

CAPITAL/TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
March 16, 2011; 6:00 pm
Human Service Center Board Room
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 Jan. 26, 2011
4. EFB Update
5. 2nd Readings
6. Old Business
7. New Business
8. Meeting Dates
9. Adjourn

Capital/Technology Commission
Wednesday, Jan. 26th, 2011
Human Service Center Board Room

Board member present included Roger Good, Dean Massey, CJ Berg, Paul Barry and Karl Kohler. Also present were Tim Miles (SSDS Tech. Dir.), Scott Mader (SR Super.), Jim Early (Hayden Tech. Dir.), Troy Zabel (Hayden HS Prin.) and Diane Maltby (MS teacher). Denise Brazier, Ski Town Executive Service, recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

Call to Order:

Roger Good called the meeting to order at 6:11 pm.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

EFB Update:

Kristi announced the IRS penalty has been waived. Dean said the commission talked about completing a long-term projection for the budget and there was discussion regarding how to determine the allocations. Preliminary allocations will be determined after 1st readings are heard by the EFB.

Approval of the Minutes:

Dean made a motion and Paul seconded, to approve the Cap/Tech minutes of the Nov. 17th, 2010.

Vote: ___ 5 Yes ___ ___ 0 No ___ The motion passed unanimously.

Innovation Grant:

As there have been several inquiries regarding the innovation grant, the commission decided on the following timeline:

April 6th – Application deadline

April 13th – 1st review with Educational Excellence

April 20th – Final review

Roger will draft language for those interested in applying for the innovation grant describing the grant.

The commission agreed there will be no filtering or requirements.

Mark Fitzgerald joined the meeting.

Meeting dates:

The meeting date schedule is:

Feb. 2nd – Ed Ex meets to determine 1st meetings

Feb. 9th – EFB meets to determine allocations and hear Cap/Tech 1st readings

Feb. 16th – Cap Tech meets to determine 2nd readings

Roger will make sure numbered and dated revisions are posted on the website.

Budget Presentation:

Requests are available to be viewed at www.steamboateducationfund.org.

Steamboat Springs Capital/Technology Commission

January 26, 2011

Page 1

A. Hayden School District:

The following requests were presented by Jim Early in the order of priority and all were approved for 1st reading (with contingencies as noted):

1. \$ 49,839 - Technology Support staff member – Provides a 2nd staff person for the Tech. dept. More support is needed as there is more technology in the district.
2. \$ 7,100 - Microsoft Software Licensing – Provides yearly renewal & Microsoft upgrades including Windows 7, client access, the latest version of Office and licensing for the servers. The licensing is a consortium with SBS and BOCES. Troy said if the licensing is not funded by EFB, Hayden district's technology would go backwards.
3. \$ 25,000 - Smartboard Acquisition Matching Funds – The funds would match \$ 25,000 granted to Hayden for Smartboards from the Morgridge Foundation. The goal is to have a Smartboard in every classroom for the 2011-12 school year. The grant includes mandatory training for the staff. This request would be the last of a 3-step process. Jim is comfortable the current infrastructure is adequate for the remaining Smartboards but is concerned about the wall loads in the elementary school. *Roger would like to know up front if additional money is needed for peripheral needs.* The Morgridge grant has been awarded to the Hayden district.
4. \$ 3,000 – Renaissance Learning – Includes online versions of Accelerated Reader, STAR testing, English in a Flash and Accelerated Math.
5. \$ 21,846 - Intervention Support Specialist for Hayden Middle School – The funds would continue to provide a paraprofessional who supports the teachers. The Hayden district is working toward assuming the cost.
6. \$ 15,445 – Hayden Secondary School Computers – Funding would replace the existing 24, 7-10 year old computers and is in alignment with the district's technology plan. Jim is trying to obtain a more standardized platform for the district and has selected Dell as a preferred vendor. Dell will sell computers from cancelled orders at a 30% discount to the district. Jim said SBS has different computer requirements than Hayden but would collaborate on like-purchases. *Roger asked Jim to look into finding ways to save money on collaborative computer purchases among the 3 districts between for 2nd reading.*
7. \$ 8,499 - Adobe Creative Suite 5 Design Premium Site License - This is a one-time purchase to provide a top-of-the line Adobe program used in the graphic design industry and opportunities for certification. *Roger asked to find out the cost for the Master Collection and the cost to include video before 2nd reading.*
8. \$ 25,500 - Auditorium/Theater Upgrades – Funding would provide theater upgrades to include lighting, curtain and carpeting. *Hayden was asked to submit an itemized breakdown and phasing alternatives for the upgrades.*

B. South Routt School District: The following requests were presented by Scott Mader in the order of priority and all were approved for 1st reading (with contingencies as noted):

1. \$16,500 - Soroco HS Fume Hood (priority #1). The Fume Hood is needed for compliance with the Dept. of Health standards for chemical storage before the start of the 2011-12 school year.
2. \$ 86,250 – Smartboard Grant Match. Restrictions are still pending response from the Morgridge Foundation. Limitations from the granting foundation and the assimilation of that number of Smartboards with adequate training were discussed. Different ways to provide the Smartboards were discussed but the commission would like to maximize the use of the matching funds as much as possible. *The commission agreed to go forward with a 1st reading for \$ 86,250, to encourage South Routt to do as much as possible to maximize the grant and to figure out and*

describe how SR can assimilate more than 20 computers in one year effectively, including the ability to provide Morgridge level training.

3. \$ 30,000 – Desktop Hardware Refresh – South Routt is willing to collaborate with Hayden and SBS to replace 50-52 computers.
4. \$ 3,000 – Renaissance Learning – Accelerated Reader, STAR testing, English in a Flash and Accelerated Math: These programs are online and part of a consortium.
5. \$ 3,000 – Symantec Endpoint Protection Antivirus - The funds will upgrade the aging antivirus software. Roger proposed the 3 districts get together to discuss standardizing this software. Tim said he is already in with another district. *The commission approved this request for 1st reading with the condition the 3 districts discuss standardization.*
6. \$ 34,595 – Heated Walkway – Scott said heating the icy walkway between buildings, used daily by students and staff, could be supported by an existing boiler. Scott does not have an estimate from an engineer. Paul said pay-back from not having to maintain the walkway would not take long. Roger asked Scott to reconsider the order of priority if the walkway is a safety issue. Dean said in the past EFB considers safety issues the responsibility of the district.

