

## **Tolleson 06/01/15 email update regarding USP budget**

---

From: Tolleson, Julie <[Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org)>  
To: 'Willis D. Hawley' <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; 'Thompson, Lois D.' <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; Juan Rodriguez (<[jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)> <[jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)>; rsjr3 <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; Anurima.Bhargava <[Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; Zoe.Savitsky <[Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; Eichner, James (CRT) (<[James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov)> (CRT) (<[James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov)> <[James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov)>; 'TUSD' <[TUSD@rlaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rlaz.com)>; Desegregation <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>  
Sent: Mon, Jun 1, 2015 8:27 am  
Subject: 2015-16 USP Budget Update

I just wanted to give everyone a status update regarding the USP budget. We are doing some pretty time consuming line-by-line budget scrubbing right now in an effort to find errors (either in Activity Code, amount of allocation, or calculations) as well as to bring various departments and items in line in terms of items like overtime, travel, supplies, etc. where fat can be buried! In addition, we also need to make some items uniform across sites (for example, the stipend for magnet coordinators), etc.

Some totals have changed due to nothing more than errors in embedded calculations. For example, amounts budgeted for wages have a benefits calculation incorporated which makes an upward adjustment of approximately 30% of salary. In scrubbing the budget, we identified some lines in which this formula was erroneously embedded. It is being corrected. Budgets for mailing (in ALE) are being reduced significantly as we anticipate those processes to become more technology-driven. The allocations of 910(G) funds to various expenditures in Human Resources, particularly those related to technology and fingerprinting have been reduced or eliminated, and some of the "hard to fill" stipend expense has been shifted to Title II. The total reduction in Activity Code 0402 will be approximately \$200,000. The printing cost estimate for student surveys associated with teacher evaluations has been slashed (Activity Code 0411) in anticipation of doing those surveys online.

In some areas, departments intended to split an allocation between activity codes but erroneously duplicated the total in two different activity codes. For example, the \$100,000 budgeted for the MORE Plan was listed twice (Activity Codes 0202 and 0204). It will be deleted from Activity Code 0202 (Magnet Plan). Budgeted monies for boundary consultants at \$100 were reflected in both Activity Code 201 (Comprehensive Boundary Plan) and 0205 (Student Assignment PD). It will be deleted from activity code 0205. The additional Research Project Managers (four positions) that had been allocated to Activity Code 0101 in Draft 3 have been moved to Activity Code 1001 (EBAS implementation). An unnecessary prior year textbook allocation in ALE (approximately \$100k) has been deleted.

Several significant reductions in the 910(G) budget have been made in response to questions and input from you all. The three pre-school teachers that had been funded in prior years out of 910(G) funds and coded to dropout prevention have been eliminated. Allocations in 301 and 302 (magnet and incentive transportation) for bus passes, etc. have been reduced from \$800k (each activity code) to \$700k with the remainder shifted to M&O.

This thorough scrubbing process should allow us to fund some of the initiatives that the parties have discussed. One of those is District-wide GATE testing (two grades) as discussed at the summit. Those efforts (budgeted at approximately \$111k) will be allocated to ALE implementation.

In addition, as part of an aggressive effort to address ongoing disparities in student discipline and excessive use of exclusionary consequences, the District is expanding alternative-to-suspension program in an effort to eliminate the overwhelming majority of out-of-school suspensions. This effort is two pronged. First, it seeks to use an in-school intervention model in lieu of in-school suspension and in lieu of short-term out-of-school suspensions. That is, students who might otherwise face an in-school or out-of-school suspension will instead spend their suspension days in a classroom continuing regular curriculum with a highly qualified teacher. The ISI classroom/curriculum will also include a dedicated component of restorative practices and character/personal supports. Funding such a program at all high schools, middle schools, and large K8s would require approximately \$1.6M in staffing. However, the intention is to highlight approximately one dozen schools at the middle and HS level for the first-year roll out. Those sites will be identified based on the discipline statistics for 2015-16. The allocation to implement ISI will be approximately \$800k and coded to dropout prevention and PBIS (I think!).

We are also going to expand our Life Skills program, which provides a curricular, campus-based alternative to students facing longer term suspension. This way, middle and high school students facing long-term suspension (for the most serious Levels 4 and 5 violations of the GSRR) or even expulsion will instead have the opportunity to continue their course of study at a District Alternative Education Program (DAEP) either at the SW Ed center or Project MORE. The budget for this expansion of Life Skills into a 75-seat DAEP offering is estimated at \$465,000.

Based on our budget scrubbing to date, we do not anticipate difficulty in being able to fund the DAEP and ISI programs without changing any other programmatic components that are underway or rolling out next year. In the meantime, if you have questions about the changes discussed here or any objections we should be talking about regarding the itemized allocations in Draft 3, can you please let us know? Our hope is that through this process we've created a 2015-16 910(G) budget that can be finalized and adopted with the board without need of litigation or dispute.

Thanks to everyone.

Julie C. Tolleson, General Counsel

## **Rodriguez 06/04/15 email regarding USP budget update**

---

From: Juan Rodriguez <jrodriguez@MALDEF.org>

To: Samuel.Brown <[Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org)>; Julie.Tolleson <[Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org)>; WBrammer <[WBrammer@rlaz.com](mailto:WBrammer@rlaz.com)>

Cc: lthompson <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; wdh <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; rsjr3 <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; james.eichner <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; Zoe.Savitsky <[Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; Anurima.Bhargava <[Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; deseg <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; TUSD <[TUSD@rlaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rlaz.com)>

Sent: Thu, Jun 4, 2015 7:59 pm

Subject: Mendoza Plaintiffs' Further Comments on 2015-16 USP Budget

Please see attached.

