

Williams – There's so much calm out there. For the benefit of the record this regular meeting of the Orange County Board of Education is called to order and our standing protocols are that we start with an invocation so if we would all stand up and we are going to have Pastor Ryan Zeulner from the Grace Fellowship Church here in Costa Mesa come and lead us. And we so appreciate that.

Pastor – Thank you. Dear Heavenly Father, you have created the heavens and the earth and you created us. You know the numbers of hairs on our heads so you are very aware of our hearts and what's going on and what's on the agenda. I pray for peace and your grace. I pray that you would give us wisdom and leading us through what is right and what is best for our students and our teachers and this great county. Lord thank you for the great leadership that you've us within the state and the government levels, Lord, but they all need your help and so would your spirit be upon us and give us love for our fellow brother and sister as we commence this meeting today. In Jesus' name, Amen.

Williams – If you all remain standing as we give our pledge to our great flag and we do have a very special person who is going to be leading us today. Her name is Daniela Gonzalez and what makes Daniela unique is she is like a lot of us coming to this great nation. She just became a U.S. citizen about 3 weeks ago.

Daniela, we'll face the flag, but you lead us and tell us when to start.

Thank you. Ready begin . . . I pledge alliance

Williams – Take a seat. Thank you Daniela. That's very very special. Ok, Penny let's continue with our agenda with the roll call.

Penn

Boyd

Hammond

Williams

Bedell

Lindholm

Williams – Nina do we have any introductions today.

Nina 2

Williams – Very very good. We have a few elected officials with us today. I'd like to acknowledge Trustee Tim Surrige from the Orange Unified School District, thank you for coming. We also have from our good supervisor's office, a representative from Todd Spitzer, Chris Nguyen. And also, my good friend and former state senator and certainly an education leader and mover in California, former state senator Gloria Romero. Thank you for coming. Anybody else who I missed. Yes.

Hammond – Out there next to Chris.

Williams – I'm afraid I don't know you. Just yell out loud and tell us who you are.

Audience member (Inaudible).

Williams – Thank you all for coming. OK, so if I can have, moving on with our agenda items, the adoption of today agenda, we do have a, one item that needs to be removed. It is a charter appeal and so if I can have a motion to adopt our agenda minus the removal of G-2. I'd like to hear a motion.

Bedell – Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move the agenda with the removal of agenda item G-6, and I would like to further remove, included in that motion is to delete Items G-2, G-3, J-1, and J-2. And if that is seconded I will speak to it.

Lindholm – I'll second it.

Bedell – Thank you very much.

Hammond – Would you restate that.

Bedell – Motion to remove Agenda Items G-6, which is the Einstein Charter, and G-2, G-3, J-1, J-2. And let me tell you why I'm doing this. In the last 2 years we have spent a lot of time on a lot of these issues imbedded in both of these documents and presentations. I am deeply concerned that we need to move on. We need to be pro-active and take responses and see how we can do things better. I think we need a time of healing. I think these are items for last year, not this year. And I think that we find that all four of them are interesting. I think all four of them are important, but I think for the future of this board, of

working relationships and the future of what we need to do, being responsive to our constituents, suggesting strategies and solutions. I don't think any of these four items really do that and I just respectfully request that they be deleted and that we move forward with the business of the body which is serving our unique children. As I read these and deal with these four documents they really don't do that. They bring a variety of issues to the forefront that really do not deal with unique ADA and I would just hope that this board, we're going to have new leadership, we need to be moving forward, and I would hope that we just move on.

Williams – Do you have anything to add to that Trustee Lindholm.

Lindholm – Um. I. I agree with many of the points that um Professor Bedell has made, I, I thing we would do well to move on and see what new accomplishments we could make and I'm happy for the board to discuss that and see if we can move on.

Boyd – This board has had a long tradition of allowing members to place on the agenda as they see fit so long as it relevant to subject matter of the board and while I would like to move on as well, I think there are a lot of people who have come today to listen to what both you and I have to say about the Common Core paper and I can certainly add some clarification that I believe will satisfy the benchmarking issue once and for all.

Williams OK. Robert.

Hammond – I really don't like seeing things thrown off the agenda. I know it's happened to me. I don't like the thought of someone putting something up on the agenda and the having someone else remove it. I'll just leave it at that. Just from personal experience.

Williams – And likewise, I do appreciate the spirit of our good Dr. Bedell here and I do agree with him on many points. Common Core is a very controversial program. It's gone in deeply into our lives into the community, into our constituents. I would rather not give G-3 as a rebuttal, response to item G-2 but that is our right. As far as J-1, I mean that is up to Trustee Boyd. If he still wants to keep that on as far as I'm concerned. As far as J-2, that is a whole different situation in that I'm asking the board to adopt officially as a white paper. It's almost the same as the synopsis Robert and I wrote as a separate opinion between the two of us. So, it was a little bit modified and edited. I think it's a much better document. So I would be against the removal items G-2, G-3, and J-1 and J-2. Obviously G-6 is going to be removed because they've asked us to remove them. So we do have a motion and a second on the floor. Would the good Dr. Bedell still like to continue with his motion or would he like to withdraw it based upon what's he's heard?

Bedell – I would like that motion to be in the record and my comments to be in the record. So how would you perceive parliamentary wise with that.

Williams – there was a motion and second so we have to vote on it.

Bedell – Then we can go with a separate motion to vote on the G-6.

Williams – Correct. OK. So does everybody understand what we are voting on. I know that perhaps that the public may be a little confused but we are voting on we are actually going to be discussing today. And there's a few items that we are going to be taking off as per suggested by our good trustee, Bedell

All those in favor in removing G-6, G-2, G-3, J-1, and J-2 per the motion by Dr. Bedell, say "AYE".

(Motion fails 2 to 3 to 0)

Williams – I'm going to need a subsequent motion then for adoption of our agenda .

