

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
May 7, 2013**

PRESENT: Board of Education: Mary Doran, Jean O'Connell, Louise Seeba, Elona Street-Stewart, John Brodrick, Keith Hardy and Anne Carroll

Staff: Superintendent Silva, Darlene Fry, Christine Osorio, Liz Keenan, Michelle Bierman, Sharon Freeman, Steve Unowsky, Andrew Collins, Willie Jett, Tim Caskey, Jackie Statum-Allen, Marsha Baisch, Jackie Turner, Michael Baumann, Kathy Brown, Julie Brown, Michelle Walker, Matt Mohs, Mary Gilbert, Efe Agbamu, Joe Munnich, Marie Schrul.

Other: Tony Lonetree

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:55 p.m., immediately following the adjournment of the closed Board meeting on labor negotiation updates.

II. AGENDA

A. Legislative Update

The District's Legislative Liaison provided a brief update on the bills currently before the Minnesota Legislature. She indicated conference committee members had been appointed to reconcile the House and Senate E-12 Omnibus Education bills. The Tax and Human Services conference committees are meeting currently. The bills they will consider include school tax provisions as well as the school-linked mental health grants and other changes to medical assistance for children. She then went on to provide a brief overview in the following areas:

- Targets
- Tax committee provisions
- Payment shift
- General education formula
- All-Day Kindergarten
- Special education
- Pre-K scholarships
- Integration revenue aid and levy
- Safe school levy
- Reading and math corp. funding
- Statewide assessments
- Bonding authority
- School lunch aid
- ABE and adult diploma
- Teacher evaluation and licensure
- Compulsory attendance
- Epi Pen
- School-linked mental health grants
- Bullying bill
- PEIP

- Pension bill
- Dream Act

DISCUSSION/QUESTIONS:

- On the bullying bill – all volunteers with any kind of contact need to be trained? Response: Yes
- Cost is covered by? Response: No one, new mandate. This is for schools, charter schools but does not apply to private schools, though that is being checked on.
- On bullying bill, this needs to be reported to the State? Response: Yes, there is a reporting requirement. Clarification needs to be obtained from MDE to ensure districts need to do only one kind of reporting.

B. SSSC Monitoring: Resources & Operational Excellence VisionCard

The Deputy Superintendent for Schools and Business Operations presented the Goal 3 VisionCard reporting on Resources and Operational Excellence.

1. **Operational Excellence**

- a. Teacher Retention (annual) has a vision of >90%. 2011-12 was 92% and 2012-13 was 96%. 33.6% of teachers hold Bachelor's degrees, 64.3% hold Master's degrees, .9% hold specialist degrees and 1% hold Doctorates.
- b. Information Technology -- Resolution of issues within 24 Hours has a vision level of >70%. 2011-12 was 68%; 2012-13 shows 64%. In FY 13, SPPS supported 87 applications, had 463 servers in operation, had 5,975 VoIP telephones in service and the SPPS network had 71,843 devices on it.
- c. Transportation
 - Buses at School within 5 minutes of scheduled arrival shows vision to be >97%. Quarter 3 of 2011-12 showed 99%; Quarter 3 of 2012-13 show 98%.
 - Students per Bus (average each day across all runs) has vision level of >90%. 2011-12 was at 103 and 2012-13 is at 98.
 - Number of Runs per bus has vision at >5.5 runs. 2011-12 was at 6.3 and 2012-13 is at 6.5.

Year-to-date there have been 35,668 students transported daily by school bus. This comes to 13,868,000 students rides provided each year. 363 buses are utilized in this transportation effort with a daily mileage reported at 39,968 miles traveled. Year to date that totals 6,924,428 miles covered for SY 12-13. There are an average of 2,364 routes covered per day with 977 a.m. route trips, 973 p.m. route trips, 179 Noon route trips and 221 EDL route trips per day.

- d. Meal Participation
 - Breakfast participation has vision at >58%. 2011-12 showed 64% and 12-13 shows 60% (vision level).
 - Lunch participation has vision at >78%. 2011-12 WAS AT 77% as is 2012-13 (progress level).

For FY 13 year-to-date 2,628,653 student breakfasts have been served. 3,381,054 student lunches have been served along with 278,335 after school snacks. Data on summer breakfasts, lunch/supper and snacks will be gathered.

