

1 P. Bruce Converse (#005868)
bconverse@dickinsonwright.com
2 Timothy W. Overton (#025669)
toverton@dickinsonwright.com
3 **DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC**
1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1400
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4568
courtdocs@dickinsonwright.com
5 Phone: (602) 285-5000
Fax: (844) 670-6009

6 Robert S. Ross (#023430)
7 Robert.Ross@tusd1.org
Samuel E. Brown (#027474)
8 Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org
TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9 **LEGAL DEPARTMENT**
1010 East Tenth Street
10 Tucson, Arizona 85719
Phone: (520) 225-6040
11 *Attorneys for defendant*
Tucson Unified School District No. 1

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

14
15 Roy and Josie Fisher, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
16 v.
17 Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,
Defendants.
18
19 Maria Mendoza, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
20 v.
21 Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,
Defendants.

4:74-cv-0090-DCB
(Lead Case)

4:74-cv-0204 TUC DCB
(Consolidated Case)

22
23 **COMBINED RESPONSE TO**
SPECIAL MASTER’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
24 **RE DISTRICT’S SY2019-20 BUDGET [ECF 2231]**
and
25 **MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS’ OBJECTION**
TO DISTRICT’S SY2019-20 BUDGET [ECF 2237]

1 The District files this combined response to the Special Master's Report and
2 Recommendation regarding the District's Section 910G budget for SY2019-20
3 (ECF2231), and the Mendoza Plaintiffs' objections to that budget (EDF 237).
4

5 **A. The District Has Budgeted Amounts for an Adequate Number of Teacher**
6 **Mentors.**

7 The District included funds in its SY2019-20 budget for 28 teacher mentors to
8 provide support to first and second year teachers in the District.

9 The Court-imposed formula requires one teacher mentor for every ten first year
10 teachers in racially concentrated or underperforming schools, and a one to fifteen ratio for
11 any other first or second year teachers. [ECF 2086 at 8.]

12 As of July 22, 2019, the District has 50 first year teachers under contract to teach
13 at racially concentrated or underperforming schools, and 135 other first or second year
14 teachers. Applying the formula adopted by the Court, the District need only budget for 14
15 teacher mentors. Accordingly, the number of teacher mentors included in the SY219-20
16 budget is more than adequate, and provides a cushion against the subsequent hiring of
17 additional first or second year teachers later in the school year.

18 **B. The District Has Budgeted for Adequate Staff for the Family and Community**
19 **Engagement Department.**

20 During last two school years, the District's Family and Community Engagement
21 Department has operated with staff consisting of a director, three coordinators, five
22 school community liaisons, four monitor/janitors for the Family Resource Centers, one
23 administrative assistant and a data entry clerk. Over the past two years, in addition to its
24 regular day-to-day operations, the department has spent considerable amounts of time
25 developing improved tracking systems, guidelines for school family engagement
26

1 activities, and conducting training for school staff involved in family engagement
2 activities, which have now been accomplished. As a result, the District has substantially
3 expanded its capacity to track and report on the occurrence and participation in family
4 engagement activities, and reduced time and effort needed to gather this information in
5 the future. The District expects that substantial staff time heretofore devoted to these
6 developmental activities can now be directed towards monitoring and supporting school
7 staff in implementing the District guidelines, and to other central FACE department
8 activities.

9
10 However, the Special Master recommends that the District budget and hire three
11 additional FTE employees for the FACE Department, to monitor and support individual
12 school compliance in implementing the school family engagement guidelines, each
13 responsible for monitoring and supporting 30 or less schools.

14 In response, the District has added two additional coordinators to the FACE
15 Department budget, paid entirely by Title I funds. There will now be five coordinators
16 who report to the director of the department. Each coordinator will be assigned to
17 monitor and support the schools in one region of the District (about 17 schools). Each
18 coordinator will have other duties, but monitoring and support of the schools in their
19 region will be a primary responsibility for each coordinator. The District believes that
20 this is more than sufficient, and that the Section 910(G) budget for Family and
21 Community Engagement is adequate.