Bedell – I'll move the agenda with the deletion of item G-6 which is the Einstein appeal.

Williams – and a second for that?

Boyd – Second

Williams – OK. Very good.

Lindholm – One comment. Item B has innovation not invocation, if we could change that for the record.

Williams – Little typo. OK. Very good. So all those in favor of adopting the agenda, say aye.

All – Aye.

Williams – Opposed, abstain, motion passes 5-0-0. OK if I can move on with the minutes. May I have approval of our June 29 meeting.

Bedell – So moved.

Williams – second?

Boyd – second.

Williams – OK. Any comments, clarifications, editing, changing. Being that there's none, all in favor say aye.

All – Aye

Williams - Opposed, abstain, motion passes 5-0. This is the organization meeting. It has been a pleasure for the last year to serve as the president and I will declare myself ineligible as far as the Executive

Committee. I'd like to move that we nominate, and I'm opening nominations, and I will nominate our current Vice President, Robert Hammond.

Lindhold – I will second that.

Boyd – I would like to nominate Trustee Lindholm.

Williams – Ok so we have a nomination for 2 people here, Robert and Linda.

Lindholm – I think would like to seek the office of vice chair. I decline but thank you ever so much,

Williams – OK

Bedell – I move that nominations be closed.

Williams – OK we have movement in a motion to ask that the nominations be closed. Ok all those in favor

Boyd – Can we have a discussion?

Williams – You want to have a discussion? Sure, absolutely.

Boyd – Last year, we moved away from the policy of, at least the informal policy of rotating the position of president and vice president. I'm paraphrasing now, from what I understand the reasoning part was that we wanted leaders who would guide the board in the direction that the majority would want the road that they would want to go down. Can I ask Trustee Hammond, as president, what would be your goals and objects for the next year.

Williams – David. I'm going rule you out of order. I think you are stalling for time I think this is political in nature. This is not the time to do this. We have time certain, we have a huge meeting in front of us and for you to do this, I think is a terrible miscarriage of the political process.

Boyd – May I comment on that Mr. President?

Williams – Most certainly David. Go ahead.

Boyd – Well, as a trustee, of course, Trustee Hammond is responsible for his constituents . As president of this board, he also represents us. And consistent with the policy that we set last year in electing what we would hope would be the most qualified individual, I think it's appropriate that we can ask questions as to, it is an elected position. So you're saying we can't ask questions of the candidate?

Williams – You can ask questions David but what you're asking is just stalling for time and it's pure politics. I am going to move that we stop

Boyd –What time? What's the advantage of time?

Bedell – We have a time certain.

Williams – We do have time certain David. I'd like to make a motions to cut off debate and call the question. Do I have a second on that?

Bedell – Mr. President I wish that we would move the agenda to our time certain and come back to this discussion.

Dunseth – We have one comment, two, on this item.

Williams – OK. Give me some guidance here. This is an organizational meeting that turning into a political circus unfortunately.

Wenkart – There's no hard and fast rules as to how to run the organizational meeting. It's really up to the board as a whole. So as I understand it where we're at right now is that we are thinking about going to the time certain that we have on the agenda which is G2 and then coming back to the organizational meeting. If the board majority wishes to do that that would be fine. I think it's going to be up to the board majority to decide how they want to proceed with the agenda.

Bedell – Mr. Chairman, I made a motion, I don't know if it was seconded, to end debate. Or to , yes, to close nominations.

Williams – Close nominations. Yeah.

Bedell – Did you recognize that?

Williams – Yes I did.

Bedell – Was it seconded?

Wililams – Penny was it seconded.

Dunseth – No it was not.

Williams – OK, so I will just call the same question to end debate. May I have a second on the nomination for president?

Hammond – Point of clarification. I believe the fist motion which was from Dr. Bedell so it's still outstanding on the table .

Williams – OK so I will second Dr. Bedell then. Thank you. OK, that resolves this issue

Bedell – undebatable

Williams – Undebatable. OK so all those in favor.

Lindholm – What was the motion?

Williams –The motion was to have Robert to close nominations and to vote for our board president.

Wenkart – so we have two votes.

Bedell – Motion to close debate.

Williams – Motion to close debate

Bedell – Motion to vote

Williams – So now what we're doing is voting to close debate.

Hammond – Was thee a second to that motion.

Williams – yeah, I seconded it.

(Conversation among all – inaudible)

Hammond . . . to lclose nominations

Bedell – what did I say?

Dunsetn to close nominations

Williams – So have a motion to close debate, that was seconded, and we are going to vote all separate.

Hammond – You have a motion on the table Mr. President. A motion to close and we need a second

Williams – We're going to close debate and then we are going to go to the election for the President position.

Hammond – There was no second to your motion. You seconded his motion to close nominations. Your motion, I believe sir, is to close debate.

Wenkart – Why don't we do this. Let me make a suggestion. We had a motion to close nominations made by Dr. Bedell and seconded by President Williams. Why don't we vote on that one and then take the next motion.

Williams – That's what I was going to do. So all those in favor of closing debates say Aye.

All Aye

Hammond – Debate?

Wenkart – That was to close nominations. As I understood it the motion was to close nominations.

Bedell – Is that what you have Penny, to close nominations?

Dunseth – To close nomination and it got confusing.

Williams – This what David you do when you make things so complicated.

Boyd – Well, I would be done by now if I had been allowed to speak.

Wenkart – Well, just let me interject. What I suggested was that we vote on the motions to close nominations and then take up the motion to close debate.

Williams – OK, so both nominations, I seconded, all those in favor of closing nominations

All Aye

Williams – opposed, abstain, motion passes 5-0. So now David has already asked the question and are you done talking David?

Boyd – No I'd like a response from Mr. Hammond.

Williams – But he doesn't have to give a response.

