

Exhibit A

MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS' COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS TO MAGNET SCHOOL AND
REVISED TRANSITION SCHOOL PLANS

May 24, 2017

Note: Attached for ease of reference is a chart (Exhibit A) summarizing the academic performance and integration goals that will be discussed below and that are set forth in the magnet school and transition school plans.

OBJECTION TO MAGNET AND TRANSITION SCHOOL REVISED PLANS

The May revisions to the March magnet and transition school plans remove approximately \$1.5 million from the total magnet and transition school budgets. Mendoza Plaintiffs object to this action and request that this sum be restored.

The intent of the objections that both the Special Master and the Plaintiffs articulated with respect to items in the March budgets like transition coordinators and personnel to curate display cases was not to reduce the overall amount allocated to these schools but, rather, to identify funds that can be used to pay for direct services to students in the form of programs and personnel to improve the academic achievement of the African American and Latino students attending these schools and close the achievement gap.

The District asserts that it will be revising the achievement goals of these schools once the results of the 2016-17 AzMerit tests become available. Mendoza Plaintiffs urge the District to devote the \$1.5 million it has pulled from the budgets of these schools to aggressively pursue initiatives to improve educational outcomes based on the needs that emerge from an assessment of the 2016-17 test results.

MAGNET SCHOOL PLANS

General Comments

Integration Goals

Mendoza Plaintiffs are concerned by what appears to have been insufficient central administration oversight with respect to integration goals in magnet plans as there are significant integration goal inconsistencies across schools and in comparison to past years' plans, and many reflect a misunderstanding of the USP's definition of integration.

Mendoza Plaintiffs begin by noting that it appears that the integration goals of several magnet schools appear to have been copied and pasted from last year's magnet plans. Each of the Borton, Drachman, and Tully magnet plans state integration goals for the 2016-17 school year, the current school year, under the heading "INTEGRATION GOAL (2017-18)."

Further, past magnet school plan integration goals reflected that the District's efforts were directed at incoming classes. Thus, by way of example, 2015-16 elementary school improvement plans contained integration "benchmarks" for the 2015-16 school year applicable to kindergarten and first grade, and contained integration goals for the 2016-17 school year applicable to kindergarten, first and second grade; plans reflected that as each year goes by, integration goals apply to an additional grade level as student cohorts proceed through grade levels.¹ (See Doc. 1816.) Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore would expect that elementary school integration goals (again by way of example) for the 2017-18 school year would be applicable to each of kindergarten and first through third grades to reflect that integration efforts are applicable to an additional incoming class. They, however, do not.² Mendoza plaintiffs believe the magnet school plans for elementary, K-8, and high schools must be revised to reflect that integration goals are applicable to an additional grade level beyond those reflected in last year's magnet plans.

In addition, while all schools that are not currently integrated contain identical integration goals concerning total Latino student enrollment based on the USP definition of integration (that is "no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment"), only two schools, Roskruge and Holladay, contain goals regarding the total enrollment of white students ("not less than 6.2%"). Mendoza Plaintiffs believe that the inclusion of

¹ In this regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that there exist inconsistencies concerning the grade levels for which integration goals are stated. For example, Carrillo's plan notes that goals "apply to each grade level cohort that moves up from Kindergarten starting in the 2014-15 SY" while Borton states that such goals "apply to each grade level cohort that moves up from Kindergarten starting in the 2015-16 SY."

² The same is true with respect to the integration goals of K-8 and high schools as reflected in the draft 2017-18 magnet plans; K-8 and high school integration goals should apply to an additional grade level in the 2017-18 school year but they do not. This is not an issue with respect to traditional middle schools as integration goals for the 2016-17 school year already applied to sixth through eighth grades, all grade levels in such schools.

white student enrollment goals in the Roskrige and Holladay plans reflect a better focus on what it will take to integrate schools and is something that should be replicated for all magnet schools.

In a telling misunderstanding of the USP definition of integration, every single school that is not integrated provides (after the goal to reduce Hispanic enrollment to no more than 70%) that white, African American, and/or Hispanic students “will maintain the USP definition of integration.” The USP definition of “integration” refers to schools as a whole not to racial/ethnic groups within schools. (USP Section II, B, 2.) This therefore is something that should be revised for all such magnet plans. To the extent this reflects principal and/or administrator misunderstandings, Mendoza Plaintiffs suggest the District provide administrators with clarification on the USP definition of “integration.”

Similar to the achievement goals discussed below, missing from the magnet plans is any analysis of the current school population and how “far” schools are from becoming integrated or what their progress was in trying to reach those goals. Further, there is no discussion or analysis of what changes or adjustments schools might make in their integration efforts to get them closer to meeting the USP definition of integration. Indeed, the integration efforts across the magnet plans consist almost entirely of magnet coordinators who are to lead recruitment efforts, and mileage, supplies, and added duty salaries for unspecified recruitment events, as has been done in the past.

As Mendoza Plaintiffs stated in their comments of March 27, 2017, given that six schools lost their magnet status this year because they failed to achieve their integration goals, Mendoza Plaintiffs would have expected the District and its schools to have renewed attention on the integration portions of magnet plans. Mendoza Plaintiffs believe this type of analysis will be necessary if schools are expected to make meaningful moves toward becoming integrated.³

³ Mendoza Plaintiffs are aware of the statement that certain “details” “(including integration goals) of the magnet plans will be updated after the results of the application process and lottery are available” in the District’s Responses to Mendoza Plaintiff Comments on Magnets (at 3). They do not believe that the sort of analysis (particularly of past results) discussed above should have been postponed until this year’s results are known and again note that the plans currently are devoid of the information needed to assess the success of those results against prior year’s goals.

Achievement Goals

Mendoza Plaintiffs have read the statement in each of the recently revised magnet plans that recites: “the District will revise goals for SY 2017-18 in the summer of 2017 once 2016-17 achievement data is available”. While they understand that the District (and the schools) will want to have the most recent achievement data in mind as they implement their plans for the 2017-18 school year, given the generality of the stated goals and the **virtual identical goals** for all 13 magnet schools⁴, it is hard to understand in what ways the District intends to “revise” the goals other than to reference the AzMerit scores the schools will receive when preliminary AZMerit results are released this summer.

What remains missing from these plans, as Mendoza Plaintiffs noted in their comments of March 27, 2017, is the sort of analysis of the current school population and of student performance and trends, based on the already existing 2014-15 and 2015-16 data, that is included in and informs the transition school plans. The District has offered no explanation for why the same analysis that was performed for the transition schools (all of which also state they will revise goals once the 2016-17 achievement data is available) was not done when the magnet school plans were being prepared earlier this year and no explanation or rationale for why such analysis failed to occur between March 27, when Mendoza Plaintiffs pointed out the inconsistency, and May 10, when the “revised” magnet plans were issued.

⁴ Every school says that it will seek to score higher than the state median in reading and math; that its students will show academic growth that is higher than the state median growth in reading and math; and that the growth of the bottom 25% of students will be higher than the state median. All also have a goal of reducing the achievement gap (with the exception of Carrillo) but variously express the standard against which this will be measured (presumably because the intent is to measure against otherwise comparable schools, that is, elementary schools, other K-8 schools, etc.). The only school specific goal relates to the letter grade to be attained on the state wide grading system. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore conclude that this is the goal that will be “revised” based on the reported results of the most recent AzMerit exam.

Also omitted from the plans is any discussion or analysis of whether the school met its **prior** goals and, if not, what might explain that shortcoming and what changes in approach, methodology, program etc. should be made to improve future performance.⁵

The consequence is that the District now is seeking funding for each magnet school based on plans that do not appear to be informed by any in-depth assessment of student achievement – with the excuse that “goals” will be “revised” after the fact when 2016-17 achievement data will be available (but when it will be very difficult to revise plans both because funding based on current (apparently limited understanding) already will be in place and because, sometime in July after the 2016-17 data will have become available, it will be difficult to do the hiring and make any necessary revisions of program or emphasis to address issues that might in fact have been surfaced by an analysis of the 2014-15/2015-16 data).

Site Specific Goals

Mendoza Plaintiffs commented on multiple issues with the “site specific” goals in the magnet school plans in their March 27 submission. Because the District has not addressed those comments, and the issues Mendoza Plaintiffs raised remain of concern to them, they repeat them here (noting the few areas where changes were made between the time of those comments and the May 10 drafts).

There is no indication of how the “site specific” goals were developed (or why) or what is to happen if the more demanding “achievement goal” is not met but the generally less ambitious “site specific” goal is attained. However, what is clear is that they are very uneven, use different measurements, and have as goals outcomes that in many instances would have significant numbers of students scoring less than “proficient”. Thus, for example, the Bonillas plan states that in 2017-18, students will score higher than the district median in both reading and math on benchmark⁶

⁵ For example, the Bonillas plan for 2015-16 stated that in 2015-16, Bonillas would close the achievement gap in reading for African American students by at least 19.5% and for Latino students by 8%. Lacking from its current plan is any indication of whether that goal was achieved or any discussion of how the success or lack of success in reaching that goal should impact its future program, pedagogy, etc. (or even its current goal setting). (Doc. 1816 at 10.)

⁶Mendoza Plaintiffs question the use of the benchmark assessments as the appropriate standard and believe that the AzMerit (which is the standard against which a few

assessments at all grade levels (but does not say where the students are now so there is no way of knowing how ambitious that goal is). Booth-Fickett sets a goal of at least a 3% increase in benchmark scores and sets out the 2016-17 result for each grade to provide at least some context for the setting of the goal (and, thereby, an indication that the goals are far from ambitious, accepting less than 50% proficiency in virtually all grades on both the math and ELA tests)⁷. Dodge states that it will reduce the achievement gap for Hispanics taking the math AzMerit 2017 by at least 10% and Drachman references both the AzMerit and benchmark exams in setting a number of different goals.

Some of the goals are for levels of achievement in fall 2017, others for December 2017, and some for June 2018, and some are not keyed to any dates at all. All of this makes it very difficult to do an evaluation of magnet school success at any single point in time or to be able to make comparisons among schools. Finally, some of the goals have nothing to do with student achievement. Thus, for example, Palo Verde lists as an **achievement** goal that it will engage in weekly Professional Learning Communities. In March, Mendoza Plaintiffs noted that one could not discern the goals for Holladay because the pages that would disclose this information were missing. In its May 10 plan, Holladay sets NO site specific achievement goals. Rather, it states as its sole “site goal” that all grade level teams participate in Professional Learning Communities on a weekly basis.

Family Engagement and Community Outreach (Issues in Common with Transition Plans)

Mendoza Plaintiffs have found that the magnet plans generally include few, if any, family engagement efforts, and that most of those efforts are not directed at

magnet schools (*e.g.* Dodge) and the transition schools have stated they will be assessed) is more appropriate. Notably, it also is the test against which goals were set in plans developed and filed with the Court in prior years.

⁷ Even as Booth-Fickett provides more detailed site specific goals than any of the other magnet schools, it fails to provide any understanding of why the goal should be a 3% increase for all grades in both math and ELA and no indication that it has asked itself why there was such a significant difference in proficiency in its 2nd grade school cohort (50% proficient) and its 3d grade cohort (only 33.3% proficient, the lowest of any grade) in math on the benchmark tests for 2016-17. (Mendoza Plaintiffs cite this as but an example of the type of analysis that they assert should have undergirded the preparation of the magnet school plans.)

authentically engaging parents, but rather involve family events that are either unspecified or at which parents will be spoken to by District personnel, and that appear to reflect the same events that the District has engaged in in the past.

To begin, there are some schools such as Tully and Palo Verde that do not seem to include any family engagement strategies at all. The entirety of other schools' family engagement and community outreach plans, such as those of Booth-Fickett, Carrillo, Drachman, Roskruge, and Tucson High, consist entirely of "added duty" for teachers to attend unspecified family events and/or for "supplies" for these events. Others such as Dodge, provide for a community liaison and state in general terms that they will engage parents. Significantly, the family and community engagement efforts described in the magnet plans, such as those cited above, provide little more information than would a budget line item and do not reflect carefully thought out plans directed at improving academic achievement and increasing integration through increased family engagement.

While some schools such as Borton and Carrillo go a bit further in describing planned events ("honor roll and perfect attendance assemblies," "culture night," "literacy night," "magnet showcases and performances"), those events reflect the less favored "parent involvement" events that the District's family and community engagement assessment described years ago as insufficient in meaningfully engaging parents. (See Doc. 1852-1 at 8, 14-15, 19-20.) What is needed are authentic efforts to engage families, including efforts to learn from parents how to best engage their children, teaching them how to access and examine their children's achievement and other data to support their education, and empowering and teaching them to advocate for their children. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore strongly suggest that the District and schools work together to revise magnet plans to include what the District itself has elsewhere described as "learning-centric family engagement" efforts that have a "greater positive effect on learning outcomes." (*Id.* 18-21.)

Budget Amounts

Notwithstanding an earlier representation that it would hold the total magnet school budget (after deductions for the transition schools) constant with last year, it appears that the District has reduced the total amount of 910(G) funds to be allocated to the magnet schools by about \$540,000. (Compare chart at page 16 of the March 27

comments with the chart below. The March chart shows the total allocated for the magnet schools plans to be \$7,920,187.70)⁸

Magnet Schools	2017-18 Budget and	FTEs	Enrollment 40 th day 2015-16	Per student desegregation budget allocation	Ranking of per student allocation
Bonillas	\$359,634.03	7.3 FTEs	425	\$846.20	8
Booth-Fickett	\$778,070.75 -\$45,000* \$733,070.75	9 FTEs	1218	\$638.81 (initial) \$601.86 (current)	11
Borton	\$490,775.00	10.88 FTEs	436	\$1,125.63	5
Carrillo	\$452,022.51 -\$55,571* \$412,894.39	7.88 FTEs	285	\$1,586.04 (initial) \$1,448.75(current)	2
Davis	\$393,908.00 -\$7,612* \$386,296.00	9.8 FTEs	334	\$1,179.37 (initial) \$1,156.57(current)	4
Dodge	\$290,922.00	3.8 FTEs	420	\$692.67	9
Drachman	\$457,351.50 -7,490.00* \$449,861.50	11.04 FTEs	323	\$1,415.95(initial) \$1,392.76(current)	3
Holladay	\$629,757.00 -\$40,000 \$589,755.00	9.5 FTEs	272	\$2,315.28 (initial) \$2,165.56(current)	1
Mansfeld	\$518,565.20 -\$12,000* \$506,565.20	8.5 FTEs	779	\$665.68 (initial) \$650.28 (current)	10
Palo	\$416,168.00	6	1208	\$344.51 (initial)	13

⁸ It is important to stress that this deduction is separate from the amounts in certain school budgets that have been “reallocated to 16-17 SY”. Mendoza Plaintiffs compared the versions of the magnet school budgets for Booth-Fickett and Carrillo (the schools with the largest “reallocations”) and determined that the sums to be “reallocated” were not in the March 2017 versions of their budgets. Thus, it appears that they were separately added to the May versions of the budgets (so that they could then be “reallocated” to 2016-17). The approximately \$540,000 reduction in total magnet school budgets from March to May therefore has nothing to do with, and is separate from, the accounting results of the added/reallocated sums. (This is further confirmed by the Magnet School Budget Comparisons attached to the District’s Responses to Mendoza Plaintiff Comments on Magnets that shows that inclusive of the “reallocated” sums, the total for all the March 2017 magnet plans came to \$8,209,409.)

Verde	<u>-\$4,654.00</u> \$411,514.00	FTEs		\$340.66 (current)	
Roskruge	\$725,466.40 <u>-\$20,761.00</u> \$704,705.	12.7 FTEs	717	\$1,011.81 (initial) \$982.85 (current)	6
Tucson	\$1,731,963.20	28.1 FTEs	3182	\$544.30	12
Tully	\$326,250. <u>\$25,000</u> \$311,250.00	5 FTEs	371	\$879.38	7
TOTAL	\$7,379,026.47				

*Accelerated expenditures

The chart above for magnet schools shows a per student allocation amount. The amount for each school is then ranked from top to bottom.

Mendoza Plaintiffs object to this total reduction and urge the District to allocate the approximately \$540,000 to programs in the magnet schools that will provide direct services to students to more aggressively target the achievement gaps in so many of the magnet schools and to provide the summer learning opportunities (and Jump Start and similar summer transition programs) that the Special Master and the Plaintiffs have repeatedly urged the District to pursue.

In their discussion of specific magnet school plans, below, Mendoza Plaintiffs identify sums currently allocated to such objectionable expenses to the above referenced programs and initiatives to reduce the achievement gap and address summer learning deficits.

Before turning to a discussion of specific plans, Mendoza Plaintiffs also note the following: In its Responses to Mendoza Plaintiff Comments on Magnets (Activity Code 202) ("Magnet Plan Responses"), the District asserted that the chart comparing magnet school allocations by school was misleading. Mendoza Plaintiffs disagree. While they understand that certain schools may have one time purchases to support their programs and that the costs of certain programs are inherently more expensive than others, they nonetheless believe that comparisons of overall allocations, relative numbers of FTEs to be paid with 910(G) funds and per student allocations offer useful perspectives in assessing how the District is proposing to fund the magnet schools. Accordingly, all that information has been included in the above chart.

Specific Plans

Bonillas

The Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate that the District has removed its planned investment in “Capturing Kids Hearts” from the Bonillas magnet plan.

Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to have significant concerns with the fact that the District proposes that 60% of the Bonillas Magnet Coordinator’s time will be spent as an instructional coach. The District asserts that the magnet coordinator will fulfill “his or her other job duties” (apparently not knowing the identity of the coordinator, which raises the additional question of the extent to which the District communicated with the Magnet Coordinator to verify that he or she has the capacity to fulfill the duties of the instructional coach and magnet coordinator positions). (TUSD Response to RFI #1084.) However, no other TUSD magnet elementary school proposes that its coordinator spend any of their time (let alone 60% of their time) as instructional coaches which suggests that fulfillment of the magnet coordinator duties at Bonillas will fall far short of those at other magnet elementary schools. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore again suggest that the Bonillas budget should include the cost of an instructional coach so that the Magnet Coordinator has the same time to fulfill his or her job duties as would such coordinators in other magnet schools.

Booth-Fickett

Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to question inclusion in the 910(G) budget of so much of the \$43,500 entry for instructional supplies as is related to “general supplies and materials to support student achievement” and “student agendas” because these expenses appear to be instances of supplantation rather than supplementation.

Borton

As Mendoza Plaintiffs stated in their March 27, 2017 budget comments, the District’s proposal to use 910g funds to employ a music teacher (in addition to the arts teacher) at Borton, a systems-thinking magnet, is increasingly encroaching on the program of Holladay, a fine arts magnet. They therefore continue to object to the proposal to add a full time music teacher to Borton. (Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the Magnet and Transition Plan Cover Letter indicates the District reduced 1 FTE from

Borton's budget, but Mendoza Plaintiffs were unable to identify what teaching position was eliminated.)

Carrillo

Mendoza Plaintiffs are confused with the District's request that they provide a their basis for asserting that revisions to Carrillo's magnet school plan to "integrate communications and creative art more broadly across the curriculum" would "enhance the school's efforts to achieve a more integrated student body" (TUSD Response to RFI #1090), when the purpose of magnet school themes and programs is to offer attractive and unique curricula that is likely to attract a diverse student body to integrate schools. Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to believe that the District should consider revising the Carrillo magnet plan (as well as the many other magnet plans that do not focus at all on magnet themes) to better integrate the theme more broadly across the program curriculum.

Davis

Mendoza Plaintiffs are concerned with the District's decision to reduce the number of teaching assistants to 3 FTEs in this TWDL school's May plan from the 5.25 FTEs proposed in the March plan, particularly when the District describes these assistants as "critical as language models, [and they] assist in district/state required assessments and help teachers manage workloads which double when leaning/teaching in two languages... ." Given the "double" workload involved in providing instruction in two languages, Mendoza Plaintiffs' are further concerned by the fact that the March 2017 plan entry is consistent with this school's adopted bilingual teaching assistants for the 2016-17 school year and the District provides no explanation for why the school's requirements for such assistants have changed from the 2016-17 school year to the 2017-18 school year. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore, insofar as they understand the reduction, object to it.

Dodge

As noted in the general comments, above, Mendoza Plaintiffs question the inclusion as "achievement goals" that "[t]he principal will increase the number of leadership opportunities in 2017 by 10%" and that there will be an increase in "the use of the PLC process to improve instruction by 10% in number of hours spent in PLCs". (While these may be goals that the principal sets in connection with his/her efforts to

implement the plan they are means to attain higher achievement, not achievement outcomes.)

The revised Dodge plan contains entries in excess of \$30,000 (inclusive of paying for the cost of substitutes to permit regular teachers to attend the referenced conferences) to permit teachers to attend conferences during the school year on, *inter alia*, best practices for magnet schools. Mendoza Plaintiffs have not seen similar entries in the budgets for other magnet schools, including schools that have not been as successful as Dodge in terms of either achieving integration or attaining high achievement. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask why this expenditure is being included in the Dodge plan but not in the plans of other magnet schools whose personnel might be in greater need of learning “best practices.” They also ask how the benefits of attendance paid for by the District are to be shared more broadly beyond the school whose teachers are enabled to attend such conferences.

In their March 27 comments Mendoza Plaintiffs questioned tasking the Magnet Coordinator with the jobs of “ensuring that student interventions are working”, “help[ing] in identifying intervention needs”, and supporting the MTSS team. They continue to question such use of the Magnet Coordinator and believe it is inconsistent both with the intent behind the position (which is related to the particular attributes of the school as a magnet school) and the job definition which refers to coordinating activities and services to facilitate the magnet school program, conducting professional development related to content and pedagogy of the magnet theme, collecting data, and providing relevant and up to date magnet school information. As Mendoza Plaintiffs previously noted, this role description in the magnet school plan raises questions as to whether the Magnet Coordinator role has sufficient clarity and consistency both at the school level and system wide.

Drachman

For reasons that are not explained and that appear to be at odds with the undertaking to have no school seek to underperform its past results, Drachman, which received an “A” score in the last reported statewide exam, sets as a goal attaining either an “A” or a “B” going forward.

Mendoza Plaintiffs repeat the comments they made on March 27 with respect to the absence of electives for the middle school Drachman students and the plan to use 6th/5th contracts:

The plan proposes placing middle school teachers on 6th/5th contracts, referring to the “plan” approved by the parties when the Court approved the proposal that it become a K-8 school. For clarity, Mendoza Plaintiffs state that while they agreed to the general proposal to permit Drachman to become a K-8 school, they do not believe they ever saw a plan with the sort of detail that is being referenced relating to additional school time, electives, and putting teachers on 6th/5th contracts.

The plan states that the school does not have funding for elective classes. Mendoza Plaintiffs believe that if the District advocated for the addition of the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades to this school, it should also have anticipated the need for these students to have elective classes and it should now fund them. They agree with the Special Master (in his Comments on 2018 Budget Narrative at 7) that use of 6th/5th contracts is not good education policy for the reasons he stated.

They note that added to the plan since March is the cost of sending teachers to the Magnet Schools of America Conference. In principle, Mendoza Plaintiffs support such attendance but since it does not appear that every magnet school in the District is sending attendees to the conference, they again ask how the magnet schools that are to send teachers were selected and how the information gained will be shared District-wide. (They also note the significant difference in budgeted amounts between the Dodge plan (that admittedly covers attendance at multiple conferences) and the Drachman plan and ask whether adjustments need to be made to one or the other plan to ensure that all applicable costs are covered.)

Holladay

The Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the District’s proposal to use almost \$42,000 for “Club Z” tutors. Mendoza Plaintiffs understand “Club Z” tutors to neither involve a research-based strategy or the use of certificated personnel to provide tutoring to “struggling” students. Mendoza Plaintiffs were surprised by the District’s apparent assertion that these tutors were “recommended by Dr. Hawley in his February 2017 memo.” (TUSD April 10, 2017 Responses to Mendoza Plaintiff Comments on Magnets at

10.) What the Special Master said concerning Club Z tutors in his February 6, 2017 is as follows:

The idea that this school would hire an organization to provide tutors that the school does not train or screen to work with struggling students is simply mind-boggling. Club Z is a for-profit franchise company that primarily works with kids in their homes. The District says that this program is research-based. I looked at their website and there is no research cited. I looked at the What Works Clearinghouse and the Best Evidence Encyclopedia; no references to Club Z...

For tutoring to work in schools, tutoring should be undertaken by certified or very well trained individuals and it should be aligned with the curriculum and the teaching strategies being used in the school. Teachers should oversee tutors. This is a good example of a deficit approach to school improvement one that has been rejected in previous budget years.

Mendoza Plaintiffs again suggest that the District revise its proposal to eliminate reliance on “Club Z” tutors and instead have qualified personnel working with students who are not “struggling” while the regular certified classroom teacher provides those students who are “struggling” with additional instructional support.

Mansfeld

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand the explanation of “duplication” for the reduction of the magnet counselor role from 1 FTE in the March plan to .5 FTE in the May plan. The only change they see in the rather extensive description of this person’s role in the plan is the omission of the sentence in the earlier version of the plan that says the counselor will coach students on behavioral strategies to maximize their time in the classroom and keep them from being sent out of class. Mendoza Plaintiffs ask whether such coaching requires a .5 FTE and, if so, who is expected to do that job if the magnet counselor does not?

The “site specific” goals stated in the plan are extremely general and non-specific and should be refined. The goals currently are to “increase” (with no number or percentage specified) the number of students enrolled in advanced level classes compared to 2016/17 (with nothing said about outcomes once in those classes) and to

“outperform” (again without any specification) “the District” in math and reading benchmarks.

Palo Verde

As noted above, the plan includes as an “achievement goal” that teachers will engage in weekly Professional Learning Communities. This may help reach a goal but is not itself an achievement goal. The only achievement goal that is stated is lacking in specificity and is very general: “Students at Palo Verde will score above District average on benchmark assessments.”

Roskruge

Once again, the site specific goal is very general and lacking in specificity, saying only that Roskruge students will perform above the District average on math and reading benchmark assessments.

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not fully understand the reduction of approximately \$60,000 for bi-lingual teaching assistants between the March and May plans. In so far as they do understand the reduction they object to it, particularly since the March 2017 plan entry is consistent with the District proposed and party approved entry for four bi-lingual teaching assistants for the 2016-17 school year and no clear explanation has been provided for why the school’s requirements in this regard have changed from the 2016-17 school year to the 2017-18 school year.

Tucson High

Again, the site specific goal is very general and lacking in specificity, saying only that students at Tucson High will score above the District average on benchmark assessments.

Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the fact that the District has reduced the number of teaching positions to be paid for from 910(G) funds but cannot tell what positions have been eliminated from the budget (and to what extent supplantation has been addressed) since the positions are not enumerated as they were in the March plan. Further, there is inconsistency which should be explained between the plan which refers

to 30.6 FTE positions and the Cover Letter that says there had been 28.8 such positions (now reduced to 23).

Mendoza Plaintiffs also note that the position of “assistant curator” has been reduced from 1 FTE to .5 FTE but they continue to object to the use of 910(G) money to pay to keep display cases current, increase signage, and maintain the gallery.

Tully

Mendoza Plaintiffs have no specific comment.

TRANSITION SCHOOL PLANS

General Comments/Objections

As shown in the chart set forth below, between March and May, the District has reduced the total amount of 910(G) funds to be allocated to the transition schools by over \$940,000.

