

STEAMBOAT SPRINGS EDUCATION FUND GRANT COMMISSION  
November 20, 6:00 pm  
Human Services Center Downstairs Board Room  
Agenda

1. 6:00 Call to Order
2. 6:01 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. The maximum time allowed for the discussion of any single subject will be three 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. 6:04 Approval of Meeting Minutes from Grant Commission
  - Meeting of May 22, 2013
  - Meeting of October 15, 2013
4. 6:05 EFB November 6, 2013 meeting recap
5. 6:20 Grant Commission Vacancy (1)
6. 6:21 Accountability Reports
  - Deadline 11/11/13
  - Report to Board 12/4/13
7. 6:41 Innovation Grants:
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading \$50,000 12/4/13
  - Deadline 12/11/13
  - Awards 12/18/13
8. 6:45 Community Groups:
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading \$75,000 12/4/13
  - Deadline 1/8/14
  - Awards 1/15/14
9. 6:50 District 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Readings:
  - Deadline 2/1/14
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Readings 4/10/14
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Readings/Awards 5/10/14
10. 6:55 Other Business
11. 7:00 Adjourn

**DRAFT**

Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board  
Grant Commission Meeting  
May 22, 2013; 6:00 PM  
Human Service Center Board Room

Grant Commission members present included Glen Airoidi, Dean Massey, Paul Berry, Barb Parnell, Barbara Winternitz and Tina Krypious. Also present were Mike Luppes (Superintendent Hayden School District) and Mike Loomis (prospective Grant Commissioner). Denise Brazier, Ski Town Executive Service, LLC, recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

**Call to Order:**

Glen Airoidi called the Grant Commission meeting to order at 6:06 PM.

**Public Comment:**

There was no public comment.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes from Grant Commission meeting of May 1, 2013:**

*Paul made a motion and Dean seconded, to approve the meeting minutes of May 1, 2013, as presented.*

*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

**EFB May 8, 2013 Meeting Recap:**

Glen reported EFB heard and approved the 2<sup>nd</sup> readings. Tina Krypious and Barb Winternitz were approved for a seat on the Grant Commission and Jay O'Hare was approved for a seat on the EFB, all for 2-year terms. The officers (Pres. Kristi Brown, VP Dean Massey and Sec./Treas. Summer Johnston) will be the same for 2013/2014. The EFB approved a budget of \$ 2,552,000 for 2013/2014.

**Hayden 1<sup>st</sup> Reading:**

Hayden School District Laptop Computers @ \$ 17,218.40:

Mike Luppes doesn't have an exact plan nailed down for the laptops but the laptops will probably be at the elementary school and moved from classroom to classroom. All the software the district has can be used on the tablets. This request is not to update, but to add to the current inventory.

*Dean made a motion and Barb seconded, to approve for 1<sup>st</sup> reading Hayden's request for Laptop Computers at an amount not to exceed \$ 15,000.*

*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

**Hayden 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading:**

*Dean made a motion and Paul seconded, to approve for 2<sup>nd</sup> reading Hayden's request for Laptop Computers at an amount not to exceed \$ 15,000.*

*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

**Interview Candidates for Potential Commission Seats:**

Michael Loomis was present as a potential member of the Grant Commission. Michael was on the Education Fund Board and commissions in the past and asked about the current structure. Michael prefers a 1-year term.

**GC Chairs and Representatives to the EFB:**

Current chairs of the Grant Commission are Glen Airoidi and Stuart Handloff. Glen will not be re-upping for 2013/2014. Dean will continue to represent the GC at the EFB meetings and Tina indicated some interest. The commission will decide during the Sept. 18, 2013 meeting the new chairs and the 2<sup>nd</sup> representative to the EFB.

The next Grant Commission meeting is scheduled for September 18, 2013.

**Adjourn:**

*A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.* The Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board Grant Commission meeting adjourned @ 6:38 PM.

**DRAFT**

STEAMBOAT SPRINGS EDUCATION FUND BOARD  
GRANT COMMISSION  
October 16, 2013; 6:00 pm  
Human Services Center Upstairs Board Room

Grant Commissioners present included Dean Massey, Barbara Winternitz, Stuart Handloff, Tina Kyprios, Barb Parnell and Beth Wilhelm. Also present were Grant Commission applicants Glen Airoidi and Mike Loomis, Kristi Brown (Chairperson EFB) and Denise Connelly (EFB school board representative). Denise Brazier, Ski Town Executive Service, LLC, recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

**Call to Order:** Dean Massey called the Grant Commission meeting to order at 6:11 PM.

**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. The maximum time allowed for the discussion of any single subject will be three 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.

There was no public comment.

**Commission Chair:** Mike Loomis declined a request to run to Grant Commission chairperson. *Barb Winternitz made a motion and Tina Kyprios seconded, to approve Stuart Handloff as Grant Commission chairperson.*

*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

**Approval of Meeting Minutes from Grant Commission meeting of May 22, 2013:** Approval of the Grant Commission meeting minutes was postponed until the November meeting.

**EFB October 2, 2013 meeting recap:** The EFB meeting recap was read from the draft EFB minutes of October 2, 2013.

*Mike Loomis made a motion and Beth Wilhelm seconded, to approve the new grant application forms included in the meeting packet and attached to these minutes.*

*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

**Grant Commission vacancies:** Glen Airoidi served on the Grant Commission the past 3 years and is able to serve again. *Dean Massey made a motion and Barb Parnell seconded, to approve a recommendation to the EFB for Glen Airoidi as a Grant Commissioner.*

*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

**Appoint 2 (or 3) GC reps to the EFB:** Dean Massey is a representative to the EFB. Dean explained advantages of having Grant Commission representation. The representatives are able to both make recommendations to the EFB and to vote. Mike Loomis and Glen Airoidi volunteered to share the 2<sup>nd</sup>

---

Grant Commission Meeting

representative position. Kristi noted the importance of attendance to the EFB meetings as at least 2 representatives are sometimes needed to establish a quorum.

**Meeting Protocol:** Stuart Handloff encouraged Grant Commissioners to be on time to be able to start the meetings at 6:00 PM, the meetings are the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month, if unable to attend to let Denise Brazier know, that Robert's Rules of order are somewhat flexible but that formal motions and voting are required. Stuart will attempt to end the meetings on time and the agenda will include time slots for each agenda item.

**Innovation Grant:**

- **Apply for extra reserve money:** Dean reviewed the purpose and history of the Innovation Grants and noted the grants have been successful in all 3 districts. The Grant Commission recommends the amount for the grants and the EFB gives approval. Timing of the Innovation Grants was discussed as some believe approval of the grant should be pushed ahead for the teacher's benefit. The commission decided to include in the letter to the districts announcing the Innovation Grants language regarding requests for technology are not to be like last year (for tablets, I-Pads, etc.). *Dean Massey made a motion and Beth Wilhelm seconded, to recommend to EFB an allocation of \$ 50,000 for Innovation Grants.* Discussion: The commission discussed the reason why the Innovation Grants weren't part of the regular budget process.  
*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*
- **Prepare letter to districts announcing Innovation Grant:** The Grant Commission discussed if the letter should be sent out after the amount allocated is approved. Dean will write the letter to the districts announcing the Innovation Grant and will include the technology piece. The Commission decided to draft the letter to the districts written now and Dean will distribute a copy to the board before distribution to the districts. The deadline for Innovation Grants is December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

**Applications proposed by summer work group:** The applications proposed by the summer work group are included in meeting packet and were approved earlier during this meeting.

Barb Parnell thanked Kristi Brown for scheduling the summer workshops. Kristi Brown thanked those who attended for their participation.

