

## **CHRONOLOGICAL MINUTES OF PVSD BOARD MEETINGS – UNIFICATION**

### **AUGUST 6, 1998**

#### **C.1. Request for Proposal for Unification Study**

Mrs. Anne Marie O'Grady submitted a petition with 530 signatures in support of updating the 1992 unification feasibility study. Members of the audience spoke in support of the petition as well as expressing concern regarding Somis issues.

Following audience input and board deliberation, the following motions were made.

Mrs. Rains moved, seconded by Dr. Donahue and passed 5-0, "That the Board approve the preparation of a new unification feasibility study."

Mrs. Rains moved, second by Miss Norris, "That a new letter be written tomorrow morning to the consultants previously listed notifying them of the Board action; and that copies of the letter be sent to the Superintendents of Oxnard Union High School District, Somis Union District, and Mesa Union District; and that the time be extended for at least a week so they may more adequately prepare their proposals."

Dr. Donahue requested that the last phrase be deleted and that the motion be read as follows: "That a new letter be written tomorrow morning to the consultants previously listed, notifying them of the Board action; and that copies of the letter be sent to the Superintendents of Oxnard Union High School District, Somis Union District, and Mesa Union District." The motion passed 5-0.

Mrs. Rains moved, second by Mr. Amador and passed 5-0, "That the Superintendent bring all of the proposals back to the Board at the meeting on August 20 after completing reference checks.

### **AUGUST 20, 1998**

#### **C.1. PROPOSAL FOR UNIFICATION STUDY**

The Board considered approval of the selection of a firm for the completion of an updated/new Feasibility Study for possible unification of the district from a K-8 to a –12 district. Proposal fees ranged from \$40,000 and \$17,500 for new studies, to \$4,500 to update the current study. Board deliberation ensued and input from the audience was received.

Miss Norris moved, second by Dr. Donahue and passed 4-0, "To approve the selection of Educational Research Consultants, Inc., to update the 1992 Unification Feasibility Study at a cost of \$4,500 plus travel expenses."

### **NOVEMBER 19, 1998**

#### **D.1. UNIFICATION FEASIBILITY REPORT**

Dr. LaCouture reported that an administrative draft of the updated Unification Feasibility Study was received by the district from consultant Mr. Terry McHenry. Following review of the draft, the updated report will be presented at the December 10, 1998 meeting by Mr. McHenry. A workshop will then be scheduled.

### **DECEMBER 10, 1998**

#### **E.1. UNIFICATION FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Terry McHenry of Educational Research Consultants presented the updated Unification Feasibility Study to the Board of Trustees. Mr. McHenry reviewed the various criteria that were discussed in the report. Members of the public provided comments to the Board regarding the report.

President Rains called a recess from 9:45-9:50 p.m. Lengthy discussion continued.

Mrs. Miller moved, second by Miss Norris and passed 5-0, to establish a task force utilizing the list (submitted by Mrs. Ann O'Grady) as a springboard, to include staff, and bring it back on the January agenda.

Mr. Speakman moved, second by Mr. Amador and passed 5-0, to have a meeting with the Boards of the other school districts to discuss the Feasibility Study, gain relevant input to assist the Board in making decisions, and to discuss our plans to go ahead with the Task Force.

Mrs. Miller moved, second by Mr. Speakman and passed 3-1, to meet prior to the next regular Board meeting for the purpose of having a study session on the Unification Feasibility Study. Miss Norris voted no. Mr. Amador was away from the table.

### **DECEMBER 21, 1998**

#### **OPEN SESSION**

The Board conducted a discussion on the 1998 updated Unification Feasibility Study. The Board also continued discussion from a prior Board meeting as to conducting a special board meeting and inviting board members and administration from the Oxnard, Mesa, and Somis School Districts, and the Board discussed possible dates for that meeting.

### **JANUARY 21, 1999**

#### **C.4. UNIFICATION TASK FORCE CREATION/CHANGE**

The Board considered action to create a Unification Task Force and to provide a charge with timeline to the Task Force.

Board President Rains and Superintendent LaCouture met with the Board Presidents and Superintendents of Oxnard Union High School District, Mesa Union District, and Somis School District. The Superintendent reported that Oxnard Union High School district has hired an attorney who will be present at the meeting that is tentatively scheduled for February 1, 1999. He recommended that the district hire an attorney to protect the legal interests of the district.

Mr. Amador moved with a second by Miss Norris that we adopt the committee plan as designed by Miss Norris. The motion was tabled (see below).

Mr. Speakman moved with a second by Mrs. Miller to table Mr. Amador's motion until such time that we can bring this back in two weeks having been looked at by a consultant/attorney and, at that point, adopt or reject. The motion was defeated 2-3, Mr. Amador, Mrs. Rains, and Miss Norris voted no.

Mr. Speakman moved, second by Mrs. Miller and passed 3-2 to table Mr. Amador's motion for two weeks. Mr. Amador and Mrs. Rains voted no.

### **FEBRUARY 1, 1999**

#### **JOINT BOARD STUDY SESSION REGARDING UNIFICATION**

The Board met in a joint meeting with the Boards of the Mesa Union School District, the Oxnard Union High School District, and the Somis Elementary School District to discuss the possible unification of the Pleasant Valley School District. Various issues were discussed among the Board Members, and an opportunity was provided for public input regarding this matter. (A video and audio tape were prepared for this meeting and are on file at the PVSD District Office.)

## **FEBRUARY 4, 1999**

### **C.1. UNIFICATION TASK FORCE CREATION/CHARGE**

The Board unanimously returned from the table the following motion that was tabled at the January 21, 1999, meeting: *'Mr. Amador moved, second by Miss Norris and read as follows "Move to adopt the committee plan as designed by Miss Norris for unification committee."*

The Board received comments from parents, teachers, and members of the community.

Mr. Amador moved, second by Miss Norris and passed unanimously, to adopt the committee plan as designed by Miss Norris for unification committee.

The Board encouraged public participation on the unification committees. An application form will be developed and placed on the district web site, and a press release will be submitted to the newspaper. President Rains reminded the audience that the committee would be advisory in nature, and that the Board of Trustees would make all final decisions. This item will be returned in March for the Board.

### **C.2. UNIFICATION VOTE**

Board Member Miller had requested that this item be placed on the agenda.

Mrs. Miller stated that the vote on the previous item fulfilled her purpose in placing this item on the agenda.

The Board received input from parents, teachers, and community members about this issue.

### **C.3. APPROVAL OF THE PROCESS FOR HIRING AN ATTORNEY**

In regard to the issue of unification, the district has been informed that the Oxnard Union High School District has hired an attorney to represent their district. As the unification process, both for and against, will have procedural and legal scrutiny, the Superintendent recommended that the Board consider hiring an attorney to represent the Pleasant Valley School District in these matters as Oxnard Union High School District has done.

Following discussion, Mr. Speakman said for the record "I want to state that my position is that if this Board doesn't take the steps necessary (getting an attorney on board to represent us), it is my opinion that we are not fulfilling our responsibility to the school district."

Mr. Amador moved, second by Mr. Speakman and passed 5-0, to approve the process for hiring an attorney, the process being to get proposals from attorneys that would guide us, or keep us legal as we proceed toward either for or against unification.

## **MARCH 4, 1999**

### **C.1. UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEES/CHARGE**

The Board considered the process to appoint individuals to the Unification Task Force. At prior Board Meetings, the Board directed that various Subcommittees be established. An application form was developed and advertised widely throughout the community.

At the March 18, 1999 meeting, applications will be provided to the Board for appointments to the Subcommittees. It is anticipated that all of the applicants will be able to participate. The Board will select a temporary chairperson with the final selection for a chairperson being determined by members of the Subcommittee.

**MARCH 18, 1999**

**C.1. APPOINTMENT OF UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEES**

The Board considered appointments to the Unification Task Force that was approved at a prior Board Meeting. Advertisements seeking applications for these Subcommittees were widely disseminated in the various media, and 69 applications were submitted.

Board President Rains received Board consensus that the following letters be read into the record so that it is understood that any communiqués to the City on this study would be going from the Board to the Mayor or the City Council.

Letter of February 9, 1999 from Major Kevin B. Kildee, City of Camarillo, to Mrs. Val Rains, President Pleasant Valley School Board of Trustees:

*Dear Val:*

*Recently the Camarillo City Council met and discussed its goals for the years 1999 and 2000. One of the topics of discussion centered around the unification study which the Pleasant Valley School District is now engaged in. The City Council directed that I write to you and advise that while the Council believes it to be premature at this time to comment on the study or the merits of the proposal, the Council is obviously quite interested in the results. Therefore, the Council wants the Pleasant Valley Board of Education to know that if there is any technical assistance which city staff may provide in this study process, the City stands ready to provide that assistance. Please contact our City Manager, Bill Little, to discuss such assistance if so desired.*

*At this time the Council also requests that any existing or future reports or documents relating to this unification study be made available to our City Manager so that he may distribute them to the Council and staff.*

*The City Council will await with interest the results of the study effort.*

On February 25, 1999 Mrs. Rains sent the following letter to Mayor Kevin Kildee:

*Dear Mayor Kildee:*

*Thank you for your recent letter regarding your goal setting session in which you discussed the potential for city involvement in the issue before the public regarding unification. We recognize that this is a matter being reviewed by the educational community and is not a city concern, per se, in terms of taking an official position. Your kind offer to provide any data or history that might assist the citizens in their review is appreciated.*

*As this study progresses, we will attempt to keep the city apprised of the progress of the study so that decision-makers will have accurate information when questions are asked.*

*We value our positive relations with the city and the spirit of cooperation that we have experienced over the years as we each serve the citizens of Camarillo from our respective positions. Please feel free to contact me personally should you have need for general or specific information regarding the unification study.*

Miss Norris moved, second by Mr. Amador and passed 5-0, to approve the individuals who have submitted their applications for Task Force Subcommittees I and II as submitted in the agenda of March 18, 1999.

As these Subcommittees are appointed by the Board, they will need to comply with the provisions of the State of California Brown Act, which indicates that all meetings will be formally agendized, posted, and open to the public. The District Office staff will be available to assist the Subcommittees in this process. Both Subcommittees I and II will select their own Chairperson as well as a Secretary, and each Subcommittee will be asked to submit a monthly report to the Board of Trustees. Married family members of a Subcommittee should constitute one vote only. The Subcommittees will establish their own timeline.

A letter will be sent to all of the applicants with the names of those appointed to Subcommittees I and II. Appointments to Subcommittees III and IV were deferred to a later time as those Subcommittees are dependent on the results of Subcommittees I and II. The charges from the Board, along with other materials including the letters to and from the city and the Feasibility Study, will be sent to members of Subcommittees I and II.

Board Member Speakman reiterated that unification is a community issue rather than a School Board issue, and he encouraged everyone concerned to become involved.

### **MAY 6, 1999**

#### **C.2. Selection of an Attorney for Unification Matters**

The Board conducted public interviews with attorneys who have submitted proposals to represent the district in unification matters. The following firms were interviewed: Merksamer, Parrinello, Mueller & Naylor, LLP; Miller Brown & Dannis; and School Legal Services.

Mr. Speakman moved, second by Mrs. Miller and passed 5-0, to engage the services of a law firm with the understanding that the agreement with that firm be such that fees for their services will only be paid upon prior approval of the Board.

Mr. Speakman moved, second by Mrs. Miller and passed 5-0, to direct the Superintendent to negotiate with the firm of Nielsen, Merksamer, Parinello, Mueller & Naylor, LLP to engage their services and to bring the contract back to the Board for consideration.

### **May 20, 1999**

#### **D.4. REVIEW OF UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEES**

At the request of Board Member Speakman this item has been placed on the agenda for the Board to discuss the progress of the Unification Task Force Subcommittees.

Following Board discussion and concerns expressed from individuals from both Subcommittees, President Rains directed the Superintendent to write a letter to both subcommittees indicating that it is the will of the Board that no press releases be given to the newspaper regarding anything. A letter will also be written to President of the Board of Trustees of Oxnard Union High School District indicating that we have had various requests that perhaps Subcommittee III should be meeting and perhaps it could be resolved and perhaps this is the best thing that could be done. Also indicate in the letter that there has been some concern expressed by committee members that they are having difficulty securing some information necessary to develop their findings.

### **JUNE 3, 1999 - Special Meeting**

#### **5. AGREEMENT WITH ATTORNEY FOR UNIFICATION MATTERS**

The agreement for services with Marguerite Leoni, the attorney for unification matters, was discussed by the Board. The Board provided direction to the Superintendent indicating acceptance of all the

terms of the agreement with the exception of a revision in the paragraph dealing with Attorney/District Communication. This item will be brought back at a future Board Meeting for Board approval.

#### **JUNE 24, 1999 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.4. UNIFICATION TASK FORCE RESTRUCTURE**

At the request of Board Members Rains and Norris, this item was placed on the agenda. Mrs. Nancy Koch, President of the Oxnard Union High School (OUHSD) District Board of Trustees, read the following letter dated June 23, 1999 addressed to Mrs. Val Rains, President and Mr. Ron Speakman, Member, Board of Trustees, Pleasant Valley School District:

This morning, I reported to the Oxnard Union High School District Board of Trustees on the informal meeting last Thursday with Ron Speakman and Roger Lund representing Unification Subcommittee No. 1 and Deborah Creadick and Sandy Biler-Rao, co-chairs of Unification Subcommittee No. 2, and myself.

Based on our discussion with Mr. Speakman and Mr. Lund, I told the Board that it was determined that the main issue driving unification in Camarillo is the desire for a second high school in the Camarillo area. Also, a secondary issue is the accessibility of the Oxnard Union High School District Board of Trustees to Camarillo citizens. I further reported that we came to the conclusion that the present unification effort is causing a harmful division of Camarillo residents. Both sides have dedicated people and strongly held beliefs, but that pursuing unification at this time will only result in adversarial relations, not to mention general fund dollars spent on legal fees. It was agreed that the Oxnard Union High School District, because of its size, would be able to pass a facilities bond at a much lower rate to the individual tax payers compared to the smaller Pleasant Valley School District. Therefore, the high school Board has directed me to make the following commitment to the effort of working together.

The Oxnard Union High School District will begin the process of developing the plan to bring a new school to Camarillo as already outlined in our Strategic Facilities Plan. We will work with all interested parties to study such items as where the school will be built, how districtwide community support will be generated, the identification of obstacles, i.e. S.O.A.R., etc., and the establishment of a timeline for successful bond passage.

The Oxnard Union High School District also believes that it would be important to have a public televised special Board meeting in Camarillo to inform the public of our intentions and be available to answer any questions.

The Oxnard Union High School District is committed to finding solutions and remedies to the school facilities issues that are important to the residents of Camarillo, and we look forward to working cooperatively with the Pleasant Valley School District and the citizens of Camarillo to make a second high school in Camarillo a reality.

Mr. Speakman said he attended a luncheon with Mrs. Koch and representatives of both Subcommittees to address issues of concern regarding Unification. He expressed interest in either forming a joint committee with Oxnard Union High School District or empowering our Subcommittees to continue the discussions that have started. President Rains complimented Mr. Speakman for meeting with Mrs. Koch, Mrs. Creadick, Mrs. Bieler-Rao (Subcommittee II), and Mr. Lund (Subcommittee I); and beginning this positive constructive avenue.

Mr. Roger Lund, Chair of Subcommittee I, encouraged the dialogue with Oxnard Union High School District and indicated that Subcommittee I would like to participate in that effort. He agreed with the suggestion from Subcommittee II's Co-Chairs that the subcommittee's chairs conduct communication through subcommittees rather than through liaison.

Mrs. Miller thanked both committees and the Oxnard Union High School District for donating their time to the community.

Mr. Speakman clarified that we can continue with Subcommittees I and II and begin Subcommittee III. Mr. Speakman moved, with a second by Mrs. Miller and passed 5-0, to activate Subcommittee III immediately, assuring that any community members interested in participating be given that opportunity. The board clarified the desire to have as many people who are concerned and wish to serve, including the original twenty-one, on Subcommittee III.

Mrs. Bieler-Rao and Mrs. Creadick urged the Board to have the membership of Subcommittee III be those who want to find workable solutions and not those who want to air their grievances.

President Rains commended everyone for seeking resolution and moving ahead. It is understood that a letter would be written to Nancy Koch at the Oxnard Union High School District, informing them Subcommittee III has been established. The board encouraged the chairs of Subcommittees I and II to jointly come up with a charge for Subcommittee III. Dr. LaCouture expressed the need for clarification of the charge to Subcommittee III.

### **JULY 1, 1999 Regular Meeting**

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

President Rains discussed a conversation with Mrs. Marguerite Leoni in which she assured her that the client is the board and not the committees. Dr. LaCouture discussed the rationale sheet prepared at request of President Rains. President Rains expressed concern over the timing of the action and any possible misinterpretation by Oxnard Union High School District. Mr. Speakman and President Rains felt Mrs. Leoni had already been hired with the understanding the wording in paragraph 2, page 2 of the contract would be revised. The Board directed staff to clarify that point; agreeing with the revised paragraph in the June 8, 1999 letter.

### **AUGUST 5, 1999 Regular Meeting**

#### **B.5. EXCLUSIVE REPRESENTATIVES AND PUBLIC COMMENTS**

President Rains read into the record a request from the Oxnard Union High School District:

*Dear Board President Rains,*

*Would you please be so kind as to make a public announcement at your Board meeting that the Oxnard Union High School District Board of Trustees will have a Special Board Meeting to discuss the process of building a second high school in the Camarillo area. The meeting will be on Monday night, August 23, 1999 in the Camarillo City Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m. This meeting will be televised. If you can make this announcement again at the next board meeting we would appreciate it. Thank you for helping us get the word out on the meeting.*

*Nancy Koch, President*

*Board of Trustees, Oxnard Union High School District*

### **OCTOBER 7, 1999 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **C.2. UNIFICATION**

This item was placed on the agenda at the request of President Rains. She indicated she needed some clarification after reading a newspaper article of a study. She needed to discuss with the board what the procedure for the unification task force committees are and how they are supposed to report and clarification of the intent of the \$49 million bond issue.

President Rains asked to entertain and distributed the following motions with consensus of the Board:

1. Move that Unification Sub Committee I "submit complete plans both oral and written to Sub Committee II" as stated in #2 of the board approved plan.
2. Move that the Unification Subcommittees refer to the approved board plan when taking any action, and be sensitive to the board request of May 20, 1999, regarding any press releases.
3. It is the intent of this Board that if any authority to issue additional bonds remain because of the proposed Mission Oaks/Santa Rosa 14 million dollar elementary school not being built, that these bonds will not be issued.
4. For points of clarification, it is the understanding of the PVSD that the 49 million-dollar bond authority was approved by the voters for the Pleasant Valley School District as it is currently structured.

Roger Lund, Sub Committee I Chairman explained the report will not be presented at the October 21, 1999 meeting. The report is not finished and the plan was for the first meeting in November. He also stated that it has never been anything but Committee I's intent to present to Committee II when the report is in its final form both orally and in written format. President Rains indicated that the direction the Board has is that Committee I will give the report to Committee II and not to the school board.

On a motion by President Rains the board moved that the Unification Subcommittees refer to the approved board plan when taking any action, and be sensitive to the board request of May 20, 1999, regarding any press releases. There was no second.

Several members of the public commented on the contents of the draft report of Subcommittee I. President Rains addressed the legal opinion on the bond measure. Several members of the community also addressed this issue.

Miss Norris moved that it is the intent of this Board that if any authority to issue additional bonds remain because of the proposed Mission Oaks/Santa Rosa 14 million dollar elementary school not being built, that these bonds will not be issued. There was no second and the motion died.

#### **C.8. FUNDS FOR DISTRICT ATTENDANCE AT WORKSHOP**

Mr. Speakman asked the item to be placed on the agenda since the board has three committees researching this item trying to complete tasks the Board has given them and that they can get information from professionals. Mrs. Elizabeth Vega addressed the Board and indicated she would like to be considered for attendance the workshop indicating many of the members were lay people and this would be a good tool for the committee.

Mr. Speakman moved, second by Mrs. Miller to provide an opportunity for attendance at the workshop for a member of each subcommittee and the district to provide the cost. This motion failed 2-3, Miss Norris, Mr. Amador and President Rains no. Miss Norris moved, second by Mrs. Miller and passed unanimously that Ron Speakman be allowed to attend the School Service of California, Inc. "Fiscal Implications of School District Reorganization" workshop with his budgeted money. Mr. Speakman moved, second by Miss Norris and passed unanimously to extend an invitation to all committee members of all committees to attend the workshop at their own cost under the auspices of the Pleasant Valley School District and be able to take advantage of our \$135 per participant rate.

## **OCTOBER 21, 1999 REGULAR MEETING**

### **C.2. UNIFICATION TASK FORCE**

The Board was asked to consider a request to release Unification Task Force Sub Committees I and II from their charges and to express appreciation for their service on the committees. Dr. LaCouture indicated that this item was placed on the agenda at the verbal request by the Chair of Subcommittee II as a placeholder pending the outcome of their meeting, which was after press time of the agenda. He indicated he had subsequently received a note from the Chair of Subcommittee I and a letter from the Chair of Subcommittee III, which he distributed to the Board, but had received nothing in writing from Subcommittee II. However, he indicated he had a transcript of a voice mail request from Subcommittee II to leave this item on the agenda.

Members of the public, including students from Rio Mesa High School addressed the board on the contents of the partial draft report of Subcommittee I. Sol Chooljian, Subcommittee III Co-Chair thanked the board for having the courage to start this process and submitted reasons not to disband the committees. He stated that it took courage to start the process going and it will take even more to finish. Debra Creadick, Co-Chair of Subcommittee II, addressed the board about Subcommittee II's meeting and their vote to continue their committee. She pointed out that the perception is that all reports are the board's reports.

Mr. Speakman commented on the school spirit of Rio Mesa and thanked the students for coming. Mrs. Miller thanked everyone that came out and indicated she would like to see committees complete their reports. Mr. Amador thanked those that attended and indicated he also would like to see the subcommittees complete their charge. Mr. Speakman stated that regardless of direction the Board takes, he is opposed to disbanding Subcommittee III. Miss Norris thanked all for coming. Mr. Amador indicated he was in support of continuing the Unification Task Force process. Mrs. Miller wanted them to continue the work and asked if some information could be presented at that time. Mr. Speakman asked to direct staff to relay to subcommittee the ground rules and if he sees any personal attacks, he will push for a motion to disband the Subcommittees. Dr. LaCouture indicated he would send an email to all Subcommittee members.

Mrs. Miller moved that Subcommittees I, II and III provide an update to this Board by November 18. This motion died for lack of second. On a motion by Mr. Amador, second by Mr. Speakman and passed unanimously, the Board moved to continue with the committee process.

## **NOVEMBER 18, 1999 Regular Meeting**

### **C.2. PRESENTATION OF FINAL REPORT FROM UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE**

#### **III**

The Board received the final report from Unification Task Force Subcommittee III. Sol Chooljian, Co-Chair Subcommittee III, recognized the members of Subcommittee III and thanked the Board for their help and Mrs. Weisberg for her help. Keith Robinson, Co-Chair, pointed out that the report is a consensus document by the group. President Rains presented the Co-Chairs and members of the committee Pleasant Valley School District mugs The Board thanked the committee members for all their hard work and honesty in handling the report. President Rains asked that a letter be sent to Oxnard Union High School District urging the board to take a serious look at the report and recognize that there were concerned individuals that put their names to the report.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Roger Lund advised the Board that the report of Unification Task Force Subcommittee I is ready for copying for presentation to Subcommittee II and he delivered the report to Dr. LaCouture. He asked for direction on what happens to the report after Subcommittee II reviews and returns it to Subcommittee I. Direction from the Board is for Subcommittee I to present the report to the Board after it has been reviewed. Mr. Lund thanked the members of Subcommittee I.

### **JANUARY 13, 2000 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.3 UNIFICATION**

Mrs. Rains felt that a letter to the Editor must be written so that the public knows exactly what this Board has and has not done, that the Board has not endorsed any unification plan nor taken a stand for or against unification because all the evidence is not in. She would also like the letter to be signed by all members of the board. On a motion by Mrs. Rains, second by Mr. Amador and passed unanimously, the Board agreed to submit a Letter to the Editor with an addendum as follows: The second paragraph of the letter to read, "At the strong suggestion of the Superintendent, this board has been reminded continuously that they should remain neutral. Therefore, our Board **has not taken action** to support or oppose any unification plan nor the establishment of the creation of a citizens' committee to further unification.;" 5. On October 21, 1999, the Board voted 4-0 to retain the committee structure.

