

Oakland Unified School District

Board of Education
1000 Broadway, Suite 680
Oakland, CA 94607-4099
(510) 879-8199 Voice
(510) 879-2299 eFax
(510) 879-2300 eTTY/TDD
hoe@ousd.org E-Mail



ACCESSIBILITY OF AGENDA AND AGENDA MATERIALS

Agenda and agenda materials are accessible at <http://www.ousd.org> or from any computer terminal in the Offices of the Board of Education and Superintendent, 1000 Broadway, Suite 680, Oakland, CA 94607-4099

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE AND LANGUAGE SERVICES

Individuals requiring interpretation or translation services or a reasonable accommodation to participate in meetings should notify the Office of the Board of Education seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting at either (510)879-8199(VM); or boe@ousd.org (E-Mail); or (510) 879-2300 (eTTY/TDD); or (510) 879-2299 (eFax).

Meeting Minutes Long - Final

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

5:00 PM

Redwood Heights Elementary, Auditorium, 4401 39th Ave, Oakland, CA 94619

Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Parent Advisory Committee

- D1 RocQuel Johnson (Oakland Tech)**
D2 Michelle Campbell-Mateo (Oakland High), Duy Vo, (Bella Vista, DELLS), Wendall Chin (Lincoln), Diana Casanova (Crocker)
D3 Cesar Escalante (Hoover, DELLS), Pernell Bailey (McClymonds)
D4 Alma Piedras (Laurel, DELLS), Monalisa Treviño (Montera, DELLS), Reginald Mosley (Montclair), Carmen Pearson (Redwood Heights)
D5 Alejandra Méndez (Global, DELLS), Tania Islas Chi (Manzanita), Teresa Díaz (Think College Now, DELLS), Yolanda García (United for Success)
D6 Ansar El' Muhammad (Markham)
D7 Jonathan Kael (Howard, DELLS), Ché Phineessee (Reach), Ashea Fuller

(Sojourner Truth), Leonardo González (Korematsu)

LEY CUMPLIMIENTO PARA AMERICANOS CON DISCAPACIDADES Y SERVICIO DE IDIOMAS

Personas que requieran servicios de traducción o interpretación o facilidades razonables para participar en juntas deberán notificar a la Oficina de la Mesa Directiva de Educación setenta y dos (72) horas antes de la junta ya sea al (510)879-8199(VM); o boe@ousd.org (E-Mail); o (510) 879-2300 (eTTY/TDD); o (510) 879-2299 (eFax).

美國殘障人士法案條例遵守及語言服務

個別人士需要傳譯及翻譯服務或有合理安排去參與會議的應該在舉行會議之前的七十二 (72) 小時通知教育委員會。請致電(510)879-8199 (留言) ; 或 boe@ousd.org (電郵) ; 或(510) 879-2300 (電子文字電話/聽障專用電信設備 (eTTY/TDD)) ; 或(510) 879-2299 (電子圖文傳真 (eFax))。

TUÂN HÀNH ĐẠO LUẬT NGƯỜI MỸ KHUYẾT TẬT VÀ DỊCH THUẬT

Những người nào cần thông ngôn hay phiên dịch hay một sắp xếp hợp lý nào để tham gia các buổi họp phải thông báo Văn phòng của Hội đồng Giáo dục bảy mươi hai (72) tiếng đồng hồ trước buổi họp, số điện thoại (510)879-8199 (VM); hay là boe@ousd.org (E-Mail); hay là (510) 879-2300 (eTTY/TDD); hay là số (510) 879-2299 (eFax).