**Set Deadlines:**

- **Community Group Applications:** The Commission discussed the Community Group grant process which is the same as the Innovation Grant. The amount last year allocated to Community Groups was \$ 70,000. *Mike Loomis made a motion and Dean Massey seconded, to recommend to the EFB an allocation of \$ 75,000 for the Community Groups.* Discussion: Denise Connelly noted the more money allocated to the Community Groups, the less would be available for the schools.  
*Vote: \_\_\_ 6 Yes \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 0 No \_\_\_ The motion passed unanimously.*

The deadline for Community Group applications is Jan. 8<sup>th</sup> and will be awarded Jan. 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014. Stuart will put together a calendar for the Grant Commission to include deadlines for applications. The Commission discussed limiting the number of times a community group is awarded a grant and how the community group grants are marketed in the community. Limiting the number of grants will be a topic of discussion for the November meeting and those involved with the community groups will be invited to attend.

**Discuss dates for district 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> readings:** The commission decided to talk to the EFB and receive feedback from Brad Meeks before finalizing dates for the district 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> readings.

**Set dates and time for Grant Commission meetings for the year:** Dates and times for the Grant Commission meetings was previously discussed. Meetings requiring longer time periods will start at 5:30 and the change in timing will be announced.

Deadlines for accountability reports will be added to the agenda for November and Barb Parnell will research the timeline.

**Adjourn:**

*A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.*

6 Yes 0 No *The motion passed unanimously.*

The Grant Commission meeting adjourned at 7:34 PM.

## ISSUE OUTLINE

### Primary Roles and Responsibilities

Board: Governance. Budget. Final approval of grants. Community outreach.

Grants Commission: Vet grant requests. Verify accountability of previous grants.

### Award of Gifts

Gifts are awarded upon application to the EFB and a multi step review process, in which the applications are thoroughly vetted by the Grant Commission with further review by the Board. In summary, the process includes a written application, a period for written comments from both Board and Grant Commission members, written responses from each applicant, a first reading and second reading by both the Grant Commission and Board, with the final decisions made by the Board following second reading. In theory, the Grant Commission's role is to utilize the expertise of the various members of the commission to thoroughly vet each request and ultimately make recommendations for action to the board as to whether or not to fund each grant and at what funding level.

#### Substantive Issues for Discussion:

1. What are the standards and criteria against which each gift is to be analyzed and decisions made? The standards clearly include whether the application is consistent with the mission statement of the SSEF. Should they also include whether the applicant has identified measurable goals consistent with the mission statement and whether, in the judgment of the board/Commission, there is a reasonable chance of attaining those goals? Is there sufficient specificity in the application to assure a way of measuring success? Are these the standards? Are there others which should be considered??

2. What is the appropriate level and depth of inquiry for the Commission as it deliberates and makes a decision? This issue resulted in a fundamental disagreement among the Commission members during deliberations for the past round of grants and focused the need for guidance from the board as to the scope of review. While it permeated the entire review process, the issue was framed in the review of the technology grants from all three districts. One philosophy contemplated a fairly deep and sophisticated review of the grant requests, looking at the types and numbers of specific technology requested and how/if they would be used in the educational process and to a lesser extent the probability of success. The counter point was framed by a question asked by one of the commission members "who are we to question whether they (the teachers/tech directors/administrators) need this? They are the educational professionals". This approach would significantly limit the scope of the review to basically fit the request into the budget. The Commission requests direction from the Board.

3. What level of deference should be give to the district's prioritization? What if we do not get a prioritization from the district or disagree with the prioritization given? Last year the Commission rejected a grant request for the Hayden Auditorium outright and recommended funding grants lower on the District's prioritization list instead.

## Procedural Issues for Discussion:

1. What is the purpose of the 1<sup>st</sup> reading and 2<sup>nd</sup> reading procedure? 1<sup>st</sup> readings are voted on by the Commission and then presented to the Board but not voted on by the Board. If an application does not pass the 1<sup>st</sup> reading by the Commission, it is dead. Eg Hayden Auditorium last year. The 2 reading system, while lengthy, provides multiple opportunities for participation by parents, teachers and interested community members. This process is consistent with what other tax-funded entities do.

2. The preliminary budget/preliminary allocation. Last year the Board made a preliminary budget and allocations prior to 1<sup>st</sup> readings and revised those allocations prior to 2<sup>nd</sup> readings. Was this a successful strategy?

3. What role does/should the EFB have, vs. the Commission regarding allocations between districts? Last year the Board requested that the Commission recommendation included a minimum award for SBS grants, with the remainder being allocated between the 3 districts at the discretion of the Commission. Did this work?

### **Establishment and Implementation of SSEF Bylaws and policies and procedures**

Board: Approves and implements SSEF Bylaws and policies and procedures

Grants Commission: Reviews proposals, initiates new proposals as appropriate, participates in discussions regarding bylaws and policies and procedures

### **Establishment of Annual SSEF budget**

Board: Conducts a monthly review of SSEF financial report, develops preliminary and final annual SSEF budget for all revenues and expenditures, including gifts, administrative costs and cash reserves.

Grants Commission: Thoroughly vets all grant applications on the basis of merit. Makes recommendations to board regarding the award of gifts to the 3 Rt. County school districts within the EFB approved budget. Directly awards grants to Community Groups and Innovation Grant applicants within the budget approved by the Board.

### **Perform governance functions on behalf of the SSEF**

Board: Holds monthly meetings that are open to the public. Agendas and meeting materials are made available to all board members in advance. Notice of meetings are posted at all 3 school district offices and announced in the newspaper Happenings. Conducts a monthly review of SSEF financial report, administrative costs and cash reserves. Approves annual budget. Reports State of the Fund on an annual basis to the City Council. Files IRS forms. Reviews tax returns and annual audit. Maintains SSEF website. Conducts annual community outreach. Advertises and fills vacant seats on board and commission. Annually evaluate and make changes that improve the process.

**Grants Commission:** Holds monthly meetings that are open to the public. Agendas and meeting materials are made available to all commission members in advance. Notice of meetings are posted at all 3 school district offices and announced in the newspaper Happenings. Makes recommendations to board regarding Commission vacancies. Completes annual accountability reports on previous year's gifts.

## 2012-2013 EFB Funding Accountability Report

11/14/13

Prepared by Barb Parnell

In an effort to standardize outcome reporting, a new excel spreadsheet form was developed. Accountability reports were submitted from 23 of the 24 School District and Community Group grants. A thorough review of the goals and outcome measures reported on each grant application were compared with the data supplied on the accountability reports. A summary of School District and Community Group grant goals and outcomes are attached. (Please note that red is where outcome measures were outlined in the grant application but no data was reported).

### **School District Grants**

The School District grants funded by EFB included personnel, technology (software, hardware and networking) and capital projects. While all students and staff were impacted by one or more of the grants, ELL and GT students in Steamboat Springs and students accessing the Response to Intervention program in Hayden were specifically targeted in a few of the funded grants.

Twelve of the funded grants were technology based and were the only grants submitted by SOROCO, 75% of grants submitted by Hayden and 50% of the grants for Steamboat Springs. All of the target technology projects were completed with the exception of networking between SOROCO and Steamboat Springs Districts, which was not completed due to issues with Eagle Net. A significant amount of funding was used to successfully accomplish upgrades and to improve the technology and connection that is available to students and teachers in the classroom.

One of the most "highly discussed" and largest grant request was Steamboat Springs Effective Classroom. Outcomes indicated student-teacher ratios were 21 and 21.8 for SPE and SCE, respectively and 22 for SSMS and 24.8 for SSHS. The District's policy is 20:1 for elementary levels and 25:1 for the secondary. With the exception of this outcome, Steamboat Springs School District met or exceeded all the other goals that were identified on their grant applications.

### **Community Group Grants**

Three community group reports were received including Yampatika, Partners and Yampa Valley Science School. The community programs outcomes continued to show strong positive impact on student achievement and teacher support for all three programs.

