

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

These RFI responses were provided to Special Master and Plaintiffs between 11/18/15 and 1/19/16. Follow-up questions were also asked and answered during this time period. All RFIs and responses are compiled and organized here by USP Section.

## II. STUDENT ASSIGNMENT

Mendoza RFI 1: As the District is aware, Mendoza Plaintiffs have stated repeatedly since the time of the negotiation of the USP that one measure of progress under the USP would be having more students attending integrated schools. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore compared the percentage of total students attending integrated schools as reported in the Annual Report filed January 13, 2014 (Doc. 1549-5) (Appendix 3 –TUSD Enrollment by Ethnicity SY 12-13 40th day (09.27.2012)) with the comparable number as reported in the current Annual Report (Appendix II-41, Doc. 1848-5, page 95 of 652 – TUSD Enrollment by Ethnicity SY 14-15 40th day (09.25.2014)). We eliminated the alternative schools from the comparison because while they appear in the most recent appendix, they were not included in the report for SY 12-13. By our calculation the percentage of TUSD students attending integrated schools has declined from 21.8% to 19.3%. (Comparable analysis for the District’s racially concentrated schools shows that the proportion of TUSD students attending such schools has increased (from 44.5% to 45.9%) in the same period.) We ask if the District has undertaken a similar analysis and, if so, whether it has reached the same result.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 1: The District has not undertaken either of these analyses (re percentages of students in integrated or racially concentrated schools) given the USP’s emphasis by design on statistics regarding numbers of integrated, neutral, and racially concentrated schools. However, as the parties agreed in early October, emphasizing the number of students in integrated environments is a metric worth exploring (See, e.g., para. E of the parties’ magnet stipulation) and we anticipate undertaking such analysis this year.**

Mendoza RFI 2: Assuming our analysis is correct, we ask what the District believes explains this decrease in the proportion of TUSD students attending integrated schools and how it intends to address this issue (as well as the increased proportion of students attending racially concentrated schools) going forward.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 2: See above response to #1.**

## III. TRANSPORTATION

No RFIs received under this Section.

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**IV. ADMINISTRATORS AND CERTIFICATED STAFF**

Mendoza RFI 3: On page 68 of the Report, the District indicates that for the first semester of the 2014-15 school year, “the District continued to use SIGMA and then transitioned to Applitrack.” Does Applitrack maintain applicant pool information for applicants who have applied to administrative and certificated staff positions in the past three years?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 3: No, Applitrack does not maintain applicant pool information for applicants who have applied to administrative and certificated staff positions in the past three years. Applicant pool information prior to SY 2014-15 is maintained in SIGMA.**

Mendoza RFI 4: For the fall 2014 and spring 2015 semesters, were “applicants in the [applicant] pool considered for all available vacancies for which they applied” (USP Section IV, D, 2)?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 4: Yes.**

- Mendoza Follow-up RFI to TUSD Response re RFI #3 and RFI #4: Mendoza Plaintiffs are confused by the District’s seemingly conflicting Response. The Report indicates that the District transitioned from SIGMA to Applitrack in the first semester of the 2014-15 school year, thus using Applitrack for most of the 2014-15 school year. (See page IV-68 of Report.) In its Response, the District states that “Applitrack does not maintain applicant pool information for applicants who have applied to... positions in the past three years,” yet the District asserts that for each of the fall 2014 and spring 2015 semesters, applicants in the applicant pool were considered for all available vacancies for which they applied. Did the District continue to use SIGMA for this purpose? If not, how did the District consider applicants in the applicant pool for positions for which they qualified given that the new tracking system (Applitrack) used does not maintain applicant pool data for earlier years?
  - **Response to Mendoza Follow-Up RFI 3 and RFI 4: AppliTrack maintains the pool from January 2015 moving forward but does not have applicant information for the previous three (3) years. When the District transferred its collection of applications to Applitrack in 2014-15, all SIGMA applicants were e-mailed and asked to re-establish their applications in the new system (Applitrack). Applicants in the applicant pool were considered for all available vacancies for which they applied, but did not use SIGMA for that purpose. At this point, the District has 13,885 applications in the system.**

**Mendoza RFI 5:** Please detail the racial/ethnic breakdown of any persons who were hired as a result of the District’s consideration of applicant pool candidates for positions for which they qualified.

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 5: We interpret this question as seeking the demographic breakdown of the applicant pools and selected candidates for positions filled in 2014-15. See Appendix IV-83. If our interpretation of the question is in error, please let us know.**

- Mendoza Plaintiffs' Follow-up to RFI 5: The District requests that the Mendoza Plaintiffs inform them if they have misinterpreted their information request. The District has. Mendoza Plaintiffs do not seek the demographic breakdown of applicant pool candidates and the separate breakdown of persons hired in 2014-15. They request the "racial/ethnic breakdown of any persons who were hired as a result of the District's consideration of applicant pool candidates for positions for which they qualified." In other words, of the TUSD certificated and administrative hires in 2014-15, how many (by racial/ethnic breakdown) resulted not from the person hired having directly applied for the position for which they were hired, but from the District having considered the individual for the position after identifying that person from its applicant pool as possessing the qualifications required of the position? (See USP IV, D, 2.)
  - **Response to Mendoza Follow-up to RFI 5: African-American (9); Anglo (10); Asian/Pacific Islander (2); Hispanic (7); Native American (1).**

Mendoza RFI 6: Describe District recruitment efforts to target African American and/or Latino candidates to participate in its Leadership Prep Academy (LPA). In that regard, the "TUSD/UA Cohort information via District's website" and "announcements at the Superintendent's Focus Group meetings, ILAs and central and site administrators reaching out directly to prospective candidates" detailed on page 74 do not appear to have been designed to target African American and Latino candidates.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 6: In addition to the efforts described in the Annual Report, the District reached out to principals and other administrative leaders to solicit recommendations for potential African American and Latino candidates on an individual basis. Review the selection process, available at <http://www.tusd1.org/contents/depart/pd/documents/LPA.pdf> ("Candidates for the Leadership Prep Academy will be selected from those who have been recommended by their principal, director, assistant superintendent, chief, or deputy superintendent.") Given the program's critical role in diversifying the District's administrative staff, race/ethnicity is taken into account when the candidate pool is reviewed. In 2014-15, the District accepted all African-American candidates into the LPA (one candidate declined due to a conflict with her PhD coursework schedule), but did not accept all Hispanic candidates.**

Mendoza RFI 7: Appendix IV-30 reflects that exactly one half of first-year teachers (137 of 274) in the 2014-15 school year were assigned to racially concentrated and/or "D" schools. However, USP Section IV, E, 5 mandates that the District "shall make efforts to increase the number of

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

experienced teachers and reduce the number of beginning teachers hired by Racially Concentrated schools or schools in which students are achieving at or below the District average in scores on state tests or other relevant measures of academic performance...” (emphasis added). Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand the average District school to be a “D” school and therefore do not believe Appendix IV-30 is adequately directed at this USP requirement. Please provide data that details how many of the 274 first-year teachers were assigned to racially concentrated schools or “schools in which students are achieving at or below the District average.”

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 7: Rather than relying on the “D” label, the District has added additional information to that provided in the Annual Report to include “RC schools” and “schools in which students are achieving at or below the District average” (based on the 2014-15 AZ Merit data – which was not available at the time of the Annual Report). See Attachment 7. Based on the additional data, 197 beginning teachers were assigned to “schools in which students are achieving at or below the District average” at “Racially Concentrated schools or schools in which students are achieving at or below the District average in scores on state tests or other relevant measures of academic performance...” See Attachment 7.**

Mendoza RFI 8: Page IV-95 of the Annual Report states that the District has implemented a “turnaround” program at six District campuses but does not state how “turnaround” or success is to be determined. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore ask what if any metrics are being applied to assess the progress/success of these “turnaround” schools and for data and/or other information evaluating or assessing the progress of these “turnaround” schools.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 8: Quarterly benchmarks are being applied to evaluate or assess progress.**

- Mendoza Plaintiffs’ Follow-up RFI 8: The District’s Response that “[q]uarterly benchmarks are being applied to evaluate or assess progress,” is non-responsive to Mendoza Plaintiffs’ inquiry on “what if any metrics are being applied to assess the progress/success of the[] ‘turnaround’ schools” and that it provide “data and/or other information evaluating or assessing the progress at the six identified “turnaround” campuses. The fact that the District applies metrics quarterly provides no information on what those metrics are or how they relate to the efficacy of the program. Mendoza Plaintiffs therefore again ask “what if any metrics are being applied to assess the program/success of the[] ‘turnaround’ schools”? Further, they again request data or information that “data and/or other information evaluating or assessing the progress of the[] ‘turnaround’ schools” be provided.
  - **Follow-Up Response to 8: The metrics applied are the District’s quarterly benchmark assessment. These assessments measure students’ progress in**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**mathematics and English-Language Arts, and are aligned to the District's Curriculum Scope and Sequence. Items on the assessment include 70% of concept and skills that have been targeted for that quarter and 30% cover standards from other quarters. The test results for each of the six UVA schools are measured against the overall District performance.**

**The University of Virginia Turnaround program provides observational data and information evaluating the progress of turnaround schools. As part of the program, the UVA turnaround staff complete an evaluation and assessment on school practices. They conduct three school site visits within the time of the two year period of the program. The UVA turnaround staff meets with the Superintendent and his senior district staff to debrief on their findings and to discuss opportunities for growth. A written report guides future implementation at the school site.**

Mendoza RFI 9: Page IV-100 reports the number of teachers who attended sessions on (1) student engagement strategies and best practices relating to the use of multicultural literature (30); (2) multicultural symposium of two hours (131); and (3) English Language Arts (50). These numbers appear low in a District of more than 2700 teachers. Has the District evaluated the level of attendance or done anything to seek to increase the level of attendance for similar programs in the future?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 9: During SY 14-15 all principals and teachers received multicultural training via ILAs (principals) and Early Release Wednesdays (teachers). The District integrated Multicultural information into the curriculum roll out, thus, all teachers received training. Desiree Cueto worked with small groups of teachers at the elementary and high school level. The small group of teachers received a deeper level of training as they began to develop MC units. For SY 15-16, the District is using an integrated approach again through unit writing for ELA K-12. Teachers who are writing the units (with MC perspective) are receiving PD on MC and unit writing. This same process is being done with HS History, HS Government, and MS Social Studies. Desiree Cueto will also be collaborating with Dr. Clarice Clash to provide Multicultural PD to all librarians and library assistants. Desiree is also planning on additional summer 2016 offerings.**

- Mendoza Follow-up RFI 9: While Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District's explanation of additional multicultural training beyond the multicultural sessions described on Page IV-100 of the Report and referenced in Mendoza Plaintiffs' information request, it does not respond to Mendoza Plaintiffs' request regarding low attendance at the sessions. Has the District evaluated attendance at these type of sessions or done anything to increase the level of attendance at these and similar programs moving forward? Or, are we to conclude that the answer to that question as posed in Mendoza Plaintiffs' original request is "no"?

