

Minutes of the School Conference Meeting on 28.2.2017 on the topic:

**Senate Offer to Change the School's "Trägerschaft"**

14:30 to 16:40 in the JFKS library

In Attendance:

Administration:	R. Roth, R. Cortinas, J. Heinsohn, B. Salzer
Teacher Representatives:	H. Rising, T. Jones, G. Jendretzki, A. de Tarr
Parent Representatives:	K. Schneidereit, S. Moffett Heyder, A. Kamradt, P. Schier, K. Winkler, L. Mouton, K. Hentges
Student Representatives:	A. Amri, M. auf der Heyde, S. Brown-H., M. Lugani
Hort Representative:	S. Ostojic

Agenda Items:

**1. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the SK meeting of 9 February 2017 were approved.

**3. Senate Offer to Change the School's "Trägerschaft"**

Mr. Roth opens the discussion of a possible change in school "Trägerschaft" with the recommendation not to vote on the issue at this time. His reasoning includes the existence of open questions regarding the process and consequences of the switch from the District to the Senate. These, he emphasizes, will be addressed at the meeting with the Senate the next day between Staatssekretär Rackles, JFKS administrators, and Mr. Hovenier (ED representative of the US Embassy). Nevertheless, he expresses his wish to survey the current opinions ("Meinungsbild") on the Senate's offer after the discussion. At this point A. Kamradt agrees to postpone the introduction of her official motion (*Antrag*) to postpone the vote until after the discussion of the topic at hand. Questions raised during the discussion include:

- Whether the district would keep its seat in the Educational Directorate
- The degree of power the Senate would receive in influencing internal decision-making
- How the promised funds from the Senate would be managed and whether these will be transferable to coming years

- Whether security measures will be extended to the Hort
- Whether the accommodation of students in test-taking situations would change.

The discussion shifts from content-related questioning of the transition to the benefits and drawbacks of voting on this day. Those arguing in favor of a vote during this meeting mention the following points:

- The necessity of making a decisive and quick decision in order to allow sufficient time for the budgeting process and to ensure that the Senate does not withdraw its offer
- The ineffectiveness and unproductiveness of waiting for an ED vote that provides only a recommendation
- Lack of obligation to wait for constituent feedback from teachers, parents, and students since the elected members of the SK have a representative function and have had the chance to gain nuanced perspectives.

Those arguing against a vote at this time note that:

- Voting on this day would mean circumventing the ED and rendering their opinion meaningless
- The embassy, represented in the ED, would be left out of the decision-making process
- The meeting between Messrs. Rackles, Roth, Salzer, and Hovenier for negotiation and clarification has not yet been held
- Various students, parents, and teachers have been asked or have already put forward questions and concerns that have not yet been answered
- The process seems rushed and that more time would be needed to clear up differences.

At this point Mr. Roth returns to the previously mentioned survey of opinion (*Meinungsbild*) and asks the SK members to indicate by a show of hands if they are generally open to a transition to the Senate. Twelve members are favorably inclined, and two abstain.

A. Kamradt comes back to her official motion to postpone a vote on the transition to the Senate. The following text is distributed to the SK members in writing:

*Ich stelle den Antrag zur Vertagung einer möglichen Abstimmung heute am 28.02.2017 in der Schulkonferenz zum Wechsel zur Senatsverwaltung für Bildung von Berlin. Erst nach den Antworten von Herrn Staatssekretär Rackles kann eine Abstimmung erfolgen.*

I present the motion to postpone a possible vote of the school conference today 28th of February on a move by the JFK School to central administration under the *Senat*. We should await Mr Rackles answers.

She provides the rationale that there are still important open questions from our community to be addressed to Staatssekretär Rackles, and we should await the answers before forming an opinion and coming to a vote on the transition offer.

The vote on A. Kamradt's motion, by secret ballot, results in a 7-7 tie. After further discussion on how to proceed, P. Schier makes an alternative motion, which he reads to the School Conference in both German and English (the written text was provided to the SK after the meeting).

*Die Schulkonferenz begrüßt das von Staatssekretär Rackles unterbreitete Angebot des Berliner Senats für einen Wechsel der JFKS in die direkte Trägerschaft des Senats und nimmt dieses Angebot im Grundsatz an. Die Schulkonferenz beauftragt den geschäftsführenden Direktor der JFKS, Herrn Roth, in Abstimmung mit Herrn Hovenier als Vertreter der Botschaft der USA mit der Klärung weiterer offener Fragen sowie mit den Verhandlungen für einen zügigen und reibungslosen Übergang der Trägerschaft vom Bezirk zum Senat.*

The School Conference welcomes the offer of the Berlin Senate as presented by State Secretary Mr. Rackles on a move by JFKS to central administration under the Senate and accepts this offer in principle. The School Conference mandates the managing director of JFKS, Mr. Roth, to conduct negotiations with the Senate in coordination with Mr. Hovenier as representative of the Embassy of the USA in order to clear up further open questions and to arrive at a swift and smooth move from district to central administration.

Because several SK members soon need to leave for another school event, discussion on P. Schier's motion is curtailed despite some requests to further clarify the proposal. An objection against the motion is raised on the basis of §6.3 of the JFKS School Law but is not voted upon. Mr. Roth voices his concern that, if the SK does not make a timely decision, the JFKS risks losing the offer of the Senate due to perceived resistance of the School. The motion of P. Schier is voted upon, by secret ballot, resulting in 8 votes in favor, 4 against, and 2 abstentions (*Note: This amounts to a simple but not a two-thirds majority. There was no discussion on the required majority for the measure to pass*). Mr. Roth then adjourns the meeting, but allows members to stay and discuss the matter.

Minutes submitted by A. Amri, M. auf der Heyde, S. Brown-H. and M. Lugani