\$ 19,000 – SR Rams Booster Club – This request does not come from the district. The request for TV monitors and computers for 2 school entrance/commons area. The computer monitors are for informational purposes such as event advertising. \$ 1,900 has already been received from the community foundation. Discussion followed whether the request aligns with the EFB's educational goals and if the request adds to the value to educational attainment and accomplishment. *The request was approved for 1st reading with 2 opposed (Mark and Dean).*

- a. **Steamboat Springs School District:** The following requests were presented by Tim Miles. Technology requests are collectively #2 in priority for the SBS district. All the requests were approved for 1st reading with contingencies as noted.
 1. \$ 396,787 – Technology Staff – This item includes all technology staff (5 people and some student help) except Tim Miles. Tim said the 10% increase from the amount of the request last year is due to benefits. *Roger would like to better understand the 10% increase.*
 2. \$ 363,500 – Technology Hardware – *Roger asked for a more detailed breakdown and that any collaborative opportunity should be considered.*
 3. \$ 100,000 – Technology Network – Includes the phones and internet and is the most important item to assure liability. Parts need replacement on the servers. The recurring cost is \$ 36,000. *Tim will provide a breakdown for 1st reading.*
 4. \$ 124,213 – Technology Software – Provides support and access to all applications.
 5. \$ 20,000 – Technology Data Analysis – This software translates data analysis for the teachers. Discussion followed on the benefits of collaboration with the other districts for this request. *The request was approved for 1st reading contingent that dialogue continue with Hayden and South Routt.*
 6. \$ 10,000 – Tech Training – The request provides training for the technology staff. *A breakdown of these costs was requested.*
 7. \$ 27,500 – Technology Maintenance – The district matches the amount of this request. *Information was requested regarding a breakdown of expenditures.*
 8. \$ 15,000 – Marmot – The request is for a consortium with the library.
 9. \$ 18,000 – Online Database – This state consortium for library subscriptions provides for safe internet searching for students. *Tim was asked to investigate collaboration with the other*

districts and to provide a list of subscriptions. The request is approved for 1st reading contingent on inquiries regarding collaboration.

10. \$ 25,000 Student Information Systems – Tim said collaboration for this request provides no economies of scale and is a per student cost.

Adjournment:

Dean made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The Capital/Technology Commission adjourned at 9:49 pm.

Capital/Technology Commission
March 16, 2011: 6:00 pm
Human Service Center Board Room

Capital/Technology commission members present included Roger Good, Dean Massey, Glen Airoli, Chad James, Mark Fitzgerald, CJ Berg and Karl Kohler. Also present were Tim Miles (SS Tech. Dir.), Scott Mader (SR Super.) and Kevin Klecker (Hayden Vo. Tech.). Denise Brazier, Ski Town Executive Service, recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

Call to Order:

Roger called the meeting to order at 6:07 pm.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Approval of Minutes:

Mark made a motion and Chad seconded to approve the minutes of January 26, 2011.

Vote: ___(7 Yes)___ ___(0 No)___ The motion passed unanimously.

EFB Update:

Roger reported EFB approved \$ 2.3 million to be split almost evenly between both commissions but instructed the commissions to provide different scenarios. Cap/Tech has requests for \$ 1.4 million. A request was sent out for voluntarily reductions. The \$ 100,000 request for a Curriculum Director from Ed. Ex. has been withdrawn.

(Paul Berry and Jody Patten join the meeting).

2nd Readings:

Comments of Note:

- Kevin Kleckner said the auditorium upgrade is non-critical and would be the first item to remove.
- Tim recommends cutting to SS's incidentals such as DataBase, Student Information Systems, data analysis, training and Marmot.
- Scott Mader said the heated walkway is a voluntary reduction for South Routt.
- Regarding the Booster Club request, Paul doesn't want to send the wrong message to groups who want small groups of money.
- SR's Smartboard request is too large, including the response units, and the request could be cut by half. Classrooms can easily use smaller boards. Scott wants the bigger boards.
- Funds should provide incremental education through technology. SR Auditorium should provide an environment for students to thrive. Adobe would set a school apart and raise the level of education.
- Important considerations include the length time whatever is funded will be used and how many students benefit.
- EFB funding should be set apart from the items needed for the business of running a school.
- The EFB answers to the community as opposed to the school district.

Capital/Technology Commission Meeting

March 16, 2011

Page 1

- Determine where incremental funding will maintain the viability of a request.

Methodologies for determining requests included:

- Reduce each request by the same percentage
- Determine the % of the budget awarded to each district in the past and look at an average of those percentages.

Dean would like to maintain the priorities this year and give EFB the message that next year the approach of the commission will be different.

Motions:

Mark made a motion, and Jody seconded, to cut SS technology staff by 10% and cut the South Routt Smartboard by 10%. The motion died.

Chad made a motion and Karl seconded to ask each district to reduce their requests by 10% , at the district's discretion, to reach a \$ 1.05 funding level. Mark said this commission has taken the district's priorities as input and have we taken the intelligence of the commission under consideration. Tim said SS is going backwards and Hayden and SR are going forward. Dean said if an average of the % distributed to the district over the past years, SS comes back slightly.

Vote: ___4 Yes___ ___5 No___ The motion fails.

RG – took Dean's percentages and worked down the list. Within 50,000. With respecting the discussion and the average of percentages. Scott said too big of a cut and there's no rule to go by the percentages. Chad has a problem also. Paul said would be better to know the number going into the requests. RG – Suspects will be between 1.25 and 1.2 and produced the worst case scenario.

Mark motion to accept RG numbers at 1.1 million level, backfill as much as possible this evening. Jody seconds. Yes – 4 Roger – 4. Roger abstains.

