

Minutes of Budget Committee Meeting

Budget Committee and Board Approved _____

Corbett School District

A hybrid Budget Committee Meeting of the Board of Trustees and Budget Committee of Corbett School District was held Wednesday, April 9, 2025, beginning at 7:00 PM in the Corbett High School Commons and via ZOOM-Owl. Board Members present in person were Bob Buttke; David Granberg; Todd Redfern (7:14 p.m.); Leah Fredericks; Ben Byers and Dylan Rickert. Board Member Todd Mickalson was not in attendance. Budget Committee members present in person were Brad Hunter, Incoming Presiding Officer; Krystina Robison, incoming Vice Presiding Officer; Patrick Murphy; Benno Lyon (7:01 p.m.); David Osborn; Jennifer Bruton and Amy Ciecko. Also present in person were Derek Fialkiewicz, Ed.D., Superintendent; Regina Sampson, CFO/Business Manager; Brie Windust, Business Office Assistant/ZOOM Moderator; and Robin Lindeen-Blakeley, Deputy Clerk/HR Lead. NOTE: The minutes are prepared to coincide with time scheduled matters and the numbering system of the agenda and is not necessarily the actual order of happenings at the meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Leah Fredericks, Board Vice Chair, called the meeting to order and led the flag salute at 7:00 p.m.

There was one employee and one patron at the meeting. There were four online attendees.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Leah Fredericks, Board Vice Chair, asked for nominations for Presiding Officer and Vice Presiding Officer.

Discussion about the process.

Benno Lyon nominated Brad Hunter for Presiding Officer and Bob Buttke seconded. The vote was 11-2; Brad Hunter abstained, Todd Redfern absent for the vote.

Krystina Robison nominated herself for Vice Presiding Officer and Ben Byers seconded.

The vote was 11-2; Krystina Robison abstained and Todd Redfern was absent for the vote.

Attachments: (1)

3. BUDGET CALENDAR REVIEW

Presiding Officer Hunter brought attention to the budget calendar dates.

Discussion.

Questions and comments regarding online training.

Dr. Fialkiewicz announced that if a second meeting is needed, then it will be after the board meeting on April 16.

Attachments: (2)

4. PRESENTATION OF BUDGET MESSAGE

Budget Officer - Derek Fialkiewicz, Ed.D. and Regina Sampson, Business Manager/CFO

<https://corbett.k12.or.us/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Corbett-SD-2024-25-Proposed-Budget-v2.pdf>

Budget Officer – Derek Fialkiewicz, Ed.D. read the proposed budget message. The 2025-26 goals were approved by the Board with feedback from staff and community. Page 101 of the budget document shows the General Fund (GF) Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance (UEFB) of \$33,763.00 proposed projection for 2025-26. Pages 113-114 has facilities projection of \$899,000.00, including staff. Requirements under 2544 show \$25,000 proposed for additional renovation. There would be \$2.5 million for a seismic grant for the MPB assuming we get it. \$250,000.00 in matching funds maximum reserve. On page 31, the proposed FTE shows cuts already made from 2024-25 to 2025-26. We are maintaining CTE and extracurriculars as we go. See pages 20 - 23 for Programming Decisions, Student Enrollment Projection, Budget Environment, Overview - At this time an additional maintenance position will not be added to the budget. Effects of 2024-2025 Budget Shortfall, the General Fund Ending Fund Balance - where a strong GF EFB is between 7%-10% of the total GF Budget, Variables That Affect Budget, and the Conclusion. Dr. Fialkiewicz shared the budget presentation on screen too. In his discussions with Ms. Sampson, the budget is conservative with projections and Revenues (RV) down and Expenditures (XP) up. We are potentially in a better situation than at the beginning of this year.

Ms. Sampson went over the Oregon Budget Law ORS on page 206 and she and Dr. Fialkiewicz explained page 207 and 208.

Dr. Fialkiewicz expressed that page 209 is from Ms. Sampson's "nuts and bolts".