Juan Rodriguez | Staff Attorney

## **Taylor 06/19/15 email regarding USP budget**

---

From: Taylor, Martha <[Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org](mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org)>

To: Anurima Bhargava <[anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; James Eichner <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; Juan Rodriguez <[jrodriguez@maldef.org](mailto:jrodriguez@maldef.org)>; Lois Thompson <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; Rubin Salter <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; Willis D. Hawley <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; Zoe Savitsky <[zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov)>

Cc: Desegregation <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; Tolleson, Julie <[Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org)>; RLL <[tusd@rllaz.com](mailto:tusd@rllaz.com)>; Soto, Karla <[KARLA.SOTO@tusd1.org](mailto:KARLA.SOTO@tusd1.org)>; Weatherless, Renee <[Irene.Weatherless@tusd1.org](mailto:Irene.Weatherless@tusd1.org)>; Vega, Adrian <[Adrian.Vega@tusd1.org](mailto:Adrian.Vega@tusd1.org)>

Sent: Fri, Jun 19, 2015 4:05 pm

Subject: USP Budget FY 2016

Dr. Hawley and counsel: Attached please find the District's Proposed Final USP budget for FY 2016 and the District's response to feedback. We look forward to speaking with the Dr. Hawley and the Mendoza plaintiffs on Monday.

Have a good weekend.

## **Salter 06/25/15 email request regarding USP budget**

---

From: Rubin Salter, Jr. <rsjr3@aol.com>  
To: Martha Taylor <Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org>  
Cc: rsjr3 <rsjr3@aol.com>; gloria.c.copeland <gloria.c.copeland@hotmail.com>; kellangfo <kellangfo@aol.com>; lhrichardson2000 <lhrichardson2000@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thu, Jun 25, 2015 12:12 pm  
Subject: Meeting to discuss the budget; questions

Dear Martha,

In advance of the meeting between the Fisher Committee, Ms. Soto, and yourself, the Fisher Committee wish to submit some of the questions they have regarding the budget.

- (1) What effect does the new court ruling on language acquisition have on the utilization of deseg funds?
- (2) Where in the Unitary Status Plan is the justification for the continual expansion of dual language programs with deseg funds?
- (3) Please provide the programmatic structure for the dual language program and what program is in place for students whose parents do not want a dual-language approach to learning.
- (4) What is the justification for paying Bryant Nodine's salary from the deseg funds?
- (5) In regards to magnet funding, why are funds being allocated for Cragin, Mansfield, Ochoa, and Robinson, which are not magnet, but theme schools?
- (6) In terms of University, what is the total amount of OCR funding that the school received and what is the total amount of deseg fund? Also, what is the position that Carmen Hernandez has been moved into and what is the funding source?
- (7) What is the justification for using deseg funds for Incentive Transportation?
- (8) What is the difference between ALE Itinerant teachers and resource teachers? Also, how many of these positions existed prior to 2015-2016 and prior to the USP? If these positions existed previously, what is the justification for funding them with the deseg budget?
- (9) Please provide an explanation as to why deseg funds are being used to fund any part of the Pan Asian Department? Pan Asian students are not part of the USP or Fisher and Mendoza suits.
- (10) We would like a complete description of the DEP – the goals, structure, and reason for choosing to fund it with deseg money.
- (11) Please explain what in the budget – especially the Quality of Instruction Section – does to improve the academic performance of African American students and the ending of their over-representation in suspensions and expulsions.

Sincerely,  
Rubin

## **Taylor 06/26/15 email response to Fisher 06/25/15 email RFI**

---

**From:** Taylor, Martha  
**Sent:** Friday, June 26, 2015 10:36 AM  
**To:** 'Rubin Salter, Jr.'  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting to discuss the budget; questions

Dear Martha,

In advance of the meeting between the Fisher Committee, Ms. Soto, and yourself, the Fisher Committee wish to submit some of the questions they have regarding the budget.

(1) What effect does the new court ruling on language acquisition have on the utilization of deseg funds? [No effect](#)

(2) Where in the Unitary Status Plan is the justification for the continual expansion of dual language programs with deseg funds? [“The District shall build and expand its Dual Language programs in order to provide more students throughout the District with opportunities to enroll in these programs...” V\(C\)\(1\) on p. 31.](#)

(3) Please provide the programmatic structure for the dual language program and what program is in place for students whose parents do not want a dual-language approach to learning. [I am attaching the TWDL program handbook \( available on the TUSD website\), which has full information on this program.](#)

(4) What is the justification for paying Bryant Nodine's salary from the deseg funds?  
[Bryant holds the position of the USP-required Director of Student Assignment. II\(C\)\(1\) p. 7](#)

(5) In regards to magnet funding, why are funds being allocated for Cragin, Mansfield, Ochoa, and Robinson, which are not magnet, but theme schools?  
[All of these four schools are magnet schools in SY 2015-16.](#)

(6) In terms of University, what is the total amount of OCR funding that the school received and what is the total amount of deseg fund? Also, what is the position that Carmen Hernandez has been moved into and what is the funding source? [Deseg funding for the 2015-16 SY is \\$443,658. Ms. Hernandez is now funded out of M&O. I'm not sure of her new title but I think it is Recruitment Coordinator.](#)

(7) What is the justification for using deseg funds for Incentive Transportation?

