

APPENDIX X – 1

Brown, Samuel

From: Brown, Samuel
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 1:20 PM
To: 'Thompson, Lois D.'; bconverse@steptoe.com; wdh@umd.edu; Vicki Balentine (vicki.balentine@gmail.com); Timothy Overton; Weatherless, Renee; Juan Rodriguez (jrodriguez@MALDEF.org); rsjr3@aol.com; Eichner, James (CRT) (James.Eichner@usdoj.gov); Chanock, Alexander (CRT) (Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov); shaheena.simons@usdoj.gov; peter.beauchamp@usdoj.gov
Cc: Becky (rebeccarmontano@aol.com); Weatherless, Renee; Taylor, Martha
Subject: RE: Budget Development Process & Templates
Attachments: 20171221 Budget Development Process - Final.pdf

Lois/Counsel: please see attached the final BDP, including Lois's suggestions below. We really appreciate everyone's hard work this year and we look forward to a productive and fruitful 2018! Thanks, Sam and Martha

From: Thompson, Lois D. [<mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com>]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 10:06 AM
To: Taylor, Martha <Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org>; Brown, Samuel <Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org>; bconverse@steptoe.com; wdh@umd.edu; Vicki Balentine (vicki.balentine@gmail.com) <vicki.balentine@gmail.com>; Timothy Overton <toverton@steptoe.com>; Weatherless, Renee <Irene.Weatherless@tusd1.org>; Juan Rodriguez (jrodriguez@MALDEF.org) <jrodriguez@MALDEF.org>; rsjr3@aol.com; Eichner, James (CRT) (James.Eichner@usdoj.gov) <James.Eichner@usdoj.gov>; Chanock, Alexander (CRT) (Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov) <Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov>; shaheena.simons@usdoj.gov; peter.beauchamp@usdoj.gov
Cc: Becky (rebeccarmontano@aol.com) <rebeccarmontano@aol.com>
Subject: RE: Budget Development Process & Templates

Martha and Sam,

Point taken.

Can we clarify the budget process documents to make it clear that at the time Draft #2 is delivered there also will be magnet school plans that indicate the 910(G) amounts for each school and confirmation that at the time we receive Draft #3 we will receive magnet school budgets that include both the allocation from 910(G) and other funding sources?

Thanks and a very good holiday and happy New Year to you both.

Lois

From: Taylor, Martha [<mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org>]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 6:31 AM
To: Thompson, Lois D.; Brown, Samuel; bconverse@steptoe.com; wdh@umd.edu; Vicki Balentine (vicki.balentine@gmail.com); Timothy Overton; Weatherless, Renee; Juan Rodriguez (jrodriguez@MALDEF.org); rsjr3@aol.com; Eichner, James (CRT) (James.Eichner@usdoj.gov); Chanock, Alexander (CRT) (Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov); shaheena.simons@usdoj.gov; peter.beauchamp@usdoj.gov
Cc: Becky (rebeccarmontano@aol.com)
Subject: RE: Budget Development Process & Templates

Lois: the Draft 1 Narrative does not include proposed budget allocations – for any area, including for magnets. As you will recall, the plaintiffs requested an initial budget narrative draft without dollar amounts to give the plaintiffs an

opportunity to understand the District's strategies and approaches *before* getting into a review and dialogue about specific line items and specific budget allocations.

The magnet schools will be developing their plans and will know, generally, what money they are likely to have: schools start with the current year funding, then analyze – per the budget process – what they will likely need to do more of, do less of, do differently, or eliminate. The magnet plans will include sufficient information to understand the results of this analysis, and to understand the level of support being offered to magnet schools without adding actual budget allocations.

The District trusts the Special Master and plaintiffs will be able to conduct an informed review of the entire Draft 1 narrative (without budget allocations) and the draft magnet site plans (also, without actual budget allocations) during the first round of review.

Thank you.

