated over \$38 million in M&O funds to the USP in the 2014-15 fiscal year. Further, they repeat that this planned initiative and the related expenses to create what the District now proclaims is a better environment for 6<sup>th</sup> graders and an opportunity for a special honors "pipeline" (see discussion below) is explicitly targeted to white students: As stated in the TUSD Response" at page 2: "As clearly delineated in the original analysis, the objective is to attract and retain mostly Anglo students..." Mendoza Plaintiffs question the use of any District funds to create what its own literature now states are special educational opportunities targeted "to...mostly Anglo students."

The District could not be clearer in advising that there is “little data to project the impact of the plan on Sabino High School” and utilizes the terms “anticipation” and “potential” which are terms grounded in speculation and not in statistically sound methodology. (This is confirmed in the wording of both Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 as well as in the TUSD Response.)

### **The Creation of Options for One Class of Parents Only**

The TUSD Response to the Special Master states:

“The Plan is designed to attract students to TUSD who typically chose to leave TUSD schools, especially during the middle-school grades. The Plan uses three approaches to help attract and retain students that are otherwise choosing other options, thereby frustrating TUSD’s desegregation efforts:

- “1. Minimize transitions so parents need only make a single choice (only a 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> grade transition versus the normal 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> followed by an 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup>);
2. Provide options for parents that they are already choosing to use at other grade levels (they already choose Fruchthendler and Sabino.); and
3. Provide options for parents that are relatively accessible, especially as they may already have other children in these schools (Sabino and Fruchthendler are close to the areas that we propose to draw students from).

“As clearly delineated in the original analysis, **the objective is to attract and retain mostly Anglo students who typically leave TUSD schools**; it does not endorse or encourage the movement of Anglo students from other TUSD schools.<sup>2</sup> TUSD has analyzed the Plan’s potential impacts on the racial composition at both schools. The projected racial composition at each school is so similar to their existing composition that the changes will be virtually non-existent.” (TUSD Memo at 2; emphasis added.)

The Mendoza Plaintiffs question why there is such intense focus on the provision of options for predominately white parents.

Currently, the District is losing **more** non-white students than white students. In examining the number of students enrolled as of the 40<sup>th</sup> day of the 2013-14 school year through May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014, a total of 604 Hispanic students were lost in contrast to 157 white students. (See below chart.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs have requested additional information in this regard to determine the

---

<sup>2</sup> See discussion of mailing to families in the Collier attendance zone which suggests that this statement of not encouraging movement of Anglo students from other TUSD schools may not be accurate.

reason for the loss (drop-out, move, etc.), however, the data itself is telling and discloses the largest number and percentage of students lost from the District are Hispanic.

TUSD 40<sup>th</sup> day enrollment

White	Af. AM.	Hispanic	Nat.Am.	Asian Am.	Multiracial	Total
11,202	2,749	31,356	1,940	1089	1,512	49,848
22.5%	5.5%	62.9%	3.9%	2.2%	3.0%	

TUSD May 8, 2014 enrollment

White	Af. AM.	Hispanic	Nat.Am.	Asian Am	Multiracial	Total
11,045	2,784	30,752	1,906	1,100	1,489	49,076
22.5%	5.7%	62.7%	3.9%	2.2%	3.0%	

Difference between 40<sup>th</sup> and May 8, 2014 enrollment

-157	+35	-604	-34	+11	-23	-772
-.0140%	+.0127%	-.0192%	-.0175%	+.0101%	-.0152%	of 40 <sup>th</sup> day enrollment
20.33%		78.24%	4.40%		2.9%	of total 772 fewer students

Source for charts: TUSD website enrollment numbers.

**The Arguments Presented by Fruchthendler for its Newly Proposed Configuration Contradict any Logic in Moving 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Graders to Sabino High School and Raise the Question of Why All Middle Schools Are Not Being Reconfigured to Return 6<sup>th</sup> Grades to the Elementary Level; No Research on 7<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Grade School Reconfiguration**

The Fruchthendler website at: <http://edweb.tusd.k12.az.us/Fruchthendler/> provides a link as follows:

6th Grade at Fruchthendler in the Fall of 2015. Click [here](#) for the letter which includes information about academic value and pre-registration form.

A copy of the referenced letter is attached as Exhibit 3. The letter includes the following:

**“The following is a brief summary of research of *“Factors Favoring Sixth Grade in Elementary School”*”:**

- Keeping the sixth graders in elementary school gives them another year to mature before they are exposed to older adolescents.
- In elementary schools, student environment is more nurturing with fewer stressors than a middle school.
- There is more opportunity for cross-age activities such as tutoring and older role model programs like “kindergarten buddies.” Parents are more involved in a school in which their children are more likely to be in the same building.
- In elementary schools, sixth graders spend most of the day with the same teacher and classmates in the same classroom. There is less freedom because the students are carefully monitored. In contrast, middle school children have several teachers for different subjects and move from classroom to classroom throughout the day.
- Sixth graders in elementary school test higher than those in middle school. The Duke study also considered test scores. The researchers found that sixth graders in elementary school scored higher than their peers in middle school on standardized end of grade tests. A recent study in the Philadelphia school system concurred with the Duke study.
- Researchers found that sixth-grade students in both elementary and combination K-12 schools outperformed sixth graders in middle schools or junior high schools and considered the number of transitions a significant factor.
- Sixth graders performed better on standardized tests when they were in K-6 configurations, as opposed to 6-8 middle school configurations. The researchers also determined that a K-6 configuration led to greater school accountability for sixth grade performance than that occurring in a 6-8th grade configuration.

