April 24, 2014

TO: Members of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee)

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee-

Wednesday, May 7, 2014

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at **9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 2014**, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of May 7, 2014.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6144.

KDC/EH:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
May 7, 2014
9:30 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Mr. Ben Allen

II. FLAG SALUTE – Mr. Allen

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on January 8, 2014, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS – Secretary Mr. Keith D. Crafton

Newspaper Articles

- A March 27, 2014, article from the Orange County Register—“Artesia residents concerned about ABC Unified trustee districts plan.” (Attachment 1)

- A March 27, 2014, article from the Orange County Register—“Voting case legal bill for Anaheim: $2.47 million.” (Attachment 2)

- An April 4, 2014, article from the Record Gazette—“School district wins approval for voting district change.” (Attachment 3)
• An April 7, 2014, article from The Tribune—“Dan Walters: New bill seeks to expand state’s voting rights act.” (Attachment 4)

• An April 16, 2014, article from Glendale News-Press—“Glendale school board weighs Sagebrush transfer.” (Attachment 5)

• An April 16, 2014, article from the Indian Country, Today Media Network—“Redistricting in California Finally Puts Tribal Reps on School Board.” (Attachment 6)

• An April 18, 2014, article from the Simi Valley Acorn—“Election format may change for SVUSD.” (Attachment 7)

• An April 18, 2014, article from the Daily Democrat—“BREAKING NEWS: Discontent lingers among Woodland City Council regarding map approved for district voting.” (Attachment 8)

• An April 21, 2014, article from the Santa Clarita Valley Signal—“Assembly bill seeks to require district elections.” (Attachment 9)

• An April 21, 2014, article from the Modesto Bee—“Turlock weighs hiring consultant to propose district boundaries.” (Attachment 10)

• A February 19, 2014, article from the Daily Breeze—“SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, Exclusive: Construction firm TELACU bankrolling Centinela Valley school board campaigns, receiving millions in contracts.” (Attachment 11)

• A February 27, 2014, article from the Daily Bulletin—“EDUCATION, District Attorney’s Office receives complaints about compensation for Centinela Valley chief Jose Fernandez.” (Attachment 12)

• A March 7, 2014, article from the Daily Breeze—“Centinela Valley schools lag in academic performance despite paying superintendent $663K.” (Attachment 13)

• A March 14, 2014, article from the Press Telegram—“Centinela Valley school district spends more than double the state average on administration.” (Attachment 14)
• A March 31, 2014, article from the LATIMES.COM-“Superintendent’s pay in South Bay district called “excessive”
The superintendent of the small Centinela Valley Union High School District, Jose Fernandez, made $674,559 last year, far more than the New York and Los Angeles school district heads.” (Attachment 15)

• An April 4, 2014, article from the Daily Breeze-“Centinela Valley ordered to cease excessive school board pay by Los Angeles County.” (Attachment 16)

• An April 17, 2014, article from the Long Beach Press Telegram-“High-paid Centinela Valley school chief can cash in lucrative whole-life insurance policies.” (Attachment 17)

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter may do so at this time. (Form must be completed and submitted to the Secretary.)

VI. UPDATE ON THE WISEBURN UNIFICATION

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the formation of the Wiseburn Unified School District, including information regarding districts impacted by the unification.

VII. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA) AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES

The Secretary will discuss recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee area issues in Los Angeles County.

VIII. UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMITTEE WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT

The Secretary will give an update on the LACOE-hosted website for the County Committee.

IX. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES

At the Regular Meeting of the County Committee on November 6, 2013, a policy review subcommittee was appointed by former Chair AJ Willmer, consisting of Mr. Joel Peterson, Mr. Frank Bostrom, and Mr. Willmer. The subcommittee may provide an update on their
preliminary review of the policies.

X. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION  
I, D*, A

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization. The County Committee may take action to support or oppose the legislation or provide comments to the authors. (Attachment 18)

XI. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY USD I, D*, A
REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (Attachment: "Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals") (Attachment 19)

XII. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY REORGANIZATION I, D*, A
PROPOSALS EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school districts other than the Los Angeles USD. (Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD]”) (Attachment 20)

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS I, D, A
FOR NEXT AGENDA

XIV. ADJOURNMENT I, D, A
Artesia residents concerned about ABC Unified trustee districts plan

BY BRITTANY WOOLSEY / LONG BEACH REGISTER
Published: March 27, 2014 Updated: March 28, 2014 3:10 p.m.

Artesia residents expressed concern over developing districts for school board members in the ABC Unified School District at a public meeting Wednesday.

In each of the three proposed maps dividing the district into seven parts, residents said Artesia wasn't well represented during the meeting at Ross Middle School.

District officials are working to draw the new districts that will each be represented by a trustee following a lawsuit that claimed the six-city school district was violated the California Voting Rights Act because Latinos had no representation on the school board.

To settle the lawsuit, the board voted in November to create districts for board members, ending at-large voting in which the top vote-getters citywide were elected to the board. The board must finalize a zoning map before May 21.

District officials said each trustee area must have about one-seventh of the school district's total population in 2010, when the last Census was conducted. This would be about 15,132 residents.

Residents who spoke at the podium Wednesday agreed Plan C was the better choice of the three, but it still segregated parts of north and south Artesia that have histories of crime and poverty.

Artesia resident Osvaldo Palhinha argued that, since it is so small, Artesia should not be divided and should instead be placed into one district. The city had a population of 16,522 in 2010, according to U.S. Census, numbers.

He said that if the city is divided as proposed on the district maps, Artesia wouldn't have fair representation in some districts since much of their population is in the north and south areas of the city.
Former Assemblyman Tony Mendoza, of Artesia, agreed with Palhinha, adding that he believed it was important to keep Artesia intact and that the north and south sides shouldn't be segregated.

"Plan C is the only one that kind of keeps the city intact," he said. "But you're taking out two important areas from the city that have historically been discriminated against. I know that when you drew these lines, you may not have known the history of our city, but those areas are very important."

Jeanne Gobalet, the demographer who led the presentation, said those areas weren't intentionally segregated. She said the maps were divided that way to keep deviations low and precincts intact.

"I certainly am going to go back and see the implications of Artesia being a single trustee area," she said. "I don't remember the specific reasons why they were divided that way without my computer in front of me. There was no nefarious plot, I assure you."

Artesia Mayor Tony Lima said that if Artesia were to be kept undivided, it would allow a greater chance for representation.

Currently, all the board members live in Cerritos.

Attendee Howard Spitzer, who said he wasn’t from Artesia, argued that if Artesia were to be kept whole, there would be only one possible representative from Artesia. If it were to be divided, however, there could be more than one, he said.

Two more meetings are scheduled for today to get public input on the districting plan. The meetings are at 4 and 6 p.m. at Fedde Middle School, 21409 Elaine Ave., in Hawaiian Gardens.

Superintendent Mary Sieu said she expects the board to adopt a trustee area map and plan at the board meeting on May 6 at 7 p.m.

The first time voters will elect board members by district will be in November 2015.

Contact the writer: bwoolsey@lbregister.com or 562-277-8343
ANAHEIM – City taxpayers will pay $2.47 million worth of legal fees accumulated from a lawsuit that alleged Anaheim’s current election system shuts out Latinos and violates California’s Voting Rights Act.

Without discussion, the City Council agreed Tuesday to pay more than $1.22 million to cover the cost of attorneys representing the American Civil Liberties Union and three Anaheim residents who filed a lawsuit in June 2012 that called for moving the city to district elections.

Anaheim spent more than $1.25 million to defend itself in the case, which ended when both sides reached a settlement in January, according to city records.

The ACLU of Southern California could not be reached for comment.

Under the settlement, Anaheim voters will decide in November whether to adopt a measure that would require City Council candidates to be elected solely by those living in the districts they wish to represent. If adopted, the city would move to district elections by 2016, ending Anaheim’s longstanding process of electing five at-large members.

If the measure is defeated, then Anaheim will move to a hybrid of district and at-large elections that would require City Council candidates to live in the districts they want to represent, with voters across the city casting ballots for each seat, similar to the election system used in Santa Ana.

A second initiative in November will ask voters whether the City Council’s size should be expanded from four members to six, while maintaining a citywide election for mayor.

Latinos make up 53 percent of Anaheim’s population and 32 percent of the city’s voting-age residents, but the City Council’s current members are all white. Only a few Latinos have been elected to the council in the city’s 157-year history.
In a surprising turn of events Monday evening, the Beaumont Unified School District almost lost the opportunity to change its electoral system from an at-large system to a by-trustee area voted on only by residents who live in that geographic section of town.

The Riverside County Committee on School District Organization, under the auspices of the Riverside County Office of Education, held a meeting and public hearing on Monday, March 31, in the Beaumont board room to determine if Beaumont trustees had followed policy and qualified for the county’s May 31 deadline.

Only eight of the 11 committee members were present for Monday night’s meeting, during which they initially voted 5-3 against the proposal, then changed their mind within 10 minutes to a unanimous 8-0 decision.

The meeting, which lasted a little under an hour, was attended by Superintendent Maureen Latham and trustees Susie Lara, Margaret De Longchamp, Wayne Hackney, Janelle Poulter and David Sanchez, along with district staff.

The initial presentation was held at the Dec. 10, 2013 board meeting, during which attorney Todd Robbins explained the three ways elections can be held under the 2002 California Voting Rights Act.

They include: at-large, where all voters can vote for candidates of choice; a from-trustee area, where the trustee presides over the district where they live and all voters can still choose a candidate; a by-trustee area, where there are five separate areas like the above scenario, but only residents can vote for candidates in their geographic district.

The trustees adopted a resolution at the Jan. 7, 2014 meeting to change the electoral system. They also approved a waiver by a 3-2 vote that allows them to bypass having an election for the voters to decide whether they wanted to keep the at-large system.

The state approved that waiver in March, according to Robbins at Monday night’s meeting.

There is a November 2014 election in which Lara’s, Poulter’s and DeLongchamp’s seats are up for re-election.
The California Voting Rights Act says that school districts can avoid potentially costly lawsuits if districts remain in an at-large electoral system. The law prohibits at-large elections that may hinder the ability of a protected class of people to elect a candidate from their community.

Attorney Robbins told the committee that the trustee maps were introduced at the Dec. 10 meeting and made available to the public on Dec. 11. The three maps were considered, selected and voted on at the Jan. 7 meeting.

Committee member Cynthia Clark asked about the variance in the total population in regards to voting. Robbins said each trustee area has between 9,300 to 9,600 citizens.

Chairman Cleveland Johnson asked if the city council members were aligned with the school district’s point of view.

“What one political entity does has a ripple effect on another,” said Robbins.

Committee member Michell Skipworth asked the student population and how many schools are in the Beaumont Unified School District. Latham said Beaumont has 11 schools with about 9,000 students.”