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

- **Response to Mendoza Follow-Up to RFI 9: The District has evaluated attendance at the multicultural sessions, and has evaluated its strategies. In 2015-16, these strategies include collaboration with English/Language Arts to develop multicultural units in which the unit writers receive additional training in multicultural literature, and working with librarians and library assistants who can then support teachers at their sites.**

**The District continues to offer monthly trainings for teachers; current courses are listed under: Introduction to Multicultural and Global Literature in the classroom. Additionally, the District has expanded its pilot program from last year to increase teacher participation. Teachers meet weekly to share strategies, revise curriculum maps and develop units. The work has focused on ELA and Social Studies. Moreover, the District is offering book studies throughout the spring semester and training librarians and library assistants on strategies and engagements to introduce at their sites.**

Mendoza RFI 10: With regard to the New Teacher Induction Program (“NTIP”), the District indicates on page 88 of the Report “123 new teachers received an overview of the District” and that there were 83 second-year teachers (206 teachers total). However, on page 82, the District indicates that there were “274 beginning teachers” “[i]n SY 2-14-15” and in Appendix IV-112 there were 217 “1st & 2nd Year Teachers.” Please provide clarification on the number of first and second year teachers at TUSD in the 2014-15 school year. In addition, how many first- or second-year teachers were placed on “individualized learning plans” (Doc. 1672, Appendix C; Appendix IV-35)? Of the first- and second-year teachers in 2014-15, how many were assigned mentors as part of NTIP?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 10: In 2014-15, there were 431 first and second year teachers at TUSD (274 First year or “beginning teachers” and 157 second year)**

**USP section IV(I)(1) defines “new teachers” participating in the NTIP as “teachers in their first two years of teaching.” The “123 new teachers” referenced participated in the four-day induction overview – these teachers included “new to TUSD” teachers (who might have more than two years experience or who are in their first two years of teaching). The “274 beginning teachers” “[i]n SY 2-14-15” referenced on page 82, refers to teachers who have less than one year experience. USP section IV(E) refers to “beginning teachers” but that term is not defined in the USP. The “individualized learning plans” referenced in the First Year Teacher Pilot are created by teachers for students. 52 first- and second-year teachers were assigned a mentor.**

Mendoza RFI 11: Appendix IV-36 is described as the “revised First-year Teacher Plan to be

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

implemented in 2015-16” on page 90 of the Report. Mendoza Plaintiffs do not recall being given the opportunity to review and comment on the revised plan pursuant to USP Section I, D, 1 and ask when they can expect that plan to formally be submitted to the Plaintiffs and Special Master for I, D, 1 review?

**TUSD RESPONSE TO RFI 11: USP section I(D)(1) requires the District to “solicit the input of the Special Master and the Plaintiffs and submit such items for review” “for all new or amended plans, policies, procedures, or other significant changes contemplated pursuant to this Order.”**

**USP section IV(E)(6) requires the District to “develop a pilot plan to support first-year teachers serving in schools where student achievement is below the District average. This plan shall include the criteria for identifying the schools in which the program will be piloted in the 2013-2014 school year and for evaluation by the Office of Accountability and Research. The plan shall include professional development targeted toward the specific challenges these teachers face.” In 2013, the Mendozas Plaintiffs were given the opportunity to review and comment on the USP-require “pilot plan.” As described on page IV-90 of the Annual Report, the District revised the current approach to supporting first year teachers serving in schools where student achievement is below district average but the revisions were not “significant” enough to warrant invoking the I(D)(1) process. Also, the revisions were not to the “pilot” per se since the pilot was undertaken that first year.**

- Mendoza Plaintiffs’ Follow-up RFI 11(a): Mendoza Plaintiffs do not understand on what basis the District concludes that its revised First-year Teacher Plan involved “revisions [that] were not ‘significant’ enough to warrant invoking the I(D)1 process.” Notably, the District’s Report indicates that teachers participating in the program “did not receive the full amount of mentoring support” required under the plan even though “this mentoring was one of the Pilot Plan’s key components for differentiated teacher support.” (Report at IV-90; emphasis added.) Indeed, in its response, the District clarified that under the NTIP program only 52 of 431 first- and second-year teachers (or 12% of these teachers) received mentoring support, and that first-year teachers actually did not receive ANY additional mentoring support under the First-year Teacher Plan. The revised First-year Teacher Plan eliminates the additional time teachers are to spend with mentors beyond that under NTIP, and eliminates the additional “video recording of a lesson and debrief[ing] with [a] mentor” beyond that required under NTIP. (Compare NTIP and First-year Teacher Pilot Plan comparison chart, Appendix IV-35 at 2 with revised First-year Teacher Plan, Appendix IV-36 at 2.) Mendoza Plaintiffs have difficulty understanding how the District believes that its revisions are not “significant enough” for USP Section I,D,1 purposes when it has eliminated ALL additional mentoring support under the First-year Teacher Plan which it identified as one of the plan’s “key components.” Because Mendoza Plaintiffs believe that the elimination of mentoring support makes the revisions subject to I,D,1 review, particularly in light of the District’s material failure to provide mentoring support under both NTIP and the First-year

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

Teacher Plan in the 2014-15 school year, by copy of this statement of their concerns they ask the Special Master to address both the District's failure to provide the mentoring to which it had committed and its failure to comply with the requirements of USP I,D,1 in the Annual Report that he currently is finalizing for submission to the Court.

- **RESPONSE TO MENDOZA FOLLOW-UP RFI 11(a): The purpose of the pilot was to determine if the additional strategies would strengthen outcomes for new teachers. In that context, the amount of mentoring time was one of the key components of the pilot, but it did not significantly improve outcomes, and it was thus adjusted. Adjusting additional but ineffective mentoring time does not constitute a significant change. If the District had "eliminated" mentoring support for first year teachers altogether, as stated by the Mendoza Plaintiffs, such would certainly constitute a "significant change." But this is not what happened. The District adjusted the amount of mentoring support – as would be expected after the evaluation of the pilot indicated that additional mentoring time was ineffective. Likewise, the revised plan includes one rather than two video recordings because one additional video recording did not prove effective. Requiring one rather than two video recordings does not constitute a significant change.**

**Mendoza Plaintiffs are not correct in their assertion that ALL changes (no matter how minor in scope) must be subjected to the I(D)(1) process. This is an unreasonable interpretation of section I(D)(1) and would be impractical in its application – particularly in this instance where the USP expressly required a pilot plan to be evaluated after the first year.**

- Mendoza Plaintiffs' Follow-up RFI 11(b): In that regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs also note that the District has misinterpreted USP I,D,1. It does not make only "significant" changes to plans subject to review. Rather, it requires that all amended plans be provided for review and states that in addition to plans, policies and procedures, "other significant changes" that also are contemplated by the USP will be subject to I,D,1 review. In other words, I,D,1 does not limit review to only "significant" changes to a plan. ALL amendments to ALL plans covered by the USP are subject to review. Accordingly, by copy of this statement of their concerns, Mendoza Plaintiffs also ask the Special Master and the Implementation Committee to ensure that no other plans, policies and procedures that were subject to I,D,1 comment have been changed by the District without notice to the Plaintiffs and the Special Master.
  - **Follow-Up Response to 11(b): The District did not amend the USP-required pilot plan, the District evaluated the USP-required pilot, assessed its effectiveness, and created a permanent plan that was not required by the USP. If the District converts a USP-required pilot into a non-USP-required plan, I(D)(1) does not apply.**



TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**USP section IV(E)(6) requires the District to “develop a pilot plan to support first-year teachers serving in schools where student achievement is below the District average.” Per the USP, the pilot plan must include: “the criteria for identifying the schools in which the program will be piloted in the 2013-2014 school year and for evaluation by the Office of Accountability and Research” and “professional development targeted toward the specific challenges these teachers face.” The District developed the pilot plan pursuant to USP section IV(E)(6), solicited Special Master and Plaintiff comment pursuant to USP section I(D)(1), implemented the pilot in school year 2013-14, and evaluated the pilot at the end of the 2013-14 school year. See AR IV-89 and IV-90. The USP-required pilot plan is provided in the Report as Appendix IV-35 “First-Year Teacher Pilot Plan.”**

**After evaluating the pilot, the District created a permanent plan and provided a copy of this plan in the Report as Appendix IV-36 “Revised First Year Teacher Plan.”**

Mendoza RFI 12: Of the teachers “eligible to participate” in the mentoring program under the First-Year Teacher Plan (see Appendix IV-112), how many received mentoring support beyond that that was to be provided under NTIP?<sup>[fn 1]</sup> <sup>[fn 1]</sup> Under NTIP, teacher participants are to collaborate with mentors for a minimum of 90 minutes weekly, while mentor collaboration under the First-year teacher plan raises that minimum to 3 hours. (See Appendix IV-35 at 2).

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 12: Teachers received mentoring support through the NTIP only. The first-year teacher pilot was completed during the SY 2013-14. The results of the pilot are in the 2014 Annual Report. See Report IV.10 First-Year Teacher Pilot Plan. As noted in the Annual Report, some of the mentoring work described in the NTIP was revised so that mentors could assist all teachers in the curriculum rollout.**

Mendoza RFI 13: In Table 4.22 (on page 93 of the Report), the District indicates that 10 teachers were placed on a “Plan for Improvement” following their identification as underperforming teachers. However, the Report then details that “only two [out of four teachers who didn’t resign following that identification] met the criteria for a Plan of Improvement and were placed accordingly” (Report at 93), and then makes reference to the “teacher” (singular) who was on a Plan for Improvement and was evaluated again for effectiveness (Report at 94). Please provide clarification on the number of teachers who were placed on a Plan for Improvement in the 2014-15 school year.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 13: As indicated on page IV-93, “thirteen teachers were classified as “Ineffective” [and] nine of the thirteen teachers resigned...[o]f the remaining**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**four teachers who were identified as “Ineffective” from the teacher evaluations, only two met the criteria for a Plan of Improvement and were placed accordingly. The other two met exemption criteria included in the Governing Board Policy and were ineligible for placement on a Plan for Improvement.”**

**Ten teachers were placed on a Plan for Improvement during the 2014-15 school year, as indicated in Table 4.22.**

- Mendoza Follow-up RFI 13: The District’s Response, like the Report, appears to contain conflicting information, and thus the District’s Response has not helped Mendoza Plaintiffs’ understand how many teachers were placed on a plan of improvement following their identification as “underperforming” teachers in the 2014-15 school year. Simply put, was it 2 or 10?
  - **RESPONSE TO MENDOZA FOLLOW-UP RFI 13: The number of teachers placed on a Plan for Improvement during SY 2014-15 was 10 (ten).**

Mendoza RFI 14: Of the teachers who were on Plans for Improvement, how many were then “classified as Effective to avoid the possibility of statement of charges (dismissal)” (Report at 94)?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 14: None of the teachers were moved to effective to avoid the possibility of statement of charges (dismissal).**

Mendoza RFI 15: Please detail any PLC training principals received in the 2014-15 school year that included “strategies to: (a) build regular structured time into teachers’ schedules to co-plan and collaborate, observe each other’s classrooms and teaching methods, provide constructive feedback so the best practices for student success can be shared; [and] (b) develop within and across-school networks to encourage teachers with experience and success in using culturally responsive pedagogy to engage students to mentor and coach their peer teachers[.]” (USP Section IV, I, 4) (emphasis added).

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 15: During the SY 2014-2015, principals did not receive formal training on Professional Learning Communities although they did exchange ideas in collaborative groups as a precursor to working as PLCs. In addition, three administrators attended the March 4-6<sup>th</sup> Professional Learning Communities (PLC) in Phoenix. See IV-48 Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Training SY 2014-15 and IV-49 Roster of PLC Training Participants SY 2014-2015.**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

Mendoza RFI 16: Please provide the documentation contemplated in USP Section IV, K, q for any such training. In addition, beyond the “six UVA schools” (Report at 95-96), in which schools were PLCs implemented for the 2014-15 school year?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 16: In 2014-15, all principals worked to build and foster professional learning communities. The documentation addressing the PLC described above was provided for the SY 2014-2015 Annual Report. Please see Section IV - Administrators and Certificated Staff files IV-48 Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Training SY 2014-15 and IV-49 Roster of PLC Training Participants SY 2014-2015. See also Attachment 16 for the data on UVA training.**

Mendoza RFI 17: Please provide the documentation contemplated in USP Section IV, K, q for the “online training module” on “Understanding the Unitary Status Plan” (Report at 97), which Mendoza Plaintiffs note they did not see on the list of “On-line USP Related Courses” (Appendix IV-56), which appeared to primarily contain non-USP related courses (e.g., “Emergency Response Plan Training,” “Mandatory McKinney-Vento Training for Office Staff,” and “Onboarding” modules such as “harassment,” “time clock,” and “workers comp”).

