

CAPITAL/TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Oct. 20, 2010; 6:00 pm
Steamboat Springs Middle School
Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment

In order to assure public awareness of and involvement in the activities of the Steamboat Springs Education Fund, this portion of the Board meeting is available to the public to discuss any item related to the Fund that is not already included in the agenda for this meeting.

The maximum time allowed for the discussion of any single subject will be five minutes. If more time is required, the topic may be placed on the agenda of a future Education Fund Board meeting to allow more time.

3. Adopt Minutes of Sept. 22, 2010
4. EFB Update
5. 2nd reading Hayden WI FI
6. Rescission Approval
7. Grant Writer
8. Hayden
9. Request for Funding Submittal Form
10. Other Business
11. Adjourn

**Capital/Technology Commission
Steamboat Springs Middle School Media Center
October 20th, 2010; 6:00 PM**

Capital/Technology commission members present included Roger Good, Dean Massey, Glen Airolti, Mark Fitzgerald, Chad James, Paul Berry and Jody Patton. Also present were Tim Miles (SS Dir. of Technology) and Dave Holloway (SS Senior Network Engineer). Denise Brazier, Ski Town Executive Service, recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

Call to Order:

Roger called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Adopt Minutes of September 22, 2010:

On page 1 under new members, change CG Berg to CJ Berg. On page 2, 2nd paragraph, change "This upgrade is needed to properly run the Smart Boards provided last year by a matching grant from the EFB to the Morgridge Foundation" to "This upgrade is needed to properly run the Smart Boards provided last year by a matching grant with the EFB to the Morgridge Foundation." *Chad made a motion and Mark F. seconded to approve the minutes of Sept. 22, 2010 as amended.*

Vote: 7 Yes 0 No *The motion passed unanimously.*

EFB Update:

Glen questioned EFB's expectation from last year's funding approval and believes measurement should be defined up front and in the request for funding. The commission discussed what and how to come up with an evaluation for the 2009/2010 requests. Comments of note:

- Evaluate one request.
- Some requests are not performance-based.
- The only component that can be measured is 'was the money was spent for what it was intended'.
- Expensed and capitalized requests may be a way to separate how to look at an evaluation. If capital, life expectancy would be the measurement. Other categories could include safety, intent and how the result affects the GPA.
- There is a distinction between accountability and effectiveness.
- Time would be better spent on how to evaluate in the long-term.

CJ Berg joins the meeting.

The commission discussed if the detail on the requests should be proportionate to the amount of money requested. Comments included:

- Let the requesters decide.
- Are the commissions the police to the granting process?
- Include a letter of expectation with the grant.
- The Colorado Grant application has an accountability piece.
- Ask the requester to include a plan for measurement.
- Create multiple forms for multiple types of requests.
- Accountability only matters in 2018 when the sales tax goes back out to vote. The accountability question is if EFB is doing the right thing. The EFB Treasurer should determine if the money is spent as intended.
- Most important is student achievement.

In summary, the commission decided to do a quick follow-up on the past requests; did you buy it, did you do what you said you were going to do? Roger will send an email to Shalee, Mike and Scott to ask for an evaluation, if only a couple of sentences. Then, concentrate on this year's requests and what if any kind of efficacy measurement can be included to be able to realistically evaluate next year. Glen suggested using language such as the commissions would like the requesters to "share" the result.

Chad said some requests are replacement or a statutory requirement that would not require the same burden of proof.

2nd Reading Hayden WI FI:

EFB had no further questions following Hayden's 1st reading. Chad made a motion and Mark seconded to move forward with a 2nd reading for Hayden's WI FI upgrade in the amount of \$ 2700.

Vote: 7 Yes 0 No 1 Abstention (Dean) The motion passed.

Rescission Approval:

Mark F. made a motion and Chad seconded to approve a rescission from Hayden in the amount of \$ 3959 due to funds unspent including \$ 729 for Hayden's Support Personnel, \$ 2700 for Hayden Standardized Software License and \$ 530 for Hayden's MS Intervention Paraprofessional.

Vote: 8 Yes 0 No The motion passed.

Grant Writer:

Jody made a motion and Roger seconded to rescind an amount of \$ 8390 for the grant writer.

Vote: 8 0 No The motion passed.

Hayden:

Next month's cap/tech meeting will be held at the Hayden High School at 6:00 pm.

Education Fund Board's Capital/Technology Commission

Request for Funding Submittal Form:

It was the consensus of the commission to have the submittal form available on a PDF electronically on the website with the capability to add attachments. Chad and Mark F. will set the form up on Google.doc.

Ed Ex is welcome to adopt the form if they choose. Roger informed Ed Ex that Cap/Tech will be using the electronic form for feedback from Ed Ex with a memo that lack of feedback assumes acceptance. Dean suggested including an instruction sheet with the form. The requests will be transmitted by the districts and can be modified on 2nd reading. Discussion will not be included on Google.doc. Anybody wanting to engage in discussion can come to the meeting.

