



Boundary Plan

Dr. H.T. Sanchez

Board Action on Comprehensive Boundary Plan

August 12, 2014

Option A – Voluntary Transportation from Racially Concentrated Schools to Howell and Sewell **APPROVED**. Moved: Juárez; Seconded: Foster. Passed 3-2 (Roll Call Vote). Mr. Hicks and Dr. Stegeman voted no.

Option B – Add a Dual Language Program to Manzo **NOT RECOMMENDED. NO ACTION TAKEN.**

Option C – Roskrige K-8 shared Attendance Area with Mansfeld **APPROVED**. Moved: Foster; Seconded: Stegeman. Passed Unanimously (Voice Vote).

Option D – Re-open Fort Lowell/Townsend and Move Dodge Program **APPROVED**. Moved: Juárez; Seconded: Stegeman. Passed Unanimously (Voice Vote).

Option E – Santa Rita and Cholla High Schools as Early Middle Colleges **APPROVED TO CONTINUE RESEARCH AND EXPLORATION WITH COMMUNITY PARTNERS**. Moved: Hicks; Seconded: Foster. Passed Unanimously (Voice Vote).


Option F – Transportation Options serving Santa Rita, Palo Verde, Cholla and Pueblo High Schools **APPROVED PENDING MORE INFORMATION ON IMPLEMENTATION**. Moved: Grijalva; Seconded: Stegeman. Passed Unanimously (Voice Vote).

Unitary Status Plan Summit – October 1 & 2, 2014

The Comprehensive Boundary Plan was discussed and the Special Master recommended the transportation options to be nulled and to move forward with the Dodge option. Dr. Sanchez indicated that the district is in the process of finalizing the estimated cost for full transition.

Special Master Draft R&R – October 19, 2014

Many people worked long hours to explore numerous options for boundary change. That their labors ***resulted in a plan that has, with the exception of the Dodge Middle School proposal, little promise of bringing about significant integration and would result in substantial economic costs and risks of losing additional students from TUSD*** is testimony not to the inadequacy of their efforts but to the difficulties of the task.

I recommend that the Court reject the Comprehensive Boundary Plan with the exception of that provision which calls for moving Dodge middle school to a site already owned by the District that will permit an estimated 230 additional students to attend an integrated school high quality. The other options adopted by the Governing Board could be pursued in the absence of boundary changes. Including them in a Comprehensive Boundary Plan is inappropriate on its face and is likely to confuse families and introduce incentives for families to move their children to non-TUSD schools. 

Email from Dr. Sanchez to Special Master – October 29, 2014

From: Sanchez, HT
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 3:19 PM
To: wdh@umd.edu
Cc: brammer@rllaz.com
Subject: Boundary Plan

Dr. Hawley:

Thank you for taking the time to visit with me this morning. I feel I have a lot of clarity to continue to direct my team to meet the requirements of the USP. I want to be certain that I capture our conversation on the Boundary Plan as a response is due today. I have also copied Mr. Brammer to ensure he has my commitments in writing.

On November 18, 2014,

1. I will recommend that the Board approve a Boundary Plan revision that only includes the Dodge Middle School Transition to the former Townsend K-8 school site.
 - a. The 910(g) funds will address physical plant updates and repairs to ensure the Dodge transition is successful.
 - b. The 910(g) funds will also ensure instructional materials and technology are up to standard, so no functionality is lost from the current Dodge site to the new Dodge site.
 - c. The estimated cost for the full transition is 4.7 million for all architect costs, HVAC updates, building repairs, technology, furniture, transition costs, and set-up costs.
2. I will recommend that all other aspects of the previously approved Boundary Plan will become null and void, i.e. express bus routes from south and west side schools to Sewell and Howell, middle college at Santa Rita and Cholla, and Mansfield/Roskrige partnership.
3. I will recommend that the 910(g) funds that would have been used for the null and void aspects of the Board approved Boundary Plan go toward student support for academic achievement in place of transportation.
 - a. The 910(g) funds fall within the 2015-16 fiscal year, so these supports will have to be addressed during the budgeting process for 2015-16.
 - b. The support will fall in line with the USP.



Special Master's Response – October 30, 2014

From: Sanchez, HT
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 3:22 PM
To: Willis D. Hawley
Cc: TUSD
Subject: Re: Agreement on the CBP

Thank you, Dr. Hawley. Ht

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2014, at 2:07 PM, Willis D. Hawley <wdh@umd.edu> wrote:

Dr. Sanchez sent me his understanding of our meeting on Monday with respect to the CBP. I was having trouble with my email and I cannot find my response. I agreed with his understanding that the proposal that I outlined in the draft R&R would go forward. I suggested that the money saved be allocated in part to the significant improvements in the Dodge situation. I also indicated that I could not speak for the plaintiffs and suggested some wording that might be used to indicate my support without implying that this would be acceptable to the plaintiffs.

Willis D. Hawley
Professor of Education and Public Policy
University of Maryland
Senior Advisor
Southern Poverty Law Center

Special Master's Response – November 1, 2014

From: "Willis D. Hawley" <wdh@umd.edu>

Date: November 1, 2014 at 7:16:17 PM CDT

To: "Thompson, Lois D." <lthompson@proskauer.com>, "Patricia L. Victory" <PVictory@rllaz.com>, "Rubin Salter, Jr." <rsjr3@aol.com>, "Rodriguez, Juan" <jrodriguez@MALDEF.org>, "Bhargava, Anurima" <Anurima.Bhargava@usdoj.gov>, "Savitsky, Zoe" <Zoe.Savitsky@usdoj.gov>, "Brown, Samuel" <Samuel.Brown@tusd1.org>, TUSD <TUSD@rllaz.com>, "Tolleson, Julie" <julie.tolleson@tusd1.org>, Desegregation <deseg@tusd1.org>

Subject: RE: Draft R&R CBP

All,

In light of the Mendoza and Fisher opposition to the proposal for a renovation of Dodge, it seems to me that there are four options:

1. A R&R would be submitted to the Court opposing the boundary plan as approved by the Board. On reflection, I agree that the use of roughly 10% of the 910G funds not constrained by OCR agreements would be inappropriate and unlikely to yield the benefits for student outcomes that other use of these funds could achieve. It follows for me that approval of the Dodge boundary proposal without an estimate of the costs would be inappropriate.
2. The parties could agree to approve the Dodge only version of the boundary plan coupled with the stipulation that no more than \$1 million could be spent to implement that proposal. This is essentially what the parties agreed to, or at least did not object to, on October 2. The Superintendent would then recommend to the board that it change its position on the boundary plan to endorse only the option dealing with Dodge.
3. The Superintendent could advise the Board that the plaintiffs and the special master oppose the boundary plan as approved but favor the Dodge proposal pending agreement about the 910 G funds to be used. Given this opposition, he would propose to put implementation of the boundary plan on hold for no more than a month to develop the appropriate cost estimates.
4. The Superintendent could recommend that the boundary plan be withdrawn in light of opposition by the plaintiffs and the special master. Even if the superintendent were to make such proposal, it seems highly unlikely to me that the Board would reverse itself.

I recommend that the parties endorse options two or three. I favor option two so that those who are now concerned about the implications of the boundary plan would know whether their students would be affected. Approval of option two would not mean that the district could present a more ambitious alternative for consideration by the parties but it would know that such an alternative proposal would face an uphill battle.

Bill Hawley

