TUSD RFI #(s): 1883-1935   **[Attachment A]**
Estimated TUSD Staff Time: 70 hours
Attachment(s): 2017-18 TUSD Magnet Schools Q2 Grown Summary (RFI #1906); Integration Analysis for Magnets (RFI #1907); Job Description-Educational Technology Integration Specialist (RFI #1934)

-------------------------------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

Submitted by:	Willis Hawley and Lois Thompson/Juan Rodriguez for Mendoza Plaintiffs
Submission Date:	February 16, 2018
Subject:	18-19 SY Budget, Draft 1
USP or Reference	

Seven Period Day at Eight Additional Schools

RFI #1883: Who in TUSD is charged with (a) monitoring the implementation of the seven period schedule at the schools and (b) oversight of the professional learning communities that the addition of a seventh period is to facilitate.

   Response: (a) School principals at each site; (b) Assistant Superintendents to whom the principals report.

RFI #1884: If there is sufficient money being allocated to this expansion in the budget to cover the needed administrative oversight?

   Response: Yes. Oversight of these activities is part of the general duties of school principals and is part of the oversight and accountability of the school principals to the Assistant

Superintendents to whom they report. The District does not anticipate the oversight of these activities to add significant cost to the District.

School-Wide AVID at Catalina High School

RFI #1885:   Does the District propose to implement what the AVID organization refers to as "AVID Secondary" on its website?

Response: Catalina currently has AVID Secondary. To implement AVID's school-wide model, the district is planning to increase the number of AVID elective sections and embed AVID strategies at each grade level and in all content areas. In addition, all Catalina teachers will be offered an AVID PATH training in May 2018 and a team of teachers and administrators will attend the AVID Summer Institute for additional training.

RFI #1886:   Do the proposed increased budget allocations include an AVID site coordinator and the costs of AVID Family Workshops as proposed on the AVID website?

Response: Yes.

RFI #1887:   What, if any, additional initiatives is the District considering for those students at Catalina who are not on a college track?

Response: AVID is a program that is for all students not only those on college track. School-wide AVID is currently the main focus for Catalina, as well as expansion of CTE courses available to Catalina students either at Catalina or at Santa Rita. AVID instructional strategies will be utilized across all curricular areas and grade levels. The use of these strategies ensures all students will be college and/or career ready.

RFI #1888:   How does this proposal "mesh" with what Mendoza Plaintiffs understand to be a broader District effort to explore expansion of AVID strategies across all District schools (about which they were informed by Dr. Trujillo at the December 2017 Tucson meeting among the parties and Special Master)?

Response: This is part of that proposed expansion. The District intends to continue AVID expansion across the District over the next several years.

Increase Stipends for Hard-to-Fill Positions

RFI #1889:   Provide information concerning **all** stipends currently offered in the District.

Response: Stipends handled through the HR Department include: 1) Hard-to-Fill stipends (math, science and Ex Ed Teacher)[current: $2,500 one-time from non-910G; proposed for 2018-19 $5,000 one-time from non-910G and 910G]; 2) Magnet stipends [$2,500 one-time from 910G]; 3) Teacher Diversity Plan stipends [$5,000 for two years 910G], 4) Dual Language stipends [$5,000 ongoing from 910G – recruitment and retention], 5) Make The Move stipends [$2,500 one-time from 910G].

Schools and departments may provide other stipends related to professional development (training stipends), additional responsibilities (Targeted Learning), and/or pay-for-performance (301 Plan). Many of these other stipends are not funded out of 910(G) funds.

RFI #1890: Define what it means by "hard-to-fill" positions for the purposes of awarding stipends (including when positions not initially considered "hard-to-fill" became "hard-to- fill" positions warranting stipends, if any).

Response: "Hard-to-Fill" positions include math teachers, science teachers and exceptional education teachers.

RFI #1891: Provide the amount of all currently existing stipends (including proposals for changes in amount for 2018-19).

> *Response:*
> 1) Hard to Fill Stipends - $2500 one-time recruitment stipend (will change to $5000 one-time in 2018-2019 School Year)
>
> 2) Magnet Stipends - $2500 one-time recruitment stipend (for all new teachers at Magnet elementary, K-8 and middle schools and for new teachers in magnet-funded positions at Magnet high schools)
>
> 3) Teacher Diversity Plan Stipends - $5000 annually for two years
>
> 4) Dual Language - $5000 per year recruitment and retention stipend (teachers receive this as long as they teach in a DL classroom).
>
> 5) Make The Move - $2500 one-time recruitment stipend

RFI #1892: Provide the extent to which 910(g) funds have allocated to pay the cost of those stipends and all other funding sources

Response: The District allocated to pay 1.6 million in total for stipends from 910(g) funds and other funding sources, and we have spent 1.1 million thus far. We anticipate spending the entire 1.6 by June 30, 2018.

