

**VENTURA COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF
June 8, 2007**

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Call To Order, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and Moment of Reflection
The Regular meeting of the Ventura County Board of Education, Agenda No. 07-11, was called to order by Mr. Marty Bates, President, at 8:04 a.m. on Friday, June 8, 2007, in the Conejo Room of the Administrative Services Center, 5189 Verdugo Way, Camarillo. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Mr. Bates and followed by a moment of reflection.

2. Roll Call
Trustees Present:
Mary Louise Peterson, Area 1
Marty Bates, Area 2
Chris Valenzano, Area 3
Ron Matthews, Area 5 – *Attended from 8:00 - 10:15 a.m.*
Dean Kunicki, Area 4 – *Absent*

Don Hurley, Assistant County Counsel

VCOE Personnel Present:
Charles Weis, Ventura County Superintendent of Schools and Ex-Officio
Secretary and Executive Officer of the Board
Nancy Manley, Executive Assistant to Dr. Weis
Sandra Shackelford, Associate Superintendent, Educational Services
Stan Mantooth, Associate Superintendent, Administrative Services

3. Approval of Agenda
Dr. Weis reported that Agenda Item E.2 had been rescheduled to June 28, 2007, and that Agenda Items E.3 and E.8 had been withdrawn. Dr. Weis further requested that Agenda Item E.1 be heard prior to Agenda Item B., Public Comments.

Mr. Matthews moved the agenda be approved as amended. Mrs. Peterson seconded the motion, and it carried 4:0.

Per the amended Agenda, the Board proceeded with Agenda Item E.1.

E. HEARINGS

1. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 443.
The parent, Manuela Aguilera, of the student was in attendance. No representative from Ventura Unified School District was in attendance due to previous school commitments. Mr. Matthews moved the Board uphold Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 443, based on childcare needs, parent's work location, and continuity of education; and set the duration of the release at one school year. Mrs. Peterson seconded the motion, and it carried 4:0.

Per the amended Agenda, the Board proceeded with Agenda Item B, Public Comments.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. *Virginia De la Piedra, Board President, Fillmore Unified School District*
Mrs. De La Piedra stated that she was unhappy with the manner in which the Board addressed the Fillmore Superintendent and staff at the last meeting. The Superintendent and staff were following the instructions of the Fillmore Board. The Fillmore Board knows many of the people affected by the interdistrict transfers as friends and colleagues. The Fillmore Board studied the issue, and made a decision which they felt was best for all the students of Fillmore Unified School District. 3,400 students of Fillmore District are affected by the decision, not just the 40 that did not successfully transfer. The Fillmore District does rely on their budget, however, the funds generated by the 40 students in question do not answer the budgetary issues the District is facing. This was a long term answer to a problem. Fillmore Unified School District has followed the law.

Mrs. De La Piedra then spoke directly to Mr. Valenzano and noted that she has never met him or talked to him. Although the County Board became aware of this issue in March, Mr. Valenzano has not come to the Fillmore District as their representative, nor has he contacted the District to ask why this decision was being made.
2. *David Dollar, Board member, Fillmore Unified School District*
Mr. Dollar read an e-mail from John Garnica, Board member, Fillmore Unified School District, which reviewed the process used to develop the 3% cap and questioned why the Board had not contacted the Fillmore Board to discuss this decision further. Mr. Garnica stated that he believes in following the law, even if it is not one he cares for. The question before the County Board is whether they will follow the law, or ignore the ones that are distasteful.
3. *Jim Romo, Attorney, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud and Romo, Representing Fillmore Unified School District*
Mr. Romo addressed Agenda Items C.1 and D.2, which imply that the Board may reconsider the decisions made on the interdistrict attendance appeals heard on May 21, 2007.

At the last meeting, it was noted that the County Board serves as an appellant body and there are rules that apply relative to the authority of the County Board to reconsider decisions that are issued and that are final. Mr. Romo distributed copies of a brief that cites case law specific to that authority. Unless express authority for reconsideration is granted in the statute, then the County Board does not have the authority to reconsider its previous decisions.

4. *Barbara Macri-Ortiz, Attorney, Representing Parents*

Ms. Macri-Ortiz stated that she represents parents who have appeals being heard tonight, as well as those denied on May 21, 2007. She stated that there was a grave misinterpretation of the law. This is a complicated issue.

