

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

Closed Session: 1) Student Records Challenge (Education Code 49070) 2) Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9) Laguna Beach Unified School District v. National Church Residences of Laguna Beach, et al. Case No. 30-2025-01518292-CU-OR-CJC 3) Conference with Labor Negotiators (Government Code 54957.6)

| Name | Comment |
|---------------|--|
| retired staff | New board members have an ethical and fiduciary duty to fully inform themselves on the history of the sale of Aliso School and protect the interests of LBUSD for the future financial stability. It is not in the best interest of LBUSD to assert any plans you (Sheri, Howard or Dee) have for the site. Stay where you are to serve----students and staff. Please treat any conversations regarding CSEA with the respect they deserve as opposed to the disrespect that has been shown in public meetings. Closed session is to be conducted with appropriateness even though you are out of the public eye---not a session to expound on hostile behavior. |

RECOGNITION EVENT

| Name | Comment |
|---------------|---|
| retired staff | Our staff and students are involved in many activities above and beyond classroom education. Commendations are important and well deserved. |
| Aurore Dupin | Congratulations to all those being recognized for their achievements! |
| Emily Rolfin | Congratulations to all of the students and staff being recognized tonight. Their hard work, talent, and dedication deserve to be celebrated, and I appreciate the time taken to acknowledge them! |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

Action: Approval of Resolution No. 26-01 International Holocaust Remembrance Day

| Name | Comment |
|---------------|--|
| retired staff | Should be an easy approval without any speeches by Howard. |
| Aurore Dupin | This would be a welcome addition to our community. It is a teaching moment for students too young to know the true horrors of what discrimination can become. It is a moment to open the students' eyes to the despicable path our country is currently leading towards. |

Information: Intentional Use of Technology Update

| Name | Comment |
|---------------|--|
| retired staff | Remembering when the acceptable goal was to achieve 1-1 capability to facilitate the advantages of tech in augmenting teacher to student interaction which was a lofty goal at that time. And a goal of most forward-thinking school districts. District tech team worked diligently to have teachers feel confident in using tech and the board(s) over those years received regular updates on increased use and how the district was reaching 1-1. Obviously now the landscape has changed, and it is important to make sure teacher to student interaction is not infringed by student time on device. Some more questions should be asked i.e. if a teacher assigns a task which the students will be using their device to work on the task---is the teacher circulating the room and closely monitoring and guiding the work. That seems to be a crossover between use of a device and teacher instruction. |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