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 17: Materials that were unchanged from a previous filing were not re-attached, in accordance with F. R. Civ. LR 7.1(d). This documentation was provided in the SY 2013-14 Annual Report . See 2013-14 AR, App IV-28 Because the training has been revised and updated, revised documentation will be provided in the SY 2015-16 Annual Report. All SY 2014-15 and 2015-16 new hires will receive the updated training during the 2015-16 school year.**

## V. QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Special Master RFI 2: I would appreciate the following info for 2014-15: Graduation rates by HS and by race.

**RESPONSE TO SPECIAL MASTER RFI 2: See attached redacted file, “Four Year Graduation Rate for the 2014-2015 Cohort with USP ethnicity.” (The n values have been removed to protect student personally identifiable information).**

Special Master RFI 3: I would appreciate the following info for 2014-15: Attendance data by school

**RESPONSE TO SPECIAL MASTER RFI 3: See attached file, “Attendance rates by School, Quarter and Year” for 2014-2015.**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

Special Master RFI 4: How many Intervention Requests for Service received by African American Student Services Department (AASSD) and Mexican American Student Services Department (MASSD).

**RESPONSE TO SPECIAL MASTER RFI 4: During SY 14-15 the total number of formal requests for intervention were:**

**AASSD: 36**

**MASSD: 26**

Special Master RFI 5: At Annual Report Narrative, p.250, the Defendant says it is piloting and implementing strategies to develop students' "intercultural competence". What are these?

**RESPONSE TO SPECIAL MASTER RFI 5: With the addition of the Itinerant Teachers (IT), the department of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Instruction (CRPI) anticipated that there would be various methods of influencing and developing students' intercultural proficiency. It was anticipated that site needs would determine the direction of this development. In the fall of 2015, this has taken various forms such as embedding ITs into PLC groups at sites, IT presentations to faculty on culturally relevant curriculum and culturally responsive pedagogy, and model teaching for non-CR teachers. Additionally, College Activity Helpers or School to College Liaisons (SCL) have developed presentations on various topics that directly contribute to increasing the intercultural proficiency of students. Their presentations incorporate their lived experiences on cultural and academic identity development, college preparation, and succeeding in a demographically and culturally challenging institution.**

Mendoza RFI 18: Goals for Participation in ALEs – As the District knows, the Mendoza Plaintiffs questioned whether the goals the District had set for increased participation in ALEs by African American and Latino students were sufficiently ambitious, but they do understand that per Court Order 1771 and Martha Taylor's memo of March 5, 2015, the District did set goals. Unless we have missed something we have seen no discussion in the Annual Report or in the Appendices of the goals for 2014-15 and how actual participation compared to those goals. If we have missed that information, we ask that you point us to it. If it is not in the Annual Report and/or Appendices we ask that it be provided in a format that allows ready comparison to the form in which goals were presented in the Taylor March 5, 2015 memo.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 18: The memo submitted to the parties on March 15, 2015, includes both the participation rates and the goals for SY 2014-2015. See Attachment 18, "Taylor March 5, 2015 Memo." In order to make it easier to find the requested information, the District has highlighted instances where the District met the goals for SY 2014-2015. See page 3, for example, where the African American, elementary student participation rate in Self-Contained Gate is highlighted (6.9%) indicating that the District exceeded the overall goal**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**of 6.3%. On page 4, this percentage (6.9%) is highlighted again to reflect that the District met the annual goal of 5.17%.**

Mendoza RFI 19: At page V-136, the District states that it cannot track and report whether an ELL student who became English proficient advanced to an ALE course but at page V-166 it reports reclassified ELL students participating in the dual language programs. How is it that the District can track reclassified ELL students in the dual language programs but not in the other ALEs?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 19: The District did not state “that it cannot track and report whether an ELL student who became English proficient advanced to an ALE course,” page V-136 states “Accordingly, an ELL student who became English proficient could have advanced to ALE participation, but the statistical tracking designed to inform these goals would not have reflected that progression.” Once a student is reclassified, they are no longer identified as “ELL.” That is all that this paragraph was designed to say.**

Mendoza RFI 20: We are having trouble reconciling the narrative on pages V-175 and V-176 with the Tables (5.34 and 5.35) on those pages. For example, at page V-175 there appears the statement that the African American retention rate for grades K-8 in SY 2013-14 was 2.0 percent; however the number in Table 5.34 for K-8 for SY 2013-14 appears to be 1.5%. Please tell us if we are reading the Table incorrectly or if there is an error either in the Table or in the narrative.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 20: The table is correct and is based on Appendix V-238 (V(G)(1)(o)) Three Year Student Retention Rate). The error is in the narrative, which should read 1.5% than 2.0%**

Mendoza RFI 21: Similarly, at page V-176 the narrative states that in 2013-14, the retention rate for Latino third graders was 1.3 percent. However, the number in Table 5.35 appears to be 1 percent. Again, please tell us if we are reading the Table incorrectly or if there is an error either in the Table or in the narrative.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 21: The table is correct and is based on Appendix V-238 (V(G)(1)(o)) Three Year Student Retention Rate). The error is in the narrative, which should read 1.0% than 1.3%**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

Mendoza RFI 22: Please confirm whether we are correct in reading Table 5.35 as showing that the retention rate for Latino students in the 8th grade increased from .4% in 2013-14 to .5% in 2014-15 (and that the narrative is in error when it says that the change was from 4.0 percent to .5 percent).

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 22: There is a typo in the narrative and it should read 0.4 percent, reflecting both table 5.35 and the Appendix V-238.**

## VI. DISCIPLINE

Special Master RFI 1: I would appreciate the following info for 2014-15: In-School Suspensions (ISS) and Out-of-School Suspensions (OSS) by school, by race.

**RESPONSE TO SPECIAL MASTER RFI 1: See attached redacted file, "In School and Out of School Suspensions by School and Race/Ethnicity." This is a disaggregation of the table contained in VI.G.1.b. (The n values have been removed to protect student personally identifiable information).**

Special Master RFI 6: On the discipline chart VI.1, the total number of students is way off. Are these incidents or students, or what?

**RESPONSE TO SPECIAL MASTER RFI 6: AR Appendix VI-1 Chart VI.G.1.b (Discipline data by Race/Ethnicity 4 years) reports duplicated student counts, so a student may be counted more than once for a specific discipline action. It is the total enrollment/incidents accumulated over the course of the year.**

Mendoza RFI 23: Mendoza Plaintiffs note that the information regarding GSRR/Discipline-related student and parent presentations in Appendix VI-8 conflicts with Appendix VI-5, which purports to report identical information, that is parent or student discipline presentations. Specifically, at least 30 additional student or parent presentations are reflected in Appendix VI-8. Mendoza Plaintiffs request clarification on which Appendix, if any, accurately reflects student/parent discipline presentations.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 23: VI-5 represents student/parent meetings conducted by LSCs; VI-8 represents total student/parent meetings (which includes those conducted by LSCs as well as by other qualified staff).**

Mendoza RFI 24: Footnote 40 at Page 245 of the Report states that school "sites at which potentially improper suspensions occurred," as a result of a failure to limit them to "ongoing

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
 Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

and escalating” misbehavior or failure to first attempt and document other interventions, “received directive memos designed to align their practices with the GSRR.” How many of these “potentially improper” suspensions occurred in the 2014-15 school year? At which schools did these suspensions occur? Did the District come to determinations on which suspensions were in fact improper? If so, please detail at which schools these improper suspensions occurred and what if any assessment was made to determine if such improper suspensions were disproportionately adversely impacting African American and Latino students.

**Response to MENDOZA RFI 24: There were 250 “potentially improper suspensions” at 30 schools. Suspensions occurred at 9 of 10 high schools (all except UHS), 7 middle schools (Doolen, Gridley, Magee, Mansfeld Vail, Pistor, Vail), 7 K-8’s (Fickett, Roberts-Naylor, Safford, Dietz, Hollinger, Lawrence, Maxwell), and 7 Elementary schools (Howell, Lineweaver, Maldonado, Marshall, Robison, Vesey, Whitmore). The District came to determinations on which suspensions were improper, and at each of the above-listed schools at least one “potentially improper suspension” was found to be improper. After making an initial assessment, the Student Equity Department sent a communication to the site and the central administrator (director) responsible for the site describing the concerns with the suspension so that leadership could further assess whether the underlying offense(s) was properly characterized, whether proper interventions were used and documented, and to ultimately determine whether the suspension was permitted by the GSRR.**

- Mendoza Follow-up to RFI 24: Mendoza Plaintiffs appreciate the District’s Response, but must again ask whether the District conducted any assessment to determine if the improper suspensions were disproportionately adversely impacting African American and Latino students and, if so, what were the findings?
  - **Response to Follow-up RFI 24: The District assessed the data to determine that the improper suspensions were not disproportionately adversely impacting African American and Latino students and determined that they were not. The only group with disparities is Anglo students who did not receive required interventions at a much higher rate than their population average. The 1% disparity for African American students is not statistically significant, particularly since the overall number (27) is so low. See chart below.**

	WHITE	AFAM	LATINO	OTHER	
	74	27	133	24	258
Percentage of Missing Interventions	29%	10%	52%	9%	100%
Percentage of District Overall Population (40th Day 14-15)	21%	9%	61%	9%	100%

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

Mendoza RFI 25: Mendoza Plaintiffs have trouble understanding Appendix VI-31. For example, that appendix includes unexplained figures in the “actual” columns and does not describe how they relate to “heat map” color-coded designations. Please provide clarification and disaggregated data as required under USP Section VI, G, 1, a.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 25: USP § VI(G)(1)(a) states, “Copies of the analysis contemplated above in (VI)(F)(2), and any subsequent similar analyses. The information provided shall include the number of appeals to the Governing Board or to a hearing officer from long term suspensions or expulsions, by school, and the outcome of those appeals. This information shall be disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender.” The heat maps are designed to review discipline data from one of many perspectives, specifically, to identify schools with high levels of disparity in discipline among schools of the same grade level. This is only one of several methods to review discipline data. See 2014-15 AR, VI-246-47.**

Mendoza RFI 26: Did the District review discipline data to identify teachers or administrators at the school-site level who administer discipline in a racially or ethnically disproportionate manner? If so, how many times was such a review conducted in the 2014-15 school year? How many teachers and administrators were identified as administering discipline in a racially/ethnically disproportionate manner, and were the schools to which these staff members are assigned notified? What, if any, follow up and/or additional training occurred with respect to these teachers? How many teachers or administrators were placed on formal corrective action plans as a result of the District’s identification of these staff members as administering discipline in a racially/ethnically disproportionate manner?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 26: The District reviewed quarterly for site with disparate discipline precisely so that it could address whether the suspending administrator had a pattern that was racially disparate. The review for teachers however, was generally conducted at the site level (since it is administrators who are going to know who is making the referrals, which Mojave does not always capture). Where the data suggested discipline might have been occurring in a disproportionate manner, central leadership investigated the particular facts.**

**Data was not kept on the numbers of teachers or administrators identified as administering discipline in a racially/ethnically disproportionate manner.**

