A. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

1. Call to Order

This meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Board President Kevin Brown in the El Dorado Union High School District Superintendent's Office, 4675 Missouri Flat Road, Placerville, CA, 95667.

After letting those in attendance know the specific items to be discussed during Closed Session, and asking if anyone in attendance had any comments or questions regarding the Closed Session agenda, the Board entered Closed Session for discussion of the following items:

a. Discuss a hearing panel recommendation regarding a possible order to expel one student. *

b. Consider one student petition for readmission into El Dorado Union High School District. *

c. Consider seven requests for a California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) waiver. *

d. Discuss and take action about certificated and classified personnel listed in the consent agenda related to personnel action. (GC 54954.5, 54957)

e. Discuss public employee discipline/dismissal/release. (GC 54954.5)

f. Discuss the following public employee performance evaluation pursuant to Government Code 54957: Superintendent.

*Action was taken in public session during the Student Services section of the board meeting. All appropriate actions were taken to preserve the confidentiality and legal rights to privacy of the students. (EC 35146, 48918[c])

The Board reconvened Open Session at 6:30 p.m.

2. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Brown.

3. Attendance

Board Members Present
Kevin W. Brown
Todd R. White
Timothy M. Cary
David J. Del Rio
Lori M. Veerkamp

D.O. Staff Present
Stephen Wehr, Secretary to the Board
Baldev Johal, Associate Superintendent
Chris Moore, Assistant Superintendent
Steve Volmer, Assistant Superintendent
Pam Bartlett, Director
Sylvia Torres, Assistant to Superintendent

Association Representatives
Evie Taylor, Faculty Association President
4. Requests to change the agenda and approval of agenda.
Mr. Brown motioned to change the agenda by moving Item J.1 up immediately after the Superintendent’s Comments (Item E) and to approve the remaining agenda as presented. Mr. Cary seconded. The motion unanimously carried (5-0).

    Brown:  Aye
    Cary:    Aye
    Del Rio: Aye
    Veerkamp: Aye
    White:   Aye

5. Consent Agenda
Mr. White moved to approve the consent agenda items. Mrs. Veerkamp seconded. The motion unanimously carried (5-0).

    Brown:  Aye
    Cary:    Aye
    Del Rio: Aye
    Veerkamp: Aye
    White:   Aye

a. Approval of Minutes of May 12, 2015, Board Meeting.
b. Approval of Commercial Warrants Report.
c. Approval of Routine Certificated Personnel Action.
d. Approval of Routine Classified Personnel Action.
e. Donations Received.
h. Approval to Authorize Payment of Warrants and Employment of Staff in July; Authorize Superintendent or Designee to Sign Contract(s).
i. Approval of the following Proclamations for 2015–16:
   National Hispanic Heritage Month (September 15 – October 15) {federal USC Title 36 §126}
   Red Ribbon Week (October 23–31) {every year}
   Character Education Month (October)
   School Safety Month (October)
   Native American Month (American Indian Heritage Month) (November) {federal}
   African American History Month (February) {federal} and Black American Day (March 5) {EC 37221}
   Women's History Month (March) {federal}
   Arts Education Month (March)
   Public Schools Month (April)
   School Bus Drivers Day (April 26) {4th Tues April}
   Day of the Teacher (May 11) {2d Wed in May, EC 37222.a.1}
   Classified School Employee Week (May 16-20) {3d full wk May, starting Sunday, EC 45460}
   Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month (May) {36 USC 102}

j. Destruction of Records.
k. Approval of Proposed New and Revised Courses of Study for 2015–16 School Year.
   New:
   • Exploring Computer Science (#0455)
   • Horticulture (#0705)
   • Principles of Engineering-Project Lead the Way (#0536)
   • Spanish for Heritage Learners 1 (#0437)
   • Advanced Manufacturing & Engineering Technology (#0515)