Martha and Sam

From: Thompson, Lois D. [<mailto:lthompson@proskauer.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 12:53 PM
To: Taylor, Martha; Brown, Samuel; bconverse@steptoe.com; wdh@umd.edu; Vicki Balentine (vicki.balentine@gmail.com); Timothy Overton; Weatherless, Renee; Juan Rodriguez (jrodriguez@MALDEF.org); rsjr3@aol.com; Eichner, James (CRT) (James.Eichner@usdoj.gov); Chanock, Alexander (CRT) (Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov); shaheena.simons@usdoj.gov; peter.beauchamp@usdoj.gov
Cc: Becky (rebeccarmontano@aol.com)
Subject: Re: Budget Development Process & Templates

Dear Martha,

Mendoza Plaintiffs have reviewed the revised Budget Development Process materials and are concerned about the suggestion that magnet school site plans will be provided **without** budgets on February 2. We do not understand how schools can develop their plans if they do not know what money they are likely to have and do not understand how we can go through a budget development process in an informed way without having information about proposed budget allocations. We therefore suggest that the magnet school plans to be provided on February 2, 2018 include the 910(g) funds **and** notations of anticipated "other" funds – to be finalized later in the budget process (with an express date added to the budget process document to confirm that –presumably May 4, 2018 with Draft #3 given the language of the current draft – although it would be preferable to receive that information sooner).

I am sorry to say that we have reviewed the draft templates and concluded that there are none that we can confidently suggest be eliminated notwithstanding my comments at our meeting. I apologize for having gotten hopes up in this regard.

Lois

From: Taylor, Martha [<mailto:Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org>]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2017 1:35 PM
To: Alexander Chanock; James Eichner; Juan Rodriguez; Thompson, Lois D.; Peter Beauchamp; Rubin Salter; Shaheena Simons; Willis D. Hawley
Cc: Desegregation; Converse, Bruce; Timothy Overton; Weatherless, Renee
Subject: Budget Development Process & Templates

Special Master and counsel:

Attached please find the Draft Budget Development Process and templates submitted for final review and comment. Please note that there is one revision comment from the district. We look forward to any comments by December 21, 2017.

Thank you.

Martha G. Taylor, JD

**Sr. Director of Desegregation
Office of Desegregation
Dept. of Legal Services
Tucson Unified School District
520-225-6067
martha.taylor@tusd1.org**

This message and its attachments are sent from a law firm and may contain information that is confidential and protected by privilege from disclosure.

If you are not the intended recipient, you are prohibited from printing, copying, forwarding or saving them. Please delete the message and attachments without printing, copying, forwarding or saving them, and notify the sender immediately.

2018-19 USP BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The following schedule and budget information for the 2018-19 910G Budget Development Process is delineated below.

Date(s)	Action
October – December 2017	The District shall initiate: assessments of 910G requirements for sites and departments; assessments of 910G capital needs.
November 17, 2017	The District, Special Master, and Budget Operations Expert shall provide a draft budget development process to the Plaintiffs for review.
December 1, 2017	The District shall provide the plaintiffs, special master and budget expert with all District formulas used or required in the allocation of funds (with all changes from previous year noted), including ELD FTE and Teacher Assistant formulas and/or standards, school level staffing/FTE formulas, and CRC Itinerant-Teacher ratios and Mentor-Teacher ratios.
December 4-6, 2017	The parties shall meet in Tucson to discuss the proposed USP budget, including budget priorities, draft templates, formulas, expectations, and other key budget-related issues (objections and recommendations re the 2016-17 USP Budget, potential new magnet funding, loss or reduction of transition school funding).
No later than December 13, 2017	Finalize the draft budget development process (including templates); submit to Special Master and Plaintiffs for final review and comment.
December 20, 2017 [no later than five (5) business days after the process is received]	Plaintiffs and Special Master review draft development process and submit comments.
December 22, 2017	Submit final budget development process to Special Master and Plaintiffs, including final templates.
DRAFT #1 NARRATIVE [no later than February 2, 2018]	District submits Draft #1 narratives using the final narrative template. On a separate form, the USP Budget Criteria information shall be provided for each proposed new or expanded program in the budget. All Student Support Forms shall be provided for each proposed new or expanded student support program separately. Any systematic evaluation of the program should be attached. All Magnet Site Plans shall be submitted separately, without budgets.
February 5, 2018 [one business day after receipt of Draft #1 Narrative]	Budget Expert in consultation with SM will confirm and note that the above information has been received by all. Lack of information provided will be noted.