Dr. LaCouture suggested and the Board agreed to put the Letter to the Editor on the district website after it has gone to the editor. It was discussed that the purpose of the website is to inform the public and that reports, letters, etc. pertaining to the unification issue should be put on the website. He read the opening statement from the website pertaining to the unification issue which clarifies the position of the Board. It was agreed that it should be stated in the letter that it has been approved and endorsed by all five members of the board rather than having each board members' signature on the letter.

### **APRIL 6, 2000 Regular Meeting**

#### **D.1. Unification Task Force Subcommittee II Update**

The Board received an update on the status of Unification Task Force Subcommittee II. The goal of the committee is to have the final draft completed by the May 11<sup>th</sup> Board meeting (to be presented to Subcommittee I and not to the Board). The district will place the report on the district web site.

### **MAY 11, 2000 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.2. PRESENTATION OF FINAL REPORT FROM UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE II**

Unification Task Force Subcommittee II presented their final report. Miss Norris read a letter from Sol Chooljian, Chairman of Subcommittee III. On a motion by Mrs. Miller, seconded Mr. Speakman and voted unanimously, the Board moved that the Board read the reports. On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded by Miss Norris and voted unanimously, the Board moved to free the Board Members to participate at whatever level they would like to participate personally in any of the Subcommittees they would like to participate as citizens of the community. Dr. LaCouture announced the reports will be on the district web page tomorrow, May 12, 2000. At a future Board Meeting all three Subcommittees will present their reports, Board action will be taken, and the Subcommittees will be released of their charge. Roger Lund, Chairman of Subcommittee III, spoke in behalf of all three Subcommittees, announcing that if anyone has questions or needs clarifications of any of the Subcommittees to please contact them.

### **JULY 6, 2000 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.2. UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE I RELEASE FROM CHARGE**

Roger Lund, Chair of Unification Task Force Subcommittee I, expressed his appreciation to the Board for setting up the task forces and thanked members of Subcommittee I for their many hours of volunteer work. He presented a response to the critique from Subcommittee II. A copy of the response is on file at the District Office. Subcommittee I proposed that PVSD Trustees sponsor a Public Education Forum in which Subcommittees I, II and III would have an opportunity to present their reports to the Board and the public in an orderly manner. They proposed that each Subcommittee be given equal time (Approx. 15-20 minutes each) to make a pre-recorded

presentation at one of the regularly scheduled Board Meetings in September or October, which will also be broadcast to the community via video cable television. When the unification process is proceeded further, a full public debate not sponsored by the District would appear to be appropriate. Following his presentation, Mr. Lund requested Subcommittee I be released from its charge.

Mrs. Rains stated that she had read all three reports and asked several questions of Subcommittee I. Mr. Lund explained to her that the draft report of September 1999 was a rough draft but was misrepresented by some as a final report. Mrs. Rains stated she did not feel the report was complete because she could not find who would be affected, the way each would be effected and the cost of each project and where the money will come from. She also had difficulty understanding the revelency of including the Legislative Analyst Report as an attachment.

Mr. Speakman requested the Board thank Subcommittee I for their efforts and release them from their charge as they indicated that they have completed their tasks. He felt Mrs. Rains was questioning their efforts and that this was not the appropriate time and place to do so. Mrs. Rains stated that she has the right to ask questions before accepting the unification report. Dr. LaCouture suggested that if the Board has questions, they be agendized for another Board Meeting so that the public knows that there will be a full discussion on all three reports. It was not the intent of this Board Meeting to discuss the reports. Mrs. Rains stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Lund's suggestion to have a Public Education Forum in September or October, but understood from the May 11, 2000 Board Meeting that she would be able to ask questions tonight.

Liz Vega and Nancy Boyce, members of Subcommittee I, expressed their opinions on unification and some of their experiences volunteering to serve on the committee and in the District.

Debra Creadick, Co-chair of Subcommittee II, was not in agreement with the proposal of Subcommittee I for each subcommittee to make pre-recorded presentations at a Public Education Forum because she felt they should not be controlled hearings with no opportunity for public input. She feels each subcommittee should be given an allowable time to make a presentation without limits on who can attend, who can be in the room and who can ask questions. She stated that although Subcommittee II has disbanded, they would be willing present information and answer questions for the public if requested.

Dr. LaCouture suggested the Board get out of the unification business. He requested the subcommittees be released of their charges. He is in favor of a public forum but believes the Board should turn it over to another organization. He stated that the Board cannot act on unification and that efforts need to be returned to running the Pleasant Valley K-8 School District.

**On a motion by Mrs. Miller, seconded by Mr. Speakman and voted 4 to 1 (Mr. Amador abstained), the Board moved to receive the response and release Subcommittee I of its charge with deep appreciation.** The Public Education Forum will be on the agenda for the next Board Meeting. Mrs. Rains clarified that by receiving the response, without asking questions, does not mean that the Board is in concurrence. The subcommittees have accomplished their tasks and the Board's role to bring the information to the public has been fulfilled. Miss Norris added that a forum be held with the understanding that each subcommittee be allowed to orally present their reports. Mrs. Miller suggested that the Board follow the recommendation that the forum be turned over to another public entity. Amador stated that our community is a very involved community and that unification is a very important issue. He expressed his views about how the Board should not stop discussion on this issue because there are still unanswered questions and uncompleted tasks. He is in favor of a public live televised meeting of all three committees. Members of Subcommittee I in attendance received a Pleasant Valley School District mug in appreciation of their efforts.

### **AUGUST 3, 2000 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.1. UNIFICATION DISCUSSION**

The Superintendent addressed the Board suggesting that the basic discussion should be who should do a forum on the unification issue. In answering the question of the forum being possibly premature, Dr. LaCouture explained that the state determines if a district meets the statutory requirements and then it is sent back to the community for a ballot measure. In order for the state to make the determination, it needs to go through a process, such as petitions, and through a County committee on district organization. He also indicated that, when the Board commissioned the Unification Feasibility Study, the charge was to determine if unification was feasible from the statutory point of view and that the author of that study indicated that unification did, in fact, meet the statutory requirements. He explained that the state still has to determine if the requirements are met, but one cannot go to the state without having gone through the process. He further indicated that the process does not necessarily have to include a forum. The statutory process would involve a petition generated in favor of unification. It then goes to the county committee on district organization, not the school boards. Depending on the percentage of signatures, the County could stop the process if the percentage was low or, if higher, have a public meeting of both districts with the county making recommendations to the state board.

Several members of Subcommittees I, II and III addressed the Board and expressed their views on the concept, need, and possible facilitators of a public forum.

Dr. LaCouture advised the audience and the public that copies of all five (two feasibility studies and three subcommittee) reports are available at the district office and on the district web site, [www.pvsd.k12.ca.us](http://www.pvsd.k12.ca.us).

Miss Norris read a statement (attached) from Board Member Dolores V. Rains, who was unable to attend the Board meeting:

**On a motion by Mrs. Miller, second by Mr. Speakman and passed unanimously, the Board moved to direct staff to contact various agencies to conduct one or more public forums on Unification, at City Hall Chambers, prior to the November elections.**

**On a motion by Mr. Amador, second by Miss Norris, the Board moved to invite the subcommittees to present their reports orally at a board meeting prior to the forum. The motion failed 2-2, Mrs. Miller and Mr. Speakman voting no.**

### **APRIL 5, 2001 Regular Meeting**

#### **D.3. Consideration Paid to Marguerite Leoni Attorney-at-Law, Nielsen, Mersamer, Parrinello, Mueller & Naylor, LLP Regarding Issues on League of Women Voters/Chamber of Commerce Forum on May 3, 2001**

Mrs. Berg requested this item be brought before the Board to answer questions and acknowledge the availability of Marguerite Leoni for services should the occasion arise. Mrs. Berg stated that the City Hall Chambers have been reserved for a unification forum on May 3, 2001, sponsored by the Camarillo Chamber Governmental Relations Committee and the local chapter of the League of Women Voters. As she understands, the three unification subcommittees will each make a presentation and then have questions from the community. Before the forum, Mrs. Berg would like the Board to present the following three issues to be addressed by Ms. Leoni and not exceed the \$5,000 previously paid her, so that the community can make an informed decision regarding unification; 1) unfunded liability, 2) responsibility for the recently passed bond; and 3) issues concerning safety and ethnicity. The Board directed staff to have the three sub-committee chairs submit their top three legally specific questions for legal clarification to the Board by April 12, 2001. The Board will then evaluate and review the questions at the April 19<sup>th</sup> meeting and present them to

Ms. Leoni to receive answers back to the committees before the May 3<sup>rd</sup> forum and not to exceed the \$5,000 previously paid her.

### **MAY 17, 2001 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.2. UNIFICATION QUESTIONS FOR ATTORNEY**

The Board reviewed the questions submitted by the Unification Task Force Subcommittees I, II, and III and directed they be submitted to Marguerite Leoni, Attorney-at-Law, Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello, Mueller & Naylor, LLP for technical assistance. The firm has been paid \$5000 for their service and it is the clear intent of the Board to not exceed that sum. There was consensus of the need for legal clarification by all three committees on three key issues:

1. The existing Oxnard Union High School District Bond Indebtedness
2. The existing Oxnard Union High School District unfunded retirement liability
3. The ability of the newly unified district to meet the state criteria, especially that of racial make-up

Subcommittees I and II additionally submitted questions regarding:

4. The blended revenue limit calculation
5. The Oxnard Union High School District's proposed site for a second high school in Camarillo

The Board directed staff to submit the questions 1, 2 & 3 to Mrs. Leoni with 4 & 5 if time and money permits, to be answered by the end of August 2001. The League of Women Voters and the Chamber of Commerce postponed the May 3<sup>rd</sup> forum.

### **OCTOBER 4, 2001 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.2. RESPONSE TO BOARD FROM MARGUERITE LEONI ON QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FROM UNIFICATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEES I, II AND III**

The Board reviewed the response to the Board from Marguerite Leoni, Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello, Mueller & Naylor, LLP, to the questions submitted by the Board from the Unification Task Force Subcommittees I, II, and III. Mrs. Rains posed possible questions for the Board's consideration. Regarding what liabilities a new unified district would have for the repayment of existing bonded indebtedness and COP's, she asked what the district would have as a debt and what the voters would have as a debt. Mrs. Rains calculated the district would start with a debt of approximately \$14 million and the voters could possibly have a debt of \$84 million or as high as \$104 million. She read portions of a letter dated Jan. 5, 1993 from Mr. Terry McHenry, who conducted the 1992 study on unification and 1998 updated feasibility study. Since there are some additional finances left, Mrs. Rains requested the Board submit an additional question (#4) regarding the blended revenue limit calculation to Mrs. Leoni. She proposed to the Board, that if they should decide to ask that question she would like to add to it the following questions: 1) Will the blended revenue be encumbered in all of the administrative positions that a high school requires that is not required on an elementary level, and 2) Within that blended revenue, how will the difference in salaries of approximately \$10,000 between the high school and the elementary be addressed. Dr. Hamilton suggested the Board wait until after the Unification Forum (to be held Monday, October 8<sup>th</sup> at City Hall at 7:30 p.m.) before suggesting additional questions to Mrs. Leoni. The Board concurred that they would like to have Mrs. Leoni answer question #4 regarding the blended revenue limit calculation. They also agreed that they continue to work with the chairs of each of the three subcommittees in terms of which questions are sent to Mrs. Leoni for legal clarification and research.

### **OCTOBER 18, 2001 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.6. UNIFICATION ISSUES FOR BOARD DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION**

This item was brought back for further discussion and possible action at the Board's request. Mr. Speakman summarized steps the Board has taken over the last three years in terms of looking at and

researching the unification issue. After the Unification Forum held October 8<sup>th</sup>, the following items, along with others, were suggested as possible additional steps for the Board to take:

- Consider implementing the recommendations of Subcommittee III
- Formally request the Oxnard Union High School District honor the October 1999 Developer Fee Agreement including retroactivity provision
- Formally request the Oxnard Union High School District join PVSD and the community in a dialogue to amicably reach a reorganization agreement
- Join with the City Council in discussing developer fees and their retention in Camarillo
- Use the remainder of the retainer with Mrs. Marguerite Leoni to answer additional unification related questions

Mr. Speakman opened the floor for public comments. Some members of the public addressed this issue, desiring the Board to move forward and take action on unification.

Mr. Speakman indicated he was willing to lift the “gag order” and state his position on unification. The Board has taken a neutral position while studies were being conducted. Mr. Speakman stated that some people believe “neutral” means “disinterested” but that the Board is definitely not disinterested in the unification issue.

Mr. Speakman suggested the Board draft two separate letters to Oxnard Union High School District (OUHSD), 1) spend the developer fee dollars that were generated from the City of Camarillo in the City of Camarillo, and 2) encourage OUHSD to honor the agreements that have been entered into as we have been negotiating the developer fee split issue and for them to complete the tasks that they said they would complete, that we can come to some agreement on the developer fee split and that they honor the agreement to make that split retroactive back to September 1, 1999.

Mr. Speakman read the following statement from Mrs. Rains into the record:

*With regard to the unification issues for Board discussion and possible action, Board member Rains submits the following points and respectfully requests that they be placed into the record of this evening's meeting:*

*There are five bulleted items submitted by board President Speakman. I submit the following input to each item:*

- 1. Consider implementing the recommendations of Subcommittee III. I agree with their suggestion and recommend we move quickly to address them.*
- 2. Formally request the OUHSD honor the October 1999 Developer Fee Agreement including retroactivity provisions. I do not think we agreed nor did we sign this agreement without a provision regarding the possibility of not being included in the final discussion and receipt of these funds. We did not want to give a carte blanche to the study, which was not concluded, so perhaps consideration will be given this new request. As I understand it, that study was to be commissioned by Mr. Mantooth of the County Office and not the OUHSD. I would suggest the Supt. Write a letter requesting that we be given strong consideration for retroactive developer fees to October 1999 in as much as our concern with the study was never addressed.*
- 3. If this request would include a discussion that discloses possible costs to the voter, how the Rio Mesa students are to be housed, the potential ethnic issue, equity issues, the fact that Camarillo is due a new high school equal to Pacifica, and finally that all members of each Board participate, I might vote in favor of the idea. I am still very concerned with the lack of information given the citizens of Camarillo regarding restructure, reorganization or reunification.*

4. *This idea was mirrored by Board member Berg on Thursday as well as City Councilwoman McDonald on Wednesday evening at their meeting. I do not believe this can be done legally. If it is the intent of our elected body to utilize the City Council to apply pressure to developers, then I would seriously suggest the legality of this idea to be researched. I assume that the Board President will assign this to the two individuals already serving as liaison members to the City Council. I am not opposed to the idea, but question whether it can be done legally.*
5. *I would respectfully request that this item be delayed until I am present. I would really appreciate being part of the discussion in deciding the questions. I had stated my concerns about the blended revenue at the meeting of October 4<sup>th</sup>, which by the way I would appreciate some reference being made in the minutes under E.1. Section C.2. I would respectfully request that this section C.2. be omitted from approval until it can be rewritten to include my remarks regarding Ms. Leoni's letter. Also, it was agreed that the three committee chairs be consulted regarding the questions that would be sent. Therefore, it is my opinion that his item should be delayed until conference can take place with the chairs.*

*And finally, I would respectfully request that no vote be taken regarding the Board's position on unification until the first meeting in November. I would appreciate tremendously being a part of that vote. Thank you for consideration to my remarks. After consultation with the Supt. It was decided this method would be easier to handle than a teleconference. I agreed to that suggestion. Appreciatively, Dolores V. Rains*

Dr. Hamilton has been in contact with the Superintendent of OUHSD about unification and announced they will be holding a Board meeting on October 31<sup>st</sup>. The topic of that evening will be renovation of Camarillo High School.

Mrs. Miller moved that the Board consider implementing the recommendations of Subcommittee III as listed in their report. After discussion, the Board agreed to bring back this item to the next Board meeting after researching and reword it to make it more specific.

Mrs. Berg moved that the Board ask the OUHSD to honor retroactively the developer fees that are due PVSD from the letter of September of 1999. Mr. Speakman clarified that he brought forward the developer fee split issue shortly after being elected to the Board as he noticed some inequities. He explained that there have been meetings with members of our staff and their staff and verbal agreements have been reached but there is no written document that says OUHSD will go forward in negotiations on developer fee split and then make it retroactive to the date PVSD first initiated the discussion. There is a record of verbal communication between members of our staff and the OUHSD that indicated the intent was to go back and do it retroactively. It was discussed at a previous meeting that if PVSD did not agree to the terms OUHSD had given us, OUHSD might not choose to go back retroactively. Mr. Speakman would like to make a very public request to the OUHSD that they come forward and continue in good

faith with those negotiations so they can be finished. And when they are finished, make the fee split retroactive back to September 1999. Mr. Speakman stated that the study has not been done so PVSD cannot decide if they are in agreement or not.

On a motion by Mr. Speakman, second by Mrs. Kitchens, passed 4-0, the Board moved to direct the Superintendent to draft a letter to the Oxnard Union High School District requesting them to proceed

forward in negotiations on the developer fee split issue and agree in writing to retroactively apply that developer fee split to September 1, 1999.

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, second by Mrs. Miller and passed 4-0, the Board moved to direct the Superintendent to draft a letter to Oxnard Union High School District requesting that all developer fees generated by construction in the City of Camarillo be spent for the benefit of Camarillo residents and any disparity in developer fees since 1984 be reimbursed.**

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, second by Mrs. Berg, and passed 3-1 (Mrs. Kitchens voted No), the board moved to authorize the Board President and/or the Superintendent to approach the City Council and other interested organizations in the City of Camarillo and encourage them to write similar letters to the Oxnard Union High School District.**

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, second by Mrs. Miller and passed 3-1 (Mrs. Kitchens voted No), the Board moved to formally request the Oxnard Union High School District to join with representatives of our Board and professional staff to develop a dialogue to amicably reach a reorganization agreement. The staff would include professionals in the field of Curriculum, Classified, Finances, the Superintendent and two Board members.** Mrs. Rains stated in her letter that she would like all the Board members to attend. Mrs. Kitchens also felt all members should attend. It was discussed by the Board and agreed that two members should attend to not be in violation of the Brown Act.

Dr. Hamilton clarified that a committee will be formed to meet with a representative committee from OUHSD with the purpose to see if there is any way to have an amicable reorganization process. The committee will also get some data in the process (assets, liabilities, etc.) and report the information back to the Board as a whole for a decision. The intent is to form a committee and meet with OUHSD as often as it takes to come to a resolution on the issue. The intent of the committee is not to go and unify the school district, but to meet with OUHSD to see what answers can be brought back to the community.

On a motion by Mrs. Miller, second by Mrs. Berg and passed 3-1 (Mrs. Kitchens voted No), the Board moved to delegate Mrs. Berg and Mr. Speakman to serve on the committee.

Mr. Lund suggested Dr. Hamilton fax the letters from the Board to the OUHSD and to request the unification issue be included on their October 31<sup>st</sup> agenda.

The meeting with OUHSD may generate different questions to ask Mrs. Leoni. Mrs. Kitchens requested the Board wait until Mrs. Rains returns to make any decisions regarding unification. Mrs. Berg feels the Board should not wait for Mrs. Rains, but get more substantial answers from Mrs. Leoni now so the issue may move forward. The Board directed to have the Superintendent and two designees (Mrs. Berg and Mr. Speakman) approach Mrs. Leoni to counsel the district if the right questions were asked and give direction. If subcommittees or members of the community have questions they can e-mail them to the Superintendent.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, second by Mrs. Miller, the Board moved that the PVSD Board of Trustees officially adopt and endorse a philosophy that a unified district structure is the preferred means of delivering educational instruction to all Camarillo students K-12, and that we instruct staff to review the issue and return to the Board with recommendations. Implicit in this motion is the understanding that each of the specialty areas will bring back information as the Board directs. Mrs. Miller withdrew her second and the motion died.** The Board felt they should wait until Mrs. Rains is in attendance so that a full vote of the Board can be made. Mrs. Miller requested this item be put on the November 1<sup>st</sup> agenda.

### **NOVEMBER 1, 2001 Regular Meeting**

#### **C.3. UNIFICATION: DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION REGARDING VARIOUS ISSUES AND QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE POTENTIAL OF UNIFYING THE PLEASANT VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT FROM A PORTION OF THE OXNARD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Mr. Speakman gave a brief history of this item. No action was taken at the last Board meeting to honor Mrs. Rain's request that the Board take no action until she is able to attend and voice her opinions and concerns.

Roger Lund requested the Board vote on the motion, not discuss it further, and he urged the Board to vote in support of the motion.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, second by Mrs. Miller and passed 3-2 (Mrs. Rains and Mrs. Kitchens voted No), the Board moved that the Board of Trustees officially adopt and endorse a philosophy that a unified district structure is the preferred means of delivering educational instruction to all Camarillo students K-12, and that we instruct staff to review the issue and return to the Board with recommendations. Implicit in this motion is the understanding that each of the specialty area will bring us back information as the Board directs.**

Mrs. Rains thanked the Board for reading her remarks into the record at the last Board meeting, as she was not in attendance. She stated she had previewed the video and audiotapes from that meeting and had a concern of who is actively serving as members on the Board-appointed committee to meet with OUHSD Board members and staff. She recommended the Superintendent preview both the district video and the audiotapes on Section C.6. of the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting to insure that the district is in compliance with the Brown Act. She requested the Superintendent extract a verbatim transcript from the audio covering all the discussion that occurred on that specific motion. She also requested a Brown Act Workshop be scheduled as soon as possible with an authority in that area. It was clarified that Board members have studied that issue but only two members, Mrs. Berg and Mr. Speakman, are on the committee.

Mr. Speakman stated he has heard every member of the Board indicate that a unified district would be preferred but that Mrs. Rains consistently stated that she wondered if it was the right time, as it hadn't been fully researched.

Mr. Speakman stated there is a district philosophy statement on the PVSD website that says the Board is neutral. He does not have that philosophy and believes it needs to be changed.

### **JUNE 5, 2002, REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.3. Unification Report and Discussion of PVSD's Participation, Committees and Demonstration of Established Patterns**

As per Mr. Speakman's request, the Board discussed unification. Members of the public addressed the Board. Bill Little, William Liebmann, and Rory Hernandez presented a petition to form a Camarillo Unified K-12 School District. They requested the district update the Board Unification Feasibility Study by Terry McHenry immediately. They also requested and the district concurred to form a subcommittee to work with the parent committee on issues as they directly affect the district. The subcommittee will consist of one board member (Mr. Speakman), the Superintendent, a district staff representative that reports to the Superintendent, and the Business Director. Mr. Speakman, Mrs. Berg, and Mrs. Miller publicly expressed their support for unification. Mrs. Rains and Mrs. Kitchens stated they would not vote on the issue until all of their previous questions had been answered. Mrs. Rains requested the action taken on November 1, 2001 on page D.3.4. reflect the vote of 3 to 2 (Mrs.

Rains and Mrs. Kitchens voted No). Mr. Speakman made a motion that the Board direct Dr. Hamilton to commission an update of the Unification Feasibility Study with Mr. McHenry. Mrs. Berg seconded the motion. Mrs. Rains felt the motion violated the Brown Act. Mr. Speakman withdrew the motion. With the consensus of the Board, Dr. Hamilton will contact Mr. McHenry and bring back as an agenda item the cost and length of time it would take to update the Unification Feasibility Study.

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 4 to 1 (Mrs. Rains voted No), the Board moved that the district form a Subcommittee to be comprised of Mr. Speakman, Dr. Hamilton, a staff member that reports to the Superintendent, and Jan Maez, to work with the chief petitioners to lend the school district's expertise and resources so that the petition process is approached appropriately so it is not repeated again at a later date.**

#### **JUNE 19, 2002, REGULAR MEETING**

##### **D.1. Unification: Cost to Update the Most Recent Study Per Direction from the PVSD School Board**

Dr. Hamilton reported that Mr. Terry McHenry would not be able to update the unification feasibility study until August or September and that his fee would not exceed \$5000. In order to reduce expenses and expedite the process, staff will gather data and do the calculations and have Mr. McHenry review the data for accurateness and legal comportment. Sherry Cole will be the one staff member reporting to the Superintendent that will serve on the district sub-committee to pursue studying the unification study.

