

**VENTURA COUNTY COMMITTEE
ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION**

OCTOBER 25, 2005 MEETING

*Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office – Conejo Room
5189 Verdugo Way, Camarillo, CA*

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order by Doyleenne Johnson, Member-at-Large and Chairperson of the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization (VCCSDO), at 5:15 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Judy Bysshe.

The following members of the Ventura County Committee on School District Organization were in attendance:

*Judy Bysshe, representing Supervisorial District #1
Leo Molitor, representing Supervisorial District #1
Jan Iceland, representing Supervisorial District #2
Janet Lindgren, representing Supervisorial District #3
Tom Baldwin, representing Supervisorial District #4
John McGarry, representing Supervisorial District #5
Barbara Vollmert, representing Supervisorial District #5
Doyleenne Johnson, Member-at-Large*

Staff:

*Stan Mantoath, Secretary to the VCCSDO; and Associate Superintendent,
Administrative Services, Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office
Sandy Wade, Administrative Assistant to Stan Mantoath – (Recorder)*

It was moved by Tom Baldwin to revise the agenda order with item #4 - Closed Session with Legal Counsel - to become the next item on the agenda - #2. The motion was seconded by Barbara Vollmert and carried by a unanimous vote.

2. Closed Session with Legal Counsel to Discuss Existing or Potential Litigation (Government Code Section 54956.9[b] and [c]) One or more cases depending on whether the County Committee is threatened with litigation concerning the proposed Camarillo Unification

Ms. Johnson asked if there was any public comment regarding the closed session item. No comments were made.

The County Committee went into closed session at 5:18 p.m.

At 6:00 p.m., Chairperson Johnson called the open meeting to order.

3. **Report of Closed Session Action**

Ms. Johnson reported that in closed session, discussion ensued regarding potential litigation with Legal Counsel, Mr. Frank Fekete. No action was taken.

4. **Approval of Agenda**

It was moved by Mr. McGarry and seconded by Mrs. Lindgren to approve the agenda as revised. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

5. **Approval of Minutes**

It was moved by Janet Lindgren to approve the minutes of the July 5, 2005 meeting. The motion was seconded by Barbara Vollmert and carried by a unanimous vote.

It was moved by Janet Lindgren to approve the minutes of the August 15, 2005 Meeting and Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Jan Iceland and carried by a unanimous vote.

6. **Public Comments** - *(Three minutes per speaker, with a maximum time limit of 30 minutes allocated)*

The following individuals spoke on the proposed unification to form a new Camarillo Unified School District:

Dolores "Val" Rains, Camarillo - (written remarks submitted)
Pamela Cwiklo - (written remarks submitted)
Tom Griffin, Sacramento, General Counsel for Oxnard Union High School District
Sol Chooljian, Camarillo - (written remarks submitted)
Nancy Feder, Camarillo
Sandy Rao, Camarillo
Sandy Berg, Board of Trustees of the Pleasant Valley School District
Marguerite Mary Leoni, General Counsel for Pleasant Valley School District
Jan Henry, Camarillo
John Alamillo, Board of Trustees of the Pleasant Valley School District
Roger Lund, Camarillo

Mrs. Johnson announced that the 30-minute allocation for public comments has been expended; and stated that two additional persons filled out speaker cards. She invited them to come forward and speak to the group if they had comments to add which were not stated by the previous speakers. The following persons came forward:

Patty Lerner, Camarillo
Debra Creadick, Camarillo

At 6:45 p.m., Chairperson Johnson requested a five-minute break.

7. **Presentation of Preliminary Draft Study of the Feasibility of Formation of the Camarillo Unified School District**

Mike Winters, Consultant from the firm Caldwell Flores Winters, Inc. of Cardiff, California, gave an explanation of his preliminary findings of the nine criteria contained in the Preliminary Draft Report on the Study of Feasibility of Formation of the Camarillo Unified School District dated October 16, 2005. Mr. Winters reiterated that the above report is a preliminary report and is not complete. He further noted that modifications will be made to the report based upon information received in today's meeting through the November 7, 2005 deadline to submit public comments to the County Committee Secretary, Mr. Stan Mantooth.

Dr. Winters pointed out that he was contracted to study and evaluate the nine conditions for school district reorganization as set forth in Education Code Section 35812 pertaining to the formation of a Camarillo Unified School District. He has received questions from the public and County Committee members which are outside the scope of Education Code Section 35812, which he was unable to address.