RFI #1893: Explain what the experience/success has been with these stipends for the last two years (as applicable).

Response: There were 256 stipends issued in 2016 – 2017 SY for Hard-to-Fill, Dual Language, and Magnet stipends. For 2017 – 2018, there were 218 stipends issued. Vacancies in the District improved from 99 at the start of 2016-17 to 77 at the start of 2017-18. The District believes that the presence of the stipends is the reason that vacancies for these positions are not substantially higher.

RFI #1894: Explain the extent to which teachers eligible for multiple stipends received all such stipends (*e.g.*, a "new-hire classroom teacher" at a magnet high school who teaches math or science).

Response: Yes, teachers eligible for multiple stipends received them.

Transition School Funding

RFI #1895: Provide an analysis of academic achievement at the transition schools and an explanation of why the positions and/or expenses that are proposed to be eliminated are "unneeded." (submit in the next budget submission)

Response: The only positions the district recommended for elimination were transition coordinators and all parties agreed that this would be a one-year position. Proposed reductions include consultants that have already provided needed training to build capacity. Added-duty was reduced because teachers will now not need to meet with consultants off contract time and expanded seven-period days will allow for PLC time embedded in the school day. Smaller reductions include materials for PD that are no longer needed.

While each schools site reports and analyzes benchmark data and submits finding in their quarterly reports, a final and complete academic analysis from the District will be completed after the AzMERIT scores are released in June or July of 2018.

RFI #1896: Will they *(transition schools)* be using Successmaker, as the budget narrative states will be the case for most magnet schools that are discontinuing Imagine Learning? (BN at 6.)

Response: At this point, some transition schools have indicated they will use Successmaker in 2018-19.

RFI #1897: Why did the District previously decide to discontinue Successmaker and why does it now believe that for the majority of schools that is the preferred program?

Response: SuccessMaker has been available to all schools since the 13-14SY when the District purchased the program and implemented extensive training for the program. Although other software products are available, many schools continue to use the program to improve students' reading and mathematics skills.   Over 50 schools are currently utilizing the program in the 2017-18SY.

RFI #1898:   Does the District have data to show the efficacy of Successmaker broken down by the race/ethnicity and English language fluency of TUSD students who used that program?

Response: Yes. The District does have student level data that captures student usage and mastery with SuccessMaker.

PLC Funding and Added Duty; Technology PD

RFI #1899:   Explain the District's overall intended approach to job-embedded professional development (and attendant costs) be provided when the District makes its next budget submission.

Response: The seven period day for middle and high schools is expressly intended as a venue for job-embedded professional development. Professional development can occur in the form of PLC or any other professional development deemed necessary. In respect to the elementary sites, PLC time occurs more easily due to shared planning time of the teachers. Job-embedded professional development can happen at that time or during Wednesday professional development time. A planned expansion of performance arts in the K-8 and middle schools will also allow for more job embedded PD.

RFI #1900:   With respect to PLCs, the District states that it "is changing its vendor for PLC training at a significantly lower cost." (BN at 3) To what extent does the "significantly lower cost" reflect a reduction in services?

Response: The district has used Solution Tree, a widely known vendor, for the last three years in order to establish a solid base line of understanding and implementation across the district. Now that the initial roll-out has occurred, including more in depth support at some sites, the district is moving toward a more self-sustaining model in which we will still bring in outside consulting for schools that are struggling and continue in-house supports and training. We expect that our in-house experts like our PDAT's and Lead CSP's will assume a primary leadership position in PLC PD.

RFI #1901:   Given that the Special Master's proposed completion plan relating to PLCs states   that the District "shall implement the PLC guidelines that have been provided to principals" (*see* January 9, 2018 Completion Plans at 12), is the District confident that it can effectively implement the "PLC guidelines" with the services that will be provided by the new vendor?

Response: Yes

RFI #1902:   How does the District plan to allocate Teacher Technology Liaisons (TTLs) in 2018-19, which it says will be "more efficient" and will result in reduction of associated costs? (BN at 3.)

Response: The new allocation will be more efficient because the district is incorporating the Microsoft educator community, which has on-line professional development classes on using technology in the classroom to enhance instruction. Teachers can take these courses at any time, at school or another location, at their convenience. This will be used in combination with the right-sizing of the TTLs.

RFI #1903:   Has the District assessed the effectiveness of TTLs in providing training, including the effectiveness of the manner in which TTLs are currently allocated?

Response: The Teacher Technology Survey is used to evaluate the effectiveness of TTLs. The instrument has been revised to increase its rigor and number of questions to go beyond self-assessment.