- Having schools with longer grade spans allow for more collaboration among teachers across grade levels as well as better alignment of curriculum across grades.
- Research reveals that school-to-school transitions negatively impact academic achievement. The fewer transitions, the better chance a student has of completing high school. If there is a transition into a new school for high school instruction, grade 7 is preferable to transitioning in later years.
- Sixth graders in middle school have more behavioral problems than their peers in elementary school. In a highly regarded 2007 study of public school students in North Carolina, a group at Duke University's Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy looked at behavior to evaluate whether sixth graders were better off in elementary school or middle school. After appropriate adjustments for socioeconomic and demographic factors, the study showed that sixth graders attending elementary school were less likely to have discipline problems than their middle school counterparts.
- The researchers found that students who attended middle school in sixth grade were twice as likely to be disciplined relative to their counterparts in elementary school. The authors note that their results complement the recent findings by other researchers that school systems that move sixth graders from elementary to middle school experience a 1-3 percent decline in on-time graduation rates. As such, the authors explained, "Based on our results, we suggest that there is a strong argument for separating sixth graders from older adolescents."

As some of these points are addressed, the same language can be posed for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders.

- Keeping the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders in middle school gives them another year or two to mature before they are exposed to older adolescents.
- In middle schools, student environment is more nurturing with fewer stressors than a high school.

**TUSD's other "Factors Favoring Sixth Grade in Elementary School" raise the question as to why TUSD would address problems as noted in its research, at an east side predominately white school and not, at the same time, address these problems in schools which are predominately comprised of minority students (Hispanic students).**

**Once again, one class of students (white) is being favored over Hispanic and African American students through TUSD's Fruchthendler/Sabino Grade Reconfiguration Plan.**

The absence of evidence to support the District's plan for its inclusion of 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade within Sabino high school is alarming. Why offer research for the Fruchthendler reconfiguration and offer **nothing** for the Sabino reconfiguration? Many have expressed concerns over the social and the physical intermingling of students ranging from 7<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade on the same campus and despite the District's position that it is segregating the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders in a different facility, the practicality of doing so might be impossible. From the allocated budget, it does not

appear that the two schools within the school will have distinct nurses or distinct libraries. Therefore, there is bound to be student interaction. Additionally, athletic events are bound to draw 7th-8<sup>th</sup> graders if in fact the students identify as Sabino students<sup>3</sup>.

**Post Card to Targeted Neighborhoods Announcing a Newly Designed Honors Pipeline Program in TUSD; Survey and Parent Meetings AFTER the Decision Has Been Made by the TUSD Governing Board**

A targeted mailing took place during the week of March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015, which is attached as Exhibit 4. The post card asks targeted parents if they are interested in sending their child/ren to **“a newly designed honors pipeline program in TUSD,** culminating with having the child/ren attend a 2013 National Blue Ribbon High School.” It also invites parents to participate in a community-based survey that will help TUSD officials “create a program that will meet your needs and your student’s interests.” The survey link is at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Fruchthendler-Sabino>

The post card also invites recipients to attend open house meetings at Sabino on April 8<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 PM, April 14 at 5:00 PM, and April 30<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 PM. This type of targeted recruitment has not taken place for any of the magnet schools.

The post card announces “a newly designed honors pipeline,” which is a complete surprise to the Mendoza Plaintiffs. The plan that went before the TUSD Governing Board and the information which has been provided to the Plaintiffs and Special Master has never mentioned “a newly designed honors pipeline”. There is no comparable pipeline anywhere else within TUSD, which results in “a newly designed honors pipeline” being offered predominately to white students in upper middle class to high socio-economic families who reside in the northeast part of the District.

The Mendoza Plaintiffs now believe that the originally stated objectives for the proposed Fruchthendler/Sabino grade reconfiguration have been a mask for what now has been revealed as the true objective as stated on the post card -- the recruitment and retention of white students **for a newly designed honors pipeline,**<sup>4</sup> the result of which is clear: further segregated Advanced Learning programs; offerings created for one class of students (white) to the exclusion of Hispanic and African American students (as well as Native American).

---

<sup>3</sup> Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the District has failed to answer most of the questions it posed in this regard in their initial objection.

<sup>4</sup> It also appears that the District is attempting to create a new advanced learning experience outside the USP and therefore one in which it will not have to set goals for the participation of Latino and African American students or be held accountable if relatively more white than Latino and African American students participate in the program.