Boyd – He does not have to give a response.

Williams – Why do you do this David? Why do you embarrass this board by bringing such nonsense up.

Williams – I've been on the board 20 years and your (inaudible)

Boyd – I'd don't feel that the understanding the goals of our future president is out of line.

Williams – You should have asked me before. This is not a political campaign. This is an organizational meeting.

Lindholm – Mr. President we can go for the motion of closing debate.

Williams – OK so

Bedell – This is not debatable.

Lindholm – This is not debatable.

Hammond – Was it seconded?

Lindholm – It was seconded. I thought you seconded it.

Williams – Penny who made the motion to stop debate

Bedell – I did.

Williams – And I seconded it. All those in favor of closing debate, say Aye

All Aye

Boyd No

Williams – OK, so motion passes 4-1.

Boyd – So for the record, the people in audience will not have the opportunity to understand what Mr. Hammond’s goals would be for the next year.

Williams – They can ask him on his own and you should have done that too. Due diligence but you didn’t shame on you. Ok, so let’s move on, all those in favor of voting for Mr. Hammond for president say Aye.

Bedell, Lindholm, and Williams Aye

Boyd – No.

Hammond - Abstain

Williams - Motion passes 3-1-1. Now it’s up to you sir.

Hammond – I guess that makes my president.

Williams – That makes you president. Congratulaitons.

Hammond – Thank you.

Bedell – Mr. President. Mr. President, I nominate

Hammond – The chair seeks nominations for vice present.

Bedell – Yes, I nominate Trustee Lindholm.

Williams – I’ll second that.

Hammond – Alright. Trustee Lindholm has been nominated and there’s been a second. Are there any other nominiations for vice present. Hearing none, the chair will seek a motion to close nominations.

Bedell – So moved.

Williams – second

Hammond – Moved and seconded to close nomiantions. All in favor of closing nominations signify by saying Aye.

All – Aye

Hammond – Opposed, abstained. Motion passs 5-0. At this time then, all those in favor of electing Trustee Lindholm to the board as vice president, signify by saying Aye.

All – Aye

Hammond– Opposed, abstained. Motion passs 5-0. Trustee Lindholm is our board vice president.

Lindholm – Mr. Chair, Mr. President, Congralations.

Hammond – Thank you.

Lindholm – Would this be an appropriate time to move our seats?

Hammond – I think it would be a very appropriate time to move our seat. We could take a few minutes to that I guess.

Lindholm – OK, let's do that.

Bedell – Time Certains?

Hammond – What are our time certains?

Hammond – Orange County Board of Ed is brought back to order. We are still actually on item G-1. We have somebody wishes to speak to item G-1.

Dunseth – Nguyen and Swarts

Hammond – The chair seeks a motion from my fellow colleagues. Mr. Boyd, we have your time certain technically up now, but we also have that expulsion coming up at 1:45 which would be in about 10 minutes. Dr. Bedell did you also something you wanted to speak about.

Bedell – I was just wondering if we could, with the consent of the board , if we could move approval of the consent items and J-3 that would take care of 3 items in the 7 minutes that we have.

Williams – Or an option, Mr. President, is to do public comments.

Boyd – Time Certain only means that we can't start before that time, is that correct?

Lindholm – I would just suggest that we removing J-1 and J-2 right now and I would second that motion. That way we're clean on the Consent Calendar items.

Hammond – J-1 and 2 or I-1 and 2.

Lindholm – I-2 and 2.

Bedell – I'll second

Hammond – Alright there is a motion and a second to accept the consent calendar items I-1 and I-2. Any discussion? No discussion. All those in favor of accepting the consent itens signifying by saying Aye.

All – Aye

Hammond - Opposed, abstained. Motion passes 5-0. Mr. Boyd, item G-2 is yours. Do you wish to postpone that a little bit so we can get ready for item G-4 or what?

Boyd – Here's the way I see it Mr. President. We have the time certain in a few minutes and there is nothing we can do if we adhere to that time certain. But if I understand it the time certain simply means that we cannot start before that time.

Hammond – Correct.

Boyd – And my concern is these hearings are very unpredictable in terms of how long they are going to take and we would have to clear the room with a lot of people who are here to hear us. So I don't object I would defer to your judgment on that any way you would like to handle it.

Hammond – The chair seeks input from the rest of the board. Dr. Bedell.

Bedell – This G-4 is a very important thing in a young person's life. I would hate to have us think that we are going to rush this or that all of all the parties here that they have been heard, the district and the parents. My preference would be that we take the two time certain which a lot of the public are here for and work through some of the pieces of the agenda that are not controversial . We have 8 minutes and that way we could, for example, J-3 to me is not controversial unless I'm missing something, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 are all what we do every year. There's nothing new there. It may change a few dollars either way. I think we could run the agenda.

Lindholm – If we could do them one at a time I would appreciate it.

Bedell – I'll move J-3

Boyd – Second

Hammond – OK Item J-3 has been moved and seconded. Discussion on Item J-3.

Bedell – Thank the staff. It's a very important piece. Big piece of the Local Control Funding Formula.

Hammond – Hearing no discussion all those in favor of accepting Item J-3 signify by saying aye.

All – Aye

Hammond-opposed?Abstentions? Motion passes 5-0. Chair seeks a motion on J-5.

Bedell – Moved.

Boyd – Second

Hammond – Moved and seconded on Item J-5. Any discussion?

Lindholm – Only that I need to look at the Board Agenda, the Conference agenda on that and I may come back to it next month and request travel. Otherwise I move to support.

Hammond – Any other discussion? Hearing none all those in favor of J-5 signify by saying aye.

All – Aye

Hammond – Opposed? Hearing none the motion passes 5-0. Chair seeks a motion on J-6.

Bedell – So moved.

Boyd- Second.

Lindholm – same comment.

