

Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board
February 1, 2017
5:00 PM
Human Service Center Board Room

Education Fund Board Directors present included Sam Jones, Kandise Gilbertson, Jay O'Hare, Jeanne Mackowski, Cristina Magill, and Summer Johnson. Chuck Mitchell, Norbert Turek, Alissa Merage, Kristin Wilson and Jill Brabec were absent. Also present were Linda Thomas (SSEF accountant); advisors Brian Hoza and Margie Huron; George Purnell (Soroco); Bob Logan (Soroco BOE); and Diane Maltby (SSSD). Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes from a recording of the meeting.

- **Call to Order:**

Sam Jones called the joint meeting of the Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board to order at 5:00 PM.

- **Public Comment:**

George Purnell and Bob Logan introduced themselves. George is principal at the Soroco High School and Middle School. Bob is a member of the Soroco BOE.

- **Meeting Minutes – January 11, 2017:**

MOTION

*Jay moved to approve the EFB meeting minutes of January 11, 2017 as written. Kandise seconded. **The motion carried unanimously.***

- **Financial Report**

Linda reviewed the financial report. She highlighted that sale tax revenues have come in 10.39% higher than forecasted, averaged over the first seven months of the fiscal year. She stated that the money currently expected to be available for granting is \$3,405,747, after taking out the \$450,000 for the cash flow cushion. Linda noted that there had been a correction to the prior year's budget, due to SSSD having over-charged the SSEF for the grant writer. This year's request has been reduced to correct the error.

Sam noted that the available current cash is now approximately \$310,000, and the Soroco reimbursement request has not yet been received. He reviewed the purpose of the cash flow cushion, adding that it usually reaches its lowest level in February or March.

- **Rescission**

Linda stated that REPS had submitted a reimbursement request right before the October 31st deadline, with no documentation. An extension was granted, and several efforts were made to obtain the necessary information, but no documentation was ever received.

MOTION

*Cristina moved to rescind the \$1,000 award to REPS. Summer seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.***

- **Communications Report**

Jeanne stated that they are still working on the new website. She asked everyone to review the site, noting that it can easily be changed after it has been launched. There was a discussion of adding content to the site. Jeanne said that sometime soon she would like to discuss setting up a media time table to increase the coverage of the SSEF. There was also a discussion of obtaining permission to use photographs of

kids in SSEF-funded programs. Jeanne said that it would be beneficial to compile a list of shots that the SSEF would like to see on the website and then have those shots set-up and taken, rather than using the random assortment of pictures submitted by grant recipients. Jay offered his services as a photographer.

- **Allocation Model**

In response to a comment from Brian, who offered that it might be better to discuss how to allocate funds to MVMCS prior to consideration of specific grant requests, Sam stated that SSEF grant awards should follow a merit-based competitive process. He offered that the merits of each request should be considered first, adding that the validity of the request and the projected outcomes should supersede any formula. There was a discussion of basing the allocation model on geographical location, roughly on a per pupil basis, considering SSSD as one pot, and all other grant recipients as another, or considering the CSI as a separate district. Brian discussed the philosophy and intent of the sales tax. Sam noted that the allocation model was developed as a tool to help the districts with their planning and budgeting, and was based on historical information – not on a top-down calculation. Cristina reviewed the October K – 12 student census for each district: SSSD – 2526; HSD – 380; Soroco – 328; MVMCS – 103. It was noted that the number of students has increased in all districts since October. Sam reviewed that last year the EFB and GC felt like they had very few choices to make, and asked the districts to submit more requests than could be accommodated by the target budget.

- **Grant review process**

Cristina reviewed the grant budget spreadsheet, noting that the “bottom line” number listed on the readings worksheet is the estimate from the January 6th financial report. This number will continue to change until the budget is set. Sam outlined the schedule for the application review process. The final recommendations from the GC will be considered by the EFB in April, with the final awards determined on May 3rd.

There was a discussion of the question and answer process. Cristina said she was surprised by the large request from MVMCS. Jeanne commented on the significant overlap between what was being requested by MVMCS and by the other districts. Sam noted that the services provided by ICCI and the district request for ELL students are not the same. He added that attention should be paid to the overlap in requests from different sources, and to trends in the nature of the requests.

There was a discussion of how to handle infrastructure requests and how SSEF funds should be targeted. Sam noted that the sales tax was never designed to be spent exclusively on technology. Kandise reviewed the history of how SSEF funds have been allocated since the sales tax was originally approved. She said that initially there were three committees, each allocated 1/3 of the money: capital projects, class size, and technology. The EFB discussed the increasing need for SSEF funds to support the basics of education rather than discretionary extras.

- **Agenda for the March meeting**

- Set preliminary budget

- **Adjourn**

MOTION

Cristina moved to adjourn the meeting; Jay seconded. The EFB meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.