## DOING NOTHING ABOUT EDUCATION IS NO LONGER AN OPTION The Journey Begins With One Step



#### SUMMARY

The 2010-11 Grand Jury has studied the issues of school district consolidation/unification in Sonoma County. The investigation was initiated by a citizen's complaint. Sonoma County has over 70,000 students, in 40 school districts, one of highest numbers of school districts in the State of California. Our schools have problems including declining enrollment, teacher and instructional staff layoffs, school closures and lack of funding. In this report, we want to make everyone aware that elected officials (i.e., County Board of Supervisors, city/town councils, and school district trustees) have the power to request studies of school district consolidation/unification that could lead to significant positive change.

We interviewed principals, district superintendents of both small and large districts, the past and present County Superintendents of Schools, members of school district boards, members of the County Board of Supervisors and an aide to a local state senator. Most of those we spoke with agreed that the current school district configuration is not financially sustainable. Reductions in state revenue, declining enrollment and the rise in charter school development have put the operation of our current school districts at risk. School districts are being forced to close campuses, increase class sizes, reduce days of student instruction and lay off teachers and other educational staff in order to cope with declining financial resources.

Most of those we interviewed agreed that there could be dollars saved by school district consolidation/ unification. They also agreed that consolidation/unification might not be the right fit for everyone. Financial savings may not result in program expansion or improved educational outcome for students. However, everyone agreed that our focus should be on educating our children. The Grand Jury believes that better education, not cost savings, is the most compelling benefit that school district consolidation/unification may achieve. Improved education can take

place through articulation and the implementation of some standardized teaching methods, which will provide a better focus to get students the best education possible. For example, the Twin Rivers School District consolidation has resulted in student achievement, with student test scores in math rising over 100 points<sup>1</sup>. They are on track to repeat this feat in their language arts program this year. This success story could be emulated here in Sonoma County.

We also found that the road to consolidation/unification can be daunting<sup>2</sup>. There are complex issues that will be raised by the multitude of stakeholders involved in educating our children. There will be initial costs, and the time frame to realization will take patience. Consolidation may not be for everyone. There are many inequities in funding between the various districts in Sonoma County<sup>3</sup>. The County Superintendent of Schools is not authorized by state statute to step in or request studies in any of the school districts he or she supervises, nor can he or she initiate a study to reorganize such districts. However, these requests can come from local school boards, city governments or the County Board of Supervisors. If the same tenacity, commitment, enthusiasm and dedication of our educators can be duplicated in the community-at-large, then the task of school district consolidation/unification can happen. The idea will require a great deal of political will from all of the stakeholders involved in education. The concept is educationally sound and has economic merit. If your district is suffering economically, and/or seeing educational achievements falling, you should consider the positive effects of consolidation/unification.

<sup>1</sup> Twin Rivers Report 2010 report to the Community

<sup>2</sup> The County Committee Plans and Recommendations Flowchart E

<sup>3</sup> Please refer to the glossary of definitions of Revenue Limit District and Basic Aid

This Grand Jury is aware of the recent developments in Petaluma, and we commend the three school districts involved and the Petaluma City Council for taking the bold first steps on the road to consolidation/unification. We hope that their efforts are considered by the remaining Sonoma County School Districts.

The Grand Jury commends all the educators we interviewed for their tenacity, commitment, enthusiasm and dedication to educating our children, in spite of the above-mentioned adversities.

#### GLOSSARY

#### ADA: Average Daily Attendance

Articulation: (more specifically, curriculum articulation) The process of coordinating curriculum content between primary and secondary schools.

**Basic Aid District (or Excess Revenue Districts):** Districts that have the advantage of being primarily funded by local property taxes (i.e., receive minimal funding from state). They also have the ability to keep all their local property taxes thus giving them revenue in excess of that in Revenue Limit Districts. Sonoma County's 2010 – 2011 Basic Aid Districts are:

Alexander Valley Union, Forestville Union, Fort Ross, Horicon, Kenwood, Montgomery, Geyserville Unified, Healdsburg Unified, Monte Rio and Sonoma Valley.