Required by the USP. III(A)(3)

(8) What is the difference between ALE Itinerant teachers and resource teachers? Also, how many of these positions existed prior to 2015-2016 and prior to the USP? If these positions existed previously, what is the justification for funding them with the deseg budget? I believe you are referring to the GATE itinerant and resource teachers. Our GATE coordinator was not available this afternoon for the background information needed for this answer. Many positions existed prior to the USP that were "deseg funded" – nothing in the USP or related court orders required TUSD to start from zero upon adoption of the USP to create all new positions. If there were positions created pre-2009, or pre 2012 (PUSP), that continued to fulfill functions under the USP, those positions, in some cases, remained.

(9) Please provide an explanation as to why deseg funds are being used to fund any part of the Pan Asian Department? Pan Asian students are not part of the USP or Fisher and Mendoza suits. -The "Pan Asian" Department is actually titled the 'Asian Pacific American Student Services and Refugee Services,' and a significant percentage of the students it serves are refugee members of our plaintiff classes.

(10) We would like a complete description of the DEP – the goals, structure, and reason for choosing to fund it with deseg money. Information on DAEP/ISI attached. These programs are specifically identified in the DPG plan and the district committed to implement and/or expand them.

(11) Please explain what in the budget – especially the Quality of Instruction Section – does to improve the academic performance of African American students and the ending of their over-representation in suspensions and expulsions. This requires a narrative explanation that cannot be done today.

Sincerely,  
Rubin

**Salter 07/02/15 email regarding Fisher 2015-16 FY USP budget RFI**

---

From: Rubin Salter, Jr. <rsjr3@aol.com>

To: pwaterkotte <pwaterkotte@rllaz.com>; wdh <wdh@umd.edu>; WBrammer <WBrammer@rllaz.com>; jrodriguez <jrodriguez@MALDEF.org>; Lthompson <Lthompson@proskauer.com>; Anurima.Bhargava <Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov>; Zoe.Savitsky <Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov>; Julie.Tolleson <Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org>; deseg <deseg@tusd1.org>; TUSD <TUSD@rllaz.com>; James.Eichner <James.Eichner@usdoj.gov>; samuel.brown <samuel.brown@tusd1.org>; Martha.Taylor <Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org>

Sent: Thu, Jul 2, 2015 4:19 pm

Subject: Fisher Plaintiffs' 07/02/15 desegregation budget RFI and objection to the ISI and DAEP

Special Master Hawley and counsel:

Please see attached the Fisher Plaintiffs' 07/02/15 RFI regarding the desegregation budget for the 2015-16 SY.

In addition funding questions raised in the attached RFI, the Fisher Plaintiffs have serious concerns about the substance and implementation of the ISI and DAEP programs. For example, the GSRR does not allow for students committing Level 1, 2, or 3 offenses to be removed from class. However, the guidelines for ISI state that a principal can place a student in ISI for repeated offenses at those offense levels.

This creates a great deal of leeway for the disproportionate removal of African American students from classes, effectively undoing the protections of the GSRR. In creating the DAEP proposal, did the District review the number of students in 2014-2015 who on long-term suspensions for Level 4 or 5 offenses? How was the predicted number of 75 determined to be the maximum capacity?

For these reasons, the Fisher Plaintiffs are opposed to the programs as described and believe that it is necessary to voice that opposition here. It is clear that the District is rushing the implementation of the DAEP program and is likely to have it in place before a formal objection can be lodged with the Special Master and the Court. The Fisher Plaintiffs are concerned that this rush to implementation is the latest instance of a recurrent and objectionable practice that appears to offer no other benefit than circumventing the critical plaintiff feedback mandated by the Court.

Sincerely,

Rubin Salter, Jr.



## **Taylor 07/08/15 email response to Fisher 07/02/15 RFI**

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Martha <[Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org](mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org)>

To: Rubin Salter <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>

Cc: Willis D. Hawley <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; Desegregation <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; Tolleson, Julie <[Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org)>; Soto, Karla <[KARLA.SOTO@tusd1.org](mailto:KARLA.SOTO@tusd1.org)>; Weatherless, Renee <[Irene.Weatherless@tusd1.org](mailto:Irene.Weatherless@tusd1.org)>

Sent: Wed, Jul 8, 2015 10:35 am

Subject: Fisher plaintiffs deseg budget questions

Mr. Salter: Below are our written answers to your budget questions regarding the 2015-16 Deseg budget. This information is what we were prepared to share yesterday in our phone conference. We hope you find it helpful.

**Request #1:** Bryant Nodine was previously the Planning Director. Who holds that position now? When did his position title change and when did desegregation funds begin to pay for his position? What is his role in student assignment since that is a primary responsibility of the Department of School and Community Services? It appears that his title was changed in order to justify paying him out of desegregation money.