Revised:
• English Language Development 1 (#0107L1)
• English Language Development 2 (#0107L2)
• English Language Development 3 (#0107L3)
• Career Reading & Composition (#0143)
• Financial Analysis (#0202)
• Biology (#0311)
• Japanese 1 (#0425)
• Japanese 2 (#0426)
• Japanese 3 (#0427)
• Japanese 4 (#0428)

o. Approval for El Dorado High School Varsity Volleyball student athletes to participate in an overnight, instructional trip: 18th Annual Girl’s NOR-CAL Varsity Volleyball Tournament, Mare Island Sports Center, Vallejo, CA, October 9-10, 2015.
p. Approval for Oak Ridge High School Junior Varsity Cheer team to participate in an overnight instructional trip, Summer Cheer and Stunt Camp, UC Davis, Davis, CA, June 30-July 2, 2015.
q. Approval for Oak Ridge High School Varsity Cheer team to participate in an overnight instructional trip, Summer Cheer and Stunt Camp, Renaissance Hotel, Indian Wells, CA, June 24-28, 2015.
r. Approval for Ponderosa High School Cheer team to participate in an overnight instructional trip, UCA 2015 Resort Cheer Camp, Squaw Valley Lodge, Olympic Valley, CA, June 17-20, 2015.
t. Permission to Dispose of Obsolete/Unusable Furniture, Equipment and Textbooks.
u. Approval for Oak Ridge High School Link Crew To Participate in an Overnight Instructional trip: Link Crew Summer Retreat, Stanford Alpine Chalet, Lake Tahoe, Ca, June 10-12, 2015.
w. Approval of Agreement with Goodell, Porter, Sanchez & Bright, LLP, to Perform the District’s Audit for Fiscal Year 2015-16.
z. Approval of Agreement to Provide Transportation Services For Latrobe School District for the Regular School Year 2015-16.

B. RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS
There were no recognitions this evening.

C. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF CORRESPONDENCE
Mr. Wehr reported that the District had received correspondence from the El Dorado County Grand Jury, Case No. GJ-14-08. The Board was in possession of copies.

D. INVITATION TO BARGAINING UNIT PRESIDENTS/DESIGNEES AND/OR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD

Mrs. Evie Taylor, Faculty Association President, was thankful for the completion of another good year. She acknowledged there were issues and ups and downs that the Association will continue to work on with the District. She recognized that they all have the same goal of doing what’s best for students and to do what is fair for teachers and staff. Mr. Taylor appreciates the attitude of the District and Board and looks forward to another very good year.

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S COMMENTS

Superintendent Wehr thanked the Board for their participation in the graduation ceremonies. He was able to attend four of the six graduations. Each was special in their own way and proved to be wonderful evenings of celebration and memories for our students. Mr. Wehr commended the teachers, classified staff and the guidance of the Board for helping to make those culminating activities so great. He found it rewarding to read where our young people will go after completing their years in our district, since so much effort is focused on helping them reach the postsecondary transition to the avenue of their choice.

Mr. Wehr highlighted the extensive LCAP review process that was followed and advised that the Board would see a first read on the entire document this evening. Mr. Moore and Mr. Johal were thanked for their work and effort on behalf of the LCAP, as were the other Cabinet members, staff at the various sites, and parents who participated in meetings. Over 31 stakeholder groups met to discuss teaching and learning, to provide their perspective on the annual review and what was accomplished in the last year, and provide input on the direction the district should take over the next three years.

Mr. Wehr thanked Mrs. Taylor for her comments. He shares her sentiments about the work that has been done with teachers, and is equally excited about work done with the classified staff, all on behalf of kids. He noted that the common interest that they all share is about how we educate our young people to the best of our ability. He very much appreciates that conversations always come back to this shared goal.

In accordance with Board Action taken in Item A.4, Item J.1 was opened for discussion at this time.

J. OTHER – ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Discussion and Preparation of the Response to the Grand Jury Case GJ-14-08.

Mr. Brown recognized two speaker cards from members of the public requesting to speak on this topic. He invited any other persons wishing to address the Board on this topic to make themselves known. Speakers were limited to 3 minutes a piece.
Madeline Restaino, who formerly served as an educator, a Gold Trail School District Board of Trustees member and an El Dorado Union High School District Board of Trustees member with Tim Cary for seven years, came before the Board to speak to the Grand Jury report and to express her support of Tim Cary. Mrs. Restaino reported on her years working alongside Mr. Cary on the Board of Trustees, noting that Mr. Cary never acted in the role of the school attorney nor did he ever coerce or exert pressure to influence her decisions on the Board. She commented that board members are elected because they have opinions, knowledge, experiences and training in areas that are of value in governing a school district. She recalled Mr. Cary’s attention to Brown Act requirements and noted that the Board she served on was cohesive, lawful and had a common vision for the District. She thanked Mr. Cary for his many years of service on the school board.

