



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  
27  
28

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

Roy and Josie Fisher, et al.,  
 Plaintiffs  
 and  
 United States of America,  
 Plaintiff-Intervenor,  
 v.  
 Tucson Unified School District, et al.,  
 Defendants,  
 and  
 Sidney L. Sutton, et al.,  
 Defendants-Intervenors,

---

Maria Mendoza, et al.,  
 Plaintiffs,  
 and  
 United States of America,  
 Plaintiff-Intervenor,  
 v.  
 Tucson Unified School District, et al.  
 Defendants.

No. CV-74-00090-TUC-DCB  
(Lead Case)

No. CV-74-0204-TUC-DCB  
(Consolidated Case)

**AMENDED as to caption only:  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

R&R: CRC and CRP Professional Learning and Multicultural Curriculum Plans

1 **Special Master's Report and Recommendation Relating to Culturally Relevant**  
2 **Curriculum and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) Professional Learning and**  
3 **Multicultural Curriculum (MC) Plans**  
4

5 **Overview**

6 The District filed its completion plans with respect to culturally relevant courses  
7 (CRC), a related professional learning plan and multicultural curriculum (MC) on August  
8 23, 2019. The Mendoza plaintiffs filed their objections to these plans on September 23,  
9 2019 and the Fisher plaintiffs filed their objections on September 20, 2019. There were no  
10 objections to the multicultural curriculum plan so the Special Master is not addressing that  
11 plan. The Fisher objections take the form of a set of questions that appear to reflect their  
12 doubts that the benefits from CRC claimed by the District do not occur. Among the  
13 questions they ask are addressed by the District's filing on October 7, 2019 (doc.2324)-1)  
14 –in which they list the CRC offered in each of the District schools.<sup>1</sup>

15 The Mendoza plaintiffs submit three objections. First that the District does not  
16 provide a comprehensive framework with respect to CRC implementation. Second, that the  
17 District fails to provide a clear description of how CRC relate to other elements of the USP  
18 empathizing the Mexican American Student Support Department (MASSD) (and by  
19 implication the African American Student Support Department) and the family  
20 engagement plan (FACE). Third, the District's description of how it trains school  
21 administrators who evaluate teacher competency with respect to CRP is inadequate. The  
22 Special Master addresses of each of these three concerns.

23 **The Adequacy of a Comprehensive Framework.**

24 The District response to the Mendoza criticisms objections by citing different  
25 characteristics of its report which it claims represents a comprehensive framework. The  
26 Mendoza plaintiffs assert that such a framework should include the specific strategies and  
27 timelines for implementing CRC in each of the District's schools. The Mendoza plaintiffs  
28

---

<sup>1</sup> The Fisher plaintiffs have long opposed the offering of CRC.

1 also expect the comprehensive framework to address the dilemma that derives from the  
2 fact that some students prefer to take CRC rather than AP courses because the CRC courses  
3 are taught by teachers “with whom they can relate better”. While this last concern may  
4 seem idiosyncratic, it draws attention to the difference between CRC courses and more  
5 traditional curriculum. The CRC courses, while they substitute for certain core courses, are  
6 taught from either an African-American or Latino perspective and they seek to develop  
7 among the students a greater sense of academic self-confidence and an understanding of  
8 the barriers they may confront as students of color and how to deal with them. So, the way  
9 these courses are taught and the dispositions of the teachers who offer them are more  
10 critical to their success than are most courses. It is easy to see why these courses appeal to  
11 the students who enroll in them but, at the same time, there are limits on the numbers of  
12 teachers who can maximize the effectiveness of these courses. This is a constraint on the  
13 diffusion of CRC and represents a caution about rapid expansion, especially at the high  
14 school level<sup>2</sup>. The expansion of any technology which involves considerable variation in  
15 implementation often leads to a weakening of the effects of the technology.<sup>3</sup>

16 It would not be productive to develop a five-year plan for implementing the CRC  
17 because the wisdom of doing this depends heavily on the ability to recruit and mentor  
18 teachers to offer these courses. Moreover, the District has committed to providing an  
19 unusual amount of support for teachers at all grade levels who teach the content of CRC  
20 meaning that offering such courses is more expensive than offering more traditional  
21 courses. The concept of the framework, as opposed to an operational plan, often has the  
22 following characteristics: the theory that explains the importance or efficacy of a given  
23 action, the essential characteristics of the program and the reasons those characteristics are

---

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> Below the high school level the content of CRC is offered as part of another course  
26 which covers both perspectives for much shorter period of time. Because CRC are part of  
27 other courses in the curriculum, when those courses are offered may vary.

28 <sup>3</sup> In organizational theory jargon, such technologies are described as “intensive” and  
fidelity to the model is often problematic. That is the case with respect to CRC.

1 fundamental, the challenges to effective implementation, and strategies for addressing  
2 those challenges. The District's plan does some of this but not all.

3 In an effort to address the requirements set by the court, both the Mendoza plaintiffs  
4 and the District suggests that CRP should be thought of as the more encompassing concept.  
5 Arguably the CRC is one of many elements of the USP that are dependent on the ability of  
6 staff to be culturally responsive in implementing everything from instruction to discipline  
7 to the creation of inclusive and civil environments.

### 8 **Interrelationships Between Organizational Units Involved with CRC**

9 Mendoza plaintiffs cite the Court's requirement that the District develop an  
10 executive summary of the success of its efforts to implement the USP and this would  
11 include how the various elements of the USP are dependent on one another. But this  
12 requirement by the Court is not specific to CRC. It is one thing to describe how the success  
13 of CRC depends on its relationships to particular elements of the USP, and quite another  
14 to describe all the different ways that CRC affect the overall success of the USP or how  
15 other elements of the USP might affect success of CRC courses. As noted, the Mendoza  
16 plaintiffs focus attention on how MASSD has related to the CRC but the functions and  
17 responsibilities of the MASSD are now being studied and may be importantly altered.  
18 These decisions should be made in the next several weeks at which time the District should  
19 modify this description of the relationships among organizations directly involved in the  
20 effective implementation of CRC.

### 21 **Training of Administrators to Evaluate Teacher Competence with Respect to CRP**

22 In a review of end of year evaluations of teachers undertaken by the Special Master and a  
23 member of Implementation Committee three years ago, they found virtually no mention of  
24 specific instructional strategies much less CRP. Whether this is still the case, is not known.  
25 There does not appear to be any process by which the validity and reliability of assessments  
26 of teacher proficiency with respect to CRP. Presumably the District assistant  
27 superintendents have this responsibility but so far as the Special Master understands, the  
28 assistant superintendents focus on the evaluation of principals and there is nothing in the

1 principal's evaluation instrument that deals with their proficiency in evaluating their  
2 teachers with respect to CRP.

3 **Recommendations**

4 An intuitive argument can be made that CRC, and especially CRP, would have the  
5 benefits the District claims for them. But if it is to make such claims, the District should  
6 document them because this is not conventional wisdom at the moment.

7 When the structure and functions of the MASSD and AASSD are determined by the Court,  
8 the District should modify the description of the relationships among organizations directly  
9 involved in the effective implementation of CRC.

10 The District should present evidence to the plaintiffs and the special master that the  
11 training of administrators to evaluate the CRP competencies of teachers is effective.

12 Respectfully submitted, November 18, 2019.

13  
14 /s/ Willis D. Hawley

15 Willis D. Hawley Special Master  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28