

## **Orange County Board of Education Meeting, June 29, 2015 Transcript**

### **A. Call to Order**

Ken Williams: Good morning. Sorry for the tardiness but I had to do last minute business to get us all started here. For the benefit of the record this regular meeting of the Orange County Board of Education is called to order. And, our protocol is to always start out with an invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and that will be led by our good Trustee, Robert Hammond. So if I can have Gloria come up. She is a constituent here in Orange County and she's going to lead us in prayer. If we can all stand.

### **B.1 Invocation**

Member of the audience, Gloria Pruyne

### **B.2 Pledge of Allegiance**

Robert Hammond: You know what? I'd rather defer cause we have a gentleman here in uniform. Sargeant, would you mind leading us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ken Williams: Very spontaneous here, aren't we. You weren't ready for this one.

Staff Sergeant Parker: I haven't said it since elementary school but I'll give it a shot.

Ken Williams: They teach you that in leadership, right?

Staff Sergeant Parker: Pledge of Allegiance

Ken Williams: Thank you Staff Sergeant. What was your name sir?

Staff Sergeant Parker: Staff Sergeant Parker.

Ken Williams: Staff Sergeant Parker, thank you for serving.

Staff Sergeant Parker: Thank you.

Ken Williams: We give you our praise and our continual prayers for your safety. Roll call, Penny.

C.     Roll Call

Penny Dunseth: Trustee Boyd.

David Boyd: Here.

Penny Dunseth: Trustee Hammond.

Robert Hammond: Present.

Penny Dunseth: Trustee Williams.

Trustee Williams: Here.

Penny Dunseth: Trustee Bedell.

Jack Bedell: Here.

Penny Dunseth: Trustee Lindholm.

Linda Lindholm: Here.

Ken Williams: Very good.

D.     Introductions

Ken Williams: Introductions Miss Boyd. Do we have any?

Nina Boyd: We have none this meeting.

E.     Agenda

Ken Williams: Well, very good. Ok. Moving on with our meeting. May I have a um, a motion for the adoption of the agenda. May be changed but I do need a motion.

Jack Bedell: So moved.

David Boyd: Second.

Ken Williams: Ok, I think there's been some changes.

Jack Bedell: Mr. President on I-3 please change the number to 450 with 18 sets of 25 for our each library. So that's I-3 goes for 50, 18 sets of 25, for each library.

Ken Williams: Very good.

Jack Bedell: Thank you.

David Bedell: Yes, Mr. President

Ken Williams: Yes sir.

David Bedell: Um, regrettably I'm gonna have to leave about 12:00 o'clock. A personal issue has come up that cannot be deferred so what I would like to do is table G-1 to the same time at the next meeting. Table J-1 as well and move Items J-3 and J-4 up to the beginning of the meeting.

Jack Bedell: Second.

Ken Williams: Ok. So we have that subsidiary motion.

Linda Lindholm: Mr. Chair?

Ken Williams: Yes.

Linda Lindholm: I totally agree that you can move those up but I do think that we have some charter schools, we the final decision for the voting on them at the next meeting.

Nina Boyd: No, charter schools public hearing will be on July 9<sup>th</sup>. And then the vote will be in August.

Linda Lindholm: ok. Thank you.

Ken Williams: Very good. And the other item that I'd like to remove is Item G-2 which was meant for rebuttal and subsequent following G-1. So um...

Robert Hammond: Are you wanting that then tabled or removed, sir.

Ken Williams: Removed from this meeting agenda.

Linda Lindholm: Second

Jack Bedell: On the table. Do you want to follow, are you gonna give it, if you remove it it means it goes away forever. Are you going to follow Trustee Boyd's?

Ken Williams: That is correct so if G-1 were to come back to any of our future meetings, G-2 would follow so technically table.

David Boyd: Which it was. My motion was to table until the same time at the next meeting.

Ken Williams: ok

David Boyd: And you know once again I apologize. This is the first time in my five years on this Board that I'm not staying every single minute. But...

Robert Hammond: Would it um, point of clarification...would it be appropriate to, cause I know we have a motion, part of the body to simply add tabling G-2 to the original motion?

Jack Bedell: I think that's friendly.

Ken Williams: Yeah, I think that's friendly. I don't see any problems with that. Ok, so basically in essence if I can iterate what I just heard we're going to be adopting today's meeting with the addition to I-3 of 18 sets of a particular books and we're going to be tabling Items G-1, G-2 and J-1. Is that the correct understanding? Any further discussion on the Agenda Items for today? Barring none, all those in favor say AYE, AYE. Oppose, abstained, motion passes 5-0. Ok. So moving on to the minutes. I have a motion for approval of our June 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

F. Minutes

Jack Bedell: Move.

Robert Hammond: Second.

Ken Williams: So I've got motion and a second...any discussion.

Linda Lindholm: Yes.

Robert Hammond: Yes sir.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: At our last meeting we took a position on a US Senate bill and we were requested that we have a letter be written to them in support of that bill, and that was to protect the identity of children during testing. Were we able to get that completed? And we'd asked perhaps if our wonderful Superintendent would sign that letter and send it off?

Al Mijares: Yes, absolutely.

Linda Lindholm: Is that complete or that's in the process.

Nina Boyd: It's in the process.

Al Mijares: No I think that it's still in process. We do have our staff looking at that in addition to a number of other bills and we're waiting for it to get down as I understand it Nina. You...

Nina Boyd: We'll actually the draft letter that Linda's referring to is um just awaiting your final remarks and editing. I believe that we're sending it through legal to make sure we had picked up the appropriate information. So it should be ready for you by I believe tomorrow.

Al Mijares: Is that a letter from the Board or...

Linda Lindholm: We passed a resolution in support of having protecting the identity of our children as they were being tested.

Ken Williams: Right. That was that position...

Nina Boyd: But Linda specifically asked if Al would put a cover to support it as well. And so there was a letter drafted under his name to go along with what the Board did.

Ken Williams: So there's two documents.

Nina Boyd: Yes. Your document is ready.

Ken Williams: I see.

David Boyd: And that's our standard "yes we support or help support".

Ken Williams: That's a template.

Linda Lindholm: Ok. Thank you so much for that. I think that's an important bill and I'm just trying to watch the timeline on it and make sure we get some input in. So, that was my comment on the minutes.

Ken Williams: Ok, very good. Robert.

Robert Hammond: Yes'm. Page two of the minutes which is also marked page five. A couple things. One under public comments there where we have Myles Durfee. It says Myles, Durfee. I don't know if that really matters.

Jack Bedell: Where are you?

Nina Boyd: It's grammatical.

Robert Hammond: It's grammatical. And then uh, under special recommendations for J-1, it says, you know we had a motion and a second secured by a vote of 5-0. However, we didn't adopt it I don't think straight out. I think we adopted it though with some changes.

Linda Lindholm: We did with Item # 2 that had a Memorandum of Understanding of a couple issues that Kelly had with that particular school. Uh so. It was...

Jack Bedell: It was on the recommendation of the staff that we accepted their recommendation.

Nina Boyd: Right. So it's captured correctly in the minutes.

Jack Bedell: Yes, that's...

Linda Lindholm: Good, good, good, good catch.

Robert Hammond: Ok, I just wanted to make sure. That we accepted it with staff's recommendations for changes and I felt like that, just wanted clear to me. So I wanted to say thank you to the staff. Um, and by the way, thank you also to Penny for doing a couple certificates for me at last minute, so...and continuing on to page six, under public the second H, public comments, down near the end where it says Carlos. It just says Carlos? We don't a last, did we not get a last name? All right, we didn't, we didn't. Um, page seven under second J, special recommendations, Item J-7 says carried by a vote of 50, I'm assuming 5-0.

Al Mijares: You need the back slash in there.

Robert Hammond: And then my last one would be on page nine, um, under Board Roundtable, L-4, third to the last where it says ad hoc committee to research time spent on testing and I thought it was Trustee Bedell that did that, was it you?

Jack Bedell: Both of us.

Robert Hammond: Was it both?

Linda Lindholm: It was jointly between both of us.

Jack Bedell: We're taking the same approach, Mr. Vice President that we took to the math piece.

Robert Hammond: Ok. I just, I just

Nina Boyd: So do you want us to add it?

Robert Hammond: So, I was just curious if we should add Dr. Bedell's name to that or not, or if it doesn't matter that's fine. I just wanted to make sure.

Jack Bedell: We'll I don't mind if it's in reverse alphabetical order.

Robert Hammond: That was it. Just those little changes.

Ken Williams: So, we have those changes noted Penny?

Penny Dunseth: Um huh.

Ken Williams: Have them all? Ok. And we have a motion to second, any other discussion?

Linda Lindholm: Oh, I'm sorry. I have one more thing.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: When we gave recognition to the employees who were here for ten, twenty-five and thirty years, do they get a certificate? Do they get anything? Can we ask that we get certificates in the future for employees that serve? I'm sorry, I think that would be very appropriate.

Renee Hendricks: They actually do receive certificates at a General Staff meeting to be recognized then and then this is just for the Board to see the years of service also.

Linda Lindholm: Ok, that's fine. I just thought they should get certificates.

Renee Hendricks: Yeah, they do get something.

Linda Lindholm: Cause I, that's great that they devote their lives to teaching children.

Jack Bedell: Miss Hendrick, I, this Friday is the twelfth anniversary of my presence on this Board should I expect a certificate?

Robert Hammond: Yes, absolutely. Gold framed.

Renee Hendrick: I'm sorry Dr. Bedell. At this point we only give certificates over twenty years.

Jack Bedell: Thank you.

Renee Hendrick: So, eight more years and I'm sure we'll keep that for you.

Jack Bedell: Thank you.

David Boyd: You'll be recognized next June.

Linda Lindholm: That was my last comment. Thank you.

Ken Williams: Very good. Barring that there's no further discussion, we have a motion and a second, all those in favor of adopting the minutes from June 17 say AYE, Aye. Opposed, abstain, motion passes, 5-0. Being that the time certians have been removed from our meeting today we will go on and do consent calendar. May I have a motion for the consent calendar?

I. Consent Calendar

Robert Hammond: So moved.

Jack Bedell: Second.

Ken Williams: Second. Ok. I have a motion and second, and any discussion on the consent calendar?

Robert Hammond: Um, I had one. But Dave?

David Boyd: No, no, I didn't think we were allowed discussion on the consent calendar.

Linda Lindholm: Yes. Are any of the individuals here that we are recognizing?

Jack Bedell: Mine, I-3 is not.

Ken Williams: Any other further discussion? Barring none, all those in favor say AYE, AYE. Oppose, abstain, motion, passes 5-0. Moving on to Special Recommendations J-1 has been removed.

J. Special Recommendations

Ken Williams: Were there any Public Comments for J-1?

Penny Dunseth: We did have one.

Ken Williams: Very good.

Penny Dunseth: Linda.

Ken Williams: No but but that's been removed. So...

Penny Dunseth: That's what I mean. Letting her know that she doesn't.

Ken Williams: Lydia sorry. You can still do a Public Comment. We freely encourage public dialogue with this Board. Moving on to Item-J2. Do I have a motion?

Robert Hammond: Moved.

Ken Williams: We have a motion, we have a second from? I will second this resolution. Any discussion?

Jack Bedell: I would like to call your attention to this mornings' Los Angeles Times on page B-3. A terrifying rare complication. The opening paragraph is; the risks of a measles survivor getting fatal disease SSBE shows needs for vaccinations medical experts say. I want to share with you, I am strongly opposed to this resolution. I believe when we become members of a society, we have some civil responsibilities and some civic responsibilities that transcend certain things. I have had, over the course of my career of forty-six years at Cal State Fullerton, I've had



no less than eight students bald or in wigs, or wearing masks because they're getting chemotherapy and they were in panic, they were afraid. They asked them if I could sit them in certain places in the room so they would not be near anybody who may be unvaccinated or unhealthy. I, all my children were vaccinated, all my grandchildren are vaccinated and I understand this and I get the sentiment behind it. However, I think at times there's a bigger piece. And the fact that some babies cannot get inoculated before they're a year old means to me that those children, the mother taking that baby to the supermarket, may be put in a very serious risk. And I think that a, sometimes they say that time has come for certain things. I don't think the time has come for this. It's at the senate as we speak in the State of California. My understanding is we have no idea what the governor is going to do with it but I think this is very, with all due respect, and I get the philosophy of it, I really do. I think it's ill advised.

