Meeting Date: June 28, 2023
Meeting Location: San Mateo County Office of Education
101 Twin Dolphin Dr.
Redwood City, California 94065
Board Members Present: Susan Alvaro, Chelsea Bonini, Hector Camacho, Jr., Jim Cannon, Beverly Gerard, Hugo Torres
Board Members Absent: Ted Lempert
County Attorney Present: John Nibbelin, County Attorney
Staff Officials Present: Nancy Magee, Secretary
Jennifer Perna, Executive Assistant
Other Staff Present: Kevin Bultema, Marco Chávez, Niambi Clay, Patricia Love

1. OPENING ITEMS
   A. Call to Order
   Board President Beverly Gerard called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
   B. Approval of Agenda
   After a motion by Board Member Cannon and a second by Board Member Alvaro, the June 28, 2023, agenda as presented was approved by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, and Torres) and one absent (Lempert).

2. PUBLIC COMMENT
   There were no persons wishing to address the Board.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. June 14, 2023, Regular Board Meeting
4. CONSENT AGENDA

B. Receive Staffing Reports
C. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 23-23 Honoring Elizabeth Nguyen on Her Retirement
D. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 23-24 Honoring Muna Kasim on Her Retirement

After a motion by Board Member Alvaro and a second by Board Member Torres, the Consent Agenda was approved by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, and Torres) and one absent (Lempert).

5. LOCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN (LCAP)

A. Receive Report on Acknowledgment of Self Reflection Regarding Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Indicators

Marco Chávez, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services Division, provided a report on the Acknowledgement of Self Reflection Regarding Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Indicators.

There were no questions from the Board.

B. Discuss/Act on San Mateo County Office of Education’s 2023-2024 Proposed Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)

Deputy Superintendent Chávez provided a brief overview of the San Mateo County Office of Education’s 2023-2024 proposed LCAP.

Board Member Camacho asked if this was the final year of the three-year LCAP. Deputy Superintendent Chávez confirmed that was correct. Board Member Camacho asked how we will account for the overlap between the final year of this plan and the next three-year plan. He asked if staff could keep the Board apprised of progress towards year-three outcomes and a preview of the 2024-2027 plan. Now that the Board is back in person, they have more opportunities to talk about the upcoming three-year plan, so he indicated he would appreciate seeing the landmarks to increase Board engagement in terms of student outcomes. This could be a topic discussed at a future retreat.

Board Member Alvaro proposed that language be included indicating that excess property taxes are being sent back to the state “for non-education-related purposes” which is an accurate description. She added that excess property taxes are received, but nearly half is being sent back to the state and not being used towards education.
After a motion by Board Member Alvaro and a second by Board Member Cannon, San Mateo County Office of Education's 2023-2024 proposed LCAP was approved by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, and Torres) and one absent (Lempert).

6. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION

A. Receive Report Regarding Annual Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Support for Districts

Joy Dardenelle, Executive Director, District Improvement and Support, Educational Services Division, and Wendy Richard, Executive Director, District Business Services, Business Services Division, provided a report regarding annual LCAP support for districts.

Board Member Cannon commented he was impressed by how comprehensive the County Office’s LCAP is. He reflected on the complexity of the jobs of educators and thanked the team for assisting in their success. Board Member Cannon asked if Executive Director Richard was also helping with the financial aspects. Executive Director Dardenelle responded that the educational support services side helps with programs but also receives assistance from Executive Director Richard’s team on the classified side. Executive Director Richard said her team works with finance staff in developing budgets. This includes where and how they are spending funds. She described how the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) delineates supplemental and concentration grants.

Board Member Cannon asked how small school districts get this work done. Executive Director Richard indicated it is sometimes difficult but with collaboration between the educational services and business sides, they get the job done.

Executive Director Dardenelle added on the program side, for small school districts, one of the benefits of having a case management structure is that the SMCOE team gets to know the district superintendents and leaders and can work with them on their timelines.

Board Member Camacho asked if every school district was on the same three-year cycle in California. Executive Director Dardenelle confirmed that was accurate. Board Member Camacho asked if the only group which might be off cycle would perhaps be charter schools that started midway through the cycle. Executive Directors Dardenelle confirmed that everyone was on the same cycle.