Transition Schools:	2017-18 Budget	FTEs	Enrollment 40 th day 2015-16	Per student desegregation budget allocation	Per student desegregation budget allocation
Cholla	From proposed \$1,445,700. to <u>\$801,668.</u> Less <u>\$544,032.</u> 37.63% reduction	Unable to determine from data provided.	1854	\$779.77 (initial) \$432.39 (current)	4
Ochoa	\$298,600. Less \$112,400. \$186,200. 37.64% reduction	Unable to determine from data provided	217	\$1,376.04 (initial) \$858.06 (current)	1
Pueblo	\$343,500.	Unable to determine from data provided	1595	\$215.36	6
Robison	From proposed \$432,040. to <u>\$360,840.</u> Less	Unable to determine from data provided	332	\$1,301.32 (initial)	2

	<u>\$71,200.</u> 16.48% reduction			\$1,086.86 (current)	
Safford	From proposed \$896,800. to \$781,400. Less \$115,400. 12.86% reduction	Unable to determine from data provided	783	\$1,145.34 (initial) \$997.96 (current)	3
Utterback	\$279,100.	Unable to determine from data provided	532	\$524.62	5
Total initial proposed in March	\$3,695,740.				
Total current Proposed in May	\$2,752,708.				
Difference	-\$943,032.				

To the extent these reductions are attributable to the elimination of personnel or programs that would otherwise have been involved in the delivery of education to students (other than those that would have been associated with the now deferred introduction of dual language programs at Ochoa and Pueblo), Mendoza Plaintiffs object to such reductions as improper alterations to the transition plans approved by the Court in its Order of March 13, 2017 (Doc. 1996).⁹

In this regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs again note, as they did in their comments of March 27, that the Court afforded the Plaintiffs and the Special Master the opportunity to object to approved (and to be implemented) transition plans to address the adequacy of those plans once the District had developed the budgetary portion of those plans. Having developed those plans and secured Court approval, Mendoza Plaintiffs do not believe that the District may vary those plans except to address the issues of adequacy

⁹ Mendoza Plaintiffs distinguish between items in those plans that were objected to by the Special Master and the Plaintiffs like transition coordinators, that did not directly relate to the teaching and support of students, and items like the provision in the approved Utterback plan for 5 FTE to support the fine and performing arts program in that school (Doc. 1984-1 at 106 of 158) that the District removed after plan approval by the Court.

raised by the Plaintiffs and the Special Master. As the Court stated: “The Court anticipates that the SY 2017-2018 budget will more fully detail the adequacy of the transition plans. For example, Plaintiffs and the Special Master express concerns regarding adequacy of training and professional development, of efforts to improve academic achievement of African American students, and family engagement efforts. The adequacy of these provisions contained in the transition plans will depend on the levels of funding they receive in the SY 2017-2018 budget. Because the line-item budget is trailing the transition plan development and approval, the Court approves the transition plans but affords Plaintiffs and the Special Master an opportunity to reurge objections related to adequacy, if any remain after the line-item budget is released.” (*Id.* at 2:11-20.)

Specific Plans

Cholla

Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the reduction in IB certified staff from 11 FTE in the March plan to 6 FTE in the May plan. (They note the addition of an RTI (response to intervention) teacher in the Title 1 portion of the budget but do not believe that addition mitigates the effect of the cut.) They heard the District state at the April meeting in Tucson that it will not cut IB classes but will, instead, increase class size but they do not believe that is sufficient justification for the magnitude of the proposed cut especially at a time when the District is expanding the program and when it is pursuing the IB Middle Years Programme for 9th and 10th graders and applying for the IB Career-Related Programme for 2017-18. (Thus, for example, in the 2015-16 Annual Report, it states at page V-154: “The total number of students in the IB Programme at Cholla increased by 58 percent in one year....” See pages V-155 and V-156 for references to the expanded programs.)

Mendoza Plaintiffs also have serious concerns about whether the six proposed teachers with larger classes than in the past will have adequate time to pursue the action steps set forth in the approved Cholla plan, including, as stated on page 27-28 of the May version of the plan: “Teachers will provide individualized feedback to students to refine their progress and ultimate success on final IB assessments; ...Provide tutoring hours before and after school.”

Ochoa

Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the District's decision to eliminate both the reading recovery program and the 1.0 Reading Specialist FTE from Ochoa's plan approved by the Court's March 13, 2017 Order as reflected in Ochoa's May transition plan. Notwithstanding that in its review of Ochoa's performance the District indicated that "Hispanic, Native American, African-American and Multi-racial subgroups need the most assistance in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELA...", the District eliminated reading recovery citing to the associated expense (although it decided to continue the program at Safford and Robison). It further eliminated a 1.0 FTE Reading Specialist whose stated purpose is to "Support the Balanced Literacy program, Guided Reading and Daily Five implementation" and that it identified as relating to each of Ochoa's five strategies to improve achievement. The result is that the thrust of the efforts in the transition plan approved by the Court to improve performance in ELA has been materially "watered down."

Pueblo

Other than to change the title of the "data coach" (as is true in most of the plans that originally listed this position) to "instructional data and interventionist coordinator", no changes have been made to the Pueblo plan since March.

Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore repeat their objections and concern that Pueblo does not yet have a plan to address (or the money to support) enhanced performance by its students.

As they commented before, preparation of the Pueblo plan reflects less attention than other plans. Thus, for example, notwithstanding that it was agreed that new dual language efforts would be deferred for at least one year (so that it could focus on existing programs to enhance achievement), the addition of 4 dual language teachers and 2 dual language teaching assistants is included in the plan (at page 2) although sums to pay for these positions no longer is included in the budget portion of the plan.

Mendoza Plaintiffs previously noted the significant difference among transition schools in the per student funding proposed. While they understand that there are differences in program, capital costs, and other factors from school to school, they continue to believe that the difference between Pueblo at \$215 per student vs. the other transition schools is glaring. (*See, e.g.* Safford, at \$997 per student even after

reductions to its March budget), Mendoza Plaintiffs urge the District to use a significant amount of the over \$940,000 that it has removed from the transition school budgets since March to revisit and revise the Pueblo plan.

Simply by way of example of how additional funds might usefully be spent, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that on page 13 of its plan, Pueblo says that students who have failed algebra I during the first semester will be required to retake the class 2nd semester before advancing to algebra II. While it also provides for bottom 25% students to be identified each semester and put in a separate “support class”, it includes no funding for aggressive interventions during the year in the non-“support” class to identify students for additional assistance before they fail and relies only on AmeriCorps volunteers rather than paid, certificated teachers to offer tutoring. By contrast, the Palo Verde magnet school plan expressly includes (and allocates money for) four teachers to tutor its students. (See Palo Verde plan at 1.) (It also is worth noting that on the most recent state rankings, Palo Verde was an “A” school while Pueblo was a “C”.)

Robison

The Robison plan appears to reflect the elimination of a math curriculum service provider (“CSP”), while retaining an ELA CSP. (The “purpose” of the retained CSP seems to contemplate involvement in ELA but not math PLCs.) Given the District’s belief in investments in CSPs as reflected in the proposed funding for such positions in a number of transition plans, and that Robison was below the District average on ELA and Math at every grade level (Robison Plan at 3), Mendoza Plaintiffs ask the District to consider, to the extent it is not already doing so, using the CSP to support efforts directed at both ELA and math.

While Mendoza Plaintiffs do not object to the elimination of the transition coordinator from Robison’s plan, they do note that “action steps” throughout the Robison transition plan still make reference to the transition coordinator as the “person completing [the] action,” something that appears to warrant revision.

Safford

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not object to the reductions in the Safford budget between March and May based on the District’s representation that the school will receive a “RPPF” and their expectation that such an “RPPF” will be appropriately trained for that position.

Mendoza Plaintiffs previously commented that the Safford plan is comprehensive and contains a level of specificity not seen in other plans. They nonetheless have concerns about an aspect of the plan that they urge the District to revise when goals also are revised this summer. The plan appears to be very focused on on-line learning and on-line interventions for students who need additional assistance, particularly in math. (*See, e.g.*, Safford plan at 8, 14, and 31.) While computer-based learning and practice certainly has an important role to play, they are concerned that it not be the primary method of teaching or coaching math and recommend that the plan be revised to the extent warranted to ensure that will not be the case.

Utterback

Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to believe that the Utterback plan is under-resourced and therefore inadequate. They have previously commented on and objected to the District's decision to remove from the Court-approved plan, 5 FTEs to support the fine and performing arts program. (And they do not find the District's statement that fine arts electives are still in the school's master schedule and that based on demand, the District will fund [from unidentified sources] teachers to teach fine arts electives (Magnet and Transition Plan Cover Letter at 4) a satisfactory response.)

They believe that a comparison with the Safford plan is revealing. They recognize that Safford's student body is 783 and Utterback's 532 so that more personnel and resources are appropriately included in the Safford plan than the Utterback plan. They also recognize that Safford has challenges in raising student achievement, having most recently received a grade of "C" on state exams. However, the same is even more true for Utterback, which was rated "D". Further, they acknowledge that Safford is a K-8 while Utterback is a middle school. All that said, as of now, the District plans to spend \$997.96 per student in 910(G) funds at Safford as compared with \$524.62 at Utterback. The Safford plan includes two math interventionists, one for grades K-5, the other for grades K-8. The Utterback plan includes one math interventionist. The Utterback plan includes no other FTE entries (and related expenses) to support student math achievement (although there is an AVID teacher). However, the Safford plan also includes an additional four FTE RTIs to provide ELA/Math classes for Tier II intervention for struggling students and three FTE teacher assistants. Mendoza Plaintiffs do not suggest that identical personnel and numbers should be in the Utterback plan but the Safford plan does suggest that Utterback is not yet adequately resourced.

Magnet & Transition School Plans
Academic and Integration Goals Comparison

Magnet Schools	State grade	goal	Academic Performance	Integration Goal
Bonillas	C	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading; general goal to score higher than District median on benchmark tests; general goal to decrease achievement gap between racial groups to less than non-magnet schools.	1 st and 2 nd will have no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment and school will maintain AF Am and white student enrollment
Booth-Fickett	C	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading; increase by 3% on Math benchmarks tests in all grades and ELA in 3 rd grade. No mention of achievement gap.	Will continue to meet USP definition of integration
Borton	C	A	Score higher than state median on math and reading; general goal to score higher than District median on benchmark tests; general goal to decrease achievement gap between racial groups to less than non-magnet schools by June 2017 (should be changed)	1 st and 2 nd will have no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment and school will maintain AF Am and white student enrollment
Carrillo	A	A	Score higher than state median on math and reading; general goal to score higher than District median on benchmark tests. Did not address achievement gap.	1 st and 2 nd will have no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment and school will maintain AF Am and white student enrollment
Davis	B	A	Score higher than state median on math and reading; general goal to score higher than District median on benchmark tests; general goal to decrease achievement gap between racial groups to less than non-magnet schools	1 st and 2 nd will have no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment and school will maintain African American and white student enrollment
Dodge	A	A	Score higher than state median on math and reading; no goals pertaining to benchmarks. Reduce achievement gap for Latino students by 10%	Will continue to meet USP definition of integration
Drachman	A	A or B	5% higher on AZ merit, Dibels, and School City ELA and Math fall and spring benchmarks. General goal to decrease achievement gap between racial groups to less than non-magnet schools.	By 40 th day 2016-17 the 1 st and 2 nd will have no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment and school will maintain African American and white student enrollment (Goal date should be changed)
Holladay	D	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading; no goals pertaining to benchmarks. Reduce achievement gap between all racial groups will be less when compared to like groups in non-magnet schools	By 40 th day 2017-18 the 1 st and 2 nd will have no more than 70% Hispanic student enrollment and white student enrollment will not be less than 6.2%; school will maintain African American and white student enrollment
Mansfeld	C	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading; Reduce achievement gap between all racial groups will be less when compared to like groups in non-magnet schools. Outperform District on math and reading benchmarks. Increase number of students in advanced education classes.	Hispanic student enrollment will be less than 70% in 6 th , 7 th , and 8 th grade by 40 th day 17-18. African American student enrollment will continue to meet USP integration definition.
Palo Verde	A	A	Score higher than state median on math and reading Reduce achievement gap between all racial groups will be less when compared to like groups in non-magnet schools. Will score above District medium on benchmark assessments	Will maintain integration status as defined by USP.
Roskruge	B	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading; will score above District median pertaining to benchmarks. Reduce achievement gap between all racial groups will be less when compared to like groups in non-magnet schools	Enrollment for 1 st and 2 nd will be less than 70% for Hispanic students, which will also apply to 6 th , 7 th , and 8 th grade with less than 6.2% white students.
Tucson	B	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading. Reduce achievement gap	Enrollment for Hispanic students will be less than 70% for 9 th , 10 th , and 11 th grades and will

			between all racial groups will be less when compared to like groups in non-magnet schools. Will score above District medium on benchmark assessments	remain to meet integration requirements for other racial groups.
Tully	C	B	Score higher than state median on math and reading; will score above District median pertaining to benchmarks. Reduce achievement gap between all racial groups in non-magnet schools.	By 16-17 will continue to meet definition of integration according to USP. (Goal date should be changed.)

Transition Schools	State grade	Goal	Academic Performance Goals	Integration Goals
Cholla	B	No goal	Very specific % goals by grade for Math and ELA for students not academically proficient, as well as those who are proficient. Goals established for IB students. However, the goals, if met will remain to have the majority of Cholla students failing the State academic performance assessment.	No goal or mention of integration.
Ochoa	B	No goal	Very specific % goals established, however, the goals, if met will remain to have the majority of Ochoa students failing the State academic performance assessment.	No goal or mention of integration.
Pueblo	C	No goal	Very specific % goals established, however, the goals, if met will remain to have the majority of Pueblo students failing the State academic performance assessment.	No goal or mention of integration.
Robison	D	No goal	Very specific % goals established, however, the goals, if met will remain to have the majority of Robison students failing the State academic performance assessment.	No goal or mention of integration.
Safford	C	No goal	Very specific % goals established, however, the goals, if met will remain to have the majority of Safford students failing the State academic performance assessment.	No goal or mention of integration.
Utterback	D	No goal	Very specific % goals established, however, the goals, if met will remain to have the majority of Utterback students failing the State academic performance assessment.	No goal or mention of integration.

Exhibit B

MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS RE: SPECIAL MASTER
RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING DRAFT # 3 OF THE TUSD 2017-18 910(G) BUDGET
AND STATEMENT OF "CONTINUING OBJECTIONS"

May 24, 2017

Pursuant to the agreed 2017-18 USP Budget Development Process (Doc. 2013), Mendoza Plaintiffs submit the within objections and comments concerning the "Recommendation of Special Master Regarding Version 3 of the 910G Budget" (Doc. 2020) ("SM Recommendation") and their statement of "continuing objections." Notwithstanding that the Special Master filed the SM Recommendation with the Court, they are not similarly filing the within document because they do not understand the agreed process to require Court filings until after the District has adopted and filed the final 910(G) budget.

They will separately address comments and objections relating to the revised transition and magnet plans.

Allocations Referenced in the SM Recommendation

Student Success Specialists (Comments/Objections to the SM Recommendation and "Continuing Objections")

Mendoza Plaintiffs previously stated that they do not object to the decision to reduce the number of Student Success Specialists (although they continue to ask that the District provide assurances with respect to its efforts to provide appropriate new positions for the individuals now holding those positions).

They also appreciate the conversation that they had with District representatives on May 11, 2017 to discuss the District's thinking concerning the roles and responsibilities of the Mexican American Student Support Department ("MASSD") and its personnel going forward and the opportunity the District provided to the Mendoza Plaintiffs for them to provide their views about the future of that Department.

Because the District has not yet made its final decisions concerning the structure, roles, and responsibilities of the student support departments, Mendoza Plaintiffs cannot yet provide their final comments and/or objections relating to the elimination of student success specialist positions and the related reduced funding of the MASSD.

For ease of reference as the District formulates its final design for the student support departments and considers the Special Master's recommendations, they include here as "continuing objections" comments/objections they offered on April 24, 2017 with respect to the Draft # 3 budget, amplified to address overlapping points made in the discussion on May 11:

Mendoza Plaintiffs are concerned that the MASSD has become almost exclusively focused on providing deficit model "support" and has strayed from both its original intent and that set forth in the USP, which had a far greater emphasis on an asset model approach. As discussed on May 11, they believe that to the extent personnel from the MASSD will be providing direct support to individual students in the future, there should be significant interaction with classroom teachers both to ensure a full understanding of the needs of the students who are to receive support and to assist the teachers in areas relating to culturally responsive pedagogy. Further, such support should be provided by certificated personnel in a manner that does not involve pulling students from their classrooms.

Mendoza Plaintiffs previously noted that they saw nothing on the web site or in the District's most recent Annual Report to suggest that the staff of the MASSD and AASSD departments have been involved in the development and implementation of District strategies to engage African American and Latino students (beyond the holding of yearly recognition/ celebratory events and quarterly information events), particularly with respect to the development of the multi-cultural curriculum and culturally responsive pedagogy, as is expressly contemplated by USP, Section V, 4, d. They therefore concur with the Special Master's suggestion (and what they understand to be the current thinking by the District) that experts in both the MASS and AASS Departments "serve as consultants and provide oversight with respect to culturally responsive practices whether it be manifest in teaching, curriculum, coaching, administering discipline, working with families, or developing future district policies and procedures." (SM Recommendation, Attachment A at 2.)

With specific reference to the family and community engagement component, Mendoza Plaintiffs remain concerned about the District's statement that the family engagement functions of the Student Support Specialists "will be supported by the newly proposed school community liaison stipend." (Response to Mendoza Plaintiffs' RFIs on Draft #2 at 4.) While they appreciate the effort to make the community liaison

role somewhat more robust, they object to the proposal to have that role replace what was intended to be a structured and centralized approach to community engagement that focuses on the specific needs of Latino families and reflects the history, experiences, and culture of Latino communities. In addition, they note that the District has proposed these \$3000 stipends for only 19 schools (Budget Narrative at 39), apparently leaving the great majority of the District's schools without anyone uniquely focused on how to engage Latino families in the education of their children.¹ Additionally, as discussed on May 11, Mendoza Plaintiffs believe that the MASSD has a role to play in ensuring that persons who are filling the role of community liaison are appropriately trained in culturally responsive practices and in serving as an on-going resource for them.

Mentors (Comments/Objections to the SM Recommendation and "Continuing Objections")

CRC "Mentors"

Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the portion of the Special Master's discussion that refers to "mentors for... CRC teachers" to be a reference to the Itinerant Teachers and the Court's order that the District "develop a meaningful itinerant teacher-CRC teacher ratio." (Order dated 12/27/2016, Doc. 1982, at 4.) They agree with the Special Master that the District has yet to provide a "program-based rationale" (*id.* at 3) for the number of Itinerant Teachers in the proposed budget, but they disagree with what appears to be the Special Master's understanding that these Itinerant Teachers are only mentors (as important as that role may be).

As Mendoza Plaintiffs stated in their comments on the Draft # 2 and Draft # 3 budgets, the Stipulation Re: Implementation of USP Section V,E,6, a, ii (Culturally Relevant Courses) (Doc. 1761) states (at page 34 of 49) that the Itinerant Teachers not

¹ Mendoza Plaintiffs have reviewed the District's responses to their RFI's on this subject, specifically, #1007 and #1129, and remain unclear whether and to what extent Title 1 staff will be performing a robust family and community engagement role in schools that do not have stipended community support liaisons or whether Title 1 staff will receive training and support in culturally responsive practices and, if so, from whom. Further they note that no reference is made to a role for MASSD or other student support departments' expertise and personnel in the review of the quality of school family engagement efforts described in the response to RFI #1129.

only are to mentor new CRC teachers by providing instructional support; they also are to teach three courses at two high school or middle school sites, and engage in the following: CR teacher and student recruitment, parent engagement and community outreach; model instruction for non-CR teachers, district wide; develop curriculum that will be available to other District teachers; develop CR curricular lessons for implementation by new and continuing CR teachers; work with site administration to provide support for CR students and families; serve on observation “walkthroughs” teams; present during CR Tier 1 PD sessions; develop comprehensive CR curriculum to present during CPRI summer symposium; and assist in bringing CR to scale.

Mendoza Plaintiffs assert a “continuing objection” to the number of Itinerant Teachers proposed in the Draft # 3 budget as not in “full compliance with the Intervention Plan’s Itinerant Teacher Model” (Doc. 1982 at 4), as required by Court order. They note a statement in response to RFI #1317 that the District “has budgeted for 12 ITs.” They will reconsider this “continuing objection” if the final version of the 910(G) budget includes an allocation for 12 ITs and is otherwise compliant with the Stipulation re: Implementation.²

Self-Contained GATE (Comments/Objections to the SM Recommendation and “Continuing Objections”)

Mendoza Plaintiffs support the creation of new opportunities for Latino and African American students to attend self-contained GATE classes; however they continue to ask whether there are alternatives to placing such a program at **Wheeler**, as the District proposes in the Draft # 3 budget, that will have a greater integrative impact. Absent more information and additional analysis they therefore object to the Special Master’s apparent agreement with that proposal based on his statement that it “may

² Mendoza Plaintiffs have reviewed the Itinerant Teacher list provided in connection with the District’s response to RFI #1331. They appreciate the information included and the level of detail but also note that (unless these are covered by descriptions that Mendoza Plaintiffs did not fully understand), there appear to be no activities relating to curriculum development, including for the CPRI summer symposium, modeling of instruction for non-CRC teachers, or participation in “walkthrough” teams.

Further, Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand why the District plans to have a total of 10 CRCs taught by a total of 12 itinerant teachers by having some of those teachers “co-teach[] a class.” (See TUSD response to RFI # 1316.)

have some integrative effect.” They also repeat as a “continuing objection” the statements they made in their April 24, 2017 comments on this proposed allocation:

Based on their current understanding, they question the overall integrative impact of a decision to place self-contained GATE at Wheeler, at least as described in the document that is itself attached to Attachment A to the District’s Responses to RFIs concerning the Budget Narrative. (Document entitled Impact of Opening Additional GATE Self-Contained Classrooms for Grades 1-3 at Wheeler and Roberts/Naylor (“Impact Doc.”).)

They note in the first instance that the District itself states that the impact of the proposal on “ethnic distribution” at Wheeler would be small. (Impact Doc. at 1.) Mendoza Plaintiffs’ concern derives from the fact that, based on the information provided, it appears that the slight relative increase in white population and the slight relative decrease in Latino population would result from the fact that more white children than Latino children would benefit from providing self-contained GATE classes for those currently on the waiting lists at Lineweaver and Kellond. (Per the chart on page 3 of the Impact Doc. there would be a gain of 13 white children and a gain of 10 Latino children (as well as a gain of five African American children).) Given the locations of Lineweaver and Kellond, and the nature of the proposal (which, as Mendoza Plaintiffs understand it, calls for remapping the neighborhood school boundaries of Kellond and Lineweaver to include Wheeler (Impact Doc. at 1), this raises questions for the Mendoza Plaintiffs of whether the waiting list is the best indication of the number of qualified students District-wide who might benefit from an expansion of self-contained GATE or whether remapping of the Lineweaver, Kellond, and Wheeler neighborhood boundaries is the most racially and ethnically inclusive approach to self-contained GATE class expansion. They therefore ask that a fuller analysis be undertaken, considering locations for self-contained GATE programs beyond the schools in closest proximity to Lineweaver and Kellond, if the District does indeed intend to go forward with a proposal to expand the number of self-contained GATE classrooms in the District. In connection with any such analysis, they would also ask for the following information: the waiting lists for all self-contained GATE elementary schools (broken down by race and ethnicity) as well as a breakdown by race and ethnicity of all students who qualified for GATE at the 1, 2, and 3 grade levels in the last two years.

As to **Roberts-Naylor**, referenced in the SM Recommendations in which he states (at page 4) that a “self-contained program at Roberts Naylor is unlikely to have integrative outcomes.” Mendoza Plaintiffs note that on March 13, 2017, the District provided a discussion of the possible impact of opening additional GATE self-contained classrooms at Roberts/Naylor based on a redrawing of boundaries so that students in the current Kellond, White or Lineweaver neighborhoods could “opt to transfer ...to Roberts/Naylor.” (Impact Doc. at 1.) It concluded that the impact on “ethnic distribution would be small” but that there would be some small increase in the percentage of white enrollment and small decreases in the percentages of African American and Latino enrollment. (*Id.*) Thereafter, on April 10, 2017, in response to a Special Master comment (that included the observation that, in his view, there was an “argument for having an additional open access GATE program in a school that serves a significant number of African American students but the District should not count this as an integration initiative.” (Draft # 3 Cover Letter, at 13)), the District stated that it had “conducted, and is assessing, desegregation impact analyses for Roberts-Naylor as a possible site for Open-Access GATE.” (*Id.*)³ In the responses to information requests that the District provided along with the Draft # 3 Cover Letter, in response to a Mendoza Plaintiffs’ inquiry, the District stated that it was “still assessing the[] options” of expanding Open Access GATE opportunities at **Hollinger** and/or **Doolen**.

As Mendoza Plaintiffs understand it, there currently are no proposed allocations in the 2017-18 budget for the expansion of either self-contained and/or open GATE programs to provide additional opportunities for African American and Latino students to participate in such programs. They therefore have a “continuing objection” to the District’s failure to have moved the assessment and consideration process more expeditiously so that necessary analyses could have been concluded and GATE expansion could have been included in that budget.

³ Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that April statement to be a change in concept for a potential GATE program at Roberts-Naylor from the concept discussed in March to the extent the District now is suggesting, as they understand it, that the GATE program would not be developed in connection with boundary changes relating to the current Kellond and Lineweaver boundaries but, rather, that TUSD is envisioning a “boundaryless” program marketed to all District students.

Successful Site-Based Strategies (Comments/Objections to the SM Recommendation and “Continuing Objections”)

Mendoza Plaintiffs agree with the SM Recommendation statement that it “does not appear that the District has provided sufficient funds” for this effort – the District having asserted it will “not cost anything to develop.” (SM Recommendation at 2.) Indeed, the Special Master believes that the District does not know “what this will cost since it does not have a plan for the development, much less for the implementation and maintenance, of such a resource.” (*Id.*) While Mendoza Plaintiffs do not know how much it would cost to implement the plan they understand TUSD to currently be developing, they, like the Special Master, have serious doubts that any plan implementation to adequately address this USP requirement will have no associated costs.⁴ Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore have a “continuing objection” to the District’s failure to allocate any funds at all to the implementation of the replication of successful site-based strategies undertakings it has agreed to.

Summer Learning (Comments/Objections to the SM Recommendation and “Continuing Objections”)

Mendoza Plaintiffs agree with the Special Master’s strong recommendation that the District invest more heavily in summer programs.

