



Lakeside Joint School District

19621 Black Road Los Gatos, CA 95033

Tel: (408) 354-2372

Fax: (408) 354-8819

March 23, 2010

The Honorable Jamie Jacobs-May
Presiding Judge
Santa Clara County Superior Court
191 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95113

FILED

MAR 26 2010

DAVID H. YAMASAKI
Chief Executive Officer/Clerk,
Superior Court of CA County of Santa Clara
BY D. ALDYCKI

Re: Responses to Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations on Education Dollars

Dear Judge Jacobs-May:

Per instructions stated in Don Kawashima's June 24, 2009 letter, I am enclosing Lakeside Joint School Districts responses to findings and recommendations detailed in the Civil Grand Jury's Final Report, Who Really Benefits for Education Dollars? (Hint: It's Not the Students).

If you have any questions do not hesitate to call me at 408/354-2372.

Very truly yours,

Bob Chrisman
Superintendent/Principal

Enc.

Lakeside Joint School District
Response to Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations
“Who Really Benefits . . . ”

Note: Text of Findings and recommendations is not repeated in this document. Please refer to the original report dated June 24, 2009.

Finding 1:

Lakeside Joint School District disagrees with this finding. Lakeside Trustees receive no compensation whatsoever. Travel and conference expenses are inimical; in fact none have been claimed for many years. We are unaware of the practices of other districts.

Recommendation 1:

Will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

Finding 2:

Lakeside Joint School District disagrees with this finding. The Lakeside Superintendent/Principal is the lowest paid superintendent in Santa Clara County. In any event, School Boards face considerable challenges in attracting and retaining qualified personnel in the high profile position of superintendent. The high cost of living in the Silicon Valley necessitates an effort to offer the most robust compensation possible. We are unaware of all of the practices of other districts.

Recommendation 2:

This recommendation will be partially implemented. Superintendent compensation is reviewed annually as a part of the annual performance appraisal of the superintendent.

Finding 3:

Lakeside Joint School District disagrees with this finding. Lakesides superintendent compensation is in proportion to the size of the district. We are unaware of the practices of other districts.

Recommendation 3:

This recommendation, while irrelevant to the Lakeside Joint School District, describes current practice.

Finding 4:

Lakeside Joint School District disagrees with this finding. The tenure of a superintendent at Lakeside far exceeds the average for California. Costs associated with recruitment are amortized over many years. Lakeside consistently uses the lowest cost vendor in the industry. We are unaware of the practices of other districts.

Recommendation 4:

Will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

Finding 5:

Lakeside Joint School District disagrees with this finding. While we are unaware of all of the legal needs of other districts, litigation is a large part of the operation of a school district in 2010. Lakeside selects legal counsel on the basis of the issue at hand. Costs are based on complexity and time involved.

Recommendation 5:

This recommendation is partially implemented. We do employ the Santa Clara County Counsel.

Finding 6:

Lakeside Joint School District disagrees with the finding because it is based on an erroneous assumption that superintendent costs should be justified on a per student basis.

Recommendation 6:

This recommendation has been considered several times in the area where the Lakeside Joint School District operates. Each time voters have resoundingly rejected it. School Districts have a strong preference for local control. Lakeside does not rule out the consideration of a "consolidation".