1 2 3 4 5	TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGAL DEPARTMENT 1010 E. TENTH STREET TUCSON, AZ 85719 (520) 225-6040 Todd Jaeger (State Bar No. 012203) Todd.Jaeger@tusd1.org Samuel E. Brown (State Bar No. 027474) Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org
6 7 8 9	STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 201 East Washington Street, Suite 1600 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2382 Telephone: (602) 257-5200 Facsimile: (602) 257-5299 P. Bruce Converse (005868) bconverse@steptoe.com Paul K. Charlton (012449) pcharlton@steptoe.com
11	Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. 1
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
14 15 16	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, V. 4:74-cv-00090-DCB (Lead Case)
17 18 19	Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., Defendants.
20 21 22	Maria Mendoza, et al. Plaintiffs, V. CV 74-204 TUC DCB (Consolidated Case)
23 24 25	Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., Defendants.
26	

NOTICE OF FILING of the 2017-2018 USP BUDGET

Telephone: (520) 225-6040

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

At the June 27, 2017 Governing Board meeting the TUSD Governing Board approved the USP Budget for the 2017-2018 school year following an eight-month budget development process, described below. The adopted 2017-2018 USP Budget is attached hereto as Exhibit A (Cover Letter and Attachments)1 and Exhibit B (Final Adopted USP Budget).

Budget Development Process for the 2017-18 USP Budget (All Parties)

On December 27, 2016, the Court ordered the parties to develop, and for the District to file, the 2017-2018 budget process procedures with the Court within 45 days of the filing date of the Budget Order [See ECF 1981, "Budget Order"].²

On January 20, 2017, the District filed the budget development process procedures pursuant to the Budget Order [ECF 1985-1]. In April 2017, the Special Master and the parties agreed to an amended budget development process timeline. On April 26, 2017, the District filed the amended timeline ("Budget Process") to reflect minor changes to the timeline [ECF 2013-1]. On June 28, 2017, the District filed a second amended budget development process timeline to reflect new dates for filing objections and responses to objections, if any, to the Final USP Budget approved on June 27, 2017 [ECF 2027]. No party objected to the revised timeline.

Compliance with Budget Development Process Benchmarks (TUSD) В.

The Budget Order directed the District to "file with the Court a Notice of Disclosure and Compliance within 5 days of each benchmark deadline" and to "explain any failures to comply." Id.

The District complied with the Budget Process procedures and timelines, including the filing of a Notice of Disclosure and Compliance within 5 days of each benchmark

¹ The Cover Letter Attachments include: (Attachment A) Responses to Draft 3 RFIs; (Attachment B) Final Budget Responses; and (Attachment C) Transition and Magnet Plans.

² These procedures were to include "the review demands of the Plaintiffs and the Special Master for both subject matter and format for TUSD's presentation of budgetary information to them," "specific review benchmarks," "a timeline for development, review and comment prior to submittal of the budget to the Governing Board for adoption," and "a date for TUSD to file the adopted budget with the Court." [ECF 1981 at 10]

1010 East 10th Street, Room 24 Tucson, Arizona 85719

Telephone: (520) 225-6040

deadline, and explaining any failures to comply. See Exhibit C, Compliance with the Budget Development Process.³

C. Budgetary / PD Assessments (TUSD)

The Court's Budget Order further directed that "future budgetary assessments shall specify who will receive professional development in what amounts and in what ways, and at what cost i.e.: its core content and relationship to provisions in the USP, the number of people in different roles receiving such professional development, mode of delivery, and the number of hours for learner participation."

The Budget Development procedures required the District to include with Draft #2 of the 2017-18 USP Budget a "PD Assessment (participants, amounts, delivery methods, costs) [ECF 2013-1 at 3]. On March 13, 2017, the District submitted a PD Assessment with Draft #2 (see Exhibit C, Attachment C-6). Because the District was still developing PD plans, it indicated that the "PD Assessment's an ongoing process and changes may occur in subsequent drafts. Information in blue (including dollar amounts) has been updated and may change; information in black (including dollar amounts) has not been updated and may change in Draft #3." On April 10, 2017, the District submitted an updated PD Assessment with Draft #3 (see Exhibit C, Attachment C-7).