Board Member Bonini thanked the team for the examples of the work and collaboration being done with districts, specifically the potential workshops around suspensions. She asked if the work looking at suspensions might be made broader in terms of looking at different types of suspensions, such as in-school suspensions and other disciplinary practices which are feeding the school-to-prison pipeline. This topic is at the top of her interest list.

Executive Director Dardenelle said the team does receive questions on this topic because they are digging deep into the data with districts that want to better understand learning conditions. She
further explained if questions arise, they analyze it together and tap into SMCOE resources to assist as needed.

7. **BUSINESS SERVICES DIVISION**

A. *Discuss/Act on San Mateo County Office of Education's 2023-2024 Proposed Budget*

Kevin Bultema, Deputy Superintendent, Business Services Division, was present to answer questions regarding San Mateo County Office of Education's 2023-2024 proposed Budget.

Board Member Bonini stated that there have been a lot of conversations about the Budget since February. Several questions were posed and issues were addressed at the February 15 meeting related to conflicts. Since then, policies have been passed, and she emphasized that it is important the Budget get passed. She discussed the Board’s responsibility to approve the Budget and indicated it should not be just a small disagreement about the Budget.

Board Member Bonini stated that the issues she had with the Budget are related to the Conflict-of-Interest topic, and she had raised these issues repeatedly in private meetings with staff, through emails, and by submitting questions. Although she felt some of her concerns had been addressed, she is not yet satisfied because there are still issues remaining, small or not, which have to do with Conflict of Interest.

Board Member Bonini asked the Board if they agree the pending conflict is still an issue. She stated she did not feel comfortable after the fact approving Budget items two years ago related to this issue without knowing about it. She did not feel comfortable doing it last June or again currently. There are a few remaining items planned to be spent in the Budget to which she objects and there have been opportunities for them to be removed, but they have not been. Board Member Bonini shared she was interested in knowing the Board’s thoughts and if they agreed this was not a small disagreement. She indicated she has a fiduciary duty to approve a Budget with which she feels comfortable, and she did not feel comfortable.

Board Member Camacho thanked Board Member Bonini for her comments and for continuing to raise questions about how the conversation around Conflict of Interest intersects with the conversation around the Budget, which is important. He noted he had asked questions directly to Superintendent Magee regarding this issue and for him, coming into the Budget conversation, there were questions around Conflict of Interest. He also stated that some of his concerns were addressed, and he was able to consider the criteria under which he would not approve the Budget. While he may not entirely agree with how the rest of the dollars are spent, the Conflict-of-Interest topic was his main concern and it was addressed to a satisfactory point. He emphasized the importance of the Board having open conversations about this topic.

After a motion by Board Member Cannon and a second by Board Member Alvaro, San Mateo County Office of Education's 2023-2024 proposed Budget was approved by a vote of five in favor (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, and Torres), one opposed (Bonini), and one absent (Lempert).
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B. Receive Update on California State Budget for 2023

Deputy Superintendent Bultema provided an update on the California State Budget for 2023.

Board Member Camacho expressed his gratitude to the California School Boards Association (CSBA), the California County Boards of Education (CCBE), the California County Superintendents, and to the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) for their continued advocacy. He discussed talking to constituents and the public about the advocacy efforts which helped get districts through 2023-2024, but the following year will be scary. He asked the Board, as they engage with the public, to remind them there is shaky ground ahead. He emphasized that education is funded now because of the hard advocacy work, but we don’t know what is next.

Deputy Superintendent Bultema said the revised estimates of revenue offer solid projections and revenues are coming in at the expected pace related to the May Revise. However, the unknown is still large and tax receipts will not be known until October. It looks like the projections are better, but it does speak to the uncertainty.

8. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

A. Receive Report from the Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) on Workforce Housing

Deputy Superintendent Bultema and Armando Sanchez, Executive Director, Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) provided a report on workforce housing.

Board Member Cannon asked if the state encourages these projects. Deputy Superintendent Bultema replied he was not aware of any state involvement; this is more of a local solution. Executive Director Sanchez confirmed that was accurate. Board Member Cannon asked if the County Office was far enough along to know if the goal was to have housing for a given percentage of staff, such as 5% or 15%. Deputy Superintendent Bultema indicated it was premature to discuss percentages. He informed this was a county-wide solution with roughly 100 units, which will not make a huge dent in the issue but is a solution to start the ball rolling.