Committee member Bill Newberry asked if the district had received community response.

“Most of the community aren’t aware of a significant difference because these school board members are in the same area,” Latham said.

The only public speaker at the meeting was resident Lloyd White.

White said he ran for school board two years ago and that, of the five candidates, three to four wouldn’t have been able to run with the new system because they lived in the same area as the incumbent.

White said he believed that the school board could wait to make a decision on the process and postpone it for another election other than this November.

He urged the committee to listen to the December and January meetings and then make their decision.

White also said that a political action committee has tried to influence the outcome by donating money to several of the board members. The group, Pass Area Families for Good Government, reportedly gave current board president DeLongchamp $10,000 and other board members received $4,000 to $5,000 in campaign contributions.

White said the group would only need to focus on one or two races.

“This is wrong on so many levels. We don’t need it here,” he said. “It’s going to bring politics into our city.”

DeLongchamp disputed White’s claim after the meeting and in an email sent to the Record Gazette on Wednesday. She said she has received $5,560 from the Pass Area Families for Good Government.

Chairman Johnson asked about the liability for the committee if they didn’t approve this electoral system.
Paul McGlocklin, an attorney who represents California school districts, said, “If you don’t do that, you may have some liability too,” he said. “Ultimately, the committee has the liability for the whole process.”

Committee member Wendy Jonathan asked if the committee could make time to listen to the school board meetings’ podcasts, table the matter and then come back in a month and make a decision.

McGlocklin said that normally, school districts have until mid-July to meet the Registrar of Voters deadline but this year, the deadline is May 31.

Chairman Johnson had concerns about delaying the decision.

“Personally, if the board has already adopted this, I wonder how the board is going to feel when they’ve already made the decision,” said Johnson.

Skipworth said it appeared that Beaumont trustees have followed the proper guidelines.

When it came time to vote, it was 5-3, which was not enough to pass the resolution.

The vote stunned Latham and the trustees, who were sitting in the audience.

Committee member Jonathan wanted to re-visit the issue.

“I think it’s important for us to hear what was said in that meeting,” she said.

McGlocklin said that Beaumont did everything legally and procedurally.

Attorney Robbins, who represents Beaumont, said that the comments made in January had nothing to do with the maps. He said that the board voted in favor of the re-districting and the waiver, which was approved by the State Board.

Within 10 minutes, the three dissenting votes changed to yes and the vote was a unanimous 8-0.

Robbins said afterward that he hasn’t seen a vote change like this in the years he has been doing this.

Latham said she was surprised by both decisions because she said that the board acted with complete integrity and met their obligation as a public school district. They also made sure that the voters are represented and that the voting rights of all citizens are protected.

“That would have put us in a jeopardized position of being challenged by any group that feels we are not meeting the tenets of the California Voting Rights Act,” she said.
Opinion

Dan Walters: New bill seeks to expand state’s voting rights act

By Dan Walters
dwalters@sacbee.com

April 7, 2014

The U.S. Supreme Court, by a 5-4 vote, struck down a portion of the federal Voting Rights Act last year, saying its 1960s-era provisions were no longer applicable to 21st-century conditions.

The invalidated section required voting changes in nine Southern states to receive pre-clearance from the federal courts or the U.S. Justice Department, including the redrawing of legislative, congressional and local government districts. But its rigid voting history formula also was applied elsewhere, including four counties in California.

The practical effect was that any changes of election procedures in those counties, as well as any statewide redistricting plan, had to be pre-cleared – which became a political factor in the Capitol’s decennial redistricting wrangle.

Those four rural counties – Kings, Merced, Monterey and Yuba – have large Latino populations.

All four also had, during the 1960s, large military installations with large contingents of nonvoting personnel, and it’s been well proven that those two factors created an arithmetic anomaly that subjected the four to the Voting Rights Act’s provisions while exempting other counties.

The oversight continued for decades – even after Latino voting rates increased and even after two bases, Castle Air Force Base in Merced and Fort Ord in Monterey, had closed. It took years, but Merced finally was granted an exemption and a few communities within Yuba County, home to Beale AFB, were as well.

The highly controversial Supreme Court decision ends that oversight and so far, efforts to restore the invalidated provision in Congress have failed.

However, state Sen. Alex Padilla, D-Los Angeles, wants to expand the California Voting Rights Act, enacted 13 years ago, to insert judges into drawing city council, county supervisor and other local voting districts.
Latino rights groups have employed California’s law to challenge the “at large” election of local government officials, without individual districts, contending that the system effectively disenfranchises non-white communities. In response, local officials have been drawing districts for their councils and boards.

Padilla’s Senate Bill 1365, if enacted, would allow courts to intervene in drawing a local district if it “impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election.”

The bill is a priority for the Legislature’s Latino Caucus, and its backers contend it would be a check on racial gerrymandering. It could also enhance Padilla’s campaign for secretary of state.

At the very least, however, it would complicate the already fractious and highly politicized redistricting of large cities and counties, such as the perpetual angst over crafting five supervisorial districts in Los Angeles County.

Glendale school board weighs
Sagebrush transfer

Board members cite support, raise questions over territory during public discussion.

April 16, 2014 | By Kelly Corrigan, kelly.corrigan@latimes.com

Reaction from Glendale school board members on transferring the Sagebrush territory to La Cañada Unified was mixed Tuesday night during the board’s first public discussion of the issue since 350 people attended a town-hall meeting last month and most of the speakers supported the move.

“At the end of the day, I think it’s the best move for all of us,” said school board member Greg Krikorian. “Far too many times, elected bodies bump heads.”

Board member Christine Walters lauded La Cañada city officials as well as school officials in both districts for creating a “democratic process” that has involved hearing input from residents at public meetings and entering into monthslong negotiations that has resulted, in part, in a six-year phase-in plan.

“To me, this is the model for how problems need to be solved,” Walters said, adding that the last time the issue surfaced between the two districts, it resulted in an “ugly” and “expensive” legal battle.

“It was fruitless in the end,” she said. “Having attorneys beating each other up over this is something I’m not interested in... I will be voting for the transfer. I have a lot of confidence that this is the right thing to do.”

Fifteen residents spoke Tuesday night, the majority were in favor of the transfer.

But not every school board member was confident in approving the transfer just yet.

“The problem with me and Sagebrush is very basically this,” said school board President Mary Boger. “You’re asking me to tell a whole group of people that their property taxes are going to go up and they’re going to pay a $400-a-year parcel tax, plus or minus, that they didn’t get to vote upon. I will be happy to say, ‘au revoir,’ to Sagebrush when I have had the opportunity to be presented with evidence that the majority of the registered voters of the Sagebrush territory are willing to assume that taxation.”

School board member Armina Gharpetian questioned the transfer’s effect on Mountain Avenue Elementary, wondering how it would cope with a potential enrollment dip.
“I would like to see — before we make any decisions — more of a plan for our schools, because that’s a priority to me,” Gharpetian said, and wondered how Glendale Unified would spend the millions of dollars La Cañada officials have proposed giving the district under negotiated terms of the transfer.

“At this point, I have not made up my mind. I still have questions... and to be honest with you, I think more of the La Crescenta families are not coming forward and expressing their views because they think this is a done deal and it’s not a done deal,” she said.

Tom Smith, who renewed the decadelong effort last year to fold Sagebrush into La Cañada Unified and was quick to gain support from La Cañada school and city officials alike, said he was proud of the progress both districts have made on the issue.

“I think when I first reinitiated this campaign to get this territory transfer completed, ‘assault’ is probably not too strong of a word by some of the people that came and expressed some of their concerns to me,” he said, adding that a lot of them were Mountain Avenue Elementary parents concerned over whether their students could still attend the school.

Glendale school officials have said they would allow parents to send their children to either district.

School board member Nayiri Nahabedian acknowledged that an “overwhelming majority” of people support the transfer.

“I’m taking that into consideration as well,” Nahabedian said. She added that should the transfer occur, she is confident that Glendale Unified would maintain Mountain Avenue as a successful school.

The Sagebrush issue will go before the Glendale school board again for discussion on May 6, said Glendale Unified Supt. Dick Sheehan.

If both districts support the transfer, school officials would need to file a request with the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, beginning a process in which county officials would review the transfer and potentially grant it.

If granted, the transfer could become official in July 2015, said Allison Deegan, a regionalized business services coordinator with the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

Follow Kelly Corrigan on Twitter: @kellymcorrigan.
After being ignored for nearly six decades the Grindstone Indian Rancheria, located in Glenn County, California, will receive its own representative on the Stony Creek Joint Unified School District Board of Education in Elk Creek, California. On February 25, 2014 the District adopted a tentative District map that includes a member designated to the Tribe on the School District’s Board of Education. As a result of a long in coming redistricting of the school district’s boundaries, which includes the Grindstone Rancheria, District boundary lines now include a district that encompasses the Tribe’s Rancheria, providing the Tribe and its membership its own representative.

Redistricting is the process whereby a school district’s representation boundaries are adjusted to reflect its population by the County Board of Education. Redistricting, as required by the California State Board of Education, requires that the School district boundaries be reviewed, at a minimum, every 10 years, in conjunction with the United States Census, to ensure that district members receive equal voting opportunities. The County Board of Education can implement recommendations to enlarge, and eliminate, boundaries to provide for equal voting opportunities. The California Voting Rights Act and established legal precedent, such as Thornberg v. Gringles 478 U.S. 30 (1986), also require that the redistricting not result in the disenfranchisement or dilution minority group voting rights.

Tribal Chairman, Ronald Kirk, who is very active with the two hundred plus member bands educational pursuits stated, “we have been here for thousands of years, you would have thought as we have represented a majority of the District’s population for many years, that our vote would be equal to everyone else’s. It’s a long time coming and we are very proud to have our own representative.” Rachel McBride, Executive Director of the Four Winds of Indian Education, a non-profit Indian education provider, who pushed for the redistricting commented, “the redistricting was for whatever reason an on again off again issue over the years. After meeting with District representatives and making them aware that legal counsel was looking into the matter, a revised map was adopted by the Board.”

Interestingly, the Tribe potentially may have two representatives on the Board as member Ken Swearinger, a Grindstone Tribal member, was elected at large before the redistricting and currently sits on the Board of Education and will not be districted out.
The Grindstone Indian Rancheria is located in Elk Creek, Glenn County, California. The Tribe’s Rancheria was placed in trust with the United States since the early 1900’s. Over one-hundred members live and work within the one-hundred acre Rancheria.

Jack Duran is affiliated with the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo of El Paso, Texas and is the owner of Duran Law Office, a Roseville, California, based Native American law firm. Jack can be reached at (916) 779-3316 or via email at duranlaw@yahoo.com.
The Simi Valley Unified School District board is moving forward with plans to change the way trustees are elected in an effort to stave off potential lawsuits from those who believe the current election format under-represents minorities.