Date(s)	Action
No later than February 7, 2018	The District shall file with the Court a Notice of Disclosure and/or Compliance (including, if applicable, an explanation of any failures to comply with the January 20, 2017 benchmark)
February 16, 2018 [no later than 10 business days after Draft #1 is received]	Plaintiffs and Special Master will review Draft #1 and submit comments.
No later than February 24, 2018	A meeting of the parties will be scheduled in Tucson in May to review and discuss the proposed budget and other budget-related issues.
No later than February 28, 2018	The District shall initiate and finalize the enrollment projections that will be used to develop 910G allocations and share the projections with the Special Master and Plaintiffs.
<p data-bbox="170 871 560 913">DRAFT #2 910(G) BUDGET</p> <p data-bbox="170 934 365 1008">No later than March 16, 2018</p>	<p data-bbox="576 871 1258 913">The 2017-18 Proposed USP Budget Draft #2 will include:</p> <ul data-bbox="592 934 1429 1848" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="592 934 1429 1081">• a rationale for any differences between the Draft #2 proposed 2018-19 and the 2017-18 allocated amounts, including a rationale for any non-incremental increase or decrease in funding for the activity during the current budget year (2017-18), if applicable <li data-bbox="592 1102 1429 1312">• a summary of the Draft #2 proposed aggregated allocations broken out by allocation from 910G and all other USP related funding sources, by activity with the 2018-19 Proposed Allocation [Form 1-A], the 2017-18 Allocation [Form 1-B], and the variance between the Draft #2 2018-19 proposed allocation and the 2017-18 allocation [Form 1-C] <li data-bbox="592 1333 1429 1438">• Draft #2 proposed allocation for the activity in the proposed budget year (2018-19), the current budget year (2017-18), and the previous budget year (2016-17), [Form 2] <li data-bbox="592 1459 1429 1606">• Actual expenditures for each activity for the previous budget year (2016-17), allocations and projections for each activity for the current budget year (2017-18), proposed allocations for each activity for the proposed budget year (2018-19) [Form 5] <li data-bbox="592 1627 1429 1774">• 910G budget detail, including Draft #2 proposed 2018-19 allocations, current year (2017-18) budgeted allocations, and comments relating to any position and/or program changes [Form 3] and specific line item allocations by department [Form 4(a)] <li data-bbox="592 1795 1429 1848">• proposed 2018-19 magnet allocations shall be included in Draft #2

Date(s)	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on a separate form, the USP Funding Criteria information shall be provided for each new or expanded program in Draft #2 of the budget that was not delineated in the Draft #1 narrative • student support criteria forms for ongoing student support programs • PD assessment (participants, amounts, delivery methods, costs) <p>NOTE: The allocations for each activity that were approved for the 2017-18 school year should not be moved to another activity for the 2018-19 school year budget year. Changes in allocations within an activity from the previous year will be completed and approved through the reallocation process after the budget is approved.</p> <p>All Magnet Site Plans shall be submitted separately, including 910(g) budget allocations.</p>
March 19, 2018 [one business day after receipt of Draft #2]	Budget Expert in consultation with SM will confirm and note that the above information has been received by all. Completed and/or lack of information provided will be noted.
No later than March 21, 2018	The District shall file with the Court a Notice of Disclosure and/or Compliance (including, if applicable, an explanation of any failures to comply with the March 10, 2017 benchmark)
March 30, 2017 [no later than 10 business days after Draft #2 is received]	Plaintiffs and Special Master review and comment period. A phone conference with the parties may prove supportive of the process during this time.
March 2017	Budget Expert in consultation with SM will confirm and note all RFI's and Responses. Any continuing RFI's will be noted.
<p>DRAFT #3 (includes Narrative related to issues raised by the Special Master and Plaintiffs, and funding from all sources in Form 4(b))</p> <p>No later than May 4, 2018</p>	<p>District submits Draft #3 including funding from all sources in Form 4(b) (all changes between drafts emphasized); the 2018-19 Proposed USP Budget Draft #3 will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a rationale for any differences between Draft #3 and Draft #2, including a rationale for any non-incremental increase or decrease between drafts, if applicable [Cover Letter] • a summary of the Draft #3 proposed aggregated allocations broken out by allocation from 910G and all other USP related funding sources, by activity with the 2018-19 Proposed Allocation [Form 1-A], the 2017-18 Allocation [Form 1-B], and the variance between the Draft #3 2018-19 proposed allocation and the 2017-18 allocation [Form 1-C]

