

Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board
January 10, 2018
5: 30PM
Human Services Board Room

Education Fund Board Directors present included Sam Jones, Jeanne Mackowski, Cristina Magill, Jill Brabec, Norbert Turek, Jay O'Hare, Chris Johnson, Jon Wade and Adam Alspach. Also present were Linda Thomas (SSEF accountant); Brad Meeks (SSSD); Christy Sinner (Hayden); Michael Girodo (MVMCS); Rim Watson (Soroco) and Kelly Latterman. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

- **Call to Order:**

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

- **Public Comment:**

There was no public comment.

- **Meeting Minutes – November 8, 2017:**

MOTION

*Norbert moved to approve the EFB meeting minutes of November 8, 2017 as written. Jay seconded. **The motion carried unanimously.***

- **Financial Report**

Linda reviewed the financial reports, as included in the meeting materials. She noted that the past two months' deposits were up 12.7% and 15.2% respectively over forecast. Fiscal year-to-date deposits are up 10.8% over forecast.

Linda discussed the potential rescissions. She said that the \$5,000 reduction from last year's BOCES i3SEED grant had been inadvertently omitted from the rescissions done in November and must be rescinded. In addition, there is a potential \$100,000 rescission from a SSSD grant for mental health services (G18-21-SBS) that was funded by the YVMC Foundation. Sam noted that it was appropriate to rescind the \$100,000 at this time (rather than in November of 2018) because the grant award included a provision that if the mental health services were funded by YVMC, this money would be rescinded to SSEF. Linda noted that BOCES had also confirmed that the final two installments of the multi-year i3 SEED grant would also be reduced by \$5,000 each, for an additional \$10,000 in potential rescissions. In response to a question from Jenny, Linda clarified that the cash-flow cushion would be taken out of the total available funds. Following further discussion, the EFB decided to rescind the remaining \$10,000 for the current year's and next year's BOCES grants, in addition to the other two rescissions.

MOTION

*Cristina moved to approve the rescission of \$5,000 for the second installment of the BOCES i3SEED grant. Jeanne seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.***

MOTION

*Cristina moved to approve the rescission of \$100,000 for the SSSD grant from mental health services for which another source of funding was found. Jeanne seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.***

MOTION

Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board of Directors' Meeting

*Cristina moved to approve the rescission of \$10,000 for the third and fourth installments of the multi-year BOCES i3SEED grant. Jeanne seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.***

Including all of these rescissions, the total funds expected to be available for granting as of the current financial report would be \$4,476,067.

Linda explained that the cash-flow cushion is not technically a reserve, but rather funds that are left un-allocated to allow for fluctuations in the cash flow as grants funds are dispersed. The \$880,702 listed as the expected reserve balance in the current financial statement is the total of the cash-flow cushion (\$420,000) and the tax deposits that have accumulated since the budget was set.

- **Systems and Processes for application review**

Jay reviewed how the applications are submitted online, converted to Google docs and then shared with the GC and the EFB. He stated that the Q&A process would be conducted through the comment function in Google docs. He presented screen shots of how the questions would be submitted, and how both the questions and answers by the applicants would be visible to all parties. This process eliminates the repetition of the same questions. Sarah stated she would be sharing each individual application with the members of the GC and EFB, and with the applicant.

Jenny proposed adjusting the grant review schedule to allow for a longer period of Q&A for the district applications, in particular. She and Cristina will review the schedule. All parties will be informed if changes are made. Norbert noted that the role of the GC is to delve into the details of each application, and that it would not be appropriate for those details to be discussed or questioned by the EFB after the GC has made its funding recommendations. He said that the time to ask about the particulars of the applications is during the Q&A process. Jeanne recommended that any EFB members interested in the details of the recommendations should attend the GC meeting at which those recommendations are finalized.

- **Allocation Model**

Sam reviewed that the role of the EFB is to provide oversight and set the general allocation guidelines for each of the categories of grants, in addition to approving the final budget. He noted that the SSEF is not obligated to adhere to any particular allocation of funds, per the MOU with the City. The allocation model is only a guideline. Sam stated that the districts had requested that the EFB provide some estimate of allocations in order to assist them with their budgeting. Sam stated that the EFB must decide how to accommodate MVMCS in its allocation model, which was originally based on the historical funding practices of the SSEF. He stated that the model used to date has been:

- 80% SSSD
- 5% Hayden
- 5% Soroco
- 5% Community + Innovation
- 5% Collaborative + administration

He added that last year MVMCS was awarded approximately \$70,000 which was taken from scraping funds from the other categories. He said that going into this grant cycle, some basis for an MVMCS allocation must be established. He offered that the only real rationale for an allocation would be funding per pupil, but said that since the allocations are only a guideline and all of the grant applications will be judged based on merit, it would be a mistake to get too granular in the enrollment figures. Sam presented a spreadsheet that Jenny had put together with per pupil calculations under an allocation for MVMCS

varying from 3% to 4%, and showing the impact on funding to SSSD. Sam noted that 90% of the students enrolled in MVMCS come from the SSSD geographical area, and that in the past Hayden and Soroco have each been allocated 5% in the guidelines, although Hayden has more students than Soroco. The spreadsheet included a 1% reduction in the funding to Soroco.