Regarding the issue of reconsideration, it is her experience that Roberts Rules of Order gives a member of the County Board, who voted in the majority, the right to bring that decision back for reconsideration. In appellant cases, an attorney has the right to request a reconsideration before the case goes to the next level. The parents are considering taking a Writ to the Superior Court, asking the Court to determine whether the County Board followed the law. The Court would remand the case back to the County Board for another look. If that is the procedure, then it is strange to take the position that the decision is final.

Ms. Macri-Ortiz reviewed a powerpoint presentation pertaining to the law on Interdistrict Transfers. Copies of the presentation were distributed. Students attend public school based on residence, work in the desired district, agreement between districts, interdistrict transfer permits, or application to a school of choice (this is a separate statute that was adopted in 1994). Interdistrict transfer permits are authorized by Education Code section 46600 and 48301. The purpose of this statute was to give parents the opportunity to select schools that best fit their children's educational needs.

There were limitations placed on the School of Choice transfers i.e. court-ordered desegregation plan and/or racial and ethnic balance. Additionally, the school district of residence may not adopt policies that in any way block or discourage pupils from applying for transfer to another district (Education Code section 48301 (c)).

The 3% cap only applies to School of Choice Districts, and only to those students newly transferring out under Education Code section 48301. The 3% cap is comprised solely on those students newly transferring out each year. Students already released in the prior year are not counted.

Other provisions were discussed. Residency requirements are met if one or both parents are employed in the district. Unless the sending district approves the transfer, districts may limit net transfer of pupils in and out of district in any fiscal year to greater of 1% ADA or 75 pupils (Education Code 48204(b)(6)(c). There is no need to reapply each year as long as the parents are still employed in district.

The 3% cap does not apply when parents are employed within the requested district. This is a totally different cap which should not be considered within the 3% calculation.

Child care needs were reviewed. Education Code 46601.5(a) allows interdistrict agreements to meet the child care needs of the pupil. Once a permit has been issued based on childcare needs, a pupil does not have to reapply. These transfers do not apply to the 3% cap.

In conclusion, Ms. Macri-Ortiz reviewed a summary of the transfer caps that exist in Education Code and stated that transfer requests related to employment, child care needs, and automatic renewals must be deducted from Fillmore's totals. Once these have been subtracted, all transfer requests should be approved, as the district will not exceed the 3% cap of 114 permits.

5. *Aaron O'Donnell, Attorney, Representing Fillmore Unified School District*
Mr. O'Donnell responded to Ms. Macri-Ortiz' interpretation of the statute. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the interdistrict attendance provisions in Education Code were established to provide an element of choice for parents, but the provisions also address how to resolve issues between competing districts and to protect districts in certain instances.

Ms. Macri-Ortiz' statement that the cap stipulated in Education Code section 48307 only applies to newly transferring out students, and not across the board, is not supported by the text of the statute. The Legislative Analysis history has not been put before the County Board. The text of Education Code section 48307 clearly provides that the Governing Board of a school district may limit the number of students transferring out to 3%. There is no reference to "newly transferring out." To the extent that there may be arguments made based on the legislative history, there is no occasion for the County Board to consider the legislative history, as the statute is clear on its face. The statute that the legislature passed states that a district can limit the number of transfers to 3%.

Education Code section 46600 provides the County Board the authority to hear appeals. Education Code section 48307 does not state any exceptions for transfers pertaining to the Allen Bill (parent employment), childcare, or existing transfers. This section does allow a district to establish a 3% cap, regardless of whether the transfers are new or not.

Mr. O'Donnell addressed transfers based on childcare needs, and stated that there is only one appeal based on childcare. Even if the 1% cap and the 3% cap were correct as stipulated, it would not make a difference, as the request does not meet the requirements as the child care is located in a district other than where the parent is requesting to attend. This request does not fall within the guidelines of Education Code 48204.

Mr. O'Donnell addressed the issue of reconsideration. The analogy of a court of appeals does not hold up as the court has specific procedures for reconsideration. Those rules have to be followed in order for a reconsideration to be made. There are no such rules in this case. The County Board has made a final decision, and without a procedure or authorization in statute that allows for reconsideration, the County Board does not have any further jurisdiction over the cases in which a determination has already been made.

In conclusion, the assertion that the 3% cap only applies to newly transferring out, is not stated in the text of the statute. The text provides the local district with the authority to limit the number of transfers to 3%.

C. CLOSED SESSION

1. Conference with Legal Counsel
Mr. Bates convened the Board into Closed Session at 9:00 a.m.

D. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Report of Action Taken in Closed Session.
Mr. Bates reconvened the Board into Open Session at 10:18 a.m., and reported that no action was taken during closed session. The Board will take action under the hearings.

