1 2 3	RUSING LOPEZ & LIZARDI, P.L.L.C. 6363 North Swan Road, Suite 151 Tucson, Arizona 85718 Telephone: (520) 792-4800 Facsimile: (520)529-4262	
4	J. William Brammer, Jr. (State Bar No. 002079)	
5	wbrammer@rllaz.com Oscar S. Lizardi (State Bar No. 016626) olizardi@rllaz.com	
6	Michael J. Rusing (State Bar No. 006617) mrusing@rllaz.com	
7	Patricia V. Waterkotte (State Bar No. 029231) pvictory@rllaz.com	
8	TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	
9	LEGAL DEPARTMENT 1010 E. TENTH STREET	
10	TUCSON, AZ 85719 (520) 225-6040	
11	Julie Tolleson (State Bar No. 012913)	
12	Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org Samuel E. Brown (State Bar No. 027474)	
13	Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org	
14	Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No.	One, et al.
15	IN THE UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
16	FOR THE DISTRICT	OF ARIZONA
17	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al.,	CV 74-90 TUC DCB
18	Plaintiffs	(Lead Case)
19	v.	RESPONSE TO FISHER
20	United States of America,	PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO TUSD'S FINAL REVISED
21	Plaintiff-Intervenor,	COMPREHENSIVE MAGNET PLAN
22	v.	CV 74-204 TUC DCB
23	Anita Lohr, et al.,	(Consolidated Case)
24	Defendants,	
25	and	
26	Sidney L. Sutton, et al.,	
27	Defendants-Intervenors,	
28		

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

ffs,
or,
al.

Tucson Unified School District #1 ("TUSD"), by and through undersigned counsel, responds to the Fisher Plaintiffs' Objection to TUSD's Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan (ECF 1815) as follows.

Defendants.

### I. Introduction

On January 16, 2015, the Court entered an order requiring TUSD to file a Revised CMP in four months ("Comprehensive Magnet Plan Order"). See ECF 1753. The Comprehensive Magnet Plan Order also required that TUSD, in consultation with the Special Master, work with its schools to prepare individual school improvement plans during the three months following the order. Between February and May 2015, the District worked closely with the Special Master and his Implementation Committee member, Dr. Rebecca Montaño, to finalize the Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan and its individual plans. See Declaration of M. Taylor ("Taylor Decl.") ¶ 2. To permit a lengthy period of time for feedback and comment, TUSD provided revised individual magnet school plans to the Special Master on March 13, 2015. Taylor Decl. ¶ 3. The time spent reviewing magnet plan issues and conferring with the superintendent, assistant superintendent, district administrators and principals is reflected in both the invoices of the Special Master (7.9) hours in February, 10.9 hours in March, 2.5 hours in April and 20 hours in May on the Revised CMP) and of Dr. Montaño (15 hours in February, 13.5 hours in March, 2.5 hours in April and 3.2 hours in May on the Revised CMP). See Taylor Decl. ¶¶ 4-5, Ex. A, Special Master Invoices, Ex. B, Dr. Montaño Invoices.

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On May 15, 2015, TUSD filed the Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan and the individual magnet school plans. See ECF 1803. Following further collaboration, on June 11, 2015, TUSD filed the board-approved Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan. On June 18, 2015, the Mendoza and Fisher Plaintiffs filed objections to the plan. See ECF 1808. In an effort to address the objections raised by the Plaintiffs, and in consultation with the Special Master, TUSD has made further revisions to the Comprehensive Magnet Plan. The nature of these revisions will require board approval. A redlined version of the revised Plan with the further revisions is attached to Martha Taylor's declaration as Exhibit C. As discussed below, the Fisher Plaintiffs' objections have been addressed either by: (1) the January Comprehensive Magnet Plan Order, or (2) modifications to the Comprehensive Magnet Plan which address the Fisher objections and the Special Master now considers those issues resolved. Accordingly, TUSD requests the Court to enter an order approving the Comprehensive Magnet Plan so that TUSD may move forward with implementation.

## II. The Fisher Plaintiffs Are Re-Raising Previously Addressed Objections.

The first three objections raised by the Fisher Plaintiffs relate to: (1) the timing of withdrawal of magnet status; (2) the criteria for evaluation of magnet status (they are arguing socioeconomic measures should be included); and (3) the allegation that there are an excessive number of magnet schools in TUSD. Each of these objections was fully litigated before the court-ordered revision of the Comprehensive Magnet Plan and the objection provides no basis for revisiting the Court's prior decision. On December 9, 2014, the Special Master made a report and recommendation on several issues including: (1) whether the process for withdrawal of magnet status is "too slow; (2) whether the criteria for withdrawing magnet status should be modified; and (3) whether the Court should find that there are "too many" magnet schools in TUSD. See ECF 1730. TUSD briefed the issues. See ECF 1735. The Court's disposition of those arguments is reflected in the Comprehensive Magnet Plan Order. The Court should disregard these re-urged and previously-resolved objections in their entirety.

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Moreover, any remaining issues regarding continuing magnet funding after withdrawal of magnet status and the timing of Special Master recommendations on integration likewise have been resolved. See Taylor Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. E, Special Master 6/23/15 Email "Changes in the CMP" ("Magnet funding will not be continued beyond the year in which funding is withdrawn but schools that had been magnet schools will be funded as needed to meet student needs. This can exceed formula funding. [. . . ] My recommendations with respect to integration will take place no later than October of the two school years remaining and recommendations relating to academic performance will be made as soon as the data from the previous year becomes available.") See also Exhibit C, Redlined Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan.