## **Challenges**

While there were a number of challenges identified by grantees, they were able to overcome the challenges to successfully complete the projects outlined.

There were a few challenges with the grant accountability process. All three school districts missed the report deadline in completing portions or all of the accountability report form and two of the Districts used their own form and were asked to redo it using the form that was provided. In addition, there were a number of areas where outcomes were not reported despite the grant application clearly stating that a specific outcome would be measured. A recommendation is that all outcomes that are "missing" be completed prior to the Community Groups or School Districts submission of a grant application in 2013-2014. Lastly, in a few areas the specific outcome was not clearly stated in the grant application, thus it was difficult to assess if the goals of the project were met. With the new grant application form it is expected that this will be eliminated. However, it is recommended that during the review process, the Grant Commission work with the applicant to write clear goals and measurement outcomes.

**Education Fund Board Grant Accountability**

Title	Goal to be achieved	Target group- Number reached	Measurements
<b>Partners School Based Mentoring Program</b>	Increase mentors from 7 to 9 and to expand the program into Steamboat Springs 2 elementary schools.	72 target students	Successful placement of 2 additional mentors in Strawberry Park and Soda Creek Elementary Schools.
	Providing direct mentoring and tutoring services to 72 targets students (eight/mentor) and to provide constructive and safe in-school and after-school programmatic opportunities to target students and other interested students.	72 target students; 376 students via in-school and after-school programming	Time spent with each target student every week; in-school and after-school programming sessions tracked weekly
			Pre and post surveys


<p>Yampatika</p>	<p><b>Yampatika's ELP will continue to advance:</b> 21st century skills, innovation and STEM skills; provide for excellence in academic achievement; achieve low instructor/student ratios; provide a connection for community and environment; and utilize verifiable and meaningful outcomes/data in its evaluation. <b>Yampatika's ELP will be a program model</b> for state-of-the-art, community-based science education, state-wide and nationally.</p>	<p>Our target populations was 30 classrooms, or approximately 600 students in 2012-13. With support from the EFB, Yampatika's ELP reached 42 classrooms and 800 students, a 56% increase over last year. All 22 K-5 classrooms in the Hayden and South Routt School Districts participated in the program. Twenty K-5 classrooms of the 55 in the Steamboat Springs School District participated.</p>	<p><b>Students will demonstrate improved academic performance and positive changes in attitudes towards learning in general and the environment, and community.</b></p>
------------------	---	---	---

			<b>The program will assist teachers in adhering to state standards.</b>
--	--	--	---

			<p>The program will assist teachers in adhering to state standards.</p>
			<p>Yampatika's ELP will be a program model that can be replicated statewide and nationally.</p>

Yampa Valley  
Science School  
2012-2013 School  
Year

**Goal #1:**  
Provide all Routt County sixth grade students with a quality, place-based environmental science education program. Sixth grade participants will demonstrate greater academic understanding while enjoying their learning experience.

**Goal #2:**  
Sixth grade participants will be more engaged in school through greater levels of comfort with teachers, peers, and older students.

**Goal #3:**  
Sixth grade participants will gain greater sense of place, and responsibility for their community.

All sixth grade students in Routt County, and 30 High School Jrs and Srs. In 2012, YVSS served 249 sixth grade students (SSMS: 171. Hayden: 26. Soroco: 32. North Routt Charter: 10. Emerald Mountain School: 7. Heritage Christian: 3.) and 30 High School Jrs and Srs (SSHS: 25. Soroco HS: 5).

Yampa Valley Science School sixth grade participants will show an overall average increase in environmental science knowledge of at least 35%, as a result of their participation in YVSS measured through self-report pre/post survey. 75% of sixth-grade participants will report they enjoyed their experience at YVSS measured through self-report post survey.

80% of sixth-graders will report that science school helps them feel more comfortable with their teachers, high school students and other middle school students, as measured through a self-report post survey.

80% of sixth-graders will report that science school helps them feel that they can help their community, as measured through a self-report post survey.

	<p>Goal #4: Local high school juniors and seniors will gain positive experiential leadership opportunities while enjoying their experience.</p>		<p>At least 30 high school students (juniors and seniors) will gain valuable leadership skills through their participation as Junior Leaders in the program, and will enjoy their experience, as measured by post self-report surveys.</p>
	<p>Goal #5: High school Junior Leader participants will gain a greater sense of place, and responsibility for their community.</p>		<p>80% of high school Junior Leader participants will report that science school helps them feel that they can help their community, as measured through a self-report post survey.</p>
			<p>. 75% of sixth-grade participants will report they enjoyed their experience at YVSS measured through self-report post survey. [addresses Goal #1]</p>
			<p>E. 90% of the reporting high school Junior Leaders will report that science school helps them feel that they are valued by their community, as measured by a self-report post survey. [addresses Goal #2 and Outcome 4]</p>

			G. 75% of Junior Leaders surveyed will report that science school helps them gain leadership skills, as measured by a self-report post survey. [addresses Goal #2 and Outcome 4]
			H. 75% of the reporting high school Junior Leaders will report they enjoyed their experience at YVSS as measured through self-report post survey. [addresses Goal #2 and Outcome 4]

Report		
Outcome	Challenges- Lessons Learned	funded amount
2 School Based Mentors (SBM) recruited, trained and placed at the elementary schools. School Administrators & Site Supervisors identified, trained, MOU's drafted and signed, school staff educated on SBM role, responsibility and AmeriCorp limitations. 9 Target students indentified and received	The SBM role can be difficult to grasp until the school sees the program in action, and PRC needs to continue to make an effort to educate faculty and staff about the program and the expectations of SBMs	\$ 37,500
2,250 hours of one-to-one mentoring services given to target students; 244 sessions of after-school programming (total of 339 hours), 117 sessions of in-school programing (50 hours)	Balancing one on one time with the importance of being in the classroom is always a challenge; the support of teachers allows mentoring to happen	
School-Bonding - target students started high on a 5 point scale and remained at the same level	measuring school-bonding at the end of the year always presents a challenge	
Self-Esteem - target students report increased self-esteem at a level that is approaching significance		
Adult Bonding - target students demonstrate increased adult bonding at a level that is statistically signigicant		

<p>3. By June 15, 2012, 72 students receiving School-Based Mentoring services will decrease, or maintain, acts of general delinquency. Post mean: 1.80/5.</p> <p>4. By June 15, 2012, 72 students receiving School-Based Mentoring services will increase, or maintain, decision-making skills. Post mean: 2.31/4.</p> <p>5. By June 15, 2012, 72 students receiving School-Based Mentoring services will increase, or maintain, social and communication skills. Post mean: 2.67/4</p> <p>6. A. By June 15, 2012, 72 students receiving School-Based Mentoring services will increase self-reported grades. Post mean: Not able to be determine as scale is new and baseline has not yet been established. Grades, attendance, and behavioral incidence records will be also be collected, and, a simple statistical analysis will be conducted by Partners staff.</p>		
---	--	--

<p>Yampatika invests in professional, third-party evaluation on an annual basis for the ELP to ensure the program is effective in meeting academic objectives and helps students meet and exceed state educational standards in STEM-related areas. These program evaluations prove, on a local level, what national research has confirmed: children's academic achievement and critical thinking skills grow substantially through hands-on environmental education; student-to-student and student-to-teacher collaboration and cooperation increases; and students show much greater concern what they can do to help preserve the land, water, animals and our communities. The final evaluation report is attached. As in previous years, the first, third, and fourth grade classes showed a significant difference between the pre- and post-program knowledge tests given during the Environmental Literacy Program. This means, that at a 95% confidence level, that the pre-program scores differ from the post-program scores in a positive way. Students are increasing their knowledge of the natural environment.</p>	<p>A major challenge that we have experienced this year is the increased demand for the ELP in the SSSD school district. At present, we are serving 46% of the classrooms in the two elementary schools in SSSD. However, that means that 54% remain unserved. This is particularly complicated given that grade levels are now teaching as blocks. We must reach point where all classrooms have equal opportunity to this program. With the help of classroom teachers, we have been able to extend the program's reach in 2013-14 using Challenge Fund Grants.</p>	<p>\$8,000</p>
--	---	----------------