In that regard, although it is not specifically a summer learning program, they draw particular attention to “Jump Start”, the 10 day summer program for incoming 6th graders that is in place at Dodge and Doolen but not at other middle schools in the District. According to the Dodge magnet school plan, that program “sets guidelines and expectations” for the program at the school, “establishes relationships with teachers, and provides remediation of basic skills in core classes.” Per the Dodge plan, the cost is

⁴ Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the District response to RFI #1324 (re replication of successful site-based strategies) that it “is not at the beginning of this effort – the District provided a report in September 2016 and has been engaged in this effort for years” to refer to actions that fall far short of what it agreed long ago it would do to comply with USP Section VI, F, 3 in connection with the Special Master’s 2014-15 Annual Report recommendation, as detailed in the Court’s December 27, 2017 Budget Order (Doc. 1981 at 8). In this regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs further note that it was not until the April 12-13, 2017 Tucson meeting that TUSD agreed to develop an online catalogue of best practices to be widely accessible (notwithstanding its initial agreement referenced in the December 27 Order).

approximately \$16,000. Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the District's failure to have budgeted to expand this program to other schools given what appears to be its success and urge the District to move forward as quickly as possible to expand the program, particularly at Mansfield since there is no reason of which they are aware why such a program should not be in all middle school magnet schools. "Continuing Objections"

General

Because the District has been unable to provide a completed Form 1-A, required by the agreed budget process and intended to provide information about what non-910(G) funds will be allocated to USP-related activities, Mendoza Plaintiffs reserve their right to object to and/or comment on the District's overall commitment to and planned expenditures for all USP-related activities, particularly those for which non-910(G) funding has been provided in the past, after that information has been provided.

Magnet School Consultant

If the final 2017-18 910(G) budget contains an allocation of \$50,000 for consultants to assist in further evaluation of specific magnet programs and the development of a new magnet school as stated in the TUSD May 10, 2017 Magnet and Transition Plan Cover Letter, Mendoza Plaintiffs will withdraw the objection they previously asserted to the failure to include such an allocation in the draft budget(s).

Dual Language Expansion/Bloom

Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to object to the District's decision to budget for only one additional dual language teacher at Bloom (to bring the total of such teachers to two). In the Budget Narrative (at 31), the District wrote: "Bloom will expand their program by adding three TWDL classes for a total of four (one at kindergarten and two at first grade; one kindergarten class began in 2016-17)." But in the Cover Letter (as confirmed by the line item budget entry), the District now says (at 14): "The District is only budgeting for one additional dual-language teacher, and will adjust based on enrollment in the fall (the District is still seeking to fill four DL classes with four DL teachers)."

Budgets drive actions. Further, absent failures to fill other vacancies (and the District already has stated it plans to use "vacancy savings" to fund stipends and to fund summer activities (Cover Letter at 2), not to hire additional teachers at Bloom), there

can be no assurance funds will be available to hire the needed teachers “in the fall.” Moreover, such an approach runs counter to the District’s recently adopted TWDL Plan because it accepts the likelihood that there will be only single kindergarten and first grade classes at the school notwithstanding the commitment to design a two classroom TWDL structure to reduce programmatic isolation of the TWDL classes at a site. Further, it precludes the opportunity to send any additional teachers hired after enrollment “in the fall” (assuming any such qualified teachers are available to be hired at that time) to the summer Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Conference, attendance at which was highlighted in the District’s initial discussions of the Bloom expansion.

Given that the District will not be expanding the dual language program to Ochoa this coming year, as it had originally proposed, it should redouble its efforts to recruit students (and teachers) for the Bloom program.

Global Issues Courses

As stated in Mendoza Plaintiffs’ March 27, 2017 Draft #3 budget comments and at the April 12-13, 2017 meeting in Tucson, Mendoza Plaintiffs do not believe the “CRC Global Issues” courses planned for the 2017-18 school year comport to the USP definition of CRCs in that they are not “courses of instruction for core English and Social Studies credit.” (USP Section V, E, 6, ii; Mendoza Plaintiffs’ March 27, 2017 Comments on TUSD USP 2017-18 Draft Budget #3.) They instead are planned “as an optional/elective credit class for 9th grade students.” (Draft #2 Cover Letter at 15.) Indeed, Mendoza Plaintiffs believe the classes which are to “have a unique focus from the African-American and Mexican American perspective” (id.) more closely align to the USP definition of multicultural curriculum, that is, curriculum that “integrates racially and ethnically diverse perspectives and experiences” (USP Section V, E, 6, i), and that these courses therefore should be re-categorized as multicultural curriculum. Mendoza Plaintiffs have a “continuing objection” to the budget allocation for this activity to the extent the planned classes are categorized as CRCs.

Higher Ground Consultant

The District’s justification for its proposed allocation for consulting services from Higher Ground (Attachment RFI 1321 (“HG Justification”)) raises serious concerns regarding the appropriateness of those services for students in DAEP. The HG Justification describes two sets of Social-Emotional Learning (“SEL”) lessons

implemented during the “2nd semester of 2016-17.” (HG Justification at 1-2.) The District indicates that the lessons involve “evidence based curriculum” called “Thinking for a Change” and “Real Colors with Youth Crossroads.” (*Id.* at 2.) However, Mendoza Plaintiffs were disappointed to find that the authority the District cites to in asserting that these lessons are evidence-based describe these programs as effective with and specifically targeting youth and adults that have been involved in the criminal justice system. (See <http://nicic.gov/t4c>; http://ncti.org/programs/crossroads_juvenile.) Indeed, in connection with the later “lesson,” curricula is described as aimed at “reduc[ing] the criminogenic needs of offenders.” (See http://ncti.org/programs/crossroads_juvenile.)

Thus it appears that the services that Higher Ground has been providing in the 2016-17 school year (and that the District proposes be provided in the 2017-18 school year) are inappropriate and may result in stigmatizing DAEP students to feel that they are criminals or have committed criminal acts. Further, from a brief review of the webpages the District cites, Mendoza Plaintiffs do not see anything that suggests there exists evidence to demonstrate the programs are effective with students who may be exhibiting behavioral issues, but are not criminals and have committed no criminal act, or that there exist effective versions of the programs tailored to and targeting students with no criminal history.

Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore object to the use of 910g funds for Higher Ground in the 2017-18 school year. Regardless of whether the District’s final version of the 2017-18 budget includes an allocation for Higher Ground consulting, Mendoza Plaintiffs request that the District provide a justification for the specific use of the program with DAEP students given that the District appears to have implemented the above-discussed “lessons” in the 2016-17 school year.

Multi-Year Facilities Plan

Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District’s explanation concerning the difference between the “CARE/UPKEEP” line item (for which there is a \$520,000 proposed allocation in Draft #3 budget) and Multi-Year Facilities Plan (“MYFP”) projects, the District having said it eliminated funding from the latter, but that explanation leaves unclear how “CARE/UPKEEP” activities are prioritized, if at all, and why the proposed expenditure does not constitute supplantation.

While what the District labeled RFI#1326 requested information on whether and how the District prioritizes “CARE/UPKEEP” activities, the TUSD response instead explains that “CARE/UPKEEP” activities are entirely separate from the MYFP, but that “CARE/UPKEEP” activities may result in the identification of safety concerns which then become MYFP issues that are addressed through MYFP procedures. Although helpful in Mendoza Plaintiffs’ understanding of the relationship between “CARE/UPKEEP” and MYFP, the District response does not help Mendoza Plaintiffs understand whether and to what extent the priorities mandated by USP Section IX, A, 3 apply to “CARE/UPKEEP” activities.

Further, the District indicates in its response to RFI#1327 that MYFP funding is in the [Architecture and Engineering] Project Management group [as distinct from the group managing “CARE/UPKEEP” activities], as is the management of FCI, ESS, and the MYFP monitoring and changes.” Thus, because the USP Section concerning facilities (IX, A.) **entirely** involves “the management of FCI, ESS, and the MYFP monitoring and changes,” Mendoza Plaintiffs are left confused as to why the District continues to propose the use of 910g funds for “CARE/UPKEEP.” Compounding Mendoza Plaintiffs’ confusion is the fact that notwithstanding the \$520,000 allocation for “CARE/UPKEEP” in Draft #3 budget, the District asserts in its response to RFI#1327 that those efforts have “no MYFP funding or budget.”

Thus, beyond repairs or maintenance relating to facility safety concerns that are identified through the activities entailed in “CARE/UPKEEP,” Mendoza Plaintiffs have been given information that only suggests the “CARE/UPKEEP” allocation is supplantation of funds for activities unrelated to the USP and that the District would have to expend even in the absence of the USP. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore have a “continuing objection” to the “CARE/UPKEEP” allocation reflected in the Draft #3 budget.

Exhibit C

From: Juan Rodriguez
To: ["Taylor, Martha"](#); ["vicki.balentine@gmail.com"](mailto:vicki.balentine@gmail.com); [Alexander Chanock](#); [James Eichner](#); [Lois Thompson](#); [Peter Beauchamp](#); [Rubin Salter](#); [Shaheena Simons](#); [Willis D. Hawley](#)
Cc: [Desegregation](#); ["Converse, Bruce"](#); [Soto, Karla](#); [Weatherless, Renee](#); [Trujillo, Gabriel](#)
Subject: RE: Draft 3 USP Budget
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 3:50:40 PM
Attachments: [MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS OBJECTIONS COMMENTS RE SM RECOMMENDATIONS FINAL.pdf](#)

Please see attached.

Juan Rodriguez | Staff Attorney

MALDEF | www.maldef.org

634 South Spring Street, 11th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90014
213.629.2512, ext. 136 t / 213.629.0266 f
jrodriguez@maldef.org

MALDEF: The Latino Legal Voice for Civil Rights in America.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission from The Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail or by telephone at 213.629.2512, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving it in any manner.

From: Taylor, Martha [<mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org>]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 5:43 PM
To: 'vicki.balentine@gmail.com'; Alexander Chanock; James Eichner; Juan Rodriguez; Lois Thompson; Peter Beauchamp; Rubin Salter; Shaheena Simons; Willis D. Hawley
Cc: Desegregation; 'Converse, Bruce'; Soto, Karla; Weatherless, Renee; Trujillo, Gabriel
Subject: Draft 3 USP Budget

Dr. Hawley and counsel:

Please find attached the following documents related to the district's submission of Draft 3 of the USP budget.

This includes a cover letter with a checklist of all documents required for draft 3 (*See Checklist of Cover Letter*) and all related documents including RFI responses (*See Attachment A*); Student Support Forms and accompanying Analyses for continuing programs (*See Attachment B*); and final PD Assessment (*See Attachment C*); district responses to Mendoza comments regarding magnet programs (*See Attachment D*).

Thank you.

Martha, Sam, Renee, Karla

Exhibit D

From: Juan Rodriguez
To: "Brown, Samuel"; lhompson@proskauer.com; wdh@umd.edu; rsjr3@aol.com; james.eichner@usdoj.gov; Shaheena.Simons@usdoj.gov; Peter.Beauchamp@usdoj.gov; Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov; [Balentine, Vicki Eileen - \(vbalenti\) \(vbalenti@email.arizona.edu\)](mailto:Balentine,Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti) (vbalenti@email.arizona.edu))
Cc: [Taylor, Martha; Jaeger, Todd; bconverse@steptoe.com; Acevedo, Janna](mailto:Taylor,Martha; Jaeger, Todd; bconverse@steptoe.com; Acevedo, Janna)
Subject: RE: Revised Magnet and Transition Plans
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 3:53:04 PM
Attachments: [MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS COMMENTS OBJECTIONS TO TRANSITION AND MAGNET SCHOOL PLANS Final.pdf](#)
[Exhibit A - Magnet and Transition School Plans Academic and Integration Goals i.pdf](#)

Please see the attached comments and objections. Thanks.

Juan Rodriguez | Staff Attorney

MALDEF | www.maldef.org
634 South Spring Street, 11th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90014
213.629.2512, ext. 136 t / 213.629.0266 f
jrodriguez@maldef.org

MALDEF: The Latino Legal Voice for Civil Rights in America.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission from The Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail or by telephone at 213.629.2512, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving it in any manner.

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

From: Brown, Samuel [mailto:Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 5:14 PM
To: Juan Rodriguez; lhompson@proskauer.com; wdh@umd.edu; rsjr3@aol.com; james.eichner@usdoj.gov; Shaheena.Simons@usdoj.gov; Peter.Beauchamp@usdoj.gov; Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov; [Balentine, Vicki Eileen - \(vbalenti\) \(vbalenti@email.arizona.edu\)](mailto:Balentine,Vicki Eileen - (vbalenti) (vbalenti@email.arizona.edu))
Cc: Taylor, Martha; Jaeger, Todd; bconverse@steptoe.com; Acevedo, Janna
Subject: Revised Magnet and Transition Plans

Dr Hawley/Counsel: please find attached the revised magnet and transition plans. Each plan has a 1-3 page cover page. Thanks, Sam

Exhibit E

MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS' COMMENTS ON TUSD USP 2017-18 DRAFT BUDGET #2

March 27, 2017

Issues Relating to the Forms Provided, Missing Information and Budget Priorities

Student Success Specialists

In Section B of its Draft #2 Cover Letter, 2017-18 USP Budget, March 13, 2017 ("Cover Letter" at 2), the District states that it is eliminating 24 student success specialist positions but provides no explanation under the heading "rationale" for that action. (Mendoza Plaintiffs know that the position was evaluated in August 2015 and that recommendations were made to re-define the role and re-consider the school assignment model but did not understand the evaluation to be saying that all of the functions performed by the student success specialists should be substantially pared down and/or eliminated. They also are aware of the Special Master's most recent email of March 23, 2017 questioning the effectiveness of the position. But that does not address where the District is now proposing to place either the funding for the positions being eliminated or an effective effort to work with students who are struggling.) The Cover Letter provides no explanation for this action either in its "Rationale" section or elsewhere. And Mendoza Plaintiffs have not been able to locate in the budget materials how the funds previously associated with these positions are to be reallocated.

Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask: (a) what was the basis for the District's decision to eliminate 24 student success specialist positions; (b) who or what positions in the proposed 2017-18 USP budget are to perform the functions of the eliminated student success specialists; and (c) where in the budget can one find the proposed allocations of funds that in the 2016-17 budget were allocated to the costs of those 24 student success specialist positions?

Vacancy Savings

Section B of the Cover Letter states that the District plans to fund summer activities via vacancy savings. (Cover Letter at 2.)

Has the District made an estimate of what those vacancy savings are likely to be? Has it prioritized "summer activities" to ensure that certain of them are covered in the

proposed budget while others, of lesser priority, will depend on the availability of vacancy savings? If so, what are those priorities?

Is it the District's position that with respect to the reallocation process for this coming year, the first activities to be funded will be stipends (as referenced in Section B of the Cover Letter) and "summer activities"?

Form 1-A and Non 910-G Funding Sources

Form 1-A shows no non 910-G funding sources for any of the activities listed in the USP Budget. Last year there were over \$6 million in M&O funds, \$1 million in Title 1 funds, and \$7 million in "other" funds. (Mendoza Plaintiffs note references to Title 1 funding in the Transition Plan budgets and discussion of the transition plans in the Cover Letter so believe the omission on Form 1-A likely is an oversight.) They therefore ask: does this represent an omission in the preparation of the Form or is the District anticipating no additional funds in any of these categories? If it is anticipating funds in any of the categories set forth on Form 1-A, please provide a revised Form.

Activity Codes 101 and 102 (Internal Compliance Monitoring, Court Orders, etc.)

In response to the Mendoza Plaintiffs' comments on the budget narrative, the District states that it has over-budgeted attorneys' fees in the past few years and that it is "proposing to pre-pay attorney fees this year." (Cover Letter at 5.)

Mendoza Plaintiffs are unclear in what context beyond this 2017-18 budget process the District intends to present its proposal. So that there is no misunderstanding in the future, they therefore now state their objection to such a use of unspent 2016-17 910(G) funds.

If there are unallocated funds that had been budgeted for attorneys' fees, Mendoza Plaintiffs believe those funds should be used for 2016-17 initiatives directed at summer efforts either to increase student achievement by Latino and African American students (for example, and only by way of example, providing opportunities for greater participation in AP Boot Camp or other comparable activities) or to permit more teachers to participate in professional development focused on the goals of the USP (increasing achievement of Latino and African American students, culturally responsive pedagogy, PBIS and restorative justice, etc.) during the summer.

Activity Code 106 (Transition Plans)

When it approved the transition plans for the schools that are losing their magnet status, the Court wrote: “Because the line-item budget is trailing the transition plan development and approval, the Court approves the transition plans but affords Plaintiffs and the Special Master an opportunity to reurge objections related to adequacy, if any remain after the line-item budget is released.” (Order dated March 13, 2017 (Doc. 1996) at 2:17-20.) Mendoza Plaintiffs have reviewed the transition plan budgets and, based on that review, reurge certain of their objections and identify others based on changes made to the plans **after** they were approved by the Court.

In reviewing the plans, Mendoza Plaintiffs were particularly struck by what they perceived to be particularly limited funding and, therefore, limited undertakings in the plans for Utterback and Pueblo. They therefore performed the analysis set forth in the chart below:

Transition Plan Budgets

School	Desegregation Budget Proposed Allocation	2016/17 40 th day enrollment	Per student deseg. expenditure	Budget Ranking Per student expenditure
Ochoa K-5	\$298,600	185	\$1,614.05	1
Robison K-5	\$432,040	332	\$1,301.33	2
Safford K-8	\$896,800	735	\$1,220.14	3
Utterback MS	\$279,100	472	\$ 591.31	5
Cholla HS	\$308,100 (transition) \$1,147,600 (IB) \$1,455,700	1899	\$ 766.56	4
Pueblo HS	\$343,500	1724	\$ 199.25	6

(It may be that Pueblo’s budget should be slightly higher because no costs are included for AVID PD and Think Through Math in the transition plan budget.) There is nothing of which Mendoza Plaintiffs are aware in terms of the challenges facing the transition schools that would explain the significant disparity in cost per student among the plans.

Further, as discussed below, cuts made to the Utterback plan after Court approval serve only to additionally diminish the already limited scope of that plan.

Cuts in the Transition Plans

Utterback

With respect to Utterback, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the plan, rather than addressing how the arts could be meaningfully integrated into the school curriculum, as both Mendoza Plaintiffs and the Special Master had recommended, now simply eliminates them, striking through the portions of the plan that had previously referenced courses in band/orchestra, visual arts, theatre, choral music, and dance. Yet, in its response to Dr. Hawley's comments on the transition plans, the District wrote: "The District...is seeking to maintain robust fine arts electives which fulfill several purposes" and that "the master schedule will be created to support content level planning for Professional Learning Communities (PLC) while students are in their elective classes." (TUSD Document labeled Dr. Hawley's January 31, 2017 Comments and TUSD Responses Re: Transition Plans at 4.)

The District offers no explanation for its decision to strip these programs from Utterback. The consequence not only is to deprive Utterback students of these electives. It also is to put a school that is racially concentrated (with Latino students comprising 80% of the student body and African Americans 7.6%) in an inferior position as compared to other District middle schools, with larger percentages of white students. A study of the web site for Magee Middle School, whose student body is 44% white, shows that it has teachers offering courses in the following areas: band, theatre, orchestra, and art. Similarly, the web site for Doolen Middle School, whose student body is 32% white, lists teachers offering courses in band, media art, and orchestra. Surely, if TUSD could find the money to offer such electives at Doolen and Magee, it can find the money to offer those electives at Utterback.

Ochoa

In the Budget Narrative, the District explained that it intended to offer Reading Recovery at all of Ochoa, Robison, and Safford, explaining that the "intensive" program "yields significant gains." (Budget Narrative at 11.) However, TUSD now has decided to eliminate the program at Ochoa. In its cover letter, it says only that it "recognizes the high cost of Reading Recovery and thus in Draft #2 it will continue the program at Robison and Safford but will not start a new Reading Recovery program at Ochoa." (Cover Letter at 7.)

Mendoza Plaintiffs have been unable to locate references to Reading Recovery in the Safford and Robison plan budgets and therefore have not been able to determine the cost that the District is purporting to “save” by not going forward with the program at Ochoa.

They therefore ask what the cost would be to include Reading Recovery in the Ochoa plan, and ask that it be returned to that plan.

Cholla

The section of the Cover Letter entitled Major Reductions or Eliminations states that the amounts expended on Cholla IB will be reduced “as it transitions out of magnet status”. Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand the relationship between Cholla’s status as a magnet and the costs associated with the IB program, particularly given the undertaking to expand the IB Diploma Programme with the addition of the Career-related Programme.

Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask in what way and for what reasons will Cholla’s IB expenses be reduced as a consequence of it no longer having magnet status?

On-Going Concerns and Objections

Mendoza Plaintiffs remain concerned that the plans (with the exception of the Cholla plan that stands out from the other five in presenting a clear statement of current status, goals, and implementation strategy) are insufficiently robust and ambitious (specifically including with respect to the goals that they set for improved achievement)¹.

Leadership and Implementation

Effective implementation will depend on leadership but two of the schools (Ochoa and Utterback) still have interim principals. The Court expressly commented on the absence from the plans of an undertaking by the District to “hir[e] permanent

¹ Mendoza Plaintiffs acknowledge that they raised their concern that the academic achievement goals in the plans are not sufficiently ambitious when they initially commented on the plans (and that the Special Master disagreed) but, having again carefully considered the plans as revised and with their budgets added, Mendoza Plaintiffs remain troubled by plans that do not set more challenging goals and then provide the resources needed to attain them.

principals to ensure consistent and sustained leadership.....” (Doc. 1996 at 3:26-28.)² Mindful of the concerns expressed by both the Mendoza Plaintiffs and the Special Master about the significant reliance on consultants and new hires to implement the plans, the Court also stated with reference to permanent principals, “[w]ithout these boots on the ground, the Court imagines that the District’s ‘new hires’ and/or consultants will find it difficult to facilitate transition....” (*Id.* at 4:2-4.)

This critical issue remains unaddressed. **They therefore ask what steps the District is taking to hire and/or place permanent principals at Ochoa and Utterback?**

In the past, Mendoza Plaintiffs frequently commented that the magnet schools received insufficient support from the District’s central administration. Similarly, no one in the central administration appears to have been tasked with responsibility to monitor and support plan implementation. In this regard they note that Activity Code 106 identifies only \$80,000 in central administration expenditures related to the transition plans and this is for “instructional aids” in the Magnet Department. (How these “instructional aids” relate to the transitional plans is not clear.) Mendoza Plaintiffs also are aware of the statement in the Budget Narrative (at 5) that TUSD wants to add a “program coordinator” and “administrative assistant” to “assist in monitoring and implementing the transition plans (6) and magnet site plans (13)” but that does not appear to sufficiently address the need for meaningful oversight. **Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask who within the central administration now is charged with responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the transition plans, how is that oversight to be accomplished, and what costs are associated with that oversight?**

² The District has attempted to address the challenge of effective leadership, coordination, implementation, and oversight by providing for the one-year position of “transition coordinator” at each school. Each plan says that this coordinator, “in conjunction with the principal and the transition team, will oversee the implementation and monitoring of the transition plan. The Transition coordinator will support the work of Tier 1 instruction and Professional Learning Committees [sic] by working directly with teachers and staff.” However, no plan says what will happen the year after this position is eliminated and the fact remains that it is for the principal to drive the plan. In this regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs also note the Special Master’s observation in his February 6, 2017 Comments on 2018 Budget Narrative (at 3) that principals should be serving this role. Period. (This of course reinforces the need to have effective, permanent principals at all transition schools.)

Program

Given that the Court made it clear that 2017-18 is a critical year for the success of the transition plans, Mendoza Plaintiffs are disappointed that after the entry of the Court's order the District did not revise those plans to provide additional programs to broaden the effort to raise student achievement. It is noteworthy that not a single initiative in any of the plans explicitly adopts recommendations of the African American Achievement Task Force. Nor does any plan contemplate taking advantage of the resources of the African American and Mexican American Student Services Departments.

One possible program that could further the efforts to improve achievement would be after school activities to support academic growth in math and ELA, possibly with a specific theme or attractive purpose. Mendoza Plaintiffs note that under Activity Code 801, the District observes that "one of the biggest obstacles to students participating in or continuing their involvement [in] extracurricular activities is grade eligibility. Students involved in athletics and competitive fine arts must maintain passing grades in all subject areas that they are enrolled in." (Cover Letter, Attachment A at 13.) The District then says that it plans to offer tutoring at 15 middle and high schools to support eligibility "but those sites have yet to be selected." (*Id.* at 14.)³ Mendoza Plaintiffs strongly recommend that Safford, Utterback, Cholla, and Pueblo be included in this initiative and that the after school tutoring be meaningfully incorporated into their transition plans⁴.

³ The Cover Letter says something a bit different (at 17-18): "the District seeks to expand this program to all high schools and all middle schools next year." Regardless of whether the goal is 15 middle and high schools or all middle and high schools, Mendoza Plaintiffs recommend inclusion of Safford, Utterback, Cholla, and Pueblo to the extent they are not already participating in the program. The Cover Letter also says the program will target students already involved in one or more extracurricular activities. (*Id.* at 17.) Mendoza Plaintiffs recommend targeting students and particularly African American and Latino students not yet participating in such activities to further their participation and the goals of the USP.

⁴ Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the Cholla plan explicitly provides for before and after school tutoring, summer programs and transportation while the Pueblo plan includes some after school tutoring (but no express reference to transportation). They do not

Further, as part of the District's undertaking pursuant to Section VIII of the USP to provide transportation to facilitate participation in extracurricular activities to the extent such transportation is not already provided at these schools, it should be.

Summer and break-session school, targeted to the underperforming students and linked with thematic excitement and incentives also should be included in the plans.

In its Cover Letter (at page 7), the District states that it will facilitate a seven-period day at Utterback to support its PLC approach. Mendoza Plaintiffs are informed that the addition of a seventh period at Mansfeld has contributed to the increased success at that school. If that is indeed the case, they recommend that the District also revise the plans of Safford, Cholla, and Pueblo to facilitate a seven-period day to the extent it may not already exist at these schools.

Family and Community Engagement

Notwithstanding the Court's observation when it approved the transition plans that the "Plaintiffs and the Special Master express concerns regarding the adequacy of...family engagement efforts" (Order, Doc. 1996 at 2:12-15), the District made no amendments to the plans to address those concerns and the fleshing out of the plans to include budgets has done nothing to alleviate those concerns. All that has occurred is that the cost of a "Student and Family Support Liaison" has been included in the budgets of schools that did not already have such a position but no new strategies to help parents to become authentically engaged in the education of their children and effective advocates for them in the educational setting have been identified (or funded).

Mendoza Plaintiffs have previously commented on the fact that the Pueblo transition plan is particularly weak. The family and engagement portion of that plan is illustrative. Apparently copying a standard set of actions provided for all transition schools to consider, under the heading Family and Community Engagement, the plan states that the school will "Hire or maintain either Student and Family Support Liaison (Certified) or School Community Liaison (Classified) to plan, implement, and oversee all family and community engagement activities" (suggesting that whoever prepared the plan did not then know whether the school had a liaison already on staff). The budget now provides for a Student and Family Support Liaison and describes that person's role

know to what extent the tutoring proposed under the extracurricular activity code could add to or supplement the tutoring already contemplated.

in language that also suggests it was taken with little thought from a standard description under “Purpose”: “Student and Family Support Liaison will be able to collaboratively embrace families as key partners in the education of children by helping to provide every family with the tools they need to navigate and support students through their K-12 education.”

Mendoza Plaintiffs recommend that the District use the period of budget finalization and review to work with the transition schools to make their family engagement strategies more relevant, focused, and effective (and adjust the schools’ budgets accordingly).

Activity Codes 201/301-302 (with Reference to Integration Initiatives and Express Busses)

Magee Bus

The District’s response to RFIs # 695 and 696 says that four students currently ride the Magee express bus, that all are new to Magee and that all increase integration at Magee. (Cover Letter, Attachment A at 2.)