**Response #1:**

**Mr. Nodine's position has been funded using 910(g) funds for some time. As Planning Director he has been responsible for such items as conducting the boundary review, preparation of Desegregation Impact Analyses, and development of the "lottery" admissions process for oversubscribed schools. He took over the USP designated position of "Director of Student Assignment" in the summer of 2014.**

**Request #2:** Please provide a breakdown of the desegregation funds utilized at University HS.

**Response #2:**

<b>5.75 FTEs</b>	<b>\$ 312,702.42</b>
<b>Instructional Aids</b>	<b>\$ 24,500.00</b>
<b>Supplies</b>	<b>\$ 5,500.00</b>
<b>Postage</b>	<b>\$ 10,000.00</b>
<b>Classified Temp-Hourly Overtime</b>	<b>\$ 5,165.00</b>
<b>Certified Temp-Hourly (BOOST and tutoring)</b>	<b>\$ 85,790.93</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 443,658.35</b>

**Request #3:** Has the District provided funds for magnet schools that are not successful academically and provided funds to create programs, increase personnel or training to help such schools increase the academic performance of their students? For example, has Holladay been allocated additional funds to create programs, hire support staff or tutors to assist it in raising its performance?

**Response #3:**

	Ochoa	Holladay	Robison	Utterback
2014-15	\$116,989	\$119,009	\$173,113	\$332,693
2015-16	\$178,046	\$170,396	\$337,831	\$449,693
Difference	+61,057	+51,387	+164,718	+117,000

**Request #4:** The USP called for incentive transportation for students moving from highly concentrated schools to lower concentrated schools. By race and ethnicity, school of origin and school of choice, please provide a breakdown of the students currently receiving incentive transportation and evidence that their transportation serves the USP goal for providing transportation incentives.

**Response #4:** A more detailed discussion of this topic is in last year's annual report and will be covered in this year's report as well. As noted there, there is no mechanism for tracking actual "use" of magnet or incentive transportation (or any other variety of transportation). Rather, we know who is eligible for magnet and incentive transportation and plan routes accordingly. However all USP-related transportation (Magnet, Incentive, ABC Zone, and ALE transportation) collectively accounts for 40% of the District's transportation routing/expense based on eligible ridership.

**Request #5:** The response from Dr. Taylor indicates that because the USP calls for increased numbers of minority students in gifted education, any position that ever existed in this department can now be funded with desegregation funds. If this is the case, this would clearly be an instance of supplanting. Desegregation funds should be used to increase enrollment of students of the protected class in ALEs, not to meet the District's general budgetary needs. Please provide a breakdown of the students served by the ALE itinerant teachers and resource teachers. Please also provide ALE and AP enrollment by race and ethnicity and school. **Please note whether and to what extent these classes are funded from the desegregation budget.**

**Response #5:** It has never been the District's position that "any" GATE position can be funded with 910(g) funds. Teachers of GATE classes are funded 60% from Deseg and 40% from M&O.

**Request #6:** The District receives state and federal dollars to serve refugee students. We would like to know how much funding they receive from all sources and what numbers of Hispanic or African American students are being served and how are they being served?

**Response #6:** \$26,534 in a federal grant is all the District receives in refugee-targeted funding.

**Request #7: What percent of the ISI and DAEP budgets are being paid out of desegregation funds?** How is the use of these funds justified? Providing programs to prevent students from dropping out is a basic requirement of the District for which they receive state

funds. ISI is a new version of In-School Suspension, which has existed for decades. This creates the appearance that the District has changed names to justify the funding of preexisting programs. The use of desegregation funds indicates that the students being served by this program will be African American or Hispanic students, which in practice means that desegregation funds will be allocated to segregate the District's AA and H students.

**Response #7:** Dr. Abel Morado is providing written answers to most of your questions regarding DAEP and ISI and those will be sent to you this week. We are including additional information below.

DAEP = 6 teachers, 1 counselor, 1 Behavior Intervention Monitor, Tutoring = \$450,820 in deseg funds. Less than a handful of sites had ISS programming, too much of which simply placed students in a controlled environment under the supervision of classified staff, etc. The ISI model is an effort to ensure that students remain in an educational setting rather than being "warehoused." The program will serve all students, though the targeted sites are selected based on both disparities in discipline and overly-high suspension numbers. The roll-out of this program should eliminate many short- and long-term suspensions and keep students in an academic setting thus both assisting with academic achievement and reducing dropout risk.

**The District receives a \$3 million grant for drop-out prevention. How are these funds allocated?** Are they being supplanted by desegregation funds?

The District does not receive a \$3 million grant for drop-out prevention. The District receives approximately \$764,000 in drop-out prevention funds and these funds are used to fund 13 drop-out prevention specialist positions. The dropout prevention work that is provided as part of the District's USP activities is supplemental to those monies and personnel and is reflected in Activity Code 0506 in the itemized budget sent on 6/19/15 (which budget includes the DAEP and ISI positions).

How is the allocation of desegregation dollars to dropout prevention - a basic goal of the District - justified? Further, if schools already have LSCs, dropout prevention specialists and student success specialists, why are they not incorporated into the program instead of allocating additional funds to hire additional staff, such as behavior intervention monitors and tutors (positions which already in place in the Equity Department)? The LSCs, Equity Department personnel, etc. reflected in the budget for Activity Code 506 are not new/additional staff but rather the budget for Activity Code 0506 includes an allocation of a small percentage of the time of various staff people (LSCs, Student Success Specialists, etc.) who have dropout prevention as part of their responsibility. The "people" and expense you see in Activity Code 0506 reflects those site-based employees that you ask about.

**Request #8:** Has the District identified schools where high numbers of African American and Hispanic students are failing classes and/or doing poorly on assessments and allocated funds to those schools to improve these students' performance?

