BARKE: We hereby open the meeting at, what is it? 3:55 and I would welcome a motion to accept the—oh, roll call first. Yes, please. Roll call first.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Present.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Present.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Present.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Here.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw? I think he is. He's trying to tap in.

HENDRICK: We'll add him later.

BARKE: Okay. I would entertain a motion to accept the agenda.

VALDES: So moved.

WILLIAMS: Second.

BARKE: All right. All those in favor. We have to do roll call because we're—yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: And Trustee Shaw is not here.

HENDRICK: Who was the first and the second on that? It was Jorge?

BARKE: First, second, third. Yep. And then a motion to accept the minutes.

VALDES: So moved.

BARKE: Do I have a second?

WILLIAMS: Second.

BARKE: Okay. All those in favor?

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: And Trustee Shaw is not in.

BARKE: Okay. All right. All right, now we are going to go into closed session and we will be back at 5:00 PM. All right. Meeting adjourned for now.

[The Orange County Board of Education goes into closed session and returns.]

BARKE: So glad to see so many smiling faces. We don't have an invocation there this evening. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to do an impromptu invocation? The first person to volunteer gets to do it. Come on. All right, come on up.

BETHANY: So, I'm a Quaker. In Quaker tradition we would just have a moment of silence and then we would speak out of the silence if you felt led, but I'll just say that I hope that everyone feels protected and safe and blessed this evening as they work to go through all the work of being a county district and school districts and every work to educate our children. And then if you join in the moment of silence. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: For the record, could you just say your name?

BETHANY: Oh, I'm Bethany Ewers.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Where are you from?

BETHANY: I live in Huntington Beach and I work for Suncoast Charter School and I practice as a Quaker. Our meeting house is in Costa Mesa.

WILLIAMS: Nice.

BETHANY: So yeah, I'm headed to Quaker craft night after this.

BARKE: Well, thank you, Bethany. We appreciate you coming up here with hardly any notice at all. You did a great job. All right. And next we'll go to the Pledge of Allegiance with our Chief of Staff, Dennis Cole.

COLE: All right. Would you all join me as we Pledge of Allegiance to our flag saying?

AUDIENCE: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COLE: Thank you. You may be seated.

BARKE: Thank you. All right. Now moving along. All right. Do have any introductions?

HENDRICK: We have none.

BARKE: Okay. And I just want to announce to those who haven't noticed that Trustee Shaw and Trustee Sparks are coming in remotely this evening. So, they will be participating in the meeting, but they will not be here in the building. And as a result, it will be roll call votes. So, any votes we take will have to be roll call. All right. Let's see. So next, can I have a motion for the consent calendar please?

HENDRICK: We have public comments.

BARKE: I'm sorry. Oh, yes.

WILLIAMS: Who has the cards?

BARKE: I believe Jorge has the cards for public comments.

VALDES: Okay. I am pinch hitting for Tim today. Public comments. General topic. First person is Katherine. The next person on deck is Cara Pettite or Pettite.

KATHERINE: Good evening. My name is Katherine Liu. I'm the association president for ACCESS and Connections. At the last board meeting, I spoke about my concern that it took Department 10 months to provide a school calendar for the upcoming school year. Tonight, I want to talk about another issue that reflects the same pattern, S1S MOU. For many years, I supported the S1S program while serving as a TOSA at the ACCESS district office. My role included helping develop curriculum supporting implementation and providing training for teachers. During those years, I repeatedly heard the same explanation whenever questions arose about delays in finalizing the S1S MOU, that the association was a reason it had not been signed. So as a TOSA supporting the department's work, I always wonder about that. This year, I had the opportunity to see the process from a different perspective. As an association president, I decided not to wait until the last minute.

Instead, I reached out to human resources and initiated conversations about the S1S MOU in February. We wanted to be proactive. We wanted to avoid annual scramble. We wanted to ensure that teachers had clarity and that students would be served without uncertainty. Yet here we are. Program is scheduled to begin in just two weeks and we still do not have assigned MOU. That raises an important question. Why? This is not a new program. The Department has operated S1S for years. Every year program begins July 1st. Every year educators step up to serve students during the summer. Every year, district rely on ACCESS to provide these services. And every year program serves more than 12,000 students. The timeline is known. Staffing needs are known. Operation requirements are known. So why? This is not simply an issue of paperwork. It's an issue of planning, communication and respect for the employees who make this program successful.

What concerns me in this situation is that it appears to be a part of a larger pattern. First, it took 10 months to produce the school calendar. Now, despite beginning discussion in February, we're approaching the start of a major summer program without finalizing an agreement. These are not unexpected events. These are routine responsibilities that occur every year. The educators of ACCESS and Connections are committed to serving students. We continue to show up, adapt, and do whatever is necessary to support student in Orange County. We ask only that the same level of urgency and commitment be demonstrated when it comes to planning and decision making. Thank you.

BARKE: Thank you.

VALDES: Okay. The next person up is Cara Pettite and Heidi Gasca is on deck.

CARA: With the MOU, what is taking so long? I started with ACCESS in October of 1998 as a paraeducator at the La Habra site. I've taught at other day schools. Besides La Habra, I've been at Fullerton site, the old Glen Oak site, which became the Anaheim North site. I was at Otto Fisher. I became a teacher on special assignment for science. I'm now back in the classroom, which I love. And I've been here so long. Walking in the door, I knew these were the students I wanted to work with. Their perseverance, their creativity, their adaptability, their courage, their joy at achieving their goals. It energized me to provide my students with rigorous academic opportunities and a safe space to thrive. But when I'm not supported, my job is harder. When I need to fight for our contracted COLA, it's frustrating. Delays in the annual calendar. Delays of the MOU for the S1S summer session.

It's exhausting. Please don't make my job harder. Please stop creating obstacles. My students deserve my best and I want to provide it for them. Thank you.

BARKE: Thank you.

VALDES: So the next person up is Heidi Gasca and Bethany Ewers is on deck.

HEIDI: Good evening, President Barke, Members of the Board and Superintendent Bean, as well as district staff. My name is Heidi Gasca and I'm the superintendent of Excel Academy Charter Schools. I'm honored to be here tonight just to briefly come and say hello and let you know that I look forward to our public hearing scheduled next month on July 8th. I sent each of you a brief overview of the school earlier this week as well as to let you know that we have the very large petition binder that may put you to sleep at night, but I just wanted to come and tell you a little bit about myself. I was raised my entire life in Orange County and I proudly reside in South Orange County within the Capistrano Unified School District boundaries. I've had the privilege of being an educator for 29 years. I started my teaching career in Irvine Unified and moved to Capistrano Unified and then I found a passion in charter schools.

I was a founding member of Excel Academy Charter School in 2012, and it's been my honor to build the school and support flex-based independent study options across Orange County for our community. I oversee currently a staff of 141 and we've had the honor of being named California Distinguished Schools, a top high school by US News and World Report and on the ERP honor role and more. We passionately offer a personalized education and this was just a brief opportunity for me to highlight our school and say hello and say I look forward to seeing you in July. Thank you.

VALDES: And the last comment tonight is Bethany Ewers.

BETHANY: Good evening and greetings to President and Members of Board of Education. My name is Bethany Ewers. I'm speaking tonight as an educator at Suncoast Charter School and I'm concerned about SCA5 that is working its way through because it would create a new funding stream while excluding charter schools and basic aid districts from participating. Regardless of how we feel about different educational models, the students we serve are public school students and they deserve access to the same opportunities and investments as any other child in California. At Suncoast, we serve families across Orange County who've chosen an independent study and homeschool-based public education program and these families pay taxes and contribute to their communities and deserve to know that their children will not be left out of future investments in public education simply because they attended charter school or basic aid funded districts. So, I respectfully ask that you oppose any proposal that excludes those basic aid districts and our charter schools from educational opportunities funded by California taxpayers. Thank you.

BARKE: Thank you.

VALDES: That's it, Madam President.

BARKE: All right. So, if I now can have a motion for the consent calendar, I'd be grateful.

WILLIAMS: I so move.

VALDES: Second.

BARKE: All right. Darou, roll call.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: Okay, great. And are there any charter submissions?

HENDRICK: We have none.

BARKE: None. Okay, great. And next is item six. Thank you, Aracely.

CHASTAIN: Good evening, President Barke, Trustee Superintendent Bean. Before you tonight is the proposed agreement between the board and Suncoast Charter School. Following approval of Suncoast Charter School, the school reviewed the standard agreement and submitted a redlined copy of the changes that they are requesting. We've carefully reviewed each of those changes. Most of the revisions are clarifying in nature and they don't materially alter the board's oversight authority or the school's obligations under law. However, staff does not support the proposed reductions to the insurance requirements that are contained in Exhibit A. Specifically, the school has requested lower coverage limits for general commercial liability, professional educators' errors and omissions liability, sexual molestation and abuse coverage and excess umbrella insurance. In reviewing the school's request, staff consulted with guidance from the Alliance of Schools for Cooperative Insurance programs or ASCIP. ASCIP's recommended insurance standards for charter schools are generally higher than the coverage that's required in the current MOU.