School board trustees are elected at-large, which means those who get the most votes win the seats. In the upcoming November election, two seats will be open. If, for example, five people run for those two seats, the top two vote-getters will fill the spots on the board.

Scores of school districts and some city councils have been sued under the California Voting Rights Act by those who say the at-large format discriminates against under-represented groups. Most districts settle out of court, and those that have fought have lost, according to SVUSD attorney Robert Thurbon.

Thurbon told the board at its Tuesday night meeting that the City of Santa Clarita agreed to pay $600,000 in March to settle a lawsuit over electing its council members with at-large elections. Sulphur Springs School District in the Santa Clarita Valley also agreed to settle a similar suit last month.

Under threat of expensive lawsuits, school districts are now deciding whether to begin electing board members by district. In this format, someone running for a board seat must live in the district they would represent.

The board was presented with three plans for dividing Simi Valley into five districts by consultant Douglas Johnson, president of National Demographics Corp. Johnson said the plans were meant only to kick-start the discussion.

The plans primarily divided the districts by school attendance areas “as much as was possible,” according to Johnson.

Trustees Dan White and Arleigh Kidd said they wanted to make sure the public weighed in on determining the ultimate boundaries for the districts. White also asked that the three plans be posted on the district website for residents to see and comment on.

The board asked Johnson to return to its next board meeting with ideas on how to get the community involved in determining the trustee district boundaries. Trustees also indicated it may be too late to
have approved voting districts in place by the November election, when seats held by Kidd and Jeanne Davis are up for election. If so, the next trustee election will be in November 2016, when seats held by White, Rob Collins and Debbie Sandland will be contested.

Kidd and Davis asked Thurbon if the district would be safe from lawsuits if it doesn’t have the voting-by-district plan in place for the upcoming November elections.

Thurbon indicated the district could be sued but it would be showing progress toward rectifying its current at-large election format.

“I don’t know about safe,” Thurbon said, “but it reduces the possibility of becoming a target.”

In other business, the board agreed to put surplus property at the southwest corner of Blackstock and Los Angeles avenues to bid. The lot is about half an acre and will open for bid to the public May 5 and must be submitted to the board by 5 p.m. June 24. The minimum bid is $390,000. The board vote was 4-1 with Sandland dissenting.
Discontent lingers among Woodland City Council regarding map approved for district voting

By Elizabeth Kalfsbeek/ekalfsbeek@dailydemocrat.com
CREATED: 04/18/2014 12:30:55 AM PDT

The possibility of rethinking the map for district elections was shot down at Woodland's City Council this week.

In November last year the City Council selected its preferred map, one of the two that was developed by the Citizens Advisory Committee on City Council District Boundaries. In the map, Mayor Skip Davies, Vice Mayor Tom Stallard and Councilmen Jim Hilliard and Sean Denny all live in the same district, meaning they would run against one another if and when district-based voting is enacted.

Davies has already announced he is retiring after his second mayoral tour when his term is up in July.

During an update on the California Voting Rights Act and the timeline for submitting the ballot measure this November, Davies posed the question on whether to have staff bring back some map alternatives, using the same guidelines as the committee.

"It's a political issue. Everyone has interests and that's just the way it is," said Stallard, who voiced his support for a four-district map and a city-wide elected mayor, saying he feels it would be more "palatable" to voters to adopt the district election if it included city-wide elected mayor.

"I accept the fact that that may not be a position shared by all my colleagues. What is really important at the end of the day is that we acknowledge the law," Stallard added. "It's not enough for us to just put something on the ballot. If it's unsuccessful, it's like we did nothing. We're going to be in court."

Without considering the four districts and at-large mayor, Stallard said his default position is to stick with the map created by the committee.

"These are worms. They don't go easily into cans. As you push some in others start to pop out. ... I think, frankly, that it would be an exercise in wisdom for us to just stand where we are," he said.

Councilman Bill Marble said he didn't see the harm in looking at other options, so long as there was unanimity among the council, committee and minority groups.
"I think it's always better when a council is unanimous in a decision that's this far reaching," Marble said. "I think the fact that we've adopted a map already by council that our minority community found acceptable is an issue. Besides the council being in agreement it's important to me that the minority communities also feel this is an appropriate solution."

Hilliard and Denny both wanted to go for map alternatives. Hilliard said he doesn't "particularly like" a mayor voted at large, and thinks there needs to be five districts to allow for more diversity.

Davies, while he seemed to lean toward readdressing the map, said the council would not move forward with that plan unless it was a unanimous vote.

"It wasn't unanimous on that map," said Denny, referring to the committee's map. "I don't understand why we can't look at anything else. What's wrong with staff looking at other options? I'm totally against this process. I thought I'd be open to seeing that people would look at it in an objective way but it's all about manipulation, so. I'm not for it at all."

At a December meeting the City Council voted to postpone the ballot measure to transition to "by district" elections to November 2014.

"This decision was informed, in part, by the council's desire to conduct the at-large council election in June of 2014 -- and thereby allow for a ballot measure seeking renewal of the city's expiring quarter-cent sales tax to appear on the same June ballot -- as well as a sentiment that the Council-District ballot measure could benefit from the higher voter-turnout typically associated with the November general election," according to the staff report.

The cost of conducting this election is estimated to be around $35,000. Staff is already providing for costs associated with the planned November election in its development of the fiscal year 2014-15 budget.

Follow Elizabeth Kalfsbeek at twitter.com/woodlandbeat
A bill that would require some cities, including Santa Clarita, to change their election systems to ones that are district-based has been introduced in the state Assembly and is scheduled for a committee hearing this week, officials said Monday.

Assembly Bill 2715, which was introduced by Assemblyman Roger Hernandez, D-West Covina, would require cities with a population of 100,000 or more to adopt “by district” election systems, in which residents in each district would elect a representative to serve that district.

Under the city’s current at-large election system, all voters in Santa Clarita are eligible to cast votes for each seat that’s up for grabs in a particular election.

“In certain communities, the voice of the electorate has been watered down, limiting the power of significant populations,” Hernandez, the bill sponsor, said in a statement.

“Through the passage of this bill, residents in these communities are guaranteed their representative rights under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

“A representative government, which reflects the electorate and promotes the will of the people, is the intended goal of this legislation,” he said.

The bill is set for a hearing Tuesday in front of the Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee, according to city Intergovernmental Relations Officer Michael Murphy.

The Santa Clarita City Council is expected to take a stand on the matter that same day. The city’s position is strictly advisory, since the decision is in the hands of the state Legislature.

One of the concerns with the bill, Murphy said, is its impact on local control.

“Under existing law, general-law cities in California can decide if they want to have at-large voting, like we do here in Santa Clarita, or they can have elections by district, which you see in (some) other cities,” Murphy said Monday.
“And it gives that city council and the community the opportunity to figure out what election system works best for them.

“This proposed bill would take away the various alternatives and it would tell cities, ‘Here’s what you have to do,’” he said.

Murphy also said there are questions about the cost of the bill and how it would be implemented.

“There’s a whole litany of questions that go unanswered here,” he said.

Assemblyman Scott Wilk, R-Santa Clarita, also said he has concerns about the bill’s impact on local control.

“If you want to have election reform, what you probably want to be doing is tightening the language under the California Voting Rights Act so cities know what they have to do so they don’t get sued,” Wilk said Monday.

The election system in Santa Clarita was the subject of a lawsuit alleging violations of the California Voting Rights Act. Plaintiffs claimed that electing council members at large prevented Latino voters from electing candidates of their choice.

A settlement agreement on that lawsuit was announced in March. As a result, the city agreed to change Santa Clarita City Council election dates from April to November of even-numbered years and to pursue a cumulative voting method, which would allow voters to vote multiple times for a single candidate, with the number limited by the number of seats up for election that particular year.

If enacted, the provisions of AB 2715 would become operative on July 1, 2015.

Lmoney@signalscv.com
661-287-5525
On Twitter @LukeMMoney
Turlock weighs hiring consultant to propose district boundaries

By John Holland jholland@modbee.com

April 21, 2014

TURLOCK — The City Council will talk Tuesday about switching to district elections, an issue that incurred a $3 million legal bill for Modesto a few years back.

Turlock is among the many entities around the state that are looking to change from at-large elections, which critics say do not provide enough representation to Latinos.

Tuesday night, the council will consider having a consultant draw proposed district boundaries, which could return for discussion next month. The final map could go before voters in November and would take effect with ensuing council elections.

The process could cost up to $60,000, City Manager Roy Wasden said last month.

Turlock would be the second city in Stanislaus County to go to districts. The first was Modesto, which did so in 2008 after a legal battle that went to the U.S. Supreme Court and ended with a $3 million settlement with attorneys for the three Latino residents who had sued.

Modesto had argued that the California Voting Rights Act of 2002, which the plaintiffs used to push for districts, was unconstitutional because it appeared to give preference to certain races. The high court declined in 2007 to hear the city’s petition. The next year, Modesto voters approved a ballot measure that phased out the at-large system.

A little of this history is in a slide presentation by National Demographics Corp., a Glendale-based firm that is advising Turlock on district elections. It was shown at four lightly attended meetings around town last month.

The firm noted that 41 of California’s 482 cities have adopted districts, as have about 120 governing bodies for schools, water and other services. Four other Stanislaus County cities — Ceres, Riverbank, Newman and Waterford — are considering districts. The Turlock Unified School District, which takes in large expanses of farmland as well as the city of Turlock, has switched.
In most cities, district elections mean that the residents of one part of town vote only for candidates from that same area. A few allow voters citywide to choose someone in each district. The mayor continues to represent the whole city, whether elected by voters or appointed by the council.

“Every city has different history, people, neighborhoods and issues,” according to part of the slide presentation. “There is no one right answer that any can provide. Experts can provide context and information but, ultimately, it is the community that must decide what is right for itself.”

The firm noted that 36 percent of Turlock’s residents are Latino, according to the 2010 census. In the November 2012 election, they made up 25 percent of the registered voters and 21 percent of the turnout.

The firm said that for California, in general, a switch to district elections has led to an increasing number of Latino elected officials, but fewer black officials. It also said districts tend to reduce campaign costs and bring more neighborhood issues before city councils.

Tuesday’s agenda includes discussion of a proposed sales tax increase for city road projects, which also could be placed on the November ballot at a later meeting. The idea of a city-only increase has returned now that a countywide proposal for half a percentage point has fallen through.

Bee staff writer John Holland can be reached at jholland@modbee.com or (209) 578-2385.
For a couple of moms from working-class families hoping to retain their seats on the Centinela Valley school board, it was a stark lesson in machine politics.