Hammond – Is there any discussion on J-6? Hearing none all those in favor of J-6 signify by saying aye.

All – Aye

Hammond – Opposed? Hearing none motion passes 5-0, J-6. Chair seeks a motion on J-7.

Boyd– So moved.

Bedell – second

Hammond – Moved by Trustee Boyd, seconded by Dr. Bedell. Any discussion?

Lindholm – Same comment.

Hammond – Any other discussion? Hearing none all those in favor of J-7 signify by saying aye.

All – Aye.

Hammond - Opposed? Hearing none motion passes 5-0. Chair seeks a motion on J-8.

Lindholm – So moved .

Boyd –second

Hammond – Moved by Trustee Lindholm, seconded

Boyd – I'll second.

Hammond – Trustee Boyd

Boyd - Just to be clear we did add the California Charter School Association in later.

Lindholm – As amended.

Hammond – As amended. Ok. Any other discussion? Hearing none all those in favor of J-8 signify by saying aye.

All – aye

Hammond – Opposed? Hearing none J-8 passes 5-0. Chair seeks a motion on J-9.

Bedell – so moved.

Boyd – second.

Hammond – Moved and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing none all those in favor of J-9 signify by saying aye.

All – aye

Hammond – Opposed? Hearing none motion passes 5-0. Dr. Bedell did you also want to include J-10?

Bedell – Yes. J-10 was in there.

Hammond – Do you wish to move?

Bedell – So moved.

Boyd – second.

Hammond – moved and seconded, any discussion on J-10? Hearing none, all those in favor of J10 signify by saying aye.

Lindholm – abstension.

Hammond – 4-0-1 it passes.

Bedell – That's it.

Hammond – So. We got through that part relatively quickly.

Lindholm – Mr. Chair I would suggest that as the time is getting close to the 1:45 Expulsion Hearing and my apologies to the audience but that is as noted that we conduct the Expulsion Hearing.

Bedell – second.

Hammond – So is that a motion

Boyd – Are they ready?

Lindholm – Are they all here?

Boyd, N. – Yes.

Hammond – They are all here then. That means we would have to skip G-2 and G-3. So could I have a motion to that effect. To skip G-2 and G-3 and go to G-4?

Bedell – So moved

Lindholm – seconded

Hammond – Moved and seconded

Lindholm – We can come back to them?

Boyd – yes.

Hammond – all those in favor of going to G-4 signify by saying aye

All – aye

Hammond – Motion passes 5-0. Our board will be in recess for about 5 minutes and 10 seconds.

Lindholm – Maybe Nina could explain the procedure. I always like to explain to people what's happening and why.

Hammond – Nina, would you do that please.

Boyd, N. – Certainly. The board is moving into closed session to hear an Expulsion Hearing so all parties that are not part of the expulsion hearing will be asked to exit through the center door. We have a quad area if you want to have seating outside in the lunch area but we will have all board doors closed during the expulsion hearing while the board hears both the hearing and then goes into closed session to rule on it. We'll bring everyone back in. I'm sorry I can't estimate the time. Typically, it could be anywhere ..it could be 45 minutes in terms of a timeframe.

#### EXPULSION HEARING – CLOSED SESSION

Hammond – Orange County Board of Ed is continuing on. Chair would seek a motion in regards to J-4.

Bedell – Move approval

Lindholm – I would second that.

Hammond – Discussion?

Boyd – I would suggest that we table this to the next meeting. I haven't had the opportunity to speak with the representative from the Charter School Association and get a better understanding as to what's done in other counties. Secondly, but not quite as important this could easily stretch our meetings out another hour and at the time the application is submitted we have nothing before us to ask intelligent questions.

Lindholm – Comment

Hammond – Please

Lindholm – The reason for this is I particularly for our last meeting we had it mixed in with Public Comments. It was very difficult to hear what the charter submitted was and some of the applicants left. Three of them at that time were unable to give us information that I think would have been helpful. Anytime a large organization which I would call this, usually in a public meeting, they have specific time

and place and it just makes it easier, cleaner, and it's only . . . I'm very support of this and I'd like to take it at this time.

Hammond – Dr. Bedell

Bedell – I think pretty self-explanatory. It's more of a procedure as to how we do business and I think, I'm hopeful, I can't imagine how any organization would be upset by this. It makes the process flow.

Hammond – Dr. Williams?

Williams – I'm fine with J-4.

Hammond – I'm fine with the way it is myself. Mr. Boyd do you wish to make a motion to table this.

Boyd – No. Not unless I feel it's a consensus. It's not a big deal in my mind and we can always tweak it as time goes along.

Bedell – Try it. If it doesn't work . . .

Hammond – Alright. Any other discussion? Then all in favor of J-4 signify by saying aye.

Voices – aye

Boyd – I'll abstain on this one.

Hammond –and one abstention on this one motion passes 4-0-1 on J-4. Nina, are we ready for

Boyd, N., We are.

Dunseth – I also have 7 Public Comments for this particular one.

Hammond – On this one for G-5?

Dunseth – Yes. And then we have another 10 for G-7.

Hammond – OK

Boyd – We need to make a decision with respect to our policy on 45 minutes of Public Comments.

Hammond – We're going to have to pretty much stick to it. Unless, the board would have to want to waive board policy so if we broach the 45 minutes then I think we will have to go with that route. Miss Nina would you help us out here? On G-5 please.

Boyd, N. – Kelly will conduct the hearing and then we'll call the public comments at the appropriate time.

Hammond – Alright.

