	Case 4:74-cv-00090-DCB Document 2401	Filed 12/20/19	Page 1 of 9		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Robert S. Ross (#023430) Robert.Ross@tusd1.org Samuel E. Brown (#027474) Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org <b>TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRIC</b> <b>LEGAL DEPARTMENT</b> 1010 East Tenth Street Tucson, Arizona 85719 Phone: (520) 225-6040 P. Bruce Converse (#005868) <u>bconverse@dickinsonwright.com</u> Timothy W. Overton (#025669) <u>toverton@dickinsonwright.com</u> <b>DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC</b> 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1400 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4568 <u>courtdocs@dickinsonwright.com</u> Phone: (602) 285-5000 Fax: (844) 670-6009	Γ			
12	Attorneys for defendant Tucson Unified School District No. 1				
14	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
1 -	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
15	FOR THE DISTRI	CT OF ARIZON	JA		
15 16 17 18 19	FOR THE DISTRIC Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,	CT OF ARIZON 4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas	DCB		
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et	4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas 4:74-cv-0204	DCB se)		
16 17 18 19 20	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, v.Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,Defendants.Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v.Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et	4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas 4:74-cv-0204	DCB se) TUC DCB		
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., Defendants. Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,	4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas 4:74-cv-0204	DCB se) TUC DCB		
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, v.Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,Defendants.Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v.Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et	4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas 4:74-cv-0204 (Consolid	DCB se) TUC DCB lated Case)		
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> </ol>	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al.,         Plaintiffs,         v.         Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,         Defendants.         Maria Mendoza, et al.,         Plaintiffs,         v.         Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,         Defendants.         Moria Mendoza, et al.,         Plaintiffs,         v.         Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al.,         Defendants.         NOTICE AND REPOR         TWO-WAY DUA	4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas 4:74-cv-0204 ' (Consolid <b>F OF COMPLIA</b> <b>L LANGUAGE</b>	DCB se) TUC DCB lated Case)		
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	Roy and Josie Fisher, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., <u>Defendants.</u> Maria Mendoza, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Tucson Unified School District No. 1, et al., <u>Defendants.</u> NOTICE AND REPOR	4:74-cv-0090- (Lead Cas 4:74-cv-0204 ' (Consolid <b>F OF COMPLIA</b> <b>L LANGUAGE</b>	DCB se) TUC DCB lated Case)		

The Court directed the District to engage dual language expert Ms. Rosa Molina to prepare a report updating her initial report from May, 2016, and an inventory of the current TWDL programs. [ECF 2295.] The District was ordered to file a Notice of Compliance including (a) the complete dual language plan, including the plan for expansion of the program filed on August 30, 2019 (pursuant to the Special Master's recommendation as adopted by the Court, and any updates necessary as a result of Ms. Molina's report, (b) the inventory of current TWDL programs, and (c) Ms. Molina's supplemental report.

In addition, this notice and Ms. Molina's report sets out discussion of concerns relating to program isolation, which do <u>not</u> relate to racial isolation as this Court apparently assumed; this notice also clarifies some apparent misunderstandings about the plan for expanding the TWDL program filed on August 30, 2019.

#### A. Dual Language Plan

In 2016, working with Rosa G. Molina, Executive Director of the Association of Two-Way & Dual Language Education (ATDLE), the District developed its Two-Way Dual Language Access Plan (the "TWDL Access Plan"). The Access Plan was finalized on November 10, 2016. The Access Plan, along with the original Molina Report, was filed as an appendix to the District's annual report for the 2016-17 school year (ECF 2061-6, pp. 1-37).

The primary recommendation of the original Molina Report was the creation of a comprehensive District master plan for implementation of TWDL programs. The District formed a task force and developed that implementation plan, known as the TWDL Framework. The TWDL Framework was completed during the 2017-18 school year, and was filed as an appendix to the District's annual report for that year. [ECF 2134-4, pp. 1-61.]

Subsequently, the Special Master recommended, and the Court directed, the District to prepare a plan "for expanding dual language laying out the obstacles and the

costs for developing additional sites" by September 1, 2019. [ECF 2123, at 101]. The
District prepared and filed this expansion plan (the "TWDL Expansion Plan") on August
30, 2019. [ECF 2258-1.]

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1

2

Together, these three documents represent the District's Dual Language Plan. Although each of these documents is already in the Court record, and mindful of the Court's enjoinder to file complete plans whenever one part has been added or updated, the District now files its complete Dual Language Plan as Exhibit A hereto, consisting of three components: the TWDL Access Plan, the TWDL Framework (program implementation) and the TWDL Expansion Plan. No updates to these plan documents were necessary as a result of Ms. Molina's program review and supplemental report this fall.