2. **Resources**

- a. Budget
 - Maintain 3% Net Favorable Variance from approved budget. The vision for this area is <3% above budget. 2010-11 results were 2.7% variance below budget and 2011-12 was at 3.9% expenditures below budget (progress level).
 - Maintain Fund Balance has vision at >5%. 2010-11 fund balance was at 5.7% and 11-12 was at 9.0% (vision level).

b. Time & Effort Certifications for Federal Grants has vision at 100%. 2011-12 was at 100% as is 2012-13. There are 736 employees on Federal grants, 151 supervisors of employees on Federal grants. There have been no audit findings in this area over the past two years. This is a reporting requirement associated with Federal grants. Perfection is required to avoid audit notes.

c. Percent of Market Share (SPPS students divided by all school age students in St. Paul).

	<u>Vision Level</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>
K-12 th	>74.5%	71%	70% (concern)
K-6 th	>76%	72%	71% (baseline)
7 th -12 th	>73%	70%	69% (concern)

d. Retention -- percent of students staying in SPPS has vision at >88%. (i.e., SY 2011-12 pre-Kindergartens enrolled in SY 2012-13 Kindergarten).

	<u>SY 11-12</u>	<u>SY 12-13</u>
Pre-K to K	82%	85% (baseline)
5 th to 6 th	86%	85% (baseline)
6 th to 7 th	82%	82% (concern)
8 th to 9 th	85%	83% (concern)

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- On the market share, has there been a change in how this is counted that would impact it from a measurement perspective? Response: There has not been a change in how this is calculated. Market share is different from enrollment. There have been several new charter schools that are very popular and these are now moving into 7th and 8th grades. SPPS does look at the trend lines for how charter and non-publics are doing along with historical data so SPPS is aware of the macro trends in St. Paul.
- Meal participation – can there be a survey as to why students are not participating in the meals? Do we know participation by living situation? Are we serving all of our homeless students? Response: The breakfast has declined; students were very enthusiastic the first year. It seems the students are more aware of what is on the menu and they decide when to eat. There have been changes in lunches due to national requirements making it less appealing to some students. Nutrition services has not set up a survey. The goal is to achieve vision level; however, the real question is are we serving our students well.
- Is SPPS butting up against the “time crunch” between lunch and recess time? Response: That could influence it. Students have to go into lunch and then can go outside at the elementary level.
- It would be helpful in future to look at the issues around market share in a broader context of how enrollment relates to overall number of kids, how it fits in the bigger picture. Meal participation, there are questions there. SPPS is not measuring how many are eating breakfast and lunch, only how many are eating SPPS meals. The end purpose is to be sure all kids are eating, who is and who is not? Are all kids eligible taking advantage of it? Target should be based on who is actually eating. Response: We can look at a way to do this. What was being looked at from an operations level is the SPPS food services provision efforts for students.
- Why are standards set so high, the issue is are kids being fed, are they healthy, are they getting the food they need. As long as the kids get their food, SPPS gets a pass on this.
- SPPS has the information but are we measuring where kids are coming from – home or another location such as a day care site where a meal may have been provided. With that information the Board would encourage staff to look at the combination of things. This may be obtainable from the addresses for the buses. After school may be impacting things here as well. Might be valuable to look at the combinations, to recognize that more kids are coming from day care, staying before and after school, greater numbers of homeless students are out there and SPPS is adapting to their needs. Our ends should be quality education for all students under whatever circumstances.