Mendoza RFI 27: How many teachers or administrators were placed on formal corrective action plans as a result of the District’s identification of these staff members as administering discipline in a racially/ethnically disproportionate manner? Please provide any such corrective action plan(s) under USP VI, G, c. In that regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that notwithstanding the District’s indication that Appendix IV-42, “Chart of Formal Corrective Actions and Exemplar”



TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

regards “teachers engaged in behavior that violated disciplinary policy or practice, discriminated against students in the administration of discipline, or constituted the administration of discipline in a racially or ethnically disproportionate manner” (Report at 250-251), no entry in that chart details the discriminatory administration of discipline as a “Reason” for the corrective action. Nor do any entries cite a District policy regulation that prohibits the administration of discipline in a discriminatory manner (which the District reports to be policy “AC (Non-Discrimination)” (Report at 250). 27(c) Please provide any such corrective action plan(s) under USP VI, G, c.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 27: See above. No teachers or administrators were placed on formal corrective action plans as a result of the District’s identification of these staff members as administering discipline in a racially/ethnically disproportionate manner. Rather, sites were placed on (or developed for themselves) corrective action/training/support plans to improve school climate and reduce disciplinary incidents.**

**Appendix VI-31 is an example of the “heat maps” used during the quarterly analyses of discipline data, required by the USP. As it is an example only, it is not a “subsequent similar analysis” and is therefore not disaggregated by gender (although, when this information is analyzed, it is disaggregated by gender – see VI-50). Also, please refer to pages VI-246-248 for more detail on how this data was used. The color-coding indicates the level of disparity.**

Mendoza RFI 28: In that regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that notwithstanding the District’s indication that Appendix IV-42, “Chart of Formal Corrective Actions and Exemplar” regards “teachers engaged in behavior that violated disciplinary policy or practice, discriminated against students in the administration of discipline, or constituted the administration of discipline in a racially or ethnically disproportionate manner” (Report at 250-251), no entry in that chart details the discriminatory administration of discipline as a “Reason” for the corrective action. Nor do any entries cite a District policy regulation that prohibits the administration of discipline in a discriminatory manner (which the District reports to be policy “AC (Non-Discrimination)” (Report at 250). Under USP Section VI, G, f, please provide any site-level analysis conducted by the District’s RPPC. In that regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs note that Appendix VI-29, to which the District cites as such analysis, is a blank “Weekly Suspension Report” form.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 28: USP § VI(G)(1)(f) refers to “Copies of any site-level analyses conducted by the RPPSCs” – not analysis conducted by the RPPC. Appendix VI-29 describes the monthly analysis that is conducted by Student Services and Academic Leadership, not the RPPSC/LSC analysis referred to in VI.G.f. The reference to VI.29 under VI.G.f (on page VI-256 and 257) is not accurate. The correct citation to the RPPSC analysis is VI-5 (RPPSC/LSC Discipline Meeting Dates) and VI-49 (MTSS Template used in monthly meetings by the RPPSC/LSC to conduct site-level analyses).**

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**As described on the VI-245, the appendix is a sample of the log that is used to conduct site-level analysis by the RPPC. The actual data included in these logs are student-specific and cannot be provided pursuant to FERPA.**

## VII. FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Mendoza RFI 30: Please provide clarification on the information reflected in Appendix VII-24.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 30: Appendix VII-24 was prepared by the Director for School Community Services (Charlotte Patterson) to reflect meetings and/or community partners as part of efforts to develop community partnerships related to marketing, recruiting, and/or clarifying student assignment processes. (See USP II.I.1.d)**

## VIII. EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Mendoza RFI 29: Workshops and classes described in the Report all appear to relate to the Wakefield family center. (See Report at 264; Appendix VII-25 (Wakefield calendar)). Please detail what workshops or classes, if any, were provided at the other family centers.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 29: In 2014-15, workshops and classes were only held at the Wakefield Family Center (no other new family centers were open at that time).**

Mendoza RFI 31: Under the "Tutoring" section (Report at 280), the District breaks down "student participation in 21st Century After-School Programs which included Tutoring," which Mendoza Plaintiffs understand to include students participating in "21st Century After-School Programs" other than tutoring, and to also include "tutors with[out] teaching certifications" (id.). For 2014-15, how many tutors had the "minimum requirements" for their position as described in the TUSD job posting (Doc. 1690-8, Appendix B)?

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 31: All tutors at the 21st Century school after school programs are certified teachers, and therefore all are qualified beyond the "minimum requirements" (the minimum requirements do not require certification).**

Mendoza RFI 32: Please identify the schools at which tutors with the minimum qualifications for their positions were assigned, and provide data breaking down the students receiving tutoring services from these minimally qualified tutors by race/ethnicity. In that regard, Mendoza Plaintiffs understand that the "District did not record ELL student participation in after-school tutoring programs" (Report at 280), but that it has the ability to do so and that it will "improve[] data collection" (Report at 284) moving forward.

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 32: The schools are identified in Appendix 6. See Attachment 32, “2014-15 21st Century Tutoring” which details the students receiving these tutoring services by race/ethnicity.**

Mendoza RFI 33: They therefore understand that the District will collect ELL data participation in tutoring programs in the 2015-16 school year, but request District clarification if they are mistaken in their understanding.

**RESPONSE TO MENDOZA RFI 33: The District is currently collecting this data for the 2015-2016 school year.**

### **IX. FACILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY**

No RFIs received under this Section.

### **X. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY**

No RFIs received under this Section.

### **MENDOZA PLAINTIFFS’ GENERAL REQUESTS**

Mendoza General Request 1: In response to a number of Mendoza Plaintiffs’ requests, the District has provided corrections to the Annual Report and supplemental information. They therefore ask whether the District intends to file an addendum to its Annual Report so that the Court and the public will also have that more accurate and complete information?

**Response to General Request 1: No, but the District may post the RFI responses online once all requests and responses are completed.**

Mendoza General Request 2: In its responses, the District also has explained its failure to provide certain information in the Appendices to its most recent Annual Report because it is unchanged from an earlier Annual Report. In so stating, it cites Arizona Local Rule 7.1(d). That rule limits what can be attached to a pleading, motion or memorandum of authorities. The Annual Report is none of those. Therefore, the Local Rule does not apply. Further, Mendoza Plaintiffs respectfully suggest that each Annual Report should be a “stand alone” document and that it places an unnecessary burden on the parties, the Special Master, the Court, and the public to have to access a prior Annual Report to obtain the needed information. They therefore request that the District consider the filing of an addendum to its 2014-15 Annual

TUSD Responses to Special Master and Plaintiff Requests for Information  
Related to the 2014-15 Annual Report

Report to include those missing documents and that it include in its 2015-16 Annual Report all needed appendices regardless of whether there has been no change from the prior year.

**Follow-Up Response to General Request 2: The District has considered this request. The Annual Report includes over 8,000 pages of appendices it is unreasonable to include additional pages of materials that have already been provided and filed with the Court. There is no reasonable justification, for example, to provide a copy of the Labor Market Analysis every single year. The District has provided, for the Parties and for the public, a full list and copies of all appendices on its website so that it is not a burden to access prior materials.**

# ATTACHMENT 7

CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1  
Year Experience in Racially Concentrated  
and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or  
Below the District Average

**CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1 Year Experience in Racially Concentrated and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or Below the District Average  
SY 2014-15 - Sorted by: School / Site**

#	Last Name	First Name	Job Code	Position Title	School / Site	Grade Level	Integration Status	Letter Grade	AT or Below District average in ELA/Math
1	Loya	Rueben	T39501	Temp Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
2	Andros	Elizabeth	T35001	Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
3	Babb	Jonathan	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
4	Hetschel	Lorraine	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
5	Jones	Corey	T35001	Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
6	Macholtz	Christophe	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
7	Pelton II	Dale	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
8	Pena	Katherine	TN3556	New Ex Ed Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
9	Smith	Alexander	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
10	Washburn	Jesse	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
11	Alday	Brian	T35001	Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
12	Guerena	Jessica	TN3472	New Job Dev Instruct	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
13	Guillory	Theodore	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
14	Hooper-	Melinda	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
15	Lindner	Julie	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
16	Olswing	Benjamin	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
17	Shove	Casey	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
18	Spies	Kayla	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
19	Vigo	Maria Del	T35001	Teacher	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
20	Zeman	Heather	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
21	Berkey	Adriana	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Cholla Magnet	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
22	Kleefeld	Amber	T35001	Teacher	Drachman	ES	Racially Concentrated	A	N
23	Burnett	Julia	T39501	Temp Teacher	Erickson	ES	Neutral	D	Y
24	Busby	JanaLee	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Erickson	ES	Neutral	D	Y
25	Floyd	Ellen	T35001	Teacher	Erickson	ES	Neutral	D	Y
26	Kramlinger	Jacqueline	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Erickson	ES	Neutral	D	Y
27	Lee	Frances	T39501	Temp Teacher	Erickson	ES	Neutral	D	Y
28	Ortega-	Regina	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Erickson	ES	Neutral	D	Y
29	Fiero	Ami	T39501	Temp Teacher	Grijalva	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
30	White-	Helen	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Grijalva	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
31	Reyes	Ingrid	T35001	Teacher	Holladay	ES	Neutral	D	Y
32	Case	Tyler	T35001	Teacher	Hollinger	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
33	Rodriguez	Nieves	T35001	Teacher	Hollinger	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y

**CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1 Year Experience in Racially Concentrated and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or Below the District Average  
SY 2014-15 - Sorted by: School / Site**

#	Last Name	First Name	Job Code	Position Title	School / Site	Grade Level	Integration Status	Letter Grade	AT or Below District average in ELA/Math
34	Siciliano	Andrea	T35001	Teacher	Hollinger	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
35	Merchant	Amber	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Hollinger	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
36	Aguirre	Peggy	T39501	Temp Teacher	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
37	Choyguha	Jeffers	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
38	Hancock	Duke	T39501	Temp Teacher	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
39	Lafreniere	Anthony	T35001	Teacher	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
40	Riddle	Morgan	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
41	Sams	Alyssa	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
42	Sarmiento	Francisco	T35056	Ex Ed Teacher	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
43	Veeder	Peggy	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
44	Walker	Andrea	T35001	Teacher	Lawrence	K8	Neutral	D	Y
45	Canez	Ernesto	T35001	Teacher	Lynn	ES	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
46	Canez	Ernesto	T35001	Teacher	Lynn	ES	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
47	Dapkus	Debra	T39501	Temp Teacher	Lynn	ES	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
48	Coy	Jayne	T39501	Temp Teacher	Maldonado	ES	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
49	Wilhite	Melissa	T39501	Temp Teacher	Maldonado	ES	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
50	Shemroske	Corey	T35001	Teacher	Maldonado	ES	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
51	Mack	Miriam	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Mansfeld	MS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
52	Vogel	Patricia	T39501	Temp Teacher	Mansfeld	MS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
53	Groeschl	Katherine	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Mansfeld	MS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
54	Nichols III	William	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Mansfeld	MS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
55	Campillo	Francisco	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Mary Belle	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
56	Casanova	Angela	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Mary Belle	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
57	Webb	Desiree	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Mary Belle	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
58	Gomez	Jahnie Dee	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Miller	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	N
59	Urman	Anna	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Miller	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	N
60	Gurgoze	Lucinda	T35001	Teacher	Miller	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	N
61	Rutman	Velma	T35001	Teacher	Morgan Maxwell	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	N
62	Caisse	Vanessa	T39501	Temp Teacher	Ochoa	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
63	Geraci	Melissa	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Oyama	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
64	Gonzales	Wendy	T35001	Teacher	Oyama	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
65	Perez	Jesse	T39501	Temp Teacher	Oyama	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
66	Basurto	Angela	T35056	Ex Ed Teacher	Pistor	MS	Racially Concentrated	C	N

**CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1 Year Experience in Racially Concentrated and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or Below the District Average  
SY 2014-15 - Sorted by: School / Site**

#	Last Name	First Name	Job Code	Position Title	School / Site	Grade Level	Integration Status	Letter Grade	AT or Below District average in ELA/Math
67	Leyva	William	TN3901	New Temp Teacher	Pueblo Gardens	K8	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
68	Reyes	Anthony	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Gardens	K8	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
69	Schilling	Crystal	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Gardens	K8	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
70	Gastelum	Cathy	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
71	Snyder	Sarah	T39501	Temp Teacher	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
72	Somoza	Ernesto	T39501	Temp Teacher	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
73	Van der Zee	Elise	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
74	Wiggins	William	TN3556	New Ex Ed Teacher	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
75	Daoust	Robert	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
76	Gunnels	Michael	T39501	Temp Teacher	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
77	Munguia	Natiely	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
78	Rodriguez	Rhianna	T35001	Teacher	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
79	Yoder	Hannah	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Pueblo Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
80	Dehner	Margaret	T39501	Temp Teacher	Robins	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	N
81	Mada	Sarah	T39501	Temp Teacher	Robins	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	N
82	Holiman	Christophe	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Robins	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	N
83	Kronmiller-	Anika	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Robison	ES	Integrated	D	Y
84	Mitchell	Charles	T35001	Teacher	Robison	ES	Integrated	D	Y
85	Knight	Lauren	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rose	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	N
86	Leon	Victoria	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rose	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	N
87	Tanner	Martha	T35001	Teacher	Rose	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	N
88	Ortiz	Itzel	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rose	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	N
89	Cruz	Eunice	T39501	Temp Teacher	Roskruge	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
90	Gonzalez	Rodrigo	T35001	Teacher	Roskruge	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
91	Orr	Amy	T39501	Temp Teacher	Roskruge	K8	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
92	Esquivel	Magda	T39501	Temp Teacher	Safford Magnet	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
93	Kapuscinski	Jean	T39501	Temp Teacher	Safford Magnet	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
94	Araujo	Elizabeth	TN3556	New Ex Ed Teacher	Safford Magnet	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
95	Fox	Barrett	T35001	Teacher	Safford Magnet	K8	Racially Concentrated	C	Y
96	De Backer	Alexandre	T39501	Temp Teacher	Santa Rita	HS	Neutral	D	Y
97	Shouse	Yvonne	T39501	Temp Teacher	Santa Rita	HS	Neutral	D	Y
98	Fernandez	Rachelle	T39501	Temp Teacher	Santa Rita	HS	Neutral	D	Y
99	O'Neill	Melissa	T39501	Temp Teacher	Santa Rita	HS	Neutral	D	Y



**CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1 Year Experience in Racially Concentrated and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or Below the District Average  
SY 2014-15 - Sorted by: School / Site**

#	Last Name	First Name	Job Code	Position Title	School / Site	Grade Level	Integration Status	Letter Grade	AT or Below District average in ELA/Math
100	Pierce	Joseph	T35001	Teacher	Santa Rita	HS	Neutral	D	Y
101	Carey	Matthew	T35001	Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
102	Gallo	Giada	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
103	Gutierrez	Nancy	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
104	Higgins	Rachel	T39501	Temp Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
105	Lizarribar	Alexandra	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
106	Myers	Dawn	T39501	Temp Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
107	Rockland	Jeffrey	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
108	Thompson	Adam	T35001	Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
109	Federico	Jesus	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
110	Gonzalez	Alejandro	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
111	Harrington	Adam	T35001	Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
112	Hoff	Sierra	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
113	Lotz	Hillary	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
114	Meisch	George	T35056	Ex Ed Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
115	Trinkle	Annette	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
116	Zuniga	Enye	T39501	Temp Teacher	Tucson Magnet	HS	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
117	Meakins	Carolyn	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Tully	ES	Racially Concentrated	C	N
118	Espinoza	Andrea	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Utterback	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
119	Lopez	Matthew	T39501	Temp Teacher	Utterback	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
120	Matias	Julia	T39501	Temp Teacher	Utterback	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
121	Maza III	Mario	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Utterback	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
122	Babb	Kathy	T39501	Temp Teacher	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
123	Contreras	Grace	T39501	Temp Teacher	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
124	Fenton	Janice	T39501	Temp Teacher	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
125	Klein	Traci	T39501	Temp Teacher	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
126	Ruiz	Elaine	T35001	Teacher	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
127	Ahlemeyer	Megan	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
128	Hinds	April	T39501	Temp Teacher	Valencia	MS	Racially Concentrated	D	Y
129	Serrano	Angelica	T35001	Teacher	Van Buskirk	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	N
130	Martinez	Rosa	T35001	Teacher	Van Buskirk	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	N
131	Hill	Cassidy	T39501	Temp Teacher	Vesey	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
132	Aranda	Janessa	T39501	Temp Teacher	Warren	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	Y

**CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1 Year Experience in Racially Concentrated and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or Below the District Average  
SY 2014-15 - Sorted by: School / Site**

#	Last Name	First Name	Job Code	Position Title	School / Site	Grade Level	Integration Status	Letter Grade	AT or Below District average in ELA/Math
133	Helsel	Anna	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Warren	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
134	Sturgeon	Dennis	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Warren	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	Y
135	Clark	Sarah	T39501	Temp Teacher	White	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	N
136	Hall	Kimberlee	T39501	Temp Teacher	White	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	N
137	Sainz-Rocha	Esmeralda	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	White	ES	Racially Concentrated	B	N
138	Richardson	Dawn	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Blenman	ES	Integrated	C	Y
139	Clarke	Jeremy	T35553	Teacher / Coach	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
140	Easterbrooks	Angelina	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
141	Garrot	Theresa	T35001	Teacher	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
142	Isaacson	Susan	TN3556	New Ex Ed Teacher	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
143	Kornmuller	Melissa	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
144	Perez	Isis	T35001	Teacher	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
145	Skeggs	Marie	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
146	Sullivan	Lisa	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
147	Tester	Trinidad	TN3556	New Ex Ed Teacher	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
148	Velgos	Alexander	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
149	Wortham	Kim	T35001	Teacher	Catalina	HS	Integrated	C	Y
150	Barngrover	Kathleen	T35001	Teacher	Davidson	ES	Integrated	B	Y
151	Guerrero Jr	John	T35001	Teacher	Davidson	ES	Integrated	B	Y
152	Ryan	Norma	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Davidson	ES	Integrated	B	Y
153	Singletary	Amy	T39501	Temp Teacher	Davidson	ES	Integrated	B	Y
154	Spence	Taylor	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Davidson	ES	Integrated	B	Y
155	Avramis	Stefan	T39501	Temp Teacher	Dietz	K8	Neutral	C	Y
156	Burgkwist	Deborah	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Dietz	K8	Neutral	C	Y
157	Pecora	Michelle	T39501	Temp Teacher	Dietz	K8	Neutral	C	Y
158	Ruetz	Theodore	T39501	Temp Teacher	Marshall	ES	Neutral	B	Y
159	Niesen	Joan	T39501	Temp Teacher	Myers	ES	Integrated	C	Y
160	Orduno	Nidia	T39501	Temp Teacher	Myers	ES	Integrated	C	Y
161	Saucedo	Henry	T35001	Teacher	Myers	ES	Integrated	C	Y
162	Elling	Helena	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
163	Henderson	Sara	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
164	Hodson	Pamela	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
165	Jones	Christophe	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
166	Ouellette	Nicole	T35001	Teacher	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
167	Pelt	Charmaine	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y

**CORRECTED Appendix IV-30 Teachers w/<1 Year Experience in Racially Concentrated and/or Schools where Students Achieving at or Below the District Average  
SY 2014-15 - Sorted by: School / Site**

#	Last Name	First Name	Job Code	Position Title	School / Site	Grade Level	Integration Status	Letter Grade	AT or Below District average in ELA/Math
168	Piaggi-Furet	Jane	T35001	Teacher	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
169	Valencia	Cynthia	T39501	Temp Teacher	Naylor	K8	Integrated	C	Y
170	Holzgrafe	Terrasa	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Palo Verde	HS	Integrated	A	Y
171	Osiago	Susan	T39501	Temp Teacher	Palo Verde	HS	Integrated	A	Y
172	Tutwiler	Elena	T35001	Teacher	Palo Verde	HS	Integrated	A	Y
173	Urcadez	Miguel	T35001	Teacher	Palo Verde	HS	Integrated	A	Y
174	Wheeler	Patricia	T39501	Temp Teacher	Palo Verde	HS	Integrated	A	Y
175	Bellamy	Susan	T39501	Temp Teacher	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
176	Brown	Margaret	T35001	Teacher	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
177	David-Baker	Melody	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
178	Espinoza	Hector	T35001	Teacher	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
179	Garza	Debra	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
180	Herndon	James	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
181	Martin	Valentino	T35001	Teacher	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
182	Upston	John	TN3556	New Ex Ed Teacher	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
183	Waclawik II	Stephen	T35001	Teacher	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
184	Wildish	William	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Rincon	HS	Integrated	C	Y
185	Abate	William	T35001	Teacher	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
186	Barnes	Suzanne	TN3901	New Temp Teacher	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
187	Engel	Hillary	TN3901	New Temp Teacher	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
188	Evans	Heather	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
189	Hokett	Melissa	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
190	Reyes-	Belen	T35001	Teacher	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
191	Stedman	Katherine	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
192	Van Gelder	Bryan	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Sahuaro	HS	Neutral	B	Y
193	Deiningner	Debra	T39056	Temp Ex Ed Teacher	Secrist	MS	Neutral	C	Y
194	Van Gelder	Natalee	T35001	Teacher	Secrist	MS	Neutral	C	Y
195	Carson	Caroline	T35001	Teacher	Steele	ES	Neutral	C	Y
196	Stickles	Laura	T35001	Teacher	Steele	ES	Neutral	C	Y
197	Klimke	Joy	TN3501	New Teacher Induction	Wright	ES	Integrated	B	Y