Mr. Bates reported that Mr. Matthews left the meeting at 10:15 a.m. in order to attend a doctor's appointment. Mr. Matthews did attend the complete Closed Session with Legal Counsel.

2. Discussion / Action regarding Prior or Future Interdistrict Transfer Appeals Pertaining to School Districts of Choice
Mrs. Peterson moved that this item be tabled. Mr. Bates seconded the motion, and it carried 3:0.

Per the amended Agenda, the Board proceeded with Agenda Item E.4.a.

E. HEARINGS (Continued)

2. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 444.
This case was rescheduled to June 28, 2007.
3. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 445.
This case was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

4.a. Information from Fillmore Unified School district Regarding Interdistrict Attendance Appeals

Representatives of Fillmore Unified School District included: Mr. Jeff Sweeney, Superintendent; Evalene Townsend, Director of Human Resources and Pupil Personnel Services; Dr. Michael Bush, Fiscal Director; Jim Romo, Legal Counsel; Virginia de la Piedra, Board President; Liz Wilde, Board member; and Katie Hadley, Educational Services.

Mr. Sweeney provided a review of the process used by Fillmore Unified School District in adopting the 3% cap. This was done for the benefit of Mr. Bates who was absent from the May 21, 2007 meeting. Fillmore Unified School District has been experiencing declining enrollment for three years. Approximately 5% of the enrollment was attending other school districts through interdistrict transfers. In 2004, legislation passed which allowed local school districts to adopt a cap on the number of students transferring out. This law strikes a balance between the needs of parents and the district of residence and an undue loss of funding and a negative impact on school programs.

This law was brought to the attention of the Fillmore Board in November and board policies were revised. Guidance was sought from legal counsel and the County Office of Education. Information was shared with parents and local school districts, and the County Board was notified. The prior opinion of County Counsel was reviewed and utilized as a basis for the decision.

The process allowed 114 out of 167 students to leave the District. There were concerns raised by parents about the process used. One parent filed a complaint in which 20 charges were made. Two of the charges were sustained: one which referenced the County form used, and the other dealt with phone call that were made to parents by Ms. Townsend (it was also noted that when Ms. Townsend made those calls, there was another person present).

The Fillmore District is sensitive to the parents and their concerns, but also to the needs of the other 3,700 students and parents in the District. Fillmore Unified School District welcomes the opportunity to educate all of its resident students.

Ms. Townsend reported that when the process of adopting this new transfer policy began, the process was reviewed with the County Office of Education; all parents currently on interdistrict transfers were notified, and an application form was provided; the information was posted in two newspapers; phone calls were made to neighboring districts, with copies of the new policy being provided; legal counsel was apprised of the process being utilized; and the experiences of another district that had previously adopted a 3% cap were reviewed.

Mr. Romo stated that the appeals presented today contain similar reasons as those heard on May 21, 2007. The reasons stated in the May 14, 2007 letter for the denial by Fillmore Unified and the arguments presented by Mr. O'Donnell, regarding the statutory rights of the district, support the District's decision.

Mr. Valenzano made a motion to extend the meeting until 12:00 p.m. Mrs. Peterson seconded the motion and it carried 3:0.

Prior to continuing with Agenda Item E.4, Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 446, Mr. Bates moved that the Board sustain the appeals and remand to the District for a determination that in so far as the issue of the number of students subject to the 3% cap of Education Code section 48307 should not have included the following multiyear:

1. Interdistrict transfer agreements relating to child care under Education Code section 46601.5(b);
2. Transfers relating to a parent or parents being employed in the receiving district under Education Code section 48204(b); and
3. Students already attending another district under a previously granted interdistrict transfer.

The District is requested to make this determination and advise this Board in writing within two weeks of the date of this hearing.

Mr. Valenzano seconded the motion, and it carried 3:0.

Mr. Hurley stated that this motion is not a reconsideration of the Board action of May 21, 2007. This is a remand to the District for a redetermination of the appropriate cap. The cap would include anyone who was subject to it. It is the expectation that the District will recalculate the cap using the exclusions noted above and make a report to this Board and the public.

Mr. Bates invited the District to contact either Dr. Weis or Don Hurley for further interpretation of the motion. Ms. Macri-Ortiz asked for clarification regarding the motion. The cases are being remanded back to the District to recalculate the 3%, based on the guidelines provided by the Board. Mr. Hurley noted that the expectation is that the District will do a recalculation, and a recalculation will apply to those cases before the Board today.

