

To: OUSD School Board Directors and Superintendent Kyla Johnson-Trammell

From: Members of the LCAP Parent and Student Advisory Committee

Date: February 22, 2019

Feedback from the 2.20.19 Meeting of the LCAP Parent and Student Advisory Committee (LCAP PSAC)

A) Background:

The LCAP PSAC dedicated its February 20, 2019 meeting to a detailed review of the budget reductions and related investments proposed by staff for the 2019-20 school year and their impact. This was not the original intent of this meeting for the committee members. On December 2018, the committee had begun study of specific outcomes across schools for four student groups designated as “in the red” on the CA Schools Dashboard in order to inform the nature and implementation of strategies to support those groups. Committee members had no choice but to dedicate the 2/20/19 meeting to a hurried review of the proposed budget reductions and the rationale offered by staff for making them. In doing so, they maintained a focus on what those reductions and related investments would mean for the identified groups. The LCAP PSAC also created a space within the meeting for participants in the Foster Youth Advisory Committee to review the reductions in relation to foster students.

Before the December 2018 meeting, the LCAP PSAC had been proactively requesting, through the LCAP Engagement Program Manager, information related to the following questions and comments:

- What impact can we predict the budget priority setting process will have on the actions and investments that are currently outlined in the LCAP?
- If any actions or investments will be eliminated or are set to be added, how can we ensure that our advisory committees are able to proactively give feedback about those changes?

Revisions to the adopted LCAP should be presented well before the December 19 meeting for a formal advisory vote at the meeting.

If any of the actions are especially related to the needs of foster students, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities; they should be vetted by the advisory bodies for those students?

Unfortunately, the LCAP PSAC membership first learned of the specific reductions impacting the LCAP on Wednesday, February 6, at the same time as the larger community was becoming aware of them and on the day when they would be discussed at a scheduled Board meeting. The members also learned that a vote on the reductions was slated for Monday, February 11.

The Lead Delegates of LCAP PSAC quickly struggled to communicate with other members in order to craft a response to the proposal for reductions. Their formal letter expressed outrage about the complete absence of consultation with the LCAP PSAC and other advisory bodies, as well as deep concern for the disproportionate impact that the cuts would have on the highest need student groups that the LCAP, as a plan and as a process, was most intended to support. [LCAP](#)

[PSAC Letter to Board and Supt--02.06.19](#) This letter was formally presented by several LCAP PSAC members to the Board during public comment at the February 11 meeting.

Agenda elements for the 2/20/19 meeting were adjusted so that the LCAP PSAC members could learn alongside members of the community and hold a consensus process for providing feedback. The agenda and materials for the 2/20/19 meeting were legally posted on Thursday, 2/14/19.

More than 60 persons from a wide diversity of experiences, roles, and affiliations attended the meeting, including 18 out of 24 LCAP PSAC members.

B) Meeting Goals and Process:

The goals of the meeting were:

- Understand the “why” for the specific budget reductions that were proposed by staff for 2019-20, what the trade-offs are for those reductions (what will be preserved, expanded, or added as a result), and the specific impact of making those reductions (services that will disappear, diminish, or be provided in a different way)
- Understand the relationship to specific outcomes in our LCAP of all proposed reductions & investments.
- Based on the focus that the LCAP PSAC chose for this school year, understand the impact of the budget reductions and re-investments for specific student groups
- Members will give official feedback about the choices for reductions, the trade-offs for those reductions, and the specific impact of the reductions as presented.

The meeting included the following process elements:

- Highlights from the most recent meetings of the District English Language Learners’ Sub-Committee, Foster Youth Advisory Committee, Community Advisory Committee for Special Education, and the LCAP Student Advisors (ACC);
- Presentation of the proposal for 2019-20 budget deductions and priority investments by Deputy Chief Sondra Aguilera and Executive Director Jean Wing with limited time for participants to ask clarifying questions [LCAP PSAC 2.20.19 General Meeting--Presentation](#);
- Small group discussion about the specific LCAP-related reductions and their impact on 5 high needs student groups (African-American Students, Students with Disabilities/IEPs, English Language Learners, Unhoused Students, and Foster Students);
- Report back of main points from the small group discussions; and
- Segment for LCAP PSAC members to develop official feedback for the School Board through a “gradients of agreement” consensus process held in an open “fishbowl” structure.