Behavior Related PD

The District anticipates a reduction of between $100k-$500k as a result of its "develop[ment of] more cost-effective methods to provide training in the areas of PBIS and Restorative Practices" (BN at 3), but does not describe any such cost-effective methods.

RFI #1904:   What does the District plan to do differently with respect to PBIS and Restorative Practices training?

Response: During the 2016 – 2017 and 2017 – 2018 school years, Desegregation funds paid KOI to train 20 MTSS Facilitators to be "Trainer of Trainers" for PBIS Tier I, Tier II and Tier III. These 20 MTSS Facilitators can now be dispatched throughout the district to provide PBIS Training on each of the three Tiers of PBIS. The only current cost to the district would be to pay for access to the KOI training materials that are on iPads that the MTSS Facilitators have been issued to use for this purpose. The District believes that the cost of such access is less than $5,000.

This summer, district school administrators will receive free Professional Development in Restorative Practices from the Western Educational Equity Assistance Center (WEEAC). After this training is complete, this group can also provide training to MTSS Facilitators, RPP Facilitators, ISI Teachers and Deans of Students in August and September of 2018. Again, this training is provided free of charge.

This district has built the capacity of the MTSS Facilitators to be able to provide PBIS training as needed to other sections of the school district. Once the WEEAC training is completed, those administrators can also be utilized to assist with Restorative Practice Training during the upcoming school year. In addition, all administrators will participate in discipline training during their summer Professional Development so that they are aware of any revisions in the GSRR and Discipline Documentation Protocols before the school year begins.

RFI #1905:   Given the on-going concerns about discipline issues in the District, is the District confident that it is allocating sufficient funds for effective training in PBIS and Restorative Practices?

>   *Response:* Yes.

Magnet Department

RFI #1906:   Provide the 1Q (10/5/17) and 2Q (12/21/17) progress reviews for each magnet school and that they be given the 3Q (3/15/18) progress reviews for each magnet school as soon as they become available.

>   *Response:* See attached 2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data.

RFI #1907:   Explain what has changed with respect to each school's integration status in the last year (or two), and what more or different it plans to do in the coming year to meet its goals in this area.

>   *Response:* Magnet Plans contain an Integration section that includes their action steps each school plans to take to maintain or improve their integration status. See attached Integration Analysis for Magnets.

Elimination: Imagine Learning

RFI #1908:   Why did the District previously decide to discontinue Successmaker *[at magnets]*?

>   *Response:* See answer to RFI #1896 & 1897.

RFI #1909:   Why does it now believe that for the majority of *[magnet]* schools that *[Successmaker?]* is the preferred program? [Same as 15.]

>   *Response:* See answer to RFI # 1896 & 1897.

The Magnet Department has chosen not to reinvest in Imagine Learning for the 2018-19 school year, but to utilize the District-owned software SuccessMaker (some magnet schools or departments may continue to use Imagine Learning. When operated with fidelity, the program has been shown to be successful for improving students' reading and mathematics skills.

RFI #1910:   Does the District have data to show the efficacy of Successmaker *[at magnets]* broken down by the race/ethnicity and English language fluency of TUSD students who used that program?

>   *Response:* The District does have student level data that captures student usage and mastery with SuccessMaker

RFI #1911:   They also ask which schools will be "opting to fund alternative programs from their site budgets" (BN at 6)

Response: Cholla is funding ALEKS, Booth-Fickett and Carrillo will continue to use Imagine Learning.

RFI #1912: Given the disappointing experience with Imagine Learning, what processes and procedures will be in place to help ensure that the alternative program is effective and user friendly?

Response: The Magnet Department and magnet coordinators will continue to work with sites to monitor implementation and data, to provide necessary PD, and to conduct walkthroughs and observations to evaluate the effectiveness of any alternative program.

Expansion: Sky School

RFI #1913: So far as Mendoza Plaintiffs can determine on a quick review of the materials provided in the 2017-18 budget process, there was no discussion of Sky School as a proposed 910(g) expense for the 2017-18 year. If they are wrong, they ask to be directed to that discussion and specifically to any explanation of how Sky School was to fit within the curriculum and academic program of the schools that were then slated to participate and its 2017-18 cost.

Response: The magnet plan for Mansfeld submitted in May 2017 [dated 5.9.17] discussed Sky School as a proposed 910(g) expense, see page 2. Borton and Booth-Fickett added the program later in the school year as a budget adjustment as Sky School was determined to be in direct alignment with their magnet theme.

RFI #1914:   They also do not believe they received a Student Support Criteria Form for what last year would have been a new program and did not receive a Student Support Criteria Form this year for what is said to be an expanded program. They therefore ask that a Student Support Criteria Form be provided.