Tim offering to stay at 936,713. Karl doesn't know the right % and the overall funding for H and SR be the same. Glen motion to allocate 85% for SBS and balance the rest between H and SR. Karl seconds. Fote 5 Yes. 1 Abstai (foger_) \ \$ 1.1 is set. Tim happy with 936,713 at the 1.1 level for SBS.

Glen said look at the line items and determine what can be cut incrementally with H and SR equitably and reflect opportunities to bring to the EFB. Glen said we need a healthy discussion per line item to go thru each thoughtfully. Dean seconds. Yes – 7 Yes. 1 No (Chad) RG abstains.

Mark made a motion and Chad seconded to accept column O for the \$ 1.1 level of funding.

Vote: ___8 Yes___ ___1 Abstains (Roger)___ The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.

Mark made a motion and Chad seconded to accept column K for the \$??? level of funding.

Vote: ___8 Yes___ ___1 Abstains (Roger)___ The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.

Capital/Technology Commission Meeting

March 16, 2011

Page 2

Mark made a motion and Chad seconded to accept column I for the \$??? level of funding.
Vote: ___ 5 Yes ___ ___ 2 No (Dean, CJ) ___ 1 Abstains (Roger) ___ The motion passed.

O – RG abstain. Mark, Dean. 7 Yes.

G – Cha, Mark. 1 Abstain. If Tim tweaks, have to be amendable to the total and asking for line item permission as long as the same or less. M8st retain the numbers in Col. G1. The problem is the school budget doesn't come until tomorrow. Dean voting again cause SBS giving back to much. 1 Opposed. 7 Yes.

Chad – We do not believe this is the best way to allocate the funds and would like to revisit the process.

New Busines – Joint meeting for Innovation Grant April 13th. Put on your calendars. That is our next meeting. Chad asked do we have a process? It will be a competition and a free-for-all. Roger suggests a subset of people come up with a process. Roger will call Jill. Roger, Chad and Glen. only. RG reiterated the criteria on the request.

Adjourn at 9:55

2011-2012 Cap Tech Comissic

Grant Name	Original Request		Voluntary Reductions		\$1.2 M
Hayden Adobe	\$13,999		\$13,999		
Hayden Auditorium	\$25,500		\$25,500		
Hayden Microsoft	\$7,100		\$7,100		
Hayden PCs	\$15,445		\$15,445		
Hayden Smart Board	\$25,000		\$25,000		
Hayden SW	\$3,000		\$3,000		
Hayden Tech Staff	\$49,839		\$49,839		
SBS Data Analysis	\$20,000		\$20,000		
SBS Software	\$124,213		\$124,213		
SBS Tech DB	\$18,000		\$18,000		
SBS Tech Hardware	\$363,500		\$ 263,500		
SBS Tech Maint	\$27,500		\$27,500		
SBS Tech Marmot	\$15,000		\$15,000		
SBS Tech SIS	\$25,000		\$25,000		
SBS Tech Staff	\$396,787		\$396,787		
SBS Tech Training	\$10,000		\$10,000		
SBS Technology Network	\$100,000		\$100,000		
Soroco Accelerated Reader	\$5,498		\$5,498		
Soroco Anti Virus	\$3,000		\$3,000		
Soroco Booster	\$1,900		\$1,900		
Soroco Chem Hood	\$16,500		\$16,500		
Soroco Heated WW	\$34,595		\$0		\$0
Soroco PC	\$30,000		\$30,000		
Soroco Smart Board	\$86,250		\$86,250		
Total Requested	\$1,417,626		\$1,283,031		0
Hayden Total Requests	\$139,883	9.9%	\$139,883	10.9%	\$0 #DIV/0!
SBS Total Requests	\$1,100,000	77.6%	\$1,000,000	77.9%	\$0 #DIV/0!
SOROCO Total Requests	\$177,743	12.5%	\$143,148	11.2%	\$0 #DIV/0!
Delta to Target					\$ 1,200,000

on WorkSheet

\$1.15M

\$1.1M

\$1.05M

\$1.0M

0

0

0

0

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$0 #DIV/0!

\$ 1,150,000

\$ 1,100,000

\$ 1,050,000

\$ 1,000,000

- a. Steamboat Springs School District:** The following requests were presented by Tim Miles. Technology requests are collectively #2 in priority for the SBS district. All the requests were approved for 1st reading with contingencies as noted.
1. \$ 396,787 – Technology Staff – This item includes all technology staff (5 people and some student help) except Tim Miles. Tim said the 10% increase from the amount of the request last year is due to benefits. *Roger would like to better understand the 10% increase.*
(Benefit upcosts, summer help)
 2. \$ 363,500 – Technology Hardware – *Roger asked for a more detailed breakdown and that any collaborative opportunity should be considered.*
(approx. \$70,000 is spoken for, with Citrix/Appsense costs)
(Discuss possible scenarios here)
 3. \$ 100,000 – Technology Network – Includes the phones and internet and is the most important item to assure liability. Parts need replacement on the servers. The recurring cost is \$ 36,000. *Tim will provide a breakdown for 1st reading.*
(SAN-\$54,000(To go Virtual), redundant @ SSHS, Larger @ SSMS, SSMS to SCE) (Centurion \$36,000, \$10,000 switch changes etc ..)
 4. \$ 124,213 – Technology Software – Provides support and access to all applications.
 5. \$ 20,000 – Technology Data Analysis – This software translates data analysis for the teachers. Discussion followed on the benefits of collaboration with the other districts for this request. *The request was approved for 1st reading contingent that dialogue continue with Hayden and South Routt.*
 6. \$ 10,000 – Tech Training – The request provides training for the technology staff. *A breakdown of these costs was requested.*
(SAN, Appsense, Citrix XenDesktop, SQL, Nortel, etc...)
 7. \$ 27,500 – Technology Maintenance – The district matches the amount of this request. *Information was requested regarding a breakdown of expenditures.*
 8. \$ 15,000 – Marmot – The request is for a consortium with the library.
 9. \$ 18,000 – Online Database – This state consortium for library subscriptions provides for safe internet searching for students. *Tim was asked to investigate collaboration with the other districts and to provide a list of subscriptions. The request is approved for 1st reading contingent on inquiries regarding collaboration.*
(Nettrekker, Grolier, ProQuest LLC, Bibliographical Center for Research, (Colorado Airs Database), Safari Montage)
 10. \$ 25,000 Student Information Systems – Tim said collaboration for this request provides no economies of scale and is a per student cost.