សេវាបកប្រែភាសា និងការអនុលោមតាមច្បាប់ជនជាតិអាមេរិកាំងពិការ

អ្នកណាដែលត្រូវការសេវាបកប្រែភាសាដោយផ្ទាល់មាត់ ឬជាលាយលក្ខណ៍អក្សរ ឬត្រូវការការជួយសម្រេចសម្រួលយ៉ាងសមរម្យ មួយ ដើម្បីចូលរួមក្នុងកិច្ចប្រជុំសាធារណៈ ត្រូវផ្តល់ដំណឹងទៅកាន់ទីការិយាល័យនៃក្រុមប្រឹក្សាអប់រំ ឱ្យបានចិតសិចពី (72) ម៉ោង មុនកិច្ចប្រជុំ តាមរយៈទូរស័ព្ទលេខ (510) 879-8199 ឬតាមរយៈអ៊ីមែល boe@ousd.org ឬទូរស័ព្ទ eTTY/TDD លេខ (510) 879-2300 ឬទូរសារលេខ (510) 879-2299។

الامتثال لفانون الأمريكيين ذوي الإعاقات (ADA) وتوفير الخدمات اللغوية

من يحتاج إلى خدمات الترجمة المكتوبة أو خدمات الترجمة الفورية أو الترتيبات التيسيرية المعقولة لكي يساهم في الاجتماعات فالمرجو منه إبلاغ مكتب إدارة التعليم إثنين وسبعين (72) ساعة قبل الاجتماع بوسيلة من الوسائل التالية:

الهاتف الصوتي:	الهاتف للصم والبكم:	الفاكس الإلكتروني:	البريد الإلكتروني:
510.879.8199	510.879.2300	510.879.2299	boe@ousd.org

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:40 pm., by Chairperson Rocquel Johnson.

B. Roll Call

C. Speaker Request Cards/Modification(s) To Agenda

None

D. Adoption of Committee Minutes

None

E. Adoption of the Committee General Consent Report

None

F. Unfinished Business

None

G. New Business

19-0334

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Welcome

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee to welcome:

- LCAP PSAC Roll Call and Establish Quorum
- Review Meeting Goals, Agreements, and Agenda
- LCAP Sub-Committee Highlights

RocQuel Johnson welcomed those attending the meeting and called roll.

The following parent members were present: RocQuel Johnson, Alan Pursell, Diana Casanova, Duy Vo, Michelle Mateo, Wendall Chin, Cesar Escalante, Pernell Bailey, Alma Piedras, Carmen Pearson, Monalisa Treviño, Reginald Mosley, Yolanda García, JJ Kael, and Ashea Fuller. With 15 parent members

present, quorum was reached.

The LCAP student advisors present were Genie Wungsukit and Ahmed Hajaji.

Genie Wungsukit reviewed the goals and agreements for the meeting.

Reginald Mosley introduced the sub-committee highlights.

Alma Piedras provided the highlights for the DELLS. The sub-committee had a meeting in January where it reviewed ranked school-site enrollment and reclassification data for ELL students and ELL students with IEPs. The committee developed a survey to learn from the school sites with the highest reclassification rates.

Alan Pursell provided the highlights for the CAC. The CAC had a meeting in January where it reviewed school site enrollment, suspension, and reading assessment data for Students with IEPs, ELLs with IEPs, and African American Students with IEPs. It learned where the needs were highest and outcomes most positive for these groups of students. The CAC also held a Special meeting on February 12 to discuss the goals of a possible teacher strike with Special Education teachers and to discuss how to best support students with IEPs during a teacher strike.

RocQuel Johnson provided the highlights for the FYAC. The committee met with middle school counselors to begin developing a high school readiness and transition planning process for middle school foster students that would support the high school readiness indicator. The committee discovered that counselors could not identify foster students at their schools to then support their unique needs. The next step is to invite Community School Managers to join counselors and FYAC for the same purpose. The FYAC is very concerned about cuts to the elimination of the FY case managers and engagement support for FYAC.

Genie Wungsukit provided an update from the LCAP student advisors. The most recent meetings of ACC were dedicated to discussing priorities for the 2019-20 budget. A new advisor from Oakland Tech was elected

Discussed

[19-0333](#)

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Election of Nominees - District 1

Election of Nominees for District 1:

ELL Membership: Nominations Open for 1 Vacancy; To Be Elected at a Future Meeting Membership (3 Seats): Rodney Jackson (Chabot), Allan Pursell (Emerson), Ethel Turner (Oakland Tech)

Alan Pursell was unanimously elected to LCAP PSAC membership for District 1 by the District 1 SSC Members from District 1.