# III. The Board Meeting Transcript Reflects Accurate Communications on the **Magnet Process**

The Fisher Plaintiffs launch into a two-page, unjustified and unsupported, complaint that there is a problem in the Governing Board review process because TUSD administration purportedly failed to inform the governing board of the Fisher Plaintiffs' objections. The Fisher Plaintiffs do not identify one issue or objection they believe should have been raised to the Governing Board but was not. Indeed, the majority of the Fisher's objections are not issues the Governing Board should be reconsidering given that the Court already has put the issues of the pillars, timing, and number of magnets to rest in its January Comprehensive Magnet Plan Order.

The Fisher Plaintiffs argue specifically that TUSD leadership inaccurately represented to the Governing Board that the Special Master had expressed "conditional approval." The Fisher Plaintiffs do not explain what they meant by "conditional approval" or why that would be inaccurate. The following is the statement made at 3:36:12 in the meeting video:

Yes ma'am. So Richard will come back up and walk us through the Magnet Plan and I believe we didn't get an email on the magnet plan. study/action item and if the board feels that they have enough information I would recommend that the board consider approving the comprehensive

Telephone: (520) 792-4800

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

magnet plan. We've been firing different renditions back and forth, the courts been looking at them back and forth. At this point, we've had a member of the special master's implementation team work side by side with former Asst. supt. Steve Holmes on this project so there's a lot of synchronicity between the special master's implementation team and the district on this and there were quite a few conversations with principals on sites with this so there's a lot of work that's gone into it. So the quicker the principals get the Board's green light to begin advertising and knowing what they're going to be held accountable for, the better they can prepare their campus plans. I just wanted to put that bug in the Board's ear. Mr. Foster please.

The phrase "conditional approval" is not used. Instead, Dr. Sanchez explains that the Comprehensive Magnet Plan was developed in collaboration with the Special Master's implementation team. This statement is accurate and is supported by the declaration of Martha Taylor and the invoices of the Special Master and his implementation committee member who each devoted many hours to working with the District on the Comprehensive Magnet Plan.

## IV. TUSD Has Responded to the RFIs and There is No Exclusionary Option

TUSD responded to the Fisher Plaintiffs' request for information. See Taylor Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. F, TUSD Response to Fisher Plaintiffs' RFI.

The Fisher Plaintiffs object that although the District stated it would not proceed with the exclusionary option for Ochoa Elementary, that decision was not evident in the Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan filed with the Court last month. That revision now has been made. See Exhibit C, Redlined Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan. The Special Master confirmed the resolution of this exclusionary issue with all parties. See Taylor Decl. 8, Ex. E, Special Master 6/23/15 Email "Changes in the CMP" ("There is no exclusionary option either now or in the future.")

#### V. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, TUSD respectfully requests that the Fisher Plaintiffs' objections be overruled and that the Court enter an order permitting TUSD to proceed with implementation of the Revised Comprehensive Magnet Plan filed herewith.

DATED this 26<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2015. 1 2 RUSING LOPEZ & LIZARDI, P.L.L.C. 3 4 s/ J. William Brammer, Jr. J. William Brammer, Jr. 5 Oscar S. Lizardi Michael J. Rusing 6 Patricia V. Waterkotte Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. 7 One, et al. 8 TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGAL DEPARTMENT 9 Julie C. Tolleson Samuel E. Brown 10 Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. One, et al. 11 **ORIGINAL** of the foregoing filed via the CM/ECF 12 Electronic Notification System and transmittal of a Telephone: (520) 792-4800 Notice of Electronic Filing provided to all parties 13 that have filed a notice of appearance in the District Court Case, as listed below. 14 ANDREW H. MARKS 15 Attorney for Special Master Law Office of Andrew Marks PLLC 16 1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW **Suite** 1100 17 Washington, DC 20004 amarks@markslawoffices.com 18 LOIS D. THOMPSON CSBN 093245 19 JENNIFER L. ROCHE CSBN 254538 Attorneys for Mendoza Plaintiffs 20 Proskauer Rose LLP 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200 21 Los Angeles, California 90067 (310) 557-2900 22 lthompson@proskauer.com jroche@proskauer.com 23 JUAN RODRIGUEZ, CSBN 282081 24 THOMAS A. SAENZ, CSBN 159430 Attorney for Mendoza Plaintiffs 25 Mexican American LDEF 634 S. Spring St. 11th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90014 (213) 629-2512 26 27 jrodriguez@maldef.org tsaebz@maldef.org 28

1	RUBIN SALTER, JR. ASBN 001710   KRISTIAN H. SALTER ASBN 026810
2	Attorney for Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs 177 North Church Avenue, Suite 903
3	Tucson, Arizona 85701-1119 rsjr2@aol.com
4	ANURIMA BHARGAVA
5	ZOE M. SAVITSKY CAN 281616 JAMES EICHNER
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor Educational Opportunities Section
7	Civil Rights Division U.S. Department of Justice
8	950 Pennsylvania Avenue, SW Patrick Henry Building, Suite 4300
9	Washington, DC 20530 (202) 305-3223
10	anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov
11	james.eichner@usdoj.gov
12	JULIE TOLLESON ASBN 012913 Tucson Unified School District
13	Legal Department 1010 E 10th St
14	Tucson, AZ 85719 520-225-6040
15	Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org
16	s/ Jason Linaman
17	St Suson Emanun
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	