.MAC
A+
Adobe
Altiris Client
ArcView GIS (ESRI)
BrainPOP
Bridges
Food Service
Intermapper
Lexia
LightSpeed
MathStories
Microsoft
NWEA
PbWorks
Renaissance Learning
SAM 2007 Net Ready
SuccessMaker
TeacherWeb
TumbleBooks
Veritas
Vision
VoiceThread
Zoomerang

Education Fund Board

Requestor

SS HDN SOROCO

Request Title

Grant Writer

Commission

District Priority

Commission Priority

Amount Requested 80,000

Request Number

Target Date for Implementation July 2011

Has EFB Previously Funded This Project

Yes

Has this been addressed in other schools

Yes

Other sources of funds not provided by EFB Include School District Funding as appropriate

None

Target group primarily impacted by this request

The students and staff in all three school districts benefit from the successful grants written by the grant writer.

Goals and Objectives of this funding request

The \$80,000 grant from EFB funds the salary and benefits for one grant writer to work on behalf of the three school districts. The goals for each school district are outlined in their Unified Improvement Plans, and should correlate to the grant requests.

Print This Fund Request

Attach Additional Files as Needed

Submit by E-mail

Alternatives Considered

Request Title

Grant Writer

What alternatives were considered before selecting this solution

This position has been funded for many years, and no alternative plans have been made should this request be denied.

Outcomes

Request Title

Grant Writer

What are the expected outcomes with the specified use of these funds

The expected outcome is that the grant writer will endeavor to write grants as requested by each district, and be awarded those grants.

Provide specific calculated measurements that will be used on an ongoing basis to measure the progress of the goals for this funding

The progress toward meeting our goal will be the number of grants written compared to the number of grants successfully awarded to each district.

Previous EFB Funding description and results

Request Title

Grant Writer

Provide Years and amounts of previous EFB funding and measurements of success defined when grant was awarded

see attached

Unintended or unexpected outcomes from the prior activities

The economic downturn has certainly made it more difficult to be awarded grants.

Previous Experience of other school districts in addressing similar issues

Request Title

Grant Writer

What solutions are in place at other school districts, and what consideration was given to their solution in generating this request

Many school districts are not fortunate enough to have a grant writer.

GRANTS 1998-2010

YEAR	REGIONAL	HAYDEN	SOUTH ROUTT	STEAMBOAT SPRINGS	TOTAL	GRANT WRITER
98-99		19,797	75,951	137,500	230,248	Myers
99-00	434,246	305,449	16,049	181,782	937,526	Myers
00-01	-	82,958	784,958	34,062	901,978	Myers
01-02	-	132,655	391,334	83,747	607,736	Myers
02-03	-	153,631	116,620	194,806	465,057	Myers
03-04	-	259,401	104,385	174,000	537,786	Myers
04-05			47,140	69,823	116,963	Myers
05-06	63,000	201,000	4,950	84,324	353,274	Gariety
06-07	2,000	502,400	80,000	53,500	637,900	Malone
07-08	69,514	130,447	37,000	1,218,971	1,455,932	McBride
08-09	503,800	10,000	20,000	714,965	1,248,765	McBride
09-10	387,460	14,986	40,510	3,539,946	3,982,902	McBride
10-11 ytd	232,960	0	10,000	3,452,336	3,695,296	McBride
10-11 pending/ research & development	66,400	391,966	391,504	922,500	1,772,370	McBride

Grants for 2010-2011

Title of Grant	Funder	Amount of Grant	District	Date Funded	Report Due Date	Person Responsible for Report
Student Mentoring in Art	Woodside Foundation	\$2000	SSSD	Summer, 2010	n/a	n/a
Yampa Valley School Counselor	Sara Craig-Scheckman Family Foundation	\$4500	Regional	Spring, 2010	Fall, 2010	Molly Lotz
ELL Community	Arthur E. Anderson	\$23,665	SSSD	Summer, 2010	Summer, 2011	Tatiana Archer
Safe Routes to School	CDOT	\$16,000	SSSD	Summer, 2010	Summer, 2011	Diane Mitsch-Bush
Summer Vocational Institute	Yampa Valley Community Foundation	\$5200	Regional	Spring, 2010	Summer, 2011	Funding Returned
SMART Boards	Morgridge Foundation	\$45,000	SSSD	Spring, 2010	Spring, 2011	Cathleen Nardi; project director and writer
Community Grant Effort; LiveWell	Health Foundation	\$150,000	Regional	Ongoing	Fall, 2010	Barb Parnell; project director and writer
Title Funding	Colorado Department of Ed	\$179,000	SSSD	Ongoing	Summer, 2011	Ruth McBride
Learning Literacy for a Lifetime	Colorado Department of Education	\$73,260	Regional	Funding suspended after awarded	Summer, 2011	n/a
"Hands In"; Day Treatment Program	Sara Craig-Scheckman	\$10,000	South Routt	Summer, 2010	Spring, 2011	Scott Mader
North Routt Charter School Construction	CDE BEST	\$3,186,671	SSSD	Summer, 2010	Summer, 2011	Colleen Poole
Musical Education	Echoing Green Fellowship Grant	\$60,000	Regional	Pending	-	Holly Fielding
Active Play	CO Health	\$15,000	Hayden	Pending		Mike Luppess;