CCSDO: County Commission on School District Organization

**CBOE:** County Board of Education

**Charter Schools:** Primary or secondary schools that are established and operated under a charter for a fixed period of time and that receive public money (also, like other schools, may also receive private donations), but are not subject to some of the rules, regulations, and statutes that apply to other public schools in exchange for some type

of accountability for producing certain results, which are set forth in each school's charter. Student attendance in charter schools is based on parental choice.

**Consolidation:** An "action to reorganize districts," which could consist of either:

(a) An action to form a new school district, which is accomplished through any combination of the following:
 (1) Dissolving two or more existing school districts of the same kind and forming one or more new school districts of that same kind from the entire territory of the original districts.

(2) Forming one or more new school districts of the same kind from all or parts of one or more existing school districts of that same kind.

(3) Unifying school districts, including the consolidation of all or part of one or more high school districts with all or part of one or more component school districts into one or more new unified school districts.(4) Deunifying a school district, including the conversion of all or part of a unified school district into one or more new high school districts, each with two or more new component districts.

(b) An action to transfer territory, including the transfer of all or part of an existing school district to another existing school district. (EC 35511)

**Dependent Charter Schools:** Referred to as schools that are established, or remain as, a legal arm of the school district or the county office of education that granted their charter.

**E.C.:** State Education Code

**Independent Charter Schools:** Referred to as schools that function as independent legal entities and are usually governed by or as public benefit ("not-for-profit") corporations. Acceptance of students is at the discretion of the school's administration.

JPA: Joint Powers Agreement – an agreement between two or more public agencies to provide services.

Revenue Limit District: The amount of general purpose funding (state and local) a school district receives per

student using ADA.

SCOE: Sonoma County Office of Education

**Unified School Districts:** School districts that include both elementary and secondary (middle and high schools) educational levels.

## BACKGROUND

Sonoma County is divided into 40 school districts, which include 31 elementary districts, 3 high school districts, and 6 unified districts that operate both elementary and secondary schools for students residing within their boundaries. This pattern is a carryover from a time when the county was largely a collection of agricultural communities separated by miles of open space and each community established a local school district.

In the early 1900s, when the population of the county was expanding and many small communities were established, the county had in excess of 100 school districts, largely compromised of "one-room schoolhouses." The majority of those 100 districts were consolidated into the present 40 districts by the development of modern transportation, larger and more permanent buildings and the need to reduce duplication of efforts and associated costs. Currently, Sonoma County has 12 school districts, each consisting of only one school, and several of these have only a single classroom.

## APPROACH

As members of the Grand Jury, we have access to community leaders, institutions and expert professionals who

have studied the multitude of competitive priorities and restrictions that shape public education in Sonoma County. Unfortunately, many of these priorities and restrictions have more to do with politics and employment security than they do with how well students learn and whether the system has sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of a very diverse student population.

We have examined education in the county because it is one of the most important issues that we face as a community. Each school day shapes the future of over 70,000 children. Their lives will either have a positive or a negative impact on Sonoma County, California and the world, well into the next century.

The Jury made the most of our brief opportunity by using our access to interview local education leaders: school board members, superintendents, principals, officials from the Sonoma County Office of Education, members of the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, a state senator's staff member and we traveled to hear presentations from the leadership of a newly consolidated school district near Sacramento.

We found that everyone agreed on one thing, which is that we must do better! We cannot continue with businessas-usual in public education. Numerous national and state studies have shown our students don't have the basic language and math skills that will allow them to compete with the world for the jobs of today and tomorrow. We observed a lack of agreement among the professionals regarding priorities to make educational improvements. There is no single thing we need to do. Instead, there is a need to rally all stakeholders (every citizen, parent, political leader, teacher, administrator) to find ways of getting a far better student educational outcome without massive additional expenditures.

The Jury sees fertile ground for improvement in inter-school communication of student records, optimization of curriculum and teaching methods (articulation), inter-district sharing of best practices and resources, some district consolidation, more choice for parents and students and renewal of public interest and focus as though our very future depends on it - - because it does. Therefore, we offer our ideas in the hope that they will help propel improvement in K-12 education in Sonoma County.