Both versions specified who would receive professional development in what amounts and in what ways, and at what cost, including the core content and relationship to provisions in the USP, the number of people in different roles receiving such professional development, mode of delivery, and the number of hours for learner participation.

D. Meaningful Teacher-Mentor Ratios (TUSD)

The Court's Budget Order further directed the District to "develop a meaningful mentor-teacher ratio for first and second year teachers and a meaningful mentor-teacher

³ Exhibit C includes all information submitted to the Special Master and Plaintiffs for each draft with the exception of the Final Proposed Budget. The documents constituting Exhibits A and B, herein, are duplicative of the information submitted via email to the Special Master and Plaintiffs on June 21, 2017. Thus, Exhibit C includes only the June 21, 2017 transmittal emails, not the attachments (as those can be found in Exhibits A and B).

ratio for beginning teachers who teach in racially concentrated schools and schools where student performance is below the District average" and to use the ratios for the 2017-2018 USP Budget.

On January 20, 2017, less than one month after the Court's Budget Order, the District submitted its Draft #1 Budget Narrative [see ECF 1986]. The Budget Narrative (and subsequent communications) included a description of the District's teacher-mentor ratios, developed pursuant to the Court's Budget Order. See Exhibit D, Explanation of Teacher-Mentor Ratios and Allocations (Draft #1 Description of Teacher-Mentor Ratios and CRC Teacher-Mentor Ratios pages 1, 28-29, 34; May 15, 2017 Response to RFI 1329). The District used its ratio-approach to allocate funding for 38 Teacher-Mentors (an increase of 20 Teacher-Mentors). The District, having already described a 1:10 ratio for CRC Mentors to CRC Teachers, used this ratio to allocate funding for 11 CRC Teacher Mentors to support 110 CRC teachers.

E. Data Gathering and Review Plan – Teacher Mentors (Special Master)

The Court's December 27, 2017 Order directed the Special Master to "develop a data gathering and review plan, both substantive and procedural, to monitor the effectiveness of TUSD's beginning teacher mentoring plans for his use in the 2016-2017 SMAR."

The District is not aware of any such data gathering and review plan.

F. Detailed Progress Report on USP Section VI. Discipline (Special Master)

The Court's December 27, 2017 Order directed the Special Master to provide a detailed progress report in his 2015-2016 SMAR or separately by R&R for section VI of the USP (Discipline). The Court noted that the "assessment should be timely so that the 2017-2018 USP Budget may catch-up, if necessary, TUSD's efforts in respect to progress in attaining unitary status, pursuant to the USP § VI, Discipline.

District staff received the 2015-2016 SMAR on June 15, 2017 [ECF 2026], several days after it had submitted the Final Proposed USP Budget to its Governing Board. The

District and parties were therefore unable to consider the findings of the report in developing the 2017-2018 USP Budget.

G. Responses to Special Master Recommendations and Plaintiff Continuing Objections
On May 10, 2017, the Special Master filed his final recommendations (a.k.a.
"suggestions for modification") [ECF 2020]. Between May 24, 2017 and June 13, 2017,
the Fisher and Mendoza plaintiffs submitted to the District their "continuing objections."

On June 13, 2017, the District's Governing Board received the Special Master recommendations and the plaintiffs' continuing objections (and the District's proposed responses to the recommendations and objections) in writing as part of the board agenda item. On June 27, 2017, District staff presented to the Governing Board the Special Master's recommendations, plaintiffs' objections, and the District's proposed responses.

See Exhibit E, District Responses to Recommendations and Objections.⁴

Respectfully submitted on June 28, 2017.

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGAL DEPARTMENT

s/ Samuel E. Brown
Todd Jaeger
Samuel E. Brown
Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. 1

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

P. Bruce Converse Paul K. Charlton Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. 1

⁴ The Governing Board suggested that staff members should attempt to schedule a meeting with the Fisher Plaintiffs to address their outstanding concerns. The District is in communication with Fisher counsel to try to arrange a meeting in the near future.

Telephone: (520) 225-6040

Certificate of Service

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

s/ Samuel E. Brown