
**SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS**
Senator Steven Glazer, Chair
2021 - 2022 Regular

Bill No:	SB 442	Hearing Date:	4/12/21
Author:	Newman		
Version:	2/16/21		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Nicolas Heidorn		

Subject: School districts and community college districts: governing board elections: charter cities

DIGEST

This bill provides that a county committee on school district organization (county committee) may approve a proposal to establish trustee areas for the governing board of a community college district or a school district, including a school district whose governing board is provided for in a city's charter, without a vote of the district's electorate.

ANALYSIS

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, generally, that the governing board of a school district or community college district may be elected using one of the following alternative methods:
 - a) Each member of the governing board is elected by the registered voters of the entire district.
 - b) One or more members residing in each trustee area are elected by the registered voters of that particular trustee area.
 - c) Each member of the governing board is elected by the registered voters of the entire district, but resides in the trustee area which he or she represents.
- 2) Provides that city charters may provide for the manner in which the members of boards of education are elected or appointed. Provides that, when the boundaries of a school district or community college district extend beyond the limits of a city, charter amendments affecting the manner in which the members of boards of education are elected or appointed must be submitted to and approved by a majority of all the qualified electors of the school district or community college district voting on the question.
- 3) Establishes the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (CVRA) which provides that an at-large method of election, as defined, may not be imposed or applied in a manner that impairs a protected class's ability to elect candidates of its choice or ability to

influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protected class, as defined.

- 4) Provides a process for changing the method for electing governing board members of school districts and community college districts with the approval of the county committee on school district organization. Specifically:
 - a) Provides that, except in a school district governed by a board of education provided for in the charter of a city or city and county, in any school district or community college district, the county committee may establish trustee areas, rearrange the boundaries of trustee areas, abolish trustee areas, and increase to seven or decrease to five the number of members of the governing board, or adopt one of the alternative methods of electing governing board members described above in 1).
 - b) Provides that a proposal to make these changes may be initiated by a county committee, or made to the county committee by a governing board of a district, or made by a petition signed by a certain number or percentage of qualified register voters residing in the district, as specified.
 - c) Requires that the county committee hold at least one hearing in the district before approving or disapproving a proposal.
 - d) Provides that the county committee's approval of the rearrangement of trustee boundaries goes into effect 120 days later, except as specified.
 - e) Provides that, for proposals other than the rearrangement of trustee boundaries, a county committee's approval of a proposal constitutes an order of election, and the proposal shall be presented to the electors of the district for approval not later than the next succeeding election for members of the governing board.
 - f) Alternatively provides that a petition requesting an election on a proposal, signed by at least 5% of the registered voters of a district for a proposal to rearrange trustee boundaries, or signed by at least 10% of the registered voters of a district for all other proposals, shall be presented to the electors of the district, as specified.
- 5) Authorizes the governing board of a school district, after a public hearing, to request that the State Board of Education (SBE) waive all or part of any section of the Education Code or any SBE regulation, except for certain specified sections and regulations. Requires that the SBE generally approve requests for waivers unless the SBE specifically finds that certain limited exceptions apply.
- 6) Provides that, notwithstanding any other law, the governing board of a community college district may change election systems, in accordance with the CVRA, by passing a resolution and receiving the approval of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (BOG). Specifically:
 - a) Provides that the governing board resolution may:

- i) Establish elections by trustee areas, where one member of the governing board is elected from each trustee area, as specified. The governing board shall set the initial boundaries of each trustee area, as specified.
 - ii) Establish a top-two primary election system, as specified.
 - iii) Determine the number of governing board members, which shall be composed of not less than five and not more than nine members, as specified. Provides that the county committee procedures for changing the number of governing board members, as described above, do not apply to the governing board's determination of the number of members pursuant to this law. Provides that if the number of governing board members is changed, the governing board shall adopt new trustee areas, as specified, and that any additional member shall be elected at the district's next regular election occurring at least 123 days after the increased number of members was approved.
- b) Provides that this law does not apply to a community college district that has been authorized by statute to provide for its own trustee elections.