Roger believes the form should dictate what questions to answer regarding the amount of money for the request. For example, if \$ 5000, answer questions 1-3, if \$ 10,000, answer question 1-6, for example. Roger will work on creating the break points. Additional information can be asked at 2nd reading.

Glen believes the requesters should "demonstrate alignment" between the voters and the mission of the EFB and should be included up front on the form. Is there a gap between what the voters are getting and what is in writing. For example, Glen believes funding items such as financial software creates a risk. Funds are more scrutinized as less is available. Roger and Glen will get together to wordsmith the form. The forms will be given version numbers.

Roger requested to be able to download the form from Google.doc and will email the form to Chad and Mark after Roger's modifications. Roger said EFB does have a Gmail account.

Other Business:

Roger introduced an idea to create an innovation grant, similar to the past small grants. An amount would be pre-approved, a certain % of a commission's allocation is set aside for innovation and would be awarded a month before the year is out. The following is taken from Roger's subsequent email sent out after the meeting.

1. The project would have to pass a 'reasonable test' that there is a direct tie to student achievement during the time period for which the grant is requested.
2. A student and teacher sponsored project would be desirable.
3. The requests would be evaluated by a combination of Ed Ex and the Cap Tech commissions; innovation would be encouraged to come through any commission but will be evaluated by both.
4. General guidelines for evaluation will be innovativeness, number of students involved and probability of success.
5. The accountability/efficacy of will not be evaluated the same as traditional as innovation by definition has a higher chance of not yielding the intended goals.
6. This will be a competitive process where we hope to hear many ideas and fund the best.

Dave added this innovation concept would be beneficial for PR. Teachers and students can prepare for it all year. Chad added this concept would be a great legacy to leave with the EFB and commissions.

Roger said innovation thrives when times are tight and the need to innovate could not be more critical. Discussion continued regarding the amount to start the program and the % of the allocation to set aside for innovation. The commission agreed an amount of \$ 10,000 or \$ 15,000 may be appropriate to start. Roger will take the concept forward with Jill.

It was the consensus of the cap/tech commission to bring forward a 1st reading for the innovation grant for an amount not to exceed \$ 50,000 to be presented at the EFB meeting on Nov. 3rd.

Other Business:

Tim's presentation is postponed to the November agenda.

Adjourn:

The Capital/Technology commission adjourned at 8:08 pm.

From: Roger Good (roger@skigood.com)

To: cw@cwjames.com; cj@cjbergphoto.com; dmassey@haydenschools.org; dobrazier@yahoo.com; gairoldi@smartwool.com; karl@trappermine.com; markfitz@gmail.com; Roger@skigood.com; pattenjody@yahoo.com; p.barry@barrycm.com; tmiles@sssd.k12.co.us;

Date: Thu, October 21, 2010 9:12:37 AM

Cc:

Subject: Innovation Grant

Cap Tech Team

Thanks for the discussion last night on the innovation grant idea

Here is what I think I heard and embedded within this are a few open questions

(feel free to wordsmith or correct / enhance as you see fit)

The Cap / Tech and EdEx (I am working this with Jill) Commissions are strongly advocating we provide a grant that will be focused on INNOVATION

We believe it is clear that our students will be entering a world where creativity and innovation will be key attributes for their success. As such the earlier we can instill this value by demonstrating it the better equipped our students will be upon graduation. It is also worth noting that throughout history, innovation thrives when "times are tight" so while school district revenues are under pressure, the need to innovate could not be more critical.

The parameters of this award are as follows

- 1) It must pass a 'reasonableness test' that there is a direct tie to student achievement during the time period for which the grant is requested.
- 2) It is desirable that it be but student and teacher sponsored
 - a. Desirable vs. required, as we want this to apply to K-12, and it may be more difficult to have the younger grades have a student participant.
- 3) The requests will be evaluated by a combination of ED Ex and CapTech commissions, innovation will be encouraged to come thru any commission but will be evaluated by both.
- 4) The general guidelines for evaluation will be (conceptually)
 - a. Innovativeness
 - b. Number of students involved
 - c. Probability of success
- 5) The accountability / efficacy of will not be evaluated in the same method as traditional grants as innovation by definition has a higher chance of not yielding the intended goals. The accountability and post project review will simply be, did it achieve the intended goals, and if not, what could or should be done differently in the future, and what was learned that could be applied for future use.
- 6) It will be a competitive process where we hope to hear many ideas and fund the best.
(more potential discussion here)

Areas open for further ideas / discussion prior to the next EFB meeting are

How much money should this be in this year's budget.

It needs to be enough to engage most teachers interest in the idea, and small enough to not materially impact the funding of the anticipated school district requests.

Ideally this would be something we could suggest come out of reserves, but more