<p>According to our evaluation, teachers chose the Environmental Literacy Program because it is: Aligned to the curriculum, Teaches about the local environment, Connects students to the community, It provides a new way of teaching - hands-on experience, It is a quality program. "It is so important to teach kids to be good stewards of their environment with informed, mindset. Yampatika teaches this better than I can by myself."</p>	<p>In our evaluation, the willingness-to-pay subject brought the most negative responses by participating teachers. Most teachers would not pay for the Environmental Literacy Program, nor would they be willing to find funding for their classrooms to attend the program. When asked what they would pay for a program, most responded that they have very tight budgets and that it would be unlikely that they would participate in the program because of this. Teachers that did write an appropriate cost, indicated that \$1.00 to \$5.00 per student would an appropriate amount for the entire three session program.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>85% of teachers were satisfied with the program experience.</p>	<p>Of the three curriculum sessions, 77% of the teachers listed the field trip as their favorite session. The reasons for this selection were much like those with the overall program experience. Teachers like the hands-on curriculum that allowed students to be more engaged when they were outdoors. Teachers also believe that being outside allows to make more connections to the real world and to a better understanding about the community in which they live. Teachers' comments regarding the field trip include the following: "The students combined their knowledge and could apply and synthesize and analyze their learning process." "The students don't get to go on many field trips. They value the experiences during these trips!"</p>	
<p>20 teachers/educators from 4 NW CO Counties attended an April 2013 workshop, offered in partnership with the Colorado Alliance for Environmental Education (CAEEE). The workshop focused on helping them use best practices in environmental literacy programming.</p>	<p>Being invited to serve as a statewide model program has been a tremendous affirmation that Yampatika's ELP is the wave of the future in education. However, the number of requests for speaking engagements, training, and sharing of the model far exceed what our limited budget allows for.</p>	

<p>Sixth grade participants demonstrated an increase in education understanding of 39% based on the pre-post education test results. Also refer to the <u>attached letter from SSMS 6th grade teachers</u>. 97% of students stated "Yes, 2% stated "Maybe", and 1% stated "No" they enjoyed their experience at YVSS.</p>		
<p>Post program results indicate that 59% of sixth grade students surveyed stated "Yes", 18% stated "Maybe", 9% stated "no", and 14% were unsure that science school helped them feel more comfortable with their teachers. As related to high school students, the responses were 79% stated "Yes", 10% stated "Maybe", 7% stated "no", and 4% were unsure. As related to their classmates, the responses were 83% stated "Yes", 7% stated "Maybe", 6% stated "no", and 4% were unsure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrollment packets were not sent out with the SSMS registration materials causing a lot of work for YVSS staff and delays in coordinating student rosters and parent volunteers.</li> <li>• Camp Nurse position was not fully utilized as the only candidate found was only available for most medication administration times.</li> <li>• Many SSMS parents signed up at the last minute since they did not know which week their child was attending until the Friday before the first YVSS SSMS week.</li> <li>• YVSS week for non-SSMS schools remains to be challenging to rally parents given that most of the parents live outside of Steamboat.</li> <li>• SSMS teachers departed on certain days without a plan in advance to have staff prepared to take over their activities.</li> </ul>	20,000
<p>78% of students reported "Yes", 9% reported "maybe", 5% reported "no", and 8% were "unsure" that science school helped them feel that they can help their community.</p>	<p>All of these issues have been reviewed</p>	

<p>100% of the 30 high school Junior Leaders felt that science school helped them to gain leadership skills and stated they enjoyed their YVSS experience.</p>	<p>All of these issues have been reviewed and revisions were made for the 2013 program year.</p>
<p>91% of high school students reported "Yes", and 9% reported "maybe" that science school helped them feel they can help their community.</p>	
<p>?</p>	


?

?

1  
2  
3

**Education Fund Board Grant Accountability Report for School Dis**

<b>Grant title</b>	<b>Goal to be achieved</b>	<b>Target group- Number reached</b>	<b>measurements</b>
HSD Tech Support Member	To provide personnel to assist the director of technology in providing staff and student technology support and training.	All staff and students in the Hayden School District	A daily measure of success is evidenced by the continued trouble free use of technology resources within the district, and the availability of the technology staff to assist with user issues and training.
Hayden Valley Elementary Infrastructure Improvements	Replace leased T1 circuits with Motorola PTP500 Point to Point Wireless Link. Replace Cisco routing and switching hardware that is 10 + years old. Allow the implementation of "VLAN Trunking" that is not supported by the T1's currently in use.	All Hayden Valley Elementary staff, students, and guests.	Increased Internet and network access speeds. Automatic configuration of wireless devices will be reflected in less technology support man hours spent assisting staff, students, and guests. Increased switch capacity will be evidenced in an increased communication/safety capacity. Approximately \$7,000.00 per year will be freed up to address other technology related issues.
HSD Software Licensing	Yearly renewal & upgrades of Microsoft: Server, Client Access License, Windows OS, Office - Yearly renewal of Renaissance Learning: Accelerated Reader, STAR Reading, STAR Early Literacy, English in a Flash, Accelerated Math	All staff and students in the Hayden School District.	Completion of the annual Microsoft Licensing Agreement. The continued use of the Renaissance Learning program.

HSD PowerSchool update & server	Upgrade PowerSchool to version 7, and replace server to meet minimum hardware requirements of new version.	All staff and students in the Hayden School District.	Completion of project as specified in deployment timeline, including data transfer and successful testing.
Hayden Valley Elementary Computers	To replace the existing 24 computers and monitors in the Hayden Valley Elementary computer lab in accordance with the District Technology Plan schedule.	Hayden Valley Elementary Students	New units to be received, configured, and deployed starting 7/1/2012, with a project completion date on or before 8/15/2012. Final testing of units to be conducted by the HVE lab instructor during the week prior to the beginning of the 2012/13 school year.
HSD SmartBoard Peripherals	To have a Smart document camera paired with every SmartBoard throughout the school district.	All staff and students in the Hayden School District.	Document cameras will be ordered on or after 7/1/2012 and deployed prior to the start of the 2012/13 school year.

<p>NRCS- Expeditionary Learning</p>	<p>Professionally develop teachers through the use of our School Designer with EL protocols and attend EL Institutes(Teacher Institutes).</p>	<p>80 Students, 8 Teachers, and 6 support staff.</p>	<p>Improve student test score through active and engaging Expeditionary Lessons. To teach the teachers how to develop thorough Expeditions based on state standards and student assessments. In addition to guided staff development and planning, Expeditionary Learning also provides a yearly progress document based on movement towards the EL model. This report measures growth in five areas: design and implementation of learning expeditions, active pedagogy and effective use of classroom instructional practices, culture and character across the school, leadership in school improvement and school structure.</p>
<p>Connect networks for SOROCO &amp; SS</p>	<p>Install Radio's at the two tower locations of Emerald Mountain and Oak Creek and on the District facilities located at Yampa and Oak Creek.</p>	<p>Original grant, all of Soroco, but scaled back primarily for Yampa Elementary. Yampa now has a useful connection to the remainder of the District.</p>	<p>If this network was completed in full to SSSD it would provide a means to consolidate firewall, content filter, switch management, wireless management, internet. It would also allow for future consolidation of many other ideas not yet considered.</p>

	Soroco and Steamboat networks will converge at Emerald Mountain.		A) Internal bandwidth increased between Soroco campuses of Yampa and Oak Creek
			A) Internet increase from 6MB to 45MB for Soroco
			B) Single management from either Steamboat or Soroco networks
			C) Consolidation of servers between Elementary and Oak Creek
Soroco/Hardware/ Infrastructure:	SmartBoards	All Soroco, students and staff	A) All classrooms outfitted with SB technology
	Infrastructure: rewire		A) Eliminate mini switches throughout district classrooms

	Infrastructure: install/upgrade switches		A) Replaced aging Cisco and Dell switches
			B) Add VLAN Security
			C) Added POE capability
Auditorium/Theater	Upgrade the existing facility to the level of a new auditorium!	The entire school district population, as well as the community at large.	We held at least 10 school programs in the auditorium. Also 2 community memorial services, 3 community events, and numerous general student activities and assemblies throughout the year.