This bill:

- 1) Repeals the exception preventing a county committee from establishing or abolishing trustee areas, rearranging the boundaries of trustee areas, changing the number of governing board members, or adopting an alternative method of electing governing board members in a school district governed by a board of education provided for in the charter of a city or city and county.
- 2) Provides that a county committee resolution approving a proposal to establish trustee areas shall take effect upon adoption, without being presented to the electors, and shall govern all elections for governing board members more than 120 days following the adoption of the resolution.
- 3) Repeals the provision enabling the submission of a petition, signed by at least 10% of the registered voters of the district, to call an election to establish trustee areas.
- 4) Makes findings and declarations.
- 5) Makes technical and conforming changes.

BACKGROUND

School and Community College District Voting Methods. State law generally provides that the governing boards of school districts and community college districts can be elected in one of three ways:

- *At-Large:* where each member of the governing board is elected by the registered voters of the entire district.

- *By-Trustee Areas:* where each member of the governing board resides in a different trustee area and is only elected by the registered voters of that trustee area.
- *From-Trustee Areas:* where each member of the governing board resides in a different trustee area but is elected by the registered voters of the entire district.

Most community college district governing boards are elected by-trustee area whereas most school district governing boards are elected at-large. However, mostly due to lawsuits or the threat of lawsuits brought under the CVRA, a large number of districts that had at-large governing boards have since transitioned or are in the process of transitioning to by-trustee area elections.

These transitions to by-trustee area elections can occur in a number of different ways, including by a court order or legal settlement resolving a CVRA claim or by a ballot measure, but most transitions are done voluntarily by the governing board without an election. Community college district governing boards may voluntarily transition to by-trustee area elections, without requiring a popular election, by receiving the approval of the BOG. According to the Community College's Chancellor's Office, 32 community college governing boards have voluntarily transitioned to by-trustee area elections using this streamlined process.

School district governing boards may voluntarily establish trustee areas, without requiring a popular election, by receiving the approval of the county committee on school district organization (county committee) and having the SBE waive the traditional requirement that the county committee's approval be subject to a vote of the district's registered voters. According to the SBE, since the enactment of the CVRA, 240 school district governing boards have voluntarily transitioned to by-trustee area elections using this waiver process.

However, not all school district governing boards may utilize this process. Under current law, county committees may not approve changes to the organization or election method of a school district governing board that is provided for in the charter of a city or city and county.

SB 442 would eliminate this prohibition, enabling county committees to approve changes for school district governing boards that are provided for in the charter of a city or city and county. SB 442 also eliminates the requirement that the county committee's approval of a proposal to establish trustee areas in a school district or community college district go before the district's voters. In effect, for voluntary transitions this would eliminate the need for a school district governing board to take the extra step of seeking an election waiver from the SBE.

What are the county committees on school district organization? According to the CDE, a county committee "is the local initiator, coordinator, analyst, facilitator, and arbitrator for the reorganization of school districts." The county committee's powers include approving proposals to change the election system for the governing boards of school districts or community college districts, which are then presented the voters for approval (except the rearrangement of trustee areas), unless, for school districts, the SBE waives the voter approval requirement.

In 35 counties, the county board of education acts as the county committee. In all other counties (except for San Francisco, which has no county committee), the county committee is an independent board, whose size and membership may vary based on the number of school or community college districts in the county. If there are fewer than six school or community college districts, the county superintendent determines the number of county committee members and appoints them. In counties with six or more school or community college districts, there must be 11 county committee members who are elected to the committee by school and community college district trustee representatives at an annual meeting. Committee members must be registered voters and at least two members must reside in each county supervisorial district. A county superintendent, an employee of the county superintendent, or any school district or community college district employee, may not serve as a committee member. However, school or community college district trustees may serve concurrently as committee members.

SBE Waivers. A school district may request that the SBE waive the requirement to hold a confirming popular election once a county committee approves the school district's proposal to transition its governing board from at-large to by-trustee area elections. CDE staff review the request which must be approved by the SBE at a regular meeting, which generally occur every few months. For example, the SBE has seven meeting dates scheduled for 2021 and six meeting dates for 2022 where it could consider waiver requests.

Elections waivers constitute a significant portion of the overall waiver requests received each year by SBE. Over the past five years for which data is available, there have been as few as nine and as many as 56 waiver requests in a year. According to CDE, no waiver request was rejected during this five-year period.