Given Suncoast's independent study model, its use of third-party vendors, enrichment vendors, a variety of educational settings in which the students receive services, staff believes the existing insurance requirements remain appropriate and provide prudent protection against potential liability exposures related to student safety, supervision, professional liability, and abuse prevention. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the agreement with all mutually agreed upon revisions incorporated while maintaining the original insurance requirements in Exhibit A.

BARKE: Okay. Thank you. You want to start, Jorge, since you're looking this way?

VALDES: I reviewed this closely and I am not inclined to make any changes to paragraph three. This board has the discretion to determine whether there is a sound educational program. Paragraph three, I think is part of our supervisory authority over a charter school and I am most certainly not inclined to eliminate paragraph three.

ROLEN: I think we need a motion and a second before we start discussing.

BARKE: Would you like to make a motion?

VALDES: Let's see. I guess my motion would be to decline all changes.

BARKE: Okay.

WILLIAMS: I'll second it for the sake of discussion. I'd like to learn more about your perspective, sir.

BARKE: All right, do you want to move on to Dr. Williams? Do you want to give us your thoughts?

WILLIAMS: Well, I'm going to actually ask for the principal herself. Come on up and let's hear from your perspective. You heard from the staff. They want you to keep the insurance requirements.

WINDI: Yes. And my insurance agent is with me as well.

WILLIAMS: Okay. And so, I want to hear from you why you think you don't need it.

WINDI: Well, I wrote notes for you guys, so if I could present those, that would be good because it talks about a couple of things in there and explains Jorge. First, I want to thank OCDE staff for their continued patience since April as they worked with me through my concerns regarding the proposed MOU for OCDE authorized charter schools. I understand the reasons for having a single MOU for all charter schools. However, one of the strengths of charter schools is that each school is unique, so different schools may require different agreements based on their educational models and operations. During your last meeting, Samueli Charter School raised similar requests to amended its MOU and the board approved those revisions. Likewise, several of Suncoast requested revisions are reflected in the red line version before you tonight, including changes to the legal action notification requirements and board training provisions. We appreciate those revisions and collaborative process that led to them.

I would like to respectfully ask the board to consider a larger question. To my knowledge, neither the Charter Schools Act nor the education code requires a charter school and its authorizer to enter into a separate MOU governing school operations. Our charter petition was reviewed, vetted, and approved by this board. The charter itself already establishes how our school will operate. In addition, we are subject to all applicable state and federal laws, oversight requirements, audits, reporting obligations, public meeting laws, and accountability measures. The items the charter office felt were missing from our petition regarding dropout rates in college and career readiness have already been addressed through our LCAP plans, which are up for approval at our school board meeting this month for both our existing and new school. I would also note that during our charter petition review and hearing process, there was no discussion of a separate MOU requirement.

We understood that the charter approved by this board would be the governing document for our school. For that reason, we were surprised to later learn that the additional agreement would be required and especially surprised to see language stating that the MOU would supersede the charter itself. For those reasons, I respectfully question whether a separate MOU is necessary at all. We welcome oversight. We value transparency. We intend to remain collaborative partners with OCDE. This is not about avoiding accountability. It's simply about determining whether a second governing document is needed. If there are specific operational matters OCDE would like documented such as oversight the billing procedures, those could be addressed through separate administrative agreements rather than a comprehensive MOU that would create additional legal obligations beyond the charter. If the board determines that an MOU should remain in place, I would respectfully ask that several remaining provisions be reconsidered.

First, the agreement continues to state that the MOU controls over the charter whenever there is a conflict. The charter is a document approved by this board after a lengthy public process. I respectfully believe that the charter should remain the governing document for the school's operations. Second, the indemnification provisions remain one-sided. The charter school is required to indemnify and defend the county office, superintendent and board, but there is no reciprocal protection for the charter school. The charter school is happy to take responsibility for any potential liability created by the charter school. The county office superintendent and board should be required to take the same responsibility for their own potential liability they create for the charter school. It is not anticipated that this would be a big risk for the county, but unforeseen circumstances and fairness dictate both parties should be protected equally. Third, the litigation reporting provisions remain extremely broad.

It requires reporting of virtually any claim, investigation, civil action, criminal manner, or governmental inquiry within three business days. We fully support transparency, but we believe the requirement should be limited to material matters that significantly affect school operations or finances. Fourth, regarding the curriculum section, our request was simply to have the agreement require compliance with applicable state and federal law. Suncoast is a parent choice independent study program. Families work with their educational specialists to select curriculum and educational approaches that are appropriate for their students while remaining compliant with all legal requirements. I believe both Suncoast and the Orange County Board of Education share a commitment to parent choice and educational options for families. For that reason, we felt the most appropriate language was a straightforward requirement that the school comply with applicable law. The approach provides clear expectations, avoids ambiguity, and best supports the parent choice model that was reviewed and approved by this board.

Finally, regarding our insurance, I have Craig here, so thank you for your time. And then there's a couple of things. The agreement that was given back to me had changes that weren't on the original agreement. My name is misspelled and the date is wrong. The date is April 4th and I believe it should be April 8th. And that's all except for what you have about the insurance.

VALDES: Can I make a comment, President Barke?

BARKE: Of course.

VALDES: When I prepared for this and I reviewed this, it was my understanding that this agenda item was really simply to address the redline language that the charter school is requesting that we remove. What was your name, dear?

WINDI: Windi.

VALDES: Windi. Ms. Windi has raised entirely new issues well beyond simply the language of the MOU and she is asking us to reconsider the existence of the MOU itself. Therefore, I will make a supplemental motion. I hope this is parliamentary correct.

WILLIAMS: It is, so far.

VALDES: That this needs to be tabled for a formal response by Mr. Rolen and further legal work by Mr. Rolen.

WILLIAMS: I'll second that motion so we vote on that. Actually, second now we discuss the supplemental and we'll go back to the original.

BARKE: Do we want to hear this insurance part first or after?

WILLIAMS: We can ask for it. Yeah.

BARKE: Yeah. So why don't we hear that and then vote?

WILLIAMS: You can, yeah.

BARKE: Okay. Yeah. I mean, this poor guy's been standing here for quite a while.

CRAIG: Even got all dressed up for this.

BARKE: I know. I know. I saw you got all dressed up and you're waiting.

CRAIG: Thank you. I appreciate that. So good evening, everybody. My name is Craig Myers. I'm the vice president of IMA. I represent Suncoast Prep's insurance portfolio as it stands currently. We had an opportunity to review the MOU as it stated related to the insurance requirements that were sent to them. And my goal today is just to share with you some of the reasons and justifications for changing the insurance requirements to better reflect the risks of Suncoast Preparatory Academy. I recognize that you all oversee a lot of different charter schools and a lot of different schools in your county and what I would say is that not all schools are alike, especially from a risk standpoint. The risks of a 5,000 student with multiple campus exposure is significantly different than one of a homeschool program, specifically like Suncoast Preparatory Academy. And so, I actually created an attachment. I don't know if this was sent previously. I'm not sure if this is allowed. Am I allowed to hand these out right now?

WILLIAMS: Sure.

CRAIG: But look, I mean the goal here is not to say that we want less protection. The goal is to say that we want the right protection for this school. And from our experience of working in the insurance marketplace, what I did in that document is kind of create different columns reflecting different things related to what the MOU requires, what Suncoast Prep's insurance policies currently reflect the dollar amount that is projected to cost the school related to reflect that. And then what we think are for lack of better words, appropriate limits related to the risks of the school. And there's a couple areas that I touch on, but specifically even taking a step back, I would say about 80% of what's included in there, we agree with what the MOU requirements are. It's the 20% that we think don't reflect the risks, again, of Suncoast Prep.

So, it's really quick talking through it and I'm happy to take any questions. Property, they don't have any physical assets. There is a requirement for property insurance. I don't feel that that's an accurate reflection of Suncoast Preparatory Academy, not only to mention that you can't get property insurance if there's no property to cover. General liability, there's a requirement for a $2 million, $5 million policy, which means $2 million per incident, $5 million in an aggregate over the course of the aggregate of the policy term. That doesn't exist in the insurance marketplace. They all follow a boilerplate $1 million, $2 million general liability policy and anything that you want to buy in excess of that, you buy what we call an umbrella policy on top of that. So, to try to even reach the $2 million, $5 million, regardless of whether you're a non-site based charter school or not, that's a hard requirement to reach.

On top of that, really quick running through the three others. The umbrella right now requires $10 million limits for schools that oversee for high school students. Suncoast Prep does represent high school students, but what I would say is that adding a $10 million umbrella to what their coverage is currently would add about $125,000 in costs, specifically again, because of their risk and what the limit marketplace looks like in California right now. Again, this is related primarily to slip and falls on campus coverage and things like that, which do not apply at the same level for Suncoast Prep as it does for, again, site-based schools.

