

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

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

No. CV-74-00090-TUC-DCB

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

No. CV-74-0204-TUC-DCB

**ORDER**

Adoption in Part and Modification in Part: SY 2016-17 SMAR & Unitary Status

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Table of Contents**

Historical Perspective: Unitary Status Review ..... 4

Special Master’s 2016-17 Annual Review (SMAR): Unitary Status Review ..... 7

1. Student Assignment: USP § II..... 15

    a. § II.E: Magnet Schools and Programs ..... 19

2. Transportation: USP § III ..... 34

3. Administrators and Certificated Staff: USP § IV..... 38

    a. Increasing Diversity..... 39

    b. Reducing Attrition ..... 40

    c. Grow-Your-Own (GYOP)..... 41

    d. Placement of Beginning Teachers..... 42

4. Quality of Education: USP § V ..... 45

    a. § V.A: Advanced Learning Experiences (ALEs) ..... 45

        a-1. District-Wide ALEs ..... 51

        a-2. GATE Programs: Elementary Schools and K-8 (grades 1-8) ..... 53

        a-3. AACs and GATE Resource: Middle Schools, K-8 (grades 6-8) and High Schools ..... 59

        a-4. ALE Action Plan: Effectiveness of Planned Strategies..... 63

        a-5. Summary: ALE Policy Manual..... 97

    b. § V.C: Dual Language Programs ..... 98

    c. § V.D: Exceptional Education ..... 101

    d. § V.E: Student Engagement and Support..... 103

        d-1. Academic Intervention and Dropout Prevention..... 104

        d-2. ....Culturally Relevant Curriculum (CRC) and Professional Development and Training for CRC ..... 105

        d-3. Support Services for African-American and Latino students and Support for Parent and Community Participation ..... 118

    e. Maintaining Inclusive School Environments: USP § V.F..... 122

5. Discipline: USP § VI ..... 124

6. Family and Community Engagement: USP § VII ..... 132

7. Extracurricular Activities: USP § VIII..... 137

8. Facilities and Technology: USP § IX..... 138

    a. Facilities ..... 138

1	b. Technology.....	139
2	9. Accountability and Transparency: USP § X .....	140
3	a. Evidence Based Accountability .....	140
4	a-1. Professional Learning: Professional Development .....	143
5	b. Budget.....	146
6	Conclusion.....	147

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

A.  
**Historical Perspective: Unitary Status Review**

Prior to launching into what will be the most comprehensive analysis of the unitary status of the Tucson Unified School District (the District/TUSD), to be done since the adoption of the Unitary Status Plan (USP) in February 2013, the Court provides a brief historical perspective of this case.<sup>1</sup> In 1974, two class action lawsuits were filed alleging segregation in TUSD between White students and African-American students (Fisher Plaintiffs), CV 74-90 TUC DCB, and Mexican-American students (Mendoza Plaintiffs), CV 74-204 TUC DCB. The cases were consolidated in 1975 and went to trial in 1977.<sup>2</sup>

In 1978, the Court found that *de jure* discriminatory segregation existed in TUSD. Regardless of the fact that only Black students were statutorily prohibited from attending White schools, Judge Frey found that even as the District dismantled the “dual Black and White school system and, thereafter, there existed some intentional segregation of minority students (Black and Mexican-American) from Anglo-students.” (Order (Doc. 1119) at 15 n.9),<sup>3</sup> *see also Fisher v. Tucson USD*, 652 F.3d 1131, 9781 n.9 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing finding of *de jure* discrimination without criticism). Judgment was entered for Plaintiffs, but nevertheless both Plaintiffs filed motions to amend the Court’s findings and prepared to appeal.

Then, the parties entered into a Settlement Agreement to resolve the consolidated case. “It appears likely that the Settlement Agreement resolved the appellate issues raised by the class Plaintiffs because Judge Frey approved it without ruling on the pending motions and ordered that the Stipulation would be the controlling Order of the Court.”

---

<sup>1</sup> More detailed discussions of the history of this case have been given by this Court in prior Orders. (Docs. 1119, 1270), *see also Fisher v. Tucson USD*, 652 F.3d 1131, 9781 n.9 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing *Mendoza v. Tucson Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 623 F.2d 1338, 1341 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980) (describing early case history)).

<sup>2</sup> Used interchangeably: Anglo, Black, Hispanic, and Latino.

<sup>3</sup> All page citations are to the CM/ECF page.

1 (Order (Doc. 1119) at 4-5); *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1137 n.10 (quoting Settlement Agreement  
2 as providing once it was implemented: “the rights and obligations of the parties to be  
3 determined solely by its terms and the terms of any subsequent stipulations or orders  
4 entered herein pursuant to it.”)

5 The 1978 Settlement Agreement provided for TUSD to implement “its proposed  
6 desegregation plans in a number of specified schools, cooperate with parents to develop  
7 and examine future student assignment policies at several additional schools, and  
8 eliminate discrimination in faculty assignments, employee training, and in policies on  
9 bilingual education, testing, and discipline.” *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1137 (citing *Mendoza*,  
10 623 F.2d at 1342). The Settlement Agreement prohibited TUSD from “engaging ‘in any  
11 acts or policies which deprive any student of equal protection of the law’ based on race or  
12 ethnicity.” *Id.*

13 The District was supposed to operate for five years under the terms of the  
14 Settlement Agreement before TUSD could file a motion to dissolve it. Around the end of  
15 this period, in 1983, the Arizona State Legislature enacted a funding provision, A.R.S. §  
16 15-910G, to allow school districts operating under court orders to generate additional tax  
17 revenues above and beyond educational spending limitations to pay for desegregation  
18 activities. By and large the express provisions of the Settlement Agreement had been  
19 implemented within the five year period, but the case did not end. (Order (Doc. 1119) at  
20 8, 10, 18, 23.) Instead, TUSD spent millions of dollars, *id.*, over the course of  
21 approximately twenty years before the Court called for TUSD to show good cause why  
22 unitary status had not been attained. (Order (Doc. 1052)). The question was briefed by  
23 the parties, and on April 24, 2008, this Court found unitary status had been attained, but  
24 not without finding some fault with the District’s failure to consider the effectiveness of  
25 the programs financed by desegregation dollars over this extended period of time. (Order  
26 (Doc. 1270)). This Court’s decision was reversed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals  
27 on August 10, 2011.

1           The case was remanded to this Court “to maintain jurisdiction until it is satisfied  
2 that the School District has met its burden by demonstrating – not merely promising—its  
3 ‘good-faith compliance . . . with the [Settlement Agreement] over a reasonable period of  
4 time.’” *Fisher v. Tucson USD*, 652 F.3d at 1143-44 (quoting *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 498  
5 (1992)). “The court must also be convinced that the District has eliminated ‘the vestiges  
6 of past discrimination . . . to the extent practicable’ with regard to all of the *Green*  
7 factors.” *Id.* at 1144 (quoting *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 492).

8           “The *Green* factors are such things ‘where it is possible to identify a ‘white  
9 school’ or a ‘Negro school’ simply by reference to the racial composition of teachers and  
10 staff, the quality of school buildings and equipment, or the organization of sports  
11 activities.’” (Order (Doc. 1119) at 16 (quoting *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of*  
12 *Ed.*, 402 U.S. 1, 18 (1971)). In the context of educational resource allocations, there are  
13 other factors such as teacher assignments for teachers with advanced degrees or more  
14 experience, availability of library books, and per-pupil financial expenditures. *Id.* (citing  
15 *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 482-83).

16           Upon returning the case to its active docket, the Court appointed the Special  
17 Master to develop a plan by which the District would attain unitary status. Given the  
18 history of the case, this Court directed the plan to be specifically designed to address the  
19 *Green* factors relevant to attaining unitary status in this case and for a plan of action that  
20 would avoid a repeat performance of the District operating under court jurisdiction in  
21 perpetuity. The parties entered into a stipulated plan, i.e., a consent decree: the USP. The  
22 Court adopted the USP in 2013. The USP called for the development of specific action  
23 plans for each of its provisions, implementation of the action plans, operation pursuant to  
24 the action plans for a time period sufficient for the District to determine the effectiveness  
25 of the various plans and make modifications accordingly, and an end date “not prior to  
26 the end of the 2016-2017 school year.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § XI.A.2.)

27           A desegregation decree, like the USP, is not intended to operate in perpetuity. *Id.*  
28 at 1143 (citing *Board of Educ. Oklahoma City Public Sch. v. Dowell*, 498 U.S. 237, 247-

1 48 (1991)). Given “local autonomy of school districts is a vital national tradition,” the  
2 Court adopted the three-year minimum operational component in the USP in order to  
3 return TUSD to the control of local authorities at the earliest practicable date to restore  
4 true accountability to the government. *Id.*; *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 491. The Court will do  
5 this when the District has demonstrated good faith implementation, monitoring, revision,  
6 and operation of the District under the USP for at least three years and the elimination of  
7 the vestiges of past discrimination to the extent practicable.

8 **B.**

9 **Special Master’s 2016-17 Annual Review (SMAR): Unitary Status Review**

10 Annually, the District files a report of activities undertaken pursuant to the USP:  
11 the District’s Annual Report (DAR). The Special Master follows with his annual report:  
12 the SMAR. The parties may make objections. This year marked the three-year  
13 presumptive end-date, SY 2016-17, for the USP. Therefore, the Court required both the  
14 DAR and SMAR to include a comprehensive analysis of the District’s progress under the  
15 USP and a status report to the Court on whether or not unitary status has been attained in  
16 whole or in part.

17 The Special Master recommends that the Court award unitary status for some  
18 elements of the USP and retain jurisdiction over other parts of the USP. The Special  
19 Master has developed completion plans, including implementation time-lines, for these  
20 remaining elements of the USP.

21 The USP is an ambitious and comprehensive plan developed to remedy the past  
22 vestiges of discrimination and segregation that existed in TUSD.

23 In addition to strategies to promote and sustain integration, the USP includes  
24 provisions to provide students with transportation, increase the diversity and  
25 effectiveness of teachers and school administrators; strengthen and enrich the  
26 curriculum and increase access to advanced learning experiences; develop safe,  
27 productive, inclusive and supportive school environments; provide services to  
28 students with special needs; meaningfully engage families; ensure equity in  
facilities and technology-facilitated learning resources; provide students with  
extracurricular activities; and create information systems and budgetary processes  
that facilitate accountability, strategic resource allocation and effective  
management.

(2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 3-4.) These elements are contained within interconnected

1 or interrelated sections of the USP, which generally address: 1) Student Assignment; 2)  
2 Transportation; 3) Administrators and Certificated Staff; 4) Quality of Education; 5)  
3 Discipline; 6) Family and Community Engagement; 7) Extracurricular Activities; 8)  
4 Facilities and Technology, and 9) Accountability and Transparency. (USP (Doc. 1713)).

5 Like the 1978 Settlement Agreement, the parties entered into the USP “to resolve  
6 the longstanding desegregation case against the District.” *Id.* § I.A. It was a plan designed  
7 with “specific substantive programs and provisions to be implemented to address all  
8 outstanding *Green* factors and all other ancillary factors.” *Id.* (citing *Green v. County*  
9 *School Board of New Kent County VA*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968)). In addressing whether or  
10 not the District has attained unitary status this Court considers that “[t]he duty and  
11 responsibility of a school district once segregated by law is to take all steps necessary to  
12 eliminate the vestiges of the unconstitutional *de jure* system.” *Id.* at 6 (quoting *Freeman*  
13 *v. Pitts*, 503 U.S. 467, 485 (1992)).

14 “A school district under a desegregation order, [such as the USP,] is obligated to:  
15 (1) fully and satisfactorily comply with the court’s desegregation decree(s) for a  
16 reasonable period of time; (2) eliminate the vestiges of the prior *de jure* segregation to the  
17 extent practicable; and (3) demonstrate a good-faith commitment to the whole of the  
18 court’s decrees and to the applicable provisions of the law and the Constitution.” *Id.*  
19 (citing *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 491-92; *Dowell*, 498 U.S. at 248-50). “A school board has  
20 no obligation to remedy racial imbalances caused by external factors, such as  
21 demographic shifts, which are not the result of segregation and are beyond the board’s  
22 control.” *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at n.4 (quoting *Manning ex rel. Manning v. Sch. Bd. of*  
23 *Hillsborough Cnty., Fla.*, 244 F.3d 927, 941 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001)).

24 “The test used to determine when unitary status has been achieved, and  
25 accordingly when federal court oversight may end, is well-established: ‘The ultimate  
26 inquiry is whether the constitutional violator has complied in good faith with the  
27 desegregation decree since it was entered, and whether the vestiges of past discrimination  
28



1 have been eliminated to the extent practicable.” *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1134-35 (citations  
2 omitted).

3 The Supreme Court has instructed that courts should “give particular attention” to  
4 the school system’s record of compliance because in this regard a school district is better  
5 positioned to demonstrate good faith by committing to a predetermined constitutional  
6 course of action and undertakings that form a consistent pattern of lawful conduct  
7 directed to eliminate earlier violations. *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1135 (citing *Freeman*, 503  
8 U.S. at 491). Good faith compliance since the inception of a desegregation decree  
9 through the entirety of the desegregation plan demonstrates a school district’s  
10 commitment to a course of action that gives full respect to the equal protection guarantees  
11 of the Constitution and guarantees “that parents, students, and the public have assurance  
12 against further injuries or stigma . . .” *Id.* at 1141 n.25. “A history of good-faith  
13 compliance is evidence that any current racial imbalance is not the product of a new *de*  
14 *jure* violation, and enables the district court to accept the school board’s representation  
15 that it has accepted the principle of racial equality and [the school system] will not suffer  
16 intentional discrimination in the future.” *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 498–99. In other words,  
17 good faith compliance over time “reduces the possibility that a school system’s  
18 compliance is but a temporary constitutional ritual.” *Morgan v. Nucci*, 831 F.2d 313, 321  
19 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1987). Therefore, good faith compliance by the District with the USP over a  
20 reasonable period of time “*is a factor to be considered* in deciding whether or not  
21 jurisdiction [should] be relinquished.” *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1141 n. 25 (citing *Dowell*, 498  
22 U.S. at 249-50).

23 In 1968, the Supreme Court established that a school district, like TUSD, that at  
24 one time operated a statutorily mandated dual school system had an affirmative duty to  
25 eliminate all vestiges of the state-imposed segregation. *Green v. School Bd. of New Kent*  
26 *County*, 391 U.S. 430, 435-36 (1968). The Court in *Green* explained that a school system  
27 can make a prima facie case for unitary status by showing that racial imbalances no  
28 longer exist in student body assignment, faculty, staff, transportation extracurricular

1 activities and facilities. The *Green* factors cover things that readily identify a school as  
2 White or Black, such as the racial composition of staff or quality of school buildings and  
3 equipment, or in the context of educational resource allocations, such as teacher  
4 assignments for teachers with advanced degrees or more experience, then a prima facie  
5 case of violation of substantive constitutional rights under the Equal Protection Clause is  
6 shown. (Order (Doc. 1119) at 16 (citing *Swann*, 402 U.S. at 18; *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at  
7 482-83)). In other words, there is a *Green* presumption of discriminatory intent which  
8 also attaches to factors that reflect resource disparities because both types of disparities  
9 are unlikely to have nondiscriminatory explanations. *Id.* (citing *Save Our Children*, 90  
10 F.3d at 776-77 (placing the burden of proof on Defendants in respect to *Green*  
11 presumptive factors, but requiring Plaintiffs to prove disparities in student achievement  
12 were vestiges of *de jure* segregation.)

13 The test for determining when unitary status has been achieved is two-sided. The  
14 District has the burden to show that any current imbalance is not traceable, in a proximate  
15 way, to the prior violation, but as the *de jure* violation becomes more remote in time and  
16 demographic changes intervene, it becomes less likely that a current racial imbalance is a  
17 vestige of the prior *de jure* system. *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1144 n.10. Still, good faith  
18 remains paramount: “The causal link between current conditions and the prior violation  
19 being even more attenuated if the school district has demonstrated its good faith.” *Id.*  
20 The test describes two-sides of the same coin, with the Plaintiffs and Defendants relying  
21 on its different sides. The Plaintiffs argue lack of good faith; the Defendants argue lack of  
22 any vestiges of the *de jure* violations which were the subject of the law suit. The analysis  
23 is not, however, one test versus the other; the Court must consider both.

24 The burden is on the school district to prove it has attained unitary status. *Fisher*,  
25 652 F.3d at 1135. Disparities in *Green* factors are presumptively vestiges of *de jure*  
26 segregation, but Plaintiffs have the burden to link disparities that fall beyond *Green*, such  
27 as performance disparities in student achievement, to vestiges of *de jure* discrimination.  
28 *Save Our Children*, 90 F.3d at 776.

1           The Court rejects the District’s argument that supervision over the Mendoza class  
2 action, CV 74-204 TUC DCB, should be terminated because Judge Frey found TUSD did  
3 not operate a dual educational system in respect to Hispanic students. This Court has held  
4 that the 1978 Settlement Agreement was the operative document resolving this case, and  
5 it did not distinguish remedies between the two classes. (Order (Doc. 1119) at 5-8, 16-  
6 17.) This Court, when it previously found unitary status and closed this case, concluded  
7 “after careful review of Judge Frey’s Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, pages  
8 206 to 223, that *Fisher/Mendoza* falls squarely within the confines of a *de jure* case for  
9 purposes of determining whether or not TUSD has attained unitary status regardless of  
10 the fact that only Black students were statutorily prohibited from attending White  
11 schools.” *Id.* at 15 n. 9, *see also Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1137 n. 9 (referencing this finding  
12 without criticism). The appellate court followed the same approach of not distinguishing  
13 between Black and Hispanic classes when it remanded the case for this Court “to decide  
14 whether partial withdrawal is warranted in this case.” *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1144. It  
15 instructed that this Court’s discretion should be informed by the following:

16           whether there has been full and satisfactory compliance with the [Settlement  
17 Agreement] in those aspects of the system where supervision is to be withdrawn;  
18 whether retention of judicial control is necessary or practicable to achieve  
19 compliance with the [Agreement] in other facets of the school system; and  
20 whether the school district has demonstrated, to the public and to the parents and  
21 students of the once disfavored race[s] and ethnicities], its good-faith commitment  
22 to the whole of the [Agreement] and to those provisions of the law and the  
23 Constitution that were the predicate for judicial intervention in the first instance.

24 *Id.* (quoting *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 491). The parties did not propose partial unitary status  
25 upon remand and instead negotiated an updated consent decree, the USP, which was  
26 expressly designed to resolve this case. The USP does not treat Hispanic students as less  
27 deserving of relief.

28           Like the 1978 Settlement Agreement, the USP addresses desegregation pursuant to  
student assignment policies, student achievement,<sup>4</sup> faculty assignments, employee

---

<sup>4</sup> The 1978 Settlement Agreement’s approach to eliminating discrimination was focused on testing, whereas the USP student achievement provisions are exceedingly broader. But even under the 1978 Settlement Agreement, this Court rejected a narrow scope of factors for assessing unitary status and held that TUSD

1 training, polices on bilingual education, and discipline. The Court considers good faith in  
2 the context of the District’s implementation, review and operation of TUSD under the  
3 USP. The USP was designed expressly to address the *Green* factors relevant in this case  
4 and to be a pathway to attain unitary status to the extent practicable. The Court will  
5 assess practicability within the context of the USP’s minimum three-year operational  
6 time-frame, not an open-ended meandering towards unitary status.

7 The Court rejects the Defendant’s objection to completion plans as new  
8 requirements, not contained in the USP. Completion plans will only be approved by the  
9 Court upon a finding that *de jure* discrimination has not been eliminated to the extent  
10 practicable as planned in the action plans. The USP called for the action plans to be  
11 developed based on data and research, therefore, the time for conducting studies has  
12 passed. Generally, the Court will not authorize further studies unless required pursuant to  
13 an action plan, necessary because there are no best practices to draw on to address an  
14 issue, or where an action plan addressing an issue failed or was limitedly effective and  
15 further study is necessary to determine whether an alternative remedy exists.

16 The District makes only three specific objections to issues presented in the SMAR,  
17 which are: 1) new ALE participation rate requirements, 2) any requirement to set a  
18 required ELL graduation rate, and 3) further requirements in teacher attrition. The Special  
19 Master has not recommended any such requirements, and the Court does not order them.

20 As for all of the other recommendations made by the Special Master, the District  
21 reports “it is deep into planning and execution of the Special Master’s many completion  
22 steps set out in the SMAR, and will of course comply with all of them that the Court may  
23 order. The District began its compliance effort upon receipt of preliminary drafts of the  
24 SMAR from the Special Master in December, 2017 and January, 2018, and has worked  
25 with the Special Master to refine many of the completion steps set out in the SMAR.  
26 Indeed, the District hopes to be able to report completion of a significant number of the

---

27  
28 had spent millions of desegregation dollars over the course of this case to close the  
student achievement gap, therefore, student achievement was at least one measure  
of program effectiveness. (Order (Doc. 1119) at 15 n.7, 22-23.)

1 steps even before the Special Master’s Reply to the parties’ objections is due (on May 11,  
2 2017).” (TUSD Response (Doc. 2099) at 4.)

3 Over the past year, the Court detected a change in attitude. From its previous  
4 reticence, the District now appears committed to bringing this case to a conclusion by  
5 implementing Completion Plans for USP provisions where unitary status has not yet been  
6 attained. Plaintiffs, however, argue against any finding of unitary status, even in part.

7 The interconnectivity of the various programs called for under the USP makes it  
8 awkward, but not impossible, to grant partial unitary status on elements that may have  
9 been achieved in one section but not another of the USP. Hesitancy to grant unitary status  
10 in part is offset by the goal of returning TUSD to the control of local authorities and to  
11 enable the public to hold them accountable. More importantly, the Court finds it is  
12 important for the community to understand the progress made by the District pursuant to  
13 the USP and for the District and the community to focus on the work that remains under  
14 the USP.

15 “To be sure, district courts possess ample discretion to fashion equitable relief in  
16 school desegregation cases, to tailor that relief as progress is made, and to cede full  
17 control to local authorities at the earliest appropriate time.” *Fisher*, 652 F.3d at 1142  
18 (citing *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 486–92). This Court will not, however, “abdicate its  
19 responsibility [in part or in whole] to retain jurisdiction until [the District] has  
20 demonstrated good faith and eliminated the vestiges of past discrimination to the extent  
21 practicable.” *Id.* at 1143. Only after the District has “‘shown that [it] has attained the  
22 requisite degree of compliance” may [the Court] craft “an orderly means for withdrawing  
23 from control.’” *Id.* “‘[T]he court’s end purpose must be to remedy the violation and, in  
24 addition, to restore state and local authorities to the control of a school system that is  
25 operating in compliance with the Constitution.’” *Id.* (quoting *Freeman*, 503 U.S. at 489)  
26 (emphasis added).

27 The Plaintiffs are concerned, as expressed by the Fishers, “that granting partial  
28 unitary status could cause the District to lose focus in these areas and allow the situation

1 to return to unsatisfactory levels.” (Fisher Response (Doc. 2100) at 2.) The Plaintiffs and  
2 the Special Master are not, however, without recourse where the Court has awarded  
3 unitary status in part, should future problems, foreseen or unforeseen, arise. The Court  
4 expressly retains jurisdiction to enforce every term of the USP, whether or not partial  
5 unitary status has been awarded or not. The Notice and Request for Approval (NARA)  
6 provisions of the USP § X.C will continue to apply in full without exception to any award  
7 of partial unitary status. Data reporting requirements remain in place unless removed by  
8 the Special Master by recommendation, with opportunity for Plaintiffs to be heard and  
9 approval by the Court. The District shall continue to report annually on all USP  
10 provisions.

11 “The Court affirms the January 6, 2012, Order, paragraph 7, directive that annual  
12 extensions of judicial oversight beyond three years will be based on reasons of unattained  
13 compliance by the District with the USP. Three years out, the Court is taking an  
14 inventory of the District’s progress towards unitary status.” (Order (Doc. 2086) at 2.)

15 The District has filed the 2016-17 DAR, (Docs. 2057-2068), and the  
16 corresponding Analysis of Compliance with USP (USP RAC) (Doc. 2075), and Revised  
17 ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092). The 2016-17 SMAR tracks the District’s compliance  
18 analysis. Pursuant to the Special Master’s authority to make recommendations to this  
19 Court regarding his compliance assessments, (Order (Doc. 2086) at 3) (citations omitted),  
20 the Special Master identifies specific non-compliance issues, makes specific  
21 recommendations for activities necessary for compliance, and provides specific deadlines  
22 for the District to complete such activities. The Plaintiffs, who have had full and ongoing  
23 discovery rights including the ability to make requests for disclosures and answers, have  
24 filed Responses and made objections, which this Court directed should be equally  
25 detailed and specific. This Court has reviewed thousands of pages, including the above  
26 referenced briefs and any referenced supporting evidence.

27 The Court grants unitary status in part only to provisions of the USP where it is  
28 confident that there has been full and satisfactory compliance with the express terms of

1 the USP. The Court does not grant unitary status in full because it finds that the School  
2 District has not yet demonstrated to the public, including African-American and Hispanic  
3 parents and students, its good-faith commitment to the whole of the USP and to those  
4 provisions of the law and the Constitution that predicated judicial intervention.

5 The Court will look to this Order when making further unitary status  
6 determinations as to the parts of the USP over which it continues to retain jurisdiction.  
7 The Court finds that an extension of judicial oversight beyond three years is necessary for  
8 reasons of unattained compliance by the District with the USP as identified below.

9 **1. Student Assignment: USP § II**

10 The Student Assignment provision of the USP provides that “[s]tudents of all  
11 racial and ethnic backgrounds shall have the opportunity to attend an integrated school.”  
12 (USP (Doc. 1713) § II.A.1.) The USP required the District to develop and implement a  
13 coordinated process of student assignment, incorporating as appropriate four strategies  
14 for assigning students to schools: attendance boundaries; pairing and clustering of  
15 schools; magnet schools and programs, and open enrollment. *Id.* The Special Master  
16 recommends that unitary status be granted with respect to these districtwide integration  
17 efforts pursuant to § II, Student Assignment, of the USP, except for magnet schools.

18 The Court takes a hard look at student assignment because it is one of the vestiges  
19 expressly addressed in the original 1978 Settlement Agreement. When this case  
20 commenced in 1974 and when the Settlement Agreement was entered into by the parties,  
21 segregation was addressed by strategically changing school boundaries and bussing  
22 students to achieve desegregation. Now, students may attend any school by choice,  
23 A.R.S. § 15-816 *et seq.*, with charter and out-of-District schools competing for student  
24 enrollment, A.R.S. § 15-181 *et seq.* Given today’s choices, student assignment strategies  
25 aimed at remediating segregation are more limited, less direct, and less effective.  
26 Demographic changes in the District require special definitions. An “Integrated school”  
27 (INT) is any school in which no racial or ethnic group varies from the district average for  
28 that grade level (elementary, middle, K-8 schools, and high schools) by more than +/- 15

1 percentage points, and in which no single racial or ethnic group exceeds 70% of the  
2 school's enrollment. A "Racially Concentrated" (RC) school is any school in which any  
3 racial or ethnic group exceeds 70% of the school's total enrollment. (USP (Doc. 1713) §  
4 II.B.1-2.)

5 According to the Special Master, "[t]he District has done those things with respect  
6 to student assignments that it was required to do by the USP, putting aside its  
7 ambivalence with respect to magnets." (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 8.)

8 He reports recent progress in integrating TUSD schools, which he attributes to the  
9 cumulative effect of more productive implementation of provisions of the USP and the  
10 relevant action plan for integration, such as the District's recent undertaking to advise  
11 families of research showing the benefits of an integrated education and its creation of an  
12 Integration Initiative. He reports that integration is trending up.<sup>5</sup> He relies on reductions  
13 in racial concentration (Hispanic) at Racially Concentrated magnet schools which began  
14 dropping below the 70% mark in SY 2016-17. *Id.*, Table II-3 (Doc. 2096-1) at 1. There  
15 has been a reduction in Racially Concentrated schools in the District from 40.7% in SY  
16 2013-14 to 35.3% in SY 2017-18. Integrated schools have increased from 21.2% to  
17 31.8% for these same years, with all Integrated schools being magnet schools. In this

---

18  
19 <sup>5</sup> The Special Master reports that from 2014-15 to "the current year," the  
20 number of Racially Concentrated schools went from 35 to 30; the number of  
21 Integrated schools went from 17 to 25. Total enrollment in an Integrated school  
22 has increased by 2,154 and the number of students in Racially Concentrated  
23 schools dropped by 2,542. (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second Reply) at 10.) The Special  
24 Master suggests that a more conventional definition of integration would result in  
25 finding that more than half of the District's students have the benefit of an  
26 integrated education. *Id.* at 8, 10. The District classifies schools as "highly  
27 diverse" if no group is over 70% and two groups, each, make up 25% or more of  
28 the student body. *Id.*, USP Integrated Schools (Doc. 2111-1) at 1.) Both Plaintiffs  
move to strike this Second Reply by the Special Master because the USP  
definition for an Integrated school is the only relevant definition. The Court  
agrees, but that does not mean that racial percentages other than +/- 15% are not  
relevant at schools which are neither Integrated nor Racially Concentrated. In  
other words, it is relevant whether schools are more or less trending towards  
integration or racial concentration. It is relevant whether schools are +/- 15%, +/-  
20%, or +/- 25%, with every percentage decrease in racial concentration and  
percentage increase towards integration being a good thing. The Court does not  
strike the Second Reply, but it does not base any ruling in this Order on any  
standard defining integration other than +/- 15%.



1 way, although the opportunity for students to attend Integrated schools dipped from 19%  
2 in SY 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16, to 18% in 2016-17, the opportunity to attend an  
3 Integrated school increased to 25% in SY 2017-18. *Id.* at Table II-2 (Doc. 2096-1) at 2.

4 “In no other state are the challenges of integrating schools greater than in Arizona  
5 where state policy not only strongly supports charter schools but essentially incentivizes  
6 suburban schools to recruit students from more diverse Districts like TUSD.” (2016-17  
7 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 8.) “The geographic and demographic characteristics of the  
8 District work together to make the time getting from home to a school beyond students’  
9 ‘neighborhood schools’ greater than is the case in many districts.” *Id.* In short, “[i]n a  
10 voluntary desegregation plan such as the USP, the primary tools for integration are  
11 magnet schools. Moreover, magnet schools have the potential of bringing new families to  
12 the District.” *Id.* at 9.

13 The Special Master reports that “[t]he District has shown limited interest in  
14 strengthening magnet schools much less expanding its magnet options.” *Id.* at 10. As  
15 evidence, the Special Master reports the following:

16 The District frequently hires consultants to help it with important initiatives (e.g.,  
17 dropout prevention, discipline and dual language). But it did not hire a consultant  
18 to help its development of a proposal for federal funding of magnet schools (the  
proposal was not funded).

19 In its marketing efforts to advise families about the choices they can make among  
20 schools – including video, handouts, text on the website – there had been no  
21 mention until the recruitment for the 2017-18 school year of the significant  
research showing that attending an integrated school provides students with  
important learning opportunities they would not otherwise have.

22 As a result of demands by the plaintiffs and pursuant to a requirement approved by  
23 the Court, the District finally launched an “Integration Initiative” in the spring of  
2016 – more than three years after the approval of the USP.

24 Until recently, the staff member serving as Director of Magnet Schools who was  
25 appointed in the fall of 2016 reported to the Director of Operations whose primary  
26 responsibilities deal with facilities and transportation. Given that magnet schools  
are fundamentally education programs, the success of which are important to the  
attainment of unitary status, one might have expected the person responsible for  
this integration initiative to report to District leaders on the academic side.

27 In its Annual Report, the District asserts that changes in the grade structures at  
28 Borman and Drachman enhanced integration. However, the racial composition at  
Borman changed little and the changes at Drachman resulted in less rather than  
more integration.

1 The person who served as Director of Magnet Schools through the 2014-15 was a  
2 forceful advocate for magnet schools. However, the scope of her responsibility  
3 was continuously narrowed until she was not allowed to perform her functions.  
4 The position of Director of Magnet Schools, which is provided for in the USP, was  
5 left unfilled for half of the 2015-16 school year. When a new director was  
6 appointed during the fall term of 2016-17, that position was redefined from full-  
time to half-time. When the plaintiffs and the Special Master objected to this  
7 violation of provisions of the USP, the District removed the half-time appointee  
8 and replaced him with an interim director. The interim director was later appointed  
9 as Director without a search.

10 In the development of its magnet school plans, the District has allowed several  
11 schools to set achievement goals lower than those they already had attained. This  
12 can be explained as a lack of commitment to higher achievement in magnet  
13 schools or a failure to monitor the development of the plans.

14 During the development of the 2017-18 budget, the Mendoza plaintiffs argued that  
15 the District was not adequately funding the magnet schools. The District  
16 responded by saying that it would reconsider its goals when it had the opportunity  
17 to analyze the new AZMerit scores. The plaintiffs and the Special Master took this  
18 response as an indication that the budgets would be revisited. But the District  
19 made no changes in magnet budgets after review of the state test scores despite the  
20 fact that students at two of the magnets previously thought of as highly effective  
21 academically – Drachman and Palo Verde – performed below the District average  
22 in the growth of student performance in English language arts and mathematics  
23 schoolwide. Further, students in these two schools who were performing in the  
24 bottom 25% scored below expectations in both of the subjects tested.

25 *Id.* at 10-11.

26 In assessing whether unitary status has been attained in the context of the  
27 District’s Comprehensive Magnet Plan (CMP), it is important to look at whether the  
28 District has the commitment and capability to engage in a process of continuous  
improvement with respect to magnets now in place and likewise to expand magnets that  
would attract families to the District. Recently, the District developed a walk-through  
protocol (WTP) for assessing the effectiveness of magnet schools. The Special Master  
reports that the WTP, coupled with the systematic analysis of student outcomes, are  
essential tools for facilitating continuous school improvement. He suggests that unitary  
status not be ordered until the District demonstrates effective use of these processes and  
procedures over time.

The Special Master also recommends the Court retain supervision with respect to  
magnet schools until the District can demonstrate its commitment to future identification  
and implementation of new magnet schools with the clear potential to increase the

1 opportunities TUSD students have to benefit from an integrated education. The Court  
2 agrees, and finds that this will serve the dual purpose of affording the District ample time  
3 to establish an effective WTP. The Court shall reconsider the WTP in the context of  
4 reconsidering unitary status of the Magnet program as set out below.

5 **a. § II.E: Magnet Schools and Programs**

6 The USP Magnet School Plan provision provides:

7  
8 By April 1, 2013, the District shall develop and provide to the Plaintiffs and the  
9 Special Master a Magnet School Plan, taking into account the findings of the 2011  
10 Magnet School Study and ensuring that this Plan aligns with its other student  
11 assignment strategies and recruitment efforts. In creating the Plan, the District  
12 shall, at a minimum: (i) consider how, whether, and where to add new sites to  
13 replicate successful programs and/or add new magnet themes and additional dual  
14 language programs, focusing on which geographic area(s) of the District are best  
15 suited for new programs to assist the District in meeting its desegregation  
16 obligations; (ii) improve existing magnet schools and programs that are not  
17 promoting integration and/or educational quality; (iii) consider changes to magnet  
18 schools or programs that are not promoting integration and/or educational quality,  
19 including withdrawal of magnet status; (iv) determine if each magnet school or  
20 school with a magnet program shall have an attendance boundary; (v) determine  
21 admissions priorities/criteria for each magnet school or program and a process for  
22 review of those criteria; and (vi) ensure that administrators and certificated staff in  
23 magnet schools and programs have the expertise and training necessary to ensure  
24 successful implementation of the magnet.

17 Pursuant to these considerations, the Magnet School Plan shall, at a minimum, set  
18 forth a process and schedule to: (vii) make changes to the theme(s), programs,  
19 boundaries, and admissions criteria for existing magnet schools and programs in  
20 conformity with the Plan’s findings, including developing a process and criteria  
21 for significantly changing, withdrawing magnet status from, or closing magnet  
22 schools or programs, that are not promoting integration or educational quality;  
23 (viii) add additional magnet schools and/or programs for the 2013-2014 school  
24 year as feasible and for the 2014-2015 school year that will promote integration  
25 and educational quality within the District, including increasing the number of  
26 dual language programs; (ix) provide necessary training and resources to magnet  
27 school and program administrators and certificated staff; (x) include strategies to  
28 specifically engage African American and Latino families, including the families  
of English language learner (“ELL”) students; and, (xi) identify goals to further  
the integration of each magnet school which shall be used to assess the  
effectiveness of efforts to enhance integration.

24 (USP (Doc. 1713) § II.E.3.)

26 Pursuant to the USP, “The District shall, to the extent practicable, implement  
27 elements of the Plan in the 2013-2014 school year, and shall fully implement the Plan in  
28 the 2014-2015 school year.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § II.E.4.)

1 It is undisputed that the USP § II.E.3 Magnet School Plan (CMP), was not  
2 completed by the District until January 28, 2016. The Court does not repeat the long and  
3 torturous path taken by the District to draft the CMP to comply with the provisions of the  
4 USP, especially those provisions that required it to identify goals to further integration at  
5 each magnet school which could be used to assess effectiveness or lack thereof. Progress  
6 stalled when it came to changing existing magnet schools or programs to better promote  
7 integration and educational quality, especially if change meant withdrawing magnet  
8 status. *See e.g.*, (Orders (Docs. 1753, 1870) (describing deficiencies and requiring  
9 revisions)).

10 On January 16, 2015, the Court rejected the CMP as adopted by the Board on July  
11 15, 2014, and required a major rework. Specifically, the Court adopted two goals as  
12 measures for assessing the effectiveness of a magnet school: 1) progress towards  
13 achieving the USP definition of an Integrated school and 2) progress towards enhancing  
14 the educational quality of the school. The Court required an immediate implementation  
15 schedule for improvement plans, transition plans, and removal of non-compliant schools  
16 or programs as magnets.