### **The Use of TUSD Funding to Support One Under-Enrolled High School and to Build an Honors Track/Pathway Targeted to White Students**

In examining the data relating to several schools, Sabino HS is one of several under-utilized high schools -- it is at 54.4% utilization. Santa Rita is at 44.8% utilization; Palo Verde is at 46%; Catalina is at 68.1%. On the extreme opposite, Cholla High School is at 101.8% utilization; Rincon is at 105.1%; Tucson High is at 111.2% utilization; and Sahuaro is at 94.1 utilization. (Source: TUSD Facility Planning Database March 21, 2014- Attached as Exhibit 5.) Clearly, the use of TUSD funding to either support increasing enrollment or to assist with "over-underutilization" would be welcome by any of the listed high schools. The same is true at the elementary level and middle school level. Did these schools know that they could initiate a site-based plan to address their issues, such as in the case of Fruchthendler and Sabino? The answer is likely that they did not.

Moreover, other schools do appear to have submitted plans to include a 6<sup>th</sup> grade offering at their school (Collier), or to add a middle school component to their site (Drachman). Apparently, their proposals were denied.<sup>5</sup>

What is clear is that there is unwavering support for the Fruchthendler/Sabino Reconfiguration/Honors Program Pipeline and such support will be to the detriment of other groups (Hispanics and African American) and schools.

### **Pre-empting Approval From the Court**

Time and time again, TUSD has not waited for approval from the Court before moving forward with an initiative that in fact requires the Court's concurrence and that raises serious issues as to its good faith commitment to removing the vestiges of its past discrimination. It has done so yet again with the current

---

<sup>5</sup> Mendoza Plaintiffs note that their inquiry concerning the apparent difference in District response to a proposal from the principal of Fruchthendler vs. proposals from the principals of Collier and Dunham in their initial objection also was not answered by the District in the TUSD Response.

Mendoza Plaintiffs also are informed that the post card inviting participation in the "honors pipeline" was sent to parents in the Collier attendance zone. This raises concerns about whether parents will move their children to Fruchthendler, further reducing attendance at Collier and potentially drawing away its white students. Notwithstanding the inclusion of the Collier attendance zone in the post card mailing, Collier has not been included in the desegregation impact analysis prepared by the District. Nor does it appear that the District's presentation of the benefits of placing sixth graders in an elementary school rather than in a middle school or the newly announced honors pipeline were considered by the District when it prepared its DIA and made its assumptions about how many students would leave TUSD schools for Fruchthendler to attend 6<sup>th</sup> grade.



“proposal.” As is clear from the District materials cited above, TUSD is actively recruiting for 6<sup>th</sup> grade students at Fruchthendler and for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students at Sabino. It also is now advertising for a program- **a newly created honors pipeline-** which will disproportionately benefit the District’s white students.

The Mendoza Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Special Master recommend that the Fruchthendler/Sabino plan be rejected by the Court and that the District be directed to focus the creation of elementary schools that include 6<sup>th</sup> grades and honors pipelines on locations in the District that will benefit its Latino and African American students as well as its white students.

# **EXHIBIT 1**



MEETING OF: January 27, 2015

---

TITLE: Consideration of K-6 Component at Fruchthendler Elementary School and a 7th - 8th Grade Component at Sabino High School

---

ITEM #: 3

---

Information: X

Study:

Action:

---

**PURPOSE:**

To provide the Governing Board with information pertaining to the possible development of a K-6 component at Fruchthendler Elementary School and a 7th-8th grade component at Sabino High School and to receive feedback from board members related to this proposal.

---

**DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:**

Summary of considerations:

1. An estimated 40 students would be added to Fruchthendler. This is based on Fruchthendler receiving 70% of the 6th graders in the current Fruchthendler K-5 Area.
2. As many as 120 students could be added to Sabino. This is based, in part, on the projected 7th and 8th graders in the entire Sabino HS Area, but the bulk of these students are expected to be those attending 6th grade at Fruchthendler.
3. Fruchthendler and Sabino have capacity to accept these additional students.
4. The Fruchthendler K-5 Area is wholly within the Sabino HS Area. The Sabino HS Area also includes the Collier K-5 Area and portions of Bloom, Hudlow, Whitmore; at the middle school level, it includes a large portion of Magee and, to a much lesser extent, Booth-Fickett.
5. These changes would, primarily, reduce the enrollment of Magee Middle School.
6. The above estimates are based on current TUSD students. Because K-8 capture rates (TUSD students/total school age population) are less than 60% in the subject areas, there may be a potential to attract students who do not currently attend TUSD schools.
7. There is very little current attendance data on which to base the above estimates.

H.T. Sanchez, Bryant Nodine, Mary Anderson and Matt Munger will be present to respond to questions.