Finally, I would just mention the last piece that I would discuss, crime insurance, it says don't add a retention, which is essentially another word for don't have any deductibles a part of your policies under the MOU requirements. I have never seen a crime policy that does not have a deductible or a retention attached to it. So again, trying to reach that related to the MOU requirements, I've not seen that in my experience of 10 years of working in charter schools and I would say our organization's 50 years of working with charter schools and independent schools in California. So, these are just some of them. That is the charter I created related to what we're seeing in the marketplace. Again, the ask here is we want not less protection, but the right protection reflecting their risk as an organization. Thank you for the time.

BARKE: Thank you. Okay. So, I want to vote on the motion now or more discussion or you want to vote or what?

WILLIAMS: I have more questions.

BARKE: Okay. Go ahead, please.

WILLIAMS: We approved the charter. That was back in April, was it? Yeah. April 8th. And we talked about the MOU that we were going to complete and this is the MOU that came from that decision in April. Is that correct?

WINDI: We did not talk about it, but yes, it did come after that decision.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Aracely, I asked you, unfortunately we can't recall exactly the details of that April 8th meeting and…

WINDI: [several inaudible words]

WILLIAMS: You did but we didn't.

CHASTAIN: So, it's part of your resolution that all charter schools will enter into an agreement and that's in all of the resolutions that you have except for the [inaudible] one, of course. It's in the two resolutions. Either you enter into the standard agreement or you enter into an agreement that addresses the conditions that the board has agreed to. So one of those two will happen if a school is approved.

WILLIAMS: Right. There were no conditions.

CHASTAIN: You guys approve the charter without any conditions.

WILLIAMS: Without any conditions.

CHASTAIN: And so, then the approval resolution states that they will enter into the standard agreement.

WILLIAMS: This is the default agreement that we use for all charters.

CHASTAIN: Right. The unredlined. It's the one that we use for all charters.

VALDES: To say that the charter wasn't aware of this is not accurate, it was in our resolution.

WILLIAMS: Right, right.

WINDI: I didn't have your [inaudible].

CHASTAIN: The resolution's in the board packet that's posted 72 hours before your meeting. All of that is included.

HENDRICK: Aracely, her prior charter had an MOU also, right?

CHASTAIN: Correct, but that was not signed by Windi. That was signed by the prior executive director.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So that helps me to set up what's happening. Thank you. Okay. So now getting back to Windi, so you may not have known, but there's an MOU every time we approve a charter, but what I'm hearing from you is that the MOU language may not be appropriate for Suncoast. Is that correct? Is that a true generalization?

WINDI: Yeah, it's a boilerplate MOU for all of the charters. Yes.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Which brings up another general policy question, government's position. Maybe our MOU should be specific for each charter because your particular needs are very different than let's say the other charters that we have. Some are school-based and maybe they need the different coverage here. By the way, your name is what again?

WINDI: Craig.

WILLIAMS: Craig. That's an easy name to remember. It's my son's name. You did a very good job again without spending too much time. I think this is very thorough. I like it how you did in the Excel spreadsheet, you gave a lot of information so thank you for that because I know insurance needs are different for you and your school. So perhaps we need to, Jorge, re-look at this.

VALDES: I thought Craig's arguments were very persuasive as far as not requiring a property policy for a school that doesn't have any property.

WILLIAMS: You can't get right?

VALDES: Right. And the other issues regarding the umbrella, I'm not that well versed in insurance coverage issues like I'm sure he is, but they sounded, he certainly sounds like he's done this before. So, my proposal again would be to take the statements that Craig has made, have the staff review the transcript and then create a reply. I don't think Aracely was aware of those arguments before today or was she?

CHASTAIN: We are aware of the arguments. We don't agree.

VALDES: Okay.

BARKE: Can I ask a question? Just listening to Craig, Craig, if I understood correctly, said that these limits aren't available in the market. If that's so, do our other…

VALDES: How do the other charters…

HENDRICK: Well, can I just say something?

BARKE: Absolutely.

HENDRICK: They may not be aware. I actually have been a board chair for the school's excess liability insurance, JPA for the state for multiple years. There is insurance coverage. We not only went through ASCIP who is our coverage and covers charter schools, we also went to Charter Safe who covers the majority of charters. I do not agree with Greg's assessment on many of the items.

ROLEN: It's Craig.

HENDRICK: Craig, sorry. There is, and I would say the liabilities that we were asking for are way below what Charter Safe and other agencies say. Even as a homeschool, I can name cases for you of outstanding liability that not only the charter school but the county and the authorizing agency faced. And so, I understand from his viewpoint, but I'm telling you from understanding insurance very deeply and other insurance things, I don't necessarily agree with that. And I can back up.

VALDES: What about the property issue?

HENDRICK: We didn't ask for that.

VALDES: Oh, you didn't ask for property insurance? Okay.

CHASTAIN: It is in there and it covers—we're not just talking about a facility. We're talking about all of the property of the organization. This is an independent study program, computers, servers, anything like that. I mean, it's all—if they do end up—they've asked this board for the permission to open resource centers, desks, furniture, all of that is property of—if that building burned down—it can be and they put a little line there that says if they have a facility, we probably could look at that potentially or have those limits reduced if they don't have—but it's not just about a location. It is about the property. Every school has property.

WILLIAMS: Right. Okay.

ROLEN: And it's replacement costs of the property they're talking about.

WILLIAMS: Don't leave. What Windi is objecting to is a redlined out. Is that correct? You don't want that language in the MOU? Is that correct?

CHASTAIN: Correct.

WILLIAMS: I see. So, everything in here that's redlined is in our other MOUs, is that correct?

CHASTAIN: Correct.

WILLIAMS: And what's highlighted in red, whether a line goes through that or whether it's added, that's what Windi you want to change the MOU to?

CHASTAIN: Right. And some of that went back and forth with our attorneys as well. And so, we kind of negotiating back and forth what we were okay with. And like we said, we are okay with the majority of her red lines as far as our office. What we were not okay with only in the exhibit is any reductions of those numbers. So that's where we're not okay. It's just any number that's reducing it from two million to one million or that's what we're not okay with.

WILLIAMS: Gotcha.

CHASTAIN: All the other red lines, our office is okay with pending whether the board agrees or not.

WILLIAMS: I got a question for you now. On page three, paragraph three, a lot of what this board believes in you redlined out. Tell me about that.

WINDI: I also agree, but running a parent choice public charter school with students that might come to us dealing with some of these situations, they might need different supports than our more conservative parents.

VALDES: I can tell you right now there's just no way. Zero chance.

WINDI: I have to ask Jorge because…

VALDES: That I change paragraph three. No chance at all. There are certain—I'm very laissez-faire. I don't want to oversee the charters. You guys can—I want you to do what you do. I'm not a professional educator. I want you to—but there are certain red lines that I will simply not support. I will not support a charter that engages in the things outlined in paragraph three. I simply won't do it.

WINDI: I understand your perspective. But I had to ask you because again, our parents choose curriculum.

WILLIAMS: Getting back down to the basics of what you don't like in the MOU, are we now Aracely talking about just the insurance numbers? Is that it? We're not involved for the record in any of the negotiations back and forth. So, when we get this document, we don't know the context of what's going on. That's why all these questions and…

CHASTAIN: There was a few versions that went back and forth and this is the version that our legal department, the language that continued to protect the board and the Department, yet also met her needs, how we needed it. And so, there was some wordsmithing that happened. Any of the changes that you approved for Samueli, we've also incorporated into this because we said that those would move forward. The board does have different tweaks to the standard agreement for just about every school, right? Some don't like certain language, some want certain things changed, some want dates changed, things like that. So, there are some—this isn't a different process. We do go through this process quite often, but we don't really get anyone asking for a reduction in insurance limits. And so, when we saw that, we decided—it'd been a couple of years since we'd looked at those limits, we really doubted that we were going to get a response back from any insurance company that said, “These should be lowered in this day and age of really high-cost litigation”.

But we decided to go out and look and what we found is that we're probably missing some insurance that we should have that has to do with—I'm trying to remember. It was kind of like the AI and cybersecurity, things like that. We don't have cybersecurity in this current agreement because it just wasn't something we looked at two years ago, but we should absolutely be looking at it again. So, if anything, not only would the limits potentially go up, but we probably would be adding additional insurance the next time the board looks at this agreement, looks at this agreement brand new. And most of our other charter schools, when we've asked in the past, they usually have more insurance than this, but again, we are talking about the majority of site-based programs, high school programs, things like that and they cover that umbrella insurance, which is fine. I mean, that works as well.

WILLIAMS: Windi…

WINDI: Craig had one more thing to add again.

WILLIAMS: Sure. Craig, come on up.

CRAIG: Look, I guess I just have a couple comments and clarifications. A couple comments too, I guess a couple of things that have been said. It is possible to get $10 million in umbrella limits, especially for at least for the homes. It is exorbitant in costs though. I mean, that's what I think if it, just to clarify what I mentioned earlier, that's another $125,000 to a charter school budget that's already frankly limited.

WILLIAMS: A year?

CRAIG: Yes.

WILLIAMS: $125,000 a year?