In a small room at the Proud Bird restaurant near LAX, a group of maybe 15 had gathered to support board members Sandra Suarez and Gloria Ramos. Nearly everyone sharing finger foods that day was connected to a community development corporation called TELACU, which bills itself as the fifth largest Latino-owned business in California.

There were architects, lawyers, consultants. And high-powered figures from TELACU itself. Everyone in attendance wrote out two checks for $99 — the highest amount that can go unreported in campaign filings — one for Suarez, one for Ramos.

Donors included President and CEO David Lizarraga, who at the time was chairman of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and has since been appointed by President Barack Obama to a key administrative post in the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Also included was John Clem, the TELACU executive who heads up all the construction projects in the Centinela district, as well as the wives of both men.

All for two women in a tiny district that oversees just three comprehensive high schools in Lawndale and Hawthorne.
“It was kind of odd,” Suarez said. “They were giving us money — I’m not used to any of that. ... To tell you the truth, I didn’t even realize they were giving for us at first.”

The event was a window into the political machine that has been picking leaders in the tiny district since 2008. In the two past contested elections, TELACU has poured large amounts of money into campaigns to elect their favored candidates who almost always win.

TELACU won, too. Since 2008, the TELACU-backed Centinela Valley school board has put two construction bond measures on the ballot totaling nearly $200 million. Voters approved both, and TELACU was awarded contracts to manage the construction projects.

Clem, president of TELACU Construction Management, did not return calls from the Daily Breeze on Tuesday and Wednesday. But Centinela Valley officials have pointed out that as a result of the two successful bond measures — one in 2008, another in 2010 — major face-lifts have occurred or are in the pipeline for all three campuses. The projects have replaced old, sometimes crumbling facilities with state-of-the-art classroom wings, media centers, offices and commons areas.

Critics, on the other hand, say the whole thing smacks of a money grab for the interested parties at the expense of the taxpayers.

“The problem with Centinela Valley, and so many school districts and community colleges, is that they have become bond-passing machines that milk the public to pay for lavish construction projects, outrageous salaries and terrible loans,” said Mariano Vasquez, the plaintiff in a lawsuit opposing a recently passed parcel tax floated by Centinela Valley and four feeder elementary school districts. “This causes a very harmful misallocation of scarce resources and capital that slowly brings ruin to the town.”

In recent weeks, Superintendent Jose Fernandez — who took the helm roughly at the same time that TELACU began exerting its influence in Centinela — has said publicly that the district intends to try for a third construction bond. This announcement came just days before a Feb. 9 story in the Daily Breeze revealed that Fernandez amassed more than $663,000 in total compensation last year. At least $215,000 of that came from a one-time expense, but Fernandez — in exercising another generous provision of his contract — also has taken a $910,000 loan from the school district to purchase a home in Ladera Heights. He has 40 years to pay it off, at 2 percent interest — an unusually favorable set of terms.

UNUSUAL DONATIONS

TELACU first demonstrated its ability to influence the outcomes of Centinela Valley school board elections in 2009. The company donated $28,000 to a political action committee called Citizens for Better Schools, according to campaign finance reports obtained from the Los Angeles County
Register-Recorder's Office. Citizens For Better Schools, in turn, dished out $55,000 to purchase mailers and other promotional materials touting three candidates: Rocio Pizano, Hugo Rojas and Maritza Molina.

(By comparison, Pizano’s election committee raised $5,000, according to the documents. Rojas and Molina apparently raised no money.)

Pizano was an incumbent. But Rojas, a karate instructor and former Hawthorne school board member with at least two DUIs on his record — and Molina — then a 23-year-old recent college graduate — ousted two incumbents with education credentials. One of them, Rudy Salas, is the principal at Hawthorne Middle School. The other, Frank Talavera, is an educator who at the time was teaching at Gardena High School. Both opposed an effort to put a bond measure on the ballot in 2008.

Sources say those two board members were controversial as well and had a vindictive streak. Salas declined to be interviewed; Talavera couldn’t be reached.

In his ballot statement that year, Talavera wrote that his experience “will help me guide the district in a more positive direction where students are the PRIORITY and not buildings or superficial fix-ups.”

TELACU’s preferred candidates were triumphant. In December 2009 — a month after the election — the new school board unanimously approved Fernandez’s generous employment contract. Not long after, the board voted to put another $98 million bond measure on the ballot. In November 2010, the voting public gave its assent.

The initiative raised eyebrows on the Lawndale City Council.

“I think it’s outrageous they do this in low-income communities,” Councilman Larry Rudolph said. “What are we getting for it? I don’t see anything except for these big fancy buildings. I don’t see how they are going to make the kids any smarter.”

Rudolph added that in his own elections, he does not accept campaign contributions. “I wouldn’t want to be in debt to anybody,” he said. “I don’t have to do anything but vote my conscience.”

Although it is common for big construction companies to make financial contributions for the passage of bond measures, it is rare for them to put up money for individual school board candidates — at least in the South Bay.

“In our case, I doubt anybody got a dime,” said Jane Diehl, a former longtime school board member in the Redondo Beach Unified School District. Diehl was on the board when voters in the district approved a $145 million construction bond measure in 2008. That project has been managed by the company Balfour Beatty.
“Most of the school board elections in Redondo are pretty sparse,” she added, saying candidates there generally raise around $8,000. “If you want to win, you gotta walk” and knock on doors.

Mark Steffen, president of the Torrance school board, said he believes the same is true in Torrance Unified, where voters approved a $355 million pair of bond measures in 2008.

Balfour Beatty manages those projects as well.

“They’ve never offered, nor have I sought out dollars from them,” Steffen said.

In the Centinela Valley school district — which oversees Lawndale, Leuzinger and Hawthorne high schools — TELACU hasn’t been the only heavy contributor to election campaigns.

In 2011, the investment firm Piper Jaffray of Minneapolis contributed $25,000 to Citizens for Better Schools, donating much of that to TELACU’s favored candidates. The two firms have combined forces elsewhere in support of school bond measures, including a 2010 bid in Claremont. Piper Jaffray contributed $25,000 to that campaign, and TELACU $20,000.

Also contributing to Centinela’s 2010 effort to get a construction bond measure passed were law firms such as Dannis, Woliver, Kelley — which has a lucrative contract with the school district. (It donated $7,500.) Another law firm gave $5,000.

**CHANGING SUPPORT**

The event at the Proud Bird back in the summer of 2010 was a campaign fundraiser for the 2011 school board race. It was early in the game, and things wound up taking an unexpected twist — both Suarez and Ramos fell out of favor.

It so happens that Suarez is big on historic preservation. When it came to her attention that the bond measure called for knocking down much of Leuzinger High, she began to have doubts. By October 2010 — a few months after the fundraiser — she was fully opposed, and speaking out publicly.

It’s less clear why the construction company ended its support of Ramos. But she — unlike the other three members — was generally known for occasionally voicing dissent on district matters.

In any event, Citizens for Better Schools found two new candidates to support: banking executive Lorena Gonzalez, who was challenging Suarez; and Ugo Felizzola II, a 24-year-old financial analyst who was trying to unseat Ramos.

This time, the political action committee spent $82,000 on its campaign favoring those candidates. Once again, TELACU made a sizable donation; records show it contributed at least $10,000. (This was the race in which Piper Jaffray pitched in $25,000.)
Because none of that money went to the candidates directly, they did not have to report the support. The committee spent at least $26,486 on each candidate. The money paid for slate mailers, door hangers, brochures and campaign signs, among other things, according to documents.

A political consultant closely aligned with TELACU met with leaders of the teachers union to request that they endorse the two political newcomers. The union declined, opting instead to endorse nobody.

The effort to oust Suarez was a success; Ramos managed to eke out a victory over the young Felizzola.

Suarez says that prior to the election, Fernandez sometimes took her and other board members to fancy restaurants such as Houston’s in Manhattan Beach. The tab, she said, was often picked up by a law firm or by TELACU.

She later took her husband to Houston’s, not knowing the prices.

“When we looked at the menu, we realized what they were, and we looked at each other,” she said.

They ordered an appetizer, ate it quickly and left.
The Los Angeles County district attorney’s Public Integrity Division has received several complaints regarding Centinela Valley schools Superintendent Jose Fernandez, spokeswoman Jane Robison confirmed Thursday.

The complaints have come in recent weeks, after it was revealed Feb. 9 that Fernandez received $663,000 in total compensation last year.

Robison would not elaborate on the complaints nor say whether the District Attorney’s Office is conducting an investigation.

Hawthorne and Lawndale residents are growing increasingly angry with Fernandez and the Centinela Valley school board that granted him the lucrative contract. Though many residents had not heard of the contract a few weeks ago, more than 100 parents, residents and teachers lashed out Tuesday night at district leaders during a school board meeting.

Board member Hugo Rojas responded that he was not aware that he had approved such a large compensation package for Fernandez, who has been at the helm of the district since late 2008.

Many people voiced their outrage at the meeting.

“I propose that there be a special recall election for this whole board, and a criminal investigation into your breach of your fiduciary responsibilities,” said one man, prompting cheers.
Rojas was among four of the five current board members who unanimously approved Fernandez’s employment contract in late 2009. The contract includes a bevy of perks and benefits that added nearly $400,000 to his base salary of $271,000 in calendar year 2013. Although $215,000 of that came from a one-time expense, the contract grants Fernandez a 9 percent raise annually.

Centinela is made up of just three high schools — Lawndale, Leuzinger and Hawthorne — but Fernandez’s compensation in 2013 more than doubled his peers in larger South Bay districts and was much larger even than that of Los Angeles Unified School District Superintendent John Deasy. LAUSD serves nearly 100 times as many students as Centinela Valley — 650,000 compared to 6,600.

The district also gave Fernandez a $\textit{910,000 low-interest loan} in 2012 to buy a Ladera Heights home, even though he was in the middle of his second bankruptcy.
Centinela Valley schools lag in academic performance despite paying superintendent $663K

By Rob Kuznia
POSTED: 03/07/14

The tiny Centinela Valley Union High School District employs one of the most expensive superintendents in the state of California, if not the nation.

And the district is spending nearly $200 million to provide state-of-the-art facilities at the three high schools it serves: Lawndale, Leuzinger and Hawthorne.

But the district’s test scores — while on the rise — remain the lowest among all 80 school districts in Los Angeles County. Its dropout rate — while improving — now sits at 24 percent according to the latest available figures from the state. This means about one out of every four students who starts ninth grade in the district stops attending school before graduating. The countywide average dropout rate for high schools is 15 percent. At the Los Angeles Unified School District, it’s 20 percent.

Still, the story of Centinela Valley’s academic progress is multifaceted. In summary, the district, under the leadership of Jose Fernandez — whose total compensation ballooned from $286,000 in 2010 to $663,000 last year — has made some academic strides, though not enough to lift the district out of the basement on many measures.

