

Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board
February 7, 2018
5: 30PM
Human Services Board Room

Education Fund Board Directors present included Sam Jones, Jeanne Mackowski, Cristina Magill, Jill Brabec, Norbert Turek, Jay O’Hare, Chris Johnson, Jon Wade, Kandise Gilbertson and Adam Alspach. Alissa Merage was absent. Also present were Linda Thomas (SSEF accountant); Jenny Maxwell and Amber Delay (GC); Brad Meeks, Tim Miles and Mark Ryberg (SSSD); Christy Sinner (Hayden); Michael Girodo (MVMCS); Rim Watson (Soroco); Brian Hoza (Hayden BOE); Michelle Dover (SSSD BOE) and Kelly Latterman. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

- **Call to Order:**

Sam Jones called the joint meeting of the Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board to order at 5:30 PM.

- **Public Comment:**

There was no public comment.

- **Meeting Minutes – January 10, 2018:**

MOTION

Cristina moved to approve the EFB meeting minutes of January 10, 2018 as written. Jeanne seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

- **Meeting Etiquette**

Sam distributed the handout regarding meeting etiquette, and urged everyone to review it in preparation for the upcoming meetings in which difficult decisions must be made.

- **Committee Reports**

- **Communications** – Jeanne reminded everyone to sign up for presentations with groups and organizations around the community. Sarah will resend the link to the google doc. Jeanne said that she would be setting up a meeting with Lisa from the *Steamboat Pilot and Today* soon to discuss upcoming coverage of SSEF. Jeanne also reported that she and Chris Sias were working on a new video that will focus on SSEF-funded projects in the schools. Last year’s video focused more on Community Groups. Sam noted that the Communication Plan is about educating the community regarding the SSEF and where the sales tax funds that support it are spent.
- **Governance** – Norbert reviewed the requirements for filing with the Colorado Secretary of State. He stated that Paul Sacks had agreed to act as the organization’s representative in order to provide the SSEF with a business address. The physical address of the SSEF will continue to be 325 7th Street and its mailing address can remain its post office box. Norbert reviewed the posting requirements under C.R.S § 24-6-402 (Sunshine Law). A resolution stating the posting places for SSEF meetings and agendas will be added to the first meeting of 2019. The meetings are currently posted on the website and the district secretaries post them outside their offices. Postings also occur in the Happenings section of the newspaper, at the newspaper’s discretion.
- **Finance** – Sam reported that the Wells Fargo operating account had been hacked and subsequently frozen. He said that before this event occurred the Finance Committee had already been considering switching to a different bank. He described how the SSEF operating account is used in conjunction with the Colorado Trust account to manage SSEF finances. Sam said that the

Finance Committee is recommending that SSEF move its operating account to Alpine Bank. He said the full proposal from Alpine Bank is available if anyone is interested in reviewing it. Adam, who is employed by Alpine Bank, was not involved in the negotiations, and recused himself from any decision on the matter.

MOTION

*Norbert moved to accept the recommendation of the Finance Committee regarding the SSEF bank account. Kandise seconded the motion. **The motion passed 9 - 0, with one abstention.***

Norbert stated that each year the Finance Committee would review the SSEF banking and finance arrangements to ensure that SSEF is getting the lowest risk, greatest liquidity and highest yield possible (in that order of priority).

- Grants Commission Report – Cristina commended Jenny and Amber on the accountability report review and summary. She said that the GC had reviewed the accountability reports and had discussed the process of the upcoming application reviews, but had not discussed the particulars of any applications.

• Accountability Reports

Jenny described the process through which the accountability reports had been reviewed and compared to their corresponding original applications. Amber reviewed the school district reports, noting the areas that had required some additional follow-up. All school district grants had been fully fulfilled. Sam noted the need for clarification and consistency regarding how student:teacher ratios are described. This topic had also been discussed at the GC meeting. Jenny said that the feedback regarding the reports would be shared with the grant recipients in the hopes that reporting would continue to improve. She said that the most significant issue had been the lack of quantitative, measurable data regarding outcomes.

Jenny reviewed the community groups' accountability reports. She noted that several groups had overcome significant staffing problems to achieve their goals. All grants were fully fulfilled with the exception of Steamboat Symphony Orchestra, which was only able to provide one event instead of two, as originally planned. Jenny said that the organizational issues at SSO had been resolved.