Ken Williams: Thank you Dr. Bedell for your thoughts. I mean we'll move on to other trustees on this issue.

Linda Lindholm: Um, this is on SB, for the benefit of the audience, SB 277. Ah, which is a resolution and a, I'm sure most of you are following this one. This is on immunization of children. Um, this particular resolution I am not in favor of but there are I would love to send a letter and let me go around to some points on this. It's absolutely essential that we vaccinate our children for measles, mumps and rubella and also the D tab. Polio is an exceedingly, exceedingly devastating disease and right now it's hitting I believe parts of Afghanistan. There are four countries in the world where polio still exists and it can resurge and it can spread. Um, so those I am definitely in favor of. What I'm not in favor of, which you have listed here as one of your whereas' um, no let me find the one. It is where it would be onerous to me and then they can add various vaccines without the senate and assemblies approval. Without parents to have the ability to make comments on that. Let me see if I can find this one. Ah, here it is. Unfortunately, the bill was not included in our packet. It's always a good idea to include the bill following the suggestion of the resolution. In this one it says, that in the resolution it gives the government unlimited power to add vaccines to the current mandated school entry immunization battery. That bothers me tremendously. So while I'm not in support of, opposition to the basic vaccines which I think are critical, in fact in some of our school districts we have 20% of children who are not vaccinated. That can cause almost an epidemic if it gets out and to your point, I do have a grandchild, so I'm following the vaccines right now. So okay, go and get your measles vaccines. Well you can't get it until you're one. So that means if you are exposed to a child who is older who can probably do quite well, if you're under that age and you're exposed, you can suffer devastating circumstances with that. So I would like to send a letter to the governor. That would be my suggestion. And say that remove, if there's any language in there, somebody needs to research the language, where they can add unlimited vaccines to the current list. That's what concerns me on this particular item. So those are my comments.

Ken Williams: I'd like to hear from the author of J-2 for his reasons for putting it on our agenda today.

Robert Hammond: Although I have all my kids vaccinated and I've been a school teacher and every place I've taught in has been, shall we say, rather rough, um, the thought of mandating for entrance into schools and in essence take away parental rights bothers me greatly. This strikes me very scarily of the 1927 US Supreme Court case of Buck v. Bell, in which the Supreme Court upheld in an 8-1 decision that if the states feel that it's within societies best interest then they can go ahead and sterilize people. It's kind of the same argument. Um, because what we're saying is that well, the needs of society outweigh. And as a general rule, I'm all in favor of protecting society. I mean, I grabbed an M-16. But my point is that at what point do we honor parental rights? You know, that's my argument. Am I in favor in joining with you in a letter to the governor and to the authors or to the assembly? Absolutely. I would, cause that means the crux of it.

Linda Lindholm: That is the crux.

Robert Hammond: You know, the crux to me is taking away parental rights per se and making this mandatory. Am I against vaccinations? In and of itself, no. That's why all my kids have been vaccinated. So, to me, I am, I have to be very wary when I see something come out of the legislature that in essence they will tout as for the good of society. I always refer back to the 27 case of Buck v. Bell. So, its cases like that just bother me.

David Boyd: Comment Mr. President?

Ken Williams: Yes sir.

David Boyd: I totally concur with Dr. Bedell and make an observation with respect to Trustee Lindholm. I'm old enough to remember polio. And the fear that went through the community when there was no hope, was no known cause, was no cure, and that tremendous damage it did to society. I also make the observation that I don't see where we're really taking away a parental right and I don't have a bill in front of me either but as I understood it this would only apply to parents who place children in public schools. If you don't want to be vaccinated you don't put your child in a public school.

Ken Williams: Are you done? Ok. Ah, I'm just looking at the law as its' been introduced in the State Senate here and I don't know anything about Buck v Bell um. As a physician who has been immunizing all of his patients for the last 28 years of my professional career I've strongly believed in vaccinations for the most part except for a few out there that I have reservations about. Especially the HPV and the HPV and um the other one that causes shingles, the chicken pox virus. Those are not perfect vaccinations. They do have problems. I think the bill is as I'm looking at it takes away any right of patients of parents to have any say so in the vaccination of

their kids. And I'm sitting here looking at it here...that there will be no option. It's whatever the government says and that's where it gets really dangerous. It's when the government says now you have to do vaccinations like for the HPV virus. Human pathaloma virus is a sexually transmitted virus and for those families who's sons and daughters are not sexually active, why do you have to have a mandate on a virus that you're not going to be exposed to if you follow certain lifestyles. Oral polio, no brainer. It's still in the world. There are isolated cases with routine immunization by the way, every single adult in here needs to get an update in their immunizations for the oral polio, the measles, mumps and rubella. You have to get updates in hepatitis B, your immune system only works for about 20 years and so every two decades you need to get immunizations. So, I would say if this bill were here I would require everybody in this room be immunized cause I'm afraid of what you're going to give me. So that has to go along with the context with why I support this resolution because I think this bill is bad public policy. And this is evenly divided amongst the physician community. Yes, vaccinations do save lives. Absolutely. But it's not a panacea. And then I have having gone into the pharmaceutical company, the manipulation of the raw data coming from the research and how they introduce vaccines for their own pure profits when it's not indicated and that's a whole nother conversation, and certainly way out of the range of us today. And so, this is obviously a bill that divides us. I will support his because I oppose the governs overreach. The current existing laws are good. They've been in existence for many, many decades. Um, the reason why this became such a big issue is because of what happened in Disneyland a few months ago. And that's because people were not immunized. Um, when was your last MMR?

Linda Lindholm: I had to get an update because we have our grandson and I just had the new Dtab.

Ken Williams: Good, good for you. When was your last MMR?

Jack Bedell: Ahhhh, my last MMR was in October I think.

Ken Williams: Good for you. I'm impressed.

Jack Bedell: And I had pneumonia last month.

Ken Williams: So you had the pneumococcal vaccine which is very good. So we can have a conversation with who is immunized and not immunized. I think it's good.

Jack Bedell: Are you immunized?

Ken Williams: I am, I have to be. I'm on staff at Children's Hospital and they make me get blood (inaudible) and approve all that. I have to have a TB test every year. It's amazing what I have to do.

Linda Lindholm: Mr. Chair?

Ken Williams: Yes sir, yes ma'am!

Linda Lindholm: Um, I think we would probably all agree on the one item in this resolution that we do not support. And that is that item the last whereas. Um, what, I am a little concerned trying to read this without the bill in front of me. The bill went to the senate was passed. The bill went to the assembly it was passed. They have us an amendments that they put on it at the assembly. I don't know what those amendments are. And then it's going back to the senate and then to my understanding then it's going to the governor for his signature. So there these, gonna be these iterations of it. I would be very supportive if I could see the language that says, I would support this resolution. If it says in there that it gives the government unlimited power to add vaccines.

Ken Williams: I just read it, it does. But you don't have it so I understand, yeah.

Linda Lindholm: No, and there are three versions right now. So I don't know what version you're looking at.

Ken Williams: So are you suggesting then a subsidiary motion to table this until the July meeting. Until we have further information on this particular item.

Linda Lindholm: Yes. Related to that specific language. And if there is discovered language I would vote for it right now. That we send a letter of opposition to the bill if it has this language in it. To the governor so he gets it in a timely manner.

Ken Williams: So Trustee Hammond, do you view that as a friendly motion?

Robert Hammond: I always view everything from Trustee Lindholm as a friendly motion.

Ken Williams: She is just so wonderful, isn't she.

Nina Boyd: Excuse me Dr. Williams. You have three public comments that have just come up related to this.

Linda Lindholm: Can we get the motion before.

Nina Boyd: Yes.

Ken Williams: Ok, so, so. The motion is?

Linda Lindholm: It's a substitute motion that in the interim between this meeting and the next meeting if we find that this new bill...

Ken Williams: Oh you want to lay on the table, that's what they were talking about.

Linda Lindholm: Pardon?

Ken Williams: You wanted to lay this on the table I thought.

Linda Lindholm: Well I can table it or I'd go ahead and make a motion to approve a letter to the governor if that language is included. Would you like to take...

Ken Williams: My own personal thoughts are I'd love to hear this. It would be much cleaner if we were to get this and vote on it when we have everything in front of us.

Linda Lindholm: That would be helpful.

Ken Williams: I'd like to hear your thought Jack on that.

Jack Bedell: Well, I don't know what...

Ken Williams: Are you just totally against it.

Jack Bedell: If I were forced on the barbed wire right now, that's where I would go with it. I'm not averse to having further conversation on it but I think it's kind of ironic to me that the kids who are going to be the most hurt by this would be a very small part of the elite in Cupertino and in South Orange County and then an overwhelming majority here will be poor kids. And that's what concerns me. If that were to take effect that's clearly what the data shows. So what I don't want to do anything that's going to put kids at risk by tabling or not tabling. So I defer to you with peer, you know, but I'd like to see...

Linda Lindholm: But we already have in the legislature that they should have these vaccinations. The only thing that we're saying is that the government cannot add vaccines without going back to the assembly and the senate. That's what concerns me. Like the human papillomavirus, actually described as you said, you know, I don't need those.

Jack Bedell: So if anyone would help clarify that then I would be comfortable with that.

Ken Williams: Oh, you're okay David and Robert? Ok. So what I'm hearing then if I can just put words in your mouth is that you would just like to table this motion until further clarification for the July meeting.

Linda Lindholm: Correct.

Jack Bedell: Of that clause.

Linda Lindholm: That is specifically to my concerns.

Ken Williams: Ok, anyone would like to second that subsidiary motion?

Jack Bedell: For tabling?

Ken Williams: Yep, tabling.

Robert Hammonds: I'll second that...

Ken Williams: Ok. Any questions or comments?

David Boyd: No, we can table it.

Ken Williams: Ok, so all those in favor of tabling this for the July meeting say AYE. Aye. Oppose, abstain, motion passes for tabling this for the July meeting. Thank you very much.

Nina Boyd: Yum, and then you did have some public comments so, Penny.

H. Public Comments

J. Special Recommendations

Ken Williams: So moving on, any other further comments on Item J-2? Barring that there's none, ok, moving on to Item J-3 which is the...

Jack Bedell: Did we vote?

Robert Hammond: Did we vote?

Jack Bedell: Did we vote to table?

Ken Williams: We voted to table so...

Linda Lindholm: Yeah, we voted on it.

Ken Williams: Ok, so moving on to um Item J-3 that the adoption of the LCAP Plan for 2015-2018.

Jack Bedell: Move approval.

David Boyd: Second.

Ken Williams: We have a motion and a second. Ok, discussion. Or actually do we have any um public comments on this item?

Penny Dunseth: We do. Tom Pollitt.

David Boyd: Mr. President, may I make a request? I realize that we have our normal policy is 45 minutes for public comments. As you know I sort of have a time certain and need to be out of here.

Ken Williams: What time do you need to be out?

David Boyd: Later than 12:15 would be difficult.

Ken Williams: So if we could do one of two things. Either restrict the public comments to specifically J-3 and J-4 and defer any other public comments to the end of the meeting including Common Core related discussions. It would be greatly appreciated.

Robert Hammond: I would agree with that.

Ken Williams: How does the Board feel about that?

Robert Hammond: I'm ok with that.

Ken Williams: Ron, what legally...are we ok with that?

Ron Wenkart: (inaudible)

Ken Williams: Linda?

Linda Lindholm: I think on this I understand you've got some medical and you need to go and I think we would be all cognizant of that and all be respectful of that. I think we should take and items that people who are speaking on Item J-3 unless you're going to do at this time, just to help...

Ken Williams: Well, I think we're limited to our protocols and with what the law says and if we're bringing up an item on J-3 we need to have public comments before that.

Linda Lindholm: Yes, absolutely.