We also discovered that several County Boards of Education in the state are consolidating from old rural seven member trusteeships to five member trusteeships. This conforms to the constituency lines of the local Board of Supervisors. This action has generated a cost savings to the taxpayers in election expenses, health and welfare benefits and travel and conference costs to the County Offices of Education. The CCSDO should study this option with its regular census review.

#### DISCUSSION

The Grand Jury visited the recently unified Twin Rivers School District in the Sacramento area and interviewed the superintendent of schools and various administrative staff. This newly unified district, now in its third year, was the result of five years of concerted effort, involving dedicated leadership, parental involvement and political support. Twin Rivers managed to unify four school districts with diverse socio-economic mixes into one unified school district. The unified district is not yet able to quantify the financial benefits. Financial issues include the melding of four union contracts into one and the creation of an equitable distribution of bond liabilities. Educationally, Twin Rivers, in its most recent 2010 report, achieved the highest increase in their Academic Performance Index (API) this past school year on a school-by-school basis.

The Grand Jury does not suggest that consolidation/unification of school districts is a panacea that will cure all

educational and financial problems. But it may, in appropriate situations, make expenditures more productive and improve student achievement. We do suggest that those districts, which are experiencing one or both of these problems, ask SCOE to do a study of potential consolidations/ unifications leading to a public hearing, if it is deemed advisable.

School principals interviewed were very clear about their problems. The most salient being:

- 1. Ever-decreasing budgets,
- 2. Lack of articulation in moving from grade school to middle school and/or grade school to middle school to high school,
- 3. Negative impact of charter schools on public schools, and/or
- 4. Declining enrollment

In interviews with school trustees we found either total opposition to considering consolidation/ unification or only a vague interest in pursuing unification. However, there was not much knowledge of the process needed to achieve that objective.

In interviews with representatives of the County Board of Supervisors, we experienced an immediate push back. One stated that while the board members were very interested in education, they did not feel that schools were within their purview. We believe that those elected bodies either do not know, or choose to ignore, that they can require SCOE to do a study on consolidation/unification. It is obviously an act with some political risk.

There are bona fide examples of efforts to consolidate school districts in California. In 2010, the City of Santa Paula asked that the Ventura County School District Organization Committee conduct a study of the merger of Santa Paula School Districts. The issue may go to a public hearing as early as June 2012. In addition, our own local community of Petaluma has several districts currently in discussions regarding consolidation, as evidenced in current Press Democrat articles. It can be done!

The final arbiter of education in Sonoma County, as in all other counties, is the State of California. The state establishes funding, promulgates the education code, sets the annual number of required school days (currently at 175, down from 180 the previous year) and determines education standards. In this capacity, one would think that the state would show considerable interest in education problems at the local level and want to help with finding solutions. In several attempts to meet and discuss these matters with one of our local state senators, there was little cooperation. We did meet an assistant of our state senator who came from Sacramento. He met with us for two hours, returned to Sacramento, and was never to be heard from again.

What have we learned from all this? Change is possible; however, not without information to drive the complex process. Information is available; one only needs to ask SCOE. SCOE knows more about education in Sonoma County than any other group, but cannot initiate the studies to help a school district in trouble unless they are requested to do so; counter intuitive as that may seem. We recognize that while not all school districts may appear to benefit from consolidation/unification, all those that are now in immediate need of academic and financial improvements should begin to explore the possibility.

The system needs to become more effective and efficient. Parents, and every other citizen, need to be involved, but leadership should come from elected officials. These elected officials need to get involved by starting a flow of information that would ultimately drive public opinion to find and implement beneficial new structures for our schools. This report is asking those elected bodies to tell all of us what they intend to do in the future.

# FINDINGS

F1. There are 40 school districts in Sonoma County, one of the highest numbers of districts in any California county.

F2. With over 70,000 students in 40 school districts, Sonoma County has more school districts per pupil than any other similar county.

F3. School districts are closing schools. Student population and budgets/revenues have been declining, and are expected to continue to decline in Sonoma County.

F4. Charter Schools are increasing in number and student enrollment in Sonoma County.

F5. State funding has decreased in California.

F6. The graduation rate is in decline, and the dropout rate has increased in Sonoma County High Schools.