Gaughran – Good afternoon President Hammond, members of the board and Superintendent Mijares. Today we will hold a hearing to consider input from the public regarding the appeal of the Enovate Santa Ana College Prep or SACP Charter School petition which was submitted to us at the June 17 Orange County Board of Education meeting following the June 9 denial by the Santa Ana School Board. Subsequent to today's meeting the charter school review team will meet with petitioners to assist with clarification and address any questions. For today's hearing each party is given 15 minutes to summarize their position. Then the hearing will be opened for the purpose of public comments. For those interested in speaking if you haven't already please submit to me a completed speaker cards located on the back table and be aware that each speaker will be allotted 3 minutes with a total of 30 for public comments on this matter. In addition, the board will consider all written information for the final recommendation. Written testimony forms are located on the back table and should be submitted by July 17. Each board member is reviewing all materials that presented by the SACP Charter School petitioners which includes a copy of Santa Ana School Board's Resolution denying the petition. Therefore in today's presentation and public comments it will not be necessary to repeat any of this information. I would like to open the public hearing for the SACP Charter School and call Ms. Jessica Cohn to the podium.

Disk 1 track 11

Disk 2, Track1

Gaughran – Thank you to all presenters and thank you for board for the due diligence in reviewing the materials before you. President Hammond I now close the public hearing and turn the meeting back over to you.

Hammond – Thank you very much.

Boyd – As a reminder, G-6 for members of the public who might have come in late. The Albert Einstein withdrew their charter so that will not be heard today and we would be moving to G-7. Another public hearing, President Hammond.

Boyd – Mr. President, I do have a couple of questions for

Hammond – I was going to open it up and see if we have some questions. Mr. Boyd would you like to lead us off please.

Boyd – Yes if we could have the young lady come up.

Track 3

Hammond – G-6 was removed so we go to item G-7. You're back up.

Gaughran – Now we are going to hold a public hearing to consider input regarding the appeal of the Unity Middle College High School or Unity MCHS charter school petition which was submitted to us at the June 17<sup>th</sup> board meeting following the June Board action by the Orange Unified Board. Subsequent to today's meeting the charter school review team will meet with the petitions to assist in clarification and addressing questions. For today's hearing each party is allocated 15 minutes to summarize their position. Then the hearing will be opened for the purpose of public comments. Please submit to me a completed speaker if you have not already. In addition, the board will consider all written information for the final recommendation. Written testimony forms are located on the back table. Each board member is reviewing all materials presented by the Unity MCHS charter school petitioners which includes a copy of Orange Unified School Board's action that resulted in a denial of the petition. Therefore, today's presentations and public comments it will not be necessary to repeat any of this information. I'd like to open the public hearing for Unity MCHS charter school and call Dr. Anne Craig the lead petitioner to the podium

Gaughran – Thank you .\_\_\_\_\_. We will now open the hearing for public comments and each speaker will be given 3 minutes for a total of 30 minutes of public comments. Penny, please call the first speaker.

Track 7

Track 9

Boyd, N . Time's up.

Audience Member – Are you gonna give the Americans an extra .

Board – all voices . .

Boyd, N. You're out of order

Audience Member – I'm out of order?

Boyd, D., Yes, you're out of order

Hammond – Sir

Audience member – This is America. It's not Guatemala, it's not Mexico, it's not El Salvador, are you gonna give every

Boyd, D., I think we need to have a recess, sir.

Lindholm – Recess! We're going into recess now.

RECESS

Hammond – They would like to continue? The Orange County Board of Education is back in order at 4:30 back in our meeting. Unfortunately, Trustee Boyd had to leave for personal medical. But at this time we are going to continue, so Miss Kelly if you would bring . .

Gaughran – They have indicated that they would like to continue

Hammond – Excellent. We would love to have . . . How about the lady that was speaking? Was she finished or not? Because if she was not finished, if she wants to we've love to be able to . .

Speaker – I'm finished. . . . (inaudible)

Hammond – Well said. OK. That was short and to the point. Miss Penny, who is out next person?

Dunseth Track 11

Track 13/14

Gaughran – Thank you to our presenters and thank you board members for you due diligence in reviewing the documentation before you. President Hammond I now close the public hearing and turn the meeting back over to you.

Hammond – Thank you and thank you for maintaining your composure. You're awesome. I will turn to my colleagues. Any questions Dr. Williams, I will start with you sir.

Williams – I do not. Very well done.

Hammond – Dr. Bedell.

Bedell – No.

Hammond – Trustee Lindholm.

Lindholm – No I don't have any questions at this time. Like our last presenter said, I'd like to go to that school.

Hammond – I did have a couple of questions but I don't who should I address them to. You doc? Really quick. You mentioned Con basically Con Academy which has helped my kids out especially our son, tremendously. You mentioned a letter by chance could you get us a copy of that letter from the Con Academy?

Speaker - Absolutely.

Hammond – That would be super. You also mentioned A-G requirements. That you are going to be in compliance with that. How do you know you are going to be in compliance with that.

Speaker – Meaning that our high school graduation requirement that we will be creating for the Unity High School graduation requirement will be directly aligned to the A-G requirement so every student that graduates, 100% of our children who graduates, will graduate meeting the A-g requirements giving them the opportunity and I want to be clear I am not of the mind set that every single child is going to go directly to

More

Track 15

Hammond – If there is nothing else on G-7

Bedell – Did we do something with OM-2 on the front part.

Hammond – That's what I was getting ready to back to right now.

Bedell – What's the relationship between OM-2 and J-11?

Hammond – I'm looking at that right now. It looks . . . Outside of the yearly dates, they look the same.

Bedell – So we'll take care of J-11 and at the same time

Hammond – I'm thinking we should back track OM-2 only because it says 2014-15 versus 2015-16.

Bedell – Why would we do something for 2 years ago?

Hammond – 14-15 is what we are currently in right now. So I think we should take care of the current before the future. That was my reason behind that. I'll defer to my colleagues. I was looking at OM-2 under G-1. That has not been dealt with by us. Dr. Williams, anything on OM-2 sir?

