

District Responses to Negative Factor Questions - Group 2		
District	Scenario 1 - Buydown NF - How would your district spend money if the Legislature invested \$200M back into the Negative Factor?	Scenario 2 - No buy down - Would your district have to make budget cuts? If so, what do you think you would do?
Adams 14	Implementing unfunded mandates and salaries for teachers.	Stop implementing unfunded mandates.
Adams 50	We would quit spending our reserves.	We would look at current program offerings and class size.
Bennett School District 29J	We would be able to retain some needed certified staffing, possibly our transportation programs as well. We have lost almost \$6M to date due to the rescissions and negative factor. We cannot sustain many more of these years. some of this money would also go to the capital reserve to fix some issues that are festering badly and are safety issues. We have tried for two mill levy overrides that have failed miserably trying to correct some of these items.	We would have to make cuts for the 6th year in a row. If our entire negative factor was given back we would probably be OK. We have already cut several teaching and administrative positions, a media specialist, classified hours from every department, have restructured our IT department and are attempting a Mill Levy override for the 3rd time in 4 years. If it fails again we will more than likely have to terminate our bus services. The outlook without these funds are not good for our schools future or the community. We are barely surviving with the funding we are receiving.
Moffat Consolidated School District #2	We have already cut to the bare minimum. We have had to combine classrooms and not fill many positions. We have even cut programs. We have not given any raises for years so have not kept up with inflation or insurance increases. This is not good for staff moral. If the negative factor is reduced we may be able to give small salary increases and keep our programs. Small schools are cutting programs and are also losing students to bigger districts because of more educational options.	If the negative factor is not reduced we may have to cut even more. We have already cut to the bare minimum. We have had to combine classrooms and not fill many positions. We have even cut programs. We have not given any raises for years so have not kept up with inflation or insurance increases. This is not good for staff moral.
Monte Vista	We have spent all our reserves and are looking at needing to cut approximately \$500K this coming year. Over the previous four years we have lost a total of more than \$4M due to the negative factor. We anticipate an ending fund balance next year of less than \$500M if there is no relief from the legislature during the 2014-15 year and beyond. If both the Governor's budget and the \$200M are in place, we may be forced still to reduce staff or we may be close to "not drowning again" (depending upon what allocation formula is in place). There are a variety of measures that have been "contemplated" ranging from reducing number of teacher professional development days, salary freezes, cutting paid medical benefits (we are already on a four day week so we cannot do anything more that way) in addition to staff reduction. None of these measure will provide the level of savings needed to put a tourniquet around the wound the negative factors has caused in our high poverty district.	We have already stopped buying needed instructional resources (no new textbooks for the past four years), have reduced staff by 16% since 2009, and not offered competitive salaries even within Colorado, let alone the rest of the mountain west or the country, and we continue to get more and more special needs students with no support from the state. We already are only one administrator in each of the five buildings, and only one district level administrator for the 1,100 students we serve. We have no curriculum support staff and only one instructional coach tasked with serving all of the new inductees (18 new staff this current school year) as well as to provide support for implementation of common core, educator effectiveness and many other "pancakes" too numerous to even mention.

District	Scenario 1 - Buydown NF - How would your district spend money if the Legislature invested \$200M back into the Negative Factor?	Scenario 2 - No buy down - Would your district have to make budget cuts? If so, what do you think you would do?
Montrose County	<p>We would be able to fully implement SB191: Train the administrators, provide sufficient personnel to do the evals and coaching, develop a real system to use student data to determine teacher performance. Add back curriculum, GT, maintenance, staff. Add professional development for new tests and standards implementation. Add back for technology purchases that were delayed. Discontinue spending of our (very, very) small reserves.</p>	<p>Without the money, Not address the needs of our highest kids (GT). Not fully implement 191 (simply can't get it done, and we will deal with the consequences of that). Not be able to get caught up on technology purchases which will impact computerized testing and evaluations. Continue to not have adequate training for the myriad of reforms/mandates/improvements from both the local levels and from the state and federal sources. Continue to spend from reserves for staffing issue; can do this only for 2 more years before reserves are depleted.</p>
Wiggins	<p>Our major need is textbooks and curriculum that we have not updated since the cuts began six years ago. Many of our textbooks are 10-15 years old. Also training our staff to teach the new curriculum and to teach in a manner that enables the students to be 21st Century Learners would be first. So if textbooks and curriculum is number one, professional development for our teachers is 1-A. With the cost at almost \$200 per student per subject area, I'm sure that would use up our entire share of the \$200M. The next priority area is our technology. We have cut this budget in recent years and it doesn't take long to fall behind in the area of technology. I'm sure our entire share will be used up by now, but if the funds are NOT one time, next we could put funds to teacher recruitment and retention. Our average teacher salary is \$11,700 per year BELOW the state average. Obviously it is difficult to attract and retain good teachers with this discrepancy. Fourth on the list is general maintenance of school grounds, buses and transportation. A new bus is needed and we have been putting that off for some time now as well as doing work on some of our older buildings</p>	<p>We would have to make cuts. At this point, not sure where those will come from. We will continue to short teachers of the materials and supplies they ask for. We will continue to make class sizes very high and not replace retiring teachers and classified staff. We will continue to use outdated curriculum and technology, and we will continue to do our best putting "band-aids" on our buildings to make them workable and safe. Since cutback started six years ago, our small school district of 500 has been cut over \$2.6M. Our negative factor this year alone is \$703,633 in a budget of around \$4M. We need money soon, the wheels are falling off and it is the students that are paying the price.</p>