Areas	Foundation					Barb Parnell
Active Play Areas	CO Health Foundation	\$15,000	South Routt	Pending		Scott Mader; Barb Parnell
Safe Routes to School	CDOT	\$200,000	South Routt	Pending		Scott Mader
Defibrillators for Hayden	Jenny's Heroes	\$5,000	Hayden	Pending		Mike Luppess
Music Education	Yampa Valley Electric Caring Community Grant	\$400	Regional	Pending		Holly Fielding
Musical Instruments	Save the Music Foundation	\$6,000	Regional	Pending		Holly Fielding
Playground Surfacing; Waste Tire Grant	Public Health & The Environment	\$19,004	South Routt	Pending		Scott Mader
Playground Surfacing; Waste Tire Grant	Public Health & The Environment	\$76,966	Hayden	Pending		Mike Luppess
Technology for Hayden & South Routt	Payless Shoe Source	\$60,000	Hayden & South Routt	Pending		Scott Mader; Mike Luppess
Supplemental Online Education	CDE	\$5,000	South Routt	Pending		Scott Mader
Geo Thermal System	YVCF	\$50,000	South Routt	R & D		Scott Mader
Greenhouse for South Routt	Gates	\$10,000	South Routt	R & D		Scott Mader
Hayden Track	YVCF; Recreation Fund	\$25,000	Hayden	R & D		Mike Luppess
Hayden Track	Public Health & the Environment	\$40,000	Hayden	R & D		Mike Luppess
Hayden Track	GOCO	\$200,000	Hayden	R & D		Mike Luppess
Effective Classrooms	EFB	\$800,000	SSSD	Pending		Shalee Cunningham
Staff Development	EFB	\$40,000	SSSD	Pending		Shalee Cunningham
Curriculum Director	EFB	\$60,000	SSSD	Pending		Shalee Cunningham
Curriculum Director	EFB	\$40,000	South Routt	Pending		Scott Mader

3-8 Spanish Instruction	EFB	\$100,000	SSSD	Pending		Shalee Cunningham
Summer Intensives	EFB	\$25,000	Regional	Pending		Shalee Cunningham, Scott Mader & Mike Lupp

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; smader@southroutt.k12.co.us; scunningham@sssd.k12.co.us; tmiles@sssd.k12.co.us;

Date: Thu, March 24, 2011 11:09:01 AM

Cc:

Subject: Special Meeting

Cap Tech Commission

As noted in this morning edition of the Steamboat Pilot, the second readings for both EdEx and CapTech were deferred until April 6th

The basis for this discussion is that Steamboat needed more time to work through absorbing the cuts we proposed in our meeting.

This will require us to have a SPECIAL meeting on the night of April 5th to review Steamboat final budget proposal.

One other point where we (CapTech) received a bit of push back from the EFB is the overall percentages of dollars flowing to Hayden and SOROCO at the higher funding amounts.

Our agenda for this meeting will be limited in scope to 3 very specific items

- 1) Agree or not with steamboats final prioritization after they work thru the budget numbers.
 - a. NOTE the total dollar amount under any overall budget scenario will not change, only shifting of the dollar amounts within the Steamboat requests.
- 2) Discussion of the rate that we "add funds" to the district as dollars increase above the minimum amount.
- 3) 1st reading on the grant writer. (this does not come out of CapTech dollars, it just needs to flow thru a commission)
 - a. This is largely a formality, I would propose we vote on this online.
 - b. If everyone voted via a one line email simply stating
 - i. 1st reading Grant Writer – YES or NO
 - c. I would be happy moving forward for 1st reading and have this done prior to the April 5th meeting.

MARK YOUR CALENDERS

Revisit 2nd reading

April 5th

5:30 PM

School District office in Steamboat

Roger

From: Karl Koehler (karl@trappermine.com)

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

Date: Mon, March 28, 2011 2:49:22 PM

Cc:

Subject: RE: Special Meeting

All,

With regard to proposed Cap Tech agenda items:

- 1) I will not be inclined to disagree with Steamboat's final prioritization whatever that may be for the reasons I outlined at the last Cap Tech meeting; Steamboat's priorities are Steamboat's priorities and it is not in my view the EFB's or Cap Tech commission's responsibility to reprioritize funding needs for any district. That's up to the respective administrations and school boards and it is what it is.
- 2) It seems to me we (Cap Tech) have parsed distributions under various funding levels dang near to death. Is it really necessary to now examine the relative *rates* that funds are added to or deducted from districts under different funding scenarios? Seems to me we could just go with the overall percentages as proposed at the next lowest funding level (for example if it turns out there are 1.16 million dollars available, use the percentages as defined for 1.15 million). Or if we really wanted to get picky, something not necessary in my view, just pro-rate the increases/decreases between districts between the higher/lower funding percentages defined. There's really nothing magic at all about the given percentages though. Perhaps I am misunderstanding this agenda item.
- 3) 1st reading Grant Writer – YES.

As for the push back from EFB, the Cap Tech commission provided very carefully considered and thoroughly debated recommendations to the EFB for funding under a wide variety of available dollar scenarios. If the EFB disagrees with these recommendations, they should just make whatever adjustments they feel are appropriate. I'm very reluctant to spend another evening rehashing these issues and fishing for an answer that may or may not be more palatable to the EFB, but will try to attend the meeting.

Sincerely,

Karl

From: Roger Good [mailto:roger@skigood.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 11:09 AM

To: Chad James; CJ Berg; Dean Massey; Denise Brazier; Glen Airoidi; Karl Koehler; Mark Fitzgerald; Me; pattenjody@yahoo.com; Paul Barry; Scott Mader; 'Shallee Cunningham'; Tim Miles

Subject: Special Meeting

Cap Tech Commission

As noted in this morning edition of the Steamboat Pilot, the second readings for both EdEx and CapTech were deferred until April 6th

The basis for this discussion is that Steamboat needed more time to work through absorbing the cuts we proposed in our meeting.

This will require us to have a SPECIAL meeting on the night of April 5th to review Steamboat final budget proposal.

One other point where we (CapTech) received a bit of push back from the EFB is the overall percentages of dollars flowing to Hayden and SOROCO at the higher funding amounts.