Williams – Typically we present it and our Assistant Superintendent will be talking to us on an individual basis as to what may be our interest. And usually by the next meeting we have more specific information.

Boyd, N. – Typically it's been listed on the July agenda but it's been carried over so that we can have discussion. You all can express your interest and we can fill the 15-16 fiscal year in and we can vote on that at the next meeting. The 14-15 that you are looking at on page 57 is just showing what the current assignments have been this year.

Hammond – So right now, OM-2 requires no motion.

Boyd, N. – No motion and J-11 would be a carry over item if that's the board's desire to

Lindholm – Can we go back – Om-2 is the board member assignments and I would just like to say it was my pleasure to be the OCSBA representative and I had some health problems this and was not able to attend as many as I'd like so I think I'd like to open that up to other people and I just to share that.

Hammond – What's the page #?

Lindholm – It's the last page in the entire book. I just wanted to mention that to you. You will not hurt my feelings because I had some health issues. I'd love to have somebody else perhaps of interest sign up for OCSBA position. There's no action it has to come back up on the next agenda.

Hammond – So do we need to make a motion then to carry over to table OM- 2 or will just simply be automatically carried over.

Dunseth – OM-2 will go away but J-11 can be carried over after you discuss it.

Hammond – OK. Then we are on to item J-11. Dr. Bedell do you have any thoughts as J-11?

Bedell – I'll defer to my colleagues. I'd like to continue to do what I do.

Hammond – I think you did great.

Dr. Williams – So as in past practices and when we have conversations that go into our next meeting and we'll be talking with Nina I'm sure.

Hammond - Madame Vice President?

Lindholm – I think that's probably a good idea for people to look the parameters of it and I know Jack Bedell has done a real good job on his delegate assembly and all that so

Hammond – Would you be open to carrying on with that?

Bedell – sure

Hammond – Then in regards to J-11, shall we table that one? Does J-11 need an action item for us to table

Bedell – Motion to table J-11 until the August meeting.

Williams – Second.

Hammond – Moved to table by Dr. Bedell, seconded by Dr. Williams. Any other discussion?

Lindholm – Just to submit an interest in (inaudible)

Hammond – So noted. Any other discussion. No? See that there is no other discussion all those in favor of tabling J-11 until our next board meeting signify by saying aye.

All – Aye.

Hammond – Motion passes 4-0. J-11 is done.

Williams – Moving on it items G-2 and G-3 Mr. President, can I make a motion that we table these Indefinitely?

Hammond – Motion by Dr.

Williams – I have to be very careful because I don't want to break our board policy in that I don't want to deny any board member the ability place items on the agenda. So let me just make that motion that would table it for today.

Bedell – You said indefinitely.

Hammond – You said indefinitely.

Williams – I'm modifying that. Table it for today.

Hammond – Just table it til next month?

Williams – Yes. Because David's not here and the only reason G-3 is on there is because we have to, it's to defend a paper that we wrote. So it wouldn't be fair.

Hammond – So your motion is to table items G-2 and G-3 until next Board meeting.

Williams –That's correct.

Hammond – That will require a second. Is there a second?

Bedell – Second.

Hammond – Any discussion? No discussion . alright. All those in favor of tabling items G-2 and G-3 til next board meeting meeting signifying by saying aye.

All - aye

Hammond – Motion passes 4-0. Onto special recommendations. J-1.

Bedell – Being consistent with what you just did, what would be the appropriate motion . . .to table that as well.

Williams – I'm not going to make a motion.

Bedell – I'm just saying in terms of being consistent.

Hammond – I'm not willing to table it per sey, I understand what you are saying, I get that. I don't see it going anywhere. It would be nice to be done with it. The chair will seek a motion in regards to J-1.

Williams - It dies if there is no motion.

Bedell – There's nothing preventing him from bringing it back.

Williams – Then he can do whatever he wants.

Hammond – If no motion is made in regards to J-2 then it simply does not get motioned and it fall off the agenda at this time.

Lindholm – It that correct?

Williams – No, no.

Lindholm – Help us out.

Hammond – It's like the pay raise a couple of months ago. There was no body touched that so

Wenkart – If there's no discussion and no motion then it basically completed the item and so it just off the agenda unless somebody puts it on the agenda for August.

Lindholm – So if we take no action do we need a motion to take no action?

Wenkart – No.

Lindhold – OK. So J-1

Hammond – So in the chair's opinion, J-1 fails to receive a motion on anything, J-1 is dealt with. Item J-2.

Williams – I'd lilke to move to adopt the draft as a white paper for our board.

Hammond – Motion by Dr. Williams. Is there a second to J-2. I'll go ahead and second J-2. Discussion:? Dr. Williams you made the motion. Would you care to discuss.

Williams – Absolutely. So earlier President Hammond and myself created an opinion piece that was submitted in May, I believe, along with a lot of other items realted to the Common Core Public Fact Finding Committee and meetings that we had. The two other papers that were considered the Lindholm/Bedell paper on mathematics, and then ofcourse we had the Hammond/Bedell that was a general synopsis for the entire October/November meetings. And, so, at that time we talked about the reception of other papers we received that was unanimously received and such was that. There's been some activity subsequent to that at the last meeting I heard from Trustee Lindholm as well as yourself about making that official position paper for the board. And I thought I could \_\_\_\_ with that and then I went home and I thought, why can't you support my paper then? So the paper that Robert and I made, there was a little bit of editing and modification but in essence it's the same paper, it's a well researched paper, it's referenced extensively, and so it was my thought that if we are going to be adopting position papers I would like to have this considered by this esteemed board. So, that's why I put it on.

Hammond – Dr. Bedell.

Bedell – I have no comment.