Board Member Alvaro referred to the percentage of public units and asked why there would be units available to the public if this project is geared towards staff. Executive Director Sanchez explained there are public units because several years ago, cities and counties began requiring developers of market-rate housing to include public, affordable units. There are strict agreements recorded against the properties which require that these continue to exist. If the team was to acquire a building for the County Office to house teachers across the county, they would still be responsible for maintaining those public, affordable buildings in the project.

Board Member Alvaro referred to the property tax loss impact on a countywide basis, but not for local districts, and asked how that worked. She asked if the building was in downtown San Mateo, how the San Mateo-Foster City School District and San Mateo Union High School District would
not be impacted by coming off the property tax rolls. Deputy Superintendent Bultema clarified that all Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) would lose out on dollars and the loss would be spread out across all districts. This would not impact the County Office which sends money back to the state.

Board Member Alvaro asked if the building is in a city, how that doesn’t impact that city more than other districts in the county. Deputy Superintendent Bultema shared that property taxes are not distributed within a specific boundary. They are collected countywide in commercial and residential properties. The total amount is distributed based on historical factors going back to Proposition 13. Board Member Alvaro described how the La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District has historically had problems with property coming off the tax rolls, such as farm property, and going into the non-profit sector. Suddenly, the district is not receiving property taxes, which directly impacts their income. However, she had never heard how that also impacts other cities and districts and asked if she had been misunderstanding all this time. Deputy Superintendent Bultema said he could double check to ensure his understanding was correct, but as he has worked more closely with the Controller, he has learned more about the countywide property taxes that are distributed based on broad factors.

Executive Director Sanchez explained most of the buildings available in the market tend to be concentrated in certain cities within the county, such as Redwood City, San Mateo, Foster City, and South San Francisco. These cities likely have the most buildings which would be ideal targets to acquire for such a project. They are not talking about 20 or 30 buildings off the tax rolls, and although real money is being taken away, it is still a small percentage of the budget. Growth in the county should replace those funds in a quick manner.

Board Member Alvaro indicated that cities may not want the project because they fear losing the property taxes, which is a fair discussion. She suggested the team keep this in mind. Deputy Superintendent Bultema explained that the County Office has a good relationship with the Controller’s Office and when a specific property is identified, analyses could be run to determine the impacts on all LEAs.

Board Member Alvaro referred to the charts explaining how the County Office would eventually own the building once the bond is paid off. She asked whether staff would have to be hired to run the building at that time. Deputy Superintendent Bultema explained the County Office could sell, have a company manage the building, or keep HEART in the role of property manager depending on the preference of the Board and Superintendent at that time.

Board Member Camacho shared he was curious about the property tax impacts. He thanked the team for offering to gather that information. He commented that whenever there are new funding mechanisms for school districts, many come with restrictions on whether they can be used to pay teacher salaries. Board Member Camacho referred to the situation of a renter moving within the county to another school district and noted he did not love that idea. He stated it was important for him that if someone entered the housing supported by this countywide effort, he would prefer that they stay with their district for an agreed-upon term. There is a lot of movement, particularly from north county and the coastside to higher paying districts, and he does not want to contribute to that.
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Board Member Camacho asked if the County Office pursuing the ownership piece would be like
other County Office properties with joint ownership between the Board and Superintendent. Deputy
Superintendent Bultema confirmed that was accurate. Drafted Board Policy 3400 spells out the
specific details and will be coming before the Board.

Board Member Camacho asked what would be asked of the Board throughout the timeline moving
forward. Executive Director Sanchez explained the evening’s presentation was to introduce the
Board to what is being proposed in terms of housing for district employees. The first step would be
for the parties to agree to be part of the project. Then the County Office would enter a memorandum
of understanding (MOU) setting the ground rules and parameters which HEART should follow in
finding a building. He then described that once HEART finds the building, there will be required
action to sign an agreement stating that once the bonds are paid off, the County Office accepts
ownership of the building. There would be no additional negotiations or hurdles.