	<p>To target students recommended for our Response to Intervention program in order to provide appropriate support through interventions and enrichments.</p>	<p>Our interventionist specialist sees approximately 20 students per day, along with working in some classrooms.</p>	<p>Last spring, our Middle School Math TCAP Proficient/Advanced %age rose 14% from the year before (39% to 53%), Reading rose 10% (from 65% to 75%). Writing scores rose 16% (from 42% to 58%). We will utilize ongoing growth data with Acuity Testing and In-House formative assessments. We are also beginning a reading intervention with Reading Plus. We will also utilize yearly data based on the Colorado Student Growth Model as it relates to the Colorado Student Assessment Program.</p>
<p>Middle School Inter SS Effective Classrooms</p>	<p>Objective 1: Work to maintain class sizes in accordance with school district policy I-14, Class Size. According to policy the elementary staffing ratio is 20:1 and the secondary level is 25:1.</p>	<p>2400 students- all levels</p>	<p>Class size ratios for 2012-13</p>

	<p>Objective 2: As stated in board policy regarding Results for Academic Achievement (R-2), students will have and apply the essential academic skills and knowledge. Every student will show evidence of reasonable growth each year.</p>		<p>TCAP (formerly CSAP) Students will continue to meet or exceed the state's proficiency goal;</p>
			<p>Colorado Growth Model- Student will continue to meet or exceed the academic growth targets</p>
			<p>Academic Growth Gaps- Achievement gaps within subgroup populations will diminish</p>
			<p>Post Secondary and Workforce Readiness Students will continue to exceed the targets in this area</p>
			<p>Accredited with Distinction- The district will strive to earn this honor in 2012.</p>

ELL Students		All identified ELL students in the district	Improve ELL student growth percentile in math by at least 10 percentage points (currently 58 percentile) Adequate by state standards is 81 percentile
			Improve ELL student growth percent in reading by at least 7 percentage points (currently 45 percentile) Adequate by state standards is 65 percentile
			Improve ELL student growth percentile in writing to at least the state measure of adequate growth (ours is currently 60 percentile and Adequate is 61).
GT students			GT: Maintain current growth percentile in math, reading, and writing. Current growth percentiles are 70 in math (Adequate is 10), 64 in Reading (Adequate is 6), and 65 in writing (Adequate is 11).

SBS Literacy Coaches	<p><b>Note that the original grant envisioned a cooperative effort between districts. As SSSD was the only district that ultimately submitted the grant. For that reason objectives in the accountability report have been adjusted to reflect those changes. The first set of outcome objectives dealt with the Mile High Literacy Grant and therefore are no longer valid.</b></p>	<p>Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.</p>	
	<p>Outcome Objectives:  Increase the number of students moving from unsatisfactory to partially proficient. Increasing the number of students moving from partially proficient to proficient on TCAP</p>		<p>TCAP Scores</p>

	<p>Learning coaches will prioritize and provide the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Coordinate consistent curriculum and instructional practices among classrooms.</li><li>2) Provide on-going professional development for teachers through coaching including:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Reading strategy trainings</li><li>b. Modeling of effective instructional strategies in individual teacher classrooms</li><li>c. Conduct observations to monitor teacher use of strategies to ensure fidelity</li><li>d. Individualized debriefing sessions for both modeling and observations.</li><li>e. Discussions about use of research based strategies in teachers' Professional Learning Communities</li><li>f. Participation in grade level and integrated curriculum team meetings for Response to Intervention.</li><li>g. Offering expertise in targeted assessments to determine students' needs</li><li>h. Analysis of intervention data to determine further interventions for students.</li></ol></li></ol>		<p>Evidence of student interventions and achievement.</p> <p>End of the school year test scores for students who were not reading at grade level at the beginning of the year</p> <p>Evidence of training attended by instructional coaches</p> <p>Evidence of on-going professional development provided by coaches</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>3) Coordinate literacy parent education</p> <p>a. The school districts will partner with other community agencies in order to encourage attendance for parents with low-income, low-achieving students.</p> <p>b. Parent literacy classes may be held in conjunction with literacy classes for children through 3rd grade.</p> <p>3) Participate in K-3 grade level team meetings for Response to Intervention. The team identifies students who need additional support beyond the core curriculum in order to be successful.</p> <p>a. Learning coach will offer expertise in targeted assessments to determine students' needs</p> <p>b. Learning coach will help in identifying appropriate interventions</p> <p>c. Learning coach will assist in analyzing intervention data to determine further interventions for students.</p> <p>5) Train and coordinate volunteers to work with children in the schools</p>		<p>Evidence of partnerships: Notes from meetings and conversations with partners; Identification of families believed to be reached through partnerships.</p> <p>Evidence of effective parent education classes: Parents will be offered to surveys on the helpfulness and logistical ease of attending classes. Survey results can provide quantitative and qualitative outputs.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>SBS Staff Development</p>	<p>To provide professional growth opportunities for all staff; classified and certificated (not including administrative per the request of the EFB). Our district will develop a staff development plan for the 2012-13 school year which will outline the priorities for professional growth. This plan will be developed by using a variety of input sources including staff surveys, information from the Colorado Department of Education, the use of a professional development council, and input from school administration.</p> <p>To provide staff development opportunities for staff in order to keep them current with best practices, allow for networking outside of Steamboat, and outside of Colorado, and to encourage new and innovative thinking in the school setting. To insure that all of our staff have the necessary training to implement any school, district, regional, and state initiatives and programs. Staff development funds are spent on training of new curriculum, new materials, and new strategies in the classroom.</p>	<p>Approximately 250 staff members (Does not include administrative staff), All 2400 students in the district.</p>	<p>Comprehensive Staff Development Plan developed and advertised. Trainings that are focused on new curriculum programs will use student achievement measures over time as one indicator to assess success. Such measure include, but are not limited to, TCAP, MAPs, and COACT. As an example the evaluation for a staff training that is centered on the Elementary Writing Program of Every Child a Writer would examine TCAP and MAPs (NWEA) scores for cohorts of students before and after the training to determine the effectiveness of the training. Trainings that dealt with the Literacy and State Academic standards would be able to use achievement data from reading assessments (TCAP and MAPs) or from content area tests (e.g. Science MAPs). These measurements would vary based upon the content of the trainings.</p>
------------------------------	---	--	---

			Number of staff participating in staff development opportunities
			Results of Staff Development Survey
Steamboat Spanish	2) Of the students testing below grade level in beginning of year 2013 assessments, 20% will have moved into proficiency by the end of the 2013-2014 as determined by appropriate literacy assessment.	518 Students, Grades 6-8	Number of students being placed in advanced levels of Spanish at Steamboat Springs High School.