Ken Williams: So we're all in agreement with that?

Linda Lindholm: Yes, absolutely.

David Boyd: Since J-3 directly relates to J-4, you know maybe we can (inaudible) those comments. People who are in support of J-3 is likely to be in support of J-4 and vis versa.

Nina Boyd: We have four, four comments.

Jack Bedell: Total

Penny Dunseth: Three.

Linda Lindholm: Three, excuse me.

Ken Williams: Three total so nine minutes?

Nina Boyd: Three public comments between the two items.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: We can make up.

#### H. Public Comments

Ken Williams: Penny, it's been brought to my attention that our Board Policy allows three minutes per person at each meeting or per subject? At each meeting. Ok. So, if you can handle the parliamentary aspects to that? And I guess now you have to use a stopwatch for everybody. Which hasn't happened before.

Penny Dunseth: Right. There's only one other person that has two more cards.

Ken Williams: Ok, so are those two people that are left have they already spoken? They have? How much time did they speak?

Penny Dunseth: Three minutes.

Jack Bedell: I understand Board Policy and I strongly support Board Policy. I think the Board Policy needs to be implemented. That said, I think we could, how many do we have total.

Penny Dunseth: Left?

Nina Boyd: No, are you talking about on this item?

Penny Dunseth: Oh, no more left.

Ken Williams: No more left on LCAP or on the budget.

David Boyd: So let's move on.

Jack Bedell: So let's move on but let us enforce Board Policy as future agenda items arise and let's declare to the public who has every right to know what the Board Policy is.

Ken Williams: Right. So.

Jack Bedell: And it is on the agenda, correct, somewhere?



Ken Williams: No, it's not specified.

Linda Lindholm: Is it on the request to speak?

Jack Bedell: Under the public comments the last sentence says comments shall be limited to three per minutes per person and 30 minutes for all comments. That is in the agenda.

Ken Williams: That should say be 45 minutes.

Robert Hammond: 45. Is it 30 or 45?

Ken Williams: Well it says...

Penny Dunseth: It's 45 but it may say...

Jack Bedell: It says 30 here.

Penny Dunseth: I may have...

Robert Hammond: What page are you lookin' at Jack?

Jack Bedell: I'm looking on June 29<sup>th</sup> agenda top of the second page. So it's three minutes per person; that doesn't change and 45 minutes for all comments. So that needs to be amended.

Ken Williams: Ok, so we have to change that.

Jack Bedell: But the three minutes is consistent.

Ken Williams: Ok, so if you can keep track of the time.

Penny Dunseth: I sure can.

Ken Williams: That makes it easier for me.

Linda Lindholm: Ah, Mr. Chair, the um, the total should be on the request to speak also, form.

Penny Dunseth: It is.

Linda Lindholm: Ok.

David Boyd: Ok.

Ken Williams: Ok, so no more comments from the Board, for discussion. David.

J.      Special Recommendations

David Boyd: Can I start out? Seems to me this comes, well, let me make a quick observation. If we vote, anybody who votes no on either J-2 or J-3 or J-4, I think they should state why. That would aid us in preparing LCAPs in future years and budgets in future years. And we also have to understand that a “no” vote on either one of these will basically be saying that we would rather have Sacramento bureaucrats come in and run this department rather than Dr. Mijares and his staff. Is that not correct?

Jack Bedell: My understanding.

David Boyd: So, um, from my standpoint um, I’m firmly in support of both J-3 and J-4. And I would encourage my Trustees to do likewise.

Jack Bedell: Mr. President?

Ken Williams: Yes sir.

Jack Bedell: Yah, I want to echo those comments as well. Uh, I’ve never seen a situation on my 12 years on the Board as where we are right now with this kind of conversation before a budget. That said, what I’m going to propose is for the, but next budget cycle will be 16-17, is that how it goes? The next time. Ok, what I’m proposing, my understanding is there are counties around the state that do this. Is that the Board have a budget advisory committee that is advisory to the Board in the early conversations, cause I think it’s kind of awkward right now and I think that Mr. Trustee Boyd just cha-cha’d around the subject about how grave it is in the long haul if we don’t have a budget. In terms of what it means for our own employees and what it means for our own operation for our unique kids. So what I would like to do, unless I’m otherwise directed, is I would like to draft a document for a Board advisory committee where each one of us would have an appointment to that Board that advises us and that we ask the Superintendent to assign two staff so that we can have anybody say, oh there’s a surprise about grants or there’s a surprise with Common Core, or there’s a surprise there’s a surprise. I think that would be helpful. I think if the staff doesn’t want to shoot me over it they’ll get over it. But I think that’s a way. My understanding again I think, I may be venture of maybe doing something like this. Comparable sized counties may have budget advisory groups. It’s advisory. So I would not want anybody to believe what they say is finale, but that it’s advisory to us. Because that’s one level. You know. And when I was thinking about this, this is germane to the motion because I agree right now not to approve this motion could within three months have very deleterious effect on this operation. And I think I’m understating it. So I think for this cycle and then go forward with that so we can have all these conversations and don’t, not the right words, but by the time we got here it almost would be rubber stamping cause we had a lot of input from a variety of constituents. That’s what I would suggest. That it would be a Board. Individual appointment. That it would not be a Board Member cause that’s like three bites of the apple ultimately and I don’t think that’s appropriate for the constituents. So, that said, I strongly support, first of all I want to acknowledge all the staff work that went into the development of the Local Control Funding

Formula. All the consultation with the parents, the kids, the kids parents for whom we serve. Our unique kids that they were and I read the data in here. Beautiful data. It's important data. But we do that and we do this and then we go forward looking at other ways on how to do this. So I strongly support and I want to thank the staff publicly. Ah, I shared Trustee Lindholm's concerns about and what's been mentioned by our audience member, and in light of that, this morning if you read the paper, there is a huge drop nation-wide in the number of people who are signing up to be teachers of the future. So at the same time we mess with their benefits as the pool goes down, we gotta look out far. And that's why a budget advisory may work on that and in some ways for recruiting. So I strongly support the budget and want to thank Mr. Mijares and his staff for putting together J-3 and J-4 and the hundreds and hundreds of hours that went into that and the consultative process. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Ken Williams: Thank you my dear colleague.

Linda Lindholm: Thank you, Dr. Bedell. I disagree with the concept of the budget committee. I think what we should do is have continued workshops which we need to have a specific time, and place and dedication to them. That gives all members, not just specific members who are chosen for a committee. So, this year was the very first year we had a budget workshop presentation that was about an hour and a half. At our last meeting we had the LCAP presentation and it was a very good presentation. Um, I do have issues with the testing at the end of this meeting under Roundtable. We have a proposal to the whole Board that Dr. Bedell and myself would like to join on reviewing the testing and the testing times. So I'm going to be looking into that at that time. But I can't go into that further at this time. Um, I will be supporting the LCAP. We need to get the budget passed. But there's a lot of issues that I have on various points that I would like to pursue. Ah, with that I would like to thank our staff. I think you did an excellent job. For those of you, and I know most of you were here, for the presentation on what our ACCESS students are getting. And it looks like just an absolutely tremendous education. There are things we found out that testing requirements are about eight hours for the Smarter Balanced. I think that's absolutely crazy so I'm going to be pursuing that in a different way. Um, looking at, are we covering both items? We're covering the budget and the LCAP right now?

Ken Williams: No we're just on Item J-3?

Linda Lindholm: All right.

Ken Williams: But the comments were to cover both.

Linda Lindholm: Ok, then I'll wait. I have comments on J-4 shall I wait?

Ken Williams: No we're not going to cover both we're on Item J-3.

Linda Lindholm: Ok, then those are my comments for the LCAP.

Ken Williams: Ok, Robert want to speak?

Robert Hammond: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir. Um, and again kudos to Dr. Mijares and to your staff for preparing this. I'm sure it took a lot of time and manpower so please pass on my thanks. Um, looking at the LCAP though my one concern is that you know we're supposed to vote on and accept the Local Control and Accountability Plan, the LCAP. Um, and I know that in the Ed Code, at section 52060D2 um, and it says that the implementation of the academic content performance standards adopted by the state board, including how the programs and services will enable English Learners to access the Common Core Academic Standards adopted, and that's the key part right here, adopted pursuant to section 60605.8. When we look at 60605.8D, it says that the Common Core Standards, yeah their going to (inaudible), but that we also have to use internationally benchmarked standards. I have not seen any proof whatsoever that these new standards are internationally benchmarked. Moreover, when we also look at Ed Code 60604.5A3, it says that the Common Core testing has to be in line which means that it has to be internationally benchmarked. I would like us to accept this LCAP but I would like us to not accept either the Common Core testing or the Common Core Standards. And pursuant to 60618, we are allowed then to treat the Common Core Standards as just some model standards and we can come up with our own standards and I don't think ending up with our own standards is the answer. I think we can simply roll back to the 1997 gold standards.

Applause

Ken Williams: Thank you for holding your applause.

Robert Hammond: Ah, pursuant to 60618, I believe we can roll back to the 1997 gold standards and that's what we should do. We accept the funding, we accept LCAP, we're in compliance with the law but we do not utilize or have any implementation aspects of the Common Core testing or the Common Core Standards and we go to the old 97 standards and we do that pursuant to 60618 of the Ed Code. That is what I'm going to recommend and if need be I will make a subsidiary motion to that effect. Because we need to keep this, we need to keep the funding because Title I, Title II and Title III funding is absolutely predicated on us receiving funds but we can only receive those funds if we're using international benchmarks standards and my concern is is that some young attorney out there gets with a couple people and decides to initiate a lawsuit that we are in violation of certain stuff. I don't want us to lose the funding. We have an easy out. We can go back to good standards that are internationally benchmarked and until they can prove that the testing and the Common Core Standards are international benchmarked then we have the 97 standards. They can prove all that? Great, we can go to Common Core. So if need be, I'll make a subsidiary motion that we accept the LCAP but without utilizing Common Core Standards and Common Core testing and we go back to the 97 standards.

Ken Williams: Are you done sir?

Robert Hammond: For the time being.

Ken Williams: For the time being, ok. I'm going to take a little bit of a different and sobering approach. I see this from a different perspective than my good colleagues here. I agree with Robert about adopting the 98 standards because Common Core is based, is not based on international benchmarks and that would make it illegal for us to adopt that basically. Local Control Education though has been a time honored concept but unfortunately today no longer exists. Traditionally in years past local boards of education have had the primary role in the education of its children and community. However, there is a new education paradigm that has been recently emerging that removes local school boards from his final place of authority and we see that with Governor Brown having a relationship with Michael Fullan and his organization; I'll get into that a little bit here. It also comes under the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence which makes us as school board members essentially figureheads. And we can only implement what is dictated or mandated to us by unelected officials in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. Take for instance Common Core and these new education standards. This board has never voted to implement these standards. We've never taken a vote. More importantly there's great evidence exists again as I've mentioned that these are not lawful because they have not been internationally benchmarked. We've had a great outcry from the public and the Superintendent and the staff just went ahead and we've been implementing Common Core. And drip by drip we've been learning a little bit more about it. Again, no board vote has ever been made about implementing Common Core. It's all been assumed that because the state mandates it or some board mandates it that we have to do it. This staff will argue that no vote is necessary to implement Common Core. But then that understanding and mindset just validates my perspective that local control of education no longer exists. As elected trustees to this department with shared responsibilities of governance with the County Superintendent of Education I believe this board has been a rubberstamp in many ways. We've been marginalized and dismissed. No longer do the people of Orange County elect school board members to make decisions or governance policies that are for the best interests of their students and children and who listen to the families who elect them. We were told by Common Core advocates that this is nothing but higher standards. Everything else doesn't matter. We were told that Common Core would not influence assessments, curriculum, or teaching methodologies. But that conversation was not true and it was predicted my many, I've written a couple of articles in the Register about that, as also the Sutherland Institute that talked about standards driving the agenda. We talked about earlier about a train that's left the station many years ago. And and it's true. This was adopted many many years ago before I even knew it was adopted. But this department is now on the bullet train. Where that bullet trains going I don't know. The cat-is-out-of-the-bag as the saying goes. Because of Michael Fullan and his role in California we've now seen what has been hidden. The hidden agenda diluted academic instruction. The reality is that Common Core has been incrementally implemented and with great stealth. I haven't reviewed any contracts

with any of the entities that we do assessment testing with. I've never seen anything like that. But under the Local Control Funding Formula or LCAP we're required to adopt a template by the State of California and call that Local Control. That is not local control. Robert has talked about making an amendment to this LCAP presentation that I will support should he make that subsidiary motion and I will talk more about Mr. Fullan who is a globalist, who wants to rule by committees and not by the traditional republican form of government where the representatives are elected by the people of the community. So with those words, I will conclude my remarks. I will be voting against the LCAP unless there is a subsidiary motion made and accepted by this Board to go back to the 98 standards, excuse me, 97 standards, which by the way have been proven to be higher than the Common Core Standards by the Fordham Institute. And we were by the way 49<sup>th</sup> out of 50 states many years ago and we had risen to the middle tier until the Common Core Standards were adopted. So that concludes my remarks and thank you for (inaudible).