17 It bears repeating, here:

18 Integration and student achievement are linked together because the goal of a  
19 magnet school is by definition “to attract a racially diverse student body by  
20 creating a school so distinctive and appealing – so magnetic – that it will draw a  
21 diverse range of families from throughout the community eager to enroll their  
22 children, even if it means having them bused to a different, and perhaps, distant  
23 neighborhood. To do so, the magnet schools must offer educational programs of  
24 high caliber that are not available in other area schools.” (2011 Magnet Study  
25 (Doc. 1738) at 3). In the best magnet schools, the magnet components, many of  
26 which are associated with effective schools, add up to higher student achievement.  
27 *Id.* In other words, high academic standards will draw students to a magnet school,  
28 and an effective magnet program will improve student achievement.

(Order (Doc. 1753) at 10.)

25 The Court held that it could not approve the CMP because it was not a  
26 comprehensive plan as required by the USP. The Court complained that it had to piece  
27 together information from various studies and reports. The Court asked for one  
28 comprehensive plan reflecting that within the time frame for attaining unitary status the

1 District had developed, implemented, and would operate a magnet plan to attain the USP  
2 goal: “Students of all racial and ethnic backgrounds shall have the opportunity to attend  
3 an integrated school.” *Id.* at 16 (quoting USP (Doc. 1713) § II.A.1).

4 The Court expressly identified the CMP deficiencies, as follows:

5 The CMP fails to present for easy comparison and evaluation the basic rubric  
6 information for the current magnet schools and programs or identify the strength  
7 of the various magnet themes operating in these schools. The Court does not know  
8 how each school fits into an overall magnet feeder school plan. In short, the CMP  
9 fails to reflect the District’s vision for a meaningful operational Magnet School  
10 Plan, which it can support long term. Within the context of implementing such a  
11 plan, the CMP fails to identify the specific activities which must be undertaken by  
12 each school to attain magnet status. There is no budgetary assessment as to how  
13 much money it will take to make the requisite improvements or even how many  
14 schools it can maintain as magnets long term. There is no transportation  
15 component in the CMP, which is the most expensive factor in operating a magnet  
16 school system. School boundaries have not yet been factored into the plan. The  
17 CMP speaks to developing Improvement Plans, but until detailed plans, complete  
18 with budget and resource estimates, are prepared for a school, it is impossible to  
19 ascertain what actions, if any, a school can undertake to attain true magnet status  
20 by the USP target date for attaining unitary status: SY 2016-17.

21 *Id.* (emphasis added).

22 The Court ordered the District to revise the CMP and file it within four months. *Id.*  
23 at 18.

24 On June 11, 2015, TUSD filed a Revised CMP which upon filing already did not  
25 conform to further stipulations between the parties for further revisions. On November  
26 19, 2015, the Court approved the Revised CMP as further revised by stipulation and  
27 ordered the District to file the Final Revised CMP. On January 28, 2016, the District filed  
28 the Final 2015-16 CMP (Doc. 1898).

The Court has reviewed the District’s SY 2016-17 Annual Report (DAR) and its  
USP compliance report (USP RAC). As would be expected, given the development of the  
CMP in 2015-16, the bulk of magnet program activity has occurred since SY 2015-16. In  
short, the criteria for magnet schools has been developed and used for evaluating the  
effectiveness of the existing magnet schools, *see* (CMP (Doc. 1898) (establishing criteria  
for magnet improvement plans and developing improvement plans for magnet schools  
where necessary)), magnet status has been withdrawn from some schools and programs

1 that did not meet the criteria for the designation, (Order) (Doc. 1983), and transition plans  
2 were developed and implemented at these schools.

3 In SY 2015-16, TUSD identified 19<sup>6</sup> magnet schools/programs in the CMP, with  
4 only two meeting the magnet criteria: Dodge Middle School and Palo Verde High  
5 School. (CMP (Doc. 1898) at 10.) Four magnet schools, Borton Elementary School,  
6 Booth Fickett K-8, Dodge Middle School, and Palo Verde, met the integration criteria for  
7 magnet status, with 1) every racial or ethnic student population being within +/- 15% of  
8 the District average for the relevant racial/ethnic group at the relevant grade level, and 2)  
9 no group exceeding 70% of the school's total population, i.e., the school is not Racially  
10 Concentrated. (USP RAC § II (2075-2) at 19.) Improvement plans were developed for the  
11 remainder. On December 27, 2016, magnet status was withdrawn from Ochoa and  
12 Robison elementary schools, Safford K-6, Utterback 6-7, and Cholla and Pueblo high  
13 schools. (Order (Doc. 1983) at 2.) Thirteen remained.

14 In 2016-17, five magnet schools were Integrated: Borton, Holladay, and Tully  
15 elementary schools, Dodge Middle School, and Palo Verde High School. *Id.* (citing 2016-  
16 17 DAR (2057-1) at 53.) At seven schools, Hispanic students exceeded 70% of the  
17 school's total student population, i.e., they were Racially Concentrated: elementary  
18 schools (Bonillas 71%), Carillo (79%) and Davis (75%)); K-8 schools (Drachman (71%)  
19 and Roskruge (78%)); Mansfield Middle School (73%), and Tucson High School (73%).  
20 Carrillo failed both integration tests, and Booth Fickett failed the +/-15% integration test.  
21 (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 53.)

22 The Court notes by September 28, 2017, the District's 40<sup>th</sup> Day enrollment report  
23 reflects the addition of four more Integrated Schools: Bonillas and Davis elementary  
24 schools and Drachman K-8 and Mansfield Middle School. (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1  
25  
26  
27

---

28 <sup>6</sup> Cragin Elementary School (INT) was eliminated as a magnet program in  
SY 2015-16, reducing the SY 2015-16 total from 20 to 19.

1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 2-3: 40<sup>th</sup> Day Enrollment 9/28/2017).<sup>7</sup> In other words, nine magnet  
2 schools were Integrated schools.

3 To be clear, there are two magnet school criteria, Integration and Student  
4 Achievement, which are as follows:

5 [1.] Integration: [a]) is being an Integrated school as defined under the USP using  
6 the 70% and +/- 15% thresholds and [b]) a school is progressing towards  
7 integration if it is Integrated at the incoming class at its lowest grade and such  
integration can be maintained as these student matriculate through two grades.

8 (CMP (Doc. 1898) at 10);<sup>8</sup> *see also* (Order (Doc. 1753) at 9), (USP RAC § II (2075-2) at  
9 58 (Data Markers for Integration)).

10 [2.] Student Achievement: [a]) A or B school as defined by the state school letter  
11 grade system; [b]) students score higher than the state median in reading and math  
12 on the state assessment; [c]) show academic growth of all students higher than the  
13 state median growth in reading and math; [d]) secure the growth of the bottom  
14 25% of the students of the school at a rate higher than the state median growth,  
15 and [e]) reduce achievement gaps between ethnic groups so that achievement gaps  
between these groups are less than those in schools with similar demographics and  
socio economic factors and that are not magnet schools in the district. The gap  
shall be defined as the difference between performance in math and  
reading/literacy of the highest ethnic group compared to other ethnic groups  
within the school.

16 (CMP (Doc. 1898) at 15); *see also* (Order (Doc. 1753) at 9-10), (USP RAC § II (2075-2)  
17 at 59 (Data Markers for Achievement)).

18 The Court points out that the first three criteria for measuring student achievement  
19 are aimed at ensuring the school is academically attractive to potential students: the  
20 school's student achievement profile. The last two criteria measure the effectiveness of a  
21 school to teach students, especially minority students. This distinction is important  
22 because, as noted above: "high academic standards will draw students to a magnet  
23

---

24 <sup>7</sup> In the remainder of this Order, the Court identifies Integrated Schools  
25 (INT) and Racially Concentrated (RC) Schools as classified on September 28,  
26 2017. (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 2-3: 40<sup>th</sup> Day Enrollment  
9/28/2017); (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 17-19).

27 <sup>8</sup> The Court defined integration as existing, "pursuant to the definition of  
28 the USP § II.E.2, based on the number of accepted magnet applications for entry  
grades K, 6, 9 and which is maintained at the cohort grade levels, i.e., as these  
students matriculate through two grades. (Order (Doc. 1753) at 9.) The Court  
defers to the CMP definition.

1 school, and an effective magnet program will improve student achievement.” Both are  
2 necessary components of a successful magnet school or program.

3 In the District’s USP RAC, it records that “it is not possible” to report on all of the  
4 goals as delineated by the Court, and hence it measures academic achievement by only  
5 two criteria: 1) proficiency rates for magnet schools meet or exceed the overall state  
6 proficiency rates and 2) achievement gaps between racial groups participating in magnet  
7 programs will be less than the achievement gaps between racial groups not participating  
8 in magnet programs. (USP RAC § II (Doc. 2075-2) at 62.) Of special concern to the  
9 Court is the District’s omission of the State’s accountability scores for the schools. The  
10 Court notes that the State Board of Education is mandated by law, A.R.S. § 15-241, to  
11 provide annual achievement profiles: A-F Accountability Scores (AZMerit grades). On  
12 May 21, 2018, the State Board of Education finalized the AZMerit grades for 2017-18.  
13 The 2017-18 AZMerit grades dramatically differed from prior accountability scores,  
14 which TUSD relied on in the CMP, as follows: Bonillas (INT) C to B; Borton (INT) C  
15 (no change); Carillo (RC) A to B; Davis (INT) B (no change); Holladay (INT) D to C;  
16 Tully (INT) C (no change); Drachman (INT) A to F; Booth-Fickett C to D; Roskruge B  
17 to D; Dodge (INT) A to B; Mansfeld (INT) C to B; Palo Verde (INT) A to D, and Tucson  
18 High (RC) B to C.

19 Even with improved integration, the existing magnet schools cannot survive the  
20 CMP criteria that they be A or B schools. No parent choosing a school will ignore its  
21 highly visible, publically posted AZMerit grade. Neither can the District. It must propose  
22 an alternative measure of the school’s student achievement profile capable of countering  
23 a low AZMerit grade. For example: Is there a means to identify C schools that are  
24 ascending, i.e., C+ schools? Should there be a 2-year probationary period before a low  
25 AZMerit grade triggers termination. The point is, magnet criteria such as the “A or B  
26 AZMerit grade” included in the CMP and adopted by the Court may be revised, but  
27 cannot be ignored.<sup>9</sup> This is especially true because, pursuant to the CMP, these schools

---

28 <sup>9</sup> For example, the Marzano Report measures academic achievement based



1 are subject to termination as magnets. The District cannot move forward by ignoring the  
2 elephant in the room: an academically “failing” magnet school or program.

3 The Special Master is currently responsible for recommending the termination of  
4 non-compliant magnet schools or programs, with the exception of any school or program  
5 where the District has prepared an improvement plan for that school no later than October  
6 1, 2018, which has been approved by the Special Master. In both instances, the Special  
7 Master shall expressly identify the criteria guiding these determinations as being relevant  
8 to improving: 1) integration, 2) the minority student achievement gap,<sup>10</sup> and 3) the  
9 school’s student achievement profile. The Court notes that improvement plans<sup>11</sup> were  
10 developed for these schools in 2015. Therefore, these magnet schools or programs are  
11 subject to having their magnet status withdrawn immediately, unless the Special Master  
12 finds it is highly likely that magnet status will be attained by SY 2018-19. (2016-17  
13 SMAR (2096) at 12.)

14 The Special Master shall base his recommendations on express criteria and  
15 guidelines for identifying a successful magnet school or program. Such criteria and  
16 guidelines, developed by the Special Master, shall be provided to the District for  
17 incorporation into the CMP for future use. Clear criteria and standards for magnet schools  
18 or programs are especially important to guide the District in making the sometimes  
19 politically unpopular decisions that are required to create and operate a viable district-  
20 wide magnet plan now and in the future. The record must reflect that the District can

---

23 on “whether achievement gaps between the racial groups participating in magnet  
24 programs were less than the achievement gaps between racial groups,” (USP RAC  
25 § II (Doc. 2075-2) at 10), (Marzano Report (Doc. 2058-3) at 94-99), utterly failing  
to consider the student achievement profile of the schools.

26 <sup>10</sup> The student achievement gap is the gap “between racial groups  
27 participating in the magnet programs is less than the achievement gaps between  
28 racial groups not participating in the magnet programs.” (Mendoza Response  
(Doc. 2101) at 12), *see also* (Order (Doc. 1898) at 15.)

<sup>11</sup> The Court assumes that transition plans have been developed in case  
magnet status is withdrawn.

1 move forward of its own accord before the Special Master and the Court may step away.  
2 Now is the time for the District to make that record.

3 The District shall review the existing criteria and standards and propose  
4 modifications to address the inadequacy of the A & B AzMerit grades and to be used in  
5 the future to determine magnet status. The District should the procedures for creating new  
6 magnet programs and procedures for terminating future non-compliant magnet programs.  
7 The Court assumes it goes without saying that the District shall establish a review  
8 schedule for the Magnet Program, thereby creating potential need for future improvement  
9 plans and transitions plans. The District with the Special Master's assistance should  
10 review the CMP sections Processes and Schedules to Improve Magnet Programs,  
11 Strategies to Improve Student Achievement, and Processes and Strategies to Eliminate  
12 Magnet Programs and revise them to be generic prototypes for future use in the event  
13 magnet schools and programs fail to meet the magnet criteria and standards in the future.  
14 To be clear, the Court does not mean to suggest that any of the current non-compliant  
15 magnet schools and programs may remain so after SY 2018-19; the existing improvement  
16 plans and transitions plans apply to them.

17 The Court refers the parties and the Special Master to the discussion in its Order  
18 (Doc. 1753) issued January 16, 2015, at pages 13 through 17, describing the deficiencies  
19 in the CMP at that time. They remain today and are the focus of the Special Master's  
20 request that the District demonstrate its commitment and capability to identify and  
21 implement new magnet schools and programs to maintain a vibrant magnet plan which  
22 affords future increased opportunities for TUSD students to benefit from an integrated  
23 education. (2016-17 SMAR (2096) at 10.)

24 The Court adopts the Special Master's recommendation that the District undertake  
25 an assessment of potential magnet schools or programs for TUSD, including identifying  
26 preferred choices and explaining its reasoning for selecting options and deciding whether  
27 such options should be implemented. *Id.* at 13. The Court agrees. The Court provides the  
28 discussions above and below to guide that endeavor, which shall culminate with the

1 District’s filing a 3-Year Plus Integration Plan: CMP (3-Year PIP: CMP) by the end of  
2 this school year.

3 The District reports that residential patterns across the District are racially  
4 concentrated within particular geographic areas, with the overall Hispanic student  
5 population being 61%. (USP RAC § II (Doc. 2075-2) at 1-2, 15.) The integrative impact  
6 of a magnet school or program is limited by the distances between target populations and  
7 Racially Concentrated schools. To have an effective Magnet School Plan, “the District  
8 must strategically place magnet schools in central locations, generally, within an eight  
9 mile radius of the center of the District, because parents will not send their children  
10 where travel time exceeds approximately 20 minutes.” (Order (Doc. 1753) at 13), *see*  
11 *also* (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 108 (describing the District as spanning 231 square  
12 miles, including east-west span greater than 30 miles<sup>12</sup> without a crosstown freeway). For  
13 example, in SY 2016-17, the District introduced a pilot<sup>13</sup> Express Bus Program to move  
14 students south-east to south-west from Mansfield and Magee middle schools to the  
15 Drachman Montessori K-8 (INT), and south-east to north-east from Cholla (RC) and  
16 Tucson (RC) high schools to Sabino High School.

17 There is an up-side to the confluence of the District’s racially concentrated  
18 demographics and geographic sprawl with State policies like ARS 15-861.01 (mandatory  
19 open enrollment) and ARS 15-181 *et seq.* (tuition-free charter schools), that “create[s]  
20 difficult challenges” in addressing segregation. (USP RAC § II (2075-2) at 5.) These  
21 same factors limit plan options and simplify the planning process. With all the variables  
22 and options known, there is no reason to delay adopting a future CMP for the District.

---

24  
25 <sup>12</sup> Travel times of 60 to 90 minutes are not attractive to parents and may be  
harmful to students. (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 108.)

26 <sup>13</sup> The Court notes that in 2015, when TUSD sought this Court’s permission  
27 to add the seven and eighth grades to the Drachman Montessori magnet school  
28 (INT), it advanced the idea that an east side express bus would “alleviate concerns  
about long bus rides and increase the likelihood of recruiting target students to  
attend Drachman [(INT)].” (Drachman Desegregation Impact Analysis (DIA)  
(Doc. 1869-4) at 6.)

1           Given the direct link between magnet status and more money for a school, which  
2 incentivizes and politicizes the creation of magnet schools and programs without regard  
3 for magnet requirements, CMP criteria and guidelines shall be rationally related to  
4 identifying schools that have the ability to act as magnets for integration purposes. The  
5 existing CMP is a start, but as of now the District relies far too much on the discretion of  
6 the Special Master and the judicial authority of this Court to make the hard decisions  
7 necessary to operate an effective Magnet Program. *See* (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at  
8 12 (proposing that Special Master shall determine by September 2018 whether each  
9 magnet school has met the standards for a magnet school and “may” recommend to the  
10 Court at any time that the school lose magnet status). The Court finds that the District is  
11 well positioned to phase-out the discretionary role of the Special Master. He shall  
12 develop the criteria and guidelines for identifying currently effective magnet schools and  
13 programs and follow them for making his recommendations for removing the existing  
14 magnet schools and programs. He shall provide these criteria and guidelines to the  
15 District for incorporation in the 3-year PIP: CMP for future use by the District in  
16 developing new magnets and/or eliminating old ones.

17           The District has already developed criteria for assessing the viability of adding a  
18 new magnet school, revising an existing magnet program, and/or relocating a magnet  
19 program, which include: racial/ethnic composition; academic achievement; facility  
20 condition/capacity; and geographic location. (Order (Doc. 1753) at 14.) The District also  
21 recognizes that budget and pipeline concerns factor into future magnet school and  
22 program planning. (CMP (Doc. 1898) at 8-9.)

23           October 6, 2016, Marzano Research, a private consultant for the District issued a  
24 Report (Marzano Report), (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 72-73) (citing Marzano Report  
25 (2058-3) at 145-168), identifying the top five magnet themes parents find the most  
26 attractive: STEAM, Fine and Performing Arts, Early College preparatory, Dual Language  
27 English/Spanish, and GATE. (USP RAC § II (2075-2) at 10.) The USP expressly requires  
28 the District to increase the number of dual language programs. (USP (Doc. 1713) §

1 II.E.3.) The Special Master reports that “[t]here are themes not explored by the District  
2 that have been proven successful elsewhere.” (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second Reply) at 7.)  
3 The District shall explore these “proven successful magnet themes” to be included 3-Year  
4 PIP: CMP. The 3-Year PIP: CMP shall “inform[] and support the direction to be taken in  
5 [the future for] developing magnet initiatives.” (USP RAC § II (2075-2) at 10 (citing  
6 2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 103-13)). Schools interested in developing magnet themes  
7 should have an approved array of theme choices with proven track records.

8 For each potential future magnet school or program, the District shall apply the  
9 criteria and guidelines for assessing the strength of its ability to improve integration,  
10 including the school’s student achievement profile and potential for improving the  
11 achievement gap between minority and non-minority students enrolled in the magnet  
12 program. The CMP should overlay the criteria for ranking the strength of the proposed  
13 magnet for each of these requisite assessments in a manner to allow easy comparisons  
14 and prioritization. The 3-Year PIP: CMP shall “demonstrate [] how any proposed new  
15 magnet school or program will demonstrably increase the number of students attending  
16 integrated schools in the District.” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 13.)

17 In short, the District knows where existing schools are located, and it knows the  
18 District’s demographics, including the racial concentrations within school boundaries and  
19 in its schools. This is the beginning point for the 3-Year PIP: CMP. In other words,  
20 geographic and demographic information which reflects the physical location of potential  
21 magnet schools and programs in relation to target populations within 20 to 30 minute  
22 travel distances shall inform the plan. A target population is a student population in a  
23 “racially concentrated boundary,”<sup>14</sup> racially diverse from the racial composition of the  
24 student population of the magnet school. In this way, the District shall identify candidate  
25 schools for magnet status. Without taking this first step, the District runs the risk of  
26 moving students for the sake of moving them, which is a concern reflected in the  
27 Mendoza objection that the District presents no direct evidence that integration is being

---

28 <sup>14</sup> The Court understands this to mean: a school attendance boundary.

1 achieved due to the District's efforts. *Cf.*, (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 12) ("Some  
2 current magnet schools are [I]ntegrated only because of the neighborhood enrollment and  
3 others have failed to demonstrate that they can provide a quality education to the students  
4 they enroll. It would make little sense to sustain those schools as magnets.")<sup>15</sup>

5 The Court notes the difference between the Sabino High School Express Bus and  
6 the Drachman Express Bus. The Sabino Express Bus moved 20 students from Cholla  
7 (RC) and Tucson (RC) high schools, both Racially Concentrated schools, north to Sabino  
8 High School, which is neither an Integrated nor Racially Concentrated school. It is also  
9 not a magnet. It is, however, a B school in comparison to Cholla High School (RC), a D  
10 school, and Tucson High Magnet School (RC), a C school. It is undisputed that these 20  
11 students made Sabino High School more integrated.

12 Only five students used the Magee Drachman Express shuttles routing students  
13 first from elementary schools Mansfield Magnet, a B school, and Howell (INT), a C  
14 school, to Magee Middle School, a D school, and next from Magee and Whitmore  
15 Elementary School, a C school, to Drachman Montessori Magnet K-8 (INT), an F school.  
16 The Mansfield and Howell (INT) elementary schools are both Integrated schools and  
17 Whitmore Elementary School is neither Integrated nor Racially Concentrated. Drachman  
18 Montessori Magnet (INT) is Integrated already, so the logic for this east west movement  
19 is not apparent, without explanation.<sup>16</sup> The Mendoza Plaintiffs are right to complain that  
20 the District has not even tracked the race of students using the express busses.<sup>17</sup>

---

21  
22 <sup>15</sup> The Court's use of this example does not mean it agrees with the  
23 Mendoza Plaintiffs' suggestion that the District's integration efforts must go above  
and beyond integration resulting from demographic changes. (Mendoza Response  
(Doc. 2101) at 12.)

24 <sup>16</sup> The Court is aware that prior to changes in 2017-18 when the Drachman  
25 Express Bus Pilot was implemented, it was an A school, but this fact alone does  
not provide an apparent link between the bus and integration.

26 <sup>17</sup> If the District is financing the Express Busses, pursuant to the USP, the  
27 District must establish that the busses are being used in efforts to integrate its  
28 schools or improve student achievement, not just that minority students can use  
the bus. This evidentiary obligation is not negated by the District's technological  
limitations to only "track eligibility for transportation broken down by race and  
ethnicity," not "actual transportation ridership." (Mendoza Response, Ex. 3 (Doc.

1           The logic for selecting future magnet schools and programs must include  
2 budgetary considerations based on estimated resource needs and availability, projected  
3 over time to arrive at planned start-up dates for future magnet operations. Given magnet  
4 schools and programs are the primary mechanisms available for integrating the District,  
5 the Court rejects the conclusion that “budget capacity does not exist to adequately  
6 resource and staff new and replicated programs.” (CMP (Doc. 1898) at 8.) If true, there is  
7 no comprehensive integration plan for the District because its primary component is in  
8 jeopardy. The 3-Year PIP: CMP shall factor in budgetary costs and constraints, based on  
9 resource demands including staffing, marketing, and transportation, to arrive at a long-  
10 term fiscally sustainable CMP.

11           While the Magnet Program may be the most effective and primary integration  
12 strategy, it is only one tool in the District’s toolbox for promoting integration in TUSD.  
13 The USP does not call for integrated magnet schools; it requires district-wide integration.  
14 The Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the Special Master’s treatment of non-magnet and  
15 magnet schools by “lumping” them together to support his recommendation that unitary  
16 status be awarded for integration district-wide because almost all the Integrated schools  
17 are magnet schools. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 5, 8, 10.) The Court finds no  
18 fault in the Special Master’s conclusion that more TUSD students now attend Integrated  
19 schools. He is correct. Still, the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ point is well taken. As the Sabino  
20 Express Bus pilot project demonstrates, integration can be promoted at non-magnet  
21 schools. The natural consequence of identifying TUSD schools that are potential future  
22 magnet schools is the identification of schools that are not. For these schools, the 3-Year  
23 PIP: CMP shall identify viable non-magnet strategies like the Sabino High School  
24 Express Bus that promote integration. On a school-by school basis, the District shall  
25 identify the non-magnet strategies, if any, that would improve integration at that school  
26 and adopt school specific integration plans. Priority shall be given to creating Integrated  
27 schools and integrating Racially Concentrated schools.

---

28  
2101-1): Request for Information (RFI) # 1711 at 17.)

1           This brings the Court to the Plaintiffs’ objection that the Court should not award  
2 unitary status, not even in part, to the District because not enough non-magnet schools  
3 meet the USP definition of an Integrated school. The 3-Year PIP: CMP will inform the  
4 more relevant question to be answered on a school-by-school basis: what non-magnet  
5 undertakings, if any, are practicable to reduce racial concentration and promote  
6 integration. The Mendoza Plaintiffs ask for further inquiry and study related to  
7 integrating non-magnet schools. As noted in the context of the Magnet Program, viable  
8 options for integration are limited, with all the variables and options being known. Just as  
9 there is no reason to delay in developing the future CMP for the District, there is no need  
10 to delay future non-magnet integration plans. It may be the natural consequence of this  
11 comprehensive inquiry that the District identifies schools that are currently and in the  
12 future may always be Racially Concentrated or never Integrated. For these schools, the 3-  
13 Year PIP: CMP shall include individual plans to improve integration, where practicable,  
14 and focus on academic student achievement.

15           To be sustainable, both future magnet and non-magnet integration plans require  
16 factoring in budgetary costs and constraints, based on actual resource availability and  
17 demands including staffing, marketing, and transportation, to arrive at estimated start  
18 dates for implementation.

19           The District shall include a transportation plan in the 3-Year PIP: CMP,  
20 considering it as a budget item and a criterion for assessing the strength or weakness of  
21 potential candidates for future designations as magnet or Integrated schools. Because  
22 transportation is a driving force fiscally, it must inform future plans or the District may  
23 annually repeat its determination that “budget capacity does not exist to adequately  
24 resource and staff new and replicated programs.” The purpose of the 3-Year PIP: CMP is  
25 sustainability, with geographically and demographically focused transportation plans that  
26 limit costs while at the same time maximizing transportation’s impact on integration or  
27 student achievement.

28



1           The Court retains jurisdiction over USP §§ II.I, Outreach and Recruitment, and III,  
2 Transportation, with its jurisdiction over these sections of the USP limited in context to  
3 assessing unitary status subsequent to the filing by the District of the 3-Year PIP: CMP.

4           Since the adoption of the USP, the District’s integration efforts, pursuant to § II,  
5 have been ongoing and are continuing now and in the future. The Court finds that unitary  
6 status may not be awarded in relation to the USP, § II.E, Magnet Programs, for all the  
7 reasons explained above. Likewise, the Court retains jurisdiction over § II.I, Outreach  
8 and Recruitment, to the extent necessary to review whether unitary status has been  
9 attained in relation to § II.E.

10           The parties and the Special Master refer the Court to the SY 2017-18 Integration  
11 Initiative described as a pro-active, pro-integrative marketing strategy, which resulted in  
12 a “surge” of magnet program applications: 3,803 magnet applications in SY 2016-17  
13 surged to 9,790 applications in SY 2017-18. (2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at 52), *see*  
14 *also* (USP RAC (2075-DAR (Doc. 2075-1) at 66-77)). The same marketing strategies  
15 resulted in increased open enrollment applications of 3,803 in SY 2016-17 to 4,834 in SY  
16 2017-18. (2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at 83.) The Court has reviewed the parameters of  
17 the District’s new marketing strategies, including geo-advertising, social-media, new  
18 marketing venues and a mobile enrollment unit, community partnerships for positive  
19 messaging, web-based video tours of schools, new school websites, YouTube videos, and  
20 bilingual marketing materials including a Facebook page, Instagram and Twitter  
21 accounts. The Court does not repeat here all the new 2016-17 Outreach and Recruitment  
22 developments, but they are described in great detail in the 2016-17 DAR. *Id.* at 88-93.

23           The Court finds that the District is now well positioned to review the effectiveness  
24 of these new initiatives with past marketing practices, such as the MORE Plan developed  
25 in 2013-14. The USP requires the District “to review and revise strategies for the  
26 marketing to and recruitment of students to District schools to provide information to  
27 African American and Latino families and community members throughout the District  
28 about the educational options available in the District.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § II.I.) The

1 USP also calls for the development of an Advanced Learning Experiences (ALE) Access  
2 and Recruitment Plan, which overlaps to a large extent in strategies. *Id.* § V.A.2.c-d.

3 It is time for the District to assess the effectiveness of the various outreach,  
4 marketing and recruitment strategies for its Magnet Program, which are equally effective  
5 for the ALE Program, and identify the strategies found to be the most effective at  
6 promoting integration to be used by the District going forward. This Outreach and  
7 Recruitment Addendum shall identify strategies universally applicable to both the  
8 Magnet and ALE programs, and identify strategies limited to one or the other. The intent  
9 is for the Outreach and Recruitment Addendum to satisfy both §§ II and V, discussed  
10 later herein, of the USP. The District may rely on the Addendum, as appropriately  
11 referenced, for either the Magnet Program or the ALE Program.

12 The District shall file the 3-Year PIP: CMP by the end of this school year,  
13 including non-magnet integration plans for individual schools where practicable, with the  
14 Outreach and Recruitment Addendum attached. This filing shall trigger reconsideration  
15 of unitary status for the USP § II.E.

16 **2. Transportation: USP § III**

17 The Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the Special Master's conclusion that the District  
18 has demonstrated satisfactory compliance with USP § III, Transportation. The Plaintiffs  
19 reiterate their concern that the District is not tracking/reporting the racial/ethnic  
20 configurations for students using transportation. This accusation harkens back to the 1978  
21 Settlement Agreement when the District spent desegregation money in schools with  
22 predominately minority students and asserted compliance because it benefitted African-  
23 American and Mexican-American students. The Mendoza Plaintiffs are correct that the  
24 District must do more than merely establish that, indisputably, it provides non-  
25 discriminatory transportation routes to all students. So for example, the activity busses  
26 placed by the District at magnet and Integrated schools give all students attending these  
27 schools the opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities. This makes these  
28 schools more attractive to all students, but it is especially important for the magnet

1 program to make the school attractive to out-of-boundary students, whose attendance  
2 increases integration. Here, the bus is linked to integration.

3 Compare, the Mendoza Plaintiffs' Express Bus concerns. On the one hand, an  
4 express bus moves students from Racially Concentrated C and D schools, Tucson and  
5 Cholla high schools, to a B school that is not Racially Concentrated, Sabino High School.  
6 The other express bus moves students from Integrated schools on the east side of the  
7 District to Drachman Montessori, an Integrated magnet school, on the west side. There is  
8 no link for the Drachman express to either USP goal, integration or improved student  
9 achievement. It is legitimate for the Mendoza Plaintiffs to question whether the  
10 Drachman Express Bus pilot program has been an effective integration strategy.

11 The USP provides, as follows:

12 The District has (a) utilized transportation services as a critical component of  
13 integrating schools; (b) made transportation decisions that promote student  
14 attendance at Integrated and magnet schools and programs; (c) included District  
15 transportation administrators in planning and monitoring activities related to  
16 student assignment and integration; (d) provided free transportation to District  
17 students enrolled in magnet schools and programs and to students enrolled in  
18 racially-concentrated schools where such transfers increase the integration of the  
19 receiving school and when those students live outside the "walking zone" of the  
20 school in which they are enrolled; (e) provided prospective and enrolled families  
21 with information regarding the availability of free transportation at school sites,  
22 Family Centers, the District office, and on the website; (f) not permitted race- or  
23 ethnicity-based discrimination by a private party with which it contracts to provide  
24 transportation; (g) included the transportation each student receives in the  
25 student's data dashboard entry by July 1, 2013; and (h) included data in the  
26 Annual Reports regarding student use of transportation, disaggregated by school  
27 attended and grade level.

28 (USP RAC, Transportation (Doc. 2075-3) at 3 (citing USP (Doc. 1713) § III.A-C)).

There are no challenges to the Special Master's conclusion that the District is  
doing these things. The challenge is whether or not the District can show that it is using  
transportation as a critical component of its integration plan. The Mendoza Plaintiffs ask  
for actual ridership data and user surveys.

The District reports that by 2013 it was including the transportation each student  
was "eligible" to receive in the student's data dashboard record. "For USP purposes, the  
District reports on eligible riders." (2013-14 DAR (Doc. 1686) at 66.)

1 In SY 2014-15, the District explained:

2 It does not track actual riders, either manually or electronically, because  
3 such tracking is neither possible nor realistic. The manual method would  
4 require the bus drivers to check the identity of each student boarding the  
5 bus, which would increase the amount of time required for boarding the  
6 bus; additional buses would then need to be added to the fleet to keep  
7 transit times reasonable. The electronic method would require a barcode  
8 reader to be installed on each bus, and students would be required to carry  
9 an ID card with a barcode. The District did not have the needed equipment  
10 on the fleet, but would consider proposals for implementing this method in  
11 the future. Moreover, because of the USP mandate to provide magnet and  
12 incentive transportation, the resulting routes must be planned and driven  
13 whether usage is high or low, and the cost is largely a function of mileage  
14 rather than the number of riders.

15 (Amended 2014-15 DAR (Doc. 1918-1) at 71.)

16 “In the absence of ridership data, the District uses eligibility to report ridership.”  
17 *Id.* ““Eligible students’ includes all students offered free transportation to and from  
18 school, excluding any students who specifically declined it.” *Id.* This has been described  
19 as: “students enrolled in magnet schools and programs and to students enrolled in  
20 racially-concentrated schools where such transfers increase the integration of the  
21 receiving school and when those students live outside the ‘walking zone’ of the school in  
22 which they are enrolled,” (USP RAC (Doc. 2075-3) at 3), or “all students enrolled in  
23 magnet schools and programs, and to students who transfer and enroll in racially  
24 concentrated schools where the transfer increases the integration of the receiving school,”  
25 *id.*, *see also* (2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at 107) (describing eligible students as:  
26 “students attending a school beyond home attendance boundaries if the student’s  
27 attendance improved integration at the target school”). The District is tracking ridership  
28 based on student enrollment/attendance criteria that track the USP integration goals.  
Therefore, the reported data is meaningful to establish whether the District is using  
transportation to promote integration.

Seemingly, ridership should mirror increases in students attending magnet  
schools<sup>18</sup> and reductions in Racially Concentrated schools. Transportation numbers are,

---

<sup>18</sup> The Special Master and Mendoza Plaintiffs attribute increased  
integration, exclusively, to magnet schools and programs, but to be exact: of 18  
Integrated elementary schools, five (Carrillo, Bonillas, Borton, Davis, and

1 however, stagnate, if not down. For example, total eligible ridership went from 23,618 in  
2 2013-14, to 23,450 in 2014-15, to 22,746 in 2015-16, and 22,557 in 2016-17. *Id.* 48.  
3 Why?

4 This inquiry should inform the District as it moves forward to plan for the future.  
5 Transportation is critical to attaining the USP’s goals. For example, in the context of  
6 student achievement, the Mendoza Plaintiffs highlight the dichotomy in connection with  
7 the GATE program. The District’s Revised ALE USP RAC reflects “that one of the  
8 reasons most frequently given for why families decide not to send their qualified students  
9 to self-contained programs is transportation.” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 14)  
10 (quoting Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 88.) According to the Revised ALE  
11 USP RAC, “representatives of the TUSD GATE and Transportation Departments met to  
12 discuss increasing alternative routes to reduce travel time to GATE sites but ‘[b]udget  
13 constraints prevented significant transportation changes.’” *Id.*

14 The District tracks transportation for students enrolled in Advanced Learning  
15 Experiences (ALE) - Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), Advanced Academic  
16 Courses (AACs) and University High School (UHS). The District tracks data regarding  
17 transportation availability by site, disaggregated by grade level as required by USP §  
18 III(C). Although not required by the USP, the District also tracks district-wide data on  
19 transportation availability disaggregated by program and by race and ethnicity. The Court  
20 finds that the District is sufficiently tracking transportation data and rejects the Mendoza  
21 Plaintiffs’ request for further data and studies, except for the express bus pilot projects.  
22 The Court finds that the past three years of operations under the USP provides sufficient  
23 data and information for the District to develop sustainable future transportation plans to  
24 support ongoing and future integration and student achievement programs planned for the  
25 District.

---

26  
27 Holladay) are magnets; the only Integrated K-8 school, Drachman Montessori is a  
28 magnet school; of three Integrated middle schools, Mansfield and Dodge are  
magnets, and of three Integrated high schools, only Palo Verde is a magnet. *See*  
(CMP (Doc. 1898) at 10), (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1): 9/28/2017  
40<sup>th</sup> Day Enrollment at 2-4).

1           The Court retains jurisdiction over the USP § III, Transportation, to the extent  
2 relevant to the questions of unitary status remaining.

3                           **3. Administrators and Certificated Staff: USP § IV**

4           This *Green* factor is aimed at identifying the vestiges of discriminatory hiring of  
5 administrators and certificated staff, i.e., teachers; there is no assertion of discriminatory  
6 hiring practices in TUSD. The USP goal is to increase staff diversity because: 1) teachers  
7 [and administrators] of color tend to expect more from minority students, and those  
8 higher expectations can lead to increased academic achievement; 2) positive exposure to  
9 a variety of races and ethnic groups can help reduce stereotypes, and 3) children who see  
10 people like themselves as role models are more likely to follow in their footsteps. (2016-  
11 17 DAR, Appendix IV-29 (Doc. 2060-2) at 2.)