---

**BOARD POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:**

---

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

For all Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs), Initiator of Agenda Item provides the name of the agency responsible for recording the Agreement after approval:

For amendments to current IGAs, Initiator provides original IGA recording number:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Advisor Signature (if applicable)

**BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:**

\_\_\_\_\_ District Budget  
\_\_\_\_\_ State/Federal Funds  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other  
Budget Cost      Budget Code

Budget Certification (for use by Office of Financial Services only):

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
I certify that funds for this expenditure in the amount of \$ are available and may be:  
Authorized from current year budget  
Authorized with School Board approval  
Code:      Fund:

**INITIATOR(S):**

**H. T. Sanchez, Ed.D., Superintendent**

**1-20-15**

Name

Title

Date

**DOCUMENTS ATTACHED/ ON FILE IN BOARD OFFICE:**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Click to download

No Attachments Available

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

BOARD AGENDA ITEM  
CONTINUATION SHEET

## **EXHIBIT 2**



MEETING OF: February 10, 2015

---

TITLE: Consideration of K-6 Component at Fruchthendler Elementary School and a 7th - 8th Grade Component at Sabino High School

---

ITEM #: 14

---

Information:

Study: X

Action: X

---

PURPOSE:

To provide additional information, as requested by the Governing Board, pertaining to the possible development of a K-6 component at Fruchthendler Elementary School and a 7th-8th grade component at Sabino High School, so the Board may consider this as a school-choice option for parents.

---

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

Summary of considerations:

1. This option would be by choice versus by assignment.
2. An estimated 40-50 students would be added to Fruchthendler. There is a potential to add an additional 60 students per grade by attracting TUSD students in the Fruchthendler Area who do not currently attend TUSD schools.
3. There is little data with which to make projections for Sabino. It is expected that virtually all of the Fruchthendler 6th graders would transition to Sabino and there is a potential to add an additional 150 students per grade by attracting TUSD students in the Sabino Area who do not currently attend TUSD schools.
4. Fruchthendler and Sabino have capacity to accept these additional students.
5. The enrollment impacts on Magee are expected to be minimal. There are currently about 30 students from the Fruchthendler Area at Magee Middle School. It is expected that some of the Fruchthendler students (about 10 each year) will continue to matriculate to Magee and some 7th graders from Magee will select the Sabino option.
6. Recruitment efforts will be aimed at attracting students who do not attend TUSD schools rather than transferring students between TUSD schools.
7. The impacts on racial-ethnic composition will be minimal because all of the affected populations have similar compositions.

H.T. Sanchez, Bryant Nodine, Mary Anderson and Matt Munger will be present to respond to questions.

---

BOARD POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

---

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS:

For all Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs), Initiator of Agenda Item provides the name of the agency responsible for recording the Agreement after approval:

For amendments to current IGAs, Initiator provides original IGA recording number:

---



Legal Advisor Signature (if applicable)

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

\_\_\_\_\_ District Budget  
 \_\_\_\_\_ State/Federal Funds  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other  
Budget Cost      Budget Code

Budget Certification (for use by Office of Financial Services only):

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 I certify that funds for this expenditure in the amount of \$ are available and may be:  
 Authorized from current year budget  
 Authorized with School Board approval  
 Code:      Fund:

INITIATOR(S):

**Bryant Nodine, Acting Director of Planning and Student Assignment**      **2/3/15**

---

Name	Title	Date
------	-------	------

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED/ ON FILE IN BOARD OFFICE:

<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>
<a href="#">Click to download</a>
No Attachments Available

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

BOARD AGENDA ITEM  
CONTINUATION SHEET

# **EXHIBIT 3**



Fruchthendler Elementary  
7470 E. Cloud Road  
Tucson, AZ 85750  
731-4400; Fax 731-4401

### **Sixth grade at Fruchthendler**

**2015-2016**

Dear Fruchthendler Families,

Over the past couple of months the TUSD Governing Board was presented data, research and parent testimonials regarding adding 6<sup>th</sup> grade to Fruchthendler and 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> to Sabino High School. On Tuesday evening the Governing Board chose to listen to our community by voting to approve our plan which provides you another choice! As mentioned during prior meetings this is a grass roots effort to Preserve Excellence! Fruchthendler once taught the sixth graders while Sabino served the 7-12<sup>th</sup> graders in our community.

With the Governing Board approval to add Sixth grade to Fruchthendler we are ready to work together with you, our community, to streamline our plan to ensure all students receive an enriching and cognitively demanding curriculum in a safe and nurturing environment. The following is the beginning of what we have proposed. The next step is to find out how many of you plan to attend 6<sup>th</sup> grade at Fruchthendler and begin setting up focus groups so that these students have a say in what extracurricular clubs, electives and events take place for their 6<sup>th</sup> grade year! They will be the first class (in decades) therefore we want them to be a part of the planning!

- Limited space ~ only two small classes
- Two teachers, one who will teach Math and Science and the other who will teach Language Arts and Social Studies
- The curriculum will follow State mandated Arizona College & Career Readiness Standards (AKA Common Core) with an emphasis on advanced learning
- Teachers will provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students with a focus to prepare them for honor's courses at Sabino
- The same start and end time (State mandated instructional minutes)
- Separate Lunch
- Electives (**such as but not limited to**):
  - Spanish
  - Korean
  - Computers
  - P.E.
  - O.M.A.
  - Orchestra
  - Band
- After School Sports (**such as but not limited to**):
  - Cross Country

- Track
- Clubs (**such as but not limited to**):
  - Yearbook
  - School Newspaper
  - Student Leadership
- Campus Partnership with Sabino (**such as but not limited to**):
  - Cross-age mentoring
  - Seasonal activities (such as Love of Reading)
  - S.T.E.M.
  - Year Book
  - Breakfast Club
  - Sporting Events
  - Talent Show
  - OMA Performances
- Parent Involvement (**such as but not limited to**):
  - Art program
  - Same activities and events that make Fruchthendler special, now just K-6
  - Parent volunteers welcome and encouraged to be a part of each day!