Robert Hammond: I'll make a subsidiary motion that we accept the LCAP as written with the exception that we do not utilize the Common Core testing or the Common Core Standards and that pursuant to 60618. We go back to the 1997 California Standards.

Ken Williams: I'll second that motion. Discussion?

Jack Bedell: Yeah, I appreciate...

Linda Lindholm: Oh, David Boyd...

David Boyd: All the points that both Trustee Hammond and Trustee Williams raised could have been raised at the last meeting. We had a public hearing on LCAP at the last meeting and it's not good business practice to drop material amendments to the Board at the very last minute without having the opportunity to fully analyze what's been said and what's been represented. So on that basis alone I would object to it. If there are going to be objections to the budget, on issues that we already know and have known for months and months and months, they should have been raised at the last meeting and we should have been advised well in advance as to what this motion was going to be. Because otherwise, I just don't know whether, what Trustee Hammond says is fully accurate or not.

(Voices from the audience and various Board members)

David Boyd: And I'm not saying he's trying to misrepresent anything, don't get me wrong, but on something as important as this LCAP and this budget, I want to make a decision based on facts that I've had opportunity to review and we haven't been given that opportunity.

Ken Williams: Thank you, David. Linda?



Linda Lindholm: Thank you. I can't say that I disagree with most of what you've said. I do support most of what you've said. If I was able to vote today to say you know, tell the California State Board that we don't want Common Core. That would be a wonderful agenda item. What we do have before us is the LCAP and we did have the meeting, last meeting where we reviewed the LCAP. My understanding is that this is a legally required document by the State of California that we do this document. Now, there are probably sections in there that we don't appreciate and we would like to change which I do agree with you on. We have a lot of kids in school. We have teachers teaching. This is the funding element for that. As we disagree with that, we need to fund those teachers. We need to fund those schools. We have 500,000 kids. I can't support something I do not know we can legally do. So, with that, I won't be supporting the subsidiary motion. I will support the LCAP and I will continue to fight all those issues that we have on student identity theft, on the Smarter Balanced test, every, on the math standards on the matrix's of math. I want to continue to do that but I want to fund our kids and this is how we're going to fund our kids so I'm not going to be supporting that motion.

Al Mijares: Can I make a just a point of clarification? The 500,000 kids are the students we have countywide.

Linda Lindholm: Countywide, sorry.

Al Mijares: We only have jurisdiction for the kids in the Orange County Department of Ed. To my knowledge all of the independent, there's 27 independent districts who have their own governing boards have approved, or in the process, well, July 1 was when that to be done, so they've gone through the process this board has gone through. And I haven't had any reaction from any county superintendent that there was a problem with their LCAP's.

Linda Lindholm: Ok. And I do have another issue with these special children that we have. We have blind, visually impaired. We have the deaf, we have the hard of hearing. We have the incarcerated we are directly responsible to. These children need us every moment of the day and they need the teachers every moment of the day. I can't support that particular motion. There will be many more motions I can support. But not this particular motion.

Ken Williams: Yes.

Jack Bedell: Yes, Mr. President, I seek your parliamentary advice. What would happen, how would you rule on a motion to end debate on all questions before the house since we've had conversation about the subsidiary motion? We've had conversation about the main motion. How would you rule about a motion should I make it I moved to end all debate on questions before the house which take us immediately to a vote on the subsidiary motion and the main motion to adopt so that we can get to J-4? Would you rule that in order?

Ken Williams: So, um. Your question has to do with the rules of how we run our business here and we do have the rules that I believe if you were to make that request the subsidiary motion discussion would stop and we vote on that then we go to the main item.

Jack Bedell: Yes, I move that we end debate on all questions before the house.

David Bedell: Second.

Robert Hammond: Bummer, I was hoping to have about a 10 second rebuttal.

Jack Bedell: It's not debatable.

Nina Boyd: Robert, we can't hear you the mics not picking up.

Robert Hammond: Oh I just said I was hoping to have like a just a 10-20 second rebuttal before the motion but the motion has been made. It's not debatable.

Ken Williams: It's not debatable. So, that will stop the discussion on the subsidiary motion. We're voting on our subsidiary motion if you can re-read that for us.

Robert Hammond: I move acceptance of the LCAP but with the stipulation that we do not utilize Common Core testing and we do not use the Common Core Standards and we go back to the 97 standards as allowed pursuant to 60618 of the Ed Code.

Ken Williams: Very good. Ok. Does everybody understand that subsidiary motion? Ok, being that the motion was made to stop conversation, all those in favorite of it say AYE. AYE.

David Boyd: We're voting to stop what?

Ken Williams: No, no. We're voting on this subsidiary motion.

Various voices

Ken Williams: You don't have, do you have to take a vote on ending?

Robert Hammond: Yah, yah, you made the motion.

Jack Bedell: Yah, then you would have three votes and the public knows...

Ken Williams: Thank you for clarifying. So this is a vote to end discussion.

Jack Bedell: Right, right.

Ken Williams: Ok, so all those in favor of ending debate? AYE, oppose-myself. Motion passes 4-1-0 to end debate. So now we're going back to the subsidiary motion...



Jack Bedell: Right.

Ken Williams: Ah, excuse me for my lack of familiarity with our parliamentary procedure. But now we're going back to the subsidiary motion which is basically to adopt the 97 standards rather than to adopt the standards of what year was that adopted?

Robert Hammond: Wasn't it...

Ken Williams: 2010?

Jack Bedell: As reflected in Common Core.

Ken Williams: In Common Core, yeah.

Robert Hammond: So it's to adopt the LCAP but with the 97 stands versus the 2010 standards known as Common Core.

Ken Williams: And that's based upon, what education code allows us to do that?

Robert Hammond: 60618.

Ken Williams: Ok, so that should all be in the minutes then. 6018?

Robert Hammond: 60618.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: And may I understand there's no discussion at this point, correct?

Jack Bedell: Absolutely.

Linda Lindholm: Ok.

Ken Williams: Ok. So we're very clear it's a straight up or down vote? All those in favor of the subsidiary motion say AYE-AYE. Oppose-NO. So that subsidiary motion fails by a vote of 2-3-0. Now, going back to the original item which is J-3 which is LCAP. Is everybody clear on that before we go ahead with that vote? I think we voted to stop discussion on it, ok? All those in favor of LCAP say AYE-AYE. Oppose-Oppose. Abstain? Motion passes 3-2-0. Moving on...

Linda Lindholm: Mr. Chair?

Ken Williams: Yes?

Linda Lindholm: Now that we've completed those items, um, is it possible to get from our legal department um, a statement saying that we could pull? Because I was not, I wanted to ask the

question that, if we could such as you recommended, I did not know, I know you cited something but I wasn't sure legally if we could. So, is it possible to get a opinion from our legal attorney at our the meeting?

Robert Hammond: Is it, I'm all in favor of that but does it deal with anything budgetary? I mean I hope not because he's recused himself on budgetary matters. So.

Linda Lindholm: Is that on all budgetary matters.

Ron Wenkart: I don't believe I have a conflict on this issue. As I understand it, you're asking for a legal opinion on 60618, whether that allows you to adopt the 1997 standards, abandon the Common Core Standards.

Linda Lindholm: Exactly for adoption of the budget. Is that...

(Inaudible voices)

Linda Lindholm: for the LCAP.

Ken Wenkart: We, I don't feel we have a conflict. We haven't answered that question before.

Linda Lindholm: Ok. You have not answered that question before and eh for the members of the public, that's what's keeping me from being (inaudible), we have to fund these kids. So, I need to know that answer. But if this had come up at the last meeting we could have asked at the last meeting.

Ron Wenkart: I would be glad to prepare a legal opinion on that.

Robert Hammond: And that's because with that I'm also eh, you know, as I've mentioned numerous times over the last few months if not a year, about 606058Delta regarding the international benchmark standards for the standards themselves and also for the Common Core testing, 60604.5A3. Um, which is all couched in then with the LCAP aspect of 52060D2.

Linda Lindholm: So the question is can we, is divest? What is the right for this? These two entities, the LCAP and the standards. I want to know if we can divest those two.

Ron Wenkart: Ok, is that the will of the Board? If that's the will of the Board...

Ken Williams: Do you need a vote on this, Nina?

Robert Hammond: Well I don't think so.

Nina Boyd: No, just a request.

(Mixed inaudible voices)

Ron Wenkart: It says should be ok if you're fine with it.

Ken Williams: David would you agree with this?

David Boyd: Yes.

Ken Williams: Ok. So we're all in agreement. So I think that's reasonable.

Ron Wenkart: Ok.

Ken Williams: So we won't have a vote.

David Boyd: Before we go on with the budget, can I have a five minute recess? I need to see if I can reschedule an appointment.

Robert Hammond: Absolutely.

Ken Williams: Absolutely. If you'd like. So we'll be meeting here at 12:30.

Break

Ken Williams: Ok, the um, Board of Education is back into session here. Its 12:32 and we're moving on with Special Recommendations and ah Item J-4 the budget for the 2015-16 year.

David Boyd: I make a motion to accept.

Ken Williams: I have a motion by Trustee Boyd and...

Jack Bedell: Second.

Ken Williams: And a second by Trustee Bedell. Ok. Discussion on the budget.

David Boyd: Sir.

Ken Williams: Yes sir.

David Boyd: Since the budget has to be aligned with the LCAP and we have approved the LCAP, it seems to me that there's not a whole lot of discussion we need to spend on the budget.

Nina Boyd: Did you make the motion?

Ken Williams: So um, we have a motion and a second and now we're in discussion here.

Nina Boyd: Ok.

Ken Williams: I'll look to my right to the lovely Trustee Lindholm.

Linda Lindholm: Thank you. I do have a couple items on this. I um, I want to thank Renee for all her incredible work on this, on this item. There's a lot of work that goes into this. Thank please all the staff members who were involved. Eh, I'd like, oh I would hope for the Boards consensus that as we go forward to look again at travel and conferences to have more budgetary codes than 5210 and 5220. I know she's hopefully going to work on that for the coming year. Um, and then, also on our cover letter we turn this in. I think we need a cover letter that says that we're going to have an increase in STRS and PERS um, and Jeff Arthur's always on that one. Um, doubling cost by the year 2020-21 of approximately 10 million dollars additional expenses a year with nothing further coming in the door on that. With those notes and then if you would please, normally what we have when you have an adopted budget it is sent back to all Board members and its spiral bound. If you could include with that and then we used it as a reference for the coming year. You already have all the documentations we just need it spiral bound with the Orange County Department of Education budget summary preceding all the paperwork. And that bound document gets to each Board Member is a reference item for members of the public whenever they want to come in and use for staff. So I just make that recommendation we get that whenever after we've approved the budget.

David Boyd: I would like to thank Trustee Lindholm for all the work she did on reformatting the budget and making it a more readable document and I don't know if I will have the pleasure to work with her in the future on this but whoever's on that committee I feel it would be very helpful if there are budgets concerns you raise them at the earliest possible moment so we can look at that and we can analyze that and we can come back and make a recommendation.

