

**TUSD RFI #(s): 2087 - 2099**

**Estimated TUSD Staff Time: 20 hours**

**Attachment(s):** (RFI 2087) *Magnet 2017-18 School Level Quarterly Reports;*  
(RFI #2089) *Magnet 2017-18 School Integrated Action Plans*

-----Information above this line is to be completed by District Staff -----

### TUSD Request for Information Form

#### RFI Instructions

1. TUSD will assign each request its TUSD RFI number.
2. Provide the topic of the request (e.g., Corrective Action Plans)
3. Present the RFI in the form of one or more specific questions.
4. Optional: For every question/request on the form, indicate include the reason(s) why the information being requested is needed.
5. Indicate the relevant section of the USP, court order, district report or other document (i.e., reference) that relates to RFI. Page numbers may be more appropriate in some instances).
6. Use a separate form for each specific topic about which information is being requested unless the answers to the questions posed are interdependent or relate to the same section of the document you are referencing (e.g., the USP).
7. Copy the TUSD email group "Deseg."

#### Request for Information

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Lois Thompson and Juan Rodriguez for the Mendoza Plaintiffs
<b>Submission Date:</b>	November 8, 2018
<b>Subject:</b>	TUSD SY2017-18 Annual Report
<b>USP or Reference</b>	Section II

**RFI 2087:** At page II -12, the DAR states that all magnet schools prepare "biannual reports" and then cites to Appendix II-3 which, it further states, is a sample year-end report. Appendix II-3 says on its face that it is a Quarterly Report (not a biannual report or "year-end" report). In fact it does not provide information for a full year. Rather, it provides data and analysis for Qs 1-3.

Please clarify whether there is a further "year-end" report, including data and analysis for all four quarters and what was meant by the DAR reference to "biannual reports." If there are indeed year-end reports, please provide copies of the "year-end" reports for each magnet school (not just a single "sample")

Response: The document attached as Appendix II-3 to the 17-18 Annual Report is in fact the final report for the school year, and contains cumulative information as of the time of the report. Each magnet school submits an initial report in October, with updates in January and

April. The word “biannual” in the Annual Report was a typographic error. Attached is the final magnet school reports for all magnet schools for the 2017-18 school year. *See attached Magnet 2017-18 School Level Quarterly Reports.*

**RFI 2088:** If “year-end” reports do not exist or do not include the full range of information set forth in the Appendix II-3 “sample” report, updated to encompass the Q4 benchmarks and any other year-end analyses, please provide copies of the Q3 report for each magnet school equivalent to that for Mansfeld that now comprises Appendix II-3.

Response: *See* RFI #2087 for copies of the cumulative reports; there are no “Q4 benchmarks.”

**RFI 2089:** Footnote 8 on page II-12 refers to the integration of magnet and Title I plans and references a School Integrated/Magnet Plan that is described more fully in Appendix II-32. Please provide copies of School Integrated/Magnet Plans for all magnet schools that have such plans (not just the Bonillas plan that is attached as a sample to Appendix II-32). [Note that some of the pages of the Bonillas plan were copied upside down making them difficult to read on a screen.]

Response: *See attached Magnet 2017-18 School Integrated Action Plans* for each magnet school’s Integrated Action Plan (SIAP). *Note:* In the attached reports, you will find “error” messages. Unfortunately, we cannot correct this as it is from the ADE ALEAT program.

**RFI 2090:** The DAR states at footnote 9 on page II-12 that Roskruge had no magnet coordinator for the entire school year and that the funds allocated to pay a magnet coordinator were instead spent on after-school tutoring. Who performed the responsibilities of the magnet coordinator during the school year? What, if any, job responsibilities of a magnet coordinator or of the person(s) filling in for the magnet coordinator were not performed during the school year because the magnet coordinator position was empty?

Response: The Roskruge principal performed all essential job responsibilities. Roskruge’s principal completed all required magnet check-ins and reports, and facilitated at least one collaborative team meeting per team each week. The principal, assistant principal, community representative, and counselor shared the duties of attending District recruitment events, while the Dean of students was responsible for providing on-site recruitment. At the end of the 2017-18 school year, the District was able to find a qualified candidate for the Magnet Coordinator position.

**RFI 2091:** Did any other magnet schools have allocated positions that were empty for the entire school year (or a significant part of the year, by which we mean more than half the year)? If so, which positions and in which schools?

Response: Of the more than 130 magnet-allocated positions in the budget, three additional positions were unfilled for more than half the year: a magnet coordinator at Palo Verde, an instructional specialist at Roskruge, and an instructional data and intervention specialist at Tucson High.

**RFI 2092:** Given the perceived need for after-school tutoring at Roskruge, why was the cost of after-school tutoring not included in its initial 2017-18 budget?

Response: This was funded at the time the District became aware of the need, when it received the 217 AzMerit results, which was after the 2017-18 budget had been adopted.