Ms. Sampson explained that page 210 has the full document in the packet. Function codes are for 1000 classrooms, 2000 outside of classrooms, 3000-4000 not in GF, 5000 debt, and 6000 rolls into EFB if not used.

Dr. Fialkiewicz read pages 211 and 212.

Ben Byers asked what the conversation was like, trustworthy?

Dr. Fialkiewicz answered that from his perspective it was richer and provided with better data than in the past. Each principal had an allocated budget to look at and fill in line items from lump sums.

Ms. Sampson added that building budgets are based on State School Fund (SSF) RV, with 3.5% to work with as discretionary in services and supplies, not salaries or benefits. We looked at three year histories for the supervisors and took totals.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said the principals allotment with student enrollment and classwork like Advanced Placement (AP) based on strong discussion on what had to stay based on importance.

Ms. Sampson noted page 213 was also reviewed by the Tax Supervising and Conservation Committee (TSCC). Page 214 showed a debt summary required in multiple sections of the budget document. Page 216, Operating Statistics is meals.

Dr. Fialkiewicz gave kudos to Ms. Sampson for finding student photos for the budget document as a reminder/grounding of why we are doing this.

Ms. Sampson stated the Beginning Fund Balance (BFB) is \$209,000.00 overall for all Funds (Debt Service, State, Local and Student Body). GF BFB is projected at \$0.00. December enrollment and percentages explained on page 218. Page 219 has

utilities, Maintenance of Effort (MOE) which must be equal or greater than the year before for where we start. Page 220 has percentages, where Support Services is up because of the seismic grant to outweigh Instruction. Page 221 is done in October each year.

Dr. Fialkiewicz added that hope is for 1224 in 2025-26 and then back down each year to an eventual 1089.

Ms. Sampson noted on page 222 that most is in the GF. Special RV includes SBMH and Title funding. Page 223 ties back in with the MESD loan of \$250,000.00 principal and \$40,000.00 interest. Page 224 shows how the accounting structure will change with the G.O. Bond and OSCIM projections.

Dr. Fialkiewicz mentioned the appropriations are wonky because of reallocations where funds should be.

Ben Byers commented that it is totally understood but hard to tell where it has been and where we came from.

Ms. Sampson noted on page 225 that we can accumulate in 400 for bigger projects. Page 227 had to consider absenteeism with the 1212 Regular Annual Daily Membership (ADMr). Special Education (SPED) and poverty conditional on a Weighted Annual Daily Membership (ADMw) of 1381.42, what we are actually paid on. Additional for SPED Individual Education Plans (IEP's) and more services. Dr. Fialkiewicz reminded us that CSD is the third lowest funded school in the state and lowest in Multnomah County. We have low numbers in English Language Learners (ELL), and no Pregnant and Parenting to weigh our scale compared to others.

Benno Lyon asked what is the baseline number 1381? And does that include weighted students? And is that weight the same for all schools?

Ms. Sampson said that the State School Fund (SSF) starting number is in the lower rectangle on page 227.

David Osborn asked about that page and whether we are below average on IEP's?

Dr. Fialkiewicz said it would be \$1.3 million in all and about \$10,000.00 per student, with up to 11% for SPED, and we are currently at 20% SPED. The legislators have talked about raising it to 15% or getting rid of it entirely. The state is averaging 15-17%. The legislature has assured it will be in addition to the \$11.4 billion.

Bob Buttke asked about staff costs not 80%.

Ms. Sampson explained that staff are within Instruction (1000) and Support Services (2000) by appropriation. We are below average for staffing based on IEP's. Page 228 the reserve for seismic grant of \$250,000.00 or can put it elsewhere. Food Service will also need a match and up to net zero going forward. \$100,000.0 for if enrollment is not met or if errors or ice storms, other risks, etc.

Todd Redfern equated it to slush fund. It would be nice to have Contingency and grow a reserve.

Ms. Sampson said that during COVID some districts did.

Dylan Rickert suggested if taking a quarter million reserve/contingency and if had to spend it would it inhibit that going to capital projects?

Ms. Sampson said we will know before June about the seismic grant.