The second speaker, Henry Batsel, introduced himself as a volunteer in a group involved in protesting school fees. He alleged that the group had been precluded from agendizing school fees on the El Dorado Union High School District Board agenda due to the District’s process of requiring three Board members’ approval to agendize items. He asserted that the District’s process restricts public access to the Board and is disrespectful of the democratic process. Mr. Batsel distributed information from the Department of Finance’s projections for student enrollment for the high school level and El Dorado County, information the group wants the Board to consider. He advised the Board of his meeting with Ken Reynolds of SchoolWorks last week that will lead to a change in how future enrollment projections are reported. He encouraged the Board to take the matter seriously and advised that the volunteer group he represents does not want to file any action against the high school district or any other district.

Justin Lee, a residence of the Blackstone community, expressed comments on behalf of himself and some of his neighbors who have reviewed the Grand Jury report. Mr. Lee indicated that he and the group feel there is a conflict of interest as the Grand Jury report concluded. They also feel that multiple violations of the Brown Act were very egregious and that Mr. Cary cannot separate his role as an attorney from his role of being on the Board. Mr. Lee stated that the only solution is to ask Mr. Cary to resign.

There being no further public comments, Mr. Brown closed the public comment section and advised that the next step is for the Board to discuss the Findings and Recommendations of the Grand Jury and the Board’s response to each of those items.

**FINDINGS:**

#1: The El Dorado Union High School District has, for a number of years, operated outside the clear intent of the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Mr. Brown and Mr. White - Partially agreed
Mr. Del Rio, Mrs. Veerkamp and Mr. Cary – Disagreed
Members of the Board concurred that Finding #1 was too general and suggested that the Grand Jury provide specifics of how and when the District operated outside the clear intent of the Brown Act.

Mr. Brown related that he took the Brown Act Training when he was elected to the Board in 2010. He had already taken the training in 2006 when he was appointed by the Board of Supervisors and already knew the public comment portion of the Brown Act. He understood how it was written and, in his opinion, the intent. He made clear that since being elected President of this Board, the El Dorado Union High School District Board Bylaws have been followed. He assumed this discussion was about what happened prior to that time, but that was a long time ago. The training he participated in was conducted by Girard, Edwards and Hanse, whose firm serves as attorneys for the County Office of Education and whom this District hires. Mr. Brown read from the manual that he received at the training, excerpts relating to Public Opportunity to Address the Board and also read out related questions and answers on agendizing items.

With regard to the beginning portion of the agenda, Mr. Brown pointed to the District Board Agenda as the same format that has been used since he was first elected five years ago: Item D. Invitation to Bargaining Unit Presidents/Designees and/or Members of the Public to Address the Board. This item is placed on the agenda for the purpose of providing members of the public and Bargaining Unit representatives the opportunity to address the Board on any item of business that does not appear on the formal agenda. Mr. Brown stated that there are two times when the public gets to speak—at the beginning of the meeting and during an item discussion. He added that this was the only complaint he had prior to becoming Board President. The verbage in the agenda is correct. It is in the Brown Act and in our own documents, but it was not being followed properly in the past, but that was over three years ago. For the Grand Jury to say that this wasn’t being followed for a long time is incorrect; it has been followed to the letter for the last three years.

Mr. Del Rio commented that he found Finding #1 to be unclear and questioned Mr. Brown’s interpretation of what the Grand Jury is referring to in its finding that the District operated outside the clear intent of the Ralph M. Brown Act. Mr. Brown responded that he was not interpreting the message, noting that there were times in the past when citizens who wanted to talk on items that were on the agenda were told they couldn’t because they were supposed to talk at the beginning of the meeting. The beginning of the meeting is clearly spelled out in the Brown Act—that it is only for board items not on the agenda. It is clearly spelled out in our agenda. Mr. Del Rio indicated that during his time on the Board this has never happened, to which Mr. Brown concurred, it had not happened since he became President.
Mr. White stated that the intent of the Brown Act is to give the public and each board member access to placing items on the board agenda. He asserted that items were restricted from placement on the agenda by the former superintendent and board president.