SBE Election Waiver Requests: 2015-2019

Year	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Election Waiver Requests	15	9	56	18	46

California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (CVRA). SB 976 (Polanco), Chapter 129, Statutes of 2002, enacted the CVRA, which was designed to address racial block voting in at-large elections for local office in California. In areas where racial block voting occurs, an at-large method of election can dilute the voting rights of minority communities if the majority typically supports candidates that differ from candidates preferred by minority communities. In such situations, breaking a jurisdiction up into districts can result in districts in which a minority community can elect the candidate of its choice or otherwise have the ability to influence the outcome of an election. Accordingly, the CVRA prohibits an at-large method of election from being imposed or applied in a political subdivision in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class of voters to elect the candidate of its choice or to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgement of the rights of voters who are members of the protected class. Upon finding a violation of the CVRA, a court may order appropriate remedies tailored to the violation, which may include imposing district-based elections.

Applicability of the CVRA to Charter Cities. The California Constitution specifies two types of cities: general law cities, which are subject to the state's general laws, and charter cities, which are cities that have adopted a city charter and enjoy some autonomy from the state's general laws.

Specifically, Section 5(a) of Article XI of the Constitution gives charter cities broad authority to "make and enforce all ordinances and regulations in respect to municipal affairs." Section 5(a) further provides that properly adopted city charters "shall supersede all laws inconsistent" with the charter. Additionally, Section 5(b) expressly authorizes city charters to provide for the conduct of city elections and grants cities "plenary authority," subject to limited restrictions, to provide in their charters for "the manner in which, the method by which, the times at which, and the terms for which several municipal officers ... shall be elected."

Similarly, Section 16 of Article IX of the Constitution provides that it shall be competent, in all city charters, to provide, "for the manner in which, the times at which, and the terms for which the members of boards of education shall be elected." However, Section 16 does not indicate whether there is similar "plenary authority" to specify school district governing board election methods in city charters.

In determining whether a charter city's local laws may prevail over a contrary state law, courts employ a four-part analytical framework:

- 1) "First, the court determines whether the local law at issue regulates an activity that can be characterized as a municipal affair.
- 2) "Second, the court determines whether there is an actual conflict between state law and the local law. If no conflict exists, the analysis is complete and there is no need to go to the next step.
- 3) "Third, the court decides whether the state law addresses a matter of statewide concern.
- 4) "Fourth and finally, the court determines whether the state law is reasonably related to resolution of the identified statewide concern and is narrowly tailored to avoid unnecessary interference in local governance."

City of Huntington Beach v. Becerra, 44 Cal. App. 5th 243, 255 (2020) (cleaned up). If a state law addresses a matter of statewide concern, and is reasonably related to its resolution and narrowly tailored, the state law will prevail over a charter city's contrary local law.

Applying this framework, the Second District Court of Appeals in *Jauregui v. City of Palmdale*, 226 Cal. App. 4th 781 (2014) held that charter cities with at-large elections are subject to the CVRA. The Court found that a number of the CVRA's objectives, including implementing the voting and equal protection provisions in the State Constitution, preventing vote dilution, and protecting the integrity of city council elections, were all matters of statewide concern. The Court also found that the CVRA was narrowly tailored, because it did not apply to cities with by-district elections and only applied where vote dilution had occurred, and was reasonably related to resolving

its objectives. Finally, the Court held that even though charter cities have plenary authority over elections, that authority can be displaced by a state law addressing a statewide concern applying the same four-part framework.

In 2015, the Legislature passed AB 277 (R. Hernandez), Chapter 724, Statutes of 2015, which codified the holding in *Jauregui* by amending the CVRA to expressly apply to charter cities.

Previous Legislation to Authorize Changes from At-Large to District-Based Elections without Voter Approval. At the time the CVRA was enacted, voter approval was generally necessary to change the method of electing a local government's governing board. That voter approval requirement made it difficult for jurisdictions to proactively transition from at-large to district-based elections to address potential liability under the CVRA. Moreover, if a jurisdiction attempted to transition to district-based elections to address CVRA concerns, but the voters rejected the proposal, the jurisdiction nonetheless would remain subject to a lawsuit under the CVRA. Additionally, to the extent that there was racially polarized voting on the question of whether to transition to district-based elections, the results of the vote on that question could provide further evidence for a lawsuit under the CVRA.