22 **C. The District Has Budgeted Adequate Amounts for Completion Plans.**

23 Both the Special Master and Mendoza Plaintiffs complain that the budget does not
24 contain specific line items devoted to completing the orders of the Court set out in ECF
25 2123. However, other than specifically asserting that the Family and Community
26

1 Engagement Department needs more FTEs to accomplish its mission, no specific
2 examples are given.

3 The District has constructed the SY19-20 Section 910(G) budget with full
4 awareness of the needs of the projects and plans ordered by the Court last September.
5 The budget represents the District's best judgment on allocation of limited funds,
6 balancing need that exceeds availability on almost every dimension. Few if any of the
7 projects and plans were of a nature that can be identified in specific budget lines of the
8 Section 910(G) budget. Programmatic change should not be conflated with budgeting
9 change. Obviously, some (but only some) programmatic change results in spending
10 funds differently, but even where funds are spent differently to accomplish programmatic
11 change this may or may not appear changes in the budget, and often will not require a
12 new specific budget line item.

13 Some examples will serve to illustrate. First, the Court ordered the District to
14 create a new 3+ year integration plan and comprehensive magnet plan. Though this
15 required huge staff effort to undertake the study, it has largely been accomplished in the
16 SY18-19 school year (by staffers who worked extraordinarily hard on top of their regular
17 duties to complete the task). So the cost of developing the plans will not impact the
18 SY19-20 budget. More fundamentally, though, implementing the plans does not
19 necessarily show up as a separate entry in the SY19-20 budget. On the magnet side, the
20 new plans (to be filed by September 1, 2019) specify the conditions for creating a new
21 magnet, the process to go through when the District decides to implement a new magnet,
22 how the District supports and evaluates magnets on an ongoing basis, and the conditions
23 for terminating magnet status of a school. None of these, once adopted, necessarily
24 involves a change in a specific line item for the SY2019-20 budget, and there is (and
25

1 need not be) a specific line item for implementing the new magnet plan. On the non-
2 magnet side, as a result of the Court order, the District has developed academic
3 improvement and integration plans for each of its non-magnet schools. Many of those do
4 not require immediate budget changes (they may require existing employees to change
5 the focus of their activities, emphasizing some things more and others less). In any event,
6 even if budget changes were implicated, those changes would be in individual non-
7 magnet regular school budgets which are not part of the Section 910(G) funds and
8 budget, and thus not part of this USP budget process.

9 As another example, the revised ALE Policy Manual, which the Court envisioned
10 as “the vehicle by which the District shall provide a record sufficient for determining
11 unitary status,” “codifying effective strategies as ALE policy,” has required significant
12 staff effort in SY18-19, but does not necessarily imply major budget line item changes
13 for SY2018-19, or even monetary changes within budget lines. It may mean that certain
14 approaches and methods may be emphasized or practices changed, but that may not affect
15 staffing or change budget items.

16 Some ECF 2123 requirements were already implemented in SY18-19 and do not
17 require changes for SY2019-20. For example, the Special Master’s discipline
18 recommendations made in February, 2018, later adopted by the Court in ECF 2123, were
19 implemented in SY2018-19, with the creation of the Student Relations department, led by
20 a director and with a coordinator for support, and do not require major budget changes in
21 SY2019-20. Similarly, the Special Master’s extracurricular recommendations, made in
22 February, 2018, and later adopted by the Court in September, 2018 (which had deadlines
23 within SY2018-19, were also implemented last year, and do not need budget changes this
24 year. In other circumstances, the SY2019-20 budget does in fact reflect changes to
25

1 accomplish the Court's orders. For example, the budget includes a position in the
2 Desegregation Department focusing primarily on recruitment for the teacher diversity
3 plan and the grow-your-own programs.

4
5 **D. Magnet Funding Amounts Were Carefully Reviewed, Line by Line, in Light**
6 **of Academic Performance Assessed Through Multiple Sources.**

7 Mendoza Plaintiffs assert, incorrectly, "*every single magnet school* is expected to
8 have the same budget it had last year." Mendoza Plaintiffs conflate "budget" with
9 "budget amount." The budget materials provided during the process clearly showed
10 differences in each school's budget between years, even where the *budget amount*
11 remained constant. Based on this faulty premise, Mendoza Plaintiffs incorrectly assume
12 that since *budget amounts* did not change, the District did not assess integration or
13 academic performance. However, in reality, magnet schools and the magnet department
14 engage in an annual 4-6 month process of assessing academic and integration progress,
15 evaluating program and human resource effectiveness, and developing funding
16 allocations for the subsequent year. The Special Master and Mendoza Plaintiffs are
17 incorrect in assuming that because dollar amounts remained the same, the District did not
18 conduct meaningful need assessments.