12           The USP, § IV, includes provisions addressing: 1) outreach and recruitment, 2)  
13 hiring, 3) staffing assignments, 4) retention, 5) reductions in force, 6) evaluations, and 7)  
14 professional support and professional development. According to the Special Master,  
15 “[t]he District has done what it was asked to do by the USP and the relevant action plan.”  
16 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 15.) Nevertheless, “[o]ver the last five years, the District  
17 has made little progress with respect to increasing the proportions of African American  
18 and Latino teachers and administrators.” *Id.* at 14. With one exception, he reports there  
19 has been a small increase (quite small) in African-American central office administrators.  
20 *Id.*

21           The District finally began reporting data distinguishing between certified staff and  
22 teachers in 2015-16. As of today, approximately 3% of teachers are African-American  
23 and approximately 27 or 28% are Latino. The Special Master recommends four areas  
24 where the District should be directed to make improvements, with the District attaining  
25 partial unitary status as to the remainder of § IV. The four areas are: 1) increasing the  
26 diversity of teaching staff at the school-site level, 2) reducing employee attrition, 3)  
27 developing Grow-Your-Own programs (GYOP), and 4) reducing the number of first year  
28 teachers teaching at lower achieving schools. The Mendoza Plaintiffs would add:

1 increasing the diversity of administrative staff and reducing the number of first year  
2 teachers teaching at Racially Concentrated schools.

3 The Special Master describes a severe nationwide teacher shortage as a  
4 fundamental problem facing TUSD’s efforts to recruit diverse teaching staff. Teacher  
5 shortages affect administrative diversity because administrators typically come from the  
6 ranks of teachers. “Moreover, Arizona ranks at the bottom among the states as attractive  
7 places for teachers to start their careers.” *Id.* at 15. Arizona teacher salaries are 17%  
8 lower than jobs that require similar levels of experience and education; “Arizona teachers  
9 who head families of four are eligible for seven need-tested federal aid programs--more  
10 than teachers in any other state.” *Id.* at 15 n.8.

11 **a. Increasing Diversity**

12 In 2016, the Special Master, working with the District, developed a Teacher  
13 Diversity Plan (TDP), which was just implemented in the spring semester. With  
14 agreement from the parties, the Special Master excepted dual language schools with  
15 Spanish speaking teachers and schools with diverse teaching staff from the plan. The  
16 TDP targeted 26 schools with “significant disparities” (more than the 15% USP INT/RC  
17 distinction) between African-American and Latino certificated staff and the district-wide  
18 minority percentages for schools at the comparable grade level. After spring and summer  
19 hiring in 2017, twelve remain without sufficiently diverse teaching staff. (2016-17  
20 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 16.) The Court has reviewed the TDP and finds it to be an  
21 ambitious and commendable undertaking by the District. (2016-17 DAR, Appendix IV-  
22 28 (Doc. 2060-1) at 184-186.)

23 Without objection, the Special Master recommends continued implementation of  
24 the TDP. “No later than April 15, 2018, the District shall evaluate additional incentive  
25 program(s) to add to the TDP to increase its impact, determine what incentives, if any, to  
26 add for the 2018-19 school year, and prepare a report for the Special Master and the  
27 plaintiffs identifying the option(s) considered, and explaining the rationale for its  
28 decision.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 19.) *The Court adopts the recommendation.*

1           The Court is eager to see the District’s assessment of the TDP’s effectiveness,  
2 especially the review of the financial incentives. While it is not possible for the District to  
3 increase salaries to make employment in TUSD more competitive with other school  
4 districts, the TDP reflects that the District can offer bonuses, stipends, and other  
5 incentives of monetary value which logically may extend to new hires to increase the  
6 District’s ability to confront teacher shortages. *See e.g.*, (2016-17 DAR, Appendix IV-28  
7 (Doc. 2060-1) at 184) (\$3000 school supply stipend for recruiting and hiring teacher who  
8 reduces racial disparity). For reasons explained below, the Court finds that the TDP  
9 should extend to administrators, not just teachers, and directs that incentives used  
10 successfully this past year be expanded to promote GYOP.

11           **b. Reducing Attrition**

12           The Special Master recommends a study be undertaken to identify ways to reduce  
13 attrition. The study will enable the District to identify ways to improve working  
14 conditions and leadership behavior, which in-turn will reduce teacher turnover and the  
15 number of new teachers, thereby improving both teacher performance and corresponding  
16 student performance. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 17.) There is no objection to this  
17 recommendation, but the Mendoza Plaintiffs call for an inquiry into an alleged blacklist  
18 maintained by the District which Plaintiffs believe may have impeded the progress of the  
19 District to improve staff diversity. The Special Master reports that in November 2017, the  
20 District examined the records of professional staff that have been listed as “not to hire,”  
21 i.e., blacklisted. The District then invited any wrongly categorized former employee to be  
22 a candidate for employment. He reports that there were a few responses, but no hires  
23 from this relatively small group of former employees. He finds no reason to delay  
24 awarding unitary status due to this alleged blacklist. (Reply (Doc. 2109) (First Reply) at  
25 15.) The Court has reviewed the District’s response to the Special Master’s inquiry  
26 regarding this matter, *id.*, Ex. 1: TUSD Response (Doc. 2109-1) at 1-2), and agrees.  
27 Strategies resulting from the attrition study determined to be effective to reduce attrition  
28 shall be included in the 2018-19 TDP.



1 **c. Grow-Your-Own (GYOP)**

2 The District has GYOPs. The Special Master reports the District is now  
3 identifying TUSD graduates who are attending the University of Arizona to recruit them  
4 as future teachers in TUSD. The Special Master reports that the biggest problem with the  
5 District's GYOPs is that the District "could no doubt" improve on them by evaluating  
6 what it has learned from its programs and "what is known about the effectiveness of  
7 GYOPs existing across the country, especially those aimed at increasing the proportion of  
8 African American and Latino professional educators." (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at  
9 17-19.) The Special Master recommends such an inquiry: to "identify options with  
10 potential for TUSD, assess their costs and benefits, and determine what if any  
11 modifications to make to existing programs. This review shall also consist of an  
12 assessment of the District's own recruitment efforts, especially as they relate to Latino  
13 and/or African-American staff participation." *Id.* at 19. The Special Master recommends  
14 that the District prepare a report describing its review and analysis, and explaining the  
15 basis for its decision regarding existing programs. *Id.* There are no objections, and the  
16 Court adopts it. The Court finds it is clearly practicable for the District to review and  
17 assess the effectiveness of its GYOPs and determine whether other or additional  
18 programs exist that are more effective.

19 Additionally, the Court adds that the study shall identify the promising GYOP  
20 initiatives the District intends to implement in SY 2018-19, with a GYOP Addendum  
21 added to the 2018-19 TDP. Specifically, the District shall report on the GYOP involving  
22 TUSD graduates who are attending the University of Arizona to recruit them as future  
23 teachers in TUSD, especially as CRC teachers.

24 The Mendoza Plaintiffs are correct that the USP makes no distinction between  
25 school-site and non-site administrative staff. Both the Special Master and the Plaintiffs  
26 agree that over the last five years there has been virtually no increased diversity in  
27 teaching or administrative staff at its schools or central office. The Court finds no reason  
28 for the District's GYOPs to be limited to teaching staff or site-based administrators,

1 especially because “virtually all administrators come from the ranks of teachers.” (2016-  
2 17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 15.) The GYOP study should determine whether there is a  
3 viable pilot program for African-American administrators and, if possible, implement it  
4 this year. The study shall include the type of proactive recruitment programs suggested  
5 by the Special Master, such as those adopted by the military which seek out and groom  
6 individuals with leadership potential from entry level positions through assigned career  
7 paths leading to the District’s top administrative positions. *Id.* at 17. The study shall  
8 provide for incentives, including monetary bonuses and stipends, to be applied in the  
9 GYOP to the maximum extent possible. Strategies resulting from the GYOP study shall  
10 be included in the 2018-19 TDP, as a GYOP Addendum.

11 The District shall file the 2018-19 TDP, revised pursuant to the directives given  
12 here, which shall trigger reconsideration of unitary status for USP § IV.A, F.1, and I.3.

13 **d. Placement of Beginning Teachers.**

14 The Court turns to § IV.E.5 of the USP, which requires that TUSD “increase the  
15 number of experienced teachers and reduce the number of beginning teachers hired to  
16 teach in racially concentrated schools or schools in which students are ‘underachieving  
17 academically.’” (Order (Doc. 2086) at 5) (addressing for budget purposes staffing ratios  
18 for peer-mentoring of beginning teachers placed at these schools). This is an issue which  
19 affects student achievement because inexperienced teachers are less effective teachers.  
20 Attrition rates are higher for beginning teachers where students are lower performing than  
21 in above-average schools, which compounds the problem of securing the most effective  
22 teachers for the students who need effective teachers the most. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
23 2096) at 18.)

24 Therefore, the USP requires the District to place more experienced teachers where  
25 the need is greatest to improve student achievement. Again, the Special Master reports  
26 difficulty in attaining this USP goal due to nation-wide teacher shortages. As has  
27 previously been brought to this Court’s attention, new teachers are being hired to teach at  
28 both Racially Concentrated and academically underachieving schools. *Id.* To off-set the

1 negative impact of placing inexperienced teachers in these schools, the District is  
2 providing teacher-mentors to new teachers during their first two years of teaching,  
3 pursuant to § IV.I.1. *Id.* at 20.

4 In his 2016-17 SMAR, the Special Master continues to point out, as he did when  
5 this issue was previously before this Court, that there is nothing about racial  
6 concentration that makes “it more difficult to teach students in [R]acially [C]oncentrated  
7 schools than in schools where students achieve above the District average.” While true,  
8 Racially Concentrated<sup>19</sup> schools are a necessary consideration because, as noted in the  
9 Student Assignment analysis above, integration as defined under the USP may not be  
10 possible in some schools; for these schools, student achievement will be of the utmost  
11 importance. The Court will not eliminate the “beginning teacher” prohibition at Racially  
12 Concentrated schools until it is convinced that this express protection is not necessary for  
13 this constitutionally protected suspect class of students. The District may, however,  
14 provide student achievement data for Racially Concentrated schools that are “high  
15 achieving”<sup>20</sup> to exempt them as a group or grant exemptions on a case by case basis.

16 It is undisputedly “clear that in developing the USP no one intended that the  
17 number of beginning teachers in what some call ‘hard to teach schools’ would be as great  
18 as it is.” (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second Reply) at 14.) Whether the Court relies on the  
19 Special Master’s number (75%) or the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ higher estimates (77.5 or  
20 78.7%) for beginning teachers teaching in under-achieving and Racially Concentrated  
21 schools, the numbers are too high. The importance of limiting the number of beginning  
22 teachers in these schools cannot be overstated because good experienced teachers are the  
23 most important factor needed to improve student achievement.

---

24  
25  
26 <sup>19</sup> There are no Anglo “Racially Concentrated” schools in TUSD.

27 <sup>20</sup> “High-achieving” is not defined and it is not clear that it is necessarily  
28 the reverse of “under-achieving,” as defined in the UPS: “schools in which  
students are achieving at or below the District average in scores on state tests or  
other relevant measures of academic performance.” USP § IV.E.5. Important  
terms must be clearly defined for purposes of any studies or plans.

1           With this in mind, the Court finds that further studies regarding alternative  
2 strategies for placing beginning teachers more strategically is insufficient. The Court  
3 adopts the Special Master’s recommendation to centralize the teacher-hiring process. The  
4 Special Master explains that currently teachers apply directly to and are hired directly by  
5 school Principals. “The consequence of this practice is that many teacher candidates do  
6 not typically seek out schools that serve large proportions of low achieving students or  
7 schools serving children who come from low income families. Like exceptional coaches  
8 who seek out the best players, effective principals seek to recruit teacher candidates they  
9 believe have the greatest promise. The consequence of this is that the District lacks the  
10 capacity to place beginning teachers in schools that do not have diverse teaching staffs or  
11 to recruit teachers with the greatest promise of effectiveness to schools serving students  
12 who are performing below the district average.” (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second Reply) at  
13 15.)

14           The Court finds that the USP called for such centralization, (USP (Doc. 1713) §  
15 IV.E.5), and adopts the recommendation that “the District alter its recruitment and  
16 placement policies with respect to all teachers, including beginning teachers, so that the  
17 central office can act more strategically with respect to the placement of teachers than is  
18 now the case.” Likewise, the Court finds that the USP charges the Superintendent with  
19 making exceptions to the “beginning teacher” provisions on a case by case basis. *Id.* The  
20 Special Master notes that the Mendoza Plaintiffs complain that the Superintendent does  
21 not review the appointment of each individual teacher but delegates this responsibility.  
22 The Court finds that such delegation of responsibility is within the spirit of the USP  
23 which allows the Superintendent to delegate responsibilities for offices and positions.  
24 (USP (Doc. 1713) § I.D.8.)

25           The Court finds that what is more important is that either the Superintendent or his  
26 delegate shall strategically grant exceptions to the prohibition against placing beginning  
27 teachers in Racially Concentrated or under-achieving schools, and include mitigating  
28 strategies. The Superintendent shall certify each exception and expressly identify the

1 strategy or strategies being employed in the school to mitigate the negative impact of the  
2 beginning teacher appointment. For example, the appointment might be accompanied by  
3 a mentoring or alternative strategy for providing extra support for new or struggling  
4 teachers. At the other extreme, the appointment might not require any extra support if  
5 made in a Racially Concentrated, high-achieving, school.

6 The Court adopts the recommendation by both the Special Master and the  
7 Mendoza Plaintiffs for the District to undertake a study to identify effective strategies, if  
8 any, for reducing the number of appointments of beginning teachers in lower achieving  
9 schools or, where a beginning teacher appointment cannot be avoided, the study shall  
10 identify mitigating strategies which must be in place at a school for such an appointment  
11 to be approved. These mitigating strategies shall inform on a case by case basis the  
12 Superintendent’s certification of each exceptional placement, with the certification  
13 expressly identifying the mitigating strategy or strategies being employed in the school  
14 where the beginning teacher is being appointed. Over the current school year the District  
15 shall implement any strategies identified by the study, centralize the hiring procedures,  
16 and implement the certification procedures for beginning teacher appointments at  
17 Racially Concentrated and lower achieving schools.

18 The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance regarding the directives  
19 herein related to centralizing the hiring process and certification for placing beginning  
20 teachers at Racially Concentrated or under-achieving schools, which shall trigger  
21 reconsideration of unitary status.

22 **4. Quality of Education: USP § V**

23 **a. § V.A: Advanced Learning Experiences (ALEs)**

24 The purpose of § V.A is “to improve the academic achievement of African  
25 American and Latino students in the District and to ensure [these] students have equal  
26 access to Advanced Learning Experiences [(ALEs)].” (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.A.1.) ALEs  
27 include: “Gifted and Talented (“GATE”) programs, Advanced Academic Courses  
28 (“AACs”), and University High School (“UHS”).” *Id.* § V.A.3-5.

1 “AACs include Pre-Advanced Placement (Pre-AP) courses, which were formerly  
2 referred to as Honors, Accelerated, or Advanced, and any middle school course offered  
3 for high school credit; Advanced Placement (AP) courses; Dual Credit [high school for  
4 college credit] courses; and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses.” *Id.* § V.A.2.

5 UHS offers a rigorous academic curriculum and is a highly-ranked college  
6 preparatory high school. *Id.* § V.A.5.

7 The Special Master emphasizes that there are limitations to the District’s ability to  
8 improve student achievement, generally, and especially in the context of increasing  
9 access, i.e., actual participation in ALE.

10 It is important to recognize that student participation in an ALE is voluntary  
11 and that outcomes students experience from any given ALE are  
12 significantly affected by influences on student learning – such as student  
13 prior academic experiences and education and developmental factors that  
reside in families and communities. These influences mitigate or enhance  
student outcomes regardless of how effectively an ALE is designed and  
implemented.

14 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 21.) “Access to some ALEs is conditioned by tests and  
15 the performance of students on these tests is shaped significantly by the family and  
16 community environments in which students live. Family and community characteristics  
17 are, in turn, correlated with race. . . . And, as noted, participation in ALE is voluntary on  
18 the part of students and large numbers of students who are eligible to participate in ALE  
19 choose not to do so.” *Id.* at 22.

20 Parity is not a reasonable goal for ALEs because voluntary participation in ALEs  
21 is “influenced by perceptions of a likely attainment of the putative benefits of  
22 participating in a given ALE. These perceptions can be influenced by teachers and  
23 counselors and other educators, but family and student perceptions of whether students  
24 will benefit from ALEs is importantly influenced by numerous factors including the prior  
25 experiences of family members, ‘stereotype threat,’ and students’ (sic) sense of his or her  
26 own academic confidence and competence.” *Id.* at 23-24. “It seems worth repeating that  
27 a major reason for differences across schools in ALE is the ‘known unknown’ of student  
28 and parent decisions. That is, we cannot determine why students and parents opt out and

1 what could be done to change their minds. The cost of such a study would be prohibitive  
2 and the results problematic.” *Id.* at 25.

3 In the context of the participation gap, which reflects that White students’  
4 participation in ALEs is greater than African-American and Latino students, he wrote:

5 [T]he differences in the participation of students from different backgrounds in  
6 ALE, . . . is that family and community influences have an enormous impact on  
7 students’ academic achievement, at least as it is measured by standardized test  
8 scores like those used to measure student achievement in Arizona. . . . The  
9 consensus is that schools, on average, account for less than a third of the variance  
10 in student achievement. Differences in family and community characteristics that  
11 are highly correlated with student performance on standardized tests are also  
12 correlated with race.

13 *Id.* at 26, *see also id.* at 28 (describing differences as not surprising and would be found  
14 anywhere where White families are more affluent with post-secondary education  
15 compared to other races), *id.* at 34 (attributing District’s failure to meet the 15% goal in  
16 Self-contained and Itinerant Pull-out GATE programs due in part to “students who are  
17 eligible choose not to participate”).

18 The Special Master also found it difficult to determine what an “equitable  
19 number” of [AP] courses and enrollment might be because:

20 . . . AP offerings are determined [in part] by student demand, . . . A student’s  
21 decision to enroll in an AP class is influenced by the students’ sense of confidence  
22 in their ability to succeed and the support they receive from parents and teachers  
23 accordingly. Some parents appear to believe that having their student take an AP  
24 class would negatively affect their grade point average and, hence, their students’  
25 opportunities to attend college (even though colleges often give weight to AP  
26 classes in making decisions about admission even when students do not pass AP  
27 exams) and teachers and counselors sometimes decide that a student will not  
28 benefit from a more rigorous curriculum (despite evidence to the contrary) and  
explicitly or implicitly discourage students from enrolling in an AP class.

*Id.* at 40.

23 The Special Master was also not surprised “that schools with the largest  
24 percentage of African-American students have the lowest proportion of students enrolled  
25 in AP classes. African-American and Latino students participate at somewhat lower rates  
26 in ALEs aimed in part at readying students to succeed in AP. Since African American  
27 and Latino students as a whole perform academically at a lower rate than the District  
28 average, students and their families may feel that AP classes are too demanding.” *Id.* at

1 41. In describing the “sizable” pool of potential African American and Latino students  
2 whose enrollment in UHS would increase its diversity further, he again described the  
3 “concern on the part of families, if not the students themselves, that the rigor of the UHS  
4 curriculum would be too stressful” and described “what may be at work” as “a  
5 phenomenon called ‘stereotype threat’—the adoption by individuals from stereotyped  
6 groups of negative social attributions.” *Id.* at 47.

7 The Court has previously considered the Special Master’s concern that there are  
8 limited student engagement and support strategies available to the District to improve the  
9 achievement gap through ALE access. The Court refers to its Order issued on October 24,  
10 2017, and its conclusion that “once a student is participating in an ALE program, [and]  
11 the District has more direct influence over the student’s ability to successfully complete  
12 the course by providing any needed academic support,” then the District has greater  
13 responsibilities. (Order (Doc. 2084) at 4.)

14 This approach looks beyond statistics to the strategies designed to increase actual  
15 student enrollment and engagement, including academic and behavioral support  
16 strategies. Implementation is especially important for strategies that are designed to offset  
17 the problematic voluntary nature of ALE programs. *See e.g.*, (Order (Doc. 2084) at 6-7)  
18 (calling for peer-to-peer recruitment, developing school-wide cultures celebrating  
19 academic excellence, and addressing misconceptions perpetrated by school counselors  
20 and teachers). In other words, is the District implementing strategies aimed at growing its  
21 own African-American and Latino, including ELL, ALE students?

22 On October 24, 2017, the Court made it clear that it would not take a singular  
23 statistical approach to determining unitary status, and that it intended “to review the  
24 District’s performance under the USP, § V, by tracking the District’s implementation of  
25 specified ALE access and support strategies set forth in the USP, the ALE  
26 Implementation Plan (ALE Action Plan) (Doc. 1645-2, Ex. A),<sup>21</sup> the ALE Supplement

---

27  
28 <sup>21</sup> ALE Access and Recruitment Plan.



1 Action Plan (Doc. 1788), or any other relevant plan or strategy proposed or agreed to by  
2 the District or ordered by the Court.” *Id.* at 17.<sup>22</sup> (Order (Doc. 2084) at 15.)

3 The Court found that the Mendoza Plaintiffs asked fair questions and raised good  
4 points. *Id.* at 16. It struck the ALE section from the District’s USP RAC, which had been  
5 filed October 2, 2017, and held it would apply a “not less than” 15% rule of thumb red-  
6 flag for when discrimination may exist in a particular ALE program. *Id.* The Court  
7 ordered the ALE USP RAC revised to reflect a comprehensive matrix-type assessment  
8 district-wide and school by school. *Id.* at 19.

9 The Court, adopting the Special Master’s recommendation, ordered: “1) the  
10 District should assess the racial distribution of eligible GATE candidates for a range of  
11 lower-cut test scores; 2) the District should focus on developing school-wide cultures  
12 where academic excellence is valued and celebrated; 3) in addition to existing marketing  
13 efforts, the District should recruit parents of children participating successfully in  
14 particular ALEs to recruit others to participate; 4) the District should create an incentive  
15 program that will draw teachers to become GATE certified; 5) the Dual Credit program  
16 should be universally available in all middle schools; 6) the District should immediately  
17 address the access problems at Catalina (INT), Santa Rita, and Cholla (RC) high schools;  
18 7) the District should ensure that parents understand the difference between AP and dual  
19 credit courses, especially the limited value of dual credit courses outside Arizona, and 8)  
20 the District should work with state policy makers to ensure funding continues for AP  
21 testing.” *Id.* at 18.

---

22  
23 <sup>22</sup> The ALE Supplement Action Plan was filed on April 14, 2015, after the  
24 Mendoza Plaintiffs requested the Special Master file an ALE R&R for non-  
25 compliance. Again the Mendoza Plaintiffs objected and asked the Court to instruct  
26 the Special Master to work with the parties to formulate a standard for determining  
27 whether the District achieves unitary status with respect to ALEs. Reasoning it had  
28 already so ordered, the Court instructed the Special Master to formulate the  
standard. (Order (Doc. 1895)). The Special Master filed an R&R on August 3,  
2017, (Doc. 2041), which subsequent to further objection from the Mendoza  
Plaintiffs, resulted in this Court’s Order (Doc. 2084), issued on October 24, 2017,  
containing the directives described herein this Order.

1           The Court Ordered “the District to open cluster Pullout GATE programs to at least  
2 the 2013-2014 level and place them strategically at schools serving minority students,  
3 and to especially target them at schools serving substantial numbers of African American  
4 students.” *Id.*

5           Following the Court’s lead, the District’s Revised ALE USP RAC included a  
6 matrix-type analysis for ALE programs district-wide and school by school. (Revised ALE  
7 USP RAC (Doc. 2092 and 2092-1.) The 2016-17 SMAR reviewed the Revised ALE USP  
8 RAC. The Plaintiffs have both filed objections. The Court addresses them accordingly.

9           The USP ALE goal is to improve the academic achievement of African-American  
10 and Latino students in the District by ensuring these students have equal access to ALEs.  
11 The Court has adopted definitions, as follows:

12           [A]ccess [is] the number of ALE programs available to minority students and  
13 opportunities for participation, and defines participation as the number of students  
14 enrolled in ALE courses and includes completion, defined as the number of  
15 students passing ALE courses and number of students taking and passing requisite  
16 certification tests necessary for African American and Latino students to secure  
the benefit of participating in ALE programs. The Court defines support as  
strategies aimed at increasing enrollment and participation in ALE programs,  
including strategies aimed at assisting minority students in passing ALE courses  
and taking and passing any requisite tests.

17 (Order (Doc. 2084) at 17.)

18           The Court has held that “increases” for the purpose of assessing effectiveness will  
19 be actual percentage increases made district-wide and at individual schools, and it will  
20 consider comparable data for White students to address concerns that ALE increases are  
21 merely an “all boats rising” phenomena. *Id.* at 15-17. The Court adopted a “not less than”  
22 15% Rule to be applied district-wide as a rule-of-thumb indicator of possible  
23 discrimination in an ALE program. *Id.* at 9, 18 (citing (Order (Doc. 1771) at 6-7). The  
24 Court expressly held that neither actual increases nor the 15% Rule will be determinative  
25 of unitary status. *Id.* at 18. To be clear, in combination they may also be insufficient. The  
26 Court required implementation plans, i.e. action plans, to be developed for each major  
27 component of the USP, including § V. Therefore, the Court considers the status of the  
28 strategies contained in the ALE Action Plan. *Id.* at 17.

1                   **a-1. District-Wide ALEs**

2                   The Court starts with the “not less than” 15% Rule. “How the participation rate  
3 proposed by Dr. Ford is determined is important. For each ALE, the percentage of  
4 African-American and Latino students enrolled Districtwide in the grades where the ALE  
5 is offered is multiplied by [75]% (if the [15]% rule of thumb is applied) to determine the  
6 percentage of students of each race that need to be enrolled in order to meet the [15]%  
7 standard. The percentage of students of each race who are actually enrolled in the  
8 specified ALE is then compared to the District goal. For example, assume that 60% of  
9 Latino students are enrolled district-wide in the grade levels in which a specific ALE is  
10 offered. [Seventy-five] percent of 60% is [45]%. If the total number of students enrolled  
11 were 1,000, the District goal for enrollment of Latino students would be [450]. If more  
12 than [450] Latinos were actually enrolled, the District would have met its goal.” (2016-17  
13 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 23.) In other words, there should not be less than 45% Latino  
14 students enrolled in the specified ALE.

15                   The Special Master’s application of the 15% Rule in his SMAR is nearly identical  
16 to the Court’s review in 2017, which was as follows:

17                   In summary, there are 15 ALE programs if you categorized them by grade-level.  
18 For African American students, the 15% goal is met in three programs: 1) Resource GATE (high school), 2) Pre-AP Advanced (K-8, grades 6-8), and 3) Pre  
19 AP Honors (middle school). The “not less than” 15% goal was met for Latino  
20 students in 12 programs, as follows: 1-2) Resource GATE in middle school (6-8)  
21 and high school programs, 3) AP high school courses, 4-5) Pre-AP Advanced  
22 ALEs in elementary (K-8, grades 6-8) and middle schools, 6-8) Pre-AP Honors  
23 ALEs in elementary, middle, and high schools, 9) Dual Credit classes offered in  
24 high schools, 10) the IB high school program, and the 11-12) Middle School  
25 Credit for High School for elementary (K-8, grades 6-8) and middle school.  
26 According to the Special Master, if you allow for approximately a 1% margin, you  
27 sweep in two more ALE programs for African American students and one more  
28 ALE program for Latino students.

29                   (Order (Doc. 2084) at 8 (citing (R&R ALE (Doc. 2041) at 10-11)), *compare* (2016-17  
30 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 28-29).

31                   In other words, all ALE’s are red-flagged as problematic for African-American  
32 students except for Resource GATE in high schools (grades 9-10), Pre-AP Advanced in  
33 middle schools, and Pre-AP Honors in middle schools and K-8 (grades 6-8). For African-

1 American students, the vast majority of ALEs are red-flagged. (2016-17 SMAR, Ex. 5:  
2 V-A (Doc. 2096-5) at 8-10.) For Latino students, there are only four ALE programs red-  
3 flagged as having access issues: Self-contained GATE in elementary and middle schools,  
4 Resource GATE in high schools, and AP in high schools. *Id.*

5 According to the Mendoza Plaintiffs, sheer increases in numbers of students  
6 enrolling in ALEs have minimal evidentiary value in the face of data that reflects a  
7 participation gap which has remained constant or has actually increased slightly over the  
8 life of the USP.

9 In SY 2011-12, 37.4% of all White students enrolled in grades 6-12 were in ALEs  
10 (other than GATE which was separately reported) while 24.4% of Latino and 20.5% of  
11 African-American students enrolled in these grades were in ALEs. The percentages were  
12 roughly the same for participation rates in AP courses in 11th and 12th grade. (Mendoza  
13 Objection (First) to R&R (Doc. 2069) at 4.)

14 By 2015-16, the overall percentage participation rates in grades 6-12 ALEs were  
15 43% for Whites (an increase of 5.6%) compared to 29% for Latinos (an increase of  
16 4.6%) and 24% for African Americans (an increase of 3.5%). AP participation rates were:  
17 47% (an increase of 9.6%) for Whites as compared to 26% for Latinos (an increase of  
18 1.6%) and 25% (an increase of 4.5%) for African Americans. *Id.* 4-5.

19 The Mendoza Plaintiff point out that the gap widened from 2011-12 and 2015-16.  
20 In 2011-12 there was a 13% difference between White and Latino students and a 17.15%  
21 between White and African-American students. In 2015-16, the gap between White and  
22 Latino students widened to 14% and 19%, respectively. The numbers are similar for  
23 GATE. From SY 2011-12 to SY 2015-16, the percentage of White students enrolled in  
24 GATE increased from 12.4% to 13.3% or by 0.9% while the numbers for Latino students  
25 saw a small decrease from 6.4% to 6.3%, and numbers for African-American students  
26 increased from 4.4% to 5%. (Mendoza Objection (First) to R&R (Doc. 2069) at 4-5.)

27 The Mendoza Plaintiffs argue “that there can be no meaningful discussion of  
28 “goals” – be they 15%, 20%, or some other number, or be they based on program or at

1 each individual school – until the Special Master (and the District) address the  
2 overarching question relating to equal access – that is, why the District’s ALE efforts not  
3 only are more successful with its white students but are increasingly successful with  
4 those students even as TUSD operates under a mandate to increase the relative  
5 participation of the Latino and African American students in ALEs in the District.” *Id.* at  
6 5.

7 The Court reaffirms its earlier determination that unitary status cannot be based  
8 solely on statistical increases in participation, pursuant to the “not less than” 15% Rule.  
9 The Court turns to the District’s elementary GATE programs, which were red-flagged by  
10 the “not less than” 15% Rule for both African-American and Latino students. The Court  
11 finds this to be especially problematic because the GATE elementary school programs,  
12 Self-contained or Pull-out, are the entry-level, gateway, ALEs for most TUSD students.

13 **a-2. GATE Programs: Elementary Schools and K-8 (grades 1-8)**

14 Self-contained GATE programs provide instruction for elementary students  
15 grades 1-8 in all core academic subjects from a GATE endorsed teacher for  
16 approximately 90 minutes per week. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 17, 43.)  
17 Itinerant Pull-out GATE provides instruction in grades 1-5 of approximately one 90  
18 minute GATE class per week. *Id.* at 17, 44.<sup>23</sup> All elementary schools offer Pull-out  
19 programs. In Pull-out GATE programs itinerant teachers provide instruction for GATE  
20 identified students for an hour and a half outside of their mainstream classroom. Self-  
21 contained GATE programs are the most advantageous for students, but are only offered  
22 in a few elementary schools, with most students having to travel to attend Self-contained  
23 GATE programs. Free transportation is provided for Self-contained GATE programs to  
24 students who do not reside within the school’s boundary. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at  
25 32.)

---

26  
27  
28 <sup>23</sup> *But see* (ALE Supplement Action Plan (1788) at 13 n.5) (describing Pull-  
out GATE as available for K-5, but Self-contained GATE available for grades 1-  
5.)

1           The Special Master reports that the GATE programs require cognitive testing,  
2 which is a bar to participation. TUSD has addressed this access issue by expanding  
3 testing to increase the pool of students who might qualify for GATE and could be  
4 encouraged to participate. In SY 2015-16, TUSD began whole-testing where it tests  
5 almost all first and fifth graders, with the number of African-American students testing  
6 for GATE (District students in grades K-6) increasing from 435 in 2014-15 to 917 in  
7 2015-16, an increase of 482 (110.8%). The number of Latino students testing for GATE  
8 (District students in grades K-6) increased from 3045 in 2014-15 to 6343 in 2015-16, an  
9 increase of 3298 (108.3%). *Id.* at 33, (2016-17 SMAR, Ex. 5: V-A (2096-5) at 17.)

10           The Special Master reports that there was a significant 57% increase in enrollment  
11 of African American students and a 41% increase in the number of Latino students in  
12 Self-contained GATE. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 30.) Nevertheless, Self-contained  
13 GATE remains red flagged for both African-American and Latino students by the “not  
14 less than” 15% Rule. *Id.* at 33. African-American students made up 5.13% of Self-  
15 contained GATE students, grades 1-5, in 2016-17, which was less than 15% of African-  
16 American students’ enrollment district-wide for these grades (which was 8.08%). Latino  
17 students made up 42.31% of Self-contained GATE students, grades 1-5, in 2016-17,  
18 which was less than 15% of Latino students’ enrollment districtwide in these grades,  
19 (which was 52.20%). Both instances violated the “not less than” 15% Rule. (2016-17  
20 SMAR, Ex. 5: V-A (Doc. 2096-5) at 6-7.)

21           In summary, there were dramatic increases in the number of students tested, with  
22 decreased numbers of students qualifying overall for enrollment and increased enrollment  
23 by African-American students but decreased enrollment by Latino students, as follows:  
24 Qualified Students (2014-15: White 314, A-A 51, Latino 419), (2015-16: White 309, A-A  
25 40, Latino 380), (2016-17: White 304, A-A 48, Latino 359), (2017-18: White 241, AA  
26 39, Latino 258); GATE Enrollment (2014-15: White 232, A-A 26, Latino 302), (2015-16:  
27 White 244, A-A 31, Latino 284), 2016-17: White 227, A-A 33, Latino 281), (2017-18:  
28 White 185, A-A 30, Latino 203). In short, the number of qualified African-American

1 students decreased from 51 to 40 to 48 to 39, but African-American GATE enrollment  
2 increased from 26 to 31 to 33 to 30. In short, the number of qualified Latino students  
3 decreased from 419 to 380 to 359 to 258 and GATE enrollment decreased from 302 to  
4 284 to 281 to 203. (Revised ALE USP RAC (2092-1) at 12: Participation Rates table.)

5 The District reports that of students who qualify for GATE services, those eligible  
6 to enroll do enroll in GATE in similar proportions. In other words,

7 White, African American and Hispanic/Latino students choose to  
8 participate in GATE at the same or similar rates. In SY 2017-2018, 77% of  
9 White students, 77% of African American students, and 79% of Latino  
10 students who qualified for GATE services chose to participate in those  
11 GATE services. Prior years also had similar participation percentages.  
Moreover, if the students who choose out of District options are removed  
from the calculation, approximately 90% or more African American and  
Latino students who qualified for GATE services participate in GATE  
services.

12 *Id.* at 11. The Court notes that this evidence is contrary to the assertion of a “known-  
13 unknown” factor that causes eligible minority students to disproportionately decline  
14 enrollment in programs, at least for the GATE ALE program.

15 Of the District’s 48 elementary schools, five have Self-contained GATE programs.  
16 Of fifteen K-8 schools, two have Self-contained GATE programs. Of 11 middle schools,  
17 three have Self-contained GATE programs. In total, there are 10 Self-contained GATE  
18 programs, with two being dual language programs. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 32,  
19 Ex. 5: V-A (Doc. 2096-5) at 2-5); (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 17-19)  
20 (reflecting seven elementary schools (Kellond (INT), Lineweaver (INT), Tully (INT),  
21 Wheeler (INT), White (RC), Hollinger K-8 (RC), Roberts-Naylor K-8<sup>24</sup>), and three  
22 middle schools (Doolen, Pistor (RC), and Vail), with dual language Self-contained GATE  
23 programs at Hollinger K-8 (RC), and Pistor Middle School (RC)). (Revised ALE USP  
24 RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 17-19); (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 2-3).

25 Of the seven Self-contained GATE programs in the elementary schools only two  
26 are in Racially Concentrated schools, White Elementary School (RC) and Hollinger K-8

---

27  
28 <sup>24</sup> In 2010, Roberts Elementary School merged with Naylor Middle School  
to create Roberts-Naylor K-8 School.

1 (RC), with Hollinger being dual language. Of the three located in middle schools,  
2 Doolen, Pistor (RC), and Vail (INT), only one, Pistor, is in a Racially Concentrated  
3 school, and it also is a dual language Self-contained GATE program. (Revised ALE USP  
4 RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 17-20); (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 3).

5 This is important because the dual language Self-contained GATE programs place  
6 “a practical limit on African American and Anglo student enrollment because success in  
7 these programs in grades three and beyond it is affected by the student’s ability to speak  
8 Spanish.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 32.) The Fisher Plaintiffs complain that  
9 African-American students are forced to leave a school that does not have an English  
10 track—which is the case in regard to these Self-contained GATE programs. The Revised  
11 ALE USP RAC reflects that 25% of GATE qualified African-American students left the  
12 District in SY 2016-17. (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 90.) Spanish-speaking  
13 students compete with non-Spanish speaking African-American, Anglo, and Latino  
14 students for these limited Self-contained GATE programs. For example, the dual  
15 language Self-contained GATE programs reduced Self-contained GATE programs at  
16 Racially Concentrated Schools for non-Spanish Speaking students to one elementary  
17 school and zero middle schools.

18 To offset the preclusive impact of the GATE testing requirements, the District  
19 added Cluster GATE and Open GATE programs. Cluster GATE programs allow students  
20 who have not tested into a Pull-out GATE program to attend it, nevertheless.<sup>25</sup> GATE  
21 students in Cluster programs are “clustered” together in a classroom with non-GATE,  
22 mainstream students, and an endorsed gifted teacher is assigned to a classroom at each  
23 grade level, grades 1-5, to provide instruction in all core areas using gifted strategies.  
24 Open GATE programs are Self-contained GATE programs without the testing  
25 requirement.<sup>26</sup>

---

27 <sup>25</sup> Teachers know which GATE students have tested in and which have not.