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 5 to 0, the Board moved to direct Dr. Hamilton and staff to proceed in gathering information needed to update the unification study.**

#### **AUGUST 7, 2002, REGULAR MEETING**

##### **C.1. REPORT FROM UNIFICATION SUBCOMMITTEE; REQUEST FOR FUNDING PER CONSULTANT'S PROPOSAL TO UPDATE THE STUDY; AND DISTRICT SUPPORT OF THE PROCESS TO GET UNIFICATION TO PUBLIC VOTE**

Dr. Hamilton reported on the Board-appointed Unification Subcommittee meeting of July 15<sup>th</sup>. Minutes from that meeting are included in the board packet and have been given to the Board to review. Dr. Hamilton provided copies of the proposal from Mr. Terry McHenry to update the prior Unification Feasibility Study to bring it current. Oxnard Union High School District is willing to cooperate to provide PVSD data needed to update the study.

After reading the minutes of the Unification Subcommittee, Mrs. Rains felt the committee had gone beyond the motion the Board had voted on at the June 5<sup>th</sup> Board meeting and that the Committee is changing their approach. Mrs. Rains stated she still has some unanswered questions. She feels a unification plan for her must address three specific areas. It must show her 1) it will be instructionally effective for the children that it impacts, 2) that it must be economically efficient for the taxpayers of Camarillo, and 3) that it must have community support. Mrs. Rains stated that she strongly believes Oxnard Union High School District owes Camarillo a high school.

Sandy Rao, co-chair of Subcommittee II, expressed her views on unification and encouraged the Board to carefully consider spending additional funds to update the Unification Feasibility Study at this time of budget cuts.

Mr. Speakman explained that the unification process cannot move forward without first having a current updated unification feasibility study prior to the petition being presented to the California State Board.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to "call for the question" on the following motion:**

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 3-2 (Rains and Kitchens voted No), the Board moved to approve an expenditure not to exceed \$5,000 to update the Unification Study from the district wide Other Services account.** The motion was made with the understanding that the Superintendent will negotiate with Mr. McHenry to keep costs as low as possible.

**On a motion by Mrs. Miller, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to accept the report of the Unification Committee.**

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 3-2 (Rains and Kitchens voted No), the Board moved to direct the Superintendent to formally contact the Superintendent of Oxnard Union High School District to explore the feasibility of having a joint resolution presented to the State Board of Education.**

Mrs. Berg offered some perspective on political ploys.

**C.2. REQUEST FROM OXNARD UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR NAMES: AD HOC COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS NEED FOR ANOTHER HIGH SCHOOL IN CAMARILLO**

The Board nominated Tari Loomis, Bill Little, Sol Chooljian, Kathleen O'Riley, Patty Lerner, Barry Hoyland, and Larry Davis, to serve on an ad hoc committee to discuss the need for a new high school in Camarillo.

**SEPTEMBER 19, 2002 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

**C.3. REQUEST TO EXTEND AGREEMENT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL BEYOND THE CURRENT RETAINER AMOUNT (\$5,000) TO ADDRESS ISSUES RELATED TO THE MATTER OF UNIFICATION**

Mrs. Rains expressed her opinion that whenever the issue of unification is brought forth, the majority of the Board is willing to vote to spend any amount of money. Mr. Speakman clarified a statement from Mrs. Rains that schools were not closed because the district is bankrupt or has financial problems but rather the district is managing funds in the most efficient way possible. Mr. Speakman feels the Board should support the process to get information on unification to the public so they can make an informed decision. Mrs. Miller and Mrs. Berg feel it is in the best interest of the community to extend the agreement with legal counsel beyond the current retainer amount.

On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 3 to 1 (Mrs. Rains voted No), the Board moved to extend the contract of legal counsel Marguerite Leoni, on a time and materials basis, at the contract hourly rate, through December 2002.

**OCTOBER 3, 2002 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

**D.10. Management Items**

Dr. Hamilton is co-chairing a Superintendent's Round Table with Tari Loomis to increase communication between the district and the community on district issues. Two meetings have been held that were very well attended and received. There was a request from a member at the Round Table that the petition process be put on the website. Displaying the unification petition on the district website was discussed and agreed that it be placed there.

**OCTOBER 17, 2002 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

**D.4. Board Announcements/Items/Correspondence**

Mrs. Berg attended the Candidates Forum for the OUHSD and PVSD Board of Trustees. She noted that six out of six candidates for OUHSD felt that a second high school in Camarillo was not warranted at present and five of the six PVSD candidates favor unifying our district.

**DECEMBER 12, 2002 ANNUAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

#### **D.5. Board Items/Correspondence/Announcements**

Mr. Alamillo announced he is open and available to the public. He reported on his attendance at the CSBA Conference, particularly on the Brown Act, unification, and budget cuts. He's been researching year-round school and unification.

Mr. Speakman reported on his attendance at the Annual CSBA Conference and expressed his hopes of the district pulling through this period of budget cuts. He requested items on the unification feasibility study and status of the arbitration agreement with OUHSD at next meeting.

#### **JANUARY 16, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

##### **D.1. Update on Unification Feasibility Study Status**

Dr. Hamilton reported that Mr. Terry McHenry (author of the original December 1992 report which was updated in 1998) is updating the unification feasibility study. It is anticipated that the update will be completed in draft form no later than February, 2003, and will provide current information in the more difficult areas of student housing, ethnic impact, and matters of fiscal liability should unification become a reality. The Superintendent recently sent a letter to parents providing factual information as to the status of the unification effort.

##### **D.4. Board Items/Correspondence**

Mr. Alamillo ...reported...(U)nification petitions have been circulating throughout the community. He read portions of an e-mail he received that was addressed to Dr. Davis and requested petitioners present only the facts about the unification issue.

Mrs. Berg reported on her attendance .... at a conference with Stan Mantooth at the County Superintendent's office. She reported that State is monitoring our district's unification progress and will be lending assistance to help at both the county and state levels.

#### **FEBRUARY 6, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

##### **D.1. Board Items/Correspondence**

Mrs. Berg attended the Ventura County School Board Association reorganization meeting and entered the minutes into the record. She also entered minutes from a meeting where she reported on the status of PVSD's petition process.

#### **FEBRUARY 20, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

##### **C.1. REQUEST FROM CHIEF PETITIONER FOR THE CAMARILLO UNIFIED CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO GIVE PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PETITION EFFORT**

William Little, one of the Chief Petitioners, gave a progress report on the petition drive and requested further assistance. Mr. Little, Board members and the Superintendent discussed district involvement in the unification petition process. The cost for lending district resources to the process and impact on the budget was also discussed.

Mr. Alamillo made a motion to accept a factual letter from Mr. Little, post it on the district website and direct petitioners to the website. The motion died due to lack of a second. Mr. Little requested the letter come from the school district.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 3-1-1 (Mr. Alamillo abstained and Mrs. Kitchens voted No), the Board moved that a letter from the Board be sent to parents and service organizations outlining the progress of the unification petition gathering to date, what the goal is, and what the community can do to help them reach the goal. Mrs. Miller amended the motion and Mrs. Berg approved the amendment to include that no district funds will be used to distribute the letter. The motion was made with the understanding that the Superintendent**

will draft the letter and sign it. Mr. Speakman stated that he would also add his signature to the letter. A statement that the letter is paid for by the Citizens Committee for Unification was requested.

### **MARCH 6, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

#### **C.3. REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT OF THE "AD HOC COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS THE NEED FOR ANOTHER HIGH SCHOOL IN CAMARILLO"**

Dr. Hamilton presented this item for discussion and direction. Mr. Alamillo reported that he is also a member of this committee and that the committee is meeting on March 11<sup>th</sup> to complete their report. He suggested that the Board may want to wait until May to hear a progress report from the committee. Mrs. Berg questioned if there is a conflict with Mr. Alamillo serving on the committee although he was on it before being elected to the Board. The Board directed staff to research past discussion by the Board as to the involvement of Board members serving on the committee.

#### **C.2. ACCEPTANCE OF UNIFICATION FEASIBILITY STUDY AND DIRECTION TO STAFF**

After discussion, the Board concurred to extend the 20-minute time limit for this item. Mr. Terry McHenry, the author of the study, reviewed the study and answered extensive questions from the Board. Mr. Speakman called for a 5-minute break at 9:10 p.m. The Board heard statements from the public.

**Mr. Speakman made a motion and it was seconded that the Board moved that the Pleasant Valley School District take a leadership role in the issue of unifying the Pleasant Valley School District and direct the Superintendent along with the Board to, 1) educate the community of the facts regarding school district unification, and 2) guide the unification issue through the statutory process such that it is available as a ballot measure to the citizens within our district boundaries so that the voting public will have an opportunity to make their wishes known regarding this issue in a public election. Extensive discussion ensued.**

A motion to Call the [Previous] Question was made by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 3-2 (Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voted No), **ending debate**. The motion by Mr. Speakman stated above failed 2-3 (Mr. Alamillo, Mrs. Kitchens, and Mrs. Miller voted No).

**Mrs. Miller made a motion and it was seconded that the Board amend the previous motion to include that the board take a leadership role and direct staff, 1) to educate (1-2 flyers). She stated the intent of her motion is to assist in getting unification on the ballot before the voters without cost to the district. A motion to Call the [Previous] Question was made by Mr. Alamillo and passed 5-0, ending debate. The Board requested the Board Recording Secretary read back the motion. She stated that the Board amended Mr. Speakman's motion to include that the board assist staff to educate the community without using district funds (meaning 1 or 2 flyers, allow the Superintendent to speak at service clubs and communicate through the Chamber of Commerce). The motion by Mrs. Miller passed 3-2 (Mrs. Berg and Mr. Speakman voted No).**

### **MARCH 20, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

#### **B.5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Several members of the public spoke on unification, and the recent factual, informational letter that was sent to parents.

### **APRIL 3, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

#### **B.5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Several members of the public spoke on unification.

## **MAY 1, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

### **B.7. BOARD ANNOUNCEMENTS**

[Mrs. Berg] She reported that she took the signed unification petitions to a professional group in El Segundo for review.

### **D.2. Board Items/Correspondence**

Mrs. Berg also commented on the presentation at the OUHSD Board meeting last night by the Camarillo Educational Design Committee on getting a new high school in Camarillo. [Mr. Alamillo] He spoke on the Camarillo Educational Design Committee's recommendation for a new high school in Camarillo with a projected date of 2010.

## **JUNE 5, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

### **C.7. REQUEST FOR DIRECTION: SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION (UNIFICATION PETITION AND QUESTIONS RELEVANT THERETO)**

Dr. Hamilton reported that the Camarillo Unified Citizens Committee has gathered 10,700 names. 9,500 signatures are needed to qualify at the 25% level. The next step in the process is to petition the County Committee on School District Reorganization. Dr. Hamilton explained each step with its respective timeline in the unification process. Dr. Hamilton is requesting the Board remove the current cap of \$5000 to consult with district legal counsel regarding the next steps needed to prepare documentation and presentation format for the County Committee and the State Department of Education. Statements were read and public speakers expressed their opposition and support of the unification process.

**Mrs. Berg made a motion that the Board authorize the Superintendent to access relevant legal counsel, as needed and as appropriate, to guide the Pleasant Valley School District through the petition process for both the County Committee and the State Department of Education in the matter of school district reorganization. Mrs. Miller seconded the motion.**

Discussion ensued on the unification issue. Mr. Alamillo stated his reasons the district should not support the unification issue. Mrs. Kitchens requested that Dr. Hamilton ask legal counsel for a proposal showing an anticipated range of cost. She also stated that she is in support of unification, but was disturbed with the timing and the present budget crisis. She reiterated her past requests for a proposal explaining where the money comes from. Mrs. Miller stated she is in favor of authorizing the Superintendent to access relevant legal counsel, as needed and explained that all expenditures go before the Board for approval and the process can be stopped at any time. Mrs. Berg stated she has great trust in Dr. Hamilton to make good decisions for the district. Community citizens donated funds to hire a professional Petition Gatherer to help with the collection of signatures. Mr. Speakman commented that to stop the unification process now would be in violation of board action that this board has already taken and would waste money already spent. He feels the Board is responsible for representing the community in making decisions for future children in the district. He responded to public comments made earlier by clarifying that the district has not paid any money to gather signatures and did not close Valle Lindo, cut programs, or lay off employees to further the unification effort.

**Mrs. Berg Called The Question. Mr. Alamillo seconded the motion and it passed 5-0. The original motion was voted on and passed 3-2 (Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voted No).**

## **SEPTEMBER 4, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

### **D.3. Status Report on Unification Effort**

The Board received a report on the status of the unification effort. The unification petitions were submitted to the county. The signatures will be validated by September 13<sup>th</sup>. After September 13<sup>th</sup>, there will be a 60-day period in which there will be at least two public hearings where the petitioners, proponents and opponents will be given the opportunity to present their case. Dr. Hamilton discussed the timeline on this process.

### **OCTOBER 16, 2003 REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

#### **C.3. REVISION OF BOARD POLICY (BP) 0200: GOALS FOR THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND FINALIZATION OF PVSD GOALS FOR 2003-2004**

**Mrs. Wagner reviewed each goal individually allowing for discussion by the Board. The goals may be amended to include a goal on unification.** On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to revise Board Policy (BP) 0200: GOALS FOR THE SCHOOL DISTRICT to conform to the March 2003 CSBA sample as presented and to approve the PVSD Goals for 2003-2004.

#### **C.4. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION #03-31 OF SUPPORT: REORGANIZATION OF PVSD TO A UNIFIED K-12 DISTRICT THROUGH THE COMMUNITY VOTING PROCESS**

**Mrs. Berg made a motion to approve Resolution #03-31 supporting unification of PVSD to a K-12 district.** The motion was seconded by Mr. Speakman. There were public comments both for and against unification. Mrs. Kitchens expressed concern on items excluded in the resolution, remaining unanswered questions regarding unification, and stated her reasons for not being able to support this resolution. Mr. Alamillo indicated the Board's responsibility to take a leadership role and answer questions from the public. Mrs. Miller stated the Board is being asked this evening to "provide support" and look to the future of students in the district and allow citizens to vote on whether they want PVSD to be reorganized into a unified school district. Mrs. Berg invited the public to attend and get additional information at the October 30<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing. Mrs. Kitchens requested the Board postpone the resolution until after the October 30<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing when more information is available. Mr. Speakman read the action point of the resolution and stated his reasons for supporting the resolution. He urged the public to read the unification study as he feels it answers many of the questions being asked about the issue. **The motion passed 3-2 (Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voted No).**

#### **C.5. PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE PETITION TO FORM A CAMARILLO UNIFIED (K-12) SCHOOL DISTRICT PER THE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION**

The Board received a progress report of work accomplished to date. They discussed the draft agenda regarding the County Committee on School District Organization Public Hearing of October 30, 2003, as provided by the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office. The district will make a presentation at the October 30<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing regarding the nine criteria of district organization. A member of the public expressed concern about the amount of time staff is spending on the unification issue rather than on district business. Dr. Hamilton explained that the district is directed by the county to produce additional material for the hearing and that staff is doing much of the work outside of district time.

### **FEBRUARY 5, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

Dr. Dase also gave an update on Unification reviewing what occurred at the County Committee on School District Organization meeting on Monday, February 2. The next meeting is February 18 and there will be no public comments at this meeting. The committee will vote on each of the nine criteria and the petition in general. They will also consider whether they wish to provide a recommendation on the area of election. Dr. Dase thanked Mrs. Maez and Mrs. Wagner for all their work on providing the information requested by the county

### **FEBRUARY 19, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.4. Report on County Committee on School District Organization**

The Board received an oral report on the County Committee on School District Organization from Dr. Dase. He indicated the County Committee met last night to review and vote on the nine criteria. The comments from the County Committee are important when the state considers the unification petition. The committee determined that eight of the nine criteria were substantially met. Even though, criteria #9 was determined to not have been substantially met, the committee agreed to forward the petition as a whole on to the state for review. The committee opted to not make a recommendation on the area of election.

Dr. Dase stated that this will now be placed on the CDE calendar and will be reviewed by the CDE staff as well, indicating that staff does not have a sense of the timeline for that review. In terms of our next steps as a district, Mrs. Wagner will convene the Visioning Committee which will be looking at the issue of unification. The district need to be prepared and have a sense of what the community would like to see happen if unification is successful.

Mr. Speakman was very impressed with district staff and the work they had done and expressed his appreciation. He also thanked Dr. Dase for being a quick study on this issue.

There was discussion of the need for a unification Board workshop. Mr. Speakman stated that staff is looking to make sure they are prepared in the event this moves forward keeping the board up to speed and therefore not having a need at this time for a workshop. Dr. Dase suggested that as Mrs. Wagner moves forward with the Vision process there may be a need to discuss the results of what that group work is. He will then ask for direction from the Board on how they would like to this reported back. The Board concurred with this process.

#### **D.5. Board Items/Correspondence**

Mr. Alamillo congratulated Camarillo Unified on jumping the first hurdle. He also noted that preparation required staff time and money that this district can't afford. Seeing that, this has been and should be a community based action. Unification started in the community and he believes this is where it belongs and not in this district. He asked that the 12,500 that signed the petition be actively solicited by Camarillo Unified for funds to cover the cost for lawyers, consultants and lobbyist. He offered a donation of \$20.00 to cover the these costs, stating that the district cannot afford these expenses.

### **MAY 6, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **B.1. Exclusive Representatives**

Ms. Suzann Zeigler, President of PVEA addressed the Board spoke on unification item D.1. She stated that representatives of Camarillo Unified met with their executive board and provided information to the association. She stated that because there are unanswered questions about facilities and costs related to unification, *"...the teachers of the association are not going to be able to support unification without answers to these questions. It would be really sad if the association simply came out in opposition to unification simply for lack of information. Therefore I would request that as soon it is at all possible, the district consider ways to remedy that situation."*

#### **D.1. Update on Unification**

Dr. Dase explained that the petition is currently at the CDE for their review and could take a 2 to 6 years before action is taken. He and Dr. Davis were both approached by representatives from Camarillo Unified to talk about options and possibilities for expediting the process. They were advised that if the two districts were in agreement that there was a possibility the review process could be expedited for placement on the ballot much sooner. His hope was to develop a process for identifying questions and providing answers to the community.

Mr. Bill Little, Chief Petitioner, Mr. Roger Lund and Mrs. Debra Creadick presented information to the Board on their proposal.

Mrs. Berg stated that their speaking was a presentation to the Board, fact finding and not public comments.

Board consensus is to meet with OUHSD in a collaborative manner. Dr. Dase along with Dr. Davis can develop the process for forming a liaison committee with two members from each district to meet. Dr. Dase indicated there should not be any costs involved.

The Board through consensus directed the Superintendent to contact Dr. Davis and indicate that our Board would like to meet with their board and determine the direction their board would like to proceed on the proposal.

Members of the public addressed the Board. Mrs. Berg asked the board to take these comments into consideration with any future meeting with the OUHSD board members.

Mrs. Berg called for a short break at 8:35 p.m.

### **MAY 20, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.2. Status Report on Vision Committee for Unification**

Mrs. Wagner reported on the work of the planning group to create a Vision Committee. Dr. Dase stated that in addition to the Vision Committee he wishes to develop and distribute a community climate survey in order to receive feedback on educational needs in Camarillo including unification. Dr. Dase stated that there is a need for fiscal analysis of unification costs. Through consensus the Board directed Mrs. Wagner to proceed and report back by June 30, 2004. The Board also directed Dr. Dase to proceed with developing a plan for a fiscal analysis and a climate survey.

#### **D.3. Discussion of Budgeting and Accounting Procedures for Unification**

This item was placed on the agenda at the request of Mr. Alamillo in order to discuss the need for accounting for costs related to unification.

Discussion ensued on his request for a budget line item on unification. Members of the public addressed the Board. There was no direction to the Superintendent.

### **JUNE 3, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.6. Superintendent Items**

Dr. Dase stated he received a reply from Dr. Davis about the possibility of OUHSD's participation in a process to review items of concern related to unification. At the May 26 regular meeting, their Board decided not to pursue meeting with PVSD, but stay the course and follow the normal procedures. Dr. Dase reported that administration is working on a plan to include fiscal analysis, community climate survey and the Visioning Committee. Mrs. Wagner stated the first meeting of this committee will be June 21 from 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. The purpose of this committee is to establish a vision, establish criteria, develop options and identify costs. She anticipates a report to the Board at the July 15, 2004 meeting.

### **JUNE 17, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.7. Superintendent Items**

Dr. Dase indicated he spoke with Dr. Gary Davis, OUHSD Superintendent, who stated he gave direction to his staff to enter into negotiations for the property in question (at the corner of Las Posas and Somis Road). Dr. Davis indicated that the owners of the land would provide a hold harmless agreement in the event of unification. The OUHSD Board was concerned that if unification occurs the

land would become an asset to the new district. The OUHSD Board of Trustees is also considering a SFID (Special Facility Improvement District) in Oxnard and a bond to build a new high school in Oxnard.

Dr. Dase also addressed the questions of expenses related to the unification petition which is filed with the State Board of Education. He stated that he supervises our legal representation which is to look at all issues related to unification. Because other representatives are lobbying to change regulations which could make unification more difficult and cause our petition to be returned to the County Committee, the District lobbyist is only to do research to keep informed on what is happening at the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and the Legislature. Anything related to lobbying for a bill is not in the scope of legal representation of PVSD. Lobbying on behalf of legislation is the responsibility of the Chief Petitioners.

A Visioning Committee, under the direction of Barbara Wagner, will meet Tuesday nights for three weeks to look at all possible options for facilities, all possible opportunities and what programs could look like.

### **JULY 15, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **B.2. Public Comments**

Another member of the public addressed the board indicating that the board has the responsibility to inform the public on the unification issue; requested for a source of answers to unification questions such as a Q&A website page; encouraged the board to put this process in place as soon as possible; and stated that the focus of PVSD and OUHSD Boards should be about what is best for the kids and not about politics.

#### **D.2. SUPERINTENDENT ITEMS**

Dr. Dase is working with several consultants for a proposal to develop a community climate survey. The district is moving forward to define the elements related to unification to be able to provide the board with a program budget which outlines the costs related to unification.

#### **E.2. ADOPTION OF POSITION ON AB 780**

Dr. Dase stated that since the Board had adopted a position in support of unification in the past it may want to consider taking a position on AB780 which would expedite the unification process.

A member of the public addressed the Board about a Senate summary of AB780 which listed the Pleasant Valley School District in support of AB780 given that there was no record of a Board action taken. She questioned the appropriateness of letters written in support of AB780 and referenced Board Bylaws. She also presented the Board with copies of a bill sponsored by Salinas (D-Salinas) which would also affect unification.

**Mrs. Berg moved to direct the superintendent to write a letter on behalf of the Board in support of AB 780 and for the Board to support those efforts with our legislative advocates. Mr. Speakman seconded the motion.**

Mr. Alamillo stated he took exception to the letters sent in support of AB780 and that this legislation was written for Humboldt and Yosemite School Districts. He indicated he had written several letters to legislators. He believed that AB780 did not apply to PVSD's situation. Mr. Alamillo stated since the Senate already had PVSD down in support of the bill, a further letter was not required and not relevant to our unification bid.

Mrs. Kitchens stated that in the past Board presidents have informed other Board members of intent to write letters. She stated that she could not vote on this because we did not give the public the right to discuss this before the Board apparently took action.

Mrs. Berg distributed copies of letters from County Supervisor Kathy Long and City of Camarillo Mayor Don Waunch in support of AB 780. She stated that support of AB780 is consistent with the Board's position on unification and the results of a recent poll commissioned by OUHSD.

Mr. Speakman stated that AB 780 would be very pertinent to PVSD's petition especially If the bill allows local control and eliminates duplicate work.

Mr. Alamillo stated he would vote positively if we also included a correction to PVSD's endorsement already listed from the legislative analyst. There was discussion of how this could logistically be done and that there is another school district in the State called Pleasant Valley.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 3-2, the Board moved to direct the Superintendent to write a letter in support of AB780 and for the Board to support those efforts with our legislative advocates.**

### **AUGUST 19, 2004, REGULAR MEETING**

#### **B.3. Public Comments**

A Member of the Public addressed the Board on unification. She spoke about Board members communicating their support or opposition for AB 780 and the alleged impropriety of these given the Board adopted position in favor of unification. She also addressed the lack of specificity in the OUHSD bond measure. Proposition 39 requires that school boards list specific projects as part of the full text of their ballot measure. In comparison she provided the Simi Valley and Community College bond statements.