# ATTACHMENT 16

UVa Training Data

Ref #	Course Title	Course #	Dates Offered	Max Capacity	Audience	Description
1a	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Catalina High School: CTE & Math	25772	March 02, 2015 - March 02, 2015	30	Certified	This workshop will build on our previous work "prioritizing the AZCCR Standards" by analyzing and aligning assessment to classroom instruction. Teachers will analyze and articulate the learning we expect our students to know and be able to do to achieve mastery of the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards by using: *AzMERIT sample questions *TUSD interim assessment questions *questions on a teacher created assessment
1b	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Catalina High School: ELA & Social Studies	25777	March 09, 2015 - March 09, 2015	30	Certified	
1c	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Catalina High School: Science & ExEd	25776	March 03, 2015 - March 03, 2015	30	Certified	
1d	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Catalina High School: Visual/Performing Arts & PE	25778	March 10, 2015 - March 10, 2015	30	Certified	
1e	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Grades 3rd-5th	25770	February 24, 2015 - February 24, 2015	30	Certified	
1f	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Grades 6-8	25771	February 10, 2015 - February 10, 2015	10	Certified	
1g	Assessing for Student Learning: The Assessment Instruction Cycle Grades K-2	25769	February 23, 2015 - February 23, 2015	30	Certified	
2a						In their study of high-performing organizations, Jim Collins and Jerry Porras (1997) found that although creating a vision can be a helpful step in the improvement process, it is never sufficient. Staff must also tackle the collective commitments they must make and honor in order to achieve the shared vision for their school or district.  Collective commitments answer the question, "How must we behave to create the school that will achieve our purpose?" In answering this question, educators shift from offering philosophical musings on mission or the shared hopes for the school of the future to making commitments to act in certain ways - starting today. Clarity on this topic guides the individual work of each member of the staff and outlines how each person can contribute to the improvement initiative.  When members of an organization understand the purpose of their organization, know where it is headed, and then pledge to act in certain ways to move it in the right direction, they don't need prescriptive rules and regulations to guide their daily work.  Finally, achieving agreement about what we are prepared to start doing, and then implementing that agreement, is one of the most effective strategies for closing the knowing-doing gap. Those who "do" develop deeper knowledge, greater self-efficacy, and a stronger sense of ownership in results than those who only talk about what should be done.  -Adapted from: DuFour, Eaker, Many, Learning by Doing, 2010
	Collective Commitments: Continuing Our Journey Towards Becoming a True PLC (Catalina)	25003	November 15, 2014 - November 15, 2014	80	All	
2b	Collective Commitments: Continuing Our Journey Towards Becoming a True PLC (Utterback)	25125	November 22, 2014 - November 22, 2014	65	All	
3a	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards- K-1	25228	September 08, 2014 - September 08, 2014	16	Certified	In-depth instruction paired with focused assessment of the essential concepts and skills found in the AZCCR standards is more effective than trying to cover every concept and skill in the standards. This workshop will provide you the opportunity to collaborate with grade-level and course specific colleagues to identify the priority standards. Once these standards have been identified, our attention will turn to aligning the priority standards to the TUSD Scope and Sequence. Finally, using a unit planning/pacing organizer, we will begin to create quarterly units of study with a focus on in-depth instruction and assessment.
3b	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade 2	25229	September 09, 2014 - September 09, 2014	16	Certified	
3c	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade 3	25230	September 18, 2014 - September 18, 2014	16	Certified	
3d	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade 4 & 5	25231	September 19, 2014 - September 19, 2014	16	Certified	
3e	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade 6-12 English/ELD/Social Studies	25233	October 14, 2014 - October 14, 2014	30	Certified	
3f	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade 9-12 PE/Arts/ExEd	25236	October 27, 2014 - October 27, 2014	30	Certified	
3g	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade 9-12 Science/CTE/ExEd	25235	October 23, 2014 - October 23, 2014	30	Certified	
3h	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Grade K-2	25232	September 25, 2014 - September 25, 2014	16	Certified	
3i	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Lawrence Grade 3-8	25234	October 18, 2014 - October 18, 2014	30	Certified	
3j	Prioritizing the ELA AZCCR Standards-Lawrence Grade 5	25238	October 22, 2014 - October 22, 2014	6	Certified	
3k	Prioritizing the Math AZCCR Standards-Grade K-2	25239	October 30, 2014 - October 30, 2014	16	Certified	
3l	Prioritizing the Math AZCCR Standards-Grade3-5	25237	October 21, 2014 - October 21, 2014	16	Certified	
4	Supportive Dialogue Strategies K-5 Para-Professionals	25780	March 13, 2015 - March 13, 2015	15	Classified	A workshop for para-professionals that will focus on effective instructional practices in math, reading, and writing at each grade level (K-5). Our main focus during this workshop will be on "Supportive Dialogue" strategies (questioning, probing, vs. providing the answers).

Ref #	Course Title	Course #	Dates Offered	Max Capacity	Audience	Description
5a	USP - Assessment for Learning	25571	May 26, 2015 - May 26, 2015	40	Certified, Admin	<p>How are your assessment practices? Are they helping students understand and attain learning goals? Are they helping you refine your instruction, provide students feedback, and report on student progress? In this workshop, you will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explore the types and uses of research-based formative assessment for learning, as learning and of learning;</li> <li>• examine which assessment practices are most effective, when to deploy them, why and how they relate to student learning and achievement;</li> <li>• connect formative assessment practices to student feedback in order to move your passive learners to active owners of their own learning;</li> <li>• apply assessment information for/of learning to gain formative or instructional feedback in order to refine instruction and report student progress.</li> </ul> <p>This is a one (1) day professional development course. Each session is capped at 40 participants. You need to attend the one (1) day PD session "ASSESSMENT FOR LEARNING" before you attend the two (2) day PD session "DATA-DRIVEN INSTRUCTION: ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS, ACTION, AND CULTURE.". Each I-Zone teacher must choose one of the following dates to attend.</p> <p>Tuesday, May 26th                      Tuesday, June 2nd                      Tuesday, June 9th                      Tuesday, June 16th</p> <p>This will be held at Palo Verde High Magnet School in the Cyber Cafe</p>
5b	USP - Assessment for Learning	25572	June 02, 2015 - June 02, 2015	40	Certified, Admin	
5c	USP - Assessment for Learning	25574	June 16, 2015 - June 16, 2015	40	Certified, Admin	
6a	USP - DATA-DRIVEN INSTRUCTION :ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS, ACTION, AND CULTURE	25533	May 27, 2015 - May 28, 2015	40	Certified, Admin	<p>Data-driven instruction is the philosophy that schools should constantly focus on one simple question: "Are our students learning?"</p> <p>This course will use data based methods to provide teachers with strategies on how to access, interpret and use data to make informed instructional decisions to boost student achievement. Data-Driven Instruction will focus on the four key principals: Assessment, Analysis, Action, and Culture.</p> <p>During this workshop you will create an action plan for the upcoming school year that will apply the insights gained.</p> <p>This is a two (2) day professional development course. Each session is capped at 40 participants. Each I-Zone teacher must choose one (1) two (2) day session to attend. Please note that you must attend the two (2) corresponding Wednesday and Thursday days.</p> <p>? Wednesday, May 27th and Thursday, May 28th                      ? Wednesday, June 3rd and Thursday, June 4th                      ? Wednesday, June 10th and Thursday, June 11th                      ? Wednesday, June 17th and Thursday, June 18th</p>
6b	USP - DATA-DRIVEN INSTRUCTION :ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS, ACTION, AND CULTURE	25534	June 03, 2015 - June 04, 2015	40	Certified, Admin	
6c	USP - DATA-DRIVEN INSTRUCTION :ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS, ACTION, AND CULTURE	25536	June 17, 2015 - June 18, 2015	40	Certified, Admin	
7a					Certified, Admin	<p>Everywhere we turn, schools are saying that they are Professional Learning Communities (PLC). The problem is that this concept is cemented more in words than in actions. To become a true PLC it takes structures and conditions from the top-down to ensure teachers can have the time and flexibility to work collaboratively together to discuss teaching and learning. This workshop takes the concept of becoming a PLC from the 10,000 foot level to the trenches. What does it look like when a school is really a PLC? Collaboratively building the Mission, Vision, Collective Commitments, and Goals within a school will be the underlying theme to spring-board the teachers into becoming a true PLC.</p> <p>2 day Professional Development - each Cohort 11 teacher must choice one option to attend:</p> <p>Option 1: Tuesday, June 3- Wednesday, June 4                      Option 2: Tuesday, June 10- Wednesday, June 11                      Option 3: Friday, July 11 and Monday, July 14                      Option 4: Tuesday, July 15- Wednesday, July 16</p>
	UVA/SIG Cohort 11- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community June 8 - 9 2015	25532	June 08, 2015 - June 09, 2015	51		
7b	UVA/SIG Cohort 11- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community Option 1: Tuesday, June 3- Wednesday, June 4- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community	24479	June 03, 2014 - June 04, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
7c	UVA/SIG Cohort 11- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community Option 2: Tuesday, June 10- Wednesday, June 11- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community	24480	June 10, 2014 - June 11, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
7d	UVA/SIG Cohort 11- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community Option 3: Friday, July 11 and Monday, July 14- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community	24481	July 11, 2014 - July 14, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
7e	UVA/SIG Cohort 11- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community Option 4: Tuesday, July 15- Wednesday, July 16- The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a Professional Learning Community	24482	July 15, 2014 - July 16, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	

Ref #	Course Title	Course #	Dates Offered	Max Capacity	Audience	Description
8a					Certified, Admin	<p>All teachers will find the Essential Elements of Instruction (EEI) useful in planning and implementing effective and engaging instruction. Based on the work of Dr. Madeline Hunter, we will explore EEI's four components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select the Objective at the Correct Level of Difficulty</li> <li>• Teach to One Objective at a Time</li> <li>• Use the Principles of Learning</li> <li>• Monitor and Adjust</li> </ul> <p>Using this framework to guide planning and instruction will yield greater results in each and every classroom.</p> <p>2 day Professional Development - each Cohort 11 teacher must choice one option to attend:</p> <p>Option 1: Thursday, June 5- Friday, June 6                      Option 2: Thursday, June 12-Friday, June 13                      Option 3: Wednesday, July 9- Thursday, July 10                      Option 4: Thursday, July 17- Friday, July 18</p> <p>Presenter: Kim Gunn                      Time: 8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. (1 hour lunch break embedded)                      Location: Palo Verde Cyber Café                      Limit: 40 participants per session</p> <p>All Cohort 11 teachers must attend one PD option for The Nuts and Bolts of Becoming a True Professional Learning Communities and one PD option for Revisiting Essential Elements of Instruction.</p>
8b	UVA/SIG Cohort 11: Teaching fo Mastery Learning: Delving into Danielson's Framework (Make up course and new teachers for UVa/IZone) Option 1: Thursday, June 5- Friday, June 6 Revisiting the Essential Elements of Instruction: Five Levers to Ensure Teaching for	24485	June 05, 2014 - June 06, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
8c	UVA/SIG Cohort 11: Teaching fo Mastery Learning: Delving into Danielson's Framework (Make up course and new teachers for UVa/IZone) Option 2: Thursday, June 12-Friday, June 13 Revisiting the Essential Elements of Instruction: Five Levers to Ensure Teaching for	24487	June 12, 2014 - June 13, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
8d	UVA/SIG Cohort 11: Teaching fo Mastery Learning: Delving into Danielson's Framework (Make up course and new teachers for UVa/IZone) Option 4: Thursday, July 17- Friday, July 18 Revisiting Essential Elements of Instruction: Five Levers to Ensure Teaching for	24489	July 17, 2014 - July 18, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
8e	UVA/SIG Cohort 11: Teaching fo Mastery Learning: Delving into Danielson's Framework (Make up course and new teachers for UVa/IZone) Option 3: Wednesday, July 9- Thursday, July 10 Revisiting the Essential Elements of Instruction: Five Levers to Ensure Teaching	24488	July 09, 2014 - July 10, 2014	51	Certified, Admin	
9						<p>Innovation Zone Principal and Curriculum Facilitator Training:</p> <p>This training was developed around the research of Paul Bambrick-Santoyo, specifically from Chapter 2 of Leverage Leadership. The content of this professional development aligns with the transformational strategies utilized in the University of Virginia (UVa) turnaround model.</p> <p>Goals for this professional development:                      Increase our ability to identify the key action steps in classroom observations and give effective feedback</p> <p>Develop the tools for holding teachers accountable to continual development, including specific initiatives for our most struggling teachers                      The purpose of this event is to provide a clear understanding of the University of Virginia School Turnaround Program and what it means to be part of the TUSD's Innovation Zone.</p>
	Principal and Curriculum Facilitator Training: Observation and Feedback	25855	May 29, 2015 - May 29, 2015	N/A	Admin, Curriculum Facilitators/Coaches	<p>Breakdown the components of the school letter grade and identify areas and ways to target subgroups.</p>
10	Uva Kick Off and Cross School Collaboration	N/A	7-Jan-15	N/A	All	
11a	AZ School Letter Grade Presentation (Lawrence)	N/A	27-Aug-14	N/A	Certified, Admin	
11b	AZ School Letter Grade Presentation (Utterback)	N/A	20-Aug-14	N/A	Certified, Admin	
11c	AZ School Letter Grade Presentation (Cavett)	N/A	13-Aug-14	N/A	Certified, Admin	
11d	AZ School Letter Grade Presentation (Mission View)	N/A	17-Sep-14	N/A	Certified, Admin	
12a	Classroom Observation Debrief (Utterback)	N/A	5-May-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	Debrief the results from the classroom walkthrough data. Discuss strengths and weaknesses and strategies to improve.
12b	Classroom Observation Debrief (Utterback)	N/A	5-Feb-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	
12c	Classroom Observation Debrief (Cavett)	N/A	13-May-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	
12d	Classroom Observation Debrief (Lawrence)	N/A	23-Jan-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	
12e	Classroom Observation Debrief (Lawrence)	N/A	16-Apr-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	
12f	Classroom Observation Debrief (Mission View)	N/A	4-May-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	
12g	Classroom Observation Debrief (Catalina)	N/A	16-Apr-15	N/A	Certified, Admin	