CRAIG: Yes. As it stands right now, that is the projected budget from the carriers that we talked to about that. What I was talking specifically about what doesn't exist was related to the general liability policy, the two million, five million that I mentioned. That's just a protocol substantial circumstance, not necessarily. What I want to clarify, that was just a one million, two million versus two million, five million, but 10 million is feasible, but the cost is not feasible and that's I think what I'm arguing related to the umbrella limits.

WINDI: My insurance already went up from more than double.

CRAIG: And to Windi's point, I think the circumstances that stemmed this is the homeschool model specifically for charter schools is extremely difficult in California. They got canceled altogether related to their insurance policies and in January just to get the rudimentary $1 million in limits, a lot of the things that you see reflected in there, it doubled their insurance overnight. So, to ask them to go from one million at the prices that they currently have in their policies, which I'm sure we would be transparent in sharing that information, to ask them to 10X that from a liability limit standpoint is going to be extremely detrimental. And regarding other programs that exist related to where insurance costs can be provided, I'm not going to talk about other programs, but what I do know related to those other programs is that a lot of them cover, especially with one that was mentioned previously, school districts primarily, not charter schools.

And the other one covers charter schools that represent thousands and thousands of students and CMOs in that organization. And what I would recommend getting—I'm representing the broker model in the insurance marketplace. There are other JPA programs that exist that can provide that, but what I would recommend to the board is don't put a position where all the charter schools have to adhere to a monopoly market related to that because the qualifications to leave or evaluate outside of that market is extremely difficult for charter schools. So, from the broker model that I think Suncoast Prep is chosen for this, the insurance at the limits that you guys are requesting is going to be an exorbitant increase in costs. So hopefully that helps.

ROLEN: May I say something?

BARKE: Please.

ROLEN: I strongly endorse Trustee Valdes motion to table this and allow us to do legal work. It would be beneficial to the board to see what protections you have and may need and with regard to the language in paragraph three as well.

VALDES: I want to make another suggestion because a lot of arguments have been made on both sides, but this is the first time that I've heard any of this besides the proposed redline. I suggest that we do this in a more formal, I don't want to call it a legal fashion because I don't want to view this as adversary, but I would like Craig to put his arguments on paper and then have the staff reply so I can read it. I can see Craig's position. I can see the staff's reply. If you want to issue a reply to their reply that's called a sur-reply, feel free to do that. But I need to see something on paper. I can't make a decision on this just from all these arguments being made verbally.

WILLIAMS: This is like lawyers getting in front of you to make a final decision and we're just getting presented to this and we don't have our due diligence and all the background and self…

VALDES: I don't want to dismiss these insurance arguments. I want to flush them out, but I need more than just Craig coming down here for five minutes and…

CRAIG: Absolutely. I'm happy to share whatever information.

WILLIAMS: So, I'm kind of weighing this and trying to use the wisdom of Solomon. When that baby comes four, do you split it in half? What do you do? There's some issues that I validate with you, maybe lowering the costs, save you $125,000. I'd like to see that. What do you pay per year, by the way, for insurance?

WINDI: $66,000 right now it went up from 32, right? I think.

WILLIAMS: And you're saying it's going to cost you $125,000…

WINDI: For one of the policies.

WILLIAMS: For just one of the policies. Now that I have sympathy for where I don't have sympathy, and I think Jorge has iterated this so well is on page three, paragraph three. That's no way that's going to change. So don't ask for that, Windi. Troublemaker you are.

WINDI: I had to ask on behalf of my parents who make educational choices for their children. Okay.

BARKE: Do Dr. Sparks and Tim have any thoughts on the matter? We are ignoring you out there.

SPARKS: Sure. I'm fascinated by all of this that's been presented to us and I wholeheartedly agree with Jorge and Ken about I need to see line item what's going on here. I can't just have oral arguments presented out of the blue. So, I agree we need to deep dive into this issue. I want to have a really good understanding of what's out there, what the increases are, what's possible. Are there differences between the online or non-property charter schools? Do we need to make an adjustment along those lines? This said, I'm a big proponent of making sure that we have proper insurance, that's going to be real important for us to sort out and until I have more information as Jorge indicated in written form with all the arguments laid out, I feel like I can't make any kind of informed decision.

WILLIAMS: And yeah, I thank you for that, Lisa. I totally agree. I was just going to say something, but Tim, you probably wanted to say a few words before I talk about parliamentary procedure.

ROLEN: Say a lot of words.

SHAW: No, Ken, I'm dying to hear about the parliamentary procedure. I guess my comment was as we were talking about this, I was thinking about, you know I've had experience being on city council, the sanitation board, the transportation board. And I think at each agency there was a time where I reflected and thought about, I wish we had a better insurance policy for this because some issue had arisen. So, I am a big proponent of insurance policies, but I hadn't thought a lot maybe in the time I've been on the Orange County Board of Education in a model where you have the student at home, if something were to happen, an injury or something, is that just on that family's insurance or where does the school's liability come in? I guess I've never thought that much about that or how that explained to me much. So, this has been a very interesting discussion. So, I would look forward to learning more about how that works and appreciate the comments from the applicants.

BARKE: All right now onto parliamentary procedure.

WILLIAMS: So, I think Jorge, what you meant to say was lay on the table to bring back rather than amending an emotion.

VALDES: I think what my supplemental motion was…

WILLIAMS: You wanted to lay on the table, right?

VALDES: I wanted to table this until next month so we could see everything on paper.

WILLIAMS: Okay. That's what I'm clarifying by the parliamentary procedure.

VALDES: And I want to see Craig's position on the insurance and I'd like to see our staff's reply. And if Craig wants to reply to the reply, that's okay too, but I can't make an informed decision on this. This is just too much for a first pass.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Before we vote, just to kind of clarify some of this. So, your motion is to lay on the table, we're going to vote on that and then that's going to go to Greg and Renee. Who's it going to go to? Greg.

ROLEN: We'll take care of it.

WILLIAMS: You'll take care of it. Then you're going to, obviously it's laying on table so you can bring it back at the next meeting or whenever.

ROLEN: We'll get an analysis to the board on each of the issues first.

WILLIAMS: Okay. It may come back in July. It may come back in August. We don't know. Windi, is that okay if you don't have an MOU, you're not required to do all these things?

BARKE: I think she'll be happy.

WINDI: Well, I asked to not have an MOU, so I would be happy. But no, let's work it out. I mean, Aracely and I have been working really hard on it since we got it in April and they've been very collaborative.

WILLIAMS: Okay. You have to have an MOU.

WINDI: Okay.

WILLIAMS: So don't argue with us. You have to have it.

BARKE: Yeah. And I guess my question, I think I asked it, I would just like to be assured and it sounds like it's so that all of the other charters have those high limits and obviously it must be more affordable than $125,000.

HENDRICK: Well, our insurance has more than doubled also. And I think using the budget...

BARKE: My home insurance has as well, so I can relate.

HENDRICK: It's everybody. But I will tell you one claim that we see is more than what their limits are listed here. So, it'll only take one claim to wipe them out.

BARKE: Yep. Okay. All right. Well, I look forward to further meetings while we'll discuss this again. Thank you for your time, Windi. Thank you for your time, Craig. We appreciate all the information and more to follow.

WILLIAMS: We have to vote.

BARKE: Oh, we need to vote. Okay. Go ahead.

HENDRICK: Do you want to repeat the motion?

ROLEN: We have a motion and a second on the table.

BARKE: Okay. To lay it on the table until we have further research.

WILLIAMS: Right.

BARKE: Okay.

WILLIAMS: That was Jorge's motion. I seconded. Yeah.

BARKE: Okay, perfect. Okay. Darou.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: All right. That was a lively discussion.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Windi.

BARKE: And now we'll move on to number seven and I believe that is mine. This is a resolution to commemorate and celebrate the 250th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and the birth of the United States. So hopefully nobody will argue.

VALDES: This is an easy one.

BARKE: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Any discussion or are we ready for a motion?

SHAW: Mari, did we fix the language that we needed corrected? I think there was…

HENDRICK: It's been corrected for the one online and then the former one. Yes.

BARKE: Yep. I have the corrected one here.

WILLIAMS: If I can ask.

BARKE: Absolutely.

WILLIAMS: I haven't seen that corrected item. Oh, okay. Are we talking about the Costa Mesa language?

BARKE: Yes.

WILLIAMS: It should be the Orange County Board of Education.

BARKE: Exactly. Yes. Yes. Yes.

WILLIAMS: Okay.

BARKE: All right. Any other questions?

WILLIAMS: So, we have a motion and I'll second that.

BARKE: Okay, wonderful. So, we have a motion a second Darou.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: Okay. Wonderful. I'm glad my resolution passed much quicker than the last item. All right. And now we are moving on to number eight, staff recommendations to adopt and approve the 2026-27 OCDE Local Control and Accountability Plan.

WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to approve that.

BARKE: I will second that.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Very good.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: Wonderful. All right. We'll move on to number nine. To adopt and approve the College and Career Preparatory Academy Local Control and Accountability Plan.

WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion.

BARKE: Wonderful.

