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Committee Purpose
What is the purpose of this committee?

| Mission | ▪ Advise the district on the pursuit of a bond, mill levy override, or both, and how to prioritize investments to be covered in those ballot initiatives  
  ▪ Make a recommendation as to the size of a bond and/or mill levy override |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Process | ▪ Leverage a sub-committee structure to allow committee members to deeply analyze potential investments in one area  
  ▪ Reconvene as a full committee to address bigger picture questions |
| Key Dates | ▪ June 13 & 16 – Recommendation to the Board of Education  
  ▪ November 8 – Election Day |
We will complete a survey today to share preferences for subcommittee participation and availability.
### 2016 CPAC: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CPAC Co-Chair Kickoff**
- **Overall CPAC Kickoff**
- **Initial CPAC Meetings**
- **Mid**
- **Second Round of CPAC Meetings**

**Check Point**

- **CPAC Sub-committee Meetings**

- **Key Community Organization Meetings**

Groups include: INC, City Council, Metro Chamber, Hispanic Chamber, Black Chamber, A+, Superintendent Forum

- **DPS Regional Briefings / Parent Forum**

- **Board of Education & Student Board Updates**

- **June 13 & 16**
- **Board Vote**
DPS Update
Overarching Goal: Great schools in every neighborhood
By 2020, 80% of students from every region within DPS will attend a high performing school in their region, as measured by the district’s school performance framework.

- **School readiness**
  - By 2020, 80% of DPS third-graders will be at or above grade level in reading and writing.

- **Ready for college & career**
  - By 2020, the four-year graduation rate for students who start with DPS in ninth grade will increase to 90%.
  - By 2020, we will double the number of students per class who graduate college and career ready while raising the bar (adding Science and Social Studies in addition to English and Math).

- **Support the whole child**
  - Schools have Whole Child incorporated into their Unified Improvement Plan
  - Student survey fall 2015 measured progress on whole child. Will align on final measure spring 2016 and can have baseline and target conversations summer 2016 after first district-wide results

- **Close the opportunity gap**
  - By 2020, the graduation rate for African American and Latino students will increase by 30%.
  - The proficiency in reading and writing for third-grade African American and Latino students will increase by 25%.
Our Vision: Every Child Succeeds

Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

A Foundation for Success in School
Support for the Whole Child

GOALS

Ready for College & Career
Close the Opportunity Gap

Leadership
Teaching
Flexibility

STRATEGIES

Invest Early Culture

Every child has talent and potential.
Our diversity is a community treasure.
We can and will eliminate the opportunity gap.

CORE BELIEFS

We must dramatically accelerate our progress.
Every family deserves choice and access.
Our kids need all of us.

Students First
Integrity
Equity

SHARED CORE VALUES

Collaboration
Accountability
Fun
DPS is the Fastest Growing Urban District in the U.S.

DPS Enrollment Growth

- 73,013
- 91,429

## More Kids Choosing DPS Has Driven Our Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denver City and County Population Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>556,094</td>
<td>664,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPS Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>70,955</td>
<td>91,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPS Capture Rate Estimates</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: US Census Bureau, Metro Denver EDC

Sources: US Census American Community Survey Estimates, CO DOLA, DPS projections based on enrollment, retention and dropout trends

+ 110,000  
19% growth

+ 20,500  
29% growth

+ 7 kids of every 100  
> 7,000 more kids choosing DPS vs. private or out of district
We Are Proud of the Diversity of Our Student Body at DPS

**DPS Student Race/Ethnicity**

- Hispanic: 51,252
- White: 20,671
- Black or African American: 12,583
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198
- Hispanic: 2,981
- White: 12,583
- Black or African American: 3,158
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198
- Hispanic: 2,981
- White: 12,583
- Black or African American: 3,158
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198
- Hispanic: 2,981
- White: 12,583
- Black or African American: 3,158
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198
- Hispanic: 2,981
- White: 12,583
- Black or African American: 3,158
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198
- Hispanic: 2,981
- White: 12,583
- Black or African American: 3,158
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198
- Hispanic: 2,981
- White: 12,583
- Black or African American: 3,158
- Two or More Races: 586
- Asian: 198

**DPS Student Socio-Economics**

- Free Lunch: <$31,525 for family of 4
- Reduced Lunch: <$44,863 for family of 4 but > $31,525
- Non Free or Reduced Lunch