19 The Court need look no further than the Magnet Site Plans (MSPs) for evidence of
20 the District's efforts to conduct assessments to inform MSPs. Each magnet school
21 identifies patterns and trends through the Arizona Department of Education's
22 Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) process to identify school strengths and
23 weakness across six School Improvement Action Plan (SIAP) Principles. Each magnet
24 plan builds academic achievement strategies and efforts around three of the six principles
25 (see, for example, Bonillas MSP, pg. 6 "B. Actions to Improve Academic Quality," Ex.
26 X, 2019-20 MSPs). Each magnet school aligns its MSP with its SIAP, and the CNA

1 informs the funding needs for both plans. Schools begin the CNA process as early as
2 September, and conclude the process in early spring in time to inform budgets.

3 In addition to the extensive CNA process, the magnet department engages magnet
4 schools in a parallel process to assess magnet staffing, programs, data, effectiveness, and
5 needs based through the lens of the MSPs and magnet budgets. This process includes:

6 **Monthly site visits.** The magnet department observes classrooms (through the
7 observation and reflection cycle), analyzes MSP implementation progress, reviews
8 outcome data (DIBLES, AzMERIT, etc.), and evaluates monthly expenditures.

9 **Determining staff needs.** Magnet site leadership analyzes teacher evaluations,
10 observations, and one-on-one meetings to determine PD and support needs for staff.

11 **Determining student and family needs.** Magnet site leadership assesses student
12 need (like additional attendance support or tutoring in certain areas, based on data
13 review), and family need (which drive the agenda and activities of family liaisons)

14 **Program Assessment.** Magnet site and central leadership evaluate various programs
15 used to improve achievement (e.g. Imagine Learning, tutoring, etc.) to determine
16 whether to continue, strengthen, or eliminate programs based on effectiveness.

17 **Quarterly Reports.** Each magnet site coordinator submits a quarterly report three
18 times annually to the magnet department after each benchmark test. Quarterly reports
19 also document recruitment, retention, and other integration efforts to gauge and adjust
20 for effectiveness. Magnet department staff then evaluate the reports and, where
21 needed, communicate back with magnet site leadership to address deficiencies, adjust
22 levels of support, and determine needs for the next learning period or upcoming year.

23 Each winter, the magnet department begins meeting with magnet site leadership to
24 review the process for developing MSPs and to begin drafting MSPs for the following
25

1 year. The central purpose of these meetings is to assess academic and integration
2 progress and identify resource needs.

3 Thus, the District develops magnet budgets based on multiple sources: the CNA,
4 monthly site visits, reviews of quarterly reports, observations, analyses of academic
5 progress on benchmarks, program assessments, and meetings focused specifically on
6 developing plans and funding based on identified need.

7 Through meetings with the magnet department, **sites adjust how resources are**
8 **used, but work to remain within their existing budget amounts.** That budget amounts
9 remain constant between years shows fiscal responsibility, not lack of assessment.

10 For example, the 2018-19 MSP for Holladay ES included instructional specialists
11 (3 FTE), master teachers (3 FTE), and magnet teachers (3 FTE). Based on multiple need
12 assessments, the District eliminated instructional specialists and master teachers, reduced
13 magnet teachers from three to two, and added an instructional data intervention specialist
14 (1 FTE), and teaching assistants (2.5 FTE). The 2018-19 USP budget allocation for
15 Holladay was \$609,332 (9.5 FTE); the 2019-20 USP budget allocation for Holladay was
16 \$609, 332.25 (10 FTE). The District conducted needs assessments, worked with
17 Holladay on how best to utilize its resources to meet those needs, and did so within the
18 existing budget amount.

19 **E. Discipline Completion Plan**

20 As noted above, the discipline requirements of ECF 2123 stemmed from the
21 Special Master's recommendations made in February, 2018. The District did not wait for
22 the Court's September, 2018, order to implement those recommendations – including all
23 of those with any significant budget impact. In the SY2018-19 budget, and during the
24 school year, the District created a whole department to implement the recommendations
25

1 (the Student Relations Department), adding a director and a coordinator to an existing a
2 compliance liaison for support. These were the primary elements that had budgetary
3 impact. The rest of the recommendations adopted by the Court with any budgetary
4 impact have already been implemented in SY2018-19. As recognized by Dr. Hawley, the
5 District *already* conducts systematic analyses of discipline data. The District has already
6 institutionalized these practices in the Student Code of Conduct, incorporated by
7 reference into Policy JK (Student Discipline). The District has *already* provided
8 additional funding to develop and implement processes to assess teacher understanding of
9 disciplinary practices in the 2018-19 USP Budget with the addition of the Student
10 Relations department in SY2018-19.