12

## B. <u>Inventory of Current TWDL Programs</u>

The District worked with Ms. Molina to prepare a complete inventory of the current TWDL programs, including three Court-specified data points.<sup>1</sup> The District and Ms. Molina identified six additional information points to be included in the inventory: language screeners, assessments in English, assessments in Spanish, monitoring and reporting students' language progress, use of the guiding principles of dual language, and professional learning. The inventory of current TWDL programs is attached as Exhibit B.

20

21

22

## C. <u>TWDL Supplemental Final Report (2019)</u>

As directed by the Court, Ms. Molina prepared a supplemental report on the District's TWDL program. That report is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

- 23 24
- 25

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Court identified three specific issues: (1) identify each school operating a TWDL program and if it is a single strand or double strand, with or without a non-TWDL strand and/or a whole-school TWDL program; 2) determine for each school whether the TWDL classes satisfy the requisite 33% linguistic composition; 3) identify that each class is being taught by certified bilingual teacher, and 4) etc. [ECF 2295 at 7:18-23.]

# D. <u>Program Isolation</u>

2	The Court noted that the 2016 Molina Report contained a reference to			
3	"programmatic isolation of the TWDL classes at the site." [ECF 2295 at 5-6]. The			
4	Court expressed concern that with the "advent of TWDL schools, the risk of isolation			
5	expands to creating segregated schools," and that "the District fails to explain how it			
6	reconciles the enrollment goal of reducing programmatic isolation with whole-school			
7	TWDL programs. It fails to address how the whole-school TWDL program can be			
8	reconciled with Brown's rejection of <i>Plessy</i> ." <i>Id.</i> at 6. The Court directed Ms. Molina			
9	and the District to consider this issue.			
10	However, Ms. Molina's reference to programmatic isolation in the 2016 report			
11	was <u><b>not</b></u> describing the type of racial and ethnic isolation referred to in <i>Plessy</i> . In her			
12	recent report, Ms. Molina clarifies:			
13	In the Order, the Court confuses my description of program isolation to mean the			
14	"racial isolation" of students. My intent in this recommendation was to suggest to			
15	TUSD that additional classes per grade level upon entry in kindergarten (double strands) has great benefit to building stronger program cohorts, programmatic			
16	flexibility, and prevents schools from confining students into the same single class cohorts from kindergarten to 8 <sup>th</sup> grades. In other words, double strands would			
17	protect against cohort isolation (aka program isolation). My references to cohort			
18	or program isolation were not directed towards racial or ethnic isolation of students.			
19	Ex. C, p. 7. Ms. Molina's references to reducing "programmatic isolation of the			
20	TWDL classes at the site" does not relate to isolation of students based on race or			
21	ethnicity. The Court expressed concern that school-wide TWDL programs have the			
22	potential to create segregated schools. However, there is no evidence at TUSD that			
23	either of the two school-wide TWDL programs, Davis or Roskruge, create or			
24	exacerbate segregation.			
25	School-wide TWDL programs only exist in TUSD as magnet schools – at Davis			
26	and Roskruge – designed specifically to create <i>integrated schools</i> . As magnet schools,			
27	both programs appeal to parents around a common desire for their students, regardless			
28				
l				

of race, to become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. The programmatic need for
linguistic balancing may result in the recruitment of Latino students to ensure nativeSpanish speaking peer-to-peer models, but there is a counter-balancing programmatic
need to achieve integration and student diversity as a magnet school through the
recruitment of native-English speakers. Ms. Molina recognizes that TWDL programs,
"throughout the United States are created to help ethnically balance a school through
the vehicle of second language opportunities for all students." Ex. C, p. 7.

At TUSD, these programs have been used in this precise manner. Davis is a 8 school-wide TWDL program that has gone from 85% Hispanic in SY2011-12, to 59% 9 10 Hispanic in SY2019-20. After more than a decade as a racially concentrated school, 11 Davis has been an integrated school for the past three years. The District has also 12 reduced racial concentration at Roskruge from 85% to 81% (though it has been as low as 77% in the past three years). The District's new TWDL school, Bloom ES, is also 13 a double-strand program and is also integrated (though it does have a non-TWDL 14 English-only strand). At all three schools, the TWDL program was the primary 15 16 vehicle for *promoting* increased integration and reduced racial concentration: attracting 17 non-Latino students to Davis and Roskruge, and attracting Latino students to Bloom.