**7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade tours/open houses (during the day to see it in action) coming soon at Sabino!**

---

**My child \_\_\_\_\_ is interested in attending 6<sup>th</sup> grade at Fruchthendler for the 2015-16 school year.**

**I have recently open enrolled/pre-registered for my child to attend\_\_\_\_\_.**

**\_\_\_\_\_ My child is interested in joining the student focus group**

**\_\_\_\_\_ I'm interested in joining the parent focus group**

**Parent Name\_\_\_\_\_**

**Phone Number\_\_\_\_\_**

**Email Address\_\_\_\_\_**

**Parent Signature\_\_\_\_\_**

**The following is a brief summary of research of “*Factors Favoring Sixth Grade in Elementary School*”:**

- Keeping the sixth graders in elementary school gives them another year to mature before they are exposed to older adolescents.
- In elementary schools, student environment is more nurturing with fewer stressors than a middle school.
- There is more opportunity for cross-age activities such as tutoring and older role model programs like “kindergarten buddies.” Parents are more involved in a school in which their children are more likely to be in the same building.
- In elementary schools, sixth graders spend most of the day with the same teacher and classmates in the same classroom. There is less freedom because the students are carefully monitored. In contrast, middle school children have several teachers for different subjects and move from classroom to classroom throughout the day.
- Sixth graders in elementary school test higher than those in middle school. The Duke study also considered test scores. The researchers found that sixth graders in elementary school scored higher than their peers in middle school on standardized end of grade tests. A recent study in the Philadelphia school system concurred with the Duke study.
- Researchers found that sixth-grade students in both elementary and combination K-12 schools outperformed sixth graders in middle schools or junior high schools and considered the number of transitions a significant factor.
- Sixth graders performed better on standardized tests when they were in K-6 configurations, as opposed to 6-8 middle school configurations. The researchers also determined that a K-6 configuration led to greater school accountability for sixth grade performance than that occurring in a 6-8th grade configuration.
- Having schools with longer grade spans allow for more collaboration among teachers across grade levels as well as better alignment of curriculum across grades.
- Research reveals that school-to-school transitions negatively impact academic achievement. The fewer transitions, the better chance a student has of completing high school. If there is a transition into a new school for high school instruction, grade 7 is preferable to transitioning in later years.
- Sixth graders in middle school have more behavioral problems than their peers in elementary school. In a highly regarded 2007 study of public school students in North Carolina, a group at Duke University's Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy looked at behavior to evaluate whether sixth graders were better off in elementary school or middle school. After appropriate adjustments for socioeconomic and demographic factors, the study showed that sixth graders attending elementary school were less likely to have discipline problems than their middle school counterparts.
- The researchers found that students who attended middle school in sixth grade were twice as likely to be disciplined relative to their counterparts in elementary school. The authors note that their results complement the recent findings by other researchers that school systems that move sixth graders from elementary to middle school experience a 1-3 percent decline in on-time graduation rates. As such, the authors explained, “Based on our results, we suggest that there is a strong argument for separating sixth graders from older adolescents.”

# **EXHIBIT 4**





# Fruchthendler-Sabino Honors Pipeline Community Survey Invitation



# TUSD

Interested in sending your child to a newly designed honors pipeline program in Tucson Unified School District, culminating in your child having the opportunity to attend a 2013 National Blue Ribbon High School?

You are invited to participate in a community-based survey that will help us create a program that will meet your needs and your student's interests. Please enter the following link in your web browser.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Fruchthendler-Sabino>

#### Fruchthendler Information

To schedule a personal tour of Fruchthendler, please call 731-4400

Fruchthendler: 7470 E. Cloud Rd., Tucson, AZ 85750

#### Sabino Information

Sabino will host the following open house meetings at Sabino on the following dates. At these meetings you will be able to hear more about the outstanding programs that will be offered at Sabino and take a tour of the facilities.

- April 8th at 5p.m.
- April 14th at 5p.m.
- April 15th at 5p.m.
- April 30th at 5p.m.