### **SEPTEMBER 2, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. Board Items**

Mrs. Berg referred to a letter from the district attorney commending the district for steps taken to comply with the Brown Act. She also referred to a Chamber of Commerce Governmental Relations Committee (GRC) and progress toward Camarillo school unification. Last year in September, the GRC voted unanimously in support of unification. Mrs. Berg stated she would like to see district provide this same type of information that is currently provided by OUHSD in their Unification Viewpoints. She explained the importance of lobbying by boards and how anyone can access lobbying fees paid on the CALACCESS website. When doing this research she found that PVSD had paid \$1,900 in lobbying fees compared to \$9,400 spent by OUHSD in the same time period. In addition, OUHSD has spent \$132,000 in lobbying fees over the last two years.

#### **D.2. Superintendent Items**

[Dr. Dase] reminded the board that he is having a fiscal analysis on costs related to unification prepared and if there are any questions from the board members, he asked that they be submitted in writing.

#### **E.7. APPROVAL OF PROGRAM BUDGET FOR EXPENSES RELATED TO SUPPORT FOR UNIFICATION AND COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMMUNITY**

Dr. Dase stated that this item was placed on the agenda at the request of Mr. Alamillo to approve a program budget for unification. The purpose of this budget is to clearly identify estimated expenditures for a specific administrative activity in support of unification.

Dr. Dase discussed the specific activities to be included in such a program budget: a community climate survey, fiscal analysis including an operating budget for a newly-unified district; and legal expenses related to unification. The estimated amount is not an increase to the 5800 account or to the district budget as a whole.

Dr. Dase stated that the Board has currently authorized the fiscal analysis and legal fees. Staff is currently reviewing proposals for the community climate survey and expects to initiate an agreement in the near future.

**For discussion purposes, Mr. Alamillo made a motion to approve a program budget for expenses related to support for unification and communication with the community. The motion died for lack of a second.**

The Board discussed various aspects of this item.

Mr. Alamillo asked that chart he developed be shown on the overhead which displayed legal costs associated with unification. His intent was not to discuss unification, but as a steward of district he felt it necessary to discuss the costs.

Mr. Speakman stated that he did not believe the need for a program budget exists because the Board approves the budget and all warrants and requisitions. He stated that there is a clear mandate to make unification a reality.

**Mr. Speakman moved that the Pleasant Valley School District take a leadership role in the issue of unifying the Pleasant Valley School District and direct the Superintendent along with the board to:**

- 1. Educate the community of the facts regarding school district unification**
- 2. Guide the unification issue through the statutory process such that it is available as a ballot measure to the citizens within our district boundaries so that the voting public will have an opportunity to make their wishes known regarding this issue in a public election.**
- 3. Resources to be utilized for this undertaking to be determined at the discretion of our Superintendent within current budget guidelines.**

Mrs. Berg seconded the motion.

Mrs. Miller stated that lobbying is an appropriate activity for a school board. Mrs. Kitchens questioned the need for immediate action.

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman seconded and passed 3-2, Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voting no, the board moved that the Pleasant Valley School District take a leadership role in the issue of unifying the Pleasant Valley School District and direct the Superintendent along with the board to: 1) Educate the community of the facts regarding school district unification; 2) Guide the unification issue thru the statutory process such that it is available as a ballot measure to the citizens within our district boundaries so that the voting public will have an opportunity to make their wishes known regarding this issue in a public election; 3) Resources for this effort to be utilized for this undertaking to be determined at the discretion of the Superintendent within current budget guidelines.**

## **OCTOBER 7, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

### **B.4. Public Comments**

A member of the public addressed the Board about unification and the expenditure of district funds on this issue as a fiduciary responsibility of the Board.

### **D.1. Board Items**

Mrs. Berg stated she met separately by invitation with teachers from OUHSD and PVEA about the implications of unification for teachers.

## **D.2. Superintendent Items**

Dr. Dase also discussed the status of the unification petition and his plans for publishing a unification newsletter for distribution via email and placement on the website. An email address will be provided for staff and the public to submit questions. Dr. Dase stated he had a successful conversation at Roundtable on unification and expressed his willingness to talk to parent or other interested groups. He stated that Mrs. Wagner will use the work of the Vision Task Force to initiate a Secondary Programs and Facilities Committee in October. A fiscal analysis of the costs of unification and a projected 5 year budget is in process. He stated that this is a very complicated process and we are waiting for information from Oxnard Union High School District to complete the report. Work on a community climate survey is underway and will look at community perceptions about education.

## **OCTOBER 21, 2004 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.2. Superintendent Items**

As part of his communication goal, he discussed the first issue of *The Unified Solution*, an intermittent communication on topics related to unification and its placement on the district website. He is also working on a monthly newsletter on activities in the district including board meetings. The first publication will be a hard copy and posted on the website. Future issues will be sent through an email distribution list and posted on the website.

Dr. Dase stated that the Community Climate Survey is in progress. Mrs. Wagner will convene a Secondary Facilities & Programs Committee to continue the work of the Visioning Committee. The Fiscal Analysis of the impact of unification is also in progress to establish the fiscal viability of a unified district, and a five year budget. A Facilities Master Plan is being worked on to project enrollment.

Mrs. Maez showed graphically how three studies underway at the present time are interrelated: Developer Fee Justification, Facilities Master Plan and Fiscal Analysis of Unification.

## **DECEMBER 16, 2004 – ANNUAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

### **D.2.1. Update on Unification**

Dr. Dase gave an update on the status of unification and AB 780 using PowerPoint stating that the intent is to provide an alternative process to expedite an election on unification. The bill allows the county to approve unification elections and identifies the state board for the appeal process. He stated that based on previous Board action it would be appropriate to use AB 780 to initiate a new petition to expedite the unification process.

Mr. Alamillo disagreed because AB780 can be appealed for perceived racial inequality. He stated that this has already been posed as problem and an appeal is very likely which could delay the current petition in Sacramento and slow down the process.

Mrs. Berg stated that the petition can be appealed on any one of the criteria, however the criterion which Mr. Alamillo raised was found to not be an issue in each of the independent studies done which was also the finding of the county committee. She reminded the audience that the new petition and the one already submitted would be two separate documents. By using AB 780 and presenting resolutions from the City of Camarillo and the Board of Supervisors along with a new petition to the County Committee, the process could be expedited.

Dr. Dase stated that based on the Board's position on legislative advocacy and prior direction, it would be prudent to utilize this process. He stated he already has direction on expediting the election process and was advising the Board that the intent of AB780 falls in this category. Dr. Dase stated that the majority of the Board was in agreement to pursue this avenue. Mr. Alamillo asked for an estimate of legal costs and Dr. Dase indicated that he would try and get costs of what this would look

like. He stated he would be prudent and make sure the costs are not out of line. Dr. Dase stated that his understanding of direction from the Board was to pursue AB 780 and bring back the next steps and approximate costs.

### **JANUARY 20, 2005, REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.2.3. Unification Update**

Dr. Dase presented an update on Unification. He stated that the district is working with consultants finalizing a fiscal analysis of the costs associated with unification. In reviewing the work to date, data were used with the assumption that Somis students would continue to attend Adolfo Camarillo High School. Because those students would be required to have an interdistrict permit after a successful unification effort Dr. Dase met with Dr. Mary McKee, Superintendent of Somis Union School District to discuss a Thompson-style unification, which allows for a K-8 district to exist within the boundaries of a K-12 district. Interest was expressed and he was invited to attend a Somis Board meeting to discuss the impact of this type of unification. The Somis Board was very interested and has planned a Town Hall Meeting the first part of February. Dr. Dase stated that this process is moving rapidly and he would like to bring this concept back as an information item.

### **FEBRUARY 3, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.2.2. Report on the Concept of a Thompson Style Unification (SB 1537)**

Dr. Dase gave a PowerPoint presentation on the current status of the unification effort stating that the petition was as the State Board of Education with no estimate of when it would be heard. The district is currently finalizing reports on a Facilities Master Plan and a Fiscal Analysis on the effects of unification.

Dr. Dase stated that AB 780 could expedite the petition process by allowing it to be approved at the county level for a vote by the public. It is a pilot process and does allow for a strong appeal process to make sure that the rights of the community members are guaranteed. Under AB 780 a petition can be initiated by signature gathering, agreement between districts, City Council resolution, or Board of Supervisors resolution.

Dr. Dase addressed Thompson-Style unification under SB 1537 authorized in 1994. This allows for the unification of an area while leaving one or more K-8 districts in place. This process is called "opting out" and allows the K-8 district to retain its governing board; the electorate within the K-8 district has the option of voting for members of the unified district, voting for members of the elementary board and may run for either board. 9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> grade students within the K-8 district attend the unified district. He was invited by the governing board of Somis Union District to discuss Thompson-Style unification and addressed the benefits including: autonomy of the K-8 district, students guaranteed access to the new unified school district, residents having a voice within the unified school district, and the increased opportunity for collaboration with textbook adoptions and staff development.

Dr. Dase stated that one of the areas of concern in looking at the draft Fiscal Analysis and Facilities Master Plan was the assumption that students residing in the Somis Union School District would continue to attend Camarillo High School. Approval of the current petition would result in Somis 9-12 students residing outside of the boundaries of the new district which would require an inter-district permit to attend Camarillo High School. Normally there is a negotiated process that allows for students to continue in place. However, there is no board for Oxnard Union High School District to negotiate with at this time to indicate that this would be allowed. The Somis District hosted a Town Hall meeting to consider a process to allow them to join the unification efforts in Camarillo. The current petition does not allow for Thompson-Style unification unless Camarillo Unified asked the state to remand it back for consideration of modification by the county. Another option is after approval of the current petition and successful vote, Somis could ask for approval to be included in

the unification. A third opportunity would be under AB 780 to have a new petition and include the Somis district.

Dr. Dase discussed the use of data and how it can be interpreted and used. He stated that there is a perception that the numbers must be correct, the data can take on different meanings in different contexts, there can be statistical errors, and the results can be marred by statistical error. He addressed evaluation of Criterion 4 in unification evaluations stating that OUHSD's legal counsel took a close look at this criterion and the data. Dr. Griffin looked at the data in the areas of ethnic segregation and the concept of "white flight." Using his data, Dr. Dase repackaged the data to see if there were different meanings and contexts. He looked at the demographic trends in the state and showed in the PowerPoint presentation a trend of declining white population and increase minority population for over a decade. The same trend is occurring in Pleasant Valley School District – the minority population is increasing and the white decreasing. He anticipated a reversal in the numbers in the next 10 – 15 years and reflect what is happening in the rest of California.

He stated that the issue of equal access for all students may be looked at through the lens of "Discrimination" as has been the case for the past 30 years. Recently there has been a strong interest in looking at equal access through "Equity and Adequacy," as evidenced with the recent Williams Lawsuit settlement. When we take a look at equity and adequacy, we look at textbooks, facilities, instruction, and through achievement.

Dr. Dase reviewed Dr. Griffin's data to determine the effect of unification on equal access. The PowerPoint presentation slides showed that there would be no change at Camarillo High School and no significant change in demographic patterns in OUHSD. He stated that the data raised more questions than answers, which will challenge staff to better understand the issues related to unification and what might happen to Camarillo after unification.

A member of the public addressed the Board on SB 1537.

### **MARCH 3, 2005 REGULAR MEETING** **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

#### **B.5. Parent Teacher Representative**

Patty Lerner, Camarillo PTA Council President, addressed the Board and thanked them and Dr. Dase for placing drafts of the fiscal analysis and facilities master plan on the website for the public to review. She stated that at the Superintendent's Roundtable Dr. Dase provided an update on unification and that in the ensuing discussion it was obvious that the community is thankful for the information provided and the opportunity to ask questions

#### **B.6. Public Comments**

Members of the Public addressed the Board in appreciation for taking the lead and providing information to the public on unification and all aspects of education; that all questions of current and former board members have been answered...

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT ITEMS**

Dr. Dase discussed the status of unification through a PowerPoint presentation focusing on four main questions: 1) Will a new Camarillo Unified School District be fiscally viable? 2) How will a new district house the students both in the short and long run? 3) What will be the impact of unification on the viability of OUHSD in terms of its finances, facilities and ethnic distribution of students? and 4) What are the opportunities available to the community as a result of unification? Answers to these four questions are being evaluated in five documents and committees currently underway: Fiscal Analysis, Feasibility Study, Facilities Master Plan, Secondary Learning Committee, and Community Climate Survey. Dr. Dase stated that he attended a Rotary luncheon providing information through a PowerPoint presentation and has offered to make the same presentation to other community/parent

groups. He also stated that Oxnard Union High School District has planned a town hall/open forum on the issues of unification on March 16 at 6:30 p.m. in the Pacifica High School Performing Arts Center.

Mrs. Wagner reported on the Secondary Learning Committee that met last Thursday. Thirty-six members of the community and district will continue the 10 session process planned to evaluate the 13 options and 15 criteria developed on the options for housing students in a unified school district. Mrs. Wagner stated that these recommendations will provide a template to enable the new board to make a decision. Mr. Speakman stated that if any member of the community was interested in providing input on how children are going to be housed, what the educational program would look like if unification occurs, this is the time to get involved. Mrs. Wagner stated that anyone interested could call or email the Educational Services Department at the district office.

## **E.6. RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES MASTER PLAN Staff Report**

Mrs. Maez stated that the objective is to review and accept the Consultant's report, review the existing Facilities Goals; assess the district's progress towards those Goals, revise the Goals as needed, and develop the next steps in facility planning. She stated that when reviewing and evaluating these objectives it is important to remember that it's not the building, but what happens inside for children that matters and balancing cost effectiveness of the buildings and programs. Through a PowerPoint presentation she discussed the effective program components: student needs including at risk populations, GATE, Home School, Class Size Reduction and Special Education; alternative programs; "opportunity rooms" which provide schools the opportunity to have effective programs; kindergarten options; transportation; preschools (3 currently including UPS); long standing day-care commitments at sites; and small learning centers. She also discussed facility constraints and what the core capacity is at sites which would involve looking at the physical plant, office space, parking lots, restrooms, work rooms and libraries.

Mrs. Maez introduced Mr. Scott Odell from Paoli & Odell, Inc. Mr. Odell stated that his Fresno-based school facility and environmental consultant firm specializes in school facilities master plan, developer fee justification studies, enrollment projections, demographic studies and environmental impact reports, and site selection studies. He stated that they have been in business over 30 years assisting districts in identifying where school facilities should be and then getting districts through the site approval process.

Through a PowerPoint presentation Mr. Odell discussed the components of his report and gave an overview of the master plan emphasizing the changes as a result of a study session conducted earlier by the Board. The two main questions addressed in the report were: How many students will there be during the next five to ten years? And what is the best way to house the students to provide the best education possible? He stated that an additional challenge is the potential of becoming a unified district. In order to answer the questions there was a need to evaluate the existing facilities use and capacity; project enrollment; compare the projected enrollment to capacity; and finally to prepare the student housing plan to best house the students. At the present time there is sufficient capacity for K – 8 and if new goals were established on optimum school size additional capacity could be demonstrated. Mr. Odell stated that if CSUCI develops the charter school, there would not be an impact on the district's non charter facilities. The enrollment projections in his report reflected the anticipated developments at Village-at-the-Park, Springville, and University Glen (CSUCI). Mr. Odell stated that with the new Village-at-the-Park school, there would be sufficient capacity for the next 10 years.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Odell stated that the figures do not include the potential capacity at Valle Lindo School; and that the impact of a possible base closure was not considered in

the report since the base closure issue is in very preliminary stages and speculative at this point in time.

Mr. Odell discussed the housing options of a unified district (which included approximately 150 Somis students) stating that he had reevaluated the numbers for accuracy in development projections.

In response to Board member questions, he stated that inter-district students were not considered assuming they would continue to attend their current school; that a common scenario is for the juniors and seniors to continue at Rio Mesa until graduation which would also narrow the gap between enrollment and capacity; and that if the Somis students do not continue at ACHS, for the first two years additional facilities may not be needed; that the shortfall indicated in the future was only for 9-12 students; that a new high school on the land already purchased by OUHSD could theoretically be completed in as little as two years.

Mr. Odell showed that in the first 5 years of unification, the only option would be to continue to use the ACHS facility, convert a middle school to a magnet high school while increasing middle school capacity, and/or converting one or more K-5 schools to K-8. He showed that in the next five years three options are possible: 1) same as the first five years previously indicated, 2) continue the use of ACHS, build a new high school (approximately 1,800 capacity), discontinue the magnet high school or, 3) build a large new high school (2,600), discontinue ACHS, and continue converted magnet high school.

Mrs. Maez continued her PowerPoint presentation and stated that the core capacities of most of the schools were more than 600 for elementary and 1000 for middle schools and have had that many housed in the past before class size reduction. She showed the criteria for a "perfect school" for elementary: 550 – 700 students, library, K-3 class size reduction, rooms for special needs, opportunity room, all-day kindergartens where needed, preschools where needed, continue existing day-care programs, multi-purpose room, faculty workroom and an office; for middle school: 1000-1200 students, library, science labs, shops/home economics, special needs rooms, opportunity room, gym, faculty workroom and an office. Mrs. Maez showed the current facilities goals and staff recommendations for the proposed facility goals. She stated that four of the eight goals have been met: expanded middle school concept; implementation of the 1991 Facilities Master Plan building needed new facilities and modernizing existing schools and district support facilities; the operation of one school/one philosophy per campus; and providing the infrastructure and technical support of meet the expanding requirements of technology.

Mrs. Maez showed that PVSD elementary and middle school enrollment ranked low in comparison to other county schools. She stated that it would be cost effective and programmatically beneficial to operate two middle schools until 2014. At that time there would be a need for a third middle school. Unification was included in the master plan. She stated that the report gives many opportunities for the future and the next steps need to be determined.

### **Public Comments**

A member of the public addressed the Board thanking them for the report and stating that the report and presentation were very informative. She stated that she hoped with this report, the fiscal analysis and the feasibility study, that the questions keeping people from committing to unification will be answered in a favorable way allowing them to get behind unification and no longer sit on the fence. She also stated she is looking forward to hearing from the board members in particular, hoping they move together as a unified board.

**Mrs. Berg moved to receive and accept the Facilities Master Plan as prepared by Scott Odell of Paoli & Odell, Inc. The motion was seconded.**

Mrs. Maez stated that a great deal of work was spent in building the blocks of each report and the same data was used in the various reports to assure continuity and accurate information.

**The motion passed 4-0.**

#### **E.5. RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF A REPORT ON THE FISCAL ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF UNIFICATION**

Mrs. Maez asked the board's indulgence to allow the public the opportunity to see the PowerPoint presentation she had planned at the study session on February 17<sup>th</sup>. She stated the report has been worked on for a number of months, bringing together information from two different districts; that data supplied by OUHSD input was important for 9-12 analysis.

Mrs. Maez showed where to find answers to questions about unification: 1) the fiscal analysis; 2) the PVSD Facilities Master Plan, which have both been completed; the updated feasibility study, 4) the Community Climate Survey; and 5) reports from the Secondary Learning Committee. She stated that the three big financial questions related to unification are: 1) Do the resulting districts have ongoing fiscal viability? 2) Can the resulting districts afford the unfunded liability? And 3) How might property tax owners in both districts be impacted by the division of bonded debt? Mrs. Maez stated that the purpose of the report tonight is to provide answers to the first question. She stated that the budgets assumptions used were a reasonable basis or foundation upon which a budget is developed; an informed premise upon which a conclusion or finding is made; and the building block used to project future financial status of a school district and that these are not a guess or a wish. She discussed the following building blocks used for the report:

- Assumption that 2006-2007 is the earliest possible dated that unification could occur and that there would be no significant change in the report's conclusions if unification occurred later.
- Revenue and expenditure projections that reflect the current activity in Sacramento for fiscal year 2005-06 and beyond.
- The report uses enrollment projections from the Facilities Master Plan for both elementary and high school age students.
- The report begins with a projected budget for PVSD as a K-8 district using the revenue and expenditures assumptions.
- The report adds the cost for the operation of a 9-12 program with an estimated 3,292 students – including a projected Somis student population.
- The liability for retiree health benefits of both elementary and high school retirees is included in the projected costs.
- A newly unified district's revenue limit is recalculated and an amount for leveling up of salaries is determined.
- The report includes the cost to level up salaries and health benefits of PVSD teachers to that of the OUHSD staff.

Mrs. Maez addressed Mr. Alamillo's question at the February 17<sup>th</sup> draft study session regarding the deficit factor and stated that deficit factor was included in all the calculations. She stated that the report demonstrates that the newly unified district will have more than sufficient funds for ongoing operations and shows that nearly \$2 million will be available to the Board of the new unified district for any number of appropriations. She stated these could include, but are not limited to: enhancing or expanding K-12 educational programs; increasing the salaries of other PVSD employees, or building a retiree health benefit reserve fund.

Mrs. Maez introduced the district consultant Ms. Christy White of the certified public accounting firm of Nigro, Nigro & White.

Ms. White addressed the board and stated that her firm does audits for school districts throughout Southern California and she has personally done unification studies for the last twelve years. The financial projects have been audited by her firm in terms of the reasonableness of the assumptions that have been used by management. Mrs. White stated that: the enrollment projections came from the Facilities Master Plan; they looked at OUHSD's projections in relation to these numbers and the County Committee's report; they had taken data from reports both districts have currently published; applied assumptions regarding cost of living and consumer price index that are published; used actual data for retiree health benefit cost and data used by actuaries trained and skilled in these areas; used actual data for special education costs and looked at the actual number of students served for secondary education. Ms. White stated that, in her opinion these are reasonable and educated assumptions and gives the best estimate of what will happen if unification happens. She stated that there will be new money from the state in recognition of potential additional costs for negotiating common salary schedules. It is not just a blending of revenue between the districts; the new district will receive additional money beyond what is currently received in this area estimated to be \$5 million which could be used for salary benefit improvements and enhancements to education.

In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Ms. White confirmed that there would be \$5 million in additional funds on top of what either district currently receives. This is ongoing, permanent and built into the revenue limit into perpetuity; as you grow in ADA this number will also grow. She stated that unification is one of the few areas that school districts can use to actually improve funding beyond what they would normally receive.

Ms. White stated that, after improving the salaries and benefits of the elementary teachers to that of the high school teachers, there will still be approximately \$2 million in which to do other salary adjustments or program adjustments. In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Ms. White stated that the projections assumes that the high school teachers will be in the same place as if they were employed by OUHSD. She stated that negotiations would be done by the new board and there is no mandate in law that the negotiations go one way or the other. However, management wanted to show that maintenance of the salaries and benefits was possible in addition to improvements for salaries and benefits at the elementary level and additional funding for other programs.

In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens, Ms. White stated that she has she worked with unifications similar to the one proposed for Camarillo and it is very common in the state. She stated that through her personal observation and agreement with Mr. Odell's analysis, the majority of students attending Rio Mesa would continue there. She also stated that the unified district would be obligated to plan to serve the students. The projection includes all the students the new district would be obligated to serve; if students opted for inter-district transfer the ADA is less and expenditures are less. She stated that she felt there would not be a significant change in conclusion based on the assumptions. In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Ms. White stated that if a unified student opted to attend OUHSD, the district would lose ADA at the lower unified amount and OUHSD would receive ADA at the higher rate possibly creating an inadvertent fiscal incentive.

Ms. White stated that the report outlines all of the assumptions in detail and that her firm concludes that unification does appear to be fiscally viable. This report is the final version with only minor editing changes; an electronic version will provided for posting on the district website.

In response to Mr. Speakman's comments about the objectivity of the report and that it may be overly optimistic, Ms. White stated that her firm is a certified public accounting firm; it has standards that must upheld including independence; that prior to being contacted to do the study there was no previous association professionally or personally with the district nor has she been through the community; that her firm came in with independence and maintained it throughout the project; and that the report is accurate and factual.