The agreement will direct HEART to buy the building to serve education employees and note that
once the building is paid off, the County Office will take ownership or HEART will provide
direction on how to have it run for the benefit of district employees in the future. He summarized
that this is a two-step process with the first step to sign the MOU. Then, when HEART finds a
building, which takes time due to market conditions, high interest rates, and volatility, the Board
would have the opportunity to execute the agreement to take ownership.

County Attorney Nibbelin asked Executive Director Sanchez to discuss the County Office’s and
Board’s liability with respect to the bonds. Executive Director Sanchez shared that if there was
financial default, the HEART Board wanted to be assured that there was no liability to other assets.
HEART hired a law firm who completed an analysis and reported in clear detail that there is no
recourse beyond foreclosure on the property. If there are ever any issues, there would be no coming
after HEART’s Board of Directors or other assets, or the beneficiaries’ assets, including the County
Office. He emphasized that HEART has improved the process to avoid the possibility of foreclosure.

Board Member Bonini explained when these buildings are purchased, they are occupied. As tenants
leave, units open and become available to employees of the districts or County Office. The level of
cost paid is below market value but is also required to pencil out for building maintenance. Costs
will change over time as there is more equity and flexibility. She shared if employees in the units
start making more money, perhaps by going to a different district, the rent would increase.
Additionally, the cost may not be in the pay range of classified staff for a while, and likely only
certificated staff may qualify and be able to pay at the outset.

Executive Director Sanchez agreed. He said the buildings are generally 100% occupied and are
primarily Class A buildings which are new, usually less than five years old. The rents tend to be
quite high and as a result, the turnover is tremendous, as much as 50% year to year.

Executive Director Sanchez also stated that with a new financial responsibility, the first step is to
pay the debt. He described the lack of property taxes and how what was paid in property taxes
subsidizes the lowering of the rents, along with several other factors. He explained when first
buying a home, it is a stretch to pay the mortgage, but as time goes by and salary increases, the
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payment becomes more and more affordable. The same happens here – as time goes by, the mortgage paying the bonds is fixed, while rents and incomes are going up. This makes it more and more feasible to lower rents for the benefit of district employees. HEART will not dictate how rent benefits will be distributed; they will work with the County Office to determine what allocation would most benefit employees of school districts in the county.

Board Member Bonini asked Superintendent Magee to discuss the equity component and the structure in place to address the needs of different districts. Superintendent Magee explained that SMCOE would develop an approach determining who would be eligible for the program. She would advocate for County Office employees to have access, but they can also use SMCOE’s equity rubric as a tool to establish criteria. Staff uses the equity rubric to determine how to charge districts, who to partner with, and who most needs support.

County Attorney Nibbelin discussed Proposition 209 and the Fair Housing Act, and the County Office’s focus on integrating equity principles into the allocation of benefits. Superintendent Magee described how in property tax conversations, every district would lose a little bit of revenue, but every district would ultimately be able to participate in the program and benefit.

Board Member Bonini said the taxes would impact the cities which adds to the political discussion. It will help to see more of the modeling. Superintendent Magee stated that contingencies can be built into the criteria, for example if units cannot be filled with educators, city employees could be the next tier of applicants. Executive Director Sanchez confirmed that was accurate. The priority is district employees and the second priority is employees of other public agencies, including the city and county. The public would be considered next because it is important to keep the units filled to pay the mortgage.

Superintendent Magee also shared that tenants would be required to complete an income check each year. If tenants are no longer working for a school district or leave the profession, they would lose the benefit. Executive Director Sanchez described how existing tenants have a specific set of state and local rights which must be respected, and the goal is to not displace people. Tenants who come into a building deemed as affordable housing enter with the understanding that there are income-based requirements. If they are no longer eligible, they have a certain period to move out. He discussed the idea of tiered units, and how a unit can be reclassified as a higher income tier, opening a vacancy for a lower income tier unit. People can move up the affordability chain without having to move out. All these criteria will be directed by SMCOE in terms of fairness, equity, and what makes the most sense.

