

To: Members of the LCAP Parent and Student Advisory Committee

From: Dr. Kyla Johnson-Trammell, OUSD Superintendent

Date: March 21, 2019

Thank you for the meaningful feedback from the 2.20.19 Meeting of the LCAP Parent and Student Advisory Committee (LCAP PSAC). I understand that you had to change the original intent of the meeting to be able to review the proposed budget reductions. I regret not ensuring that the budget reductions that were presented at the Fiscal Vitality Committee and regular board meeting in January and early February were not part of the December PSAC meeting so that you would have had more information on the Reduction Plan. For the remainder of the 2018-19 school year we would like for PSAC to be able to provide feedback on the central office reorganization that will be focused on how the roles, responsibilities and central services to sites will be reorganized based on the reductions that were approved by the board on March 4, 2019. We will provide a draft of the LCAP by April 15, 2019 for the sections we have completed. Responses to your feedback, comments, and questions are found below.

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?

What prevented OUSD leadership from bringing these changes before the LCAP committees in a timely manner as they had requested?

Superintendent's Response:

We originally did not identify reductions from LCAP actions and services funded by supplemental services prior to February 6, 2019. We were working with our OUSD School Board on various scenarios throughout the Fall 2018 through the Fiscal Vitality Committee and provided a list of reductions on January 30, 2019. At that time, the Board allowed us to consider student services because we were not able to identify the total reduction in central office staff alone. We returned with an updated scenario for Board review on February 6, 2019. After that review, we were again asked to adjust the scenario and return with another scenario on February 11, 2019 and again refined on February 13, 2019. The scenario that was approved on March 4, 2019 is the scenario that was updated on February 11, 2019 and February 13, 2019.

We did not have a reduction scenario that included supplemental funded services that was acceptable to our Board until February 13, 2019. We understand that the PSAC requests that when central office staff are to complete scenarios that include a reduction funded through supplemental, that we include time for the PSAC to have input on the scenario. In order to accommodate time for PSAC review, we request that the PSAC suggest a way for District office to alert them when an issue arises and provide the ability to call special PSAC meetings to avoid concerns going forward. Additionally, it may be necessary to have monthly PSAC meeting because having meetings every other month is proving difficult when we are in a climate of needing to identify reductions to our overall budget.

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.

Approximately 60 attendees 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.

What contributed to the insufficiency of information and the incomplete analysis of reduction/investment trade-offs as expressed by LCAP PSAC within these consensus statements? What could be done to address the needs and concerns raised within them?

Superintendent's Response:

We can hear from the PSAC about what information they would find helpful in understanding the investments and trade-offs to understand what they would consider sufficient information. We can take the PSAC through the investments so there is an understanding about the LCAP actions and services that remain.

Knowing the content of what the PSAC would find helpful by April 2 would be helpful. Often, extensive information is requested and we would like to provide the information requested and meet our deadlines for submitting items on time to the Board office.

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

Breakout Group Focused on Foster Students

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

- a. There is an increased focus at the level of the CA legislature on foster youth and their unique needs.
- b. How will AB 216 and AB 1909 be upheld in the absence of foster youth case managers that advocate at the school site level?
- c. 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.
- d. 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.
- e. 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?

Superintendent Response for a - e above:

Legal Requirements

AB 216 - A student in foster care or a probation youth is released from district graduation requirements that exceed state requirements if the pupil transfers to the district, or transfers from one high school or to another within a district after the completion of the second year of high school; unless the district discovers that the student is reasonably able to complete the additional requirements in time to graduate from high school while they remain eligible for foster care benefits pursuant to the state law.

AB 1909 - Current law requires school districts to provide parental notification when a student is faced with pending expulsion or suspension. Existing law also requires that a parent is notified if the student has a disability and is subject to a manifestation determination IEP meeting, which is a meeting with appropriate school officials to determine if the student's conduct was linked to his or her disability

Compliance with Legal Requirements: OUSD will continue to provide supports to foster youth eligible for alternative graduation requirements. We will ensure that school principals, counselors, and other staff are aware of graduation requirements as well as provide notification to eligible foster youth about alternative graduation requirements. OUSD will continue to implement discipline processes as required by California Law / AB1909 and will work with our Discipline office to ensure to inform additional adult supports for any student eligible for additional supports during the discipline process.

Training & Supports: We will organize central training for site all based case managers to increase their capacity to support the specific needs of foster youth. We will work with the Coordination of Service Teams to increase their awareness of how best to support Foster Youth with academic and behavioral supports. We will also partner with sites to identify a point person to ensure that the rights of Foster Youth are met.

