

1 **Special Master's Report and Recommendation Relating to Family and**
2 **Community Engagement (FACE) Plan**

3
4 **Discussion**

5 In response to an order from the Court the District filed a revised FACE plan on
6 August 30, 2018. The Mendoza plaintiffs filed their objection to the revised plan on
7 September 23, 2019. The Fisher plaintiffs filed their objection on September 20, 2019. The
8 District responded to the plaintiff's objections on October 7, 2019. As they have with other
9 completion plans of the District, the Fisher plaintiffs raised questions but did not object to
10 specific elements of the District's completion plan.

11 The Mendoza plaintiffs raise two objections. First, they assert that the District's plan
12 does not reflect the interconnectivity and interrelatedness of the USP's various units
13 relating to family engagement emphasizing the role of the Mexican American Student
14 Support Department. Following the Court's lead, they claim that it is not clear who is
15 responsible for what. The Special Master believes that it is premature to resolve questions
16 of interconnectivity and interrelationships for two reasons. First, the roles and functions of
17 MASSD are under review by order of the Court. Second, the District is implementing a
18 major new initiative with respect to school level family engagement. At the time it
19 presented its completion plan, it was less than a month into the school year and the
20 implications of the reorganization effort, spurred by external consultants of national
21 prominence, remained unclear. The characteristics of the new initiative should be well
22 understood by the time the roles and functions of the student support departments have
23 been determined.

24 The second objection by the Mendoza plaintiffs is that the websites at the school
25 level are not current and that some are more than a year out of date. The District's response
26 is that it has since specified what is expected of each school and has taken steps to ensure
27 that the schools provide the appropriate information on their websites. The District points
28 out that some of the information that the Mendoza plaintiffs say should be on the websites

1 but are not, are names of individual parents or family members who do not want their
2 names to be published in this way for fear of potential immigration issues. The District
3 should specify a procedure for ensuring that the websites are kept up to date and have all
4 the information they should have, except for the names of individuals who choose not to
5 have their names published on the website.

6 **Recommendation**

7 When the roles and responsibilities of the student support departments is resolved
8 by the Court, presumably by the beginning of the next term, the District should revise its
9 organizational plan demonstrating the relationships among the departments of the district
10 that have direct responsibility for family engagement making clear which organizations
11 play the leading role and which have responsibilities that are supplemental and provide
12 related support.

13 The District should identify an officer who will be responsible for recurrently
14 reviewing each school's website to ensure that the required information is present. This
15 monitoring would be facilitated by a check sheet to be approved by the Special Master
16 before the end of this calendar year.

17
18 Respectfully submitted, November 18, 2019.

19
20 /s/ Willis D. Hawley

21 Willis D. Hawley Special Master
22
23
24
25
26
27
28