**Response #8:** The District believes that best practice is to target support to students based on individual student data rather than assigning it institutionally to particular sites. The District's Student Services Department uses the four-pronged approach to identify students in need of support and targeted interventions to them. This early "flagging" system can identify students, including African American and Latino students, who are in need of academic support. This model analyzes data related to a student's grades, attendance, discipline and graduation rate. In addition, individual sites can refer students for services based on the evaluation done by their MTSS team.

**Request #9:** Regarding the Pan Asian Department, are there special, non-desegregation, funding flows directed to meet the unique needs of African nationals enrolled in TUSD schools? Please breakdown of funding flows allocated to TUSD students of African origin.

**Response #9:** The budget is not broken out by student ethnicity or race. This department is split funded between 910(g) and M&O based primarily on its Refugee Services component. However, its director is also part of the team that serves as the District's USP designated Academic and Behavioral Supports Coordinator and conducts quarterly discipline data reviews.

**Request #10:** How many new/additional certified African American teachers and counselors have been hired for 2015-2016 and is this an increase. What are their positions and their schools or departments? The same question should be asked regarding African American building administrators. Where are they placed? Did the number and percentage of African American certified employees increase in 2015-2016?

**Response #10:** This information will be in our Annual Report for the 2014-15 SY. Year-end data is just now being aggregated and digested for that purpose.

**Request #11:** If students are placed in ISI, they will only receive instruction in CORE classes and not in electives. How long are the assignments to ISI expected to be? Further, one teacher is unlikely to be highly qualified in all classes and under State standards, teachers should be highly qualified in the subjects they teach. Finding highly qualified math teachers is difficult for regular classes much less for ISI. How will the District resolve these dilemmas? Further, how students will receive Exceptional Education services when placed in ISI?

**Response #11:** Dr. Morado will address these questions in his written response.

**Request#12** What is the justification for extending two student success specialists in African American Studies to 12-month employees? What will they do in the summer when there are no students?

**Response#12**

Currently, there is only one twelve-month specialist in African American Student Services. This person works with summer enrichment programs focused on reading, Math and STEM through the months of June and July. This year there was a June 1-18 STEM program with 45 students enrolled. In addition, this person has provided mentoring training to 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students who then are able to work with incoming Freshman at designated schools. In the past, Freshman students were invited to participate in leadership training at their new high school and interact with upper-class students trained to serve as peer mentors. Thus, when these new Freshmen come to their new campus they will be comfortable and know someone. This summer the twelve-month employee will work on developing a 1:1 mentor program to implement in two high schools. Based on researched best practices, 1:1 mentoring is a strategy that can support the improvement of academic achievement and self-empowerment.

**Brown 07/09/15 email regarding plaintiff feedback on desegregation budget**

From: Brown, Samuel <[Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org)>  
To: 'Willis D. Hawley' <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; 'Anurima Bhargava' <[anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; 'James Eichner' <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; 'Juan Rodriguez' <[jrodriguez@maldef.org](mailto:jrodriguez@maldef.org)>; 'Lois Thompson' <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; 'Rubin Salter Jr.' <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; 'Zoe Savitsky' <[zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov)>  
Cc: Tolleson, Julie <[Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org)>; Taylor, Martha <[Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org](mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org)>; 'TUSD' <[TUSD@rllaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rllaz.com)>  
Sent: Thu, Jul 9, 2015 11:18 am  
Subject: RE: Final USP Budget Recommendations

Apologies, I inadvertently hit send before finishing the message...

Dr. Hawley/Counsel: as you are aware we will be presenting the final USP Budget to the Governing Board for adoption next Tuesday. The USP requires the District to note and provide separately to the Governing Board for consideration "[a]ny recommendation of the Plaintiffs and the Special Master not included in the Superintendent's final USP Budget proposal..." USP X(B)5). On June 19, 2015 we sent a revised budget and cover letter. The cover letter included what we have identified as the final recommendations from the Plaintiffs and Special Master. Since June 19, 2015, we have engaged in several communications with the Plaintiffs and Special Master to provide further information and to clarify various inquiries. On June 25, 2015, we received an email from the Fisher Plaintiffs containing a recommendation related to LSCs, which we added to the lists of recommendations provide on June 19, 2015 (see attached). On July 6, 2015, in response to questions about the budget process, the District submitted the attached memo to the Special Master (see attached, "Budget Process Detail") which we submit here for clarity regarding the process.

As the District has done in the past, we have provided (at the June 23 meeting), and will provide again (at the July 14, meeting) the SMP recommendations that were adopted, and those that were not adopted. We now ask that each party carefully review the attached list of final recommendations and provide any comment or feedback no later than close of business tomorrow, Friday July 10, 2015 (or, at the very latest, by noon on Monday July 13) so that we can be sure we are communicating your final recommendations accurately to the Governing Board next Tuesday. Thank you in advance, Sam

Samuel Emiliano Brown  
Legal Counsel  
Tucson Unified School District  
[520.225.6040](tel:520.225.6040)  
[520.225.6136](tel:520.225.6136)(fax)  
[samuel.brown@tusd1.org](mailto:samuel.brown@tusd1.org)

**Taylor 07/10/15 email regarding Morado response to Fisher DAEP/ISI RFI**

From: Taylor, Martha <[Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org](mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org)>  
To: 'Rubin Salter, Jr.' <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>  
Cc: Tolleson, Julie <[Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tusd1.org)>; Desegregation <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; RLL <[tusd@rllaz.com](mailto:tusd@rllaz.com)>; Vega, Adrian <[Adrian.Vega@tusd1.org](mailto:Adrian.Vega@tusd1.org)>  
Sent: Fri, Jul 10, 2015 9:57 am  
Subject: RE: Fisher Plaintiffs' 07/02/15 RFI regarding the desegregation budget for the 2015-16 SY

Mr. Salter: Please find attached information from Dr. Abel Morado regarding the District's DAEP and ISI programs. This information is provided in response to specific questions that you asked in the email below. As you know, we answered your other questions in an email sent on July 8.