Response: Sky School is a short-term, exploratory program involving 1-3 days of field work, depending on the program. Sky School is not a "student support" program that lasts all year similar to other student support programs that require an SSC form.

RFI #1915: Explain how the Sky School experience is to be integrated into the overall academic experience.

Response: The experience supports science inquiry and research, enhances students' interest, engagement, and understanding of science. Skills developed in the program are applicable to all STEM-related learning and support college and career readiness by exposing students to careers in science and astronomy.

RFI #1916: Explain why the experience should be funded with 910(g) money rather than from non 910(g) sources.

Response: The Sky School program relates to the magnet themes of these schools.

Magnet Site Budgets

Booth-Fickett:

RFI #1917:   What have been the "programmatic challenges" with its after school tutoring program? (BN at 8.)

   Response: Not enough teachers were interested in staying after-school to tutor beyond the contract day.

RFI #1918:   Why is the school (and by extension, the District) continuing to rely on the services of an outside consultant (Catapult) to provide push-in intervention services? (*Id.*)

   Response: To fill in an existing gap, the school is utilizing the benefit of Catapult to fill a *short-term* need that it cannot currently fill with existing staff. As described in the narrative, "Consultant services will be continued but decreased according to current training needs…"

Borton:

RFI #1919:   What is the basis for the District's decision to modify the theme of this school to a STEAM school? (BN at 8.)

   Response: Based on the Marzano report and internal evaluation, the District determined that Borton was already implementing STEAM activities through systems-thinking. It is more attractive to promote Borton as a STEAM school that uses systems-thinking than the other way around. Also, Borton feeds Mansfeld (a STEM school), so the theme transition is more fully aligned. This change is essentially a marketing and recruitment strategy, but not a significant change to the implementation of the magnet.

RFI #1920:   How does it anticipate that this change will affect integration?

   Response: See RFI #1919 above.

RFI #1921:   How does it anticipate that this change will affect Student achievement?

   Response: See RFI #1919 above.

RFI #1922:   How does it anticipate that this change will affect closing the achievement gap?

   Response: See RFI #1919 above.

Borton/Carrillo:

Borton states that it will use substitutes to free up regular teachers for professional development; Carrillo states that it will hire three specialist teachers (in art, technology, and music) to cover for regular teachers who are engaged in professional development. (BN at 9.)

RFI #1923: What is the rationale for using substitutes in one case and specialist teachers in another?

> *Response:* These are two different things. At Carrillo, specialist teachers provide time for teachers to meet daily for PLCs during the school day. At Borton, substitutes are needed for all-day professional development (not daily PLCs).

Carrillo:

RFI #1924: Why is Carrillo continuing to use the services of an outside consultant (Teachers Observing Teachers) for its training? (BN 9.)

> *Response:* This program has improved teacher morale and improving Tier I instruction in its first year and the District will continue to train teachers on this program for a second year.

RFI #1925: Why is it reducing recruitment supplies (BN at 10) given that it is still (per the October 2017 40th day report) a racially concentrated school?

> *Response:* Carrillo was 89% Hispanic in 2012-13, 78% in 2016-17, and is down to 72% in 2017-18. The school has sufficient recruitment supplies to continue this fantastic trend towards integration.

RFI #1926: What steps is it taking to ensure integration of its entering classes?

> *Response:* The site is continuing to implement the steps it has been taking over the past three years – see magnet plan.

Dodge/Roskruge:

RFI #1927: If the Summer Jump program at Dodge (BN at 11) and the Summer Bridge Program at Roskruge (BN at 13) are successful, is the District planning to expand these or comparable programs at non-magnet schools?

> *Response:* The District does not know the response to this at this time.

Tucson:

RFI #1928: What is the work/job description of "classified accompanists" (BN at 14)?

Response: These are classified, hourly employees who support magnet-related fine arts activities who play music during a fine arts class or performance (three individuals who will be paid hourly, approximately $22k).

Diversity Assignment; Experience Assignment; Outreach, Recruitment and Retention

RFI #1929: Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand why the District says there are "no anticipated changes" with respect to each of the above-referenced activities (BN at 15) when it simultaneously anticipates an increase in stipends for "22 non-magnet, majority-minority D and F labeled schools" (*id.* at 2) which Mendoza Plaintiffs understand to refer to "experience assignments," indicates elsewhere in the narrative anticipated increases for outreach, recruitment and retention (*id.*), and notes increases for stipends for "hard-to-fill" positions (which Mendoza Plaintiffs believe may include diversity assignments).3 They assume that the noted "no anticipated changes" were an oversight or are Mendoza Plaintiffs misreading the budget narrative?

Response: To clarify, there are no anticipated changes other than those listed on p.2 in the budget narrative.