Action: First Reading of Board Bylaw 9322 – Agenda/Meeting Materials

| Name | Comment |
|--------------------|--|
| Leslie Elliott | <p>This proposal is a clear power grab. Given your majority's record—like the behind-closed-doors maneuvering to secure the presidency and clerk roles after promising a different approach, it's hard to believe you can be trusted with even more control. You ran on transparency, but your actions have shown the opposite.</p> <p>The Superintendent's memo makes it plain: giving the Board President control over the agenda isn't how top-performing California districts operate. Yet you're still pushing ahead, deciding what the public gets to see and what dissenting trustees can even bring up.</p> <p>You're giving one officer the power to bury uncomfortable issues, silence opposing voices, and undermine transparency, all under the guise of "efficiency." That's not governance; it's gatekeeping. It creates confusion, distrust, and lasting damage to the institution, exactly as the Superintendent advises..</p> <p>Then there's the \$50,000 consent agenda ban. Counsel already said it's unnecessary and counterproductive. It's going to bog down meetings with routine contracts, stall key purchases, and force workarounds that make things less—not more—transparent. It's performative politics dressed up as accountability.</p> <p>The community sees through this. If you care about restoring trust, drop these power plays and start living up to the transparency you promised.</p> |
| Lauren Unterberger | Had a prior school board attempted this kind of naked power grab, the current three-member majority would have been apoplectic—launching themselves over the |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>lectern, shrieking about abuse of power until they nearly collapsed from their own theatrics.</p> <p>Let's be clear about what this is: an overt attempt to silence dissent and consolidate control of the narrative. Nothing more. Nothing defensible.</p> <p>This isn't governance; it's domination. And the majority should be ashamed of how brazenly—and cynically—they're choosing to seize power.</p> |
| retired staff | <p>Sheri and Howard you have already incurred a lot of Superintendent and other staff time and countless legal costs to explore a dangerous idea. Dr. Glass has done extensive research and provided guidance that should be heeded. This has never been an issue or a problem over many previous boards and Superintendents. Why now? Because those who paid attention to the campaign particularly of HILLs the idea that a Superintendent was potentially not even needed and the Board should be the supreme authority of the district---not just what is understood to be their accepted role (by code, law and practice) but to let themselves run the whole show. How self-important and ego centered is this proposal. Collaboration and teamwork must prevail. Take the recommendation of Dr. Glass. As well his research proving that consent calendar items must be decided as exists in policy by those items that are considered routine and will not need discussion. The dollar amount is not the deciding factor as a repeat item with a high dollar amount may be a routine item that comes yearly. Again, take the recommendation of Dr. Glass. Overarching here is the concept to respect what already works and get off your pedestals.</p> |
| Julie Gersten | The proposed revision to Bylaw 9322 demonstrates a broader effort by the board majority to weaken the role |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|---------------|--|
| | <p>of the Superintendent and consolidate power within the board majority. I urge you to remove the clause that you are trying to add in. The existing balance of power between the Board and Superintendent is designed to advance the best interests of the students and district and that's what we should all be focused on.</p> |
| Aurore Dupin | <p>The attempted amending of Board Bylaw 9322 is an effort to weaken the independence of the Superintendent. This is antithetical to the beliefs of our community. You, Sheri Morgan, Howard Hills, and Dee Perry, crave to be despots who run their little fiefdom that is the Laguna Beach Unified School District. That cannot happen to the students, staff and community in Laguna Beach.</p> |
| Garthe Knight | <p>As one who craves power and hopes to use that power to destroy all who oppose me, most importantly, Michael Knight (!!!) , I am whole heartedly in favor of any naked power grab to wrest control from those considered subordinate or inferior. In this case it makes perfect sense that Sheri Morgan have final authority on any item on the meeting agenda in which she or the board majority finds displeasing. She is clearly superior to all as she has run the PTA Book Swap and the very complex Sports Swap. This clearly trumps any knowledge or wisdom the Superintendent might posses. We all know PH.Ds are a dime a dozen these days. Anyone can buy one on the internet. I have three. One in metallurgy, particle physics and tantric yoga. I suggest the Board Majority visit the many websites available to obtain some advanced degrees so that they may lord them over all who oppose them. Or you can always contact me about using the services of my glorious Goliath! That is all. I have spoken.</p> |
| Claudia | <p>I am opposed to the proposed changes to Board Policy 9322. Consolidating agenda-setting power in the hands of the Board President undermines the expertise of our</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | <p>Superintendent and creates a lack of transparency. Effective governance requires collaboration, not a "final authority" clause that excludes the professional advice of our district's top educator. If there is a dispute on the agenda, the item should be brought forward to the whole board. This will allow public transparency. Please vote NO on this revision</p> |