28 <sup>26</sup> Teachers do NOT know the students’ test scores.



1 In 2016-17, TUSD added three Cluster GATE programs at Fruchthendler,  
2 Dunham and Robins (RC) elementary schools. The first two are majority White schools,  
3 Robins (RC) is Racially Concentrated. In its Order (Doc. 2084), issued October 24, 2017,  
4 the Court reviewed the Cluster GATE programs in the District, which according to the  
5 Special Master were much reduced in comparison to the 14 Cluster GATE programs  
6 offered in 2013-14. The Special Master sought an Order from the Court, which was  
7 granted, that the District open Cluster GATE programs to at least the level existing in SY  
8 2013-14 and place them strategically at schools serving minority students, and especially  
9 target them at schools serving substantial numbers of African-American students. (Order  
10 (Doc. 2084) at 11.)

11 Currently, the District reports nine “sc”<sup>27</sup> Cluster GATE programs at: elementary  
12 schools Blenman (INT), Cavett (RC), Dunham, Fruchthendler, Grijalva (RC), Maldonado  
13 (RC), Myers/Ganoung (INT), and Wright, and K-8 Drachman Montessori (INT) Magnet.  
14 (2016-17 SMAR, Ex. 5: V-A (Doc. 2096-5) at 2-5); (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1 (Doc.  
15 2101-1) at 2-3), *but see* (Reply (Doc. 2015) at 10 (citing 2016-17 DAR reporting  
16 planning for five additional Cluster GATE programs in 2017-18 at Cavett (RC), Grijalva,  
17 Maldonado (RC), Myers/Ganoung (INT) and Wright). The Court notes that the changes  
18 in the Cluster GATE programs since this Court’s directive last year included removing  
19 Robins K-8 (RC), the only Racially Concentrated school of the three programs created  
20 last year, *id.* at 4.

21 The Special Master reports that the open GATE program at Tully (INT)  
22 Elementary School has been a great success, including student improvement in state test  
23 scores, and this year the District intends to add an open-access GATE program at  
24 Roberts-Naylor so that the students in the Tully (INT) open-access program may continue  
25 through a GATE pipeline to Roberts-Naylor K-8 School, and so the Roberts-Naylor  
26 program could become a magnet program. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 35), *but see*  
27 (Order (Doc. 2084) at 10 (discussing plan in 2017 to operate open GATE at Roberts-

---

28 <sup>27</sup> The Court does not know the meaning of “sc.”

1 Naylor)). The open GATE program at Tully (INT) is a “modified” GATE Self-contained  
2 model, where gifted-endorsed teachers provide gifted instruction to all students in regular  
3 classrooms. (2016-17 SMAR, Ex. 5: V-A (Doc. 2096-5) at 19.)

4 The Tully Open Gate program has led the Special Master to recommend that  
5 unitary status should be awarded for Self-contained and Pull-out GATEs, if TUSD lowers  
6 the eligibility cut scores for ALEs. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 35.) And, if the  
7 District increases “the number of cluster GATE programs to at least 10 by the beginning  
8 of the 2019-2020 school year.” *Id.* Based on a prior recommendation by the Special  
9 Master, this Court already ordered Cluster GATE programs increased to 14.

10 All the parties object to lowering eligibility cut scores. The Fisher Plaintiffs “are  
11 strongly opposed to increased enrollment of African-American student enrollment by  
12 lowering standards.” (Fisher Response (Doc. 2100) at 4.) The Fisher Plaintiffs argue that  
13 standards would not need to be lowered at all, if the District simply enrolled all qualified  
14 students who pass the GATE test. The Fisher Plaintiffs ask the District to apply the same  
15 enrollment policies to gifted programs that it applies to remedial programs, which would  
16 be automatic assignment to a remedial or gifted program without requiring parental  
17 permission. *Id.*

18 According to the Mendoza Plaintiffs, the Special Master is recommending a 10  
19 point change for an increase of 82 eligible students. The Mendoza Plaintiffs believe the  
20 increase will be either 61 or 67 students, and they do not believe the Special Master has  
21 identified the racial breakdown of these additional students. (Mendoza Response (Doc.  
22 2101) at 30.) In other words, changing cut scores is an “all boats float” approach, and the  
23 Mendoza Plaintiffs call first for more targeted approaches aimed at specifically  
24 increasing African-American and Latino participation in GATE ALEs. The Mendoza  
25 Plaintiffs argue that a more targeted approach is especially important because the number  
26 of students who qualified for GATE services, using the assessments the District currently  
27 has in place, dropped dramatically between 2015-16 and 2016-17. *See* (Revised ALE  
28 USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 12, 95-96: Table 5.7) (summarizing dramatic increases in

1 number of students tested; decreased numbers of qualified African-American students but  
2 increased African-American enrollment and decreased numbers of qualified and enrolled  
3 Latino students).

4 According to the Mendoza Plaintiffs the drop in eligibility is greater than the  
5 number of potential GATE participants that would be accounted for by a 10 point  
6 reduction in the eligibility score. The District agrees. (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc.  
7 2092-1) at 28.)

8 Given the Parties' objections, the Court does not adopt this recommendation. A  
9 better more cost-effective strategy might be Plaintiff Fishers' recommendation to simply  
10 enroll all qualified students like it does for remedial classes. The Special Master correctly  
11 notes that students cannot be enrolled in classes over parental objections, but opt-out  
12 provisions can be utilized to address such objections. (Reply (Third) (Doc. 2115) at 17.)  
13 This would directly address the "known-unknown" factor which the Special Master  
14 highlights as the number one impediment to the District's successful implementation of §  
15 V of the USP. In fact, "this would almost certainly increase the number of African  
16 American and Latino students enrolled in ALEs." *Id.* However, such a policy might have  
17 significant implications, such as "substantial effects on the allocation of resources." *Id.*  
18 As recommended by the Special Master, the District shall consider whether this is a  
19 practicable strategy for increasing enrollment numbers for African-American and Latino  
20 students in ALE's that require test scores for eligibility. *Id.* at 18.

21 **a-3. AACs and GATE Resource: Middle Schools, K-8 (grades 6-8) and**  
22 **High Schools**

23 In middle schools, K-8 (6-8 grades), and in high schools, TUSD offers GATE  
24 Resource for grades 9-10 and Advanced Academic Courses (AACs): Pre-AP Advanced  
25 or Honors (Pre-AP), AP Advanced or Honors (AP) for grades 11-12, International  
26 Baccalaureate (IB), and Middle School class for High School Credit (MS-HS), High  
27 School class for College Credit (HS-CC).

1 Resource GATE: In grades 6-12, students receive either core or enrichment  
2 classes.<sup>28</sup> GATE identified students get priority placement and others are eligible based  
3 on AIMS scores, grades, teacher recommendation, and/or parent or student requests.  
4 (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 18.)<sup>29</sup>

5 Pre-AP: These programs are designed as more rigorous studies to prepare students  
6 for AP or IB classes, (2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at 195), and are seen as “a pipeline  
7 for eventually taking AP classes in high school,” (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1)  
8 at 60: Pre-AP Honors (language arts, social studies, and science) or Pre-AP Advanced  
9 (accelerated mathematics)), *but see* (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 37) (Special Master  
10 reports that students who take Pre-AP courses are only modestly more likely to take AP  
11 courses, there is no correlation to achieving grade of three or higher on AP exam, and  
12 Pre-AP courses do not “map”<sup>30</sup> on AP curriculum or exam and are not intended to  
13 prepare students to succeed in AP classes).

14 AP: Advanced Placement classes are College Board approved, college level,  
15 classes that use a standard curriculum and students may receive college credit by taking  
16 and passing a national exam at the end of the year.

17 IB: International Baccalaureate is a K-12 international program for students who  
18 aspire to be rigorous learners as part of a global community. The IB high school  
19 curriculum program provides either individual IB courses or an entire IB Diploma  
20 Programme. Students enrolled in IB courses or the IB Diploma Programme may earn  
21 college credits. Both require students to take and pass an end-of-year exam. The IB  
22 Programme, a standardized college-preparatory course of study, is offered at Cholla High  
23

---

24  
25 <sup>28</sup> *But see* (Supplement ALE Plan (1788) at 13 n.5) (describing Resource  
GATE in high school for grades 9-10 and AP courses for grades 11-12).

26 <sup>29</sup> The Court does not know if the open access philosophy for AACs applies  
27 to Resource GATE.

28 <sup>30</sup> The Court does not have an understanding of the meaning of “map” but  
assumes that as used here it means there is a programmatic disconnect between  
Pre-AP and AP courses.

1 School (RC), Safford K-8 (RC), and Robison ES (RC). (2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at  
2 195.)

3 Dual Credit: Students simultaneously earn credit in middle school for high school  
4 (MS-HS), and in high school earn college credit (HS-CC).

5 AACs in the middle school and high school grades are intended to be an open  
6 access program, with no eligibility prerequisites except for content requirements.<sup>31</sup> This  
7 was not the case when the USP was adopted; then, the middle school and high school  
8 AACs had different and varied identification policies for eligibility ranging from course  
9 grades, state-standardized scores, benchmark testing, teacher recommendations, and/or  
10 allowed placement pursuant to student or parent requests. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-  
11 2) at 20.)

12 According to the District, ALE access is equitable. “Most” K-8 schools, grades 6-  
13 8 provide access to multiple ALEs, including Pre-AP classes and all provide GATE  
14 services,” with two schools having only one GATE service and “one is Racially  
15 Concentrated and one is not.” (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 18-19.) The  
16 District’s report is similar in regard to its middle schools, concluding: “[i]ndeed, all  
17 middle schools offer at least three types of ALEs, with no schools standing out as having  
18 fewer [ALEs] than all other schools.” *Id.* at 15.

19 As the Court reads the data reported by the District, it sees fifteen K-8 schools,  
20 grades 6-8, with seven Resource GATE programs out of a total of fifteen schools. Five  
21 K-8 schools have robust ALE programs: Booth-Fickett, Hollinger (RC), Roberts-Naylor,  
22 Roskruge (RC), and Safford (RC), with Safford being a pipeline for the IB program at  
23 Cholla High School (RC). Six K-8 schools, grades 6-8, have one ALE: Dietz, Drachman  
24 (INT), Lawrence, Morgan Maxwell (RC), and Rose (RC). Borman has no ALE programs.  
25 McCorkle (RC) and Pueblo Gardens (RC) have two ALE programs, with one being a  
26 Dual Language program. Miles has a Resource GATE program and a Dual Credit (MS-

---

27  
28 <sup>31</sup> The Court does not know whether this open access philosophy applies to  
GATE Resource programs.

1 HS) program; Robins (RC) has the same. (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 19),  
2 (Mendoza Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 3).

3 There are 10 middle schools. Of these, Utterback and Valencia are Racially  
4 Concentrated schools. All have Resource GATE programs, except Magee, and all have  
5 Dual Credit (MS-HS) programs, except Secrist. All have a Pre-AP Honors program,  
6 except Dodge (INT). All have a Pre-AP Advanced program. *Id.* at 20. Three even have  
7 Self-contained GATE programs: Doolen, Pistor (RC) and Vail (INT), with Pistor (RC)  
8 being a Dual Language ALE. (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 20); (Mendoza  
9 Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 3).

10 There are nine high schools, excepting University High School (UHS). All have  
11 Resource GATE, except Catalina (INT), and all have Pre-AP Honors programs. Six high  
12 schools have a Dual Credit (HS-CC) program: Catalina (INT), Cholla (RC), Pueblo (RC),  
13 Rincon (INT), Santa Rita, and Tucson High (RC).<sup>32</sup> Three do not: Palo Verde (INT),  
14 Sabino, and Sahuaro. Pueblo High School (RC) offers a dual language program. Cholla  
15 High School (RC) offers the IB program. (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 20);  
16 *Id.* at 4.

17 The Mendoza Plaintiffs point out that Latino enrollment in AP classes dropped  
18 from 1633 in 2016-17 to 1494 in 2017-18, African-American enrollment in AP classes  
19 dropped from 192 in 2016-17 to 178 in 2017-18, and White enrollment in AP classes rose  
20 from 1182 in 2016-17 to 1190 in 2017-18. By the Mendoza Plaintiffs' calculations,  
21 Latino enrollment in AP courses declined by 8.5% while total Latino high school  
22 enrollment declined by only 1.3%, but White student enrollment in AP high school  
23 courses increased notwithstanding a drop of 3% in total white high school enrollment.  
24 (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 34) (citing 2016-17 SMAR (2096-5) at 9), *compare*

---

25  
26  
27 <sup>32</sup> The ALE Action Plan “require[ed] all District high schools to actively  
28 advertise and recruit for Dual-Credit courses.” (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at  
22.) Assumedly, all high schools should offer Dual Credit (HS-CC), *but see*  
(Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 20 (reflects no Dual Credit program at:  
Palo Verde (INT), Sabino, Sahuaro).

1 (R&R ALE, Addendum Table II (Doc. 2041-1) at 8); (Mendoza Response, Ex. 11 (2101-  
2 2) at 2.)

3 **a-4. ALE Action Plan: Effectiveness of Planned Strategies.**

4 The Court turns to the District’s ALE Action Plan, which tracked three broad areas  
5 of concern addressed in the USP, as follows: 1) Student Identification and Recruitment,  
6 2) Increase Student Enrollment, and 3) Student Support Strategies for Successful ALE  
7 Completion. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 11.) The ALE Action Plan and ALE  
8 Supplement Action Plan (Doc. 1788) identified strategies to address each of these areas  
9 of concern for GATE programs, AAC programs, and UHS. The Court finds significant  
10 duplication between recruitment strategies identified in the ALE Action Plan, Subsection  
11 III, Student Identification and Recruitment, and Subsection IV, Increase Student  
12 Enrollment. There is also conceptual overlap with USP § V.E, Student Engagement and  
13 Support, and USP § II.I, Outreach and Recruitment, which are not limited to ALEs but  
14 are aimed, generally, at increasing access, participation and student achievement for  
15 minority students in all USP programs. As it did in respect to the Magnet Plan provisions  
16 of the USP, the Court retains jurisdiction over USP § II.I to the extent relevant to the  
17 ALE Program. As the Special Master noted, “key elements” of the USP are now in place  
18 and “there is more coherence in the extent to which these elements reinforce one  
19 another.” (Reply (Third) (2115) at 19.) The Court sees no reason to duplicate  
20 recommendations and correspondingly balloon the record for these cohesive USP  
21 provisions. As directed in the Magnet Program section of this Order, the District shall  
22 prepare a comprehensive Outreach and Recruitment Addendum covering both the  
23 Magnet Program and ALE Program.

24 Going forward the Court asks the parties and the Special Master to eliminate  
25 duplication as much as possible. Therefore, instead of following the format of the ALE  
26 Action Plan, the Court discusses strategies designed to increase African-American and  
27 Latino access and participation in ALEs as follows: 1) Student Identification: Access and  
28

1 Availability; 2) Increase Student Enrollment: Recruitment, and 3) Student Support and  
2 Engagement.

3 Student identification strategies increase access and are aimed at increasing  
4 program availability by increasing the number and strategic placement of ALE programs  
5 and increasing the number of eligible African-American and Latino, including ELL,  
6 students, who are qualified to participate in ALEs. Strategies to increase student  
7 enrollment include recruitment strategies to increase actual participation in ALEs, such as  
8 recruitment through marketing, peer-to-peer and family outreach programs, teacher and  
9 school counselor outreach programs, and the creation of environments of academic  
10 excellence. Support strategies, include student engagement strategies set out in USP §  
11 V.E.1.b, promoting socially and culturally relevant curriculum and improving student  
12 achievement by providing academic and behavioral support necessary for African-  
13 American and Latino students who enroll in ALEs to successfully complete the courses,  
14 including passing requisite tests, and strategies aimed at retaining these students in ALE  
15 programs, in school, and until graduation.

16 The Mendoza Plaintiffs object to an award of unitary status because the District  
17 allegedly failed to implement several strategies set out in the ALE Action Plan, the ALE  
18 Supplement Action Plan, and Orders of this Court. The Special Master, thereafter, called  
19 for a response from the District, and reconsidered his Reply, First and Second, and filed a  
20 Third Reply relevant to the Plaintiffs' charges. The need for this additional briefing  
21 highlights the problem of navigating the record, which stretches over three years of  
22 voluminous annual reports. The problem is compounded by reliance on the Special  
23 Master's recommendations in lieu of the record. In other words, the record may well exist  
24 to support unitary status but it is buried like a truffle waiting to be ratted out by the Court.  
25 *See Dunkel*, 927 F.2d at 956 ("Judges are not like pigs, hunting for truffles buried in  
26 briefs.")

27 Based on the record presented to the Court, it is impossible to determine which  
28 strategies planned by the District to increase access and success in ALEs are effective and



1 which the District intends to maintain going forward with the ALE Program. The ALE  
2 Action Plan called for the District to “[c]reate [an] ALE Policy Manual outlining policies  
3 for student participation and retention in TUSD’s ALEs.” (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-  
4 2) at 25.)<sup>33</sup> The Court adopts the ALE Policy Manual as the vehicle by which the District  
5 shall provide a record sufficient for determining unitary status. This Order shall guide the  
6 District in codifying effective strategies as ALE policy in the ALE Policy Manual.

7 1. Student Identification: Access and Availability

8 GATE Programs: Elementary Schools and K-8, grades 1-8

9 In 2013, when the District prepared the ALE Plan, it recommended an increase in  
10 GATE funding for K-8 schools. *Id.* at 14. There is no evidence of any direct ALE funding  
11 increases for either programs or staffing. In his SMAR, the Special Master recommends  
12 an ALE completion plan that includes: “Teachers shall be trained to offer GATE  
13 programs and, if necessary, the District shall provide appropriate incentives.” (2096 at  
14 35.) The Court has already issued this mandate: “The District should create an incentive  
15 program that will draw teachers to become GATE certified.” (Order (2084) at 18.) The  
16 Court so ordered this in response to the District’s assertion last year that it did not have a  
17 sufficient number of teachers who are GATE certified. Now, it is time for the District to  
18 appraise the effectiveness of the incentive program, revise it up or down and estimate,  
19 based on its cost, whether it is effective for addressing the need for certified GATE  
20 teachers.

21 The Mendoza Plaintiffs note that one of the main reasons given for not sending  
22 qualified students to Self-contained GATE programs is transportation. (Mendoza  
23 Response (Doc. 2101) at 30 (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 92) (describing  
24 2017 meeting between GATE and Transportation departments to discuss increasing  
25 alternative routes to reduce travel time, without success, due to budget constraints). The

---

26  
27 <sup>33</sup> The Mendoza Plaintiffs question whether the District complied with the  
28 recommendation in the ALE Action Plan to create an ALE Policy Manual. The  
Special Master replies that it was created, is posted and will be distributed. (Reply  
(Third) (Doc. 2115) at 13.) A copy has not been provided to the Court, but the  
Court assumes it will have to be amended to satisfy the directives of this Order.

1 Mendoza Plaintiffs are correct that there is no evidence this budget issue was resolved in  
2 2017-18. According to the Revised ALE USP RAC, representatives of the TUSD GATE  
3 and Transportation departments met to discuss increasing alternative routes to reduce  
4 travel time to GATE sites but “[b]udget constraints prevented significant transportation  
5 changes.” *Id.*

6 To the extent the transportation issue is, as asserted by the Special Master, aimed  
7 at the availability of certified teachers to teach particular high school courses, especially  
8 Algebra 1, the Court finds no objection from the Plaintiffs, and the Court has none, to the  
9 District’s strategy of bussing middle school students to the nearest high school to take  
10 courses for dual (MS-HS) credit. (Reply (Third) (Doc. 2115) at 4.) The District reports it  
11 provides transportation for 8<sup>th</sup> grade students in K-8 schools to take Algebra 1 as follows:  
12 Pueblo Gardens (RC) to Utterback Middle School (RC); Dietz and Roberts-Naylor to  
13 Palo Verde High School (INT), and McCorkle (RC), Rose (RC) and Hollinger (RC) to  
14 Pueblo High School (RC). “There are approximately 40-50 participating students in SY  
15 2016-2017.” (Reply (Third) (Doc. 2015) at 3.) In the ALE Policy Manual, the District  
16 shall determine whether this is a practicable strategy for providing the Dual Credit  
17 program, especially Algebra 1, to African-American and Latino, including ELL, students.  
18 With robust marketing, will transportation costs constrain this strategy? Is there an ELL  
19 component available? What is the requisite annual cost required to implement this  
20 strategy?

21 To prove budgetary constraints, the District must demonstrate there is no  
22 practicable means to address budgetary issues, including transportation, in SY 2018-19 or  
23 going forward. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 30-31.) The ALE Policy Manual shall  
24 account for budgetary constraints, including staffing and transportation, as a factor in  
25 determining the practicability of adopting a strategy as a policy.

26 The Mendoza Plaintiffs raise several challenges involving the expansion of GATE  
27 programs. Specifically, the Mendoza Plaintiffs question whether the District has explored  
28 the possibility of expanding existing Self-contained GATE programs and/or adding Self-

1 contained GATE programs on the east side of Tucson. (ALE Supplement Action Plan  
2 (Doc. 1788) at 20.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs question whether the District has studied the  
3 possibility of implementing kindergarten Push-In Itinerant Services to expand GATE  
4 services to provide all kindergarten students with thirty minute weekly lessons from a  
5 gifted endorsed teacher stressing critical thinking, creative thinking, and problem-solving  
6 skills. Has the District studied the possibility of implementing primary Push-In Itinerant  
7 Services to provide services to all students in first grade except those in self-contained  
8 GATE with a forty-five minute weekly lesson from a gifted endorsed teacher who is  
9 stressing critical thinking, creative thinking, and problem-solving skills? (ALE Action  
10 Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 26.)

11 In 2013, there were five elementary Self-contained GATE programs. (ALE Action  
12 Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 17.) Now, there are seven, with the addition of White Elementary  
13 School (RC) and Roberts-Naylor K-8. (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 17-  
14 19.) There were, and there are now, three middle school Self-contained GATE programs,  
15 with only one being located in a Racially Concentrated school, Pistor (RC), which is the  
16 Dual Language ALE and, therefore, not available to non-Spanish speaking students.  
17 (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 17; (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 20.)  
18 In 2013, like now, the District offered the dual language Self-contained GATE programs  
19 at Hollinger K-8 School (RC) and Pistor Middle School (RC). (ALE Action Plan (Doc.  
20 1645-2) at 17; (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 86.) As it does now, it offered  
21 Itinerant Pull-out GATE programs in all elementary and K-8 schools for 1<sup>st</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup>  
22 grades. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 17; (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1)  
23 at 17-19).

24 In 2016-17, the District re-established a Self-contained GATE program at Tully  
25 Elementary School (INT) as an Open GATE program<sup>34</sup> and added a Self-contained  
26 GATE program at Wheeler Elementary School (INT). The District added Pre-GATE

---

27  
28 <sup>34</sup> The Court understands the Tully (INT) program to be a modified Self-  
contained Open GATE program, meaning that the Self-contained GATE program  
at Tully in grades 1-3 is open to all students in these grades without testing.

1 kindergarten, and 1st through 3rd grade Self-contained GATE programs at both schools.  
2 (2016-17 SMAR, Ex. 5: V-A (Doc. 2096-5) at 19.) It added a pre-GATE kindergarten  
3 and a Self-contained 2<sup>nd</sup> grade GATE class at Roberts-Naylor K-8.<sup>35</sup> (Reply (Doc. 2115)  
4 at 10 (citing 2116-17 DAR)). Roberts Naylor K-8 is centrally located and Wheeler  
5 Elementary School (INT) is on the east side. (Reply (Doc. 2115) at 9.) The District has  
6 more recently expanded one class at Lineweaver Elementary School (INT), but due “to  
7 student or classroom capacity no other self-contained site could expand or was it  
8 necessary to expand services.” *Id.* at 10 (quoting TUSD Response to Request for  
9 Information (RFI)).

10 The District reports that as a result of these 2016-17 additions, it was able to offer  
11 placement through a lottery system to students wait-listed for Self-contained GATE  
12 programs. *Id.* at 10. Prior to the Lineweaver (INT) addition, students on wait-lists for  
13 Self-contained GATE at Kellond (INT) and Lineweaver (INT) were offered placement at  
14 the newly added Roberts-Naylor or Wheeler (INT) Self-contained GATE programs. *Id.* at  
15 8. It seems disingenuous to report that there is no need for further expansion of Self-  
16 contained GATE programs when students are wait-listed for the program.

17 In SY 2015-16, for the first time, the District offered whole-class itinerant GATE  
18 services for kindergarten and primary grades at targeted schools with high populations of  
19 underrepresented students: Holladay (INT), Carrillo, White, Hollinger (RC), Pueblo  
20 Gardens (RC), and Grijalva. *Id.* at 14 (citing 2015-16 DAR). In SY 2016-17, the District  
21 expanded the whole-class itinerant GATE program for kindergarten and primary grades  
22 at targeted schools, as follows: Roberts-Naylor and Maldonado (RC), Mission View  
23 (RC), and Wheeler (INT) elementary schools). (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 179), *but see*  
24 (Reply (Doc. 2115) at 14-15 (citing 2015-16 DAR, 2016-17 DAR)) (reporting itinerant  
25 teachers as providing such whole-class instruction at most elementary sites).

26 <sup>35</sup> The Pre-GATE kindergarten pilot program at Roberts-Naylor K-8 School  
27 resulted in 14 kindergarten students, including eight Latino students, attending and  
28 successfully completing it and being promoted to the Self-Contained GATE program at  
Roberts-Naylor. (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 178.)

1 An itinerant GATE teacher, assigned to a school, provides weekly 45-minute  
2 critical thinking and reasoning lessons using gifted strategies in the regular education  
3 kindergarten classroom to all the children, with the purpose being twofold: 1) to provide  
4 early exposure to gifted instructional strategies and 2) to potentially increase the number  
5 of students tested for GATE. *Id.*

6 In SY 2015-16, “push in (whole grade) lessons were provided in kindergarten and  
7 first grade classrooms at their assigned schools as schedules permitted. The number of  
8 lessons each classroom received increased in SY 2016-17 and as schedules permit the  
9 number will increase in SY 2016-17 and as schedules permit the number will increase in  
10 SY 2017-18 . . . .” (Reply (Doc. 2115) at 14 (citing TUSD Response to RFI)).

11 In 2016-17, the District reports implementing an ELL Whole Grade Push-In  
12 program at Mission View Elementary School (RC), as a pilot program to increase  
13 participation of ELL students in GATE programs, because this school has a large ELL  
14 population. Mission View was also assigned a GATE itinerant teacher to provide weekly  
15 45-minute critical-thinking and reasoning lessons using gifted strategies in all regular  
16 education classrooms at Mission View (RC). (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 178-179.)

17 As part of the Mission View Elementary School pilot, the GATE department  
18 developed and implemented a classroom observation rubric, Differentiated Observation  
19 Classroom Screener, (DOCS48), for observational screeners to use to identify students  
20 who might benefit from receiving additional GATE services in a Pull-out or Self-  
21 contained GATE program. The goal was to develop an observational scale to identify  
22 underrepresented students who qualify for gifted services. The GATE DOCS identified  
23 eight additional Latino students, including four ELL students, and the department invited  
24 them to participate in the GATE Pull-out program at Mission View (RC). These students  
25 will be monitored throughout their participation in the GATE program. (2016-17 DAR  
26 (Doc. 2057-1) at 178-79.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs ask whether this pilot might be  
27 expanded to other schools. The answer is assumedly yes because the District also plans  
28 for a dual language pre-GATE kindergarten at Hollinger K-8 School (RC) in 2017-18,

1 with testing already identifying 59 students, including four African-American students  
2 and 35 Latino students. All four African-American students and 27 Latino students were  
3 offered placement for SY 2017-18. (2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 178).<sup>36</sup>

4 Accordingly, the record reflects that since 2013, the District has increased access  
5 to GATE programs by adding Self-contained GATE programs at two new schools, White  
6 Elementary School and Roberts-Naylor K-8, and re-instating the Tully (INT) program as  
7 an Open Self-contained GATE. The District has made expansions to the Self-Contained  
8 GATE programs at Roberts-Naylor K-8, and Wheeler (INT), Tully (INT), and  
9 Lineweaver elementary schools (INT). This increased access has enabled the District to  
10 accommodate ALE eligible students who were previously on waiting lists. The District  
11 added a dual language Pre-GATE kindergarten at Hollinger K-8 (RC) in 2017-18. The  
12 Court does not know the extent of remaining wait-lists, if any, for Self-contained GATE  
13 programs, including the dual language Self-contained GATE programs.

14 The District reports recently adding “whole-class itinerant GATE services at  
15 Roberts-Naylor, Hollinger [(RC)], Maldonado [(RC)], Mission View [(RC)], and  
16 Wheeler elementary schools [(INT)] and the pilot ELL Whole Grade Push-In program at  
17 Mission View [(RC)] Elementary School.” The Court assumes there is a distinction  
18 between whether the GATE experience is offered to one whole class or the whole grade  
19 at the school. The Court does not know, but assumes, these itinerant GATE services are  
20 in addition to the Pull-out GATE programs which already existed at “all the elementary  
21 schools.” As noted, these programs were offered “as schedules permitted,” which affords  
22 no basis for the Court to review the availability of this program beyond knowing of its

---

23 <sup>36</sup> It appears DOCS is the current multiple measure for determining GATE eligibility  
24 being considered by the District. The District has implemented as pilots and subsequently  
25 rejected as ineffective the following: the Discovery Intellectual Strengths and Capabilities  
26 While Observing Varied Ethnic Responses (Discover Pilot) and the Naglieri Non-Verbal  
27 Abilities Test (NNAT Pilot). (Reply (Doc. 2115) at 5-8.) The ALE Action Plan required  
28 the District to undertake these pilot studies. It is time for the District to determine  
whether or not to use, and if so to identify, multiple eligibility measures, including the  
use of nontraditional student qualifying criteria and/or non-cognitive measures, in  
addition to verbal and non-verbal cognitive assessments.

1 existence. The record does not reflect the significance of a “whole grade” versus “whole-  
2 class” program and sometimes refers to Push-in GATE programs. The Court assumes the  
3 whole-class itinerant GATE services are in fact the Push-in GATE programs being taught  
4 by itinerant GATE teachers, who are the teachers responsible for Pull-out GATE  
5 instruction. “As schedules permitted and will permit in the future” offers little insight into  
6 the extent of actual increased services provided by these programs.

7 The District did not expand the Cluster GATE programs to 14. Instead, the District  
8 has reduced the 12 Cluster GATE programs to nine, with 8 at its elementary schools and  
9 with its two K-8 Cluster GATE schools cut to one. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at  
10 18), *compare* (Revised ALE USP RAC (2092-1) at 17-19.)

11 The nine Cluster GATE programs, like the Tully Open GATE program and the  
12 five “whole-class/grade itinerant Push-in GATE services, are GATE programs that  
13 expand access by allowing participation without any eligibility limitation. Of these  
14 approximately 15 expanded access programs, about seven are located in Racially  
15 Concentrated schools. There are 23 Racially Concentrated elementary schools, including  
16 K-8 schools. The Court notes that schools are Racially Concentrated by Latino student  
17 populations, not African-American students. There is no evidence that targeting Racially  
18 Concentrated schools is an effective strategy for targeting African-American students,  
19 and the Court notes that African-American students are extremely underrepresented in  
20 ALEs, with almost all ALE programs red-flagged under the 15% Rule for African-  
21 American students.

22 AACs and Resource GATE: Middle Schools, K-8 (grades 6-8)

23 In 2013, when the District prepared the ALE Action Plan, it recommended that  
24 Resource GATE programs be at every middle and K-8 schools in grades 6-8, and high  
25 schools. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 26.) Resource GATE programs are at all  
26 middle schools, except for Magee Middle School, (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-  
27 1) at 20), but only about half (seven out of fifteen) of the K-8 schools, grades 6-8, have  
28 Resource GATE programs. *Id.* at 19-20, *see also* (Mendoza Objection (First) to R&R,

1 Addendum (Doc. 2069-1) at 3 (citing (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) (recommending  
2 an enrichment (resource) GATE class at every middle, especially K-8 schools)).  
3 Resource GATE programs are offered at all the high schools, except Catalina High  
4 School (INT). *Id.* at 20, *but see* (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 36) (reporting District  
5 intends to expand to all high schools a Resource GATE elective experience).

6 The Mendoza Plaintiffs assert that the District is not providing Resource GATE at  
7 every middle and K-8 school as recommended in the ALE Action Plan. The District  
8 reports that in 2015-16, it “assisted Safford Middle<sup>37</sup> School [(RC)] to establish a GATE  
9 resource class with current staff.” (Reply (Doc. 2115) at 15 (citing 2015-16 DAR)). The  
10 Court notes however that the 2016-17 Revised ALE USP RAC reflects there is no  
11 Resource GATE offered at Safford (RC). The District reports that it provides a co-  
12 teaching Resource GATE at Roskrige Bilingual K-8 Magnet School and at McCorkle K-  
13 8 (RC). *Id.* at 15. As for the other K-8 schools, the District “provided pull-out services  
14 once a week with instruction by an itinerant GATE teacher,” as follows: Morgan  
15 Maxwell (RC), Pueblo Gardens (RC), Borman, Rose (RC), Dietz, Drachman (INT), and  
16 Lawrence. *Id.* at 15-16 (citing 2015-16 DAR, 2016-17 DAR). In response to the Mendoza  
17 Plaintiffs’ challenge, the District replies that in 2018-19, “several smaller K-8s will  
18 transition to resource rather than pull-out based on the availability of GATE-certified  
19 teachers and school scheduling.” *Id.* Subsequently, the Court does not know how many  
20 K-8 schools will be without Resource GATE programs and whether the “one 90 minute  
21 class” per week “pull-out” GATE format, as understood by this Court in the context of  
22 GATE services for grades 1-5, compares to an effective Resource GATE program, for  
23 middle school, and ninth and tenth grade, students.

24 In 2013, when the District prepared the ALE Plan, it recommended increasing  
25 AACs offered at middle schools with few or no AACs, especially at K-8 schools grades  
26 6-8, with Algebra 1 being added at all middle schools for dual high school credit, and  
27 eliminating entrance requirements for any Pre-AP and AP classes in middle schools or

---

28 <sup>37</sup> Safford (RC) is a K-8 School.



1 high schools. (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 14, 20, 28-29.) The District  
2 recommended increasing the number of AAC offerings by opening all AAC classes to  
3 any interested student at both the middle and high schools, equalizing access to  
4 technology<sup>38</sup> at middle and high schools, increasing the number of teachers highly-  
5 qualified to teach math by providing incentives and recruitment, offering Advanced  
6 classes in language arts and math in all 6-8 grades, providing Algebra 1 for all qualified  
7 8<sup>th</sup> graders, expanding the number of AP courses in its high schools level by focusing on  
8 those that are high-interest to African-American and Latino students, including ELL  
9 students.

10       Until challenged by the Mendoza Plaintiffs, neither the District nor the Special  
11 Master reported on the status of the above strategies planned three years ago to increase  
12 access to AACs at middle schools for African-American and Latino, including ELL,  
13 students. As noted above, only about five of the fifteen K-8 schools, grades 6-8, have  
14 what the Court considers robust AAC programs. Six of the K-8 schools only have one  
15 AAC program. Of the fifteen K-8 schools, grades 6-8, only nine offer Dual Credit (MS-  
16 HS) courses, with four of these same schools also having the Pre-AP Advanced AAC.  
17 (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 28.)

18       The Special Master recommends that every middle school should have at least two  
19 pre-AP courses, Honors and Advanced, with at least one being available in SY 2018-19.  
20 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 39). According to the middle school evidence reported  
21 by the District, all middle schools, except Dodge Middle School (INT), offer the two  
22 programs; Dodge Middle School (INT) only offers the Pre-AP Advanced program.  
23 (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 19-20), *but see* (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096)  
24 at 36) (reporting that four schools with middle grades do not offer either of the two pre-  
25 AP options). The Special Master's recommendation may be referring to the middle-  
26 school grades at the K-8 schools, which only offer both programs at four out of 15

---

27  
28       <sup>38</sup> The parties and the Special Master present their concerns regarding equal  
access to technology under USP § IX. The Court does the same.

1 schools (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 20.) The Court notes that the value of  
2 this access is limited unless the District ensures that these Pre-AP courses effectively  
3 function as pipelines for AP programs, including UHS.

4 Both Plaintiffs and the Special Master note problems with Pre-AP course  
5 effectiveness. The Special Master asserts there is no evidence that existing Pre-AP  
6 classes serve as a pipeline to enrollment and successful completion of AP and other  
7 rigorous high school classes and whether and to what extent the Pre-AP classes need to  
8 be redesigned to accomplish this stated goal. As the Fisher Plaintiffs articulately explain,  
9 it is not enough to just increase the number of Pre-AP courses. “For this to be effective,  
10 the criteria and curriculum for these classes need to be aligned with the College Board,”  
11 and 8th grade and earlier grade standards must be aligned to ensure successful transitions  
12 from Pre-AP courses to AP courses. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2100) at 4-5.) Both  
13 Plaintiffs ask the District to redesign these courses and/or offer additional student  
14 support, inclusive but not limited to tutoring, to ensure students successfully transition  
15 from Pre-AP to AP programs. The Mendoza Plaintiffs ask the District to compare the AP  
16 success rate for students taking Pre-AP courses versus those transitioning to AP courses  
17 from Self-contained GATE programs. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 33)  
18 (identifying Magee Middle School as offering Pre-AP programs for comparison with Vail  
19 Middle School (INT) offering Self-contained GATE). Given the critical need for Pre-AP  
20 courses to be effective pipelines to AP courses, including the AP curriculum offered at  
21 UHS, the Court grants the Plaintiffs’ request.