In response to a question from Jeanne, Sam offered that the accountability reports, while available to the public, are really intended for internal consumption by the SSEF. The results section of the website should be limited to higher level summaries of the programs that are funded.

• Financial Report

Linda reviewed the financial reports, as included in the meeting materials. She noted that the fiscal year-to-date deposits are up 10.3% over forecast. The amount of funding available, before taking out the cash flow cushion, is currently expected to be just shy of \$4.5 million.

• Allocation Model

Sam reviewed that in order to accommodate MVMCS, the allocation model that serves as a guideline for what percentages of SSEF funding go into which categories of recipients must be revised. He noted that the 5% currently allocated to Collaborative Grants and administration exceeds the amount needed. This year the grant writer request is for \$78,000 and there remains one more payment of \$33,000 due on the BOCES i3SEED grant. Administration was allocated \$40,000 last year, but could be reduced to \$30,000 without an impact. Sam suggested the allocation to this "bucket" could be reduced from 5% to 3%. He also proposed that an additional 1% could be shifted from SSSD, as most of the MVMCS students reside

in the RE-2 district. The remaining 1% could be shifted from Soroco, which currently has a lower enrollment than Hayden, for a total allocation for MVMCS of 4%. He reviewed a spreadsheet (included in the meeting materials) that provides an accounting of the per pupil funding that would be received under this proposal, as well as the difference in allocation between this model and the former model (which was based on historical funding patterns, prior to the inception of MVMVCS). Sam acknowledged that although this model might not provide a long-term solution, it would provide a workable model to start with for this year.

Jill stated that she continues to struggle with the concept of the allocation model, given the commitment and mission of SSEF to award grants based on merit. She suggested that even if the model is described as a guideline, varying from it becomes very difficult once it has been formalized. Sam reviewed the history of the allocation model, which was developed at the request of the districts to help them with their budgeting. Jill offered that the districts should base their grant requests on their true needs and not on the amount of money they anticipate receiving. Jay offered that over the past several years SSEF funding has moved from being supplementary to being an integral part of the operating budgets of the districts, and needs to be considered in their budgeting process. Sam added that the SSEF retains full discretion over what programs get funded.

Brad stated that SSSD prefers a “no less than x ” approach to the funding allocations. He expressed concern that the districts are pitted against each other in the competition for funds. Christy stated that she had been told that it was quite difficult for Hayden when the district was told it would get 5% and ended up receiving less than that. Rim stated that all of his requests are based on drastic needs, and that if the SSEF does not fund them, these needs will not be addressed. Jeanne said that the allocation model does not provide a “no less than x ” guarantee. Sam agreed, stating that the actual amount of SSEF funding for grants is not known until quite late in the process.

Mark suggested an allocation model that would leave Soroco at its current level by taking 2% from the Collaborative Grants and administration and another 1% from Community Group and Innovation Grants. Sam stressed that the SSEF must remain independent in its choices regarding how to allocate SSEF funds.

There was a discussion of whether a motion was needed to effect a change in the allocation model. Sam asked the EFB members if there were any formal objections to the proposed changes to the allocation model. There were no formal objections. Therefore, the model proposed in this meeting and documented in the meeting materials as a draft is to be used as the allocation model for this year’s granting process. The new allocation model is as follows: SSSD (79%), Hayden (5%), South Routt (4%), Montessori (4%), Community/Innovation (5%), Collaborative (2%), Admin (1%). Cristina will put the proposed allocation model into the “readings” sheet of the working budget spreadsheet. Cristina reminded the EFB not to work on the first “Final Budget” sheet, but rather on the following sheets, which feed into the Final Budget sheet.

- **Other Business**

Chris asked about the parameters for the Q&A process, and the possibility of follow-up questions. Cristina reviewed the deadlines for questions and responses for the different application types. Chris asked if the EFB or GC could recommend different evaluation measures. Sam stressed that the questions should be limited to clarifications regarding the applications, rather than suggested changes to the proposed programs.

- **Agenda Items for March meeting**

- Preliminary budget discussion

- Preliminary grant application discussion

- **Adjourn**

MOTION

Cristina moved to adjourn the meeting; Jay seconded. The EFB meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.