SBS Tech Staff	1) Support our end users (students/staff) as best we can and provide technology access that meets their needs to the best of our ability	Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.	a) Help Desk Tickets b) Talk with Staff c) Local support at each building d) How many people does this fund?
SBS Tech Software	1) Provide support and appropriate access to all of our applications both inside and outside our walls	Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.	a) Access to apps inside/out b) Access to apps based upon proper demographics, (Grade, Person, Location)
	2) Work with Staff and other personnel to review and evaluate. We are in the process of upgrades to the Elementary environment which is forcing us to retire some applications and find replacement for others. 3) Work closely with our new Teaching and Learning Director as it relates in the review of these applications		a) Meet with appropriate personnel to review applications
	4) Move key applications to internet based where it makes sense		a) Are applications moving to cloud?
	5) Migrate Email to Office365 and evaluate the need for school supplied student email		a) Migrate Exchange server to outside hosted exchange server b) Student Email

	<p>6) iPad- Applications can be added at an expedited rate .. Review and/or refine/recreate procedures to assist in management of this.</p>	
<p>SBS Tech Network</p>	<p>1) Maintain what we have and upgrade where necessary</p>	<p>Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.</p>

- a) Automate distribution of apps on iPads
- b) Procurement of apps on iPads

- a) Maintenance Contracts Renewed
- b) Change Firewall
- c) Upgrade Internet
- d) Exchange Server
- e) Extend Network to announcer booth at SSHS
- f) Become current and upgrade software on camera and introduce new server technology

SBS Tech Software	1) Provide support and appropriate access to all of our applications both inside and outside our walls	Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.	a) Access to apps inside/out b) Access to apps based upon proper demographics, (Grade, Person, Location)
	2) Work with Staff and other personnel to review and evaluate. We are in the process of upgrades to the Elementary environment which is forcing us to retire some applications and find replacement for others. 3) Work closely with our new Teaching and Learning Director as it relates in the review of these applications		a) Meet with appropriate personnel to review applications
	4) Move key applications to internet based where it makes sense		a) Are applications moving to cloud?
	5) Migrate Email to Office365 and evaluate the need for school supplied student email		a) Migrate Exchange server to outside hosted exchange server b) Student Email

	<p>6) iPad- Applications can be added at an expedited rate .. Review and/or refine/recreate procedures to assist in management of this.</p>	
<p>SBS Tech Network</p>	<p>1) Maintain what we have and upgrade where necessary</p>	<p>Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.</p>

- a) Automate distribution of apps on iPads
- b) Procurement of apps on iPads

- a) Maintenance Contracts Renewed
- b) Change Firewall
- c) Upgrade Internet
- d) Exchange Server
- e) Extend Network to announcer booth at SSHS
- f) Become current and upgrade software on camera and introduce new server technology

SBS Tech Hardware	1) Replace all eMAC and iMAC computers at Elementary. The previous year we replaced 100 of our oldest eMacs and this would finish this project.	Approximately 250 staff members, All 2400 students in the district.	a) Replacement of computers
	2) Replace all 3-6+ year old laptops for staff, qty=25, and shuffle the newest of the oldest to student use. We do not have but a hand full that are in student use.		a) Upgrade of Laptops
	3) Upgrade paging/intercom/bells for SSMS/SPE/SCE .. We use our phones for this (a great example of stretching the dollars). This is a must as this year we have experienced significant issues, where it has been working for 5 years without any problems.		a) Upgrade of paging/bells
	4) Maintenance agreements on key appliance/server based systems such as Overland, Barracuda, LeftHand, Safari, Citrix and Appsense		a) Service contracts on key systems
	5) Server upgrades for Provisioning		b) Upgrade Provisioning Servers

tricts

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Challenges- Lessons Learned</b>	<b>funded amount</b>
Tech Support staff member was retained and had a favorable annual review.	No challenges were encountered in retaining the support staff member. The continuing lesson of the value of this position is very evident.	44,856.00
All equipment was successfully installed and tested in accordance with the implementation timeline. Projected savings was realized. Increased Internet speeds and network reliability was accomplished.	Challenges were faced in the Cisco programming aspect of this project. The lesson learned was a better flowchart of the overall project could have been better documented on paper first.	47,721.00
All licensing was successfully renewed	Getting proper administrative account access was a challenge due to the purchase consortium with NWBOCES. The lesson learned was not to assume District account numbers had stayed the same from year to year.	6,558.00

<p>New server was deployed. New version of PowerSchool was installed. Database was successfully migrated to new platform. Testing was completed, and the deployment timeline was achieved.</p>	<p>The only challenge here was that the vendor, Daktech, didn't properly configure the RAID array as specified in the server configuration. The lesson learned was "If you want something done right, do it yourself".</p>	<p>5,295.00</p>
<p>New units were received, configured, deployed, and tested successfully in accordance with the implementation timeline.</p>	<p>This deployment went routinely and no unique challenges were faced. We have learned not to re-invent the wheel with our successful method of configuring and deploying units for use in our computer labs.</p>	<p>16,992.00</p>
<p>Document cameras were received and deployed to the classrooms in accordance with the implementation timeline.</p>	<p>Challenges were faced in the recording of serial numbers and registering new units with the vendor for warranty purposes. The lesson learned was don't deploy new units to the classroom until warranty registration has been accomplished.</p>	<p>10,880.00</p>

<p>The support given through these funds has made a huge impact on the teachers and students of NRCCS. The school designer has stated that our staff is utilizing everything they have learned and the students of NRCCS are greatly benefiting. What are the test score and yearly progress changes? We need specifics here.</p>	<p>NRCCS has learned that to continue the great success in the last two years, the continuation with Expeditionary Learning for the long-term future is evident. Educational professionals are finding that the EL model is aligned with 21st Century Skills and we will continue this active association with EL for the long-term future.</p>	<p>32,500</p>
<p>a) This Project was drastically scaled back from the original request of \$90,000+, partially in anticipation of EagleNet providing network from Steamboat to Oak Creek. EagleNet agreed to do this but they are no longer able.</p>	<p>This idea/project has been ongoing for over two years. If Soroco had paid for it, it would have been complete. Other incumbents and/or providers have promised easier and more cost effective solution, but they have not materialized. Even with the setbacks positives have been realized. We will continue to pursue a connection with a provider connecting Soroco to SSSD and if we need to complete the project ourselves we will.</p>	<p>\$40,000</p>
<p>c) Servers between Yampa Elementary and Oak Creek were consolidated.</p>		
<p>d) The internet was consolidated between these two Soroco campuses to use an upgraded 50+MB connection.</p>		

e) Voice calls have been routed over this connection and the older T1 connection is still in the process of being retired.		
f) The connection between these campuses increased from 512KB to a 100MB and can be upgradable to 200MB if so desired.		
a) Completed		
b) 512KB connection increased to 100MB		
a) Completed but outside the connection to SSSD.		
a) Not completed because SSSD connection did not happen		
a) Completed		
a) Completed	Old buildings are not easily upgradable for new technologies. With the plethora of devices in our student's hands it is very important to secure the network while still allowing use of needed devices.	\$119,000
b) All work performed by summer students		
a) Rewired all classrooms and eliminated the many mini switches in classrooms also consolidated all switches to single closets at all campuses	We were able to do all of the wiring using student summer help, which is a great skill development for our students.	
b) All wiring work performed by summer students		

a) Installed new switches and programmed network using VLANS to enhance security on internal files from external sources	We rely on external sources to help us with the programming pieces and we struggle with in-house vs. external expertise in this area.	
b) * Still work need to be done at Admin. office to complete item (a))	With the plethora of devices in our student's hands it is very important to secure the network while still allowing use of needed devices.	
c) Added enclosure around switches at MS lab to enhance physical security and silence fans		
d) Completely recreated lab @ MS and added more computers lab can handle two classes now		
e) Wherever possible cleaned up wiring hanging across walls and running across floors in every classroom in the District		
f) Did not upgrade switch at Admin office		
g) Added 96 port 1GB switch at Elementary and MS		
h) Added (2) 96 Port 1GB switch at HS		
i) Added POE switches to power new wireless and future POE items		
We painted and repaired all of the walls on the backstage area. New backdrop and front stage curtains were installed, with all chains and track systems being totally serviced and repaired.	With limited funding available, only able to complete curtain part of the total project (\$14,650). Total stage project = \$19,500	10,000