VALDES: I'll second.

BARKE: All right.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: All right. Wonderful. Onto number 10, to approve the annual county school services fund budget of the county superintendent of schools.

WILLIAMS: I'll make the motion.

VALDES: I'll second.

WILLIAMS: And I have a couple things to say.

BARKE: Please.

WILLIAMS: I want to thank Dr. Bean and the staff for making this process so smooth and easy compared to the past years and many of us know the battles and conflicts and challenges we've had. It's been really nice having this be so calm, cool, collective mind and a similar spirit. So, with that in mind, those are my comments.

VALDES: I want to say it's just nice not to have a combative atmosphere on something like this. To be able to talk it out like adults is really, really refreshing to me.

BARKE: I would agree. Any comments from afar?

SPARKS: Totally agree.

BARKE: All right. And by Tim's smile, it looks like he agrees as well.

WILLIAMS: And let's thank David for what you've done to present the information to clear and concise. A little bit long at times, but you did a good job.

BARKE: Concise but long. I like that.

SISAVATH: Okay. Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: Okay. Now on these next three items, there's no board action, but we'll receive the California school dashboard local indicators, Orange County Department of Education Schools and Programs, ACCESS County Community, ACCESS Juvenile Hall, OCCS, CHEP, PCHS, and Connections. And because there's no action, I'm just going to read each one and we'll just so noted. All right. Number 12 again, no board action is to receive the California School Dashboard Local Indicators College and Career Preparatory Academy. And third, no board action. Number 13 is to receive the Orange County Department of Education annual summary report. All right. Moving on to number 14, to approve resolution 18-26 in accordance of regulations required under Prop 30 and 55 regarding the education protection account proposed and expenditures. So, number 14, that is brought to us from David. Is there any comments or questions?

WILLIAMS: I'll make the motion.

BARKE: Okay.

WILLIAMS: And we need a second, but I'd like David to come up afterwards.

BARKE: Okay. I'll go ahead and make the second on that. And David, if you would join us for some questions, that'd be great.

WILLIAMS: So, David, this resolution was given to you to be submitted by the executive committee. Could you help explain the background?

GIORDANO: Yeah, absolutely. And so, thank you.

WILLIAMS: In a concise way.

GIORDANO: This will be fairly short for me. Thank you and good evening, President Barke Members of the Board. Some background information on this item. In November of 2012, California voters approve Proposition 30 and this is an initiative that creates the state general fund account and this is to receive and disperse the incremental taxes originating from Proposition 30. And then Prop 55, which was later approved, this was in November of 2016, continues those income taxes instituted by Prop 30 through the year 2030. These are tax revenues that are accounted for in the state's education protection account. And then every year, each year, school districts and county offices are required to determine how those funds receive from the EPA account are spent. When you look at our current year, fiscal year ‘25-‘26, our staff estimates that we receive approximately $248,000 from the state's EPA account and then all of these funds are spent on teacher salaries.

When we look at the budget year ‘26-‘27, the amount is very close to that. I believe it's about $223,000 we estimate to receive in the budget year.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So basically prop 30 and prop…

GIORDANO: Proposition 55.

WILLIAMS: 55. $248,000 we're getting into our education protection account and all that money is going to teacher salaries. Is that correct?

GIORDANO: That's correct.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Does the average person know that?

GIORDANO: Average business person in schools definitely knows that, but I'd say the average person, no. They don't know that. That Prop 30 came into play when we were coming out of the great recession back in, what was it, 2012-13, they were looking for a way to be able to continue to fund schools at the levels that they needed to be funded and that's how this sort of all came about. So, it was one of those things that they wanted to make sure schools were funded at the levels they needed to be in. This was the maneuver that was came up with.

WILLIAMS: And these funds that we get from this EPA, they're a part of our teacher's salary and we gave them—how much was the raise with the last bargain? How much did we give them?

GIORDANO: So, for the teachers, it depended on what step they were on the salary schedule. I think it was the first step, second step, well, the first step was I believe 10%. The second step I believe was 6% and then the next three steps, three, four, and five were 5% increases. And then we picked up the increased costs in health and welfare benefits as well. And then for the current year, there was also an increase as well.

WILLIAMS: So, these funds go to help decrease that.

GIORDANO: Correct.

WILLIAMS: Okay. That's all I wanted to ask.

BARKE: Okay.

WILLIAMS: So, we're not voting in favor of these propositions. We're just acknowledging that the money's going to teachers. Okay.

BARKE: All right. We have a motion and a second, I believe, and we can go ahead with the roll call.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: All right. Number 15, that is probably an easy one, to approve the apportionment of the Federal Forest Reserve receipts in the amount of $34,580.46.

WILLIAMS: I'll make the motion.

BARKE: Okay.

VALDES: I'll second.

BARKE: Okay. Second by Jorge. And we can call for the vote.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: All right. Wonderful. Number 16, board action on superintendent's salary.

WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to increase the salary as recommended by 10% and that'll keep our superintendent within the top third of comparable counties to other districts of our size.

BARKE: All right. I will go ahead and second that motion.

SHAW: Can I ask a question?

BARKE: Absolutely.

SHAW: I wanted to be reminded how longevity works and what constitutes that. And I should have asked earlier, but I see that's part of the compensation overview. I just wanted to be reminded what that looks like.

HENDRICK: The longevity is based on the years in the educational system.

SHAW: It's not years that he's been superintendent for us. It's years in his career.

HENDRICK: Right. Which is the same as our senior management receives.

BEAN: May I also make a comment if I?

BARKE: Of course.

BEAN: Yeah. When I saw that, I said, no, I really want to encourage this board to consider that at average the teachers receive 5%. I'm looking to just 5%, not 10%.

HENDRICK: And if I could kindly disagree because the survey that you see in front of you is based on data from ‘25-‘26. It doesn't include increases that are going to come forward for ‘26-‘27. The teachers did receive the salary increase of 5% last year. You did not receive a cost of living last year. You only received what the board gave you. And so, in consideration of looking at that, salary will fall further behind in the studies because they're all going to get a salary increase for ‘26-‘27. The 10% got him within that amount. They're all going to move up based on whatever their salary increases are. So that makes sense.

BEAN: So that the board just knows that I'm okay with 5% right now and you can discuss this further in the future, but I really think…

VALDES: I like Dr. Bean's position. If the teachers are going to get 5% then...

HENDRICK: Well, but the teachers are also receiving a cost of living increase. We've already negotiated a 2.87%. We are in the middle of looking at what the cost of living increase because it's unclear what the governor's going to sign. It's so great. Because there's some...

VALDES: But Dr. Bean is standing here saying he only wants 5%.

ROLEN: Dr. Bean welcomes decent among his staff.

WILLIAMS: I have a question, Renee. What I just heard from you is that this data is based upon ‘25-‘26, and ‘26-‘27 hasn't come out.

HENDRICK: Correct.

WILLIAMS: When that comes out, even if it's 5%, he's still going to be in the lower percentage.

HENDRICK: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So maybe the 10% will be, which I'm hearing from you, is going to be matching what is expected in ‘26-‘27. Is that correct?

HENDRICK: Correct.

WILLIAMS: Okay.

SPARKS: Can I chip in a second?

BARKE: Of course.

WILLIAMS: Of course.

SPARKS: Yeah. I wonder if maybe we do the 5% and the cost of living 2.87% because that would align with what Dr. Bean is comfortable with, that would align with the cost of living increase that's already been approved. And then next year when we have the more data we can add to that. I don't know, something to consider rather than just going for the 10% if that's something that people are uncomfortable with.

WILLIAMS: Lisa, does that mean a 5% plus…

SPARKS: Plus, the 2.8%, which would be basically 8%.

WILLIAMS: Okay. 8% increase. Is that what you're saying?

SPARKS: Yeah, because then we're addressing this cost of living adjustment and the 5% that Dr. Bean has indicated would be the same as the teacher's increase. And then next year when we have this additional tab, if we need to make some additional 2% adjustment, we can add that in next year.

HENDRICK: So can I just make a friendly…

WILLIAMS: Yeah, Renee, I want to hear from you.

HENDRICK: Because we do the teachers of the 2.87%, we know for sure. There is other language that we are waiting for the governor to sign, which could increase that to, depending on what it ends up being right now, there's an extra percent that currently they're saying is not part of the COLA, but both the assembly and the Senate have put in their proposal to have it as part of the COLA and so we're unsure. I would just say that if you make the motion, it should be the same cost of living increase that other groups receive. So that way if it's higher, he would get that same benefit.

SPARKS: That's fair.

ROLEN: And that's right around the 10%.

SPARKS: Can we do that? Then can we do that? Can we say we're going to do the 5% to match what the teacher's got and then we'll do whatever this amount is if it's above 2.87%, whatever it is that we approve that same amount. So, it's fair.

WILLIAMS: Jorge, are you okay with that? I'd like to hear your opinion on this.