- Total: 55,455
- Free Lunch: 27,054
- Reduced Lunch: 7,423
And Have Many Unique Schools Across Our City To Meet Students Where They Are
DPS Has Worked to Bring High Quality Schools to Every Region of the City and, While Progress Has Been Made, Work Remains

% Students in Blue/Green Schools by Geographical Region

Note: DPS uses a School Performance Framework that evaluates schools based on a number of factors including student proficiency, student academic growth and engagement. Blue and Green are the highest ratings.
DPS On-time Graduation Rate Has Increased Faster Than Other Large Districts In the State…

Percentage Point Change in On-Time Graduation Rate
(2006-2015)

- AURORA: -3%
- BOULDER VALLEY: 7%
- COLORADO SPRINGS: 2%
- DENVER: 13%
- DOUGLAS COUNTY: 2%
- GREELEY: 6%
- JEFFERSON COUNTY: 8%
However, our overall on-time graduation rates remain too low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2015 On-Time Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AURORA</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOULDER VALLEY</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO SPRINGS</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS COUNTY</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREELEY</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON COUNTY</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the past decade, while dropout rates have decreased by 60%...

1,000 more students graduated in 2015 compared to 2006

2,200 fewer students dropped out
...Gaps remain, particularly among our African American and Latino students.
While more of our students are graduating college ready, too many need remediation.

Count of Students Meeting College Readiness Benchmarks Overall

- **College Ready**
- **Graduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College Ready</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>3764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>3854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A student is considered College Ready if they demonstrate competency in English, Math and Reading via one of several demonstration points such as the ACT, Advanced Placement or Concurrent Enrollment.
We Have Raised The Bar For All Students, Revealing Some Significant Gaps

Historical State and DPS performance on English Language Arts for Students of Color

Note: State calculations exclude DPS Students
Students of Color includes students identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and two or more races
DPS Has Consistently Been Growing Our Students More Than the State

Denver Annual Median Growth Percentile

State MGP


133

164
DPS Funding and Tax Comparison
Amendment 23 and the Colorado School Finance Act outlines the Total Program Funding formula used to determine a per-pupil funding level for each school district.

- The Total Program Funding includes a base amount plus additional factors that vary by district and compensate for financial differences among districts such as cost of living, size of the district, and personnel costs.
- In addition to these factors, additional funding is allocated for At-Risk and Online pupil counts.

**Per Pupil Base**
Equal funding per pupil across all districts, increases annually by inflation.

**Factors and At-Risk / Online**
Adjusts the Base per Pupil Funding by the following categories:
- Cost of Living
- Size of District
- Personnel costs
- At-Risk Pupils
- Online & Ascent Pupils

**Total Per Pupil Program Funding for each District (PPR)**
Total funding for each district is determined by multiplying its PPR times its Funded Pupil Count.
Shrinking Funding for Colorado Schools

In the early 1980s, Colorado spent $473 more per student than the national average.

By 2000, Colorado was spending $928 less per student than the national average.

The latest figures show that Colorado spends $2,060 less per student than the national average.

*Colorado per student spending based on statewide average

Source: Colorado Fiscal Institute
What is TABOR?

- TABOR is an amendment to the Colorado Constitution approved by voters in 1992.
- The three main provisions of TABOR are:
  - Limits revenue collections to a cap that, for the state, is set according to the rate of inflation plus population growth, requiring rebates to taxpayers when revenue exceeds the cap.
  - Mandates elections for all tax or debt increases, taking away elected officials' ability to raise revenue.
  - Specifically prohibits certain kinds of taxes, including a return to a graduated income tax and a statewide property tax or new or increased real estate transfer taxes.

Projected TABOR rebates ($s in millions):

- Due to the impact of TABOR rebates and increased healthcare, corrections and transportation costs to the state, the Governor’s proposed budget for FY 16-17 includes an increase to the Negative Factor of $50M
In 2009, the legislature reinterpreted Amendment 23 to mean that only the base amount was covered by the mandatory increases, not the factors associated with District Funding.

In order to make across-the-board cuts from all school districts, the legislature added a new “Budget Stabilization” or “Negative Factor” to the School Finance Act formula.

Since 2010-11 the annual State Total of the “Negative Factor” has grown to nearly $1 billion.

The “Negative Factor” impacts Denver Public Schools by nearly $92 million per year and has reduced funding to DPS by more than $430 million since its inception.
Denver vs Neighboring Districts – Weighted Per Pupil Funding

- Comparing Denver Public Schools and neighboring districts based on the costs of serving students of need, DPS is funded $724 less than its neighboring districts on average.

