

Steamboat Springs Education Fund Board

January 9, 2019

5:30PM

Human Services Board Room

Education Fund Board Directors present included Sam Jones, Jeanne Mackowski, Cristina Magill, Jay O'Hare, Norbert Turek, , Kandise Gilbertson, Adam Alspach, Julie Tourigny and Jon Wade. Jill Brabec and Chris Johnson were absent. Grants Commissioners Jenny Maxwell. Also in attendance were Jay Hamric, Tim Miles, Michelle Dover and Brad Meeks (SSSD); Christy Sinner and Brian Hoza (HSD); Rim Watson (Soroco); Michael Girodo (MVMCS); and Jennifer Bock (City of Steamboat Springs). Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

- **Call to Order:**

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

- **Sunshine Law**

Jennifer Bock, a staff attorney for the City reviewed the Open Meetings (Sunshine) Law. She stated that anytime three or more members meet to discuss public business, it is meeting, and must be noticed 24 hours in advance. Email threads can also be considered meetings if there is a back-and-forth discussion involving more than two members. She advised against discussion of public business via email. In addition to noticing, meetings also require minutes to be taken, public voting and provision for public comment. Regarding how to handle comments made on a shared Google document, Ms. Bock advised that EFB and GC members should not respond to others' comments. The summer workshops must be noticed.

Cristina read the Sunshine Law Resolution designating posting places for meeting notices, as presented in the meeting materials.

MOTION

Norbert moved to approve the Sunshine Law Resolution, as written. Cristina seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

- **Public and Advisory Board Comment:**

There were no comments. Sam noted that moving forward, there would be an opportunity for public comment with each agenda item.

- **Meeting Minutes – November 14 & December 19, 2018:**

MOTION

*Cristina moved to approve the EFB meeting minutes of November 14 and December 19, 2018 as written. Jeanne seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.***

- **Financial Report**

Sam, standing in for Linda, reviewed the financial report. He noted that the total funds available for granting will be less than last year by approximately \$400,000, even if revenues are the same, because last year there had been a significant reserve that was spent down through grants. He said that revenues so far this year over last year are up 3.3% through December's deposit. The current forecast for total cash

available for granting is \$4,124,336 before the cash flow cushion. Sam said that the cash flow cushion has not yet been set, but that there has been discussion of setting the reserve amount as 10% of the available funds, rather than as a dollar figure.

- **Innovation Grants**

Sam reviewed that the number of Innovation Grant applications had fallen steadily and that last year only \$35,000 was granted through this program. He reviewed the discussion held at the December meeting regarding re-purposing the funds towards “pathways” programs, which are focused on career and college readiness. He said that rather than coming from the teachers, the grant applications would come from the district administrations along with their other requests. Certain applications would be “tagged” as pathways programs. Sam offered that a lot of the innovative programming that SSEF wants to support is already in the curriculum through the pathways programming. He suggested that even within traditional requests, such as teaching positions, a particular position could be tagged as belonging to a pathways program. He offered that while much of this programming is at the high school level, the concept is trickling down to the middle schools, as well. Sam said that although no particular percentage of grant requests must be tagged for pathways programs, the SSEF would like to see some grant applications from each district tagged as such. Sam said that under the former guidelines, 5% of available funds was dedicated to Community Group and Innovation Grants, with Community Group Grants taking about 4% of that. Sam said that the current proposal is to eliminate Innovation Grants and fold the funding back into the districts for college and career readiness programming. Brian offered that the idea was to reframe the Innovation Grants as STEAM projects to be proposed by the districts rather than by teachers. Sam agreed with this description. Jenny said that she would hope that the projects would be conceived in collaboration with teachers. Sam reviewed Stuart’s comments from the December meeting regarding the importance of communication, problem solving and critical thinking in these programs rather than simply technology. He offered that these skills could apply to curriculum at the middle and elementary school levels.

Brad said that SSSD (and HSD) want to address the innovative programming issue in the designs for new facilities. He asked if the EFB would consider grant funding to support the equipment, furniture, tools, etc. for such a facility. Mark offered that some money could be set aside and allowed to build up to support one-time capital needs without affecting the general grant requests. Sam offered that this could be considered, although there are not ever “extra” funds. Jon offered that it would be a matter of prioritizing projects within the available funding. Cristina noted, however, that the SSEF will no longer be committing funds for multi-year grants.

There was consensus in support of the move away from Innovation Grants towards pathways programming.

- **Allocation Model**

Sam reviewed the proposed allocation model, as listed on the last page of the financial report. He noted that in the past 4% of funds had been allocated to collaborative grants (which includes Karla) and administration. He said that that less than 1% is needed to administer the fund. The collaborative grant allocation has been reduced to 2%. Sam also noted that MVMCS had been bumped up to 4%. Sam stressed that these allocations are only guidelines.

- **Committee Reports**

- Governance – Norbert asked for assistance in the development of the Policies and Procedures document.

- Finance – no addition report.
- Communications – Jeanne said that she had added a link to the accountability reports to the website. She said she would review the communications plan and consider on-going public relations. There was discussion of collating the materials used in the tax renewal campaign in one location – perhaps a folder on the SSEF google drive. Cristina suggested that a note should be added stating that going for a renewal one year in advance of the expiration is not early, but rather just in time. If the tax were not renewed until the following year, the districts would only be able to budget for half of the year.

Sam said that he would schedule his report to City Council. Following discussion of the percentage-based payment by the SSEF to the City for administration, it was decided that the City Manager should be approached about renegotiating the agreement to a flat fee prior to the presentation to City Council.

- **Topics for February meeting**
 - Determination of terms for each EFB member
 - Accountability reports review
 - Preliminary budget discussion

The EFB meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.