On May 13, 2016, when it presented this integration initiative, the District said that the primary objective in year one (which is this current year) “is to determine the potential impact of this strategy, improve upon deficiencies, and roll it out in year two with a goal of improving integration at the targeted school[]....” (TUSD Integration Initiatives, May 13, 2016 (“TUSD 2016 Initiatives”) at 2.

The 2017-18 budget narrative stated an intention to fund the Magee bus for the 2017-18 school year (at 2) and in response to RFI # 979 (dated March 10, 2017), TUSD indicated that “it is too early to determine whether it can be a successful tool for reducing racial concentration and improving integration....” (Cover Letter, Attachment A at 2.)

Yet, the Cover Letter itself says “[a]fter analyzing the current and potential impact, the District will discontinue the Magee express shuttle....” (Cover Letter at 7.)

Mendoza Plaintiffs ask that the District provide the analysis that led to this decision.

Drachman Bus

In its responses to RFIs # 697 and 698, the District failed to provide information concerning the current ridership of the Drachman bus. (Cover Letter, Attachment A at 2.) However, in an email dated March 14, 2017, Sam Brown reported that two non-Latino students currently are riding the bus.

The Cover Letter states that “[a]fter analyzing the current and potential impact, the District...will focus its express shuttle efforts at magnets (Drachman)....”

Mendoza Plaintiffs ask that the District provide the analysis that led to its decision, including that of focusing on magnets.

Santa Rita Bus/Dual Credit Initiative

In 2014, in connection with its comprehensive boundary review, the District considered a somewhat similar proposal as it relates to Santa Rita **and** Cholla High Schools.

On August 12, 2014, the Governing Board voted to continue to research and to explore with community partners what was then Option E as presented by the Boundary Committee. That Option stated: “The Boundary Committee recommends providing an early middle college program at both Cholla High School and Santa Rita High School with high tech offerings. It is important to the Boundary Committee to supply this program at both sides of the District to present equal opportunity and access for this high level setting. The program emphasis selected at each school must not compete with each other in order to maximize movement between the east and west sides of town.”

What research (and/or analysis) did the Governing Board and/or the TUSD administration undertake with respect to this option after August 12, 2014? On what basis did the District determine to go forward with the Santa Rita High School, travel to the east side portion of town, half of the option but not go forward with the Cholla High School, travel to the west side of town portion?

What is the basis for the District’s determination that this initiative will cost between \$100,000 and \$500,000, and what sum is the District actually proposing be included in the 2017-18 budget?

Activity Code 201 (Other Integration Initiatives)

Open Access GATE Expansion (Potentially involving Hollinger and Doolen); Self-Contained GATE Expansion (Proposed for Wheeler and Roberts-Naylor)

Mendoza Plaintiffs are confused about what is being proposed by the District (and therefore are also confused as to the attendant proposed costs). In its Cover Letter (at 8), it states that the District “is proposing to extend the Tully pipeline to the 6th – 8th grades at Roberts-Naylor, starting with 6th grade in 2017-18 (and states that it soon will be submitting a Desegregation Impact Analysis). Its RFIs (Attachment A to the Cover Letter) state in response to RFIs # 982 and 983, specifically in the Attachment RFI # 983, that it plans to open self-contained classrooms for grades 1-3 at Roberts-Naylor (and provides projected enrollment figures that show a small increase in the white population and a small decrease in the Hispanic population but overall conclude that “[t]he impact on ethnic distribution would be small.” (Attachment RFI # 983 at 1.)

Is the District also proposing to extend the Tully pipeline to the 6th -8th grades at Roberts-Naylor? If so, when will it provide the promised integration analysis and what will be the attendant costs?

Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the proposal relating to Roberts- Naylor to be further to its April 15, 2016 Roberts-Naylor Report: Academics, Demographics, and Feasibility of Actual and/or Potential Transformative Measures.

As to Wheeler, they ask, on what basis did the District determine to propose Wheeler for the location of additional self-contained GATE classrooms (other than its proximity to Lineweaver and Kellond) and did it consider placing additional self-contained GATE classrooms in schools more centrally located or on the east side of the District that are more likely to have feeder patterns that include more Latino students than Wheeler (including the proposed revised Wheeler feeder pattern discussed in the budget materials).

In the Budget Narrative (at 4), the District stated that it was considering expanding the Open Access Gate opportunities from Tully at Hollinger and/or Doolen and noted that “the Doolen option is primarily an integrative initiative that will also result in increased ALE participation.”

Given that statement, on what basis did the District decide not to go forward with the Doolen option?

Activity Code 202 (Magnet Plan)

After considering the amount intended to be allocated to transition plans, the total amount allocated to this activity code is approximately \$1 million less than was allocated to the activity code last year (\$2.6 million (transition plans) + \$9.4 million (activity code 202) = \$12 million v. 2016-17 budget of \$13 million for activity code 202 as reflected on Draft # 2, Form 2.) Is it the case that the \$1million decrease represents a shift of the expenses for the IB program at Cholla from Activity Code 202 to Activity Code 501?

Central Office Expenses

In the past, the Mendoza Plaintiffs have stated that there was insufficient support for and monitoring of the magnet schools by the District's central administration and have urged more active and robust oversight. They are nonetheless surprised to see that the District intends to increase central administration expenses in this activity code by more than \$480,000 (to \$702, 181 from \$202,812 for the Magnet Department) as well as to increase "communication and media outreach" under this activity code by over \$70,000. (Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the additional costs for the "Knowledge Changes Everything" campaign to be separately accounted for elsewhere in the budget, specifically under Activity Code 201.)

The only explanation the District provides for this combined increase of over \$550,000 is that statement that in the Magnet Department, "the District will add additional administrative staff, support staff, funding for conferences, and magnet-related PD, and centralized funding to support the transition schools (e.g., Imagine Learning expenses)⁵." (Cover Letter at 8.)

⁵ So far as Mendoza Plaintiffs can determine, the increase for attendance at conferences is approximately \$50,000. They do not see any references to magnet-related PD in the Magnet Department entries and the only entry that might cover Imagine Learning expenses ("tech related hardware and software") is \$7000 above last year's entry on this line, leaving something just under \$500,000 in new staff expenses.

Mendoza Plaintiffs ask what the job definitions are of the proposed new staff and in what ways they are expected to support and/or monitor the performance of the magnet schools.

The “communication and media outreach” portion of the activity code is the only place in the proposed budget in which the Mendoza Plaintiffs found a reference to “advertising” associated with the central administration. (They saw no comparable reference in Activity Code 204.) They ask how much of the total budget for advertising (regardless of where it appears in the budget) is for Spanish language marketing outreach and how much is for English language marketing outreach and whether advertising marketing outreach is being budgeted in any other languages?

Magnet School Plan Goals

Mendoza Plaintiffs find it extraordinary that the District failed to require the magnet schools to engage in the same sort of assessment in preparing their 2017-18 plans that was required of the schools that have lost their magnet status. Absent from these plans is any discussion of actual student performance. Therefore, absent as well is any discussion of any needed changes in approach or program to double down on what, based on the data, appears to be working, or to revise or abandon approaches that do not appear to be successful.

In virtually every case⁶, each of the magnet schools gave themselves an extension of one year to reach their achievement goals.

For example, in its 2016-17 plan, Mansfeld stated that by June **2017** it would earn a state letter grade of B as defined by the state grading system, that its students would score higher than the state median in reading and math, that its students would show academic growth that is higher than the state median growth in reading and math, that the growth of the bottom 25% would be higher than the state median growth, and that the achievement gap between racial groups at Mansfeld would be less than the achievement gap between the same grade configurations in the District. Now, in its current plan, it says that it seeks to achieve these same goals by June **2018**.

⁶ Borton appears to be the sole exception. Mendoza Plaintiffs suspect this was the result of failing to change dates to 2018 rather than a decision to stick with its original goals.

A number of schools recite goals that are below what they previously achieved notwithstanding that Mendoza Plaintiffs and the Special Master objected to such goals last year and, as the Court noted in its Order of December 27, 2016 (Doc. 1981 at 3:10-14), the District agreed to revise school goals so address that objection. For example, Dodge recites a goal of A with a minimum of 140 points on the state exam but it scored 151 points in 2013-14. Roskrige recites a goal of B with a minimum of 120 points but it scored 121 points in 2013-14. Tucson High recites a goal of B with a minimum of 120 points but scored 135 points in 2013-14. (A further issues with Tucson High is that it has reduced its achievement goal from the goal of an A with a minimum of 140 points that it set in its 2015-16 plan.)

Each of the plans also now contains something called a site specific goal. There is no indication of how these goals were developed (or why) or what is to happen if the more demanding “achievement goal” is not met but the generally less ambitious “site specific” goal is attained. However, what is clear is that they are very uneven and use different measurements. Thus, for example, the Bonillas plan states that in 2017-18, students will score higher than the district median in both reading and math on benchmark⁷ assessments at all grade levels (but does not say where the students are now so there is no way of knowing how ambitious that goal is). Booth-Fickett sets a goal of at least a 3% increase in benchmark scores and sets out the 2016-17 result for each grade to provide at least some context for the setting of the goal (and, thereby, an indication that the goals are far from ambitious, accepting less than 50% proficiency in virtually all grades on both the math and ELA tests). Davis states that it will reduce the achievement gap for Hispanics taking the math AzMerit 2017 by at least 10% and Drachman references both the AzMerit and benchmark exams in setting a number of different goals. Some of the goals are for levels of achievement in fall 2017, others for December 2017, and some for June 2018 (and there may be still other dates specified, Mendoza Plaintiffs not having done a full listing for each school) and some are not keyed to any dates at all. All of this makes it very difficult to do an evaluation of magnet school success at any single point in time or to be able to make comparisons among schools. Finally, some of the goals have nothing to do with student achievement. Thus,

⁷Mendoza Plaintiffs question the use of the benchmark assessments as the appropriate standard and believe that the AzMerit (which is the standard against which other magnet schools (*e.g.* Dodge) and the transition schools have stated they will be assessed) is more appropriate. Notably, it also is the test against which goals were set in plans developed and filed with the Court in prior years.

for example, Palo Verde lists as an achievement goal that it will engage in weekly Professional Learning Communities. (One cannot determine the goals for Holladay at all because although its plan begins with a page that bears the number “1”, a first page setting forth its goals and the initial portion of its budget is simply missing.)

Comparable issues exist with regard to the magnet schools’ integration goals. Each school had an integration goal set with reference to the 40th day of the 2016-17 school year. Without any analysis of what progress if any the school made toward achieving that goal or any attempt to assess which if any of the portions of its plan intended to promote integration and recruitment might need improvement or revision to better achieve integration at the school, with the exception of a few schools which merely repeat their 2016-17 goals and do not even purport to update them, the schools have merely stated that they will achieve the goal that had previously set for the 40th day of the 2016-17 school year by the 40th day of the 2017-18 school year.⁸ Given that six schools lost their magnet status this year because they failed to achieve their integration goals, Mendoza Plaintiffs would have expected the District, together with the schools, to focus renewed attention on the integration portions of each remaining magnet school’s plan. Instead, what they see is a mechanistic repetition of last year’s goals and no efforts to enhance integration efforts.

Given the issues set forth above, the Mendoza Plaintiffs believe the District would be well served if it withdrew the plans and revised them after engaging in meaningful assessment of current student achievement and enrollment, setting a uniform set of parameters for the establishment of academic goals based on the Az Merit test, and assessing and, to the extent warranted, revising the portions of the plans focused on increasing integration. However, because they cannot be confident that will occur, they will offer further comment on the plans in their current form.

General Comments on the Magnet School Plans

The plans themselves largely are cut and paste versions of the plans that were prepared last year with modifications to the budgets. Therefore, like last year, with one or two exceptions they are almost totally devoid of discussion of their magnet themes

⁸ Such an approach might make sense for those magnet schools that are integrated but even they, Mendoza Plaintiffs believe, should be assessing their enrollment figures and initiatives to be certain that they are on course to maintain that status and to continue to attract an integrated student body.

or how those themes infuse and enrich the schools' academic offerings. In most cases, the theme is listed under the school's name on its plan and then barely referenced again. Mendoza Plaintiffs continue to believe that the absence of robust themes as the focus for the schools' activities and pedagogy undermines the ability of those schools to serve as magnets and attract a diverse student population.

As an aid to their review of the individual school budgets, the Mendoza Plaintiffs prepared the following chart. As will be evident below, it informs a number of their comments about individual plans.

Magnet School	2017-18 proposed budget Draft 2	2016-17 budget	Difference		
Bonillas	\$372,531.13	\$359,635.	\$12,898.13	↑	3.46% Increase
Booth-Fickett	\$768,378.75	\$831,571.	\$63,192.25	↓	8.22% Significant decrease
Borton	\$559,841.	\$545,082.	\$14,579.	↑	2.6% Increase
Carrillo	\$379,257.39	\$473,834.	\$94,576.61	↓	24.94% Very significant decrease
Davis	\$465,713.30	\$484,273.	\$18,558.70	↓	3.99% Decrease
Dodge	\$385,118.	\$314,541.	\$70,577.	↓	18.32% Very significant decrease
Drachman	\$458,688.50	\$497,251.	\$38,562.50	↓	8.41% Significant decrease
Holladay	\$524,131.25	\$689,457.	\$165,325.75	↓	31.54% Very significant decrease
Mansfeld	\$553,866.	\$562,665.31	\$8,799.31	↓	1.6% Significant decrease
Palo Verde	\$390,188.75	\$359,635.	\$30,553.75	↑	7.83% Significant increase
Roskruge	\$753,434.45	\$791,118.13	\$37,683.55	↓	5.0% Significant decrease
THMS	\$2,110,714.50	\$1,957,362.	\$153,352.50	↑	7.26% Significant increase
Tully	\$198,325.	\$292,391.	\$94,066.	↓	47.43% Significant decrease*
	\$7,920,187.70	\$8,158,815.43			3.02%
	Total difference from 2016-17 to 2017-18: \$238,627.70				

Any difference of 5% or more is considered significant; a difference of 10% or more is considered very significant

Bonillas

Bonillas is proposing that for a second year in a row, the Magnet Coordinator spend 60% of his or her time as an instructional coach. **If so much coaching is still required, should the budget include the cost of such a coach so that the Magnet Coordinator has the time to fulfill his or her other job duties?**

The statement that Bonillas wants to invest in “Capturing Kids Hearts” because Dodge is using the program and Bonillas feeds into Dodge (Cover Letter, Attachment A at 5) does not warrant further investment in the program by the District absent a demonstration that the program is effective. The Special Master has noted that “Capturing Kids Hearts” is not included in the seminal publication on research on effective practices for character development and asked for research to demonstrate its efficacy. Notably, the District failed to provide a Student Support Form for this program when it delivered its magnet plans as required by the budget process (and likely should have done so last year given the statement in Attachment A that Dodge began implementing the program in 2015-16), Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore withhold further comment on this budget item (including as it may affect the Dodge budget) pending receipt of the Student Support Form and the information requested by the Special Master.

Booth-Fickett

Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the Booth-Fickett plan is one of the few plans that is explicitly framed around its theme.

Mendoza Plaintiffs share Dr. Hawley’s reaction to the proposal to hire a data coach: **if Booth-Fickett needs a data coach, doesn’t every school? What is the specific set of needs at this school to warrant the investment?**

The rationale for the hiring of a counselor suggests that the school continues to have discipline issues. **Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask whether the hiring of an intervention or behavior specialist (as it contemplated in other magnet plans) might make more sense and whether there has been adequate training of school personnel in restorative justice, the technique the counselor is to facilitate.**

The plan includes after school tutoring and references an intent to hire a certified teacher to coordinate the program at a cost of \$45,500 but the entry also refers to 13

certified teachers x \$25 x 7 hours/week x 20 weeks. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore are unclear about what is being proposed and whether this is only to be a 20 week effort. **What is the intent? And is there sufficient money in the budget to address that intent?**

The plan includes \$43,500 for supplies, including “general supplies and materials to support student achievement” and “student agendas.” These expenditures appear to be supplanting rather than supplementing and therefore should not be included in the overall school budget.

Mendoza Plaintiffs stated in their comments on the Budget Narrative that they would await receipt of the budget to comment on Booth-Fickett’s family engagement activities. While Booth-Fickett is taking positive steps to increase opportunities for teachers to attend family engagement events and meet families there is no suggestion in the plan of efforts to develop the sorts of partnerships in which educators learn from parents about their children and use that knowledge to improve instruction and motivate their students. This should be an integral part of the Booth-Fickett and all the magnet school plans.

The 2017-18 budget is about \$63,000 below the school’s 2016-17 budget. Therefore, to the extent additional funding is required to address the discipline/restorative practices and tutoring issues identified above, even after the supplanting purchases are removed, it would appear there should be funds available to cover these expenses given the District’s statement that it is maintaining the same or similar funding as last year for the magnet schools. (Cover Letter at 9.)

Borton

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not see an entry for the purchase of round tables in the budget so therefore assume that it was eliminated based on the Special Master’s comments, with which they agree. **In an excess of caution they ask the District to confirm that that purchase is no longer included in the Borton plan.**

They object to the proposal to add a full time music teacher because the Borton program is increasingly encroaching on the Holladay magnet school theme. If Borton is to add to its teaching staff, it should invest in a teacher whose area of expertise is more closely aligned with the school’s systems thinking theme.

Carrillo

Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that Carrillo is a school that is doing well academically and its plan is appropriately focused on maintaining that level of achievement even as it addresses the needs of students who are struggling. But there is virtually nothing in the plan that focuses on its communication and creative arts theme. Mendoza Plaintiffs ask whether revisions to the plan to more directly address the roles of the visual arts and performing arts teachers with respect to the school's theme and to integrate communications and creative arts more broadly across the curriculum would enhance the school's effort to achieve a more integrated student body.

Mendoza Plaintiffs also ask what the rationale was for the decision to reduce the targeted before and after school tutoring from 18 teachers in 2016-17 to 8 teachers in 2017-18.

Davis

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not see anything in the Davis plan to indicate that it is following the Two Way Dual Language Framework or that its teachers are being trained in the guiding principles for dual language education although it is listed as a TWDL school on the District's web site. Please explain how Davis is implementing the two way dual language framework or, if it is not, please explain how it relates to the TWDL framework and program.

Dodge

Mendoza Plaintiffs have referenced and recommended the addition of a seventh period in their discussion of the transition plans assuming there is confirmation of their understanding that Mansfeld and other schools that have added this period have determined that they have meaningful positive outcomes. They therefore also join in Dr. Hawley's comment (in his Comments on 2018 Budget Narrative at 6) that if adding a seventh period is important for Dodge, shouldn't that also be the case for all schools?

Mendoza Plaintiffs question the intention to use the Magnet Coordinator as the person who will "ensure that student interventions are working and to help in identifying intervention needs" and who will support the MTSS team and suggest that the descriptions of the Magnet Coordinator in this and other school plans indicate that

this role does not have sufficient clarity and consistency. (Bonillas, for example, states in its plan that the Magnet Coordinator will spend 60% of his or her time as an instructional coach.)

As a follow on to the comments on Bonillas, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that they see no reference to any costs associated with “Capturing Kids’ Hearts” in the Dodge budget (although they do see references in the budget for last year).

Drachman

The Montessori theme is infused in the Drachman plan.

The plan proposes placing middle school teachers on 6th/5th contracts, referring to the “plan” approved by the parties when the Court approved the proposal that it become a K-8 school. For clarity, Mendoza Plaintiffs state that while they agreed to the general proposal to permit Drachman to become a K-8 school, they do not believe they ever saw a plan with the sort of detail that is being referenced relating to additional school time, electives, and putting teachers on 6th/5th contracts.

The plan states that the school does not have funding for elective classes. Mendoza Plaintiffs believe that if the District advocated for the addition of the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades to this school, it should also have anticipated the need for these students to have elective classes and it should now fund them. (They have made a similar argument as it relates to Utterback and again invite comparison to Magee and Doolen.) They agree with the Special Master (in his Comments on 2018 Budget Narrative at 7) that use of 6th/5th contracts is not good education policy for the reasons he stated.

Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the proposal to hire a half-time assistant and to extend the contracts of the office manager and attendance technician “to maintain accurate counts of enrollment so that prospective families could be granted placement...in a timely manner” and to purchase materials more readily. These are or should be central office functions and/or should be functions performed at all schools. They should not be funded at a single school. If this function is necessary at Drachman and cannot be performed in the District’s central office, it should be made available by the District with M&O money at all schools.

Holladay

It is very difficult to comment on this plan because the actual first page (there is a page numbered “1” but it plainly is not the first page) is missing but what is clear is that the District is proposing to decrease Holladay’s funding by more than \$165,000 or more than 30% from last year.

Both the Mendoza Plaintiffs and the Special Master objected to the proposal in the Budget Narrative to hire “Club Z Tutors” to work with students in their classrooms but Mendoza Plaintiffs made clear that they would have no objections to a revision of the proposal that would have qualified personnel working with students who are not “struggling with mastering target standards” while the regular certified classroom teacher is providing those who are “struggling” with additional assistance. (Mendoza Plaintiffs’ February 3, 2017 Comments on 2017-18 910(G) Budget Narrative at 6.) Mendoza Plaintiffs do not see a proposal for “Club Z Tutors” in the plan but neither do they see an alternative proposal. Based on what clearly was a perceived need at Holladay, they believe this should be added to the plan.

They also question whether sufficient funds (\$18,000) are budgeted for the before and after school tutoring and summer school that is being proposed.

They note the proposed funding for a counselor to address a “backlog of students in the MTSS process and to address the social/emotional needs of the students” and ask whether if there is a backlog of students in the MTSS process, more resources should be directed at this issue?

As with the other magnet school plans, the family engagement portion of the plan has not been adequately addressed. For example, the plan states that “the need for a full time community liaison was stressed heavily by the special master and his team” (and, Mendoza Plaintiffs add, by them as well) but the role remains essentially undefined. The plan says only that the liaison will “address the financial, social, and emotional needs of our community.”

Mansfeld

This is one of the only plans to discuss full-fledged efforts at student recruitment to achieve integration.

As noted above, Mansfeld initiated a seventh period this year which it seeks to continue. If it does indeed lead to positive outcomes, it should be made standard throughout the District.

An issue raised by the plan is its discussion of “neighborhood and Magnet students” and its proposal that the Magnet Counselor will be responsible for Magnet (but apparently not “neighborhood”) students. All students enrolled at Mansfeld are “Magnet” students and there should not be any separation of or distinctions drawn between the neighborhood students and other “magnet” students.

Given the concerns expressed about “Club Z Tutors”, Mendoza Plaintiffs are troubled by the statement in the plan that tutors will be made up of interested Mansfeld faculty “and augmented by outside vendors as needed.” Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask who that “outside vendor” is, object if it is to be “Club Z Tutors” and again state their view that such tutoring must be provided by qualified, usually certificated, personnel.

Palo Verde

This is a plan that says virtually nothing about the school’s theme other than to propose that a network tech be hired and supplies be purchased to support STEAM subjects.

The plan also gives considerable evidence of being a cut and paste version of last year’s plan. Thus, for example, it says that a reading specialist will be hired and describes that specialist’s role. Exactly the same language was used last year. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask with respect to the referenced reading specialist, the network tech, and the data coach, also “to be hired” in plans for both years, whether the positions were indeed filled last year or do they remain empty?

Roskruge

Mendoza Plaintiffs have no specific comments.

Tucson High

A very significant increase of over \$153,000 is being proposed, taking the proposed budget to over \$2,110,000.

In a year in which Utterback in its transition plan is proposing to eliminate all electives, and Drachman is seeking a work around to address the fact that there are no electives in its budget, it may be that the number of arts and music classes proposed for THMS are disproportionate and money that THMS proposed to spend (for courses in steel drums, mariachi, guitar, jazz dance, etc. [these are examples, not Mendoza Plaintiffs' explicit recommendations]) should be reallocated to other magnet and transition schools unless there is sufficient money to support all three schools in their elective offerings.

Mendoza Plaintiffs do specifically object to the proposal to spend \$25,000 for an "assistant curator" to keep display cases current, etc. and \$35,000 for a media specialist to be in charge of the school's social media, etc.

Tully

Mendoza Plaintiffs have no specific comments.

Activity Code 204 (Marketing, Outreach, and Recruitment)

Please confirm that some of the costs of the District's marketing, outreach, and recruitment effort for 2017-18 is to be paid with M&O funds and state that amount.

What costs if any under Code 204 are associated with providing marketing, outreach, and recruitment services and support to the magnet schools not listed on page 7 of Attachment A to the Cover Letter and what is the nature of any such services and/or support?

Activity Codes 301, 302 (Transportation)

Per the examinations of desegregation expenses for year ended June 30, 2015 and year ended June 30, 2016, in the school year 2014-15, the District budgeted approximately \$10.6 million and incurred transportation costs of approximately \$11.4 million (off by about \$855,000); in the school year 2015-16, the District budgeted approximately \$9.6 million and incurred transportation costs of approximately \$10.5 million (off by about \$900,000). Mendoza Plaintiffs cannot tell what the actual vs. budget is for the current year based on the reports that have been provided. However, given the experience of the two prior years, they ask whether the District is reasonably confident that the approximately \$8.8 million that it has budgeted for 2017-18 (a reduction of about \$160,000 from the current year) is sufficient? (In this regard, we

note that the section of the Cover Letter headed Major Reductions or Eliminations does state “reduce transportation allocations” but no rationale is provided.)

Activity Code 402 (“Make the Move” Program)

The Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate that the District has added \$25,000 to its budget for marketing materials to promote the program beyond what was budgeted for the 2016-17 school year. (Cover Letter at 10; Draft 2 Budget, Form 4 at 33.) They urge the District to promptly prepare its plan and materials to market this program so that its entire staff is aware of the opportunity.

In this regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs are concerned that in reviewing the District’s webpage concerning the program (at <http://www.tusd.k12.az.us/CONTENTS/employment/makethemove.html>), it appears that the District did not update the page to include relevant information for enrollment for the 2016-17 school year. They therefore ask **how did the District market the “Make the Move” program for the 2016-17 school year? How many individuals participated in the program for the 2016-17 school year?**

Mendoza Plaintiffs further request that the District promptly update its webpage concerning the program to provide applications for the 2017-18 school year and to alert teachers to the fact that the program will be available for positions beyond exceptional education. Mendoza Plaintiffs also see that for the 2015-16 school year, applications for the program were due in the month of February and that only 30 eligible candidates were to be accepted. **When will applications for the “Make the Move” program for the 2017-18 school year be due?** Mendoza Plaintiffs urge the District to expedite efforts to market the program and push back to the extent practicable the deadline to apply for the program. **How many eligible candidates does the District anticipate it will accept in to the program for each of the exceptional education and dual language components?**

Activity Code 409 (USP-Related PD and Support)

Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District’s belief that in-person training is not practicable for its over 3,000 staff members who are to receive USP-related training. (Cover Letter at 11.) However, this assertion does not address Mendoza Plaintiffs’ inquiry, stated in their Budget Narrative comment regarding the TUSD 2015-16 Annual Report, asking the District to identify the mechanisms to which it referred in its statement that the District is developing a “stronger monitoring mechanism to ensure

the training is received” (2015-16 Annual Report at IV-107), Mendoza Plaintiffs believe the problem of common TUSD staff misperceptions regarding the USP may largely stem from the fact that only a relatively small number of them have in the past received the mandated USP-related training. They therefore ask, given that only a tiny fraction of the District’s over 3,000 staff members have in the past received USP-related training, what does the District plan to do differently in the 2017-18 school year to ensure that its certificated staff all receive the mandated USP-related training?