Fernandez, who took the helm in 2008, did not respond to a request for comment. But under his watch, the district has made gains on test scores, graduation rates, college readiness, attendance, the performance of English learners and the number of students taking Advanced Placement courses, among other things.

It also has launched several academies — schools within schools — designed to spark student interest in careers such as engineering, marine science, criminal justice, environment and culinary arts. Last year, it was recognized by the state for linking coursework to career pathways.
Hawthorne High recently became the only high school in the South Bay or Harbor Area to offer a curriculum called International Baccalaureate, an accelerated program that rivals Advanced Placement and whose most successful graduates can enter college as sophomores.

Although controversial, the new facilities bankrolled by two voter-approved bond measures have been a boon to a population of students whose level of poverty can be staggering. Teachers union President Jack Foreman says students at Hawthorne High use the brand-new media center as a place to study until 8 p.m., in many cases because it beats trying to do homework in cramped apartments.

“Half of these kids are living in very unstable homes — crazy living situations,” he said. “There were two brothers last year who told me, ‘We’re back living behind the tattoo parlor.’ ”

The Lennox apartment of a family he visited was even more discouraging, Foreman said.

“It was worse than things I’ve seen in Third World countries,” he said. “You walk in and there’s some little tiny kitchen like in the hallway. ... No central room to sit, it was dark. Oh, God — just run down. A lot of our kids are coming from places like this.”

**TEST SCORE STRUGGLES**

Although the district’s test scores have risen in five years, they remain a sore subject. The district’s 2013 Academic Performance Index score — a number from 200 to 1,000 assigned to schools every fall based on the performance of students on a handful of springtime tests — rose from 626 when Fernandez first arrived to 680 last year.

And yet, the 680 figure is not only the lowest districtwide score in Los Angeles County, it’s 19 points below the next lowest-scoring district, Compton Unified. In fact, Centinela Valley’s API score has been the lowest of all 80 districts since at least 2009, with the exception of 2012, when it crept up to 78th before dropping back to last, according to the California Department of Education.

(The county technically serves 81 districts, but the lowest performing of them — the Los Angeles County Office of Education — isn’t considered a regular school district as it caters to high-risk students: juvenile offenders, pupils with disabilities and potential dropouts.)

In fairness, educators say high school districts are at an inherent disadvantage when it comes to API scores because elementary students generally perform better on tests than older students.

“I would strongly argue that the L.A. County ranking is way too simplistic and definitely does not provide a fair and accurate picture of CV’s academic situation,” said John Schwada, a public relations consultant hired in late February by the district, about three weeks after the Daily Breeze published the initial story about Fernandez’s compensation. “The L.A. County ranking compares apples and oranges.”
Even so, there are five high school districts in Los Angeles County, and Centinela Valley currently ranks last among them. And of the 67 high school districts across California with a 2013 API score, Centinela Valley ranks 65th, ahead of King City and Upper Lake. (A handful of high school districts had no score.)

Schwada also noted that Lawndale High School’s scores fall in the top 50 percent when held against individual schools across the state with similar demographics. Hawthorne High falls in the top 40 percent among like high schools; Leuzinger, the bottom 40 percent.

He also pointed out that, although the district’s dropout rate as a whole is higher than LAUSD’s, the corresponding figure for individual schools paints a more favorable picture. Lawndale High’s dropout rate of 5.6 percent is better than nearly 60 percent of all high schools in Los Angeles County. He also noted that Hawthorne High’s rate of 18.6 percent is better than 21 percent of the county’s high schools, including Gardena High.

In any event, Allan Mucerino, who in the fall of 2012 became the district’s assistant superintendent of educational services, said the district’s overall API ranking among school districts in Los Angeles County is all the more reason to redouble efforts to improve further.

“I don’t want to make excuses,” he said. “I think that’s just a message that we need to continue to improve and do better. It’s why I’ve chosen to work here, because there is a lot of room for growth and work to be done, and, as a result of that, the rewards are that much greater.”

Foreman is adamant that schools in Centinela Valley have improved significantly over the past four years.

“Leuzinger (High) is a transformed school,” he said. “I mean, that place was a hell-hole before.”

The most easily recognizable change at that school at 4118 Rosecrans Ave., in Lawndale, is the campus itself. Bankrolled by funds from a pair of voter-approved construction bonds worth a combined $196 million, the district replaced half of Leuzinger’s 80-year-old campus with a state-of-the art wing of classrooms.

Educators say discipline problems there are way down as well. And Leuzinger is no longer at the bottom of the heap on test scores.

Some, however, attribute the school’s aberrant API score spike of 56 points in a single year in 2011-12 to a corresponding sudden near quadrupling of the student population at the nearby Lloyd Continuation School, reportedly to ensure that the tests of poor-performing students would not take be reflected in Leuzinger’s scores.
“A lot of the API score comes from the 10th grade CAHSEE score,” said a district employee who asked not to be named for fear of reprisal, referring to the California High School Exit Exam. “There was a big sweep of 10th-graders sent to Lloyde. Those kids should not have been sent.”

Mucerino — who was not in Centinela Valley at the time — says while he has heard the same accusation, he believes the number of students short on credits was just unusually large that year. However, the following year, enrollment at the continuation school dropped closer to normal, and Leuzinger’s test scores plunged by 25 points.

Despite Centinela Valley’s academic struggles, plenty of the district’s students do go on to thrive after high school.

Genesis Gutierrez, the 2013 valedictorian at Lawndale High School, earned a full-ride scholarship to Cal State Long Beach, where she is already on pace to graduate early. Four of the other top students all went to either Brown University, UC Santa Barbara or UCLA.

“I loved the teachers, they were amazing,” she said. But she added: “It was just very sad that at Lawndale High School, sometimes we would have textbooks that were outdated, mismatched, tearing, ripping, etcetera.”

She lamented that students had to procure their own novels for English class, and the science labs — due to the massive construction under way — were held in bungalow classrooms.

“We had to share goggles and lab aprons,” she said. “It’s not the teachers’ fault by any means, it’s just that there wasn’t the funding.”
Centinela Valley school district spends more than double the state average on administration

By Rebecca Kimitch

POSTED: 03/14/14

The same school district that made Jose Fernandez perhaps the most highly compensated superintendent in California last year also spends two-and-a-half times the state average on its administration as a whole.

The Centinela Valley Union High School District spent an average of $1,150 per student on districtwide administrative costs in the 2011-12 school year, the latest year for which such data is available, according to the California Department of Education. California school districts spent an average of $468 per student in 2011-12.

Centinela’s administrative spending figure was the second highest among the more than 80 school districts in Los Angeles County, following the single-school Gorman Elementary School District.

The four previous school years show similarly high administrative spending at Centinela, according to the Department of Education. The figures are for districtwide spending only and do not include the administration at individual high schools.

But what is driving the spending isn’t exactly clear.

Of the $6.9 million that Centinela spent on district administration in 2011-12, a little more than half was for salaries and benefits. The rest went toward legal fees, consulting services, travel and conferences as well as other “services and operating expenditures.”

Ron Hacker, assistant superintendent of business services, said spending on financial consultants and legal fees is largely responsible for the higher spending, although he could not provide specific
figures. The Daily Breeze requested information regarding Centinela’s attorneys’ fees three weeks ago and is still awaiting a response.

“We are working hard to reduce legal and those other expenditures,” Hacker said.

Centinela Valley has been under fire since it was revealed in a Daily Breeze report on Feb. 9 that Superintendent Jose Fernandez received $663,000 in total compensation last year. As a result of the criticism, Fernandez announced at a school board meeting Tuesday that he would voluntarily cut several perks from his salary through the end of the fiscal year, resulting in a salary of $295,000.

Despite that announcement, a steady stream of parents, students and residents blasted school board members about Fernandez’s contract for more than two hours at the board meeting. They also criticized board members for giving Fernandez a $910,000 low-interest home loan in 2012, even though he was in the middle of his second bankruptcy.”

“You should all be ashamed of yourselves. There is no justification for the reckless spending. The damage has been done. There is only one solution — Mr. Fernandez needs to resign immediately. ... The school board members, you also need to resign,” Hawthorne resident Regina Dinnell told the board, echoing the sentiments of many members of the public.

Some of those who attended the meeting also questioned how much other administrators make and asked why the district isn’t spending more on books and students.

Hacker and other district officials said that while spending on districtwide administration might be higher than average, spending on instruction is slightly above average as well.

In 2011-12, the district spent $5,615 per student on instruction. The state average was $5,475.

Spending also was slightly above average on instruction-related services, which included expenses for the technical and logistical support for teachers such as research and staff development ($1,189 at Centinela and $1,029 statewide), pupil services ($851 at Centinela and $687 statewide) as well as books and supplies ($366 at Centinela and $340 statewide).

“It would (be) false and unfair ... to conclude or imply that because of its administrative costs Centinela Valley is shortchanging students. ... The big picture reveals that Centinela Valley has the right spending priorities. Its focus is on students,” said John Schwada, a public relations consultant hired by the district in late February for a fee of $175 an hour. Schwada’s contract cannot exceed $24,000.

Teachers Union President Jack Foreman disagreed with the district notion that high spending on administration is acceptable if matched by above-average spending on instruction.
“That is the stupidest thing I have ever heard in my life,” he said. “It has come out in the Breeze’s own articles that we are a very high-needs community. We need above-average spending to improve the education for these kids we are serving. So if our test scores and social problems and our high-needs students are not adequately being met, that funding should go toward filling that gap, not toward administration.”

The district’s test scores — while on the rise — remain the lowest among all 80 school districts in Los Angeles County. Its dropout rate — while improving — now sits at 24 percent, according to the latest available figures from the state.

About 72 percent of students at Centinela qualify for free/reduced lunch and about 24 percent of students at Centinela are considered English language learners. Hacker and Schwada pointed to these figures as one reason Centinela’s administrative spending is so high.

“There are costs associated with having a lot of students from a community with a lot of poverty,” Hacker said.

For example, the district covers the cost of insurance for students participating in organized sports — a cost that might be paid by parents in more affluent districts, he said.

Hacker also said the smaller size of the district, which serves about 6,600 students, contributes to higher administrative spending.

“There are efficiencies of scale in everything,” he said.

Still, Centinela spends twice as much on district administration as similar-size districts with similar-size populations of English language learners and students who qualify for free or reduced lunch.

Medium-size school districts — those with 3,000 to 10,000 students — that have a similar number of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch (70 to 80 percent) spent, on average, $550 on district administration, still less than half what Centinela spent. Likewise, medium-size districts with a similar number of English language learners students (20 to 30 percent) spent, on average, $547.

Administrative costs are also typically higher for high school districts, according to experts. Still, among 80 high school districts in the state, only eight had higher administrative spending than Centinela.

And while most high school districts direct 6 percent of their budgets to district administration, Centinela directed 11 percent of its budget toward administration.