C) Presentation by Deputy Chief Sondra Aguilera and Questions:

Ms. Aguilera explained the overall need for budget reductions and related School Board mandates. She explained that reductions were necessary to close a budget shortfall and to increase pay for teachers and other staff, provide new teacher supports, and expand teacher pipeline programs. The stated overall goal of the re-investments as described are to improve teacher retention and, by doing so, improve outcomes for the students most impacted by teacher turnover.

Data was presented to support the argument for investment in actions targeted to improving teacher retention. Ms. Aguilera also outlined the priority areas for continuing investments.

Following the presentation, members and participants had questions and comments related to the following: absence of discussion of other factors affecting teacher retention that were mentioned in the teacher survey slide, no accounting for the role of LCAP PSAC--including within the slides related to stakeholder input nor within the fast decision-making timeline from February 6 to February 11, reasons for allocating a large amount in the budget to materials and supplies, lack of accounting of space use needs for Special Education classrooms and programs, lack of time to receive answers to the questions raised at the meeting, among others.

Due to the limited time, study of the specific reductions and investments by LCAP Goal and Action Area happened within the breakout discussions focused on specific student groups.

The feedback from the Breakout Discussions is included at the end of this document. It follows the Collective Statements developed by the LCAP PSAC members through consensus. For a full accounting of the member and community response to the proposals presented at the 12.19.20 LCAP PSAC meeting, please review this document in its entirety.

D) LCAP PSAC Feedback to the School Board and Staff Regarding the Proposed Reductions and Investments for the 2019-20 School Year:

These are the questions and process that the LCAP PSAC utilized to develop its feedback. They discussed:

- 1) Does the LCAP PSAC believe that it has sufficient information to understand the reductions and investments that are being proposed? If not, what additional information is needed? *If people vote with a 3,4, or 5 card, they are stating that they have sufficient information to move forward. If people vote with a 1 or 2 card, they do not believe that they have enough information to move forward and a needs statement must be created.*
- 2) Does the LCAP PSAC agree with the priorities for investments and the related reductions as presented? *If yes, what are the main reasons for agreement? If people vote with a 3,4, or 5 card, they are in agreement. If people vote, with a 1 or 2 card, they are in disagreement with the proposal as a whole.*

If the members disagree with the proposal, what is preventing them from agreeing with the proposal? The 1 and 2's take the floor to express their disagreement and a consensus process ensues. The members can create a statement of agreement with exceptions as long as the 1s and 2s approve of that statement.

- 3) If any, which specific reductions are causing most concern for committee members? Why? Do all members agree that these particular reductions are of most concern? *All members voting with a 3,4 or 5 card indicates that the members have reached consensus.*

Before addressing the questions, the LCAP PSAC members had a prolonged discussion about the lack of a role for LCAP PSAC in the development of budget reductions and investments that would impact the LCAP. They characterized the way they have been treated as "disrespectful", "rushed", "unacceptable," lacking information," etc. They were especially distressed by the fact that the vote now scheduled for Monday, February 25 did not account for the need to gather feedback from this meeting.

They expressed their intention to seek a protocol that would allow for timely and efficient exchange of information between the LCAP PSAC and the School Board in the future.

Consensus Statements from LCAP PSAC Members

The LCAP PSAC members do not have sufficient information to understand the reductions and investments that are being proposed nor to evaluate the impact statements as presented by staff.

The LCAP PSAC members do not agree with the priorities for reductions and related investments as presented.