Mendoza Plaintiffs also are concerned with the attitude reflected in the District’s statement that online training “is appropriate [because USP-related training] involves subject matter [that] is primarily informational (i.e. ‘elements and requirements’ of the USP).” As the District knows, the USP’s requirements are directed at eliminating vestiges of past discrimination across broad areas of the District’s activities and operations, many of which require compliance from or application by site administrators and teachers (e.g., culturally responsive pedagogy, discipline-related strategies). While Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that there is training specific to the components of the USP, they believe there also is a need to have the USP’s components, processes and goals explained to TUSD staff multiple times in connection with the many aspects of their professional development that relate to the USP, including during this training that should provide staff with a “10,000 foot view” of the USP, and should not be thought of as only “primarily informational.” It should be intended to guide subsequent behavior.

Activity Code 412 (New Teacher Induction Program)

Teacher Stipends

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not have significant problems with the District’s decision to eliminate the teacher mentor stipends in favor of extending those mentor’s contracts with the District by a month (Cover Letter at 7-8), but do not understand the reason for this change. They therefore ask, on what basis did the District conclude that eliminating teacher mentor stipends in favor of extending their contracts by month is preferable? Has the District considered what impact this decision may have on its ability to attract candidates to apply for this position?

Increase for Additional Teacher Mentors

The District’s response to Mendoza Plaintiffs’ RFI # 995 does not provide Mendoza Plaintiffs with the basis to understand the District’s reasoning in assigning 1, 2,

or 3 points under its point system to its first- or second-year teachers (based on whether they are underperforming and/or at a racially concentrated school), or why it believes the point system would ensure meaningful mentoring. The District's process for assigning points and thereby determining the mentor:teacher ratio appears to be arbitrary. Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that the number of mentors and amount of mentoring teachers should receive is something to be evaluated and adjusted, and appreciate the effort to be more nuanced in the creation of the ratio but do not understand whether the current proposal stems from additional evaluation of the needs of first and second year teachers in underperforming and/or racially concentrated schools or from other bases. They therefore rephrase their information request: **Is there any basis beyond what is described in the District's Budget Narrative and response to RFI # 995 for the District's proposed teacher mentor ratio, and if so, what is it?**

Activity Code 501 (ALE Access and Recruitment Plan)

Mendoza Plaintiffs support the initiatives to fund the PSAT for all freshman and to further expand the AVID and GATE programs.

They have the following questions about the budget entries:

What textbooks are to be purchased with the allocation of \$200,000? Are these equivalent to the \$200,000 for textbooks that was specifically identified in relation to GATE last year?

Are Mendoza Plaintiffs correct in concluding that the \$1,776,146 in activities and expenses comprising what is now referred to as "ALE Total" were shifted from other areas in the 501 code of last year? If so, what functions/line entries were shifted? Does this include activities/expenses that last year were reported under "GATE Total" (which is shown to decrease from \$2.3 million last year to \$950,000 this year)? If so, what is the rationale for the movement and reclassification?

Activity Code 502 (UHS)

The Cover Letter states (at page 13) that there are not major changes but the expense in this activity code is indicated to increase by more than \$60,000 from last year, which is more than the changes (up and down) for many of the magnet schools. **What is the reason for this proposed increase?**

Activity Code 503 (Dual Language)

The Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District's explanation that it has in its proposed budget allocated funds for dual language assessments in two languages and the preparation of the TWDL master plan and individual school handbooks. They are however disappointed with the District's Cover Letter statement that the requirement to " 'build and expand dual language' is separate from the USP requirement to consider adding dual language magnets, and is also separate from the District's actions to expand dual language in a manner that promotes integration (Bloom expansion)" and its indication that the Ochoa expansion was not meant to further integration. (Cover Letter at 14.)

While Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate that the planned Ochoa Dual Language expansion is no longer moving forward in the 2017-18 school year, and that the above referenced dual language program requirements are in different subsections of the USP, Mendoza Plaintiffs would expect that the District would, in any USP-related efforts concerning its Dual Language program and regardless of what subsection of the USP the initiative is primarily intended to address, explore and make efforts to further the purpose of each of the USP's dual language requirements and the USP taken as a whole, including in particular promoting integration. In that regard they note the Court's statement in its December 22, 2016 Order concerning withdrawal of magnet status from certain schools (including Ochoa) that "The Mendoza Plaintiffs are 100 percent correct: "[T]he failure of the subject schools to achieve the integration criteria set forth in the USP should not relieve them (or the District) of on-going efforts to increase integration at those schools particularly given that every one of them is reported to be racially concentrated in the District's most recent Annual Report." (Doc. 1980 at 4:20-24.)

Bloom

Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the District's decision to budget for only one additional dual language teacher at Bloom (to bring the total of such teachers to two). In the Budget Narrative (at 31), the District wrote: "Bloom will expand their program by adding three TWDL classes for a total of four (one at kindergarten and two at first grade; one kindergarten class began in 2016-17)." But in the Cover Letter (as confirmed by the line item budget entry), the District now says (at 14): "The District is only budgeting for one additional dual-language teacher, and will adjust based on enrollment in the fall (the District is still seeking to fill four DL classes with four DL teachers)."

Budgets drive actions. Further, absent failures to fill other vacancies (and the District already has stated it plans to use resulting funds stipends and to fund summer activities (Cover Letter at 2)), there can be no assurance funds will be available to hire the needed teachers “in the fall.” Moreover, such an approach runs counter to the District’s recently adopted TWDL Plan because it accepts the likelihood that there will be only single kindergarten and first grade classes at the school notwithstanding the commitment to design a two classroom TWDL structure to reduce programmatic isolation of the TWDL classes at a site. Further, it precludes the likelihood of being able to send the teachers to the summer Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Conference.

Given that the District will not be expanding the dual language program to Ochoa this coming year, as it had originally proposed, it should redouble its efforts to recruit students (and teachers) for the Bloom program.

Activity 506 (Dropout Prevention and Graduation Plan)

Please provide clarification on what is meant in the Cover Letter (at 14) that the District “will upgrade two DAEP support staff.” Does the District mean that it is adding two staff members at DAEP sites? If so, what are the titles of those support staff members and at which site will they be assigned?

The Draft #2 Budget reflects the elimination of several positions in connection with “Alternative[s] to Suspension” under this activity code, including “Inst Spec-Gen Subj,” “Teacher CORE Plus,” DAEP teachers at Project More, and Life Skills Teachers. (Draft #2 Budget, Form 4 at 131-32.) It also reflects the addition of 12 “Teacher” FTEs (*Id.* at 132.) While Mendoza Plaintiffs generally understand that the District was expanding its alternatives to suspension programs, particularly with respect to site-level In-School Intervention (ISI), Mendoza Plaintiffs could not tell whether or to what extent these changes reflect substantive changes (including expansion) to the DAEP and ISI programs. Can the District please describe what accounts for the above referenced elimination of positions and additional 12 teachers reflected in the budget with regard to Alternative to Suspensions. What will the District be doing differently with respect to DAEP and ISI in the 2017-18 school year?

Activity Code 510 (Culturally Relevant Courses)

Expansion of CRC Global Issues Courses

When the District first described its planned expansion of CRC Global Issues Courses in the budget narrative, it indicated that it would “add an additional ninth grade CRC” course and that the expansion “will provide an opportunity for students to take CR options from 5th – 12th grade in social studies and ELA.” (Budget Narrative at 34.) Mendoza Plaintiffs understood this explanation to say that the District was planning an expansion beyond the “[e]ight additional 5th grade elementary schools” that are to “infuse CR literature to satisfy the ELA content standards in ELA and social studies” in the 2017-18 school year to which it committed in the CRC Stipulation (which are in addition to the nine elementary schools at which the expansion was to have occurred in the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years, respectively three in 2015-16 and six in 2016-17). (See CRC Stipulation (“CRC Stip”)(Doc 1761), Exhibit 2 at 10-12.) Mendoza Plaintiffs are concerned that the Draft # 2 budget materials suggest there are issues both of misclassification of the planned courses and potential non-expansion required under the CRC Stip.

First, the District response to RFI # 1001 indicates that these courses, that would (as distinct from existing Global Issues classes) “have a unique focus from the African-American and Mexican American perspective” (Cover Letter at 15), would be “offered as an optional/elective credit class for 9th grade students.” However, the USP provides that CRCs are to be “courses of instruction for **core English and Social Studies credit**” (USP, V, E, 6, ii; emphasis added). While Mendoza Plaintiffs are encouraged by the proposed expansion, they do not believe the planned “optional/elective” credit classes conform to the USP requirements for CRC courses. Thus, they further believe that the courses should be re-categorized as multicultural curriculum which the USP, consistent with the District’s description of the planned “CRC Global Issues courses,” defines as “courses which integrate racially and ethnically diverse perspectives and experiences.” (See Doc. 1713 at 37.) Mendoza Plaintiffs object to this proposed expenditure only to the extent the District classifies these classes as CRCs.

Second, notably absent from the District’s Draft # 2 budget materials is any reference to or description of what the District described in its budget narrative as the “opportunity for students to take CR options from 5th – 12th grade in social studies and ELA” that would result from the “proposed expansion.” This therefore causes Mendoza

Plaintiffs doubt as to whether and to what extent the District intends to expand CR courses to eight additional elementary schools as is required under the CRC Stip.⁹ They therefore ask for the following information: **How many of the District's elementary schools "infuse[d] CR literature to satisfy the ELA content standards in ELA and social studies" in the 2016-17 school year? At how many elementary schools is the District planning to expand the above referenced infusion of CR literature in the 2017-18 school year beyond that in the 2016-17 school year?**

Itinerant Teachers

While Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District's explanation for why it believes itinerant teachers (ITs) are not needed to teacher 3 CRCs under the CRC Stip, they believe it is based on a misunderstanding of the reason for the requirement for itinerant teachers and that it is inconsistent with the Court's December 27, 2016 Order concerning CRCs ("CRCs Order") (Doc. 1982).

The District's response to RFI # 1002 that it recruited "enough site-based teachers to not require IT staff to teach as many as 3 sections" and that it would request a budget modification if there is a larger than anticipated CRC growth reflects that the District understands the sole purpose of the itinerant teacher requirement to have been ensuring adequate numbers of teaching staff to meet demand. However, ITs were to teach courses to stay connected to instruction and as a way to facilitate development of effective and efficient model instruction, teacher mentoring, and development of curricular lessons for CRC teacher implementation, among other things. (See CRC Stip, Exhibit 2 at 18 (detailing non-instructional duties); CRCs Order at 2-3). Indeed, the CRC Stip. indicates that as the CRC program expands and central staff grows and as ITs are phased out, TUSD is to "ensure that central staff is routinely connected to the classroom by requiring central staff to teach a minimum of one course. This ensures a staff that *continues to be grounded in what is happening at the school level*" (emphasis added). Further, the Mendoza Plaintiffs remind the District that the Court ordered Special Master review of "the District's use of itinerant staff to ensure *full compliance* with the Intervention Plan's Itinerant Teacher Model." (CRC Order at 4.) The budget must support full compliance with the CRC Stip. and the CRC Order.

⁹ Mendoza Plaintiffs were unable to tell from the budget Form 3 amounts for curriculum development and teacher salaries under this activity code whether the District intends to expand CR courses at the elementary school level as required by the CRC stip. for the 2017-18 school year.

In its CRC Order (at 3), the Court acknowledged the Special Master’s “note[] that TUSD offers no program-based rationale for estimating that it needs one itinerant teacher for every ten CRC teachers, except to say that this ratio is within the 15 to 1 ratio generally recommended for peer assistance and review programs” and ordered that the District “develop a meaningful itinerant teacher-CRC teacher ratio” (at 4).¹⁰ In response to RFI # 1002, the District does not provide a program-based rationale for why it “anticipates a similar level of [IT] need for the 2017-18 SY.” **Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask whether there is a program based rationale beyond what already has been provided in response to RFI # 1002 for the District’s proposed 10 ITs, and if so, what that rationale is.**

Activity 601 (Restorative Practices and PBIS Training)

Restorative Practices

The Mendoza Plaintiffs are confused by the District’s response to Mendoza Plaintiffs’ question (RFI # 1005) about what the District will be doing with respect to Restorative Practices training for the 2017-18 school year because that response largely concerns training that is to occur “prior to the end of the 2016-17 school year”.

Response to RFI # 1005 also describes 2-3 days of training for principals and MTSS facilitators that will occur over the summer and states that principals will then follow up with “select staff” to develop and implement teacher Restorative Practices training.

Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand what is being described to be different from what the District has done in the past with respect to Restorative Practices Training. In its September 1, 2016 Supplement to TUSD’s Approach to Addressing Student Behavior, Engagement, and Discipline, the District described that it had “reached out to other urban school districts and to the White House to develop the best approaches to RP training, and to identify successful trainers.” **What are the referenced “best approaches to RP training” that the District developed, if any, and did the District identify successful trainers? Will the approaches be implemented and identified trainers be used in the 2017-18 school year? If so, does the Draft #2 Budget reflect allocations to cover associated costs?**

¹⁰ The Court’s December 27, 2016 Budget Order (“Budget Order”) (Doc. 1981) (at 6) further notes that “Like he did in his R&R on itinerant mentors for CRC teachers, the Special Master seeks some rationale for the number of mentors reflected in the 2016-17 USP budget for new teachers. The Court agrees.”

Mendoza Plaintiffs are gravely concerned that at a time when a number of District schools have long been facing ongoing discipline issues and the District will be rolling out a new student code of conduct, it appears that the District's central administration does not intend to be much involved with respect to site-level professional development on Restorative Practices. Indeed, it states that principals "will be asked" to develop plans to train teachers on Restorative Practices, and "expected" to implement those plans. How will the District's central administration be involved in the plans of action principals will develop to train the teachers at their schools (e.g., in terms of review, suggestions, monitoring of implementation, etc.)? How will the District monitor the work of MTSS facilitators to ensure that they are fulfilling their purpose at each school to avoid the kind of inconsistencies that occurred with respect to LSCs?

At the parties' meeting in Tucson in November 2016, the Special Master reported that schools like Cholla have been quite successful in managing student behavior. On the other hand, as the parties and Special Master know, some schools like Secrist and Utterback have faced significant issues with student behavior. Other schools like Safford, Palo Verde, Booth Fickett and Pueblo have also faced issues with discipline. If the District will be involved in the development (and implementation) of plans of action for Restorative Practices training, as Mendoza Plaintiffs believe it must, how will it ensure that each such plan will be adequately tailored to address the specific circumstances that each school may be facing?

PBIS Training

With respect to PBIS training, has the District determined how many schools will receive the KOI Education training? Mendoza Plaintiffs are particularly concerned that they have heard reports that Utterback teachers have had little to no training on PBIS. They therefore ask what the nature of the District's PBIS coordinator's work with the Utterback principal has been in the 2016-17 school year, as referenced in the District's response to RFI # 1006. They further urge the District to include Utterback as a school to receive KOI training, regardless of whether or not it is a school that had a CAP in the 2016-17 school year.

The USP requires that an RPPSC be hired or designated for each school and that the individual is to "own" (this is the Mendoza Plaintiffs' term) professional development by "implement[ing] Restorative Practices and PBIS." (USP Section VI, E, 1.) In the 2015-16 school year, the LSCs were designated to these positions. (2015-16

Annual Report at VI-28.) While the District has identified principals, MTSS facilitators and discipline teams that will be in charge of discipline for the current and upcoming school year, it is unclear who will take “ownership” of the implementation of PBIS and Restorative Practices. Is there a specific position at TUSD schools that will take over the role of RPPSCs? If not, who will take ownership of the above referenced training? Has the District determined that for each TUSD school, a person has been identified who will serve as the site’s RPPSC for the 2017-18 school year?

Corrective Action Plans

Please provide the list of TUSD schools that have corrective actions plans (CAPs) in the 2016-17 school year (among which the District says it will decide which schools will receive KOI training). Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that for the 2015-16 school year, only Doolen, Secrist (see 2015-16 Annual Report at VI-316), Palo Verde, and Catalina (TUSD Response to RFI # 832) had CAPs which seems low given the reports of discipline issues at other schools. How will the District decide which sites will need discipline-related CAPs for the 2017-18 school year? Is the District certain that existing allocations would be sufficient to support the development and monitoring of CAPs (there is \$0 allocated to this activity) (Draft #2 Budget, Form 4 at 184)?

As may be apparent, Mendoza Plaintiffs cannot fully comment on the District’s discipline approach, including restorative Practices, MTSS facilitators, and related professional development until they have received responses to the above information requests and the questions they posed concerning the funds and roles previously associated with the Student Support Specialists functions. .

Their failure to comment more fully on the number, job definitions, and role of MTSS facilitators and MTSS behavior support staff (referenced in Activity Code 511) should not be understood to signal that the Mendoza Plaintiffs do not have significant concerns relating to their roles and how the proposed revisions in roles will be implemented.

Mendoza Plaintiffs believe that much of the meeting of the parties and the Special Master in Tucson in April should be devoted to a discussion of the interrelated discipline, targeted intervention, and behavioral support topics.

Activity Code 607 (Successful Site-Based Strategies)

In its Cover Letter, the District appears to take issue with Mendoza Plaintiffs' statement that the District appears not to be complying in good faith with the USP requirements related to this activity code and asserts that whether its actions in this regard reflect good faith "should be assessed by the Special Master and the IC, and should incorporate information and data provided in the Annual Report." (Cover Letter at 17.) In doing so, the District ignores that the Special Master already assessed the District's actions in this regard (and having considered the District's Annual Report), stated that "as I've indicated before, when the District made a similar proposal, I believe this falls short of the intent of the provisions of the USP." (Special Master's April 29, 2016 Memo re: Comments on the District's Response to My Annual Report Recommendations.)

Indeed, the Court expressly addressed the District's lack of compliance regarding this USP requirement in its Budget Order when it stated the following:

"The Court notes that since the 1974 inception of this case, TUSD has failed to take its disciplinary practices and procedures seriously... This Court, therefore, does not take lightly the Special Master's concern that \$25,000 in the 2017 budget fails to move TUSD forward in respect to satisfying the USP Section VI.F.3 disciplinary provision to identify and share successful disciplinary practices... He explains that an effective sharing plan should provide for widespread sharing of effective practices, have follow-on activities that allow teachers and principals ongoing access to what is learned about how best to deal with different disciplinary issues. He describes it as fairly simple to design a plan that would allow access to information about effective practices when the information is needed by a teacher or principal. TUSD agreed to this, but the Court notes that the Special Master made this recommendation to TUSD in his 2014-15 Annual Report to the Court."

The Draft # 2 Budget (Form 4 at 189) reflects that the District is proposing a mere additional \$250 in the 2017-18 school year beyond the amount budgeted in the 2016-17 school year to implement the inadequate best practices plan the Court and Special Master directed their above comments to. Mendoza Plaintiffs refer the parties and Special Master to their February 3, 2017 budget comments for further discussion of why

the District's proposal for this activity code falls short of what the USP requires and urge the District to rethink its approach particularly given that compliance with this requirement is "fairly simple" and given the significant disciplinary issues the District has and faced in the past year. Indeed, Mendoza Plaintiffs see no reason why the District could not post on a website (perhaps the TUSD website) videos dealing with different strategies and best practices to address common discipline issues. (In this regard, the District could recruit teachers exhibiting successful strategies at schools like Cholla that have been identified as successful in their management of discipline issues to develop short videos that can be made available to teachers and administrators district-wide.)

Activity Code 702 (Family Engagement Resources)

School Community Liaison Stipends for School Staff

Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District's explanation that it will use stipends to designate individuals at schools at which no liaisons currently exist. (Response to RFI # 1007.) However, Mendoza Plaintiffs have significant concerns regarding a lack of focused and directed efforts that are also reflected in their discussion of family and community engagement efforts above in the section concerning magnet plans.

In response to Mendoza Plaintiffs' RFI # 856 in which they asked the District why there were so many schools that did not report family and community engagement efforts (in its 2015-16 Annual Report appendix purporting to list all such efforts), the District indicated that a "request for family engagement information was made to site administrators at all school sites in May, 2016," **the end of the 2015-16 school year**, but that only 64 schools reported their efforts at that time. That response attached family engagement information concerning 15 additional schools and indicated that the District is still working to obtain information from an additional eight schools. Thus, the District appears to largely be uninvolved in site-level family engagement efforts and apparently does not conduct ongoing monitoring of the quality and number of such efforts. For these reason, Mendoza Plaintiffs are especially concerned that the District's proposed use of stipends for family liaisons to "be accountable for ensuring USP requirements for family engagement are met and reported" misses the issue of the need for greater central administration involvement and monitoring of site-level family and community engagement efforts.

Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask what will the District do in the 2017-18 school year to monitor the number and quality of family and community engagement efforts at the site level?

Family and Community Engagement Tracking

The District's 2015-16 Annual Report states that "[t]he District purchased a new student information system for use beginning in SY 2016-17. As a result, Technology Services was unable to make any changes to the older system in SY 2015-16, and tracking the families using the family engagement services continued through manual sign-in sheets. Family Engagement and Community Outreach staff met with Technology Services on January 26 and February 1, 2016, to discuss creating an online system for tracking FRC use across all locations. Technology Services projected that the tracking system will be completed during the 2017 spring semester." (For the 2017-18 school year, the District proposes a reduction of almost \$17,000 for this activity code. (Draft #2 Budget, Form 4 at 194.)) Did the District complete the development of the tracking system referenced in its Annual Report? Will the system allow for electronic tracking of families' use of family engagement resources at family centers only, or will individual schools also be able to use the system? Will the District use the family tracking system to better monitor the number and quality of family engagement efforts at the site level, and if so, how does it intend to do so?

Activity Code 801-802 (Extracurricular Activities)

Mendoza Plaintiffs have included their comments on this activity code in their discussion of transition plans, above, and therefore do not repeat it here.

Activity Code 901 (Multi-Year Facilities Plan)

The District states that "[b]ased on Special Master and Plaintiff objections, the District has eliminated proposed funding to complete needed projects at racially concentrated schools... The District will also seek to utilize unexpended funds during the 2016-17 school year in order to complete at least some of the necessary projects through the reallocation process." (Cover Letter at 18.) As the Mendoza and Fisher Plaintiffs stated during the subsequent March 16, 2017 discussion concerning the reallocation request for capital improvements, they see significant contradiction in the District's positions in that the District is arguing to the Court that it has achieved unitary status as to this *Green* factor, but it seeks to spend desegregation funds on this activity

when it acknowledges it has not yet achieved unitary status with respect to other USP obligations.

Further, although the District says it has eliminated capital improvement projects from the budget, it still proposes to spend over \$1.7 million on the Multi-Year Facilities Plan activity code.

Notably, the operative Multi-Year Facilities Plan (“MYFP”) (Doc. 1777-1, Exhibit 1) filed February 27, 2015 expressly states that “In effect, the Multi-Year Facilities Plan will be followed for two years, at which time a new plan will be created based on the updated FCI and ESS scores.” (MYFP at 5.) Thus, Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that the District apparently illogically proposes to spend over \$1.7 million pursuant to an outdated MYFP at a time when it claims to have eliminated all vestiges of race discrimination as to facilities but acknowledges it has work to do as to other desegregation activities.¹¹

As part of the proposed allocation of over \$1.7 million on this activity, the District proposes to spend \$750,000 on “Deseg-MYFP” and \$540,000 on “CARE/UPKEEP OF,” however, there is no information that would allow the Mendoza Plaintiffs to understand the nature of these proposals or how they relate to the District’s recent reallocation request relating to racially concentrated schools. They therefore ask the following: Which District schools would receive facilities repairs, maintenance, or upgrades in connection with the proposed total amount of \$1,290,000 for “Deseg-MYFP” and “CARE/UPKEEP OF,” and for each, what facilities work would the school receive? How were the schools and the projects included in the proposed allocation selected? How does the facilities work at the schools entailed in this proposed District allocation fit in with the work at the racially concentrated schools that is the subject of the District’s pending reallocation request in terms of prioritization?

Notwithstanding the above requests for information, the Mendoza Plaintiffs request that the District consider whether it instead should use the proposed funds for

¹¹ While Mendoza Plaintiffs do not agree that the District has achieved unitary status as to the facilities *Green* factor, they do believe that the District, particularly as it believes it has achieved such status, could better invest funds currently proposed for the MYFP on activities to further USP desegregation purposes in areas in which it concedes it had additional work to do. (In these budget comments, Mendoza Plaintiffs have identified a number of initiatives in those areas that they believe warrant additional funding).

other desegregation purposes, including for returning reading recovery to Ochoa, the art programs to Utterback, and creating more robust family engagement plans at the transition schools as discussed more fully in the section of these comments concerning transition plans.

(In reviewing facilities data, Mendoza Plaintiffs found that the District's FCI data attached to its Annual Report for the 2014-15 school year (Doc. 1852-4, Appendix IX-3) appears to have gotten cut off after the first page and thus does not provide FCI data information for TUSD's K-8 schools, middle schools, and high schools. They therefore request the missing FCI data to this appendix (which is dated February 19, 2015).)

Activity Code 902 (Multi-Year Technology Plan)

What is the work of the data analyst and programmer that have been left in this portion of the budget?

Activity Code 903 (Technology PD for Classroom Staff)

Mendoza have reviewed both the budget entries and the section of Attachment D (page 26) to the Cover Letter relating to Technology PD for Classroom Staff.

There is a reference to \$80,000 to pay the costs of a planning year for Booth-Fickett and Palo Verde "to become a member of New Tech Network (Technology Integration via Project-based Learning)" but Mendoza Plaintiffs see no reference to such an endeavor or plan in either the Booth-Fickett or the Palo Verde magnet school plans for 2017-18. They therefore ask: what is this initiative and how does it relate to each school's plan? What is technology is to be integrated via project-based learning?

Are any of the costs for the Microsoft Partnership included in the total of \$1,231,818 for this activity code? If so, where and how much?

If the Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the trainer of trainer model, the training teachers will visit the to-be-trained teachers in their classrooms. Is this correct? If so, who will be covering the classes of the trainer teachers when this occurs?

Is technology training to be available to classroom teachers outside the trainer of trainer model other than in the form of summer PD? If so, in what format and when?