Board discussion.

Ms. Sampson pointed out the GF Contingency line on page 226 Function 6000 is \$250,000.00 and the Capital Fund Reserve is \$250,000.00 (page 228). We also have a Special RV Fund and Debt Fund (page 225).

Brad Hunter assumed then the overall number is closer to \$350,000.00 without a seismic grant.

Board discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said the seismic grant is overinflated but net zero. The state has this grant available for older buildings. We received one prior for the main gym about five or six years ago. Now we would like it for the MPB and also in the future the back gym.

Patrick Murphy asked about enrollment projections of 25% increase in CHS. Would the percentage of Contingency cover if less than predicted? Is it in flex?

Dr. Fialkiewicz stated that the first week of April we looked at lottery applicants and almost all slots filled with students on the waiting list, so \$100,000.00 reserve, with a leeway of 10 students. It is easier to have higher class sizes with upper grades. We need the lowest numbers in K/1 CGS and K/2 CAPS. We slowly increased as we went up.

Brad Hunter asked when enrollment will be set.

Dr. Fialkiewicz answered the first day of school through that week.

Leah Fredericks asked about why \$100,000.00 out of GF and not Contingency.

Ms. Sampson said the reserve fund keeps it a little more protected.

Dylan Rickert asked about the five students up in K/1 projections on page 165 of packet or 139 of document.

Dr. Fialkiewicz explained this is an increase at CAPS, with five less kindergarten and three more first graders.

Board discussion.

Ms. Sampson continued with page 229 where High School Success (HSS) and Early Literacy Grant (ELG) are moved out of GF and coding is to Special RV 2240 or 2410 or the corrected allocation. This moves some functions out of Superintendent and into Finance. All staff were reviewed and properly coded.

Dr. Fialkiewicz explained there are multiple pieces to different job areas now depicted. Apples to oranges but should be more precise going forward.

8:21 p.m.

Ms. Sampson directed to page 230 RV with SBMH 4000 and 5000 Reserves. 2000 includes seismic grant and SBMH Counseling for XP and 3000 for nutrition. Page 231 is Special Revenue including RV and XP.

Dr. Fialkiewicz explained examples of federal grant funds like IDEA, SPED Funds and Title Funds to improve the classroom. State and local funds include examples like Fund 20 the Energy Fund, or like the TAP grant that helps assess facilities to see if we need seismic or bonds in the future. Youth Transition Program (YTP) is for post high school.

Leah Fredericks asked if the media attention around federal sources affects their restriction?

Ms. Sampson explained that the SBMH and one other grant in 4300 which are restricted and in 4300. Title funds and others are funds passed through by the State. We are hearing nationally and in Oregon of the strong possibility of title funds being

reduced by 25%. We've projected that, and if we get more information we will ask for additional resources. We are shifting mainly for better management at the federal level. If we don't have the grants, we can't spend the money.

Ben Byers reiterated that we are assuming a 25% reduction in this budget for Title grant dollars.

Ms. Sampson confirmed.

Dr. Fialkiewicz suggested the largest grant is SBMH and he doesn't think it will be reduced.

Benno Lyon summed up that these are back pocket contingencies so that if half goes away with a new story weekly, we would resort to RIF.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said they are not for direct instruction.

Ms. Sampson agreed, these supports are not directly for the classroom. We would look at supplies and materials before FTE. Page 232 shows highlighted G.O. Bond debt for 2025-26. We expect some uncollected funds when we levy.

Todd Redfern asked if that is delinquent property taxes.

Ms. Sampson said it was not collected in the previous year. Page 233 shows the seismic \$250,000.00 match.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said we are not buying property. Page 234 shows we have only 10% to work with after the budget is approved, unless a supplemental budget is done. A snippet of the proposed resolution to approve the budget is on page 235.

Leah Fredericks asked about MS/HS athletics. Case by case on others?

Ms. Sampson said local RV is 1000 for non athletic extracurricular and 1740 is pay to play athletics. Clubs are in an activities fund in a Special RV.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said most goes into (Associated Student Body) ASB and is spent out of there.