VALDES: I think this additional COLA, if I'm not mistaken, the governor called it like a super COLA, but then he said this is for, then he said it's for disability payments that he's requiring the districts to cover additional disability pay. So, it sounds like there's language in the assembly in the Senate that is different from what the governor has actually said. He called it a super COLA, but until he actually signed something we don't really know what it is and we don't know how much it's going to be. I'm fine with just saying whatever the teachers get and Dr. Bean will get. And I'm also fine with the 5% because Dr. Bean, that's what he asked for. So, I'm okay with it.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Lisa, Tim, are you guys okay with it?

SPARKS: Yeah. I think if I understand what we're okay with at this point, can someone clarify? Well,

WILLIAMS: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to do is clarify. It's 5%, Lisa, that you recommended plus adding the COLA, whatever that may be. Currently it's 2.7% and it may be more Renee?

VALDES: I think it's 2.87%.

WILLIAMS: 2.87%.

HENDRICK: I think using the language that whatever the cost of living increase that other groups receive.

SPARKS: Yeah, that sounds fair.

WILLIAMS: Okay.

BARKE: We're expecting that to be close to 5%, which would get us to the 10% that…

ROLEN: Essentially.

HENDRICK: Probably closer to nine.

ROLEN: Just under it.

WILLIAMS: Okay. To be specific, so we're talking about five, because I have to make a subsidiary motion for our parliamentary orders and rules.

BARKE: And are we sure we don't want to just go with a straight 10 to get him to where he should be and it'd be clean and easy and simple?

VALDES: Then we always have this COLA issue. I think we should keep him separate.

SPARKS: I agree.

BARKE: The base and the COLA.

VALDES: Yeah.

BARKE: Okay.

SPARKS: Yeah.

WILLIAMS: Okay. I'm going to amend my original motion to…

VALDES: Are you even allowed to do that?

WILLIAMS: Wait minute. That's a good question.

BARKE: I think so. Your own motion, you can amend it, I'm pretty sure.

WILLIAMS: I don't think I can. I have to go look that one up. That's a good one. You got me with that one.

BARKE: I don’t see why you couldn’t amend your own.

WILLIAMS: But you can make the motion to amend it. I think that's favorable. It's not adversarial, so friendly.

VALDES: I would amend the motion to reflect for Dr. Bean a 5% increase in salary plus whatever the statutory COLA is determined to be on June 30th.

ROLEN: It's probably later than that.

VALDES: Later than that.

ROLEN: July 15th.

VALDES: Okay. So, whatever the statutory COLA is determined to be for this fiscal year.

BARKE: And we'll do retroactive if we're waiting.

SPARKS: I second that.

WILLIAMS: Renee's not happy.

HENDRICK: Well, that's what's actually gotten us into the question that we have with the teachers right now is if you say statutory COLA, it's 2.87%. And so that's why I'm saying the same amount that the other groups will be funded, because depending on how that wording comes out from the governor…

VALDES: Do you want to write it down and then give us the language you want?

ROLEN: You can say the same amount the other...

HENDRICK: I think they just say the same amount that other groups will receive.

VALDES: Okay.

BARKE: Okay. You're thinking it'll be around 4%. Is that what I'm hearing?

HENDRICK: I mean, I don't know for sure.

ROLEN: We just don't know if they're even going to do that.

HENDRICK: We don't know. The governor has said two different things, one in one part, one in the other. All the state groups right now are saying statutory COLA is 2.87%. Again, the assembly and the Senate all have different proposals. And they're saying 4.31%. So that's why I'm saying we're going to iron this out because we need to with our groups. I was saying it's fair if he gets the same amount that the groups get.

BARKE: Okay.

WILLIAMS: So, you have to make the motion.

BARKE: Just one more thought here. He is still below where we feel he should be.

ROLEN: Well, that's up to you, but the data, somebody who immersed themselves in the status some years ago, this is conservative data. This is what's going on now. All these numbers are going to move in a year. So, we could elevate the salary 10% and next year he's out of the top third. There's three interim superintendents that are making more than him in Orange County.

BARKE: But somebody, I hear you like the idea of a raise and a COLA. What about if we did a 5% raise and a 5% COLA to bring them to where he should be and then next year we can re-look at…

VALDES: We can't make our own COLA.

BARKE: We can't?

WILLIAMS: No, that's why we're just saying we don't want to make any problems with other staff members.

VALDES: Whatever our teachers get in their COLA would be what Dr. Bean gets plus the 5% in straight salary increase.

WILLIAMS: If that's your motion I'll second.

VALDES: That's my motion.

WILLIAMS: Okay. That's a subsidiary motion. So, we vote on that. Let me go back to the main.

VALDES: I'm ready.

SPARKS: I second it.

SISAVATH: Okay. Are you voting on the amended motion?

WILLIAMS: Yeah.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So now we go back to vote for the main motion, which is the raise.

ROLEN: You have to vote down the 10%.

WILLIAMS: So now the subsidiary motion raised and lowered it. And so that's what I have to vote on now.

VALDES: So now we're voting on the raise.

ROLEN: The 10% raise.

WILLIAMS: No, no, no, no, no, no.

ROLEN: The raise in total?

WILLIAMS: No, he changed my motion to 5% and whatever our other teacher groups get. So that amends the primary motion that I made. So now we go back to the primary motion and we vote on that.

ROLEN: Okay.

WILLIAMS: I'll go over it with you.

ROLEN: What was the primary motion?

HENDRICK: The primary motion is 10%.

WILLIAMS: Yeah. So now the 10%'s removed because the subsidiary motion changed that.

HENDRICK: Okay.

WILLIAMS: That's what a subsidiary motion does to the primary motion.

HENDRICK: Okay. Now you're just voting to actually give the increase.

WILLIAMS: Exactly.

HENDRICK: Got it. Okay. Got it.

ROLEN: That makes sense.

HENDRICK: Darou. Roll call.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Okay.

BARKE: Okay. Item number 17 is board action on notice of intent to revoke Explore Academy. Aracely, do you want to come in? Thank you.

CHASTAIN: The proposed item is a notice of intent to revoke for Explorer Academy Charter School, if you'll recall on February 2nd. This board issued a notice of violation and opportunity to cure for Education Code 47607. We provided the school a remedy period through May 15th and that was based on the timeframe that they requested and that gave them opportunity to respond and address the identified concerns. We've reviewed their response and materials and based on that review, staff recommends the board approve the proposed notice of intent to revoke. We've provided you with that analysis. Approval of this item would not revoke the charter school. Rather, it would continue the statutory process that we're under right now of the revocation process. So, if you approve it, the board will hold a public hearing on July 8th where the school will be able to come and address this last notice that you will be issuing if you want to issue it today, the notice of intent to revoke and everything that's in there.

So, they would have that opportunity on July 8th as well as having a public hearing. And then after that public hearing, the board can take action to revoke or decline to revoke the charter school at that time.

WILLIAMS: And just for the record, the original letter went out in October of ‘25, is that correct?

CHASTAIN: The original notices to the school? Yeah, they've had multiple notices. I can't off the top of my head my head remember the dates, but I'm sure they're in this packet that we've given you. And then the final intent, the final notice of violation was on February 2nd and that was after I believe three notices of concern regarding their finances.

WILLIAMS: Okay. And as I recall, the primary reason why they wanted more time was to get their numbers up?

CHASTAIN: Their enrollment numbers, that's correct.

WILLIAMS: What are they at?

CHASTAIN: Well, it's interesting because obviously school hasn't started and so a lot of them are families that have submitted applications or partially submitted applications, things like that. But it looks like they're at about 100 and I believe it was five students or 103 students is what we had. And then in the last few days, our understanding is that they've gotten that number up to 110. But again, we don't know how many of those—when we called a few of the families just to verify, it's about 25% of those applications and most of them said yes, we filled that out. But of course it's a charter school, right? A school of choice. And so, we did have some families say to us, "I filled out multiple applications. I haven't decided yet." And so, it's not that these are for sure enrolled students yet, it's just that they have this number of interested families, which is not quite what we were looking for, but at least it gets them close to that number. But since then, of course, there have been issues with their facility and other things that have come up that…

VALDES: Aracely and Greg, I have a question. So, we're mid-year, we're in the summer, no one's committed to the school yet. I don't want to say let's read the writing on the wall here, but I think the question I have is if we vote yes tonight on this notice of intention to revoke, would it be appropriate that that notice be sent to all the families in that school? So, what I don't want to have is the same situation that we had with the prior charter school that we had to close down a few years ago where we were really, I was really concerned that we were going to have a school closing in April before a June graduation. I mean, that's what we don't want. The numbers that you are outlining in this agenda item are at best really bad and…

CHASTAIN: Yes. Even with the minimum enrollment, it's very bad.

VALDES: The question I have is as far as fairness to the families who may not know that we are even talking about this tonight, should they be notified of this?

CHASTAIN: Well, I think that that's under this process, that's what the public hearing is about, right? So, it's for the families to have that opportunity to come and talk about why they want to have whatever it is that they want to express. What would probably happen at that time too is you probably have some families who say, "Not interested anymore." And that's the situation we sort of try to avoid with this process, but sometimes it's unavoidable.