Our agenda for this meeting will be limited in scope to 3 very specific items

- 1) Agree or not with steamboats final prioritization after they work thru the budget numbers.
 - a. NOTE the total dollar amount under any overall budget scenario will not change, only shifting of the dollar amounts within the Steamboat requests.
- 2) Discussion of the rate that we "add funds" to the district as dollars increase above the minimum amount.
- 3) 1st reading on the grant writer. (this does not come out of CapTech dollars, it just needs to flow thru a commission)
 - a. This is largely a formality, I would propose we vote on this online.
 - b. If everyone voted via a one line email simply stating
 - i. 1st reading Grant Writer – YES or NO
 - c. I would be happy moving forward for 1st reading and have this done prior to the April 5th meeting.

MARK YOUR CALENDERS

Revisit 2nd reading

April 5th

5:30 PM

School District office in Steamboat

Roger

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

From: Mark Fitzgerald (markfitz@gmail.com)
To: roger@skigood.com; karl@trappermine.com;
Date: Tue, March 29, 2011 9:07:25 AM
Cc: cw@cwjames.com; cj@cjbergphoto.com; dmassey@haydenschools.org; dobrazier@yahoo.com; gaioldi@smartwool.com; pattenjody@yahoo.com; p.barry@barrycm.com; smader@southroutt.k12.co.us; scunningham@sssd.k12.co.us; tmiles@sssd.k12.co.us;
Subject: Re: Special Meeting

1st reading Grant Writer – YES

I am also inclined to agree with Karl's remark: "the Cap Tech commission provided very carefully considered and thoroughly debated recommendations to the EFB for funding under a wide variety of available dollar scenarios. If the EFB disagrees with these recommendations, they should just make whatever adjustments they feel are appropriate."

I plan to attend the meeting.

-Mark

On Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 2:49 PM, Karl Koehler <karl@trappermine.com> wrote:

All,

With regard to proposed Cap Tech agenda items:

- 1) I will not be inclined to disagree with Steamboat's final prioritization whatever that may be for the reasons I outlined at the last Cap Tech meeting; Steamboat's priorities are Steamboat's priorities and it is not in my view the EFB's or Cap Tech commission's responsibility to reprioritize funding needs for any district. That's up to the respective administrations and school boards and it is what it is.
- 2) It seems to me we (Cap Tech) have parsed distributions under various funding levels dang near to death. Is it really necessary to now examine the relative *rates* that funds are added to or deducted from districts under different funding scenarios? Seems to me we could just go with the overall percentages as proposed at the next lowest funding level (for example if it turns out there are 1.16 million dollars available, use the percentages as defined for 1.15 million). Or if we really wanted to get picky, something not necessary in my view, just pro-rate the increases/decreases between districts between the higher/lower funding percentages defined. There's really nothing magic at all about the given percentages though. Perhaps I am misunderstanding this agenda item.
- 3) 1st reading Grant Writer – YES.

As for the push back from EFB, the Cap Tech commission provided very carefully considered and thoroughly debated recommendations to the EFB for funding under a wide variety of available dollar scenarios. If the EFB disagrees with these recommendations, they should just make whatever

adjustments they feel are appropriate. I'm very reluctant to spend another evening rehashing these issues and fishing for an answer that may or may not be more palatable to the EFB, but will try to attend the meeting.

Sincerely,

Karl

From: Roger Good [mailto:roger@skigood.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 11:09 AM

To: Chad James; CJ Berg; Dean Massey; Denise Brazier; Glen Airoidi; Karl Koehler; Mark Fitzgerald; Me; pattenjody@yahoo.com; Paul Barry; Scott Mader; 'Shallee Cunningham'; Tim Miles

Subject: Special Meeting

Cap Tech Commission

As noted in this morning edition of the Steamboat Pilot, the second readings for both EdEx and CapTech were deferred until April 6th

The basis for this discussion is that Steamboat needed more time to work through absorbing the cuts we proposed in our meeting.

This will require us to have a SPECIAL meeting on the night of April 5th to review Steamboat final budget proposal.

One other point where we (CapTech) received a bit of push back from the EFB is the overall percentages of dollars flowing to Hayden and SOROCO at the higher funding amounts.

Our agenda for this meeting will be limited in scope to 3 very specific items

- 1) Agree or not with steamboats final prioritization after they work thru the budget numbers.

- a. NOTE the total dollar amount under any overall budget scenario will not change, only shifting of the dollar amounts within the Steamboat requests.
- 2) Discussion of the rate that we "add funds" to the district as dollars increase above the minimum amount.
- 3) 1st reading on the grant writer. (this does not come out of CapTech dollars, it just needs to flow thru a commission)
 - a. This is largely a formality, I would propose we vote on this online.
 - b. If everyone voted via a one line email simply stating
 - i. 1st reading Grant Writer – YES or
NO
 - c. I would be happy moving forward for 1st reading and have this done prior to the April 5th meeting.

MARK YOUR CALENDERS

Revisit 2nd reading

April 5th

5:30 PM

School District office in Steamboat

Roger

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

From: Paul Barry (p.barry@barrycm.com)
To: markfitz@gmail.com; roger@skigood.com; karl@trappermine.com;
Date: Tue, March 29, 2011 11:47:12 AM
Cc: cw@cwjames.com; cj@cjbergphoto.com; dmassey@haydenschools.org; dobrazier@yahoo.com; gairoldi@smartwool.com; pattenjody@yahoo.com; smader@southroutt.k12.co.us; scunningham@sssd.k12.co.us; tmiles@sssd.k12.co.us;
Subject: RE: Special Meeting

I am in agreement with Karl and Mark on how to move forward.

1st reading for Grant Writer – YES

Paul P. Barry

BARRY Construction Management Company

31020 Pawnee Trail • Oak Creek, Colorado 80467

Office: 970.736.2425 Mobile: 970.846.5779

e-mail: p.barry@barrycm.com

The information contained in or attached to this electronic message is privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error remove any record of this message.