Funding: The LCFF provides additional funds to support Foster Youth/English Language Learners/Low Income. As the majority of LCFF funds have been allocated to school sites, we will work with school sites to identify strategies and potential resources that would best support Foster Youth. We will work with our school plan process to ensure that schools with Foster Youth include strategies in their plans.

Other Questions and Comments:

- a. The elimination of the foster youth case managers was not clearly named in the spreadsheet.

Superintendent's Response:

There are a few different funding sources and positions that are called case managers. The Foster Youth case managers referenced were inadvertently not included in the draft provided. The position that will be sustained in 2019-2020 is the Program Manager for Foster Youth. The case managers at schools sites and the attendance specialists will work collaboratively to better understand and prioritize the needs of Foster youth throughout our District. We are also seeking funds from the City of Oakland and investigating other funds such as the CAL New grant funds (state) that support case management focused on our newcomer population that will also be collaborating to support student needs.

- b. The only specifically named case managers are "Attendance and Discipline" case managers. (5)

Superintendent's Response: The spreadsheet has been updated.

- c. The spreadsheet states that 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.

Superintendent's Response:

We are working hard to secure funding from outside sources for Foster Youth Case Managers. We will prioritize foster youth students while also meeting the requirements of future funding agencies and opportunities.

- d. 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.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for this feedback.

Breakout Group Focused on African American Students

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

- a. 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.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for this feedback.

- b. For teacher retention, support services like restorative justice are critical.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for this feedback.

- c. 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.
- d. 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?

Superintendent's Response for c - d above

We successfully exited the oversight that came with the Office of Civil Rights voluntary resolution plan because our rates overall for suspension decreased and we had practices in place to continue to transform school cultures and monitor disproportionality. We believe that our ability to exit the VRP was due to a variety of supports that were implemented. Many schools have already purchased RJ Facilitators and we are working to retain many of our strategies like Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS), behavior management, and mental health supports as a complete approach to supporting our schools to improve their school culture. We are seeking outside financial support from organizations, local and county government agencies, and federal agencies to support the reduction in Restorative Justice.

We are not able to require teachers to stay in their positions for any length of time. We can, however, include the recommendation that our hiring managers encourage teachers remain beyond 5 years.

Other Questions and Comments:

- Action 2.1 What is the amount for professional learning stipends?

Superintendent's Response - \$3,920,579 planned expenditure for 2018-19.

- Action 5.1 .5 position for behavioral health manager is being reduced by 1 FTE. How does that happen?

Superintendent's Response - Instead of 2.0 FTE there will be a reduction of .50 FTE, therefore, a total of 1.5 FTE. We are able to potentially multi-fund positions using other resources. So we potentially are paying, as an example, .5 FTE from Supplemental, but we may also be paying the other part of the .5 FTE to form a 1.0 FTE from a grant.

- Action 5.4 Same question as above. How do you take a 1 from a .4?

Superintendent's Response - We listed the reduction as a total reduction because in many departments like Community Schools Student Services and Linked Learning, we are either losing grant funding or grant funding is being decreased. Reflecting a 1.0 reduction signifies that the total position is being reduced, not only the portion that is funded through Supplemental funding.

Breakout Group Focused on Students with Disabilities/IEPs

Key Points Reported to the Large Group:

Action 5.2

- a. 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?
- b. How will "MTSS coaches" be hired? Are they current employees being re-purposed?

Superintendent's Response: for a - b above - The Restorative Justice program did not focus on any particular student group like students with Special Needs. The positions that help support the needs of special education students are being maintained. These positions are the special education program specialists and the behavior specialists.

The first scenario we created reduced the Program Managers for Mental Health and created MTSS coaches. We have since decided to maintain the Program Managers for Mental Health and not create a MTSS Coach position.

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.

Superintendent's Response:

School Security Officers (SSOs) are funded through Supplemental funds. The budget that pays for police is not Supplemental funding, it is base/general purpose dollars.

Reducing SSOs will not change protocols at our schools. There may be less SSOs overall at a particular school site. We will prioritize SSOs at high schools and middle schools while potentially decreasing at our elementary schools.

Action 6.2

- The cutting of the LCAP Engagement 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?

Superintendent's Response: We are working through a central office redesign and will provide updates as requested by our school board starting May 8, 2019.

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.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for the feedback.

\$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.

Superintendent's Response: We need to continue to make very difficult decisions to ensure fiscal vitality.