Foreman said the district spends too much on consultants and lawyers for functions that could be done by district staffers.
“Even this public-relations guy, that is crazy, too. We’re spending $24,000 on him. This is a school system — that is money that needs to go primarily to the classroom,” he said.

Hacker said the district two years ago was still paying for outside consultants to help it through a fiscal crisis it faced in 2008 and had unusually high-legal expenses due to “protracted legal battles.” Spending on both has been reduced this year, he said.

The district was on the brink of bankruptcy in 2008 and, with nearly $1 million in deficit spending, the Los Angeles County Office of Education stepped in to manage the district’s finances.

“In (20)11-12, we were still on the tail end of a fiscal crisis. We were no longer under county control, but we had outside people helping us get our house in order,” Hacker said. “We have weaned ourselves off those.

“We are making concerted efforts to reduce our legal — we inherited some things and some long, protracted battles that we had to get through. We are past a lot of that. We are not the same district we were two years ago.”

The district also has worked to reduce its workers’ compensation claims in an effort to reduce the cost of its workers’ compensation insurance, Hacker said. It was recently honored by the Alliance of Schools for Cooperative Insurance Programs for these efforts.

Foreman and Hacker both said districtwide staffing levels are appropriate.

“I see no evidence that they were overstaffed,” Foreman said. “Especially during those financial crisis years — they had very thin staff in that building.”

Centinela is made up of just three high schools — Lawndale, Leuzinger and Hawthorne — but Fernandez’s compensation in 2013 more than doubled his peers in larger South Bay districts and was larger than even Los Angeles Unified School District Superintendent John Deasy.

Salaries of three Centinela assistant superintendents are closer to those of nearby and similarly sized districts. Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources Bob Cox and Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services Allan Mucerino and Hacker have base salaries of $152,625.

By comparison, the Culver City Unified School District, which is similar in size, the base salary of assistant superintendents ranges from $113,579 to $132,875, according to its salary schedule.

At El Monte Union High School District, which is demographically similar to Centinela but has a slightly larger student population, assistant superintendents’ base salary ranges from $126,664 to $133,497, according to its salary schedule. And, at nearby El Segundo Unified, assistant superintendents’ base salary ranges from $124,950 to $139,944.

None of the figures includes longevity pay.
Centinela assistant superintendents receive a longevity salary increase of 3 percent at five, 10, 15, 20 and 25 years. They also receive pay raises when either certified or contract employees do. And they receive a $600 monthly car allowance, a $200 monthly cellphone allowance, health benefits and life insurance, according to Hacker’s contract.

Hacker’s total 2013 compensation was $163,474, Cox’s was $162,225 and Mucerino’s was $164,938, according to the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

Their work year is 240 days — 25 days more than Fernandez’s work year — and they receive 24 days of paid vacation.

In addition, various directors in Centinela’s district administration start at a base salary of $98,898, which grows to $121,914 after 3.5 years.
Superintendent's pay in South Bay district called 'excessive' 

The superintendent of the small Centinela Valley Union High School District, Jose Fernandez, made $674,559 last year, far more than the New York and Los Angeles school district heads.

By Howard Blume

March 31, 2014

New York City Chancellor Carmen Farina oversees more than a million students, 1,700 schools and a budget the size of many states. Her pay: $412,193.

Los Angeles Unified Supt. John Deasy has half a million students, 1,000-plus schools, a $7-billion budget — and made $393,106 last year.

Supt. Jose Fernandez's South Bay school district has just 6,600 students, five high schools and a $70-million budget.

His earnings: $674,559 last year.

"I don't know of anybody, in any major city, who makes anything close to that, even with extra bonuses or compensation," said Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of the Great City Schools, based in Washington.

California Supt. of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson called Fernandez's compensation package at Centinela Valley Union High School District "wrong, significantly excessive, unreasonable."

After his pay came to light in articles in the Daily Breeze, Fernandez voluntarily surrendered some perks, including the balance of his annual raise; he did not provide specifics.

He defended his contract, saying that it was an emergency arrangement that offered a high payoff in exchange for high risk.

"This district was going 80 miles an hour straight into a brick wall, and I had to get into that car," Fernandez said. "This thing could have gone south in six months," doing serious harm to his professional reputation.
Some residents agree that Fernandez has done a good job, gradually improving the district — covering the working-class communities of Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox — which was on the brink of financial disaster several years ago.

"Everything looks like it is improving little by little," said parent Patricia Rivera. But she was also taken aback by the size of his salary.

"Some parents are really upset," she added, wondering why they are paying him money that could be used to pay for things that are needed at the schools.

Here's how Fernandez made $674,559 in 2013:

His contract provided a base salary of $281,331 and a cost-of-living adjustment of $4,205. An automatic annual 9% raise added $25,698.

The district gave him $230,213 to purchase more seniority in state retirement systems so he would receive a higher annual pension.

The balance of his pay came from a variety of perks, including $12,000 for expenses; a $2,500 bonus for his master's degree, $7,200 for his auto expenses and $2,400 for his cellphone bill. The district also covers his share of pension payroll deductions, about $18,000 a year.

He's also compensated when he doesn't use his full 30 days of paid vacation, which brought him an extra $37,850 last year. And he's paid extra for each day of work beyond the 215 stipulated in his contract, adding up to $52,991.

From 2010 through 2012 he also did well — and progressively better — making $310,965, $382,370 and $407,786 respectively, according to district records Fernandez provided after a California Public Records Act request.

Fernandez, 54, also has a $1-million whole life insurance policy and a 40-year housing loan fixed at 2%, which he used to buy a $910,000 home in Ladera Heights.

He cited the home purchase as an example of how he has been relatively restrained in using some perks in his contract, which would have allowed for a larger loan to purchase a home in a more expensive area.

"I could have gone to Brentwood or Malibu if I wanted to abuse something," Fernandez said.

Fernandez said he based his contract on models from professional associations. "Some of the things may be a little higher in pay, but it's not unusual," he said.

The contract also offers job security. To dismiss the superintendent requires a vote of four of the five board members. He's entitled to as much as 18 months' severance as long as he's not fired for misconduct.
Centinela school board members hired Fernandez in 2008 when the district — made up of three high schools and two small alternative programs — was veering toward bankruptcy.

The district was laying off employees because of poor financial management, according to both the district and the teachers union.

Fernandez, a Centinela graduate, had previously been replaced as chief business officer, not long after he warned officials about the system's perilous finances.

School board President Maritza R. Molina, who joined the panel after Fernandez was hired, said he was brought back because of his honest assessment of the budget — and also because of his commitment and long experience in the school system.

Fernandez's background did not suggest that he could necessarily solve the district's financial woes. He declared bankruptcy twice in the decade before becoming schools chief: once in the wake of a divorce; the second time after the failure of a business he ran with his second wife.

But Fernandez had broad government experience for an educator. He served on the Inglewood City Council for 14 years and a local water board for three.

By multiple accounts, he has helped turn around the district.

Fernandez said in an interview that he has renegotiated debts and helped promote two successful local school bond measures as well as a parcel tax.

On a recent day, Fernandez drove the short distance from his office to each campus. He donned a hard hat to show how new construction is reshaping the school system, noting that he took down fences to make campuses look "more like community colleges than prisons."

The new library at Hawthorne High is his prototype media center, with no books but rows of computers with access to electronic collections. It stays open until 8 p.m. All the schools also will have new science labs, allowing them to offer some advanced courses for the first time.

He headed toward the prize-winning robotics lab.

"Can I pat you on the back?" he asked Lucas Pacheco, who coordinates the nascent School of Manufacturing and Engineering. Fernandez said he was especially pleased at how Pacheco has encouraged girls to take part.

Jack Foreman, head of the teachers union, said Fernandez has a mixed record, but did stabilize finances and "there have been improvements."

Still, he added: "This is no excuse for him to come into a poor community in the middle of a financial crisis and make sure he has manipulated his contract to take unprecedented compensation."
Teachers and other staff continued to be laid off even as Fernandez's pay rose sharply every year, Foreman noted.

Molina, the head of the school board, said the furor over the superintendent's salary, "starts making us aware, reflecting on what we're doing."

She added: "We are evaluating his contract as we speak." A revised contract is expected to be presented to the board this month.

Torlakson, the state superintendent, said he was exploring legislation to curb what he called future abuses; one legislator already has proposed such a bill.

As for Fernandez, he said the controversy has made his job harder, including his goal of completing the modernization of the district.

He said he'll need to go to the voters again for a property tax increase, and some people are just focusing on his pay.

"To see people using me as a strategy to destroy the work we've been doing here is disappointing," Fernandez said. "It truly is."

*Times staff writer Teresa Watanabe contributed to this report.*

Copyright © 2014, [Los Angeles Times](http://www.latimes.com)

**School district wages**

A sample of what L.A. County superintendents were paid in 2013 and the district enrollment:

**Jose Fernandez**

Centinela Valley

$674,559; 6,637

**John Deasy**

Los Angeles

$393,106; 655,494

**Gary W. Woods**

Beverly Hills

$255,000; 4,515
Christopher Steinhauser
Long Beach
$251,155; 82,256

Cynthia Parulan-Colfer
Hacienda La Puente
$189,423; 20,358

Sources: state, county and district data

Reporting by Teresa Watanabe and Howard Blume

Copyright © 2014, Los Angeles Times
The Los Angeles County Office of Education has ordered Centinela Valley Union High School District to halt the potentially illegal compensation it pays to its school board members — the elected officials who made Superintendent Jose Fernandez one of the highest-compensated K-12 public school leaders in the nation.

The reprimand is the first indication that the Centinela Valley school district has violated either the spirit or the letter of the law since this news organization initially reported in early February that Fernandez’s compensation package totaled $663,000 in 2013.

While the board members are not getting rich from their payments — their stipends and allowances total $1,040 a month — they are getting paid much more than they should under state law, according to a bulletin issued Thursday by LACOE, and much more than any other school board in the South Bay, according to documents obtained by the Los Angeles News Group.

California’s Education Code limits how much school board members can be compensated based on the size of the districts they lead. In Centinela Valley, which has about 6,600 students, board members can earn a total compensation of no more than $240 a month. That is exactly how much the district’s board members earn as their stipend for attending monthly board meetings. But in addition to that, they are paid a $200 cellphone allowance and a $600 car allowance.

The latter sparked LACOE’s order to cease payments.

“Effective immediately, if your governing board members are receiving additional stipends or allowances that cause the EC (Education Code) limits to be exceeded, these payments must cease,” reads the LACOE bulletin from Executive Director of Business and Finance Patricia Smith.
Though the bulletin was issued to all school districts in the county — and makes no mention of Centinela by name — LACOE spokesman Kostas Kalaitzidis said it came in direct response to questions from the Los Angeles News Group regarding Centinela’s board compensation.