The Board's motion was not a reconsideration of the previous cases as this Board cannot reconsider those earlier determinations. It is the Board's understanding that a recalculation will affect the students in tonight's cases. This Board's action is limited by the motion. It will be up to the District to determine next steps. A formal order will be prepared and executed within one week.

Mr. Hurley clarified that if a student falls within the scope of one of the three items listed, then their appeal is sustained. If the student does not, and if the District does make a recalculation based on the three categories, then there may be a situation where the District does not meet the 3% cap, and an interdistrict transfer should not be denied..

Mr. Hurley clarified that the Board's motion, in effect, states that if the student falls within one of the three categories identified, then the appeal has been upheld as the student should not have been considered as part of the 3% calculation.

Each of the parents accepted the motion to sustain the appeal and the remand back to the district.

4. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 446.
This case was sustained and remanded back to the district. A formal order and decision will be forwarded to the parent and district in the next week.
5. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 447.
This case was sustained and remanded back to the district. A formal order and decision will be forwarded to the parent and district in the next week.
6. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 448.
This case was sustained and remanded back to the district. A formal order and decision will be forwarded to the parent and district in the next week.
7. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 449.
This case was sustained and remanded back to the district. An order and decision will be forwarded to the parent and district in the next week.
8. Interdistrict Attendance Appeal Case No. 450.
This case was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

A copy of the motion was distributed to the District and public. A formal order and decision will be forwarded to the parent and the district within one week of this hearing.

Mr. Romo asked if there is an expectation that the District will recalculate the 3% cap? Mr. Hurley affirmed this expectation, stating that the District could conceivably limit the application of this order to only those cases before the Board today. This Board cannot reconsider its previous decisions. The Board is asking the District to recalculate the number of students subject to the 3% cap, pursuant to the three limitations mentioned in the motion.

Mr. Romo clarified that those students who fall within the three categories are not to be included in the 3% cap, and that it is the Board's opinion that these students are to be excluded from the 3% cap. Mr. Romo further clarified that what is left for the District to decide is whether or not the reasons set forth by the parents, with respect to the appeals, qualify under any one of the categories. Mr. Hurley affirmed this interpretation, and stated that if the District does not reach the 3% cap, then the interdistrict transfer cannot be denied.

Mr. Valenzano clarified that at the May 21, 2007 meeting, the Board dealt with procedural issues, and that at this meeting the Board has determined what they believe is the intention of the law.

Mr. Hurley stated that he was wrong at the May 21, 2007 meeting as there was not enough focus on the basic issues. There was an assumption that the process followed by the Fillmore District was correct. The examination did not include the language of the Education Code as it relates to the 3% cap. This is a gray area, and this section of Education Code is very poorly drafted.

The Board took at break at 10:50 a.m.

F. PRELIMINARY

1. Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting of May 21, 2007 (Budget Study Session)
2. Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting of May 21, 2007.

Due to a lack of a quorum of members that were in attendance at the May 21st meetings, Agenda Items F.1 and F.2 were postponed until June 28, 2007.

G. CORRESPONDENCE

1. E-mails from the Neighborhood First Association, dated May 16, 2007, titled, "Impact of Consolidation on the LSOS Neighborhood."
2. E-mail from Mary Louise Peterson and Dean Kunicki to Board members regarding the May Revise.

H. PRESIDENT'S AND BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS

1. Mrs. Peterson reported that she attended the BTSA Gala. At the event, she met with the Director of BTSA for the CCTC. She was pleased to learn that participation in BTSA will become a requirement for all new teachers during their first two years of teaching. She was excited to see that the quality of training and support for teachers has increased.
2. Mr. Bates questioned which Board members would be attending the Graduation events. Mrs. Peterson noted that she will attend all but the Boswell graduation.

I. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

None.

J. LEGISLATIVE REPORT

1. Mrs. Peterson distributed information from CCBE Legislative Action Committee. This year the Committee will focus on Adequacy of Funding for Education studies, and how governance for education is structured in California. She distributed a summary of the Getting Down to Facts report. Focus on accountability and transparency of the budget process at the local level are common themes throughout the reports. Texas spends 12% more on education than California; New York spends 75% more; and, on average, the nation spends 35% more. Schools in lower socio-economic areas have lower API scores. There is consensus that an improved and increased investment in public schools in California is needed. Meetings with State Legislators will be held to assist them in understanding the corrections needed based on these studies.
2. Mrs. Peterson asked that Mr. Kunicki contact her prior to the CCBE Legislative Committee meeting on June 23, 2007, if there is something he would like the CCBE Legislative Committee to do regarding AB270. This item was postponed until June 28, 2007.