| Emily Rolfing | <p>I'm very concerned about the proposed change to Board Bylaw 9322 that would give the Board President final control over the agenda.</p> <p>Given the current Board President's repeated missteps and ongoing disregard for community input, I do not trust her with more authority. Families, staff, and community members already feel unheard, and this proposal only deepens that concern.</p> <p>Our Superintendent was hired to lead the district and should not be undermined by a board member whose actions have damaged public confidence. Agenda control matters because it determines what issues are discussed and what gets pushed aside.</p> <p>This proposal moves the district in the wrong direction. I urge the Board to stop and reconsider a change that further erodes trust and transparency.</p> |
| Tara | <p>This change request effectively consolidates power with the board president and majority, reducing the role of the superintendent, who is best positioned to oversee educational processes and due diligence.</p> |
| Meredith McMahon | <p>I strongly oppose the proposed revision to Board Policy 9322.</p> <p>This change is not procedural — it is a power grab. Granting the Board President final authority over the agenda whenever there is a disagreement with the</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>Superintendent undermines the Superintendent's role as the district's chief educational leader and concentrates power in a single board officer.</p> <p>The Superintendent is hired to lead the District. Weakening that role by allowing the Board President to override agenda decisions shifts governance away from professional expertise and toward political control. That is not good governance, and it is not in the best interest of students.</p> <p>The language may claim to encourage collaboration, but in reality it removes balance and accountability. When one person has final authority, disagreement is no longer resolved — it is silenced.</p> <p>Taken together with other recent actions, this proposal appears to be part of a broader effort by the board majority to consolidate power. That should concern every member of this community.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject this change and uphold transparent, collaborative governance that puts students first — not politics.</p> |
| Jamie Jameson | I'm writing to express concern over the proposed revision to this bylaw. I feel the superintendent, as the educational professional, should have the final say in the event of a dispute over agenda items. This is what is done at the city level where the city manager finalizes all agenda items to ensure legal requirements are met and followed. The same should apply at the district level. Our current board president has only served on the board for a year and any future board presidents may not have the same expertise as a superintendent, whose job is to run a district. |
| Alison Mikkor | I strongly oppose the proposed bylaw change because |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| | <p>it would privilege the view points of non-experts over the professional judgments of those with expertise and it would reduce transparency in decision making. None of the five Board members would have been successful applicants in the recent superintendent search. None of them. That is because whatever experience and expertise that they have in other spheres of life, they lack the education, prior work experience, and expertise to manage our district. The Board has an important role to play but that role is high-level oversight of and support of district staff, rather than to directly manage the district. If the Board is working collaboratively rather than antagonistically with the professional leadership at the district the occasions on which there are disputes over what items to discuss and when to discuss them should be rare. And when such a dispute occurs, deference should be given to the experts and the professionals. Let the Superintendent do his job.</p> |
| Jeb Brown | <p>The proposed change giving the Board President final say on the agenda is an egregious power grab and should not occur. We have hired an excellent Superintendent who has a Doctorate in Education. He should make the final decision about the Agenda.</p> |
| CSEA President Thasa | <p>I strongly oppose the proposed revisions to Board Bylaw 9322. Described as procedural clarification, these changes represent a significant and unnecessary consolidation of power. Granting the Board President unilateral authority to resolve agenda disputes undermines shared governance and weakens the Superintendent's role as the district's chief executive. Agendas are not administrative details; they determine what issues are heard, when they are heard, and whether the public ever sees them. Concentrating this authority in a single officer invites political gatekeeping and limits transparency, particularly during periods of</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p>Board division. These concerns are not hypothetical. The Superintendent's own analysis, supported by legal counsel, cautions against this change and notes that no comparable California districts or governance associations use this model. Governance policies should promote stability and trust, not resolve short-term conflicts by shifting structural power. The proposed restriction on the consent agenda raises similar concerns. Legal counsel advised against a fixed dollar threshold, noting that cost alone is a poor measure of risk or transparency. Existing safeguards already allow any Board member to pull items for discussion, making this proposal unnecessary and inefficient. These revisions are an unnecessary power grab that weakens checks and balances and erodes public trust.</p> |
| Valiha Strecker | <p>This proposed bylaw language is alarming. It strips authority from the Superintendent and hands it to the board majority. Where is the respect for long-standing, effective processes? Where is the respect for the educational leader you hired? I have watched these meetings, and only two board members consistently try to bring the focus back to students. The rest feels driven by control, not care. This is harmful to our schools and our community, and I strongly oppose it.</p> |