Exhibit F

Magnet School Budget Comparisons

Site#	School Name	FY17 Adj Bud as of 4/6/17	Accelerating Spending into FY17	Draft 3 Budget Submission	FY18 Magnet Plan
1131	Bonillas	359,635	0	359,635	359,635
1143	Borton	545,082	(0)	545,082	545,082
1161	Carrillo	467,894	(55,000)	412,894	467,894
1191	Davis	484,273	(7,612)	476,661	484,273
1203	Drachman	497,251	(7,490)	489,761	497,251
1239	Holladay	689,457	(40,000)	649,457	689,457
1419	Tully	292,391	(15,000)	277,392	292,391
1502	Dodge	314,542	1	314,543	314,542
1510	Booth Fickett	831,571	(45,000)	786,571	831,571
1520	Mansfeld	562,665	(12,000)	550,665	562,665
1595	Roskruge	791,118	(20,761)	770,357	791,118
2620	Palo Verde	416,168	(4,654)	411,514	416,168
2660	Tucson	1,957,363	0	1,957,363	1,957,363
TOTAL		8,209,409	(207,516)	8,001,894	8,209,410

Exhibit G



Tucson Unified School District

REVISED FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN¹
September 26, 2014

USP LANGUAGE

By April 1, 2013², as more fully set forth below in Section (VII), the District shall develop a plan to expand its existing Family Center(s) and/or develop new one(s). [II.1.2]

By July 1, 2013³, the District shall develop a plan to expand its existing Family Center(s) and/or develop new one(s). The District Family Center (“DFC”) Plan shall:

(i) indicate where the Family Center(s) shall be located, including whether existing Family Centers or other related resources should be consolidated or relocated;

(ii) provide for the creation and distribution of new or revised materials to provide families with information regarding enrollment options pursuant to Section (II) and regarding the availability of transportation;

(iii) provide for the creation and distribution of new or revised materials to provide families with detailed information regarding Advanced Learning Experiences (including the informational sessions on ALEs, information on UHS and the complaint process related to ALEs);

(iv) provide for the creation and distribution of new or revised materials to provide families with detailed information regarding student discipline policies and procedures, including the revised GSRR;

¹ This Plan is identified as the “Family and Community Engagement Plan” because it combines the “Family Center Plan” (USP § VII.C.1.a), the plan to track data on family engagement (USP § VII.C.1.c) and the plan to reorganize or increase family engagement resources (USP § VII.C.1.d).

² This date in section II of the USP is inconsistent with the July 1, 2013 date that is in section VII of the USP. The District assumes this was merely a typo. But, as section VII appears to contain the controlling language relevant to the District Family Center Plan, the District initially referred to the July 1, 2013 date.

³ The District planned to hire or designate a Family Engagement Coordinator by the start of the fiscal year – July 1, 2013. Thus, the District requested, and the parties and Special Master did not object, to moving the due date for the Family Center Plan from July 1, 2013 to October 1, 2013. In the fall of 2013, the District proposed combining the Family Center Plan and the Family Engagement Plan. On December 2, 2013 the Court set a due date of February 15, 2014 for the Family Engagement Plan (including the Family Center Plan). The District requested the parties and the Special Master to extend this date to March 31, 2014. This request has not yet been granted or denied.

(v) provide for the creation and distribution of new or revised materials to provide families with detailed information regarding the curricular and student support services offered in Section V(C) Student Engagement and Support, including information on Academic and Behavioral Support, dropout prevention services, African American and Latino Student Support Services, culturally relevant courses and policies related to inclusion and non-discrimination;

(vi) provide for the creation and distribution of new or revised materials to provide families with information regarding educational options for their ELL children, including the availability of dual language programs and other programs designed for ELLs;

(vii) include strategies for how teachers and principals can learn from families regarding how to meet the needs of their children;

(viii) detail how the Family Center(s) will be staffed, including language requirements for all staff and whether they will be under the supervision of the FEC. [VII.C.1.a]

By July 1, 2013⁴, the FEC shall review and assess the District's existing family engagement and support programs, resources, and practices. This review and assessment shall focus on programs, resources and practices for African American and Latino students, including ELL students, and families, particularly those for (i) students who are struggling, disengaged, and/or at risk of dropping out and (ii) students who face additional challenges because of a lack of access to technology.⁵ The review shall include information on the location of programs and resources, the personnel assigned to family and community engagement efforts, funding allocated, and the data systems in place to provide information on outreach to and engagement with families and communities. [VII.C.1.b]

By October 1, 2013⁶, the FEC shall develop and implement a plan to track data on family engagement, and the District shall make necessary revisions to Mojave to allow such data to be tracked by student. [VII.C.1.c]

By January 1, 2014⁷, the FEC shall develop and implement a plan to reorganize or increase family engagement resources, including consolidating additional resources at the Family

⁴ The District requested, and the parties and Special Master did not object, to moving the due date for the Family Engagement Review and Assessment from July 1, 2013 to October 1, 2013.

⁵ *Such programs, resources, and practices include, but are not limited to, efforts by the African American and Latino Student Services Departments, the School Community Services Department, the Family Centers, the Family and Community Outreach Department, the Parent and Child Education ("PACE") Program, the Parent-Teacher-Student Association, the School Community Partnership Council, the Wellness Centers, and any new or amended versions of the aforementioned programs. [VII.C.1.b, footnote 8]*

⁶ The District requested, and the parties and Special Master did not object, to moving the due date for the Family Engagement Data Tracking Plan from October 1, 2013 to January 1, 2014.

⁷ The District planned to hire or designate a Family Engagement Coordinator by the start of the fiscal year – July 1, 2013. Thus, the District requested, and the parties and Special Master did not object, to moving the due date for the

Center(s), to both ensure equitable access to programs and services and to concentrate resources on school site(s) and in areas where data indicates the greatest need. [VII.C.1.d]

The District shall collaborate with local colleges and universities to provide parents with information about the college enrollment process and to disseminate such information at the Family Centers. [VII.C.1.e]

The District shall provide access at its Family Centers to computers for families to complete and submit open enrollment/magnet applications online. [VII.C.1.f]

The District shall disseminate the information identified above and in Section (II), in all Major languages, on the District’s website, and through other locations and media, as appropriate. [VII.C.1.g]

DEFINITIONS

Family	Family is an enduring relationship, whether biological or non-biological, chosen or circumstantial, connecting a child/youth and parent/guardian through culture, tradition, shared experiences, emotional commitment and mutual support (United Advocates for Children of California).
Family Engagement	Family Engagement means building relationships with families that support family well-being, strong parent-child relationships, and ongoing learning and development of parents and children alike. It refers to the beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and activities of families that support their children’s positive development from early childhood through young adulthood. Family engagement happens in the home, early childhood program, school and community. It is a shared responsibility with all those who support children’s learning (National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement).
Community Engagement	Community Engagement is achieved when the school district, families, and community leaders come together to make a joint commitment that ensures the success of all students.
Student Services and Partnership Centers (Family Center)	A Student Services and Partnership Center (Family Center) provides resources that are open and responsive to the needs of all families in linguistically and culturally affirmative ways.

plan to reorganize family engagement resources (the Family Engagement Plan) from July 1, 2013 to October 1, 2013. On December 2, 2013, the Court set a due date of February 15, 2014 for the Family Engagement Plan (including the Family Center Plan). On January 29, 2014, the District proposed to the Special Master and parties a due date of March 31, 2014 for completion of the Family Engagement Plan (including the Family Center Plan and the Family Engagement Data Tracking Plan). This request has not yet been granted or denied.

TUSDStats Parental Accounts	TUSDStats Parental Accounts provide a world of data that can help parents and guardians understand their child’s academic experience.
Parent Link	The ParentLink system provides a communication platform for District staff to communicate with parents and families using phone calls, emails, text messages to update parents and families on everything from emergency situations to important school events.
Family Engagement Coordinator (FEC)	The Family Engagement Coordinator is a District employee responsible for implementing, monitoring, and evaluating this Plan.
Director of Family and Community Engagement	The Director of Family and Community Engagement is a District employee responsible for implementing, monitoring, and evaluating this Plan.
Community Representative	A Community Representative serves as a liaison between schools and families to encourage parent and community involvement.
Student and Family Support Liaison	A Student and Family Support Liaison provides activities to meet academic needs of targeted students, consults with teachers, staff, and parents to enhance their effectiveness in helping students, and collaborates with students, parents, and staff to increase academic and social achievement.
Academic Parent Teacher Team (APTT)	This is a model that replaces the traditional parent-teacher conference with three group meetings throughout the year, where teachers meet at one time with all parents in their classroom. Each parent is provided with a folder of their child’s performance indicators. Teachers then provide an in-depth coaching session on how to interpret this data based on overall classroom performance, school benchmarks, and state standards. Parents are provided with strategies and tools to help support learning at home. Together, parents and teachers set goals for their students, individually and as a class. See http://www.ed.gov/oese-news/innovative-model-parent-teacher-partnerships .
Supportive and Inclusive Learning (SAIL) environment	A supportive and inclusive learning environment is about the learning, engagement and inclusion of each learner. In fully supportive and inclusive schools, students are achieving and experiencing success, being challenged and enjoying things they are interested in. School communities foster the identity, language and culture of all learners. All members of the learning community feel valued and included.
Learning-centric	A centered learning climate where adults are focused on student learning.
Child Find	All children with disabilities residing in the state, including children with disabilities who are homeless children or are wards of the state and children with disabilities attending private schools, regardless of the

	severity of their disability, and who are in need of special education and related services, are identified, located and evaluated; and a practical method is developed and implemented to determine which children are currently receiving needed special education and related services. (20 USC 1414 & 612); (34 CFR 300.111)
District Advisory Council (DAC)	A volunteer organization of parents and staff from District schools as well as private and parochial schools that receive Title I funds. DAC provides the following functions: carry out the Parent Involvement mission of "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001" by "affording parents substantial and meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children." (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), P.L. 107-110, SEC. 1001); support and facilitate parent leadership development; Participate in the planning, development, operation and evaluation of Title I projects; and advise the District on matters pertaining to Title I.
School Community Partnership Council (SCPC)	The School Community Partnership Council (SCPC) is a volunteer group of parents and staff from District schools that facilitates communication between each school community, the District, and the Governing Board.
Khan Academy	An on-line, non-profit educational organization that provides math support through free video tutorials and interactive exercises.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Plan provides the context for Family and Community Engagement practices that are being implemented throughout the District and outlines the following strategies specific to USP requirements. The Plan will be organized into four overarching elements:

- I. Background
- II. Plan to Reorganize and/or Increase Family Engagement Resources
 - A. Review and Assessment
 - B. Recommendations for Reorganizing Family Resources
 - C. Reorganizing Family Engagement Resources, Programs, and Practices
- III. Plan to Expand and Develop Student Service and Partnership Centers
- IV. Plan to Share Enrollment Information
- V. Plan to Track Data on Family Engagement

I. BACKGROUND

In the spring of 2013, the District's previous administration designated Teresa Guerrero (Title I Family Engagement Coordinator) as the USP Family Engagement Coordinator (FEC). The District's initial strategy was to combine Title I and USP family engagement efforts to ensure continuity of service, to share resources, to avoid duplication, and to strengthen family engagement efforts at the site and district level. Under the structure of project management⁸, through Project 8 – Family Engagement, Ms. Guerrero worked with several different departments to begin implementing the USP requirements for family engagement. In September 2013, due to conflicts with Title 1 responsibilities, Ms. Guerrero stepped down as the FEC. Although the District's strategy was sound in theory, in practice it proved unsustainable and the District accordingly has had to rethink its approach.

In September 2013, the District's new administration designated Noreen Wiedenfeld as the USP Family Engagement Coordinator (FEC). Ms. Wiedenfeld is the Director of School Community Services, was a member of Project 8, and had coordinated the development of family engagement activities for several years. During this time several facets of USP implementation underwent a reorganization that ultimately resulted in the thirteen USP projects being incorporated into a new structure that included a Business Leadership Team (BLT) and an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). Implementation of the Project 8 activities continued under the leadership of Mrs. Wiedenfeld through the ILT.

In the spring of 2014, Margit Birge⁹ of the Region IX Equity Assistance Center at WestEd reviewed the draft plan and provided recommendations. District staff communicated with her to discuss her recommendations. This version of the plan has incorporated many of her recommendations.

II. PLAN TO REORGANIZE AND/OR INCREASE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT RESOURCES

A. Review and Assessment

The Family Engagement Coordinator (FEC), assisted by relevant staff, reviewed and assessed existing family engagement and support programs, resources, and practices. The

⁸ Initially, USP implementation was divided into 13 distinct projects that generally tracked the order of the USP sections.

⁹ Margit Birge serves as a Program Associate with the Region IX Equity Assistance Center at WestEd. Birge provides technical assistance to districts and schools in family engagement and school climate, and coordinates projects at the Center that address equity issues related to race, gender, and ethnicity. Birge has extensive experience in federal Title I and Migrant Education programs. At the state level, she has worked with staff and parents in the California Migrant Education Program. She facilitated the processes that produced a comprehensive needs assessment and a five-year plan that helps to ensure effective services to migrant students. At the site level, Birge worked as a school reform facilitator in Title I schools with large populations of English learners and students from diverse backgrounds. She conducted needs assessments and developed action plans to address school climate and instruction and assessment practices.

review and assessment was district-wide, and included information focused on programs, resources and practices for African American and Latino students, including ELL students, and families. The review included information on the location of programs and resources, the personnel assigned to family and community engagement efforts, funding allocations, and the data systems in place to provide information on outreach to and engagement with families and communities. As the review and assessment is an ongoing process, the District will define various data points with greater specificity in future reviews and assessments. For example, future reviews and assessments will include targeted questions about engagement efforts for families of students who are struggling, disengaged, and/or at risk of dropping out and students who face additional challenges because of a lack of access to technology. This section includes three subsections: (1) programs, resources, and practices at sites and departments; (2) online resources – TUSDStats; and (3) external research of best practices.

1. Programs, Resources, and Practices at Sites and Departments

a. August Survey

In August 2013, the District conducted the Student Support Review, a district-wide survey that included a section that identified family engagement activities. The review identified numerous activities taking place across the District at school sites as of August 2013; the relevant dates for the data provided in the assessment are August 1, 2012 through August 1, 2013. The Student Support Review found the following information regarding family engagement activities:

- 40% of the activities are “presentation style”
- 29% of the activities have a curricular focus
- 18% of the activities have a family focus
- 10% of the activities are considered to be parent education
- 3% are activities such as graduation or open house
- 65 schools have a Title I-funded Community Representative or Student and Family Liaison, responsible for providing many of the listed activities as well as serve as liaisons for students in need of extra supports.
- The percentage of activities offered by grade level varies, as seen below:

Grade span	% of schools in the District at that grade span	# of family engagement activities reported	% of family engagement activities at each academic level
K-5	58%	404	62%
K-8	14%	105	16%
6-8	14%	69	11%
9-12	14%	70	11%

b. October Survey

After the initial review of the data collected in August, the District discovered that more information was needed in order to have a thorough understanding of all the opportunities for family engagement being offered throughout the District. The first survey in August revealed whether or not schools had certain types of family engagement programs, resources, or practices, but it did not provide the team the following detailed information:

- Description
- Frequency
- Location
- Personnel Assigned
- Funding Source
- Target Audience

Accordingly, in October 2013, the FEC collected data from an open-ended survey that was provided to all District principals, the Director of School and Community Services, the Director of Health Services, the Coordinator of the Parent and Child Education (PACE) program, and staff from Family and Community Outreach. The survey results indicated over one thousand family engagement activities were offered throughout the District as of the date of the survey. This number is higher than what was found in the August survey because schools and departments responded to this survey as opposed to the August 2013 survey to which only school sites responded. The relevant dates for the data provided in this survey assessment are August 1, 2012 through October 2013. The review revealed the following information:

- Historically, there was no systemic District-wide plan that provides consistent access to family engagement programs or a way of evaluating the effectiveness of those programs—singular, linguistically, culturally, by school, by subgroup, or in the aggregate.
- The majority of family engagement efforts offered by schools have been focused primarily on parent involvement such as open houses, student concerts, recognition awards, and social events.
- The District's major method for tracking parent engagement has been through sign-in sheets that are submitted to Title 1.
- Schools with Community Representatives or Student and Family Liaisons had a dedicated employee charged with coordinating family engagement efforts.
- At the District level, Student Support Services provided family engagement efforts for targeted populations. Examples of the District-led Student Support Services family engagement opportunities included:

- Parent University provided K-12 students and families an opportunity to learn about what TUSD and local colleges had to offer students and families to prepare for college and beyond. This event occurred annually during the fall semester.
 - Quarterly parent education provided learning opportunities for families to engage in their child's academic success.
 - Student Rights and Responsibilities Presentations (in targeted languages), regarding the Guidelines for Student Rights and Responsibilities, a document to assist a students, parents, teachers, staff, and principals in creating and sustaining a environment which will enhance the achievement of a positive learning process.
 - Connecting families with social services such as behavioral health services, clothing bank, and food bank.
- Provided online resources for parents such as TUSDStats, ExpectMoreArizona (a nonprofit, nonpartisan education advocacy organization working to build a movement of Arizonans – individuals, businesses, community organizations, schools, and many other partners – in support of world-class education for all students.), and Metropolitan Education Commission (composed of 34 Citizen Commissioners, advises, makes recommendations and serves as an advocate in all areas as they affect the educational welfare of Tucson and Pima County)
 - Advocated for parents during student conferences or disciplinary hearings through Student Support Services staff.

c. Activities Targeted Towards African American Students and Families, including ELLs

The District conducted a specific review of family engagement activities that focused on programs, resources and practices for African American students and families – particularly events and communications from the African American Student Services Department (AASSD). The review found that AASSD staff conducted the following activities:

SY 2012-13

- Mailed letters of introduction home to students' families at sites where AASSD provided direct daily service to 23 schools: Blenman ES, Booth-Fickett K-8, Carson MS, Catalina HS, Cholla HS, Cragin ES, Doolen MS, Erickson ES, Ft. Lowell-Townsend K-8, Holladay ES, Magee MS, Mansfeld MS, Maxwell MS, Myers-Ganoung ES, Palo Verde HS, Pistor MS, Pueblo HS, Rincon HS, Roberts-Naylor K-8, Safford K-8, Santa Rita HS, Tucson HS, and Utterback MS
- Mailed and e-mailed quarterly newsletter to all families of African American students with an address within the Mojave database
- Provided Saturday tutoring throughout the school year for 275 students, from 58 schools, including 30 elementary schools, six K-8s, eleven middle schools, ten high schools, and 1 K-12. During tutoring sessions, information was provided to parents regarding District events like Parent University

- Hosted Annual Parent University for over one-hundred students and parents at Catalina High School. Parent University was an opportunity to collaborate with local colleges and organizations to provide information about college preparation, scholarships, and other post-secondary opportunities
- Conducted phone outreach to parents inviting them to the USP Forums (provided parents information about the Unitary Status Plan and a venue to ask questions) held at Tucson HS, Palo Verde HS, and the El Pueblo Regional Center (a City of Tucson community center) in November 2012
- Hosted Annual Student Recognition Program at the University of Arizona in May 2013.
- Hosted Family Literacy Night with Floyd Cooper (interactive workshop for elementary students and their parents. Mr. Cooper is an author and illustrator of children's books) at Blenman in March 2013.
- Hosted school-community events at Blenman ES and Booth-Fickett K-8 in March 2013.
- Hosted parent forums at Palo Verde High School to capture feedback regarding parent concerns in April and May of 2013

SY 2013-14

- Provided over 400 hours of contact with parents (phone, school, home-visits, conferences), as tracked through the Grant Tracker monitoring program
- Mailed letters of introduction home to students' families at sites where AASSD provided direct daily service, including the following 16 sites: Blenman ES, Booth-Fickett K-8, Catalina HS, Cholla HS, Cragin ES, Doolen MS, Erickson ES, Magee MS, Mansfeld MS, Myers-Ganoung ES, Palo Verde HS, Rincon HS, Sahuaro HS, Secrist MS, Tucson HS, Utterback MS
- Mailed and e-mailed quarterly newsletters to all families within the Mojave database, this includes all African American families with an address in Mojave
- Invited parents to attend each school's open house and assisted during parent conferences during the fall of 2013
- Hosted two quarterly superintendent meetings with District parents and community in September 2013 at Donna Liggins Neighborhood Center and November 2013 at Living Water Ministries Church. Hosted three quarterly parent meetings in October 2013 (Tucson HS and Palo Verde HS), December 2013 (Rincon HS), and February 2014 (Mt. Calvary Church) informing parents of AASSD department services, ALE information, UHS, Promotion Retention Policy, Move on When Reading (in 2010, Arizona Revised Statute section 15-701 established the requirement that a pupil not be promoted from the third grade if the pupil obtains a score on the reading portion of the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards test (AIMS) or a successor test, that demonstrates that the pupil's reading falls far below the third grade level)
- Held parent-community advisory meetings held at the District office – listening to parents' concerns/needs and discussing supports for their children/youth in September and October 2013
- Hosted Annual Parent University for hundreds of students and parents in partnership with Pima Community College in October 2013

d. Activities Targeted Towards Latino Students and Families, including ELLs

The District conducted a specific review of family engagement activities that focused on programs, resources and practices for Latino students and families – particularly events and communications from the Mexican American Student Services Department (MASSD). The review found that MASSD staff conducted the following activities:

- Planned and implemented resource fairs during Parent Quarterly Informational Meetings, which were held at various District sites in December 2013 (Pueblo HS) and February 2014 (Cholla HS, Tucson HS, McCorkle, and Catalina). Parent Quarterly Informational Meetings included sharing information with parents about MAASD services, ALE opportunities, TUSDStats, Achieve 3000, and “Expect More” training.
- Shared information with parents, students and community members on the following:
 - Before and After school tutoring and mentoring services at various sites
 - Saturday Math tutoring services at various sites
 - Webinar sessions to parents
 - Information resources i.e., Math websites and nutritional information
 - Advanced Learning Experiences
 - Pre-college entrance information for successfully completing college application and financial package requirements
 - Student retention rates, particularly the matriculation rates of Latino students
- Coordinated with community agencies for the specific purpose of serving Latino families, in areas such as: Alternative Educational resources; Behavioral Health services; Community Home resources; and Medical Resources
- Conducted home visits by Student Support staff throughout the year to provide families with resources and to assist students in their academic and behavioral success
- Attended parent conferences and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings
- Communicated with parents and families through the department newsletter, brochures, pamphlets, and community bulletins
- In addition to MASSD family engagement activities, the District engages Latino families through Title I and a majority of Title I family engagement events are targeted towards Latino students and families.

These activities, as well as Title I family engagement activities, were and are provided using bilingual presenters, staff, and interpreters when necessary.

2. Online Resources – TUSDStats

TUSDStats has been in existence since 2003 and is an online tool for District parents and families to monitor students’ achievement, attendance, academic progress, and other information. Generally schools have been responsible for informing their respective students’ families about TUSDStats Parental Access Accounts. Teachers, counselors, office staff, and administrators at each site have access to print the information for parents/guardians to create accounts. The Student Support Services Departments actively inform parents of the value of using TUSDStats

Parental Access Accounts to monitor students' grades, attendances, and test scores. Through TUSDStats, parents can set up a parental account to view their student's information. The District describes parental accounts as follows: "When you create a TUSDStats Parental Account, you gain access to a world of data that can help you better understand your child's academic experience."

The District conducted a review of utilization of TUSDStats by race and ethnicity, by school, and by grade level. The evidence indicates that this powerful tool (TUSDStats) available to families is underutilized; utilization of this powerful resource for parents varied dramatically by grade level (and schools within grade levels), and by race/ethnicity as shown in the charts below:

Grade Span	by Parental Account at a Grade Level	Average Percentage of Parent Use	
K-5	.3% to 24.3%	7.2%	
K-8	3.8% to 33.4%	15.2%	
6-8	17.8% to 71.5%	42.9%	
9-12	40.6% to 96.8%	65.7%	
Alternative K-12	15.2% to 40%	27.4%	
Total District	.3% to 96.8%	29.8%	
K -5 Students (All)			
	# of Families that Accessed TUSDStats	Total # of Families	% of Families that Accessed TUSDStats
White/Anglo	625	5120	12.32%
African American	91	1910	4.76%
Hispanic	888	15,544	5.74%
Native American	41	1049	3.91%
Asian American	61	446	13.68%
Multi Racial	72	925	7.89%

6-8 Students (All)			
	# of Families that Accessed TUSDStats	Total # of Families	% of Families that Accessed TUSDStats
White/Anglo	1201	2182	56.60%
African American	256	877	29.42%
Hispanic	2191	6665	33.25%
Native American	113	487	23.41%
Asian American	82	229	35.81%
Multi Racial	115	300	38.33%

9-12 Students (All)			
	# of Families that Accessed TUSDStats	Total # of Families	% of Families that Accessed TUSDStats
White/Anglo	3056	3972	80.29%
African American	638	1148	58.54%
Hispanic	4744	7932	64.66%
Native American	207	419	53.46%
Asian American	302	453	68.87%
Multi Racial	215	318	70.44%

3. External Research of Best Practices

The District has long been committed to involving families as a part of supporting parents and guardians as they strive to encourage their children in school. The research described below on family engagement reveals many important lessons that can strengthen family engagement practices in the District, and will help the District differentiate between family involvement and family engagement. The District reviewed the following research and best practices:

a. Harvard Family Research Project

The District plans to focus family engagement on “learning-centric” opportunities. Utilizing the work from The Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP), the District hopes to strengthen the link to learning in family engagement. These principles have been adopted by America’s Promise Alliance, with which the District is aligned, as well as the National PTA. The HFRP policy brief titled *Seeing is Believing: Promising Practices for How School Districts Promote Family Engagement* pinpoints three core elements that are essential for engaging families:

1. Creating district-wide strategies
2. Building school capacity
3. Reaching out to and engaging families

b. Multicultural Partnerships Involve All Families (Hutchins, et al., 2012)

The NNPS book, *Multicultural Partnerships Involve All Families* (Hutchins, et al., 2012) features activities to help schools increase the involvement of parents with different backgrounds to promote more successful students. The recommendations reflect the National Networks of Partnership Schools at Johns Hopkins University guidelines for good partnership programs, including but not limited to:

- Welcome all families. Parents need to know that educators value and respect the work they do to care for and guide their children

- Communicate in languages that parents understand. This starts with clear English in messages and meetings with parents. This may require translators and interpreters to communicate with parents with limited English-speaking ability
- Provide parents with useful and timely information about school and district policies, programs for their children, and students' progress. Also, provide a contact person for parents to communicate with if they have questions.
- Organize an intentional, well planned partnership program to engage all families in their children's education at school and/or at home in ways that help all students do their best in school
- Incorporate student backgrounds and family cultures into the classroom curricula and in the school's program of family and community involvement. Teachers may use family and community "funds of knowledge" and resources to enrich the curriculum and boost students' learning.

c. Additional Parent and Family Involvement Practices

The following practices, organized under six categories, are based on the Ohio Board of Education's Parent and Family Involvement Policy, the National PTA's National Standards for Family-School Partnerships and Joyce L. Epstein's Framework of Six Types of (Parent) Involvement:

1. Create a welcoming school climate
2. Provide families information related to child development and creating supportive learning environments
3. Establish effective school-to-home and home-to-school communication.
4. Strengthen families' knowledge and skills to support and extend their children's learning at home and in the community
5. Engage families in school planning, leadership and meaningful volunteer opportunities
6. Connect students and families to community resources that strengthen and support students' learning and well-being

B. Recommendations for Reorganizing and/or Increasing Family Engagement Resources

The District assessed the internal data obtained from the various reviews in light of the research-based practices for family engagement to develop recommendations for reorganizing family resources.

Recommendation 1: Create District-Wide Strategies

The Review and Assessment revealed that District schools and departments provided multiple opportunities for family engagement. However, these efforts were not connected to one another as part of a comprehensive scheme, and often were focused on parental involvement rather than informing parents about student learning and the parents' role in their student's success. The District relied heavily in the past on Title 1 and Student Support Services to provide parent

educational opportunities. According to the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP), the first step in engaging families is creating district-wide strategies.

The National Networks of Partnership Schools stated that it is important to organize a well-planned partnership program to engage all families in their children's education at school and/or at home in ways that help all students do their best in school.