As the number of jurisdictions that faced lawsuits or threats of lawsuits under the CVRA increased, many jurisdictions sought ways to transition from at-large to district-based elections without having to receive voter approval for such a change. Most notably, many school districts have transitioned from at-large to district-based elections without receiving voter approval using the county committee process and an SBE waiver, as described above, in an effort to avoid potential liability under the CVRA.

In response to concerns that community college districts were subject to liability under the CVRA but were unable to change to district-based elections without voter approval, AB 684 (Block), Chapter 614, Statutes of 2011, established a process under which a community college district could voluntarily transition with just BOG approval, as described above.

During the 2015-2016 Legislative Session, the Legislature took further steps to facilitate transitions from at-large to district elections. Specifically, SB 493 (Cannella), Chapter 735, Statutes of 2015, permitted a city with a population of fewer than 100,000 people to change the method of electing council members to a by-district method of election without receiving voter approval if such a change was made in furtherance of the purposes of the CVRA. AB 278 (R. Hernandez), Chapter 736, Statutes of 2016, expanded on SB 493 by allowing any city, regardless of population, to change the method of electing its governing board members from at-large to a by-district method of election without receiving voter approval. Similarly, AB 2389 (Ridley-Thomas), Chapter 754, Statutes of 2016, permitted a special district to change the method of electing its governing board members from at-large to a by-district method of election without receiving voter approval, if the change was made in furtherance of the purposes of the CVRA.

In addition to taking steps to make it easier for local governments to comply with the CVRA by transitioning from at-large to district-based elections, the Legislature also enacted new laws designed to provide a more formal mechanism for prospective

plaintiffs and local jurisdictions to address at-large election systems that are potentially unlawful under the CVRA prior to litigation being filed. Specifically, AB 350 (Alejo), Chapter 737, Statutes of 2016, required that written notice be provided before an action can be brought against a political subdivision under the CVRA, and capped the amount of attorney's fees that a prospective plaintiff could recover from a political subdivision under the CVRA if the subdivision promptly transitioned from an at-large to a district-based method of election upon receiving such a written notice.

Under the provisions of AB 350, once a jurisdiction receives a written notice from a prospective plaintiff alleging that the jurisdiction's method of conducting elections may violate the CVRA, the jurisdiction has 45 days to pass a resolution outlining its intention to transition from at-large to district-based elections (a jurisdiction may also choose to enact such a resolution before receiving any such written notice). If a jurisdiction has passed such a resolution, no legal action may be filed against the jurisdiction alleging a CVRA violation within 90 days of the resolution's passage. To take full advantage of the cap on attorney's fees to prospective plaintiffs that is provided in AB 350, a jurisdiction would have a maximum of 135 days (45 days to pass a resolution plus 90 days to adopt districts) from the time it received a written notice from the prospective plaintiffs until it had to finalize the new district boundaries.

AB 2123 (Cervantes), Chapter 277, Statutes of 2018, later added to this timeline by permitting a political subdivision and a prospective plaintiff to enter into a written agreement to extend the time period during which a prospective plaintiff is prohibited from commencing an action for up to an additional 90 days in order to provide additional time to conduct public outreach, encourage public participation, and receive public input.

COMMENTS

- 1) According to the author. Since the passage in 2001 of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) to ensure greater representation and equity in California elections, more than 200 of California's 1,037 school districts have switched from systems of at-large elections, where all trustees are elected by the entire school district, to district-based elections, where trustees are elected by specific geographic segments of a school district.

California's Education Code deliberately allows county committees that oversee school district organization to establish trustee-area elections in a prompt, inclusive and efficient process. Under current code, however, this same process is not available for school districts "governed by a board of education provided for in the charter of a city or city and county."

School districts subject to this provision are statutorily required, as part of the process of establishing trustee-area elections for a particular district, to schedule an official election and secure the approval of a majority of the residents of a district.

As a matter of practice, school districts subject to this provision can bypass that requirement by securing a waiver from the State Board of Education, but this additional step nevertheless still adds time and additional costs to the adoption of trustee-area elections. In some cases, the delay associated with this additional step

has resulted in the holding of at-large elections that are in violation of the provisions of the CVRA.

SB 442 fixes this problem by requiring ordinances establishing trustee area elections to take effect immediately upon adoption, without the need for an additional election or waiver to affirm approval. By creating a clear path and timeline for the transition to school district at-large elections, SB 442 will streamline the process while eliminating ambiguity and possible additional costs to the public resulting from delays and prospective litigation.