Ms. Maez answered questions from the Board including:

- The confusion raised in the OUHSD *Unification Viewpoint* stating the new district would not have the money that this report indicates – *the revenue must be neutral except for cap and after unification, there will be \$5 million more than what both districts currently receive providing enough funds to cover expenditures and still have \$2 million extra.*;
- Other financing sources and uses – *the negative number in excess of \$250,000 in the K-8 portion is the transfer to the deferred maintenance fund. The numbers in the report only reflect the general fund.*
- Fluctuation of Special Education encroachment – *encroachments increases in all districts.*
- Interest rate shown as 5% - *interest rates are currently low, less than 2%, the 5% used in the report was from published School Services projections which are usually very credible.*
- Adult Education - *Adult education revenue and expenditures are separate funds. This may come out of the work of the Secondary Learning Committee. The adult ed was not included in this report – they are not a significant financial impact that would affect the results of the report.*
- The new reporting requirements and how this is reflected – *This report reflects the same modified accrual basis that is used in the interim audit report. During the audit process the information is converted into government wide reporting bringing in all of the assets and liability. As part of the GASB requirement all districts must report the long term cost of the retiree benefits. There is some uncertainty how and when it is to be reported and how to amortize the cost over time. Until those questions are clarified, no one is reporting this type of cost. Normally you would never see that type of cost in a report like this because of all the unknowns.*
- The large Special Education encroachment for a small number of students and why not use the data we know rather than the high school data – *It is common that encroachment increases as students get older. The requirement to educate those students does not stop when they are 18 but continues until age 22. In order to be accurate in this report the impact on the unified district is more accurately reflected by using OUHSD data. Using the PVSD data would not give an accurate estimate of the true costs involved.*
- COLA – *this is applied to the revenue limit at the time of unification.*
- How do we pay off the unfunded liability if the district does not unify? If we unify are we in a better position to pay it off, worse, or does it affect it one way or the other? - *The last actuarial report looked at the PVSD unfunded liability, how much is expended on a pay-as-you-go basis, and determined the additional amount needed every year or needed to set aside for amortizing according to the new GASB regulation was estimated at \$120,000. Based on the analysis that the unified district will have an excess of nearly \$2 million in revenue over expenditures, it is clearly in a better position to amortize that cost. The feasibility study will reflect a strong recommendation that regardless of unification, both districts need to be addressing this question.*

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 4-0, the Board moved to receive and accept the Projected Financial Information for the Proposed Camarillo Unified School District prepared by district consultant, Ms. Christy White of the certified public accounting firm of Nigro, Nigro & White.**

### **MARCH 8, 2005 SPECIAL MEETING**

#### **5. STUDY SESSION ON UPDATED FEASIBILITY STUDY COMMISSIONED FROM EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICES, THE AUTHOR OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY**

Dr. Dase stated that this study is one of a continuing series of documents being released that the district has commissioned to provide information on the impact of unification. Through PowerPoint he

gave an update of the status of the unification effort and stated that the petition approved by the County Committee on District Organization was forwarded to the State Board of Education for review by staff and is tentatively scheduled for a hearing in September. He stated that there are four main questions that consistently arise from the community: 1) Will a new Camarillo Unified School District be fiscally viable? 2) How will a new district house the students in the short and long run? 3) What will be the impact of unification on the viability of OUHSD in terms of its finances, facilities and ethnic distribution of students? and 4) What are the opportunities available to the community as a result of unification?

Dr. Dase stated that on February 17<sup>th</sup>, the Board conducted a study session on the fiscal analysis, received and accepted the analysis on March 3<sup>rd</sup> which concluded that a new unified district would be fiscally viable, would be able to maintain OUHSD salaries and benefits for all teachers in the new district, and would have approximately \$2 million for Board discretion. The Board conducted a study session on the Facilities Master Plan on January 13<sup>th</sup>, received and accepted the plan on March 3<sup>rd</sup> which concluded that the K-8 district would have adequate capacity through 2014; and that for the K-12 district, the 9-12 enrollment will exceed capacity and provided some housing options for those students. The remaining reports are the feasibility study on the agenda tonight for review with anticipated acceptance on March 17<sup>th</sup>. In progress are Mrs. Wagner's Secondary Learning Committee and the Community Climate Survey. He stated that it is important to remember that this all about the kids and creating schools for their future.

Mrs. Maez stated that she wanted to stress how the independence of the consultants provided a tremendous asset by their ability to draw their own conclusions and recommendations in their reports. Each report stands alone, but is interrelated and intended to provide the Board, staff, parents and the public with information that contains complex and sometimes complicated information which is best understood if the preparers are allowed to present first and then answer questions. She introduced Mr. Terry McHenry and distributed his resumé. Mr. McHenry prepared the initial report in 1992, and updated it in 1998 and 2003. She stated that he had incorporated changes since his last report such as Measure H, updated enrollment projections, and information from the fiscal analysis and facility master plan. Mrs. Maez stated his report will answer the questions related to the fiscal viability of OUHSD, bonded indebtedness, retiree benefits, and will review the nine criteria used by the state in evaluation unification proposals.

Mrs. Maez also introduced Ms. Marguerite Leoni, attorney with Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello, Mueller & Naylor, LLP, who will address the legal implications and/or issues related to unification this time.

Mr. McHenry stated his background included: six years with School Services; twelve years as president of his consulting firm; working for almost 400 districts across the state; working on all aspects of unification from breaking up existing unified districts, unifying high school districts, and providing arbitration when districts could not agree.

Mr. McHenry stated that as currently proposed this report concludes that unification is feasible and presents the information on which that conclusion is based. The report contains information on:

- Students
  - Analysis of the elementary and secondary student population including their number and ethnicity.
  - The impact of unification on the number and ethnicity of the students in PVSD.
  - The impact of unification on the number and ethnicity of the students at ACHS and Rio Mesa High School.
- Facilities
  - Analysis of the facilities at PVSD and OUHSD.

- A review of the prior and current building program for the two districts.
- The impact of unification on the location and capacity of the school facilities.
- The manner in which the new district could meet the current and future facility needs.
- Instructional
  - Analysis of the impact of unification on the instructional programs of the new district
  - Analysis of the impact of unification on the instructional programs of the remaining OUHSD
- Staffing
  - Analysis of the staffing of both PVSD and OUHSD and their salaries and benefits
  - Impact of unification on the staffing level of the new district and the remaining OUHSD
- Financial
  - Analysis of the fiscal condition of PVSD and OUHSD
  - Calculation of the general fund revenue for the new district
  - Development of the budget for the new district
  - Analysis of the fiscal status of the remaining OUHSD
- Assets and Liabilities
  - Analysis of the assets and liabilities for PVSD and OUHSD
  - Calculated the distribution of assets including bonds authorized and sold
  - Calculated the distribution of liabilities including retiree benefits

Mr. McHenry stated that the analyses above were evaluated in relation to the nine criteria the state uses in determining whether a unification petition should be brought to the voters. He stated the response from the County Committee and OUHSD's legal counsel's opinions were also used in evaluating the nine criteria.

Through a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. McHenry demonstrated the study's finding that all nine criteria have substantially been met. He then addressed each item in detail.

Ms. Leoni stated that some of the legal standards that will drive the review by the County Committee or the State Board of Education. She stated that the statute states that criteria have to be substantially met. The purpose is not to get down to fine tuning in the analysis. The state board will ask if this can happen in a substantial way. She stated that Mr. McHenry's report shows that this can happen. In regard to criteria #4 (racial and ethnic distribution), Ms. Leoni stated what the report does not address is the fact that the law in this area has changed significantly and much of the old analysis has been based on cases that have since been superseded by constitutional amendments and other cases. She stated that what the state board and courts consider now is equality of educational opportunities and resources. In this report, after unification, both districts will be able to maintain and enhance educational programs for the students they serve, regardless of color.

Ms. Leoni also addressed the question of where the high school students will be housed. The presentation has assumed that the new district will acquire the property where the new Camarillo high school will be built. She stated that other than including Somis in the unified district, there are several options, including territory transfer, or the new board could purchase the new property. She also stated that the tax rate voted on by the people of the OUHSD will remain the same. Ms. Leoni stated that in regard to distribution of assets and liabilities, all of the reports demonstrate that there can be a fair division; education code does not dictate how it happens, it only requires showing that it can happen.

Board members asked questions about each section of the report. Mr. McHenry and Ms. Leoni responded to these questions and noted where the information could be found in the report. The questions directed to staff for further research include:

1. What are the details of the revenue limit calculation and how do you reconcile what appears to be differences in the report?
2. Is there a different or better way to estimate Special Education Encroachment and Non Public School (NPS) costs?
3. What is the impact on transportation costs?
4. How is eligibility for state school building funds impacted? Will the new unified district have state eligibility?

On behalf of the Board, Mr. Speakman thanked Mr. McHenry for the report and both Mr. McHenry and Ms. Leoni for talking the time to answer their questions.

The study will be returned to the Board for acceptance on March 17, 2005.

### **MARCH 17, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT ITEMS**

##### **D.1.4. Update on Unification**

Dr. Dase stated that another issue of *The Unified Solution* was sent out, that the OUHSD public forum to receive input from public on unification was held last night, and that the final document commissioned by the district is on the agenda for the Board to accept tonight.

Dr. Dase also stated that the monthly newsletter had been sent home to parents and is available on the district website. He stated that the Ventura County Star had a favorable article about the district's test results. Mrs. Wagner stated that PVSD is one of five districts in Ventura County that scored 800 and above; that there was growth of second language learner scores; that there was concern with the similar school rankings and that the data is being reviewed on how the ranking was determined. The information is available on the CDE website.

#### **E.3 REVIEW AND ACCEPT DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION STUDY**

Mrs. Maez reviewed key areas from the Facilities Master Plan which was previously received and accepted by the Board. She stated that the school consists of the building, the students, and the programs. A "Perfect" elementary school would house 500-750 students, and provide a library, special education needs, an opportunity room, all day kindergarten (where needed) and day care on-site (where needed). She stated that the facility goals would be brought back for adoption and that the first two were important to consider during this item: 1) comprehensive instructional program meeting the needs of all students and 2) augment existing schools to reach recommended size for cost effectiveness. Mrs. Maez stated that when reviewing the fees collected from new development in the community, there is a need to show the nexus of the justification for the fee.

Mrs. Maez introduced Mr. Matt Pettler from School Services. He stated that developer fees were initiated because of loss of revenue due to Proposition 13 and that the legislation developed regulations to mitigate these effects. He stated that the residential and commercial fees collected are split between OUHSD and PVSD 40%/60% respectively. The study presented tonight fully justifies the PVSD's need for collection of developer fees because it shows a need that is greater than the amount collected. The justification for these fees builds largely on the recently adopted master plan and the school facility goals of the board. He stated that in preparing for the study, the existing capacity was evaluated and that because of the stated district goals it was determined that there was justification for fees. Mr. Pettler stated that the same criteria would be used if unification occurred and the need for fees was also established.

In response to questions from the Board Mr. Pettler stated that there was an estimate of 2,095 units to be developed over the next 10 year period; that since the commercial estimate was difficult to

predict they looked at historical data; and that "Springville" on page 11 would be corrected to "Village-At-The-Park on page 11 of the report. He also stated that should unification occur, the fees paid to OUHSD for development of Village-At-The-Park would need to be negotiated to determine what portion the new unified district would be entitled to.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 4-0, the Board moved to review and accept the Developer Fee Justification Report as presented.**

Mrs. Maez stated that an item will be brought back at the end of April for a public hearing and resolution to increase the developer fees.

## **E.2. RECEIVE AND ACCEPT UPDATED UNIFICATION FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Mrs. Maez stated that she has not received any additional questions from the Board since the last meeting, but wanted to review the questions asked during the last study session. She stated one of the questions was, "How much state facility funding will the new unified district be eligible for and will this cover the difference of a \$66 million cost to build a new high school facility and the \$48 million estimated bond authorization that would come to the new unified district leaving a potential \$18 million gap. Mrs. Maez stated that she has worked with School Facilities on what would be available, and stated that yes, given what is in the master plan, projections for enrollment, and existing capacity the new district would be eligible. She stated that this translates to approximately \$14.5 million. Currently there is a great deal of new construction money at the State level and there was an anticipation that, upon approval of unification the new district would apply for these funds. Mrs. Maez stated that in the feasibility study there is an availability of \$2.8 million in a building fund; \$5.6 in capital facilities fund (developer fees) and \$3.5 million in a county facilities school fund (state money already existing) for the newly unified school district to cover the \$3.5 million gap.

Mrs. Maez stated that she had confirmed this data with Mr. Randy Winton of OUHSD that the ACHS Cafeteria Fund runs a deficit of \$200,000. Mrs. Maez stated that a new unified district would have many options to eliminate that deficit including a centralized kitchen which would provide services to the other district schools.

Mrs. Maez stated that the revenue limit was calculated with the inclusion of the deficit. She acknowledged that the bond data were old, but were the most current provided by OUHSD at the time that the consultant was working on the report.

Dr. Dase clarified that receiving and accepting this report allows staff to proceed, confirms that the consultant has completed his task, and that the Board can still direct questions and concerns to him. Mr. Alamillo stated that the report needs to be as accurate as possible.

**On a motion by Mrs. Berg, seconded and passed 3-1, Mr. Alamillo voting no, the Board moved to receive and accept the Updated Unification Feasibility Study as presented.**

## **APRIL 7, 2005 SPECIAL MEETING**

### **8. SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS**

Dr. Dase stated he met with the Roundtable today and that one of the questions posed was about sharing information from the reports the district has commissioned on the effects of unification. Suggestions included: a special board meeting/town hall, forums at the middle schools, a formal debate possibly co-sponsored with the League of Women Voters, a candidates' debate/forum at city hall, or a resident's meeting at Leisure Village. He asked for direction from the Board. He stated that PTA Council would be happy to facilitate the planning process within their charter restrictions on perceived political activity.

### **10. INFORMATION**

### **10.a. Consideration of Board Position on Appeal of AB 780 (Unification) Outcome**

Dr. Dase stated that the Legislature passed AB 780 creating a process for unification. The Camarillo City Council and the County Board of Supervisors both passed resolutions petitioning the County Committee to pursue avenues provided by AB 780. Dr. Chuck Weis, County Superintendent, is responsible for evaluating the process under AB 780 and may choose to accept or reject the resolutions. Dr. Weis has announced that a press conference will be held next Monday, April 11 at 3:30 p.m. and has invited parties from both the PVSD and OUHSD boards. Dr. Dase stated that Dr. Weis asked for both boards to consider whether or not they intended to appeal any potential action taken by the County Committee. Dr. Dase stated he was not prepared to respond on behalf of the board and therefore, placed this item on the agenda for discussion. The options are yes; no; or maybe (reserving the right to appeal). Mr. Alamillo read the actual question from Dr. Weis:

*If the County Committee finds that the required conditions and criteria are not substantially met and rejects the petition; or if the territory for the election does not meet with your approval: do you intend to appeal that decision?*

He also read the question Dr. Weis posed to OUHSD.

*If the County Committee finds that the required conditions and criteria are substantially met and approves the petition; or if the territory for the election does not meet with your approval: do you intend to appeal that decision?*

In response to Mr. Speakman's question, Dr. Dase indicated that although OUHSD discussed the question in closed session, PVSD did not have enough time to arrange for the presence of legal counsel for discussion in a closed session.

Mr. Alamillo stated that no ground could be gained by AB 780 and that the issue of unification would end up in the same place. Mrs. Berg stated that an appeal of AB 780 to the State Board of Education would only be on the specific criterion or criteria in question. She stated that her response would be "maybe." Mrs. Miller stated she wanted to keep all options open and indicated "maybe". Mr. Alamillo stated his response was to say "no, we are not going to appeal." Dr. Dase stated that there are a variety of ways for the board to consider their decision, including consulting with the attorney. Mr. Alamillo stated that he felt the attorney did not need to be contacted. Mr. Speakman stated that OUHSD has been approached many times by the Board and has not agreed to meet on this issue. He also stated that it was important to have both districts sit down with Dr. Weis to resolve some of the issues. Mrs. Berg stated that Dr. Weis has the authority to assist both districts in working through the issues. She also stated that the traditional route through the State Board leaves open appeals through the court system. AB 780 allows local negotiations out of the court system and will save a tremendous amount of money. In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Alamillo, Dr. Dase stated there was direction from the board of a "maybe" position and to express to Dr. Weis a desire to utilize his ability to work with both districts for a resolution that would work for both districts.

## **APRIL 21, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.1.3. Update on Unification**

Dr. Dase stated that Dr. Charles Weis, Ventura County Superintendent, held a press conference on Monday, April 11, 2005 to receive input on whether the AB 780 petitions from the City Council and Board of Supervisors should be accepted. Dr. Dase stated that the press conference was well attended with representatives from various community groups. Dr. Weis announced his decision to accept the petitions and move forward. Dr. Weis and his Associate Superintendent Stan Mantooth, have called for a preliminary hearing on May 3 at 6:00 p.m. in the Adolfo Camarillo High School gym for the County Committee on School District Organization to receive input from the public and representatives from the affected school districts on whether the Committee should accept the petitions.

Mrs. Wagner distributed information on what was discussed at the last Secondary Learning Committee meeting. She stated that there were approximately forty members representing a broad-based cross section of the district and community. She stated that the group came to consensus on four options for student housing should unification efforts be successful: Rio Mesa High School as a school of choice; a traditional high school (Camarillo High School) with a technology or magnet school; another type of magnet school with a series of alternative programs, and construction of alternative programs at a middle school to phase in until the new high school is built; and the possibility of ACHS becoming a magnet school and the new school as the center. The committee is scheduled to meet again next Thursday afternoon to reevaluate and rank the criteria based on "needs, wants and nice to's." Mrs. Wagner stated that representatives from Foothill and Santa Susana High Schools would be coming to speak to the committee in three weeks. The Board expressed interest in hearing their presentations and asked to be advised of the date and time.

In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens, Mrs. Wagner stated that former students would be invited to be involved in the meetings at a future date.

Mrs. Wagner distributed a sample flyer for naming the new elementary school in the Village-At-the-Park development that is scheduled to open in Fall 2006. The top five recommendations from the community will be brought to the Board for consideration.

#### **D.4. DISCUSSION OF ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 36 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT UNIFICATION, (ASSEMBLY MEMBER STRICKLAND)**

Dr. Dase stated that this item was placed on the agenda at the request of Mr. Speakman for the purpose of discussing the merits of taking a formal position in the form of a resolution.

Mrs. Berg stated that Oxnard Union High School District came out in opposition to this legislation in its previous incarnation and that the legislation has since been modified. She stated that district legal counsel, Mrs. Marguerite Leoni, identified five areas of potential challenges in the unification process, one of which was the bond money and what happens. Education code currently provides regulations for bonds passed by two-thirds vote, but not 55 percent. Mrs. Berg stated that the wording in the bill referring to OUHSD had been removed. Board consensus was to have a resolution brought back in support of AB 36 as an action item provided it clearly stated that the board was supporting the bill as long as it dealt with the bond issue.

#### **MAY 5, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **B.7. Exclusive Representatives**

Mrs. Zeigler also requested that a meeting be held during regular staff meeting time for the purpose of informing and answering questions on unification. She suggested May 17th at 3:30 p.m. for a meeting with district staff present to facilitate the meeting along with members of the Board.

#### **MAY 19, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **B.8. Exclusive Representatives**

Suzann Zeigler, PVEA President, addressed the Board and thanked them for allowing a meeting on unification during staff time stating that the information was helpful. She also thanked Dr. Dase, Mrs. Maez and Mrs. Berg for their efforts and Mr. Alamillo for being present at the meeting.

#### **JUNE 2, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **D.1.6. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the potential effects on the District and staff.**

Dr. Dase stated that the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization (Committee) has created a subcommittee for the purpose of gathering information from the districts affected by the petition currently before the Committee. The subcommittee has communicated its intent through Mr. Stan Mantooth, Associate Superintendent for the County and the Secretary to the Committee, that a

meeting will be convened on June 7 from 9 a.m. to 12 noon. The subcommittee is inviting three representatives from each of the affected districts (the superintendent, a board member, and the district business manager). Dr. Dase stated that although this is a closed meeting, there will be minutes. He stated that the intent of the meeting is to share information and concerns and for the subcommittee to report back to the Committee. One of the major concerns is area of election. Dr. Dase showed a chart prepared by the Committee on all previous unifications in Ventura County. He noted that all of the unification elections in Ventura County included only those areas where students were directly affected by the unification.

Dr. Dase stated that at this point there is no date set for the Committee to meet again. Mrs. Berg asked the Board to consider input for Mr. Speakman, as the board representative to subcommittee, on area of election. Mrs. Miller stated that the area of election should be limited to the boundaries of the proposed unified district. Mr. Alamillo noted that the Oxnard Union High School District has stated they will appeal and that taking a stand is not appropriate at this time. He suggested that a third party should facilitate the decision to avoid costly litigation. Mr. Speakman stated that he agreed with Mr. Alamillo's suggestion of a third party deciding with both districts agreeing to abide by the decision.

#### **JUNE 16, 2005 REGULAR MEETING** **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Mr. Alamillo expressed concern on the legal expenses for unification. Dr. Dase stated that he would review the timeframe for the current charges.

#### **JULY 17, 2005 SPECIAL MEETING**

##### **6.a. Board Items/Comments**

Mrs. Miller asked that administration draft resolutions for the Board to consider related to unresolved aspects of the tentative petition for unification approved by the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization. There was consensus to have staff return this item for action at the next meeting.

#### **AUGUST 4, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **B.9. Public Comments**

A member of the public addressed the Board on unification and the fundraising event that was held on July 16. She stated there was a variety of support from the community and that the event was held to raise funds to help support current unification effort under AB 780 and the potential election. She stated that tonight the Board will have the opportunity to give direction to the County Committee on where the Board stands and show a united Board for the children of this district. She presented the Board with T-shirts and buttons promoting unification.

#### **AUGUST 11, 2005 SPECIAL MEETING**

##### **7. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION #05-22 ON TENTATIVE PETITION PENDING BEFORE THE VENTURA COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION: AREA OF ELECTION**

Dr. Dase stated that the item has been brought back from the August 4, 2005 meeting. The Board had asked that the wording correctly reflected the City and County resolutions. Mrs. Berg stated that all of the language had been discussed with legal counsel.

*Mr. Speakman moved to adopt resolution #05-22 on tentative petition pending before the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization: Area of Election with the modification to be in the "Now, therefore be it resolved" section to read: Now therefore be it resolved that the Pleasant Valley School District Board of Trustees has full faith and confidence in the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization and supports their efforts to define as appropriate the area of election for the pending unification the tentative recommendation made by the committee on July 5, 2005.*

*Further, the Pleasant Valley Board of Trustees recognizes the administrative difficulties expressed by the elections division and will support any modifications made by the County Committee necessary to remedy said difficulties. The motion was seconded.*

Mr. Alamillo stated that the best interest of district was to accept the recommendation of the County Committee as final with no intention of litigation.

Mrs. Kitchens stated she was concerned that the language in the "Now, therefore" section was vague and did not clearly state the Board's position and that she could not support it.

Mr. Speakman stated that both the County Committee and its subcommittee have requested input from districts on their positions. He stated that it behooves the Board to cooperate with their process and provide assistance.

Mr. Alamillo stated that the intent of AB 780 is to rely on local control and that "local people know best." He noted that if this is true, that the district needs to accept the decision of the County Committee and not litigate.

In response to Mr. Speakman, Mrs. Kitchens stated that "cooperation is different from facilitating." She also noted that she had no problem cooperating with the County Committee, "but it was not her intent to continue to facilitate."

Mr. Alamillo moved to call the question. Mr. Speakman clarified that a member of the public wished to address the Board and a no vote would allow him the opportunity to speak. The motion was seconded and failed on a roll-call vote 2-3 (Mrs. Berg, Mrs. Miller, and Mr. Speakman voting no)

A member of the public addressed the Board, questioned the change in the resolution, and agreed with the changes after they were explained.

**Mr. Alamillo Called the Question. The motion was seconded and passed 5-0.**

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 3-2 (John Alamillo and Suzanne Kitchens voting no), the Board moved to adopt resolution #05-22 on tentative petition pending before the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization: Area of Election with the adoption of the revision: Now therefore be it resolved that the Pleasant Valley School District Board of Trustees has full faith and confidence in the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization and supports their efforts to define as appropriate the area of election for the pending unification the tentative recommendation made by the committee on July 5, 2005. Further, the Pleasant Valley Board of Trustees recognizes the administrative difficulties expressed by the elections division and will support any modifications made by the County Committee necessary to remedy said difficulties.**

Mr. Alamillo restated his position of abiding by the Committee's decision and not litigate their decision.

**8. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION #05-25 ON TENTATIVE PETITION PENDING BEFORE THE VENTURA COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION: A PLAN FOR FLEXIBLE ENROLLMENT AT RIO MESA AND ADOLFO CAMARILLO HIGH SCHOOLS**

Mrs. Berg stated that at the last meeting, the Board discussed the resolution and asked that it be returned for action tonight.