Ken Williams: Dr. Bedell?

Jack Bedell: No comment.

Ken Williams: Robert?

Robert Hammond: Not at this time sir.

Ken Williams: Ok. Um, I'll make my comments quick here. I'm going to vote no on the budget for several reasons. Uh, as I outlined in my LCAP statement I think that there is an emerging paradigm in education where we as locally elected representatives have become nothing more than figureheads. Um, there are decisions that are made, especially by this e, um it is called the California Collaborative for Education Excellence. I don't know if my colleagues know anything about this. Um, but in this new paradigm that's emerging, the republican form of government where we directly elect our representatives that is being diluted. No offense to our superintendents in California, but they are giving a tremendous amount of power and duties and responsibilities and local boards of education are being marginalized and dismissed. Not

because it's purposeful, but because that is this new emerging paradigm. The Local Control Funding Formula, LCAP, it's a ruse. There is no local control. It's all what people up at the state government and you can even reach so far as to the federal government and people at a national level who want to have a one size fits all national curriculum. And that's where this is all going. And that's not me. I didn't come up and make that statement. That's what many, many people in this nation have been saying about these national standards that are being created and I just got a read this from this document. It's a remarkable document. It's made by Michael Fullan and he talks about positive changes in California. And I'll be giving more specifics. I have a whole five minute that I created that I will read. But he talks about if you're a district and you don't want assistance, in such cases, this is Michael Fullan saying, the state should define mechanisms to require the district to take part in an assistance partnership. And that's where this is going. It's going to be about partnerships not going to be about individuals, not this Board. But other 26 other local Boards in this county and throughout this state. So this is a real serious problem. I'm saddened by it. I think it was validated by national commentator (inaudible) when he said, basically that we don't have that ability to make decisions for our kids here. Couple items on the budget. Yeah. I think the budget could be incorporating as Mr. Arthur said, the benefit costs of what the future retirees. I've always said that in my twenty years that I've been here. Maybe it will come true someday. I think there is talk about it may be required. I'd also like to talk about this time about adding to the budget a designated Board person that would take care of this needs to make us more efficient. And make us more professional in what we do. That is somebody who's full time, we're all part-time here. Um, and we have many, many requirements and duties and obligations outside of this Board and it is really, really tough to do what we do here. And so I would like to talk about having someone that is just specific for our Board that is hired by this Board that just interacts with the Superintendent so we can have better governance, and this is a dual governing body here. Sometimes I don't feel like that. Uh, but these are the types of things that I would like to incorporate in there. I know Miss Lindholm we've talked about this before.

Linda Lindholm: I do think as we try and gather more information as Dr. Bedell and I tried to gather more information on the Math Standards, as we try and gather more information on the amount of time our kids are doing testing that we do need more staff time. Um, and Penny does a fabulous job. It's just there's only one of her. And as an example today it would have been great to have the actual wording of the bill.

Ken Williams: SB 277.

Linda Lindholm: So we would have that there. I just, I think it needs a little more time and whoever I realize that the hiring does go through the Superintendent with the intent that this person supports the Boards actions. I'm asking a lot of questions. I think that's our job. (inaudible)

Ken Williams: But the Board according to the State Education Code can hire their own individual if they want.

Linda Lindholm: I think we should hire our individual but the scope of the individual comes under all the kind of technical stuff that comes under the Superintendent's office. So, it's a teamwork effort I think.

Ken Williams: Historically the conversation began, because when Lynn Hartline left this department, she retired a couple of years ago, she was an absolutely incredible individual that helped the cohesiveness of this Board and she helped to assist and dialogue in getting things done. Um, and Nina, expanded her roles and she got a raise which she definitely deserved cause she works so very hard and diligently for this Board, but it's hard because she has so many other responsibilities within this department and so she picked up a whole responsible by a former Superintendent Lynn, Lynn Hartline. And it's just real hard to do what she does and I don't want to burden anyone else more. So I think we should at some point talk about having some full time who is just dedicated to the duties and responsibilities of our Board.

Linda Lindholm: Well I agree with you and we mentioned that you needed to go back to your patients which is a good thing. Doing Roundtable at the last meeting at the very end. So something perhaps could get created that we can figure out how we can get more support. And not be using our wonderful heads of all our departments to answer these questions so that the meetings do go smoothly and that you have information on the back table and all those things that it takes another body.

Ken Williams: Very good.

David Boyd: Dr. Williams?

Ken Williams: Yes sir?

David Boyd: Conceptually I don't have a problem with that. I think we would have to clearly define what those responsibilities would be however. And the Board clearly has the responsibilities to the ability to hire a consultant to help us in our duties whether or not that is broad enough to cover a qualified administrator is probably questionable but I would suspect, that Dr. Mijares, and I don't want to speak for you, but you've always been receptive to the needs of the board and I think if we create a job description and we sit down with Dr. Mijares, perhaps Nina, that we come up with a plan.

Al Mijares: Yes, there's different models that we can look at. And we can propose them and you can react. Tell us what you think.

Linda Lindholm: I think that would be very helpful and we would have had the bill here today. It's not because you couldn't it's just that there are some hours in the day.

Penny Dunseth: Well yeah.

Linda Lindholm: Yeah. And that's the problem.

Penny Dunseth: If I was told you wanted it it would have been there.

Al Mijares: In fairness to the point as well I think that getting that type of dialogue for Board Members is important. So that we know. If you had wanted that bill here it would have been here. If you'd wanted it analyzed by that attorney it would have been analyzed. And I think what's happening is that it's a reflection of saturation. You know, we're all running as fast as we can run. You're all busy. We are busy. And I'll take responsibility for that. So, we'll hound you a little bit more.

Linda Lindholm: Sounds good.

Ken Williams: Ok, any further discussion on Item J-4. Barring that there's no discussion, all those in favor of the budget say AYE-AYE. Opposed-Opposed. Obstain. Motion passes 3-2. Moving on with our meeting to J-5.

Robert Hammond: Safe travels, David.

Ken Williams: Thank you, David.

Linda Lindholm: Take care.

## J.5

Jack Bedell: Do you need a motion for this?

Ken Williams: Um, yes we need a motion for this.

Jack Bedell: I move that we approve the countywide expulsion plan.

Linda Lindholm: I'll second that. From what I've read it looks good unless there's any staff comments on it.

Ken Williams: Very good, so we have a motion, a second and our binder is sooo thick.

Jack Bedell: Do we need to approve each district by itself?

Nina Boyd: No.

Jack Bedell: So it's ours and that's backup.

Nina Boyd: All of the districts have reviewed the document. All of the districts helped participate in the development of the countywide plan as they do. This is something that is done about every four years. But if you have specific questions, we can have Ron answer any questions that you might have.

Jack Bedell: Mr. Chairman, there's a big and I don't want to belabor this but there's a very big public education policy issue going through the country this year on expulsions. And there's a huge push, and nationwide the number of expulsions is down. And there is a huge push now to study the impact of not expelling on the operation of those who historically would have been expelled. And there's also some conversation that I've been party to about working conditions of the staff and the teachers by districts keeping students who historically would have been expelled. So it's an issue that I think we need. When it happens daily attendance. When it happens districts keep kids in the classroom and however it affects the learning and the holistic environment. It's an interesting public policy issue as we address I think, I support our plan.

Ken Williams: Robert, any questions or comments?

Robert Hammond: I agree with Jack.

Ken Williams: I do have a couple of thoughts and questions for our council. As you know the Newport Mesa Unified School District Case was unusual and it all based upon stipulated contracts and whether this Board had the right or shall I, digress here. It is all dependent upon whether the student and the parents have the right to come before the board. Or are they forced to go and have a stipia(?) contract and if they do sign it do they have the ability to later I wish I didn't sign it and I want to appeal it to the county Board of Education. Is that covered in any of these plans?

Ron Wenkart: I don't believe so. Because it comes up so rarely. I don't believe that that's (inaudible)

Ken Williams: As a general rule, I know in Anaheim in their stipulated contracts they even say that after you sign it you can still appeal to the County Board of Education. Are there any other districts with that language?

Ron Wenkart: Not that I'm aware of and I'm not that familiar enough with Anaheim having that provision in there. So I would have to check with them but you know if they wanted to put that provision in there to allow an appeal as part of the agreement they could do that.

Ken Williams: Do you have to have that? Do you have the right of the parent to appeal to the County Board of Education?

Ron Wenkart: Well most of the districts when they have a stipulated expulsion, they have the parent wave the appeal to the county board. That's general practice. And the idea behind it is



because it's kind of like a plea bargain in the sense that they usually impose a lesser penalty and in return the parent agrees to waive the appeal. So usually they work out some kind of accommodation at the district level.

Ken Williams: Ok, so we can get into the philosophical aspect of stipulated contracts. We've had many conversations about that.

Ron Wenkart: Sure we can certainly do that. Here at a meeting or outside the meeting I'd be glad to.

Ken Williams: But that's typically is not (inaudible).

Ron Wenkart: No, typically not. No, this mainly addresses the programs that are out there for kids that are expelled, what the gaps still remaining are and so on and so if you look at these plans you'll see a lot about referral processes and that type of thing. And a lot about programs being developed to address the needs of the kids who are expelled.

Ken Williams: Ok. Do any of these documents tell the parents of these kids that they do have the right to appeal? Or should the question be do they not tell them they have the right?

Ron Wenkart: That's part of the process that they have the right to appeal.

Ken Williams: Ok, so they're told that and they're given the document that they have to sign.

Ron Wenkart: Yeah, when a student's expelled, they are told that they have a right to appeal to the county board.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Ron Wenkart: So if they go through the whole expulsion process they're told that.

Ken Williams: Even if they sign the stipulated contract?

Ron Wenkart: Well, when they sign the stipulated contract, they're told they are waving their right to appeal to the county board. That they're giving up their right to appeal to the county board. So...

Ken Williams: And that's not in State Education Code though right?

Ron Wenkart: Ah, not specifically, no.

Ken Williams: Right. Hence the discussion and argument and debate.

Ron Wenkart: Right.

Ken Williams: That's all I wanted to know and that's all the questions I have. Any other questions on Item J-5 before we move on? Ok. All those in favor of Item J-5 say AYE-AYE. Oppose, abstain. Motion passes 4-0-0 with Trustee Boyd being absent. We're going to move on to public comments and how many public comments do we have? Cause I know my Board Members they want to grab a bit to eat here but I have the public here that I want to let them know that we care for them.

Penny Dunseth: We have nine more for Common Core and then five general comments on other things.

Robert Hammond: Can we go with the other things before Common Core?

Ken Williams: The other thing?

Robert Hammond: What thing.

Several voices speaking at one time regarding the remaining public comments.

Penny Dunseth: Take those first? Ok.

Ken Williams: I think that's reasonable.

#### H. Public Comments

Ken Williams: That's it? Wonderful. Ok. Thank you all for expressing your thoughts and we will move on with our meeting and see then public comments, consent, any closed session? Ron, any closed session? None? Ok. Information items our good Superintendent.

#### L. Information Items

Al Mijares: Thank you Mr. President. I simply want to commend Nina Boyd and our principles, our teachers most especially, our support staff, our directors, everybody that has a roll in ACCESS. We went to some amazing graduation services and Dr. Bedell thank you for showing up and stirring the hearts of students as only you can do.

Jack Bedell: Well thank you.

Al Mijares: And eh it was just phenomenal. And one case we had, there were 3 or 4 speakers, but one girl in the Foster Care System had gone to 11 high schools. Another young man was celebrating one year of sobriety from alcohol and drugs. And these were graduating. They were graduating and then going on to college beyond this. We had another young person whose father was deported and the mother left the family, forcing her on the streets and yet stayed the course, made the grade, did all the requirements necessary by law, which reminds me of a very interesting point. I don't know if all of you realize this but every time we award the diploma to a

high school graduate we have to make a public testimonial that that student has met all of the requirements of the Orange County Department of Education or whatever district it is. It could be Santa Ana Unified, Garden Grove Unified, Orange County Department of Education and the State of California. That's important because it means that the student adhered to the requirements of the State of California. When I sign that diploma, in this case the board president signs it, we are making a public testimonial to that. These are state schools, we have to keep that in mind. Yes they are governed by a local governance but it is done in concert with those who have or empowered by the people and have more authority than we do. That's important to understand, I think. But Nina, I want to commend you because those students were marvelous and the staff did a great job in nurturing them, and now they're going on to college when most people would have written them off and not given them a prayer. So, ACCESS was the point of salvation for them. So that's a great thing and that's all that I have in my reports. Thank you.