- The weights of .35 for FRL and .47 ELL are based on an analysis APA Consulting conducted of the cost of serving such students in several states in 2013.

Due to slower birth rates during the recession and gentrification in Denver, student growth is slowing.

At-Risk student population is expected to continue the trend of declining at ~1-2% per year.
Due to the financial outlook for total program funding, DPS is taking steps beginning in FY16-17 to ensure ongoing stability & the highest level of support possible for our students and schools.

These steps include:
- Reduced Central Office budgets by more than $20M annually
- Transferring 48 critical instructional staff directly to our highest needs need schools
  - Reduced 157 central office positions
  - Details for all reductions & positions transfers can be found in the appendix

The impact of these changes will help stabilize fund balance that will be needed in order to achieve the academic progress and goals of the Denver 2020 plan.
## Summary of Bond and Mill Levy Overrides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>General Obligation Bond</th>
<th>Mill Levy Override</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Mills on Property taxes</td>
<td>Mills on Property taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Funding</th>
<th>General Obligation Bond</th>
<th>Mill Levy Override</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>One-time Revenue</td>
<td>Annually recurring revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Solely within our district for capital investments</td>
<td>Solely within our district for operating expenses or capital investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowable Investments</th>
<th>General Obligation Bond</th>
<th>Mill Levy Override</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New schools</td>
<td>Anything is allowable, DPS has historically used the funds for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building improvements / renovations</td>
<td>• Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land purchases</td>
<td>• Textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equipping or furnishing a building</td>
<td>• Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Investments</th>
<th>General Obligation Bond</th>
<th>Mill Levy Override</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating expenses (e.g., Teachers, supplies)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recent DPS Election Approvals</th>
<th>General Obligation Bond</th>
<th>Mill Levy Override</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Mill Levy Overrides
Key Consideration

- Mill Levy Override funds are provided directly to school budgets or, in some cases, managed centrally to provide direct services to schools.
- Schools must use funding in accordance with the ballot language and board-approved resolutions. DPS provides charter schools a per student share of eligible Mill Levy Override funding as long as those funds are used as intended.

1. Charters in DPS facilities benefit from this allocation in the same way as district-run schools
Mill Levy Override Rate Calculation

- Mill Levy Override Rates are determined based on 2 factors:
  1. Type of Mill
  2. Assessed Valuation

Types of Mills

**Fixed Dollar**: Set $ amount to be collected annually, mill rate amount set based on assessed value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Amount to be Collected</th>
<th>2015 Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>Mill Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$13,221,694,094</td>
<td>X 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fixed Mill**: Set number of Mills to be collected annually, $ amount received based on assessed value
- 2012 Mill Levy is a Fixed Mill Levy
- Example of the 2012 Fixed Mill Levy calculation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill Rate</th>
<th>2015 Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>$ Amount to be Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>$13,221,694,094</td>
<td>/ 1,000 = $64,257,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DPS Mill Levy Overrides – Historical Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill Levy</th>
<th>FY12-13</th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Valuation $</td>
<td>$10,007,267,892</td>
<td>$10,454,481,228</td>
<td>$10,517,386,669</td>
<td>$13,221,694,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Levy Overrides</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>1.626</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>2.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mill Levy Override</td>
<td>12.714</td>
<td>12.431</td>
<td>12.466</td>
<td>10.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Redemption</td>
<td>10.913</td>
<td>10.446</td>
<td>10.519</td>
<td>10.250</td>
<td>GOB Debt Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Override &amp; Bond Redemption Mills</td>
<td>23.627</td>
<td>22.877</td>
<td>22.985</td>
<td>21.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assessed Value is given to DPS annually by the Denver Assessor’s Office

- As Assessed Value increases, fewer mills are needed to collect the Fixed Dollar Mill amounts, therefore decreasing the amount of total mills levied by DPS to property taxpayers

- The purchasing power of MLOs decreases annually with enrollment growth and inflation, although AV growth may compensate for this for Fixed Mill Overrides.
Inflation and Enrollment Increases in student enrollment have eroded the purchasing power associated with each Fixed Dollar MLO

The 1998 and 2003 MLO’s inflation-adjusted Per Pupil Revenue have decreased 51% and 42% respectively, for a combined purchasing power loss of $31.4M in FY15-16 based on current enrollment
### Metro District FY15-16 Mill Levy Override Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>FY15-16 Mill Levy Override</th>
<th>% of Available MLO Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northglenn</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Compared to other Metro-Area school districts, Denver Public Schools levies a lower amount of override mills to local taxpayers.
- Based on Actual FY15-16 Mill Levy Override amounts from CDE.
- Many other local districts considering requesting voters for a new MLO in 2016.
Additional FY16-17 Mill Levy Override Potential