“It has come to our attention that, in some instances, districts are not in compliance with the Education Code because they have exceeded the compensation limits or because their Board members are receiving allowances or stipends, i.e. car allowance, in addition to the stated compensation limits,” reads the bulletin from LACOE, which provides financial services for school districts in the county and, according to its website, is responsible for “ensuring fiscal solvency and compliance with state laws.”

DISTRICT RESPONSE

In response to the bulletin, the district issued a statement early Friday afternoon saying it is “immediately terminating” payment of the allowances to board members. The statement pointed out that the bulletin was directed to all K-12 and community college districts in California.

“The District has not received any communication from LACOE specific to the District’s Governing Board compensation,” the statement said. “The District also is aware that other districts in Los Angeles County currently are paying stipends to Board Members.”

Former school board member Frank Talavera criticized the board’s compensation.

“I think it’s unethical — it’s a shame,” said Talavera, who was ousted in 2009. Talavera said that while he was on the board he never received the $600 month car allowance.

In late 2009, four of the five current board members — Hugo Rojas, Gloria Ramos, Rocio Pizano and President Maritza Molina — all approved the contract that allowed Fernandez’s compensation to balloon year over year to $663,000 in the 2013 calendar year. The contract also enabled him to take a low-interest, $910,000 loan to purchase a home in Ladera Heights. Fernandez exercised that option in late 2012.

Among the nine other standalone school districts in the South Bay, the next highest paid board members govern Torrance Unified, which is four times the size of Centinela. They earn about $4,800 a year, or less than half of what their counterparts in Centinela receive.

The monthly stipends for other districts in the area range from zero for Palos Verdes Peninsula and Redondo Beach to $252 for Lawndale). Although board members in Redondo Beach do not get a board stipend, they are the only elected board members in the area besides Centinela to get an automatic allowance for travel. Theirs is $250 monthly. (Based on their size, they are allowed to receive a $240 monthly stipend). In Lennox, in addition to the $240 board stipend, elected trustees
are provided a cellphone and computer during their tenure, and the district covers their monthly payments for Internet access, which range from $50 to $80.

In Los Angeles Unified, where the position is considered a full-time job, the seven board members — one of whom is based in the South Bay — earned as much as $46,000 annually as of 2007, according to media reports. However, board members who have other employment earned $26,000. LAUSD did not respond to a request for updated figures sent March 10.

**SOURCE OF CONTROVERSY**

School board members can be reimbursed for actual expenses they incur, while performing their duties, according to the LACOE bulletin. To avoid violating the compensation limits, they must provide appropriate documentation and then they may be reimbursed.

“If the Board Member is paid a flat amount, the amount is additional compensation,” the bulletin explains.

To spend $600 a month on mileage, at the federal mileage rate of 56 cents a mile set by the IRS, each Centinela board member would have to drive 1,071 miles every month. Since the district’s three comprehensive high schools — Hawthorne, Leuzinger and Lawndale — are all located within two miles of each other, that means the board members would have to travel between the schools about 18 times a day, seven days a week. (Its two alternative programs, Lloyde Continuation School and Family First Charter School for adults, are both on the Lawndale High campus.) The Texas-shaped district is, at the farthest points, four miles wide and five miles long.

The district also provides board members medical benefits and a $150,000 life insurance policy. For a time, starting in 2010, Centinela provided board members a retirement plan administered by a private, nonprofit company based in Orange County called PARS, which stands for Public Agency Retirement Services. But a Centinela spokesperson on Friday said the district no longer provides the benefit.

Centinela’s car and cellphone allowances — which also have been granted to administrators — have been a source of controversy before.

Vicente Bravo, once an award-winning principal at Lawndale High and a former administrator in the district office, questioned the legitimacy of the allowances a few years ago, even though they boosted his own salary from $133,000 to $141,000.

“I would have to drive to Vegas four times and back just to even come close to meeting that,” Bravo said of the car allowance in a Daily Breeze article about the matter in December 2010.

Reached by phone this week, Bravo said: “I just couldn’t understand why anyone would need (an allowance) that large for a district that small.”
After raising concerns about the allowances, Bravo was demoted back to the classroom just before his 18-year tenure in Centinela Valley ended. He now works as a LACOE administrator, but spoke to the Los Angeles News Group as a former employee of Centinela Valley, not a representative of the county office.

In the statement issued Friday, Centinela officials noted that they had sought legal advice from two law firms on the travel allowances.

The first review of the existing policy occurred in early December 2010. In a letter dated Dec. 7 — four days after the story about Bravo was published in the Daily Breeze — an attorney from the district-hired firm Luna & Glushon reviewed the policy of granting board members an automatic car allowance in lieu of reimbursement for miles actually traveled. In a densely worded four-page opinion, Dennis Hernandez concluded that it was legal.

“This section authorizes school board members to be compensated for traveling expenses incurred resulting from their duties as board members,” he wrote. “This section does not state the manner in which local board members may be compensated for said travel.”

For some reason, two months later, another attorney, Ruben Duran from Meyers Nave, issued a follow-up three-page opinion. His conclusion was more cautious, although his short answer on whether the practice is legal was yes.

“There is no requirement that the district reimburse Board members only for ‘actual’ expenses,” he wrote.

But he added: “While the legal standards discussed above authorize the District to maintain a vehicle allowance for its Board members, the District should weigh the benefits of the program against the risk that the public may view the program with suspicion.”

Duran further stated that if the district cannot adequately explain the policy, “it may be more prudent to simply reimburse Board members for mileage actually traveled.”
High-paid Centinela Valley school chief can cash in lucrative whole-life insurance policies

By Rob Kuznia, Long Beach Press Telegram

POSTED: 04/17/14

The embattled superintendent of the Centinela Valley school district — who is under investigation for his massive pay — took out a $750,000 life insurance policy before securing approval from the school board to do so, the Daily Breeze has learned.

That life insurance policy was in addition to a $1 million policy that Jose Fernandez had already taken out. Both were whole-life plans, meaning the premiums paid by the district can be cashed out, like the balance of a bank account.

For 54-year-old Fernandez, whose total compensation of more than $663,000 in 2013 made him one of the highest-paid public school superintendents in the nation, those policies grant him access to even more income, should he choose to surrender the policies and take the cash.

Fernandez today could surrender the larger policy for $154,770 in cash, and the smaller policy for about $83,000, said Rob Damico, an insurance expert who came to this conclusion based on charts in the policies that were obtained by the Daily Breeze.

After giving the school district the 20 percent share of any payout to which it is entitled by contract, Fernandez could cash out both policies and take home about $190,000.

“That’s a nice little bonus he’s getting,” said Damico, a State Farm insurance agent in Signal Hill. “I wish I had been the one that sold this policy. The commission would have been really nice on this thing.”

School experts say it is rare for school administrators to get whole-life insurance policies from their employers. Most public school administrators — and most employees in general — have term-life policies that offer a payout to a beneficiary only in the event of death.

Whole-life policies, on the other hand, double as savings accounts, yielding modest annual returns to the tune of about 2 to 3 percent, Damico said.
Naj Alikhan, communications director for the Association of California School Administrators, said most professionals inside and outside of education have a compensation package that includes some sort of life insurance policy.

“Those policies could come in various forms, from term-life to accidental death and dismemberment to any other configuration,” he said in an email to the Daily Breeze. “Whole life policies are rare in all lines of work.”

But Ken Shelton, the former chief business officer of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, said it isn’t unheard of for administrators to get whole-life policies.

“It happens, but I don’t know the frequency,” he said. “It’s not totally unreasonable.”

In any case, whole-life policies are expensive. The Centinela Valley school district, which oversees three comprehensive high schools in Hawthorne and Lawndale, has been paying New York Life about $56,000 a year in premiums for the $1 million policy, and about $41,000 a year for the $750,000 policy. That adds up to about $97,000 a year, all for premiums.

The $1 million policy was among the many perks enshrined in Fernandez’s employment contract, approved by the school board in December 2009. Documents show Fernandez initiated the policy the next month, securing a plan from New York Life.

Nearly a year later, on Oct. 28, 2010, Fernandez took out a second policy from New York Life, according to documents obtained by the Daily Breeze. The date of issue on that $750,000 policy was Nov. 8, 2010.

However, it wasn’t until the following month, on Dec. 14 of that year, that the Centinela Valley school board approved the second whole-life policy for Fernandez among a batch of revised board polices and administrative regulations. The milieu also included $300,000 whole-life policies for Assistant Superintendents Bob Cox and Ron Hacker, as well as $150,000 term-life policies for all managerial employees, including the school board.

The school board vote wasn’t unanimous.

Voting against it was one board member, Sandra Suarez, who by then had become a lone-wolf dissenter on a board whose core three members were in lock step. (Gloria Ramos abstained on that item.)

Suarez said she wasn’t even aware of the life insurance issue at the time. Instead, she objected to a pattern she was noticing: district officials, she said, would make decisions first, and then seek board approval later. District officials often would try to rectify such matters by making the votes retroactive to an earlier date. Fernandez’s whole-life insurance policy, for example, was made retroactive to the beginning of the school year.
“Certain things he might have wanted done, they did ahead of time,” she said. “It tells us something: The board was not making the decisions; he was making the decisions.”

Reached on his cellphone Thursday, Fernandez declined to comment on the story. The Daily Breeze also emailed detailed questions to Fernandez’s attorney, Spencer Covert. Aside from a follow-up question sent by Covert’s secretary, the office had not responded by Thursday evening.

Fernandez’s compensation package is currently being reviewed by several agencies, including the FBI, the Los Angeles County Office of Education and the Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office. What’s more, the California Public Employees’ Retirement System also is investigating the matter.

Cox, a longtime administrator in Centinela Valley who is serving as interim superintendent during the multiple probes into Fernandez’s compensation, did not dispute that it appears Fernandez took out the insurance policy before the board approved it.

“This was a district that was driven by one person,” he said. “Now, board members and even senior administrators are trying to come out from under that and to figure out how to do the right thing. That’s what’s going to happen here, and it’s going to be painful for a while, but we’re going to have to show that it’s not business as usual.”

It’s unclear whether that sequence of events amounted to a breach of state education law. Officials from two agencies — the District Attorney’s Office and the county Office of Education — declined to weigh in. Both agencies are refraining from making any further comments until completion of their probes.

Teachers union President Jack Foreman has long sounded the alarm on the policies, saying they are hidden income for Fernandez.