Restorative Practices and PBIS

RFI #1930: Provide confirmation that the Full-Time Discipline Coordinator (who will serve as the RPPC under the USP) it plans to hire in the 2018-19 school year (*see* BN at 23) will have the authority to direct or instruct sites on what actions should be taken to ensure USP compliance in connection with the RPPC's work with sites on discipline matters.

Response: Yes.

RFI #1931: Beyond what is described in the Budget Narrative (at 23) and the USP's description of RPPC duties, will the Full-Time Discipline Coordinator take on any other significant duties? If so, what are they and are there any budget implications stemming from such other duties?

Response: Depends on completion plan, but no significant budget impact.

Family Center Plan – New Data Technician for Family and Community Outreach

RFI #1932: MP believe that the District's family engagement efforts need to be far more robust and ask whether adequate resources (and funds) have been allocated to comply with the Court's November 8, 2017 Order (Doc. 2086), to ensure that the family engagement efforts at the school level are significantly enhanced, and that there is adequate District-level staffing to oversee and monitor that process, including review and follow up with respect to the information the new data technician will be helping to provide. (*See* November 8, 2017 Order at 20:11-14 (adopting Special Master's recommendation that "District [] prepare FACE Action Plan

guidelines for principals and school staff for Building School Capacity provisions for creating learning-centric environments and two-way parent-teacher/school partnerships").)

     Response: Yes.

RFI #1933: Mendoza Plaintiffs also ask that the FACE Action Plan guidelines be shared with the Plaintiffs and the Special Master no later than when the District provides its next budget submission.

     Response: The district is currently drafting the FACE Action Plan guidelines. The FACE Department is anticipating that these guidelines will be available by the end of the school year, after consulting with experts in the field. The district notes that it is also working with the Special Master on these guidelines, as requested in his doc #2096.

Technology PD for Classroom Staff

RFI #1934: Please provide a job description for the "Ed Tech Integration Specialist" position.

     Response: See attached job description for Educational Technology Integration Specialist.

RFI #1935: How does the increase from four to five "Ed Tech Integration Specialists" relate to the reduction of Teacher Technology Liaisons (TTLs), particularly given that these specialists provide support to TTLs?

     Response: During the analysis of right-sizing the TTL structure, the Instructional Technology Department worked to align its personnel support with the district's new reorganization into five regions. Thus it added on Integration Specialist so that each region, and the TTLs in each region, would have support from a specialist.

TUSD Magnet Schools
Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth
Summary

Growth data from Q1 to Q2 ELA and math benchmark assessments was analyzed to determine how students at TUSD magnet schools compared with all TUSD students at each assessed grade level.   Growth was measured as increasing 1 or more level, maintaining the same level, or decreasing 1 or more level.

Math
Results indicate that students at all grade levels at the following seven magnet schools demonstrated positive growth that corresponded with (no fill) or exceeded (green) district growth in math:

- Bonillas
- Borton
- Drachman
- Mansfeld
- Palo Verde
- Tucson High
- Tully

Schools with one or more grade levels that had a significant decline in growth (pink) included:

School	Grade Level(s)
Booth-Fickett	3
Carrillo	2
Davis	5
Dodge	8
Holladay	4, 5
Roskruge	2, 3, 7, 8

ELA:
Results indicate that students at all grade levels at the following six magnet schools demonstrated positive growth that corresponded with (no fill) or exceeded (green) district growth in math:

- Bonillas
- Booth- Fickett
- Mansfeld
- Palo Verde
- Tucson High
- Tully

Schools with one or more grade levels that had a significant decline in growth (pink) included:

School	Grade Level(s)
Borton	4
Carrillo	2, 5
Davis	5
Dodge	6, 8
Drachman	3, 4, 8
Holladay	2, 4
Roskruge	6

2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data

Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth by Magnet School

Growth data from Q1 to Q2 ELA and math benchmark assessments was analyzed to determine how students at TUSD magnet schools compared with all TUSD students at each assessed grade level. Please refer to the district charts below when reviewing each school's growth data.

TUSD ELA Q1-Q2 Growth

Grade	% of students increasing 1 or more level	% of students maintaining same level	% of students decreasing 1 or more level
2	19.3	58.3	22.4
3	19	64.3	16.7
4	12.7	60.3	27
5	17.1	61.5	21.4
6	24.3	54.4	21.3
7	21.5	57.7	20.8
8	19	61.3	19.6
9	22.9	59.3	17.9
10	29	54.6	16.4

TUSD Math Q1-Q2 Growth

Grade	% of students increasing 1 or more level	% of students maintaining the same level	% of students decreasing 1 or more level
2	21.6	59.7	18.7
3	21.4	58.5	20
4	21.7	65.3	13.1
5	18.6	62.1	19.3
6	19.6	62.9	17.5
7	15.9	57.6	26.5
8	18.6	50.1	31.3
Algebra I	26.1	47.5	26.3
Algebra II	17.1	55.2	27.7
Geometry	24	53.7	22.3

Key:

No Fill: School positive/negative grade level growth is within +/- 10% of TUSD growth.
Green Fill: School positive grade level growth is greater than 10% of TUSD positive growth.
Pink Fill: School negative grade level growth is greater than 10% of TUSD negative growth.

