

Mill Levy Stabilization

Effects of Stabilizing the Mill Levy

1. Impacted 175 out of 178 school districts. Cherry Creek, Harrison and District 11 were excluded because they did not “de-Bruce”.
2. ***Did not increase*** school districts per pupil operating revenue (PPR).
3. Impacted school districts differently:
 - a. Districts above 27 mills were lowered to 27.
 - b. Districts below or equal to 27 mills did not change.
4. Increased the “floor districts” PPR more than the formula in the school finance act.
5. In 2008, the state’s money not allocated to districts as a result of the stabilization will be redirected to fund more pre-school and kindergarten students.

Why stabilize the mill levy?

1. When the school finance act was implemented in 1994, two of the goals were:
 - a. All school districts mill levies were to be equal and as close to 40 mills as possible.
 - b. State and local portions for school finance were to each be at 50%.Neither of these goals were accomplished by the 1994 school finance act.
2. The stabilization helps the state’s budget. It reduces the percentage of funds directed to K-12 education.
3. To stop the increasing disparity of local mills arising in the school finance act (the range was from about 2 mills to 40 mills).