Ken Williams: Very good. Thank you sir. Ok, communication, Association Superintendents, Ron? Were you going to be presenting anything to us today?

Jack Bedell: Are we Mr. Chairman under announcements that Board Roundtable can we make announcements under announcements? Or is that just the Superintendents?

Nina Boyd: Superintendents, Associates and...

Jack Bedell: (inaudible) say something.

Ken Williams: Sure!

Jack Bedell: Where can I say to go to a graduation then? Where is that?

Ken Williams: Say it now. Spontaneously.

Jack Bedell: Spontaneously?

Ken Williams: You're gonna say something...

Jack Bedell: Well I would like to follow up on the Superintendent's remarks. Well, I think graduation is for me, one of the two best weeks of the year. The first week is seeing them start and the second thing is seeing them graduate. There is incredible energy in the graduation I attended. They had a good time I think. The parents were there and their stories were moving. Some of them had babies. Some of them you could just tell had horrible experiences. I talked to some families afterwards and they were so thankful for what Nina your staff did, the teachers. And what they do for those kids. And I really appreciate your highlighting our unique students because very frequently we don't hear much about them. So thank you.

Ken Williams: Very good. I just have one public comment that I forgot before Ellen. Eric Stoelting if you want to come up. You put in a time card and I want to get you in because as we're winding down with our meeting I want to make sure that all the people who want to say something publically get up there.

H. Public Comment

L. Information Items

L.1

Ken Williams: Ok, moving on. Communication from staff. Ellen.

Nina Boyd: Ellen?

Ellin Chariton: Just wanted to give you preview of a Board Policy that will be coming for your consideration at your July 9, 2015 meeting. And this is absolutely proposed revisions to Board Policy 400-13 which is the Policy regarding education for homeless children and youth. There have been many revisions that have been required due to new legislation and um identifying both our requirements as a school district under McKinney/Vinto Homeless Education Act as well as the County Office of Education responsibilities for dispute resolution when matters between a family and a school district need to be intervened upon for consideration. So you'll have that on your agenda for July. Thank you.

Ken Williams: Thank you, Ellen.

Ron Wenkart: Good afternoon everyone, Superintendent Mijares, members of the Board. It's a pleasure to be here. The reason I'm here is to give you an update on the Albert Einstein Academy for Letters, Art, and Sciences, their charter petition. It's going to have a public hearing on July 9<sup>th</sup>. We did a preliminary review of the petition submitted by Einstein Academy and staff and I noticed a number of items in the petition that have changed since the petition was filled with the Huntington Beach City School District. Many of these changes are material provisions that are inconsistent with Board Policy 400 – 12, which was adopted by the Board earlier this year. So, it should be noted, this is the first time that we've had a petition with so many changes since the county board adopted its policy. And before I list some of the concerns that we have regarding those material revisions, I wanted to mention that Einstein Academy submitted a petition to the Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District in LA County and on January 8, 2015, the Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District Board granted Einstein Academy a petition for a five year period. So that granting of that petition will allow them to operate a satellite location in Huntington Beach. So therefore, if the Academy's Einstein Academy's appeals not successful with this Board, the students in the Einstein Academy can continue to be served in Huntington Beach without interruption until the charter granted by the

Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District issue is resolved. So now let me just talk for a minute about the policy that the Board adopted. At page 3 in the policy refers to a change in petitioners enrollment projections and operational budget which have occurred subsequent to the denial by the school district and at page 4 it talks about proposed changes in the educational program and the grade configuration of the school. So the petition submitted includes the increase in 25 students for first grade and 25 students for second grade. And we'll provide you with the additional information on all of this. And then the petition also makes changes with respect to STEAM, the NRC framework, World Languages, Visual and Performing Arts, Next Generation Science Standards, AP and College Preparatory Electives, and Curriculum and Materials. And so, because there are so many material revisions we wanted you to have a heads-up before the public hearing. We'll provide you with more information before the public hearing and Einstein Academy we'll alert them. They'll have an opportunity to address those issues at the July 9<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting. We also wanted to alert you to the fact that there are a number of lawsuits that have been filed against Einstein Charter Academy and its parent organization and we're in the process of gathering more information on those lawsuits. One lawsuit is filed by the San Diego Unified School District and it's expected that an attorney from the San Diego Unified School District will be here at the July 9<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting to address their concerns about Einstein Charter Academy. There was also, and that lawsuit was filed in San Diego County Superior Court against Alpine Unified School District and Einstein Charter and the court ruled in favor of San Diego Unified and ordered Alpine Unified School District to revoke the charter of the Einstein Academy. So there's similar issue Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District as well. There's a similar lawsuit pending in Los Angeles County Superior Court with a lot of the same issues. So, we're concerned about those ramifications. We'll get more information as to how that's going to affect Orange County and so we just wanted to alert you to some of these issues to be prepared in the public hearing. We'll get you more information. You can questions of us, of Einstein Charter. We'll give them an opportunity to provide more information as well. Couple of things I wanted to mention about County Charter that may come up at the next Board Meeting too. It should be kept in mind that County Charters are designed in the code to serve students that county offices serve; such as our at risk students in our ACCESS program or severely disabled students in our Special Schools program. Countywide Charters are designed to serve students countywide of a nature that can't be supervised by a local school district. And they're designed in small rural counties where you have small school districts there not able to supervise those charter schools cause these charter schools are bigger than the school district. That's not the case here in Orange County. All of our districts are fairly large and are capable of supervising charter schools. So those issues may come up on July 9<sup>th</sup> too so I just wanted to mention those. And then with that I'll just open it up to questions if you have any questions at this point. Just wanted to give you, we have three charter petitions scheduled for July 9<sup>th</sup>. I'm only, this only refers to Einstein Charter. There was nothing in the others that we felt we needed to alert you to at this point.

Linda Lindholm: I have questions after you. After you, go ahead.

Ken Williams: Ok. So Ron, you and I have gone back and forth over the last few decades about what a County Charter is and I so appreciate you and I respect you for who you are. We may disagree on interpretation of State Education Code, I'm just a plain old simple Marcus Welby family doctor, you're a well-educated Ivy League lawyer.

Ron Wenkart: I wouldn't say Ivy League. I would leave out the Ivy League but ok, thank you.

Robert Hammond: Is this where the other shoe drops?

Ken Williams: Well, um, the issue always comes down to the students we serve and of course we have a charter out there that we opened up for Foster Youth along with the Orange home here and as you know, the state said no, you can't do that. You gotta open up. So it's not a charter school for Foster Youth. Everybody and anybody from that community is attending it. Then we have our home school children here. So one could argue that a county charter is not just for the high-risk, adjudicated or incarcerated youth that we take care of. It's the county...

Ron Wenkart: We'll that's what the code says. So I just, you know, interpret the code as it's written. If the state wants to interpret it in a different way we can certainly discuss it. But it says, you know, in the code, for students who are typically served by County Offices of Education.

Ken Williams: And home education kids.

Ron Wenkart: I guess you could put home education kids in that as well.

Ken Williams: Yeah. But they're regular folk too. Anyway.

Ron Wenkart: But it's the ideas that the local school district's that serve the general student population are the ones that are supposed to supervise charter schools. That's the main gist.

Ken Williams: And those attorneys of course are saying, no, we don't want you as a charter school and that's wrong. So when they come to us, now they can be (inaudible)

Ron Wenkart: We'll that's on an appeal. So on an appeal if you feel that the school district acted in an inappropriate manner you can reverse their decision.

Ken Williams: Right. And that charter becomes (inaudible) charter right?

Ron Wenkart: Yes, and that's a different sub-set.

Ken Williams: Can I argue then that ok, those are regular folk out in the community, not the high risk kids that we take care of and therefore...

Ron Wenkart: Well, they came on an appeal. They didn't come directly to the county office of education as a countywide charter. Ok.

Ken Williams: Enough of that.

Ron Wenkart: Ok. I understand your point though. I understand what you're saying.

Linda Lindholm: Um, thank you for coming up and giving us an update. Um, a couple questions. We have three charter schools coming to us on appeal. You are talking just about one of them...

Ron Wenkart: Just one only.

Linda Lindholm: Ok. And there's some concerns on that school.

Ron Wenkart: Yes, just wanted you to be aware of these issues. Yes.

Linda Lindholm: I have a question. I've received some communication on that. Is that public record? Has that been shared with the school or is that confidential and attorney/client privilege?

Ron Wenkart: No, no. That's public information and we planned to share it with Einstein but we wanted to share it with you first.

Linda Lindholm: Ok. Um, but you will share that before the July 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ron Wenkart: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Linda Lindholm: So as that information and um, I am for great charter schools. I'm not for bad charter schools. Though just what you know, share that with you. But um, one of the concerns that sounds like you raised that they were trying to solve some of the problems they had before and I thought what we had decided as a Board was they would submit the same application that they did to the school district and then if they had any corrections that would be submitted in and look at that also.

Ron Wenkart: Right.

Linda Lindholm: Is that what you're saying?

Ron Wenkart: Well, I'll let you decide when you see it whether you think they went beyond what your allowing policy or not. That'll be a Board decision. But I just wanted to alert you that they've made what appears to be some major changes.



Linda Lindholm: But you only said that. Well they added like 25 students here and 25 students. To me that's not a major change that's a few students. But I'm more concerned about their financial ability, their teaching, their board structure.

Ron Wenkart: We'll provide you that information.

Linda Lindholm: But 25 students here that's not gonna, that's not gonna.

Ron Wenkart: Ok. Well I think what the Board decides whether these are material revisions or not.

Linda Lindholm: But I think some of the other things I've been reading those are pretty interesting and significant.

Ron Wenkart: Ok. We'll try to get you more information on those.

Ken Williams: Can you redline it so we can make a comparison?

Ron Wenkart: Yes, we will redline.

Linda Lindholm: And I guess the greatest thing I would appreciate is not getting things at the dais. If, if you have a communication come through and Penny thank you so much, I give it to us as it comes in. If it's public record.

Ron Wenkart: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: And let us know if it's public record or not.

Ron Wenkart: Yeah, all of this information is public record. I'll follow-up with a memo to the Board outlining this information and I'll try to redline it for you, I will redline it for you so that you can see what those changes were.

Linda Lindholm: But that that's I greatly appreciate it. So um I'm looking forward to seeing that.

Robert Hammond: Um, a couple things. One is, um, about how long do you think it will take to get this information from you guys and from where you think the changes...

Ron Wenkart: I'll try to get it to you by the end of the week, this week.

Robert Hammond: Ok.

Ron Wenkart: We're just pulling it together in the last few days.



Robert Hammond: Can you also comment, and gosh I'm asking you this question and I don't know if the Board would want this but can you give us your opinion about these lawsuits, about the merit of them and stuff? Or is that beyond our scope.

Ron Wenkart: I, you know, um...

Linda Lindholm: I don't need, I'm sorry I don't need your (inaudible) on that. If you give me the facts I think I can, I can read through the lines.

Ron Wenkart: Ok, ok...

Robert Hammond: All right. And then, have we heard from ah, is it the Charter School Association at all on any of these?

Ron Wenkart: Ah, I've not had any direct contact with them so I don't know how they feel about it but we could have staff reach out to them if you want. Ok.

Robert Hammond: Thank you.

Ron Wenkart: Thank you.

Ken Williams: Jack, anything else? Ok.

Nina Boyd: And then just as a reminder, our office is closed in observance of the 4<sup>th</sup> of July this Friday and then additionally the next Board Meeting on July 9<sup>th</sup>, there was a time change. You will begin at 1:00 o'clock p.m. And as Ron just mentioned, there are three charter presentations that will be done at that meeting. You all have carried over two additional presentations and there's also an expulsion appeal that will be at that Board Meeting. So you have a very full agenda just based on what we have now.