From: Mark Fitzgerald [mailto:markfitz@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 9:07 AM
To: Roger Good; karl@trappermine.com
Cc: Chad James; CJ Berg; Dean Massey; Denise Brazier; Glen Airoidi; pattenjody@yahoo.com; Paul Barry; Scott Mader; Shallee Cunningham; Tim Miles
Subject: Re: Special Meeting

1st reading Grant Writer – YES

I am also inclined to agree with Karl's remark: "the Cap Tech commission provided very carefully considered and thoroughly debated recommendations to the EFB for funding under a wide variety of available dollar scenarios. If the EFB disagrees with these recommendations, they should just make whatever adjustments they feel are appropriate."

I plan to attend the meeting.

-Mark

On Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 2:49 PM, Karl Koehler <karl@trappermine.com> wrote:
All,

With regard to proposed Cap Tech agenda items:

1) I will not be inclined to disagree with Steamboat's final prioritization whatever that may be for the reasons I outlined at the last Cap Tech meeting; Steamboat's priorities are Steamboat's priorities and it is not in my view the EFB's or Cap Tech commission's responsibility to reprioritize funding needs for any

district. That's up to the respective administrations and school boards and it is what it is.

2) It seems to me we (Cap Tech) have parsed distributions under various funding levels dang near to death. Is it really necessary to now examine the relative *rates* that funds are added to or deducted from districts under different funding scenarios? Seems to me we could just go with the overall percentages as proposed at the next lowest funding level (for example if it turns out there are 1.16 million dollars available, use the percentages as defined for 1.15 million). Or if we really wanted to get picky, something not necessary in my view, just pro-rate the increases/decreases between districts between the higher/lower funding percentages defined. There's really nothing magic at all about the given percentages though. Perhaps I am misunderstanding this agenda item.

3) 1st reading Grant Writer – YES.

As for the push back from EFB, the Cap Tech commission provided very carefully considered and thoroughly debated recommendations to the EFB for funding under a wide variety of available dollar scenarios. If the EFB disagrees with these recommendations, they should just make whatever adjustments they feel are appropriate. I'm very reluctant to spend another evening rehashing these issues and fishing for an answer that may or may not be more palatable to the EFB, but will try to attend the meeting.

Sincerely,

Karl

From: Roger Good [mailto:roger@skigood.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 11:09 AM

To: Chad James; CJ Berg; Dean Massey; Denise Brazier; Glen Airoidi; Karl Koehler; Mark Fitzgerald; Me; pattenjody@yahoo.com; Paul Barry; Scott Mader; 'Shallee Cunningham'; Tim Miles

Subject: Special Meeting

Cap Tech Commission

As noted in this morning edition of the Steamboat Pilot, the second readings for both EdEx and CapTech were deferred until April 6th

The basis for this discussion is that Steamboat needed more time to work through absorbing the cuts we proposed in our meeting.

This will require us to have a SPECIAL meeting on the night of April 5th to review Steamboat final budget proposal.

One other point where we (CapTech) received a bit of push back from the EFB is the overall percentages of dollars flowing to Hayden and SOROCO at the higher funding amounts.

Our agenda for this meeting will be limited in scope to 3 very specific items

- 1) Agree or not with steamboats final prioritization after they work thru the budget numbers.
 - a. NOTE the total dollar amount under any overall budget scenario will not change, only shifting of the dollar amounts within the Steamboat requests.
- 2) Discussion of the rate that we "add funds" to the district as dollars increase above the minimum amount.
- 3) 1st reading on the grant writer. (this does not come out of CapTech dollars, it just needs to flow thru a commission)
 - a. This is largely a formality, I would propose we vote on this online.
 - b. If everyone voted via a one line email simply stating
 - i. 1st reading Grant Writer – YES or NO
 - c. I would be happy moving forward for 1st reading and have this done prior to the April 5th meeting.

MARK YOUR CALENDERS

Revisit 2nd reading

April 5th

5:30 PM

School District office in Steamboat

Roger

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

March 24, 2011

Dear Kristi,

I am writing to inform you that I am resigning from Educational Excellence and the Education Fund Board, effective after the June meetings. Due to an extensive travel schedule, I will be out of town for some very important meetings, and it would not serve the commissions well for me to remain on board. I have enjoyed and appreciated the work we have done on both commissions, and I appreciate your leadership.

Regards,

Don

From: Kristi brown (krisjeffb@hotmail.com)
To: dobrazier@yahoo.com;
Date: Fri, March 25, 2011 7:40:48 AM
Cc:
Subject: FW: EFB openings

Notice from Jill that she will not renew below for your records.

Have a great day!

*Kristi Brown
P.O. Box 883260
Steamboat Springs, CO 80488
home (970)879-7667
cell (970)819-0053*

From: jboyd12@mindspring.com
To: krisjeffb@hotmail.com
CC: donnierocky@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: EFB openings
Date: Thu, 24 Mar 2011 22:02:46 -0600

Do you have a copy of the Sunshine Laws that we could use to inform/educate such member(s) of ethics breach?
Also, my intention is to step down from Ed Ex as I've served two terms and ready to move on. Thanks, Jill