**#2:** Timothy Cary, a long-time member of the EDUHSD board of trustees, has wielded too much influence over the board and is primarily responsible for its deviation from strict adherence to the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Mr. White – Partially Agreed (when Mr. Cary served as President)
Mr. Del Rio, Mrs. Veerkamp, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Cary – Disagreed

Mr. Del Rio stated that Mr. Cary has no influence over him. Mr. Brown stated that he is not very easily influenced either. Mrs. Veerkamp stated that in her years on the board with Mr. Cary, she has never been coerced in any way and Mr. Cary has never come to her with any items. She strongly disagrees with Finding #2. Mr. White agreed with the finding in the sense that while Mr. Cary was Board President he did hold too much authority over the Board. Mr. Brown noted that the word used in Finding #2 is “influence” not authority. Influence, he stated, infers that someone is able to change someone’s mind and Mr. Cary did not influence his decisions.

Mr. Cary stated that it is easy to make vague statements because it is impossible to challenge them. Mr. Cary indicated that he was not sure how to operationalize this finding. He questioned, if the Board were to agree with Finding #2, what would he no longer do? Would he not talk anymore? Would he divorce his head from what he knows about the practice of law and being a school board member for twenty-five years? Mr. Cary stated he did not understand how he would stop wielding influence over his fellow board members. He felt that was his job and the job of each board member as a public official; to try to change peoples’ minds by providing his opinion supported by logic and facts about what’s best for kids. Mr. Wehr noted that each member works to influence the direction of the Board from their perspective. He noted that the wording of “too much” was interesting in this particular item. Mr. Wehr heard from the majority of the board that they wholly disagreed that Tim Cary wielded too much influence over the Board.

Mr. White stated that Finding #2 was almost repetitive of Finding #1 in relation to the Brown Act. The influence Mr. Cary would have had was in not putting items on the agenda, which is different than having influence over individual board members.

Mr. Cary stated that the Grand Jury is not supposed to attack individual people; it is supposed to look at the operations and policy of a government entity. Mr. Brown agreed that the Grand Jury should be focusing on policy and indicated that that is why this board should be focusing on the recommendations.
#3: Mr. Cary, an experienced school law attorney, has confused his participation on the EDUHSD board of trustees with his professional career, to the detriment of the district.

Mr. Del Rio, Mrs. Veerkamp, Mr. Brown, Mr. White and Mr. Cary – Wholly Disagreed.

Mrs. Veerkamp strongly disagreed with Finding #3 as it pertains to current or past years. Mr. Brown disagreed, noting that he has not, in the past three years, allowed Mr. Cary to do anything to the detriment of the district. Mr. White stated that Mr. Cary has never acted as official counsel for the district. However, he does not appreciate when Mr. Cary uses legal language and talks down to other board members.

Mr. Cary indicated he did not know what the statement meant and doesn’t know how to operationalize it. He stated that he has never issued a legal opinion to this district in his life. Mr. Wehr noted that there is significant evidence that the District has attorneys who work for the district outside of Mr. Cary.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

#1: The El Dorado Union High School District Board of Trustees should contract for training its members in the requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act. That training should be conducted by an attorney other than Mr. Cary and not an employee of the EDUHSD and should be held at an open meeting of the Board of Trustees with all members of the Board and appropriate staff in attendance.

Mr. Del Rio, Mrs. Veerkamp, Mr. Brown, Mr. White and Mr. Cary – Wholly Agreed

The Board unanimously agreed to implement Brown Act training. Mr. Brown suggested that the Board attend a Brown Act training together as a simple solution to this recommendation. There were no objections to this. Mr. Brown indicated that he would like to obtain a legal opinion on the Brown Act and that he had given Mr. Wehr a contact in the District Attorney’s Office that could provide such training. Mrs. Veerkamp suggested including someone from CSBA at the training.

Mr. Cary respectfully requested that the response indicate that the Board has no intention and never has invited Mr. Cary to conduct trainings for the district.

#2: The EDUHSD Board of Trustees should formally adopt procedures for the conduct of their meetings immediately. Those procedures must conform to the requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act. They should be adopted at an open
meeting of the Board, after both notice to the public and an opportunity for the members of the public to comment on the proposed procedures prior to their adoption.

Mr. Brown acknowledged that the District actually does have bylaws and policies in place but that they need to be reviewed. He indicated that he wants to agendize a review of board policies and bylaws at a future meeting so the Board can discuss them and add in clarifications from the Brown Act training as needed. He acknowledged that the Brown Act training needs to occur prior to the policy review in order to understand how to revise and/or make clarifications that align with Brown Act requirements for public comment. Mr. Brown emphasized that the Board needs to make sure that the bylaws reflect clarifications this group comes up with and that the instructors at the training advise. He indicated that he is confident that when it comes to the one area of public comment that the bylaws will be clarified and updated so that there would not be any further disagreements. The Brown Act training is the time for board members to receive clarification of any questions they have and to voice their opinions in order to determine what is right, wrong or indifferent and be able to make changes where needed to fully comply with the Brown Act.