Board Member Camacho stated that the process may move quickly without full opportunity for input, so he wanted to provide his considerations at this time. First, he indicated he just learned there are some districts in the state paying their intern teachers a lower pay than a first-year teacher, when the intent of the intern credential program was for them to earn teacher salaries. He advocated that this issue be considered because he is finding more and more people entering the profession through alternative pathways who are being burned. They should be prioritized because they are the future of the profession.
Board Member Camacho stated that he is opposed to teacher and staff housing because he believes teachers, staff, and all school employees should be able to buy homes in the community where they work. However, he understands that is not possible and will not happen anytime soon. Knowing that, he supports these projects because homes can be created of which teachers and school employees are deserving. He emphasized there should not be a vacancy issue because these units should have tremendous value for school employees. The units should consider the employees’ day jobs and salaries, but also their family obligations, and consider childcare and collaborative spaces. Since teachers and school employees are not paid at a level at which they can buy a home which makes them feel like this is their home and place, they should be given the best possible living experience within what can be provided. He underscored these as his priorities upon entering this business because so much is being asked of these employees without giving them what they fully deserve.

Board Member Alvaro agreed saying educators should have a real home for themselves and their families. She discussed her concerns about equity, sharing that a teacher who lives in her community may not be interested in a building in Daly City or South San Francisco, unless they are looking to change jobs. She suggested looking at whether those in the outlying areas can be served without encouraging them to leave those areas. Board Member Alvaro discussed how people have left teaching on the coast because they can make more money somewhere else. She emphasized that she does not want to be part of creating an exodus from the smaller, rural districts already badly impacted by this issue.

Board Member Torres shared that his previous organization would purchase full properties and send letters to the tenants letting them know the property had been purchased. Within five or six months, the turnover rate was huge. They often got 90% of the people they wanted in the units and the people who didn’t want to live there had the opportunity to stay or leave. A lot chose to opt out. He noted that the feedback and comments were helpful because the criteria had not yet been established.

Superintendent Magee thanked Executive Director Sanchez and his partners, Mark Wiesenthal and Ian Parker, who were in attendance, noting that they have been supportive, instructive, and patient throughout the process. She expressed appreciation for Executive Director Sanchez’s expertise. Superintendent Magee underscored that this project is one step toward addressing the big challenge of housing in the county. This will not solve everything, but it is action which will make a difference for those who get to live in the building and that is worth considering.

B. Public Hearing on the Initial Proposal from the San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) to the San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools for 2023-2024

Board President Gerard opened the public hearing on the initial proposal from the San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) to the San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools for 2023-2024. Receiving no public comment, Board President Gerard declared the Public Hearing closed.

C. Public Hearing on the Initial Proposal from the San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools to the San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) for the 2023-2024 Reopener Bargaining Agreement
Board President Gerard opened the public hearing on the initial proposal from the San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools to SMCEA for the 2023-2024 reopener bargaining agreement. Receiving no public comment, Board President Gerard declared the Public Hearing closed.

D. Superintendent’s Comments

Superintendent Magee shared that the previous week she was in San Diego with a team of 13 from the County Office at the California Labor Management Institute, which is funded and sponsored by the Californians Dedicated to Education Foundation, a California Department of Education (CDE) foundation. Their presentations, tools, published materials, and trainers were impressive. The entire environment was top-rate, and the team had a fantastic experience. They learned a lot, brought back wonderful tools, created a plan together, and have scheduled meeting dates throughout the year. The conference provided an excellent way for the team to connect in ways they haven’t been able to in the past, including a full team dinner together.

Superintendent Magee reported the County Office mural is progressing. There are two dates in July when students will be painting in the building and Board members are welcome to join. Superintendent Magee emphasized the mural has been a wonderful community-building experience. Pedro Rivas Lopez, the artist, has been working with many students, teachers, and SMCOE staff.

Superintendent Magee addressed the latest Grand Jury report entitled “Education is Everyone’s Business.” She shared that many of the findings are pointed toward the County Office to move forward. The report will be shared with the Board, as well as the response letter, which is due at the end of August.

Superintendent Magee wished a happy upcoming birthday to Tami Moore, Associate Superintendent, Human Resources. She also wished everyone a wonderful, safe, and relaxing Fourth of July.

