	Jim Gebhard					Board of Education			
B - C - D - E -	Lesli	/ But e Kie	ler sler			Mesa County Valley School District 51			
	A B C D E				E	Regular Meeting Minutes — October 3, 2006 Adopted as Presented: October 17, 2007			
						AGENDA ITEM	ACTION		
Present Motion Second Aye No	x	x x x	x	x x x	x x	RETREAT: Randy Black, Colorado Association of School Boards (CASB) Agenda Format Board Purpose Essential Board Roles Board Focus Areas Core, Driving Values Break: 5:50 pm CALL TO ORDER: 6:17 pm A-1. BUDGET READOPTION A-1.4. Budget Re-adoption: Resolution 06/07:21. Dan Robinson commented on the enormity of the budget, and gave assurance that each Board Member has been briefed on the budget and has taken time to look in-depth at the detail presented. He stated this budget did not lightly pass, as there has been a great deal of study, shifting of priorities, and a lot of time invested. Dan thanked Tim Mills, Vi Crawford, and Melissa Callahan deVita for their work. Ron Rowley spoke of the budget process as being an on-going process, from September through June each year. Tim Mills stated the key-factor in the budget re-adoption is the student enrollment increase; there are 540 additional students. Additional expenditure	Adopted		
Motion Second Aye No	х	х	x x	x	х	adjustments are needed along with the added revenue. A-1.7. Use of Beginning Fund Balance: Resolution 06/07:22.	Adopted		
Motion Second Aye No	х	х	x x	x x	х	A-1.9. Bond Interest Transfer: Resolution 06/07: 23 A-2. Personnel Recommendation	Adopted		
Motion Second		х	х			 Dr. Tim Mills cited Colorado School Law 22-63-301 & 22-63-302 (2). As the Chief Administrative Officer of an employing school district, Dr. Mills brought forward a recommendation that the Board dismiss a teacher, Ms. Tammy Lee. Dr. Mills reviewed the grounds for dismissal and recommended dismissal, based on one or more of the grounds stated in State Statute, 22-63-301(III) C, D, F: "Neglect of duty, Immorality, and Other Good and Just Cause." A-3. Resolution in Opposition to Amendment 39 and Referendum J on Classroom Spending Requirements Ron Rowley asked to read a prepared resolution into the official record in opposition to the above amendment and referendum. Harry Butler presented the following motion: To allow for the reading of the resolution. Dan Robinson seconded the motion. 	Recommendation For Teacher Dismissal		

Α						Board of Education			
B - Dan RobinsonC - Harry ButlerD - Leslie KieslerE - Ron Rowley						Mesa County Valley School District 51			
	A B C D E					Regular Meeting Minutes — October 3, 2006 Adopted as Presented: October 17, 2007			
						AGENDA ITEM	ACTION		
Second Aye No	x x	x	х	х	х	 After the Resolution was read, a Primary Amendment to the Main Motion was brought forward by Dan Robinson, to read: Motion to allow for the reading of the resolution and adoption of said resolution. Jim Gebhard seconded the motion. The Board voted; all were in favor. 	Adopted		
Motion Second Aye No	х	X X	x x	Х	х	ADJOURNED: 6:32 pm WORK SESSION: New Teacher Orientation / Induction Update High School Graduation Credits			
Motion Second Aye No	x	х	х	х	x x	EXECUTIVE SESSION: 8:30 pm > Legal Advice, CRS Section 24-6-402(4)(b) Present: Harry Butler, Jim Gebhard, Leslie Kiesler, Dan Robinson, Ron Rowley, Tim Mills, David Price	Adjourned to Executive Session		
Motion Second Aye No	х	x x	x x		х	OPEN SESSION: 8:50 pm	Returned to Open Meeting		
Motion Second Aye No	Х	x x	X X		х	ADJOURNED: 8:51 pm	Adjourned		
						Jamie Sidanycz Secretary, Board of Education			

Budget Re-Adoption 2006-07

Adopted: October 3, 2006

Board of Education Resolution 06/07: 21

._____

WHEREAS, the Board of Education has published October 3, 2006, as the date of re-adoption for the 2006-07 budgets for Mesa County Valley School District 51; and

WHEREAS, the Board may adopt the budgets at any regular or special meeting on or before October 15, 2006;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education of Mesa County Valley School District 51 does hereby re-adopt the budgets and reserve all ending balances, as presented, and authorize the following fund amounts to be appropriated as specified in the adopted budgets for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2006, and ending June 30, 2007.