Mr. Cary indicated that Recommendation #2 infers that the District does not have such policies now and stated that the District definitely does have policies and bylaws in place. A review of the District website clearly shows that the District has many policies. Mr. Cary agreed that the Board should formally review the existing policies to adopt procedures that comply with the current requirements of the Brown Act.

Mr. Brown also suggested that language should be put in place in case violations of the bylaws should occur. He indicated that he was not saying that they had occurred; only that he felt there should be a response that spells out some consequence for violating policy. He suggested that if the Board is going to revise the bylaws, they should be made clear and board members should hold each other accountable.

Mr. Del Rio noted that Recommendation 1 and 2 are married. As Mr. Brown had noted the training needs to occur before the review of policy and bylaws. Board members agreed to conduct a formal review of bylaws after the Brown Act training.

#3: Mr. Cary should separate his professional role as an education law attorney from his role as a member of the EDUHSD Board of Trustees.

This recommendation does not fall under the jurisdiction of the board. The recommendation is not addressed to the Board as a whole, but to a single board member. The EDUHSD Board of Trustees is a board of five.
Mr. Del Rio, Mrs. Veerkamp and Mr. Cary wholly disagreed with this recommendation. Mr. Brown did not feel anything more was needed than to indicate it is not the jurisdiction of the board. Mr. White did not disagree with the recommendation but didn’t feel the Board could force Mr. Cary to separate his roles.

Mr. White stated that one way that Mr. Cary could separate his profession from his role as a board member would be to not list the District Superintendent as a reference on his website. He suggested this could be considered a conflict of interest since Mr. Cary is responsible, along with fellow board members, for oversight of the superintendent’s evaluation and salary. Mr. Brown indicated that the argument could be made that a board member using an employee for whom they oversee their evaluation and raises could give a favorable evaluation in return for their reference or endorsement.

Mr. Cary indicated he did not agree with the comments pertaining to a conflict of interest. The list of names referenced in the comments reflected people he knew and worked with not endorsements. He also found these comments confusing as Recommendation #3 is connected to Finding #3 with which this Board had already wholly disagreed.

Mr. Del Rio indicated he was confused by Mr. White’s statement that Mr. Cary must separate himself from his profession while acting as a board member. He related that he often references his professional knowledge of matters as they pertain to actions taken in his service and role as a member of this board.

**#4:** Each member of the EDUHSD Board of Trustees should recognize his or her own responsibility for the decisions and actions of the Board. No one member is entitled to deference not given to other members.

Each members of the EDUHSD Board of Trustees is responsible for their own decisions and actions.

Mr. Brown tasked Mr. Wehr with drafting an official response based on the Board’s input. Mr. Wehr is to present the drafted response for the Board to review and modify, if needed, at the June 23, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Cary expressed that he took issue with the beginning of the Grand Jury’s report in which they described the Board of Trustees’ response to last year’s Grand Jury report about the Ponderosa High School football field as “dismissive.” Mr. Cary and Mr. Brown concurred that the Board had been thoughtful and thorough in their research, planning and response to the Grand Jury. Mr. Brown noted that these comments in the Grand Jury report do not require a response.
Mr. Cary shared that a year ago he was nominated by every board member for the county-wide board leadership award, which he appreciated and which meant a lot to him. He noted that if he has a problem with a member of this board he would tell them and would expect the same; not to get blindsided by things that damage his professional reputation and his ability to earn a living, without any chance to comment, respond or speak his truth. He commented that the Grand Jury is supposed to conduct a full and complete investigation which should certainly include the person they are targeting unless they are planning to indict the person. The Grand Jury is supposed to be fair and impartial, not politically motivated. He added that the Grand Jury is not beyond the laws of libel and defamation in the State of California. Mr. Cary expressed that this was not fair from the Board’s standpoint or from the Grand Jury’s standpoint. Mr. Cary stated that he was not contacted or interviewed by the Grand Jury on this matter. Mr. Del Rio and Mrs. Veerkamp indicated they, too, had not been contacted or interviewed by the Grand Jury on this matter.