The District also recognizes that Roskruge's ability to attract students may be 18 19 enhanced by improvement in overall academic achievement. Ms. Molina has 20 recommended that one key strategy for improving academics, and thereby improving 21 attractiveness and integration, is to ensure that – as occurs at Davis – only students truly 22 interested in the TWDL program are enrolled in the TWDL program (not merely 23 whoever happens to live in the neighborhood). This is achieved through the use of a 24 screener. Thus, despite a theoretical risk of increasing segregation (though that has not 25 occurred at TUSD), this is viewed by the TWDL expert (and has proven true at Davis) 26 to be a key means of *promoting integration* by improving academic achievement and thereby improving the overall academic profile and attractiveness of the TWDL 27 28 program to diverse families.

1 2

3

4

## E. Clarifications to the TWDL Expansion Plan.

In light of the subsequent briefing and orders, the District wishes to clarify three aspects of its TWDL Expansion Plan (part of the District's overall Dual Language Plan).

First, the plan to change the Roskruge program by modifying the boundary was
not a plan to *create* a school-wide program – Roskruge *is already* a school-wide
TWDL program. This plan is for a modification of the existing school boundary to
address point of entry issues that are frustrating TWDL implementation at this school.<sup>2</sup>
Second, the short term Language Academies at TWDL elementary schools are
designed to increase enrollment at <u>existing</u> sites, not to create new programs at new
schools. These academies are already in place and operational.

Finally, the plan to add a TWDL program at Magee MS may be reassessed after
the possible K-6 expansion currently under consideration, for which both Bloom and
Magee are possible options. Depending on the success of the pilot, if approved, the
District may reconsider other middle school candidates or other options for developing a
TWDL option for grades 6-8 on the eastside of the District within a seven-year period.

## **Conclusion**

Ms. Molina states that "Two-Way Dual Language schooling... addresses the
challenging issues of performance gaps in minority students and equal protection
under the law for all students by serving formerly underserved students with a rigorous
and well-defined educational program option." Ex. C, p. 15. According to Ms.
Molina, TUSD has "made great progress toward achieving" her 2016
recommendations, has "built a strong professional plan," and has "completed a TWDL

24

17

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Court's September 30, 2019 Order states that the "boundary change is necessary to accommodate the expansion of the TWDL program under the [USP] at Roskruge by changing it from a single classroom TWDL strand to a double classroom strand." [ECF 2295 at 2]. But Roskruge <u>already</u> offers a double-strand; the boundary change will strengthen instruction within the double strand but it is <u>not</u> being proposed to expand the current model at Roskruge.

Program Framework to serve as the roadmap for the present and future development of
 these programs." *Id.*

3 The District has utilized double-strand TWDL programs to create integrated schools at Davis ES and Bloom ES, on opposite sides of the District. It has created a 4 5 comprehensive framework for implementation and continues to expand existing 6 programs by adding double-strand programs. Based on a multi-year effort 7 spearheaded by TUSD staff, State obstacles to English Learning enrollment in TWDL 8 have been relaxed and the District is enrolling more ELs to attain the desired linguistic 9 mix. The District has addressed the once seemingly insurmountable issue of staffing 10 TWDL programs: in SY2019-20, 105 of 112 teachers in TWDL designated classes 11 have a bilingual or provisional bilingual endorsement (all others are working towards 12 earning one). TWDL programs in TUSD now assess students in both English and 13 Spanish, and monitor students' language progress and communicate such to parents.

The program is bearing fruit: test score school comparisons show that despite
State obstacles to obtaining the desired linguistic balance, TWDL students *still outperform their non-TWDL* peers on State assessments. Enrollment is up more than
300 students since SY2014-15, and continuing to grow.

The District respectfully submits that it has complied with the Court's orders,
and has met the requirements of USP § V(C), as shown by the record herein and
through its annual reporting. Accordingly, the District requests that the Court grant
unitary status in this area of District operations (§ V(C)).

Respectfully submitted on December 20, 2019.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGAL DEPARTMENT

<u>/s/Samuel E. Brown</u> Robert S. Ross Samuel E. Brown Attorneys for Tucson Unified School District No. 1

	Case 4:74-cv-00090-DCB	Document 2401	Filed 12/20/19 Page 8 of 9
1 2			P. Bruce Converse Timothy W. Overton <b>DICKINSON WRIGHT, PLLC</b>
3			1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1400 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4568
4			Attorneys for Tucson Unified School
5			District No. 1
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of December 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/ Samuel E. Brown