Sabino: 5000 N. Bowes Rd., Tucson, AZ 85749

# TUSD

Tucson Unified School District  
1010 E. 10th Street  
Tucson, AZ 85719

Non-Profit Org.  
US Postage  
PAID  
Tucson, AZ  
Permit #790

3581-4 \*\*\*\*\*AUTO\*\*SCH 5-DIGIT 85715



# **EXHIBIT 5**

## TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT / FACILITY PLANNING DATABASE / MARCH 21, 2014

School Number / Name	District	Type	Status	Site Acres	Facility Condition	Avg. Year Blt.	Capacity					Bond \$ 08-13	Average Util. PSF
							Operate	Utilize	Av. Seats	TempCap	Portables		
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</b>													
120 Banks	D1	E	Open	10.3	3.33	2002	500	73.0%	135	0	0	\$715,770.50	\$2.61
125 Blenman	D2	E	Open	7	2.46	1968	640	77.5%	144	50	2	\$2,766,897.86	\$1.96
128 Bloom	D3	E	Open	9.3	3.11	1972	440	89.3%	47	50	2	\$1,761,179.17	\$2.64
131 Bonillas	D4	E	Open	11	2.07	1959	470	92.8%	34	75	3	\$476,159.08	\$2.55
140 Borman	D5	E	Open	10.3	2.97	1976	620	80.3%	122	0	0	\$1,098,094.82	\$2.40
143 Borton	D6	E	Open	7.7	2.94	1957	470	88.9%	52	0	0	\$1,785,261.07	\$2.69
161 Carrillo	D7	E	Open	3.5	2.92	1950	320	95.9%	13	0	0	\$95,396.15	\$1.49
167 Cavett	D8	E	Open	8.9	2.85	1966	530	57.0%	228	150	6	\$263,533.46	\$2.04
170 Collier	D9	E	Open	9.2	3.11	1973	360	58.9%	148	75	3	\$468,810.66	\$3.09
179 Cragin	D10	E	Open	9	2.46	1961	500	71.6%	142	150	6	\$321,807.36	\$1.68
185 Davidson	D11	E	Open	10	3.37	1972	440	76.8%	102	0	0	\$406,877.25	\$3.34
191 Davis	D12	E	Open	3.4	2.77	1961	320	108.4%	-27	50	2	\$237,582.56	\$2.36
203 Drachman	D7	E	Open	8.6	2.89	1996	420	72.4%	116	150	6	\$519,338.51	\$1.99
211 Dunham	D14	E	Open	9.9	2.41	1974	350	59.1%	143	75	3	\$6,920.97	\$2.86
215 Erickson	D15	E	Open	7.7	2.71	1969	620	96.3%	23	0	0	\$488,416.51	\$1.83
218 Ford	D16/31	E	Open	9.9	2.42	1974	430	92.1%	34	0	0	\$435,794.34	\$2.05
225 Fruchthendler	D17	E	Open	8.9	2.45	1973	420	90.2%	41	50	2	\$383,889.28	\$2.16
228 Gale	D18	E	Open	9.3	2.37	1970	390	105.9%	-23	0	0	\$811,986.43	\$3.64
231 Grijalva	D19	E	Open	9.9	3.03	1990	620	117.3%	-107	275	11	\$1,521,359.99	\$2.88
238 Henry	D21	E	Open	9.5	2.37	1971	390	101.3%	-5	50	2	\$912,997.69	\$2.45
239 Holladay	D22	E	Open	6	2.42	1966	350	74.6%	89	0	0	\$13,848.83	\$2.10
245 Howell	D23	E	Open	8.2	2.56	1954	400	89.5%	42	100	4	\$265,389.95	\$2.53
251 Hudlow	D24	E	Open	8.4	2.96	1964	370	81.6%	68	125	5	\$1,353,511.61	\$2.17
257 Hughes	D25	E	Open	3.6	2.95	1938	340	103.2%	-11	50	2	\$1,477,093.19	\$2.65
266 Johnson	D26	E	Open	9.4	3.07	1991	490	74.3%	126	50	2	\$570,780.83	\$1.82
275 Kellond	D27	E	Open	8.6	2.46	1960	640	90.3%	62	0	0	\$752,902.45	\$1.87
277 Lawrence	D28	E	Open	9.2	2.56	1995	420	96.7%	14	0	0	\$531,589.89	\$2.12
281 Lineweaver	D29	E	Open	7.6	2.24	1963	420	132.6%	-137	200	8	\$172,359.33	\$2.29
287 Lynn/Urquides	D30	E	Open	14.7	3.10	1967	700	88.6%	80	525	21	\$1,236,780.32	\$2.19
290 Maldonado	D32	E	Open	9.9	2.97	1988	640	65.6%	220	125	5	\$1,457,697.54	\$2.77
293 Manzo	D33	E	Open	5.4	2.54	1956	350	101.4%	-5	50	2	\$203,343.78	\$2.17
295 Marshall	D34	E	Open	9.6	3.05	1966	460	75.0%	115	0	0	\$1,025,575.69	\$1.77
308 Miller	D35	E	Open	10	2.56	1981	550	110.2%	-56	325	13	\$1,665,071.71	\$2.86
311 Mission View	D36	E	Open	4	2.92	1955	360	74.7%	91	200	8	\$559,289.42	\$1.92
317 Myers/Ganoung	D37	E	Open	10	2.31	1967	640	67.0%	211	150	6	\$548,009.10	\$1.93
323 Ochoa	D38	E	Open	5.1	3.03	1945	330	68.5%	104	50	2	\$813,060.84	\$2.01

## TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT / FACILITY PLANNING DATABASE / MARCH 21, 2014

School Number / Name	District	Type	Status	Site Acres	Facility Condition	Avg. Year Blt.	Capacity					Bond \$ 08-13	Average Util. PSF
							Operate	Utilize	Av. Seats	TempCap	Portables		
327 Oyama	D39	E	Open	10.1	3.29	2002	520	80.6%	101	100	4	\$634,080.70	\$2.20
353 Robison	D42	E	Open	8.2	2.59	1956	400	90.5%	38	0	0	\$287,229.21	\$2.47
395 Sewell	D44	E	Open	9.2	2.71	1959	330	94.5%	18	50	2	\$332,878.99	\$2.22
410 Soleng Tom	D45	E	Open	9.9	2.90	1987	520	89.2%	56	75	3	\$1,194,829.17	\$2.15
413 Steele	D46	E	Open	9.9	2.88	1961	490	73.9%	128	50	2	\$388,316.60	\$2.23
417 Tolson	D47	E	Open	10	2.78	1976	520	70.6%	153	50	2	\$380,017.27	\$2.40
419 Tully	D48	E	Open	11.8	2.85	1968	540	78.1%	118	100	4	\$686,507.32	\$2.18
431 Van Buskirk	D49	E	Open	9.6	2.47	1962	500	77.0%	115	100	4	\$500,715.68	\$2.23
435 Vesey	D50	E	Open	10	3.16	1979	580	105.3%	-31	500	20	\$2,219,832.32	\$2.30
440 Warren	D51	E	Open	8.2	2.93	1978	380	69.7%	115	75	3	\$646,013.35	\$2.72
443 Wheeler	D52	E	Open	8	2.67	1961	580	87.9%	70	0	0	\$24,253.09	\$2.02
449 White	D53	E	Open	10.2	2.97	1977	650	109.2%	-60	350	14	\$3,051,464.37	\$1.98
455 Whitmore	D54	E	Open	10.3	3.00	1965	490	73.5%	130	0	0	\$413,373.32	\$1.37
461 Wright	D55	E	Open	8.5	2.88	1964	490	84.1%	78	175	7	\$684,908.00	\$2.28
197 Dietz K-8	D13	EK8	Open	8.5	2.66	1965	520	80.6%	101	50	2	\$372,057.20	\$1.64
233 Hollinger K-8	D20	EK8	Open	9.4	2.63	1966	810	67.5%	263	75	3	\$341,000.62	\$2.32
351 Robins K-8	D41	EK8	Open	16.7	2.96	1995	680	84.9%	103	50	2	\$1,914,737.26	\$1.44
371 Rose K-8	D43	EK8	Open	13.3	2.49	1993	770	101.3%	-10	25	1	\$416,936.37	\$1.98
<b>ELEMENTARY TOTALS</b>				<b>484.8</b>				<b>26,480</b>	<b>3,861</b>	<b>4,975</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>\$42,613,528.98</b>	
<b>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</b>													
502 Dodge	NA	M	Open	10.2	2.90	1970	345	121.7%	-75	0	0	\$1,013,132.98	\$2.33
505 Doolen	D1	M	Open	19.8	3.08	1972	1,140	69.8%	344	0	0	\$4,972,578.25	\$2.76
511 Gridley	D2	M	Open	27.4	2.36	1977	790	92.7%	58	50	2	\$836,739.51	\$2.58
515 Magee	D3	M	Open	18.5	2.61	1972	720	90.1%	71	150	6	\$1,198,796.58	\$1.77
520 Mansfeld	D4/14	M	Open	6.6	2.37	1962	810	99.6%	3	0	0	\$3,224,778.77	\$1.55
527 Pistor	D5	M	Open	17.4	2.49	1978	830	115.9%	-132	325	13	\$1,716,744.70	\$1.95
537 Secrist	D6	M	Open	18.4	2.48	1973	650	98.2%	12	0	0	\$688,761.26	\$2.48
550 Utterback	D7	M	Open	15.8	2.43	1976	880	78.8%	187	175	7	\$585,449.22	\$1.74
555 Vail	D8	M	Open	18	2.39	1965	730	92.1%	58	200	8	\$795,353.90	\$2.57
557 Valencia	D9	M	Open	30.7	3.11	1993	1,075	90.3%	104	0	0	\$4,909,505.13	\$3.34
305 Miles - E. L. C. K-8	NA	MK8	Open	5.5	3.01	1946	370	86.2%	51	75	3	\$171,890.10	\$2.48
329 Pueblo Gardens K-	D59/12	MK8	Open	9.8	2.41	1957	530	86.2%	73	125	5	\$1,665,968.82	\$2.40
510 Booth-Fickett K-8	D56/10	MK8	Open	28.2	2.85	1970	1,210	106.2%	-75	75	3	\$748,490.42	\$1.87
521 Morgan Maxwell K	D57	MK8	Open	18	2.53	1978	650	62.6%	243	25	1	\$369,530.17	\$2.04
523 McCorkle K-8	D58/11	MK8	Open	10	3.70	2011	950	89.6%	99	0	0	\$23,308,805.17	\$1.75
525 Roberts-Naylor K-	8 D59/12	MK8	Open	18.7	2.55	1970	830	72.2%	231	0	0	\$1,116,733.36	\$1.88

## TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT / FACILITY PLANNING DATABASE / MARCH 21, 2014

School Number / Name	District	Type	Status	Site Acres	Facility Condition	Avg. Year Blt.	Capacity					Bond \$ 08-13	Average Util. PSF
							Operate	Utilize	Av. Seats	TempCap	Portables		
535 Safford K-8	D60/13	MK8	Open	4.4	2.65	1956	980	88.7%	111	0	0	\$1,374,574.85	\$2.40
595 Roskruge K-8	D61	MK8	Open	4.4	2.48	1920	670	102.8%	-19	0	0	\$2,068,539.94	\$2.06
<b>MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTALS</b>				281.8			14,160		1,344	1,200	48	\$50,766,373.13	
<b>HIGH SCHOOLS</b>													
610 Catalina	D1	H	Open	35.8	2.73	1962	1,500	68.1%	479	0	0	\$5,653,031.24	\$1.66
615 Cholla	D2	H	Open	33.4	2.89	1964	1,650	101.8%	-30	125	5	\$10,058,465.94	\$1.99
620 Palo Verde	D3	H	Open	35.5	2.35	1961	2,070	46.0%	1,117	0	0	\$6,907,058.34	\$1.86
630 Pueblo	D4	H	Open	37.7	2.46	1966	1,900	79.5%	390	250	10	\$7,837,474.20	\$1.68
640 Rincon	D5	H	Open	35.1	2.56	1964	1,070	105.1%	-55	75	3	\$8,641,560.90	\$1.56
645 Sabino	D6	H	Open	37.2	2.56	1975	1,950	54.4%	890	0	0	\$12,554,380.67	\$1.69
650 Sahuaro	D7	H	Open	37.4	2.82	1969	1,950	94.1%	116	0	0	\$12,477,386.66	\$2.28
655 Santa Rita	D8	H	Open	44.8	2.60	1971	2,070	44.8%	1,143	0	0	\$8,198,419.60	\$1.82
660 Tucson	D9	H	Open	27	2.80	1958	2,900	111.2%	-326	0	0	\$13,861,036.47	\$1.80
675 University	NA	H	Open	35.1	2.56	1964	900	112.1%	-109	0	0		
<b>HIGH SCHOOL TOTALS</b>				359.0			17,960		3,615	450	18	\$86,188,814.02	
<b>ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS</b>													
195 Meredith K-12	NA	A	Open	4	3.50	2008	0		-59	0	0	\$4,439,448.82	\$2.43
602 Direct Link II	NA	A	Open				0		-36	0	0	\$17,756.88	
674 Project MORE	NA	A	Open	2.2	2.79	1994	220		145	0	0	\$67,756.79	\$2.03
676 Teenage Parent Pr	NA	A	Open	1.7	2.77	1954	180		117	0	0	\$78,921.72	\$2.59



## TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT / FACILITY PLANNING DATABASE / MARCH 21, 2014

School Number / Name	District	Type	Status	Site Acres	Facility Condition	Avg. Year Blt.	Capacity					Bond \$ 08-13	Average Util. PSF
							Operate	Utilize	Av. Seats	TempCap	Portables		
<b>CLOSED SCHOOLS</b>													
149 Brichta	NA	E	Closed	11.7	2.05	1973	280	0.0%	290	125	5	\$438,912.36	\$1.87
173 Corbett	NA	E	Closed	6.9	2.38	1958	600	0.0%	650	0	0	\$220,787.76	\$2.11
209 Duffy	NA	E	Closed	11.7	2.70								
221 Fort Lowell	NA	E	Closed	8.5	2.30								
263 Jefferson Park	NA	E	Closed	2.9	2.60								
288 Lyons	NA	E	Closed	10	2.67	1975	340	0.0%	360	50	2	\$737,413.80	\$2.58
299 Menlo Park	NA	E	Closed	6.3	2.30	1959	350	0.0%	370	150	6	\$380,350.72	\$2.34
338 Reynolds	NA	E	Closed	9.4	2.50								
341 Richey	NA	E	Closed	7.8	2.80								
347 Roberts	NA	E	Closed	8.7	2.60								
359 Rogers	NA	E	Closed	12.4	2.60								
389 Schumaker	NA	E	Closed	9.5	2.43	1964	380	0.0%	410	0	0	\$341,951.68	\$2.39
433 Van Horne	NA	E	Closed	9	3.10								
467 Wrightstown	NA	E	Closed	9.2	2.20								
503 Carson	NA	M	Closed	17.7	2.70	1973	830	0.0%	830	0	0	\$286,760.72	\$2.15
513 Hohokam	NA	M	Closed	27.6	3.03	1990	700	0.0%	700	75	3	\$502,294.42	\$1.62
545 Fort Lowell-Town	NA	M	Closed	19.5	2.74	1965	650	0.0%	650	75	3	\$1,544,461.33	\$2.54
560 Wakefield	NA	M	Closed	9.3	2.87	1967	610	0.0%	610	0	0	\$580,170.08	\$1.84
680 Howenstine	NA	H	Closed	6.4	2.48	1975	130	0.0%	130	300	12	\$448,202.33	\$4.12
671 PASS Alternative	NA	A	Closed	0.3	2.70	1970	250	0.0%	250	0	0		\$0.74
672 PACE Alternative	NA	A	Closed	0.2	2.90	1987	0		0	0	0	\$48,773.36	\$1.24
681 Broadway Bridge	NA	A	Closed	0.4			0		0	0	0		\$0.40