Bonillas:

ELA: All grades at Bonillas increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of all TUSD students grades 2-5.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining same level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	21.4	53.6	25
3	17.9	62.5	19.6
4	16.3	63.3	20.4
5	17.7	59.7	22.6

Math: All grades at Bonillas increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of all TUSD students grades 2-5.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	16.4	65.5	18.2
3	23.6	49.1	27.3
4	26.5	69.4	4.1
5	13.1	59	27.9

Booth- Fickett:

ELA: Grades 3-8 at Booth-Fickett increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of all TUSD students grades 3-5. 17.7% more grade 2 students at Booth-Fickett increased one or more levels than all grade 2 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	37	47.8	15.2
3	27.4	54.8	17.7
4	11.8	64.7	23.5
5	18.6	55.9	25.4
6	18	60.2	21.8
7	11.7	65.5	22.8
8	21.5	63	15.5

Math: Grades 4-8 at Booth-Fickett increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD students grades 4-8. 22.2% more grade 2 students increased more or one level than all TUSD grade 2 students, and 12.4% fewer grade 2 students decreased one or more level than all TUSD grade 2 students. 11.1% fewer students in grade 3 increased more than one level than all TUSD grade 2 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	43.8	50	6.3
3	10.3	61.8	27.9
4	24.5	58.5	17
5	19.7	62.3	18
6	14.4	66.2	19.4
7	12.6	52.8	34.6
8	12.6	59.7	27.7

3

Borton:

ELA: Grades 2 and 5 at Borton increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of all TUSD grades 2 and 5 students. 16.1% more grade 3 students at Borton increased one or more levels than all grade 3 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	19.4	54.8	25.8
3	35.1	45.6	19.3
4	3	74.6	22.4
5	9.7	67.7	22.6

Math: Grades 2 and 5 at Borton increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD students grades 2 and 5. 14% more grade 3 and 12.6% more grade 4 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 2 and 3 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	25.8	59.7	14.5
3	35.4	46.2	18.5
4	34.3	50	15.7
5	21.1	52.1	26.8

Carrillo:

ELA: Grade 3 at Carrillo increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD grade 3 students. 14.6% more grade 2 students and 12.7% more grade 5 students at Carrillo decreased one or more levels than all grade 2 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	6.5	56.5	37
3	14.9	63.8	21.3
4	22.9	58.3	18.8
5	6.8	59.1	34.1

Math: Grades 4 and 5 students at Carrillo increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD grade 4 and 5 students. 13.6% fewer grade 2 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 2 students. 13.3% more grade 2 students decreased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 2 students. 12.6% more grade 3 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 3 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	8	60	32
3	34	54	12
4	16.4	63.6	20
5	15.2	63	21.7

2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data

Davis:

ELA: Grade 2 and 3 students at Davis were administered the ELA in Spanish Q2 benchmark. Grade 4 increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all grade 4 TUSD students. 14.2% more grade 5 Davis students than TUSD grade 5 students decreased one or more levels.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
3	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
4	7.8	62.7	29.4
5	22.2	42.2	35.6

Math: Grades 2, 3 and 4 at Davis increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% than all grade 2, 3, and 4 TUSD students. 11.9% fewer grade 5 students increased one or more level than all grade 5 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	20	64	16
3	16.1	58.9	25
4	23.5	56.9	19.6
5	6.7	75.5	17.8

Dodge:

ELA: 20.3% more grade 6, 12% more grade 7, and 18.7% more grade 8 students decreased one or more levels than all TUSD grades 6, 7, and 8.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
6	7.7	49.7	42.7
7	13	54.2	32.8
8	6.8	54.9	38.3

Math: Grades 6 and 7 at Dodge increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all grades 6 and 7 TUSD students. 10.6% fewer grade 8 students at Dodge increased one or more levels than all grade 8 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
6	25.4	54.2	20.4
7	15.3	58	26.7
8	8	61	31

2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data

Drachman:

ELA: Grades 2 and 5 at Drachman increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of TUSD students grades 2 and 5. 25.7% more grade 6 and 25.2% more grade 7 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grades 6 and 7. 10.5% more grade 4 students and 15.7% grade 8 students decreased one or more levels than all grade 4 and grade 8 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	17.5	65	17.5
3	16.3	74.4	9.3
4	9.4	53.1	37.5
5	7.7	76.9	15.4
6	50	40	10
7	46.7	53.3	0
8	17.6	47.1	35.3