- Information technology – one thing that is true is there are a number of people able to set up their computers but cannot at work, they must call for help. Can SPPS define areas that can be done by individuals on their own that does not need support from IT? License is a big issue when working on and setting up networks. SPPS will evolve into a higher degree of knowledge and usage as this rolls out and calling IT may be reduced somewhat.
- Transportation – great numbers. As the district continue with SSSC, there may be some additional measures more relevant over time. Are you gathering what the distribution looks like, as that is what Board members have to address. Perhaps a slightly bigger view on this.
- Teacher retention – what is proficient teacher retention? Is that people we want to keep vs. those we want out? What is healthy turnover rate? What does SPPS see this as? Response: SPPS retention rate is incredibly high at 96%, probably one of the highest in the nation. Teacher retention is total numbers of teachers divided into terminations and retirements. What does proficient mean? That will need to be clarified later. What is industry standard around healthy turnover vs. excessive retention. What does SPPS aim for?
- Does SPPS have the ability to measure student contact time with teachers particularly Special Ed services? Is SPPS increasing student contact time with instructors or support staff (from a kid perspective)? Response: Students need to be in class longer whether in schools or extended daytime. Now, with breakfast in the classroom it allows relationship development with the teacher. Under SSSC all schools have 100 minutes of science, 60 minutes of math, 90 minutes of language arts as well as phy ed, music and arts and this is more and more in blocks of 60 to 90 minutes allowing maximization of the time for student contact. The District is looking at scheduling in elementary to optimize use of staff and interaction with students. Generally this is looked at on the basis of adults to kids, however kids to adults is also important.
- Transportation – on time and within 5 minutes. Explain why a tiered bus system precludes having a two-hour delay on bad weather days? Response: What was done differently this year was to dismiss the high school 15 minutes ahead of 2:00 p.m. Then when you go to tier two they were ahead of time but the third tier was late but not as much as it might have been. With each tier delay everything gets pushed back, there are not more buses available, it is the same bus on a different routes. It is a trade off between efficiency, cost, safety and ability to service students. SPPS is as tight as it can be to meet those goals. It usually comes down to go or no go, delay is really not an option. This will not change in the upcoming school year. SPPS is always looking to optimize this area.

MOTION: Ms. Street-Stewart moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the report on the Resources & Operational Excellence VisionCards. Ms. Seeba seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

C. Quarterly Financial Report

The Chief Budget Analyst provided details on the second quarter financials for the period ending March 31, 2013. He indicated there had been relatively little change in the General Fund over the past period. The unassigned fund balance was estimated to be \$31.1 million in the General Fund, which represents 5.7% of current year expenditures. This is above the minimum current Board policy of 5%. The projection assumes the use of \$18.2 million assigned fund balance in FY 14. He then reviewed the non-spendable, restricted, committed, assigned and unassigned fund balances. Total fund balance as of 6/30/13 is projected to be \$100,900,000.

An overview of each of the other fund balances was provided in the areas of:

- Fully Financed General Fund

- Food Service Fund
- Community Service Fund
- Fully Financed Community Service Fund
- Building Construction Fund
- Debt Service Fund

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Fully Financed General Fund with the Title I piece, what is happening that is making it fall behind expectations? Response: Title I funds go to the schools and some expenditures are not up-to-date, there is a lag and average salary is used so that affects the figures as well. In addition, there are certain expenses that hit at year-end so that is a lag as well.
- Having a negative fund balance is not typically allowed. Can you explain why this is? Response: The negative fund balance will go away. With debt service, a negative is allowed because so much depends on the timing of funding.
- In the case of SPPS budget approval in June, SPPS must have a balanced budget, correct? Response: SPPS needs to have a budget. It could be in statutory operating debt but you do have to have a budget with a plan.
- Is SPPS in good or better shape than in years past? Response: One of the reasons SPPS is getting good ratings on its bonds is they are backed by the State and the State has a good economy. SPPS has the authority to levy for the debt. The payment for the debt comes from the levy not from the operating General Fund. The borrowing is the only way the District can afford to fund its capital improvements.

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved, seconded by Ms. Seeba that the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education accept the Quarterly Financial Report.

Motion passed.

D. FY 14 Budget

Board members were then presented with the proposed 2013-14 Budget book. The Deputy Superintendent of Schools and Business Operations and the Chief Budget Analyst walked the Board through the book that was broken out into the categories of Executive Summary, General Fund Supplemental Information, School Budgets, General Fund Program Budgets, Adjustments and Expansions and Appendices. The key factor in developing the budget is continuing the implementation of the SSSC Strategic Plan.

Each of the major fund balances were reviewed.