11 TUSD will file the discipline professional development completion plan by
12 September 1, 2019, and it will include details of District plans to link systematic analysis
13 of disciplinary actions with necessary professional development, and processes to
14 regularly assess how well teachers understand **and use** their discipline training, using
15 existing resources. Because the District is already undertaking the Court's requirements,
16 no major budgetary change from last year is needed.

17 **F. MASSD**

18 The omission of the \$100,000 amount at issue in the MASSD budget was simply a
19 clerical error, pointed out internally by staff even before the issue was raised by others
20 outside the District. The District is working to correct the clerical error, and will report
21 when additional funds are properly reflected in the MASSD budget.

22 **G. Reading Recovery.**

23 In the 2018-19 USP Budget, the District allocated 12 Reading Recovery (RR)
24 teachers to serve 12 schools. The District initially submitted the same allocation for the
25

1 2019-20 USP Budget. After the submission of Draft 3, Dr. Hawley recommended the
2 District increase the number of RR schools by adding at least two additional teachers.

3 The District submitted an allocation of 12 RR teachers in Draft 2 (March 15) and
4 Draft 3 (May 6). As stated in the District's final cover letter, "*If feasible*, the District will
5 add at least two RR teachers. The budget is already over-allocated by \$1.3M, and funding
6 two teachers in mid-June does not guarantee the ability to hire and develop structures for
7 new programs by August 1" (ECF 2233-1 at 29). Adding two additional RR teachers
8 requires finding and hiring the teachers (causing or not filling other existing teacher
9 vacancies), and the elimination of other positions in the budget or reducing other funding
10 (after the school year has already started). The District might have mitigated these issues
11 had the Special Master made the recommendation to add two teachers after Draft 2 in
12 March or after Draft 3 in May, but he did not.

13 The District has assessed its budget capacity, student need, and other factors, and
14 has agreed to increase funding for RR by one additional teacher (from 12 to 13). The
15 District believes this addition is reasonable given the existing constraints: TUSD (and the
16 nation) continue to face teacher shortages; Reading Recovery is expensive; and there are
17 no other available desegregation funds without reducing funding in some other area.

18 **H. Transition funds removed/create contingency**

19 **1. Transition Funds**

20 The underlying purpose of removing magnet status from a school is to redeploy
21 the magnet funds used by the school "*so that resources can be used more effectively in*
22 *other schools or programs.*"¹ The understanding has been that the funds would stay with
23 the demagnetized school for a brief transition period to provide some level of continuity
24

25 ¹ Special Master Report on Magnet Schools, ECF 2147 at 10:2-4.

1 and ability to transition to new status. Indeed, for the most recently demagnetized
2 schools, the Court ordered complete transition plan implementation in SY 2017-2018,
3 and phasing out the positions and expenditures that facilitate transition “no later than SY
4 2018-2019.”² The existing, adopted budget represents the District’s best effort at
5 accomplishing this directive without negatively impacting student performance at the
6 former magnet schools. In fact, no transition school has had a net loss in FTEs as a result
7 of removal of transition funds, and an additional \$953,000 has been added to the budgets
8 of these schools in other categories, to ensure continued support for students at these
9 schools.

10 **2. Contingency Fund**

11 The Special Master recommends that the District create an “integration
12 contingency fund” for SY2019-20 in an amount equal to the amount allocated to the
13 former magnet schools for transition funding in SY2018-19. However, the District
14 simply does not have this luxury. Until the very final SY219-20 budget, the Section
15 910(G) budget totaled well over a \$1 million more than the \$63.7 million statutory cap on
16 Section 910(G) funds. The final budget was reconciled with the statutory cap simply by
17 reducing the percentage of transportation costs allocated to the Section 910(G) budget
18 below the actual percentage of transportation costs attributable to USP activities.³
19
20

21 ² See Order re Transition Plans (ECF 1996 at 4-5).

22 ³ As the District has previously reported, approximately 54% of all transportation costs in
23 the District are directly attributable to transportation provided to students for USP
24 purposes. The final budget for SY2019-20 allocated substantially less than that
25 percentage to the Section 910(G) budget, to bring that budget within the \$63.7 million
26 statutory cap. Thus, transportation is again underbudgeted by an amount substantially in
excess of a million dollars, as it has been in past years, without including any “integration
contingency fund.”