Robert Hammond: And dinner will be when? Long Island Iced Tea. No.

Linda Lindholm: Question for the Board because I think we carried over the G-1 and G-2, or whatever it was. Um, if we're gonna do that and the charter schools and we made them a time certain, no.

Nina Boyd: The charter presentations will be time certain as well as the expulsion appeal will be time certain.

Linda Lindholm: Well, if you want to get the other one done I suggest, if I may suggest, that that's first and have like a 2:00 o'clock appointment or something for the charters.

Ken Williams: The executive committee will take that under consideration. Thank you.

Ken Williams: You're wonderful.

Linda Lindholm: Laugh, well I was just trying to get.

Ken Williams: No, I gotcha on that one.

Linda Lindholm: Ok, thank you.

Nina Boyd: And we'll provide the expulsion appeal because that's already being developed over the last couple of months. We had to send letters out to them with regards to time so we'll be sharing that information with you so that we're making sure we're keeping in accordance with what we've already done.

#### L-3 Executive Committee Report

Ken Williams: Anything else? Executive Committee, we didn't have an Executive Committee. I was in Europe last week but we did everything over email and ah, it seemed to work out fine. We had a good meeting, a lively debate.

#### L-4 Board Roundtable

Ken Williams: Ah, moving on the Board Roundtable. Um the Common Core Fact Finding Paper – Bedell/Hammond. Um was there a discussion on that last meeting?

Jack Bedell: Just carried forward.

Ken Williams: Just carried forward?

Jack Bedell: Just received, we received it. Right?

Robert Hammond: That's all we did.

Jack Bedell: That's right, yeah.

Ken Williams: That was it.

Linda Lindholm: We didn't do anything.

Ken Williams: Ok. Ok. So just...

Robert Hammond: Was there any...comments.

Ken Williams: I think David wanted this on here because he wanted to talk about it. I'm not sure if he wants to do that as a special presentation.

Linda Lindholm: Well he should have his name on it then.

Nina Boyd: Well, if I can remind the Board, what happened at the last meeting was everything that was related to Common Core was carried over to this agenda so that's why it's showing up, again. There was no discussion on Roundtable for those.

Ken Williams: So, um, my thought is, I really don't need to talk about papers that we've received.

Jack Bedell: Sure.

Ken Williams: Unless David wants to bring it up, he would have that ability to bring it up. I'm not interested and I'm polling the rest of you, are you interested in bringing it back up?

Linda Lindholm: No I agree with you.

Ken Williams: Jack do you want to, do you have any interest in bringing it up?

Jack Bedell: No, I'm fine.

Ken Williams: And then secondly, the synopsis that Robert and I wrote, um a opinion by both of us, I guess David wants to bring that up? I'm not sure? Um, we'll kind of figure that out over the next few days here. We have a time certain um, to getting this Board agenda developed. We only have a few days and with July 4<sup>th</sup> being in the weekday it's even less time. Um, so I really don't wanna, we received it. I don't really need to talk about it.

Linda Lindholm: I have no interest in having it on there. To me we received it.

Robert Hammond: The only thing is just that there were a couple grammatical things so...

Linda Lindholm: I think you could live with those maybe?

Jack Bedell: Just have to say received as submitted and that's fine.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Robert Hammond: We'll there, there was one thing that I inadvertently left out that I'd like to...

Jack Bedell: So it's a different document then you see.

Ken Williams: If you add something it becomes a different document.

Linda Lindholm: Then you bring the whole thing back. Do you want to bring the whole thing back?

Robert Hammond: I don't want to but yet I feel I need to on this one thing.

Linda Lindholm: If it's a specific like we're doing one on math, you could bring back a separate thing. And leave the synopsis as written.

Robert Hammond: Let me see what I can do.

Linda Lindholm: Ok. Just a thought.

Ken Williams: Ok. So unless David wants to bring it back, I don't sense any interest in the four Board Members here to have this onboard Roundtable. Um, Reception and Knowledge of Legal Services Documents. In the last few weeks uh, it's become known to me that our good Legal Service Department gives out Legal opinions to um, different districts, um the county, excuse me, the Community Colleges, local school districts, probation department, etc. etc. And so I thought that wow, this is great stuff. I like to read and learn about and Ron and I were dialoguing about this and he didn't think that the Board would be interested in having access to these items but I thought we would. And so I brought this up here to see if my other Board Members would be interested in receiving this information.

Robert Hammond: Well, if it's relevant to what we do. Sure.

Ken Williams: It can be. Not everything.

Ron Wenkart: Yeah, ah, I thought we had a you know a very good discussion. We haven't in the past provided copies to Board Members. We typically send them to the District Superintendents and the Assistants and then they share them with the board members. I don't think they do it all the time. I think on occasion. Um, you know, a lot of them have to do with the day-to-day operation of schools and so on, so that's kind of why I was thinking, that you know, Board Members might want to be bogged down in all that detail. But I don't think there's any objection to sharing those memos with Board Members if the Board's interested.

Al Mijares: There is an exception on the client privilege.

Ron Wenkart: Ya, right. Well the ones that the individual ones that we send to districts yeah, and the ones that are attorney/client privilege. But um, these general bulletins that we send out, I don't think there's a...

Ken Williams: Yeah, this one happened to be about two issues of the data that's collected and there were two briefs that were created and they're very interesting um, legal opinions that I thought that our Board would really like to know. Did you receive them? Did you send those out Penny?

Penny Dunseth: I thought I did.

Ron Wenkart: Yeah, I think we sent them out to the Board about three weeks, two three weeks ago.

Nina Boyd: They were sent to all Board Members.

Ken Williams: Ok, so, so, everybody did receive them. Anyway, that brought up the the topic of more access to understanding what's given out as legal opinion to the education committee and the other various government agencies that we work with. So, um, how to do that I'll leave that up to you.

Ron Wenkart: Sure. Well, you know, those two opinions one had to do with the storage of records you know with private companies which we don't do so and some updates of state law with respect to student information and contracting with, you know, third parties...

Ken Williams: ...for data collection

Ron Wenkart: ...for data collection which we don't do.

Linda Lindholm: That would be interested.

Ron Wenkart: So sure. We'll we can re-send these out to you and sure, you know, we can share memos, general ones that we submit.

Linda Lindholm: Can I suggest if it's a memo that goes to one specific school about a specific school issue, don't sent those to us.

Ron Wenkart: Yeah, no.

Linda Lindholm: If it has to do with what we're hearing from the public or is agendized I'd love to see that.

Ron Wenkart: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: But try and use your, I don't need a huge inbox.

Ron Wenkart: Ok. Well we'll resend these and then we'll go from there. Thank you.

Ken Williams: Ok, moving on with the agenda item I was going to talk about um a Educational Conference we had last month, May 19<sup>th</sup>, regarding Michael Fullan and um, there was a document, I think everybody received it, it was this orange one here about Michael Fullan's involvement here in California as well as his relationship with Governor Brown. Kinda like to look at this as the cat, letting the cat out of the bag. That old colloquial in that, and if you look at what that means, that means to reveal facts that were previously hidden. You know for the longest time we've been talking about Common Core, it's all about higher standards. That's

been the rouse. The real fact about Common Core is that it brings change in teaching methodology or pedagogy, assessment testing and curriculum and everyone hates a national curriculum. Um, and then when I discerned by a constituent who told me about Michael Fullan and I just I was very, very upset. So we had him at one of our conferences and I need to just kind of share with you some truths on what he said in his documents he has out there in public domain. And a lot of what I'll be talking about is um a program he has that's called Education Plus and of course I'll be quoting from him from the document he has here for California. And basically Fullan he looks at developing a new governance model and he says it in his document here. And I mentioned him and quoted him earlier that if you're a district and you don't like him, this is his words, in such cases the state should define mechanism to require the district to take part in a assistant partnership. That's very utopian. That is Marxist and Communist, and everything to do with that type of philosophy of governance and not with our American Republican form of governance. He is a globalist and he's a change agent of society's ideals and beliefs and cultural perspectives, politics, institutions, and governance. He's from Canada. He holds all these degrees from Canada. My family's from Canada so I can kind of make fun of how different they are than us as Americans. They don't understand our true American form of governance. But he is promoting and will be promoting I believe is what I can see in all his documents the concept of diluted academics. And I was elected 20 years ago based upon the concept that education should be about direct academic (inaudible) of facts and knowledge and not about changing somebodies personality or the way they think. That is from the family that has to be created and instilled inside all the children. But yet what he's promoting is exactly the opposite. He talks about changing the culture. He talks about having partners. Unelected partners. Collaboration. His words are collaboration is the biggest driver in this new system. He talks about in his document, it's again Education Policy, he calls this and refers to it as the DNA of pedagogies. He also goes on to say that fundamental to the evolutionary future of human development and our social cultural economic and environmental sustainability and cohesion. And even better that social intervention serves as evolution that contains the adaptation or intervention of our sustainable future. This is very interesting. He believes students, again these are his words, first must understand the existential essence of this new human being. Existential essence of this new human being. I have no idea of where we're going to go with Fullan and the Common Core train that has left the station. But I am very very concerned when our department puts on something like this and I didn't know about it until afterwards which is kind of typical. Everything is drip drip and after the fact. And I can go on and I'm probably going to write a paper and publish it in the Register. They love these sort of things. And it will be critical of Fullan and what he believes in Common Core. So, I just want to let and allow my Board Members know about this dangerous dangerous trend that's happening in education. And a, this is the Trojan horse that we've all been talking about. The folks that have been coming here have talked about this and now the cat is out of the bag.

(Applause)

Ken Williams: Let's let's let's move on. Thank you so much.

Al Mijares: May I comment Mr. President in as much as we did have him here?

Ken Williams: Yes, yes. Go ahead.

Al Mijares: (inaudible) And I promise you I will not answer, not even attempt to answer all the points you made nor will I defend Fullan. Cause that's not my business to defend anybody other than myself and my family and the students that I serve.

Robert Hammond: Here, here.

Al Mijares: But um, Dr. Fullan is Canadian. He's worked in Canada, South Carolina. He's worked with the OPCD organization that you talked about international benchmarking. They're the people that create the international benchmarks. He is currently the Organization of Economic Cooperative Development. He is working with the State of California. And, do you remember the API.

Ken Williams: Oh yeah.

Al Mijares: It's the Academic Performance Index by which all of our schools are judged. They're recalibrating that. He's helping the recalibration of the API. It was suspended, it has been suspended for the last couple of years but it will be brought back. Which incidentally is connected to No Child Left Behind. NCLB was probably the most sweeping form of Federal Government Legislation to effect local lives than anything else. That happened under President Bush and Edward Kennedy. They formed a team to pass NCLB through the Congress of the United States. So in the case of Fullan, did you know that he's working with several districts in Orange County? He's working with Santa Ana, he's working with Garden Grove, he's working with several districts. And don't you think that in as much as he's helping to reshape the API that we out to at least, even though we may not agree with him on everything, we ought to at least know what that is all about? He's one voice of many. And so what we did was to have him speak on aspects of leadership. He didn't address the Common Core. He didn't address this existential concept that you just threw out there. Nothing wrong with the word existential. It just depends on how it's applied. And he has written a book on technology and the changing culture we all face. His concept of globalization simply means that our students are competing only with the other 49 states in the United States but they're competing with the world. That's how the world has become. So, in that vein, Fullan spoke for maybe half hour and he spoke at a hotel in Costa Mesa, no I'm sorry, Garden Grove. We also had Trevor Packer who's the head of AP, Advanced Placement. He is Mr. AP and we wanted him here because we have thousands of students who are taking AP courses here in Orange County. Thousands across the country and across the world. As a matter of fact AP is taught throughout the world, Europe, Asia, Latin America and the United States. So, you have your opinion of him and that's great. I just wanted

to provide another counter balance to the context by which he was used. But I do think it's important that we ought to pay attention to what's happening in Sacramento. You know we actually went through our records, I think you made a statement about the Common Core and not ever hearing about it and we came up, we just went back to 2012. There's over 100 citations when that was made common here in this Board Meeting, in this Board Room. And then I think you made the comment three times that the train has left the station which indeed it had. So I'm simply saying that I think we have to be, we have to have awareness, we have to have a sense of intelligence of these things that are happening that effect the classroom because it's our responsibility in working with our principals and our teachers to be able to at least steer and guide the dialogue, the discourse. And that is what emanated the whole notion of having this meeting here. And we had probably 450 educators that attended. Many of them were teachers.