F. **EDUCATIONAL SERVICES – ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **Approval of Proposed English, Mathematics, and Science Instructional Materials Recommended for Adoption for 2015-2016 School Year.**

Each year, the El Dorado Union High School District adopts instructional materials for new courses and classes which have revised their courses of study in accordance with the adoption cycle. Instructional materials in each curricular area are aligned with District and California content standards.

Assistant Superintendent Chris Moore explained that for the 2015-2016 school year, English, mathematics, and science instructional materials are being recommended for adoption in new or revised courses. Instructional staff wrote or revised the course of study for all classes which required or were due for instructional materials adoption. Those courses of studies were reviewed and approved by the Standards and Instructional Leadership Team (SILT). He confirmed that in each course, the new curriculum aligns with the District and State content standards for that department. The process included staff from all sites, as well as parent and student representatives participating in the evaluation of instructional materials in each curricular area, and a consensus or a majority vote was used to select a common instructional material for all District courses. Mr. Moore commended the SILT Coordinating Chairs for each curricular area for their excellent organization and management of this selection process.

Mr. Moore presented the list of recommended English, mathematics, Science, and Social Science instructional material purchases for the 2015—2016 school year. The instructional materials being recommended for adoption are available for review in the Educational Services Office.

1. **English**
   a. English Language Development 1 (#0107L1), English Language Development 2 (#0107L2), English Language Development 3 (#0107L3)
b. AP Language & Composition (#0126AP)
c. AP Literature & Composition (#0139AP)
d. Career Reading & Composition (#0143)

2. Mathematics
   a. Financial Analysis (#0202)

3. Science
   a. Horticulture (#0705)
   b. Biology (#0311)

Mr. Brown opened the meeting for a public hearing and called for public comment. There being no public comments, Mr. Brown closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Veerkamp moved to approve the adoption of instructional materials for English, mathematics, and science recommended for adoption for the 2015-16 school year. Mr. Del Rio seconded. The motion unanimously carried (5-0).

Brown: Aye
Cary: Aye
Del Rio: Aye
Veerkamp: Aye
White: Aye

On a side-note, Mr. Moore advised that Gabriel Garcia, 2014-15 Student Board Member, participated on SILT this year and has requested to continue his membership through 2015-16. Mr. Moore pointed out that all other members of the committee serve for two years. The student representative by virtue of the fact that the Student Board Member is usually a senior would normally only serve one year. In Gabriel’s case, he served in the position as a junior and would be able to participate another year if the Board approved this modification to the SILT membership. The Board unanimously supported Mr. Moore’s recommendation to allow Gabriel Garcia to serve a second year on the SILT committee.

G. BUSINESS SERVICES – ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) Presentation & Public Hearing.
   The LCAP is an important component of the LCFF. Under the LCFF, EDUHSD is required to prepare an LCAP, which describes how we intend to meet annual goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities identified pursuant to EC Section 52060(d). The governing board is required to adopt an LCAP on or before July 1, 2015.

   Assistant Superintendent Moore advised that EC Sections 52060 and 52066 specify that the LCAP must include a description of the annual goals to be achieved for each student group for each state priority. Goals must address each of the state priorities and any additional local priorities; however, one goal may address multiple priorities. Mr. Moore provided a brief overview of the various components of the LCAP, including goals, metrics and budgetary allocations and expenditures. He explained the process undertaken to obtain extensive stakeholder input, much like was done in developing the initial LCAP. Over 31 stakeholder groups participated in reviewing the original LCAP and determining if what had been proposed last year was done. The stakeholder groups then considered and proposed adjustments, changes or additions for the development of the 2015-16 LCAP. Throughout the
process, each stakeholder group’s input was documented and posted on the District website for public viewing, as was the draft LCAP presented this evening.

**Public Hearing: Local Control and Accountability Plan**

Mr. Moore advised that in order to fulfill requirements of Education Code 42127, 52062, a public hearing must be held to solicit the recommendations and comments of members of the public regarding the specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) or the annual update.

Mr. Brown opened a public hearing and called for public comment regarding the 2015-16 LCAP. There being no public comments, Mr. Brown closed the hearing.

No further action was required at this time. The 2015-16 LCAP will be presented for Board approval at the June 23 Board meeting.

*Mr. Cary excused himself at 8:14 p.m. due to travel plans.*

2. **2015-16 Budget Inspection and Public Hearing.**

Education Code requires that school districts hold a public hearing to receive and consider public comments regarding the 2015-16 Proposed Budget.