<p>We were very pleased with this increase in our TCAP scores. There are numerous changes and programs that we believe improved these scores, one of which is the role the interventionist played. ? Other measures</p>	<p>We are doing a much better job of identification of specific areas of improvement for students in need of intervention. We hope that this continues.</p>	<p>\$19,662</p>
<p><b>Class size ratios at the elementary level do not include counseling, ELL specialists, GT specialists, Special Education Teachers, Media Specialists, PE, Music, and Art teachers, and intervention specialists.</b>  SPE: 525 students, 25 classroom teachers, Average class size 21.0  SCE: 544 students, 26 classroom teachers, Average class size 21.8  <b>Class size ratios at the secondary level do not include counseling, ELL specialists, GT specialists, Special Education Teachers, Media Specialists, and Intervention specialists</b>  SSMS: 517 students, 31.28 classroom teachers, Average class size 22.0  SSHS: 642 students, 34.79 classroom teachers, Average class size 24.6</p>	<p>Determining exact staffing ratios while including positions such as counseling, ELL specialists, GT specialists, Special Education Teachers (?), and intervention specialists provide challenges. In addition staffing ratios can be deceptive when accounting for SPED staffing which is dictated by law and individual IEPs. Another challenge lies in determining the break point on when you add a classroom teacher to balance out class size as the number of students at a grade level does not lead to a clean break. The final challenge rests with space. Both elementary schools have maxed out their classroom space and the district is currently working on creative space reallocation to provide for more classrooms within existing buildings.</p>	<p>986,000</p>

<p>Students exceeded state averages in all grade levels and in all content areas by 8-32 percentage points. The school district received over 93% of the available points in this sub-category on the state District Performance Framework.</p>	<p>New state and multi-state assessment systems will be coming on line in the 2013-14 and 2014-15 academic years. Those systems will require a recalibration of expectations as far as performance of students in the district. While our expectation is to exceed state and multi-state averages we do not have a base line for these new assessments. In addition as the district continues to have students perform at high levels there will be some fluctuations based on cohort groups that will require the district to examine a range of scores that meets expectations.</p>	
<p>Growth targets were met for the district. The school district received over 81% of the available points in this sub-category for the state District Performance Framework.</p>		
<p>The district met the state targets for academic growth gaps. The school district received over 71% of the available points in this sub-category for the state District Performance Framework</p>		
<p>The district exceeded the state targets for Post-Secondary and Workforce Readiness. The school district received 90% of the available points in this sub-category for the State District Performance Framework.</p>		
<p>SSSD will be accredited with distinction for the 2012 school year for the fourth consecutive year. For the first time all individual schools in the district, including NRCCS and the alternative school, received the highest state rating for schools which is Performance.</p>		

<p>The adequate growth percentiles move every year. Outcomes are reported out using 2012 targets using school level data. District wide data is not available from CDE. In general if a group is in the typical growth category (35-64%ile) they are maintain growth. If they in the high growth category (above 65%ile) they are exceeding the growth of their peers.</p> <p>Elementary Math ELL Median Growth Percentile was 59, Adequate was 54.</p> <p>Middle School Math ELL Median Growth Percentile was 73, Adequate was 84</p> <p>H.S. Math ELL Median Growth Percentile was 44, Adequate was 99.</p>	<p>The Adequate Growth Percentiles are so high for ELL students as they move up that they amount to an almost impossible task. As an example HS Math percentiles are 99 meaning that students have to be in the top 1% to reach this goal. There needs to be an evaluation of a realistic growth target and metric for students as they move up in grade level. The growth percentiles do not take into account the movement of cohorts.</p>
<p>Elementary Reading Median Growth Percentile was 50. Adequate was 41.</p> <p>Middle School Reading Median Growth Percentile was 65. Adequate was 44.</p> <p>High School Reading Median Growth Percentile was 46. Adequate was 61.</p>	
<p>Elementary Writing Median Growth Percentile was 59. Adequate was 44.</p> <p>Middle School Writing Median Growth Percentile was 74. Adequate was 72.</p> <p>High School Writing Median Growth Percentile was 58. Adequate was 89.</p>	
<p>?</p>	

	<p>When the district began the application process for this grant there was interest in a multi-district partnership. As the other districts dropped out of consideration there needed to be an adjustment made in the scope of the work for the coaches. In addition as the process continued the district discovered an interest on the part of the secondary schools for similar support for their teachers. EFB granted the district the permission to extend this beyond the scope of elementary school. Coaches found that they were focused on more than just literacy and became instructional coaches. There is an emerging desire for more support in the form of instructional coaches and several staff and community members have asked about adding additional coaches with expertise in STEM to further extend the opportunities for professional growth for SSSD teachers in the STEM areas.</p>	110,000
<p>Cohort data is currently unavailable for students in classes of teachers who have had the instructional coaches available to them. Two years of data is necessary to track students in teachers classrooms moving in and out of proficiency levels and we currently only have one year of data available.</p>		

Instructional Coaches have:

- Facilitated and Developed Process for K-5 Data Team Meetings in both elementary schools.
- Supported 8th and 6th grade team with intervention planning and goal setting

The following improvements were made for students at each grade level in the SSSD as measured by the DIBELS assessment.

% of Students Moving from Below Grade Level to At or Above Grade Level:

K-49%, 1st grade-35%, 2nd grade-12%, 3rd grade-37%, 4th Grade-35%, 5th grade-35%

The number of students scoring below grade level at the start of the year was between 55 and 86 per grade level. By the end of the year that number had been reduced to between 28 and 64 per grade level.

Instructional coaches attended trainings on NWEA data analysis, ECAW, Lindamood Bell literacy strategies, and Cognitive Coaching.

- Literacy coaches provided presentations at every school level staff meetings, district administrative team meetings (3), and school board meetings.
- By the end of the 2012-13 school year they had worked with 57 individual teachers. By October of 2013 they had worked with 58 individual teachers.

This goal was shifted to the BOCES wide literacy grant focused on students with IEP's. A portion of that grant pays for parent outreach through the MotherRead program. The grant is providing for 8, one hour sessions which provide strategies to parents to help improve early childhood literacy and support in the home environment. 4 SSSD teachers are being trained in this program.

--	--

It is important to note that the funds from EFB were one part of the total Staff Development program of the district. In addition to the items below SSSD conducted four staff development days during the school year. On one of those days staff participated in a BOCES COLLAB day in which more than 15 SSSD staff members presented. The other days included cross-building articulation discussions, development of curriculum, and updates on curriculum programs. The above opportunities were funded through the district and cooperative efforts.

The Comprehensive Staff Development plan was developed at the end of the 2011-12 school year using input from the Staff Development Council, the Administrative Team, and the results of the Staff Development Survey.

The Staff Development Council consists of 19 staff members, 17 of which are teachers, from all buildings and departments in the district.

The Staff Development Survey was distributed via e-mail to all staff members of the district. The return rate was slightly under 30%.

The Staff Development plan was distributed to all staff via e-mail before the end of the 2011-12 school year to facilitate summer and school year planning by staff for the 2012-13 school year.

The staff development plan is posted on the district website in the employees only section under a newly developed "Staff Development" sub-page.