1 Moreover, the SY2019-20 budget includes almost one million dollars (\$953,000)
2 in 910G funding to continue to support transition schools. As recognized in the R&R, the
3 District has reallocated another \$677k to student assignment funding. In addition, as
4 described in the District's cover letter (ECF 2233-1 at 2), TUSD has re-purposed its
5 resources to other schools and programs, as described by the Special Master:

6 (a) **increased the English Language Development (ELD) budget** to support ELL
7 students;

8 (b) **shifted and increased support for transition schools through other USP**
9 **activities;**

10 (c) **increased transportation** funding proactively as requested by the Special Master
11 and Plaintiffs, rather than through unused funds;

12 (d) **increased funding for outreach and recruitment;**

13 (e) **increased funding for 7th period day** at Gridley MS [a 58% minority school with
14 a student population that is half African American and Latino, combined (49%)];

15 (f) **increased funding for AVID expansion** as requested by the parties;

16 (g) **increased funding for dual-language expansion** as required by the USP;

17 (h) **increased funding for targeted academic supports and interventions** to
18 enhance academic and instructional support at former magnet sites and at all sites.

19 Having increased funding in all of these areas, and facing a USP budget that is *still*
20 underfunded, the Special Master's request to set aside a contingency fund is
21 unreasonable, untenable, and contradicts his earlier findings. There is no available
22 money from which to create a contingency fund. There is no evidence the District will
23 need an integration contingency fund at any point during the 2019-20 school year. It
24 would be fiscally irresponsible to scale back the increases listed above for people and
25

1 programs that will begin benefiting students next week, to set aside monies that may or
2 may not be used all year.

3
4 **I. The Mendoza Plaintiffs' Suggestions Regarding Funding for BrightBytes and**
5 **School City Software Make no Sense and Ignore the History of this Case**

6 The Mendoza Plaintiffs suggest that funding for BrightBytes and School City be
7 moved off the 910G budget to the District's principal budget, as if this solves a problem.
8 Of course, it solves nothing, because the principal budget is fully subscribed, and this
9 would mean a cut to something else in the principal budget. With declining enrollment,
10 the principal budget is declining.

11 But more fundamentally, this suggestion ignores the history of the case. Both of
12 these software programs were initially licensed by the District as a direct result and in
13 response to a requirement of the USP – to improve tracking and assessment of students,
14 to better identify struggling students and improve academic outcomes, for African
15 American and Hispanic students. Both were brought to the District because the District's
16 information systems at the time did not have strong capabilities in these areas. It is clear
17 that the rationale for using Section 910(G) funds for these funds is unassailable. Even
18 more telling, the licensing fees for these programs have been funded 100% by the Section
19 910(G) levy from the outset, for several years, without objection. It is clear that the only
20 reason that plaintiffs now suddenly suggest that the principal budget absorb these costs is
21 to deflect attention away from the impractical and unworkable impact of their other
22 budget suggestions.

23 EBAS implementation spending under the §910G Budget has brought about
24 significant increase in the District's analytic capacity, and has been remarkably consistent
25 for the past several years:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

EBAS IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING UNDER § 910G				
2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
\$1,350,761	\$1,057,792	\$1,106,368	\$1,178,150	\$1,210,226

Moreover, the amount proposed for EBAS implementation in Draft 2 of this year’s budget, provided to the Mendoza Plaintiffs in early March, 2019, was \$1,265,283, \$55,000 more than in the final adopted budget. Mendoza Plaintiffs did not object, or suggest that a substantial portion of this funding should be moved to the principal budget. The amount proposed for EBAS implementation in Draft 3 of this year’s budget, provided to the Mendoza Plaintiffs in early May, 2019, was the same: \$1,265,226. The Mendoza Plaintiffs did not object, or suggest that a substantial portion of this funding should be moved to the principal budget. Only now, after both budgets have been finalized and adopted, do the Mendoza Plaintiffs pipe in with this unworkable suggestion.

J. Multi-Year Facilities Plan

Mendoza Plaintiffs suggest, “that no specific projects to address deficient conditions in a racially concentrated school have been identified.” Had they asked, they would have learned that the District has identified many specific projects to address deficient conditions in racially concentrated schools, and that these projects are prioritized over non-racially concentrated schools. In SY 2016-17, the District budgeted close to \$1.8 million to support MYFP projects; in SY 2018-19, the District reduced that amount by almost in half to \$1 million. In SY 2019-20, the District has again reduced that amount by almost half to \$585,650.