9. BOARD MEMBERS

A. Board Member Comments

Board Member Alvaro

Board Member Alvaro wished a happy birthday to Associate Superintendent Moore and congratulated Gwenn Lei, Coordinator, Reading/Language Arts, Educational Services Division, on her promotion to Executive Director, Curriculum and Instruction Services, Educational Services Division. She described how Coordinator Lei has been amazing in the work she does and she is happy to see her continue to move up the ranks.

Board Member Alvaro also congratulated Shelly Johnson, Principal, Court and Community Schools, Educational Services Division, on getting a new job closer to her home and her child’s school district. She shared she has worked with Principal Johnson for a long time, has been proud to watch her go from teacher to Assistant Principal to Principal, and will miss her.
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Board Member Torres
Board Member Torres wished a happy birthday to Associate Superintendent Moore and thanked staff moving up or moving out through retirement or other job opportunities. He noted they have all done an excellent job representing the county.

Board Member Cannon
Board Member Cannon agreed with the wonderful job Principal Johnson has done over the years in a tough and challenging position.

Board Member Camacho
Board Member Camacho had no comments.

Board Member Bonini
Board Member Bonini shared she had been invited by former Youth Commission Liaison Allyson Chan, Program Director for the Student Board Member Association, to join a conversation regarding their upcoming Student Trustee Advocacy Readiness Training (START) conference. They were gathering input and held various thoughtful sessions about the different components of the conference. The organization is comprised of students from around the country and Board Member Bonini was happy to attend one of the sessions.

Board Member Bonini reported she attended the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission (JJDPC) meeting the previous evening. Susan Swope, who is on the JJDPC and the Grand Jury, gave a summary of the Grand Jury report. The focus was on Career and Technical Education (CTE) and how to make it easier for people to get into teaching in certain areas.

Board Member Bonini noted there was a report at the meeting from Paul Bocanegra and Johanna Rasmussen around the SamTrans issue. Mr. Bocanegra is the co-founder of the non-profit ReEvolution, which is working to get families and students to the Youth Services Center. The office of Supervisor Noelia Corzo dedicated $10,000 to the effort. They are working with any agencies which might have contact with the families and students and are offering to do presentations. Board Member Bonini suggested it might be helpful for staff and perhaps the Board to attend these presentations being organized by Ms. Rasmussen.

Board Member Bonini said she looks forward to the conversation about Gateway at the next meeting. She renewed her request to form an Ad Hoc Subcommittee, perhaps at the next meeting, so the Board can stay apprised of what is going on and be involved and prepared in terms of rescinding the closing date and further discussions.

Board Member Bonini addressed the Conflict of Interest issue and ongoing investigations. She stated that the Board has been told they will be informed of what happens at the end of the process, but she wants the Board to further review policies. Board Member Bonini indicated that any correspondence sent to the County Office under the purview of the Executive Assistant to the Board is something that the Board should know about. She learned of a correspondence that was sent to the Executive Assistant to the Board from the investigator at the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), who had contacted her. She was surprised that Board President Gerard had
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not heard about it. She stated this was a sensitive matter which was raised by the Board in February
and the Board is integrally involved in this issue. Board Member Bonini emphasized her expectation
that any communication sent to the Executive Assistant to the Board be received by the Board.

Board President Gerard
Board President Gerard agreed with Board Member Bonini’s request regarding correspondence sent
to the Executive Assistant to the Board.

Board President Gerard reported she had attended a special meeting of the CCBE Board of
Directors the previous Monday. At that time, CCBE accepted the resignation of President Gina
Cuclis, effective June 30. John McPherson will be taking over as President of CCBE as of July 1.

Board President Gerard shared she was looking forward to the Court Schools Graduation on Friday.
The students are special and everyone works hard to get them to the position of graduation. The
students understand this, which makes it even more exceptional.

Board President Gerard wished a happy birthday to Associate Superintendent Moore.

Board President Gerard congratulated those staff moving on to new jobs and those who have been
promoted within.

Board President Gerard thanked and expressed her appreciation to the County Office for the
excellent work and reports they put together. She discussed how the Board wants a lot of
information and how important it is for the Board to have the information for themselves and their
constituents.

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.
Board President Gerard announced the next regular meeting would take place on Wednesday, July 19,
2023, at 7:00 p.m.

Nancy Magee, Secretary
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