Ms. Sampson verified that there is a special RV within the ASB Fund.

Krystina Robison asked about actual budget goals. How will we know it is successful and be measured?

Ms. Sampson said it is like constant maintenance and cleaning, improving is a little harder. For example the seismic grant is totally dependent on what funding we get in and also things not happening elsewhere.

Dylan Rickert commented an example would be on the likelihood of the percentage of students, which should be over 50% for a determination.

Dr. Fialkiewicz added that the first goal is quantitative. The second goal is done because allocated money is more qualitative than quantitative. The third goal is quantitative retention. The fourth goal is student safety with surveys and Panorama for staff, students and community twice a year at the beginning and end of school. The fifth goal is CTE and extracurricular and their enrollment and participation.

Ms. Jeanne Swift, Asst. Superintendent/Student Services Director, stated that over 50% of the students did the survey this year from 6th grade up and staff and parents/families, one per student. There is lots of data to aggregate right now. This overall guides Social/Emotional Learning.

Amy Ciecko asked what are the noted changes in the current budget as a difference from last year through this year?

Leah Fredericks noted that there were priorities on this specific budget, so that we don't have a parallel take away, but a tougher budget.

Dylan Rickert added that this is the first year of increased enrollment and the preliminary steps to correct for future moves on growing EFB. Allowing flexibility since we're at a beginning.

Dr. Fialkiewicz mentioned that the only increase is in facilities while others are maintained, except for athletics in the decrease for CMS to go to Corbett Youth Sports (CYS) which takes a huge burden off of the District.

Ms. Sampson added that Panorama was not used for budget priorities.

Ben Byers thoughts were that this was the first time a community survey around budget priorities. He felt it was a dynamic measure of success and perception of the staff/students/parents input. We should use it next year for qualitative and get feedback.

Dylan Rickert appreciated the good thoughts from Ben and remembered that student percentage is of number one importance in his mind.

Dr. Fialkiewicz would like to see increased participation with teachers so that they can give 10-15 minutes in their classes to help increase participation.

Board discussion.

Todd Redfern and Bob Buttke asked about comparative percentages and objectives in the support of facilities.

Ms. Sampson said it resides in the 2000 function, 2540's 1-4. Last year some expenses related to the storm, but not apples to apples. Expenditures in budget and proceeds in GF, so difficult to assess.

Todd Redfern inquired that it seems overall support is higher by \$6,000.00 to \$7,000.00, but where is the comparative percentage for facilities of \$500,000.00?

Ms. Sampson reiterated the \$250,000.00 Reserve is part of the \$500,000 and wages and benefits roll in within additional projects, so the difference between the \$10.8 and \$11.3 billion state budgets make the difference.

Board/budget discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said the seismic grant changes.

Ms. Sampson said we don't need to accept the grant, and it is up to the Board to decide if they need to match it, but the last one she did had a 10% match. We look at salaries first for maintaining grants, and there are no additional maintenance folks. \$500,000 into GF Contingency and Reserve Contingency and a capital projects transfer, as well as a risk management transfer.

Board/Budget Committee discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said we have tried to hire an additional maintenance position.

Ms. Sampson added that in order not to increase salaries in the 5000 function on page 235, could move \$250,000.00 into 6000 and \$250,000.00 to 2000 Support Services.

David Granberg said the Board will decide, but safer to put in capital.

Ms. Sampson reminded that over \$500,000.00 is considered a capital project.

Board discussion.

David Osborn felt the focus should be on the future. Did the principals and staff feel they will be supported? The difficult situation is paying \$548,000.00 to MESD.

Ms. Sampson said the building conversations went into the staffing.

Board discussion.

Both Dylan Rickert and Ben Byers are hoping that the goals done in the Board's December discussion are reflected and ensure for the current budget and for the future. We are all trying to ratify perspectives and gain more clarity.

Ms. Sampson reiterated that without the \$11.3 billion budget there would not be \$250,000.00 Capital project, \$250,000.00 Contingency and \$100,000.00 Reserve. We can work on appropriations.