Racially concentrated and magnet schools have been the beneficiaries of this funding in prior years. For example, in SY 2017-18, these funds were used to improve facilities conditions at Carrillo, Drachman, Hollinger, Miller, Ochoa, Roskruge, Safford,

1 and Utterback – all racially concentrated schools at the time, except for Drachman
2 (Drachman’s facility improvements supported its grade reconfiguration, as approved by
3 the Court)(see ECF 2233-2 at 147-148). Now, Mendoza Plaintiffs argue the District
4 should reduce funding to repair facilities at racially concentrated schools to pay for
5 unknown and undisclosed allocations in other areas.⁴ This is unwarranted and unwise.

6 **K. Gridley**

7 The District has developed systems to engage in evidence-based decision-making.
8 Here, the District has provided evidence to the parties that PLCs (required by the USP)
9 and interventions for struggling students (also required by the USP) are supported by
10 seven-period days which allow extra time for teachers to meet in PLCs and for struggling
11 students to receive academic interventions during the school day. Mendoza Plaintiffs did
12 not object to expanding seven-period days during the entire budget process, but now
13 assert that the District should eliminate funding for a seven period day at Gridley middle
14 school. Ignoring their own acknowledgement “there may be sound reasons for creating
15 such a schedule at Gridley,” they object because the school is 42% Anglo, 38% Hispanic,
16 and 11% African American. Apparently, to the Mendoza Plaintiffs, the 313 Hispanic
17 students and 95 African American students at Gridley (49% of its population) do not need
18 or deserve the benefits of a seven-period day because it also has a higher-than-average
19 Anglo population and is a highly diverse school.
20
21

22 ⁴ Mendoza Plaintiffs have “suggested that additional sums must be spent to
23 implement the USP” but have not suggested a specific staff addition, program, or other
24 allocation. They appear to be saying, simply, “spend more” in certain areas with no data,
25 evidence, or other information to suggest that spending more will result in better
26 outcomes. The District does not have the luxury to take such an uninformed and rote
approach to budget development.

1 The District believes Gridley’s 408 Hispanic and African American students, 24
2 Asian-Pacific Islander students, 45 multiracial students, and six Native American
3 students all deserve the benefit of a seven-period day. The USP provision requiring
4 PLCs is not limited to racially concentrated schools (which generally have **smaller**
5 African American student populations than schools like Gridley with disproportionately
6 high Anglo populations). Secrist MS, for example, has the second highest percentage of
7 African American middle-school students (17%), and the second highest percentage of
8 Anglo students in middle school (36%). By the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ reasoning, the
9 District should also deny the benefits of a seven-period day to African American students
10 at Secrist because it also happens to have a large number of Anglo students. The District
11 vehemently opposes this reasoning.

12 **L. Fisher Plaintiffs’ Late Objections**

13 The USP Budget Development Process required Plaintiffs to submit their budget
14 objections by July 9, 2019. On July 12, counsel for Mendoza Plaintiffs filed a request for
15 an extension of time for Plaintiffs to file objections by July 16, 2019 – indicating that
16 they had communicate with counsel for the parties (including counsel for Fisher
17 Plaintiffs), and that no party objected to the extension. Mendoza Plaintiffs filed their
18 objection on July 16, 2019 (ECF 2237). In this document, the District has responded to
19 both the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ objections and the Special Master’s recommendations set
20 out in his June 25 report and recommendation (ECF 2231).

21 On July 22, 2019, Fisher Plaintiffs filed a set of objections **six days** after the
22 agreed-upon, **extended** due date. As the District was developing responses to both the
23
24
25
26

1 ⁵Special Master and Mendoza Plaintiffs, it has not had adequate time to analyze and
2 respond to the materially late Fisher Plaintiff responses, but plans to do so within ten days
3 of the filing, by August 1, 2019.

4 **Conclusion**

5 For the foregoing reasons, the District respectfully request that the Court approve
6 the District's 2019-20 desegregation budget.

7 Dated this 26th day of July, 2019.

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 /s/P. Bruce Converse

10 P. Bruce Converse

11 Timothy W. Overton

12 **DICKINSON WRIGHT, PLLC**

13 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1400

14 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4568

15 *Attorneys for Tucson Unified School*

16 *District No. 1*

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 _____
25 ⁵ The Special Master just informed the District that he will be filing a second report and
26 recommendation on the SY2019-20 budget on Monday, July 29, 2019. The District will
respond to that report and recommendation in a subsequent filing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 26th day of July, 2019, I electronically transmitted the attached foregoing document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic filing to all CM/ECF registrants.

/s/ Veronica S. Newbanks