F7. Parents are able to take over failing schools (Charter Schools) and/or move their children out of failing schools (Open Enrollment Act, E.C. 48350)

F8. Certain elected bodies (city and town councils, County Board of Supervisors, governing body of a special district or local agency formation commission with jurisdiction over all, or a portion of, a school district) may request the County Committee on School District Organization (CCSDO) to do a study on unification/consolidation (E.C. #35721 (c)).

F9. The County Superintendent of Schools does not have the authority to initiate a study on consolidation/ unification even if a school district is, or is in danger, of economically failing

F10. The last study of school district consolidation/unification in Sonoma County was initiated in 2004.

F11. Articulated curriculum supports consistency in learning experiences from feeder schools to high schools.

F12. School Boards of districts in receivership lose financial control (assumed by a trustee appointed by the state) but continue to control those academic decisions that have no financial implications and remain in an advisory capacity.

F13. As noted in F8 above, CCSDO oversees and approves school district requests for territorial transfer, school board issues and studies for consolidation. They approve all school district consolidations before sending them to the state for approval prior to final public approval by election.

F14. The County Board of Education is an elected body of seven trustees at present. The CCSDO has the authority to reduce membership to five trustees to realize a cost savings to the citizens of Sonoma County.

F15. There has only been one contested election for the County Board of Education in the last 10 years.

F16. Student record transfers from one school district to another are problematic. In some instances it can take up to a year to get records transferred within Sonoma County.

F17. Parents can get statistical data for a teacher's grade level performance from SCOE; however, districts do not disseminate this information routinely.

F18. A breakdown of the number of schools in the school districts of Sonoma County is as follows:

- 12 districts
  1 school
  6 districts
  2 schools
  4 districts
  3 schools
  5 districts
  4 schools
  3 districts
  5 schools
- 2 districts 6 schools
- 8 districts have between 8 and 19 schools

Additional information can be found in the attached Appendix.

F19. Some Sonoma County school districts are failing financially (Schedule of 2010 - 2011 Financial Reporting in the attached Appendix).

# RECOMMENDATIONS

R1. Every school district in Sonoma County that is not currently a K-12 or basic aid district should request a CCSDO study to determine if educational and/or financial benefits could be achieved through either consolidation or unification.

R2. Every city or town council in Sonoma County should exercise their prerogative per the E.C. 35720-35724 to initiate a CCSDO study of educational and financial benefits that might be achieved for their citizens through consolidation or unification of school districts within their city boundaries.

R3. As per the E.C. 35720-35724, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors should request that the CCSDO initiate a fact finding study for the purpose of determining the educational and financial benefits, if any, of reconfiguring or consolidating school districts within their overlapping jurisdictions within Sonoma County into K12, or other configurations of unified school districts, that would benefit all stakeholders.

R4. The Sonoma County Superintendent of Schools should sponsor twice-annual regional meetings of all school

district superintendents to:

(a) discuss and implement "best practices";

- (b) explore and implement school district cost-sharing programs that would reduce school district duplication;
- (c) initiate horizontal and vertical articulation of classroom curriculum, in order to meet educational needs,

which benefit the students going forward feeding into the high school district;

(d) provide for prompt transfer of pupil records among all schools that any student may chose to attend in Sonoma County, especially those students who are entering a secondary school districts.

R5. All CCSDO studies should include the statutory elements required by the state educational code and:

- (a) an evaluation of an articulated K-12 curriculum,
- (b) the economic benefits of Special Education, transportation, administrative services,
- (c) board members' health and welfare benefits, and
- (d) stipend savings through elimination of duplicate services.

R6. The CCSDO, in an effort to better manage costs, should study the potential savings available by reconfiguring the CBOE trusteeships (currently 7 members) to align with the County Board of Supervisors (currently 5). A new, smaller CBOE would then also reflect current census distribution within the county.

R7. The County Board of Education and the County Superintendent of Schools should support and work with state legislators to establish a provision in the educational code that would empower the County Superintendent to make his/her own request for district consolidation or unification studies if a school district has filed qualified or negative financial certification for two or more years.

R8. The Sonoma County Board of Education should conduct a study of SCOE to determine the possible costs and savings of fewer school districts to manage Sonoma County Schools, and where those costs/savings, if any, could be applied to better the education of students.