# ATTACHMENT 18

20% Rule Report



**MEMO**

Re: Response to Report and Recommendations: Advanced Learning Experiences  
Court Order 1771 – 20% Rule  
To: Special Master and Counsel  
From: Martha Taylor, Sr. Director of Desegregation  
Date: March 5, 2015

---

**20% Rule Report**

*IT IS FURTHER ORDERED approving the 20% Rule as a rule-of-thumb annual goal to be met as soon as practicable but no later than the USP target date: SY 2016-17. TUSD has agreed to categorize GATE programs by the amount of time students are engaged in them in a typical week and for all AAC programs to break data down by school level– elementary, middle, K-8, and high school. It shall report the 20% Rule goal in the same way. Within 20 days of the filing date of this Order, TUSD shall provide Plaintiffs and the Special Master with a 20% Rule Report for all eleven ALEs.*

Below are the data for the ALE analysis required by Court Order 1771. For each of the eleven ALEs listed in Order 1771 (three GATE programs (self-contained; pull-out, and resource) and eight AACs (Advanced Placement (AP); Advanced Pre-AP; Honors Pre-AP; Dual-Credit; IB; Dual language; UHS, and middle school courses for high school credit)., two charts are included to explain the data requested. In each chart the separate ALE programs are analyzed with results broken out by grade level (ES, K-8, MS, HS).

On the first chart (“Enrollment”) a minimum 20% goal was set for each grade level and each program. Please note, TUSD believes the 20% goal is its minimum obligation and its

ultimate goal would be that participation in each ALE program would match district enrollment for African American and Latino students. A narrative analysis is provided for each of these charts.

On the second chart, (“Goals”) TUSD has set goals based on the 20% rule and shown them over a five-year period (2012-13 SY – 2016-17 SY). Where TUSD has not already met the 20% goal in 2012-13, it has targeted achieving the minimum 20% goal by 2016-17.

**1. Self-Contained GATE  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Self-Contained GATE</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elem	7.9%	4.0%	6.1%	6.9%			6.3%	0.6%
	K-8	7.2%	3.8%	2.4%	0.0%			5.8%	0.5%
	Middle	7.6%	4.5%	4.4%	3.8%			6.0%	0.4%
Latino	Elem	60.4%	41.6%	42.2%	38.5%			48.3%	1.7%
	K-8	69.9%	73.1%	75.6%	92.6%			55.9%	
	Middle	61.7%	48.9%	48.7%	51.0%			49.4%	0.1%

- African American

Enrollment growth was seen for elementary schools across all years and the 20% goal was exceeded in 2014-15. However, growth was not seen in the K-8 and middle school self-contained GATE programs, and the 20% goal has not been achieved yet for those programs.

- Latino

Enrollment growth was seen for K-8 schools across all years and the 20% goal was exceeded in 2014-15, as was the district Hispanic enrollment percentage. However, little growth was seen for the elementary and middle school self-contained GATE programs. The 20% goal was met for the middle school but not yet for the elementary schools.

**Self-Contained GATE Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Self-Contained GATE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elem	7.9%	4.0%	6.1%	6.9%			6.3%	0.6%
	Elem	Goals	4.0%	4.60%	5.17%	5.74%	6.31%	6.31%	
	K-8	7.2%	3.8%	2.4%	0.0%			5.8%	0.5%
	K-8	Goals	3.8%	4.33%	4.81%	5.29%	5.77%	5.77%	
	Middle	7.6%	4.5%	4.4%	3.8%			6.0%	0.4%
	Middle	Goals	4.5%	4.88%	5.27%	5.66%	6.05%	6.05%	

Latino	Elem	60.4%	41.6%	42.2%	38.5%			48.3%	1.7%
	Elem	Goals	41.6%	43.26%	44.95%	46.65%	48.34%	48.34%	
	K-8	69.9%	73.1%	75.6%	92.6%			55.9%	
	K-8	Goals	73.1%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				55.95%	
	Middle	61.7%	48.9%	48.7%	51.0%			49.4%	0.1%
	Middle	Goals	48.9%	49.03%	49.15%	49.26%	49.37%	49.37%	

**2. Pull-Out GATE Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Pull-Out GATE</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elem	7.9%	4.2%	4.2%	4.0%			6.3%	0.5%
	K-8	7.2%	6.2%	5.7%	5.0%			5.8%	
Latino	Elem	60.4%	45.3%	46.6%	47.8%			48.3%	0.8%
	K-8	69.9%	55.0%	60.5%	60.3%			55.9%	0.2%

- African American

No enrollment growth has been seen for the AA students and the 20% goal has not been achieved yet for any grade level.

- Latino

Some enrollment growth was seen for elementary students and the 20% goal has been met for the K-8 students.

**Pull-Out GATE Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Pull-Out GATE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elem	7.9%	4.2%	4.2%	4.0%			6.3%	0.5%
	Elem	Goals	4.2%	4.74%	5.27%	5.79%	6.31%	6.31%	
	K-8	7.2%	6.2%	5.7%	5.0%			5.8%	
	K-8	Goals	6.2%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				5.77%	

Latino	Elem	60.4%	45.3%	46.6%	47.8%			48.3%	0.8%
	Elem	Goals	45.3%	46.07%	46.83%	47.58%	48.34%	48.34%	
	K-8	69.9%	55.0%	60.5%	60.3%			55.9%	0.2%
	K-8	Goals	55.0%	55.25%	55.48%	55.71%	55.95%	55.95%	

**3. Resource GATE  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Resource GATE</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.9%	2.0%	5.0%	3.1%			6.3%	1.1%
	Middle	7.6%	7.7%	6.1%	7.7%			6.0%	
	HS	7.8%	6.5%	6.8%	8.1%			6.2%	
Latino	K-8	67.8%	92.0%	91.3%	72.1%			54.2%	
	Middle	61.7%	41.0%	42.1%	39.4%			49.4%	2.1%
	HS	55.1%	45.2%	44.3%	57.5%			44.1%	

- African American

Some enrollment growth has been achieved in all grade levels. Middle school and high school growth was solid and the 20% goal was met in the baseline year of 2012-13SY. K-8 growth was achieved in SY 2013-14, but experienced a decline in SY 2014-15.

- Latino

Enrollment growth was achieved at the high school level, and in SY 2014-15 the Latino participation in Resource GATE exceeds the district-wide Hispanic percentage. K-8 started by exceeding the district Hispanic percentage in 2012-13 and continues to do so in 2014-15. Middle school showed enrollment growth in 2013-14 but has not yet achieved its 20% goal.

**Resource GATE Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Resource GATE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.9%	2.0%	5.0%	3.1%			6.3%	1.1%
	K-8	Goals	2.0%	3.07%	4.14%	5.21%	6.28%	6.28%	
	Middle	7.6%	7.7%	6.1%	7.7%			6.0%	
	Middle	Goals	7.7%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				6.05%	
	HS	7.8%	6.5%	6.8%	8.1%			6.2%	
	HS	Goals	6.5%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				6.24%	

Latino	K-8	67.8%	92.0%	91.3%	72.1%			54.2%	
	K-8	Goals	92.0%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				54.21%	
	Middle	61.7%	41.0%	42.1%	39.4%			49.4%	2.1%
	Middle	Goals	41.0%	43.11%	45.20%	47.28%	49.37%	49.37%	
	HS	55.1%	45.2%	44.3%	57.5%			44.1%	
	HS	Goals	45.2%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				44.12%	

**4. Advanced Placement (AP)  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: AP</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	High	7.8%	5.3%	5.8%	6.1%			6.2%	0.2%
Latino	High	52.7%	41.6%	43.9%	44.1%			42.2%	0.2%

- African American

Enrollment growth has been seen over each of the two years SY 2012-13. Participation is only 0.1% below the 20% goal.

- Latino

Enrollment growth has occurred over each of the two years following SY 2012-13. The 20% goal was achieved in SY 2013-14 and currently exceeds that goal by 1.9%. However, as stated above, the District’s ultimate goal will be to increase further the Latino participation in AP courses, ideally reaching 52.7%, which is the district percentage for Latino high school students.



**AP Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: AP Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	High	7.8%	5.3%	5.8%	6.1%			6.2%	0.2%
	High	Goal	5.3%	5.52%	5.76%	6.00%	6.25%	6.25%	
Latino	High	52.7%	41.6%	43.9%	44.1%			42.2%	0.2%
	High	Goal	41.6%	41.73%	41.88%	42.04%	42.19%	42.19%	

**5. Advanced Pre-AP  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Advanced Pre-AP</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.9%	7.8%	7.1%	8.5%			6.3%	
	Middle	7.6%	5.2%	5.1%	7.9%			6.0%	0.2%
Latino	K-8	67.8%	56.6%	52.1%	58.5%			54.2%	
	Middle	61.7%	56.9%	57.4%	57.1%			49.4%	

Note: Previous to this analysis, TUSD had always reported Pre-AP as a single category, consisting of Honors courses, Accelerated courses, and middle school courses for high school credit. Although TUSD has courses labeled “Advanced,” they are taken mostly by 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders; thus, would not seem to fit into the “Pre-AP” category. For the sake of continuity, TUSD will report the “Accelerated” courses in this category (which are middle school math courses).

- African American

Enrollment growth has occurred over a three year period, despite a slight drop in SY 2013-14. By SY 2014-15, African American participation in Advanced Pre-AP had not only exceeded the 20% goal, it had exceeded district African American enrollment for both grade levels.

- Latino:

Some enrollment growth was achieved for Latino students in both grade levels. The 20% goal was met in the 2012-13 SY baseline year. Nonetheless, TUSD's ultimate goal will be to further increase the Latino participation in Pre-AP Advanced courses, ideally reaching K-8 - 67.1% and MS - 62.7%, which is the district-wide Latino student representation.

**Advanced Pre-AP Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Advanced Pre-AP Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.9%	7.8%	7.1%	8.5%			6.3%	
	K-8	Goals	7.8%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				6.28%	
	Middle	7.6%	5.2%	5.1%	7.9%			6.0%	0.2%
	Middle	Goals	5.2%	5.41%	5.62%	5.84%	6.05%	6.05%	
Latino	K-8	67.8%	56.6%	52.1%	58.5%			54.2%	
	K-8	Goals	56.6%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				54.21%	
	Middle	61.7%	56.9%	57.4%	57.1%			49.4%	
	Middle	Goals	56.9%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				49.37%	

**6. Honors Pre-AP  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Honors Pre-AP</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.1%	7.0%	6.5%	7.4%			5.7%	
	Middle	7.3%	6.2%	8.9%	8.9%			5.9%	
	High	7.8%	5.8%	5.9%	6.2%			6.2%	0.1%
<hr/>									
Latino	K-8	70.1%	60.6%	58.2%	63.4%			56.1%	
	Middle	60.1%	44.0%	55.3%	51.0%			48.1%	1.0%
	High	55.0%	47.2%	50.4%	52.9%			44.0%	

- African American

The 20% goal was exceeded in the base line year of SY 2012-2013 for all grade levels except high school, although it was achieved in SY 2014-15. However, as stated above, the TUSD’s ultimate goal will be to increase further the African American participation in Pre-AP Honors courses, ideally reaching 7.8%, which is the district-wide percentage for African American high school students. Of special note are the African American middle school students whose participation in Pre-AP Honors exceeds their district enrollment.