Math: Grades 2, 3 and 8 at Drachman increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all grades 2, 3, and 8 students. 10.4% fewer students grade 4 decreased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 4 students. 13.5% more grade 5 students and 25.4% more grade 6 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 5 and grade 6 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	20.4	59.2	20.4
3	14.6	58.5	26.8
4	29.7	67.6	2.7
5	32.1	50	17.9
6	45	40	15
7	21.4	42.9	35.7
8	27.8	50	22.2

2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data

Holladay:

ELA: Grade 5 at Holladay increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of TUSD grade 5 students. 13% more grade 3 students at Holladay than TUSD grade 3 students increased one or more levels. 10.9% more grade 4 students at Holladay decreased one or more levels than TUSD grade 4 students. 15.7% fewer grade 2 students at Holladay increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 2 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	3.6	64.3	32.1
3	32	52	16
4	16.3	51.7	37.9
5	12.9	71	16.1

Math: Grade 2 at Holladay increased more than one level, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of TUSD grade 2 students. 27% more grade 3 students at Holladay increased one or more levels than all grade 3 TUSD students. 12.9% fewer grade 4 students and 18.6% fewer grade 5 students at Holladay increased one or more levels than all grade 4 TUSD students. 12.1% more grade 5 students at Holladay decreased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 5 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1or more level
2	15.6	56.3	28.1
3	48.4	45.2	6.5
4	8.8	82.4	8.8
5	0	68.6	31.4

Mansfeld:

ELA: Grade 7 and 8 at Mansfeld increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of TUSD grade 7 and 8 students. 10.6% more grade 6 students at Mansfeld increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 6 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more
6	34.9	54.7	10.4
7	26.5	53.4	20.1
8	24.8	57.5	17.7

Math: Grades 6 and 7 at Mansfeld increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD students grades 6 and 7. 12.1% fewer grade 8 students decreased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 8 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
6	18.2	58.8	23
7	13.8	60.2	26
8	26	54.9	19.1

2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data

Palo Verde:

ELA: Grade 10 at Palo Verde increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD grade 10 students. 13% more grade 9 students at Palo Verde increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 9 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
9	35.9	48.3	15.9
10	34.9	54.8	10.2

Math: Students in Algebra I and II at Palo Verde increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD Algebra I and Algebra II students. 15.8% more Geometry students increased one or more levels than all TUSD Geometry students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
Algebra I	25.5	52.2	22.4
Algebra II	19.7	52.9	27.4
Geometry	39.8	45.9	14.4

Roskruge:

ELA: Grades 2 and 3 were administered the ELA Spanish benchmark. Grades 4, 5, 7, and 8 at Roskruge increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD students grades 4, 5, 6, and 8. 13% fewer grade 6 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 6 students. 13.6% more grade 6 students at Roskruge decreased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 6 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
3	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
4	17.8	53.3	28.9
5	12.2	57.1	30.6
6	11.3	53.8	34.9
7	13.8	56.9	29.3
8	14.5	61.1	24.4

8

Math: Grades 3, 5 and 6 increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD students in grades 3, 5, and 6. 13.9% fewer grade 2 students increased one or more levels than all TUSD grade 2 students. 11.4% more grade 3, 14.2% more grade 7, and 13% more grade 8 students decreased one or more levels than all grade 3, 7, and 8 TUSD students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	7.7	74.4	17.5
3	14.3	54.3	31.4
4	26.5	55.1	18.4
5	19.6	64.7	15.7
6	21.4	56.3	22.3
7	7.6	51.7	40.7
8	13.5	42	44.3

Tucson High:

ELA: Grade 9 and 10 at Tucson High increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of all TUSD students grades 9 and 10.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
9	17.9	57.3	24.8
10	31.2	49.9	19

Math: Students in Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/- 10% of all TUSD Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
Algebra I	34.1	43.8	22.2
Algebra II	18	50.7	31.3
Geometry	26.8	52.6	20.6

2017-18 TUSD Q1-Q2 Benchmark Growth Data

Tully:

ELA: Grade 3 students at Tully increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD grade 3 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	33.3	58.8	7.8
3	28.2	56.4	15.4
4	19.6	49	31.4
5	29.8	53.2	17

Math: Grade 2 at Tully increased one or more levels, maintained the same level, or decreased one or more levels within +/-10% of all TUSD grade 3 students. 29.7% more grade 3, 27.5% more grade 4, and 38.8% more grade 5 students at Tully increased one or more level than TUSD grade 3, grade 4, and grade 5 students.