Elected

Enactment No: 19-0466



19-0335

**LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Proposal for 2019-2020
Budget Reductions - Priority Investments**

Presentation by Sondra Aguilera, Deputy Chief of Continuous School Improvement, to LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee of Proposal for 2019-2020 Budget Reductions and Priority Investments:

Grounding Questions:

1. Which services have been made a priority for continuing or increased funding? (When applicable) to which specific LCAP outcomes are those services directed? How were they identified as the most needed and/or effective?
2. Which services and associated staff positions will be reduced or eliminated? (When applicable) to which specific LCAP outcomes were those services directed? How were they identified as having a lower degree of priority?
3. Which services will be provided in a different way? In which cases, if any, will roles be expanded to provided additional services?
4. What is the plan for how to best utilize the Low Performing Student Block Grant in the context of these budget reductions and changes?

Attachments: 19-0335 Presentation - LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Proposal for 2019-2020 Budget Reductions - Priority Investments
19-0335 LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Operations: Proposed Staff Reduction and Position Funding Reallocation Impact Analysis
19-0335 LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Summary of Programs and Resources at School Sites in 2018-19 and 2019-20--LCAP PSAC 2.20.19 Meeting
19-0335 LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Average Teacher Retention at School Sites - 2.20.19 LCAP PSAC Meeting

Ms. Aguilera made a presentation about the reductions and investments for the 2019-20 budget and LCAP. She 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.

JJ Kael made the motion to add ten minutes to the segment to complete the discussion. The motion was seconded by Diana Casanova. The members used their consensus cards to vote to add 10 minutes to the segment. Consensus was reached.

Ms. Aguilera continued to review the areas identified as a priority for investment.

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.

Members and participants also had questions about the large amount of funds allocated to books and supplies in the budget and how it would be finally allocated, especially given that many schools were experiencing a great scarcity of basic resources. The need to better account for materials and supplies was discussed.

Time ran out on the segment once more. Study of the specific reductions and investments by LCAP Goal and Action Area happened moved to the breakout discussions focused on specific student groups. Ms. Aguilera requested time to discuss the Low Performing Student Block Grant. No member made the motion to add time.

A member protested the intention of staff to present a large density of information without allowing sufficient time for study and feedback to happen. She appealed for greater respect of the committee and its process.

Discussed



19-0336

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Review Reports of Student Group Data Study - December 2018

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee to review reports of Student Group Data Study from December 2018.

Selected Student Outcomes for Study (district, school sites):

Enrollment, Participation in Reading Assessments, Reading At or Above Grade Level, Suspensions, Reclassification (English Language Learners)

Attachments: 19-0336 LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Findings, Questions, and Choices from 12.19.18 LCAP Study
19-0336 LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Fall 2017 and Fall 2018 CA Schools Dashboard Results.docx

Cintya Molina points out to the members and participants that graphics with student data for the student groups is available in their packets as a reference. She lists the years, indicators, and groups included.

Discussed

19-0337

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Student Group Dialogues

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee to transition to student group dialogues with grounding questions:

“What are the implications of the proposed budget reductions and related investments for this student group? In other words, what could be the possible impact of the proposed changes, especially as it relates to specific student outcomes in our LCAP?”

Members and participants split into five student group breakouts to review the proposed reductions to the 2019-20 Budget and LCAP the impact of the reductions.

The breakout groups presented the following feedback in turn to the large group at the meeting:

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?*

Discussed

19-0338

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Large Group Discussion

Discussion by LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee of the most important points from discussion regarding the possible impact of the proposed changes, especially at it relates to specific student outcomes in the LCAP.

The breakout groups present their findings, comments, and questions to the larger group.

