משערשה: ששום דע

SCUCATION ACOUNTAINAGE OF THE MOITACUTERS

NO. CIV92-596-TUC-ACM

STIPULATION

COPYI Timothy M. Hogan, State Bar 004567 ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST 2 202 E. McDowell Rd., Ste. 153 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 3 Attorney for Plaintiffs 4 Lynne C. Adams, State Bar 011367 Elliot Talenfeld, State Bar 009322 Gretchen O. Schneidau, State Bar 017478 Assistant Attorneys General 1275 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2997 Phone: (602) 542-1610 Fax: (602) 364-0700 Attorneys for Defendants

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

MIRIAM FLORES, individually and as parent of Miriam Flores, a minor child, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

16

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

STATE OF ARIZONA, et al.,

Defendants.

The parties, by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

1. The passage of Proposition 203 by Arizona voters on November 7, 2000 repealed Arizona's statutes prescribing the models for the delivery of language acquisition programs and established a new model based on sheltered English or structured English immersion, subject to the waiver provisions recited in the Proposition. Under certain circumstances, these waiver provisions require that individual schools provide classes teaching English

and other subjects through bilingual education techniques or other generally recognized educational methodologies permitted by law.

- 2. The State agrees that it will determine the training, background and qualifications that are necessary for teachers of LEP students under Proposition 203 and will adopt appropriate rules addressing same. Since it is the State's intention to implement Proposition 203 at the beginning of the 2001-2002 school year, the State will make every effort to have those rules in form for submission to the State Board of Education at its July, 2001 meeting.
- 3. The cost study that will be prepared and submitted to the Legislature pursuant to the Court's order dated October 12, 2000 will reflect, among other things, the funding and resources that are necessary to train and develop teachers of LEP students under Proposition 203. However, by so agreeing, the State does not waive its right to litigate the outstanding issue of whether it is obligated to provide funding for the training of qualified LEP teachers or otherwise insure their availability in sufficient numbers within any particular school district.
- Plaintiffs reserve the right to challenge the adequacy of the rules adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to paragraph 2, above (or the State's diligence in adopting such rules).
- 5. Based on the foregoing, the parties agree that the Court should vacate the trial scheduled for December 18, 2000, retain jurisdiction in this matter, and schedule a status conference in this matter in March 2001.

DATED this 28 day of November, 2000.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ORIGINAL and two copies of the foregoing mailed this 29 day of November, 2000 to 16 17 CLERK OF THE COURT 18 United States District Court U.S. District Court 405 W. Congress 19 Tucson, AZ 85701 20 COPY of the foregoing mailed this All day of November, 2000. 21 22 23 The Honorable Alfredo C. Marquez United States District Court 44 E. Broadway Tucson, AZ 85701-1711 24 25 26

ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW
IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Timothy M. Hogan (004567) 202 E. McDowell Rd., Ste. 153 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 (602) 258-8850

Attorney for Plaintiffs

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Lynne C. Adams (011367)
Elliot Talenfeld (009322)
Gretchen O. Schneidau (017478)
1275 W. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 542-4385

Attorneys for Defendants

- 3