FUND	ORIGINAL	RE-ADOPTED	EXPLANATION					
General Fund (10)	\$134,990,178	\$137,747,903	Student increase, AV increase, Fund Balance adjustment					
Colorado Preschool & Kindergarten Program (19)	\$1,293,693	\$1,261,492	Fund Balance adjustment, Align to projections					
Independence Academy Charter School (11)	\$874,259	\$1,058,841	Fund Balance adjustment					
Special Revenue Funds								
Capital Reserve (21)	\$12,030,841	\$13,708,527	Student increase, Fund Balance adjustment					
Capital Reserve - Asbestos (29)	\$25,628	\$24,457	Fund Balance adjustment					
Physical Activities (23)	\$512,788	\$521,961	Fund Balance adjustment					
Student Body Activity (24)	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000						
Beverage (27)	\$715,970	\$756,471	Fund Balance adjustment					
Governmental Designated Purpose Grants (22 & Sub-funds 70-99)	\$15,674,725	\$15,749,505	Fund Balance/Additional Grants					
Career Center Grant (26)	\$235,000	\$280,006	Sale of 2 houses					
Other Local Projects/Grants (28)	\$226,174	\$219,025	Fund Balance adjustment					
Debt Service Fund								
Bond Redemption (31)	\$16,763,077	\$16,615,341	Fund Balance adjustment, AV increase					
Capital Project Fund								
Building (42)	\$56,200,000	\$32,820,085	Fund Balance adjustment					
Capital Projects Building (DIA) (41)	\$420,000	\$286,377						
Enterprise Fund								
Food Service (51)	\$9,529,161	\$9,239,249	Fund Balance adjustment					
Internal Service Fund								
Insurance (64)	\$2,823,235	\$2,956,373	Fund Balance adjustment					
Dental Insurance (63)	\$1,949,554	\$2,121,857	Fund Balance adjustment, Premium adjustment					
Medical Insurance (62)	\$10,256,527	\$10,349,943	Fund Balance adjustment, Premium adjustment					

October 3, 2006 A-1.4

Use of Beginning Fund Balance

Adopted: October 3, 2006

Board of Education Resolution 06/07: 22

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 03-149 created a new subsection in C.R.S. 22-44-105 1B (1.5) (a) that states:

"A budget adopted pursuant to this article shall not provide for expenditures, interfund transfers, or reserves, in excess of available revenues and beginning fund balances. If the budget includes the use of a beginning fund balance, the school district board of education shall adopt a resolution specifically authorizing the use of a portion of the beginning fund balance in the school district's budget. The resolution, at a minimumc shall specify the amount of the beginning fund balance to be spent under the school district budget, state the purpose for which the expenditure is needed, and state the school district's plan to ensure that the use of the beginning fund balance will not lead to an ongoing deficit."

WHEREAS, the Board of Education has set October 3, 2006, as the date of re-adoption for the 2006-2007 budgets for Mesa County Valley School District 51; and

WHEREAS, the Board may re-adopt the budgets at any regular or special meeting on or before, October 15, 2006;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education of Mesa County Valley School District 51 does hereby approve the usage of the beginning fund balances as specified in the plan below for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2006, and ending on June 30, 2007.

FUND	PAGE#	AMOUNT OF BEGINNING FUND BALANCE TO BE SPENT	PURPOSE FOR EXPENDITURE	PLAN
FUND	FAGE#	TO DE SI ENT	Maintenance of bldgs	Funding of prior year's
Capital Reserve	A-1.16	\$77,451	Info Tech projects	projects
Capital Reserve -				Project using remaining
Asbestos	A-1.19	\$23,657	Asbestos removal	Underwood Levy funds
				Not reoccurring
Beverage	A-1.22	\$188,767	Staff development	expenditures
			Upgrade/building	Projected to complete
Building	A-1.29	\$31,620,085	schools	projects in 05-06
Capital Projects			Complete DIA building	Expenditures anticipated in
Building	A-1.30	\$266,377	project	carryforward amount
				Replacing equipment over a
			Major replacement of	period of time & reduce
Food Service	A-1.31	\$708,835	equipment	fund balance
			Insurance premium	Monitor and make
Insurance	A-1.32	\$111,186	costs	adjustments as needed