**RFI 2093:** Mendoza Plaintiffs ask the following questions here although they also relate to family engagement because the topic is addressed in the DAR discussion of student assignment and the referenced appendix is attached to the student assignment discussion as Appendix II-14. That appendix refers to family engagement activities at the magnet schools.

Who is responsible for overseeing family engagement activities at the magnet schools and what is the nature and extent of the review of such activities (and attendance at those activities) during the school year?

Response: The principals at all schools, including magnet schools, have the primary responsibility for ensuring that family engagement activities occur at the school level, including implementing the guidelines and submitting regular reports of family and community engagement activities at the school. As described in section VII.A.4 and VII.A.5, every school identified a specific point of contact to coordinate local family engagement efforts (Appendix VII – 4, School Site Family Engagement Contacts SY2017-18), and submitted family engagement reports to the FCO department on a monthly basis.

The assistant superintendent for each of five regions is responsible for ensuring that principals in his or her region actually do this.

The Director of the Family and Community Outreach (FCO) Department analyzes the reports submitted by schools including tracking data captured, communicates with the Regional Assistant Superintendents with line authority for any non-compliant schools, targets particular schools for additional training and encouragement on family engagement activities, and acts generally as a resource and source of advice and guidance in the implementation of the guidelines. The Director reports to the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction. .

**RFI 2094:** Is there a reason of which the District is aware why the attendance at family engagement activities at Roskruge is reported as being significantly less than at other magnet schools (with the exception of Palo Verde)?

Response: It appears that the quarterly report significantly understates the number of family engagement activities undertaken at Roskruge for the 2017-18 SY. Based on the monthly FCO reports, Roskruge reported 57 family engagement activities during the course of the school year with a total participation of over 5,500 people at these activities.

**RFI 2095:** Why is there no reported attendance at any Palo Verde family engagement events in Q1 and Q2 and is the District aware of why the attendance at family engagement activities in the combined 3Q/4Q appears to have totaled just over 100 (in a school of over 1100 students)?

Response: As with Roskruge, it appears that Appendix II-4 is incomplete with respect to reporting family engagement. Based on the monthly FCO data, Palo Verde reported 23 family engagement activities with total participation of 2,619 people.

**RFI 2096:** Page II-17 refers to a “magnet only” priority teacher interview event in January 2018 and reports that six magnet schools participated. Why did the other magnet schools, and specifically Booth-Fickett which has had particular challenges in hiring full time staff, not participate?

Response: Drachman and Carrillo did not participate because they did not have open positions for the upcoming school year, Borton and Holladay were still determining their staffing needs at the time of the event, and Booth-Fickett, Davis, and Dodge had principal vacancies at the time of the event that needed to be filled prior to hiring teachers. Once the Booth-Fickett principal was hired, the Human Resources department provided centralized interview opportunities to fill teacher vacancies.

**RFI 2097:** What efforts/outreach/follow up occurred to ensure participation by all magnet schools in the priority teacher interview event in advance of that event?

Response: Following the initial invitation, HR followed-up with email reminders and telephone calls to each site.

**RFI 2098:** The “sample final transition report – Ochoa” that is referred to in Appendix II-15 is not attached. Please provide a copy of that report as well as copies of the final transition reports for all other transition schools.

Response: *See* RFI #2087 *Magnet 2017-18 School Level Quarterly Reports* for transition reports.

**RFI 2099:** Mendoza Plaintiffs ask the following questions here although they also relate to transportation because the topic is addressed in the DAR discussion of student assignment and the referenced appendices are attached to the student assignment discussion as Appendix II-21 and Appendix II-22 and because there is a reference to the creation of a new express shuttle bus route from the boundary of a racially concentrated school (Pueblo) to Santa Rita on page II-23 of the DAR. [Mendoza Plaintiffs know that they have asked similar questions before and were disappointed that the District did not have the requested information. Given the relevance of that information, the previous inquiries, and the specific focus on using the express buses to promote integration and/or reduce racial concentration as the above referenced DAR statement indicates, they are hopeful that the information now exists.]

Please provide data on the ridership of each of the express shuttles, inclusive of the new Pueblo boundary to Santa Rita express shuttle, to each of Santa Rita, Sabino, Magee, and Drachman schools broken down by race, ethnicity, and grade.

Response: See the chart below:

	<b>Routed Student Count</b>	<b>Grade (count)</b>	<b>Race (count)</b>
Santa Rita	6	9 (1), 10 (2), 11(2), 12 (0)	HI (5), MR(1)
Sabino	13	9 (9), 10 (4), 11 (0), 12 (0)	HI (10), MR(1), AS(2), BL(1)
Magee	0	0	
Drachman	0	0	

HI=Hispanic; MR=Multiracial; AS=Asian; BL=Black