- Latino

The 20% goal was exceeded in the base line year of SY 2012-2013 for all grade levels except middle school, although it was achieved for middle school in SY 2013-14. However, as stated above, the District’s ultimate goal will be to increase further the Latino participation in Pre-AP Honors courses, ideally reaching 60.1%%, which is the district-wide percentage for Latino middle school students.

**Honors Pre-AP Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Honors Pre-AP Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.1%	7.0%	6.5%	7.4%			5.7%	
	K-8	Goals	7.0%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				5.67%	
	Middle	7.3%	6.2%	8.9%	8.9%			5.9%	
	Middle	Goals	6.2%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				5.87%	
	High	7.8%	5.8%	5.9%	6.2%			6.2%	0.1%
	High	Goals	5.8%	5.89%	6.00%	6.12%	6.23%	6.23%	

Latino	K-8	70.1%	60.6%	58.2%	63.4%			56.1%	
	K-8	Goals	60.6%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				54.21%	
	Middle	60.1%	44.0%	55.3%	51.0%			48.1%	1.0%
	Middle	Goals	44.0%	45.05%	46.06%	47.08%	48.09%	48.09%	
	High	55.0%	47.2%	50.4%	52.9%			44.0%	
	HS	Goals	47.2%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				44.12%	

**7. Dual Credit Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Dual Credit</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	High	7.8%	7.4%	8.1%	10.1%			6.2%	
Latino	High	52.7%	38.9%	51.7%	52.2%			42.2%	0.8%

- African American

From the baseline year, the 20% goal has been exceeded. In addition, as of SY 2013-14, the enrollment percentage also was exceeded. The District will strive to maintain this level of participation.

- Latino

Growth was seen over a three year period, with the largest growth percentage seen from SY 2012-13 to SY 2013-14. As of SY 2014-15, Latino participation in Dual Credit courses significantly exceeds the 20% goal and is only .5% below district-wide Hispanic enrollment.

**Dual Credit Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Dual-Credit Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	High	7.8%	7.4%	8.1%	10.1%			6.2%	
	High	Goal	7.4%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				6.25%	
Latino	High	52.7%	38.9%	51.7%	52.2%			42.2%	0.8%
	High	Goal	38.9%	39.8%	40.6%	41.4%	42.2%	42.19%	

**8. International Baccalaureate (IB)  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: IB</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elementary	7.8%	4.8%	5.6%	6.9%			6.3%	0.4%
	K-8	6.6%	5.9%	8.2%	7.9%			5.3%	
	High	7.8%	6.6%	7.2%	6.6%			6.2%	
Latino	Elementary	60.2%	83.0%	84.1%	79.9%			48.2%	
	K-8	71.7%	77.8%	72.9%	74.6%			57.3%	
	High	55.0%	77.9%	76.9%	78.8%			44.0%	

- African American

Enrollment growth occurred over a three year period. For elementary schools the 20% goal was achieved in 2014-15; in middle school and high school the 20% goal was achieved in baseline SY 2012-13. However, as stated above, the District’s ultimate goal will be to increase further the African American participation in IB courses, ideally reaching ES - 7.8%, K-8 - 6.6%, HS – 7.8%, which are the district-wide percentages for African American students at those grade levels. Of particular note is the growth for African American K-8 students who exceed the district-wide % of African American students.

From the ST 2012-13 baseline year, the 20% goal was greatly exceeded at every grade level. In fact, Hispanic participation in IB was higher than the district-wide Hispanic percentage at every grade level.



**IB Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: IB Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elem	7.8%	4.8%	5.6%	6.9%			6.3%	0.4%
	Elem	Goals	4.8%	5.18%	5.54%	5.90%	6.26%	6.26%	
	K-8	6.6%	5.9%	8.2%	7.9%			5.3%	
	K-8	Goals	5.9%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				5.31%	
	High	7.8%	6.6%	7.2%	6.6%			6.2%	
	High	Goals	6.6%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				6.24%	

Latino	Elem	60.2%	83.0%	84.1%	79.9%			48.2%	
	Elem	Goals	83.0%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				48.15%	
	K-8	71.7%	77.8%	72.9%	74.6%			57.3%	
	K-8	Goals	77.8%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				57.32%	
	High	55.0%	77.9%	76.9%	78.8%			44.0%	
	High	Goals	77.9%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				44.02%	

**9. Dual Language Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Dual Language</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elementary	8.0%	1.8%	2.6%	1.9%			6.4%	1.2%
	K-8	7.2%	1.7%	1.9%	3.3%			5.7%	1.0%
	Middle	7.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%			6.0%	1.3%
	High	7.8%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%			6.2%	0.3%
Latino	Elementary	60.2%	87.9%	86.3%	87.1%			48.1%	
	K-8	70.3%	87.8%	85.3%	85.1%			56.3%	
	Middle	61.7%	93.3%	94.0%	92.8%			49.4%	
	High	55.1%	69.6%	100.0%	98.9%			44.1%	

- Dual Language was not named originally as ALE in the USP. However, the TUSD Governing Board approved it as such in March of 2013.
- African American students:  
 The data shows that over the past three years our African American students’ participation in Dual Language has fluctuated but remains below our goal. In our dual language sites, the African American student enrollment is below 2%.
- Latino students:  
 The data shows that over the past three years our Latino students’ participation in Dual Language has consistently exceeded the district-wide Latino student enrollment percentage.

**Dual Language Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: Dual-Language Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	Elem	8.0%	1.8%	2.6%	1.9%			6.4%	1.2%
	Elem	Goal	1.8%	2.96%	4.11%	5.27%	6.42%	6.42%	
	K-8	7.2%	1.7%	1.9%	3.3%			5.7%	1.0%
	K-8	Goal	1.7%	2.71%	3.71%	4.72%	5.73%	5.73%	
	Middle	7.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%			6.0%	1.3%
	Middle	Goal	0.7%	2.02%	3.36%	4.71%	6.05%	6.05%	
	High	7.8%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%			6.2%	0.3%
	High	Goal	5.2%	5.45%	5.71%	5.97%	6.24%	6.24%	

Latino	Elem	60.2%	87.9%	86.3%	87.1%			48.1%	
	Elem	Goal	87.9%	Participation far exceeds District Latino enrollment				48.13%	
	K-8	70.3%	87.8%	85.3%	85.1%			56.3%	
	K-8	Goal	87.8%	Participation far exceeds District Latino enrollment				56.26%	
	Middle	61.7%	93.3%	94.0%	92.8%			49.4%	
	Middle	Goal	93.3%	Participation far exceeds District Latino enrollment				49.37%	
	High	55.1%	69.6%	100.0%	98.9%			44.1%	
	High	Goal	69.6%	Participation far exceeds District Latino enrollment				44.12%	

**10. University High School (UHS)  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: UHS</b>									
			ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	High	7.8%	2.9%	2.8%	3.6%			6.2%	0.8%
Latino	High	55.0%	30.7%	32.2%	32.0%			44.0%	3.3%

- African American

Enrollment growth has occurred over a three year period and the growth from SY 2013-14 to SY 2014-15 met the .8% yearly increase goal. A gap remains that TUSD will strive to close by SY 2016-2017.

- Latino

Enrollment growth has occurred over a three year period. The growth from SY 2012-13 to SY 2013-14 was less than half of TUSD’s yearly increase goal. TUSD will strive to close that gap by SY 2016-2017.

**UHS Goals using the 20% Rule calculated over five school years: 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	GOALS: UHS Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	High	7.8%	2.9%	2.8%	3.6%			6.2%	0.8%
	High	Goal	2.9%	3.72%	4.56%	5.39%	6.23%	6.25%	
Latino	High	55.0%	30.7%	32.2%	32.0%			44.0%	3.3%
	High	Goal	30.7%	34.03%	37.36%	40.69%	44.02%	44.02%	

**11. Middle School Courses for High School Credit  
 Enrollment**

<b>Enrollment: Middle School Courses for High School Credit</b>									
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	ALE Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
			2012-2013	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.9%	5.4%	4.2%	2.7%			6.3%	0.2%
	Middle	7.6%	5.9%	6.5%	5.2%			6.0%	0.0%
Latino	K-8	67.8%	75.9%	74.9%	80.2%			54.2%	
	Middle	61.7%	53.3%	54.1%	55.7%			49.4%	

Note: After SY 2-12-13, TUSD closed eleven schools and reconfigured the grade levels of several others. Because of these actions, K-8 data from SY 2012-13 may not be as comparable to subsequent years as for other grade levels.

- African American

African American enrollment has decreased in middle school courses for high school credit at both grade levels.

- Latino

Some Latino student enrollment growth has been seen in both grade levels. The 20% goal was achieved for both grade levels in the baseline SY 2012-13. For K-8, MS courses for HS credit were taken by Latino students at a rate higher than their district-wide enrollment representation and this number continued to grow to its 2014-15 level of greater than 80%.

			GOALS: Middle School Courses for High School Credit Enrollment %					ALE Goals	
Ethnicity	Grade Level	Baseline Enrollment % 2012-13	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Overall 20% Goal	Yearly Increase Goals
African American	K-8	7.9%	5.4%	4.2%	2.7%			6.3%	0.2%
	K-8	Goals	5.4%	5.64%	5.85%	6.07%	6.28%	6.28%	
	Middle	7.6%	5.9%	6.5%	5.2%			6.0%	0.0%
	Middle	Goals	5.9%	5.97%	6.00%	6.02%	6.05%	6.05%	
Latino	K-8	67.8%	75.9%	74.9%	80.2%			54.2%	
	K-8	Goals	75.9%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				54.21%	
	Middle	61.7%	53.3%	54.1%	55.7%			49.4%	
	Middle	Goals	53.3%	Met minimum goal but will continue to work to increase enrollment				49.37%	

# ATTACHMENT 32

21<sup>st</sup> Century Tutoring



## ATTACHMENT 32

## 2014-2015 21st Century Tutoring

Number and Percentage of Students Receiving Tutoring Services at 21st Century Schools by Race/Ethnicity - 2014-2015							
School	White	American	Latino	American	Islander	Multi Racial	Total
	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Borton	43	16	113	*	*	11	191
Cavett	*	*	89	*	*	*	102
Cragin	17	13	45	*	*	*	84
Dietz	32	25	52	*	*	*	121
Drachman	*	10	74	*	*	*	91
Grijalva	*	*	89	*	*	*	105
Johnson	*	11	46	40	*	*	103
Lawrence	*	*	35	36	*	*	73
Maldonado	*	*	61	*	*	*	70
Miller	*	*	67	*	*	*	80
Mission View	*	*	52	*	*	*	66
Maxwell	*	10	103	*	*	*	132
Pueblo Gardens	*	*	64	*	*	*	73
Robins	23	*	116	*	*	*	152
Robinson	16	10	106	*	*	*	135
Safford	*	*	71	11	*	*	104
Van Buskirk	*	*	104	13	*	*	125
Vesey	24	*	94	10	*	*	138
Warren	*	*	84	11	*	*	104
White	*	*	101	*	*	*	114
Doolen	24	16	27	*	11	*	82
Mansfeld	17	*	105	*	*	*	142
Pueblo Magnet	11	*	156	10	*	*	187
Santa Rita	37	13	43	*	*	*	106