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.

Superintendent's Response: The ratio of counselors to students is already well below the contractual threshold of students to counselors. The reductions were of positions that were vacant all year long. Also, one school site had a counselor assigned to their school full time and their caseload of students was low, 250-300. This particular counselor will be reassigned this upcoming year and potentially serve more than one small school.

Action 1.7 How will the loss of FTE for analysts impact the ability to understand the needs of Students with Disabilities?

Superintendent's Response: Students with Disabilities are a focus group within our LCAP and are not impacted by the reduction of our data analysts. The inclusion of our Students with Disabilities on all our District Data Dashboards will continue and this work will not be impacted.

Other Action Areas

- Interest in Classified to Certified Pathways
- We have safety concerns. Will site-based staff have enough support? [This question refers to the low number of staff in schools that can respond to unsafe/emergency situations without leaving classrooms unattended.]

Superintendent's Response: We have phone systems in our schools so that classrooms can contact the front office for support in any safety situation. Many schools also have buddy systems where teachers can be a team in any safety situation.

- Kids in seats=major \$. Why aren't we offering programs to get kids in seats?

Superintendent's Response: The Special Education Department worked on projections and reserving of Gen Ed seats in October with our Student Welcome Center. Student placement is done through the IEP process. All SpEd students who require a Gen Ed seat have been prioritized at or closest to their neighborhood school. When students require more of their Specialized Academic Instruction in the Gen Ed seating, they are included in the classroom with supports reflected in each IEP.

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.

Superintendent's Response: All schools have a Coordination of Services Team (COST) to which anyone can refer a student for additional supports. The COST reviews the reasons for student referrals, identifies resources available on campus, as well as taps into our central resources for students. The supports for unhoused/homeless students is part of our Central Family Resource Center where families are able to access supports with transportation, public benefits, and food. These resources will continue and we are also continuing to partner with our City and County to identify additional supports. Finally, some schools fund case managers to work with groups of students, we will work to provide coaching and support to these site based staff to increase their ability to provide quality supports to students.

- 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.

Superintendent's Response: We are working hard to secure additional funding for Restorative Justice. Over half of the site based positions will be sustained next year through site funds and we are working to maximize restricted grants to support the program oversight including central and site based professional learning and coaching.

- 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.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for this feedback.

Other Comments and Questions:

- Are we out of compliance with the loss of the LCAP leads and support?

Superintendent's Response: We are not out of compliance.

- What is the distinction between the LCAP Engagement Program Director (corrected title to LCAP Engagement Program Manager) and the Director of Community Engagement that is not being cut under "Parent and Family Engagement?"

Superintendent's Response: The Director of Community Engagement leads a team of 4 Regional Family Engagement Liaisons, a All City Counsel Specialist and a Governance Specialist. The LCAP Engagement Program Director is responsible for working on District wide engagement of the LCAP duties. The Family Engagement team is responsible for working with schools to provide enhanced ways for schools to improve family engagement at the school level.

- What is the impact of the reduction of the LCAP Engagement Manager? It was missing from the document.

Superintendent's Response: This position was on the document that was presented to the School Board along with an impact statement, so I am not sure why it was missing on the night of the PSAC meeting, 2/20/19. For 2019-20, there will be a position that will facilitate and lead the PSAC. We are working through a central office redesign and will provide updates as requested by our school board starting April 24, 2019.

- Can RJ be funded at specific schools with the Comprehensive School Improvement Grant? Board should not reduce the allocation to schools receiving this grant.

Superintendent's Response: Per the CDE, the CSI grant cannot be used to pay for staff positions that would not be sustainable in the absence of these funds. Consequently, these one-time funds are not a potential funding source for Restorative Justice facilitators. However, schools can pay for RJ training for staff through the CSI funds, and can potentially shift funding for other eligible expenditures to the CSI grant to free up less restricted dollars to fund an RJ Facilitator.

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.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for this feedback.

- 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?

Superintendent's Response: We are in the process of a central office re-design and parent engagement will be structured differently.

- 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.

Superintendent's Response: There is no plan to close the NEST academy 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.

Superintendent's Response: Thank you for your feedback. The discussion is currently taking place in Board meetings. We invite PSAC to become involved in futures discussions about the City Wide Plan and Board Policy 6006. For every change, we do a financial analysis of the change at the school site. Closing a school also means potentially investing in a school that will be receiving students from the closure.

- 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?

Superintendent's Response: We have a unit in the Talent Department that is leading the Retention initiative.

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.