VALDES: How soon are we going to have this public hearing? You said July.

CHASTAIN: It's July, it's the next board night.

ROLEN: 30 days.

CHASTAIN: It's 30 days from when we issue this notice, right? Which it has to be done within those 30 days. So that would be the July meeting and then at that meeting you will also take a vote on what you want to do and that's a little bit of a compressed timeline only because for the reasons that you're stating, we want these families to have the opportunity to enroll elsewhere if they need to before school begins for most of these districts in August. And so, we pushed this timeline for them to get their numbers up as far as we could, but we really couldn't push it beyond May knowing that we needed them to come to you in June for this intent to revoke, to keep going with these statutory timelines that we needed to follow.

ROLEN: To your point, Trustee Valdes, we've seen the writing on the wall as well. We were trying to not put our finger on the scale with their enrollment, but we have already started looking for places for alternative places for the students to go if necessary.

VALDES: Yeah, that was the next comment I was going to make is the same thing we did with, what was that other…

BARKE: Unity.

CHASTAIN: So, the number of returning students that have agreed, that said that they're going to return is obviously a much smaller number than this group that is saying, "We potentially want to attend this school." So that's a condensed number. I don't even know if that's 70 students.

BARKE: The retention is not good as far as kids are there, they're not saying they want to come back or they are?

CHASTAIN: Yeah, they do have a group of students coming back, but then obviously some move on.

BARKE: Of course.

VALDES: Dr. Bean I think that if things go the way they are looking like we need the staff to be ready the day after this public hearing to start calling families and making sure they are not only aware but are given some options from other schools in the area. We should start working on that.

HENDRICK: I think one of the exasperating factors right now too is we're understanding that they don't have a facility, which is going to make it a lot of parents may deselect the school just for that reason.

WILLIAMS: This is the first I've heard of this.

HENDRICK: So, they lost their prop 39 in Orange. And a lot of that is because they didn't have from the information so the district's not offering that facility, which they knew because the district's selling that facility I think is what the issue is.

CHASTAIN: They have to have 80 in district students in order to qualify for Prop 39. I believe the district has stated that they don't have those 80 in district students. I'm sure the school disagrees, that's typically how Prop 39 works, but at this point they've finished that Prop 39 process and they have not been offered a facility. And so, I do know that they are looking for a facility and they were going to look in these like last two weeks. Their next board meeting I believe is June 23rd where they will I think have some discussion as to whether they've found a facility or not. That should happen at that public meeting. So, we're looking, we are monitoring that to make sure that that does happen in an open session hopefully.

VALDES: Is it appropriate for us to send a representative from our offices there?

CHASTAIN: We can attend that meeting. Yes. We attend a few meetings every year or we listen to all of them, but we can definitely attend. If it's online, we can listen to it online as well. We would highly encourage the school if they have not found a facility by that board meeting that they do notify their families. Whether they notify their families that they are under a potential revocation, I don't know. We've never been through this process before. This is literally the first time that we've gone through a revocation process with this board.

WILLIAMS: What is the minimum amount of students they need to stay afloat?

CHASTAIN: They have identified that they need a minimum of 105, but remembering that that is with the Prop 39 facility, which is significantly lower cost than a private facility. And we would not know whether that 105 number really is accurate without knowing what their potential facility costs could be for the future.

WILLIAMS: So, if we approve this, we have the public meeting July 8th. Is that the next…

CHASTAIN: Correct. By then we should have a much more definitive answer as to whether they found a facility and whether their budget supports it.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So, we're not actually revoking them in July. We're having a public hearing discussing it.

CHASTAIN: And then making a decision.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So, we can or we do not have to in other words.

CHASTAIN: You would decide whether you want to revoke or not revoke at that point.

WILLIAMS: When we revoke, they can't operate that, even if they find another site, is that correct?

CHASTAIN: Their facility would close, correct.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Well, their number would be stricken from the state and they would have that number removed?

CHASTAIN: If they wanted to operate a school, they would have to reapply for a new charter.

WILLIAMS: Okay. There's no appeal process to the state.

CHASTAIN: They can appeal to the state.

WILLIAMS: Oh, they can?

ROLEN: So, you're understanding this really well, Dr. Williams. All we're really doing tonight is letting the statutory process move forward, giving them a final opportunity to say their piece and let the board make a decision with all the information in front of them. We just need to move forward with the statutory process. Without doing that, our ability to revoke if we so choose would be severely compromised.

WILLIAMS: Got it.

BEAN: I'll ask this. I'll direct the staff to go to that next meeting. Their next meeting is 23rd, is that correct?

CHASTAIN: I believe it's the 20th.

BEAN: And then bring back that information in July

CHASTAIN: In that time with more information, the school may themselves decide to do—they have to take a hard look at where they're at and they may make decisions as well. So, we will definitely know hopefully in the next week or so whether this public hearing even needs to move forward.

BEAN: Will they have awareness of this conversation?

CHASTAIN: Yes. They'll get sent this letter as soon as if it is approved, they'll get sent the intent. And then they have, again, at that public hearing is when one of the things we would do then is we would present this report, they would have a chance to tell you their side of where they're at. It's given them a little bit more time potentially to figure more things out and see where they're at that point. And so, it seems as it was with Unity and as it is with the school, things change almost weekly, sometimes for the better, sometimes not for the better. And so that's sort of where we're at right now, right? Things have gotten a little bit worse since we first came to you for the notice of violation, unfortunately for this school, but their enrollment numbers have gotten a little bit better, but their facility, then the facility issue came up. So that's where we're at.

WILLIAMS: So, did we make a motion or we're just discussing it now? I'll make the motion to approve for the notice of intention. Is it NOV notice of violation? Is that…

ROLEN: Notice of intent to revoke.

WILLIAMS: Okay. I make the motion to approve the notice to revoke.

VALDES: I'll second.

BARKE: Okay. Oh, any comments before we vote? Tim, Lisa?

SHAW: It just feels like if we approve this, any efforts they're making at recruiting students are going to be damaged here, obviously. So, I don't know how actively they're out trying to do that at the moment. It just feels like this is a public meeting. We take this vote. It just would seem very difficult at that point to continue to recruit students, but I guess that's…

HENDRICK: Tim, just to let you know, the reason why we waited so long to issue the notice was waiting for them to get their enrollment up to a number that they thought could work. They have barely gotten that and so I think I'm not sure by having more time it really changes it for them.

SHAW: I understand.

WILLIAMS: Yeah, they lost Prop 39 so if they get a property in the next week or two, it's probably not going to be justified in their budget.

BARKE: Right.

SISAVATH: Trustee Valdes?

VALDES: With a heavy heart, I will vote, yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Barke?

BARKE: The same for me.

SISAVATH: Trustee Williams?

WILLIAMS: Heavy heart and spirit. I vote, yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Sparks?

SPARKS: Same. I vote yes.

SISAVATH: Trustee Shaw?

SHAW: Yes.

BARKE: Okay. Before we go back to information items, I want to go back, sorry, I apologize to number seven, the 250th. You know what, Renee? I realize the last paragraph, I believe that should be that the Orange County Board of Education, not just Orange County. Here, I'll show you. And I just want to make sure it's in the minutes so that. That's so noted. Thank you.

HENDRICK: We will make those corrections when it's sent out. Thank you.

BARKE: Thank you. All right. Moving to information items. Okay. Communication information salary increases over $10,000 in accordance with ed code. So, let's see. So, you're just letting us know that and that's behind this tab here. Does anybody have any comments, want to…

WILLIAMS: Do we have an audiologist on staff?

HENDRICK: I think we might have three or four.

WILLIAMS: Oh, really? Okay.

HENDRICK: Mostly with the deaf and hard hearing program.

WILLIAMS: Oh yeah, yeah, yeah. Okay. That makes sense.

BARKE: Okay. Any other discussion? It's just information, but anyone want to discuss it further? Okay. Then we'll move to the announcements. Superintendent please.

BEAN: All right. First thing I want to introduce is our updated logo and brand mark. So let me tell you what triggered this was that if you look at the right logo on the bottom there, we had to decouple the Orange County Department of Education circle or whatever you want to call it, away from that logo so that it actually could be a favorite icon on a browser or an Apple app, things like that, because when you shrink it to that size, that small size, the logo on the left doesn't make sense. As you can see, we updated the logo, little bit of changes in that the mountain range used to be higher on the left versus higher on the right. We switched it because of the viewpoint of those mountains. So those are Santiago mountains. It used to be from the viewpoint of Riverside.

From the viewpoint of Riverside, you would have the mountain peak be higher on the left, but since we're viewing it from the Orange County side, that peak mountain is on the right. We made that small change. And then as you can see here, also we changed the color. We have the California gold and this deep blue. This is the new logo.

VALDES: Looks purple to me.

WILLIAMS: It's nice.

BEAN: Is it purple? Well, that's because the—yeah, it's blue. This is because of the LCD projector. Behind you though, you can actually see it.

BARKE: Yeah, it's true. Much bluer.

BEAN: Jorge right there. Better. It's bluer there.

VALDES: That's blue.