K. CONSENT/ACTION

1. Travel Expense Claim
Mr. Valenzano moved the Board approve the Superintendent's Travel Expense Claims for March, April 2007. Mr. Bates seconded the motion, and it carried 3:0.

L. PRESENTATIONS

None.

M. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION/ACTION

1. Change Order No. 12 to Viola Constructors for Construction of the Ventura County Office of Education, Conference & Educational Services Center
Mr. Mantooth reported that Change Order No. 12, dated May 11, 2007, includes additive changes for additional drywall reinforcement, egg crate lighting fixtures and exit signs. Mr. Mantooth noted that the Construction of the Conference Center remains \$50,000 under the original bid amount of the construction. Mrs. Peterson moved the Board approve Change Order No. 12 to Viola Constructors. Mr. Valenzano seconded the motion, and it carried 3:0.
2. Notice of Completion for Viola Constructors for the New Conference & Educational Services Center Project
Mr. Mantooth reported that on May 2, 2007, the Project Manager for the Ventura County Office of Education, the Project Inspector, and the Project Architect, reviewed the new Conference & Educational Services Center project and recognized that Viola Constructors had achieved substantial completion.

The project is essentially complete and only punch list items remain. At this time, it would be appropriate to record a Notice of Completion that will begin the final period in which sub-contractors and material providers may submit stop notices prior to retention release. The Ventura County Office of Education will continue to withhold an amount of Viola Constructors' final payment until all punch list and other remaining contract items are completed.

Mrs. Peterson moved the Board authorize staff to record a Notice of Completion for Viola Constructors for the new Conference & Educational Services Center project. Mr. Bates seconded the motion, and it carried 3:0.

3. New Conference Center, Construction of Unimproved Space

As originally designed and bid for construction, the new Conference and Educational Services Center on Adolfo Road included approximately 10,000 square feet of "shelled space" for future tenant/VCOE use not included in the original construction contract. During the course of construction, the Office has experienced continued growth in the levels of program responsibility and attendant staffing in the Educational Services Department to the extent that additional space in the new facility will be required within the next 12 to 18 months.

Mr. Mantooth noted that he, Mr. Hanson, and Mr. Valenzano, met with real estate broker/agent Steve Doll from NAI Capital Commercial Real Estate Services and verified that the major building systems in the unimproved space should be completed in order to make it more appealing to a tenant. It is anticipated that the cost would not exceed \$1 million. Mr. Valenzano noted that Mr. Doll did recommend that the drop ceiling, finished walls, flooring, and electrical should be completed.

Mr. Valenzano moved the Board: (a) approve a contract with tBP Architecture for design to finish the unimproved space; and (b) authorize a bid for improvements to the unimproved area. Mrs. Peterson seconded the motion, and it carried 3:0.

4. Rental of Facility to SELPA and Discussion of a Possible Board Policy on Real Estate Transactions, including Rental of Facilities

Mrs. Peterson reported that she had e-mailed staff regarding a policy on rental of facilities. In addition, she requested that staff research other educational agencies to find if they have policies regarding this issue. Mr. Bates requested that staff begin to work on a policy for this purpose. Mr. Mantooth requested clarification that this is for tenancy of facilities, as the Office has a policy regarding use of facilities. Mr. Valenzano noted that staff does have an extensive Facilities Use policy that establishes a priority for educational agencies. Mrs. Peterson stated that she would like Facilities Use to be included in this policy as well. No action was taken on this item.

5. Formal Relationship between NAI Capital, Commercial Real Estate Services, and the County Board of Education

Mr. Valenzano noted that when he contacted Mr. Doll regarding the possible rental of the Conference Center, it was indicated to him, by Mr. Mantooth, that if the Board wants to pursue using Mr. Doll in order to secure renters, the Board should enter into a formal relationship in order to allow him to act on the Board's behalf.

Mr. Valenzano moved the Board authorize a formal agreement with Mr. Doll, of NAI Capital, for representation in matters relating to tenancy of the Ventura County Office of Education Conference and Educational Services Center.

Mr. Bates stated that he is concerned about entering into a contract without seeing the formal contract. In addition, he would not want the agreement to refer to the full Conference and Educational Services Center. Each space should be considered individually, as needed. Mr. Valenzano noted that would be fine, but that it was his understanding that a formal agreement would be needed in order for Mr. Doll to begin contacting possible tenants.