Date(s)	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft #3 proposed allocation for the activity in the proposed budget year (2018-19), the current budget year (2017-18), and Draft #2 [Form 2] • Actual expenditures for each activity for the previous budget year (2016-17), allocations and projections for each activity for the current budget year (2017-18), proposed allocations for each activity for the proposed budget year (2018-19) [Form 5] • 910G budget detail, including Draft #3 proposed 2018-19 allocations, current year (2016-17) budgeted allocations, and comments relating to any position and/or program changes [Form 3] and specific line item allocations by department [Form 4(a)] • the USP Funding Criteria and/or Student Support Criteria forms shall be provided for each new or expanded program in Draft #3 of the budget that was not delineated in Draft #2 or the Draft #1 narrative. <p>NOTE: The allocations for each activity that were approved for the 2017-18 school year should not be moved to another activity for the 2018-19 school year budget year. Changes in allocations within an activity from the previous year will be completed and approved through the reallocation process after the budget is approved.</p> <p>All Magnet Site Plans shall be submitted separately, including budget allocations from all sources.</p>
May 7, 2018	Budget Expert in consultation with SM will confirm and note that the above information has been received by all. Completed and/or lack of information provided will be noted.
No later than May 9, 2018	The District shall file with the Court a Notice of Disclosure and/or Compliance (including, if applicable, an explanation of any failures to comply with the May 4, 2018 benchmark)
May 7-18, 2018	The parties shall meet in Tucson to discuss the proposed USP budget and other related issues.
May 18, 2018 [no later than 10 business days after Draft #3 is received]	Plaintiffs and Special Master review and comment period limited to newly proposed allocations in Draft #3 except when new changes in proposed allocations affect specific proposals in Draft #2 or when a rationale is provided as to why the comment was not provided in Draft #2. The Plaintiffs and Special Master may also restate comments related to prior drafts. A phone conference with the parties may prove supportive of the process during this time.
June 1, 2018 [within 10 business days of plaintiffs comments on Draft #3, per court order]	Special Master submits any suggestions for modification related to proposed allocations reflected in Draft #3 to the District.

Date(s)	Action
June 8, 2018	The plaintiffs submit any and all “continuing objections” and any objections or comments they have on the Special Master’s suggestions.
June 2018	Budget Expert in consultation with SM will confirm and note all RFI’s and Responses. Any continuing RFI’s will be noted.
FINAL DRAFT No later than June 26, 2018	District presents Final Proposed Budget to the Special Master and Plaintiffs and presents Final Proposed Budget, Special Master suggestions for modification, and Plaintiffs’ continuing objections to the Governing Board. The Final Proposed Budget will be in the approved format. The District provides a copy of the “Final Draft” 2017-18 Proposed USP Budget that will be considered by the Governing Board with any allocation revisions using the approved format. Any changes from Draft #3 and other previous drafts shall be noted in the same way as described in previous formats. If approved, the District will file the Final USP Budget no later than June 30, 2017.
June 29, 2018	Budget Expert in consultation with SM will confirm and note that the above information has been received by all. Completed and/or lack of information provided will be noted.
No later than July 10, 2018	Any plaintiff may file objections to the Final USP Budget.
No later than July 20, 2018	The District may file a response (which may include commitments to reallocate funds in response to objections).
No later than July 31, 2018	Special Master will file a request for expedited ruling within 30 days.