“It’s a gift of cash, but it masquerades,” he said. “The reason it builds cash value is you’re paying a fortune in premiums.”
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LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW - MAY 2014

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 2715 / Hernandez
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/21/14
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 04/07/14: Set for Elections and Redistricting hearing on 04/22/14

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require the members of the legislative body of a city with a population of 100,000 or more, as determined by the most recent federal decennial census, to be elected by district. This bill would require the legislative body to provide by ordinance, without submitting the ordinance to the electors of the city for approval, for the election of the members in this manner. This bill would require that the boundary lines of each district be adjusted in accordance with specified provisions of law.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Initial language of bill isn’t specific to school districts, so unless forthcoming hearings add such language, the effect to school boards would likely come via court interpretations. The initial standard trailer language in the bill mentions school districts, but only insofar as it relates to state mandate reimbursements for costs encumbered. Bill is attached.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch** Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve** County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support** County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose** County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove** County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 1365 / Padilla
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/21/14
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 04/21/14: Scheduled for State Senate Elections and Constitutional Amendments Committee hearing on 04/22/14

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require a court to implement specified remedies upon a finding that a district-based election was imposed or applied in a manner that impaired the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election. The bill would also direct a court to implement a redistricting plan if it would provide redress, as well as allow the court to increase the size of the governing body, delay an election, or require elections to be held on the same day as a statewide election.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Bill would likely result in more court decisions and proactivity regarding CVRA grievances. Bill is attached.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve**  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support**  County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose**  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove**  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for amendments to the bill language, suggested alternative language is attached.
CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for correspondence to the bill’s author, the Governor or other governmental officials, a draft of suggested language is attached.

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee at (562) 922-6144.
An act to add Section 14028.5 to the Elections Code, and to add Section 36503.2 to the Government Code, relating to elections.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2715, as amended, Roger Hernández. District-based municipal elections.

Existing law provides for political subdivisions that encompass areas of representation within the state. With respect to these areas, public officials are generally elected by all of the voters of the political subdivision (at-large) or from districts formed within the political subdivision (district-based). Existing law, the California Voting Rights Act of 2001, prohibits an at-large method of election to be imposed or applied in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protected class, as defined.-Existing

Existing law authorizes the legislative body of a city to submit to voters at any municipal or special election an ordinance providing for a district-based method of election for the election of members of the legislative body by districts, from districts, by districts with an elective mayor, or from districts with an elective mayor. Under existing law, “by district” means election of members of the legislative body by voters of the district alone and “from district” means election of members of the legislative body who are residents of the district from which they
are elected by the voters of the entire city. Existing law prescribes the procedures for the electors to change from the election of these members by district to election from districts or vice versa.

This bill would require a district-based election to be imposed for the election of the members of the governing body of a city with a population of 100,000 or more, as determined by the most recent federal decennial census. This bill would authorize a city to petition the superior court for an order permitting the city to impose an at-large method of election for the members of the governing body. This bill would permit the court to grant the order if it determines that imposing an at-large method of election would not violate the California Voting Rights Act of 2001. This bill would provide that a voter may file an action against a city that has been granted an order permitting the city to impose an at-large method of election alleging that the city violated the act.

This bill would require the members of the legislative body of a city with a population of 100,000 or more, as determined by the most recent federal decennial census, to be elected by district. This bill would require the legislative body to provide by ordinance, without submitting the ordinance to the electors of the city for approval, for the election of the members in this manner. This bill would require that the boundary lines of each district be adjusted in accordance with specified provisions of law.

By requiring cities to conduct elections for members of their legislative bodies in a specified manner, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

This bill would specify that its provisions become operative on July 1, 2015.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 14028.5 is added to the Elections Code, to read:
14028.5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subdivision (b), in a city with a population of 100,000 or more, as determined by the most recent federal decennial census, a district-based election shall be imposed for the election of the members of the governing body of the city in accordance with Section 36503.2 of the Government Code.

(b) A city described in subdivision (a) may petition the superior court of the county in which the city is located for an order permitting the city to impose an at-large method of election for the members of the governing body of the city. The court may grant the petition if it finds that imposing an at-large method of election would not violate Sections 14027 and 14028.

(c) A voter may file an action under Section 14032 against a city that has been granted an order permitting the city to impose an at-large method of election pursuant to subdivision (b) alleging a violation of Sections 14027 and 14028.

SEC. 2. Section 36503.2 is added to the Government Code, to read:

36503.2. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, the members of the legislative body of a city with a population of 100,000 or more, as determined by the most recent federal decennial census, shall be elected by district as provided in subdivision (a) or (c) of Section 34871. The legislative body shall provide by ordinance, without submitting the ordinance to the electors of the city for approval, for the election of members of the legislative body in this manner.

(b) The boundaries of the districts for the legislative body shall be established and adjusted in accordance with Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 21600) of Division 21 of the Elections Code.

(c) For purposes for this section, "by district" has the same meaning as set forth in Section 34871.

SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

SEC. 4. This act shall become operative on July 1, 2015.
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An act to amend Section Sections 14027 and 14029 of the Elections Code, relating to elections.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 1365, as amended, Padilla. California Voting Rights Act of 2001. Existing law, the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (CVRA), prohibits the use of an at-large election in a political subdivision if it would impair the ability of a protected class, as defined, to elect candidates of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election. The CVRA provides that a voter who is a member of a protected class may bring an action in superior court to enforce the provisions of the CVRA, and, if the voter prevails in the case, he or she may be awarded reasonable litigation costs and attorney’s fees. The CVRA requires a court to implement appropriate remedies, including the imposition of district-based elections, that are tailored to remedy a violation of the act.

This bill would also prohibit the use of a district-based election in a political subdivision if it would impair the ability of a protected class, as defined, to elect candidates of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election. The bill would require a court to implement specified remedies upon a finding that a district-based election was imposed or applied in a manner that impaired the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 14027 of the Elections Code is amended to read:

14027. (a) An at-large method of election or a district-based election shall not be imposed or applied in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protected class, as defined pursuant to Section 14026.

(b) A district-based election shall not be imposed or applied in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protected class, as defined pursuant to Section 14026.

SEC. 2. Section 14029 of the Elections Code is amended to read:

14029. (a) Upon a finding of a violation of subdivision (a) of Section 14027 and Section 14028, the court shall implement appropriate remedies, including the imposition of district-based elections, that are tailored to remedy the violation.

(b) (1) Upon a finding of a violation of subdivision (b) of Section 14027 and Section 14028, the court shall implement appropriate remedies, as provided in this subdivision, that are tailored to remedy the violation and that are guided in part by the views of the protected class.

(2) (A) If reasonably feasible, the court shall implement, as an appropriate remedy under this subdivision, a redistricting plan that provides the protected class the opportunity to elect candidates of its choice.

(B) If a redistricting plan under subparagraph (A) is not reasonably feasible, the court shall implement, as an appropriate remedy under this subdivision, a redistricting plan that provides the protected class the opportunity to join with a coalition of groups to elect candidates of their choice.
(C) A redistricting plan implemented under this paragraph shall comply with all applicable state and federal laws.

(D) In addition to implementing a redistricting plan under this paragraph, a court may implement additional remedies, including the remedies provided in paragraph (3).

(3) If a redistricting plan under paragraph (2) is not reasonably feasible, the court shall implement other appropriate remedies, including, but not limited to, increasing the size of the governing body; issuing an injunction to delay an election; or requiring an election to be held on the same day as a statewide election, as provided in Section 1001.

(c) This section does not prohibit the parties from settling a dispute arising under this chapter. If the parties agree to settle a dispute, the parties shall consider the remedies provided for in this section when negotiating a settlement agreement.
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Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

May 2014

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of April 22, 2014

PROPOSAL TO TRANSFER CERTAIN TERRITORY FROM THE COMPTON USD TO THE LOS ANGELES USD

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last nine months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Inner City Unified School District/July 2012

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None
May 2014

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of April 22, 2014.]

FORMATION—WISEBURN USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SD)

In May of 2001, the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization petitioned to form a Wiseburn USD from within the boundaries of the Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD). After approval by the County Committee and a long review period by the CDE and SBE, the petition was moved forward via successful legislation, the formation of two related joint power agencies, and final approval by the SBE on May 9, 2013. The voter approval of the proposal and the election of the first governing board for the Wiseburn USD occurred on November 5, 2013. Staff is working on logistics related to the launch of the unified district.

*Status: Proposal passed and first governing board elected November 5, 2013
Status Date: April 22, 2014

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE ABC USD

On January 18, 2013, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to establish trustee areas, and trustee area voting within the ABC USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. Charles Ara. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On February 21,
2013, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on February 27, 2013, for circulation.

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: April 10, 2013

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE POMONA USD

On June 6, 2012, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On June 19, 2012, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on June 20, 2012, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, requesting some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 6,100 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD, based on the most recent count of registered voters). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: June 20, 2012

FORMATION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3.

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.
On March 7, 2006, staff forwarded the draft petition to the Registrar-Recorder for verification that the description of the proposed boundaries of the Altadena USD was sufficiently clear (so that registered voters residing within the proposed petition area could be identified with specificity). The Registrar-Recorder confirmed that the description was sufficient on March 10, 2006.

The petition was mailed to the chief petitioners on March 14, 2006, for circulation within the petition area. The Registrar-Recorder estimated the chief petitioners will need to collect approximately 7,000 valid signatures in order to meet the criteria set forth in EC §35700(a).

On September 23, 2010, chief petitioners delivered signed petitions to LACOE. Staff submitted the petitions to the Registrar-Recorder on September 27, 2010, for signature verification. On October 22, 2010, the Registrar-Recorder notified staff that there were insufficient valid signatures (less than the required 25 percent of the registered voters within the petition area). Staff notified the chief petitioners of the insufficiency, and at Mr. Wasson’s request, returned the petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for a signature audit. Staff also advised the chief petitioner regarding the collection of additional signatures. Upon notification by the Registrar-Recorder of a sufficient number of valid signatures, staff will present the petition to the County Committee at the next regular meeting.

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder’s office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staffs contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011, staff from the Registrar-Recorder’s office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

Status: Petition insufficient; chief petitioners may gather additional signatures.
Status Date: December 5, 2011

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.
Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 7,000 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: August 20, 2009

FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

Status: Petition currently in circulation.
Status Date: February 21, 2008

FORMATION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: May 11, 2007

FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK – LA MIRADA USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: March 20, 2007

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD, RETAINING THE AT-LARGE VOTING METHOD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: January 17, 2007

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: October 2, 2006
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

Status: Petition in circulation.  
Status Date: April 11, 2006

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.  
Status Date: April 11, 2006

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.  
Status Date: July 21, 2003

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD

Status: Petition in circulation.  
Status Date: June 16, 2003

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS, AND TO REQUIRE THAT EACH GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER RESIDE IN AND BE ELECTED BY THE REGISTERED VOTERS OF EACH PARTICULAR TRUSTEE AREA WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.  
Status Date: August 20, 2001

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/November 2011
Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Glendale USD to La Canada USD/May 2013
- Pasadena USD to La Canada USD/April 2013
- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/January 2013

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.