| Harpal | <p>Please do not vote in favor of this. In no world does the current board president know more about Ed policy or what should or should not be agendized than a superintendent with an educational doctorate. This is a power grab and not at all in the best interest of the students. AT. ALL.</p> |
| Peggy Wolff | <p>Please continue to have the Superintendent be the final approval to an agenda. It has always been done in partnership, but having the expertise of the Superintendent and education professionals helps to make sure our agendas are meeting education codes, legal obligations and covering curriculum changes as</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | <p>well. The education professionals are who should be running the district. The Board President can review and the entire board can make suggestions for future agenda items at board meetings, but to give total power to ONE board member is wrong. A five person governing board meets in public to make decisions and VOTE on action items. To give power to one person on the board for this large of decision making goes against the elected roles of the other four board members. Stop trying to usurp power and instead WORK WITH the District Leaders. Work with the people who teach our kids everyday. Work with and understand what the future looks like in education. This will become a pet project grievance agenda with one board member leading it. Put students and quality education first - TRUST YOUR DISTRICT LEADERS.</p> |
| Karly S | <p>The superintendent should have final say on meeting agendas because they are responsible for day-to-day operations and ensuring items are timely, legally compliant, and aligned with district priorities. This keeps governance focused on policy and oversight rather than individual leadership preferences.</p> |
| Iva Pawling | <p>This is an unnecessary edit that takes power away from our Superintendent, who is the most qualified person to guide meeting agendas, and squarely sets this power to one person. There is a balance of power that is important to maintain for best practice.</p> |
| Kit Verdugo | <p>It is very clear from the attorney and superintendents report that is available with the meeting agenda this change to the bylaws is not recommended, is not in line with how best in class school districts operate and when it comes down to it, is an obvious power play by the current board majority to force their own personal agendas on the district. The bylaws are well written and clear, and don't need to be amended. The board majority needs to instead educate themselves on how</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>they are to do their jobs within the parameters of these bylaws. The superintendent is the expert on how a school district should be run, no matter how certain board members feel about how that went with the prior super. And what happens when this majority is no longer the majority? I bet you will want to change it back to current version if Joan was president... We see what you are doing</p> |
| Andrew Strickman | <p>We are disappointed to see this effort to delegitimize the role of the Superintendent in helping develop board agendas in place of a “strong” board president model, which does not match traditional or expected governance policy for this type of relationship.</p> <p>We urge you to vote know and maintain trust and credibility of whomever is in the Superintendent role. Thank you. Andrew Strickman, father of a TOW 5th grader and LBHS freshman.</p> |
| Julie Spencer | <p>I am a parent in this district, and I strongly oppose the proposed revision to Board Policy 9322.</p> <p>The added language would give the Board President final authority over the meeting agenda whenever there is a disagreement with the Superintendent. This is not a minor procedural change. It fundamentally shifts power away from the Superintendent — the educational professional hired to lead this district — and concentrates it in the hands of one board officer.</p> <p>Agenda-setting is not a political tool. It shapes what issues are discussed, what information the public sees, and what priorities guide the district. Granting unilateral authority to the Board President undermines the Superintendent’s role, weakens professional leadership, and erodes the system of checks and balances that good governance depends on.</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|--------------|---|
| | <p>The reference to “good faith” discussion does not resolve this concern. When one person ultimately holds final authority, collaboration becomes optional, not required.</p> <p>As a parent, I am deeply concerned that this change reflects a broader effort to sideline the Superintendent and consolidate control within the board majority. This direction risks politicizing district operations and damaging trust in district leadership.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject this revision and to preserve a governance structure that respects professional expertise, shared responsibility, and transparency.</p> |
| Carol Nilsen | <p>Dear Members of the Board,</p> <p>I am concerned with the proposal to give the Board President final authority over agenda setting.</p> <p>Current best practice for setting agenda requires that the Board President and Superintendent draft the agenda jointly and collaboratively.</p> <p>Adding a proviso for the Board President to resolve an impasse between the two anticipates a failure to collaborate, which, in turn predicts adversarial board spectacles.</p> <p>Instead of seeking to structure final control of the agenda by the board President, I urge the board reaffirm commitment to collaborative behavior and support of the superintendent they serve.</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