R9. All 40 Districts in Sonoma County shall respond to the following questions, as summary of which will be published by the Grand Jury:

a. After hearing public comments and by a majority vote of the Board of Directors we \_\_\_\_invite or \_\_\_\_\_ decline to cooperate with a SCOE funded study to discover whether there could be benefits to both educational and financial costs in district consolidation.

b. Current 2010/2011 enrollment is \_\_\_\_\_. Enrollment for 2009/2010 was \_\_\_\_\_.

c. We are currently a K-12 unified school district? \_\_\_\_\_ yes, or \_\_\_\_\_no. If not our current structure is: \_\_\_\_\_

d. We \_\_\_\_\_are or \_\_\_\_ not currently classified as a Basic Aid District. As a Basic id District we derive the following financial benefit: \_\_\_\_\_\_

e. We currently have enrolled \_\_\_\_\_\_students living outside district boundaries. Five years ago there were \_\_\_\_\_\_ students living outside district boundaries.

f. We currently have \_\_\_\_\_\_ students living inside district boundaries who have chosen to attend schools in other districts. How many such students were there in the 2005/2006 school year\_\_\_\_\_?

g. There are currently \_\_\_\_\_\_dependent and \_\_\_\_\_\_ independent charter schools operating within our district. Five years ago there were \_\_\_\_\_\_ dependent and \_\_\_\_\_\_ independent charter schools in our district.

h. We currently have developed effective protocols with all surrounding districts to insure complete and timely access to student records transferring in or out of our district <u>yes</u> no.

i. We currently \_\_\_\_\_ have or \_\_\_\_\_ have not implemented coordinated plans to insure articulation and basic curriculum compatibility with those districts most likely to receive our students and from whom we are likely to receive students.

j. We currently \_\_\_\_\_ have or \_\_\_\_\_ do not have Joint Power Agreements (JPAS), or similar significant shared cost saving plans with neighboring districts.

## **REQUIRED RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS**

From the following school districts: To R1, R9 and to Findings F3, F5, F7, F11, F16, F17, and F19:

Alexander Valley Union	Montgomery Elementary
Bellevue Union	Oak Grove Union
Bennett Valley Union	Old Adobe Union
Cinnabar	Petaluma City Elementary
Cloverdale Unified	Petaluma Joint Union High
Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified	Piner-Olivet Union
Dunham	<b>Rincon Valley Union</b>
Forestville Union	Roseland
Fort Ross	Santa Rosa City Elementary
Geyserville Unified	Santa Rosa City High
Gravenstein Union	Sebastopol Union
Guerneville	Sonoma Valley Unified
Harmony Union	Twin Hills Union
Healdsburg Unified	Two Rock Union
Horicon	Waugh
Kashia	West Side Union
Kenwood	West Sonoma County High
Liberty	Wilmar Union
Mark West Union	Windsor Unified
Monte Rio Union	Wright

From the City or Town Councils of Cotati, Cloverdale, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Sonoma and Windsor to: R2 and F8.

From the County Superintendent of Schools to: R4 and R7, F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F9, F11, F12, F17 and F19.

From the Deputy County Superintendent of Schools to: R8

From the Sonoma County Board of Education to: R4, R6, R7, and R8, F14 and F15.

From the County Commission of School District Organization to: R1, R2, R3, R5, and R6, F8, F10 and F13.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### Individuals Interviews Conducted:

- County Superintendent of Schools
- Former Superintendent of Schools
- School District Superintendents
- Presidents of Boards of Trustees
- Member of the School District Board
- Member of the California School Board Association
- Deputy County Superintendent of Schools
- High School Principal
- Middle School Principal
- Sacramento Area Superintendent of Schools
- Sacramento Area Administrative Staff
- Santa Clara County Grand Jury Member
- Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Members
- Sonoma County Administrative Officers
- Field Representative for State Senator
- Sonoma County Public Information Officer