Mr. Speakman, moved to adopt resolution #05-25 on tentative petition pending before the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization: A Plan for Flexible Enrollment at Rio Mesa and

Adolfo Camarillo High Schools with the 8<sup>th</sup> whereas being deleted; in the first "Now therefore be it resolved" deleting "subject to space availability"; and in the first "Be it further resolved" deleting "and also space availability." The motion was seconded.

A member of the public addressed the Board on the area of unification.

**Mr. Speakman restated his motion to: adopt resolution #05-25 on tentative petition pending before the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization: A Plan for Flexible Enrollment at Rio Mesa and Adolfo Camarillo High Schools deleting the 8<sup>th</sup> whereas, changing the second to last line of the "Now therefore be it resolved" to "approved by the voters, subject to space availability and the discretion of the Oxnard Union High School District" and adding "at the discretion of the new unified district to the first "Be it further resolved." The motion was seconded and passed 3-2 (Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voting no).**

#### **9. REVIEW OF DISTRICT GOALS FOR 2005-2006**

Mrs. Berg stated that this is a continuation of the workshop from last week. Dr. Dase distributed revised goals and objectives based on review by the management team. In addition he distributed budget priorities from the management team. These included salaries and benefits, technology, staffing additions, custodial, program expansion, and staff development.

Mr. Alamillo stated that the management items were not goals and not measurable. Mrs. Maez stated the importance of showing what the management team sees as budget priorities for the use of resources and how they might support or compete with the draft goals and objectives.

Dr. Dase agreed with the concern about salaries and benefits. He stated that this is something that needs to be dealt with and is very serious.

#### **10. REVIEW OF THE COMMUNITY CLIMATE SURVEY DRAFT PREPARED BY VISIONLINK**

Dr. Dase stated he gave a very brief overview of the survey at the last meeting and that there was a request from a Board member to bring the item to this meeting. He stated that VisionLink, Inc. consultants will be present at the next regular meeting to address questions from the Board and that the Board will be asked to accept the report.

Mr. Alamillo asked that the Board be provided the questions that were used in the follow-up telephone interviews.

### **AUGUST 18, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.2. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization held a public hearing on August 15. He stated that the Committee has planned a meeting in September to address CEQA; has planned another meeting in October for additional consideration of the area of election; and has requested that each of the affected districts provide a statement on their position on the area of election with the rationale for that position. Dr. Dase also stated that the Committee is expecting their consultant's report in 6 – 8 weeks.

#### **E.2. ACCEPTANCE OF COMMUNITY CLIMATE SURVEY PREPARED BY VISIONLINK**

Dr. Dase introduced Mr. Doug Zimmerman and Ms. Andea Hendrix, representatives from VisionLink, Inc. Mr. Zimmerman gave a brief overview of the firm stating that the firm works with a lot of communities across the country and is based on data collection. Through PowerPoint Mr. Zimmerman discussed various aspects of the survey. He stated that the survey began in December 2004; was completed in May 2005; addressed a cross section of subjects; and was directed to

students, parents, community members, teachers, administrators and classified staff. He stated that the objectives were to assess community perceptions on: district programs and policies; the teaching and learning environment; and to identify areas of success and concern. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the survey was not an analysis of curriculum or student learning, but a climate survey about the community perception of the district. He stated that the survey had significant statistical validity. He stated that the survey indicated the population is very supportive of the district; that the student and staff safety was viewed positively by teacher/administrator/parent responses and slightly less so by students; that school engagement of parents was high, with student responses again not as high; and that the effective use of technology was not meeting expectations with an understanding of budget constraints; and that there was a concern of equitable distribution of technology resources throughout the district. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the area of the survey that dealt with preparation for the future is often an indication of what is provided at the high school level. He stated that the data and follow-up interviews reflected the desire from parents for traditional high schools.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that through the survey process his firm learned that the unification issue has been on the table for some time. He stated that a really important statement for the Board to hear that came out of the survey was that there was broad support for unification; the vast majority of people had already decided they were in favor but wanted to know more. The major concerns about unification for teachers, administrators and community was cost; for parents the main concern was how fast can the process move forward and what it will look like, not how much is it going to cost. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the anecdotal comments and phone interviews reflected a lot of trust in PVSD and its ability to provide the same level of curriculum and support at higher grade levels. He stated that the issue of unification came to the top. He stated that this was a climate survey and was not set up as a referendum on the issue; but that essentially the community has decided and wants to know the details.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there was an explicitly expressed concern with the ability of Oxnard Union High School District to provide programs and services to students from Camarillo and that more than 60% of the respondents offered the comment. At the same time they expressed satisfaction with Pleasant Valley and how it could be extended from K-8 to 9-12. He stated that 90% of the randomly selected telephone interviews were in support of unification. He stated that they do this type of work in many districts and that it cannot be stated enough that it is unusual to have such strong cross-section/cross-issue support of an issue like unification.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the additional insights that consistently popped up were: strong, cross-stakeholder, cross-issue support of the district; parent engagement at school site issues that could be considered; concern that the last four years of the K-12 program was outside the scope of PVSD; and in general, that the stakeholders seek additional information to understand issues. Mrs. Hendrix suggested a link on the website for "Questions" to identify the community's areas of concern or need for understanding.

In response to a question from Mr. Alamillo, Mr. Zimmerman stated that the follow-up set of questions were randomized to sites that had low responses on low satisfaction and high responses on high satisfaction in an attempt to assess the gaps. In addressing Mr. Alamillo's concern on the difference in response levels from east-side and west-side schools, Ms. Hendrix stated that they did not know where schools were located or what the demographics were. The information reflects those who chose to respond, which reflects the climate of the community. She stated the data could be disaggregated by specific school sites determined by the Board. Mr. Zimmerman stated that in addition to providing the disaggregated data, they would also provide the statistical validity of the data in smaller numbers.

In response to Mr. Alamillo's question about the validity of 90% in favor of unification based on a small number of follow-up interviews, Mr. Zimmerman stated the survey was about climate and during

the course of the survey, they realized this was the top issue and therefore, explored the issue further in the phone interviews. He stated that caution should be used in evaluating the number of responses; however, they have great comfort in looking at the survey responses, phone interviews, and people asking to know more about something on which they agree, that the data reflects “shockingly overwhelming support of unification.”

Mrs. Berg stated that the district is currently in a “window of opportunity” for unification that Mr. Zimmerman previously stated was important to address. She asked for an executive summary that could be submitted to the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization along with the climate survey report.

In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens, Ms. Hendrix stated that the “other schools” listed in the report were respondents indicating their school was Adolfo Camarillo or Rio Mesa High School.

Dr. Dase stated that many items discussed by the Board as goals had bubbled up in survey.

Mr. Zimmerman and Ms. Hendrix indicated they would provide an executive summary and disaggregation of the data based on geographical areas. The Board thanked them for their work on the report.

**On a motion by Mr. Alamillo, seconded and passed 4-0, the Board moved to accept the Community Climate Survey as presented.**

#### **SEPTEMBER 1, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.4. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD**

Dr. Dase stated that the current petition at the State Board of Education has no date set for a hearing and that there has been no communication from the State. He stated that there are three or four petitions ahead with one scheduled for the November State Board of Education meeting. He stated that the State will give advance notice of approximately 3 – 4 months and require a two-month posting notification for agenda items. Dr. Dase stated that the County Committee has a meeting scheduled for October 5 which will include a CEQA Public Hearing.

#### **SEPTEMBER 15, 2005, REGULAR MEETING**

##### **E.1. APPROVAL OF BOARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2005-2006**

Dr. Dase stated that this item has been discussed by the Board at several meetings. Through PowerPoint he discussed the difference between goals (broad general philosophical statement) and objectives (a specific accomplishment within a given timeline that advances a goal). He stated that CSBA recommends that the Board of Trustees clearly articulate goals and objectives in order for staff to develop more detailed action plans that link the vision.

Dr. Dase reviewed the four goals and stated that they are not in any particular order.

*Goal 1: Provide Educational Leadership and Promote a Common Vision Within the Community*

*Goal 2: Sustain and Enhance Instructional Practices and Student Achievement*

*Goal 3: Promote Effective Communication within the School Community*

*Goal 4: Maintain and Enhance a Safe and Effective Learning and Working Environment*

He stated that goal # 1 was, in his opinion, the most important goal (providing educational leadership and a common vision within the community) and that the other goals are equally important but speak to the important aspects within the school district. Dr. Dase stated that, in reviewing the community climate survey, meeting with the management team, and observing the Board’s consideration of goals and objectives, the four goals are common threads which consistently appear.

Dr. Dase reviewed the four objectives presented; stated that they cut across the goals and that administration could now develop the plans related to the objectives. He indicated that there are already three plans in process that the Board would like to see put into place: Communication, Facilities, and Technology.

Mrs. Berg asked that another objective be added: "Offer employment opportunities that attract, train, and retain highly qualified personnel." Mrs. Kitchens stated that these items were brought in after previous deliberation and that they had not been discussed before. Mrs. Berg stated that the reason the Board has continuing deliberation is to have time to think things over. Mrs. Miller stated that the Board has had discussions on numerous occasions and that she believed the Board needs to do what it can to increase salaries as the budget allows. Mrs. Berg stated that her recommended objective speaks to professional development, honoring employees currently in the district, and new hires.

Mr. Speakman stated he had no objection to adding the new objective and that he appreciated Mrs. Kitchen's comment in not having reviewed the listing of additional items from staff. Dr. Dase stated that this information was shared at the workshop setting on August 11 and the question at the time was the manner in which it was presented. He stated that staff had evaluated budget priorities, and this was the #1 budget priority of management; that staff felt very strongly about this issue; and that should the Board choose to incorporate this objective, this would send a strong message to the community and employees. Mrs. Maez agreed with Dr. Dase's statements.

Mrs. Berg asked that the word "statutory" be deleted from the last objective presented stating that the district could potentially go into arbitration with unification issues and elimination of "statutory" would give the district more latitude in the process.

Mrs. Kitchens stated that she preferred voting on the goals together and the objectives as individual items.

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to approve the Board Goals #1 through #4 as presented.**

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to approve Board Objective #1: Assess and evaluate the allocation of district resources to ensure equity while providing educational options and alternatives.**

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to approve Board Objective #2: Develop and implement a district communication plan to create a more successful connection with the district and the community.**

**On a motion by Mrs. Kitchens, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to approve Board Objective #3: Implement a district facilities plan to ensure efficient and cost effective use of facilities and resources.**

**On a motion by Mr. Speakman, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to approve Board Objective #4: Develop and implement a district technology plan that places the district as a leading edge implementer in which students demonstrate increased levels of proficiency and staff demonstrate both increased productivity and proficiency.**

**On a motion by Mrs. Kitchens, seconded and passed 5-0, the Board moved to approve the Board Objective to: Offer employment opportunities that attract, train and retain highly qualified personnel.**

**Mrs. Miller moved to approve the Board Objective to: Provide the leadership and resources necessary to support the processes leading to a vote on unification. Mr. Speakman seconded the Motion.**

Mr. Alamillo read from the PVSD July 6, 2000 regular meeting minutes: Dr. LaCouture suggested the Board get out of the unification business. He requested that the subcommittees be released of their charges. He is in favor of a public forum and believes that the Board should turn it over to another organization. He stated that the Board cannot act on unification and the efforts need to be returned to running the Pleasant Valley School District." Mr. Alamillo stated that the vision of unification did not come from the Board; it came from the community; that when the original petition that is in Sacramento was in the signature process, statements were made that "if we unify we will get a new high school, we will pay less taxes, all our money goes to Oxnard; that these statements are patently not true at this time and there is a difference in perception and reality."

Mrs. Berg asked that Mr. Alamillo's statements pertain to the objective. He stated that he had the floor. He stated that the two new schools in Oxnard were built with federal money and bond money and that the portion of that as a community was \$9.62 million. He noted that the same hurdles have existed since the feasibility study in 1998: ethnicity, housing and financial; that there are not enough seats in Camarillo for all of the high school students; and that leaving the students at Rio Mesa will impose a financial burden to the new district. He stated that the fiscal study shows that the new district would have a \$1.9 million surplus, but omits \$200,000 in the cafeteria fund, between \$100,000 and \$125,000 for transportation and Special Ed encroachment of approximately \$1 million. He stated that also missing from the fiscal analysis is no increase for classified personnel, site administrators, or district office administrators; that with no Measure H dollars, the community would have to have a \$76 million bond to build a new high school. Mr. Alamillo also stated that in the survey, 40% of the people said they don't have information and went on to say "written comments provide direct information about and suggestions for improving the information flow related to unification." Mr. Alamillo also stated that the "90%" figure was based on a limited response.

Mr. Speakman said to Mr. Alamillo, "*You're spinning pretty good right now.*"

Mr. Alamillo continued his comments by noting that if we stick to the facts so that the community knows what they are voting on; that we still have not answered the original questions of ethnicity, housing, and financial; that the community would be better served to wait until the high school is built by OUHSD. He stated that the district would probably be better served, because as Oxnard continues to grow, the ADA percentages will be reduced which will create less financial burden. He said, "*We were all elected as trustees and it is our duty to all the constituents to guide them in making a decision that will conclude with the best educational opportunity for the children in our community....No one in the community is against unification ....but the time is not right. You may ask, 'When is the time right?' I don't know other than sometime after a new high school is built.*"

Mrs. Berg restated the motion and asked for further discussion. Mrs. Kitchens stated that she would vote no and stated that there were two reasons: First she believed that there was previous consensus that in the absence of unanimous agreement an objective would not be brought forth. Second, the superintendent had already been given direction in this specific area.

Mr. Speakman stated that he appreciated Mrs. Kitchen's comments as being rational, logical, well laid out and appreciated her position on it. He also said "*that in the future if we are trying to making a political speech that we at least try to be accurate.*" Mr. Speakman opined that, "*Mr. Alamillo shared a lot of his opinions tonight; one of them was we ought to entertain facts as we discuss and deliberate issues as a board and I really didn't hear any during his comments. I heard a lot of opinion. Mr. Speakman said, 'that to express [an] opinion in the position you hold as a trustee and make it sound*

*like a fact...does an injustice to the position.” Mr. Speakman requested that “in the future, provide us with a copy of the speech so we can come prepared to address some of the issues that you bring up.”*

Mr. Alamillo addressed Mr. Speakman and said, *“If there is anything in here that is non-factual, please let me know and I will gladly show you the backup for it”*. He stated that to put this item on here, in his opinion was purely political in nature, since the Board has already given the Superintendent his direction and given staff direction on what to do.

Mr. Speakman addressed Mr. Alamillo and stated that if he would like to Mr. Speakman would be happy to take a copy of his comments and go through it and point out the inaccuracies and the areas where he expressed an opinion as a fact.

Mrs. Berg stated that that would not be appropriate since there was a motion on the floor and asked if there was any further discussion about the objective. Hearing none, she called for a vote.

**The motion passed 3-2 (Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voting no) to adopt board objective to provide the leadership and resources necessary to support the processes leading to a vote on unification.**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.5. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the potential effects on the District and staff**

Dr. Dase stated that the County Committee will conduct a joint meeting and CEQA Public Hearing on October 5 at the VCSSO in the Conejo room at 6:00 p.m. He also stated that he has not heard from the State Board of Education on the status of the petition.

#### **OCTOBER 6, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.5. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that he received notification from Mr. Stan Mantoath, Secretary to the County Committee, that the consultant’s report has been delayed a week; that there will be an opportunity to review the report and for the affected districts to meet with the consultant; and that the CEQA Public Hearing is currently scheduled for October 25. He stated that the Committee anticipates being able to take tentative action on the petition on November 14. He also stated he has not received any notice from the Department of Education or State Board of Education on the Camarillo petition currently at the state level.

#### **OCTOBER 20, 2005**

##### **D.3. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.3.4. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the potential effects on the District and staff**

Dr. Dase stated that the County Committee Consultant’s draft report is released and is posted on the VCSSO website and linked to the PVSD website. He stated that there will be a meeting on October 25 at 6:00 p.m. at the VCSSO to give the consultant the opportunity to present the draft report to the Committee and answer questions, and that there will be a CEQA hearing on November 14 at 6:00 p.m. He stated that the CEQA draft is a mitigated negative declaration which indicates there will be minimal impact from unification. Dr. Dase stated that the Camarillo Unified Petition is still in the California Department of Education and has not been put on the State Board of Education agenda. In response to a question from Mrs. Berg, Dr. Dase stated that there has not been any movement on the unification petitions ahead of the Camarillo petition and that they have been working on the same one for more than one year.

### **NOVEMBER 3, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.5. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that there will be a Public Hearing by the County Committee on the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) negative declaration on November 14 at 6:00 p.m.

### **NOVEMBER 17, 2005 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.3. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that he had no updates since the last meeting. He stated that he will be providing a copy of the OUHSD desegregation plan to the Board and is working with legal counsel on a response to Stan Mantooh, Secretary to the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization. He stated that at this time there is no reason to have any closed session discussion on potential litigation, however the OUHSD has indicated they would litigate the current CEQA plan that was prepared for the County Committee.

### **DECEMBER 15, 2005 ANNUAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.4. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that at the recent meeting the Committee agreed to have their environmental quality act attorney go back and do another review. He stated that he received a notice that the Ventura County Board of Education will be conducting a meeting on December 28 at 9:00 a.m. in the Conejo Room to consider initiation of a waiver to extend the statutory time limit currently in place under AB 780 for the petition.

### **JANUARY 19, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.2. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.2.8. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that Ventura County Board of Education (VCBOE) took action to request that the VCBOE has oversight on school district organizations. He stated that Mrs. Berg will attend a meeting scheduled on January 30th to select the representatives to the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) and that there will be three openings. In response to a question from Mrs. Berg Dr. Dase stated that he did not believe PVSD would be a party to the pending OUHSD litigation against the County Committee.

### **FEBRUARY 2, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.2. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.2.2. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and staff**

Dr. Dase stated that the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization (VCCSDO) will conduct a meeting on Friday February 10 in Somis to review the status of the CEQA process.

### **FEBRUARY 16, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.4. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and staff**

Dr. Dase stated that the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE) is working on setting up meetings related to the County Committee on School District Organization. He stated that there has been no notification from the State Board of Education about the pending petition.

### **MARCH 2, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.2. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the potential effects on the District and staff**

Dr. Dase stated that a hearing is scheduled to be held on March 15 in Somis and that the agenda lists an item for hiring a legal firm to do a California Environmental Quality Act review related to unification. The current petition in Sacramento has not had any progress.

### **MARCH 16, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **D.1.4. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization held a public hearing and meeting in Somis. He stated there was a presentation made by a representative of an environmental impact company that will prepare a focused EIR report on facilities and transportation. The report is expected to take 8 -10 months and cost approximately \$50 – 75,000 to be funded by the county and not the district.

### **APRIL 4, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **E.1. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORTS/ITEMS**

##### **E.1.1. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated he received a letter from Marty Bates, President of the Ventura Board of Education, inviting the Governing Board Members and Superintendents of all districts affected in the proposed Camarillo unification to participate in a roundtable discussion facilitated by with a CSBA representative. Dr. Dase expressed his concern with compliance with the Brown Act and asked the Board to email Mrs. Phillips with their availability May 1 through May 31. The Board came to consensus and agreed to participate in mediation.

### **MAY 4, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **INFORMATION**

##### **D.4. PRESENTATION BY DALE SCOTT OF DALE SCOTT AND COMPANY ON THE RESULTS OF A COMMUNITY SURVEY ON A POTENTIAL BOND ELECTION**

Dr. Dase introduced Mr. Dale Scott who presented the results of a survey commissioned by the Board on a potential bond election. Mr. Scott stated that the survey was conducted with a random sampling of four hundred high propensity voters. He discussed various aspects of the survey results including: a high percentage of the respondents did not have children; a large group of the voters are "anti-tax;" the need for improvements to school facilities was conveyed to the survey respondents even though the majority did not have children; the voters believe that the Board is doing an excellent or good job on educating children; modestly strong support for educational projects; and that the younger and older individuals surveyed are strong supporters of the district. He stated that the question of unification has strong support among all groups. In a similar survey for Oxnard Union High School District the support was higher (79% to 69%), which did not surprise him. He stated that this question had the strongest support.

Mr. Scott stated that there is enough support to pass a bond. He stated that he believes there is support to give future Boards flexibility in spending the bond funds on a future high school if unification occurs and that this is a legal option to consider. Mr. Scott stated that under Proposition

39 the Board must provide voters with a project list that indicates the options for expenditure of funds; however the funds may not necessarily be spent on all the options.

In response to a question from Mrs. Berg, Mr. Scott stated that in general, state matching funds could generate an additional 35% - 40%; as an example, if the bond was \$100 million, the total could be \$160 million. In response to a question from Mr. Alamillo on the district's eligibility for matching funds, Mrs. Maez stated that this information could be obtained in a reasonable amount of time. Mr. Scott stated that under Proposition 39 with a 55% passage rate, a bond can only be on a general election; the first opportunity would be November 2006 and that the next opportunity would not be until June 2008. Bonds are rated at the time of the sale of the bonds; there is no collection of taxes until proceeds are used.

In response to a request from Mr. Alamillo, Mr. Scott provided the breakdown on the unification questions: 64% support, 5% lean in support, 10% undecided, 3% lean in opposition, and 18% oppose. In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Mr. Scott stated that under state law the issuing agency cannot advocate for or against a bond measure; however it can send information on how the funds are to be spent. This information would not be the guiding document; the information in the voter pamphlet is the guiding information.

Mr. Alamillo requested a needs list be developed to determine an amount that would be sufficient to cover the current needs. Mr. Scott recommended that needs be balanced with the difficulty and expense of an election. Districts will typically project 4 – 10 years for needs.

In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Mr. Scott stated that it is less important to be concerned about the amount and more concerned about length of time before another vote. When asked about the impact of rising fuel prices, Mr. Scott stated that there is no impact. Core values do not change in 2 to 3 months; economic changes do not make a big difference.

Mrs. Berg said that it appeared the district should go for enough to cover current and future needs. In the event of unification the new district would be able to take care of the students coming back from Rio Mesa. Mr. Scott stated that the voters are not concerned with how the district will handle the funds because they feel the Board does a good job.

Mr. Scott stated that in order to be on the ballot in November, the Board would need to take action by the end of June. He recommended consideration of action at the next Board meeting. Mr. Speakman suggested that staff come back with a list which includes possible future needs. He stated that the district should go for the biggest number it can.

Direction to staff was to return with a proposed amount and a needs list.

#### **D.2.5. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that the County Committee will meet next week on May 10.

#### **MAY 18, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

##### **E.2. Project List for Bond Measure to Improve and Renovate District Facilities**

Dr. Dase stated that Mr. Bill Kadi, Bond Counsel with Jones Hall, was present to answer questions from the Board. Mrs. Maez distributed information to the Board including the Facility Goals adopted in November 2004. She stated that two important goals were: To augment existing school to reach recommended cost effective size of K-5/K-8: 550 – 700 and 6-8: 1000-1200; and To provide comprehensive instructional programs meeting the needs of all students by providing an Opportunity Room at each site; continuing the existing Day Care programs; providing Kindergarten options where needed; and providing Preschool options where needed. She discussed the optimum school size with the number of classrooms required and the facility needs at each school site. She discussed a

draft exhibit for a potential bond measure containing voter language outlining the list of the facilities projects. She stated that this document needed to state all potential projects. She stated it is important that the language provide future boards with as much flexibility as possible and be as thorough as possible. If projects are on the list they may not necessarily be completed, but if they are not on the list, they cannot be done. Mrs. Maez stated that the estimated cost of the facility projects discussed is \$65,500,000 spent over time with a 15% contingency built in for potential increased construction costs. She discussed additional language that would provide future boards in the event of reorganization with the ability to issue bonds to build a high school. She stated that she did not have accurate numbers for state eligibility for state matching funds and that the current estimate for building a high school is \$100 million.

In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens, Mr. Kadi stated that in order to have a measure on the ballot for November, action would need to be taken by the Board by July. The Board directed staff to return the item with more details broken down by projects by site. They also asked for two options: one K-8 and the other K-12. In response to a question from Mrs. Berg, Mr. Kady stated that two separate ballot measures tend to be confusing.