The advent of the new Educator Effectiveness the ability to personalize staff development is becoming increasingly important. Through the use of an application process for conference funding, a staff development council to get staff input, an annual staff development survey, and the leveraging of resources from CDE and NWBOCES we are moving towards a system that uses multiple systems to provide a great deal of choice for staff. Internal capacity needs to continue to be developed through the use of a "train the trainer" model and establishment of such positions as instructional coaches, technology mentors, induction mentors, teacher leaders, and administrative staff providing for staff development.

39,000

<p>EFB funds were used for over 100 staff members attending over 200 individual training opportunities ranging from Technology Conferences to Every Child a Writer Trainings, AP trainings, In-school book studies, and Mindful Life trainings. 26 Separate conferences, trainings, and book studies were funded from EFB funds.</p>		
<p>The staff development survey showed 100% participation in at least one of the options offered by the district for staff development. The highest preferences were for Professional Learning Communities that meet regularly, attendance at a professional conference, and working one on one with an instructional leader. The most important reasons for participation included improving professional practice and personal growth.</p>		
<p>For the 2013-14 school year, 158 of the 178 incoming Freshman enrolled in Spanish classes at Steamboat Springs H.S. There were 95 students who were placed above level I. 91 Freshman students were placed in level II and 4 were placed in level III. 60% of all Freshman students who enrolled in Spanish were placed above level I.</p>	<p>Not all students are equipped to move to higher levels of language instruction even if they have had similar "seat time." A proficiency based placement procedure has helped the district articulate the best placement for students so they have the best chance for academic success as they move to H.S. There will need to be continued articulation conversation between the MS and HS level teachers to better align curriculum, curriculum materials, and assessments.</p>	<p>110,000</p>

<p>a) We use help desk system and constantly review levels. Against our best wishes we always have tickets. As hard as we try, tech never works as 100% intended.</p> <p>b) We established a tech committee with representatives from each school and discussed Staff Development primarily. I will be inviting this committee and others to review and plan tech related things going forward.</p> <p>c) We have a tech support person at each building in SSSD and a person for Soroco. We have one other person other than myself who we share with Soroco and is not assigned to a building.</p> <p>d) This funds three people from a 7 person Tech department, including the Director.</p>		182,400
<p>a) We offer application access based on location and or student and or grade level</p> <p>b) We offer Remote Access from home and while in school for student laptop usage. Usage is dropping off as we move applications to web facing. We try to offer access to all applications via Remote but some cannot be programmed</p>		124,213
<p>c) We retired and retired/replaced a few applications based on this review.</p>		
<p>a) We are forced in some instances because applications move themselves this direction. This is the direction we will continue to move as it is easier to manage when they host</p>		
<p>a) We looked at both Google and Office365. We choose Office365 because it was Exchange to Exchange move and also because of the options for applications we currently use. However we will continue to monitor because we are experiencing issues.</p> <p>b) Students have the ability for email but licenses have not</p>		

<p>a) MDM (Mobile Device Management) license entered with LightSpeed. We entered into an agreement with this vendor because we already had a relationship with them for virus and content filtering. Also in review of others the differences were not enough to warrant another vendor. MDM is a third party tool to manage our Apple device. We have learned a lot and it is still cumbersome (hope to get better) to deploy apps on these devices because Apple itself has not embraced global management of their devices. We wait as Apple makes available more control via MDM of their device.</p> <p>b) We have established volume licenses with Apple. This program is also not without challenges, similar to what is said above.</p>		
<p>a) We contract with CenturyLink to manage our data and voice network. We also have contracts on our storage systems and large batteries.</p> <p>b) Our existing Firewall was not able to sustain the demand so we upgraded to a new Firewall.</p> <p>c) Through District Funds we upgraded from 45MB internet to 300MB</p> <p>d) Due to demand our Exchange Server (email) performance was very poor. We upgraded the server to better handle the demand.</p> <p>e) Because of the increasing desire for streaming of sporting events via the Web we extended our network via fibre to include the announcer's booth. We also installed a displaced switch in this location.</p> <p>f) It was realized that our current camera software was not under contract so we had to become current to allow upgrade. In addition our current DVR's are EOL (end of life). We began the purchase of the newer server environment to begin the convert to the new system. Our schools would not be without these camera's. With the District upgrade to a Gig Fibre between our facilities we feel we can consolidate camera's to a single location.</p>		145,000

<p>a) We offer application access based on location and or student and or grade level</p> <p>b) We offer Remote Access from home and while in school for student laptop usage. Usage is dropping off as we move applications to web facing. We try to offer access to all applications via Remote but some cannot be programmed to do so.</p>		124,213
<p>c) We retired and retired/replaced a few applications based on this review.</p>		
<p>a) We are forced in some instances because applications move themselves this direction. This is the direction we will continue to move as it is easier to manage when they host the software.</p>		
<p>a) We looked at both Google and Office365. We choose Office365 because it was Exchange to Exchange move and also because of the options for applications we currently use. However we will continue to monitor because we are experiencing issues.</p> <p>b) Students have the ability for email but licenses have not been granted until we are definite on decision.</p>		

<p>a) MDM (Mobile Device Management) license entered with LightSpeed. We entered into an agreement with this vendor because we already had a relationship with them for virus and content filtering. Also in review of others the differences were not enough to warrant another vendor. MDM is a third party tool to manage our Apple device. We have learned a lot and it is still cumbersome (hope to get better) to deploy apps on these devices because Apple itself has not embraced global management of their devices. We wait as Apple makes available more control via MDM of their device.</p> <p>b) We have established volume licenses with Apple. This program is also not without challenges, similar to what is said above.</p>		
<p>a) We contract with CenturyLink to manage our data and voice network. We also have contracts on our storage systems and large batteries.</p> <p>b) Our existing Firewall was not able to sustain the demand so we upgraded to a new Firewall.</p> <p>c) Through District Funds we upgraded from 45MB internet to 300MB</p> <p>d) Due to demand our Exchange Server (email) performance was very poor. We upgraded the server to better handle the demand.</p> <p>e) Because of the increasing desire for streaming of sporting events via the Web we extended our network via fibre to include the announcer's booth. We also installed a displaced switch in this location.</p> <p>f) It was realized that our current camera software was not under contract so we had to become current to allow upgrade. In addition our current DVR's are EOL (end of life). We began the purchase of the newer server environment to begin the convert to the new system. Our schools would not be without these camera's. With the District upgrade to a Gig Fibre between our facilities we feel we can consolidate camera's to a single location.</p>		145,000

<p>a) All eMAC and iMAC computers were replaced at elementary.</p>		<p>300,000</p>
<p>a) Laptops were upgraded and those worthy of re-tasking did get re-tasked to the SSMS Gate program.</p>		
<p>a) System was replaced with a different manufacturer. In order for us to stay with existing manufacturer we would have had to upgrade majority of our phones. The project was tedious but not that difficult. The bug we encountered afterwards was much more difficult to resolve and took us almost 6 months to resolve but we have had great success since then.</p>		
<p>a) We purchased contracts on our key systems and continually review to be sure worth the cost.</p>		
<p>b) We were able to upgrade 4 of our servers. The newest server was 6 years of age. This is how we extend the life of our hardware ... the computers (all student facing at SSMS and SSHS currently) boot from network vs. local hard drive. We intend to deliver this kind of boot via all student facing this next year.</p>		

# Partners in Routt County Thank-a-thon



INFO (info@partnersrouttcounty.org) Add to contacts 11/06/13 Photos

To: 'Kristi brown' ✕

Hi Kristi,

As the holiday season fast approaches, we want to take a moment to put into practice the "attitude of gratitude" that we promote throughout our organization and with our mentoring relationships.

Thank you and everyone at SS Education Fund Board for all you do to support the many wonderful organizations doing great work.

Best,

Jan Vanderbloemen, PRC Board of Directors