- 2) The Varied Paths for Adopting District Elections without Voter Approval. Under current law, most school district governing boards, and all city, community college, and special district governing boards may transition from at-large to by-district elections without voter approval. However, whether a governing board can do this on its own, or only with the approval of another body, varies by jurisdiction type. A city or special district's governing board can transition to by-district elections on its own. A community college district governing board can only do so with the approval of the BOG. A school district governing board can only do so with the double approvals of first the county committee and then the SBE, or, in the case of a school district governing board provided for in a city charter, cannot do so at all.

SB 442 allows school district governing boards provided for in a city charter to transition without voter approval, the same as other local governments. At the same time, the bill eliminates school district governing boards' unique need to get double approval for a voluntary transition to by-trustee area elections. The bill also gives community college district governing boards two paths for receiving streamlined approval to transition: they can either seek the approval of the BOG (current law) or the county committee (SB 442).

- 3) Furthering the Purposes of the CVRA. The CVRA was enacted to protect democratic principles of fairness and equal access to representation in government. Democratic principles also suggest that local voters should be allowed to make fundamental decisions about the methods by which their communities' local officials are elected. Sometimes these principles conflict, as is the case when at-large elections for a local governing board are supported by a majority of a community's voters but impair a protected class of voters' ability to influence elections. Accounting for this situation, state law allows many local jurisdictions to transition to by-district elections without voter approval if the transition is "in accordance with" (community college districts) or "in furtherance of the purposes of" (cities and special districts) the CVRA.

By contrast, SB 442 does not require, as a condition of waiving the voter approval requirement, that a county committee declare that a school district or community college district's transition to by-trustee area elections is in accord with or furthers the purposes of the CVRA. SB 442 also eliminates entirely the ability of the county committee, or the voters by petition through the county committee process, to call an election for the establishment of trustee areas in those districts.

Staff recommends that, as with cities, special districts, and community college districts, the bill be amended to keep the general rule that election method changes

require voter approval, but to allow transitions to by-trustee area elections without voter approval when the CVRA is implicated. Requiring a nexus to the CVRA, which has been held to supersede city charters requiring at-large elections, may also strengthen the legal argument that school districts whose governing boards are provided for in a city charter may transition to by-trustee areas without requiring district voters to approve a charter amendment.

Under this amendment, the deleted words “establish or” would be restored in Sections 5020(a)(1) and 5020(c), the deletions and insertions in Section 5020(e) would be reversed, and proposed Section 5020(a)(2) would be amended as follows:

Notwithstanding paragraph 1, a county committee may, by resolution, approve a proposal to establish trustee areas and to elect governing board members using district-based elections, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 14026 of the Elections Code, without being required to submit the resolution to the electors of the district for approval. A resolution adopted pursuant to this paragraph shall include a declaration that the change in the method of electing members of the governing body is being made in furtherance of the purposes of the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 14025) of Division 14 of the Elections Code). The resolution ~~of the county committee approving a proposal to establish trustee areas~~ shall take effect upon adoption, ~~without being presented to the electors,~~ and shall govern all elections for governing board members more than 120 days following the adoption of the resolution.

- 4) School District Independent Redistricting Commissions. The perceived success of California’s Citizen Redistricting Commission, which is responsible for redistricting Congressional, State Senate, State Assembly, and State Board of Equalization Districts, has led more than a dozen local jurisdictions to establish local redistricting commissions to redraw local governing board election districts. In 2018, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed SB 1018 (Allen), Chapter 462, Statutes of 2018, which, among other changes, authorizes school districts and community college districts to establish independent redistricting commissions and hybrid redistricting commissions, where the governing board has no role or a limited role in adopting districts, respectively. According to a database of local redistricting laws compiled by the California Local Redistricting Project, at least three school districts have established some form of independent commission. West Contra Costa Unified School District has a seven-member independent commission to redraw trustee areas, which was agreed to by its governing board as part a CVRA settlement. The Pasadena Unified School District has a nine-member hybrid redistricting commission, established in the City of Pasadena’s city charter. Oakland Unified School District’s trustee areas are coterminous with Oakland’s city council districts, which are drawn by a 13-member independent commission established in the city’s charter.