### **JUNE 1, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.2. DISCUSSION OF PROJECT LIST FOR BOND MEASURE TO IMPROVE AND RENOVATE DISTRICT FACILITIES**

Mrs. Maez discussed support documentation including: number of rooms needed for optimum size schools with all the options; facility needs at the school sites; a project list reflecting upgrade and major repair of existing elementary facilities; and construction of new school facilities in the event of reorganization of the District. She stated the part of Proposition 39 language requires districts to specifically list projects they intend to complete with the proposed bond funds and that if a project is not listed, bond funds cannot be used. She responded to questions from the Board and stated that Mr. Scott would be present at the June 15 meeting to address additional concerns and questions. Mrs. Berg requested "swimming pool" be added to the second page of project list.

At 8:55 p.m. the Board voted unanimously to continue the meeting to the close of business.

Mrs. Maez stated that at the June 15 staff will be presenting a resolution calling for an election and setting the bond amount; the actual ballot language for approval; and the project list for approval.

Dr. Dase stated that renovation is much more of an issue than construction. He also stated that the language of Proposition 39 states that Board approval requires a super majority or 4 out of 5 members. The Board directed staff to return with bond language for \$165 million.

### **JUNE 15, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **E.2. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 06-17 OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE PLEASANT VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT ORDERING AN ELECTION TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF SCHOOL BONDS, ESTABLISHING SPECIFICATIONS OF THE ELECTION ORDER, AND REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION WITH OTHER ELECTIONS OCCURRING ON NOVEMBER 7, 2006**

Dr. Dase stated that this item was returned at the request of the Board. He stated that effective leadership within a community is to identify, understand, and address areas of concern. He stated that the ballot measure as presented addressed both current and future needs of the district and that it provides future boards with the ability to meet the needs as circumstances change. He stated that the survey conducted by Mr. Dale Scott's company reaffirms the findings of the previous surveys – members of the community are proud of the district and have placed their trust in the leadership to make decisions that are in its best interest. Mr. Dale Scott, of Dale Scott and Company, stated that his firm has been a financial advisor for 15 years to PVSD as well as the Oxnard Union High School

District for 15-20 years along with numerous other districts and that his role is to give the district the best advice financially and to the core mission. He also stated that he has been approached by numerous people with suggestions. He expressed apologies for not being able to say what everyone suggested, but would instead state what he felt. Mr. Scott stated that he has the deepest respect for the board members and staff of PVSD and OUHSD.

Mr. Scott explained general obligation bonds: when voters pass a bond measure, they give the public agency “a line of credit” and that there is no cost until assessed by the elected officials. As an example, he stated that OUHSD passed a bond in 2004 (Measure H) and has not issued any of those bonds; there has been no cost to the taxpayers for that bond. Current tax bills reflect a bond passed in 1996 but not Measure H. He stated that it is unclear when OUHSD will issue the bonds, however the authorization never goes away.

Through a PowerPoint presentation he showed that only 15% of the voters disagreed with the statement “Because of the current condition of elementary schools, improvements need to be made in classrooms throughout the district.” He stated that regardless of whether or not voters had students in the district, they understand the need for upgraded K-8 facilities. He indicated that the survey asked to rate the quality of education provided by PVSD and that the 2% “poor” rating was remarkable. Mr. Scott stated that in evaluating the respondents in other areas challenging the district, it was evident that the voters still support the district. He stated that this positive support, or political capital, has two very important aspects:

1. It is the most important thing we own; however it is transitory or fleeting. It can take a long time to get, but the moment it is perceived that we are not doing our job, it will be gone.
2. More importantly – how did we get it? Where did this come from? Why do people feel this way? It is because of the decisions and challenges faced and made by past boards. The difficult decisions they made gave the current board the opportunity to do what is being done now and have these positive ratings.

Mr. Scott stated that it took five attempts to pass the last bond. Each time it was difficult to do again, but the Board determined that this was what was necessary. He stated that past board members who may not have agreed on the direction the district was going made the decision to work together for the bond election.

He stated that he has never encountered an opportunity that has so many positive potential attributes as this bond. He stated that many people are thinking it is about unification, but he does not believe it is – it is about management and opportunities. He stated that, 1) If the bond passes, needed improvements at existing facilities, that has overwhelming support, could be made immediately and 2) if unification occurs, future boards don't have to face another election or spend between \$35,000 - \$100,000 for another election; don't have to pay for advisors; don't have to “muster up” the psychological energy that it takes to have another election - the voters are ready. He stated that if unification does not happen, the funds would still be available in 10 – 15 years or longer for continued modernization of existing facilities.

Mr. Scott stated that the proposed bond measure provides a great deal of clarity, opportunity, and challenge. He stated that the most important and startling aspect of the survey is the faith that the voters have in the way the Board manages the district.

Members of the public addressed the board on consideration of the bond measure including: expressions of support; requests for the opportunity to vote on the measure; requests for more details on the project list; concerns about funds for a high school facility in the event of unification; and concerns about a “blank check”.

Mrs. Berg stated that Board members had received 25 emails on this issue: 2 would vote in favor if K-8; 20 would vote in favor if K-12; 3 would vote no. She stated that this is consistent with Mr. Scott's survey results indicating 85% in favor of the bond measure.

Mrs. Kitchens asked that a tally be made of the emails received

**At 8:55 p.m. the Board voted unanimously to continue the meeting until the end of business.**  
Mr. Speakman called for a 10 minute recess.

In response to questions from Mr. Alamillo, Mrs. Maez stated that matching funds are based on state calculations for numbers of un-housed students. She stated that when the Master Facilities Plan was developed, consultants indicated that, should unification take place, the district would be eligible for approximately \$15 million in matching funds. She stated that the recommendation presented tonight did not include matching funds for elementary facilities. Mrs. Maez stated that the existing state bond contains portions for modernization, which were used for the last modernization, and for new facilities. The new state bond [if passed] would contain larger funds for upgrading and modernization which the district would aggressively pursue as it did with the last PVSD bond resulting in \$7-8 million in matching funds. She stated that School Facilities assisted with the application process.

Mrs. Berg stated that correspondence from Superintendent Jack O'Connell praised all the districts that had passed bonds in anticipation of getting in line for the matching funds from the state bond.

In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Mrs. Maez stated that there is not much funding left for modernization on the existing state bond. She stated that the needs list and associated costs were developed assuming support would be with local bond funds for the elementary portion and that the secondary portion was reduced by an assumed \$15 million matching funds eligibility.

In response to a question from Mr. Alamillo, Mrs. Maez stated that the bond amount was reduced by the amount of potential matching funds. She stated that language regarding the district office was in the original proposal along with an \$8 million contingency. She expected future boards would look at meeting the needs of the school sites first and, if funds became available, look at district facilities.

Mr. Alamillo stated that he did not want students to be in substandard facilities and that he understands the need for improved facilities. He stated that he did not see Las Posas parents jumping in and stating that "we need this" and that there are plenty of other sites that need things. He stated that the project list has a redundancy of operations that are not needed and gave an example of the need for more classrooms at Rancho Rosal, Valle Lindo, or Las Posas. He stated that this item was not presented in a workshop and is not a comprehensive idea of what is needed. He expressed concern with being presented the information in May and the need for time to prepare a comprehensive plan. He stated that this item is not about unification; that although Mrs. Berg's stated that Camarillo does not want a comprehensive high school, that would be his preference; that in two years, the board should consider allocating \$10 million for the purchase of land and designing of buildings for potential high school students; and that he could not support the plan as presented.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Speakman on the concerns of a "blank check", Mr. Scott stated that under old regulations for 2/3 bond passage, there was not a lot of control imposed; that the new 55% guidelines require an enormous amount of "teeth"; that the project list is new and required; that if projects are not on the list they cannot be done; that there is a tax rate limitation; and that the most important and stringent requirement is to have a citizens advisory commission appointed to oversee expenditure of funds – not to direct how to spend but to make sure funds are spent correctly. He stated that the advisory commission has a fair amount of power; that it requires a specific list of members including retiree association members, and business and tax representatives. In response to a question from Mr. Speakman Mr. Scott stated that the best approach is to make sure

language exists to give latitude to the overriding concern in providing equal facility and technology access to all students and to make sure that one can be proactive and visionary as times change.

In response to a question from Mr. Speakman on the concern for technology allocations, Mr. Scott stated that the current language does not state how much will be spent on technology and that the Board will determine how to allocate the resources along with oversight from the citizen advisory commission.

Mr. Speakman stated that during a meeting with the City Manager, when the Navy military housing area development was discussed, no one could predict how many residences would be developed and that he would like to amend the wording to not be specific to a high school and leave it open for a potential elementary site. Mr. Scott stated that that language is what is needed for flexibility. Mrs. Berg stated that the decision on the Navy housing will be made next year. Mrs. Maez stated that it would be simple to add to the box on page 8 [Exhibit A-1] "and elementary school" after the word "high school." Mr. Speakman stated that he did not want to delineate between unknown specifics and suggested the wording be "for construction of new facilities as needed to house students within the district" to eliminate restrictions.

In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens, Mr. Scott stated that the deadline for adoption of the resolution was June 30. He also explained the process for determining who was contacted for the survey: high propensity voters that had voted in 2 of the last 3 elections. In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens regarding the bonds that were not passed at the June 2006 election, Mr. Scott stated that the reason was voter turnout. He stated that the November 2006 election with gubernatorial candidates would increase voter turnout and the likelihood of bond passage.

In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens regarding something not being on the list, Mr. Scott stated that the reason the language is repeated over and over again is to give latitude to what can be done in the future and that is why it appears to be overly comprehensive. He stated that what is important is that the district won't have to do everything on the list, but if a project is not on the list, it cannot be done. He stated that based on the wording, funding for technology in the future would not be an issue.

In response to a question from Mr. Alamillo, Mr. Scott stated that the wording "build and equip" is broad enough to cover a server, repave a parking lot, or build a computer lab. He also stated that the reason "computer lab" was specifically listed for Los Senderos was the assumption that it is an actual planned project and that this is important information to provide the community.

In response to a comment from Mr. Alamillo for more specificity, Mrs. Berg stated that the problem with specificity is limitation. She stated that she had evaluated the pros and cons of passage of the bond: equal facilities could be obtained with the bond-status quo would remain without; PVSD would be in line for state matching funds along with 37 districts but would not be in line without; in the event of unification, it allows funding for housing 700 students with but would not without. Mrs. Berg opined that it is important that board members be responsive to their constituency and it would be arrogant to turn their back on the positive feedback from the community. She asked if the board was willing to say to the community that it doesn't think they should vote on this issue when it is clear that 80-85% of the community is in favor.

Mr. Speakman stated that he wished that revenue generated by developer fees, sales tax, property tax and money from the state and federal government were adequate for the education of students. He stated he viewed the bond measure as a community issue and not a school district issue. He stated that he viewed his personal role in the decision making process as one that would benefit the entire community. Mr. Speakman stated that, if there would be assurance of adequate control and oversight of expenditure. He had some suggestions for modifying the language that contains a

description of the oversight committee makeup and function; identification of projects; and the timing and expenditure of funds for those projects. He stated that, if the issues of money being spent at the will of the community were addressed, the right thing to do would be to have as much money as possible available when the community wants to spend it.

Mr. Speakman suggested language that would indicate bond funds are to be used for modernization and construction of facilities and technology as needed in the district. The citizens committee in conjunction with the district would then expand and fine tune the work already completed by staff to determine the current project needs for subsequent approval by the community before the money is spent. He recommended a vote for and approval of the bond resolution provided there was language that gives the community as much flexibility as possible.

Mrs. Miller stated that there were two things that needed to be done: 1) determine whether or not to put this on the ballot, not what we would personally vote, and put it to the community. 2) amend the language of the ballot measure.

In response to a question from Mrs. Berg concerning the language and its ability to provide flexibility, Mr. Scott stated that the existing language provided latitude at each of the existing campuses. He suggested revised language in the last box of Exhibit A-1 "Construction of New School Facilities" to acquisition, construction, and equipping including technology, and new classrooms and educational facilities as needed based on ongoing district needs. He stated that the concerns and complaints rarely have to do with projects that should have been done, the tax rates being high or the dollar amount too much; rather it's almost always running out of money.

In response to questions from Mrs. Kitchens on educating the public on potential bond measures, Mr. Scott stated that it depends on the community. He stated that this district did a remarkable job of communicating with the public after the bond was passed. He stated that this meeting has been very open to hearing more information. He stated that the important factors in successful passage of a bond are 1) the core values in community that do not change, that this community has always been supportive of bonds at over a 60% level; and 2) are the needs there and whether or not the public believes they are, and to communicate clearly what we are going to do. He stated that most voters don't look at the amount of the bond but rather how much it is going to cost them and that he felt the community would be supportive of the bond measure.

In response to a question from Mrs. Berg on the likelihood of passage, Mr. Scott stated that the poll shows a strong probability of passage; that in the past, no bond has received less than 55% support and that he believed the bond would pass.

In response to a request from Mr. Speakman for suggested language, Mr. Scott recommended a new paragraph be inserted that read, "Acquisition, construction, and equipping (including technology) of new classrooms and educational facilities based on on-going needs of the district." Mr. Scott stated that if the bond passed for \$150 million and unification did not take place, the language is broad enough to cover any needs that may come up.

Mr. Alamillo stated that he felt this was in fact a "blank check"; that the last bond measure had very specific projects listed and identified the core needs. Mr. Speakman stated that his first condition for the broad language is a mechanism in place that ensures that money is not spent until there is an empowered citizens committee representing the community determining where the money is spent. He stated that the language is not a "blank check" but instead provides latitude and opportunities as far in the future as possible.

Mr. Alamillo stated that the law for the bond oversight committee indicates overseeing the decisions that the board has already made and money already spent. He stated that Mr. Speakman's condition

needs to be part of the actual ballot language. Mr. Speakman re-stated his previous request for additional language on the makeup and role of the citizens group to oversee the process of identifying projects and related expenditure of funds to allow the flexibility to address the needs of the community once they are identified. He stated he would like to empower the community with language in addition to that required by law.

Mrs. Miller stated that the Board has an opportunity to take action in support of the community and asked that they not take counsel from their fears.

In response to Mr. Speakman's request for a motion, Mr. Alamillo stated that he felt an hour's worth of discussion on \$150 million bond was not ample and without seeing any other language, he was not sure what the board would be voting on. Mrs. Miller stated that the Board was not voting on the bond, only deciding what it would cost the district to place the bond on the ballot to let the voters decide. Mr. Alamillo responded saying that only some of the projects have been identified; that inequity between campuses was shown; and that until it could be shown why money would need to be spent on a school that has yet to open, on one that is closed, or on one that is growing, the Board is not doing the public a service. Mrs. Miller responding saying that she relied on the professional opinions submitted.

Mrs. Kitchens stated that she appreciated what Mr. Scott has tried to do, but felt short changed in discussing in May and making a decision by June 30. She expressed disappointment that as a board, that if this was something the board wanted to do, they didn't have the foresight to bring out to the community. She stated she was very annoyed that this popped up in May, amounts had changed, and that she is not pleased that this is not the best effort. She stated that she is not comfortable saying she knows what the board is doing.

Mrs. Miller stated that meetings could be conducted to inform the public and address concerns prior to the November election, the same that was done for the last bond election. She stated that if action was not taken now, the opportunity would no longer exist. Mrs. Miller stated that Mr. Scott indicated the chances were greater this fall with the anticipated high voter turnout than anywhere in the new future. Mrs. Kitchens stated that she could not support the bond without a sense of a high degree of success which she has not gotten from the community.

In response to a question from Mrs. Berg regarding the timeline of OUHSD's Measure H, Mr. Scott stated that it had the same amount of time; same process involving a poll, same discussion by the board about possible projects; and that the language had the same magnitude as that proposed in the PVSD bond. She reminded the Board and the audience that one of the supporters of the Measure H bond was Mr. Alamillo. Mr. Alamillo questioned the relevance of Mrs. Bergs comment. Mr. Speakman called for a short recess. The Board recessed for 10 minutes.

Mr. Alamillo moved to adopt Resolution 06-17 ordering an election to authorize the issuance of school bonds, establishing specifications of the election order, and requesting consolidation with other elections occurring on November 7, 2006, and approve the following exhibits: Exhibit A, Ballot Measure Full Text of Measure: Exhibit A-1, Bond Project List: Exhibit B, Ballot Measure (Abbreviated Form) and Exhibit C, School Bond Election Notice. Mrs. Berg seconded the motion and asked if that included the amendment. Mr. Speakman stated the motion did not specify an amendment and she withdrew her second. The motion died for lack of a second.

**Mrs. Miller moved to table the item to another meeting before June 30<sup>th</sup>.** Mr. Speakman asked for clarification on Roberts Rules and whether or not the motion was made properly to allow the item to be discussed at another meeting. Dr. Dase stated that Board Bylaws do not specify a particular guideline for making motions even though in the past the Board has relied on Roberts Rules as a guideline. He stated that, in terms of best practices, he would recommend a date certain. **Mrs. Miller**

**amended her motion to table the item to June 21 or June 28 at 6:00 p.m.** Mrs. Miller suggested the Board determine a date they were available. Mr. Alamillo appreciated Mrs. Miller attempting to find a common date; however, he stated the problem was not language, but the needs. Until the needs were identified he was not comfortable with the bond measure. **Mr. Speakman confirmed Mrs. Miller's motion to table the item to a meeting on June 29 at 6:00 p.m. and stated he would second the motion with the understanding staff would work on the language and the project list with associated costs.** Mr. Speakman called for a vote. **The motion passed 4-1 (Mrs. Kitchens voting no)**

In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Dr. Dase stated this particular item would need 4 votes to pass. If only three members were present at the meeting, the item could not pass.

Mrs. Kitchens stated she was ready to vote tonight but not willing to put people through anything. She stated she would plan on attending the meeting on June 29.

### **JUNE 29, 2006 SPECIAL MEETING**

#### **11. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 06-17 OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE PLEASANT VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT ORDERING AN ELECTION TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF SCHOOL BONDS, ESTABLISHING SPECIFICATIONS OF THE ELECTION ORDER, AND REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION WITH OTHER ELECTIONS OCCURRING ON NOVEMBER 7, 2006**

Mr. Speakman stated that with 14 speaker sheets, the 20 minute time limit for public comments would be exceeded and requested that the timer be changed to 2 minutes to allow everyone a chance to address the Board. He stated that if, at the end of the 2 minute limit, a member of the public felt their position was not clearly articulated, to let the Board know. Members of the public addressed the Board on the proposed bond measure expressing their concerns including support/non-support, "blank check", request for more detailed information on how the bond money would be spent, and consideration of postponement to a later election.

Dr. Dase stated that his motto of "Valuing for Past, Caring for the Present, and Looking to the Future" provides guidance in discussing the bond. He stated that the community has a strong history of doing what is right for the children and that decisions are based on what is known about the community and from lessons in the past. He stated that the previous bond was not adequate to meet the needs and that it is important to anticipate what the future will look like when caring for the present.

Dr. Dase stated that "blank check" and line of credit were two distinctly different ways to look at the bond. He stated that a "blank check" implies unfettered freedom to spend without responsibility or accountability. He stated that Mr. Scott talked at length on the need for flexibility to address immediate and long term needs. He stated that a line of credit is an important part of any business plan and addresses the goals and intended outcomes.

Dr. Dase stated that accountability for outcomes and specificity should not be confused. He stated the revised ballot language includes more specific opportunities for project and priority input and that the line of credit allows the district to deal with immediate identifiable needs, consider opportunities, and address future needs. He stated that a line of credit is only used as needed and that the city has identified areas of growth and development. In response to questions about Rancho Rosal, Los Altos and the district office on the project list, he stated that if the sites are not listed, bond money could not be considered for future projects. He gave an example of thin client technology at school sites requiring reconfiguration at the district office and stated that if the district office was not listed on the ballot measure, bond funds could not be used.

Dr. Dase stated that the board objective of allocating district resources to ensure equity is a paramount concern. He stated that if one trusts the Board with strong community input to direct districts administration to make wise decisions about what projects need to be done then this bond makes tremendous sense. He stated that the bond matches board goals and is driven by community needs.

With overheads Mrs. Maez addressed the Board on questions that had previously been raised by staff, parents and the public regarding the bond:

- *How can you be sure that bond funds will be spent on improving our schools?*

Current Law and Education code require an independent citizens' oversight committee be established and include representatives from the business community, senior citizen's organization, and an active parent-teacher organization representative that is also a parent/guardian of a PVSD student. The district must conduct annual independent audits to ensure bond funds are properly spent. Bond funds cannot be used for employee salaries.

- *Why has the amount recommended by staff changed from meeting to meeting?*

At the May 18 Board meeting, staff outlined recommendations for \$65 million for elementary sites. Per Board direction for a project list that included elementary needs and future, long-term district needs, staff presented a \$165 million project list at the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. At the June 15 meeting the same list was presented for \$150 million reflecting a reduction of \$15 million, the amount staff estimated for matching funds.

- *Why aren't there other matching funds included?*

Although there is a statewide bond on the November ballot, passage is uncertain and there are no rules or regulations that provide guidance in estimating the amount the District might be eligible for. Should the bond pass and PVSD has available matching funds due to the passage of our own bond, staff would aggressively pursue additional facility funds.

- *Why does the new school, Rancho Rosal, need another classroom wing?*

It is important to remember that Rancho Rosal is a developer built school with an obligation to provide facilities for children generated by the Village at the Park development estimated at 500. The boundaries of the school are larger than the development and it will be a district responsibility to construct an additional wing to complete the school to full capacity of 600 students. If these development projects do not happen and growth is not realized, construction of additional facilities would not be required.

- *Why is there proposed funding to increase the size of a closed school?*

The Ponderosa corridor, Navy housing, and Arneill corridor projects will significantly impact the district with as many as 700-800 students over the next several years. Bond language must contain language for classrooms at the Valle Lindo site to allow the district to reopen the school with the necessary capacity to accommodate this growth.

Mrs. Maez stated that, when the decision was made to close Valle Lindo temporarily until the Ponderosa corridor was developed, the Board was not aware of the Navy Housing or the Arneill corridor projects. She stated that this is an example of why flexibility is important in the proposed bond language. She stated that it would be a huge mistake to not plan for this project and be in the position of having to tell the community that there were no funds available to bring the school to needed capacity because of missing bond language.

Mrs. Maez displayed a map showing the size and location of the Ponderosa corridor, Navy housing and Arneill corridor projects. She stated that, because there are several large areas of development in the community, as district and fiscal advisor to the Board, she would be falling short of her duties if she did not support and bring to the Board what would meet future needs. She stated that she believed in the Board's vision and long term goals for the district and that their stated belief in

equity and equality for all students and their concern regarding present and future generations supports this vision. Mrs. Maez stated that the Board is committed to providing technologically advanced, up-to-date facilities without overburdening the taxpayers. She stated that if the goal is to provide meet and immediate facility needs of the district; to provide future boards the ability to set priorities and meet future facility needs; and to raise the necessary funds at the least cost and least disruption to the taxpayer, it is her very strong recommendation that the Board adopt the resolution calling for a bond election in November authorizing \$150 million with the project list as presented.

In response to a question from a member of the public regarding playgrounds on the project list, Mrs. Maez stated that with funds from the prior bond, the district removed the old galvanized equipment and replaced them with new equipment in the kindergarten and primary grade areas as well as removing all swings. She stated that, based on a strong interest at the school sites, the district would like to have the ability to improve the playground areas.

**Mr. Speakman moved to adopt Resolution 06-17 ordering an election to authorize the issuance of school bonds, establishing specifications of the election order, and requesting consolidation with other elections occurring on November 7, 2006, and approve the following exhibits: Exhibit A, Ballot Measure Full Text of Measure; Exhibit A-1, Bond Project List; Exhibit B, Ballot Measure (Abbreviated Form) and Exhibit C, School Bond Election Notice. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Berg.**

Mrs. Kitchens stated that the discussion with Mrs. Maez and Dr. Dase would have been appreciated at the beginning of consideration of the item. She stated she had created a check list of her understanding of the resolution: the majority of the community understanding what we are doing in a transparent way and that she felt the majority of the community did not understand; and the Facility plan needs to be more closely tied to the bond proposal. She stated she did not feel the analysis of risk and reward had been covered enough for the community to understand and that she had a concern with some of the bond language. She stated that there was community support to make the bond go and that there needs to be a template for where the district is going. She stated that the majority of her items had been addressed and substantially met for her. She stated that she could not support the bond proposal at this time.