1. General Fund – Revenue for FY 14 is projected to increase by \$7.7 million. The main contributor is the additional voter approved referendum by \$9.0 million. Total FY 14 expenditures are projected to increase from FY 13 by \$16.8 million; again, the new referendum funding is the main reason as the Personalized Learning Through Technology Initiative begins implementation. The expenditures exceed revenues by \$18.2 million. This difference will be covered by the use of unassigned fund balance. The fund balance will focus on implementation of the third year of the SSSC plan in the area of embedded professional development. All elementary schools will have an extra prep time for science. All schools with grade configurations of 6-12 and 9-12 will have a 7-period day schedule. The unassigned fund balance for FY 14 is projected to be \$31.2 million or 5.5% of projected general fund expenditures.
2. General Fund Fully Financed – This includes only budgets that meet a \$500,000 threshold. The proposed budget will be \$2.4 million lower than the FY 13 adopted budget. Two new Federal budgets have been added: IDEA Preschool Incentive and IDEA Part C. Two budgets will not be adopted this year, as they are less than the \$500,000 threshold: Itinerant Vision and Special Education Alternative Delivery. Federal title programs are low by about \$.6 million, mainly due to sequestration. State revenues will be lower due to the elimination of the Special Education Alternative Delivery. Local revenues will be lower due to the elimination of the Itinerant Vision program and some

reductions in estimated grants from 3M. Due to the nature of Fully Financed budgets, revenues should always equal expenditures resulting in no change to the fund.

3. Food Service Fund – Revenue and expenditures are projected to increase 2.5% for FY 14. Breakfast to Go will continue to be available district-wide at no charge. The USDA Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Grant will continue in FY 14. USDA allows for net cash resources of up to three months of average operating expenses in this fund..
4. Community Service Fund – Revenue is projected to increase by \$.05 million due to increased Community Program fees, Discovery Club fees, state ECFE funding and decreased state and federal ABE and state School Readiness funding. Expenditures are projected to be up by \$.83 million (4.1%) due to contract salary and benefit increases, additional staffing expense associated with four new Discovery Club sites and additional staffing at the new ABE HUBS at Harding Center. There will be no staffing reductions other than through attrition. There is an overall reduction in purchased services and supplies/materials due to budgetary constraints. Fund balance is expected to decrease by \$1.6 million (38.4%). Fund Balance is reserved in the Community Service Fund by program with statutory limitations on the amounts. Each program's fund balance is well under statutory limitations and expected to approximate a minimum of 3% of FY 14 budgeted expenditures at fiscal year end.
5. Community Service Fully Financed – This represents grants that exceed \$500,000 in total expenditures. As of July 1, both the 21st Century Cohort V grant and the PEK-McKnight grant will begin. Revenue is projected to increase by \$1.85 million due to grants noted. Projected expenditures usually follow revenue. Due to the nature of Fully Financed budgets, revenues should always equal expenditures resulting in no change to the fund.
6. Building Construction Fund – During FY 12, the District issued \$15 million Capital and \$11 million Alternative bonds to support implementation of the SSSC initiative. For calendar year 2012, \$16 million General Obligation Bonds 2012A were issued in June. In FY 13, the District will issue \$15 million Capital, \$11 million Alternative and \$26 million General Obligation bonds. The District will continue to issue \$11 million in alternative bonds to fund deferred maintenance projects and \$15 million to fund capital improvement projects. Calendar year 2014 issuance of Alternative and Capital bonds is projected to take place prior to June 30, 2014 as continued support for the SSSC plan. The fund balance will decrease from implementation of projects supporting SSSC.
7. Debt Service – Revenue is projected to increase by approximately \$5.3 million (12.2%) driven by scheduled payments of debt as provided to and approved by the Minnesota Department of Education. Expenditures are projected to increase by approximately \$1.7 million (4.1%) driven by scheduled debt redemptions and refundings that have restructured debt payments to retire principal earlier and reduce long-term interest expense.

General Fund revenue for FY 14 is projected to be higher than projected FY 13 by \$7.7 million (2%). Reasons include:

1. Total levy decreased by \$1.9 million due to the combination of an increase in the referendum by \$9.0 million and a loss in integration revenue of \$5.7 million, reduction in the OPEB levy of \$2.9 million and reduction in the levy components by \$2.3 million.
2. Other revenue is projected to be lower by \$1.5 million due to lower revenue in the Intra-school account.
3. State aid revenue increased by \$5.7 million with changes in:
 - Increase in enrollment generated an additional \$2.7 million
 - Increase in ELL and Compensatory Education revenue of \$1.1 million
 - Increase in Special Education revenue of \$3.5 million
 - Loss in Integration state aid of \$2.0 million
 - Increase in other state aid by \$.3 million
 - Federal revenue is projected to increase by \$2.4 million in Third Party Billing and E-Rate revenue.