The District recommends creating district-wide strategies through the following approaches:

a. Promote a District Family Engagement Vision

This vision includes systems and structures that focus on student achievement and the impact of families on student learning. This will be accomplished through the following:

- To demonstrate its commitment to enhancing student success through family engagement, the District will create the infrastructure to support family engagement that is aligned with other district strategies, is a key component of the District's Five Year Strategic Plan, and will support the implementation of district-wide family engagement. This infrastructure includes staffing in place to ensure coordination of efforts, continuous quality improvement, and effective service delivery. The staffing structure includes an Assistant Superintendent for Equity that supervises the Director of Family and Community Engagement, who in turn supervises a Family Engagement Coordinator. The Director of Family and Community Engagement and the Family Engagement Coordinator will work closely with the Student Services Directors, Title I, and other departments and directly with schools to support the implementation of the Family Engagement Plan. The Director of Family and Community Engagement will coordinate district-wide family engagement activities such as: ESSL (English to Support Student Learning. The purpose of ESSL classes is to provide improved communication between parents and teachers to support academic student success, including USP topics such as student discipline, open enrollment, and ALEs; and Parental Access Class (this class has been made available at Open House at several schools this year. The Title I team works in school computer labs to teach parents how to use this service. Title I sends teams of staff to school events as invited to provide this service.)
- District Departments, Structures and Staff including Title I, Student Support Services, Professional Development, and others.
- Student Services and Partnership Centers ("Centers") (see details in Section III, below)
- Additional Family Engagement strategies targeting families of African American students that are culturally appropriate and linguistically friendly:
 - Specific strategies provided by Support Services for struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk African American students. The process for identifying the students who will be targeted for these strategies is the same process as outlined in the Dropout Prevention

- and Retention Plan and can be found in Appendix A: Process for Identifying Struggling Students.
- Quarterly Family Meetings to educate families of African American students regarding district opportunities and resources including Advanced Learning Experiences, Career and Technical Education, Tutoring, etc.
 - Additional Family Engagement strategies targeting families of Latino students that are culturally appropriate and linguistically friendly:
 - Specific strategies provided by Support Services for struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk Latino students. The process for identifying the students who will be targeted for these strategies is the same process as outlined in the Dropout Prevention and Retention Plan and can be found in Appendix A: Process for Identifying Struggling Students.
 - Quarterly Family Meetings to educate families of Latino students regarding district opportunities and resources including Advanced Learning Experiences, Career and Technical Education, Tutoring, etc.

District Professional Development.

The District is committed to partnering with families to ensure the success of all children. Partnerships ensure that families and schools are aligned and working together to support learning. The overarching strategy for the District will be to provide training for district staff on Supportive and Inclusive Learning Environments (SAIL)¹⁰. The District will use a “train the trainer” model. Classes will be offered both during the summer and the school year. The SAIL Professional Development modules have embedded the Danielson Framework for Teaching along with components of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. The fundamentals of SAIL include understanding and working with bias, understanding student characteristics and needs, and partnering with families. This SAIL training will be mandated for all certificated staff, administrators, and para professionals. With this training, strategies for how teachers and principals can learn from families regarding how to meet the needs of their children will be delivered. Family engagement training provides tools for staff to build relationships with families, and to offer information and experiences to families that are relevant to them. The Director of Family and Community Engagement, the Family Engagement Coordinator, and the Director of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Instruction will be responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the training relevant to family engagement.

Cross-departmental coordination to support effective implementation of the Family Engagement Plan.

The District recognizes that district-wide strategies can only be effective and efficient with intentional and clearly planned opportunities for cross-departmental collaboration and

¹⁰ The USP requires the District to provide training to certain staff on how to create supportive and inclusive learning environments. The District has labeled this training “SAIL” for Supportive and Inclusive Learning.

coordination. A plan for alignment among departments for family engagement activities is included in Appendix B: Strategies for Family Engagement Alignment.

b. Provide Robust and Pervasive Communication

Communication will be provided in relevant and appropriate languages that cut across all stakeholders including administrators, departments, school staff, families, and community members through:

- Parent Link (A system that provides a powerful communication platform with a full range of options to meet the unique needs of your District. From emergency messaging, to custom messages, language translation, and surveys, ParentLink gives your schools a proven, easy-to-use tool that gets information to the people who need it, when it's needed.)
- Family Engagement Website
- Community Partnerships, (faith-based groups, non-profits, etc.)
- Student Services and Partnership Centers (Family Centers) (see Section III for details)
- Surveys and feedback
- Additional outreach efforts will be made to families of African American students who are struggling, disengaged, and/or at risk through phone calls, emails, or home/work visits, etc.
- Additional outreach efforts will be made to families of Latino students who are struggling, disengaged, and/or at risk through phone calls, emails, or home/work visits, etc.

c. Data Collection and Analysis

In addition to tracking attendance and events, and to ensure reporting and accountability for family engagement activities throughout the District, the District will gather data to assess differences in behavior, knowledge, and attitudes among parents and school staff. Measures along the way to interpret progress will include review of the following data on family engagement (each can be tracked by student):

- Surveys and feedback
- Participation at Educational Opportunities
- Data from use of TUSDStats by parents

Data will be collected and analyzed to assess the effectiveness of the engagement initiatives for the African American and Latino families. The District will use student information systems such as TUSDStats and Grant Tracker.

Recommendation 2: Building School Capacity (to Engage Families)

Based on the Review and Assessment, there currently is limited communication among schools and departments about what is being provided for families and the impact it is having on student learning. According to the research, schools should strengthen families' knowledge and skills to support and extend their children's learning at home and in the community by organizing a well-planned partnership program to engage all families in their children's education at school and/or at home in ways that help all students do their best in school.

As part of a district-wide strategy to engage families in a learning-centric environment, the District will begin implementation of the Academic Parent Teacher Team (APTT) model developed by Dr. Maria Paredes (Creighton School District). Key components of this family engagement outreach model include building school capacity and structures which create opportunities and an environment of teachers and parents as partners in educating children.

a. In order to serve all families better, all District schools will:

- i. designate a family engagement point of contact
- ii. create a learning-centric environment to support the academic success of all students by implementing strategies such as the Academic Parent Teacher Team (APTT) model of parent engagement
- iii. provide training to parents at least twice per year (minimum once per semester) regarding curricular focus. A required element of these trainings for parents will be specific strategies along with providing materials/tools for families to employ at home to support student achievement in reading and/or mathematics using a model such as Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT). These events may be held during parent conferencing and/or other times.
- iv. participate in district training to ensure that parents feel welcomed and needed as partners in enhancing their children's learning
- v. provide information regarding parent education and resource opportunities in concert and coordination with Student Support and Partnership Centers

b. In order to better serve families of African American and Latino students, the District will:

- i. Hold quarterly events throughout the community. These sessions will inform parents of the programs and opportunities available for African American or Latino students, respectively. All family engagement staff and district Student Support Services staff assigned to schools will work collaboratively on these quarterly meetings. The focus of the parent quarterly sessions shall be to enhance and support relationships as well as the academic success of students especially identified as struggling, disengaged and/or at-risk of dropping out in an interactive engaging format. These quarterly events will include at least two types of documented additional outreach and support opportunities for Latino and African American students and their families and include topics such as:

- Advanced Learning Experiences
- Graduation, Matriculation & Student Retention
- College Preparation, Post-Secondary Matriculation & Retention
- Parent/Family Engagement Leadership & Partnerships
- Parent Teacher Conferences
- Academic Parent Teacher Teams
- Individual Data Talks with students and parents to review student test scores and/or graduation requirements.
- Parental Stats Informational sessions that explain how to navigate the Parental Access Account.
- Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards Informational sessions

c. In order to better serve families of African American and Latino students, all District certificated staff and administrators will receive training in Supportive and Inclusive Learning (SAIL) Environments, Partnering with Families Module that provides specific strategies to address engagement of African American and Latino families.

Recommendation 3: Engaging Families

Based on the Review and Assessment of the District, the majority of the family engagement efforts provided historically by the District have been focused primarily on family involvement in student activities rather than learning-centric family engagement. The Harvard Family Research Project found family engagement practices linked to learning have a greater positive effect on student outcomes. Providing learning opportunities discussed in Building School Capacity is vital to engage families in student focused learning.

The District is using the Multi Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) model to implement different types of family engagement. In order to remain consistent, the District will follow a tiered model for family engagement and support.

Type 1 family engagement involves general outreach to all families, with a focus on African American and Latino students and families, occurring mostly at school sites and family centers at times that are accessible to families. Type 1 family engagement includes activities such as: parent training, quarterly informational events, parent education and resource opportunities; and using multiple media to connect with families.

Type 2 family engagement involves specific outreach to the families of African American or Latino students who are struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk of dropping out. Type 2 family engagement includes specific activities related to the needs of the identified students as documented on the District's Student Equity and Intervention Request for Service form.

Family Engagement – Type 1

- a. All schools will provide training to parents at least twice per year (minimum once per semester) regarding curricular focus. A required element of these trainings for parents

will be specific strategies along with providing materials/tools for families to employ at home to support student achievement in reading and/or mathematics using a model such as Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT).

- i. Training for implementation of this model will be required – Proposed Training would be Train the Trainer Model.
 - ii. All schools in concert and coordination with Student Support and Partnership Centers will provide information regarding parent education and resource opportunities.
- b. Quarterly events will be held throughout the community. These sessions will inform parents of the programs and opportunities available for African American and Latino students.
 - c. Accessibility - In order to maximize parent participation, the sessions will take place at various times and may be connected to student related or community events within a positive supportive environment, particularly for families of African American or Latino students.
 - d. Scheduling - Event dates will be coordinated through the District Family Engagement Director and/or Family Engagement Coordinator.
 - e. Multiple media - Develop and use social media structures to connect with students and families in contemporary fashion. This may include Facebook, text messaging, mobile/smartphone applications (i.e. TUSD's Parent Link), media-based parent training and events. Family engagement opportunities and outreach may include:
 - webinar sessions for parent trainings linked to school websites
 - math websites for parents such as Khan Academy
 - strategies for parent student interactions in newsletters
 - inspirational texts or quotes for families to discuss
 - parent access to TUSDStats
 - administrative newsletter and website communications for parents and students

Family Engagement – Type 2

The District's African-American and Mexican American Student Services Departments, in conjunction with site administrators, Family Engagement Staff, and Title I staff, are primarily responsible for coordinating targeted parent outreach for African American or Latino students identified as struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk of dropping out.

1. Families of students identified as struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk of dropping out will receive outreach from District staff most closely aligned to students' identified demographic or academic need as possible.
 - a. Site staff including Title I family engagement, teachers, and other school staff will perform targeted outreach to families with students identified as struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk of dropping out.
 - b. Site staff will use the District's Student Equity and Intervention Request for Service referral form provides another opportunity to coordinate and communicate specific

outreach needs (form available to site staff at <http://intranet/interventionform.asp>). To ensure more comprehensive support, the District will add Language Acquisition and Exceptional Education to the list of departments from whom service requests may be submitted.

2. Outreach to families of students identified as struggling, disengaged, and/or at-risk of dropping out will be conducted to encourage attendance and engagement at site and district quarterly events, and may include direct mailing(s), home visits, and/or phone calls to targeted families. This outreach will be coordinated between school and district resource staff including Title I family engagement & district support staff. These communications will meet the District's language accessible standards for families.

The District recognizes that there are challenges faced when engaging families of struggling students and/or families who are dis-engaged. The District plans to address these barriers with specific strategies as outlined in Appendix C:

Recommendation 4: Monitoring for Effectiveness

The Review and Assessment revealed there is no system to provide consistent access to programs or a way of evaluating the effectiveness of programs. Currently, the District's major method for tracking family engagement is through sign-in sheets that are submitted to the Title I Department. Research supports data collection systems as a necessary component of ongoing evaluation, planning and improvement. To track family engagement data, the District will develop and implement ongoing assessments and create a schedule for monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendation 5: Expanding Student Services and Partnership Centers (District Family Centers)

The Review and Assessment revealed that the District's families come to the current family center sites to conduct very specific business. Staff members at these sites are specialists in their roles. For example, the emphasis at the Duffy Center is Child Find and Clothing Bank. The School Community Services site focuses on Open Enrollment and Magnet Applications for the District. The utilization of the two locations does not provide the comprehensive proactive family engagement that is needed to affect student achievement.

a. Better Marketing of Student Services and Partnership Centers

The District will ensure that all District staff are aware of the existence, and understand the role, of the Student Services and Partnership Centers within the community through the following:

- Staff Training
- Community Outreach

- Posters/Flyers in every school readily visible to families

b. Targeted purpose of the Student Services and Partnership Centers

The District will communicate the mission of the Student Services and Partnership Centers through multiple media. All Centers will have a baseline of services.

C. Reorganizing Family Engagement Resources, Programs, and Practices

Based on the recommendations discussed above, the District will reorganize current family engagement resources and programs to implement the best practices.

1. Resources

- Staff to implement the plan, including Title I staff, the Family Engagement Coordinator and other staff¹¹.
- District Parent Communication System to communicate to parents about emergencies.
- District Advisory Council (DAC)
- Student Support Services
- Clothing Bank
- School and Community Services
- Child Find
- School Community Partnership Council (SCPC)
- Deployment of Computer Kiosks in each school providing families with easy access to TUSDStats Parental Account, applications, and other District resources beginning 2014-15. The kiosks will be part of the District's effort to make each school site office welcoming and inviting where parents can drop in and connect with staff and resources.

2. Programs

- Parent Education will be offered throughout the District, and will include topics such as: English as a Second Language (ESL), Nutrition, Post-Secondary Education, Parenting, Leadership Classes, and Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT)
- Foster Ed – the District has entered into a partnership with FosterEd Arizona to increase the communication among foster families, teachers, CPS Specialists, and Mental Health providers. Traditionally this kind of engagement has been difficult for these high-risk students; but with the assistance of Social Media, teachers and school staff can communicate easily on subjects such as attendance, behavior, homework, how things are going, etc. In addition, FosterEd Liaisons will provide training for

¹¹ The District will require all Family Center Staff to be trained in language-accessibility no later than September 1, 2014, and staff members will be supervised initially by the FEC.

foster families on how to advocate for their foster child in the educational setting and how to access the resources available care through our Student Services and Partnership Centers.

III. Plan to Expand and Develop New Student Service and Partnership Centers

The following plan outlines how the District will expand its existing Family Center(s), and/or develop new one(s), and operate them for the benefit of the District's students and their families. The District Family Centers will be known as the Student Service and Partnership Centers (SSPC) and includes (A) the location of the Centers, (B) the creation and distribution of new or revised materials, (C) strategies to create welcoming environments and relevant educational activities, and (D) strategies for how principals and teachers can learn from families.

A. Location of Centers

1. Centers in SY 2013-14

In March 2013, the District initiated discussions to create and/or expand the SSPC (Family Centers) starting in the beginning of SY 2013-14, and to develop a District Family Center Plan. The initial proposal was to develop the first center at the District main offices and a second center at the site of Duffy Student Service Center. The District has made significant improvements to the original site, and opened a second site. The District currently offers support services, and provides information to families, at two locations. The first Center is School Community Services (SCS) at 1010 E. Tenth Street where approximately 10,000 families visit annually. The second Center opened in November 2013 at Duffy Student Service Center at 655 N. Magnolia Avenue. Family and Community Outreach serves approximately 4,000 students on site each year through the services of the Clothing Bank and another 1,000 are served through the Child Find program.

The initial plan was for the Centers to provide information, resources, support, and access to information for students and families. The existing sites already have a high volume of family and student traffic and the District's intent was to take advantage of this existing traffic to share information and resources with families who already are going to these offices for services. Both buildings have high visibility, are easily accessible, and provide access to other materials. The sites were to have computers for online access, access to open enrollment/magnet applications, information about schools and opportunities throughout the District, and other resource and support materials.

What has become apparent is that families come to the current sites to conduct very specific business. Staff members currently working at these sites are specialists in their roles. For example, the emphasis at the Duffy Center is Child Find and Clothing Bank. The School Community Services site focuses on Open Enrollment and Magnet Applications for the District. The utilization of the two locations does not provide the level of proactive family engagement the District envisions as necessary to affect student achievement.

2. Centers in SY 2014-15 and SY 2015-16

After a review of District demographic data, the District has determined a need to establish Centers in strategic locations in the community starting in SY 2014-15.

The District envisions the Student Services and Partnership Centers as a two year rollout. In school year 2014-2015 the District will create two additional Centers. One will be in the southwest area of the District where a large population of the district continues to grow. A Director of Student Support Services will provide administrative oversight for the Center. Concurrently, the District will establish a Center in an area in the proximity of South Tucson, where the highest percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch attend school. The District will place another Director of Student Support Services on that campus for oversight.

In SY 2014-2015 discussions will take place in consultation with external expert(s), research and other information such as the district demographic study to determine the appropriate placements for the third and fourth additional Centers in SY 2015-16. In SY 2015-2016 these two Centers will be established based on the discussions and analysis of data with the external expert(s).

B. Creation and Distribution of New or Revised Materials

Each Center will have a baseline of services that will be common to all and language accessible. Families will have full access to new or revised materials about programs and educational options throughout the district, such as:

- As described in the Outreach and Marketing plan an information guide will be provided to all families (see page 6 and 7 of Outreach and Marketing Plan)
- Student Assignment Options: School Choice; Open Enrollment; Magnet Schools; and Dual Language
- Transportation
- Advanced Learning Experiences (ALE's) (including the informational sessions on ALEs, information on UHS and the complaint process related to ALEs). The Advanced Learning Experience Access and Recruitment Plan describes ALE materials (pages 22 – 24)
- Guidelines for Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSSR)
- Curricular and Student Support Services, including Behavioral Support Services
- African American Student Support Services
- Mexican American Student Support Services
- Student Equity and Intervention
- Family and Community Outreach Department Brochure
- Culturally Relevant Courses
- Policies related to inclusion and non-discrimination
- Career and Technical Education (CTE)
- College and Career Readiness Resources
- Resources from local colleges and universities

- District Information Catalogue
- Exceptional Education
- Resources for Homeless, Neglected, and Delinquent Students
- Preschool Opportunities
- Before and After School Care
- Information about Grad Link2
- Community Schools
- Interscholastic Activities
- Dropout Prevention Services
- Educational Options for ELL Children

C. Strategies to Create Welcoming Environments and Relevant Educational Activities

The District will provide the following resources to create a welcoming environment at the Centers:

- District staff members who can explain the many educational and support options available, and to help families navigate our school system
- A parent training room with media set up for presenting workshops
- Space for child care
- Computers with full access to the Internet; District website; online applications to Magnet Programs, Open Enrollment, and Transportation; and TUSDStats (Details of access to technology is provided in the District's Technology Condition Index pages 1 and 5).
- To address conditions of the technology gap where lower-income students and families do not have ready access to the technology, the District will provide training to families through the Family Centers on how to use certain technological tools (internet, TUSDStats, filling out FASFAs, etc.) to better engage with their child's school, teachers, etc.
- Space available for community resources and services
- Access to clothing with resources from District and community partners

District human resources may be reallocated and/or relocated and housed throughout the Centers, including Title I and non-Title I staff, with the ability and skill to provide proactive and language-accessible support for our families. In the past, these services have been school site specific and dependent on building collaboration with schools. While school-site-specific programs will continue to build and improve, the District envisions the SSPCs (Family Centers) as being open to all, with a community outreach philosophy. Evaluating the metrics to be determined based on community needs, the District will assess whether SSPCs (Family Centers) should be consolidated or relocated. The District will provide staff members and services within the communities we serve. The District will create a District calendar of educational opportunities that will be offered at convenient times for families. These workshops will be available at all Centers. Examples of topics for the educational opportunities are college enrollment process, bullying and cyberbullying, drug prevention, and gangs/gang culture.

The development and coordination of these Centers will allow community resources to provide support to families. The District Family Engagement Coordinator will help coordinate committee work such as District Advisory Committee and School Community Partnership Council to ensure district-wide diverse representation of schools and families. The District Director of Family and Community Engagement and the FEC will be the lead in recruitment and collaboration with community groups and non-profit organizations.

A part of this coordination will allow the same services to be offered at each of the centers on a rotating basis. For example, the District may offer an anti-bullying workshop at Center 1 for a week, and then offer it the following week at Center 2, and so forth. Rotating services will be provided as a consistent resource to all District families and students in locations convenient to them.

D. Strategies for How Principals and Teachers can Learn from Families

The District is committed to partnering with families to ensure the success of all children. In having partnerships with families, students, families and schools are aligned and working together to support learning. The overarching strategy for the District will be training on Supportive and Inclusive Learning Environments (SAIL). The fundamentals of SAIL include understanding and working with bias, understanding student characteristics and needs, and partnering with families (Details of the SAIL training is developed through the Cultural Responsive Pedagogy and Instruction Director). This training will be mandated for all district employees. With this training, strategies for how teachers and principals can learn from families regarding how to meet the needs of their children will be delivered. The goal of the family engagement training is to provide tools for educators to welcome, build relationships, and offer information and experiences in which families are interested.

IV. Sharing Enrollment Information with families (District's Marketing, Outreach, and Recruitment Plan).

This Plan includes specific strategies to share enrollment information with families, including specific strategies for sharing enrollment information with African-American and Latino families. Specific recruitment strategies are described in detail in the District's revised Marketing, Outreach, and Recruitment Plan.

The Marketing, Outreach, and Recruitment Plan includes specific strategies that support the requirements of the USP, such as:

- English and Spanish language TV ads to air in mainstream and Spanish language media.
- Radio ads highlighting opportunities for students in mainstream and Spanish language media.

- Television ads and print ads featuring actual TUSD students, parents and teachers, with a focus on racial and ethnic diversity so all audiences see themselves represented in the TUSD brand.
- Direct mail campaign to highlight learning opportunities to African-American families; strategically targeted to known addresses.
- Direct mail campaign for magnet schools; strategically targeted to certain zip codes to maximize integrative effects.
- Internet outreach, including space on popular banners and social media outreach
- Event marketing – leveraging community events with high attendance to reach a large number of families.

The director of student assignment, the Director of Family and Community Engagement, and other appropriate staff will collaborate to engage with community groups and community members to share information and involve local stakeholder organizations in the enrollment process. District staff will be trained to actively engage community members (with an emphasis on African-American and Latino families) to inform them about educational options available in the District.

The District will seek partnership with other organizations such as the City of Tucson, Pima County Libraries, Pima Community College, chambers of commerce, youth clubs, and others to display and distribute recruitment and promotional materials throughout the community, and to involve them in the enrollment process (as coordinated through the director of student assignment and the family engagement director). A list of possible organizations/sites is being compiled to determine if TUSD would be allowed to place materials at their sites. The number of sites that will actually be used has not yet been determined, but it must be kept to a reasonable number that can be monitored and stocked. The Family Center personnel will be responsible for keeping the chosen sites stocked.

V. Plan to Track Data on Family Engagement

To track family engagement data effectively, the District will develop and implement ongoing assessments and create a schedule for monitoring and evaluation.

- A. The District will conduct ongoing assessments and will use multiple forms of data including:
 - Surveys similar to the Harvard Graduate School of Education Pre-K-12 Family-School Relationships Survey. This survey will be used to measure change over time and evaluate the impact on student learning.
 - TUSDStats and Parent Link on parent usage including disaggregation of usage by African American and Latino families

- TUSD School Quality Survey
- Title 1 Family Engagement Documents
- School Family Engagement Activity Report
- Student Service and Partnership Center usage
- Feedback from Family Events and Trainings

B. Schedule of data collection

- Feedback form after each Family Event and Training
- Schools will submit Family Engagement Activity Report monthly
- Director of Family and Community Engagement reviews quarterly Family Engagement Data (by school and district-wide)
- District Parent Surveys will be analyzed annually
- The Director of Family Engagement and the Family Engagement Coordinator, in collaboration with an external expert, will review district data for effectiveness and make annual recommendations for possible revision of the Plan where appropriate to provide improvement.

Appendix A: Process for Identifying Struggling Students

Background:

In SY 2013-14, the District piloted automatic identification of students for interventions (using a system in Mojave called WatchPoint) based on criteria in three areas: 1) grades; 2) overall attendance; and 3) behavior. Based on the first semester data, analysis revealed that student identification based on the academic threshold of “two Fs” is over-identifying students, particularly at the high schools, while the “3 days of unexcused absences per week” threshold was only identifying very few students as having attendance problems. The changes to the discipline code enacted in 2013-14 also seemed to have reduced the number of out-of-school suspensions compared to previous years.

Based on this data, and on observing best practices in other school districts, the District will make the following changes to its practices for identifying students in need of intervention for SY 2014-15:

- 1) Use individual course absence data, not overall absence data, for middle and high school students
- 2) Combine the individual course absence data with the grades data and only automatically identify students who are failing a course **and** excessively not attending a course
- 3) Continue to use behavior data to identify students automatically
- 4) Explore adding other sources of data to enhance automatic identification, including benchmark and other standardized tests
- 5) Align automatic student identification with the MTSS (Multi-Tier System of Support) so the automatic identification will help to place students into either tier two or tier three support

The District will continue to refine the WatchPoint system to ensure that the data points are identifying “At Risk” students and interventions are being implemented.

Based on the Student Support Review and Assessment and other research (Kennelly & Monrad, 2007) (Heppen & Therriault, 2008), the District will implement specific supports and interventions for identified “At-Risk” students. The District will also focus specific supports and interventions for schools whose data supports the need for additional assistance. By targeting supports and interventions, the District will seek to meet the goals stated above.

Appendix B: Strategies for Family Engagement Alignment

USP Activity	Complimentary Factors (IP) USP	Coordination	Timeline
<p>Provide information to African American and Latino families and community members throughout the District about educational opportunities, enrollment options.</p>	<p>FACE Plan (TBD) VII.C.1.a.ii</p> <p>MORE Plan (IP: II.12) II.I.1.a-f, II.I.2</p> <p>CMP (Magnet Schools: Strategies and Processes for Integration. C.3. pgs.14-17)</p>	<p>Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Coordinator (TBD), Damon Jackson (Chief Information Officer), Martha Taylor (Director of Advanced Learning Experiences), Vicki Callison (Director of Magnet Programs), Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) meet quarterly to review information resources (informational guide), revise resources as needed, create distribution plan, implement distribution plan, and monitor progress. Collaborate in planning and implementing a community meeting and informational session regarding educational opportunities and enrollment options in geographically diverse District locations.</p>	<p>Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly</p>
<p>Provide access at Family Centers to computers and staff support for families to complete and submit open enrollment/magnet applications online, and provide support to families to learn how to submit applications</p> <p>Recruit a racially and ethnically diverse student body to its</p>	<p>FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.f</p> <p>Student Assignment Plan, (IP: II.12) II.E.2, II.I.c</p>	<p>Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Coordinator (TBD), Damon Jackson (Chief Information Officer), Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) meet quarterly to review data (number of families requesting computer access to submit online application and number of families receiving support with application completion) and monitor progress of supporting families with applications.</p>	<p>Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly</p>

magnet schools and programs through Family Centers and other recruitment strategies			
Provide information about free transportation to families	FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.ii Transportation Plan (IP: III.4) III.A.5	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Coordinator (TBD), Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) meet quarterly to review information resources, revise, create distribution plan, implement distribution plan, and monitor progress.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly
Provide training for school site principals to build and foster professional learning communities to develop strategies to encourage and provide space, resources, and support for constructive teacher-family interactions and how to learn from families regarding how to meet the needs of their children	FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.vii Administrators and Certificated Staff Plan IV.I.4 PLC Training (IP: IV.28)	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Coordinator (TBD), Richard Foster, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) Richard Foster collaborate to ensure principal trainings include content as outlined in USP.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly
Provide information to African American and Latino families regarding Advanced Learning Experiences (ALE), including informational sessions on GATE, ACs, UHS, and the parent complaint process related to	FACE Plan (IP:TBD) VII.C.1.a.ii ALE Plan Section (IP: V.4, V.9) V.A.II.d.i-iii, V.A.II.e	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family and Community Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Helen LePage (GATE Coordinator), Martha Taylor (Director of Advanced Learning Experiences), Dean Packard (Principal, UHS), Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) coordinate to distribute accessible	Collaboration meetings will begin October 6, 2014, and will continue as needed. Distribution of materials will be on-going through the SY as needed.