Mrs. Miller stated that she and Mrs. Kitchens met with Mrs. Maez for clarification of the bond proposal and were able to address their concerns. She stated that the Board still has the responsibilities of our facilities and needed to make a decision that will allow staff to move in a progressive manner. She stated that the Board needs to consider what other plan will be in place if the decision is to wait for two years.

Mr. Alamillo stated that his concern was not being brought along with the project list and lack of input from the sites and community. He stated that he understands the needs, but there is a need to come up with a list that the community could get behind to be able to go for a bond once and pass once. He stated that the Facility Master Plan addresses the Springville project and states that the district would have capacity until 2015 and that the Navy housing project would not generate anymore students. He stated that high-density housing does not have the generation factor of children.

Mr. Alamillo stated that the \$100 million portion was for a comprehensive high school and that the reason he supported Measure H was because he recognized that this was the only funding vehicle to get a new comprehensive high school in Camarillo and is still to this day the only mechanism. He stated that he would not support the bond; not because it wasn't needed or because he did not have a passion for the district and community, but instead because there had not been enough thought and that there was a need to step back, plan, and get everyone involved.

Mr. Alamillo showed the bonding capacity for PVSD stating that there was not enough to build a comprehensive high school. Mrs. Maez pointed out the chart showed the bonding capacity for a K-8 district and that should the district unify, the bonding capacity would double. Dr. Dase gave the example of a Southern California district that passed a bond for \$500 million with a bond capacity of only \$20 – 30 million. He stated that the community authorized the board the flexibility over 20-30 years or more as circumstances and the community changes.

Mr. Speakman stated that he had not voted for the last 5 PVSD bonds because he did not understand the need and that he has a different perspective at this time. He stated that he respects the opinions of those that have a concern with the project list or bond language not being complete or clear and that he read the bond language for Las Virgenes, Palm Springs, Oxnard, New View, Kern, Fruitdale, and Jefferson districts and compared them to the current proposal and although they were different, he stated he has no problem with the bond language as it is currently presented. He stated that a local district passed a resolution to put a bond on the ballot and at the same meeting identified a need, but realized that the bond language was very specific and the funds could not have been used. He stated that there is a need for flexibility to provide equal access & equal facilities for all students, which is not the case in the district now.

Mr. Speakman stated that the success of the bond comes with educating the community and that one of the best aspects of the city is the level of understanding. He stated that a common misunderstanding in the emails received was the perception is that if you pass a bond, you will immediately get a bill. He stated that you only receive a statement when and if the funds have been issues. He stated that another misconception was that “we are already paying for Measure H” and that no bonds have been issues yet. He stated that it is very difficult to pass a bond measure if there is not a unified board.

Mr. Speakman stated that taxpayers don't like to see bonds, however this proposal is presented tonight is because, if goal is to spend as little money as possible, you do not want to have staff spending time trying to get bond language passed every few years. He stated it is cheaper to pass a larger bond and not have the recurring costs of bond counsel, legal counsel, and elections costs. He stated that this is an election year and not a popular decision, however he felt this was the right thing to do and that the Board needed to be forward thinking.

Mrs. Berg stated that she had already expressed her opinions at the last meeting; however she wanted to state that she has been on the Board for over 6 years and had never heard staff make a “strong recommendation.” She stated that the district hires good people that look not only in the present, but also in the past for what could be done better and to the future to make us more efficient. She stated that few districts in the state can say they are an 800 district; that few can say they have the trust of the community as we have; that Mr. Scott stated he had never seen a community as supportive of the district and its plans as PVSD.

Mrs. Berg stated that although Valle Lindo was closed as a K-5, it is not vacant and used the facility to house preschool students and county educational programs. She stated she would be supporting the bond because it was an obligation of the Board to look at the needs for today and the future. She stated that without a line of credit it is very difficult for staff to plan and schedule what needs to be done in 5 years without knowing the funds would be available. She thanked staff for their hard work and the community for their input.

**The motion failed 3-2, (Mr. Alamillo and Mrs. Kitchens voting no).** [Motion requires a 2/3 vote or 4 of 5 members]

Mrs. Berg stated that since there appeared to be reluctance on funds for a potential high school, she stated she still would like to facilitate a K-8 district and had a specific list and wanted to give the

citizens the opportunity to vote. **Mrs. Berg asked to repeat motion and replace the amount with \$95 million which would allow the district to take care of future anticipated needs for a K-8 district. Mr. Alamillo seconded the motion.** He stated that the opposition to supporting the bond comes from not having the time to figure out what is needed and the process of identifying specific needs was missing. He stated that there needs to be a specific list of projects with associated costs.

Mrs. Kitchens stated that she would have appreciated knowing that another amount of money was an option. Mr. Alamillo stated that he had asked Mr. Speakman and Dr. Dase for an additional agenda item representing only \$65 million.

Mr. Speakman stated that Mr. Scott's survey showed a very high level of trust on the part of the community regarding actions and past practices of this board. In each meeting that the bond has been discussed, he stated that he made a conscious effort to make the point that the community be the one that has the strong ability to identify needs and collaborate with the board and district in terms of when and where money is spent. He stated that he trusts the abilities of the community and that the dollar amount doesn't concern him because of language in the ballot measure:

*"The Board shall establish an Independent Citizen's Oversight Committee pursuant to Education Code Section 15278 and following to i) advise the Board as to the appropriateness and need of those school facility projects listed below in Exhibit A-1."* He stated that is proactive – before money is spent; and that the committee has input with the Board and deliberates in public sessions regarding the appropriateness of where the money is spent.

*"ii) provide the Board with a proposed prioritization of said projects";* He stated that again, this would be before the money is spent.

*"iii) ensure bond proceeds are expended only on said projects." The committee shall be established within 60 days of the date when the results of the election appear in the minutes of the Board.* He stated that his comfort level comes from the fact there will be citizens from the community collaborating with school district personnel and the Board to identify the projects before the money is spent. He stated that he sees no problem with the community having access to a line to credit to educate their children. He stated that this language goes beyond provisions of Ed Code Section 15278 to provide the community with more input.

A member of the public questioned the ability to take action on a lower amount. Mrs. Berg stated that she did clarify this issue in anticipation of the \$150 million not passing and the desire to have something for the staff to work with as they plan for the future. She stated that it does not mean that the \$150 million was not needed; it means it will not last as long.

Mrs. Kitchens stated that for her, it is more about passing the appropriate amount with the appropriate community support once. She stated that she is not interested in doing another stop-gap measure.

**The motion failed 2-3 (Mr. Alamillo, Mrs. Kitchens, and Mrs. Miller voting no).**

## **AUGUST 17, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

### **A.7.1. Presentation**

Through a video presentation Mr. Chris Valenzano, Ventura County Board of Education Trustee Area III and Mr. Stan Mantooth, Associate Superintendent Administrative Services addressed the Board on the role of the Ventura County Office of Education. The Board thanked them for the presentation and Dr. Davis presented them with a district mug and pen. On behalf of the community, Mrs. Berg thanked Mr. Mantooth for his patience, grace and work on the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization (VCCSDO). In response to a question from Mrs. Berg on the status of the unification petition, Mr. Mantooth stated that the committee was anticipating sunshining of the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in late September and that the committee expected to conduct a public hearing on the report and render a decision in December.

## **SEPTEMBER 7, 2006 REGULAR MEETING** **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Mr. Alamillo stated that he had asked that his request for a program budget for unification be reflected in the minutes of August 17, 2006.

### **D.1.5. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Dase stated that a draft EIR is expected this month from the consulting firm hired by the committee and that there is a timeline for public review of the document. He stated that Mr. Stan Mantooh, VCOE, indicated that a meeting of the county committee is expected at the end of November or first of December to accept or reject the EIR. If accepted, the county committee could then take action on the petition.

## **SEPTEMBER 21, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.1.6. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Mrs. Maez stated that the draft EIR (Environmental Impact Report) is complete and that the 45 day review period began September 14. She stated that the document is available on the county website, at three district offices (Oxnard High, PVSD, or Somis); the Camarillo library; and the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE). She stated that copies are available at VCOE for purchase. Mrs. Maez stated that information on unification is available on the district website along with links to the *Unified Solution*. She stated that the next County Committee meeting is expected to take place late November or early December. Mrs. Berg stated that Mr. Stan Mantooh, secretary to the County Committee indicated that in October, representatives from each county school district will be assembled to elect new members should the process continue past December.

### **D.3. BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed various items including: ....compiling past newspaper articles on unification for legal counsel and how long unification has been an issue in the community; Oxnard Elementary and PVSD's jointly looking at unification in the early 90s; Oxnard High School District's prior concept of unifying the entire Oxnard plain; current letter-to-the-editor suggesting Oxnard Elementary again consider unification.....

In response to Mrs. Berg's comments at the last meeting, Mr. Alamillo confirmed his no vote on the bond measure [\$150 and \$100 million] and that his request for placement of a separate item for \$65 million was not followed. He stated that at the last OUHSD meeting their board president indicated at their last meeting that the board had not voted to not build two high schools under Measure H, that the board had not voted to continue with the process of building two high schools, and that unification had effectively stalled the process. Mr. Alamillo quoted a June 2000 statement from former Superintendent, Dr. LaCouture, suggesting that the Board "get out of the unification business...efforts to return to...K-8." He stated that that this has been his request for some time.

## **OCTOBER 5, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.1.4. Update on the Status of Unification of PVSD from K-8 to K-12 and the Potential Effects on the District and Staff**

Dr. Moffett stated that the draft EIR [Environmental Impact Report] is complete and that the 45-day review began September 14. He stated that the document is available on the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE) and PVSD website, for review at various locations, and available for purchase at VCOE.

## **OCTOBER 19, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.5. BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed various items including: ...the upcoming election for three county committee members in the event the committee cannot come to a decision on the unification petition by the end of their terms and that all three have agreed to re-election to have continuity....

In response to a request from Mrs. Berg, Dr. Moffett reviewed expenditures related to unification, Fiscal Analysis, Feasibility Study, Facilities Master Plan, and Climate Survey; allocation for classroom supplies; allocations added for technology, facilities and maintenance, music and fine arts, and special education.

The Board also discussed items including: a response from former superintendent Dr. LaCouture regarding his support of unification, the importance of allowing the community the opportunity to vote, and the responsibility of boards to educate the community on the issue; expenditures on legal fees related to unification; respecting the decision of the county committee.....

## **NOVEMBER 16, 2006 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.5. BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed other items including; attendance at a meeting of representative of each school district to elect members of the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization, which determines if unification of Camarillo will go to a vote of the public; that Mr. Steve Sullivan, President of Mesa Union School District, was elected to replace Mrs. Janet Lindgren, current representative and former Oxnard Union High School District Board member on January 1, 2007 due to a perceived conflict of interest.....

## **JANUARY 18, 2007 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.1.6. Superintendent Report**

Dr. Moffett stated that he needed direction from the Board on how to proceed with unification. He stated that at the September 2, 2004 meeting, the Board took action to take a leadership role in educating the public, guide the unification process through the statutory process so the voting public would have the opportunity to vote on the issue, and provide resources for this at the discretion of the superintendent within current budget guidelines. He stated that the county committee voted 9-1 to allow the unification petition to go to a vote of the residents of the PVSD and Somis School Districts. He stated the Oxnard Union High School District (OUHSD) has appealed the committee's decision and that filing a brief in support of the county committee's decision is consistent with the previous direction. He asked if this issue be brought back so that there is a clear understanding of the Board's current direction, given Board elections and Superintendent change.

Mr. Speakman stated that the direction has not yet changed and that he had no problem bringing the item back as long as it comes back with recommendations from the superintendent on his assessment of the process and whether or not the district should stop support of allowing the citizens to vote on unification. Mrs. Kitchens asked that the superintendent also provide information on process, financials, and "what we are getting ourselves into." Mr. Speakman also asked for clarification of who defends the appeal. Dr. Moffett stated he would bring this information back and look at the cost.

Dr. Moffett stated that money has been spent on unification since 1992. He stated that as superintendent, he would recommend seeing the issue through, allowing the community a chance to vote and not letting them down without giving them the opportunity. He stated he believed in unification, that it provides guaranteed vertical and horizontal articulation, that it allows you to follow students K all the way through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, that core program can be much stronger, that it provides an opportunity for teacher transfer from middle to high school, that it provides parents easier access to the power structure, and that it is easier to develop shadowing and big-brother/big/sister tutoring programs. Mrs. Kitchens stated that she would also like to see a way to ensure that steps determined by the current superintendent are able to be followed by a new superintendent.

## **FEBRUARY 1, 2007 REGULAR MEETING**

### **E.3 REAFFIRMATION OF BOARD ACTION SEPTEMBER 2, 2004 TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE ISSUE OF UNIFYING THE PLEASANT VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO THE SUPERINTENDENT**

Dr. Moffett stated that the Board took action in September 2004 taking a leadership role in the issue of unification. Since that time there has been a Board election with two members re-elected and a new member elected along with a new superintendent. Dr. Moffett stated that this item is being brought back for reaffirmation. He stated that the county committee voted 9-1 to allow the petition to go to vote for the affected districts - Pleasant Valley and Somis - and that this petition has been appealed by Oxnard Union High School District and appealed by eleven members of our community. He stated that without the appeals this would be moving to a vote of the affected communities; but with the appeal process he anticipates the need for legal counsel. He stated that the City of Camarillo is the original petitioner and could take the lead; however, our Board has taken the lead in the past consistent with prior action and direction. He stated that the Board has spent a great deal of time, energy and money on this issue since 1992 and that there is an obligation to the community to continue this effort to get unification to a vote for them to have the final say.

Dr. Moffett recommended that the budget not exceed \$100,000 and that this is within current budgeted amount for legal expenditure. He stated that he did not feel the expenditures would even come close to this amount. He stated that we do not know what may asked of us at the state level and need to be able to respond to their requests.

**For purposed of discussion, Mr. Speakman moved that the Pleasant Valley School District take a leadership role on the issue of unifying the Pleasant Valley School District and direct the superintendent along with the board to 1) educate the community of the facts regarding school district unification: 2) follow and support the unification on appeal before the State Board of Education pursuant to AB780 such that it is available as a ballot measure to the citizens so that the voting public will have an opportunity to make their wishes know regarding this issue in a public election; 3) provide resources for this effort to be determined at the discretion of the superintendent within current budget guidelines not to exceed \$100,000. Mrs. Miller seconded the motion.**

Ms. Miller stated that she is comfortable with the motion and the amount and asked for quarterly reports on expenditures. Mrs. Kitchens asked to consider the three items listed in the motion separately and what the contingency is if the \$100,000 is absorbed by other legal expenses. In response to a question from Mrs. Kitchens on what he sees coming forward, Dr. Moffett indicated that we would have been voting on this had it not been challenged and that he is surprised that it has been appealed because Oxnard is growing and has other issues in their community. He stated that he expects to have a decision by May or June and that he hopes the decision will be forthcoming quickly so the community can move on. He does not expect enormous costs, that there will be items to respond to if requested by the state board, and that he sees this moving forward. He stated that the state board could turn down the appeals and that he does not see a tremendous amount of expenditure, but instead, the need instead for reports or correspondence.

Mrs. Kitchens stated that it has never been her intention to not allow the community to be educated or to have the opportunity to vote, but her concerns have not been addressed to a level that allows her to comfortably act on this item. She stated that the unification process was flawed and that she would be voting against the motion. She stated that the community needs to be educated, that they should have the opportunity to vote, but she could not vote to approve any additional expenditures.

Mrs. Miller stated that she would be willing to withdraw her motion if that is what the Board desires. Mr. Speakman stated that he could not understand how you can vote to do something and then not fund what you voted to do. Mrs. Kitchens disagreed and stated that we have funded in the past and need to account for what we may spend in the future and that this has to do with the history and not always giving members of the community the opportunity to discuss this. She stated that if it was voted on in one motion, she would vote against it.

Mrs. Berg stated that there was a process in place starting in 1998 when three subcommittees of the community were created and that every aspect was discussed, studied, and reported. At that point the Board took action to pursue unification and that the issue bubbled up from the community. She stated that she would vote with regret to authorize additional expenditures because it has been the demonstrated desire of the

community to put the issue of unification to a vote. She stated that those that have filed the appeals have attempted to deny our community their constitutional rights. She stated that the first petition was signed by 12,511 citizens and that unfortunately, 11 citizens have appealed and that is why we have to go forward with funding our response to this appeal. She read the names of those that filed the appeal based on segregation: Mrs. Val Rains, Mrs. Sherry Cole, Mr. Sol Choljian, Mrs. Shawn Megli, Mrs. Lori Lester, Mrs. Sandy Bieler-Rao, Mrs. Linda Dawson, Mrs. Nancy Feder, Mrs. Anna Bevins, Mrs. Pam Cwiklo, and Mrs. Nancy Ma. She stated that these eleven people are costing the classrooms in our district by their insistence on taking this to the state and denying the community the opportunity to vote. She stated that she would like to address the members of the Oxnard High School District and stated that many leaders in the county have expressed their desire to keep this issue local and many elected officials and minority groups in the county have attempted to bring the Oxnard and Pleasant Valley districts to the table. She stated that we have said that we are willing to meet, and we would like to extend the offer to the Oxnard Union High School District to sit down and negotiate at a local level without attorneys.

**The motion passed 4 – 1 with Mrs. Kitchens voting no.**

### **MARCH 1, 2007 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **D.5. BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed various items including: ..... appeal on county committee's unification decision filed by eleven community members based on race and the cost to the district; ....

### **MARCH 15, 2007 SPECIAL MEETING**

#### **D.3. BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed various items including: .... attendance at the State Board of Education for the appeal on the Camarillo unification and observing a public hearing on another unification that had been going on for decades that was finally approved, enjoying the trustees comments on how they appreciated that the districts put aside their political agenda and sat down at the table at the local level to work out the issues, and how much they valued local control, that the reason for attending was for the appeal from citizens that the SBE did choose to hear later in the year; .....

### **JULY 19, 2007 SPECIAL MEETING**

#### **4. WORKSHOP – DISTRICT ASSET MANAGEMENT**

Dr. Joel Kirschenstein from ... Other areas discussed were required notices and postings to the public; adherence to the Brown Act; implications and flexibilities of unification, interpretation of foreseeable future; the Naylor Act; CEQA;...

### **AUGUST 16, 2007 REGULAR MEETING**

#### **E.4. APPROVAL OF THE USE OF THE VENTURA BOULEVARD PROPERTY (FORMER LOS PRIMEROS STRUCTURED SCHOOL SITE) BY PROVIDER LANG FAMILY CHILD CARE CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF A LEASE AGREEMENT AND RELATED REQUIREMENTS CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF A LEASE AGREEMENT AND RELATED REQUIREMENTS**

Dr. Kirschenstein stated he has been working with...

**Mr. Speakman moved to approve the use of the kindergarten classrooms on the former Los Primeros Structured School site at 2222 Ventura Boulevard, which site is hereby deemed surplus, contingent upon Board approval of a two year lease with a one-year extension agreement, licensing, and other related requirements. The motion was seconded.**

Mr. Speakman requested that the lease be approved by the Board. In response to a question from Mr. Speakman, Dr. Kirschenstein clarified that a licensed child care facility does have priority and that the district is following proper guidelines in approving the use of the district facilities. He also stated that he and staff are making sure that all the necessary procedures are closely followed on the balance of the use of facilities; however, the pending issue of unification could have an effect on the use since a K-12 district would have other opportunities available. In response to a question from Mrs. Berg, Dr. Kirschenstein stated that, because of the timeline, existing square footage usage in our district and two other county districts were used for the lease terms for the kindergarten classroom. He clarified that additional use of the Ventura Boulevard site will require appraisals which are expected to be completed in approximately 60 days due to the complexity of potential uses. He said that the goal, after dealing with

the priority use requests, is to have everything in place by first of the year.

## **OCTOBER 18, 2007 REGULAR MEETING**

### **D.8. BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed various items including: serving on County Commission.....Mrs. Berg attending a VCCSDO meeting as the Board representative on October 30; attendance at the Inaugural Ventura County Educators Hall of Fame that recognized State Superintendent Jack O'Connell and that two of the ten recognized were from PVSD; that the former county superintendent James Cowan who was recognized was given accolades for overseeing the unification of four districts in the county; ...

## **March 6, 2008 REGULAR MEETING**

### **I. Superintendent's Report/Items**

#### **1. Update on Unification**

The Superintendent will provide an update on the petition to unify the Pleasant Valley School district into a K-12 district.

#### Minutes

Dr. Villegas stated the California Department of Education (CDE) recommendation on appeals to the unification petition approved by the County Committee were that the unification would not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation and that the area of election be PVSD and Somis Union School District. The appeals are on the State Board of Education March 13 agenda. He stated that he will be attending the meeting at his expense.

Dr. Villegas asked Linda Bekeny to provide information on what additional revenue would be generated by the unified district should it be approved by voters.

Mrs. Bekeny explained revenue limits and that, based on a projected ADA of 9,700, the additional revenue to the new unified district would be approximately \$5.4 million. She indicated that this was based on information received from the County.

Joel Kirschenstein, SAGE Realty Group, addressed the Board indicating that this was an exciting time to become a unified school district; that PVSD is surrounded by unified districts; and that the CDE evaluates petitions and appeals and that this is the most thorough evaluation he has seen. He stated that the CDE found that there is no compelling reason to accept arguments in the appeals and that they recommended denying the appeals.

Mr. Kirschenstein responded to questions from the Board stating that he had just worked with 4 school districts that unified into one and that the communities voted knowing that unification was the only source of new revenue; and that unification is the only ongoing source of additional revenue today. He explained that high school districts were formed to be eventually eliminated and that high school districts forget this. They were formed for only one reason - to support rural and semi-rural communities; that overtime they were expected to go away and that is why there is a financial incentive to unify; and that now is the time to take unification to a vote. He stated that the most recent unification approved by voters, one of the four most influential forces behind the unification effort was the teachers union because it was very clear what unification could provide. He also stressed the importance of the support of teachers and that he knows of no district that has gone back or regretted unification.

### **March 13, 2008 SPECIAL MEETING**

#### **a. Attend Meeting of State Board of Education Regarding Unification Appeal**

Board members and staff attended the State Board of Education meeting. They addressed the State Board on the appeal of the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization's decision to approve the petition to unify the Pleasant Valley School District into a K-12 district.

### **April 17, 2008 Regular Meeting**

#### **I. Superintendent's Report/Items**

##### **1. Update on Unification**

Dr. Villegas stated that on March 13 the State Board of Education affirmed the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization's recommendation to approve the proposed formation of a Camarillo Unified School District. The State Board denied the appeals on the Committee's recommendation and affirmed that the proposed formation would not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation. He said that the State Board designated the area of election to include the Oxnard Union High School District in addition to the Committee's recommendation of Pleasant Valley and Somis Union School Districts.

He addressed a Letter to the Editor that appeared in the Ventura County Star that, in part, questioned "if PVSD was funding" a unification survey. He clarified that the district was not involved nor was it aware of the survey. He stated that school districts are prohibited from using district funds for political campaigns or political activity. He also stated that School District employees are also prohibited from participating in political activity during work time.

---

### **May 15, 2008 Regular Meeting**

#### **12. Approval of Scope of Work/Authorization of Costs with Sage Institute Inc. (V)**

Dr. Villegas stated that a significant amount of work has been done in the past for unification transition planning. There is a need to continue to involve the community. The Sage Institute and Mr. Kirschenstein have years of experience and can give assistance in the planning process. He indicated he strongly recommends approval of agreement.

Mrs. Berg stated that during the county committee deliberations, Jan Iceland faulted the District for having made no preparation and there was criticism from community for not being prepared.

Dr. Villegas said that Mr. Kirschenstein has done an exceptional job of consolidating 25 board members into 10 following the last unification he worked with. Dr. Villegas felt that Mr. Kirschenstein's experience and unemotional basis would be an asset for those of us who have been close to the unification process and his experience would help get the public involved in transition plan.

Mrs. Lerner understood that this process would provide a to-do list of how to put all the pieces together and that the K-8 education would be a part of process. She said that whether we unify or not we will get good information.

Dr. Villegas said that this would prepare the District for the November election to communicate the design of Camarillo Unified and that there would be no additional costs.

Approve Scope of Work/Authorization of Costs with Sage Institute Inc. as presented.

Motion made by: Sandra Berg

Seconded by: Patty Lerner

Votes

Sandra Berg	Yes
Suzanne Kitchens	No
Patty Lerner	Yes
Jennifer Miller	Yes

---