For FY 14, a central allocation method was utilized in support of the SSSC plan following the funding requirements from the federal and state monies. Differentiation criteria were used to allocate resources in an equitable manner that targeted the needs in each school. In addition, staffing allocations were based on class size ranges established by central administration. The school's level of poverty was taken into consideration in this. The poverty threshold used was 73% or higher to be considered at a high poverty level. There was an increase in teacher FTEs due to adding embedded professional development at the various sites. This will provide time, at all sites, within the school day for structured professional development for teachers in professional learning communities.

Schools will receive \$255,850,187 in total allocation for FY 14. The school allocation has increased overall by approximately \$5.9 million. This increase is due to General Fund and Compensatory Education Funds. All secondary sites will continue to receive Title I funds.

The total increase in the General Fund Program budget is \$16.7 million. Of that amount, 66% has been allocated directly to school support programs, 32% to district-wide support programs and 2% to central administration. The major additions to the programs are Library Media Center and Personalized Learning Through Technology that represent the budget for the new referendum money.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What about the drop in OPEB? Response: When SPPS went for the referendum, SPPS promised to keep the levy at the same level except for the increase. As a result, one of the levy components needed to be reduced. OPEB was selected because it has no strings; it does not affect programming or other revenue.
- At what point will the impact and future of OPEB relative to the next budget be discussed? Response: This is looked at each fiscal year. Without knowing the revenue expenditure situation for FY 15 that cannot be determined. It is an analysis done each cycle.
- Staffing allocations – who makes up the 48.5% classroom teachers and 30% Special Ed Staff – are those teachers? Response: They are classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and educational assistants.
- Does the 48.5% also include EA and TAs? Response: No those are specifically classroom teachers. So where would we find EA & TAs who are not special ed? Response: The only EAs and TAs administration allocates are Special Ed, library supports and ELL. Schools may purchase EAs and TAs in their budgets.
- Has Special Ed percentage gone up because Special Ed is being integrated into the classroom and therefore they are represented here as being in the classroom? Response: Special Ed allocations did not increase they are reflected as going into classrooms to support special ed within general ed. The shift is within the building on an as needed basis depending on Special Ed needs. Every school was looked at; its population and allocations were based on needs according to population to support the teaching staff around that.
- Will there be support for teachers due to unidentified special ed students coming in to Pre-K and K. Response: Remember with Pre-K the ratio is 20:1. If a student comes in with an IEP in many cases it is speech, physical therapy and to some extent autism. Special Ed is transitioning to being much more proactive in addressing issues in Kindergarten in order to catch students early and mitigate behaviors early on.
- Per pupil allocations -- what is being done this year to help those schools who do not qualify for Title I funding to help them with their per pupil allocation if they have a demonstrated need for extra funds? Response: The district looks at those situations (these occur because of the way State and Federal funding is provided -- the money follows the student.) The assistant superintendents, principals and the finance teams maintain an unfunded request list. Through that process, the District tries to mitigate the situations that occur. The SSSC process is holistic, and with finances, it is shifting the focus to look at the system. That is done first and then individual situations are

addressed. It is an FTE based process. Each school is looked at from baseline standards and FTE basis. Flexibility is built in along with defined requirements.

- What is the additional \$1 million going for substitute teachers? Response: This was the additional amount needed to meet needs for substitutes based on historical experience. In addition, the substitute rate has been increased and that is reflected here as well.
- The allocations to the schools – some show zero for integration aid dollars? Why? Response: There is not enough money provided to go around, it is used for the magnet schools, to fund all day Kindergarten and some of the intervention specialists. Use of these funds has to be part of the integration plan and funds are provided in a priority order based on other funding.
- Why are other sites (Agape) not receiving referendum funds? Response: Referendum funds are utilized based on the referendum plan – all day Kindergarten, ECFE, Pre-K, class size reduction, etc.
- What are the implications to this budget under various EMID scenarios? Response: Administration is assuming Crosswinds will continue in its planning assumptions. SPPS does not know what the legislature will do so there may be some financial requirements that may come up. Administration should have a better sense of this by end of session.

E. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. Review of Draft of **Racial Equity In Education Policy**

SPPS has a racial “achievement gap” – academic results for students of color has historically been lower than those of white students. This is true regardless of income. SPPS is addressing this through a racial equity transformation effort aimed at improving outcomes by transforming institutional practices and systems and developing, implementing and monitoring District equity plans and policies.

