| 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 | |
| 0 | Tucson, Arizona 85719 | |
| | Phone: (520) 225-6040 | |
| 11 | Attorneys for defendant | |
| | Tucson Unified School District No. 1 | |
| 12 | | EC DICTRICT COLIDT |
| 12 | IN THE UNITED STATE | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA | | TT OF ADIZONA |
| 4 | FOR THE DISTRIC | OF ARIZONA |
| 1 | Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., | 4:74-cv-0090-DCB |
| 15 | Plaintiffs, | (Lead Case) |
| | V. | (Lead Case) |
| | [*] · | |
| 61 | | |
| 16 | Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al. | |
| | Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., Defendants. | |
| 17 | Defendants. | 4:74-cv-0204 TUC DCB |
| 17 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., | 4:74-cv-0204 TUC DCB (Consolidated Case) |
| 17 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, | 4:74-cv-0204 TUC DCB (Consolidated Case) |
| 17 18 19 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., | |
| 17 18 19 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. | |
| | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, | |
| 17 18 19 20 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. | |
| 17 18 19 20 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 222 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 222 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., | (Consolidated Case) |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., Defendants. | (Consolidated Case) RESPONSE |
| 17 18 19 20 21 | Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., Defendants. DISTRICT'S | (Consolidated Case) RESPONSE S' OBJECTION (2276) |

The Court directed the District to prepare and file a notice and report of compliance with its directive to prepare plans for operating the African American Student Services Department (AASSD) and Mexican American Student Services Department (MASSD) beyond a declaration of unitary status. [ECF 2123 at 121-22, 150.] The District prepared and filed those departmental operating plans on December 6, 2018. [ECF 2151-1 and 2151-2, respectively.] The Fisher Plaintiffs did not file any objection to the AASSD Operating Plan submitted by the District.

In a subsequent order, the Court ordered the District to revise the operating plans according to its directives and resubmit them. [ECF 2213 at 3-10, 17-19.] As requested, the District revised the operating plans by providing a narrative explanation of the roles and functions of the various key positions in these departments, addressing whether the function or service provided is academic, behavioral or outreach, and also identifying whether the roles of the department in those functions is supportive, supplemental or additional. The revised plans also identify and cross-reference other departments involved in those functions. The revised plans also reflect other directives from the Court, including the requirement of a bachelors' degree for all AASSD staff, and revised and clarified roles. The revised AASSD plan was submitted to the Court on August 30, 2019. [ECF 2265-1.]

The Fisher Plaintiffs filed a combined objection to all of the District's completion plans, which principally set out a general and unfounded attack on the District not here addressed,¹ but did include a small section objecting to the revised AASSD operating plan. [ECF 2276, pp. 6-8.] This objection does not address the particular revisions to the

¹ The District briefly addresses these other arguments in its separate Response to Fisher Plaintiffs' Objections, filed of even date herewith.

AASSD operating plan directed by the Court, but rather include a series of seven demands.

Several of these demands are already been included in the revised AASSD operating plan, which the Fisher Plaintiffs have not apparently reviewed closely. First, a bachelor's degree is <u>already</u> a requirement for all positions in the AASS Department, excepting only the administrative and activity assistants. Second, the director of the department <u>already</u> reports directly to the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction. Third, the director <u>already</u> files periodic reports.² Fourth, the District <u>did</u> invite the Fisher Plaintiffs representatives to participate onn hiring panels for positions in the department, and they declined. Fifth, the department <u>does</u> follow and use research and evidence-based plans to realize its broad goal of improving academic outcomes for African American students.³

Finally, the department went through a comprehensive review of its structure during 2018, using a consultant suggested and approved by counsel for the Fisher Plaintiffs (Trayben Associates). The operating plan represents the results of that review, with a structure specifically approved by the consultants. From SY2014-15 to SY2018-19, in addition to its director, the department had 10-14 student success coaches (some with a bachelor degree) and two behavioral specialists. The new structure has a director,

² As noted above, the District reports annually on the operations of the department in its Annual Report. In addition, it reports annually on student achievement (which is only measured annually by the state test), graduation rates, dropout rates (all annual figures), and does already provide quarterly discipline reports to the Department of Justice. The Fisher Plaintiffs demand "quarterly reports," without specifying what they wish reported on quarterly, or what benefit would be provided by quarterly reports. In this context, the District does not understand what else the Fisher Plaintiffs need.

³ Improving academic outcomes is a broader and more appropriate goal than merely closing the achievement gap, which is only one measure of success. Improving graduation rates, reducing dropouts and retentions, improving overall academic importance, reducing the severity and frequency of discipline are all part of the broad aspects of improved outcomes for African American students.

program coordinator, four program specialists, four RTI specialists (certified teachers), two behavioral specialists, and five student success coaches, all of whom have a bachelor's degree, and experience in the position. The District respectfully submits that the restructuring which has taken place over the last year and a half has provided the "new department" that the Fisher Plaintiffs demand.

As noted above, the District has recently gone through the process of rehiring for a number of positions in the department. However, the District respectfully declines to require that its current director re-apply for his job as demanded by the Fisher Plaintiffs. The District does not believe that it is either necessary or appropriate for USP purposes for the Court to get involved in hiring or dismissal of particular individuals.

Conclusion

The District respectfully submits that it has complied with the Court's orders regarding the operating plan for the African American Student Services Department, and has met the requirements set out in USP § V.E.7, as shown by the record herein, including its annual reports on student support services. Accordingly, the District requests that the Court grant unitary status in this area of District operations (USP § V.E.7).

⁴ Compliance with USP student support services requirements is addressed in the record at the following specific locations incorporated herein by reference: ECF 2057-1, pp. 275-319 and appendices cited therein; ECF 2124-1, pp. 89-111 and appendices cited therein; ECF 2075-5, pp. 94-182 and documents cited therein.

⁵ The District submits this notice filing without waiver of its position that there is no basis in fact or law for continued federal court supervision of the District in this or any other area, given the findings of Judge Frey in 1978, subsequent rulings of this Court, and the record herein. The District recognizes that the Court has overruled these objections, but wishes to make clear that they are preserved for appeal.

Case 4:74-cv-00090-DCB Document 2314 Filed 10/07/19 Page 5 of 6

| 1 | Dated this 7 th day of October, 2019. | |
|----|--|---|
| 2 | | Respectfully submitted, |
| 3 | | /s/ P. Bruce Converse |
| 4 | | P. Bruce Converse Timothy W. Overton |
| 5 | | DICKINSON WRIGHT, PLLC |
| 6 | | 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1400 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4568 |
| 7 | | Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. 1 |
| 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 7th day of October, 2019, I electronically transmitted the 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/ P. Bruce Converse