Dr. Fialkiewicz pointed to pages 113-114 with shifts to Maintenance. Budget Committee discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz stated we chose half Contingency to make additional EFB and half in Capital for seismic.

Board discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz maintained that we can allocate Contingency to the Capital Fund, but we run the risk of low EFB again.

Dylan Rickert surmised that when the seismic grant is approved, we have a choice in it.

Budget Committee discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz could consult with Steve Salisbury again in May if we don't get the seismic grant, for priorities like roofing, bathrooms.

Board and Budget Committee discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz sees priorities as 1. EFB (Contingency into EFB) 2. Maintenance - \$250,000.00 into Capital Fund.

Budget Committee discussion.

Dr. Fialkiewicz experienced Ms. Sampson proved to him that underestimating RV and over estimating XP puts us in a better place.

Ms. Sampson addressed that adding students will increase support services.

Unknowns like sewer back ups or ice storms would be out of Contingency. Still has to be appropriated in order to spend money, which is better suited for a supplemental budget.

Dylan Rickert would like to see risk mitigation, like a back up generator.

Ms. Sampson said that could be considered in risk management.

Leah Fredericks said that as we go through the year we can see what needs to be reallocated.

Ms. Sampson said yes, we can reappropriate within functions, without board approval if under 10%. If equal or more than 10% of Budget, the Board has to approve supplemental budget, and also if after approval, and/or after adopted too.

Board discussion.

Budget Committee discussion.

Attachments: (3)

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE DISCUSSION – under 4. Above. And discussion for better microphones and a clearer picture of last year's budget to this year ex. Cuts. Anecdote from Ben Byers, budget is just guidance from his last four years that nothing ever goes as planned. Everything changes, with guardrails.

Dr. Fialkiewicz suggested that a vote can be done tonight, then the Board can change in May-June.

Ms. Sampson concluded that we would still be appropriating the same.

Board and Budget Committee discussion.

David Osborn suggested we should adjourn as we are still having the same conversation.

Dr. Fialkiewicz said the decision with staffing would be his decision and is status quo except that may be adding one CMS teacher and .5 FTE to 1.0 FTE CHS teacher with three educational assistants to help with students.

David Osborn understood discretion, but was just trying to understand the budget document.

Benno Lyon felt there was omission in preamble on the effects of shortfall and no mention of staff taking furlough days, so felt like an oversight.

Board discussion.

Ms. Sampson suggested there is flexibility at board level if not at this committee. Motions are in the packet.

Ben Byers felt the need to compromise again given the conversation. Lots of good thoughts and will still need to make a decision, that takes time.

<https://policy.osba.org/corbett/D/DBD%20D1.PDF>

9:48 p.m.

6. AUDIENCE/PUBLIC COMMENTS – Ms. Tunie Betschart from TSCC commented from the online ZOOM platform. She could not hear much online except for the Superintendent. She will hope to hear the recording online.

<https://policy.osba.org/corbett/AB/BDDH%20D1.PDF>

6.1. Approval/Recommendations **at this meeting.**

Action Item - **not approved**

Presenter: Budget Committee

Description: Approve 2025-26 Budget and Appropriation of Funds as attached in the Budget Agenda Packet

Approve Levying Taxes as attached in the Budget Agenda Packet

<https://policy.osba.org/corbett/D/DBEA%20D1.PDF>

Attachments: (1)

7. ADJOURNMENT – David Osborn moved and Patrick Murphy seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Budget Committee and Board discussion about lots of information since the fall, commitment to budget opportunity, thanks to work of the team, and decision would feel better on another day.

The vote of the Board/Budget Committee was 12-1; Dylan Rickert opposed.

Adjournment at 10:12 p.m.

7.1. Next Meetings: Wednesday, April 16 and April 23, 2025 if necessary
Wednesday, June 18, 2025, Public Hearing on the Budget

All meetings are at 7:00 p.m. in the MPB/Board Room /Via ZOOM

Minutes budget 4925