22 The Special Master recommends that the District increase participation of middle  
23 grade students in ALEs and ensure that all students have access to at least one dual credit  
24 (MS-HS) course. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 38) (complaining that MS-HS is only  
25 offered in six middle schools and four of them only offer one such course; recommending  
26 all middle schools have at least one). A year ago, this Court adopted this recommendation  
27 and ordered the District to make the Dual Credit program universally available in all  
28 middle schools. (Order (Doc. 2084) at 18); (2016-17 SMAR (2096) at 39.) The Court will

1 not re-order that which it has already ordered to be done. The Court finds no fault with  
2 the District's strategy of offering the Dual Credit (MS-HS) program via transportation to  
3 District high schools for classes, especially for courses like the Algebra 1 course which  
4 the ALE Action Plan recommended providing for all qualified 8<sup>th</sup> graders. The District  
5 shall show good cause why a Dual Credit program (MS-HS) is not offered at: Borman,  
6 Dietz, Lawrence 3-8, McCorkle (RC), Morgan Maxwell (RC), Rose (RC), and Secrist.  
7 (Revised ALR USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 19-20.)

8 The District has nine high schools, with only six having Dual Credit (HS-CC)  
9 courses. (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 20.) All have AP Honors courses,  
10 but only seven have AP Advanced courses. *Id.* The Special Master reports that the  
11 District only offers 22 Dual Credit (HS-CC) courses, with 12 of them being offered at  
12 Santa Rita. He recommends expansion of this program, with priority being placed on  
13 schools servicing the largest populations of students eligible for free and reduced meals.  
14 The District agrees to so proceed. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 44.)

15 In 2013, the ALE Plan recommended expanding AP courses at the high school  
16 level, "focusing on AP courses of high-interest to African-American and Latino students,  
17 including ELL students. Initially, all high schools will offer Spanish Lang & Culture,  
18 World History, English Language (first course), and Biology. Subsequently, all high  
19 schools will also offer Spanish Literature, English Literature (second course),  
20 Psychology, Human Geography, U.S. History and Studio Art." (ALE Action Plan (Doc.  
21 1645-2) at 29.) Neither the District nor the Special Master provides the status of the  
22 expansion plan described above in the ALE Action Plan, but the Mendoza Plaintiffs  
23 complain that there are no Culturally Relevant Curriculum (CRC) AP courses. This  
24 subject is discussed in greater detail for UHS, where almost all core courses are AP. The  
25 Court's discussion there shall apply equally here.

26 The Special Master describes the major issue confronting the District as being the  
27 disparity in the proportion of African-American and Latino students enrolled in ALEs  
28 between high schools. So for example, Pueblo High (RC), with 90% African-American

1 and Latino students, and Tucson High (RC), with 78% minority students, have  
2 approximately 15% of their minority students enrolled in at least one AP course. He  
3 compares this to Sahuaro High and Sabino High, where minority students make up less  
4 than 50% of the student populations, but where 57% and 70%, respectively, of their  
5 minority students are enrolled in one or more AP courses. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096)  
6 at 41.) He describes African-American and Latino students' enrollment in AP classes as  
7 "particularly low" at Tucson High (RC), where it has declined each of the last three  
8 years. He also describes enrollment as "exceptionally low" at Catalina High (INT), where  
9 there are 741 students with only six AP classes available in 2016-17 and 2017-18. He  
10 compares Sabino High, with 196 more students, which has twice as many AP courses and  
11 five times as many sections. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 42-43.)

12 The Special Master believes the greater availability of courses at Sabino may be  
13 why enrollment of African-American and Latino students there exceeds enrollment at  
14 Catalina (INT). He recognizes that Catalina (INT) also has more ELL students,<sup>39</sup> which  
15 affects both demand and opportunity with respect to AP courses, but that does not explain  
16 the disparity, "which at Catalina [(INT)] is unbelievable- with average class sizes being  
17 less than 10 in 2016-17" and "not a single AA or Latino at Catalina [(INT)] passed an AP  
18 exam." (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 42-43.)

19 The Special Master recommends that the District identify the reasons for low AP  
20 enrollment at Catalina (INT) and reasons why AP enrollment at Tucson High (RC) is on  
21 a steady decline and develop strategies to address these problems. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
22 2096) at 43.)

23 This is not the first time the Court has seen these examples of gross disparities.  
24 The Special Master included them, almost verbatim, in his R&R on the District's ALE  
25 Plan, filed with the Court on August 3, 2017. (R&R ALE (Doc. 2041) at 17, 19-20.) Then  
26 to address this issue, he recommended, as a high priority, the District should establish

---

27  
28 <sup>39</sup> See (District Response (Doc. 2199) (identifying high ELL population as one reason why Catalina AP participation is low).

1 school cultures with “an ethos of achievement” or as the Court ordered, “the District  
2 should focus on developing school-wide cultures where academic excellence is valued  
3 and celebrated.” (Order (Doc. 2084) at 18.) Then, he recommended that “[t]he situation at  
4 Catalina [(INT)] demanded immediate attention.” (R&R ALE (Doc. 2041) at 25.) He  
5 noted that “Tucson High [(RC)], Rincon [(INT)], Pueblo [(RC)], and Palo Verde (INT)  
6 also stand out as schools with low AP participation.” *Id.* He recommended, “[t]he District  
7 should develop plans to enhance enrollment in the five schools.” *Id.*

8 On October 24, 2017, the Court adopted the Special Master’s recommendations  
9 made then and ordered the District to immediately address the access problems at  
10 Catalina (INT), Santa Rita, and Cholla (RC) high schools. (Order (Doc. 2084) at 18.)  
11 Then, Catalina (INT) had six AP courses, Santa Rita had one, and Cholla (RC) had one,  
12 but it had the IB program. *Id.* at 13. The record reflects no action by the District to either  
13 add AP courses or to develop ethos of achievement at Catalina (INT) and Tucson High  
14 (RC). The access disparities between high schools, especially the conditions at Catalina  
15 High (INT) remain the same, and Tucson High (RC) continues to slide downward. There  
16 is no mention of Rincon (INT), Pueblo (RC), and Palo Verde (INT) high schools and no  
17 reason to assume any changed circumstances there. It remains for the District to develop  
18 plans to enhance enrollment at five high schools: Catalina (INT), Tucson High (RC),  
19 Rincon (INT), Pueblo (RC), and Palo Verde (INT).

20 From the 2016-17 SMAR, it appears that the Special Master now accepts Santa  
21 Rita’s lack of an AP program in favor of a Dual Credit (HS-CC) program and Cholla’s  
22 (RC) lack of an AP program in favor of the IB program. The Court accepts the latter but  
23 not the former change in the Special Master’s position.

24 As noted by the Special Master last year in his R&R reviewing the ALE Plan,  
25 there is a “virtual absence of AP classes at Santa Rita,” (R&R ALE (Doc. 2041) at 18),  
26 with only one studio art class offered and having a very low enrollment, . . . but in 2015-  
27 16, it offered nine AP classes.” *Id.* at 19. Now, Santa Rita offers 12 Dual Credit courses.  
28 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 44.) Dual credit courses guarantee credit at Arizona

1 colleges and universities including community colleges, with almost all students who  
2 take dual credit courses received passing grades in comparison to students taking AP or  
3 IB classes who must pass a more rigorous examination in order to receive college credit.  
4 Many TUSD students start their postsecondary education at community colleges. “The  
5 downside of these courses is that when students who have taken them seek admission at a  
6 college or university outside of the state of Arizona, they may be at a disadvantage as  
7 compared to students who take and succeed in traditional AP or IB courses;” therefore,  
8 Santa Rita students and families should be advised, accordingly. *Id.* The Court has  
9 already issued this directive: “the District should ensure that parents understand the  
10 difference between AP and dual-credit courses, especially the limited value of dual credit  
11 courses outside Arizona.” (Order (Doc. 2084) at 18.) This advice does not remedy the  
12 lack of access to AP courses for students attending Santa Rita High School.

13 The Special Master reports that 9th and 10th grade students at Cholla High School  
14 (RC) have the opportunity to participate in the IB program. There is every reason to  
15 believe that the IB program, while it’s per student costs are relatively high, is a successful  
16 initiative. Large proportions of Cholla (RC) students take at least one IB course, take the  
17 IB exam for that course and pass the exam at a level that will earn them college credit.  
18 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 43.)

19 The IB experience has two strands: 1) a diploma program and 2) the opportunity to  
20 take IB courses that can result in college credit, similar to college credit that is received  
21 for AP courses. The diploma program is extremely rigorous and only a small number of  
22 students choose it, but over half of the 9th and 10th grade students at Cholla High School  
23 (RC) take an IB course. “It is generally thought that IB is more rigorous than AP. There  
24 is, however, a relatively high rate of success among Cholla [(RC)] students which may  
25 be, in part, because students are tutored by IB course teachers. This model might be  
26 explored for AP tutoring.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 44.)

27 Over the last three years, the percentage of White and Latino students taking the  
28 IB courses increased by three percent; the percentage of African-American students

1 increased by seven percent. *Id.* at 43. Of students who took an IB course, 85% of 12th  
2 grade students also took an IB exam. *Id.* Of those who took the IB exam, 54% of students  
3 earned a score of four or higher while 84% earned a grade of three or higher and qualified  
4 for college credit at most four-year colleges. *Id.* According to the Special Master: “This is  
5 remarkable; during the spring 2017, 41% of non-UHS students earned a qualifying score  
6 of three or better (which is comparable to the score 3 on the IB exam).” *Id.* at 43-44.

7 In short, the IB program is very successful, with the downside being that Cholla  
8 High School (RC) only offers AP courses in four subjects not covered by IB courses.  
9 (R&R ALE (Doc. 2041) at 18.) However, students who take IB classes and receive a  
10 passing grade have at least as good a chance of receiving college credit as students who  
11 take an AP class. *Id.* at 20. There may be a further slight disadvantage to the IB program  
12 because, generally, there is a greater range of content in AP courses than exists in IB  
13 courses. *Id.* at 20. The Special Master recommends awarding unitary status for the IB  
14 program. The Court agrees that further judicial oversight of this successful program is  
15 unnecessary.

16 The Mendoza Plaintiffs agree, but “believe the District should be directed to  
17 further explore how effective marketing and public education of the successful IB  
18 program at Cholla (RC) might lead to greater enrollment of White students and a  
19 decrease in its level of racial concentration.” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 36.) The  
20 Court agrees, and so directs the District. If determined to be a practicable strategy for  
21 increasing integration, the District shall include it in the ALE provisions Outreach and  
22 Recruitment Addendum. Given the District’s strong commitment to the IB Program, the  
23 Court’s retention of jurisdiction over the Outreach and Recruitment provisions of the  
24 USP is sufficient to see this task through.

25 The Court recognizes that it is undisputed that the District has increased AP  
26 programs. It “received national recognition for the increase in the number of AP courses  
27 offered and students tested in 2013-14 and 2015-16, with the number of individual  
28 African-American and Latino students who enrolled in AP classes stabilizing at about

1 1700 students.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 40.) “However, all of the increases in the  
2 number of classes offered are accounted for by increases in two high schools: UHS and  
3 Sahauro High School. In other schools, the aggregate number of courses actually  
4 declined.” (R&R ALE (Doc. 2041) at 17.) UHS is a unique circumstance, but Sahauro  
5 High School offers the District a successful prototype AP program for developing ALE  
6 policies.

7 The District is not free to ignore an Order of the Court, and must show good cause  
8 and seek leave for non-compliance. The District has presented no such requests, but also  
9 has presented no evidence of compliance. The Court reaffirms its prior directives. The  
10 District shall show good cause why it has delayed addressing the access problems at  
11 Catalina (INT), Santa Rita, and Cholla (RC) high schools. The District shall identify  
12 reasons why these schools have disproportionately low participation in AP courses and  
13 why Tucson High School (RC) participation numbers continue to decline, and  
14 immediately develop strategies, including but not limited to adding AP programs and  
15 programs to create school-wide ethos of academic excellence, and implement these  
16 strategies at Catalina (INT), Santa Rita, Tucson High School (RC), Rincon (INT), and  
17 Pueblo (RC) high schools.

18 University High School (UHS)

19 “University High School is considered one of the best high schools in America.  
20 Admission to UHS is based primarily on performance on admission test (the CogAT) and  
21 grade point average above 3.0. It is also among the most racially and ethnically diverse  
22 ‘exam schools,’ especially if diversity is measured by the relative ratios of African  
23 American, Latino and White. In 2017-18, the racial composition of the UHS student body  
24 of 1122 students was: White-46%; African American-3.4%; Latino-35%; Native  
25 American-.20%; Asian Pacific Islander-10%; Multiracial 6%.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
26 2096) at 45.) “Another indication of diversity, is the fact that 56% of UHS enrollment in  
27 2016-17 were eligible for free and reduced meals.” *Id.* UHS is not, however, an  
28 Integrated high school, pursuant to the USP.



1 In comparison to UHS, Palo Verde High School (INT), which has almost the same  
2 number of students, 1139, has an AP enrollment of: White-23%; African American-19%,  
3 and Latino-48%. AP enrollment at Rincon High School (INT), with a total of 1054  
4 students, has an AP enrollment of: White-20%; African American-14%, and Latino-59%.  
5 Both Palo Verde (INT) and Rincon (INT) high schools are Integrated schools. (Mendoza  
6 Response, Ex. 1 (Doc. 2101-1) at 4.)

7 Early on, in 2013-14, the Court ordered:

8 a change in admission criteria to allow students who fell slightly below the  
9 50 point admission bar based on the test and grade point average to write  
10 short answer essays to demonstrate their qualifications. Between 2013-14  
11 and 2016-17, Latino enrollment at UHS increased by 18% and African  
12 American enrollment by 20%.” All of the gains for African American  
students (that resulted in a total enrollment of 37 students in all grades),  
occurred for African Americans in 2014-15. The number of Latino students  
has grown each year over the last four years, with the biggest annual  
growth having occurred in 2016-17.

13 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 45.) “These increases in the number of African  
14 American and Latino students occurred while the total enrollment in UHS increased so  
15 the actual percentage of increase attributable to the change as compared to increased  
16 enrollment was .5% for African-American students and 3.8% for Latino students. (The  
17 proportion of white students at UHS declined slightly).” *Id.* at 45.

18 Most core academic courses at UHS are AP courses, with UHS enrolling 8.1% of  
19 TUSD’s high school students and accounting for 25% of all the District’s high school  
20 students enrolled in AP classes in 2017-18. *Id.* at 40. UHS students’ AP scores are as  
21 follows: 94% of White students score 3 or higher on AP tests, and 85% of African  
22 American-students and 87% of Latino students score 3 or higher. The Mendoza Plaintiffs  
23 complain that there are no CRC AP courses at UHS, which is the strategy designed to  
24 address this type of achievement gap.

25 According to the Special Master, “UHS provides considerable academic support  
26 for all students who need it; a small percentage of students of all races withdraw from  
27 UHS for academic reasons.” (2016-17 SMAR (2096) at 46.) “In general, African  
28

1 American and Latino students are successful at UHS.” *Id.*<sup>40</sup> The Special Master reports  
2 that attrition rates for African American students went from 7% in 2013-14 to 3% in  
3 2017-18. The attrition rates for Latino students increased from 4% to 7%. He reported a  
4 4% retention rate for White students, which the Court assumes is the retention rate for  
5 2017-18. Like other ALEs, The graduation rates for both African-American and Latino  
6 students at UHS are greater than the graduation rates for high school students district-  
7 wide. (2016-17 SMAR (2096) at 46.)

8 The Special Master recommends that the District inquire into “why the attrition  
9 rate for Latino students is twice the attrition rate for [W]hite and African American  
10 students.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 48.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs ask that TUSD be  
11 required to develop and implement an action plan to increase Latino retention. (Mendoza  
12 Response (Doc. 2101) at 37.) Given the findings below, the Court agrees that the District  
13 must inquire into why the attrition rate for Latino students is twice that of other students,  
14 develop, and implement strategies to decrease attrition and increase retention for Latino  
15 students, if practicable.

16 According to the Special Master, “*a significant number* of UHS students had not  
17 enrolled in the TUSD school before enrolling in UHS or live in communities outside the  
18 boundaries of TUSD. However, this does not affect the admission of African American  
19 or Latino students who have attended TUSD schools because all students who meet the  
20 admission requirements are accepted.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 46) (emphasis  
21 added). According to the Special Master, “[t]he District has reviewed and revised the  
22 process and procedures used to select students for admission to UHS to ensure that  
23 multiple measures for admission are used and that all students have an equitable  
24 opportunity to enroll at University High School using all the criteria and input as directed  
25 by the Unitary Status Plan.” *Id.*

---

26  
27 <sup>40</sup> The Special Master has recommended that the District might use the very  
28 successful IB tutoring program, where tutoring is provided by IB course teachers,  
as a prototype to follow for the District. The Court assumes UHS has a similar  
tutoring program.

1 As described by the District, in 2014-15, it adjusted the distribution of admission  
2 points by increasing the number of points associated with qualifying test scores, reducing  
3 the value of the GPA so that fewer students had to participate in the short answer essay.  
4 (2016-17 SMAR, Ex. V-C (2096-9) at 1.) The District found the short-answer essay to be  
5 ineffective. *Id.* In 2014-15, the District began to phase out the short-answer essay and by  
6 2015-16, it was replaced by “the ACT Engage,” a non-cognitive measurement. *Id.*, Ex.  
7 V-C (2096-9) at 2. The Special Master recommends that a second essay answer<sup>41</sup> be used  
8 for borderline qualified students, with the Mendoza Plaintiffs asking that the essay  
9 answer only be applied to boost UHS in-District enrollment. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
10 2096) at 47.)

11 The District has considered cutoff score reductions but believes that the small  
12 number of African-American students this might benefit would be swallowed up by the  
13 additional number of White students. *Id.*, Ex. V-C (2096-9) at 2. The District also  
14 believes that lowering the GPA requirement from 3.0 to 2.9 or 2.8, would likely bring in  
15 students who would struggle with the rigorous and advanced UHS curriculum. The Court  
16 notes this assertion is contrary to the District’s open enrollment philosophy adopted for  
17 all other ALE AP courses. Without knowing the number of White students being  
18 recruited from outside the District, the Court can only wonder whether the number of  
19 White students qualifying under any lower-cut score could be limited by applying it  
20 preferentially to only boost UHS’s in-District enrollment. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096)  
21 at 47.)

22 The Fisher Plaintiffs complain that in 2017-18, there were approximately 12  
23 African-American students who passed the admissions test, but missed the GPA score by  
24 one-tenth of a percent and were not allowed to enroll while students from outside the  
25 District enrolled at UHS. (Fisher Response (Doc. 2100) at 5.) The Special Master replies  
26 that out-of-District students do not push out African-American students because “all  
27 TUSD students who qualify for UHS are offered placement.” (Reply (Second) (Doc. 211)

---

28 <sup>41</sup> More accurately described as a reinstatement of the short-answer essay.

1 at 21.) But, the Fisher Plaintiffs describe UHS and Rincon (INT), where UHS students  
2 also take courses, as being over capacity with UHS out-of-District White students so as to  
3 potentially push in-District Rincon students out of their school. (Fisher Response (Doc.  
4 2100) at 5.)

5 The Fisher Plaintiffs also complain that TUSD students must take the admissions  
6 test during their 7<sup>th</sup> grade year, while out of District students take it during their 8<sup>th</sup> grade  
7 year so their achievement level is one year advanced. (Fisher Response (Doc. 2100) at 5.)  
8 The Fisher Plaintiffs charge that TUSD students must enter UHS in their 9<sup>th</sup> grade year,  
9 but out of District students may enter at any grade level. *Id.* at 6. The Special Master  
10 replies that the Fisher Plaintiffs are referring to “a make-up test that is given in December  
11 for 8<sup>th</sup> grade students new to TUSD or non-TUSD students who did not live in the area<sup>42</sup>  
12 at the time of 7<sup>th</sup> grade testing.” (Reply (Second) (Doc. 2111) at 21.) The Court  
13 recognizes that the USP § V.A.5.b requires the UHS admission test to be given to all  
14 students in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, but just as there is no restriction from giving the make-up test to  
15 8<sup>th</sup> graders, the District may offer in-District students with a 2.9 GPA a re-take test in the  
16 8<sup>th</sup> grade or allow them to simply re-apply, if their GPA improves between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>  
17 grade. In short, the UPS does not preclude this or any other preferential considerations for  
18 in-District students, especially if in-District enrollment would increase integration at  
19 UHS.

20 The Special Master reports on UHS targeted recruitment of African American  
21 students as follows: 1) it reached out to parents of African-American students with  
22 before-school coffee events aimed at soliciting their advice regarding strategies to recruit  
23 more African-American students for UHS; 2) it held an African-American family dinner  
24 attended by 70, 7th and 8th grade TUSD students and their parents, with current UHS  
25 African-American parents and students answering questions, dispelling myths, and  
26 encouraging student enrollment. UHS offers parental support from an African-American

---

27  
28 <sup>42</sup> The Court assumes students living outside the area are students living  
outside of the Tucson metropolitan areas because any student may enroll in UHS  
without geographic limitation based on availability.

1 UHS alumni parent who also is a UHS staff member. (Reply (First) (Doc. 2096) at 46  
2 (citing Ex. V-C (2096-9) at 2.)) There is no similar evidence referenced in the record  
3 regarding targeted recruitment for Latino students.

4 The Special Master makes no recommendations for increasing enrollment  
5 numbers, but the Mendoza Plaintiffs ask that the District be held accountable for ALE  
6 Action Plan goals of 7% enrollment for African-American students and 38.9% enrollment  
7 for Latino students. UHS enrollment is only 3.4% for African-American students and  
8 35% for Latino students. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 37.)

9 The Mendoza Plaintiffs ask that these goals be attained before unitary status is  
10 granted. The Court denies this request. The Court rejects the Mendoza Plaintiffs request  
11 to apply ALE enrollment goals to only in-District enrollment. African-American and/or  
12 Latino students recruited from out-side the District create the same diversity as in-District  
13 African-American and Latino students. Of concern to the Court is the number of White  
14 students recruited from outside the District, and here the record is silent. Given White  
15 student enrollment at UHS is double in-District norms, the Court suspects that “a  
16 significant number” of the UHS students being enrolled from outside TUSD may be  
17 White. If true, the Court finds that the District should consider the practicability of  
18 implementing in-District preferences for the more racially diverse in-District students,  
19 who are on the borderline of qualifying for enrollment at UHS.

20 The Mendoza Plaintiffs submit that before unitary status should be granted “UHS  
21 should be required to offer CRC courses (and/or work to develop a College Board  
22 approved AP course that fits within the USP definition of CRC.” (Mendoza Response  
23 (Doc. 2101) at 2), *but see* (2016-2016 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 46 (reporting there is  
24 currently one CRC AP course, AP World History, listed as leading toward 24 college  
25 majors including African American-Studies and Ethnic studies)). As a starting point, the  
26 ALE Policy Manual should accurately identify the status of CRC AP course development  
27 and/or implementation at UHS, and include a plan for a CRC AP program at UHS as a  
28 policy matter. They ask that the District determine there are no pipeline issues impeding

1 enrollment at UHS. The District’s assessment regarding the effectiveness of the Pre-AP  
2 program to prepare students for the AP program may answer this question in part.

3 The Special Master focuses his concern on the “number of students who are  
4 eligible for admission to UHS, [who] chose not to enroll.” *Id.* 47. He describes a “*sizable*  
5 *pool* of potential African American and Latino students whose enrollment in UHS would  
6 increase its diversity.” *Id.* at 47 (emphasis added). He recommends that the District  
7 “[d]ocument that all students who do not accept an enrollment invitation have been  
8 contacted for additional recruitment purposes as well as to provide rationale for  
9 enrollment refusal.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 48.) He believes “[o]ne reason for  
10 reluctance to do enrolling in UHS may be a concern on the part of families, if not the  
11 students themselves, that the rigor of the UHS curriculum would be too stressful,” *id.*, at  
12 47, which he refers to as: “a phenomenon called ‘stereotype threat,’” *id.*n.22. He submits  
13 that “providing prospective eligible candidates an opportunity to experience what  
14 academic work at UHS involves and to learn that they will have support of UHS faculty  
15 and fellow students could encourage some students to enroll.” *Id.* at 47. He recommends  
16 that the District “explore the usefulness of a summer program for seventh and eighth  
17 grade students who have qualified for admission to UHS that provides them with the  
18 opportunity to know what the level of academic demand is in UHS.” *Id.* at 48.

19 Noting that the District has not attained the ALE goals it set for UHS, the Court  
20 grants the Mendoza request that it identify whether there are any pipeline issues impeding  
21 UHS enrollment, and if so address such issues in the ALE Policy Manual. The Court also  
22 orders the District to implement a CRC AP course at UHS and a summer program for  
23 seventh and eighth grade students who have qualified for admission to UHS or show  
24 good cause why these strategies are impracticable for addressing the phenomena of  
25 “stereotype threat.” Likewise, the Court finds that the District must do more than  
26 document why each African-American and Latino student does not accept an enrollment  
27 invitation. The District shall develop a remedial strategy, if practicable, and likewise  
28 develop a remedial strategy for Latino attrition. The District shall identify recruitment

1 strategies for Latino students similar to those for African-American students, if it has  
2 determined these strategies are effective. The District shall develop in-District enrollment  
3 preferences, if determined to be practicable strategies for promoting integration at UHS.  
4 Recruitment strategies determined to be effective to increase enrollment shall be reflected  
5 in the ALE Policy Manual.

6 ELL students, Dual Language ALEs, not § V.C Dual Language Programs

7 The District reports “unique challenges” to its efforts to increase English  
8 Language Learners (ELL) student participation in ALE programs. First, there are  
9 “Arizona Department of Education (ADE) requirements for ELL students,” which “at  
10 times [] has meant students are unable to participate in many ALE programs, including  
11 self-contained GATE (all-day program), GATE resource (during elective classes), and  
12 several AP or Honors ELA (sic) classes.” (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 81  
13 (citing 2016-17 DAR (2057-1) at 219-220)). “Another factor is that students classified as  
14 ELL lose that designation once they achieve English proficiency.” *Id.* So, once an ELL  
15 student advances to ALE participation, he or she is no longer an ELL student. *Id.* Despite  
16 all these challenges, the District reports that from SY 2012-13 to 2016-17, ELL  
17 participation increased in three AACs, as follows: 1) Pre-AP Advanced programs (4 to  
18 35), 2) Pre-AP Honors programs (10 to 115), and 3) AP programs (6 to 14) students. *Id.*  
19 at 81. ELL student participation in GATE programs increased from 2013-14 to 2016-17  
20 in Self-contained GATE from 4 to 9, decreased in Pull-out GATE from 33 to 23, and  
21 increased in Resource GATE from 1 to 18. *Id.* at 88.

22 In addition to increasing ELL participation in ALEs, USP § V.A.3-4, the USP, §  
23 V.C, calls for the District to build and expand its Dual Language Program. Such  
24 programs “are positive and academically rigorous programs designed to contribute  
25 significantly to the academic achievement of all students who participate in them and  
26 which provide learning experiences comparable to the advanced learning experiences  
27 described above.” *Id.*

28

1 Under the USP, there are two different dual language obligations. First, the  
2 District must offer dual language ALE programs to increase access to and participation in  
3 ALEs. Second, the District must expand the Dual Language programs, which offer dual  
4 language courses in K-12 grades to teach coursework in both Spanish and English to  
5 increase the number of academically bilingual students, thereby preparing them to  
6 compete in a global economy. (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 65), (2016-17  
7 DAR (2057-1) at 195). The Court previously treated the two the same, (Order (Doc.  
8 1771) at 4 (identifying the Dual Language Program as an ALE), but stands corrected. The  
9 two USP requirements are not the same but fit together, with the dual language ALE  
10 programs providing ALE opportunities to ELL students and students participating in the  
11 Dual Language programs.

12 The Court understands the former to be a gifted program, requiring cognitive  
13 testing, taught by certified gifted teachers for Spanish-speaking students, assumedly ELL  
14 students, students with an ELL history, or students enrolled in Dual Language programs.  
15 Whereas, the Dual Language programs require language proficiency and the courses are  
16 not taught by certified gifted teachers. *See* (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 21, 38)  
17 (describing additional effort needed to recruit teachers from Spain and/or Puerto Rico and  
18 proposing GYOP to address shortage of dual language teachers by focusing on bilingual  
19 paraprofessionals currently working in dual language program).

20 The USP stopped short of categorizing the Dual Language program as an ALE,  
21 and so does the Court. It finds this distinction is important. There is no evidence before  
22 the Court that Dual Language programs, K-12 grades, teaching coursework in both  
23 Spanish and English to increase the number of academically bilingual students, include  
24 critical thinking and reasoning lessons using gifted strategies. There is no suggestion that  
25 certified gifted teachers teach them. These bilingual courses are designed to contribute  
26 significantly to the academic achievement of all students who participate in them, but  
27 participation is not limited by cognitive or academic standards.

28



1           Based on the record presented here, the Court finds that the only dual language  
2 ALEs are the Self-contained GATE programs at Hollinger K-8 school (RC), grades 6-8,  
3 and Pistor Middle School (RC), which served 68 and 91 students, respectively, in SY  
4 2014-15, and 74 and 83 students, respectively, in SY 2016-17. (Revised ALE USP RAC  
5 (Doc. 2092-1) at 86.) The Court does not know whether the Self-contained GATE  
6 programs at Hollinger (RC) and Pistor (RC) enrollment numbers are inclusive or  
7 exclusive of the ELL student participation numbers reported by the District, above. *See*  
8 (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 88) (referencing ELLs in GATE programs),  
9 (Revised ALE USP RAC) (Doc. 2092-1) at 81) (referencing ELLs in AACs), *but see*  
10 (Revised ALE USP RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 82 (citing 2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at  
11 219-20) (asserting ELL students cannot participate in GATE, especially Self-contained  
12 GATE programs).

13           Possibly misled by the Court, the Special Master and the parties reviewed all dual  
14 language programs as ALEs and failed to make any recommendations or objections  
15 specific to the dual language ALEs being offered in the District. The District shall  
16 include plans and effective strategies, if any, for increasing dual language ALEs in the  
17 ALE Policy Manual, including how to offset the impact of dual language ALEs on access  
18 to ALEs for non-Spanish speaking African-American and Latino students.

19                           2. Increase Student Enrollment: Recruitment

20           First, the USP Outreach and Recruitment provision requires the District, after  
21 review and revision, to have marketing and recruitment strategies “to provide information  
22 to African-American and Latino families and community members throughout the  
23 District about the educational options available to the District.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § II.E.)  
24 ALE programs are educational options. As noted in the context of the Magnet Program,  
25 the Court retains jurisdiction over this section of the USP. Likewise, the USP ALE  
26 Program includes recruitment provisions, (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.A.2.d), which were  
27 accordingly reflected in the ALE Action Plan, (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 19, 20,  
28 23 (respectively for GATE, AAC, and UHS) and in the ALE Supplement Action Plan.

1           In 2013, the District recommended specific recruitment strategies for the various  
2 ALE programs. For example, the ALE Action Plan provides a GATE recruitment strategy  
3 of sending a postcard to all students in TUSD inviting them to take the GATE test. (ALE  
4 Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 19.) For AACs, the ALE Action Plan recommended that the  
5 District provide professional development for designated staff regarding how to identify  
6 AAC students including issues of equity, cultural relevance, and the value of AAC  
7 programs, (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 21), and recommended open-enrollment in  
8 AACs for middle schools and high schools, (ALE Action Plan (Doc. 1645-2) at 21).

9           Over the duration of the USP, the District intended to move towards an open  
10 access philosophy, *id.* at 21, by providing professional development to designated staff  
11 regarding identification of students for AACs and discussing the open access philosophy  
12 with AAC teachers to “ensure” that all teachers support it, and “require” middle and high  
13 schools to promote TUSD’s commitment to open access for AACs. (ALE Action Plan  
14 (Doc. 1645-2) at 21-22.)

15           In 2017, in response to the ALE R&R, the Mendoza Plaintiffs reviewed the ALE  
16 Action Plan and questioned the status of various strategies contained in the ALE Action  
17 Plan, including the implementation of the open access policy. They reurge, now, this  
18 same status question. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 35.)

19           The District reports “it meets with principals to inform them about the relevant  
20 provisions of the USP and the ALE plans.” (Reply (Third) (Doc. 2015) at 12.) It also  
21 appears that the Director of ALE also meets with school counselors. *Id.* The Special  
22 Master believes that it is necessary to depend on the District’s assertions that professional  
23 training for AAC teachers is, accordingly, being conducted at the schools.

24           The Court does not agree. At a minimum, the Director of ALE shall report the  
25 status of the open enrollment policy at the individual schools and report the specifics of  
26 any eligibility requirements, if any remain, except for content prerequisites. The Court  
27 cannot imagine that there are no tracking procedures in place in the District for  
28 mandatory training requirements for its teachers. The professional training at issue here

1 goes to the heart of overcoming bias and stereotypes by teachers. The District has direct  
2 responsibility for the professional development of its teachers. The Court agrees with the  
3 Mendoza Plaintiffs that the record does not reflect whether this professional development  
4 is being provided to AAC teachers. More importantly, the Court asks the District to  
5 report on whether the open enrollment philosophy has been implemented in all middle  
6 and high schools or if there remain some of the various identification requirements, such  
7 as a GPA standard or teacher recommendation, which existed at the inception of the USP.  
8 If the open access philosophy has not yet been fully embraced by middle and high  
9 schools, including principals, counselors, and teachers, the District shall identify an  
10 effective strategy for immediately implementing this essential USP goal to the greatest  
11 extent practicable in these schools.

12         Prior Orders of this Court have directed the District to implement family peer-to-  
13 peer recruitment strategies aimed to address the “known unknown” factor that leads to  
14 qualified students and their parents declining to participate in ALEs. (Order (Doc. 2084)  
15 at 6-7) (calling for peer-to-peer recruitment and developing school-wide cultures  
16 celebrating academic excellence, and directing District to address misconceptions  
17 perpetrated by school counselors and teachers). Here, the Court has ordered that the  
18 District compare AP enrollment at schools like Sabino and Sahuaro high schools with  
19 schools that have declining AP participation and develop strategies for turning the latter  
20 around. The ALE Policy Manual shall identify the strategies the District finds effective to  
21 comply with these directives.

22         Not yet addressed is the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ argument that the District must  
23 develop programs that focus on creating school-wide cultures of excellence and that this  
24 strategy be “broadened” to expressly include the District’s on-going USP undertakings  
25 relating to the development and implementation of multicultural curriculum and  
26 culturally responsive pedagogy creating a synergistic intertwinement between the ALE  
27 provisions of § V.A and the general student engagement and support provisions of the  
28 USP in § V.E. (Mendoza Response (2101) at 25, n.16). The Court understands the

1 Mendoza Plaintiffs to be asking for the application of this strategy, generally, to improve  
2 student achievement for all minority students and for the requisite corresponding  
3 professional development and training for administrators and certificated staff regarding  
4 strategies to create this ethos of excellence, similar to the training given for the CRC  
5 Program.

6 First, the Court notes that the Special Master described creating ethos of academic  
7 excellence at individual schools as a recruitment strategy to redress “stereotype threat”  
8 syndrome which causes minority students to decline participation in ALEs because they  
9 lack confidence in their own academic competence. On the other hand, culturally relevant  
10 pedagogy (CRP), multi-cultural or culturally relevant curriculum (CRC), are engagement  
11 and support strategies to increase academic success for African-American and Latino,  
12 including ELL, students across the board, including ALEs. To be clear, the Court ordered  
13 the District to develop ethos of academic excellence in the context of a recruitment  
14 strategy for ALEs, not to address the District’s broader responsibility to develop and  
15 implement engagement and support strategies, including CRCs, aimed at improving  
16 academic achievement, generally, for minority students. The Court rejects the argument  
17 that unitary status in respect to the latter depends on a synergistic creation of  
18 environments of excellence.

19 The Court does acknowledge that creating ethos of excellence to increase  
20 participation in ALE programs will likewise improve student achievement, generally.  
21 Therefore, these efforts in respect to the ALE programs necessarily satisfy the District’s  
22 more general obligation to develop and implement transformative engagement and  
23 support strategies that are “designed to change the educational expectations of and for  
24 African American and Latino students.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.E.1.a.) The Court finds  
25 that effective strategies for creating environments of excellence to increase participation  
26 in ALEs shall be deemed effective strategies for improving academic achievement and  
27 educational outcomes, generally, for all African-American and Latino, including ELL,  
28 students.



1 educational outcomes to close the achievement gap and eliminate racial and ethnic  
2 disparities, including access to ALEs, using transformative strategies that are designed to  
3 change the educational expectations of African-American and Latino students, improve  
4 student engagement in the academic curriculum, adopt culturally responsive teaching  
5 methods, and encourage and strengthen participation and success of African-American  
6 and Latino students, and provide necessary student support services that allow them to  
7 improve their educational outcomes. (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.E.) Culturally relevant  
8 teaching methods and curriculum are relevant to the extent they promote student  
9 engagement to improve student participation and success in ALEs.

10 The Mendoza Plaintiffs charge that the District has failed to use the student  
11 engagement CRC strategy in its AP program and at UHS. The Court agrees. The ALE  
12 Policy Manual shall include strategies for the ALE programs to use culturally relevant  
13 curriculum to promote student engagement to improve the academic success of African-  
14 American and Latino students enrolled in ALEs. Further discussion of the District's  
15 efforts to improve student engagement in the academic curriculum by adopting culturally  
16 responsive teaching methods, such as CRC, multi-cultural courses, is discussed later  
17 outside the context of the ALE program.

18 In the context of a recruitment strategy, the Court ordered the District to use the  
19 transformative strategy of creating ethos of excellence to change the educational  
20 expectations of African-American and Latino students to increase enrollment in ALEs.  
21 Synergistically, creating ethos of excellence is also an ALE engagement and support  
22 strategy. The same applies to family engagement strategies for recruitment, like peer-to-  
23 peer efforts to dispel the stereotype threat syndrome. There is a porous line between  
24 recruitment and support. For example, the District pays exam fees for low-income  
25 students as a support strategy under USP A.2.d.v., but this subsidy also serves to help the  
26 District recruit students who would otherwise be unable to participate in the program.  
27 The Court nevertheless rejects the Mendoza Plaintiffs' arguments of synergy to preclude  
28 a partial award of unitary status. As explained earlier in this Order, the interconnectivity

1 between the USP programs makes it awkward to grant unitary status in part, but not  
2 impossible. The problem is more a difficulty in structuring review than an impossibility  
3 to attain unitary status in one program and not in another.