In response to a question from Cristina, Michael stated that the current enrollment of MVMCS is 145 K-6. He noted that although the total enrollment grew by 40% this year over last year, the enrollment should remain fairly stable at between 150 – 155 students over the next 3 – 5 years, based on capacity.

Reviewing the spreadsheet of sample allocations, Brad noted that NRCCS would do better on a per student basis if it were not included in the SSSD allocation, as it has generally been awarded \$60,000 - \$70,000 and has a maximum enrollment of 108. He said that if NRCCS were to submit its own application separately, those funds would also be taken out the SSSD allocation.

Christy offered that it makes sense to take the funding for MVMCS out of the SSSD allocation since the students come from that district.

Michael noted that there is a common misconception that charter schools are not public schools. He suggested that the goal should be as close to equitable funding on a per pupil basis for all students within the SSSD boundaries.

Jill asked about the number of students at MVMCS with IEPs. Michael said that last year 6 or 7 students had IEPs and another several were under 504s (another level of accommodation). He said that this year the internal review of special education needs would increase, and with it the number of students in these programs may rise. Brad said that approximately 12% of SSSD students have IEDs, which is fairly common across districts.

Chris asked about the rationale for the allocations to Hayden and Soroco. Sam said that the allocations were based on historical percentages, but that there was no rationale provided when funding to these two districts began in 2009.

Jay stated that the sales tax that funds SSEF would be up for renewal next year, and that it would be important to ensure that all voters within the SSSD felt that they were benefitting from the SSEF. 90% of MVMCS families live within the district.

Norbert asked if MVMCS has access to funding sources not available to the other districts. Michael said that it did not, other than a small federal start-up grant.

Sam said that while 1% of the funding for MVMCS could come from Soroco, due to the discrepancy between the Soroco and Hayden enrollments, he thinks the remainder should probably come from SSSD, as that is where the majority of the students live.

Jeanne stated her support for a guideline, rather than a firm allocation, as the grants should be evaluated on merit. She stated that she is uncertain where the percentage for MVMCS should come from.

Cristina suggested that the 80% allocation to SSSD should remain intact, or close to it. She said she would lean toward an allocation to MVMCS of 3%. She suggested that taking too much away from SSSD could be unpopular with the majority of voters.

Brad stated that while he believes strongly in providing school choice to parents, he does not want to return to a system in which the districts are competing with each other for SSEF funding. He said that all the districts have needs.

Norbert stated his support for basing the funding allocation on a per pupil calculation, rather than on percentages of the whole that would go to each district. Sam reviewed the relative rate of funding per pupil in each district.

Sam suggested that everyone think about the issue in preparation for the February meeting, when the discussion will resume, and a decision can be made.

- **Communication Plan**

Jeanne distributed a handout of the draft communications plan. She reviewed the goals, strategies and tactics of the plan. She discussed the community outreach plan and the importance of making presentations to the groups and individuals that have the most influence on community opinion. She asked everyone to review the groups listed in the handout, and to suggest additions. Jeanne said she would put together a google doc through which EFB & GC members would be asked to sign-up to give presentations to groups with whom they have affiliations. A list of influential individuals will also be developed. She also asked that giving presentations to significant businesses and employers (or their boards/executives) in town would be useful. Jeanne said that a sample presentation would be given at the February EFB meeting. A proposed timeline for the communications plan was included in the handout. Norbert said he would put together a timeline of important dates and deadlines for the ballot measure process.

Jill suggested that the FAQs should include a response to the question of, “didn’t we just approve...?” that outlines the difference between the recent SSSD mill levy and the sales tax for SSEF, and why they are both important.

Sam suggested that the SSEF put out a press release early in the process with a summary (and pie chart) of what is funded by the SSEF with the tax revenues it receives.

There was a discussion of the campaign committee, which will need to be formed somewhat later in the process.

- **Committee Reports**

- Governance – Norbert stated that non-profits are not allowed to have P.O. Box mailing addresses. He said he would figure out a way to set up a physical address for the SSEF.
- Grants Commission – Jenny noted that accountability reports and summary document would be reviewed by the GC later in the month and by the EFB in February. She also requested feedback on the new applications from the applicants.

- **Agenda Items for February meeting**

- Accountability reports
- Allocation model (continued)
- Communications Plan presentation demo
- Preliminary budget discussion
- Preliminary grant application discussion

- **Adjourn**

MOTION

*Cristina moved to adjourn the meeting; Jay seconded. **The EFB meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.***