Ken Williams: Do we have transcripts of what he said. Do we have audio or anything like that?

Al Mijares: Well, you have Board Meeting Minutes.

Ken Williams: No, no no of this meeting where he spoke.

Al Mijares: David Boyd also attended. I thought you guys had all been invited to that. I think we did invite you. Cause I think maybe you had another appointment.

Linda Lindholm: I couldn't go.

Al Mijares: She couldn't make it.

Robert Hammond: I couldn't make it I had a prior...

Al Mijares: He couldn't make it. So we invited the whole Board to hear him. So anyway, I just wanted to share a couple of pieces with all due respect to you and the rest of the Board but our role is to be transparent with everybody.

Robert Hammond: I think what he's asking is was there a transcript of when Michael spoke in Garden Grove.

Al Mijares: Oh, no I don't believe so.

Ken Williams: No video or audio.

Al Mijares: No because we're not equipped to do that but...

Jack Bedell: Was the format, Mr. Superintendent, such that people could question him and debate his ideas.

Al Mijares: Yes, there was Q and A.



Jack Bedell: So in other words if he came and chatted this out there were opportunities to have an intellectual academic dialogue on it. What are you thinking here, that's crazy. This, so there was that give and take opportunity. Ok, that makes me feel better.

Al Mijares: Several of our superintendents were there. He's working with the core districts, Santa Ana is one of the core districts.

Ken Williams: I'm not sayin...

Robert Hammond: (inaudible) Garden Grove right?

Al Mijares: Santa Ana and Garden Grove are both core districts, yes.

Ken Williams: So it was a kumbaya moment then it sounds like. There's nobody with antagonistic...

Al Mijares: I don't know what kumbaya means but um...

Ken Williams: Holding hands and loving one another.

Al Mijares: Well that's what the good Lord told us to do.

Jack Bedell: Wear Birkenstocks and join the...

Al Mijares: But I will say that um...superintendents there were superintendents. There were school board members there from across the county.

Ken Williams: But no one questioned him.

Al Mijares: No, there were some questions asked about the whole notion of change. How do we keep up with the pace of information? How do we assure that the pedagogy in the classroom is done with fidelity? There were some good questions that were asked of him.

Ken Williams: Very good. Anything else sir?

Al Mijares: That's it. Thank you.

Ken Williams: Moving on with the agenda. Board Agenda coversheet. Um, this is something that perhaps the next Executive Committee could pick up. But in our Board Agenda, the coversheet, if I can just draw your attention, let's pick out an item, such as J-3. Um, the coversheet that we use is this document here. And there is some questions regarding how it should be created especially if a Board member puts an item on it and wants to have a certain outcome. But the recommendation in the past has been to adopt whatever it was. So, when a certain Board member put a certain item on the agenda, it was the Executive Committee's feeling

that that is not come from staff, that came from the Board Member who put it on the agenda and so we felt that it should be then...

Jack Bedell: Source, the source...

Ken Williams: ...the source should be the recommendation. I just want to make sure that I'm not thinking outside of what is the consensus of the Board. So does everybody kind of agree with that?

Robert Hammond: And the financial cost?

Ken Williams: Pardon me?

Robert Hammond: And financial cost would be good. If we could have, cause you mentioned it before.

Nina Boyd: There was some brief discussion at the last Board Meeting Ken when you were not here. We gave them a recap of the Executive Committee conversation and Linda pointed out that also it would be helpful to have any impact, financial impact on the coversheet as well.

Ken Williams: Ok. Good.

Nina Boyd: We mentioned the fact that because it does show to and from, the inference is that the from is always where the recommendation is coming from. But in our dialogue that you all thought that there should be more clarity.

Ken Williams: I think everyone agrees then.

Linda Lindholm: Absolutely.

Ken Williams: I like the fiscal impact too, yeah.

Linda Lindholm: If it's coming from staff, we should know it's coming from staff. If it's coming from a Board Member as a Board Members opinion, we should know that, and I would also suggestion that after subject it should have some background. You know, this was voted on blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Background always helps and then you go into current recommendations.

Jack Bedell: Get the context.

Linda Lindholm: But background is always good.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Linda Lindholm: but totally agree with you on that.

Ken Williams: And the other item that I put on here as receipt of documents, um a lot documents get thrown up upon us. Huh, and some are from our constituents and some are from staff and so I believe that if these documents were somehow put into the record that they were received by us. Now it's official documentation. That we receive them. There's been some discussion in the Executive Committee over this last year, oh when did we receive that document? When did we review that? And so from that conversation I thought well, maybe we should just be officially receiving these documents. So it's in the record so my early dementia that I'm having might easily, forgetting these items that'll be in the record.

Linda Lindholm: What, what, I, I'm not sure if staff gives us something, we receive it. If the public gives us something, that goes into the public comment...

Ken Williams: Right.

Linda Lindholm: ...that's not received because we haven't verified, I mean it could be...

Ken Williams: And I'm not referring...

Linda Lindholm: ...anything about the cats over in Huntington Beach or something. But I mean, those aren't received, those are submitted.

Ken Williams: Right, so what I'm suggesting that whatever the staff gives us, if it's significant and it impacts us that should be officially in the documentation of the records and of our agenda item. That's what's the thought behind it.

Jack Bedell: Is it an appendix kind of thing?

Ken Williams: Um, I'm not sure how it would be done. We can talk about this at Executive Committee but I think it's important that we, anything that comes from staff that it gets documented we've received it. So that was kind of the thought behind that. Um so we'll kick that around. That'll be something for the next Executive Committee. Ok, so moving on, Ad Hoc Committee Jack you have put that on.

Jack Bedell: Yeah, ah, as you know, Trustee Lindholm and I worked on a document on math and I think that some point in time we would like that agendized for approval by the Board. It's a step on Common Core. And it's a math piece which we have serious concerns about. Also, in doing some looking around and looking at concerns and the data, and I wanna thank Jeff and his people for giving us data. There are significant changes in time being spent on testing when you compare the two basic, the one's we're using in Park. There are differences. Park is actually long as I understand it. Within the testing piece that California is using, they have an interesting piece dedicated to critical thinking rather than just straight back memorization. So there's some

interesting things on that. We were looking at time, format, how the data are used, so with the consent of the Board, we're going to move forward with a reaction piece on testing the way we did with the math.

Ken Williams: Do you want to write that as individuals or do you want to write it on behalf of the Board and have it on Board stationery and make it an official document.

Jack Bedell: Well the first pass will be we'd write it ourselves and see if you wanted to do that. The way we did with the math. Cause it would be like to move the math. The next step to be on record on our recommendations on the math. Does that (inaudible)

Linda Lindholm: Um, um, um, what we did on was we brought it forward if there were any questions or concerns. And we know it's not perfect but what it is is basically some criticism on what the Common Core does with math. And um, I think you were gone at the time, but we, the Board approved it, and we want to bring it back at the next meeting as a resolution. And with that resolution we'd like to send it to Sacramento and to the California School Board. Eh, with our concerns on some of the math. So, kind of that kind of procedure. The testing we found out, we looked at what some of the Smarter Balanced testing involved. And it's about eight hours for kids who are in 3<sup>rd</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Why, why do we need to do that? I understand if I'm giving a test on history, or geography, or that, in addition to that, then there was about eight hours devoted to this Smarter Balanced testing. And I believe, I can be corrected all the time, but their cutting out an hour and a half next year but I'd really like to see some improvement on that and get some time to look at that and then bring that back to you and look at our head of academics and go, what do the teachers think? Is this driving the kids crazy? Well, it's driving the kids crazy we need to fix it. So, and then once we get that bring it to you. Get a resolution if you approve it and then send it again to the California Board of Education. And we just keep sending them letters.

Ken Williams: Question of clarification here. So, item J-3 at the last meeting was your two person draft on math standards. Is that correct?

Jack Bedell and Linda Lindholm: Yes.

Ken Williams: Ok. And that was passed 4-0.

Jack Bedell and Linda Lindholm: Yes.

Ken Williams: But that was your personal opinion. It was not adopted officially by the Board, is that correct?

Jack Bedell: It was received by the Board.

Ken Williams: It was received that's all it was.

Linda Lindholm: It was received.

Jack Bedell: Right.

Ken Williams: Ok. So what you're asking for is to create a document that we would vote on and it would be a Board approved document.

Jack Bedell: Yes.

Linda Lindholm: Right.

Ken Williams: I love that.

Jack Bedell: Yes, yes.

Linda Lindholm: Thank you.

Jack Bedell: We see this as a way to do, finally do something. To get some action going.

Linda Lindholm: To start sending a message.

Jack Bedell: The conversation going, you know.

Linda Lindholm: And then we're gonna just give them a lot of mail.

Ken Williams: So you approved Roberts and Eissen?

Jack Bedell: That I don't know, I have to read it. I haven't read it yet.

Ken Williams: You didn't read it?

Jack Bedell: I haven't read it yet.

Ken Williams: It's a source of controversy.

Linda Lindholm: So we need a, we're looking for an Ad Hoc Committee for the next meeting. On the time that it takes to do this SBAT.

Ken Williams: Would you be open to having it shared by a representative of me if I can't make it and be on this Ad Hoc committee? A constituent? Or does it have to be Board?

Jack Bedell: That's what we did the last time.

Linda Lindholm: That's fine.

Jack Bedell: I don't care.

Linda Lindholm: It just can't be three of us if it's an Ad Hoc. I mean it can't be three Board Members.

Probably Robert Hammond in a whisper: I'll talk to them too.

Ken Williams: Ok.

Unknown: All right.

Ken Williams: Very good. Ok, um, so in the Board Roundtable it looks like we're done. Anything else that you want to bring up? Ok. Yes.

Robert Hammond: Um there was a while back I think we all got this. It was an open letter, that says, Open Letter to the Board and it was mailed out on March the 18<sup>th</sup> from a lady down in Capo Valley. I just, does this look familiar?

Linda Lindholm: I can't see it from here but tell me about it.

Robert Hammond: Well anyway, it says Open Letter to the Orange County Department of Education Board of Trustees and it's from a lady down in your neck of the woods and I didn't know if any of you guys have read it and if there's any action you felt we need to take cause I don't know.

Linda Lindholm: Was that on the decorum of the Board?

Robert Hammond: No ma'am. It actually has to do with ah Capo Valley and I was just..

Linda Lindholm: Ok.

Robert Hammond: So, you know what?

Nina Boyd: You sent letters, responses. It was shared with full Board because it was in Linda's area. Linda drafted response so it's been handled. So from the standpoint she responded she's actually received a second letter from a different concerned parent. So she drafted a response letter and sent something:

Robert Hammond: Is it possible to get a copy of the response.

Linda Lindholm: Absolutely.

Robert Hammond: Thank you. That's, let's see. And then I was asked to share an email with the Board and that I will do and it's about the teachers in our, that serve our wonderful students. And I will leave it at that and I'm done, so.

Ken Williams: Anything else? Just a real quick notice our next meeting is July 9<sup>th</sup> um, and so anything that you have to get in for that meeting has to be in by July 2<sup>nd</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup>? Or is it tomorrow. It's very soon so if you want to put anything on that agenda, it will have to be done real quick here. This is my last meeting chairing for this last twelve months. It's been my pleasure and honor and I appreciate the opportunity to do so. So, I will let the next Executive Committee work hard on our behalf. Any other issues? Barring that are no other concerns may I have a motion...

Robert Hammond: Motion to adjourn.

Ken Williams: Second?

Jack Bedell: Second.

Ken Williams: We are adjourned.