I. CALL TO ORDER

II. AGENDA
   A. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON FY 16 BUDGET
      1. Introduction
      2. Presentation
      3. Discussion
      4. Action (Direction for Administration)

III. ADJOURNMENT
Feedback from Small Group Meetings with Board Directors
May 11-12, 2015

Board Directors: John Brodrick (5/11), Anne Carroll (5/11), Louise Seeba (5/11), Mary Doran (5/12), Jean O’Connell (5/12), Chue Vue (5/12)

Administration: Valeria Silva, Michelle Walker, Marie Schrul, Christine Osorio, Jean Ronnei, Jackie Turner

Following is a high-level summary of the May 11 and May 12 Board Small Group Meetings regarding the FY 16 Proposed Budget. Board Directors and Chief Officers reviewed the items for consideration identified during the May 5 Committee of the Board, as well as program budget allocations and proposed reductions.

Items for Consideration from May 5 Committee of the Board

• **Job-embedded PD time (including PLCs and 7 period day)** - There was no consensus on whether job embedded PD time should be eliminated at either elementary or secondary level or at both. However, all members supported dollars remaining at school sites for flexible use should a reduction be made.

  The following concerns and/or questions were raised:
  - Concern about potential negative impact on science instruction with elimination of elementary PD time
  - Elementary PD seems to be better implemented than secondary so preference would be to leave that alone.
  - Is it possible to implement a secondary PD time reduction after first semester (costs, feasibility)?

• **Board’s Resolution on Staffing Supports** - There was no consensus regarding the Board Resolution on Staffing. The following options were discussed:
  - Reallocation of unused funding for different types of staffing supports than those originally identified (EAs, TAs, intervention specialists, etc.); OR
  - Extend timeline to fulfill the resolution over next two years.

• **Committed & Assigned fund balances** - There was no expressed desire to allocate additional funds from the unassigned fund balance (currently 5.2%) to the FY 16 Budget.

• **OPEB (including contributions, and $3 million)** - There was considerable concern about the district’s future liability for retiree benefits. There was no expressed interest in significantly reducing the committed fund balance. However, there was support for possibly un-committing funds to cover the gap between the OPEB levy and our total liability. CFO Schrul estimated this amount to be $600,000, which could be free up general fund dollars for another use.

• **Zero-based budgeting** – There was little discussion on this item as a strategy for immediate cost savings. However, CFO Schrul identified potential opportunities for revising the budget development process in the future.
FY 16 Program Budgets
• All members expressed concerns about the proposed elimination of **community partnerships and student/family events**.

• Other questions, concerns and/or requests related to program budgets included:
  o Can we eliminate **PEG contract** given internal capacity already developed?
  o Can we charge higher income families for **testing fees** (AP, IB, etc)?
  o Can we seek external funds to support **senior recognitions**?
    ▪ Director O’Connell was willing to be a part of a team to help make the asks

• Additional information was requested on **staffing for the following offices** (# of FTE and role/functions):
  o Communications, Marketing and Development (CMD)
  o Equity
  o Teaching and Learning (OTL)
  o College and Career Readiness (OCCR)
  o Family Engagement and Community Partnerships (FECP)