[The LCAP PSAC members did not have sufficient time to fully consider question #3. They were not able to lift particular reductions as causing greater concern than others. In responding to this question, the members named the specific services that were discussed in detail within the Student Group Breakouts right before the meeting time ran out. Review the feedback from the Breakouts for more details.]

This feedback includes a closing segment with follow-up requests from the committee members.

E) Feedback from Breakout Discussions about Impact on Student Groups:

Breakout Group Focused on Foster Students

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

- There is an increased focus at the level of the CA legislature on foster youth and their unique needs.
- How will AB 216 and AB 1909 be upheld in the absence of foster youth case managers that advocate at the school site level?
- Zero investment was outlined in the spreadsheet for designated foster youth case managers. They were lumped with everyone else in some actions but foster youth have very specific needs. Case managers need specific training.
- Foster youth were identified as “in the red” and for “differentiated assistance” on several categories, including chronic absenteeism. One of the tasks of the case managers is to help get foster youth “out of the red” on the dashboard through specific strategies.

Other Questions and Comments:

- The elimination of the foster youth case managers was not clearly named in the spreadsheet.
- The only specifically named case managers are “Attendance and Discipline” case managers. (5)
- The spreadsheet states that they (OUSD) is seeking funding for case managers who “could” prioritize working with foster youth. In saying “could” and in the absence of any specified action or investment, there is no guaranteed attention to foster students.
- The Foster Youth Advisory Committee already advocated and provided documentation for the importance of designated foster youth and case managers for this population of students.

Breakout Group Focused on African American Students

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

- We must reframe the question about how to retain teachers. While allocating more money to a raise is important, missing is how to increase equity for students, not just how to retain teachers.
- For teacher retention, support services like restorative justice are critical.

- Programs that came from the voluntary resolution plan with the Office of Civil Rights are being slashed. The purpose of these programs was to address the disproportionate suspension and expulsion of African American students. The reduction of 9.3 Restorative Justice Coordinators will impact African American students.
- If they are going to take all these services away, could we get a commitment from teachers to stay at the school for at least 5 years in exchange for the raise?

Other Questions and Comments:

- Action 2.1 What is the amount for professional learning stipends?
- Action 5.1 .5 position for behavioral health manager is being reduced by 1 FTE. How does that happen?
- Action 5.4 Same question as above. How do you take a 1 from a .4?

Breakout Group Focused on Students with Disabilities/IEPs

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

Action 5.2

- From the data we know that suspensions are very high for Students with Special Needs. The elimination of school climate/behavioral positions will have a strong impact on Special Education students, many who need behavioral and social/emotional supports. Also, kids with autism need stability of staff. Who will replace the work of the RJ staff? Which program? RJ positions are effective. How do we make sure that schools have resources to maintain them?
- How will "MTSS coaches" be hired? Are they current employees being re-purposed?

Action 5.3

- School Security Officers are the culture keepers at many sites. They prevent escalation to police. How will this change protocols? We wish to re-examine the police budget for potential cuts.

Action 6.2

- The cutting of the LCAP Program Manager has an impact for the Community Advisory Committee for Special Education. This is the one person holding the outreach and also integrating the voices of families of students with disabilities into the LCAP. There is already not enough capacity to support several committees. One person is holding multiple roles to keep this work going. How will CAC and other committees be supported and held. What is the support for parental oversight?

Teacher Retention

- Given the shortage of Special Education teachers and low teacher retention, we need a central pool of substitutes for Special Education readily available. Teacher coverage and substitutes is intense as it is. No more rolling substitutes when teachers are on leave; it is especially harmful for children with autism.

\$3 Million Cut to School Sites

- Frustrated at this cut, especially the impact on elementary school where they are losing positions to support teachers, such as Instructional Teacher Leaders.

Other Questions and Comments:

- Action 1.3 There is concern about the counselor ratio already being too high. It will be made worse by cuts.
- Action 1.7 How will the loss of FTE for analysts impact the ability to understand the needs of Students with Disabilities?