The framework for racial equity transformation has three “pillars”: Engagement, Leadership and Teaching & Learning. The plan has been rolling out on a five-year plan designed to cover all levels of personnel within SPPS.

Actions that have or are occurring include:

- Engagement: Reorganizing the Multicultural Resource Center to align with District racial equity development. This has brought families, students and community members together to engage in activities that both align to standards and bring in multiple perspectives.
- Leadership included the development of a personal and professional “lens” through individual coaching and commitment. Organization capacity has been built through interrupting inequities and development of a Racial Equity policy.
- Teaching & Learning has applied an equity lens to the curriculum cycle with the adoption of science through inquiry and equity that includes the student voice in the classroom along with inquiry-based curriculum. Social Studies has followed this model in its standards and curriculum cycle changing materials under a systemic equity focus and bringing in American Indian perspectives.

The development of a racial equity policy supports the SPPS mission, ends and racial equity pillars. Its purpose is to provide respectful learning environments where races, cultures and languages are indicators of success rather than academic disparity. It aims at eliminating racial predictability and disproportionality by increasing achievement for all students and narrowing the gaps between the highest and lowest-performing students. It also aims at eliminating systemic disparity by interrupting systems that perpetuate those inequities by transforming practices that are racially predictable and disproportionate, creating adaptive solutions to equity issues and monitoring and reporting on implementation and effectiveness.

Engagement to deepen, transform and develop equitable practices for and with SPPS students by seeking out and lifting up students’ perspectives and engaging family and

community members in the effort. Leadership will ensure transformation drives actions and lead to improved results by recruiting, employing, supporting, retaining and continuously developing a workforce of racially conscious and culturally competent personnel. And, by creating and monitoring conditions for equitable business systems and operational practices. Efforts will be made to increase the capacity to teach a racially and culturally diverse and changing student population and to collaborate with teachers to implement culturally responsive instructional practices and curriculum.

The policy was then presented in its most recent iteration and discussed in-depth with recommendations for modification to the language. Some recommended language changes were incorporated. It was recommended the policy be brought for its first reading to the May Board meeting. This timeline was recommended in order to achieve approval prior to August administrative and staff development sessions for SY 13-14. The policy will be taken out for community input with further refinements made over the next three months with the final recommendation being brought to the third reading in July.

MOTION: Ms. O’Connell moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education move Policy 101.00 Racial Equity in Education forward for its first reading at the May 21 Board meeting. Mr. Hardy seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 4 in favor and 3 opposed (Seeba, Carroll & Brodrick)

F. Work Session

1. **Board Budget Review**

The Board reviewed their current budget status at 83% spent for FY 13 and then moved on to the FY 13-14 budget. There was a straight roll over with some inflation provided on some lines. A request was made for more annotation on budget line items. Discussion occurred on details of a contract up for renewal, the consensus was to add an inflationary increase. Request was made for information on industry standard for this area. Directors Hardy and Seeba were assigned to follow-up on this and bring a recommendation to the June COB meeting. A job study on Board Secretary position was requested. Other slight adjustments were recommended.

2. **Board Public Engagement Discussion**

Work group members reviewed the recommendation they had brought forward in this area. Consensus was to remove the Consent Agenda from the “public comment” as originally recommended. Consensus was to do a “trial run” of the new process over the summer into early fall and then readdress it on a COB agenda for final consideration on the process.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Committee of the Board recommend the Board of Education implement the new public engagement plan, as revised, on a trial basis beginning in July, 2013 and that it be brought back at the October COB meeting for final action. Mr. Hardy seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

3. **Board Check-In**

There was a brief discussion on the PEG Summit coming up in October and Board participation in the event.

4. **Discussion on Budget & Finance Advisory Committee (BFAC) & Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) Status**

Following discussion on the two committees, the consensus was that both groups be left in the status of "on hiatus" for SY 13-14. It was recommended the entire "committee" reporting structure be reviewed in light of the strategic plan, district needs, etc.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved that BFAC and CEAC remain on hiatus for SY 13-14.
Motion seconded by Ms. Street-Stewart.

Motion passed.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Seeba moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Ms. Carroll.

Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss
Assistant Clerk