Thank you and have a good weekend.

Martha

## **Salter 07/13/15 email recommendations for desegregation budget**

---

From: **Rubin Salter, Jr.** <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>

Date: Mon, Jul 13, 2015 at 12:07 PM

Subject: Fisher Plaintiffs' budget feedback

To: [Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org)

Cc: [julie.tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:julie.tolleson@tusd1.org), [martha.taylor@tusd1.org](mailto:martha.taylor@tusd1.org), [wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu), [Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov), [Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov), [James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov), [jrodriguez@maldef.org](mailto:jrodriguez@maldef.org), [lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com), [brammer@rllaz.com](mailto:brammer@rllaz.com), [pvictory@rllaz.com](mailto:pvictory@rllaz.com)

Counsel:

In addition to the Fisher Plaintiffs' recommendations detailed in the document circulated by District counsel Samuel Brown on 07/09/15, the Fisher Plaintiffs make the **detailed recommendations highlighted in yellow** in the attached document.

In brief, those recommendations address the following areas: (1) the allocation of 910 (G) funds to pay the salary for Bryant Nodine's newly titled (but largely unchanged) position; (2) the inadequate justification for the proposed allocation of desegregation funds at University High School (UHS); (3) the allocation of desegregation funds to place magnet coordinators at Ochoa and Cragin (schools which will lose their magnet status in the 2016-17 SY); (4) the proposed ratio of desegregation to M&O funding for GATE; (5) the District's plans to spend \$1,350,000 to fund In-School Intervention (ISI) and the District Educational Alternative Program (DAEP); and (6) the District's proposed allocation of desegregation funding for the Pan Asian Studies Department.

Further, the Fisher Plaintiffs renew here their request for an in-person meeting with District staff to address their overriding concern that a significant percentage of the desegregation budget supplants, rather than supplements the District's M&O budget. Absent the requested, in-person meeting, the representatives of the Fisher plaintiff class lack the information necessary to fully and accurately evaluate the District's proposed desegregation budget.

Sincerely,

Rubin Salter, Jr.

## **Thompson 07/13/15 email recommendations for desegregation budget**

From: Thompson, Lois D. <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>  
To: 'Brown, Samuel' <[Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org)>  
Cc: julie.tolleson <[julie.tolleson@tusd1.org](mailto:julie.tolleson@tusd1.org)>; martha.taylor <[martha.taylor@tusd1.org](mailto:martha.taylor@tusd1.org)>; wdh <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; Anurima Bhargava ([Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)) <[Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; Savitsky, Zoe (CRT) ([Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov)) (CRT) ([Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov)) <[Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; Eichner, James (CRT) ([James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov)) (CRT) ([James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov)) <[James.Eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:James.Eichner@usdoj.gov)>; rsjr3 <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; Juan Rodriguez ([jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)) <[jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)>  
Sent: Mon, Jul 13, 2015 10:26 am  
Subject: FW: Final USP Budget Recommendations Mendoza Comments/Additions

We will separately address the letter you addressed to Dr. Hawley relating to the budget process. Following are Mendoza Plaintiff Recommendations that are not incorporated in the "Final Recommendations" document attached above:

### Magnet Schools

(1) Mendoza Plaintiffs have repeatedly noted that notwithstanding the Court's clear direction that the budget be transparent and a document that can be understood by the general public, the budget fails to present information on planned 910(g) spending at the individual magnet schools in a clear manner. Nor has the District responded to requests that it clearly align the budget entries with those on the individual schools' improvement plans notwithstanding having been shown (using Carrillo as the example) that the entries do not now align.

(2) Based on understanding of the information that has been provided, it appears that a number of the magnet schools are underfunded if they are to comply with the directive to enhance achievement and improve integration. This appears to be particularly true for Holladay, Ochoa, Robison, and Utterback.

### Dual Language

The District is failing to use 910(g) funds to expand dual language programs and participation. In fact, the number of schools providing dual language programs and the number of students enrolled in such programs has declined significantly in the last few years.

### Family Engagement

Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to be concerned that insufficient funds have been allocated for the robust family engagement effort outlined in the USP.

### Facilities

Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the use of 910(g) funds to pay for consultants and related activities in anticipation of a "November 2016 bond" in the absence of a showing that these expenditures are in direct support of the portion of the facilities plan that is intended to ensure equal access to facilities at racially concentrated schools.

### OMA/Fine Arts/Multi-Cultural

Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the extent to which the District has focused on these expenditures in response to the supplement vs. supplant issues that they previously have raised. They nonetheless remain concerned that the allocation of almost \$1.3 million of the total proposed \$1.8 million allocation for multi-cultural curriculum in the budget, particularly with entries like that for 50% of the salary and benefits for the OMA Director – Fine Arts, continues to suggest that supplanting rather than supplementing is occurring, especially when one notes that there are separate entries in the budget for fines arts folklorico,



fine arts mariachi teachers (which Mendoza Plaintiffs do understand to be consistent with the Court's Order and are not objecting to here) elsewhere in the budget as well. (For example in the entries for Roskruge and Tucson under category 202.)