- School districts in Colorado are allowed to ask their voters for Mill Levy Override revenues up to 25% of their Total Program Funding, plus a cost-of-living adjustment from 2002

- Based on current Assessed Value and Total Program forecasts, DPS has the potential to issue 4.24 additional Override Mills in FY16-17, for a value of $56.8M

Cost of adding 1 Mill:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Actual Assessed Value</th>
<th>Assessment Rate</th>
<th>1 Additional Mill / 1,000</th>
<th>Annual Levy Tax for 1 Additional Mill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>7.96%</td>
<td>1 / 1,000</td>
<td>$19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>1 / 1,000</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bond Program
What is the statute and history of DPS Bond initiatives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Districts are limited in the amount of bonds they can raise through local district bonds based on the latest assessment valuation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ For Denver, the bonded debt limit is roughly $2.6 billion. Currently, DPS has roughly $1.3 billion in general obligation debt outstanding, leaving up to $1.3 billion available for additional authorization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Issuances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ In 2012, Denver citizens voted to authorize $466 Million in general bond obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ In addition to 2012, there have been four other recent authorizations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2008: $454M authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2003: $311M authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1998: $305M authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1990: $200M authorization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denver Public Schools has a lower bond redemption mill property tax burden than many other Metro Area school districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>FY15-16 Bond Redemption Mills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>22.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northglenn</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>15.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on:
- Passage of 2016 Mill Levy Override of no more than 3.9 Mills annually, decreasing as Assessed Valuation grows
- Passage of 2016 Bond with Debt Service of no more than 2.3 Mills annually until payoff
On a notecard at your table, answer the following questions:

1. What about the school finance situation was new or surprising information?

2. What further questions do you have around school finance?
Committee Process
## Committee Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPAC Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Advise the district on the pursuit of a bond, mill levy override, or both, and how to prioritize investments to be covered in those ballot initiatives  
| ▪ Make a recommendation as to the size of a bond and/or mill levy override  
| ▪ Determine committee members to chair the sub-committees  
| ▪ Receive recommendations regarding prioritization of investments across sub-committees, and consolidate into single recommendations for the MLO and Bond.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPAC Sub-committee Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Deeper level of analysis into specific areas of potential investment within sub-committee  
| ▪ Provide recommendations to the overall committee regarding prioritization  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPS Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Identify and prioritize potential investments for both the bond and mill levy  
| ▪ Categorize investments into topics to better organize efforts  
| ▪ Present information to the committees and respond to questions and requests for additional information  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Determine whether to go forward with bond and/or mill levy initiatives, and final contents of the package(s).  

---
DPS Areas of Interest for MLO Fund Investment Linked to Denver Plan 2020

**Denver Plan Goals**

- **Great Schools in Every Neighborhood**
  - Innovative teacher and school leadership models
  - Additional time for teacher planning & collaboration

- **A Foundation for Success in School**
  - Early literacy supports such as teacher professional development and tutoring

- **Ready for College & Career**
  - Exposure to college coursework and career opportunities
  - 21st century classroom technology

- **Support for the Whole Child**
  - Supports for student social emotional health and student engagement
  - In-school enrichments and summer learning

**Potential MLO Areas of Investment**

- **Great Teachers in Every Classroom, Great Leaders in Every School:**
  - Innovative teacher and school leadership models
  - Additional time for teacher planning & collaboration

- **Invest Early:**
  - Early literacy supports such as teacher professional development and tutoring

- **Ready for College & Career:**
  - Exposure to college coursework and career opportunities
  - 21st century classroom technology

- **Support for the Whole Child:**
  - Supports for student social emotional health and student engagement
  - In-school enrichments and summer learning
DPS Areas of Interest for Bond Investment

New Capacity
- New facilities
- Expanded capacity at existing campuses

Quality Learning Environments
- Targeted investments at select older facilities to allow them to upgrade and personalize learning spaces
- Investments to bring facilities up to Education Suitability guidelines

Maintenance
- Addressing deficiencies in existing assets (e.g., heating/cooling, roofing, electrical, plumbing)
- Addressing any ADA or code issues