4 The Special Master recommends that the District assess the effectiveness of the  
5 various engagement and support strategies being used and identify those that are most  
6 effective in order to cull out those that are less or not at all effective. The Court adopts  
7 this recommendation.

8 The Court has expressly directed the District to compare successful tutoring  
9 programs where course-teachers tutor students, which is the model being used in the IB  
10 program and at UHS, with what is being done or not done at other schools. The Special  
11 Master notes that tutoring is only being provided for AP, IB and UHS programs. (2016-  
12 17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 37.) Given the Court’s directive that the District develop a  
13 GYOP for ALE students, the District shall consider the practicability of effective tutoring  
14 for elementary grade ALEs, and in relationship to the District’s need to develop an  
15 effective pipeline for Pre-AP to AP programs. Above, the Court directed the District to  
16 compare high schools with high AP enrollment to schools with low enrollment to  
17 determine if different recruitment strategies make a difference. To the extent the answer  
18 is not recruitment, the District shall identify engagement and support strategies aimed at  
19 increasing AP participation at Cholla, Rincon, Palo Verde, Pueblo, and Tucson High  
20 School. The District shall include the effective strategies for engagement and support in  
21 the ALE Policy Manual.

22 To ensure equal access to ALEs, the District is expressly required “to increase  
23 access to academic preparation programs such as AVID.” (USP (Doc. 1713) §V.A.2.d.v),  
24 *see also* § V.E.8 (requiring District to fund and sustain support services for Latino  
25 Student Achievement including AVID).

26 In 2013, when the District drafted the ALE Action Plan, the “highly-regarded  
27 college preparatory support program was in place at three high schools, Cholla, Pueblo,  
28 and Palo Verde, with feeder middle schools being Valencia, Secrist, and Booth-Fickett.

1 (ALE Action Plan (1645-2) at 31.) The ALE Action Plan recommended the District  
2 create a plan that outlines how this expansion could take place over a multi-year period,  
3 *id.* at 32.

4 The Special Master reports that the District has an incremental plan to increase  
5 AVID programs, and notes that AVID is a costly program which requires buy-in from  
6 teachers and administrators to be successful. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 31.) The  
7 District will add AVID at Wright Elementary School (RC) next year at a cost of \$40,000  
8 plus the costs for teacher training. He reports that Catalina (RC) already has an AVID  
9 program within the school, which the District plans to expand school-wide with the goal  
10 of having AVID strategies embedded at each grade level and in all content areas. The  
11 anticipated cost of the Catalina AVID program is \$185,000. (*Id.* at 32.) The Special  
12 Master reports that the District’s ultimate goal is to have the District be an AVID District.  
13 (Reply (Second) (Doc. 2111) at 21.) The Special Master did not prepare a completion  
14 plan for AVID and the Mendoza Plaintiffs did not object.<sup>43</sup>

15 The Special Master’s Reply (Third) reflects recent conversations with the District  
16 that reveal “the District has undertaken a strategy for building achievement oriented  
17 school cultures that seek to enhance student interest as well as confidence in achieving at  
18 high levels,” including becoming an AVID District, “the development among students  
19 and teachers of achievement mindsets, building student’s persistence or ‘grit,’ culturally  
20 responsive pedagogy, dealing with ‘stereotype threat,’ and expanding CRC.” (Reply  
21 (Second) (Doc. 2111) at 29.) According to the Special Master, the District agrees to  
22 prepare a description of this work.

23  
24  
25 <sup>43</sup> The Mendoza Plaintiffs reurged that the District and Special Master  
26 failed to “review[] the District’s implementation of the Specified ALE access  
27 support strategies set forth in the ALE Action Plan, the Supplement, and other  
28 plans or strategies proposed or agreed to by the District or ordered by the Court,”  
as set out in the Addendum to their Objection to the ALE R&R. (Mendoza  
Response (Doc. 2101) at 25.) The Court has reviewed the Addendum, (Mendoza  
Objection (First), Addendum (Doc. 2069-1) at 1-4) and finds no reference to  
AVID.



1 This work may or may not be satisfactory to show good cause for the District's  
2 failure to develop and/or implement strategies, like AVID, to address the low AP  
3 program participation at Catalina (INT), Santa Rita, Tucson High (RC), Rincon (INT),  
4 and Pueblo (RC) high schools or to develop and implement strategies to deal with  
5 "stereotype threat" syndrome, including creating ethos of excellence. It may assist in  
6 determining the practicability of implementing a summer program for seventh and eighth  
7 grade students who have qualified for admission to UHS to address the phenomena of  
8 "stereotype threat" and increase UHS enrollment. Likewise, this work may assist the  
9 District in identifying remedial strategies for the known unknown phenomena where  
10 qualified African-American and Latino students do not accept an enrollment invitation to  
11 UHS. The District plans for expanding CRC in its ALE program shall be included in the  
12 ALE Policy Manual.

13 **a-5. Summary: ALE Policy Manual**

14 The ALE Policy Manual shall be based on the District's assessments of the  
15 effectiveness of the various ALE strategies contained in the ALE Plan, the ALE  
16 Supplement Action Plan, and strategies ordered by this Court. The ALE Policy Manual  
17 affords the District the opportunity to answer unanswered questions noted by the Court in  
18 this Order, such as: whether the Pre-AP program is an effective pipeline versus Self-  
19 contained GATE programs for AP programs; whether tutoring would improve the  
20 effectiveness of this pipeline; whether Dual Credit (MS-HS) programs are effective  
21 substitutes for middle school ACCs, including Pre-AP courses; whether Dual Credit (HS-  
22 CC) programs may entirely replace AP programs in a high school, and whether the most  
23 effective tutoring programs are teacher-based like the IB and UHS programs. For  
24 example, it should identify a practicable policy for strategically placing Self-contained  
25 GATE programs to serve the greatest number of African-American and Latino students,  
26 especially targeting African-American students for ALE services, and apply that policy to  
27 identify where and when this expansion will occur.

28 The Court does not intend the examples given in this summary section to be the

1 exclusive content in the ALE Policy Manual. The entirety of this ALE Order shall guide  
2 the District in drafting the ALE Policy Manual. The District should focus on strategies  
3 and policies that will create a cohesive ALE program, providing a structure for a GYOP  
4 for ALE students beginning in the elementary GATE programs, retaining them through  
5 middle school in GATE and Pre-AP programs and into high school AP programs,  
6 including UHS. The ALE Policy Manual should guide the District's ongoing operation of  
7 the ALE Program pursuant to chosen effective strategies. The District has identified  
8 various ALE strategies for access, recruitment, and support, and now it must determine  
9 whether these strategies were sufficiently effective and are fiscally sustainable to warrant  
10 permanency, including a determination that the District can meet staffing and  
11 transportation requirements. In short, the Policy Manual shall make programmatic and  
12 strategic choices addressing in sufficient detail the issues identified by the Court in this  
13 Order to guide the District in the future.

14 Last and importantly, the District should note that, for reasons explained later in  
15 this Order, it shall be held accountable for ensuring that the Evidence-Based  
16 Accountability System (EBAS) data shall be used to assess program effectiveness.

17 The ALE Policy Manual shall be filed with the Court and guide the District's  
18 future decisions related to ALE programs, including the Outreach and Recruitment  
19 Addendum. Filing of the ALE Policy Manual shall trigger this Court's reconsideration of  
20 the question of unitary status for the USP § § A and E, to the extent subsection E applies  
21 to ALEs, and retains jurisdiction over § III, Transportation, to the extent transportation is  
22 a necessary component of the ALE Program.

23 **§ V.C: Dual Language Programs**

24 The Court sees no evidence that the Dual Language programs at Bloom, Davis  
25 (INT), Grijalva (RC), Howell (INT), Hudlow (INT), Mission View (RC)) and White  
26 (RC) elementary schools Dual Language programs are ALEs. The Court finds the same  
27 for the Dual Language programs at K-8 schools, 6-8 grades, offered at McCorkle (RC),  
28 Pueblo Gardens (RC), and Roskruge and for the Dual Language program at Pueblo High

1 School (RC).<sup>44</sup> The District does not provide participation data for these programs.

2 Further supporting this Court's determination that the District's Dual Language  
3 program is not an ALE, the Special Master reports that the District has struggled between  
4 its obligations to increase the number of programs and the need to improve programs  
5 already in place, with current efforts focusing on Bloom and McCorkle (RC) schools.  
6 According to the Special Master, a nationally prominent consultant hired by the District  
7 in 2016-17 advised the District to start over. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 58.)

8 The Special Master echoes the Mendoza Plaintiff's conclusion that the major  
9 obstacle to the Dual Language program is the lack of qualified dual language teachers.  
10 He reports that the District recently doubled the incentive stipend it was offering to  
11 teachers to become certified in addition to offering to pay for the expense of becoming  
12 certified, with about 50 teachers showing up for the information session but only three  
13 moving forward to become certified dual language teachers. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
14 2096) at 58; (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 38.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs recommend  
15 the District develop a GYOP program focused on bilingual paraprofessionals currently  
16 working for the District, who may already be involved with the dual language program,  
17 and recruit teachers from Spain and/or Puerto Rico. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at  
18 38.) The Court notes that neither the Special Master nor the Mendoza Plaintiffs address  
19 any need for these teachers to be certified as gifted teachers.

20 The Special Master recommends that by the end of this school year, the District  
21 should do the following: 1) continue to advocate with the State to provide legislative  
22 alternatives that will allow ELL students to participate in dual language courses,<sup>45</sup> 2)

---

23  
24 <sup>44</sup> The Court is aware that the dual language Self-contained GATE  
25 programs at Hollinger K-8 (RC) and Pistor MS (RC) feed into the dual language  
26 program at Pueblo High School (RC), but this does not establish that the high  
27 school or any dual language course offered there is an ALE.

28 <sup>45</sup> In 2000, Arizona adopted its English-only law stopping bilingual  
education programs in favor of 4hr-per-day English immersion programs.  
Currently, two bills are being considered by the Arizona State legislature to cut the  
immersion time in about half and allow ELL students to attend bilingual classes,

1 develop a comprehensive plan for expanding the Dual Language program laying out the  
2 obstacles and the costs for developing additional sites by the end of the current school  
3 year, 3) assess evaluations by principals at TWDL schools regarding the effectiveness of  
4 the TWDL program, and 4) assess the possibility of establishing a full K-8, no boundary  
5 dual language magnet program at Roskruge. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 59.)

6 The Court adopts these recommendations and includes the Mendoza Plaintiffs'  
7 recommendation that the District assess the sufficiency of the incentive stipend to recruit  
8 certified dual language teachers, develop a GYOP focused on bilingual paraprofessionals  
9 develop, and determine whether it is a practicable strategy to recruit dual language  
10 teachers from Spain and/or Puerto Rico.

11 In summary, the Court concludes that the Dual Language programs, developed  
12 pursuant to USP § V.C, are not ALE programs but their expansion is, nevertheless,  
13 mandated by the USP. The Court will not ignore that these dual language courses do not  
14 promote integration. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 32.) Especially, the Two Way Dual  
15 Language (TWDL) model, which was chosen by the District because research shows it to  
16 be the best for developing fluency in English and a second language, here Spanish, does  
17 not promote integration because students must speak reasonably good Spanish by the  
18 beginning of the third grade or have trouble catching up. *Id.* n. 15. Given the model,  
19 TWDL is “premised on successful and significant recruitment for first grade (and even at  
20 the kindergarten and pre-kindergarten levels).” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 38.)

21 The Mendoza Plaintiffs take issue with the Special Master’s portrayal of the Dual  
22 Language program as segregative because “they believe that just as the District has  
23 focused on promoting increased integration for its magnet schools at the entry level  
24 grades, the same approach can be adopted for dual language.” (Mendoza Response (Doc.  
25 2101) at 38.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs are correct that nothing prevents the District from  
26 creating a Dual Language magnet program to promote integration, which the Court notes

27  
28 

---

which is a more effective model for addressing achievement gap issues between  
English and non-English speaking students.

1 would necessarily ensure the academic integrity of such a program. And, as noted by the  
2 Mendoza Plaintiffs, African-American student enrollment grew in elementary (K-5) dual  
3 language programs from 1.80% in 2012-13 to 3.35% in 2016-17. (Revised ALE USP  
4 RAC (Doc. 2092-1) at 66.) Still, the 15% Rule would red-flag the Dual Language  
5 program for African-American students as segregative. While TWDL might have an  
6 integrative impact as a magnet program, as an ALE it is especially disconcerting in the  
7 context of limited ALE programs such as the Self-contained GATE. The Fisher Plaintiffs  
8 are correct that these dual language ALEs decrease the number of available ALE  
9 programs for them and other non-Spanish speaking students. The Court will review the  
10 District’s plans for dual language ALE programs when it reviews the ALE Policy  
11 Manual.

12 The Court has no choice but to agree with the Special Master’s recommendation to  
13 retain jurisdiction over USP § V.C, the Dual Language Programs. The Court has no  
14 information that would enable it to determine whether this program has been expanded  
15 since the inception of the USP. It has no information for: 1) how many students Dual  
16 Language programs serve; 2) how many ELL students there are in TUSD, 3) how many  
17 TUSD students there are where English is not spoken at home, or 4) how many TUSD  
18 students qualify for extra language services. There is no information regarding the  
19 projected need for this program that the District should strive to meet. In short, there is no  
20 information offered to the Court upon which it might assess unitary status.

21 The Court adopts the Special Master’s recommendations for Dual Language  
22 programs, including that prior to receiving unitary status the District shall “[d]evelop a  
23 comprehensive plan for expanding dual language laying out the obstacles and the costs  
24 for developing additional sites. The Dual Language Action Plan shall be submitted to the  
25 plaintiffs and the Special Master by the end of the current school year.” (2016-17 SMAR  
26 (Doc. 2096) at 59.) The Court orders it simultaneously filed with the Court, which shall  
27 trigger reconsideration of unitary status.

28 **c. § V.D: Exceptional Education**

1 To guard against minority students being disproportionately assigned to  
2 Special/Exceptional Education (ExEd) programs, the USP required the District “to  
3 develop appropriate criteria for data gathering and reporting to enable it to conduct  
4 meaningful review of its referral, evaluation and placement policies and practices on an  
5 annual basis to ensure that African American and Latino students, including ELL  
6 students, are not being inappropriately referred, evaluated or placed in exceptional  
7 (special) education classes or programs.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.D.)

8 The Special Master, after reviewing the data gathered by the District from 2016-18  
9 and the process implemented by the District to safeguard against disproportionate and  
10 possibly discriminatory placement of minority students in the ExEP program,  
11 recommends granting unitary status, here. The Mendoza Plaintiffs object because: “the  
12 [Special Master’s] discussion fails to address the referral, evaluation, and placement of  
13 ELL students.” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 45) (citing 2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
14 2096) at 53-54.) The Court disagrees. The District’s referral, evaluation, and placement  
15 procedures for ExEd students apply equally to ELL students.

16 As summarized by the Special Master, the District has adopted a systematic  
17 process for reviewing referrals to special education, with referrals being examined by  
18 psychologists who determine whether the alleged symptoms of need warrant special  
19 education placement. Then there is further oversight because professional staff from the  
20 District’s Central Office conduct a review for potential misplacements, and students are  
21 tracked to establish that they make progress in light of services being provided. Senior  
22 District staff conducts quarterly reviews of the placements, trends and relevancy of  
23 service being provided to each student. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 54.) The Special  
24 Master reviewed the data gathered by the District from 2016 to 2018 for 16 categories of  
25 disability, paying particular attention to categories which studies have flagged as possible  
26 venues for discrimination, including emotional disability, mild intellectual disability and  
27 language impairment. He found nothing amiss. According to the Special Master, “[t]he  
28 assignment to these different categories of disability roughly mirror the proportion of

1 white, African American and Latino students in the larger school population.” *Id.*

2 The Court has reviewed the 2015-16 DAR (Doc. 2057-1) at 238-242) and the  
3 2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2075-5) at 30-36, and for the sake of brevity, incorporates the  
4 information contained therein, here. These reports clearly reflect the District’s referral,  
5 evaluation and placement procedures that apply to all ExEd students, including ELL  
6 students. The Plaintiffs have had access to these reports and data which included ELL  
7 students, and the power of discovery. With all of this, the Mendoza Plaintiffs fail to point  
8 to any evidence to support the charge that ELL students may not be protected by the  
9 District’s ExEd program. The Mendoza Plaintiffs’ objection is disingenuous.

10 Early on the District began gathering and reviewing data so that by 2014-15, it  
11 was applying uniform reporting criteria and by 2015-16, it implemented a four-part plan:  
12 the Multi-Tiered Standards Support (MTSS). The District applies MTSS across the board  
13 to all students. The MTSS, designed to more accurately identify ExEd students, has the  
14 dual benefit of identifying non-ExEd behavioral issues. The District adopted an  
15 alternative to discipline for the general education population using a positive behavioral  
16 modification model. The District provides training and professional development not  
17 only to ExEd program staff, but to general-ed teachers with the goal of ensuring ExEd  
18 referrals and evaluations occur only when all other interventions have been unsuccessful.

19 In short, the District has exhibited a strong commitment to an ExEd program that  
20 safeguards against disproportionate and possibly discriminatory placement of minority  
21 students, including ELL students. There is no reason to believe the District will abandon  
22 this strong commitment for the ExEd program, which it designed to ensure African-  
23 American and Latino students, including ELL students, are not being inappropriately  
24 referred, evaluated or placed in exceptional (special) education classes or programs. The  
25 Court finds the District has attained unitary status for the USP § V.D.

26 **d. § V.E: Student Engagement and Support**

27 The USP requires the District to implement strategies to improve academic  
28 achievement and educational outcomes to close the achievement gap and eliminate racial

1 and ethnic disparities for African-American and Latino students, including ELL students,  
2 as follows: 1) in academic achievement, 2) dropout and retention rates, 3) discipline, 4)  
3 access to ALEs and 5) any and all other areas where disparities and potential  
4 improvement may be identified. The District is required to use transformative strategies  
5 designed to change educational expectations of and for African-American and Latino  
6 students, to adopt culturally responsive teaching methods to improve African-American  
7 and Latino student engagement in the academic curriculum, thereby encouraging  
8 participation and improving the academic success of African-American and Latino  
9 students, and to provide African-American and Latino students with the necessary student  
10 support services that will allow them to improve their educational outcomes. (USP (Doc.  
11 1713) at § V.E.a.)

12 To carry out these objectives the USP expressly requires the District to implement  
13 the following strategies: “(i) student support services that focus on academic intervention  
14 and dropout prevention; (ii) socially and culturally relevant curriculum, including courses  
15 of instruction centered on the experiences and perspectives of African-American and  
16 Latino communities; (iii) professional development and training for administrators and  
17 certificated staff to teach socially and culturally relevant curriculum and engage African-  
18 American and Latino students; (iv) establishment of support services for African-  
19 American and Latino students including college mentoring programs; and (v) support for  
20 parent and community participation to improve the educational outcomes of African  
21 American and Latino students.” *Id.* § V.E.b.)

22 **d-1. Academic Intervention and Dropout Prevention**

23 The Special Master and the Mendoza Plaintiffs agree that unitary status has been  
24 attained for graduation, dropout, retention and absenteeism for all students except ELL’s,  
25 but the Mendoza Plaintiffs object to awarding unitary status in part.

26 The Special Master reports that the District’s graduation rates are relatively high  
27 and would be envied by any other District serving such a diverse student body. “Dropout  
28 rates, and retention rates are exceptionally low. Absenteeism rates are reasonable.”



1 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 52.)

2 For example, the most recent available data indicates a national dropout rate of  
3 6.5% and a dropout rate in Arizona of 4%, with a 2016-17 dropout rate for TUSD of  
4 2.5%. Graduation rates in the District for all students is exemplary and rates of retention  
5 and absenteeism are low, with the District making modest and consistent progress since  
6 2012-13 on each of these metrics. The one exception, graduation rates for African-  
7 American students improved in the last two years and now exceed state and national  
8 averages. “In 2016-17, African American students graduated at rates the same or higher  
9 than Whites students at UHS, Sahuarro, Rincon, Cholla, Palo Verde and Catalina high  
10 schools. In 2016-17, African-American graduation rates were higher or the same as  
11 graduation rates for Latino students at Sabino, Sahuarro, Cholla, Rincon, Pueblo and  
12 Catalina. Graduation rates for Latino students were the same or higher than White  
13 students at UHS, Sabino, Sahuarro, Cholla and Pueblo and Catalina. The overall  
14 graduation rates are the highest they have been since 2012-13. Between 2015-16 and  
15 2016-17, the African American graduation rate increased by 7.5% and the Latino  
16 graduation rate increased by 4%.” *Id.* at 52-53.

17 The Special Master reports that the parties have already met to identify a  
18 practicable graduation rate for ELL students. Both seek an Action Plan from the District  
19 for ELL students. The Court agrees that given the success achieved by the District in  
20 preventing dropouts and grade-retentions and in increasing graduation rates, unitary  
21 status hinges on the Action Plan developed for ELL students. The Court retains  
22 jurisdiction over USP § V.E.1.b.i. to the extent necessary to consider ELL students. The  
23 District shall file the Dropout, Retention and Absenteeism ELL Action Plan, which shall  
24 trigger the Court’s reconsideration of unitary status for USP § V.E.1.b.i.

25 **d-2. Culturally Relevant Curriculum (CRC) and Professional Development**  
26 **and Training for CRC**

27 The Court has already called for the District to include in the ALE Policy Manual  
28 the effective strategies it intends to use to implement CRC in the ALE program. The  
Court discusses the remainder of the CRC provisions, here. This includes the District’s

1 implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) and professional development and  
2 training. CRP requires teachers to be culturally responsive to students. The teacher  
3 creates cross-cultural or multicultural learning environments by interacting with students  
4 in a way that enables a student to personally relate course content to the student's own  
5 cultural context. In other words, the goal of the pedagogy is to make learning culturally  
6 relevant.

7 The Special Master initially recommended the Court grant unitary status for CRC,  
8 but subsequent to the Mendoza Plaintiffs' Response, he withdrew his recommendation  
9 and devised a Completion Plan requiring the District to establish two CR courses at Santa  
10 Rita High School, where now there are none, including one with an African American  
11 perspective even though the course enrollment will be lower than the minimum for  
12 elective courses. (Reply (Third) (Doc. 2111) at 25.) He "proposes an 'interim completion  
13 plan' be endorsed by the Court directing the parties to reevaluate the provisions of the  
14 Stipulation before its provisions are implemented." *Id.* at 26. The Court rejects this  
15 recommendation.

16 The Special Master refers to the Stipulation Re: Implementation of USP Section  
17 V.E.6.a.ii (Culturally Relevant (CR) Courses) (the Stipulated Action Plan).

18 By way of background, the USP provides:

19 The District shall continue to develop and implement a multicultural  
20 curriculum for District courses which integrates racially and ethnically  
21 diverse perspectives and experiences. The multicultural curriculum shall  
22 provide students with a range of opportunities to conduct research and  
23 improve critical thinking and learning skills, create a positive and inclusive  
24 climate in classes and schools that builds respect and understanding among  
25 students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, and promote and  
26 develop a sense of civic responsibility among all students. All courses shall  
27 be developed using the District's curricular review process and shall meet  
28 District and state standards for academic rigor. The courses shall be offered  
commencing in the 2013-2014 school year.

25 *Id.* at (6)(i).

26 By the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year, the District shall develop  
27 and implement culturally relevant courses of instruction designed to reflect  
28 the history, experiences, and culture of African American and Mexican  
American communities. Such courses of instruction for core English and  
Social Studies credit shall be developed and offered at all feasible grade  
levels in all high schools across the District, subject to the District's

1 minimum enrollment guidelines. All courses shall be developed using the  
2 District's curricular review process and shall meet District and state  
3 standards for academic rigor. The core curriculum described in this section  
4 shall be offered commencing in the fall term of the 2013-2014 school year.  
5 The District shall pilot the expansion of courses designed to reflect the  
6 history, experiences, and culture of African American and Mexican  
7 American communities to sixth through eighth graders in the 2014-2015  
8 school year, and shall explore similar expansions throughout the K-12  
9 curriculum in the 2015-2016 school year.

6 *Id.* at (6)(ii).

7 As the Court understands these USP provisions, CRC modules are integrated into  
8 standard academic courses whereas CR courses are stand-alone core courses like English  
9 or Social Studies, with the subject instruction reflecting the history, experiences and  
10 culture of either African-American or Mexican-American communities. The purpose of  
11 having a multicultural curriculum is to create a positive and inclusive climate in classes  
12 and schools, build respect and understanding among students from different racial and  
13 ethnic backgrounds, and provide a range of opportunities to improve critical thinking and  
14 learning. The purpose of CR courses is to improve academic achievement; “[t]his  
15 curriculum is critically important to provide opportunities that enhance student  
16 learning.” (Stip. Action Plan (Doc. 1761) at 18 (citing Cabrera Report)).

17 The USP mandated CR courses to be developed and offered at all feasible grade  
18 levels in all high schools. The USP mandated a pilot program for expanding CR courses  
19 in the middle schools, 6-8<sup>th</sup> grades, and required the District to explore “similar  
20 expansions” throughout K-12 curriculum.

21 Subsequent to challenges of noncompliance from the Mendoza Plaintiffs to the  
22 District's CRC Action Plan, the two negotiated the Stipulated Action Plan, which was  
23 first an intervention “to ensure that by the start of the 2015 spring semester [SY 2014-15]  
24 at least one Culturally Relevant (CR) course” was being taught at five of the Districts  
25 high schools were no CR courses were available: Catalina, Palo Verde, Rincon, Sahuaro,  
26 and Santa Rita high schools. (Stip. Action Plan (Doc. 1761) at 7, 17.) From there, it  
27 provided a very specific “short term solution,” the 2015 Intervention Plan (SY 2015-16  
28 Intervention Plan), *id.*, at 7, 17-38, “pending completion of a comprehensive curriculum

1 framework [to] include additional expansion of CR classes in high school and middle  
2 school, as well as the piloting of CR units at the elementary school level,” *id.* at 7. The  
3 Stipulated Action Plan requires a comprehensive evaluation at the conclusion of SY  
4 2015-16 to determine future development and modification to the plan. *Id.* at 23. The  
5 2015-16 Comprehensive Plan is described as “a systemic approach to ensuring the  
6 implementation of CR courses as prescribed in the USP.” *Id.* at 7. It is this last step that is  
7 in question.

8         As stipulated, the SY 2015-16 Intervention Plan, included in the Stipulated Action  
9 Plan, clearly identifies the CRC curriculum for TUSD’s high schools as follows: 11-12<sup>th</sup>  
10 grades, English Language Arts (ELA) courses for African-American and Mexican-  
11 American Literature, 11<sup>th</sup> grade History courses from African-American and Mexican-  
12 American Viewpoints, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade Government from African-American and Mexican-  
13 American Perspectives. *Id.* at 24.

14         The middle school pilot program includes implementing in 2015-16, in all ten  
15 traditional middle schools, the following: 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA with 1<sup>st</sup> semester for Mexican-  
16 American literature and 2<sup>nd</sup> semester for African-American literature, with three Social  
17 Studies classes infused with a minimum of one designated section for historical  
18 perspectives of African Americans and Mexican Americans. For 2016-17, the pilot for 6-  
19 8 grades continues to be implemented for all 11 K-8 schools, as follows: 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA  
20 with 1<sup>st</sup> semester for Mexican-American literature and 2<sup>nd</sup> semester for African-American  
21 literature, with six Social Studies classes infused with a minimum of one designated  
22 section for historical perspectives of African Americans and Mexican Americans. *Id.* at  
23 24-26. Annual expansion continues in 2017-18, whether or not unitary status is attained,  
24 with continued growth and expansion being ongoing. *Id.* at 26.

25         The District’s elementary school pilot program commenced in 2015-16, with  
26 infusion modules reflecting experiences of Mexican Americans and African Americans  
27 for 5<sup>th</sup> grade ELA and Social Studies. *Id.* at 26-28. Annual expansion continues in 2017-  
28 18, whether or not unitary status is attained, with continued growth and expansion being

1 ongoing. *Id.* at 27.

2 The Special Master and the Mendoza Plaintiffs both criticize the District for its  
3 absolute and complete failure to implement, as planned, CR courses at Santa Rita High  
4 School. (Stip. Action Plan (Doc. 1761) at 23-24.) According to the Special Master, the  
5 Director of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Instruction (CRPI) met with Santa Rita  
6 staff and reported little interest in CRC. “The Director is working with the principal to  
7 identify capable CRC teachers at Santa Rita, which the Special Master believes ‘should  
8 result in greater student interest.’” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 59.) The Court finds  
9 that the Special Master’s better response is found in his recommendation: “[t]he District  
10 should establish two CR courses at Santa Rita High School during the 2018-19 school  
11 year,” including offering a course with an African-American perspective even though the  
12 course enrollment is lower than the minimum established for offering elective courses.  
13 (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second) at 25.) The Court adopts this recommendation.

14 As for the lack of CR courses at UHS, the Special Master acknowledged the  
15 District is working with the College Board to develop at least one CRC AP course. *Id.* at  
16 24. This issue is being addressed in the UHS section of the ALE Policy Manual.

17 To the extent the Mendoza Plaintiffs are complaining that the District has  
18 developed a number of courses, like “CR global issues” or “CR economics,” that do not  
19 fit the definition of CR courses provided for in the USP, the Special Master reports that  
20 he did not consider them in reporting that substantial progress has been made towards  
21 implementing the USP CRC provisions. The Court understands the Special Master’s  
22 attestation to be that he has only considered courses such as those identified in the 2015  
23 Intervention Plan to the Stipulated Action Plan.

24 The Fisher Plaintiffs argue that African-American CR courses should be  
25 eliminated, with the curriculum instead integrated into multicultural classes. (Fisher  
26 Response (Doc. 2100) at 7.) Fisher Plaintiffs assert the pilot infusion modules foster  
27 inclusion and integration. *Id.* Generally, the Fisher Plaintiffs complain that the Court  
28 lacks an interest in the African-American focused curriculum compared to having great

1 concern for Latino focused CRCs. The Fisher Plaintiffs, however, do not now nor have  
2 they previously sought redress for any such disparity and instead recommend abandoning  
3 CR courses entirely.

4 The Court finds confusion exists between integrated “multicultural curriculum”  
5 courses and CR courses, which has been compounded by the stipulated CR “infusion”  
6 pilot programs for middle school Social Studies courses and the elementary school  
7 programs. The Court is not using these terms loosely. As noted, USP § V.6.a.i. requires  
8 the District to integrate racially and ethnically diverse perspectives and experiences in  
9 academic courses, thereby, creating multicultural curriculum aimed at creating inclusive  
10 class environments while providing “a range of opportunities to improve critical thinking  
11 and learning skills.” Subsection ii requires CR courses of instruction reflecting either  
12 African-American or Mexican-American history, experiences, and culture to improve  
13 academic achievement and reduce the achievement gap. (Stip. Action Plan (Doc. 1761) at  
14 24-27.)

15 Perhaps in part due to this confusion, the Mendoza Plaintiffs challenge the District  
16 for implementing multicultural CRCs instead of CR courses, and the Special Master  
17 deferred recommending unitary status for multicultural curriculum CRCs. He prepared a  
18 Completion Plan requiring the District to report by August 2018 on the following: (1) the  
19 progress made in “infusing” multicultural content throughout the curriculum; (2) the  
20 process for review, curriculum modification and relevant professional development that  
21 ensures books and other hard copy or electronic materials are purchased for school-level  
22 libraries or as resource materials for LIRC,<sup>46</sup> and ensures those materials are selected  
23 with multicultural perspectives taken into consideration as a component of the selection  
24 process; (3) a schedule for “infusing” multicultural content to curriculum domains not yet  
25 revised, including reviewing the science curriculum during the current school year, and  
26 (4) the frequency with which review of curriculum is recurrently undertaken to determine

---

27  
28 <sup>46</sup> The Court guesses this acronym is: Learning and Information Resource  
Center (LIRC).

1 whether further infusion of multicultural content is warranted.

2 The Court adds that the District shall clarify whether infusion CRCs differ in any  
3 substantive way from integrated multicultural curriculum courses. If different in name  
4 only, the District shall determine whether any CR course options exist for middle school  
5 Social Studies and elementary school students or adopt multicultural curriculum as the  
6 best practicable strategy for delivering these CRCs.

7 The District shall issue this report by revising the Comprehensive Plan<sup>47</sup> to  
8 expressly include all CRCs, USP § V.E.6.i.-ii.: the CRC Comprehensive Plan.

9 When the Special Master withdrew his recommendation for unitary status he  
10 suggested the Court endorse an interim completion plan directing the parties to reevaluate  
11 provisions of the Stipulated Action Plan in hopes of ending further dispute over the  
12 original provisions. (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second) at 26.) The Court does not endorse  
13 revising the Stipulated Action Plan. Instead, the Court resolves the issues raised by the  
14 Mendoza Plaintiffs,<sup>48</sup> which in one way or another challenge the District's development  
15 and ongoing vetting of CRC courses.

16 The Mendoza Plaintiffs do not dispute that the number of CRC high school  
17 courses and CRC modules in other grades has grown steadily over the last three years.  
18 The number of students enrolled in high school courses is understated because many

---

19  
20 <sup>47</sup> The Court assumes the District prepared the Comprehensive Plan at the  
21 end of SY 2015-16. (Stipulated Action Plan (Doc. 1761) at 23.) In the event the  
22 District failed to prepare the Comprehensive Plan, the District shall immediately  
23 comply and prepare it in full accordance with this Order and the Stipulated Action  
24 Plan provisions, including measuring the effectiveness of CRC courses. *Id.* at 32.

25 <sup>48</sup> As a third issue, the Mendoza Plaintiffs complain that the District fails to  
26 present any evidence of progress for a Grow-Your-Own Program (GYOP) involving  
27 TUSD graduates at the University of Arizona (UofA). According to the Mendoza  
28 Plaintiffs, the National Panel recommended the District consider using this GYOP as a  
strategy for recruiting CRC teachers. This Court has already ordered the District to  
prepare a study, including review of the UofA GYOP for recruiting teachers. To be clear,  
the District shall report therein on whether it's work with the UofA has included  
developing a CRC path through university work and teacher preparation for TUSD's  
CRC graduates to return to the District as classroom CRC teachers. The study's efficacy  
assessments should include the UofA GYOP effectiveness to recruit CRC teachers. This  
issue shall be revisited in the context of the question of unitary status for USP § IV,  
Administrators and Certified Staff and appropriately cross-referenced.

1 students take more than one CR course, but the District only counts student enrollment  
2 once. The Special Master estimates that “the total enrollment in high school CRC has  
3 been about 2000 students over the last two years,” without counting multicultural courses  
4 or multiethnic<sup>49</sup> courses. He reports the number of students enrolled in middle school, 5-8  
5 grades, CRC infused modules doubled over the last two years. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
6 2096) at 50.)

7 The Mendoza Plaintiffs do not challenge these successes. Instead, they accuse the  
8 District of failing to establish the annual review, modification, and further development  
9 of CR courses, (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 40 (citing Stip. Action Plan (Doc.  
10 1761) at 31-32), and that there is no record reflecting that the panel of national experts  
11 (National Panel), commissioned by the District pursuant to the Stipulated Action Plan,  
12 “develop[ed] and vet[ted] curriculum materials on an on-going basis,” *id.* (citing (Stip.  
13 Action Plan (Doc. 1761) at 15). To the extent the Mendoza Plaintiffs are suggesting that  
14 the National Panel is responsible for “developing and vetting curriculum on an ongoing  
15 basis” in the context of “the relevant evaluation on an annual basis . . . to guide decision  
16 making for the continued expansion and potential modification to curriculum and  
17 program design,” the Court rejects this outright.

18 The Court sees no support for the assertion that the National Panel is responsible  
19 for developing and vetting CRC annually and/or for making decision for continued  
20 expansion and potential modification to CRCs and program design. It has always been  
21 the understanding of this Court, the Special Master, and the Parties, including the  
22 Mendoza Plaintiffs when previously arguing CRC noncompliance, that curriculum  
23 development, including CRC lessons, is a function of Itinerant Teachers with the primary  
24 burden for curriculum development belonging to Itinerant teachers. *See* (Mendoza  
25 Objection CRC R&R (Doc 1932) at 6) (describing multiple duties of Itinerent Teachers,  
26 including non-instructional duties to develop curriculum units for CR and non-CR  
27 courses throughout the year).

---

28 <sup>49</sup> This term is undefined and not found in the USP.



1           The Stipulated Action Plan, section for “Curriculum Development and  
2 Articulation” provides:

3           a cadre of experienced CR teachers and district staff will work on curricular  
4 and programmatic alignment. Identified district teachers with experience in  
5 CR instruction shall collaborate with CRPI staff to develop necessary  
6 curriculum for CR expansion for the following upcoming school  
7 year...[t]hey will be tasked with revision of the curriculum maps,  
development of CR lessons, ensuring vertical articulation of curriculum  
across grade levels, and general preparation for full implementation of this  
plan in the 2015-2016 SY.

8 (Stip. Action Plan (Doc 1761) at 22.) Further, “Mentor/Itinerant Teachers will develop  
9 extensive curricular units for courses at the middle school and high school level,” *id.*, and  
10 “continue to develop research-based, culturally relevant curriculum lessons throughout  
11 the year,” *id.* at 23. In the past, the concern has been the shortage of CR teachers,  
12 especially Itinerant Teachers, to effectively perform non-teaching CRC responsibilities so  
13 as to not dilute the planned intensity of the Itinerant Teacher model for implementing the  
14 CRC program. (Order (Doc. 1982) at 3 (taking a “wait and see” approach to District’s  
15 hiring 6 of the 12 CRC teachers recommended in Stipulated Action Plan).