**Lois D. Thompson**

## **Hawley 07/15/15 email questions regarding desegregation budget**

---

From: Willis D. Hawley <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>  
To: Rubin Salter, Jr. <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; Juan Rodriguez <[jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)>; lthompson <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; Bhargava, Anurima (CRT) (CRT) <[Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; zoe.savitsky <[zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; james.eichner <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; deseg <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; TUSD <[TUSD@rllaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rllaz.com)>  
Cc: Balentine, Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti) (vbalenti) <[vbalenti@email.arizona.edu](mailto:vbalenti@email.arizona.edu)>  
Sent: Wed, Jul 15, 2015 5:32 pm  
Subject: Budget questions

Please see attached questions generated by plaintiff budget challenges. Bill

Willis D. Hawley  
Professor of Education and Public Policy  
University of Maryland  
Senior Advisor  
Southern Poverty Law Cente

**Salter 07/16/15 email regarding objection to desegregation budget**

---

From: Rubin Salter, Jr. [mailto:rsjr3@aol.com]  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 2:34 PM  
To: wdh@umd.edu; jrodriguez@MALDEF.org; Thompson, Lois D.;  
Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov; zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov;  
james.eichner@usdoj.gov; deseg@tusd1.org; TUSD@rllaz.com  
Cc: vbalenti@email.arizona.edu  
Subject: Re: Budget questions

Special Master Hawley and counsel:

I am writing to clarify the authority (order or subsequent stipulation) governing the time and form of objections, responses and replies regarding the District's formal notification of the Governing Board's adoption of the desegregation budget. I am assuming that the plaintiffs will file their objections directly with Judge Bury and that there will be no need to request a report and recommendation from the Special Master. Please correct me if I am wrong, but I am also assuming that the time to respond will run from the 07/15/15 date of notification.

Thank you,

Rubin Salter, Jr.

**Thompson 07/16/15 email regarding objection to desegregation budget**

---

From: Thompson, Lois D. <lthompson@proskauer.com>  
To: 'Rubin Salter, Jr.' <rsjr3@aol.com>; wdh <wdh@umd.edu>; jrodriguez <jrodriguez@MALDEF.org>; Anurima.Bhargava <Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov>; zoe.savitsky <zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov>; james.eichner <james.eichner@usdoj.gov>; deseg <deseg@tusd1.org>; TUSD <TUSD@rllaz.com>  
Cc: vbalenti <vbalenti@email.arizona.edu>  
Sent: Thu, Jul 16, 2015 3:03 pm  
Subject: RE: Budget questions

Rubin,

We are relying on the budget process document that the District filed with the Court in February (Doc. 1762-1 at page 34) that paraphrases the USP (Section X, B, 5) which says that within 10 days of approval by the Governing Board, if any of the Plaintiffs or the Special Master disagrees with the budget as approved, they may file objections with the Court and the Court shall resolve the objections on an expedited basis. We therefore are planning to file our objections 10 days from the approval date, that is July 24, 2015.

Lois D. Thompson

**Balentine 07/20/15 email regarding Foster salary allocations in USP budget**

From: Balentine, Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti) (vbalenti) <[vbalenti@email.arizona.edu](mailto:vbalenti@email.arizona.edu)>  
To: Rubin Salter, Jr. <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>  
Sent: Mon, Jul 20, 2015 10:27 am  
Subject: Memo Re: Costs Associated with Interim Asst. Supt.

Good Morning,

Attached is the memo with the costs associated with the Interim Asst. Supt.

Have a good day.

Vicki Balentine

## **Brown 07/21/15 email response to SM budget questions**

---

From: Brown, Samuel <[Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org)>  
To: 'Willis D. Hawley' <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; Rubin Salter, Jr. <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; Juan Rodriguez <[jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)>; lthompson <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; Bhargava, Anurima (CRT) (CRT) <[Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; zoe.savitsky <[zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; james.eichner <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; Desegregation <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; TUSD <[TUSD@rlaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rlaz.com)>  
Cc: Balentine, Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti) (vbalenti) <[vbalenti@email.arizona.edu](mailto:vbalenti@email.arizona.edu)>  
Sent: Tue, Jul 21, 2015 5:21 pm  
Subject: RE: Budget questions

Dr Hawley/Counsel: These questions are untimely in light of the approved budget adoption process. However, in good faith we submit the attached responses. Thanks, Sam

## **Hawley 07/23/15 email regarding SM budget questions**

---

From: Willis D. Hawley <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>

To: Brown, Samuel <[Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org)>; Rubin Salter, Jr. <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; Juan Rodriguez <[jrodriguez@MALDEF.org](mailto:jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)>; lthompson <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; Bhargava, Anurima (CRT) (CRT) <[Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; zoe.savitsky <[zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; james.eichner <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; Desegregation <[deseg@tusd1.org](mailto:deseg@tusd1.org)>; TUSD <[TUSD@rlaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rlaz.com)>

Cc: Balentine, Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti) (vbalenti) <[vbalenti@email.arizona.edu](mailto:vbalenti@email.arizona.edu)>