2011-2012 Cap Tech Comission WorkSheet - prioritized

Priority	Grant Name	Original		Voluntary		\$1.25M		\$1.2M		\$1.15M		\$1.1M		\$1.05M	
		Request		Reductions											
1	Hayden Tech Staff	\$49,839		\$49,839		\$49,839		\$49,839		\$49,839		\$49,839		\$49,839	
2	Hayden Microsoft	\$7,100		\$7,100		\$3,500		\$3,500		\$3,500		\$3,500		\$3,500	
3	Hayden Smart Board	\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000	
4	Hayden SW	\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000	
6	Hayden PCs	\$15,445		\$15,445		\$15,445		\$15,445		\$15,445		\$4,100		\$0	
7	Hayden Adobe	\$13,999		\$13,999		\$13,999		\$13,999		\$9,900		\$0		\$0	
8	Hayden Auditorium	\$25,500		\$25,500		\$25,500		\$9,000				\$0		\$0	
1	SBS Tech Staff	\$396,787		\$396,787		\$380,000		\$360,000		\$360,000		\$360,000		\$360,000	
2	SBS Software	\$124,213		\$124,213		\$124,213		\$124,213		\$124,213		\$124,213		\$124,213	
3	SBS Technology Network	\$100,000		\$100,000		\$100,000		\$100,000		\$100,000		\$100,000		\$100,000	
4	SBS Tech Hardware	\$363,500		\$363,500		\$351,500		\$350,000		\$332,500		\$325,000		\$282,500	
5	SBS Tech Training	\$10,000		\$10,000		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
6	SBS Data Analysis	\$20,000		\$20,000		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
7	SBS Tech Maint	\$27,500		\$27,500		\$27,500		\$27,500		\$27,500		\$27,500		\$27,500	
8	SBS Tech Marmot	\$15,000		\$15,000		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
9	SBS Tech SIS	\$25,000		\$25,000		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
10	SBS Tech DB	\$18,000		\$18,000		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
1	Soroco Chem Hood	\$16,500		\$16,500		\$16,500		\$16,500		\$16,500		\$16,500		\$16,500	
2	Soroco Smart Board	\$86,250		\$81,400		\$75,000		\$65,000		\$50,000		\$40,000		\$40,000	
3	Soroco PC	\$30,000		\$30,000		\$30,000		\$30,000		\$26,250		\$15,000		\$11,350	
4	Soroco Accelerated Reader	\$5,498		\$5,498		\$5,498		\$5,498		\$5,498		\$5,498		\$5,498	
5	Soroco Anti Virus	\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000	
6	Soroco Heated WW	\$34,595		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
	Soroco Booster	\$1,900		\$1,900		\$1,900		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
	Total Requested	\$1,417,626		\$1,378,181		\$1,251,394		\$1,201,494		\$1,152,145		\$1,102,150		\$1,051,900	
	Hayden Total Requests	\$139,883	9.9%	\$139,883	10.1%	\$136,283	10.9%	\$119,783	10.0%	\$106,684	9.3%	\$85,439	7.8%	\$81,339	7.7%
	SBS Total Requests	\$1,100,000	77.6%	\$1,100,000	79.8%	\$983,213	78.6%	\$961,713	80.0%	\$944,213	82.0%	\$936,713	85.0%	\$894,213	85.0%
	SOROCO Total Requests	\$177,743	12.5%	\$138,298	10.0%	\$131,898	10.5%	\$119,998	10.0%	\$101,248	8.8%	\$79,998	7.3%	\$76,348	7.3%

2011-2012 Budget Worksheet

HAYDEN	Tech Staff	Tech/Cap	\$49,839	\$49,839		
	2 Microsoft	Tech/Cap	\$3,500	\$3,500		
	3 Smart Board	Tech/Cap	\$25,000	\$25,000		
	4 Software	Tech/Cap	\$3,000	\$3,000		
	5 Intervention Specialist	Ed Ex	\$21,846	\$21,846		
	6 PCs	Tech/Cap	\$15,445	\$15,445		
	7 Adobe	Tech/Cap	\$13,999	\$9,900	2008-2009	0%
	8 Auditorium	Tech/Cap	\$25,500	\$0	2009-2010	4.11%
	9 Summer Intensives	Ed Ex	\$7,500	\$7,500	2010-2011	4.95%
	total 2011-2012		\$165,629	\$136,030		5.91%
SOROCO	Chem Hood	Tech/Cap	\$16,500	\$16,500		
	2 Smart Board	Tech/Cap	\$75,000	\$50,000		
	3 Intervention Support	Ed Ex	\$23,346	\$23,346		
	4 Curriculum Mapping Staff	Ed Ex	\$13,500	\$9,308		
	5 PC	Tech/Cap	\$30,000	\$26,250		
	6 Summer Intensives	Ed Ex	\$7,500	\$7,500	2008-2009	0%
	7 Accelerated Reader	Tech/Cap	\$5,498	\$5,498	2009-2010	3.24%
	8 Anti Virus	Tech/Cap	\$3,000	\$3,000	2010-2011	5.26%
	total 2011-2012		\$174,344	\$141,402		6.14%
SBS	Effictive Classrooms	Ed Ex	\$980,000	\$885,000		
	2 Software	Tech/Cap	\$124,213	\$124,213		
	2 Tech Hardware	Tech/Cap	\$351,500	\$332,500		
	2 Tech Maint	Tech/Cap	\$27,500	\$27,500		
	2 Tech Staff	Tech/Cap	\$380,000	\$360,000		
	2 Technology Network	Tech/Cap	\$100,000	\$100,000		
	3 Staff Development	Ed Ex	\$40,000	\$40,000	2008-2009	97.8%
	4 Spanish	Ed Ex	\$100,000	\$90,000	2009-2010	89.34%
	5 SBS Summer Intensives	Ed Ex	\$20,000	\$0	2010-2011	86.02%
	total 2011-2012		\$2,123,213	\$1,959,213		85.10%
COM	Partners (H/SR/SBS)	Ed Ex	\$50,000	\$37,500		
	Science School (H/SR/SBS)	Ed Ex	\$34,000	\$20,000	2008-2009	2.2%
	Yampatika (H/SR/SBS)	Ed Ex	\$29,692	\$8,000	2009-2010	3.31%
	Soroco Booster (SR)	Tech/Cap	\$1,900	\$0	2010-2011	3.77%
	total 2011-2012		\$115,592	\$65,500		2.85%
		Hayden	\$165,629	\$136,030		5.91%
		SOROCO	\$174,344	\$141,402		6.14%
		SBS	\$2,123,213	\$1,959,213		85.10%
		COM	\$115,592	\$65,500		2.85%

Program	Amount Requested	1 million funding	1.15 million funding	1.2 million funding
Effective Classrooms	980,000	813,000	885,000	916,000
Staff Development	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Spanish Language	100,000	80,000	90,000	100,000
Summer Intensives	35,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Hayden Intervention	21,846	21,846	21,846	21,846
Yampatika	29,692	0	8,000	14,020
Science School	34,000	0	20,000	20,000
Partners	50,000	0	37,500	37,500
New Requests				
SR Intervention	23,346	23,346	23,346	23,346
SR Curriculum Mapping	13,500	6,808	9,308	12,654
Total	1,327,384	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,200,366