October 3, 2006 A-1.7

Bond Interest Transfer

Board of Education Resolution 06/07: 23

Adopted: October 3, 2006

WHEREAS, the Board of Education of Mesa County Valley School District 51 is the governing body authorized by law to administer the affairs of the school district; and

WHEREAS, interest earned in the Bond Redemption Fund can be transferred to the General Fund, if approved by resolution;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education of Mesa County Valley School District 51 does hereby approve the transfer of interest earned in the Bond Redemption Fund to the General Fund.

October 3, 2006 A-1.9

Resolution in Opposition to Amendment 39 & Referendum J

Adopted: October 3, 2006

Board of Education Resolution 06/07-28

WHEREAS, voters will be asked to consider two measures on classroom spending requirements on the general election ballot on November 7, 2006, both of which deprive our community, though the locally-elected board of education, from making decisions about the best use of school district resources; and

WHEREAS, Amendment 39 is an amendment to the Colorado Constitution, promoted by outof-state interests, which will require each school district in Colorado to spend at least 65 percent of its operational expenditures on classroom instruction; and

WHEREAS, Referendum J was referred to the ballot by the Colorado General Assembly as an alternative to Amendment 39, will change state law to require each school district in Colorado to spend at least 65 percent of its operational expenditures on instructional and non-instructional services that directly affect student achievement; and

WHEREAS, both measures require any school district that spends less than 65 percent of its operating budget as required by either Amendment 39 or Referendum J, to increase its spending on the specified items by two percentage points each year until the 65% threshold is met; and

WHEREAS, in addition to applying the 65% spending requirement to different items, the two measures define an operating budget differently and as a result, affect school districts differently, which will be extremely confusing to voters; and

WHEREAS, if the requirements of Amendment 39 were in place during the 2004-05 school year, 166 school districts would have failed to meet the spending requirement by a total of \$278 million and three school districts would have fallen short by a total of \$1 million under Referendum J; and

WHEREAS, both measures are misleading to the public because voters may assume more funding will support classroom instruction when, in fact, the revenues available to school districts will not change as a result of either measure, but will have to be reallocated from programs that the community, through the elected board of education, has deemed important; and

WHEREAS, this "one size fits all" approach, which imposes an arbitrary percentage for classroom expenditures on all the school districts in the state regardless of size or unique circumstances, removes the ability of local communities to set their own budget and spending priorities for their public schools; and

WHEREAS, there is nothing in Amendment 39 or Referendum J that will enhance student achievement or school accountability because it is a school district's ability to achieve high returns on available resources, rather than its ability to reach arbitrary spending levels, that drives student achievement; and

Resolution in Opposition to Amendment 39 & Referendum J

Board of Education Resolution 06/07-28

Adopted: October 3, 2006

WHEREAS, both Amendment 39 and Referendum J are contrary to the constitutionally established right of local control of instruction given to locally-elected boards of education to establish and maintain educational programs for their students; and

WHEREAS, the elimination of local control over expenditures will deprive the Board of Education of important decision-making authority and interfere with the Board's ability to develop its own priorities for expenditure of revenues based on local needs and circumstances.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Directors of the Mesa County Valley School District officially declares its opposition to Amendment 39 and Referendum J because they both impose a "one size fits all" solution on the state and eliminate the flexibility of the local Board of Education to make decisions about appropriate allocation of school district funds based on the needs of this community; and

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED, that Mesa County Board of Education hereby urges registered voters to sustain local control by voting against Amendment 39 and Referendum J because decisions about classroom funding should be made through the local budget process, not through an arbitrary formula that has no relationship to the operation of this School District.

I hereby certify that the information contained in the above resolution is accurate and was adopted by the Mesa County Valley School District No. 51 Board of Education on October 3, 2006.

Jamie Sidanycz Secretary, Board of Education