#### **Documents Reviewed:**

Sonoma County Schools Directory, California State Education Code, Santa Clara County Grand Jury Report (2009-2010 School Consolidation), Twin Rivers School District Publications, West Sonoma County School Study (Published 2006), Financial Accountability and Oversight Program Provisions (Assembly Bill 2756- July 2004, Sonoma County Office of Education Statistical Reports, California Department of Education Program ("NAEP"), Star School Test Results, Santa Rosa Press Democrat Articles, Ventura County Article, Various Education Websites, California School Financial Report, Lawsuits against the State of California (Adequate Funding Structure)

# APPENDICES

Map of Sonoma County School District (SCOE Report) The County Committee Plans and Recommendations – Flowchart E (SCOE Report) Financial Status (SCOE reports as of 3/31/2011) Statistical Schedules of School Districts (SCOE Report) Sonoma County School Board Member Stipends Benefits (SCOE Report) Sonoma County Office of Education

Sonon	Sonoma County					
2010-1	2010-11 District Financial Status					
09-10 2nd Interim	nd District Name	Budget	1st Interim Report		2nd Interim Report	
				Self- Certification	Final Certification	GF expend + Trans out + Uses
I Negative	e Cloverdale	Approved	Negative			12,835,053
2 Negative	· Cotati-Rohnert Park	Approved	Negative			52,019,420
3 Qualified	d Forestville	Approved	Positive			3,715,255
4 Qualified	d Geyserville	Approved	Qualified			3,347,298
5 Negative	- Healdsburg	Approved	Negative			19,590,116
6 Qualified	d Piner-Olivet	Approved	Positive			9,879,644
7 Qualified	d Sebastopol	Approved	Qualified			6,968,540
8 Qualified	d West Sonoma County High SD	Approved	Qualified			21,381,972
10 Qualified	d West County Trans JPA	Approved	Positive			10,003,898

Flowchart E

# COUNTY COMMITTEE PLANS AND RECOMMENDATIONS



#### CURRENT SONOMA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

SONOMACOUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	the second s	NUMBER OF DISTRICT BOARD TRUSTEES	1. 第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第二、第
Alexander Valley Union	1	128	1	5	1,602,576
Bellevue Union	4	1,762	5	5	13,716,875
Bennett Valley Union	2	957	3	5	6,883,627
Cinnabar	1	195	1	5	2,099,604
Cloverdale Unified	5	1,525	4	5	11,006,662
Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified	11	6,206	. 18	5	45,898,299
Dunham	2	178	1	5	1,420,108
Forestville Union	2	434	3	5	3,672,844
Fort Ross	1	44	1	3	555,380
Geyserville Unified	4	255	2	5	2,859,624
Gravenstein Union	3	617	2	5	4,118,076
Guerneville	2	296	2	5	2,560,884
Harmony Union	3	774	6	5	2,762,739
Healdsburg Unified	4	2,048	10	5	15,527,725
Horicon	1	73	1	5	1,426,078
Kashia	1	11	1	3	269,000
Kenwood	1	148	1	5	2,009,182
Liberty	3	1,172	16	5	3,532,691
Mark West Union	4	1,428	6	5	9,239,365
Monte Rio Union	1	95	1	5	1,110,913
Montgomery	1	37	ľ	5	595,225
Oak Grove Union	3	812	4	5	7,152,341
Old Adobe Union	4	1,771	9	5	13,020,102
Petaluma City Elem/High	18	7,875	36	5	63,636,707
Piner-Olivet Union	5	1,671	8	5	8,809,466
Rincon Valley Union	8	3,123	9	5	27,655,530
Roseland	3	2,168	14	5	15,365,821
Santa Rosa City Elem/High	32	16,577	53	7	130,497,289
Sebastopol Union	5	1,077	4	5 .	5,607,793
Sonoma Valley Unified	12	4,671	16	5	36,066,331
Twin Hills Union	4	991	6	5	4,839,638
Two Rock Union	1	187	1	5	1,876,371
Waugh	2	920	2	5	6,356,801
West Side Union	1	171	1	5	1,193,060
West Sonoma County Union High	4	2,344	11	5	20,452,506
Wilmar Union	1	204	1	5	1,564,624
Windsor Unified	9	5,720	16	5	40,982,035
Wright	3	1,487	8	5	11,739,466
TOTALS	172	70,152	285	188	529,683,358