ALEs		<p>materials describing the District's ALE offerings by content, structure, requirements, and location. Collaborate in planning and implementing a community meeting and informational session regarding ALEs in geographically diverse District locations.</p> <p>Team will review the ALE parent complaint process and will revise if necessary. Team will disseminate information regarding this process at all school sites, Family Centers, District Office, and on the website.</p>	Information meeting will be offered in January/February before the registration process for the next SY begins.
Provide information to families regarding educational opportunities for their ELL children, including the availability of dual language programs and other programs designed for ELLs	<p>ALE Plan (IP: V.11) V.C.1</p> <p>FACE Plan (IP:TBD) VII.C.1.a.vi</p>	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Ignacio Ruiz (Language Acquisition Director), Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) meet quarterly to review information resources, revise, create distribution plan, implement distribution plan, and monitor progress.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly
Provide information to families regarding culturally relevant courses	<p>Student Support and Engagement Plan (IP: V.28-29) V.E.4.c, V.E.6.a.i-ii</p> <p>FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.v</p>	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Clarice Clash, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) meet quarterly to discuss how the District will inform parents of the courses, create a plan to inform, implement the plan, and monitor progress. Team will collaborate to organize an event (such as an Open House) to introduce families to the CRC courses and to provide information to families and the community about culturally relevant and responsive pedagogy.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly

Hold quarterly events for Latino students and families	Student Support and Engagement Plan (V.38) V.E.8.d FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.v	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) collaborate in planning and implementing Quarterly Events and host some events at Family Centers.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly
Hold quarterly events for African American families and students (FACE Plan VII.C.1.a.v)	Student Support and Engagement Plan (V.32) V.E.7.d	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, and Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director) collaborate in planning and implementing Quarterly Events and host some events at Family Centers	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly
Provide parents with information about the college enrollment process and disseminate such information at the Family Centers.	Student Support and Engagement Plan FACE Plan (IP:TBD) VII.C.1.e	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) collaborate in planning and implementing Parent University Team collaborates in establishing and maintaining partnerships with local colleges and universities and in distributing relevant information regarding college enrollment at Family Centers.	Begin August 8, 2014, ongoing as needed
Provide language accessible training for all personnel involved in family engagement initiatives and implement the Multi-Tier System of Support (MTSS) Structure to address	Student Support and Engagement (IP: V.17) V.E.2.c FACE (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.vii	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) review plan to implement the MTSS at schools and the language accessible training for all	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly

family engagement at all schools.		personnel involved in family engagement initiatives.	
All elementary schools will provide informational sessions to parents at a minimum of once per semester regarding curriculum focus.	Student Support and Engagement (IP: V.17) V.E.2.c FACE (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.d	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) create guidance and design PD that will be provided to schools to build site capacity in engaging families during informational sessions School principals responsible for implementing informational sessions using guidance.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing as needed
All schools will hold regular “Parent Academies” run by well-trained parent leaders to provide parents with the skills necessary to support their children’s academic success and to provide a forum for continuous feedback on District-related initiatives.	FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.e Student Discipline Plan (IP: V.32, V.38) V.E.7.d, V.E.8.d	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) create guidance and design PD that will be provided to schools to build site capacity in engaging families during Parent Academies School principals, Community Reps collaborate to implement informational sessions using guidance.	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing as needed
Provide Disciplinary Information Sessions to students/parents	Student Discipline Plan (VI.5-6) VI.D.1-2	Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Title 1 staff, Roxanne Begay-James (Student	Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly

<p>Provide the Student Discipline Handbook and related documents to families in all major languages</p>	<p>FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.iv</p>	<p>Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) create guidance for site administrators to use when providing Disciplinary Information Sessions to parents/students (including strategies for documentation)</p> <p>School principals, Learning Support Coordinators, and Community Reps collaborate to implement informational sessions using guidance.</p>	
<p>Same Provide information to families regarding voluntary tutoring and extra-curricular opportunities for their children, including the availability of transportation</p>	<p>Extracurricular Plan (IP: VIII.2-4) VIII.A3-5</p> <p>FACE Plan (IP: TBD) VII.C.1.a.v</p>	<p>Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Director (TBD), Family Engagement Coordinator (TBD), Herman House (Director of Secondary Schools), Title 1 staff, Roxanne Begay-James (Student Equity Director), Jimmy Hart (Student Equity Director), Tsuru Bailey-Jones (Student Equity Director), and Maria Figueroa (Student Equity Director) meet quarterly to review information resources, revise, create distribution plan, implement distribution plan, and monitor progress.</p>	<p>Begin October 6, 2014, ongoing quarterly</p>

Appendix C: Strategies to Address Family Engagement Barriers

Challenges	Strategies to Address Challenges
<p>Some school sites and staff lack skills and dispositions needed to engage families as partners</p> <p>Target audience: District staff and community leaders</p>	<p>District staff will receive training to increase their capacity to partner with families and adopt a strengths-based approach¹²</p> <p>District staff will receive training to increase their skill in creating welcoming environments, learning from families, and to offer experiences and information that are relevant to families</p> <p>Engage community leaders to assist the district in providing culturally appropriate strategies</p>
<p>Families may have difficulty navigating the school system</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>District staff will be in place at school sites and at Family Engagement Centers that will be available to support families in navigating the school system</p> <p>District will provide robust and pervasive communication, including: website, ParentLink, surveys to allow parents to provide feedback, and strategies specific to families of students who are struggling through phone calls, emails, and home/work visits.</p>
<p>Families may need ideas and strategies about how to participate in their child's</p>	<p>Family Engagement Centers will host regular workshops for families to learn</p>

¹² Widely used in the social service sector, a strengths-based approach “refers to policies, practice methods, and strategies that identify and draw upon the strengths of children, families, and communities. Strengths-based practice involves a shift from a deficit approach, which emphasizes problems and pathology, to a positive partnership with the family. The approach acknowledges each child and family’s unique set of strengths and challenges, and engages the family as a partner” (retrieved from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/acloserlook/strengthsbased/strengthsbased1.cfm>, August 29, 2014)

<p>education and academic success</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>about strategies to support their child’s learning, with specific focus on math and literacy.</p> <p>Sites will provide training to parents twice per year regarding curricular focus.</p>
<p>Families may lack child care during events/trainings</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>District will provide child care during parent trainings offered at Family Engagement Centers</p>
<p>Families may lack access to computers with full access to the Internet; District website; online applications to Magnet Programs, Open Enrollment, and Transportation; and TUSDStats</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>Computer access available at Family Engagement Centers with staff available to assist families in navigating various online resources</p>
<p>Families may lack skills or knowledge on how to use certain technological tools (internet, TUSDStats, filling our FASFAs, etc.) to better engage with their child’s school, teachers, etc. to improve access to schools or to on-line communication</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>Parent trainings and staff available at Family Engagement Centers to</p>
<p>Families may lack access to community resources and services</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>Provide referrals and follow up to families as well as co-located resources at Family Engagement Centers</p>
<p>Families may need clothing for children</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>Continue and expand TUSD Clothing Bank</p>
<p>Families may need language-accessible support related to lack of facility with English</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>District will provide English to Support Student Learning to improve communication between parents and teachers to support student academic success</p>

<p>Families may lack access to organized educational opportunities at times that are convenient for them</p> <p>Target audience: Families</p>	<p>Provide educational opportunities at Family Engagement Centers at times that are convenient for families, including courses offered by the district and community-based organizations</p>
<p>Families may lack access to information about the challenges that at-risk, struggling and/or disengaged students may face, such as bullying and cyber-bullying, drug prevention, gangs/gang culture</p>	<p>Provide educational opportunities and information at Family Engagement Centers, including courses offered by the district and community-based organizations. Calendar of opportunities will be available to all school sites as well as on the website.</p>
<p>Families may need knowledge about the college enrollment process</p>	<p>District will collaborate with local colleges and universities to provide parents with information about the college enrollment process and to offer an outreach event (Parent University)</p>

Exhibit H

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT



Tucson Unified is where
Students love to Learn
Teachers love to Teach
and People love to Work
We are Team TUSD

Complete Budget Book

Fiscal Year 2016-2017

Tucson Unified School District

FY 2016 - 2017 Adopted Budget

	M & O		Capital		Deseg		Title I		Other		Total Amount	Total FTE
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE		
Elementary Schools	59,685,314	1,290.14			8,467,703	165.71	8,004,385	163.58	15,776,960	149.67	91,934,361	1,769.09
K-8 Schools	25,830,139	545.44	3,318	0.00	5,144,197	96.10	3,519,854	66.51	5,214,826	27.45	39,712,335	735.50
Middle Schools	23,105,196	504.46	9,000	0.00	3,899,652	67.62	2,957,432	51.20	3,785,285	13.00	33,756,564	636.28
High Schools	48,717,303	1,026.45	10,000	0.00	7,119,466	112.00	3,604,721	58.68	11,219,091	74.98	70,670,581	1,272.11
Departments	89,778,086	1,186.35	11,975,694	5.00	38,480,868	376.70	10,882,819	88.69	203,237,468	593.17	354,354,936	2,249.90
Private Schools							689,074	0.00	221,240	0.00	910,314	0.00
Alternative Schools	2,700,489	61.79			599,161	8.26	146,887	2.20	723,737	13.68	4,170,274	85.93
Grand Total	249,816,528	4,614.63	11,998,012	5.00	63,711,047	826.38	29,805,172	430.86	240,178,606	871.95	595,509,365	6,748.81

Tucson Unified School District
FY 2016 - 2017 Adopted Budget

	M & O		Deseg		Title I		Other		Capital		Total	
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE
Elementary Schools												
Banks	990,247	20.60	97,370	2.00	172,224	3.47	229,204	1.90			1,489,045	27.97
Blenman	1,125,814	24.23	111,670	2.00	216,288	4.36	270,348	1.90			1,724,119	32.49
Bloom	1,091,026	25.91	102,700	2.00	146,510	2.46	409,688	5.90			1,749,924	36.27
Bonillas	1,320,244	29.57	407,995	8.00	237,563	4.99	344,648	3.65			2,310,449	46.21
Borman	1,352,896	27.00			106,320	2.60	369,250	3.50			1,828,466	33.10
Borton	1,150,099	24.27	589,542	12.01	100,118	1.35	429,202	2.90			2,268,962	40.53
Carrillo	987,951	20.15	517,554	8.48	86,385	1.16	154,166	0.60			1,746,056	30.39
Cavett	1,044,790	23.66	66,430	2.00	175,686	2.68	232,262	1.60			1,519,167	29.94
Collier	900,276	19.43					281,589	3.98			1,181,865	23.41
Cragin	1,283,624	28.78	52,260	1.00	158,527	3.09	371,541	1.60			1,865,953	34.47
Davidson	1,174,018	25.35	52,260	1.00	164,596	3.14	188,246	0.90			1,579,120	30.39
Davis	902,454	18.10	817,710	21.80	81,070	1.72	238,616	1.90			2,039,849	43.52
Drachman	1,170,680	25.61	503,491	11.21	153,087	3.03	279,103	2.40			2,106,362	42.25
Dunham	801,488	16.65			61,577	0.83	234,774	3.79			1,097,838	21.27
Erickson	1,301,629	26.60	51,200	1.00	217,671	4.80	307,404	2.90			1,877,904	35.30
Ford	1,021,383	21.35	48,360	1.00	157,825	3.32	230,234	1.90			1,457,801	27.57
Fruchthandler	961,188	19.60					281,552	2.90			1,242,740	22.50
Gale	1,183,143	25.85	250,894	6.50	407,443	7.66	469,419	2.50			1,751,822	34.78
Grijalva	1,767,170	36.00			148,902	12.99	434,833	7.28			2,894,925	52.66
Henry	1,189,030	26.79			120,198	2.20	219,792	1.60			1,772,765	47.06
Holladay	966,614	20.65	791,416	10.50	207,459	3.99	234,503	2.10			2,098,020	34.95
Howell	1,141,529	25.34	45,890	1.00	148,904	2.62	435,855	5.85			1,629,380	32.43
Hudlow	1,017,721	24.21	73,710	1.00							1,676,190	33.68
Hughes	1,029,006	21.65	50,960	1.00			377,072	5.30			1,457,038	27.95
Johnson	956,593	21.70	103,610	2.00	171,325	2.64	538,795	5.30			1,770,323	31.64
Kellond	1,600,850	35.25	281,606	4.60	144,866	1.95	588,133	7.53			2,615,455	49.33
Lineweaver	1,835,243	38.65	298,922	5.20	127,584	2.22	439,529	4.53			2,701,278	50.60
Lynn/Urquides	1,908,309	42.51	157,430	3.00	300,910	6.38	348,900	2.90			2,715,549	54.79
Maldonado	953,239	19.65	92,430	2.00	209,950	5.33	152,798	0.60			1,408,417	27.58
Manzo	1,113,234	23.65	102,560	2.00	157,873	2.83	202,360	1.60			1,576,027	30.08
Marshall	1,112,825	24.65			121,394	2.51	401,430	7.60			1,635,649	34.76
Miller	1,776,971	37.10	107,770	2.00	322,940	7.22	497,719	3.65			2,705,400	49.97
Mission View	933,616	20.52	52,759	2.25	125,846	1.96	256,800	1.60			1,369,021	26.33
Myers/Ganoung	1,664,415	39.10	118,170	2.00	233,219	4.58	293,700	1.90			2,309,504	47.58
Ochoa	774,670	15.90	337,855	2.75	123,354	2.43	211,994	1.35			1,447,873	22.43
Oyama	1,243,697	28.16	102,830	2.00	199,133	4.49	201,026	0.90			1,746,686	35.55
Robison	1,177,875	27.35	452,247	8.75	181,315	3.54	369,465	1.60			2,180,901	41.24
Sewell	1,150,308	26.34	52,910	1.00	85,056	1.45	246,494	2.40			1,534,767	31.19
Soleng Tom	1,253,767	25.10	45,760	1.00	159,665	3.09	556,621	10.68			1,856,148	36.78
Steele	1,196,486	26.65	54,860	1.00	179,424	3.22	153,554	0.60			1,629,883	32.59
Tolson	972,942	20.15	97,370	2.00	203,230	3.95	189,362	0.90			1,403,290	25.97
Tully	1,125,086	24.10	394,701	6.00							1,912,379	34.95
Van Buskirk	1,214,064	26.15	144,854	4.51	217,428	4.08	286,728	1.60			1,863,073	36.34

Tucson Unified School District
FY 2016 - 2017 Adopted Budget

	M & O		Deseg		Title I		Other		Capital		Total	
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE
Vesey	1,919,263	38.80	197,470	4.00	332,401	8.00	425,675	1.20			2,874,809	52.00
Warren	1,016,488	22.77	60,710	1.00	159,068	2.59	194,596	1.60			1,430,862	27.96
Wheeler	1,289,977	29.41	263,640	5.00	191,460	3.29	325,858	2.90			2,070,935	40.60
White	1,906,532	39.56	219,627	6.15	314,548	3.89	431,359	2.70			2,872,066	52.30
Whitmore	1,319,390	29.09	45,890	1.00	140,530	2.65	306,777	1.90			1,812,587	34.64
Wright	1,395,459	30.48	50,310	1.00	243,475	5.43	436,475	3.90			2,125,719	40.81
Elementary Schools Total	59,685,314	1,290.14	8,467,703	165.71	8,004,385	163.58	15,776,960	149.67			91,934,361	1,769.09

Tucson Unified School District
FY 2016 - 2017 Adopted Budget

	M & O		Deseg		Title I		Other		Capital		Total	
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE
K-8 Schools												
Booth/Fickett	3,496,038	74.27	1,009,682	16.72	490,954	8.90	690,142	4.40			5,686,817	104.29
Dietz	1,510,914	31.43	186,321	3.12	260,728	4.60	378,948	1.40			2,336,911	40.55
Hollinger	1,782,953	36.93	507,908	11.85	214,084	3.64	260,619	0.60			2,765,563	53.02
Lawrence	1,136,393	24.08	54,210	1.12	202,475	4.19	224,904	0.00			1,617,982	29.39
Mary Belle McCorkle K-8	2,427,265	50.61	233,849	5.80	394,680	6.94	589,932	5.95	3,318	0.00	3,649,044	69.30
Miles E	1,765,667	39.68					473,262	7.30			2,238,928	46.98
Morgan Maxwell	1,672,553	38.81	51,610	1.00	224,250	4.49	502,126	3.60			2,450,539	47.90
Naylor	2,058,015	45.01	344,739	5.72	315,743	5.15	281,810	0.60			3,000,308	56.48
Pueblo Gardens	1,280,868	26.23	63,050	1.12	221,165	4.37	192,422	0.60			1,757,505	32.32
Robins	1,637,103	34.04	76,700	1.12	125,369	2.44	341,499	0.60			2,180,671	38.20
Rose	2,211,350	44.88	236,210	4.62	344,081	8.18	365,702	1.20			3,157,343	58.88
Roskruge	2,246,753	45.73	1,239,490	25.59	319,685	5.17	411,301	0.60			4,217,229	77.09
Safford	2,604,268	53.74	1,140,427	18.32	406,640	8.44	502,159	0.60			4,653,494	81.10
K-8 Schools Total	25,830,139	545.44	5,144,197	96.10	3,519,854	66.51	5,214,826	27.45	3,318	0.00	39,712,335	735.50

Tucson Unified School District
FY 2016 - 2017 Adopted Budget

	M & O		Deseg		Title I		Other		Capital		Total	
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE
Middle Schools												
Dodge	1,244,152	25.08	320,813	3.87	108,092	1.46	221,694	1.00			1,894,750	31.41
Doolen	2,481,663	54.44	469,472	9.00	384,390	6.68	433,617	1.00			3,769,141	71.12
Gridley	2,409,516	55.32	72,302	1.40	147,076	2.98	418,748	3.00			3,047,642	62.70
Magee	2,109,012	46.54	142,110	2.60	172,769	2.83	355,127	2.00			2,779,018	53.97
Mansfield	2,492,420	53.98	738,176	12.72	337,272	6.37	450,939	1.00			4,018,807	74.07
Pistor	2,822,818	58.04	573,367	11.45	400,658	7.13	386,209	0.00			4,183,052	76.62
Secrist	1,891,655	41.86	138,523	3.02	264,913	5.15	280,911	1.00	9,000	0.00	2,585,002	51.03
Utterback	2,081,578	48.38	817,888	12.12	312,746	5.75	389,748	1.00			3,601,960	67.25
Vail	2,441,124	53.56	369,330	6.32	309,166	3.84	403,988	2.00			3,523,608	65.72
Valencia	3,131,261	67.26	257,670	5.12	520,349	9.01	444,304	1.00			4,353,584	82.39
Middle Schools Total	23,105,196	504.46	3,899,652	67.62	2,957,432	51.20	3,785,285	13.00	9,000	0.00	33,756,564	636.28

Tucson Unified School District
 FY 2016 - 2017 Adopted Budget

	M & O		Deseg		Title I		Other		Capital		Total	
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE
High Schools												
Catalina	3,711,929	83.74	393,416	7.30	390,494	5.90	1,627,713	14.68			6,123,551	111.62
Cholla	6,070,280	126.56	1,494,531	16.90	835,679	12.35	1,160,833	5.50			9,561,322	161.31
Palo Verde	4,746,476	100.84	786,058	12.30	575,873	9.75	1,339,695	9.50			7,448,101	132.39
Pueblo	5,987,804	125.44	1,111,459	19.10	869,707	15.34	985,143	3.50			8,954,113	163.38
Rincon	4,040,478	85.76	636,616	10.90	221,392	2.98	1,103,239	4.50			6,001,724	104.14
Sabino	3,264,901	65.14					681,369	7.60	10,000	0.00	3,956,271	72.74
Sahuaro	5,517,375	113.62	159,715	3.10			1,167,444	8.90			6,844,534	125.62
Santa Rita	2,610,577	55.54	126,165	2.50	239,200	4.39	628,532	5.70			3,604,474	68.13
Tucson	9,527,926	203.06	2,193,630	36.80	472,376	7.97	1,685,560	6.80			13,879,491	254.63
University	3,239,558	66.75	217,877	3.10			839,564	8.30			4,296,999	78.15
High Schools Total	48,717,303	1,026.45	7,119,466	112.00	3,604,721	58.68	11,219,091	74.98	10,000	0.00	70,670,581	1,272.11

Exhibit I

Section B

These proposed reductions or eliminations appear to require additional explanation. My guess at the logic of these proposals causes me to support them but my decision should not be based on guesswork.

Funding summer activities as proposed does not seem to be a reduction but it is a sensible expenditure. Indeed, one way almost all researchers agree is a way to narrow achievement gaps is to address the summer learning loss among low income students. More investments here would be productive.

I believe the reduction of master teachers from 8 to 6 (in two schools) is unwise. The strategy of which this is a part typically has four teachers or more involved because this is also a turnaround strategy and an incentive for excellent teachers to move to more challenging schools. If the schools involved are very small, three master teachers may be sufficient.

Is the pre-payment of legal fees for partial payment? If not, how does one provide an accurate estimate of the actual number of hours involved for external counsel?

Section C

With effective professional development, it is important to focus on improving classroom instruction when teacher evaluation identifies a need for improvement. As I point out in my annual report, this will be difficult because the district does not have mechanisms for identifying teacher weaknesses in instruction in a highly reliable way. Noticeably missing from the list is funding for professional learning communities. In order to function effectively professional learning communities must have time available for teachers to meet. But it appears that the amount of time teachers do meet varies considerably from school to school. And, if PLCs are to bring about change, it would be very surprising if they could do this without significant professional development targeted on the changes being proposed.

Section G

In this response to my concerns that the information in the first draft did not provide information necessary to make informed decisions, the district response is that Section B provides the necessary answers to these concerns. I fail to say that this Section B provides much guidance because the one sentence explanations—where there are such explanations—do not focus on the priorities in most cases. So far as I can tell, there's almost no relationship between my comments and the response to these comments. Similarly, in the district response to my comment with respect to student services, they basically finesse my suggestion. That is fine and it is their prerogative--but that is not a response.

Section E

Activity 106

The district characterizes my acceptance of the transition coordinator position as necessary in order to ensure successful implementation. In my comments, I noted that while I would not oppose such expenditures, that I believe that the schools already had a transition coordinator; that person had the title of principal.

I agree that each transition school should have a school community liaison and I look forward to learning how these individuals will “help teachers learn from families in order to facilitate learning”.

In the Court’s order on the transition plans, the importance of research supporting initiatives such as those identified-- Imagine Learning or Thinking Through Math— it said that research was needed to justify new initiatives. No research is cite but the district notes that research “shows that millennial learners oftentimes have higher levels of engagement if they utilize technology and technology device (sic)”. This is not sufficient to document a research based practice (most millennial’s will have, in any case, already graduated from TUSD).

Activity 201

Adding the untested self-contained GATE program at Robert Naylor is it is a decision I opposed in the past, if the justification is integration. The reason that Robert Naylor is not “integrated” now is that it has too many African American students. If the district believes that a significant number of white students will come to a school where Robert Naylor is located and is 30% white, I would be interested in seeing what evidence that this might occur. If the strategy is to reduce the proportion of African-American students, that is an interesting that questionable strategy. In any event, the benefits of integration have to do with both racial integration and socioeconomic integration. There is, as I have noted before, and argument for having an additional open access GATE program in a school that serves a significant number of African American students but the District should not count this as an integration initiative.

Activity 204

I assume that a “cusp” school is one that is close to being integrated. The transportation incentive applies only to racially concentrated schools. The district should explore the feasibility of providing transportation students who would, by attending a “cusp” school increase its integration.

Activity 402

This seems a useful strategy.

Activity 405

If the provision of the stipend of \$7500 was not adequate to achieve the goals of the teacher diversity plan, by what analysis does the district propose that reducing that amount to \$5000 address the challenges and getting teachers to move. I do think that a 20% increase in pay should be adequate but I am interested in knowing how the district reaches its conclusion. It might be more effective to rethink the teacher compensation plan as we go forward so that teachers who continue service in schools serving large numbers of students from low income families receive increases after some years of service become part of base salary and therefore part of retirement compensation which is provided by the state.

Activity 410 and 412

It is important that the number mentors provided to beginning teachers and first-year teachers serving in particular schools is sufficient for reasons I've explained elsewhere. I am concerned, however, that there is a caveat embedded in the text related to activity 412 in which the district appears to say that will use this point system for determining appropriate mentor-teacher ratio. That system was explained to me last year as a reason why the number mentors was adequate, even though it was not.

Activity 501

This seems a useful step.

Activity 504

I understand the District's commitment to two way dual language programs. But as this program was explained to me, it is very difficult for students who do not speak Spanish to benefit from a dual language program in Spanish if the enroll after the first two years or so. This means that dual language programs into TUSD may be productive of bilingualism but they are not likely to result in integration.

Activity 506

I think it is wise not to move forward on a district-wide early literacy program in the coming year. This will allow teachers to focus on enhancing math skills.

Activity 511

I would be interested to know how the district plans to employ MTSS facilitators with behavior an academic missions. I wonder if a stipend of \$1000 dollars for

MTSS Leads is adequate to sustain people in this work. Is it possible that middle and high school and MTSS Leads could be provided with reduced workloads? I certainly think they be provided with a larger stipend. Indeed, the size of the stipend suggests that there is not much for the Leads to do.

From Attachment A

RFI 985

The table does not provide info needed to determine the effectiveness of ALEKS. If the two non-ALEKS scores are meant as comparison groups, how comparable are the courses. If these are comparison groups, it appears that Algebra prep is as effective and may be more effective given the greater number of students taught.

RFI 980

EEI has been the core instructional model at TUSD for a while (despite the fact that another instructional model is what teachers are evaluated on—a potential legal issue). Are there no in-house experts after years of experience with EEI? Why is a consultant needed?

RFI 1000

The RFI asks for a reason why BOOST is not used more. The District's response is unresponsive. Why not, if it is effective?

RFI 1001

Creating a CRC Global Issues course--when there is strong evidence that the model focused on one ethnic group is very effective--makes no sense to me. If the Global Issues course is part of a multicultural effort, that is fine but it should not be counted as evidence that the district has met its obligations re CRC.

RFI1002

Please show, by using the current year, how the number of ITs needed is calculated and assigned given that only two fifths of an IT's time is available for mentoring and the many other tasks they perform. Perhaps I misread the explanation, but please demonstrate how this formula is being applied now.

RF 902 and 1013

I read this to say that the district is not going after any e-rate or Microsoft support funding. Is this right?

Reading Recovery

Why is this program so ineffective in TUSD compared to national findings?

Why are so few African American students involved given that RR was supposed to be implemented in schools with the highest number of AA students? Where was RR implemented?