Other Action Areas

- Interest in Classified to Certified Pathways
- We have safety concerns. Will site-based staff have enough support?
- Kids in seats=major \$. Why aren't we offering programs to get kids in seats?

Breakout Group Focused on Unhoused Students

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

- Loss of Foster Youth Case Managers, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS), and Restorative Justice equals the loss of hands and feet for unhoused youth across the district! They are the ones who can identify student needs.
- RJ is not just a program but a shift in culture. These cuts wipe out the entire program since the cuts are actually to 18 positions. These positions are partially funded from the Central Office.
- Retention of the LCAP Engagement Manager is about more than a learning curve for the Board. It is relationship building, "connective tissue." This is a model for the vision of the district.
- What is the letter of the law for supporting foster youth? Are we out of compliance for that? Do we return the money that they generated?

Other Comments and Questions:

- Are we out of compliance with the loss of the LCAP leads and support?
- What is the distinction between the LCAP Program Director and the Director of Community Engagement that is not being cut under "Parent and Family Engagement?"
- What is the impact of the reduction of the LCAP Engagement Manager? It was missing from the document.
- Can RJ be funded at specific schools with the Comprehensive School Improvement Grant? Board should not reduce the allocation to schools receiving this grant.

Breakout Group Focused on English Language Learners

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

- We appreciate the process today but it is too fast to digest the information and offer feedback. It is outrageous that the vote was going to happen on Monday without community input.
- We are concerned that the engagement position that supports the LCAP Parent and Student Advisory Committee and the District English Language Learners' Sub-Committee is being cut. How will we support parent engagement? Is a new structure being proposed?
- The cuts to school site budgets were not equitable. They were done on a per-pupil basis and did not account for the specific needs of students.
- There is concern about the possibility that certain academies at school sites that support newcomers will close due to site cuts--e.g. NEST at Fremont.

- These cuts are catastrophic.
- \$80,000 revenue from closing a school site does not seem worth the savings in exchange for what would be lost.
- Loss of teachers can really affect students and attendance. It can affect the relationship between teachers and students, especially for newcomer transition. How do we best retain teachers?

F) Closing:

The LCAP PSAC is requesting a formal response to this letter by the OUSD Superintendent and the School Board with answers to the questions and concerns raised within it. The hope of the committee is that such a response will demonstrate that feedback from LCAP PSAC is valued and will be integrated into any plan to the greatest extent possible. Whenever it is not possible to do so, the LCAP PSAC would like written explanation of the reasons for not doing so and details about the alternatives selected by staff and Board. See [Article 4.5, 52062 \(a, 1\) and 52062 \(c\)](#) for legal provisions related to this request.

The members of the LCAP PSAC request that a means for direct communication and engagement with the School Board be established so that the committee can fulfill its role of advising on the development, implementation, and evaluation of actions and investments outlined in the Local Control and Accountability Plan. In fulfilling that role, the LCAP PSAC will continue to uplift the voices of other advisory committees and stakeholder bodies in accordance with its mission to represent all students and families in OUSD.

Remedies must include direct communication from the Board when items related to the LCAP are presented for Board discussion and vote. Those items should be forwarded directly by the School Board to the LCAP PSAC to ensure that consultation occurs. Any and all documents as described should be received by the LCAP PSAC at the same time as the School Board and with enough time to set up a meeting if necessary or required.

The LCAP PSAC members, along with the committees and community that supports its representative role, appreciate the full consideration of this report and the needs expressed within it.

LCAP PSAC members in attendance at the 2.20.19 LCAP PSAC Meeting: RocQuel Johnson, Alan Pursell, Diana Casanova, Duy Vo, Michelle Campbell-Mateo, Wendall Chin, César Escalante, Pernell Bailey, Alma Piedras, Monalisa Treviño, Carmen Pearson, Reginald Mosley, Yolanda García, Ashea Fuller, Jonathan Kael, Genie Wungsukit, Ahmed Hajaji.