Associate Superintendent Baldev Johal reported that each year in mid-May the Governor produces a revision to the state’s proposed budget issued in January. Education Code section 42127(a)(2) requires that school districts adopt an annual budget no later than July 1st of each year. Mr. Johal presented the first draft of the District’s budget based on the May revision. He highlighted national, state and local economic trends contributing to the budgetary projections for the District, reviewed the Local Control Funding Formula funding for the District and the effect of enrollment projections on the budget. Mr. Johal presented an overview of the federal, state and local revenues the District will receive in 2015-16 and explained the proposed general fund expenditures. In summary, Mr. Johal reported that the District is very good shape. Although deficit spending is expected at the end of the current year and again in 2017/18 and 2018/19, the District is projected to carry forward a healthy reserve each year through 2018/19. As part of the 2015/16 budget, the District expects to receive about $3.3 million as one-time funds which the administration is recommending be focused on instructional materials, staff development and technology.

As required, Mr. Brown opened the public hearing and called for public comment. There being no public comment, Mr. Brown closed the public hearing and invited comment from the Board.

Board members expressed favor with the proposed recommendation for use of the one-time $3.3 million. The Board directed that the Budget Advisory process be utilized to develop the specific recommendations for the use of those one-time monies.
Mr. Johal advised that the final budget will be submitted for approval at the June 23rd Board meeting. Meanwhile, staff will be closely monitoring developments in Sacramento as well as other budget information as it comes in before producing the budget for approval.

II. STUDENT SERVICES – ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
1. Consideration of Student Disciplinary Matters Relating to Expulsions and/or Readmissions. (GC 54954.5[h]; EC 35146, 48918[c])
   a. Mr. White moved to adopt the Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Recommended Order of the Administrative Panel, and order the expulsion of Student #14-18. Mrs. Veerkamp seconded. The motion carried (4-0).
   b. Mr. White moved to approve the readmission of Student #14-N to the schools of the District. Mrs. Veerkamp seconded. The motion carried (4-0).

2. Consider Recommendations for CAHSEE Waiver Requests.
   a. Mr. White moved to adopt the waiver request for the 2013/2014 California High School Exit Exam for Student No. CEEW1314-14 through CEEW1314-19. Mrs. Veerkamp seconded. The motion carried (4-0).
   b. Mr. White moved to adopt the waiver request for the 2012/2013 California High School Exit Exam for Student No. CEEW1213-24. Mrs. Veerkamp seconded. The motion carried (4-0).

I. HUMAN RESOURCES – ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
1. Proposal From the California School Employees Association (CSEA) and the District Regarding Negotiations for 2015-16 and Public Hearing.

Article 8, Section 3547(a) of the Government Code provides that all initial proposals of exclusive representatives relating to matters within the scope of representation shall be
presented at a public meeting and shall be public records, and that meeting and negotiations shall not be done until the public has become informed and has had the opportunity to express itself at a public meeting.

Within the context of this Code, Mr. Wehr presented the proposal from the CSEA and District to begin the process of negotiations for the 2015-2016 school year.

Automatic Openers:
- Article 7 Compensation
- Article 10 Insurance Protection

In addition, the CSEA proposed to open:
- Article 11 Other Post Employment Benefits
- Article 14 Leaves

As there were no further comments on this item, Mr. White moved to adopt the 2015-16 negotiation proposals from the CSEA and District. Mr. Del Rio seconded. The motion carried (4-0).

Brown: Aye
Cary: Not Present
Del Rio: Aye
Veerkamp: Aye
White: Aye

K. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY BOARD AND CABINET, IF NEEDED.

Announcements and topics of interest reported by board members/cabinet and time line of items for future board meetings.

Mrs. Bartlett congratulated the schools on their graduations. She had the pleasure of attending ceremonies at IHS, EDHS and PHS. Training on meaningful and legally defensible IEPs began last week. Many of our educational specialists and a few assistant principals attended this first series. Training is being provided in a three series rotation to allow choices that meet individual staff schedules and needs. Feedback on the first series has been positive. Mrs. Bartlett expressed gratitude to our SELPA partners who joined her in presenting to the educational specialists. An invitation was extended to the Board and Administration, on behalf of Hands for Hope, to their Summer Fest fundraising event at Cielo Estate in Shingle Springs on June 28, 2015, from 12 PM to 6 PM.