Technology and Safety
- Classroom technology
- District infrastructure and systems
- Safety, cameras, door access
DPS Recommendation: Structure of CPAC Sub-Committees

Based on internal planning to date as well as previous election efforts, DPS recommends the following four sub-committees to identify and prioritize investments. We would like each sub-committee to have at least ten members, with one designated as the lead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond: Capacity and Quality Learning Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded capacity at existing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investments to upgrade and improve learning environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond: Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Addressing deficiencies in existing assets (e.g., heating/cooling, roofing, electrical, plumbing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addressing ADA or code issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addressing facility life-safety concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond: Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District infrastructure and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety, cameras, door access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill Levy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Great Teachers in Every Classroom, Great Leaders in Every School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invest Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ready for College and Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support the Whole Child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Member Survey

- Before you leave, please complete the short survey to:
  - Force rank which sub-committee you would prefer to join
  - Share information on your availability for sub-committee meetings

---

2016 Community Planning Advisory Committee
Kick-off Survey

Name: ____________________

Sub-Committee Participation (Please rank in order of preference from 1 - most preferred - to 4 - least preferred)

___ Bond New Capacity + Quality Learning Environment
___ Bond Maintenance
___ Bond Technology
___ Mill Levy

Please check all times that you would be available for a sub-committee meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Afternoon + Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Additional space for comments on following dates & times meetings]
Next steps

Next meeting is scheduled for February 29, 5:00pm – 7:00pm
Location: Byers Cafeteria – 150 S Pearl
Topic: Overview of each sub-committee
  - Vision
  - 2012 investments and Oversight
  - Initial Thoughts on 2016 Needs

Hold: Monday March 7th at 5:30pm for first Sub-committee meetings
Shrinking Funding for Colorado Schools

Gallagher Amendment passes maintaining a proportional relationship between revenue raised from business and residential property taxes (55% / 45%).

TABOR passes establishing limits on revenues and the ability of elected officials to increase revenue or change property assessment rates.

Amendment 23 passes establishing minimum increase in “base” per pupil funding by at least the rate of inflation and with the goal of catching K-12 funding up to 1988-89 levels adjusted for inflation.

Due to the declining local dollars and lower state revenues as a result of the Great Recession, Legislators introduce the “negative factor” reducing K-12 funding by ~$1B per year.

In the early 1980s Colorado spent $473 more per student than the national average.

By 2000, Colorado was spending $928 less per student than the national average.

The latest figures show that Colorado spends $2,060 less per student than the national average.

Source: Colorado Fiscal Institute
Shrinking Funding for Colorado Schools

- From FY96 to FY11, the spending gap of Colorado vs. National Average increased by 58%, or -$1,816.
- Despite recent increases in Colorado Per Pupil Revenue, the funding gap still remains.

Source: Colorado School Finance Project
### Additional FY16-17 General Obligation Bond Levy Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Obligation Bond Debt Policy - State Statute</th>
<th>GO Bond Debt of a School District cannot exceed 20% of the latest Assessed Valuation of taxable property in the District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver Assessed Valuation &amp; GO Bond Limit</td>
<td>FY16-17 Forecasted Assessed Valuation $13,420,019,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY16-17 DPS General Obligation Bond Limit% 20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY16-17 DPS General Obligation Bond Limit $2,684,003,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-17 General Obligation Bond Forecast</td>
<td>Total FY16-17 Outstanding GO Bonds $1,316,812,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY16-17 MLO % of Total MLO Cap 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Obligation Bond Availability</td>
<td>% of General Obligation Bond Limit Remaining 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ GO Bond Potential based on Est. FY16-17 Assessed Valuation $1,367,191,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Forecasts are based on DPS estimated FY16-17 Assessed Valuation
- Based on current State Statute, DPS has used 49% of the potential General Obligation Bond limit
- The amount of mills required in any given year to fund an additional GO Bond would vary based on the debt service schedule of the bond
DPS continues to maximize funding in the classrooms by reducing centrally budgeted services and is among the districts with the lowest percentage of central funding.

**HOW A DOLLAR IS SPENT**

- **59¢** Direct School Funding
- **36¢** School-Based Services
  - **11¢** Special Education and Student Services
  - **8¢** Academic Supports
  - **5¢** Facilities, Utilities, and Insurance
  - **4¢** Food Service
  - **3¢** Community Engagement, Adult Education, Voc Ed, Other Ed
  - **2¢** Transportation
  - **2¢** Other
  - **1¢** Athletics

**5¢** Central School Support Services