BEAN: Yeah. What do you guys think? Is that pretty cool?

BARKE: Looks great. Yeah.

BEAN: It looks really nice on letterhead business cards as an app, favorite app on your phone and on the browser. But I want to share you the process with this is that we had multiple focus groups, really give their input and feedback and we literally went over probably dozens of iterations of where we wanted to land. At one point the logo looked almost completely different and then everybody wanted to bring back to the traditional logo and that's how we landed here. And this will also help with our new website that we'll be launching soon, color theme as well as the logo you see. All right, let's just get into some. I've had the pleasure of attending. Let's see three ACCESS graduations now, one connection's graduation. There'll be more in the next couple of weeks. And last night when I was at the Connections, this is the Connections picture.

It's such a beautiful ceremony to recognize and honor our graduates in eighth grade and 12th grade and adult transition. So just really special moment for me. And then here are some pictures of our class of 2026. I will say that CCPA graduated their second highest class ever. The first highest class I believe was in during—yes, let's give them big round applause.

BARKE: And I understand that was partially because of us approving the new requirements, which made it more accessible to more students. I was there as you can see on the stage and it was amazing.

BEAN: Yes. It was, yes, it was beautiful. I had attended another graduate year at the time, so I couldn't attend this one, but that was—I think they graduated 166 students that night.

WILLIAMS: Wow.

BEAN: So that is fantastic. Well done with that program. One thing I want to share though was that today I was at a graduation for area eight and nine and there was a student there that spoke from her heart and she shared that she was at the lowest point of her life so much so that she was preparing to commit suicide, lined up everything and then she got a call from one of our teachers and said," Hey, we miss you in class. "And so, she hung up the phone, went back to the ACCESS class the next day and was able to change her life around so much so that she became top student in her class and spoke today.

BARKE: Wow. That is a great story.

BEAN: The amazing things that our teachers and Connections and ACCESS and staff do for our students. Yes, many of our students, we know that we should look at them through an asset perspective. They all have strengths and things to contribute back to our community, but they also come with challenges that other students may not face and for our teachers to extend so much love and our staff extend so much love to these students, it literally, and I sent a message out today, literally and figuratively saves lives. They literally save lives and that was one example of that.

BARKE: Yeah, I believe that.

BEAN: Such a beautiful, beautiful program. All right and then just really quickly excited to share that as a part of the USA 250 celebration that we're doing, we were able to bring the contestants or the student entrant, whatever you call that, applications into this competition and a couple weeks ago, June 6th we awarded Ella Wu the Grand Prize and she's going to be invited to perform her actual song that she wrote at the July 4th Spectacular done by Pacific Symphony.

BARKE: Wow. Amazing.

BEAN: So, if you guys want tickets, let us know because Scott does, he is coordinating all that to go to that if you'd like to watch this student perform. We may want her to come to the board meeting to perform that song.

BARKE: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah, let's invite her. Absolutely.

BEAN: Would you like that?

BARKE: Yeah. Would you guys like that?

BEAN: Renee? Would that be possible for that July board meeting?

HENDRICK: July 8th?

BEAN: July 8th? Yeah. After that performance, she'd come in and perform her song that she won for. It was a great competition in partnership with USA 250 led by Joellen Chatham. We also, we had several teams that did very well in the National Pentathlon in Orange County. As you can see here from McGarvin Intermediate School as well as Gordon Betty Middle School as well. Very proud of their achievements there. We'll end it with that just as a reminder that we do this work for what you see there, those students and proud of the work that we as adults at Orange County Department of Ed ACCESS to Connections do to support our students across Orange County.

BARKE: All right. Renee.

HENDRICK: We have our next board meetings on July 8th. The submission deadline is June 24th. Board packet delivery is Thursday, June 2nd. The office will be closed on Friday, July 3rd, and a service of the 4th of July holiday.

VALDES: I think you said June 2nd.

BARKE: She meant July.

HENDRICK: July. I'm sorry. I did.

BARKE: I knew what you meant.

HENDRICK: I went backwards. July 2nd. Yes. Thank you. And that's all I have.

BARKE: Okay. Any legislative updates? Nothing? Okay.

SHAW: Can I ask one thing there, Mari?

BARKE: Of course.

SHAW: We had a public comment about SCA 5. I thought maybe Greg, can we double check with Sheehy Group about that bill and maybe we take a position on that if appropriate in the future?

ROLEN: I have a meeting with them tomorrow.

BARKE: Perfect.

SHAW: Okay. So, I think it was, she said SCA Senate Constitutional Amendment 5 if I got it right.

BARKE: Yep.

HENDRICK: I'm sorry, Mari. I did want to mention also we currently have five interdistrict appeals for July.

BARKE: Okay.

HENDRICK: Would the board like those before the meeting like we have been?

BARKE: I think 2:30. Does that accommodate everything we need to do?

HENDRICK: I'm trying to count in my head. I think two maybe. It depends on if you have another closed session.

BARKE: Okay.

HENDRICK: So that will…

BARKE: So, either 2:00 or 2:30 to plan on.

ROLEN: We're doing the organizational meeting.

HENDRICK: Yeah. The other thing to keep in mind is for August, currently we have 11 interdistrict appeals, so we may want to look at adding a different date to do some of those.

BARKE: Yep. If a substantial amount of those don't settle, we'll have to…

HENDRICK: They only expect probably one will settle.

BARKE: Okay.

HENDRICK: But the deadline isn't for another week or two, so we actually could get more added.

BARKE: Wow. Okay.

HENDRICK: I'll keep you updated on that.

BARKE: Okay. Yeah. We used to do that in the old days before you were around, Jorge. We would have a extra meeting or suggest to do the IDTs. Yeah. Okay.

VALDES: And that's what parent choice is all about.

BARKE: Yep. It is absolutely. That's the work we do important. All right. Let's see. Committee reports, board member comments. Any from the distance there? Any comments?

SHAW: I bring you greetings from the nation's capital, Washington DC, where I've been the last week. You see the number 250 everywhere in this town right now.

BARKE: I bet.

SHAW: That's pretty exciting. Think about our country turning 250 here real soon. So anyway, I'm only a quarter to 10:00 PM. I think Lisa's about to watch the sun rise where she's at, so she's quite a trooper.

BARKE: Yes. We've tried to move along so you won't be up for breakfast. We're hoping you'll get success before breakfast there. Anything to record, Lisa?

SPARKS: Thank you. No. The G7 summit was here very close to where I'm teaching my travel course. So, we had a few traffic issues for an excursion, but all is well. All is well.

BARKE: Anything to report?

VALDES: Well, I have a comment. So, we had some teachers tonight making a public comment and unfortunately this is the first time I'm hearing this about an MOU coming in late. Is this something…

BEAN: Yeah, that's being worked out between HR and the union right now.

VALDES: So, we have a class that starts in July?

BEAN: No, not a class, but classes.

VALDES: Classes.

BEAN: Called S1S, yes.

VALDES: And the teachers want their contract sooner, quicker? Is that what's going on?

BEAN: That's correct. That's correct. So, they're working that out and they're negotiating back and forth on that.

VALDES: How soon do you think we can get this to them?

BEAN: Renee, do we know?

VALDES: I'm guessing this is a planning issue. They want to know that they actually are working during the summer.

BEAN: Well, it's more than that. It's issues within the contract itself. In terms of number of students, et cetera, et cetera. There's a lot of fine details that need to be ironed out between the two parties, our organization and the union.

VALDES: All right. Well, I guess I would just ask, Dr. Bean, that we prioritize…

BEAN: We're prioritizing it. Yes, we're prioritizing it.

BARKE: All right. I'm just going to comment. I'm excited for you, Tim, that you're seeing all that fun 250 because I love all that stuff. That's super cool. I've had a great time these last couple of weeks going to a lot of graduations. Last night I was at CCPA and just such a moving graduation. I always love it. I was at Sunburst with you last week. I was at Skyview, which was another really moving graduation with five incredible students who all spoke. I went to Los Alamitos. That's always interesting. And went to Learn4Life, went to Sycamore. So I've been to quite a few and it's a fun time of year, busy time of year. And Dr. Williams, do you have anything? I don't know what happened to Dr. Williams. All right. Well, I guess that's our part. We do need closed session though before we close out.

ROLEN: The report out from closed session number one, the board met with counsel on a matter of potential litigation and gave direction to council and staff by a vote of 4-1. Voting in favor was Trustees Williams, Sparks, Barke, and Valdes, trustee…

VALDES: I think it was not 4-1. It was 4-0-1.

ROLEN: 4-0-1.

VALDES: 4-0-1.

SHAW: 4-0-1. Thank you.

ROLEN: With Trustee Shaw abstaining. Yes. 4-0-1. Closed session item number two. The board had a closed session with the real property negotiator and gave direction on parameters of negotiation.

BARKE: Okay. Well, unless we have anything else, we can move to adjourn and get Lisa to sleep. All right.

SPARKS: Thank you all. Thanks so much.

BARKE: All right. Travel safe.

SPARKS: See you next time.