Information compiled February 4, 2011

DISURCE	STRPEND	u D MamcA	L DENI	AL VISIO	N DIN		
Alexander Valley Union	none						
Bellevue Union	\$50	×	×	×			
Bennett Valley Union	none	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense	e benefits at	employee re	ite at own e:	kpense	
Cinnabar	none		×				
Cloverdale Unified	may recei	may receive a stipend of \$229.64 or participate in benefits up to \$591/mo	29.64 or part	ticipate in be	prefits up to	\$591/mo	
Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified	\$240	×	×	×	×	\$1331/mo	\$1331/mo toward all benefits
Dunham	none						
Forestville Union	\$10 (dinne	\$10 (dinner allotment)		may pr	irchase ben	efits at employe	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense
Fort Ross	none						
Geyserville Unified	none			may pr	Irchase ben	efits at employe	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense
Gravenstein Union	\$10 - dep	\$10 - deposited into an account for lunches, retiree gifts, etc.	ount for lunch	nes, retiree (	gifts, etc.		
Guerneville	none						
Harmony Union	none						
Healdsburg Unified	none						
Horicon	none	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense	e benefits at	employee ra	ate at own e.	xpense	
Kashia	\$30						
Kenwood	none						
Liberty	none						
Mark West Union	none	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense	e benefits at	employee ra	ate at own e.	xpense	
Monte Rio Union	none	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense	e benefits at	employee ra	ate at own e	xpense	
Montgomery	none						
Oak Grove Union	none	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense	e benefits at	employee ra	ate at own e	xpense	
Old Adobe Union	\$240 cash sti	n stipend & \$260 towards benefits or \$500 towards health benefits	owards bene	efits or \$500	towards hea	alth benefits	
			~	~	~		

SONOMA COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER SITPENDS BENEFITS

2/11/11

	MONGAL				
Distruct	STOPEND	MUDICAL	DENTAL	VISION	v. Lope
Piner-Olivet Union	none				
Rincon Valley Union	\$250	may purchase be	nefits at em	ployee rate	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense
Roseland	none	up to \$1659/mo X	×	×	×
Santa Rosa City	\$400	×	×	×	X \$565/mo towards all benefits
Sebastopol Union	\$75				
SCOE	\$315	up to \$2048/mo	×	×	×
Sonoma Valley Unified	none				
Twin Hills Union	none				
Two Rock Union	none		×	\$400 con	\$400 contribution to medical benefits
Waugh	\$45	may purchase be	nefits at em	ployee rate	may purchase benefits at employee rate at own expense
West Side Union	none				
West Sonoma Union High	none	×	×	×	×
Wilmar Union	none				
Windsor Unified	\$216	up to \$1519/mo	×	×	
Wright	\$125	×	×	×	\$1530/mo toward all benefits
NB - An "X" in the benefits column		ndicates the benefit is paid by the district.	aid by the d	istrict.	
Government Code sections 53200 th		53210 state that a	local agen	cy's contr	hrough 53210 state that a local agency's contribution toward the cost of benefit
premiums for board members whos greater than the highest contributio	ers whose servion tribution made	ce begain as of Ja on behalf of any	anuary 1, 19 employee	95 or later group. The	premiums for board members whose service begain as of January 1, 1995 or later, are limited to a contribution no greater than the highest contribution made on behalf of any employee group. The "up to" limit on this spreadsheet
does not apply to all board member than the "up to" figure.	members in the	various districts	. Board mei	nbers taki	s in the various districts. Board members taking office after 1995 may receive less

SONOMA COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER SITPENDS BENEFITS

-

# **Sonoma County School Districts**

There are 40 school districts that provide kindergarten through grade 12 education for Sonoma County: 31 elementary school districts, 3 high school districts, and 6 unified districts.

Students in elementary districts "feed" into high school or unified districts as indicated by the color coding on this map.



Unified districts operate both elementary and secondary schools for the students residing within their boundaries. Cloverdale, Cotati-Rohnert Park, Geyserville, Healdsburg, Sonoma Valley, and Windsor are unified districts.

Horicon and Kashia are unique in that these small elementary districts feed into Mendocino County.