Mrs. Peterson stated that she would first want a policy pertaining to real estate transactions. She feels that the Office has a competent staff that could do this. Mr. Bates again clarified that he would need to see the agreement in writing, and in addition, the Board needs to seriously consider how this area will be utilized.

This item will be held for a future discussion item.

6. Report on Activities of Lobbyists

Dr. Weis distributed information from Anchor Consulting. Mr. Bates postponed this item to June 28, 2007.

7. Discussion of Potential Language for AB911

Dr. Weis noted that AB911 was amended in early May and is currently in Assembly Appropriations. The amendments as made, will take money away from our office. Mr. Bates noted that the bill is dead in appropriations. Mr. Bates postponed this item to June 28, 2007.

8. Lobbyist Statement for Services

The statement of services from April 1, 2007 – June 30, 2007, from Anchor Consulting LLC was presented for the Board's information and review.

Mrs. Peterson stated her concern that the Office frontloaded these contracts and she has not seen much progress. Additionally, during the time that the Board negotiated the contracts with these two firms, both firms donated \$1000 to Tony Strickland for his Controller Office. This was not disclosed when the Board was given recommendations for these two firms.

Mrs. Peterson further stated that this Board has a close relationship with both Assemblymember Strickland and Tony Strickland. This conflict should have been disclosed. There is currently a lot of controversy surrounding lobbying firms, and she is concerned about how this reflects on the Office.

9. Notice of Rate Increase from Board Legal Counsel for Matters Related to County Committee on School District Organization

The Office has received notification from Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, that the firms' hourly rates for school district legal work will increase effective July 1, 2007 from \$185 per hour to \$205 per hour. Terry Filliman, Attorney, currently serves as the Board's Legal Counsel for matters related to County Committee on School District Organization. The current written Agreement for Legal Services authorizes rate increases without executing a new Agreement.

Mr. Valenzano asked that the Board look into other counsel for representation. Mr. Bates noted that this item will be brought back to a future meeting.

N. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Peterson stated that she is very disappointed in the fiscal irresponsibility of this Board. The Board spent thousands of dollars to research a possible conflict of interest with Janet Lindgren, and yet there is no conflict of interest when lobbyists hired by this Board make contributions to Tony Strickland when a current Board member was a legislative assistant to Tony Strickland when he was an Assemblymember. This is a clear conflict of interest. Mrs. Peterson asked that the Board reexamine how they do business when they talk about how they want to make a profit from the rental of the Conference Center, and yet spend \$300,000 on lobbyists, and legal fees. Mrs. Peterson stated that the Board is making arguments to suit personal interests and this is not right.
2. Mr. Valenzano noted that he was a legislative staff member for Assemblymember Tony Strickland, not his fund raiser, and he was not aware that the lobbyist firm contributed this money to Mr. Strickland. If Mrs. Peterson had this concern, it should have been brought up when the contract was approved. It was not a conflict of interest when the Board was not aware of the contribution. Mr. Valenzano further noted that he was not a member of the subcommittee that brought the two lobbyist firms to the Board for approval.

O. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Resolution to Transfer the Duties and Powers from the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization to the Ventura County Board of Education (June 28, 2007).

2. Adoption of Science Textbook (June 28, 2007).
3. Report on VCOE Preparedness Plan for Pandemic Avian Flu (Requested by Mr. Kunicki / TBD).
4. EMT Program Offered through ROP (Requested by Mr. Valenzano / TBD).
5. Framework for Developing a Performance Review of the Ventura County Office of Education (TBD).
6. Formal Relationship between NAI Capital, Commercial Real Estate Services, and the County Board of Education (TBD).

P. FUTURE MEETINGS

Date: **Thursday, June 28, 2007**
 Time: 6:00 p.m.
 Location: 5100 Adolfo Road, Board Room, Camarillo
 Purpose: Regular Meeting of the Board

Date: Friday, July 6, 2007
 Time: 8:00 a.m.
 Location: 5100 Adolfo Road, Board Room, Camarillo
 Purpose: Regular Meeting of the Board

Date: Monday, July 23, 2007
 Time: 6:00 p.m.
 Location: 5100 Adolfo Road, Board Room, Camarillo
 Purpose: Regular Meeting of the Board

BOLD denotes modified schedule

R. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

Approved by Board Action on 7/13/07.

*Board meetings are recorded by audio tape pursuant to Government Code Section 54953.5(b).
 Copies of these audio tapes are available by request to this office at (805) 383-1900.*