Beaverton School District
Budget Reduction Background
2010-11

Reduction Item	Amount	Implications	Rationale for Reduction
1. Reduce Health Insurance Reserve Fund	$1,000,000	▪ Decreases amount available for future cost increases ▪ Non-sustainable	▪ Quick and easy implementation ▪ Equitable ▪ Protects the classroom and staff positions ▪ Does not affect staffing process
2. Reduce Workers' Compensation Insurance Reserve Fund	$500,000	▪ Lowers amount available for future claims ▪ Non-sustainable	▪ Quick and easy implementation ▪ Equitable ▪ Protects the classroom and staff positions ▪ Still within actuarial recommendation ▪ Does not affect staffing process
3. Reduce Ending Fund Balance to 4%	$5,800,000	▪ Concern for bond rating and future bond interest rates ▪ Reduces ability to respond to future revenue losses ▪ Reduces current year operating contingency ▪ Plan to reinstate fund balance to 5% will need to be presented to the School Board ▪ Non-sustainable	▪ Quick and easy implementation ▪ Equitable ▪ Protects the classroom and staff positions ▪ Purpose for which it was intended ▪ Does not affect staffing process
4. Reduce Non-salary Accounts District-wide by 10%	$2,982,000	▪ Small schools will not have the scale of economy to make reductions ▪ Inequity between schools to fundraise and provide a cushion for non-salary expenditures ▪ Schools have already reduced 10% ▪ Central cost centers have already reduced 15%	▪ Need to protect classroom ▪ Retains jobs ▪ Provides for flexibility of targeted object reductions ▪ Does not affect staffing process

Reduction Item	Amount	Implications	Rationale for Reduction
5. Reduce Athletics and Activities by 10%	$422,000	▪ Staff needed to volunteer for meet management ▪ Programs could be eliminated potentially impacting students ▪ Transportation could be eliminated ▪ Raising athletic and activity fees will pass costs along to the community ▪ Safety (with reduced meet management) ▪ Cost to the District for greater visibility of law enforcement ▪ Students disenfranchised if they cannot play sports ▪ Low income students will be unable to participate ▪ School spirit will be hurt	▪ Need to protect the classroom ▪ Potential for booster fundraising support ▪ Non-required education function ▪ Does not affect staffing process
6. Reduce the Staffing Reserve by 6.2 APU (Prior Allocation 20.12 APU)	$496,000	▪ Decreases amount available to respond to class size issues ▪ Concern for adding back staff in conflict with making staff reductions ▪ Non-sustainable	▪ Easily implemented ▪ Potential to protect staff ▪ Does not affect staffing process

Reduction Item	Amount	Implications	Rationale for Reduction
▪ Cut Remaining Prevention/Intervention Specialists (6 APU)	$479,000	▪ Already discussed by budget committee and been reinstated ▪ Avoiding layoffs highly valued by Internal Finance Work Group	▪ Counselors have received training to support prevention program ▪ Supports state standards for counseling program ▪ Sustainable
▪ Reduce Small School Specialists (per original recommendation) (7 APU)	$563,000	▪ Already discussed by budget committee and been reinstated ▪ Avoiding layoffs highly valued by Internal Finance Work Group	▪ Attains equitable staffing allocations across system ▪ Consistent with post-Measure 5 reductions ▪ Sustainable
▪ Cut Response to Intervention (RTI) Specialists (22 APU)	$1,700,000	▪ Struggling students will not receive interventions ▪ 50% of time is working directly with students ▪ Significant re-staffing implications including payroll delays due to positions being .5 APU ▪ Would put the progress being made on Response To Intervention on hold	▪ Minimal or no impact on class size ▪ Supports moving teachers back into the classroom ▪ Significant savings
▪ Reduce X Number of Days @ $1,067,000 per day		▪ Loss of instruction, conference or professional development days ▪ Decline in staff morale ▪ ODE waiver needed at high school level for instructional minutes ▪ Non-sustainable ▪ Employees loss of salary ▪ Community impact (ex. daycare) ▪ Requires Memorandum of Understanding with employee groups ▪ Concern for District's image on the national forefront ▪ Concern for not leaving an option to respond to September, December, and March forecasts	▪ Quick and easy implementation ▪ Across the board and equitable ▪ Preserves well-trained staff ▪ Clearly understood by community ▪ Increases community awareness of implications of budget crisis ▪ Protects programs (same level of service) ▪ Practical ▪ Substantial savings

Reduction Item	Amount	Implications	Rationale for Reduction
▪ Reduce 5 Administrators: School and Central Services	$766,000	▪ Already many administrative reductions ▪ Increased workload for building/central administrators ▪ State/federal compliance issues at central level ▪ Delayed decision making	▪ Non-classroom positions ▪ Need to protect the classroom ▪ To realize equity in responsibility for leadership in small and large schools ▪ Modest cost savings ▪ Sustainable
▪ Reduce Safety and Security	$500,000	▪ Fewer campus monitors and crossing guards ▪ Risk student and staff safety ▪ Danger in crossing streets for students ▪ Staff will need to be assigned as hallway monitors ▪ 25% reduction to overall safety and security budget ▪ Contributes to job loss	▪ Need to protect classroom positions ▪ Potential to increase community volunteerism for crossing guard positions ▪ Moderate cost savings ▪ Sustainable
▪ Reduce Counselors by 20% (16.4 APU)	$1,264,000	▪ Not supported by principals ▪ Low priority for entire Internal Finance Work Group ▪ Already reducing counselors in staffing formula ▪ Eliminates some level of community outreach	▪ Need to protect the classroom ▪ Maintains class size ratios ▪ Sustainable
▪ Reduce School Psychologists by 20% (5.7 APU)	$524,000	▪ Not supported by principals ▪ Low priority for entire Internal Finance Work Group ▪ Safety issue ▪ Psychologists would have large caseloads	▪ Need to protect the classroom ▪ Licensure less likely to create bumping scenarios ▪ Helps keep the maintenance of effort down to 2009-10 level ▪ Maintains class size ratios ▪ Sustainable