16           Conversely to the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ argument, the “National Panel on Culturally  
17 Responsive Curriculum & Instruction 2016-2017,” attached to the 2016-17 DAR,  
18 provides that the National Panel is a group of renowned scholars, with diverse  
19 perspectives, working collaboratively with the District and the Special Master to provide  
20 guidance to the Department of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Instruction (CRPI) “in  
21 the development of culturally responsive and relevant curriculum and pedagogy.” The  
22 National Panel is commissioned to work three days’ time throughout the year, with its  
23 purpose being “to provide consultative guidance on the theoretical and practical  
24 application of culturally relevant & responsive, critical and multicultural education. . . .  
25 The expectation is that panel members will review general materials and be vocal  
26 advocates on a national level for the ongoing work being done within the District.”  
27 (DAR 2016-17, Appendix IV-77 (Doc 2060-5) at 57).

28

1           The Court finds that the National Panel serves as a resource to the District and  
2 develops and vets curriculum materials on an on-going basis, accordingly. Nothing in the  
3 Stipulated Action Plan changes the USP which mandates CRC to “be developed using the  
4 District’s curricular review process.” (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.E.6.i, ii.) The Court notes  
5 that the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ interpretation undermines the USP requirement that the  
6 District hire a Director of CRPI to “supervise the implementation of courses of  
7 instruction that focus on the cultural and historical experiences and perspectives of  
8 African American and Latino communities,” . . . who “shall have experience developing  
9 and teaching” CRC. *Id.* § E.4.c.

10           The Court rejects the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ request that the District be ordered to  
11 “promptly take action to expand membership on the National Panel to include  
12 practitioner experts who have taught ethnic studies courses at the high school level.”  
13 (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 41.) The Court will not order the District to “submit  
14 all CRC curriculum that has not been vetted by the National Panel . . . to that Panel for its  
15 review/vetting.” *Id.*

16           The Mendoza Plaintiffs also argue that “[i]n light of the recent federal court ruling  
17 that the State of Arizona may not enforce A.R.S. Section 15-112,<sup>50</sup> the District, assisted  
18 by members of the National Panel and/or other experts recommended by the Panel,  
19 should review the curriculum for all CRC courses to ensure that the existence of A.R.S. §  
20 15-112 and the potential threat of State enforcement thereof did not have a chilling effect  
21 on what has been included in that curriculum and shall revise the curriculum to the extent  
22 warranted.” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 41.) The Court reminds the Mendoza  
23 Plaintiffs of its ruling February 6, 2013, when it denied the State of Arizona’s request to  
24 intervene in this action to enforce A.R.S. § 15-112. Then and now, “the MAS courses,

---

25  
26  
27           <sup>50</sup> A school district is prohibited from including in its program of instruction any  
28 courses or classes that: 1) promote the overthrow of the United States government, 2)  
promote resentment toward a race or class of people, 3) are designed primarily for pupils  
of a particular ethnic group, or 4) advocate ethnic solidarity.

1 which were terminated subsequent to the administrative decision issued by the State that  
2 they violated A.R.S. § 15-112, are not at issue in this case.” (Order (Doc. 1436) at 14.)

3 The Court does, however, take judicial notice of *Acosta et al. v. Huppenthal et al.*,  
4 CV 10-623 TUC AWT, wherein the District challenged the constitutionality of the  
5 State’s preclusion of Mexican-American Studies (MAS) courses. The Court does so, not  
6 so much because the District ultimately prevailed, but because the District’s advocacy for  
7 these courses was unstoppable. TUSD was unflinching in its efforts to implement MAS  
8 courses, even in the face of serious opposition from the State Department of Education,  
9 and only terminated MAS courses when the Department threatened to cut the District’s  
10 funding. Beginning the case in 2010, the District appealed a preliminary decision that  
11 was only partially favorable, and ultimately prevailed at trial in 2017, obtaining a  
12 permanent injunction against the State from enforcing A.R.S. § 15-112 against TUSD.

13 The District created the MAS program in 1998 to further the objectives of the  
14 1978 Settlement Agreement entered in this case “to remedy existing effects of past  
15 discriminatory acts or policies.” (Order (Doc. 468) (CV 10-623 AWT TUC) at 2  
16 (quoting *Fisher v. TUSD*, 652 F.3d 1131, 1137 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2011)). “The [MAS] program  
17 included art, government, history, and literature courses at the kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup>  
18 grade levels, with each course focusing on historic and contemporary Mexican-American  
19 contributions. The concept of the program was to engage Mexican-American students by  
20 helping them see ‘themselves or their family or their community’ in their studies, and its  
21 purpose was to close the historic gap in academic achievement between Mexican-  
22 American and white students in Tucson.” *Id.* (trial testimony citations omitted). “At the  
23 high school level, the MAS courses were research-based, designed as college preparatory  
24 courses, and ‘used texts that are regarded as canonical in the fields of Ethnic studies and  
25 Mexican American Studies.’” *Id.* To the extent MAS courses differed from CRC  
26 courses,<sup>51</sup> the District has won the right to reinstate them.

---

27  
28 <sup>51</sup> An issue not litigated here or in CV 10-623 AWT TUC.

1 In CV 10-623 TUC AWT, the District presented evidence that in 2010-11, when  
2 the State banned the MAS courses, TUSD had 53,000 students, with 60% of TUSD  
3 students being Latino. Twenty-one MAS classes were offered that year at eight high  
4 schools and middle schools, with a total of 1,300 students enrolled and almost ninety  
5 percent of the MAS students were Latino. TUSD tracked certain measures of MAS  
6 student success, such as graduation rates, state standardized test passage rates, discipline  
7 rates and attendance rates. *Id.* at 3-4.

8 TUSD presented testimony:

9 that students in the program surpass[ed] and outperform[ed] similarly  
10 situated peers. TUSD presented evidence of a significant and positive  
11 relationship between taking MAS classes and increased academic  
12 achievement-- measured by increased high school graduation rates and  
13 increased AIMS-test passing rates for all students who took the courses, and  
14 in particular for Mexican-American students at TUSD. The more MAS  
15 classes a student took the greater the positive relationship, with the results  
16 being especially impressive because students electing to take MAS classes  
17 generally had extremely low academic performance prior to taking the  
18 courses.

19 *Id.*

20 The take-away for this Court is the clear record reflecting that the District has been  
21 a vanguard in implementing culturally relevant courses to close the achievement gap  
22 between minority students and White students, especially for Latino students. It has  
23 staunchly advocated for courses containing culturally relevant curriculum. It has  
24 demonstrated to the students and the TUSD community its commitment to this program.  
25 The Court finds that there is a long history of good-faith efforts to implement culturally  
26 relevant curriculum in TUSD, first with the MAS program and then through the CRC  
27 program adopted in the USP. The Court finds that judicial oversight is not necessary to  
28 ensure further development and growth of the CR courses.

Nevertheless, the Court does not award unitary status in part. The two CRC  
strategies, CR courses and multicultural curriculum, may be more fluid than suggested by  
USP § V.E.6.i-ii. The Stipulated Action Plan, including infusion CR courses, the  
Mendoza Plaintiffs' objections related to multicultural curriculum courses, and the  
Special Master's proposed Completion Plan lead the Court to clarify that there is one

1 strategy, which is CRC. Under the USP, CRC may be delivered through CR courses or  
2 multicultural courses. The Court rejects the Fisher Plaintiffs’ objection to CR courses  
3 because they jeopardize “racial harmony.” (Fisher Response (Doc. 2100) at 6)  
4 (complaining ethnic-based classes are counterproductive and against concept of inclusion  
5 and integration). This Court takes judicial notice of Judge Tashima’s conclusion that  
6 there is “no legitimate basis for believing that the MAS Program was promoting racism.”  
7 (Order (Doc. 468) (CV 10-623 AWT TUC) at 41.) The Court finds that CR courses do  
8 not jeopardize racial harmony. The Court finds that both strategies for implementing  
9 CRC shall be included in the CRC Comprehensive Plan, which shall make it clear when  
10 and why one strategy is used versus another. There shall be a priority for CR courses  
11 because of their track record to improve academic achievement and reduce the  
12 achievement gap. The CRC Comprehensive Plan shall include both subsections i and ii of  
13 § V.E.6.a, and the Completion Plan report recommended by the Special Master for  
14 subsection ii, multicultural curriculum, with the additions ordered by this Court.

15 Likewise, the Court finds that the Special Master’s Completion Plan  
16 recommendations for CRP shall be included in the CRC Comprehensive Plan. The Court  
17 rejects the Mendoza Plaintiffs’ request for a broad sweeping pedagogy plan for “all  
18 administrators and certified staff [and paraprofessionals] ...with training on how to create  
19 supportive and inclusive learning environments for African American and Latino students  
20 with an emphasis on curriculum, pedagogy, and cultural responsiveness.” (Mendoza  
21 Objections (Doc. 2101) at 39.) Pedagogy means the method of teaching, and the Special  
22 Master has appropriately aimed his Completion Plan at teachers. The CRC  
23 Comprehensive Plan shall reflect the District’s development of: (1) the teacher evaluation  
24 instrument used by TUSD, amended, to include culturally responsive pedagogy as an  
25 element of teacher proficiency; (2) training for administrators who evaluate teachers to  
26 be trained to evaluate teacher proficiency in culturally responsive pedagogy, including  
27 procedures for validating the capabilities of administrators to undertake such evaluation,  
28 and (3) teacher training which employs culturally responsive pedagogy as an integral part

1 of their training to implement the curriculum (e.g., teaching students to read through  
2 culturally responsive instruction).

3 For reasons explained later in this Order, the Court shall consider whether the  
4 District has implemented a Professional Learning Plan for CRP. The CRC  
5 Comprehensive Plan shall include a Professional Learning Plan to ensure implementation  
6 of CRP district-wide.

7 The CRC Comprehensive Plan shall be filed by the end of SY 2018-19 and trigger  
8 reconsideration of unitary status for the CRC program.

9 **d-3. Support Services for African-American and Latino students and**  
10 **Support for Parent and Community Participation**

11 The Court begins by noting the difference in the approach between the USP  
12 provision for academic and behavioral support for at-risk students, including African-  
13 American and Latino students, including ELL students, (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.E.2), and  
14 support services for African-American and Latino students, *id.* §§ V.E.7 and 8. Support  
15 services for at-risk students is overseen by a coordinator, the ABSC, who is responsible  
16 for implementing a plan to equitably provide academic and behavioral support programs  
17 and dropout prevention services, focusing on individualized assistance and mentoring to  
18 students, concentrating on school sites and in areas where student and school data  
19 indicate there is the greatest need to reduce the dropout rate and increase graduation rates.  
20 Within this context, strategies identifying African-American and Latino students,  
21 including ELL students, exist aimed at providing resources to accelerate and advance  
22 their learning such as: lowering grade retentions in grades 3 and 8, providing literacy  
23 programs, engaging language-appropriate social workers, health clinics, school staff,  
24 volunteers, etc., as necessary to assist in providing support for these students. (USP (Doc.  
25 1713) § V.E.2.)

26 In comparison, the USP § E.4.a-b provides for a Director for African-American  
27 Support Services (AASS) and a Director for Latino Student Support Services (MASS).  
28 The retention of the MASS acronym and the existence of two separate departments,

1 AASSD and MASSD, are holdovers from the original Mexican-American Studies and  
2 African-America Studies programs, which had their origins in the 1978 Settlement  
3 Agreement. Importantly, the Court notes that the USP does not require AASS or MASS  
4 departments. The Court assumed that with unitary status the structure for delivering  
5 support services to African-American and Latino students would look more like that  
6 being used to deliver support services for at-risk African-American and Latino students.

7 The USP § V.E.7 expressly requires support services aimed at promoting  
8 academic achievement for African-American students. The USP § V.E.8 provides the  
9 same for Latino students. Noticeably, there is duplication here in comparison to strategies  
10 being implemented by the ABSC coordinator in the context of support services for at-risk  
11 African-American and Latino students. *Compare* (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.E.2.b.i.III and  
12 V.E.7.b.-c, V.E.8.b.-c.) Noticeably, § 7, AASS, differs from § 8, MASS, by including a  
13 provision for a Task Force to be created in 2013, to consult with experts, to develop a  
14 research-based strategy for enhancing educational outcomes, including potential to  
15 reduce the achievement gap and improve academic educational outcomes, for African-  
16 American students. *Id.* § V.E.7.g-i. In comparison, § 8, MASS, provides for the  
17 implementation of specific strategies aimed at improving Latino student educational  
18 outcomes and to close the achievement gap, such as Arizona Department of Education  
19 Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS), *id.* § V.B, and Advancement  
20 Via Individual Determination (AVID), *id.* § V.E.8. And, there is the CRC USP  
21 requirement for CR courses. *See* (Reply (Doc. 2111) at 25) (recommending one of two  
22 CR courses at Santa Rita High School be an African-American perspective “even though  
23 the course enrollment is lower than the minimum established for offering elective  
24 courses”).

25 The Special Master does not recommend unitary status for African-American or  
26 Latino student support services. Instead he reports these two departments, AASSD and  
27 MASSD, cost approximately 1.5 million dollars a year without any concrete showing of  
28 benefit to either African-American or Latino students. Nevertheless, he reports an

1 unflagging adherence by the Plaintiffs to maintaining these departments in spite of the  
2 past, present, and anticipated future disagreement between the parties over the function of  
3 these departments. It has been clear to this Court since the inception of the USP that these  
4 two departments were as symbolic as they were substantive, especially given the  
5 duplication of efforts between each of the departments and between other District  
6 departments and other District operations. Like the Special Master, this Court would be  
7 remiss if it did not consider ending these departments as the natural consequences of  
8 attaining unitary status. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 56.)

9 The Special Master reports:

10 In January 2018, the District and the Fisher and Mendoza plaintiffs  
11 developed a completion plan for how these departments would function  
12 going forward. These plans provide very little information about how the  
13 departments will actually function. The plans basically retain the current  
14 staffing but appear to give some of the people different titles. The staff of  
15 the proposed departments have multiple and poorly defined functions in  
16 direct contradiction to recommendations made by the District in its  
17 evaluation of the efficacy of these departments.

18 *Id.* at 55-56.

19 The Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the Special Master's report of an agreement:  
20 "They are aware of no such plan," and they remain actively engaged with the District to  
21 develop a new plan for MASSD. (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 48.) The Fisher  
22 Plaintiffs are silent. In addition to his objection to the apparently nonexistent agreement,  
23 the Special Master recommends that the parties continue to meet to: identify activities to  
24 be performed by staff of the two departments and demonstrate how these activities are  
25 integral to the core functions of the District; specify the qualifications that members of  
26 the department staffs should have to perform specific functions and describe how staff  
27 with these qualifications can be recruited, trained and retained (e.g., current salary levels  
28 will not do it); convene a small panel of experts (no more than four people) to advise the  
District on effective practices for providing support services to African-American and  
Latino students, and no later than May 1, 2018, to submit a revised plan for AASSD and  
MASSD or an alternative. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 57.)



1           The Special Master recommends continued negotiation between the parties even  
2 though “[i]t would not be difficult to identify effective strategies for enhancing the  
3 achievement and social-emotional development of African-American and Latino  
4 students,” and even though the “District is already implementing some of the strategies.”  
5 *Id.* Further negotiations are needed according to the Special Master because of the  
6 contentious history between the parties over how to define and support effective ways to  
7 enhance the quality of education for African-American and Latino students. The Court  
8 disagrees. Party contentiousness is not a reason to implement or not implement a strategy.  
9 The USP calls for the District to determine whether effective support strategies exist, and  
10 if so to implement them and to operate the District to the extent practicable pursuant to  
11 effective strategies. The Special Master’s SMAR suggests that the District has evaluated  
12 the efficacy of the MASSD and AASSD and recommended changes. Such  
13 recommendations are appropriate, here, where the District has operated the student  
14 support services, pursuant to § § 7 and 8, for several years.

15           The District shall recommend an organizational and substantive plan for the post-  
16 unitary status delivery of student support services to African-American and Latino  
17 students, including ELL students, which shall: identify activities to be performed by staff  
18 of the two departments and demonstrate how these activities are integral to the core  
19 functions of the District, and specify the qualifications that members of the department  
20 staffs should have to perform including specific functions and describe how staff with  
21 these qualifications can be recruited, trained and retained (e.g., current salary levels will  
22 not do it). The District shall develop a Post-unitary Status Plan for AASS and MASS, and  
23 may convene a small panel of experts (no more than four people) to advise it regarding  
24 effective practices for providing support services to African-American and Latino  
25 students. The Court notes that student support services are an area where the District, for  
26 reasons explained later in this Order, will be held accountable for the effective use of the  
27 Evidence-Based Accountability System (EBAS). The Post-unitary Status Plan for AASS  
28 and MASS shall ensure the effective use of EBAS.

1           The District shall file the Post-unitary Status Plan for AASS and MASS, which  
2 shall trigger reconsideration of unitary status in respect to student support services for  
3 African-American and Latino students.

4 **e. Maintaining Inclusive School Environments: USP § V.F**

5           The USP § V.F prohibits the District from assigning students to classrooms and  
6 services in a manner that impedes desegregation. “The District shall review its referral,  
7 evaluation and placement policies and practices, as well as relevant disaggregated  
8 enrollment data, and shall take appropriate action to remedy any classroom assignment or  
9 placement of students that results in the racial or ethnic segregation of students.” (USP  
10 (Doc. 1713) § V.F.1.) The Mendoza Plaintiffs call for the District to demonstrate that it  
11 has reviewed “its referral, evaluation and placement policies and practices, as well as  
12 relevant disaggregated enrollment data, and shall take appropriate action to remedy any  
13 classroom assignment or placement of students that results in the racial or ethnic  
14 segregation of students.” (Mendoza Response (Doc. 2101) at 46 (quoting USP (Doc.  
15 1713) § V.F.a.) The District’s student assignment policies have been under scrutiny for  
16 the past three years, with DARs and SMARs filed every year. This year, the District filed  
17 the USP compliance report for every USP provision. The Mendoza Plaintiffs have access  
18 to disaggregated enrollment data and the power of discovery. Yet their objection leaves  
19 the Court guessing: is there a problem, and what is the problem? ELL programs segregate  
20 students; Dual Language programs segregate students. GATE programs, requiring  
21 cognitive testing, segregate students and sometimes create a racial composition in a  
22 GATE class that differs dramatically from the racial composition of the school, but still  
23 the racial composition of the GATE classroom is more integrated now than before the  
24 USP. Without more, the Court cannot identify a problem related to the District’s  
25 compliance with the USP and this USP provision.

26           The USP also requires the District to develop and maintain inclusive school  
27 environments as follows: 1) adopt inclusive, non-discriminatory policies for all District  
28 activities and disseminate them throughout the District; 2) pilot and implement strategies

1 to develop intercultural proficiency, and 3) amend policies, including JICFB, and  
2 practices to protect all members of the school communities from discriminatory  
3 harassment and bullying. The District shall require each school principal to develop  
4 strategies to highlight the historic and ongoing contributions of diverse ethnic, racial, and  
5 linguistic groups in a manner that is evident throughout each school, including public  
6 displays, classroom environments and libraries. (USP (Doc. 1713) § V.F.2.)

7 Many of these strategies have been discussed in the context of ALEs and CRCs  
8 because multicultural curriculums and creating environments of excellence serve the dual  
9 purpose of being strategies which highlight positive contributions from diversity. There is  
10 no assertion that principals have failed to publicly display positive portrayals of diversity  
11 in classrooms and school libraries. The Special Master proposes a Completion Plan  
12 requiring the District to compile a report of existing data from annual student and teacher  
13 surveys, which he believes should reflect whether students feel accepted by students of  
14 other races and by teachers or experience bullying or harassment. In the event the data  
15 reflects that levels of inclusiveness that need to be improved and/or that perceptions vary  
16 by race, the District shall identify remedial strategies and implement them during SY  
17 2018-19. The Special Master's Completion Plan enables the District to address issues on  
18 a school by school basis.

19 The Mendoza Plaintiffs call for more. They want the Special Master to review  
20 claims and investigations of alleged discriminatory harassment and/or bullying at school  
21 sites. They want him to review the Governing Board Policy JICK to ensure that staff  
22 persons responsible for investigating and responding to complaints have and are  
23 perceived by parents, students, and staff as having sufficient independence to effectively  
24 and fully perform this responsibility. Governing Board policies are public and available  
25 to the Mendoza Plaintiffs for them to review. Again, without more, the Court cannot  
26 identify any problem related to the District's compliance with this USP provision.

27 The Special Master's Completion Plan complies with the USP. He requires the  
28 District to provide the 3-year survey data by May 2018 and identify the strategies the

1 District has utilized to improve inclusive school environments, which shall be studied by  
2 the District in collaboration with the Special Master before the beginning of SY 2018-19,  
3 to determine the effectiveness of such strategies overall and/or by race, and to identify  
4 any additional strategies to improve inclusiveness. Depending on this analysis, the  
5 District shall report and implement in SY 2018-19 the planned strategies for maintaining  
6 and/or improving inclusiveness. For reasons explained later in this Order, the Court shall  
7 consider whether the District has implemented a Professional Learning Plan for these  
8 strategies aimed at creating cultures of civility.

9 The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance with the Completion  
10 Plan, including a Professional Learning Plan, which shall trigger reconsideration of  
11 unitary status.

## 12 **5. Discipline: USP § VI**

13 From its inception, this case challenged the District's disciplinary policies and  
14 practices as having a disparate effect on minority students, especially African-American  
15 students. It was addressed as a *Green* factor and expressly included in the 1978  
16 Settlement Agreement and again in the USP. "Disproportionality does not, in itself,  
17 demonstrate discrimination," (2016-17 SMAR (2096) at 60n.24), but it is a red-flag for  
18 when discrimination may exist. In 1978 and now, African-American students are  
19 disproportionately subject to disciplinary actions. Latino and White student suspension is  
20 not disproportionate to their respective percentage representations in the total student  
21 body. Latino students are 61% of the student population. White students are 20%.  
22 African-American students make up only 9% of TUSD's students. There is no  
23 explanation offered for why 10% of the total student population accounts for almost the  
24 same number of suspensions compared to White students, who make up approximately  
25 20% of the student population. In other words, African-American students are twice as  
26 likely to be suspended as White students. "Although, compared to national averages in  
27 other school districts, African-American students receive less disciplinary measures in  
28 TUSD." (TUSD Response (Doc. 2099) at 39.)

1 To be exact, in 2016-17: White students made up 21% of TUSD students, African-  
2 American students were 10%, and Latino students were 61% of TUSD students. White  
3 students made up 17% of in-school suspensions, African-American students were 18%,  
4 and Latino students were 55% of the students who were suspended in-school. White  
5 students were 17% of out-of-school long-term suspensions, African-American students  
6 were 19% and Latino students were 52% of out-of-school long-term suspensions. (2016-  
7 17 SMAR, Revised Discipline Report 11/14/2017 (Doc. 2096-10) at 4.)

8 The Court has no evidence that the level of disproportionality has decreased  
9 during or from the USP. According to the Special Master, “[t]he District is still finding its  
10 way in developing and implementing coherent policies and practices related to  
11 discipline.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 62.) The Court finds this is an  
12 understatement. There has actually been a retreat from initial steps forward. The number  
13 of in-school suspensions grew by about 28% between 2015-16 and 2016-17, but was  
14 obscured by the District changing the definition for exclusionary discipline. The Special  
15 Master could not rely on the District’s data reported in the 2016-17 DAR because it failed  
16 to use the definitions of disciplinary action in place in 2013-14, and he had to obtain  
17 relevant data by Requests for Information.

18 November 9, 2017, the Court issued an Order resolving this data reporting issue,  
19 which at that time the parties reported had been in dispute for over a year. First, the Court  
20 repeated its prior admonition that in the context of data gathering, the parties should and  
21 the Court would defer to the Special Master’s data gathering directives related to his data  
22 needs for monitoring the District’s progress under the USP. (Order (Doc 2087) at 4.)  
23 More to the point, the Court adopted the definition for exclusionary discipline as: “being  
24 removed from a regular classroom.” The Court rejected the District’s reclassification of  
25 in-school disciplinary interventions (ISI) as “not exclusionary.” *Id.* 4-5.

26 The Court issued its Order in response to the Special Master’s complaint that the  
27 District’s reclassification jeopardized compliance with the USP because it was difficult to  
28 correctly calculate the extent of declines in the amount of serious student misbehavior. *Id.*

1 at 5. He questioned a dramatic drop in the overall amount of disciplinary actions between  
2 2014-15 and 2015-16, with a big change for in-school suspensions which dropped by  
3 78% and long-term suspensions which dropped over 50%. He attributed the drops in part  
4 to the District's change in the Guidelines for Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR)  
5 that allowed the introduction in 2015 of the in-school District Alternative Educational  
6 Program (DAEP) for disciplinary offenses that previously would have required out-of-  
7 school suspension. The Court commended the District on DAEP, but held that the  
8 District went too far in its quest to reduce out-of-school suspensions when it classified  
9 long-term placement of a student in DAEP as a school transfer and not as an exclusionary  
10 removal of a student from classroom instruction. *Id.* at 6. The difficulty now in assessing  
11 the effectiveness of the disciplinary strategies rests on the District's definitional-  
12 programmatic change in 2015 and stubborn adherence to it, even in the face of the  
13 Special Master's directive and this Court's Order to discontinue it.

14 In the USP, "the Parties acknowledge that the administration of student discipline  
15 can result in unlawful discrimination when students are disproportionately impacted or  
16 treated differently by virtue of their race or ethnicity" and "acknowledge that the punitive  
17 use of serious disciplinary sanctions for low-level offenses creates the potential for  
18 negative educational and long-term outcomes for affected students." (USP (Doc. 1713) §  
19 VI.A.1.) To redress these realities, the USP requires the District to consider its student  
20 behavior policies and discipline practices in the context of its overall goal of creating  
21 inclusive and supportive school environments. *Id.* § VI.A.2. The USP requires the  
22 District to "commit to ensuring that students remain as often as practicable in the  
23 classroom settings where learning happens" by devising a variety of graduated positive  
24 behavior techniques to be used based on the student behavior at issue with the goal being  
25 "to prevent students from being excluded for any amount of time from the classroom or  
26 school." *Id.* "The District shall reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the administration  
27 of school discipline." *Id.*

28 The USP provides for two comprehensive, school-wide approaches to classroom

1 management and student behavior: Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior  
2 Intervention and Supports (PBIS). Correspondingly, the USP required the District to  
3 evaluate and revise its Guidelines for Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR) to:

- 4 (i) limit exclusionary consequences to instances in which student  
5 misbehavior is ongoing and escalating, and the District has first attempted  
6 and documented the types of intervention(s) used in PBIS and/or  
7 Restorative Practices, as appropriate; (ii) require the administration of  
8 consequences that are non-discriminatory, fair, age-appropriate, and  
9 correspond to the severity of the student’s misbehavior; (iii) require that  
10 consequences are paired with meaningful instruction and supportive  
guidance (e.g., constructive feedback and reteaching) to offer students an  
opportunity to learn from their behavior and continue to participate in the  
school community; and (iv) require that law enforcement officers, including  
School Resource Officers, School Safety Officers, and other law  
enforcement and security personnel who interact with students, are not  
involved in low-level student discipline.

11 *Id.* § VI.2.a. Likewise, the USP requires the District to monitor disciplinary data, analyze  
12 it, and develop corrective action plans “to ensure that exclusionary discipline  
13 consequences are not meted out in a manner that impermissibly targets or has a disparate  
14 effect on students of a particular race or ethnicity.” *Id.* § VI.F.2.

15 The Court finds that the USP is designed to create a disciplinary program that if  
16 implemented and staunchly adhered to will reduce exclusionary discipline, thereby  
17 reducing disproportionality. And disproportionality, if discovered, will trigger corrective  
18 action plans whenever possible. The Court asks: What are the corrective action plans, if  
19 any exist, for African-American students who are disproportionately affected by  
20 exclusionary discipline? *See* USP § VI.B.2.a.(iii) (requiring consequences be paired with  
21 meaningful instruction and supportive guidance so students learn from their behavior and  
22 continue to participate in the school community).

23 The Special Master does not recommend unitary status because: there has been a  
24 “reversal of progress with respect to in-school suspensions during the 16-17 school year;”  
25 the fact that the District has made only modest improvement in out-of-school  
26 suspensions, and the persistence of disproportionality in suspensions between White and  
27 African-American students. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 63.)

28 The Special Master reports specific road blocks to unitary status, as follows:

1 In its Annual Report, the District describes processes for problem solving  
2 and communication, but staff interviews and reports from the Special  
3 Master's Implementation Committee, who tour the schools, indicate that  
the processes described in the DAR are not being reliably implemented  
throughout the District.

4 There is no way to identify what issues confront which schools or what has  
5 been done to address identified problems and to ascertain whether different  
strategies are more effective than others.

6 There is no way to ensure that the different offices involved in discipline  
7 are working collaboratively and systematically, and with the exception of  
8 the Coordinator of Discipline, all of the key central office personnel who  
9 are involved in addressing important disciplinary problems have other  
important roles so that the allocation of their time to discipline issues is  
potentially problematic.

10 Implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) is  
11 fundamental to reducing discipline issues and creating positive learning  
12 environments free from disciplinary disruption, but the District did not  
13 provide principals with a protocol for evaluating progress made at the  
14 school level with PBIS until the end of SY 2015-16.

15 The District couples PBIS with "Restorative Practice" as two strategies, but  
16 Restorative Practice is a strategy to be used with PBIS, not a separate  
17 strategy.

18 Principals are accountable for implementing PBIS, and report on the  
19 effectiveness of PBIS at their schools, but there is no regularly scheduled  
20 process for monitoring the accuracy of these reports, and there is evidence  
21 that effective implementation varies noticeably from school to school.

22 Training for principals, who are responsible for implementing PBIS, is  
23 woefully insufficient, dealing mainly with administrative matters such as  
24 data resources and data gathering, and some bias-training which does little  
25 to address how to deal with students who violate school disciplinary  
26 policies. Instead, principals need training to enable them to confront the  
27 challenges involved in bringing about changes in the school culture or how  
28 to manage difficult disciplinary situations that threaten school safety. An  
effective PBIS program depends on substantial professional development  
for principals but the District's Annual Report does not indicate any  
training for individual principals.

The District uses "walk-throughs" by District personnel who have  
responsibility for oversight of PBIS implementation at multiple schools, but  
there is no on-going analysis of reports on these walk-throughs.

If TUSD central office review of data from individual schools sets off  
alarms that there are problems with respect to the administration of  
disciplinary policies and practices, the schools involved are asked to  
prepare Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), but there is no continuity in these  
reports and some are nothing more than assertions to do better.

Responses to student and teacher surveys indicate that discipline problems  
persist in many schools, staff at several schools indicated that staff and



1 students do not feel safe at school, bullying and harassment are not  
2 uncommon, and report principals are not fair or consistent.

3 IC interactions with teachers indicate a frequent lack of understanding  
4 regarding disciplinary practices, the GSRR, PBIS and Restorative Practices.

5 The TUSD Superintendent has reported to the Governing Board that  
6 training for PBIS and Restorative Practices is inadequate and requires  
7 additional investment.

8 Administrators receive “Fred Jones” training which contradicts the  
9 premises of PBIS and Restorative Practices.

10 In SY 2016-17, the District’s handling of fighting as an immediate  
11 suspension violated the GSRR, which it has suspended but now there is  
12 evidence that in some schools routine fights are being mischaracterized as  
13 assaults to justify suspension under the GSRR.

14 In short, the USP includes extensive professional development provisions to  
15 ensure that the disciplinary procedures and the positive behavioral models are being used  
16 by administrators and teachers in its schools. (USP (Doc. 1713) § E.) The Special Master  
17 reports that “there is insufficient evidence to be confident that the District has put in place  
18 processes and developed the capabilities of key actors that will enable the District to  
19 make progress in the future to reduce levels of discipline, especially that which involves  
20 suspensions, and further reduce the disproportionality in disciplinary actions involving  
21 African-American students.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2069) at 63.) In other words, the  
22 evidence reflects that on a school-by-school basis there is a varied degree of effective  
23 implementation of the disciplinary strategies developed pursuant to the USP.

24 The Mendoza Plaintiffs object to the Special Master’s failure to point out that in-  
25 school suspensions are underrepresented because the District counts the number of  
26 students suspended, not the number of suspensions. In other words, the District counts  
27 one in-house suspension for a student that may receive multiple in-house suspensions.<sup>52</sup>  
28 The Special Master agrees this compounded the difficulty he had correctly calculating

---

<sup>52</sup> The Fisher Plaintiffs are confusingly silent on the subject of discipline. They offer this: “Forty years of futility on deseg efforts and after billions of dollars of deseg funds were spent, African-American children are still last, not closing the achievement gap, and disproportionately suspended from classes.” (Fisher Response (Doc. 2100) at 8.)

1 whether the number of suspensions had increased or decreased. He amends his  
2 Completion Plan recommendations, accordingly.

3 The breadth of the Special Master’s Completion Plan is telling in respect to the  
4 progress or lack thereof made under the USP, § VI: Discipline. The amended Completion  
5 Plan is as follows:

6 By the beginning of SY 2018-19, the District shall take the following steps:

7 A. Data on student offenses and responses to them shall use measures  
8 that were in place in 2013-14 to ensure that trends can be accurately  
9 assessed and distinctions between types / actions that respond to student  
10 misbehavior are clear.<sup>53</sup> The District shall report such discipline data both  
11 by number of each type of disciplinary consequence imposed and by  
12 number of students receiving each type of disciplinary consequence. Data  
13 should include students with multiple infractions to avoid any miscount of  
14 the degree of discipline difficulties.

15 B. Teachers, principals and others shall have easy access to information  
16 about how best to deal with particular offenses as defined by the GSRR.  
17 Such information shall be available in real time (e.g., online), and be based  
18 on research in other districts and effective practices identified within  
19 TUSD. Such information could include name of individual teachers and  
20 other professional personnel who have demonstrated relevant expertise and  
21 be willing to provide peer support.

22 C. The District shall hire or designate an individual “Director of  
23 Discipline” whose sole focus is the implementation of discipline-related  
24 desegregation efforts. (The Office of the Director of Discipline shall be  
25 staffed with full-time personnel sufficient to:

26 1. Analyze school level data, including all data the District is  
27 required to collect and analyze under USP Section VI.F.2,  
28 and bring any issues warranting investigation or remediation  
to the attention of the chief academic officer of the District.

2. Review schools' use of exclusionary discipline to ensure  
that it is fair and equitable and complies with the GSRR,  
including ensuring that exclusionary discipline is not  
inappropriately used for low-level incidents involving  
physical aggression (including “fights” that do not lead to  
significant injury) and that catch-all offenses such as  
“disorderly conduct” and “other aggression” are not used to  
improperly impose exclusionary discipline.

3. Provide technical assistance to school level personnel.

---

<sup>53</sup> The Court has no intention of issuing this directive a 3<sup>rd</sup> time, without there being consequences for the failure to comply with it. *See* (Order (Doc. 2087) at 7.)

1 4. Contribute to the design of professional development that  
2 focuses on handling potential disciplinary problems at the  
3 classroom level and that recognizes that disciplinary problems  
4 are often related to the need for improved instruction.

5 5. Assist schools in developing corrective action plans  
6 (“CAPs”), review CAPs for consistency and efficacy, monitor  
7 the implementation of CAPs monthly, suggest modification  
8 or support as needed, and track any improvements resulting  
9 from the implementation of CAPs.

10 6. Conduct and monitor site-level walkthroughs of PBIS  
11 implementation and conduct follow-up in an effort to make  
12 PBIS implementation across schools consistent and effective.

13 D. The Coordinator of Discipline shall report to the chief academic  
14 officer for the District.

15 E. The process for dealing with hotspots and high visibility problems  
16 shall be streamlined. It shall not be necessary to regularly convene meetings  
17 of central office staff who have other responsibilities than discipline in  
18 order to determine how best to address challenges.

19 F. For any student offered a DAEP placement, the District will include  
20 any days suspended prior to the DAEP placement in calculating the length  
21 of the DAEP placement offered the student will not exceed the number of  
22 days issued for the suspension.

23 The Court adopts this Completion Plan in full, including its deadline. The Court  
24 adds that the District shall comply with §§ VI.B.2a.(iii), F.2 and develop corrective action  
25 plans either on a case by case basis or district-wide to address the consequences of  
26 exclusionary discipline which is disproportionately experienced by African-American  
27 students, and ensure implementation of these action plans.

28 The Court adopts the Completion Plan provisions recommended by the Mendoza  
29 Plaintiffs, as follows:

30 1. The District shall institute a process to regularly assess that teachers have  
31 an understanding of District disciplinary practices, the GSRR, PBIS, and restorative  
32 practices.

33 2. The District shall regularly review and assess the accuracy of reports by  
34 principals relating to the use of PBIS and to ensure that they are using the District’s  
35 protocol for evaluating progress with PBIS at the school level.

1 The Court adds that the District shall develop practices and procedures to ensure  
2 that the disciplinary program designed by the USP is implemented, and buy-in is being  
3 promoted, now and in the future, by the District in its schools, by its principals and  
4 teachers. For reasons explained later in this Order, the District shall be held accountable  
5 for the effective use by principals and teachers of the Evidence-Based Accountability  
6 System (EBAS) data related to discipline. Likewise, for reasons explained later in this  
7 Order, the Court shall consider whether the District has implemented a Professional  
8 Learning Plan for USP § VI strategies to ensure the discipline strategies are uniformly  
9 used by teachers and principals district-wide.

10 The Court notes that the Special Master's Completion Plan, the Mendoza  
11 Plaintiffs' recommendations, and this Court's concerns are the same: the effective use of  
12 EBAS and the USP disciplinary strategies designed to reduce the negative effects of  
13 discipline to address the issue of disproportionality, especially for African-American  
14 students.

15 The District shall make attaining unitary status in discipline, pursuant to USP §  
16 VI, a top priority. The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance at the end of  
17 SY 2018-19, including a detailed progress report specifically addressing each provision  
18 of the Completion Plan and a Professional Learning Plan. The Notice of Compliance  
19 shall trigger reconsideration of unitary status for USP § VI, Discipline.