Dr. Winters briefly discussed his preliminary findings on the nine conditions as follows:

- ❖ Condition 1: “The new district will be adequate in terms of the number of pupils enrolled.” This criteria stipulates that each district must have a minimum projected enrollment of 1,501 students. CBEDS data was used to determine that both districts have met this condition; and the study recommends that the County Committee deem this condition substantially met.
- ❖ Condition 2: “The districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.” The study concludes that both the proposed Camarillo Unified School District and the remaining Oxnard Union High School District would have substantial community identity and, therefore, recommends that the County Committee deem this condition substantially met.
- ❖ Condition 3: “The proposal will result in an equitable division of property and facilities of the original district or districts.” Dr. Winters stated that the purpose of Condition 3 is not to divide up the assets and liabilities of each of the districts; but to judge whether it is feasible to make an equitable division of property and facilities. In analyzing Condition 3, the Consultant utilized the actual cost for housing students with a 30:1 loading figure and used Average Daily Attendance figures. The current data shows that Condition 3 is feasible; however, there will be revisions to numbers on the asset side and liability side for both districts.

- ❖ Condition 4: “The reorganization of the district will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.” (This Condition was held for discussion at the end of the Consultant’s presentation.)
- ❖ Condition 5: “The proposed reorganization will not result in any substantial increase in costs to the state.” The Consultant pointed out that there are transportation costs which should be noted in this section and will be included in the final draft report.
- ❖ Condition 6: “The proposed reorganization will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the proposed district and districts affected by the proposed reorganization and will continue to promote sound educational performance in those districts.” Dr. Winters stated that the Oxnard Union High School District and the Pleasant Valley School District need to be commended for the outstanding job they are doing in promoting educational programs; and further stated that in high minority populations with English Language Learners, it is remarkable that OUHSD has no Program Improvement Schools and is meeting the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. The Consultant pointed out that there will not be a problem with the educational program with the proposed unification, except for current certificated staff teaching at Adolfo Camarillo High School who may leave the newly-formed Camarillo Unified School District and opt into the remaining Oxnard Union High School District. Consequently, the list of certificated staff needs to be re-examined to determine which staff will choose to remain at Camarillo High School and which staff will choose to remain with the Oxnard Union High School District. The findings may be altered after reviewing this data; however, with the data received to date, this condition has been substantially met.
- ❖ Condition 7: “The proposed reorganization will not result in a significant increase in school housing costs.” The Consultant stated that he utilized the State’s Loading Program Standards of 25:1 and 27:1 when calculating the loading classroom figures and recommends that the County Committee deem this condition substantially met.
- ❖ Condition 8: “The proposed reorganization is not primarily designed to result in a significant increase in property values causing financial advantage to property owners because territory was transferred from one school district to an adjoining district.” The study recommends that the County Committee deem this condition substantially met.
- ❖ Condition 9: “The proposed reorganization will not cause a substantial negative effect on the fiscal management or fiscal status of the proposed district or any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.” This criteria will be further examined.

Condition 4: “The reorganization of the district will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.” Dr. Winters stated that the current school districts are operating well within the parameters of the law and are meeting all of the conditions and criteria in Title 5. He noted that people inadvertently move into neighborhoods with like ethnic and racial groups; and the school district has offered programs in order for students to mix ethnically and racially within the schools. The boundaries of the current petition happen to fall along those ethnic and racial lines which will, in effect, segregate the potential school district communities. Dr. Winters stated that the current school districts are not practicing segregation today; however, if the County Committee approves the formation of a Camarillo Unified School District, their action could, in effect, promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation. Currently, the Consultant’s study recommends that the County Committee deem this condition not substantially met. It was noted that this criteria will be re-examined by the Consultant in his Final Draft Report.

During the course of the consultant’s presentation, and at the conclusion, Dr. Winter’s took specific questions from members of the County Committee, a number of which will require follow up for discussion at the next scheduled County Committee meeting and/or inclusion in the Consultant’s final report.

8. **Next Meeting Date(s)**

The next County Committee Meeting will be held on November 14, 2005. The Public Hearing on the California Environmental Quality Act (*CEQA*) review process will be conducted at that meeting. It is anticipated that the Consultant’s Final Draft Report will also be presented to the County Committee at that meeting.

After the County Committee members checked their calendars for their availability to meet the beginning of December, it was agreed that their second upcoming meeting will be held on December 6, 2005, at 6:00 p.m.

9. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Doyleenne Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Stan Mantoath
Secretary to the County Committee on School District Organization
Associate Superintendent, Administrative Services,
Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office