The county committee process might be interpreted to allow a school district or community college district’s governing board to circumvent such an independent redistricting process, including one established in a city charter pursuant to the amendments in SB 442, by seeking a county committee’s approval for a specific

rearrangement of trustee areas to replace those adopted by its independent commission.

Staff recommends that SB 442 be amended to clarify that the county committee process may not be used to undo trustee area boundaries established by a hybrid or independent redistricting commission. Staff recommends adding a new Paragraph (3) to Section 5019(a), as follows:

Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the county committee on school district organization shall not rearrange trustee area boundaries in a school district or community college district that has established a hybrid or independent redistricting commission for this purpose pursuant to Section 23003 of the Elections Code, the charter of a city or city and county, or a legal settlement.

- 5) Districing Timing for School and Community College Districts. Under current law, new school district and community college district trustee areas may be used in any election that occurs at least 120 days or 123 days later, respectively. SB 442 similarly provides that new trustee areas adopted by a county committee are effective for any election occurring 120 days later. These provisions, however, may conflict with Elections Code Section 12262, which provides that “jurisdictional boundary changes occurring less than 125 days before an election shall not be effective for purposes of that election. Voters residing within an area affected by a boundary change, occurring within 125 days before an election, shall vote at the ensuing election in all respects as if a boundary change had not occurred.”

To avoid a potential conflict, staff recommends amending the Education Code to provide that any new trustee area boundaries are effective for elections occurring at least 125 days later, rather than 120 or 123 days later, as follows:

- **In Education Code Section 5019(d), replace the two references to “120 days” with “125 days”;**
- **In proposed Education Code Section 5020(a)(2), replace the phrase “more than 120 days following” with “occurring at least 125 days after”; and**
- **In Education Code Section 72036(c), replace the reference to “123 days” with “125 days” (and, per legislative counsel style guidelines, replace “he or she” with “the candidate” in 72036(a) and “Prior to” with “Before” in 72036(c)).**

- 6) Argument in Support. In a letter supporting SB 442, the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project stated, in part, the following:

By allowing all school districts to adopt trustee-area elections, and eliminating the time-consuming and unnecessary process for obtaining a rubber-stamp election waiver from the State Board of Education, SB 442 would promote the purposes of the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”) while eliminating wasteful costs in the process of adopting trustee-area elections to comply with the CVRA. ...

Over the past 18 years, the CVRA has improved the political empowerment of Latinos throughout California. To comply with the CVRA, cities, school districts and special districts have scrapped their at-large elections in favor of district-based elections known to be more favorable to minority voters.

Those changes in electoral structure have energized Latino communities. Latino candidates who would have never dreamed of running in an at-large election sought local elected office in the first-ever district elections in their communities. The adoption of district elections, and subsequent historic victories of Latino candidates, have destroyed the sense of political futility in Latino communities, prompted those communities to organize, and even improved the rate of voter registration in those communities. In many instances, Latino communities have been energized by the CVRA, and the electoral changes it has ushered, in ways not seen since the aftermath of Proposition 187 in 1994.

Because of their ability to empower minority communities, the adoption of district-based elections should be encouraged, and unnecessary time-consuming obstacles should be removed.

- 7) Double Referral. This bill has been double-referred to the Senate Education Committee.

RELATED/PRIOR LEGISLATION

AB 1546 (Chau) of 2021 would authorize the Alhambra City Council to submit a proposal to amend the Alhambra city charter to remove all references to the Alhambra Unified School District from the charter at a special election held on specified election dates before the next established statewide general election. The bill has been referred to the Assembly Local Government Committee and the Assembly Committee on Elections.

SB 443 (Newman) of 2021 would change the criteria for establishing or adjusting district boundaries for the members of the governing body of a county board of education, school district, community college district, special district, city, or county. The bill has been referred to this committee.

AB 1302 (Weber) of 2019 would have required the governing board of the San Diego Unified School District to be elected by trustee area. The bill was held in the Assembly Committee on Elections and Redistricting.

(See the BACKGROUND section, above, for a discussion of other prior legislation related to this bill.)

POSITIONS

Sponsor: Author

Support: California League of United Latin American Citizens

California Teachers Association
Southwest Voter Registration Education Project

Oppose: None received

-- END --