Mr. Moore shared that his father-in-law passed away unexpectedly, leaving a large hole and much sadness in the family. The graduations, however, have been the best medicine for lifting his spirits. The joy and enthusiasm of families that he observed while attending the Ponderosa and Independence graduations were very uplifting. It brought back to light the work we do and what it’s all about. Mr. Moore noted that summer has come back as an educational season. Over 200 students remediated a semester via Intersession, improving a high ‘F’ grade to a ‘D.’ In an attempt to help more students, the District will hold a longer version of summer school using a blended model of faculty support and online tools in both math and English, for some forty students. As Mrs. Bartlett
shared, there is a lot of staff training occurring this summer; although the year has ended, the teaching and learning continues.

Mr. Johal thanked Marti Zizek, Director of Fiscal Services, for her work on compiling the budget information and the great work she does each and every year. Mr. Johal commented that the state has to present a balanced budget to the Governor by June 15, which they have upheld since tying the requirement to their salaries. Nonetheless, Mr. Johal indicated no changes are anticipated. Mr. Volmer commented on Mrs. Bartlett’s work organizing training for the special education staff and complimented her on an amazing accomplishment. It is not an easy feat to organize and present a 4-day workshop on the topic stated in such a short amount of time.

Mr. Wehr commented that this district is blessed to have a Cabinet that does such incredible work. They are an amazing group of people.

Mr. Del Rio shared that his wife has been attending staff training. She was immersed in reading last night in preparation for a presentation today. Mr. Del Rio had the opportunity to attend graduations at UMHS, PHS and EDHS. At UMHS, he was on stage as his last daughter graduated and his wife, also on stage, read her name; it was a special day for the family. Mr. Del Rio commented on what a great time of year this is with award and graduation ceremonies, and appreciating all the work done by Cabinet and the site staffs. He was glad to get through the Grand Jury responses as a group and encouraged the Board to move on. Mr. Del Rio commented that having been involved with at least six Grand Jurys in his years as a law officer and while running a corporation, this was the most poorly written report.

Mrs. Veerkamp felt the absence of Gabe Garcia on the Board tonight but looks forward to seeing a lot more of him next year. Recognizing that site staff are out enjoying summer, she hoped the district staff will find opportunities to enjoy their summer, too. Mrs. Veerkamp enjoyed the graduations she attended. She agreed that we are truly blessed to have such a great district, with great employees and staff. Mrs. Veerkamp indicated she had a written statement that she didn’t read during the Grand Jury discussion, but that she wished to read into record to express her sentiments in regards to the Grand Jury report: “I would like to go on the record in support of Mr. Tim Cary as a Board Member of the El Dorado Union High School District. I’ve had the pleasure and honor for the past ten and one-half years to sit with Mr. Tim Cary on this Board. I have never once been coerced, urged or strong-armed into changing a decision, or felt pressured to do so by Mr. Cary. I have never been easily confused by the source of Mr. Cary’s opinions as stated in the Grand Jury’s report. I have never once seen Mr. Cary urge other members on this board that they should take his advice. This district pays for legal counsel/advice and our legal counsel is not and never has been with Mr. Cary’s law firm. I have never viewed or believed Mr. Cary’s participation on the El Dorado Union High School District Board of Trustees, with his professional career, to have been perceived as a detriment to this district. In fact, I believe that Mr. Cary and many others that practice law that sit on numerous school boards across this great country bring a very valuable asset to their boards.”

Mr. White enjoyed the graduations he attended. He was complimentary of the Independence High School graduation and the progressively positive changes occurring. Every part of the graduation
was thought out, detailed and choreographed. Alison Gennai made families and students feel good.

Mr. White also attended the ORHS graduation Friday night and the El Dorado and Virtual Academy ceremonies on Saturday. Mr. White looks forward to the Board Governance training.

Mr. Brown stated he, too, enjoys this time of year, with awards and graduations. He was able to attend four graduations. He found it amazing that the Virtual Academy has grown so much. There has been a tremendous turn-around in the enrollment and Aaron has done a magnificent job. Being able to attend these events reminds us why we’re here—to help and educate kids. Mr. Brown stated he has only seen two Grand Jury reports but he also thought it was very poorly written. Regardless of what their intent was, it leaves too many questions. Mr. Brown wished everyone a great vacation.

L. CLOSED SESSION
This session was not needed.

M. OPEN SESSION
This session was not needed.

N. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

________________________
Stephen Wehr
Secretary to the Board of Trustees