Hammond – Ms. Vice President

Lindholm – First I want to thank Dr. Williams for all his effort on this. And I've supported that the (inaudible) received at the prior meeting to (inaudible) under the two of you. Your names. But . . . interesting level, if it's going to be a white paper it has to have both sides of the issue like when you are doing ( ? ) report and that it kind of it's more of an opinion piece I'm happy to keep it as an opinion piece from the two of you if you are looking for support then I have all those academic and research questions that in terms of how it's written there's a few subjective adjectives it's not written as a research paper as many medical matters you have as a doctor but as a registered therapist research papers. So there's a few things in here if you want our my full support I need to make some amendments. Where it gives a little more practical background it (?) a little to that there were also other presenters that under conclusion that it was adopted by state of California in 2010. Do I like Common Core, no that wasn't asked. But I think it needs a few changes in the sentences and if you would like for me to sign on to that then I need to do it in that research and academic point of view and I have those suggestions. If you wanted to keep it just from the two of you, I more than happy to do that. So, I just had that suggestion.

Hammond – Dr. Bedell.

Bedell – I valued it as an opinion piece and I thought it was well crafted as an opinion piece. But I want in the process of developing some resolutons and strategy used in one of the math and there's one coming on to share some of my concerns, some of my concerns are the same as Trustee Lindholm, we're testing times one coming on privacy issues and I agree that this is an opinion piece coming off as a board policy which is very different. And so I welcomed it as I said as an opinion piece and I respect that, but I do not think it rises to the level, and that's not a negative it's not characterized a full white paper in my definition. So, we've received it already, right?

Lindholm – We have received it and I voted to receive it as an opinion piece from the two of you and I'm happy to have done that.

Hammond – We did receive it but there's been some changes to it so I think if we are going to keep in that spirit as to receiving it then I think it then it should be received anew?

Bedell – You like it. You are saying it's substantially revised in substance, right? As it is submitted today.

Hammond – No. It's some subtle nuances .

Bedell – So it was fine tuning?

Hammond – There was, unfortunately, it was my mistake, Stanford was misspelled.

Williams – Commas here and there.

Hammond – The word to was left out, spaces.

Bedell – I don't think rises to

Lindholm – Any entire paragraphs that are new? Yes, there is on page,

Williams – That would be new to me if that happened.

Lindholm – It's on page 26. Could we either it needs little tweaking to be an academic research paper or I think we stay with it as you had and maybe if want to bring back addendum that we accept. I'm willing to do that.

Williams – So express to me what part are you concerned about.

Lindholm – Academic paper or research paper it has to be, it needs to be totally factual and unbiased and it's usually up to the reader at the end when you ask the question. Is this (jumps on disk) some omissions. And clarifications. I stayed up until midnight last night working on the State Board of Education website to check out the internationally benched mark issue and a lot of other things and it's important to me, I don't like them, but we have to kind of live with it and within the perameters and what I found looking at the math standards and the English standards, is it says specifically that it is internationally benchmarked by our state of California repressed State of Educatin website is where I found it. And signed by him. If we're going to have that those kinds of statements you have to have both kinds of statements. When your coming against the State of Califonria and they're saying it's internationally benchmarked and I've looked at some of the internationally benchmarking resources. It has to be an academically researched paper. If it wants to be an opinion, I'm happy with that but if it's academic and research then I need a different

Williams – So a lot

Lindholm - methodology

Williams – Sure. I didn't mean to cut off

Lindholm – No. That's OK it's late too.

Hammond – Would you be amiable to receiving anew. Would you say that there was some changes, I think what you are referring to on page 26 is that the middle paragraph, the last 3 sentences were added. So maybe it would help them to just receive anew and then just build upon that?

Bedll – You could do the same thing if we referred it back to the authors in light of these comments. That might be a way to handle it. I don't know what receive anew means Robert.

Hammond – I'm just saying we received this before and now what's before us there have been some changes, it's like the middle paragraph on page 26 there was 3 sentences added so my thought is to re-receive, to receive what this is to supercede what was previously received and then whatever changes that Trustee Lindholm has to move forward. I feel like we can't move forward with

Lindholm – I can't do this. I can't do it as written as a white paper. I have been a university instructor for 2 ½ years and a (inaudible) director. When you have writing it needs to be, and this is from the Orange County Department of Education, it should be

Williams – Board of Education

Lindholm – It should be very and it's and I know you've been traveling. I have a great respect for you and all and I know there's probably not as much time. And I want to know how to , question.

Boyd, N. –I just wanted to let you know before you take action you do have one public comment on this. When you are finished with your discussion.

Williams – There's going to be no discussion. Do you want to want to hear the public comment?

Hammond – Penny why don't you go ahead and call the one person.

Penny – Celia Jaffe.

Hammond – Welcome back.

Jaffe's comments.

Disk 2, track 19

Hammond – Penny any other comments

Dunseth – No not on this item.

Hammond – Thank you.

Lindholm – We're trying to help with the resolution of this. I think it needs to be brought back for my vote and support. Certain things like I'm looking at this is a copy of the letter from Tom Torlakson. Where he says, in this letter which is on the California Common Core standards, through the website that I printed last night as midnight. The CCSS are internationally benchmarked, research based, and unequivocally rigorous. We disagree with him but it needs to be said in there if we are going to say that it's not internationally benchmarked then it you still have to show both sides of the story and it's not showing both sides of the story. So in terms of

this paper, I cannot put it written from me, happy to support it from both of you. I have personally 5 major areas of Common Core which I'm very disturbed about which is the data mining which we are trying to send that letter to which in the Senate and the US House right now and we really want to protect our children that way. I want to look at the testing and get some letters out on that. There's way too much testing when they've got 7 to 8 hours of testing in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grade. I want to get letters out on that. We have some of the math issues in that the math is not in good (inaudible). We can't get our kids into college. Take the calculus (-----) . So there are about 5 areas I've heard for you and I want to incorporate and those are not incorporated in here,. Whether it's legal or not or internationally benchmarked, I'm not sure that gets me that is one issue for you, for me it's all this other and the matrix that I've seen on the implementation for math it's just not acceptable. So there are all those issues I would like to have within this paper or in a separate paper and then get that distributed to the California School Board Association. That's where I am on this and I can't give you support at this time.