Grade	% increasing 1 or more level	% maintaining level	% decreasing 1 or more level
2	26.6	56.3	17.2
3	51.1	44.7	4.3
4	49.2	47.5	3.3
5	57.4	35.2	7.4

10

Magnet Programs

40th Day Integration Analysis for Tucson Unified Magnet Schools

BONILLAS TRADITIONAL ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Bonillas was Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 71.29%, but its kindergarten, second and 3rd grade were Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Bonillas is Integrated.

BOOTH-FICKETT MATH/SCIENCE K-8 MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Booth-Fickett was not Integrated compared to the K-8 level, but its elementary component (Booth) was Integrated when compared to the elementary level and its middle school component (Fickett) was Integrated when compared to the middle school level. .
- In 2017-18, Booth-Fickett is still not Integrated when compared to the K-8 level, but its separate elementary and middle school components remain Integrated when compared to their respective levels.

BORTON ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Borton was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Borton remains Integrated.

CARRILLO K-5 MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Carrillo was Racially Concentrated with a 79% Hispanic population, but its kindergarten and first grade were Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Carrillo is less Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 72%, and its kindergarten, first, and second grade are Integrated. Carrillo is approximately 6 students away from being Integrated.

DAVIS BILINGUAL K-5 MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Davis' Hispanic population was 74.68%, but its kindergarten and first grades were Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Davis is Integrated.

DODGE TRADITIONAL MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Dodge was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Dodge remains Integrated.

DRACHMAN MONTESSORI K-8 MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Drachman was Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 71.12%, but its kindergarten, first and third grades were Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Drachman is Integrated.

Magnet Programs

40th Day Integration Analysis for Tucson Unified Magnet Schools

HOLLADAY ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Holladay was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Holladay remains Integrated.

MANSFELD MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Mansfeld's was Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 72.79%, but its sixth grade was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Mansfeld is Integrated.

PALO VERDE HIGH MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Palo Verde was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Palo Verde remains Integrated.

ROSKRUGE BILINGUAL K-8 MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Roskruge was Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 78.07%, but its second grade was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Roskruge remains Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 77%, and its second grade remains Integrated. Roskruge is approximately 49 students away from being Integrated.

TUCSON HIGH MAGNET SCHOOL
- In 2016-17, Tucson High was Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 72.48%, but its ninth grade was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Tucson High is less Racially Concentrated with a Hispanic population of 71%, and its ninth and tenth grades are Integrated. Tucson High is approximately 15 students away from being Integrated.

TULLY GIFTED AND TALENTED ELEMENTARY MAGNET
- In 2016-17, Tully was Integrated.
- In 2017-18, Tully remains Integrated.

Educational Technology Integration Specialist: Job Description

Provides professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators to ensure that TUSD students are provided access to the tools and the skills needed to compete and function in the global society. Collaborates with principals, teachers and other stakeholders to facilitate the delivery of 21st century learning, researched-based professional development strategies designed to achieve the goals and objectives of the District Technology Plan. Ensures instruction is aligned with State Technology Standards and that data is collected and used by sites in the implementation of their site plans.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS
Arizona IVP fingerprint clearance card.
Two years of teaching experience, utilizing technology in instruction.
Experience providing professional development to adults and with the instructional strategies identified in SIOP and Skillful Teacher.

PREFERRED REQUIREMENTS
Masters degree in Educational Technology, Educational Leadership or content area and/or experience in field.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER HIRE
Proof of immunity to rubeola (measles) and rubella (German measles), or proof of MMR immunization.

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS
THE LIST OF ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS IS NOT EXHAUSTIVE AND MAY BE SUPPLEMENTED.
- Develops and implements professional development based on 21st Century Skills aligned with AZ
- Serves as cluster leader to assigned campus cluster and Teacher Technology Liaisons
- Manages, trains and supports assigned school cluster and Teacher Technology Liaisons
- Technology, ISTE, and NETS standards.
- Assists with creating and implementing the District Technology Plan based on input and
- recommendations form the Technology Task Force and Technology Oversight Committee.
- Assists with the creation of Site Technology Plans in conjunction with Principals, teachers, and
- community representatives.
- Explores options for grant proposals designed to secure additional funding for the district in the area of technology and shares results with Assistant Superintendents, Principals and the District Chief Technology Officer.
- Assists with coordinating the purchase of technology equipment and materials.
- Reviews, evaluates, and informs instructional staff of recent technology developments in commercial products.
- Coaches and models scientifically research-based strategies/processes with teachers.
- Coordinates the use of technology by teachers, administrators, support staff, and students.
- Manages and supports use of technology by teachers through assigned geographic school cluster with assigned teacher technology liaisons
- Facilitates regular teacher technology liaison training meetings
- Creates and implements innovative curriculum based on 21st Century Skills with sites.