Ms. Aguilera responded to the comments and questions from the breakout groups:

About investment in teacher retention:

- *We analyzed teacher retention data in the decision to make reductions to other investments.*
- *Recommending using supplemental funds to add a strategy for teacher retention*
- *Include supports from peer teachers, coaching, and professional development as retention strategies*

About connection between Restorative Justice Program & Office Civil Rights Report:

- *Reduction of suspensions spans all of our Community Schools & Student Services, hard for Executive Director to identify the reductions there*

- *It is not only the RJ program. Many elements of Community Schools & Student Services added to the reduction of suspension rates. District also made a big investment in training & tracking.*
- *This includes the impact of PBIS, and the Behavioral Health Program Managers - positions that we are still investing. This connects to the comments made about Special Education students. We still have Behavioral Health Specialists (5 FTE)*
- *Case management—It is difficult to understand all of it within the LCAP budget*
- *There is still investment in attendance & discipline case managers (new position to support reduction of chronic absenteeism and suspensions) (5 positions), but yes, there is an overall reduction in case management.*
- *Still, school sites are investing a lot in case management. It is not only about what the central office does.*
- *There is not total clarity in terms of decreasing investment in RJ and PBIS, but we still have to make tough decisions. It is not easy but we have to think differently in terms of the services we are providing.*

About the FTE for LCAP engagement (Cintya's position):

- *Unknown what happened to the impact statement*
- *The work will fall upon the LCAP office (largely Lisa Spielman – the LCAP Coordinator, and the remaining engagement staff*
- *I know this is hard to hear, especially because many of you are here because Cintya recruited you.*

About \$3M cuts to discretionary school site budgets:

- *Will follow up with the correct per pupil allocation.*
- *There is an equal amount reduction across the board because per LCFF's base program is for every student; each one is given the exact same funds. Funds would be removed from the base program.*
- *S&C funds are additional. That is how specific schools get increased funding based on their specific student populations.*

Ms. Aguilera: There is lot more to follow up on with the PSAC. Feedback is needed for the low-performing block grant, which affects funding at specific sites. The plan for the grant goes before the Board next week.

A parent member expressed great frustration about what she described as staff disruption of the meeting, bringing documents without providing enough time for review. This isn't adequate engagement.

Discussed

19-0339

LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee - Collective Statement about Proposed Budget Reductions - Changes

Discussion by LCAP - Parent Advisory Committee on the Collective Statement about Proposed Budget Reductions and Changes:

Key Questions:

Does the LCAP PSAC believe that it has sufficient information to understand the reductions that are being proposed? If not, what additional information is needed?

Does the LCAP PSAC agree with the priorities that have been presented

for investments and the related reductions as presented?

If any, which specific reductions are causing most concern for committee members? Why?

The LCAP PSAC members then moved into a consensus process to develop statements in response to the following questions:

Ashea led the members into a discussion of the questions on agenda for developing consensus statements about the proposed reductions.

Initial Discussion by Members:

The Board was going to vote on these issues more than a week ago and would now vote next Monday, not enough time to consider the information.

The Board doesn't even know reason why they are voting on Monday.

This is unacceptable "engagement"

Why are we again running through things at the end?

The PSAC should receive information as the Board is receiving it.

Question for Board President Aimee Eng: Why do we have a deadline of Monday for something we weren't given information about.? We aren't being engaged per LCAP requirements. Why didn't we receive the information as the Board was receiving it.

Ms. Eng: In November, the county required the Fiscal Vitality Committee to reduce spending by \$30M. They then had to explore redirecting S&C funds from Central Services to the school sites, The Board's November 2018 resolution directed staff to prioritize teacher retention, reorganize central office. It also asked for engagement of stakeholders.

Ms. Eng: What came back to us was the Superintendent's proposal in January. There was supposed to be a detailed review in January. Staff asked for an extension. This is the timeline Board was provided. We did not get the information until now as well.

Comment from Member: It is up to the Board when that happens. When are you coming to engage this body? It's not just 5-10 days before the vote. PSAC is not the one that engages with district rather district has responsibility to engage PSAC in a timely manner. You had to reach out directly and early before calling for a vote to adopt the budget resolution. When are we going to say enough is enough?

Comment from Member: The ball was dropped somewhere between 11/14 and now. Whom do we need to address to prevent this?

Ashea Fuller introduced the first question for the consensus process: "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?"

Discussion by Members:

Member: We don't have sufficient information.