Sent: Thu, Jul 23, 2015 2:04 pm

Subject: RE: Budget questions

**My “untimely” questions reflect concerns of the plaintiffs.** It seemed useful to get relevant information so that should objections be raised to the budget—which they almost certainly will be, I could deliver my report to the Court expeditiously. Some of the responses do not deal fully with the questions. Perhaps it would be best if I could talk with people who could answer questions I still have about these queries. Or, if you wish, we can **wait to see if the answers given address the plaintiffs’ concerns. Thanks.**

Bill

## **Rodriguez 07/23/15 email regarding GSRR/ISI/DAEP**

From: Juan Rodriguez <jrodriguez@MALDEF.org>  
To: Tolleson, Julie <[Julie.Tolleson@tUSD1.org](mailto:Julie.Tolleson@tUSD1.org)>; 'Willis D. Hawley' <[wdh@umd.edu](mailto:wdh@umd.edu)>; 'Lois Thompson' <[lthompson@proskauer.com](mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com)>; 'Rubin Salter Jr.' <[rsjr3@aol.com](mailto:rsjr3@aol.com)>; 'Zoe Savitsky' <[zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov](mailto:zoe.savitsky@usdoj.gov)>; 'James Eichner' <[james.eichner@usdoj.gov](mailto:james.eichner@usdoj.gov)>; 'Anurima Bhargava' <[anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov](mailto:anurima.bhargava@usdoj.gov)>; TUSD <[TUSD@rlaz.com](mailto:TUSD@rlaz.com)>; Desegregation <[deseg@tUSD1.org](mailto:deseg@tUSD1.org)>  
Sent: Thu, Jul 23, 2015 3:08 pm  
Subject: RE: GSRR Final Track Changes from 14-15 SY vs. 15-16 SY

Dear Counsel and Special Master Hawley,

Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate Julie's email of yesterday regarding the inapplicability of ISS/ISI to level-two infractions in the GSRR, which addresses one of their concerns with the GSRR revisions and obviates the need for an R&R on the issue.

Based on the District's July 21 budget response that the ISI-DAEP "plan will not affect the GSRR in an adverse way" and its June 18 indication in its GSRR responses that it declined to include the specific locations and circumstances under which the ISI/DAEP alternatives would be available, Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the District's position to be that it will not rewrite the GSRR to address these programs or the ISI-DAEP plan in any detail. However, like the Fisher Plaintiffs, the Mendoza Plaintiffs remain very concerned about how the programs will be implemented, and about the possibility that they may fail to address or remediate the disproportionality in the administration of discipline at TUSD schools.

They also question the District's view that a detailed discussion of how the ISI/DAEP plan will be implemented does not belong in the GSRR, so as to fully inform parents and students of students' rights. However, under USP Section VI, D, 1 the District is required to "provide[] to all parents of students enrolled in the District" "[t]he revised GSRR, *all related documents* and the informational programs described" in the USP, (emphasis added), which Mendoza Plaintiffs understand to cover the "ISI-DAEP plan" referenced in the District's July 21 budget responses. In that regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that as far as they can tell, the plaintiffs have not been provided with the ISI-DAEP plan and they therefore now request that the District circulate a copy of it. Mendoza Plaintiffs hereby expressly reserve their right to object to that plan and seek an R&R to the extent it deviates from the USP's disciplinary requirements once they have been given the opportunity to review it. They also seek a commitment by the District to provide copies of the plan to all parents.

Mendoza Plaintiffs also note that they agree with the Special Master's July 21 comments to the GSRR, which they generally believe, if addressed by the District, would make the GSRR more internally consistent and easier to understand. They further believe that the importance of the Special Master's comments is highlighted by the fact that the District has now included a parent/student "2015-16 SY Acknowledgement Form" with signature lines for students and parents, which the GSRR indicates students are to "**return[] to [their] school within 5 days of receiving the GSRR.**" (Emphasis in original.) In the circumstances, the District should do everything possible to provide a document that can be read and understood within five days of receipt.



They also agree with the Special Master that “allowing for the elevation of an offense seems unwise and opens the door to discrimination and excessive exclusionary consequences because the criteria for elevation are vague and ambiguous.” Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore request that the Special Master, if he did not already intend to do so, provide the parties with any report that Dr. Peyton may prepare in his “examin[ation of] all instances of elevation.” The Special Master’s comments also reminded the Mendoza Plaintiffs of their November 24, 2015 request that the implementation committee “monitor the District’s administration of discipline to ensure that first-time level three offenses that do not implicate student safety [and therefore remain subject to the “ongoing and escalating” USP limitation] and have been elevated one level do not result in long-term suspension, as is required by the USP.” Mendoza Plaintiffs request that the Special Master direct Dr. Peyton to also examine and report on this issue as it is directly implicated in the examination Dr. Peyton will conduct and would help to provide a meaningful analysis of the appropriateness of elevations.

Additionally, on June 12, 2015, Mendoza Plaintiffs requested that the District commit to making revisions to its regulations and do what is necessary to ensure that only qualified interpreters provide translation services at suspension and expulsion hearings. The request stemmed from Mendoza Plaintiffs’ understanding that when Spanish-language interpreters are needed at these hearings, typically any available person with any level of Spanish-language proficiency is used, which materially affects students’ rights to a fair hearing. In their June 18 GSRR responses, the District asserted that it does in fact use qualified interpreters. Mendoza Plaintiffs now request that the implementation committee verify that only qualified interpreters are used at suspension and expulsion hearings.

Thank you,

**Juan Rodriguez** | Staff Attorney