Williams – That document by Torlakson, when was the standards done? What date do they give reference to?

Lindholm – I just printed this last night off the website

Williams – Is it 2008?

Lindholm – you are welcome to have it.

Williams – I want to thank you for your thoughts and input and I take them very seriously and I'm open to modifying the document to represent the board's perspective. I think that's reasonable. I not hardheaded. I would like to, without breaking the Brown Act, learn your concerns with it maybe Ron you can give us some advice here. How to deal with this when we're trying not to break the Brown Act and yet talk about something that is very serious and divisive. I'm not going to sit here and say that Common Core is not divisive but I think we cannot sit back and let things happen just because somebody else wants it to happen. I think we are the voice of the people, we're elected by the people, and it's duty and responsibility to talk about these difficult things. Thank you for coming forward, I do appreciate it. I disagree entirely with you but we can respectfully disagree. So how can we best work

Wenkart – Two board members can talk to each other and a one-on-one conversation. That's not a violation of the Brown Act. But once you get a 3<sup>rd</sup> board member involved outside of meeting then you are violating the Brown Act. So if you wanted to talk to Ms. Lindholm about the paper and making changes, that would be fine and then you bring it back to the Board meeting in August for discussion, that would be OK too. But once you talk to one of the other Board members about what you and Linda talked about, what you and Ms. Lindholm talked then you have a violation of the Brown Act.

Williams – So it would be OK and consistent with the Brown Act that Linda and I talk about altering this document?

Wenkart – Yes.

Williams – OK. Are you interested in such?

Lindholm – I would be very glad to have an academic research paper.

Williams – I take a little offense at the word academic.

Lindholm – I know

Williams – Because this is very thoroughly researched.

Lindholm – I hope you recall that on our mathematics paper, you called it decent.

Williams – Interpretation is welcome.

Lindholm – OK, same with yours.

Williams – So, if I may make a motion then lay on the table until the next meeting for this document and we'll discuss it

Lindholm – So table it right now?

Hammond – You are making a subsidiary motion, Dr. Williams, you are making motion to table until next meeting. That would require a second.

Bedell – Second.

Hammond – Seconded by Dr. Bedell. Any discussion on tabling it.

Lindholm – Just a question. Would it be better to have and I'm happy to meeting with him, would it be better to have, because then Jack can't make comments, would it be better to send all the comments to one person? I'm OK.

Williams – What I see it, that you and I chit-chat and exchange emails and share with me your concerns, we modify the document and I send it back to you and you like it and then we present it at the next meeting and then we talk about again.

Lindholm – OK. But then you (Bedell) and I can't talk about it.

Wenkart – Not in between meetings.

Lindholm – OK happy to do that.

Hammond – Say Jack has comments, questions, couldn't he send them to either Trustee Lindholm or . . . and say don't reply. Is that

Wenkart – No because then you have 3 board members involved because they would be talking about his comments. So it has to be just

Hammond – If he has any comments, can he send them to Penny and then Penny.

Wenkart – Penny. Well you'd have to

Hammond – Because I'm sure he has at least a comment.

Wenkart – Those comments would have to be discussed at the next board meeting. Once you get 3 the Brown Act says you can't have serial conversations either by email, by phone, whatever means. Even using an intermediary, which, using a staff member. Just the two of them could have a conversation and bring it back to the board for full discussion at the board meeting, the next board meeting

Hammond – At the last board meeting did we ask you to give us your thoughts on Education Code 60618.

Wenkart – Yes and I'm working on that. I should have something before the next board meeting.

Hammond – OK, thank you. Dr. Bedell.

Bedell – Ron in your sense what's the difference between postponing and tabling?

Wenkart – There's not really a whole lot of difference. Under Robert's Rules of Order, they talk about tableing so we usually make motion to table. But postpone is basically the same thing.

Hammond – Any other discussion of tabeing.

Williams (\_\_\_\_\_) on tabling. I'll make a comment later.

Hammond – If there is no other discussion then the chair will call for a vote on tableing of this item next month. All those in favor of tableing until next month signify by saying aye.

All – Aye

Hammond – Opposed? Motion passes 4-0.

Bedell – Mr. Chairman there have been several people in the audience who may have comments about this document. Would it be possible for them to get to somebody those comments so that might faciliaate the conversation instead their time and the board's time next meeting.. Is there any way to provide that input.

Wenkart – That would be fine if anybody from the public has comments on the document they can give them to Penny then Penny could share them with Dr. Williams and Ms. Lindholm and they make that part of their discussion.

Bedell – That way

Wendart – Then bring it back to

Hammond – Are there comments though.

Dunseth – We have 3 comments on J-1 which did not go anywhere.

Boyd, N. – J-1 vanished

Hammond – It vanished.

Boyd, N. There is no longer a J-1

Dunseth – Linda Cone, Kristen, Jessica

Lindholm – Penny, you might want to explain that there is no long a J-1.

Dunseth – Right, but I thought they , There is no more J-1.

Williams – But there was a J-1.

Wenkart – They still have right to speak.

Audience ( inaudible)

Boyd, N. – We are not able to capture everything from the audience so if Ms. Cone if you want to speak, you have 3 minutes. Did you want to speak?

PC – Linda Cone.

Hammond – Anyone else for J-1

Dunseth- 2 others. Christian Kaun

Kaun, C. – Before I start is this going in the audio transcripts for Mr. Boyd to hear.

Boyd, N. – It will be in the audio transcripts. They are taping here.

Kaun, C.-