20 **6. Family and Community Engagement: USP § VII**

21 A major component of the USP is § VII, Family and Community Engagement,  
22 which stretches across the USP, especially the outreach provisions for § II, Student  
23 Assignment; § V, Quality of Education, and § VI, Discipline. In short, Family and  
24 Community Engagement is a multi-provision, multi-departmental program. The breadth  
25 of the program is both its strength and weakness.

26 The USP requires the District to adopt strategies to increase family and  
27 community engagement in schools, including developing and implementing an outreach  
28 plan to families, providing information to families about available services, programs and

1 courses of instruction, learning from families how best to meet the needs of their  
2 children, and collaborating with local colleges and universities and community groups to  
3 provide information and guidance designed to improve the educational outcomes of  
4 African-American and Latino students, including ELL students, and providing relevant  
5 information to their families. (USP (Doc. 1713) § VII.A.1.)

6 The USP requires the District to develop and implement the Family and  
7 Community Engagement Services, District Family Center Plan. (USP § VII.C.1.) The  
8 USP calls for the District to hire or designate a District Office employee to be the Family  
9 Engagement coordinator (FEC), located at a Family Center, and to be responsible for  
10 reviewing and assessing the District's existing family and engagement and support  
11 programs, resources, and practices, focusing on African-American and Latino students,  
12 including ELL students, and families, particularly students struggling, disengaged, and/or  
13 at risk of dropping out, to participate in the development and implementation of the  
14 outreach and recruitment plan. *Id.* § VII.B.1. When the USP was drafted, the District  
15 operated two Family Centers and the AASD and MASSD. The USP called for a Family  
16 and Engagement Plan to reorganize family engagement resources for an effective  
17 delivery system by increasing Family Center services to ensure equitable access to these  
18 programs and to concentrate the programs at school sites as indicated based on need. *Id.* §  
19 VII.C.d.

20 All parties agree staff assignments were made, the program assessments were  
21 made, and these efforts resulted in the Revised Family and Community Engagement Plan,  
22 (FACE Action Plan), dated September 26, 2014, including: the Plan to Reorganize and/or  
23 Increase Family Engagement Resources and the Plan to Expand and Develop New  
24 Student Service and Partnership Centers. The first plan focuses on school-site programs,  
25 resources and practices, and the latter focuses on programs, resources and practices at the  
26 Family Centers. It is undisputed that the District opened two more Family Centers, which  
27 provide computer access for family engagement, distribute comprehensive information  
28 on all the USP student service programs, and provide translation and interpretation

1 services. (TUSD Response (Doc. 2099) (citing 2016-17 DAR (Doc. 2075-7) at 4-4-6, 11-  
2 21, 27-48).

3 The question of unitary status hinges on the implementation and effectiveness of  
4 the FACE Action Plan, which includes both school-site and Family Center programs,  
5 resources and practices to create learning-centric family engagement and support  
6 opportunities. First, the Special Master considers “learning-centric” an ill-defined term.  
7 (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2069) at 67.) The Court does not agree. Under the FACE Action  
8 Plan, family engagement is not simply parental involvement, but must be a learning-  
9 centric engagement strategy informing parents about student learning and the parent’s  
10 role in their student’s success. (FACE Action Plan (Doc. 2101-2) at 101.) In other words,  
11 it is not a school social event or any school activity attended by parents, like a student  
12 concert or play.<sup>54</sup> As noted in the FACE Action Plan, often student engagement at  
13 District schools is limited to parental involvement activities, not strategies to support  
14 learning. *Id.*

15 The FACE Action Plan identified as a problem the District’s heavy reliance on  
16 Title 1 and Student Support Services provided by AASD and MASSD to provide parent  
17 education opportunities, without any district-wide coordination or comprehensive  
18 strategy. *Id.* at 101-102. The FACE Action Plan prioritized a need for the District to have  
19 a district-wide family engagement vision, and recognized that to effectively promote it  
20 the District would have to create a cross-departmental infrastructure with some kind of  
21 cohesive staffing plan to ensure coordination of efforts, continuous quality improvement,  
22 and effective service delivery. The FACE Action Plan administrative scheme includes the  
23 Assistant Superintendent for Equity, supervising the Director of Family and Community  
24 Engagement, supervising the FEC, with the Director and FEC working closely with the  
25 Directors of AASD and MASSD, Title 1 and other departments.

---

27  
28 <sup>54</sup> To be clear, data reporting for family and community engagement shall  
not include family involvement; family engagement must facilitate student  
learning or be training of family leaders for schools.

1           The Court has opened the door for the District to reassess its reliance on AASD  
2 and MASSD, and consequently there may need to be a revision of the District’s reliance  
3 on AASD and MASSD as direct providers of family and community engagement  
4 services. Effective coordination of services shall be addressed in the context of any  
5 proposed changes from the District in the roles and responsibilities for AASS and MASS  
6 under USP § V.E.7 and 8.

7           The FACE Action Plan makes the Director of Family and Community  
8 Engagement responsible for the district-wide coordination of family engagement  
9 activities. (FACE Action Plan at 102.) However, the SMAR makes it clear that the  
10 effectiveness of the FACE Action Plan at school sites is the responsibility of school  
11 principals, but the FEC “is not in a position to hold school leaders accountable or to  
12 direct them to engage in improvements.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 69.) The  
13 Special Master recommends that the District make it clear that “responsibility for  
14 overseeing implementation of school-level strategies for family engagement rests  
15 primarily with the principal, and oversight of principals’ efforts in implementing family  
16 engagement strategies is the responsibility of District supervisors-- assumedly the  
17 Director of Family and Community Engagement or the Assistant Superintendent for  
18 Equity. If not, the District shall propose an administrative structure that can effectively  
19 ensure buy-in from principals<sup>55</sup> and teachers to implement the FACE Action Plan.

20           In the SMAR, the Special Master finds that the District has complied with the  
21 FACE Action Plan for Family Centers but not for school sites. *See* (2016-17 DAR RAC  
22 (Doc. 2075-7) at 1-56.) Following objections from the Mendoza Plaintiffs,<sup>56</sup> the Special  
23 Master agrees that the District’s data tracking for family engagement has been

---

24  
25 <sup>55</sup> The data review for family and community engagement efforts at schools  
26 reflects “a significant number of school principals did not even file the requisite  
27 reports for on-site family and community engagement activities. *See* (Mendoza  
Response, Ex. 21 (reflecting 23 reports complete out of 77 schools, with  
remainder needing updates or missing.)

28 <sup>56</sup> The Court is not persuaded that missing survey data would preclude  
unitary status; substantive research-based strategies shall inform District priorities.  
(Reply (Doc. 2111) at 37.)

1 insufficient for both school-site and Family Center activities. He reports that in SY 2018-  
2 19, the District initiated a more robust approach to gathering data on family engagement,  
3 and the District has engaged a national expert at Johns Hopkins University to provide  
4 services to schools for the development of effective family engagement strategies.<sup>57</sup>  
5 (Reply (Doc. 2111) at 37-38.) These two actions by the District address both reasons for  
6 not granting unitary status for § VII, Family and Community Engagement.

7 The Special Master points out that the most effective strategies for addressing  
8 education-related issues “occur at the school-level where families have a greater  
9 incentive to be involved in the pursuit of strategies to enhance the learning opportunities  
10 and outcomes of their own children.” *Id.* at 38. The Court finds that the District shall task  
11 the expert with developing district-wide guidelines for fostering family engagement at the  
12 school level, including strategies which enable teachers to learn from families how best to  
13 meet the needs of their students and strategies which enable parents to participate  
14 meaningfully in school plans and activities. The District shall provide professional  
15 development for principals, assistant principals, and teachers to implement these  
16 strategies. District supervisors, who are responsible for overseeing principals’  
17 performance, shall oversee implementation by principals of the strategies developed as a  
18 result of the expert’s work with the District.

19 The Court finds that the only remaining question relevant to awarding unitary  
20 status for VII, Family and Community Engagement, is the implementation of a district-  
21 wide strategy for family and community engagement services at school-sites and an  
22 effective data gathering and tracking program. Subsequent to the conclusion of the  
23 expert’s work, the District shall file an update to the FACE Action Plan, reflecting the  
24 directives contained in this Order and cross-referencing as appropriate the District’s Post-  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>57</sup> The Court directs that the expert consider the Special Master’s concern  
28 that the Academic Parent-Teacher Teams (APTT) is not a two-way family-teacher  
information sharing strategy and that Supportive and Inclusive Learning (SAIL) is  
an effective strategy for schools, not Family Centers. (2016-17 SMAR (Doc.  
2096) at 68.)



1 unitary Status AASS or MASS Plan as relevant. The filing of the Updated FACE Action  
2 Plan will trigger reconsideration of unitary status for the USP VII.

3 **7. Extracurricular Activities: USP § VIII**

4 The Special Master recommends deferring the unitary status analysis for extra-  
5 curricular activities until additional information is gathered and analyzed. He reports that  
6 he is unable to make school-level participation comparisons, particularly between  
7 Racially Concentrated and Integrated schools, which are necessary to determine parity, or  
8 a lack thereof. The District changed the data components to develop a more  
9 comprehensive approach to assessing participation, but this created difficulty in  
10 comparing year-to-year data. Two years of like-participation data is needed to determine  
11 whether the District has effectively addressed parity. In short, the current data is for one  
12 year and it is not possible to determine whether the District has met its responsibilities  
13 with respect to extracurricular activities until adequate data is available. He proposes a  
14 Completion Plan to attain unitary status, including the development of procedures and  
15 formats for data gathering, its analysis, and if necessary, development of remedial  
16 strategies. The Mendoza Plaintiffs agree that the Completion Plan will result in unitary  
17 status for USP § VIII.

18 The Completion Plan is as follows:

- 19 1. The District shall revise its reporting on extracurricular activities to  
20 include all such activities clearly delineating which are funded by parents,  
21 the community, the District, or other sources outside the District including  
22 the 21 Century or similar grants.
- 23 2. Data shall be reported by grade structure and race of student  
24 participants in extracurricular activities.
- 25 3. By September 2018, the District shall conduct the study of  
26 participation in its schools with particular attention to racially concentrated  
27 schools and those schools at which Anglo student enrollment exceeds 25%.  
28 If disparities exist, the District should explain the reasons for these and  
identify strategies for eliminating them, if practicable.
4. By August 30, 2018, the District shall have put in place and  
implemented a process by which principals are responsible for reviewing  
the extent to which extracurricular activities at their schools are providing  
opportunities for interracial contact and positive settings of shared interest  
as mandated by the USP. The District shall analyze the array of  
extracurricular activities occurring in the schools and identify those that

1 provide opportunities for interracial contact and positive settings of shared  
2 interest, and if necessary develop remedial strategies to ensure such  
opportunities are occurring in each school.

3 5. By January SY 2018-19, the District shall implement any strategies  
4 identified for eliminating disparities in extracurricular activities between  
schools and/or for extracurricular activities to afford opportunities for  
5 interracial contact and positive settings of shared interests.

6 At the end of SY 2018-19, the District shall file a Notice and Report of  
7 Compliance for USP § VIII.

### 8 **8. Facilities and Technology: USP § IX**

9 The District developed two indexes: 1) the Facilities Conditions Index (FCI),  
10 which includes an Educational Suitability Score (ESS), and 2) the Technology Conditions  
11 Index (TCI). The District conducts a biannual review of both and uses these measures as  
12 decision-making tools, respectively, for capital expenditures pursuant to the Multi-Year  
Facilities Plan and Multi-Year Technology Plan, respectively.

13 The FCI tracks such things as classroom capacity and utilization, portable  
14 classrooms, heating and cooling systems, playgrounds libraries, textbooks, special  
15 facilities like laboratories and gymnasiums, capacity and use of cafeteria, fire and safety  
16 conditions, and asbestos abatement. The multi-year plan for facility repairs and  
17 improvements, places a priority on facility conditions that impact health and safety, and  
18 then Racially Concentrated Schools that score below 2.5. (USP (Doc. 1713) § IX.A.1.)

19 The TCI tracks student access to computers and other learning devices like smart  
20 boards, availability of wireless and broadband internet in a school, research-based  
21 educational software and courseware, and teacher proficiency in facilitating student  
22 learning with technology. *Id.* § IX.B1.

#### 23 **a. Facilities**

24 The Special Master reports that the Indexes were completed and filed with the  
25 Court on February 27, 2015, and that same school year, the District without notice or  
26 input from the Parties or Special Master changed the FCI Index. As noted by the  
27 Mendoza Plaintiffs, on November 9, 2017, this Court ordered the District to return to the  
28

1 original FCI formula so that the Special Master’s unitary status assessment would be  
2 made pursuant to the original FCI. (Order (Doc. 2087) at 8.) This did not happen.

3 According to the “altered” FCI and ESS measures, the Special Master finds no  
4 evidence that Racially Concentrated schools have lower scores than non-racially  
5 concentrated schools. He reports that the Implementation Committee, all experienced  
6 educators, visited sample District schools to rate the facilities and their rating closely  
7 aligned with the District’s altered FCI scores. The Special Master recommends that upon  
8 recalculating the FCI scores using the originally agreed to criteria, and assuming those  
9 scores demonstrate that Racially Concentrated schools do not have lower FCI scores than  
10 those of non-racially concentrated schools, the District shall have attained unitary status.  
11 The Mendoza Plaintiffs agree, but ask that prior to awarding unitary status, the Court  
12 require the recalculation to be based on the most recent FCI data. The Court agrees.

13 According to the Special Master’s Completion Plan, by the beginning of SY 2018-  
14 19, the District will submit its revisions, including the most recent FCI data, for the  
15 Special Master’s review. The Special Master shall file a Notice and Report of  
16 Compliance with the Court, triggering an award of unitary status for USP § IX.A.

17 **b. Technology**

18 The Mendoza Plaintiffs, the District, and the Special Master agree that recent  
19 investments in technology with priority for Racially Concentrated schools increased  
20 demand for internet service, especially at these schools. The Court assumes the Parties  
21 have proceeded pursuant to the proposed expedited review and revision process  
22 suggested by the Mendoza Plaintiffs for revising the TCI to include internet access.  
23 Previously, it was not included in the TCI because all schools had the same level of  
24 connectivity. The District shall review the updated TCI, and to the extent inadequate  
25 internet speeds disproportionately affect Racially Concentrated schools, the District shall  
26 develop a plan for correcting the disproportionality by the end of SY 2018-19, and submit  
27 the plan for the Special Master’s review and recommendation for unitary status.

28

1           The Special Master recommends that the Court retain jurisdiction for USP §  
2 IX.B.1.iv. and B.4 “teacher proficiency in facilitating student learning with technology.”  
3 For reasons explained later in this Order, the Court retains jurisdiction here to ensure that  
4 the District has implemented a Professional Learning Plan to ensure teacher proficiency  
5 in using technology to facilitate student learning.

6           The Special Master shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance with the Court,  
7 triggering an award of unitary status for § IX.B, except for teacher proficiency in using  
8 technology to facilitate student learning. The District shall seek reconsideration of USP  
9 IX.B.1.iv and IX.B.4 by filing a Notice and Report of Compliance: Professional Learning  
10 Plan.

11                           **9. Accountability and Transparency: USP § X**

12           **a. Evidence Based Accountability**

13           According to the Special Master, “[a] core concept that is essential to the success  
14 of TUSD going forward is that decision-making will be driven by collaborative evidence-  
15 based problem solving.” (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 76.) He refers to the USP § X,  
16 Accountability and Transparency, the express provision that the District create a system  
17 to be known as: the Evidence-Based Accountability System (EBAS). The USP requires  
18 the EBAS data system to be capable of tracking individual student demographics,  
19 academic and behavioral data pursuant to requirements set forth in an Appendix A to the  
20 USP, running reports for tracking personnel data and information, and automatically  
21 producing alerts, flags, and other programmed signals to indicate when students do not  
22 meet pre-determined goals or expectations for academic performance or behavioral  
23 concerns. (USP (Doc. 1713) § X.A.2.) The purpose of EBAS is to “review program  
24 effectiveness and ensure that, to the extent practicable, program changes address racial  
25 segregation and improving the academic performance and quality of education for  
26 African American and Latino students, including ELLs.” *Id.* § X.1.

27           The District reports that in 2014, it purchased Synergy and added an application,  
28 Clarity, to support the USP requirement for automatic flagging of at-risk students and for

1 tracking interventions. Clarity involves two modules, the Early Warning Module (EWM)  
2 and the Intervention Module (IM). Clarity also provides current national research-based  
3 suggestions for administrators and facilitators of interventions to address high-risk areas  
4 of concern: academics, attendance, and behavior. The EWM ranks every student's risk  
5 level along a continuum of one to nine. The IM formalizes the intervention referral  
6 process by connecting the at-risk student with the right supports, and then allows for  
7 tracking the fidelity and frequency of support efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of  
8 specific supports to specific students. Clarity is supported by a company BrightBytes for  
9 customization to meet the needs of TUSD, including the USP, and for training. (USP  
10 RAC (Doc. 2075-10) at 6-8.) The EBAS includes user-friendly dashboards to enable  
11 users to interface with data either through Clarity's student specific dashboards or with  
12 Synergy through big-picture dashboards for Enrollment, Discipline, and Classroom  
13 capacity and scheduling. *Id.* at 9-10.

14 The District began rolling out Synergy and Clarity at the beginning of SY 2016-  
15 17, with feedback to BrightBytes to make corrections to improve effectiveness, and the  
16 final roll out for EBAS was scheduled for SY 2017-18. *Id.* at 9. According to the District,  
17 it has "worked hard to make sure that all staff--administrators, teachers and others--have  
18 appropriate training on the use of the system for the position they fill, and are evaluated  
19 on their ability to utilize the system." *Id.* at 14.

20 The Special Master describes EBAS as the corner-stone to effective evidence-  
21 based decision making, but believes that unitary status cannot be attained by its mere  
22 development or even implementation. He recommends this Court retain jurisdiction over  
23 EBAS until the District demonstrates capabilities and commitment with respect to what  
24 he describes as the five domains of an Organizational Learning System (OLS), with  
25 EBAS being one, and the other four elements of an effective system being: Professional  
26 Learning Communities (PLCs), MTSS, discipline monitoring, and program evaluation.  
27 He admits that over the last two years, "the District has done a very good job on the  
28 development of EBAS." (2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096) at 78.) The problem is that the

1 other four elements have with varying degrees of effectiveness been implemented from  
2 school to school. *Id.*

3 The Special Master is likely correct that the District needs a well-developed OLS,  
4 but that is not the question. What is relevant is how well the District has effectively  
5 implemented EBAS, and here the Special Master asks the right question: how well is the  
6 data utilized? The District will be well advised to consider the Completion Plans he offers  
7 to answer this question. For now, the record regarding EBAS is scant, especially related  
8 to its implementation and use in the context of the USP programs where unitary status is  
9 at issue. Now that EBAS is operational its use is relevant to the effective implementation  
10 of USP programs. For example, the Court has called for the District to review AASS and  
11 MASSD and make recommendations as to the most effective strategies for providing  
12 student support services for African American and Latino students, i.e., AASS and  
13 MASS. According to the District, EBAS plays a major role in the District's future plan  
14 for student interventions to improve student achievement for African-American and  
15 Latino students, including ELL students, and to address major issues like the  
16 disproportionality of discipline on African-American students. When the District seeks  
17 reconsideration of unitary status in the context of V.E.7-8, AASS and MASS, the District  
18 shall provide details on the use of EBAS for AASS and MASS.

19 In short, the District adopted a multi-tiered support system (MTSS) for student  
20 academic and behavioral interventions, emphasizing the most positive intervention  
21 possible at each tier. The first-level of support is to provide strong instruction for all  
22 students in the class room. Then support is tiered upwards to provide additional  
23 interventions for students who need additional small group or individual supports. MTSS,  
24 accordingly, spans all Student Support Services, including AASS, MASS, and at-risk  
25 students, for all services from tutoring to out-of-school suspensions. The focus of the  
26 Special Master's Completion Plan is to ensure district-wide school-site use of EBAS in  
27 the context of intervention programs and the use of EBAS to assess program  
28 effectiveness, especially USP initiatives, including the systematic analysis of EBAS data

1 to identify problem areas and/or schools that are positive and negative outliers with  
2 respect to success in implementing initiatives or achieving particular goals. He suggests  
3 positive results would create a resource library of effective practices and negative results  
4 would flag outliers for review.

5 The District objects because USP § X.A, EBAS, does not call for more than its  
6 development and implementation, but the USP requires the District to establish effective  
7 strategies, and EBAS is a major part of many USP strategies. Therefore, EBAS must be  
8 used effectively. So for example, the Court must consider how well the relevant EBAS  
9 data is used to provide student support services to African American and Latino students,  
10 including ELL students. Additionally, the express purpose of EBAS is to review program  
11 effectiveness. Therefore, the District must show that relevant EBAS data is being  
12 effectively used by the persons responsible for implementing the various USP program  
13 strategies. In this way on reconsideration, the District will address the only remaining  
14 impediment to unitary status for USP § X.A, EBAS, which is to establish that it is being  
15 used.

16 The Court will take an especially close look at how well EBAS data is used to  
17 implement effective strategies for: student support services, USP § V.E.6-7; reducing  
18 discipline, especially exclusionary discipline, USP § VI, and the evaluation of the  
19 effectiveness of new initiatives, such as those implemented pursuant to USP § V.A. The  
20 Special Master argues that if the EBAS is being effectively used in these three areas then  
21 the requisite degree of professional development related to the implementation and use of  
22 EBAS has occurred. The Court agrees, and will address this showing on reconsideration  
23 of these USP provisions, which correspondingly, will establish unitary status for EBAS.  
24 In other words, when unitary status is attained for these USP provisions, §§ V.A and E.6-  
25 7, and VI, unitary status is likewise attained for EBAS.

26 **a-1. Professional Learning: Professional Development**

27 The USP requires the District to provide training and professional development for  
28 implementing USP provisions across the board for administrators, certificated staff, and

1 any other staff involved as follows: § II.J, student assignment and/or enrollment process;  
2 § IV.I and J, the use of culturally responsive pedagogy and to improve teacher  
3 performance and for principals to foster professional learning communities (PLCs) so  
4 that effective teaching methods may be developed and shared; § V.E.5, for teachers and  
5 administrators to teach and promote socially and culturally relevant curriculum and  
6 pedagogy; § VI.E, to use positive behavior approaches to discipline and Guidelines for  
7 Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR); § IX, the use of technology (computers,  
8 smart boards, and educational software for the classroom) to promote student learning,  
9 and § X.A, the use the EBAS.

10 The Special Master reports that the District has undertaken new and more  
11 productive strategies for professional development that he describes as Professional  
12 Learning. The Special Master proposes that the District with his assistance develop a  
13 comprehensive research-based plan for how professional learning is provided to teachers  
14 and administrators, which shall be implemented especially in the context of seeking  
15 reconsideration for unitary status related to culturally responsive pedagogy, § V.E.6.a.i  
16 and ii; reducing student misbehavior, § VI; creating cultures of civility in schools, § V.F;  
17 enhancing teacher and administrator proficiency in using technology for student learning,  
18 X.A, and EBAS. The Special Master proposed that work on the Professional Learning  
19 Completion Plan would commence in SY 2018-19, and be completed by the end of the  
20 school year.

21 This brings the Court to the Special Master's criticism of the professional  
22 development and training provisions that are sprinkled across the various USP programs.  
23 He explains it means little to track the number of trainings offered here and there to  
24 determine whether professional development has actually occurred. The Court agrees.  
25 What is important is that the District has implemented an effective professional  
26 development program or as stated by the Special Master: whether the District has  
27 implemented a Professional Learning Plan with the ultimate measure of effectiveness  
28



1 being whether or not teachers and administrators are using the USP strategy, such as  
2 EBAS, which is the subject of the Professional Learning Plan. The Court agrees.

3 The best way to look at professional development is to determine whether a USP  
4 program or strategy is in fact being used by teachers and administrators. Without  
5 effective professional development, the best plans, strategies, or programs, developed by  
6 the District, adopted by the Board, and approved by this Court, mean nothing. The  
7 teachers and administrators are the boots on the ground implementing the USP strategies.  
8 Of course, it is a massive undertaking to implement professional development programs  
9 at each school for each USP program and strategy, but this is where the rubber meets the  
10 road in the end. The Special Master proposes the following test for assessing whether the  
11 District has accomplished the requisite degree of professional development to ensure  
12 implementation of UPS strategies. He suggests measuring the effectiveness of  
13 professional development by considering whether the District has implemented an  
14 effective Professional Learning Plan in its schools in four USP programs: culturally  
15 relevant pedagogy, reducing student misbehavior, creating inclusive school  
16 environments, i.e., cultures of civility, and enhancing teacher and administrator  
17 proficiency in using technology for student learning.<sup>58</sup>

18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 <sup>58</sup> The Court emphasizes that there must be evidence of district-wide,  
20 school-site implementation of the Professional Learning Plan. Therefore, the  
21 District should consider the Special Master's suggestion for a rubric to assess  
22 effectiveness, such as the effectiveness of MTSS facilitators and leads in  
23 performing their responsibilities to identify and provide student support services  
24 using EBAS. The Court notes that the Special Master's Completion Plans for both  
25 EBAS and Professional Learning include the recommendation that the District  
26 place program responsibility in one person at the top of the administrative chain,  
27 reporting directly to the Superintendent. He similarly suggested in the context of  
28 USP § VI, Discipline, that the District create a Director of Discipline to report  
directly to the Chief Academic Officer. For USP § VII, Family and Community  
Engagement (FACE), the Special Master recommended that District supervisors  
should oversee principals' implementation of FACE, not the Family Engagement  
Coordinator (FEC), who is responsible for Family Centers. This Court noted the  
FACE Action Plan's administrative scheme includes the Assistant Superintendent  
for Equity, supervising the Director of FEC, supervising the FEC, who works  
closely with the Directors of AASD and MASSD. The point being that the  
interconnectivity of the various USP programs is a strength that can become an  
administrative weakness because it lends itself to duplication, disorganization,  
confusion, and lack of accountability. Now is the time for the District to correct

1 The Court agrees, and will address this showing on reconsideration of unitary  
2 status for these USP programs, which correspondingly, will establish unitary status in  
3 respect to the District’s obligations to provide professional development under the USP, §  
4 § II.J, § IV.I and J, V.E.5, VI.E, IX, and § X.A. In other words, when unitary status is  
5 attained for USP §§ V.E.6.a.i-ii, V.F, VI, and X.A, unitary status is likewise attained for  
6 professional development.

7 **b. Budget**

8 The District claims that it has complied fully with USP budget provisions, but  
9 again the Special Master reports non-compliance with agreed to guidelines for the  
10 budget- comment and review process. “Each year, modification of the budget processes is  
11 made in an effort to facilitate review by the plaintiffs and Special Master by giving the  
12 District the opportunity to reallocate funds throughout the school year.” (2016-17 SMAR  
13 (Doc. 2096) at 85.) “But the guidelines could be better implemented.” *Id.* The Court finds  
14 this is an understatement. “The Court is well aware that the budget development process  
15 has been a conflicted one.” (Reply (Doc. 2111) (Second) at 44.) The Special Master  
16 reports that this fiscal year ending June 2017, the District made major changes involving  
17 millions of dollars in mid-year to the Budget without submitting these proposals to the  
18 agreed-upon reallocation process.” *Id.* This is not ok. The budget provision is located in  
19 the USP § X, Accountability and Transparency, for a reason. The transparency and  
20 accountability of the budget process is as important as the actual budgetary allocations.  
21 Unitary status cannot be attained in respect to the District’s good faith efforts to be  
22 transparent and accountable to TUSD students and the community in its allocation of  
23 millions of dollars if it cannot at a minimum comply with agreed to USP transparency  
24 and accountability requirements, i.e, the budget review and comment processes. The  
25

---

26  
27 any such weaknesses, especially if existing administrative or organizational  
28 structures are impeding effective program implementation or operations. The  
District is on the cusp of unitary status but implementation of many successful  
strategies varies from good to nil, school to school. The District must attain  
unitary status district-wide.

1 Court retains jurisdiction over USP § X.B. for another year. The District may seek  
2 unitary status again following the next budget cycle.

3 C.  
4 Conclusion

5 The nature of this Order requires the Court to focus on the areas of the USP where  
6 the District has not attained unitary status. The Court would be remiss to not mention the  
7 innovative strategies and general progress resulting from the USP.

8 There are absolutely more students in TUSD attending more racially diverse  
9 schools than existed at the inception of this case. For example, the number of students  
10 attending Integrated schools in 2016-17 was 8,337 and in 2017-18 there were 11,522.  
11 This dramatic jump reflects the results of better community outreach and marketing of  
12 the academic programs offered in TUSD. It also reflects improvements in the Magnet  
13 Program and increased ALE programs.

14 TUSD has been the only recipient in Arizona of the Magnet Schools of America  
15 award that in the last three years went to Borton Elementary School, which received the  
16 Merit Award of Excellence (the highest MSA award), and Mansfeld and Dodge middle  
17 schools which received the Merit Award of Distinction.

18 In delivering gifted programs, the District has implemented whole grade testing to  
19 create access to ALE programs for all students, and has created innovative ALE programs  
20 like the Cluster GATE program and the Open GATE program at Tully Elementary  
21 School. In offering gifted endorsed curriculum to all students, the District has established  
22 that regardless of cognitive test scores students taking gifted classes excel academically  
23 by 10% higher than the district averages in ELA and Math benchmarks and have  
24 improved in AZMerit state standard test performance. The District is implementing a K-1  
25 district-wide enrichment program of open-access gifted services through a whole-grade  
26 push-in program offering critical thinking lessons in all K-1 classrooms.

27 The District operates two exceptional college preparatory programs. The  
28 nationally recognized UHS, where minority enrollment increased between 2013-14 and

1 2016-17, for Latino students by 18% and for African American students by 20%. The  
2 International Baccalaureate (IB) program at Cholla High School (RC), is “remarkable,”  
3 with 85% of 12th grade students who took an IB course also taking an IB exam, and 54%  
4 of those students earning a score of four or higher while 84% earned a grade of three or  
5 higher and qualified for college credit at four-year colleges.

6 While the Court does not award unitary status for CRC, it notes that the District is  
7 a vanguard in offering culturally relevant curriculum to students. The District has reduced  
8 its drop-out rate and achieved a graduation rate to be envied in and out of Arizona. The  
9 District dropout rate for African-American students is 2.5% as compared to Pima County  
10 at 4.9%, Arizona 4.0%, and the national average of 6.5%. The District dropout rate for  
11 Latino students is 2% as compared to Pima County at 4.9%, Arizona 4.08%, and the  
12 national average of 9.2%. The District’s Latino student graduation rate is 80%, compared  
13 to Pima County at 71%, Arizona 72%, and the national average of 78%. The District’s  
14 African-American student graduation rate is 82%, compared to Pima County at 74%,  
15 Arizona 74%, and the national average of 80%.

16 The Court notes that much, if not most, of the progress has occurred this past  
17 school year. In part, the Court attributes this to the time it took to develop strategies and  
18 action plans, but these recent dramatic changes also reflect the power of the strategies and  
19 the certitude with which the District has proceeded since approximately SY 2016-17. As  
20 to those parts of the USP where the Court awards unitary status, the Court finds that the  
21 District has acted in good faith to fully and satisfactorily comply with the USP program,  
22 eliminated the related vestiges of the prior *de jure* segregation to the extent practicable  
23 for that program, and demonstrated a good-faith commitment to the whole of the USP  
24 program where unitary status is awarded. To be clear, the Court awards unitary status in  
25 part only as to USP programs where the Court is confident judicial oversight is no longer  
26 necessary. In other words, the Court is confident that the District is committed to a future  
27 course of action as to these USP programs that will give full respect to the equal  
28

1 protection guarantees of the Constitution and guarantee parents, students, and the public  
2 assurance against any further injuries or stigma.

3 The Court notes that in several parts of the USP where it does not award unitary  
4 status, there is minimal work remaining to attain full program compliance. In every  
5 instance where unitary status is denied, the Court has identified what remains to be done  
6 to comply with the USP, and the Court believes that unitary status may be attained within  
7 approximately one year. In issuing the orders below, the Court relies on the District's  
8 representation that even as it objected to recommendations by the Special Master, it  
9 nevertheless was moving forward to comply with the Completion Plans.

10 **Accordingly,**

11 **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to 2016-17 SMAR (Doc. 2096), unitary status is  
12 GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that unitary status has been attained for all  
14 provisions of the Unitary Status Plan, except those identified below.

15 1. GRANTED for USP § II, Student Assignment, except for the Magnet  
16 Program, with unitary status to be reconsidered as follows:

17 § II.E: The District shall file the 3-Year Plus Integration Plan, including individual  
18 school non-magnet integration plans, if any are practicable, and the Outreach and  
19 Recruitment Addendum, by: September 1, 2019.

20 2. GRANTED for USP § III, Transportation, with the Court retaining  
21 jurisdiction for the purpose of considering unitary status for the Magnet Programs and  
22 Advanced Learning Experiences (ALE) Programs.

23 3. GRANTED for USP § IV, Administrative and Certificated Staff, except for  
24 §§ A, F.1, I.3, and E, with unitary status to be reconsidered as follows:

25 § IV.A, F.1, I.3: The District shall file the 2018-19 Teacher Diversity Plan (TDP),  
26 including the attrition and Grow-Your-Own Program studies, by: 90 days of the filing  
27 date of this Order.

28

1           § IV.E: The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance with the Court’s  
2 directives related to centralizing the hiring process and certification for placing beginning  
3 teachers at Racially Concentrated or under-achieving schools by: 90 days of the filing  
4 date of this Order.

5           4.       GRANTED for USP § V, Quality of Education, including § D,  
6 Exceptional/Special Education, and excepting §§ A-C, E.1.b.a.i-ii, E.7-8, and F, with  
7 unitary status to be reconsidered as follows:

8           § V.A: The District shall file the ALE Policy Manual by: September 1, 2019.

9           § V.C: The District shall file the Dual Language Plan by: September 1, 2019.

10          § V.E.1.b.i: The District shall file an ELL Action Plan for dropout prevention by:  
11 90 days from the filing date of this Order.

12          § V.E.6.a.i-ii: The District shall file the CRC Comprehensive Plan and CRP  
13 Professional Learning Plan by: September 1, 2018.

14          § V.E.7-8: The District shall file the Post-unitary Status Plan for AASS and  
15 MASS, including ELL students, by: 90 days from the filing date of this Order.

16          § V.F: The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance with the  
17 Completion Plan for Maintaining Inclusive School Environment and Professional  
18 Learning Plan by: 90 days from the filing date of this Order.

19          5.       DENIED for USP § VI, Discipline, with unitary status to be reconsidered as  
20 follows:

21          § VI: The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance, including a  
22 detailed progress report specifically addressing each provision of the Discipline  
23 Completion Plan and Professional Learning Plan by: September 1, 2019.

24          6.       GRANTED for USP § VII, Family and Community Engagement, except  
25 for school-site services and to develop data tracking capabilities, with unitary status to be  
26 reconsidered as follows:

27          § VII: Subsequent to the completion by the expert on effective family engagement  
28 strategies, the District shall file an update to the FACE Action Plan, reflecting the

1 directives contained in this Order and cross-referencing the District's Post-unitary Status  
2 AASS or MASS Plan as relevant by: 90 days from the filing date of this Order.

3 7. GRANTED for USP § VIII, Extracurricular Activities, except for  
4 documenting that there are no disparities between Racially Concentrated and Integrated  
5 schools and extracurricular activities are being used to facilitate positive interracial  
6 interactions, with unitary status to be reconsidered as follows:

7 § VIII: The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance with the  
8 Extracurricular Activities Completion Plan by: September 1, 2019.

9 9. GRANTED for USP § IX, Facilities and Technology, except for the FCI  
10 and TCI, and for § IX.B.1.iv and B.4, for teacher proficiency in using technology to  
11 facilitate student learning, with unitary status to be reconsidered as follows:

12 § IX.A: The Special Master shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance for  
13 recalculation of FCI scores.

14 § IX.B: The Special Master shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance for the  
15 TCI update for internet access and correction of any disproportionality, by: September 1,  
16 2019.

17 § IX.B.1.iv and B.4: The District shall file a Notice and Report of Compliance:  
18 Professional Learning Plan for teacher proficiency in using technology to facilitate  
19 student learning by: 90 days from the filing date of this Order.

20 10. GRANTED for USP § X, Accountability and Transparency, for EBAS, §  
21 X.A, EBAS, except for professional development, and DENIED for Budget, § X.B, as  
22 follows:

23 § X.A: Unitary status shall be deemed attained as to professional development for  
24 the effective use of EBAS when unitary status is granted for USP §§ V.E.6.a.i-ii, V.F,  
25 and VI.

26 § X.B: The District may seek reconsideration following the next budget cycle.

27 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the above filings shall trigger reconsideration  
28 of unitary status. Within 14 days, the Plaintiffs may file Supplementary Responses.

1 Within 7 days, the District may file a Supplementary Reply. Within 14 days, the Special  
2 Master shall file an R&R after the Supplementary Reply. The Court shall thereafter,  
3 reconsider unitary status.

4 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Court shall retain jurisdiction over all  
5 provisions of the Unitary Status Plan for the purpose of enforcement.


6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that for the purpose of reconsidering unitary  
7 status, the Court shall retain jurisdiction over USP § II.J, IV.I and J, V.e.5, VI.E, IX, and  
8 X.A for Professional Development; USP § III for Transportation related to the Magnet  
9 Program and the ALE Program, and USP §§ II.I and V.A, for Outreach and Recruitment  
10 related to the 3-Year PIP: CMP, the ALE Policy Manual, and the Outreach and  
11 Recruitment Addendum.

12 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the District shall continue to file the annual  
13 report, and the Parties may request the Special Master to file a Report and  
14 Recommendation in the event any compliance issues arise that are not being addressed by  
15 the filings above.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the motions to strike (Docs. 2112 and 2114)  
17 are DENIED.

18 Dated this 5th day of September, 2018.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



---

Honorable David C. Bury  
United States District Judge