Member: What statement did we get beyond today's information about what is available have in the LCAP and budget?

Response from Director Jumoke Hinton-Hodge: Between November and February 6 there was a generic proposal, the distinctions and impact on LCAP didn't show up until February 6. This doesn't mean we couldn't have done better engagement

Member: Who can we address now?

Member: This body is supposed to have an advisory role in adjustments to LCAP and supplemental and concentration dollars. The reductions became public on 2/6 and to be voted on 2/11. We were meeting on 2/20. That completely removes us from the process

Member: They should move the Monday vote. It's the obstacle that is keeping us from having meaningful input

Member: Clarification that the reductions that are happening are to the LCAP.

Member: Does the vote to make the reductions have to happen on Monday?

Response from Ms. Sondra Aguilera: It is required for next steps, such as sending staff layoff notices on time. Also, to get the money from the state, the district must submit the plan by March 1st.

Question from Member to other Members: How many total days in advance do we need information?

Cintya Molina clarifies that the Superintendent must also respond to the written comments from the PSAC about changes to the LCAP before those changes get adopted by the Board.

JJ Kael proposes that a specific process be presented by PSAC. He moves that a statement with specific process requests that include all of the comments from this meeting be created via google doc by Monday with the opportunity for all of the members to suggest revisions. The motion is seconded by Ashea Fuller.

Votes Cast: 5 5 4 5 3 5 4 5 4 3 3 3 5 4 5 5. Consensus is reached.

Ashea Fuller made the motion for consensus on the statement: "The LCAP PSAC members have sufficient information to understand the reductions and

investments that are being proposed nor to evaluate the impact statements as presented by staff.” RocQuel Johnson seconded the motion.

Votes cast: 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 3 1 1 2. Consensus was not achieved.

Consensus was confirmed on a negative statement: “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.”

Ashea Fuller made the motion for consensus on the statement: “The LCAP PSAC members agree with the priorities for reductions and related investments as presented.” RocQuel Johnson seconded the motion.

Votes cast: 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1

Consensus was confirmed on a negative statement: ““The LCAP PSAC members do not agree with the priorities for reductions and related investments as presented.”

Ashea Fuller introduced the last question for discussion: “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?”

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 were only able to list the specific services that were discussed in detail within the Student Group Breakouts right before the meeting time ran out.

Sondra Aguilera: About the Low Performing Student Block Grant: the Board is voting on it on Wednesday. We want your guidance. We are open how to administer these funds. We are the proposal on Friday.

Member: We need 48 hours before we can offer feedback.

Motion is made by _____ to formally request an additional 48 hours before providing feedback. Members will be able to review proposal and give individual comments to it over e-mail. The motion is seconded by Duy Vo.

Votes cast: 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 3 5 5 5 5. Consensus is reached.

Discussed

H. Public Comments on All Non-Agenda Items Within the Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Committee

[19-0340](#)

**Public Comments on All Non-Agenda Items Within the Subject
Matter Jurisdiction of the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee - Up
to 30 Minutes - February 20, 2019**

Public Comments on All Non-Agenda Items Within the Subject Matter
Jurisdiction of the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee - Up to 30 Minutes -
February 20, 2019.

*Member: I want to register my discontent. I would have liked to have seen
10-15 minutes ago a proposal to take this process back, not forced into a
process that isn't acceptable. Would like proposal to say "shut down that
vote altogether."*

*Another member agrees this process has been disrespectful, feels rushed,
cut off, getting important information at the last minute. Upset that yet
another decision is being made without the group's input. It doesn't do us
good to be doing this kind of stuff so late when she doesn't feel prepared,
feels her time is being wasted.*

*Trish Anderson urges continued participation from the members. They have
demonstrated their power and leadership at this meeting.*

*Another member expresses that when reporting to his community, he doesn't
like feeling uninformed.*

*Members and participants in the meeting gather in a circle and share
appreciations.*

Presentation/Acknowledgment Made

I. Announcements

None

J. Introduction of New Legislative Matter

None

K. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m., by Chairperson Rocquel Johnson.

Prepared By: _____

Approved By: _____