Public Comment - Items not on the agenda, within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board

| Name | Comment |
|----------------|---|
| Leslie Elliott | If you genuinely wanted to give everyone a voice and hear what your constituents think, you wouldn't place public comments on non-agenda items at the very end of the meeting—often near midnight. No one can outlast the long-winded majority of the school board. You got what you wanted or as Sheri said, "It worked." |
| | Board majority - every meeting where public comment appears at the end of the meeting provides further evidence that you lied about your intentions of putting it at the end of the meeting. Sheri you were caught on a mic last meeting regarding public comment and you should be ashamed at the intentional silencing of the community. |
| retired staff | Hills no one cares about what you did or did not do in high school. What most care about is your rude treatment of anyone who dares to question what you say. The best for the district is for you to resign. Morgan---well you really stepped in it didn't you. As you have shown from the audience for years when board members had the composure to sit and take your rants at them and at the Superintendent the old adage is true---you and Howard can't take it now that you are in the hot seat. Your position here as a public official anything other than an overt threat can be said to you by a member of the public. Trying to move that to the end to circumvent that is childish. Or public speakers can do as Hills did for year---speak on most agenda items and speak off topic to say whatever he wanted. Your hot mic comment was shameful. |
| Aurore Dupin | Public comments for items not on the agenda needs to be returned to the beginning of the meeting. The "hot mic" at the last meeting was a dead giveaway to the |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| | board majority's effort to silence the community's voice. That is a direct violation of the First Amendment in citizens' rights to petition their government. Wear them down until they are silenced. Dee Perry, Sheri Morgan, Howard Hills- SHAME ON YOU! |
| Emily Rolffing | <p>The Board President's remarks at the end of the last board meeting reflected a lack of transparency and a dismissive tone toward the community she serves. After such a long meeting, when many families and staff were unable to stay or fully participate, those comments felt especially disrespectful.</p> <p>Students, staff, families, and community members make real sacrifices to show up, listen, and engage. When they are denied the opportunity to address the Board on non-agenda items, it damages trust. Listening to the community is not optional. It is a core responsibility of this role, and it has not been happening consistently.</p> <p>This is why so many in the community could not support her to be elected as Board President. Leadership requires trust, humility, and a genuine effort to hear the people you serve, and it is clear that this has not been a priority.</p> <p>Please restore public comment on non-agenda items to the start of the open meeting.</p> |
| CSEA President Thasa | Sheri show you are listening and that you really do want to bring community together and move this back to the beginning otherwise your words mean nothing and is all for show. |
| Peggy Wolff | The puff pieces on board members on social media is ridiculous. The quality of your service is seen in meetings, written emails and how you talk to constituents, parents and students. No puff piece or |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|---------------|--|
| | personal ad can change how you are perceived. Your actions always show through. Focus on students in social media. Leave the board members out of it. The school district serves students! Put Students first. |
| Iva Pawling | Move public comment on non-agenda items back to the beginning of the meetings. We now know that this was an intentional decision to silence community input as President Morgan told us in the last meeting when declaring victory by saying " IT WORKED". An incredible shift considering how frequently Member Morgan and Member Hills have used the platform of public comment to communicate with the prior boards for decades. |
| Julie Spencer | <p>I am a parent in this district, and I strongly oppose the proposed revision to Board Policy 9322.</p> <p>The added language would give the Board President final authority over the meeting agenda whenever there is a disagreement with the Superintendent. This is not a minor procedural change. It fundamentally shifts power away from the Superintendent — the educational professional hired to lead this district — and concentrates it in the hands of one board officer.</p> <p>Agenda-setting is not a political tool. It shapes what issues are discussed, what information the public sees, and what priorities guide the district. Granting unilateral authority to the Board President undermines the Superintendent's role, weakens professional leadership, and erodes the system of checks and balances that good governance depends on.</p> <p>The reference to "good faith" discussion does not resolve this concern. When one person ultimately holds final authority, collaboration becomes optional, not required.</p> |

**Public Comments Submitted Electronically for the
January 22, 2026 Recognition Event and Regular Board Meeting**

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>As a parent, I am deeply concerned that this change reflects a broader effort to sideline the Superintendent and consolidate control within the board majority. This direction risks politicizing district operations and damaging trust in district leadership.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject this revision and to preserve a governance structure that respects professional expertise, shared responsibility, and transparency.</p> |
|--|---|